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ARTICLE 1 MISSION, COMMITMENTS AND CORE VALUES

Section 1.1. MISSION

(a) The mission of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers ("ICANN") is to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems as described in this Section 1.1(a) (the "Mission"). Specifically, ICANN:

(i) Coordinates the allocation and assignment of names in the root zone of the Domain Name System ("DNS") and coordinates the development and implementation of policies concerning the registration of second-level domain names in generic top-level domains ("gTLDs"). In this role, ICANN's scope is to coordinate the development and implementation of policies:

- For which uniform or coordinated resolution is reasonably necessary to facilitate the openness, interoperability, resilience, security and/or stability of the DNS including, with respect to gTLD registrars and registries, policies in the areas described in Annex G-1 and Annex G-2; and

- That are developed through a bottom-up consensus-based multistakeholder process and designed to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique names systems.

The issues, policies, procedures, and principles addressed in Annex G-1 and Annex G-2 with respect to gTLD registrars and registries shall be deemed to be within ICANN's Mission.

(ii) Facilitates the coordination of the operation and evolution of the DNS root name server system.

(iii) Coordinates the allocation and assignment at the top-most level of Internet Protocol numbers and Autonomous System numbers. In service of its Mission, ICANN (A) provides registration services and open access for global number registries as requested by the Internet Engineering Task Force ("IETF") and the Regional Internet Registries ("RIRs") and (B) facilitates the development of global number registry policies by the affected community and other related tasks as agreed.
with the RIRs.

(iv) Collaborates with other bodies as appropriate to provide registries needed for the functioning of the Internet as specified by Internet protocol standards development organizations. In service of its Mission, ICANN's scope is to provide registration services and open access for registries in the public domain requested by Internet protocol development organizations.

(b) ICANN shall not act outside its Mission.

(c) ICANN shall not regulate (i.e., impose rules and restrictions on) services that use the Internet's unique identifiers or the content that such services carry or provide, outside the express scope of Section 1.1(a). For the avoidance of doubt, ICANN does not hold any governmentally authorized regulatory authority.

(d) For the avoidance of doubt and notwithstanding the foregoing:

(i) the foregoing prohibitions are not intended to limit ICANN's authority or ability to adopt or implement policies or procedures that take into account the use of domain names as natural-language identifiers;

(ii) Notwithstanding any provision of the Bylaws to the contrary, the terms and conditions of the documents listed in subsections (A) through (C) below, and ICANN's performance of its obligations or duties thereunder, may not be challenged by any party in any proceeding against, or process involving, ICANN (including a request for reconsideration or an independent review process pursuant to Article 4) on the basis that such terms and conditions conflict with, or are in violation of, ICANN's Mission or otherwise exceed the scope of ICANN's authority or powers pursuant to these Bylaws ("Bylaws") or ICANN's Articles of Incorporation ("Articles of Incorporation"):  

(A)  

(1) all registry agreements and registrar accreditation agreements between ICANN and registry operators or registrars in force on 1 October 2016 [1], including, in each case, any terms or conditions therein that are not contained in the underlying form of registry agreement and registrar accreditation agreement;

(2) any registry agreement or registrar accreditation agreement
not encompassed by (1) above to the extent its terms do not vary materially from the form of registry agreement or registrar accreditation agreement that existed on 1 October 2016;

(B) any renewals of agreements described in subsection (A) pursuant to their terms and conditions for renewal; and

(C) ICANN's Five-Year Strategic Plan and Five-Year Operating Plan existing on 10 March 2016.

(iii) Section 1.1(d)(ii) does not limit the ability of a party to any agreement described therein to challenge any provision of such agreement on any other basis, including the other party's interpretation of the provision, in any proceeding or process involving ICANN.

(iv) ICANN shall have the ability to negotiate, enter into and enforce agreements, including public interest commitments, with any party in service of its Mission.

Section 1.2. COMMITMENTS AND CORE VALUES

In performing its Mission, ICANN will act in a manner that complies with and reflects ICANN's Commitments and respects ICANN's Core Values, each as described below.

(a) COMMITMENTS

In performing its Mission, ICANN must operate in a manner consistent with these Bylaws for the benefit of the Internet community as a whole, carrying out its activities in conformity with relevant principles of international law and international conventions and applicable local law, through open and transparent processes that enable competition and open entry in Internet-related markets. Specifically, ICANN commits to do the following (each, a "Commitment," and collectively, the "Commitments"): 

(i) Preserve and enhance the administration of the DNS and the operational stability, reliability, security, global interoperability, resilience, and openness of the DNS and the Internet;

(ii) Maintain the capacity and ability to coordinate the DNS at the overall level and work for the maintenance of a single, interoperable Internet;

(iii) Respect the creativity, innovation, and flow of information made
possible by the Internet by limiting ICANN's activities to matters that are within ICANN's Mission and require or significantly benefit from global coordination;

(iv) Employ open, transparent and bottom-up, multistakeholder policy development processes that are led by the private sector (including business stakeholders, civil society, the technical community, academia, and end users), while duly taking into account the public policy advice of governments and public authorities. These processes shall (A) seek input from the public, for whose benefit ICANN in all events shall act, (B) promote well-informed decisions based on expert advice, and (C) ensure that those entities most affected can assist in the policy development process;

(v) Make decisions by applying documented policies consistently, neutrally, objectively, and fairly, without singling out any particular party for discriminatory treatment (i.e., making an unjustified prejudicial distinction between or among different parties); and

(vi) Remain accountable to the Internet community through mechanisms defined in these Bylaws that enhance ICANN's effectiveness.

(b) CORE VALUES

In performing its Mission, the following "Core Values" should also guide the decisions and actions of ICANN:

(i) To the extent feasible and appropriate, delegating coordination functions to or recognizing the policy role of, other responsible entities that reflect the interests of affected parties and the roles of bodies internal to ICANN and relevant external expert bodies;

(ii) 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 to ensure that the bottom-up, multistakeholder policy development process is used to ascertain the global public interest and that those processes are accountable and transparent;

(iii) Where feasible and appropriate, depending on market mechanisms to promote and sustain a competitive environment in the DNS market;

(iv) Introducing and promoting competition in the registration of domain names where practicable and beneficial to the public interest as
identified through the bottom-up, multistakeholder policy development process;

(v) Operating with efficiency and excellence, in a fiscally responsible and accountable manner and, where practicable and not inconsistent with ICANN's other obligations under these Bylaws, at a speed that is responsive to the needs of the global Internet community;

(vi) While remaining rooted in the private sector (including business stakeholders, civil society, the technical community, academia, and end users), recognizing that governments and public authorities are responsible for public policy and duly taking into account the public policy advice of governments and public authorities;

(vii) Striving to achieve a reasonable balance between the interests of different stakeholders, while also avoiding capture; and

(viii) Subject to the limitations set forth in Section 27.2, within the scope of its Mission and other Core Values, respecting internationally recognized human rights as required by applicable law. This Core Value does not create, and shall not be interpreted to create, any obligation on ICANN outside its Mission, or beyond obligations found in applicable law. This Core Value does not obligate ICANN to enforce its human rights obligations, or the human rights obligations of other parties, against other parties.

(c) The Commitments and Core Values are intended to apply in the broadest possible range of circumstances. The Commitments reflect ICANN's fundamental compact with the global Internet community and are intended to apply consistently and comprehensively to ICANN's activities. The specific way in which Core Values are applied, individually and collectively, to any given situation may depend on many factors that cannot be fully anticipated or enumerated. Situations may arise in which perfect fidelity to all Core Values simultaneously is not possible. Accordingly, in any situation where one Core Value must be balanced with another, potentially competing Core Value, the result of the balancing must serve a policy developed through the bottom-up multistakeholder process or otherwise best serve ICANN's Mission.

ARTICLE 2 POWERS

Section 2.1. GENERAL POWERS

Except as otherwise provided in the Articles of Incorporation or these Bylaws, the powers of ICANN shall be exercised by, and its property controlled and its
business and affairs conducted by or under the direction of, the Board (as defined in Section 7.1). With respect to any matters that would fall within the provisions of Section 3.6(a)-(c), the Board may act only by a majority vote of all Directors. In all other matters, except as otherwise provided in these Bylaws or by law, the Board may act by majority vote of the Directors present at any annual, regular, or special meeting of the Board. Any references in these Bylaws to a vote of the Board shall mean the vote of only those Directors present at the meeting where a quorum is present unless otherwise specifically provided in these Bylaws by reference to "of all Directors."

Section 2.2. RESTRICTIONS
ICANN shall not act as a Domain Name System Registry or Registrar or Internet Protocol Address Registry in competition with entities affected by the policies of ICANN. Nothing in this Section 2.2 is intended to prevent ICANN from taking whatever steps are necessary to protect the operational stability of the Internet in the event of financial failure of a Registry or Registrar or other emergency.

Section 2.3. NON-DISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT
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.

ARTICLE 3 TRANSPARENCY

Section 3.1. OPEN AND TRANSPARENT
ICANN and its constituent bodies shall operate to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner and consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness, including implementing procedures to (a) provide advance notice to facilitate stakeholder engagement in policy development decision-making and cross-community deliberations, (b) maintain responsive consultation procedures that provide detailed explanations of the basis for decisions (including how comments have influenced the development of policy considerations), and (c) encourage fact-based policy development work. ICANN shall also implement procedures for the documentation and public disclosure of the rationale for decisions made by the Board and ICANN's constituent bodies (including the detailed explanations discussed above).

Section 3.2. WEBSITE
ICANN shall maintain a publicly-accessible Internet World Wide Web site (the "Website"), which may include, among other things, (a) a calendar of scheduled meetings of the Board, the EC (as defined in Section 6.1(a)), Supporting Organizations (as defined in Section 11.1), and Advisory Committees (as defined in Section 12.1); (b) a docket of all pending policy development matters, including their schedule and current status; (c) specific meeting notices and agendas as described below; (d) information on the ICANN Budget (as defined in Section 22.4(a)(i)), the IANA Budget (as defined in Section 22.4(b)(i)), annual audit, financial contributors and the amount of their contributions, and related matters; (e) information about the availability of accountability mechanisms, including reconsideration, independent review, and Ombudsman activities, as well as information about the outcome of specific requests and complaints invoking these mechanisms; (f) announcements about ICANN activities of interest to significant segments of the ICANN community; (g) comments received from the community on policies being developed and other matters; (h) information about ICANN's physical meetings and public forums; and (i) other information of interest to the ICANN community.

Section 3.3. MANAGER OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There shall be a staff position designated as Manager of Public Participation, or such other title as shall be determined by the President, that shall be responsible, under the direction of the President, for coordinating the various aspects of public participation in ICANN, including the Website and various other means of communicating with and receiving input from the general community of Internet users.

Section 3.4. MEETING NOTICES AND AGENDAS

At least seven days in advance of each Board meeting (or if not practicable, as far in advance as is practicable), a notice of such meeting and, to the extent known, an agenda for the meeting shall be posted.

Section 3.5. MINUTES AND PRELIMINARY REPORTS

a. All minutes of meetings of the Board, the Advisory Committees and Supporting Organizations (and any councils thereof) shall be approved promptly by the originating body and provided to the ICANN Secretary ("Secretary") for posting on the Website. All proceedings of the EC Administration (as defined in Section 6.3) and the EC shall be provided to the Secretary for posting on the Website.

b. No later than 11:59 p.m. on the second business day after the
conclusion of each meeting (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office), any resolutions passed by the Board at that meeting shall be made publicly available on the Website; provided, however, that any actions relating to personnel or employment matters, legal matters (to the extent the Board determines it is necessary or appropriate to protect the interests of ICANN), matters that ICANN is prohibited by law or contract from disclosing publicly, and other matters that the Board determines, by a three-quarters (3/4) vote of Directors present at the meeting and voting, are not appropriate for public distribution, shall not be included in the resolutions made publicly available. The Secretary shall send notice to the Board and the Chairs of the Supporting Organizations (as set forth in Article 9 through Article 11) and Advisory Committees (as set forth in Article 12) informing them that the resolutions have been posted.

c. No later than 11:59 p.m. on the seventh business days after the conclusion of each meeting (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office), any actions taken by the Board shall be made publicly available in a preliminary report on the Website, subject to the limitations on disclosure set forth in Section 3.5(b) above. For any matters that the Board determines not to disclose, the Board shall describe in general terms in the relevant preliminary report the reason for such nondisclosure.

d. No later than the day after the date on which they are formally approved by the Board (or, if such day is not a business day, as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office, then the next immediately following business day), the minutes of the Board shall be made publicly available on the Website; provided, however, that any minutes of the Board relating to personnel or employment matters, legal matters (to the extent the Board determines it is necessary or appropriate to protect the interests of ICANN), matters that ICANN is prohibited by law or contract from disclosing publicly, and other matters that the Board determines, by a three-quarters (3/4) vote of Directors present at the meeting and voting, are not appropriate for public distribution, shall not be included in the minutes made publicly available. For any matters that the Board determines not to disclose, the Board shall describe in general terms in the relevant minutes the reason for such nondisclosure.

Section 3.6. NOTICE AND COMMENT ON POLICY ACTIONS

(a) With respect to any policies that are being considered by the Board for
adoption that substantially affect the operation of the Internet or third parties, including the imposition of any fees or charges, ICANN shall:

(i) provide public notice on the Website explaining what policies are being considered for adoption and why, at least twenty-one days (and if practical, earlier) prior to any action by the Board;

(ii) provide a reasonable opportunity for parties to comment on the adoption of the proposed policies, to see the comments of others, and to reply to those comments (such comment period to be aligned with ICANN's public comment practices), prior to any action by the Board; and

(iii) in those cases where the policy action affects public policy concerns, to request the opinion of the Governmental Advisory Committee ("GAC" or "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.

(b) Where both practically feasible and consistent with the relevant policy development process, an in-person public forum shall also be held for discussion of any proposed policies as described in Section 3.6(a)(ii), prior to any final Board action.

(c) After taking action on any policy subject to this Section 3.6, the Board shall publish in the meeting minutes the rationale for any resolution adopted by the Board (including the possible material effects, if any, of its decision on the global public interest, including a discussion of the material impacts to the security, stability and resiliency of the DNS, financial impacts or other issues that were considered by the Board in approving such resolutions), the vote of each Director voting on the resolution, and the separate statement of any Director desiring publication of such a statement.

(d) Where a Board resolution is consistent with GAC Consensus Advice (as defined in Section 12.2(a)(xi)), the Board shall make a determination whether the GAC Consensus Advice was a material factor in the Board's adoption of such resolution, in which case the Board shall so indicate in such resolution approving the decision (a "GAC Consensus Board Resolution") and shall cite the applicable GAC Consensus Advice. To the extent practical, the Board shall ensure that GAC Consensus Board Resolutions only relate to the matters that were the subject of the applicable GAC Consensus Advice and not matters unrelated to the applicable GAC Consensus Advice. For the avoidance of doubt: (i) a GAC Consensus Board Resolution shall not have the effect of making any other Board resolutions in the same set or series so
designated, unless other resolutions are specifically identified as such by the Board; and (ii) a Board resolution approving an action consistent with GAC Consensus Advice received during a standard engagement process in which input from all Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees has been requested shall not be considered a GAC Consensus Board Resolution based solely on that input, unless the GAC Consensus Advice was a material factor in the Board's adoption of such resolution.

(e) GAC Carve-out

(i) Where a Board resolution is consistent with GAC Consensus Advice and the Board has determined that the GAC Consensus Advice was a material factor in the Board's adoption of such resolution as described in the relevant GAC Consensus Board Resolution, the Governmental Advisory Committee shall not participate as a decision-maker in the EC's exercise of its right to challenge the Board's implementation of such GAC Consensus Advice. In such cases, the Governmental Advisory Committee may participate in the EC in an advisory capacity only with respect to the applicable processes described in Annex D, but its views will not count as support or an objection for purposes of the thresholds needed to convene a community forum or exercise any right of the EC ("GAC Carve-out"). In the case of a Board Recall Process (as defined in Section 3.3 of Annex D), the GAC Carve-out shall only apply if an IRP Panel has found that, in implementing GAC Consensus Advice, the Board acted inconsistently with the Articles of Incorporation or these Bylaws.

(ii) When the GAC Carve-out applies (A) any petition notice provided in accordance with Annex D or Approval Action Board Notice (as defined in Section 1.2 of Annex D) shall include a statement that cites the specific GAC Consensus Board Resolution and the line item or provision that implements such specific GAC Consensus Board Resolution ("GAC Consensus Statement"), (B) the Governmental Advisory Committee shall not be eligible to support or object to any petition pursuant to Annex D or Approval Action (as defined in Section 1.1 of Annex D), and (C) any EC Decision (as defined in Section 4.1(a) of Annex D) that requires the support of four or more Decisional Participants (as defined in Section 6.1(a)) pursuant to Annex D shall instead require the support of three or more Decisional Participants with no more than one Decisional Participant objecting.

(iii) For the avoidance of doubt, the GAC Carve-out shall not apply to the exercise of the EC's rights where a material factor in the Board's decision was advice of the Governmental Advisory Committee that was
Section 3.7. TRANSLATION OF DOCUMENTS
As appropriate and to the extent provided in the ICANN Budget, ICANN shall facilitate the translation of final published documents into various appropriate languages.

ARTICLE 4 ACCOUNTABILITY AND REVIEW

Section 4.1. PURPOSE
In carrying out its Mission, ICANN shall be accountable to the community for operating in accordance with the Articles of Incorporation and these Bylaws, including the Mission set forth in Article 1 of these Bylaws. This Article 4 creates reconsideration and independent review processes for certain actions as set forth in these Bylaws and procedures for periodic review of ICANN’s structure and operations, which are intended to reinforce the various accountability mechanisms otherwise set forth in these Bylaws, including the transparency provisions of Article 3 and the Board and other selection mechanisms set forth throughout these Bylaws.

Section 4.2. RECONSIDERATION
(a) ICANN shall have in place a process by which any person or entity materially affected by an action or inaction of the ICANN Board or Staff may request ("Requestor") the review or reconsideration of that action or inaction by the Board. For purposes of these Bylaws, "Staff" includes employees and individual long-term paid contractors serving in locations where ICANN does not have the mechanisms to employ such contractors directly.

(b) The EC may file a Reconsideration Request (as defined in Section 4.2(c)) if approved pursuant to Section 4.3 of Annex D ("Community Reconsideration Request") and if the matter relates to the exercise of the powers and rights of the EC of these Bylaws. The EC Administration shall act as the Requestor for such a Community Reconsideration Request and shall act on behalf of the EC for such Community Reconsideration Request as directed by the Decisional Participants, as further described in Section 4.3 of Annex D.

(c) A Requestor may submit a request for reconsideration or review of an ICANN action or inaction ("Reconsideration Request") to the extent that the Requestor has been adversely affected by:
(i) One or more Board or Staff actions or inactions that contradict ICANN's Mission, Commitments, Core Values and/or established ICANN policy(ies);

(ii) One or more actions or inactions of the Board or Staff that have been taken or refused to be taken without consideration of material information, except where the Requestor could have submitted, but did not submit, the information for the Board's or Staff's consideration at the time of action or refusal to act; or

(iii) One or more actions or inactions of the Board or Staff that are taken as a result of the Board's or staff's reliance on false or inaccurate relevant information.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision in this Section 4.2, the scope of reconsideration shall exclude the following:

(i) Disputes relating to country code top-level domain ("ccTLD") delegations and re-delegations;

(ii) Disputes relating to Internet numbering resources; and

(iii) Disputes relating to protocol parameters.

(e) The Board has designated the Board Governance Committee to review and consider Reconsideration Requests. The Board Governance Committee shall have the authority to:

(i) Evaluate Reconsideration Requests;

(ii) Summarily dismiss insufficient or frivolous Reconsideration Requests;

(iii) Evaluate Reconsideration Requests for urgent consideration;

(iv) Conduct whatever factual investigation is deemed appropriate;

(v) Request additional written submissions from the affected party, or from other parties; and

(vi) Make a recommendation to the Board on the merits of the Reconsideration Request, if it has not been summarily dismissed.
(f) ICANN shall absorb the normal administrative costs of the Reconsideration Request process. Except with respect to a Community Reconsideration Request, ICANN reserves the right to recover from a party requesting review or reconsideration any costs that are deemed to be extraordinary in nature. When such extraordinary costs can be foreseen, that fact and the reasons why such costs are necessary and appropriate to evaluating the Reconsideration Request shall be communicated to the Requestor, who shall then have the option of withdrawing the request or agreeing to bear such costs.

(g) All Reconsideration Requests must be submitted by the Requestor to an email address designated by the Board Governance Committee:

(i) For Reconsideration Requests that are not Community Reconsideration Requests, such Reconsideration Requests must be submitted:

(A) for requests challenging Board actions, within 30 days after the date on which information about the challenged Board action is first published in a resolution, unless the posting of the resolution is not accompanied by a rationale. In that instance, the request must be submitted within 30 days from the initial posting of the rationale;

(B) for requests challenging Staff actions, within 30 days after the date on which the Requestor became aware of, or reasonably should have become aware of, the challenged Staff action; or

(C) for requests challenging either Board or Staff inaction, within 30 days after the date on which the Requestor reasonably concluded, or reasonably should have concluded, that action would not be taken in a timely manner.

(ii) For Community Reconsideration Requests, such Community Reconsideration Requests must be submitted in accordance with the timeframe set forth in Section 4.3 of Annex D.

(h) To properly initiate a Reconsideration Request, all Requestors must review, complete and follow the Reconsideration Request form posted on the Website at https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/accountability/reconsideration-en. Requestors must also acknowledge and agree to the terms and conditions set forth in the form when filing.

(i) Requestors shall not provide more than 25 pages (double-spaced, 12-point font) of argument in support of a Reconsideration Request, not including
exhibits. Requestors may submit all documentary evidence necessary to demonstrate why the action or inaction should be reconsidered, without limitation.

(j) Reconsideration Requests from different Requestors may be considered in the same proceeding so long as: (i) the requests involve the same general action or inaction; and (ii) the Requestors are similarly affected by such action or inaction. In addition, consolidated filings may be appropriate if the alleged causal connection and the resulting harm is substantially the same for all of the Requestors. Every Requestor must be able to demonstrate that it has been materially harmed and adversely impacted by the action or inaction giving rise to the request.

(k) The Board Governance Committee shall review each Reconsideration Request upon its receipt to determine if it is sufficiently stated. The Board Governance Committee may summarily dismiss a Reconsideration Request if: (i) the Requestor fails to meet the requirements for bringing a Reconsideration Request; or (ii) it is frivolous. The Board Governance Committee's summary dismissal of a Reconsideration Request shall be documented and promptly posted on the Website.

(l) For all Reconsideration Requests that are not summarily dismissed, except Reconsideration Requests described in Section 4.2(l)(iii) and Community Reconsideration Requests, the Reconsideration Request shall be sent to the Ombudsman, who shall promptly proceed to review and consider the Reconsideration Request.

(i) The Ombudsman shall be entitled to seek any outside expert assistance as the Ombudsman deems reasonably necessary to perform this task to the extent it is within the budget allocated to this task.

(ii) The Ombudsman shall submit to the Board Governance Committee his or her substantive evaluation of the Reconsideration Request within 15 days of the Ombudsman's receipt of the Reconsideration Request. The Board Governance Committee shall thereafter promptly proceed to review and consideration.

(iii) For those Reconsideration Requests involving matters for which the Ombudsman has, in advance of the filing of the Reconsideration Request, taken a position while performing his or her role as the Ombudsman pursuant to Article 5 of these Bylaws, or involving the Ombudsman's conduct in some way, the Ombudsman shall recuse himself or herself and the Board Governance Committee shall review the Reconsideration Request without involvement by the Ombudsman.
(m) The Board Governance Committee may ask ICANN Staff for its views on a Reconsideration Request, which comments shall be made publicly available on the Website.

(n) The Board Governance Committee may request additional information or clarifications from the Requestor, and may elect to conduct a meeting with the Requestor by telephone, email or, if acceptable to the Requestor, in person. A Requestor may also ask for an opportunity to be heard. The Board Governance Committee’s decision on any such request is final. To the extent any information gathered in such a meeting is relevant to any recommendation by the Board Governance Committee, it shall so state in its recommendation.

(o) The Board Governance Committee may also request information relevant to the Reconsideration Request from third parties. To the extent any information gathered is relevant to any recommendation by the Board Governance Committee, it shall so state in its recommendation. Any information collected by ICANN from third parties shall be provided to the Requestor.

(p) The Board Governance Committee shall act on a Reconsideration Request on the basis of the public written record, including information submitted by the Requestor, by the ICANN Staff, and by any third party.

(q) The Board Governance Committee shall make a final recommendation to the Board with respect to a Reconsideration Request within 30 days following its receipt of the Ombudsman’s evaluation (or 30 days following receipt of the Reconsideration Request involving those matters for which the Ombudsman recuses himself or herself or the receipt of the Community Reconsideration Request, if applicable), unless impractical, in which case it shall report to the Board the circumstances that prevented it from making a final recommendation and its best estimate of the time required to produce such a final recommendation. In any event, the Board Governance Committee shall endeavor to produce its final recommendation to the Board within 90 days of receipt of the Reconsideration Request. The final recommendation of the Board Governance Committee shall be documented and promptly (i.e., as soon as practicable) posted on the Website and shall address each of the arguments raised in the Reconsideration Request. The Requestor may file a 10-page (double-spaced, 12-point font) document, not including exhibits, in rebuttal to the Board Governance Committee’s recommendation within 15 days of receipt of the recommendation, which shall also be promptly (i.e., as soon as practicable) posted to the Website and provided to the Board for its evaluation; provided, that such rebuttal shall: (i) be limited to rebutting or contradicting the issues raised in the Board Governance Committee’s final
recommendation; and (ii) not offer new evidence to support an argument made in the Requestor's original Reconsideration Request that the Requestor could have provided when the Requestor initially submitted the Reconsideration Request.

(r) The Board shall not be bound to follow the recommendations of the Board Governance Committee. The final decision of the Board and its rationale shall be made public as part of the preliminary report and minutes of the Board meeting at which action is taken. The Board shall issue its decision on the recommendation of the Board Governance Committee within 45 days of receipt of the Board Governance Committee's recommendation or as soon thereafter as feasible. Any circumstances that delay the Board from acting within this timeframe must be identified and posted on the Website. In any event, the Board's final decision shall be made within 135 days of initial receipt of the Reconsideration Request by the Board Governance Committee. The Board's decision on the recommendation shall be posted on the Website in accordance with the Board's posting obligations as set forth in Article 3 of these Bylaws. If the Requestor so requests, the Board shall post both a recording and a transcript of the substantive Board discussion from the meeting at which the Board considered the Board Governance Committee's recommendation. All briefing materials supplied to the Board shall be provided to the Requestor. The Board may redact such briefing materials and the recording and transcript on the basis that such information (i) relates to confidential personnel matters, (ii) is covered by attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine or other recognized legal privilege, (iii) is subject to a legal obligation that ICANN maintain its confidentiality, (iv) would disclose trade secrets, or (v) would present a material risk of negative impact to the security, stability or resiliency of the Internet. In the case of any redaction, ICANN will provide the Requestor a written rationale for such redaction. If a Requestor believes that a redaction was improper, the Requestor may use an appropriate accountability mechanism to challenge the scope of ICANN's redaction.

(s) If the Requestor believes that the Board action or inaction for which a Reconsideration Request is submitted is so urgent that the timing requirements of the process set forth in this Section 4.2 are too long, the Requestor may apply to the Board Governance Committee for urgent consideration. Any request for urgent consideration must be made within two business days (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) of the posting of the resolution at issue. A request for urgent consideration must include a discussion of why the matter is urgent for reconsideration and must demonstrate a likelihood of success with the Reconsideration Request.

(t) The Board Governance Committee shall respond to the request for urgent
consideration within two business days after receipt of such request. If the Board Governance Committee agrees to consider the matter with urgency, it will cause notice to be provided to the Requestor, who will have two business days after notification to complete the Reconsideration Request. The Board Governance Committee shall issue a recommendation on the urgent Reconsideration Request within seven days of the completion of the filing of the Reconsideration Request, or as soon thereafter as feasible. If the Board Governance Committee does not agree to consider the matter with urgency, the Requestor may still file a Reconsideration Request within the regular time frame set forth within these Bylaws.

(u) The Board Governance Committee shall submit a report to the Board on an annual basis containing at least the following information for the preceding calendar year:

(i) the number and general nature of Reconsideration Requests received, including an identification if the Reconsideration Requests were acted upon, summarily dismissed, or remain pending;

(ii) for any Reconsideration Requests that remained pending at the end of the calendar year, the average length of time for which such Reconsideration Requests have been pending, and a description of the reasons for any Reconsideration Request pending for more than ninety (90) days;

(iii) an explanation of any other mechanisms available to ensure that ICANN is accountable to persons materially affected by its decisions; and

(iv) whether or not, in the Board Governance Committee's view, the criteria for which reconsideration may be requested should be revised, or another process should be adopted or modified, to ensure that all persons materially affected by ICANN decisions have meaningful access to a review process that ensures fairness while limiting frivolous claims.

Section 4.3. INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESS FOR COVERED ACTIONS

(a) In addition to the reconsideration process described in Section 4.2, ICANN shall have a separate process for independent third-party review of Disputes (defined in Section 4.3(b)(iii)) alleged by a Claimant (as defined in Section 4.3(b)(i)) to be within the scope of the Independent Review Process ("IRP").
The IRP is intended to hear and resolve Disputes for the following purposes ("Purposes of the IRP"):

(i) Ensure that ICANN does not exceed the scope of its Mission and otherwise complies with its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws.

(ii) Empower the global Internet community and Claimants to enforce compliance with the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws through meaningful, affordable and accessible expert review of Covered Actions (as defined in Section 4.3(b)(i)).

(iii) Ensure that ICANN is accountable to the global Internet community and Claimants.

(iv) Address claims that ICANN has failed to enforce its rights under the IANA Naming Function Contract (as defined in Section 16.3(a)).

(v) Provide a mechanism by which direct customers of the IANA naming functions may seek resolution of PTI (as defined in Section 16.1) service complaints that are not resolved through mediation.

(vi) Reduce Disputes by creating precedent to guide and inform the Board, Officers (as defined in Section 15.1), Staff members, Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees, and the global Internet community in connection with policy development and implementation.

(vii) Secure the accessible, transparent, efficient, consistent, coherent, and just resolution of Disputes.

(viii) Lead to binding, final resolutions consistent with international arbitration norms that are enforceable in any court with proper jurisdiction.

(ix) Provide a mechanism for the resolution of Disputes, as an alternative to legal action in the civil courts of the United States or other jurisdictions.

This Section 4.3 shall be construed, implemented, and administered in a manner consistent with these Purposes of the IRP.

(b) The scope of the IRP is defined with reference to the following terms:

(i) A "Claimant" is any legal or natural person, group, or entity including, but not limited to the EC, a Supporting Organization, or an Advisory
Committee that has been materially affected by a Dispute. To be materially affected by a Dispute, the Claimant must suffer an injury or harm that is directly and causally connected to the alleged violation.

(A) The EC is deemed to be materially affected by all Covered Actions. ICANN shall not assert any defenses of standing or capacity against the EC in any forum.

(B) ICANN shall not object to the standing of the EC, a Supporting Organization, or an Advisory Committee to participate in an IRP, to compel an IRP, or to enforce an IRP decision on the basis that it is not a legal person with capacity to sue. No special pleading of a Claimant's capacity or of the legal existence of a person that is a Claimant shall be required in the IRP proceedings. No Claimant shall be allowed to proceed if the IRP Panel (as defined in Section 4.3(g)) concludes based on evidence submitted to it that the Claimant does not fairly or adequately represent the interests of those on whose behalf the Claimant purports to act.

(ii) "Covered Actions" are defined as any actions or failures to act by or within ICANN committed by the Board, individual Directors, Officers, or Staff members that give rise to a Dispute.

(iii) "Disputes" are defined as:

(A) Claims that Covered Actions constituted an action or inaction that violated the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws, including but not limited to any action or inaction that:

1. exceeded the scope of the Mission;

2. resulted from action taken in response to advice or input from any Advisory Committee or Supporting Organization that are claimed to be inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws;

3. resulted from decisions of process-specific expert panels that are claimed to be inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws;

4. resulted from a response to a DIDP (as defined in Section 22.7(d)) request that is claimed to be inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws; or

5. arose from claims involving rights of the EC as set forth in the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws.
(B) Claims that ICANN, the Board, individual Directors, Officers or Staff members have not enforced ICANN’s contractual rights with respect to the IANA Naming Function Contract, and

(C) Claims regarding PTI service complaints by direct customers of the IANA naming functions that are not resolved through mediation.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision in this Section 4.3, the IRP’s scope shall exclude all of the following:

(i) EC challenges to the result(s) of a PDP, unless the Supporting Organization(s) that approved the PDP supports the EC bringing such a challenge;

(ii) Claims relating to ccTLD delegations and re-delegations;

(iii) Claims relating to Internet numbering resources, and

(iv) Claims relating to protocol parameters.

(d) An IRP shall commence with the Claimant's filing of a written statement of a Dispute (a "Claim") with the IRP Provider (described in Section 4.3(m) below). For the EC to commence an IRP ("Community IRP"), the EC shall first comply with the procedures set forth in Section 4.2 of Annex D.

(e) Cooperative Engagement Process

(i) Except for Claims brought by the EC in accordance with this Section 4.3 and Section 4.2 of Annex D, prior to the filing of a Claim, the parties are strongly encouraged to participate in a non-binding Cooperative Engagement Process ("CEP") for the purpose of attempting to resolve and/or narrow the Dispute. CEPs shall be conducted pursuant to the CEP Rules to be developed with community involvement, adopted by the Board, and as amended from time to time.

(ii) The CEP is voluntary. However, except for Claims brought by the EC in accordance with this Section 4.3 and Section 4.2 of Annex D, if the Claimant does not participate in good faith in the CEP and ICANN is the prevailing party in the IRP, the IRP Panel shall award to ICANN all reasonable fees and costs incurred by ICANN in the IRP, including legal fees.

(iii) Either party may terminate the CEP efforts if that party: (A)
concludes in good faith that further efforts are unlikely to produce agreement; or (B) requests the inclusion of an independent dispute resolution facilitator ("IRP Mediator") after at least one CEP meeting.

(iv) Unless all parties agree on the selection of a particular IRP Mediator, any IRP Mediator appointed shall be selected from the members of the Standing Panel (described in Section 4.3(j) below) by its Chair, but such IRP Mediator shall not thereafter be eligible to serve as a panelist presiding over an IRP on the matter.

(f) ICANN hereby waives any defenses that may be afforded under Section 5141 of the California Corporations Code ("CCC") against any Claimant, and shall not object to the standing of any such Claimant to participate in or to compel an IRP, or to enforce an IRP decision on the basis that such Claimant may not otherwise be able to assert that a Covered Action is ultra vires.

(g) Upon the filing of a Claim, an Independent Review Process Panel ("IRP Panel", described in Section 4.3(k) below) shall be selected in accordance with the Rules of Procedure (as defined in Section 4.3(n)(i)). Following the selection of an IRP Panel, that IRP Panel shall be charged with hearing and resolving the Dispute, considering the Claim and ICANN’s written response ("Response") in compliance with the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, as understood in the context of the norms of applicable law and prior relevant IRP decisions. If no Response is timely filed by ICANN, the IRP Panel may accept the Claim as unopposed and proceed to evaluate and decide the Claim pursuant to the procedures set forth in these Bylaws.

(h) After a Claim is referred to an IRP Panel, the parties are urged to participate in conciliation discussions for the purpose of attempting to narrow the issues that are to be addressed by the IRP Panel.

(i) Each IRP Panel shall conduct an objective, de novo examination of the Dispute.

(i) With respect to Covered Actions, the IRP Panel shall make findings of fact to determine whether the Covered Action constituted an action or inaction that violated the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws.

(ii) All Disputes shall be decided in compliance with the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, as understood in the context of the norms of applicable law and prior relevant IRP decisions.
(iii) For Claims arising out of the Board's exercise of its fiduciary duties, the IRP Panel shall not replace the Board's reasonable judgment with its own so long as the Board's action or inaction is within the realm of reasonable business judgment.

(iv) With respect to claims that ICANN has not enforced its contractual rights with respect to the IANA Naming Function Contract, the standard of review shall be whether there was a material breach of ICANN's obligations under the IANA Naming Function Contract, where the alleged breach has resulted in material harm to the Claimant.

(v) For avoidance of doubt, IRPs initiated through the mechanism contemplated at Section 4.3(a)(iv) above, shall be subject to a separate standard of review as defined in the IANA Naming Function Contract.

(j) Standing Panel

(i) There shall be an omnibus standing panel of at least seven members (the "Standing Panel") each of whom shall possess significant relevant legal expertise in one or more of the following areas: international law, corporate governance, judicial systems, alternative dispute resolution and/or arbitration. Each member of the Standing Panel shall also have knowledge, developed over time, regarding the DNS and ICANN's Mission, work, policies, practices, and procedures. Members of the Standing Panel shall receive at a minimum, training provided by ICANN on the workings and management of the Internet's unique identifiers and other appropriate training as recommended by the IRP Implementation Oversight Team (described in Section 4.3(n)(i)).

(ii) ICANN shall, in consultation with the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, initiate a four-step process to establish the Standing Panel to ensure the availability of a number of IRP panelists that is sufficient to allow for the timely resolution of Disputes consistent with the Purposes of the IRP.

(A) ICANN, in consultation with the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, shall initiate a tender process for an organization to provide administrative support for the IRP Provider (as defined in Section 4.3(m)), beginning by consulting the "IRP Implementation Oversight Team" (described in Section 4.3(n)(i)) on a draft tender document.

(B) ICANN shall issue a call for expressions of interest from potential panelists, and work with the Supporting Organizations and Advisory...
Committees and the Board to identify and solicit applications from well-qualified candidates, and to conduct an initial review and vetting of applications.

(C) The Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees shall nominate a slate of proposed panel members from the well-qualified candidates identified per the process set forth in Section 4.3(i)(ii)(B).

(D) Final selection shall be subject to Board confirmation, which shall not be unreasonably withheld.

(iii) Appointments to the Standing Panel shall be made for a fixed term of five years with no removal except for specified cause in the nature of corruption, misuse of position, fraud or criminal activity. The recall process shall be developed by the IRP Implementation Oversight Team.

(iv) Reasonable efforts shall be taken to achieve cultural, linguistic, gender, and legal tradition diversity, and diversity by Geographic Region (as defined in Section 7.5).

(k) IRP Panel

(i) A three-member IRP Panel shall be selected from the Standing Panel to hear a specific Dispute.

(ii) The Claimant and ICANN shall each select one panelist from the Standing Panel, and the two panelists selected by the parties will select the third panelist from the Standing Panel. In the event that a Standing Panel is not in place when an IRP Panel must be convened for a given proceeding or is in place but does not have capacity due to other IRP commitments or the requisite diversity of skill and experience needed for a particular IRP proceeding, the Claimant and ICANN shall each select a qualified panelist from outside the Standing Panel and the two panelists selected by the parties shall select the third panelist. In the event that no Standing Panel is in place when an IRP Panel must be convened and the two party-selected panelists cannot agree on the third panelist, the IRP Provider’s rules shall apply to selection of the third panelist.

(iii) Assignment from the Standing Panel to IRP Panels shall take into consideration the Standing Panel members’ individual experience and expertise in issues related to highly technical, civil society, business, diplomatic, and regulatory skills as needed by each specific proceeding, and such requests from the parties for any particular expertise.
(iv) Upon request of an IRP Panel, the IRP Panel shall have access to independent skilled technical experts at the expense of ICANN, although all substantive interactions between the IRP Panel and such experts shall be conducted on the record, except when public disclosure could materially and unduly harm participants, such as by exposing trade secrets or violating rights of personal privacy.

(v) IRP Panel decisions shall be made by a simple majority of the IRP Panel.

(l) All IRP proceedings shall be administered in English as the primary working language, with provision of translation services for Claimants if needed.

(m) IRP Provider

(i) All IRP proceedings shall be administered by a well-respected international dispute resolution provider ("IRP Provider"). The IRP Provider shall receive and distribute IRP Claims, Responses, and all other submissions arising from an IRP at the direction of the IRP Panel, and shall function independently from ICANN.

(n) Rules of Procedure

(i) An IRP Implementation Oversight Team shall be established in consultation with the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees and comprised of members of the global Internet community. The IRP Implementation Oversight Team, and once the Standing Panel is established the IRP Implementation Oversight Team in consultation with the Standing Panel, shall develop clear published rules for the IRP ("Rules of Procedure") that conform with international arbitration norms and are streamlined, easy to understand and apply fairly to all parties. Upon request, the IRP Implementation Oversight Team shall have assistance of counsel and other appropriate experts.

(ii) The Rules of Procedure shall be informed by international arbitration norms and consistent with the Purposes of the IRP. Specialized Rules of Procedure may be designed for reviews of PTI service complaints that are asserted by direct customers of the IANA naming functions and are not resolved through mediation. The Rules of Procedure shall be published and subject to a period of public comment that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN, and take effect upon approval by the Board, such approval not to be unreasonably withheld.
(iii) The Standing Panel may recommend amendments to such Rules of Procedure as it deems appropriate to fulfill the Purposes of the IRP, however no such amendment shall be effective without approval by the Board after publication and a period of public comment that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN.

(iv) The Rules of Procedure are intended to ensure fundamental fairness and due process and shall at a minimum address the following elements:

(A) The time within which a Claim must be filed after a Claimant becomes aware or reasonably should have become aware of the action or inaction giving rise to the Dispute;

(B) Issues relating to joinder, intervention, and consolidation of Claims;

(C) Rules governing written submissions, including the required elements of a Claim, other requirements or limits on content, time for filing, length of statements, number of supplemental statements, if any, permitted evidentiary support (factual and expert), including its length, both in support of a Claimant's Claim and in support of ICANN's Response;

(D) Availability and limitations on discovery methods;

(E) Whether hearings shall be permitted, and if so what form and structure such hearings would take;

(F) Procedures if ICANN elects not to respond to an IRP; and

(G) The standards and rules governing appeals from IRP Panel decisions, including which IRP Panel decisions may be appealed.

(o) Subject to the requirements of this Section 4.3, each IRP Panel shall have the authority to:

(i) Summarily dismiss Disputes that are brought without standing, lack substance, or are frivolous or vexatious;

(ii) Request additional written submissions from the Claimant or from other parties;

(iii) Declare whether a Covered Action constituted an action or inaction that violated the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws, declare whether
ICANN failed to enforce ICANN’s contractual rights with respect to the IANA Naming Function Contract or resolve PTI service complaints by direct customers of the IANA naming functions, as applicable;

(iv) Recommend that ICANN stay any action or decision, or take necessary interim action, until such time as the opinion of the IRP Panel is considered;

(v) Consolidate Disputes if the facts and circumstances are sufficiently similar, and take such other actions as are necessary for the efficient resolution of Disputes;

(vi) Determine the timing for each IRP proceeding; and

(vii) Determine the shifting of IRP costs and expenses consistent with Section 4.3(r).

(p) A Claimant may request interim relief. Interim relief may include prospective relief, interlocutory relief, or declaratory or injunctive relief, and specifically may include a stay of the challenged ICANN action or decision until such time as the opinion of the IRP Panel is considered as described in Section 4.3(o)(iv), in order to maintain the status quo. A single member of the Standing Panel ("Emergency Panelist") shall be selected to adjudicate requests for interim relief. In the event that no Standing Panel is in place when an Emergency Panelist must be selected, the IRP Provider's rules shall apply to the selection of the Emergency Panelist. Interim relief may only be provided if the Emergency Panelist determines that the Claimant has established all of the following factors:

(i) A harm for which there will be no adequate remedy in the absence of such relief;

(ii) Either: (A) likelihood of success on the merits; or (B) sufficiently serious questions related to the merits; and

(iii) A balance of hardships tipping decidedly toward the party seeking relief.

(q) Conflicts of Interest

(i) Standing Panel members must be independent of ICANN and its Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, and so must adhere to the following criteria:
(A) Upon consideration for the Standing Panel and on an ongoing basis, Panelists shall have an affirmative obligation to disclose any material relationship with ICANN, a Supporting Organization, an Advisory Committee, or any other participant in an IRP proceeding.

(B) Additional independence requirements to be developed by the IRP Implementation Oversight Team, including term limits and restrictions on post-term appointment to other ICANN positions.

(ii) The IRP Provider shall disclose any material relationship with ICANN, a Supporting Organization, an Advisory Committee, or any other participant in an IRP proceeding.

(r) ICANN shall bear all the administrative costs of maintaining the IRP mechanism, including compensation of Standing Panel members. Except as otherwise provided in Section 4.3(e)(ii), each party to an IRP proceeding shall bear its own legal expenses, except that ICANN shall bear all costs associated with a Community IRP, including the costs of all legal counsel and technical experts. Nevertheless, except with respect to a Community IRP, the IRP Panel may shift and provide for the losing party to pay administrative costs and/or fees of the prevailing party in the event it identifies the losing party’s Claim or defense as frivolous or abusive.

(s) An IRP Panel should complete an IRP proceeding expeditiously, issuing an early scheduling order and its written decision no later than six months after the filing of the Claim, except as otherwise permitted under the Rules of Procedure. The preceding sentence does not provide the basis for a Covered Action.

(t) Each IRP Panel shall make its decision based solely on the documentation, supporting materials, and arguments submitted by the parties, and in its decision shall specifically designate the prevailing party as to each part of a Claim.

(u) All IRP Panel proceedings shall be conducted on the record, and documents filed in connection with IRP Panel proceedings shall be posted on the Website, except for settlement negotiation or other proceedings that could materially and unduly harm participants if conducted publically. The Rules of Procedure, and all Claims, petitions, and decisions shall promptly be posted on the Website when they become available. Each IRP Panel may, in its discretion, grant a party’s request to keep certain information confidential, such as trade secrets, but only if such confidentiality does not materially interfere with the transparency of the IRP proceeding.
(v) Subject to this Section 4.3, all IRP decisions shall be written and made public, and shall reflect a well-reasoned application of how the Dispute was resolved in compliance with the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, as understood in light of prior IRP decisions decided under the same (or an equivalent prior) version of the provision of the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws at issue, and norms of applicable law.

(w) Subject to any limitations established through the Rules of Procedure, an IRP Panel decision may be appealed to the full Standing Panel sitting en banc within sixty (60) days of issuance of such decision.

(x) The IRP is intended as a final, binding arbitration process.

(i) IRP Panel decisions are binding final decisions to the extent allowed by law unless timely and properly appealed to the en banc Standing Panel. En banc Standing Panel decisions are binding final decisions to the extent allowed by law.

(ii) IRP Panel decisions and decisions of an en banc Standing Panel upon an appeal are intended to be enforceable in any court with jurisdiction over ICANN without a de novo review of the decision of the IRP Panel or en banc Standing Panel, as applicable, with respect to factual findings or conclusions of law.

(iii) ICANN intends, agrees, and consents to be bound by all IRP Panel decisions of Disputes of Covered Actions as a final, binding arbitration.

(A) Where feasible, the Board shall consider its response to IRP Panel decisions at the Board's next meeting, and shall affirm or reject compliance with the decision on the public record based on an expressed rationale. The decision of the IRP Panel, or en banc Standing Panel, shall be final regardless of such Board action, to the fullest extent allowed by law.

(B) If an IRP Panel decision in a Community IRP is in favor of the EC, the Board shall comply within 30 days of such IRP Panel decision.

(C) If the Board rejects an IRP Panel decision without undertaking an appeal to the en banc Standing Panel or rejects an en banc Standing Panel decision upon appeal, the Claimant or the EC may seek enforcement in a court of competent jurisdiction. In the case of the EC, the EC Administration may convene as soon as possible following such rejection and consider whether to authorize commencement of such an action.
(iv) By submitting a Claim to the IRP Panel, a Claimant thereby agrees that the IRP decision is intended to be a final, binding arbitration decision with respect to such Claimant. Any Claimant that does not consent to the IRP being a final, binding arbitration may initiate a non-binding IRP if ICANN agrees; provided that such a non-binding IRP decision is not intended to be and shall not be enforceable.

(y) ICANN shall seek to establish means by which community, non-profit Claimants and other Claimants that would otherwise be excluded from utilizing the IRP process may meaningfully participate in and have access to the IRP process.

Section 4.4. PERIODIC REVIEW OF ICANN STRUCTURE AND OPERATIONS

(a) The Board shall cause a periodic review of the performance and operation of each Supporting Organization, each Supporting Organization Council, each Advisory Committee (other than the Governmental Advisory Committee), and the Nominating Committee (as defined in Section 8.1) by an entity or entities independent of the organization under review. The goal of the review, to be undertaken pursuant to such criteria and standards as the Board shall direct, shall be to determine (i) whether that organization, council or committee has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure, (ii) if so, whether any change in structure or operations is desirable to improve its effectiveness and (iii) whether that organization, council or committee is accountable to its constituencies, stakeholder groups, organizations and other stakeholders.

These periodic reviews shall be conducted no less frequently than every five years, based on feasibility as determined by the Board. Each five-year cycle will be computed from the moment of the reception by the Board of the final report of the relevant review Working Group.

The results of such reviews shall be posted on the Website for public review and comment, and shall be considered by the Board no later than the second scheduled meeting of the Board after such results have been posted for 30 days. The consideration by the Board includes the ability to revise the structure or operation of the parts of ICANN being reviewed by a two-thirds vote of all Directors, subject to any rights of the EC under the Articles of Incorporation and these Bylaws.

(b) The Governmental Advisory Committee shall provide its own review mechanisms.
Section 4.5. ANNUAL REVIEW

ICANN will produce an annual report on the state of the accountability and transparency reviews, which will discuss the status of the implementation of all review processes required by Section 4.6 and the status of ICANN's implementation of the recommendations set forth in the final reports issued by the review teams to the Board following the conclusion of such review ("Annual Review Implementation Report"). The Annual Review Implementation Report will be posted on the Website for public review and comment. Each Annual Review Implementation Report will be considered by the Board and serve as an input to the continuing process of implementing the recommendations from the review teams set forth in the final reports of such review teams required in Section 4.6.

Section 4.6. SPECIFIC REVIEWS

(a) Review Teams and Reports

(i) Review teams will be established for each applicable review, which will include both a limited number of members and an open number of observers. The chairs of the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees participating in the applicable review shall select a group of up to 21 review team members from among the prospective members nominated by the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, balanced for diversity and skill. In addition, the Board may designate one Director or Liaison to serve as a member of the review team. Specific guidance on the selection process is provided within the operating standards developed for the conduct of reviews under this Section 4.6 (the "Operating Standards"). The Operating Standards shall be developed through community consultation, including public comment opportunities as necessary that comply with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN. The Operating Standards must be aligned with the following guidelines:

(A) Each Supporting Organization and Advisory Committee participating in the applicable review may nominate up to seven prospective members for the review team;

(B) Any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee nominating at least one, two or three prospective review team members shall be entitled to have those one, two or three nominees selected as members to the review team, so long as the nominees meet any applicable criteria for service on the team; and
(C) If any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee has not nominated at least three prospective review team members, the Chairs of the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees shall be responsible for the determination of whether all 21 SO/AC member seats shall be filled and, if so, how the seats should be allocated from among those nominated.

(ii) Members and liaisons of review teams shall disclose to ICANN and their applicable review team any conflicts of interest with a specific matter or issue under review in accordance with the most recent Board-approved practices and Operating Standards. The applicable review team may exclude from the discussion of a specific complaint or issue any member deemed by the majority of review team members to have a conflict of interest. Further details on the conflict of interest practices are included in the Operating Standards.

(iii) Review team decision-making practices shall be specified in the Operating Standards, with the expectation that review teams shall try to operate on a consensus basis. In the event a consensus cannot be found among the members of a review team, a majority vote of the members may be taken.

(iv) Review teams may also solicit and select independent experts to render advice as requested by the review team. ICANN shall pay the reasonable fees and expenses of such experts for each review contemplated by this Section 4.6 to the extent such fees and costs are consistent with the budget assigned for such review. Guidelines on how review teams are to work with and consider independent expert advice are specified in the Operating Standards.

(v) Each review team may recommend that the applicable type of review should no longer be conducted or should be amended.

(vi) Confidential Disclosure to Review Teams

(A) To facilitate transparency and openness regarding ICANN's deliberations and operations, the review teams, or a subset thereof, shall have access to ICANN internal information and documents pursuant to the Confidential Disclosure Framework set forth in the Operating Standards (the "Confidential Disclosure Framework"). The Confidential Disclosure Framework must be aligned with the following guidelines:

(1) ICANN must provide a justification for any refusal to reveal requested information. ICANN's refusal can be appealed to the
Ombudsman and/or the ICANN Board for a ruling on the disclosure request.

(2) ICANN may designate certain documents and information as "for review team members only" or for a subset of the review team members based on conflict of interest. ICANN's designation of documents may also be appealed to the Ombudsman and/or the ICANN Board.

(3) ICANN may require review team members to sign a non-disclosure agreement before accessing documents.

(vii) Reports

(A) Each report of the review team shall describe the degree of consensus or agreement reached by the review team on each recommendation contained in such report. Any member of a review team not in favor of a recommendation of its review team (whether as a result of voting against a matter or objecting to the consensus position) may record a minority dissent to such recommendation, which shall be included in the report of the review team. The review team shall attempt to prioritize each of its recommendations and provide a rationale for such prioritization.

(B) At least one draft report of the review team shall be posted on the Website for public review and comment. The review team must consider the public comments received in response to any posted draft report and shall amend the report as the review team deems appropriate and in the public interest before submitting its final report to the Board. The final report should include an explanation of how public comments were considered as well as a summary of changes made in response to public comments.

(C) Each final report of a review team shall be published for public comment in advance of the Board's consideration. Within six months of receipt of a final report, the Board shall consider such final report and the public comments on the final report, and determine whether to approve the recommendations in the final report. If the Board does not approve any or all of the recommendations, the written rationale supporting the Board's decision shall include an explanation for the decision on each recommendation that was not approved. The Board shall promptly direct implementation of the recommendations that were approved.

(b) Accountability and Transparency Review
(i) The Board shall cause a periodic review of ICANN’s execution of its commitment to maintain and improve robust mechanisms for public input, accountability, and transparency so as to ensure that the outcomes of its decision-making reflect the public interest and are accountable to the Internet community ("Accountability and Transparency Review").

(ii) The issues that the review team for the Accountability and Transparency Review (the "Accountability and Transparency Review Team") may assess include, but are not limited to, the following:

(A) assessing and improving Board governance which shall include an ongoing evaluation of Board performance, the Board selection process, the extent to which the Board’s composition and allocation structure meets ICANN’s present and future needs, and the appeal mechanisms for Board decisions contained in these Bylaws;

(B) assessing the role and effectiveness of the GAC’s interaction with the Board and with the broader ICANN community, and making recommendations for improvement to ensure effective consideration by ICANN of GAC input on the public policy aspects of the technical coordination of the DNS;

(C) assessing and improving the processes by which ICANN receives public input (including adequate explanation of decisions taken and the rationale thereof);

(D) assessing the extent to which ICANN’s decisions are supported and accepted by the Internet community;

(E) assessing the policy development process to facilitate enhanced cross community deliberations, and effective and timely policy development; and

(F) assessing and improving the Independent Review Process.

(iii) The Accountability and Transparency Review Team shall also assess the extent to which prior Accountability and Transparency Review recommendations have been implemented and the extent to which implementation of such recommendations has resulted in the intended effect.

(iv) The Accountability and Transparency Review Team may recommend to the Board the termination or amendment of other
periodic reviews required by this Section 4.6, and may recommend to
the Board the creation of additional periodic reviews.

(v) The Accountability and Transparency Review Team should issue its
final report within one year of convening its first meeting.

(vi) The Accountability and Transparency Review shall be conducted no
less frequently than every five years measured from the date the
previous Accountability and Transparency Review Team was convened.

(c) Security, Stability, and Resiliency Review

(i) The Board shall cause a periodic review of ICANN's execution of its
commitment to enhance the operational stability, reliability, resiliency,
security, and global interoperability of the systems and processes, both
internal and external, that directly affect and/or are affected by the
Internet's system of unique identifiers that ICANN coordinates ("SSR
Review").

(ii) The issues that the review team for the SSR Review ("SSR Review
Team") may assess are the following:

(A) security, operational stability and resiliency matters, both physical
and network, relating to the coordination of the Internet's system of
unique identifiers;

(B) conformance with appropriate security contingency planning
framework for the Internet's system of unique identifiers; and

(C) maintaining clear and globally interoperable security processes for
those portions of the Internet's system of unique identifiers that ICANN
coordinates.

(iii) The SSR Review Team shall also assess the extent to which ICANN
has successfully implemented its security efforts, the effectiveness of
the security efforts to deal with actual and potential challenges and
threats to the security and stability of the DNS, and the extent to which
the security efforts are sufficiently robust to meet future challenges and
threats to the security, stability and resiliency of the DNS, consistent
with ICANN's Mission.

(iv) The SSR Review Team shall also assess the extent to which prior
SSR Review recommendations have been implemented and the extent
to which implementation of such recommendations has resulted in the
(v) The SSR Review shall be conducted no less frequently than every five years, measured from the date the previous SSR Review Team was convened.

(d) Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review

(i) ICANN will ensure that it will adequately address issues of competition, consumer protection, security, stability and resiliency, malicious abuse issues, sovereignty concerns, and rights protection prior to, or concurrent with, authorizing an increase in the number of new top-level domains in the root zone of the DNS pursuant to an application process initiated on or after the date of these Bylaws ("New gTLD Round").

(ii) After a New gTLD Round has been in operation for one year, the Board shall cause a competition, consumer trust and consumer choice review as specified in this Section 4.6(d) ("CCT Review").

(iii) The review team for the CCT Review ("CCT Review Team") will examine (A) the extent to which the expansion of gTLDs has promoted competition, consumer trust and consumer choice and (B) the effectiveness of the New gTLD Round’s application and evaluation process and safeguards put in place to mitigate issues arising from the New gTLD Round.

(iv) For each of its recommendations, the CCT Review Team should indicate whether the recommendation, if accepted by the Board, must be implemented before opening subsequent rounds of new generic top-level domain applications periods.

(v) The CCT Review Team shall also assess the extent to which prior CCT Review recommendations have been implemented and the extent to which implementation of such recommendations has resulted in the intended effect.

(e) Registration Directory Service Review

(i) Subject to applicable laws, ICANN shall use commercially reasonable efforts to enforce its policies relating to registration directory services and shall work with Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees to explore structural changes to improve accuracy and access to
generic top-level domain registration data, as well as consider safeguards for protecting such data.

(ii) The Board shall cause a periodic review to assess the effectiveness of the then current gTLD registry directory service and whether its implementation meets the legitimate needs of law enforcement, promoting consumer trust and safeguarding registrant data ("Directory Service Review").

(iii) The review team for the Directory Service Review ("Directory Service Review Team") will consider the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development ("OECD") Guidelines on the Protection of Privacy and Transborder Flows of Personal Data as defined by the OECD in 1980 and amended in 2013 and as may be amended from time to time.

(iv) The Directory Service Review Team shall assess the extent to which prior Directory Service Review recommendations have been implemented and the extent to which implementation of such recommendations has resulted in the intended effect.

(v) The Directory Service Review shall be conducted no less frequently than every five years, measured from the date the previous Directory Service Review Team was convened, except that the first Directory Service Review to be conducted after 1 October 2016 shall be deemed to be timely if the applicable Directory Service Review Team is convened on or before 31 October 2016.

Section 4.7. COMMUNITY MEDIATION

(a) If the Board refuses or fails to comply with a duly authorized and valid EC Decision under these Bylaws, the EC Administration representative of any Decisional Participant who supported the exercise by the EC of its rights in the applicable EC Decision during the applicable decision period may request that the EC initiate a mediation process pursuant to this Section 4.7. The Board shall be deemed to have refused or failed to comply with a duly authorized and valid EC Decision if the Board has not complied with the EC Decision within 30 days of being notified of the relevant EC Decision.

(b) If a Mediation Initiation Notice (as defined in Section 4.1(a) of Annex D) is delivered to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 4.1(a) of Annex D, as soon as reasonably practicable thereafter, the EC Administration shall designate individuals to represent the EC in the mediation ("Mediation Administration") and the Board shall designate representatives for the
mediation ("Board Mediation Representatives"). Members of the EC Administration and the Board can designate themselves as representatives. ICANN shall promptly post the Mediation Initiation Notice on the Website.

(c) There shall be a single mediator who shall be selected by the agreement of the Mediation Administration and Board Mediation Representatives. The Mediation Administration shall propose a slate of at least five potential mediators, and the Board Mediation Representatives shall select a mediator from the slate or request a new slate until a mutually-agreed mediator is selected. The Board Mediation Representatives may recommend potential mediators for inclusion on the slates selected by the Mediation Administration. The Mediation Administration shall not unreasonably decline to include mediators recommended by the Board Mediation Representatives on proposed slates and the Board Mediation Representatives shall not unreasonably withhold consent to the selection of a mediator on slates proposed by the Mediation Administration.

(d) The mediator shall be a licensed attorney with general knowledge of contract law and general knowledge of the DNS and ICANN. The mediator may not have any ongoing business relationship with ICANN, any Supporting Organization (or constituent thereof), any Advisory Committee (or constituent thereof), the EC Administration or the EC. The mediator must confirm in writing that he or she is not, directly or indirectly, and will not become during the term of the mediation, an employee, partner, executive officer, director, consultant or advisor of ICANN, any Supporting Organization (or constituent thereof), any Advisory Committee (or constituent thereof), the EC Administration or the EC.

(e) The mediator shall conduct the mediation in accordance with these Bylaws, the laws of California and the rules and procedures of a well-respected international dispute resolution provider, which may be the IRP Provider. The arbitration will be conducted in the English language consistent with the provisions relevant for mediation under the IRP Rules of Procedure and will occur in Los Angeles County, California, unless another location is mutually-agreed between the Mediation Administration and Board Mediation Representatives.

(f) The Mediation Administration and the Board Mediation Representatives shall discuss the dispute in good faith and attempt, with the mediator's assistance, to reach an amicable resolution of the dispute.

(g) ICANN shall bear all costs of the mediator.

(h) If the Mediation Administration and the Board Mediation Representatives
have engaged in good faith participation in the mediation but have not resolved the dispute for any reason, the Mediation Administration or the Board Mediation Representatives may terminate the mediation at any time by declaring an impasse.

(i) If a resolution to the dispute is reached by the Mediation Administration and the Board Mediation Representatives, the Mediation Administration and the Board Mediation Representatives shall document such resolution including recommendations ("Mediation Resolution" and the date of such resolution, the "Mediation Resolution Date"). ICANN shall promptly post the Mediation Resolution on the Website (in no event later than 14 days after mediation efforts are completed) and the EC Administration shall promptly notify the Decisional Participants of the Mediation Resolution.

(j) The EC shall be deemed to have accepted the Mediation Resolution if it has not delivered an EC Community IRP Initiation Notice (as defined in Section 4.2(e) of Annex D) pursuant to and in compliance with Section 4.2 of Annex D within eighty (80) days following the Mediation Resolution Date.

ARTICLE 5 OMBUDSMAN

Section 5.1. OFFICE OF OMBUDSMAN

(a) ICANN shall maintain an Office of Ombudsman ("Office of Ombudsman"), to be managed by an ombudsman ("Ombudsman") and to include such staff support as the Board determines is appropriate and feasible. The Ombudsman shall be a full-time position, with salary and benefits appropriate to the function, as determined by the Board.

(b) The Ombudsman shall be appointed by the Board for an initial term of two years, subject to renewal by the Board.

(c) The Ombudsman shall be subject to dismissal by the Board only upon a three-fourths (3/4) vote of the entire Board.

(d) The annual budget for the Office of Ombudsman shall be established by the Board as part of the annual ICANN Budget process. The Ombudsman shall submit a proposed budget to the President, and the President shall include that budget submission in its entirety and without change in the general ICANN Budget recommended by the ICANN President to the Board. Nothing in this Section 5.1 shall prevent the President from offering separate views on the substance, size, or other features of the Ombudsman’s proposed budget to the Board.
Section 5.2. CHARTER

The charter of the Ombudsman shall be to act as a neutral dispute resolution practitioner for those matters for which the provisions of the Independent Review Process set forth in Section 4.3 have not been invoked. The principal function of the Ombudsman shall be to provide an independent internal evaluation of complaints by members of the ICANN community who believe that the ICANN staff, Board or an ICANN constituent body has treated them unfairly. The Ombudsman shall serve as an objective advocate for fairness, and shall seek to evaluate and where possible resolve complaints about unfair or inappropriate treatment by ICANN staff, the Board, or ICANN constituent bodies, clarifying the issues and using conflict resolution tools such as negotiation, facilitation, and "shuttle diplomacy" to achieve these results. With respect to the Reconsideration Request Process set forth in Section 4.2, the Ombudsman shall serve the function expressly provided for in Section 4.2.

Section 5.3. OPERATIONS

The Office of Ombudsman shall:

(a) facilitate the fair, impartial, and timely resolution of problems and complaints that affected members of the ICANN community (excluding employees and vendors/suppliers of ICANN) may have with specific actions or failures to act by the Board or ICANN staff which have not otherwise become the subject of either a Reconsideration Request or Independent Review Process;

(b) perform the functions set forth in Section 4.2 relating to review and consideration of Reconsideration Requests;

(c) exercise discretion to accept or decline to act on a complaint or question, including by the development of procedures to dispose of complaints that are insufficiently concrete, substantive, or related to ICANN's interactions with the community so as to be inappropriate subject matters for the Ombudsman to act on. In addition, and without limiting the foregoing, the Ombudsman shall have no authority to act in any way with respect to internal administrative matters, personnel matters, issues relating to membership on the Board, or issues related to vendor/supplier relations;

(d) have the right to have access to (but not to publish if otherwise confidential) all necessary information and records from ICANN staff and constituent bodies to enable an informed evaluation of the complaint and to assist in dispute resolution where feasible (subject only to such confidentiality obligations as are imposed by the complainant or any generally applicable confidentiality policies adopted by ICANN);
(e) heighten awareness of the Ombudsman program and functions through routine interaction with the ICANN community and online availability;

(f) maintain neutrality and independence, and have no bias or personal stake in an outcome; and

(g) comply with all ICANN conflicts of interest and confidentiality policies.

Section 5.4. INTERACTION WITH ICANN AND OUTSIDE ENTITIES

(a) No ICANN employee, Board member, or other participant in Supporting Organizations or Advisory Committees shall prevent or impede the Ombudsman's contact with the ICANN community (including employees of ICANN). ICANN employees and Board members shall direct members of the ICANN community who voice problems, concerns, or complaints about ICANN to the Ombudsman, who shall advise complainants about the various options available for review of such problems, concerns, or complaints.

(b) ICANN staff and other ICANN participants shall observe and respect determinations made by the Office of Ombudsman concerning confidentiality of any complaints received by that Office.

(c) Contact with the Ombudsman shall not constitute notice to ICANN of any particular action or cause of action.

(d) The Ombudsman shall be specifically authorized to make such reports to the Board as he or she deems appropriate with respect to any particular matter and its resolution or the inability to resolve it. Absent a determination by the Ombudsman, in his or her sole discretion, that it would be inappropriate, such reports shall be posted on the Website.

(e) The Ombudsman shall not take any actions not authorized in these Bylaws, and in particular shall not institute, join, or support in any way any legal actions challenging ICANN structure, procedures, processes, or any conduct by the ICANN Board, staff, or constituent bodies.

Section 5.5. ANNUAL REPORT

The Office of Ombudsman shall publish on an annual basis a consolidated analysis of the year's complaints and resolutions, appropriately dealing with confidentiality obligations and concerns. Such annual report should include a description of any trends or common elements of complaints received during the period in question, as well as recommendations for steps that could be
taken to minimize future complaints. The annual report shall be posted on the Website.

ARTICLE 6 EMPOWERED COMMUNITY

Section 6.1. COMPOSITION AND ORGANIZATION OF THE EMPOWERED COMMUNITY

(a) The Empowered Community ("EC") shall be a nonprofit association formed under the laws of the State of California consisting of the ASO, the ccNSO (as defined in Section 10.1), the GNSO (as defined in Section 11.1), the ALAC (as defined in Section 12.2(d)(i)) and the GAC (each a "Decisional Participant" or "associate," and collectively, the "Decisional Participants").

(b) This Article 6 shall constitute the articles of association of the EC and shall be considered the formational "governing document" (as defined in Section 18008 of the CCC) of the EC, and the terms contained herein and in these Bylaws relating to the EC shall be the EC's "governing principles" (as defined in Section 18010 of the CCC), which may only be amended as set forth in Section 25.2. Where necessary for purposes of interpretation of these Bylaws, an "associate" shall be deemed to be a "member" of the EC as defined in Section 18015 of the CCC. Any change in the number and/or identity of Decisional Participants for any reason (including the resignation of any Decisional Participant or the addition of new Decisional Participants as a result of the creation of additional Supporting Organizations or Advisory Committees), and any corresponding changes in the voting thresholds for exercise of the EC's rights described in Annex D of these Bylaws, will only be effective following the completion of the process for amending Fundamental Bylaws described in Section 25.2 and Annex D. The EC may not be dissolved except upon the completion of the process for amending Fundamental Bylaws described in Section 25.2 and Annex D.

(c) The sole purpose of the EC is to exercise its rights and perform its obligations under ICANN's Articles of Incorporation and these Bylaws, and the EC shall have no other powers or rights except as expressly provided therein. The EC may only act as provided in these Bylaws. Any act of the EC that is not in accordance with these Bylaws shall not be effective.

(d) The EC shall not acquire, hold, manage, encumber or transfer any interest in real or personal property, nor have any directors, officers or employees. The EC shall not merge with or into another entity nor shall it dissolve, except with the approval of the Board and as part of a Fundamental Bylaw Amendment (as defined in Section 25.2(b)).
(e) Decisional Participants shall not transfer their right to be an associate of the EC. Any attempted transfer by any Decisional Participant of its right to be an associate of the EC shall be void ab initio.

(f) The location and street address of the EC shall be the principal office of ICANN.

(g) Each Decisional Participant shall, except as otherwise provided in Annex D, adopt procedures for exercising the rights of such Decisional Participant pursuant to the procedures set forth in Annex D, including (i) who can submit a petition to such Decisional Participant, (ii) the process for an individual to submit a petition to such Decisional Participant, including whether a petition must be accompanied by a rationale, (iii) how the Decisional Participant determines whether to accept or reject a petition, (iv) how the Decisional Participant determines whether an issue subject to a petition has been resolved, (v) how the Decisional Participant determines whether to support or object to actions supported by another Decisional Participant, and (vi) the process for the Decisional Participant to notify its constituents of relevant matters.

Section 6.2. POWERS AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

(a) Pursuant to and in compliance with the terms and conditions of these Bylaws, the EC shall have the powers and rights, as set forth more fully elsewhere in these Bylaws, to:

   (i) Appoint and remove individual Directors (other than the President);

   (ii) Recall the entire Board;

   (iii) Reject ICANN Budgets, IANA Budgets, Operating Plans (as defined in Section 22.5(a)(i)) and Strategic Plans (as defined in Section 22.5(b)(i));

   (iv) Reject Standard Bylaw Amendments (as defined in Section 25.1(a));

   (v) Approve Fundamental Bylaw Amendments, Articles Amendments (as defined in Section 25.2(b)), and Asset Sales (as defined in Article 26(a));

   (vi) Reject PTI Governance Actions (as defined in Section 16.2(d));

   (vii) Require the ICANN Board to re-review its rejection of IFR Recommendation Decisions (as defined in Section 18.6(d)), Special IFR
Recommendation Decisions (as defined in Section 18.12(e)), SCWG Creation Decisions (as defined in Section 19.1(d)) and SCWG Recommendation Decisions (as defined in Section 19.4(d));

(viii) Initiate a Community Reconsideration Request, mediation or a Community IRP; and

(ix) Take necessary and appropriate action to enforce its powers and rights, including through the community mechanism contained in Annex D or an action filed in a court of competent jurisdiction.

(b) The EC may pursue an action in any court with jurisdiction over ICANN to enforce the EC’s rights under these Bylaws. ICANN acknowledges the EC’s legal personhood and shall not raise the EC’s legal personhood as a defense in any proceeding between ICANN and the EC. ICANN shall not assert as a defense that prior filing or completion of a Reconsideration Request or an IRP Claim was a prerequisite to an action in court regarding the EC’s power to appoint or remove an individual Director or recall the Board (except to the extent an IRP Panel award is applicable pursuant to Section 3.6(e)).

(c) By nominating a Director for designation by the EC or exercising the community mechanism contained in Annex D with respect to any rights granted to the EC pursuant to these Bylaws, the EC and each of its Decisional Participants agrees and consents to the terms of these Bylaws and intends to be legally bound hereby.

Section 6.3. EC ADMINISTRATION

(a) The Decisional Participants shall act through their respective chairs or such other persons as may be designated by the Decisional Participants (collectively, such persons are the “EC Administration”). Each Decisional Participant shall deliver annually a written certification from its chair or co-chairs to the Secretary designating the individual who shall represent the Decisional Participant on the EC Administration.

(b) In representing a Decisional Participant on the EC Administration, the representative individual shall act solely as directed by the represented Decisional Participant and in accordance with processes developed by such Decisional Participant in accordance with Section 6.1(g).

(c) In representing the EC Administration, the individuals serving thereon shall act as required for the EC to follow the applicable procedures in Annex D, and to implement EC decisions made in accordance with such procedures.
(d) All communications and notices required or permitted to be given under these Bylaws by a Decisional Participant shall be provided by the Decisional Participant's representative on the EC Administration. All communications and notices required or permitted to be given under these Bylaws by the EC shall be provided by any member of the EC Administration. Where a particular Bylaws notice provision does not require notice to the Secretary, the EC and the Decisional Participants shall provide a copy of the notice to the Secretary in accordance with Section 21.5, and ICANN shall post it on the Website.

(e) ICANN shall be entitled to rely on notices from a Decisional Participant's representative or an individual serving on the EC Administration delivered in accordance with Section 21.5 as evidence that the actions set forth therein have been approved by or are the actions of the Decisional Participant, the EC or the EC Administration, as applicable, pursuant to and in compliance with the requirements of these Bylaws (including Annex D).

(f) No person participating in the EC, the EC Administration or a Decisional Participant shall be liable for any debt, obligation or liability of ICANN or the EC, other than in the case of a fraudulent act committed by such person.

Section 6.4. CONSENT TO BOARD-INITIATED REMOVAL OF DIRECTOR WITHOUT CAUSE

In the event the EC Administration receives from the Secretary a valid notice as described in Section 7.11(a)(i)(B), indicating that the Board has voted to remove a Director without cause pursuant to Section 7.11(a)(i)(B), the EC shall without deliberation consent to such removal, and the EC Administration shall provide notice to the Secretary of such consent.

ARTICLE 7 BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Section 7.1. COMPOSITION OF THE BOARD

The ICANN Board of Directors ("Board") shall consist of sixteen voting directors ("Directors"). In addition, four non-voting liaisons ("Liaisons") shall be appointed for the purposes set forth in Section 7.9. Only Directors shall be included in determining the existence of quorums, and in establishing the validity of votes taken by the Board.

Section 7.2. DIRECTORS AND THEIR SELECTION; ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR

(a) As of the effective date of the amendment and restatement of these Bylaws on 1 October 2016, the EC shall be the sole designator of ICANN and shall
designate, within the meaning of Section 5220 of the CCC, all Directors except for the President ex officio. The EC shall notify promptly the Secretary in writing of the following designations:

(i) Eight Directors nominated by the Nominating Committee to be designated as Directors by the EC. These seats on the Board are referred to in these Bylaws as Seats 1 through 8.

(ii) Two Directors nominated by the ASO to be designated as Directors by the EC. These seats on the Board are referred to in these Bylaws as Seat 9 and Seat 10.

(iii) Two Directors nominated by the ccNSO to be designated as Directors by the EC. These seats on the Board are referred to in these Bylaws as Seat 11 and Seat 12.

(iv) Two Directors nominated by the GNSO to be designated as Directors by the EC. These seats on the Board are referred to in these Bylaws as Seat 13 and Seat 14.

(v) One Director nominated by the At-Large Community to be designated as Directors by the EC. This seat on the Board is referred to in these Bylaws as Seat 15.

In addition to the Directors designated by the EC, the President shall serve ex officio as a Director. The seat held by the President on the Board is referred to in these Bylaws as Seat 16.

(b) In carrying out its responsibilities to nominate the Directors for Seats 1 through 8 for designation by the EC, the Nominating Committee shall ensure that the Board is composed of Directors who, in the aggregate, display diversity in geography, culture, skills, experience, and perspective, by applying the criteria set forth in Section 7.3, Section 7.4 and Section 7.5. At no time when it makes its nomination shall the Nominating Committee nominate a Director to fill any vacancy or expired term whose designation would cause the total number of Directors (not including the President) from countries in any one Geographic Region to exceed five; and the Nominating Committee shall ensure when it makes its nominations that the Board includes at least one Director who is from a country in each ICANN Geographic Region (“Diversity Calculation”). For purposes of this Section 7.2(b), if any candidate for director maintains citizenship of more than one country, or has been domiciled for more than five years in a country of which the candidate does not maintain citizenship (“Domicile”), that candidate may be deemed to be from either country and must select in his or her Statement of Interest the country of
citizenship or Domicile that he or she wants the Nominating Committee to use for Diversity Calculation purposes. For purposes of this Section 7.2(b), a person can only have one Domicile, which shall be determined by where the candidate has a permanent residence and place of habitation.

(c) In carrying out their responsibilities to nominate Directors for Seats 9 through 15 for designation by the EC, the Supporting Organizations and the At-Large Community shall seek to ensure that the Board is composed of Directors who, in the aggregate, display diversity in geography, culture, skills, experience, and perspective, by applying the criteria set forth in Section 7.3, Section 7.4 and Section 7.5. The Supporting Organizations shall ensure that, at any given time, no two Directors nominated by a Supporting Organization are citizens from the same country or of countries located in the same Geographic Region. For purposes of this Section 7.2(c), if any candidate for Director maintains citizenship or Domicile of more than one country, that candidate may be deemed to be from either country and must select in his or her Statement of Interest the country of citizenship or Domicile that he or she wants the Supporting Organization or the At-Large Community, as applicable, to use for nomination purposes. For purposes of this Section 7.2(c), a person can only have one Domicile, which shall be determined by where the candidate has a permanent residence and place of habitation.

(d) The Board shall annually elect a Chair and a Vice-Chair from among the Directors, not to include the President.

(e) The EC shall designate each person nominated as a Director by the Nominating Committee, the ASO, the ccNSO, the GNSO and the At-Large Community in accordance with this Section 7.2.

(f) As a condition to sitting on the Board, each Director other than the President ex officio shall sign a pre-service letter pursuant to which such Director:

(i) acknowledges and agrees to the EC’s right to remove the Director at any time and for any reason following the processes set forth in these Bylaws;

(ii) acknowledges and agrees that serving as a Director shall not establish any employment or other relationship (whether to ICANN, the EC, any body entitled to nominate a Director, or any of their agents) that provides any due process rights related to termination of service as a Director; and

(iii) conditionally and irrevocably resigns as a Director automatically
effective upon communication to the Director or, in the case of Board recall, communication to the Board of a final determination of removal following the processes set forth in these Bylaws.

Section 7.3. CRITERIA FOR NOMINATION OF DIRECTORS

Directors shall be:

(a) Accomplished persons of integrity, objectivity, and intelligence, with reputations for sound judgment and open minds, and a demonstrated capacity for thoughtful group decision-making;

(b) Persons with an understanding of ICANN's Mission and the potential impact of ICANN decisions on the global Internet community, and committed to the success of ICANN;

(c) Persons who will produce the broadest cultural and geographic diversity on the Board consistent with meeting the other criteria set forth in this Section 7.3;

(d) Persons who, in the aggregate, have personal familiarity with the operation of gTLD registries and registrars; with ccTLD registries; with IP address registries; with Internet technical standards and protocols; with policy-development procedures, legal traditions, and the public interest; and with the broad range of business, individual, academic, and non-commercial users of the Internet; and

(e) Persons who are able to work and communicate in written and spoken English.

Section 7.4. ADDITIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

(a) Notwithstanding anything herein to the contrary, no official of a national government or a multinational entity established by treaty or other agreement between national governments may serve as a Director. As used herein, the term "official" means a person (i) who holds an elective governmental office or (ii) who is employed by such government or multinational entity and whose primary function with such government or entity is to develop or influence governmental or public policies.

(b) No person who serves in any capacity (including as a liaison) on any Supporting Organization Council shall simultaneously serve as a Director or Liaison to the Board. If such a person is identified by, or presents themselves...
to, the Supporting Organization Council or the At-Large Community for consideration for nomination to serve as a Director, the person shall not thereafter participate in any discussion of, or vote by, the Supporting Organization Council or the committee designated by the At-Large Community relating to the nomination of Directors by the Council or At-Large Community, until the Council or committee(s) specified by the At-Large Community has nominated the full complement of Directors it is responsible for nominating. In the event that a person serving in any capacity on a Supporting Organization Council is considered for nomination to serve as a Director, the constituency group or other group or entity that selected the person may select a replacement for purposes of the Council's nomination process. In the event that a person serving in any capacity on the At-Large Advisory Committee is identified as or accepts a nomination to be considered for nomination by the At-Large Community as a Director, the Regional At-Large Organization or other group or entity that selected the person may select a replacement for purposes of the At-Large Community's nomination process.

(c) Persons serving in any capacity on the Nominating Committee shall be ineligible for nomination or designation to positions on the Board as provided by Section 8.8.

(d) No person who serves on the EC Administration while serving in that capacity shall be considered for nomination or designated to the Board, nor serve simultaneously on the EC Administration and as a Director or Liaison to the Board.

Section 7.5. INTERNATIONAL REPRESENTATION

In order to ensure broad international representation on the Board, the nomination of Directors by the Nominating Committee, each Supporting Organization and the At-Large Community shall comply with all applicable diversity provisions of these Bylaws or of any memorandum of understanding referred to in these Bylaws concerning the Supporting Organization. One intent of these diversity provisions is to ensure that at all times each Geographic Region shall have at least one Director, and at all times no Geographic Region shall have more than five Directors on the Board (not including the President). As used in these Bylaws, each of the following is considered to be a "Geographic Region": (a) Europe; (b) Asia/Australia/Pacific; (c) Latin America/Caribbean islands; (d) Africa; and (e) North America. The specific countries included in each Geographic Region shall be determined by the Board, and this Section 7.5 shall be reviewed by the Board from time to time (and in any event at least once every three years) to determine whether any change is appropriate, taking account of the evolution of the Internet.
Section 7.6. DIRECTORS' CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The Board, through the Board Governance Committee, shall require a statement from each Director not less frequently than once a year setting forth all business and other affiliations that relate in any way to the business and other affiliations of ICANN. Each Director shall be responsible for disclosing to ICANN any matter that could reasonably be considered to make such Director an "interested director" within the meaning of Section 5233 of the CCC. In addition, each Director shall disclose to ICANN any relationship or other factor that could reasonably be considered to cause the Director to be considered to be an "interested person" within the meaning of Section 5227 of the CCC. The Board shall adopt policies specifically addressing Director, Officer, EC and Supporting Organization conflicts of interest. No Director shall vote on any matter in which he or she has a material and direct financial interest that would be affected by the outcome of the vote.

Section 7.7. DUTIES OF DIRECTORS

Directors shall serve as individuals who have the duty to act in what they reasonably believe are the best interests of ICANN and not as representatives of the EC, the Nominating Committee, Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee that nominated them, as applicable, their employers, or any other organizations or constituencies.

Section 7.8. TERMS OF DIRECTORS

(a) The regular term of office of Director Seats 1 through 15 shall begin as follows:

(i) The regular terms of Seats 1 through 3 shall begin at the conclusion of each ICANN annual meeting every third year after 2003;

(ii) The regular terms of Seats 4 through 6 shall begin at the conclusion of each ICANN annual meeting every third year after 2004;

(iii) The regular terms of Seats 7 and 8 shall begin at the conclusion of each ICANN annual meeting every third year after 2005;

(iv) The terms of Seats 9 and 12 shall begin at the conclusion of each ICANN annual meeting every third year after 2015;

(v) The terms of Seats 10 and 13 shall begin at the conclusion of each ICANN annual meeting every third year after 2013; and
(vi) The terms of Seats 11, 14 and 15 shall begin at the conclusion of each ICANN annual meeting every third year after 2014.

(b) Each Director holding any of Seats 1 through 15, including a Director nominated and designated to fill a vacancy, shall hold office for a term that lasts until the next term for that Seat commences and until a successor has been designated and qualified or until that Director resigns or is removed in accordance with these Bylaws. For the avoidance of doubt, the new governance provisions effective as of the amendment and restatement of these Bylaws on 1 October 2016 shall not have the effect of shortening or terminating the terms of any Directors serving at the time of the amendment and restatement.

(c) At least two months before the commencement of each annual meeting, the Nominating Committee shall give the EC Administration (with a copy to the Decisional Participants and Secretary) written notice of its nomination of Directors for seats with terms beginning at the conclusion of the annual meeting, and the EC Administration shall promptly provide the Secretary (with a copy to the Decisional Participants) with written notice of the designation of those Directors. All such notices shall be posted promptly to the Website.

(d) At least six months before the date specified for the commencement of the term as specified in Section 7.8(a)(iv) through Section 7.8(a)(vi) above, any Supporting Organization or the At-Large Community entitled to nominate a Director for a Seat with a term beginning that year shall give the EC Administration (with a copy to the Secretary and the Decisional Participants) written notice of its nomination of Directors for seats with terms beginning at the conclusion of the annual meeting, and the EC Administration shall promptly provide the Secretary (with a copy to the Decisional Participants) with written notice of the designation of those Directors. All such notices shall be posted promptly to the Website.

(e) No Director may serve more than three consecutive terms. For these purposes, a person designated to fill a vacancy in a term shall not be deemed to have served that term.

(f) The term as Director of the person holding the office of President shall be for as long as, and only for as long as, such person holds the office of President.

Section 7.9. NON-VOTING LIAISONS

(a) The non-voting Liaisons shall include:
(i) One appointed by the Governmental Advisory Committee;

(ii) One appointed by the Root Server System Advisory Committee established by Section 12.2(c);

(iii) One appointed by the Security and Stability Advisory Committee established by Section 12.2(b); and

(iv) One appointed by the Internet Engineering Task Force.

(b) The Liaisons shall serve terms that begin at the conclusion of each annual meeting. At least one month before the commencement of each annual meeting, each body entitled to appoint a Liaison shall give the Secretary written notice of its appointment.

(c) Each Liaison may be reappointed, and shall remain in that position until a successor has been appointed or until the Liaison resigns or is removed in accordance with these Bylaws.

(d) The Liaisons shall be entitled to attend Board meetings, participate in Board discussions and deliberations, and have access (under conditions established by the Board) to materials provided to Directors for use in Board discussions, deliberations and meetings, but shall otherwise not have any of the rights and privileges of Directors. Liaisons shall be entitled (under conditions established by the Board) to use any materials provided to them pursuant to this Section 7.9(d) for the purpose of consulting with their respective committee or organization.

Section 7.10. RESIGNATION OF A DIRECTOR OR NON-VOTING LIAISON

Subject to Section 5226 of the CCC, any Director or Liaison may resign at any time by giving written notice thereof to the Chair of the Board, the President, the Secretary, or the Board. Such resignation shall take effect at the time specified, and, unless otherwise specified, the acceptance of such resignation shall not be necessary to make it effective.

Section 7.11. REMOVAL OF A DIRECTOR OR NON-VOTING LIAISON

(a) Directors

(i) Any Director designated by the EC may be removed without cause:
(A) by the EC pursuant to and in compliance with procedures in Section 3.1 or Section 3.2 of Annex D, as applicable, or

(B) following notice to that Director, by a three-fourths (3/4) majority vote of all Directors; provided, however, that (x) each vote to remove a Director shall be a separate vote on the sole question of the removal of that particular Director; and (y) such removal shall not be effective until the Secretary has provided notice to the EC Administration of the Board's removal vote and the requirements of Section 6.4 have been met.

(ii) The Board may remove any Director who has been declared of unsound mind by a final order of court, or convicted of a felony, or been found by a final order or judgment of any court to have breached any duty under Sections 5230 through 5239 of the CCC, and in the case of such removal, the Secretary shall promptly notify the EC Administration in writing, with a copy to the body that nominated such Director, and shall promptly post such notification to the Website. The vacancies created by such removal shall be filled in accordance with Section 7.12(a).

(iii) All Directors (other than the President) may be removed at the same time by the EC by the EC Administration delivering an EC Board Recall Notice to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 3.3 of Annex D. The vacancies created by such removal shall be filled by the EC in accordance with Section 7.12(b).

(b) With the exception of the Liaison appointed by the Governmental Advisory Committee, any Liaison may be removed following notice to that Liaison and to the organization which selected that Liaison, by a three-fourths (3/4) majority vote of all Directors if the selecting organization fails to promptly remove that Liaison following such notice. The vacancies created by such removal shall be filled in accordance with Section 7.12. The Board may request the Governmental Advisory Committee to consider the replacement of the Governmental Advisory Committee Liaison if the Board, by a three-fourths (3/4) majority vote of all Directors, determines that such an action is appropriate.

Section 7.12. VACANCIES

(a) This Section 7.12(a) shall apply to Board vacancies other than those occurring by recall of all Directors (other than the President). A vacancy or vacancies in the Board shall be deemed to exist in the case of the death, resignation, or removal of any Director or Interim Director (as defined in
Section 7.12(b)), or if the authorized number of Directors is increased. Vacancies occurring in Seats 1 through 15 shall be filled by the EC after nomination as provided in Section 7.2 and Articles 8 through 12. A vacancy in Seat 16 shall be filled as provided in Article 15. A Director designated by the EC to fill a vacancy on the Board shall serve for the unexpired term of his or her predecessor in office and until a successor has been designated and qualified. No reduction of the authorized number of Directors shall have the effect of removing a Director prior to the expiration of the Director's term of office.

(b) This Section 7.12(b) shall apply to Board vacancies occurring when all Directors (other than the President) are recalled as provided by Section 7.11(a)(iii). Concurrently with delivery of any EC Board Recall Notice (as defined in Section 3.3(f) of Annex D), the EC Administration shall provide written notice of the EC's designation of individuals to fill such vacancies (each such individual, an "Interim Director") to the Decisional Participants and to the Secretary, who shall cause such notice to be promptly posted to the Website. An Interim Director must meet the criteria specified in Section 7.3, Section 7.4 and Section 7.5, as applicable. An Interim Director shall hold office until the EC designates the Interim Director's successor in accordance with Section 7.12(a), and the successor's designation shall occur within 120 days of the Interim Director's designation. For avoidance of doubt, persons designated as Interim Directors may be eligible for designation as Directors as well.

(c) The organizations selecting the Liaisons identified in Section 7.9 are responsible for determining the existence of, and filling, any vacancies in those positions. Such organizations shall give the Secretary written notice of their appointments to fill any such vacancies, subject to the requirements set forth in Section 7.4, as applicable.

Section 7.13. ANNUAL MEETINGS

Annual meetings of ICANN shall be held for the purpose of electing Officers and for the transaction of such other business as may come before the meeting. Each annual meeting of ICANN shall be held at the principal office of ICANN, or any other appropriate place of the Board’s time and choosing, provided such annual meeting is held within 14 months of the immediately preceding annual meeting. If the Board determines that it is practical, the annual meeting should be distributed in real-time and archived video and audio formats on the Internet.

Section 7.14. REGULAR MEETINGS
Regular meetings of the Board shall be held on dates to be determined by the Board. In the absence of other designation, regular meetings shall be held at the principal office of ICANN.

Section 7.15. SPECIAL MEETINGS

Special meetings of the Board may be called by or at the request of one-quarter (1/4) of the Directors, by the Chair of the Board or the President. A call for a special meeting shall be made by the Secretary. Special meetings shall be held at the principal office of ICANN unless otherwise specified in the notice of the meeting.

Section 7.16. NOTICE OF MEETINGS

Notice of time and place of all meetings shall be delivered personally or by telephone or by electronic mail to each Director and Liaison, or sent by first-class mail (air mail for addresses outside the United States) or facsimile, charges prepaid, addressed to each Director and Liaison at the Director's or Liaison's address as it is shown on the records of ICANN. In case the notice is mailed, it shall be deposited in the United States mail at least fourteen (14) days before the time of the holding of the meeting. In case the notice is delivered personally or by telephone or facsimile or electronic mail it shall be delivered personally or by telephone or facsimile or electronic mail at least forty-eight (48) hours before the time of the holding of the meeting. Notwithstanding anything in this Section 7.16 to the contrary, notice of a meeting need not be given to any Director or Liaison who signed a waiver of notice or a Director who signed a written consent to holding the meeting or an approval of the minutes thereof, whether before or after the meeting, or who attends the meeting without protesting, prior thereto or at its commencement, the lack of notice to such Director. All such waivers, consents and approvals shall be filed with the corporate records or made a part of the minutes of the meetings.

Section 7.17. QUORUM

At all annual, regular, and special meetings of the Board, a majority of the total number of Directors then in office shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, and the act of a majority of the Directors present at any meeting at which there is a quorum shall be the act of the Board, unless otherwise provided herein or by law. If a quorum shall not be present at any meeting of the Board, the Directors present thereat may adjourn the meeting from time to time to another place, time or date. If the meeting is adjourned for more than twenty-four (24) hours, notice shall be given to those Directors not at the meeting at the time of the adjournment.
Section 7.18. ACTIONS BY TELEPHONE MEETING OR BY OTHER COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT

Directors and Liaisons may participate in a meeting of the Board or Board Committee (as defined in Section 14.1) through use of (a) conference telephone or similar communications equipment, provided that all Directors participating in such a meeting can speak to and hear one another or (b) electronic video screen communication or other communication equipment; provided that (i) all Directors participating in such a meeting can speak to and hear one another, (ii) all Directors are provided the means of fully participating in all matters before the Board or Board Committee, and (iii) ICANN adopts and implements means of verifying that (A) a person participating in such a meeting is a Director or other person entitled to participate in the meeting and (B) all actions of, or votes by, the Board or Board Committee are taken or cast only by Directors and not persons who are not Directors. Participation in a meeting pursuant to this Section 7.18 constitutes presence in person at such meeting. ICANN shall make available at the place of any meeting of the Board the telecommunications equipment necessary to permit Directors and Liaisons to participate by telephone.

Section 7.19. ACTION WITHOUT MEETING

Any action required or permitted to be taken by the Board or a Committee of the Board may be taken without a meeting if all of the Directors entitled to vote thereat shall individually or collectively consent in writing to such action. Such written consent shall have the same force and effect as the unanimous vote of such Directors. Such written consent or consents shall be filed with the minutes of the proceedings of the Board.

Section 7.20. ELECTRONIC MAIL

If permitted by applicable law, communication by electronic mail shall be considered equivalent to any communication otherwise required to be in writing. ICANN shall take such steps as it deems appropriate under the circumstances to assure itself that communications by electronic mail are authentic.

Section 7.21. BOARD RIGHTS OF INSPECTION

(a) Every Director shall have the right at any reasonable time to inspect and copy all books, records and documents of every kind, and to inspect the physical properties of ICANN.
(b) ICANN shall establish reasonable procedures to protect against the inappropriate disclosure of confidential information.

Section 7.22. COMPENSATION

(a) Except for the President of ICANN, who serves ex officio as a Director, each of the Directors shall be entitled to receive compensation for his or her services as a Director. The President shall receive only his or her compensation for service as President and shall not receive additional compensation for service as a Director.

(b) If the Board determines to offer a compensation arrangement to one or more Directors (other than the President) for services to ICANN as Directors, the Board shall follow the process that is calculated to pay an amount for service as a Director that is not an excess benefit under the standards set forth in Section 4958 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (the "Code").

(c) As part of the process, the Board shall retain an Independent Valuation Expert (as defined in Section 7.22(g)(i)) to consult with and to advise the Board regarding Director compensation arrangements and to issue to the Board a Reasoned Written Opinion (as defined in Section 7.22(g)(ii)) from such expert regarding the ranges of Reasonable Compensation (as defined in Section 7.22(g)(iii)) for any such services by a Director. The expert's opinion shall address all relevant factors affecting the level of compensation to be paid a Director, including offices held on the Board, attendance at Board and Board Committee meetings, the nature of service on the Board and on Board Committees, and appropriate data as to comparability regarding director compensation arrangements for U.S.-based, nonprofit, tax-exempt organizations possessing a global employee base.

(d) After having reviewed the Independent Valuation Expert's Reasoned Written Opinion, the Board shall meet with the expert to discuss the expert's opinion and to ask questions of the expert regarding the expert's opinion, the comparability data obtained and relied upon, and the conclusions reached by the expert.

(e) The Board shall adequately document the basis for any determination the Board makes regarding a Director compensation arrangement concurrently with making that determination.

(f) In addition to authorizing payment of compensation for services as Directors as set forth in this Section 7.22, the Board may also authorize the reimbursement of actual and necessary reasonable expenses incurred by any
Director and by Liaisons performing their duties as Directors or Liaisons.

(g) As used in this Section 7.22, the following terms shall have the following meanings:

(i) An "Independent Valuation Expert" means a person retained by ICANN to value compensation arrangements that: (A) holds itself out to the public as a compensation consultant; (B) performs valuations regarding compensation arrangements on a regular basis, with a majority of its compensation consulting services performed for persons other than ICANN; (C) is qualified to make valuations of the type of services involved in any engagement by and for ICANN; (D) issues to ICANN a Reasoned Written Opinion regarding a particular compensation arrangement; and (E) includes in its Reasoned Written Opinion a certification that it meets the requirements set forth in (A) through (D) of this definition.

(ii) A "Reasoned Written Opinion" means a written opinion of a valuation expert who meets the requirements of Section 7.22(g)(i)(A) through (D). To be reasoned, the opinion must be based upon a full disclosure by ICANN to the valuation expert of the factual situation regarding the compensation arrangement that is the subject of the opinion, the opinion must articulate the applicable valuation standards relevant in valuing such compensation arrangement, the opinion must apply those standards to such compensation arrangement, and the opinion must arrive at a conclusion regarding whether the compensation arrangement is within the range of Reasonable Compensation for the services covered by the arrangement. A written opinion is reasoned even though it reaches a conclusion that is subsequently determined to be incorrect so long as the opinion addresses itself to the facts and the applicable standards. However, a written opinion is not reasoned if it does nothing more than recite the facts and express a conclusion.

(iii) "Reasonable Compensation" shall have the meaning set forth in §53.4958-4(b)(1)(ii) of the Regulations issued under §4958 of the Code.

(h) Each of the Liaisons, with the exception of the Governmental Advisory Committee Liaison, shall be entitled to receive compensation for his or her services as a Liaison. If the Board determines to offer a compensation arrangement to one or more Liaisons, the Board shall approve that arrangement by a required three-fourths (3/4) vote.

Section 7.23. PRESUMPTION OF ASSENT
A Director present at a Board meeting at which action on any corporate matter is taken shall be presumed to have assented to the action taken unless his or her dissent or abstention is entered in the minutes of the meeting, or unless such Director files a written dissent or abstention to such action with the person acting as the secretary of the meeting before the adjournment thereof, or forwards such dissent or abstention by registered mail to the Secretary immediately after the adjournment of the meeting. Such right to dissent or abstain shall not apply to a Director who voted in favor of such action.

Section 7.24 INTERIM BOARD

Except in circumstances in which urgent decisions are needed to protect the security, stability or resilience of the DNS or to the extent necessary to comply with its fiduciary obligations under applicable law, a Board that consists of a majority or more of Interim Directors (an "Interim Board") shall (a) consult with the chairs of the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees before making major decisions and (b) consult through a community forum (in a manner consistent with the process for a Rejection Action Community Forum pursuant to Section 2.3 of Annex D) prior to taking any action that would, if implemented, materially change ICANN's strategy, policies or management, including replacement of the then-serving President. Interim Directors shall be entitled to compensation as provided in this Article 7.

Section 7.25 COMMUNICATION OF DESIGNATION

Upon its receipt of nominations as provided in Articles 7 through 12, the EC Administration, on behalf of the EC, shall promptly notify the Secretary of the EC's designation of individuals to fill seats on the Board. ICANN shall post all such designations promptly to the Website.

ARTICLE 8 NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Section 8.1. DESCRIPTION

There shall be a Nominating Committee of ICANN ("Nominating Committee"), responsible for nominating all Directors except the President and those Directors nominated by Decisional Participants; for nominating two directors of PTI (in accordance with the articles of incorporation and bylaws of PTI); and for such other selections as are set forth in these Bylaws. Notification of the Nominating Committee's Director nominations shall be given by the Nominating Committee Chair in writing to the EC Administration, with a copy to the Secretary, and the EC shall promptly act on it as provided in Section 7.25. Notification of the Nominating Committee's PTI director nomination shall be given to the Secretary.
Section 8.2. COMPOSITION

The Nominating Committee shall be composed of the following persons:

(a) A non-voting Chair, appointed by the Board;

(b) A non-voting Chair-Elect, appointed by the Board as a non-voting advisor;

(c) A non-voting liaison appointed by the Root Server System Advisory Committee established by Section 12.2(c);

(d) A non-voting liaison appointed by the Security and Stability Advisory Committee established by Section 12.2(b);

(e) A non-voting liaison appointed by the Governmental Advisory Committee;

(f) Five voting delegates selected by the At-Large Advisory Committee established by Section 12.2(d);

(g) Voting delegates to the Nominating Committee shall be selected from the Generic Names Supporting Organization established by Article 11, as follows:

   (i) One delegate from the Registries Stakeholder Group;

   (ii) One delegate from the Registrars Stakeholder Group;

   (iii) Two delegates from the Business Constituency, one representing small business users and one representing large business users;

   (iv) One delegate from the Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers Constituency (as defined in Section 11.5(a)(iii));

   (v) One delegate from the Intellectual Property Constituency; and

   (vi) One delegate from consumer and civil society groups, selected by the Non-Commercial Users Constituency.

(h) One voting delegate each selected by the following entities:

   (i) The Council of the Country Code Names Supporting Organization established by Section 10.3;

   (ii) The Council of the Address Supporting Organization established by
Section 9.2; and

(iii) The Internet Engineering Task Force.

(i) A non-voting Associate Chair, who may be appointed by the Chair, at his or her sole discretion, to serve during all or part of the term of the Chair. The Associate Chair may not be a person who is otherwise a member of the same Nominating Committee. The Associate Chair shall assist the Chair in carrying out the duties of the Chair, but shall not serve, temporarily or otherwise, in the place of the Chair.

Section 8.3. TERMS

(a) Each voting delegate shall serve a one-year term. A delegate may serve at most two successive one-year terms, after which at least two years must elapse before the individual is eligible to serve another term.

(b) The regular term of each voting delegate shall begin at the conclusion of an ICANN annual meeting and shall end at the conclusion of the immediately following ICANN annual meeting.

(c) Non-voting liaisons shall serve during the term designated by the entity that appoints them. The Chair, the Chair-Elect, and any Associate Chair shall serve as such until the conclusion of the next ICANN annual meeting.

(d) It is anticipated that upon the conclusion of the term of the Chair-Elect, the Chair-Elect will be appointed by the Board to the position of Chair. However, the Board retains the discretion to appoint any other person to the position of Chair. At the time of appointing a Chair-Elect, if the Board determines that the person identified to serve as Chair shall be appointed as Chair for a successive term, the Chair-Elect position shall remain vacant for the term designated by the Board.

(e) Vacancies in the positions of delegate, non-voting liaison, Chair or Chair-Elect shall be filled by the entity entitled to select the delegate, non-voting liaison, Chair or Chair-Elect involved. For any term that the Chair-Elect position is vacant pursuant to Section 8.3(d), or until any other vacancy in the position of Chair-Elect can be filled, a non-voting advisor to the Chair may be appointed by the Board from among persons with prior service on the Board or a Nominating Committee, including the immediately previous Chair of the Nominating Committee. A vacancy in the position of Associate Chair may be filled by the Chair in accordance with the criteria established by Section 8.2(i).

(f) The existence of any vacancies shall not affect the obligation of the
Nominating Committee to carry out the responsibilities assigned to it in these Bylaws.

Section 8.4. CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF NOMINATING COMMITTEE DELEGATES

Delegates to the ICANN Nominating Committee shall be:

(a) Accomplished persons of integrity, objectivity, and intelligence, with reputations for sound judgment and open minds, and with experience and competence with collegial large group decision-making;

(b) Persons with wide contacts, broad experience in the Internet community, and a commitment to the success of ICANN;

(c) Persons whom the selecting body is confident will consult widely and accept input in carrying out their responsibilities;

(d) Persons who are neutral and objective, without any fixed personal commitments to particular individuals, organizations, or commercial objectives in carrying out their Nominating Committee responsibilities;

(e) Persons with an understanding of ICANN’s mission and the potential impact of ICANN’s activities on the broader Internet community who are willing to serve as volunteers, without compensation other than the reimbursement of certain expenses; and

(f) Persons who are able to work and communicate in written and spoken English.

Section 8.5. DIVERSITY

In carrying out its responsibilities to nominate Directors to fill Seats 1 through 8 (and selections to any other ICANN bodies as the Nominating Committee is responsible for under these Bylaws), the Nominating Committee shall take into account the continuing membership of the Board (and such other bodies), and seek to ensure that the persons it nominates to serve as Director and selects shall, to the extent feasible and consistent with the other criteria required to be applied by Section 8.4, be guided by Section 1.2(b)(ii).

Section 8.6. ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL SUPPORT

ICANN shall provide administrative and operational support necessary for the
Section 8.7. PROCEDURES
The Nominating Committee shall adopt such operating procedures as it deems necessary, which shall be published on the Website.

Section 8.8. INELIGIBILITY FOR SELECTION BY NOMINATING COMMITTEE
No person who serves on the Nominating Committee in any capacity shall be eligible for nomination by any means to any position on the Board or any other ICANN body having one or more membership positions that the Nominating Committee is responsible for filling, until the conclusion of an ICANN annual meeting that coincides with, or is after, the conclusion of that person’s service on the Nominating Committee.

Section 8.9. INELIGIBILITY FOR SERVICE ON NOMINATING COMMITTEE
No person who is an employee of or paid consultant to ICANN (including the Ombudsman) shall simultaneously serve in any of the Nominating Committee positions described in Section 8.2.

ARTICLE 9 ADDRESS SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

Section 9.1. DESCRIPTION
(a) The Address Supporting Organization ("Address Supporting Organization" or "ASO") shall advise the Board with respect to policy issues relating to the operation, assignment, and management of Internet addresses.

(b) The ASO shall be the entity established by the Memorandum of Understanding entered on 21 October 2004 between ICANN and the Number Resource Organization ("NRO"), an organization of the existing RIRs.

Section 9.2. ADDRESS COUNCIL
(a) The ASO shall have an Address Council, consisting of the members of the NRO Number Council.

(b) The Address Council shall nominate individuals to fill Seats 9 and 10 on the Board. Notification of the Address Council's nominations shall be given by the Address Council in writing to the EC Administration, with a copy to the
Secretary, and the EC shall promptly act on it as provided in Section 7.25.

ARTICLE 10 COUNTRY-CODE NAMES SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

Section 10.1. DESCRIPTION
There shall be a policy-development body known as the Country-Code Names Supporting Organization ("ccNSO"), which shall be responsible for:

(a) developing and recommending to the Board global policies relating to country-code top-level domains;

(b) Nurturing consensus across the ccNSO's community, including the name-related activities of ccTLDs;

(c) Coordinating with other ICANN Supporting Organizations, committees, and constituencies under ICANN;

(d) Nominating individuals to fill Seats 11 and 12 on the Board; and

(e) Other responsibilities of the ccNSO as set forth in these Bylaws.

Policies that apply to ccNSO members by virtue of their membership are only those policies developed according to Section 10.4(j) and Section 10.4(k). However, the ccNSO may also engage in other activities authorized by its members. Adherence to the results of these activities will be voluntary and such activities may include: seeking to develop voluntary best practices for ccTLD managers, assisting in skills building within the global community of ccTLD managers, and enhancing operational and technical cooperation among ccTLD managers.

Section 10.2. ORGANIZATION
The ccNSO shall consist of (a) ccTLD managers that have agreed in writing to be members of the ccNSO (see Section 10.4(b)) and (b) a ccNSO Council responsible for managing the policy-development process of the ccNSO.

Section 10.3. ccNSO COUNCIL
(a) The ccNSO Council shall consist of three ccNSO Council members selected by the ccNSO members within each of ICANN's Geographic Regions in the manner described in Section 10.4(g) through Section 10.4(i); (ii) three ccNSO Council members selected by the ICANN Nominating Committee; (iii)
liaisons as described in Section 10.3(b); and (iv) observers as described in
Section 10.3(c).

(b) There shall also be one liaison to the ccNSO Council from each of the
following organizations, to the extent they choose to appoint such a liaison: (i)
the Governmental Advisory Committee; (ii) the At-Large Advisory Committee;
and (iii) each of the Regional Organizations described in Section 10.5. These
liaisons shall not be members of or entitled to vote on the ccNSO Council, but
otherwise shall be entitled to participate on equal footing with members of the
ccNSO Council. Appointments of liaisons shall be made by providing written
notice to the ICANN Secretary, with a notification copy to the ccNSO Council
Chair, and shall be for the term designated by the appointing organization as
stated in the written notice. The appointing organization may recall from office
or replace its liaison at any time by providing written notice of the recall or
replacement to the ICANN Secretary, with a notification copy to the ccNSO
Council Chair.

(c) The ccNSO Council may agree with the Council of any other ICANN
Supporting Organization to exchange observers. Such observers shall not be
members of or entitled to vote on the ccNSO Council, but otherwise shall be
entitled to participate on equal footing with members of the ccNSO Council.
The appointing Council may designate its observer (or revoke or change the
designation of its observer) on the ccNSO Council at any time by providing
written notice to the ICANN Secretary, with a notification copy to the ccNSO
Council Chair.

(d) (i) the regular term of each ccNSO Council member shall begin at the
conclusion of an ICANN annual meeting and shall end at the conclusion of the
third ICANN annual meeting thereafter; (ii) the regular terms of the three
ccNSO Council members selected by the ccNSO members within each ICANN
Geographic Region shall be staggered so that one member's term begins in a
year divisible by three, a second member's term begins in the first year
following a year divisible by three, and the third member's term begins in the
second year following a year divisible by three; and (iii) the regular terms of
the three ccNSO Council members selected by the Nominating Committee
shall be staggered in the same manner. Each ccNSO Council member shall
hold office during his or her regular term and until a successor has been
selected and qualified or until that member resigns or is removed in
accordance with these Bylaws.

(e) A ccNSO Council member may resign at any time by giving written notice
to the ICANN Secretary, with a notification copy to the ccNSO Council Chair.

(f) ccNSO Council members may be removed for not attending three
consecutive meetings of the ccNSO Council without sufficient cause or for grossly inappropriate behavior, both as determined by at least a 66% vote of all of the members of the ccNSO Council.

(g) A vacancy on the ccNSO Council shall be deemed to exist in the case of the death, resignation, or removal of any ccNSO Council member. Vacancies in the positions of the three members selected by the Nominating Committee shall be filled for the unexpired term involved by the Nominating Committee giving the ICANN Secretary written notice of its selection, with a notification copy to the ccNSO Council Chair. Vacancies in the positions of the ccNSO Council members selected by ccNSO members shall be filled for the unexpired term by the procedure described in Section 10.4(g) through (i).

(h) The role of the ccNSO Council is to administer and coordinate the affairs of the ccNSO (including coordinating meetings, including an annual meeting, of ccNSO members as described in Section 10.4(f)) and to manage the development of policy recommendations in accordance with Section 10.6(a). The ccNSO Council shall also undertake such other roles as the members of the ccNSO shall decide from time to time.

(i) The ccNSO Council shall nominate individuals to fill Seats 11 and 12 on the Board by written ballot or by action at a meeting; any such nomination must have affirmative votes of a majority of all the members of the ccNSO Council then in office. Notification of the ccNSO Council's nominations shall be given by the ccNSO Council Chair in writing to the EC Administration, with a copy to the Secretary, and the EC shall promptly act on it as provided in Section 7.25.

(j) The ccNSO Council shall select from among its members the ccNSO Council Chair and such Vice Chair(s) as it deems appropriate. Selections of the ccNSO Council Chair and Vice Chair(s) shall be by written ballot or by action at a meeting; any such selection must have affirmative votes of a majority of all the members of the ccNSO Council then in office. The term of office of the ccNSO Council Chair and any Vice Chair(s) shall be as specified by the ccNSO Council at or before the time the selection is made. The ccNSO Council Chair or any Vice Chair(s) may be recalled from office by the same procedure as used for selection.

(k) The ccNSO Council, subject to direction by the ccNSO members, shall adopt such rules and procedures for the ccNSO as it deems necessary, provided they are consistent with these Bylaws. Rules for ccNSO membership and operating procedures adopted by the ccNSO Council shall be published on the Website.

(l) Except as provided by Section 10.3(i) and Section 10.3(j), the ccNSO
Council shall act at meetings. The ccNSO Council shall meet regularly on a schedule it determines, but not fewer than four times each calendar year. At the discretion of the ccNSO Council, meetings may be held in person or by other means, provided that all ccNSO Council members are permitted to participate by at least one means described in Section 10.3(n). Except where determined by a majority vote of the members of the ccNSO Council present that a closed session is appropriate, physical meetings shall be open to attendance by all interested persons. To the extent practicable, ccNSO Council meetings should be held in conjunction with meetings of the Board, or of one or more of ICANN’s other Supporting Organizations.

(m) Notice of time and place (and information about means of participation other than personal attendance) of all meetings of the ccNSO Council shall be provided to each ccNSO Council member, liaison, and observer by e-mail, telephone, facsimile, or a paper notice delivered personally or by postal mail. In case the notice is sent by postal mail, it shall be sent at least 21 days before the day of the meeting. In case the notice is delivered personally or by telephone, facsimile, or e-mail it shall be provided at least seven days before the day of the meeting. At least seven days in advance of each ccNSO Council meeting (or if not practicable, as far in advance as is practicable), a notice of such meeting and, to the extent known, an agenda for the meeting shall be posted.

(n) Members of the ccNSO Council may participate in a meeting of the ccNSO Council through personal attendance or use of electronic communication (such as telephone or video conference), provided that (i) all ccNSO Council members participating in the meeting can speak to and hear one another, (ii) all ccNSO Council members participating in the meeting are provided the means of fully participating in all matters before the ccNSO Council, and (iii) there is a reasonable means of verifying the identity of ccNSO Council members participating in the meeting and their votes. A majority of the ccNSO Council members (i.e. those entitled to vote) then in office shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, and actions by a majority vote of the ccNSO Council members present at any meeting at which there is a quorum shall be actions of the ccNSO Council, unless otherwise provided in these Bylaws. The ccNSO Council shall transmit minutes of its meetings to the ICANN Secretary, who shall cause those minutes to be posted to the Website as soon as practicable following the meeting, and no later than 21 days following the meeting.

Section 10.4. MEMBERSHIP

(a) The ccNSO shall have a membership consisting of ccTLD managers. Any ccTLD manager that meets the membership qualifications stated in Section.
10.4(b) shall be entitled to be members of the ccNSO. For purposes of this Article 10, a ccTLD manager is the organization or entity responsible for managing an ISO 3166 country-code top-level domain, or under any later variant, for that country-code top-level domain.

(b) Any ccTLD manager may become a ccNSO member by submitting an application to a person designated by the ccNSO Council to receive applications. The application shall be in writing in a form designated by the ccNSO Council. The application shall include the ccTLD manager's recognition of the role of the ccNSO within the ICANN structure as well as the ccTLD manager's agreement, for the duration of its membership in the ccNSO, (i) to adhere to rules of the ccNSO, including membership rules, (ii) to abide by policies developed and recommended by the ccNSO and adopted by the Board in the manner described by Section 10.4(j) and Section 10.4(k), and (ii) to pay ccNSO membership fees established by the ccNSO Council under Section 10.7(c). A ccNSO member may resign from membership at any time by giving written notice to a person designated by the ccNSO Council to receive notices of resignation. Upon resignation the ccTLD manager ceases to agree to (A) adhere to rules of the ccNSO, including membership rules, (B) to abide by policies developed and recommended by the ccNSO and adopted by the Board in the manner described by Section 10.4(j) and Section 10.4(k), and (C) to pay ccNSO membership fees established by the ccNSO Council under Section 10.7(c). In the absence of designation by the ccNSO Council of a person to receive applications and notices of resignation, they shall be sent to the ICANN Secretary, who shall notify the ccNSO Council of receipt of any such applications and notices.

(c) Neither membership in the ccNSO nor membership in any Regional Organization described in Section 10.5 shall be a condition for access to or registration in the IANA database. Any individual relationship a ccTLD manager has with ICANN or the ccTLD manager's receipt of IANA services is not in any way contingent upon membership in the ccNSO.

(d) The Geographic Regions of ccTLDs shall be as described in Section 7.5. For purposes of this Article 10, managers of ccTLDs within a Geographic Region that are members of the ccNSO are referred to as ccNSO members "within" the Geographic Region, regardless of the physical location of the ccTLD manager. In cases where the Geographic Region of a ccNSO member is unclear, the ccTLD member should self-select according to procedures adopted by the ccNSO Council.

(e) Each ccTLD manager may designate in writing a person, organization, or entity to represent the ccTLD manager. In the absence of such a designation, the ccTLD manager shall be represented by the person, organization, or entity
listed as the administrative contact in the IANA database.

(f) There shall be an annual meeting of ccNSO members, which shall be coordinated by the ccNSO Council. Annual meetings should be open for all to attend, and a reasonable opportunity shall be provided for ccTLD managers that are not members of the ccNSO as well as other non-members of the ccNSO to address the meeting. To the extent practicable, annual meetings of the ccNSO members shall be held in person and should be held in conjunction with meetings of the Board, or of one or more of ICANN’s other Supporting Organizations.

(g) The ccNSO Council members selected by the ccNSO members from each Geographic Region (see Section 10.3(a)(i)) shall be selected through nomination, and if necessary election, by the ccNSO members within that Geographic Region. At least 90 days before the end of the regular term of any ccNSO-member-selected member of the ccNSO Council, or upon the occurrence of a vacancy in the seat of such a ccNSO Council member, the ccNSO Council shall establish a nomination and election schedule, which shall be sent to all ccNSO members within the Geographic Region and posted on the Website.

(h) Any ccNSO member may nominate an individual to serve as a ccNSO Council member representing the ccNSO member’s Geographic Region. Nominations must be seconded by another ccNSO member from the same Geographic Region. By accepting their nomination, individuals nominated to the ccNSO Council agree to support the policies committed to by ccNSO members.

(i) If at the close of nominations there are no more candidates nominated (with seconds and acceptances) in a particular Geographic Region than there are seats on the ccNSO Council available for that Geographic Region, then the nominated candidates shall be selected to serve on the ccNSO Council. Otherwise, an election by written ballot (which may be by e-mail) shall be held to select the ccNSO Council members from among those nominated (with seconds and acceptances), with ccNSO members from the Geographic Region being entitled to vote in the election through their designated representatives. In such an election, a majority of all ccNSO members in the Geographic Region entitled to vote shall constitute a quorum, and the selected candidate must receive the votes of a majority of those cast by ccNSO members within the Geographic Region. The ccNSO Council Chair shall provide the ICANN Secretary prompt written notice of the selection of ccNSO Council members under this paragraph.

(j) Subject to Section 10.4(k), ICANN policies shall apply to ccNSO members
by virtue of their membership to the extent, and only to the extent, that the policies (i) only address issues that are within scope of the ccNSO according to Section 10.6(a) and Annex C; (ii) have been developed through the ccPDP as described in Section 10.6, and (iii) have been recommended as such by the ccNSO to the Board, and (iv) are adopted by the Board as policies, provided that such policies do not conflict with the law applicable to the ccTLD manager which shall, at all times, remain paramount. In addition, such policies shall apply to ICANN in its activities concerning ccTLDs.

(k) A ccNSO member shall not be bound if it provides a declaration to the ccNSO Council stating that (i) implementation of the policy would require the member to breach custom, religion, or public policy (not embodied in the applicable law described in Section 10.4(j)), and (ii) failure to implement the policy would not impair DNS operations or interoperability, giving detailed reasons supporting its statements. After investigation, the ccNSO Council will provide a response to the ccNSO member's declaration. If there is a ccNSO Council consensus disagreeing with the declaration, which may be demonstrated by a vote of 14 or more members of the ccNSO Council, the response shall state the ccNSO Council's disagreement with the declaration and the reasons for disagreement. Otherwise, the response shall state the ccNSO Council's agreement with the declaration. If the ccNSO Council disagrees, the ccNSO Council shall review the situation after a six-month period. At the end of that period, the ccNSO Council shall make findings as to (A) whether the ccNSO members' implementation of the policy would require the member to breach custom, religion, or public policy (not embodied in the applicable law described in Section 10.4(j)) and (B) whether failure to implement the policy would impair DNS operations or interoperability. In making any findings disagreeing with the declaration, the ccNSO Council shall proceed by consensus, which may be demonstrated by a vote of 14 or more members of the ccNSO Council.

Section 10.5. REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

The ccNSO Council may designate a Regional Organization for each ICANN Geographic Region, provided that the Regional Organization is open to full membership by all ccNSO members within the Geographic Region. Decisions to designate or de-designate a Regional Organization shall require a 66% vote of all of the members of the ccNSO Council and shall be subject to review according to procedures established by the Board.

Section 10.6. ccNSO POLICY-DEVELOPMENT PROCESS AND SCOPE

(a) The scope of the ccNSO's policy-development role shall be as stated in
Annex C to these Bylaws; any modifications to the scope shall be recommended to the Board by the ccNSO by use of the procedures of the ccPDP, and shall be subject to approval by the Board.

(b) In developing global policies within the scope of the ccNSO and recommending them to the Board, the ccNSO shall follow the ccNSO Policy-Development Process ("ccPDP"). The ccPDP shall be as stated in Annex B to these Bylaws; modifications shall be recommended to the Board by the ccNSO by use of the procedures of the ccPDP, and shall be subject to approval by the Board.

Section 10.7. STAFF SUPPORT AND FUNDING

(a) Upon request of the ccNSO Council, a member of the ICANN staff may be assigned to support the ccNSO and shall be designated as the ccNSO Staff Manager. Alternatively, the ccNSO Council may designate, at ccNSO expense, another person to serve as ccNSO Staff Manager. The work of the ccNSO Staff Manager on substantive matters shall be assigned by the Chair of the ccNSO Council, and may include the duties of ccPDP Issue Manager.

(b) Upon request of the ccNSO Council, ICANN shall provide administrative and operational support necessary for the ccNSO to carry out its responsibilities. Such support shall not include an obligation for ICANN to fund travel expenses incurred by ccNSO participants for travel to any meeting of the ccNSO or for any other purpose. The ccNSO Council may make provision, at ccNSO expense, for administrative and operational support in addition or as an alternative to support provided by ICANN.

(c) The ccNSO Council shall establish fees to be paid by ccNSO members to defray ccNSO expenses as described in Section 10.7(a) and Section 10.7(b), as approved by the ccNSO members.

(d) Written notices given to the Secretary under this Article 10 shall be permanently retained, and shall be made available for review by the ccNSO Council on request. The Secretary shall also maintain the roll of members of the ccNSO, which shall include the name of each ccTLD manager's designated representative, and which shall be posted on the Website.

ARTICLE 11 GENERIC NAMES SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

Section 11.1. DESCRIPTION

There shall be a policy-development body known as the Generic Names
Supporting Organization (the "Generic Names Supporting Organization" or "GNSO", and collectively with the ASO and ccNSO, the "Supporting Organizations"), which shall be responsible for developing and recommending to the Board substantive policies relating to generic top-level domains and other responsibilities of the GNSO as set forth in these Bylaws.

Section 11.2. ORGANIZATION

The GNSO shall consist of:

(a) A number of Constituencies, where applicable, organized within the Stakeholder Groups as described in Section 11.5;

(b) Four Stakeholder Groups organized within Houses as described in Section 11.5;

(c) Two Houses within the GNSO Council as described in Section 11.3(h);

(d) A GNSO Council responsible for managing the policy development process of the GNSO, as described in Section 11.3; and

(e) Except as otherwise defined in these Bylaws, the four Stakeholder Groups and the Constituencies will be responsible for defining their own charters with the approval of their members and of the Board.

Section 11.3. GNSO COUNCIL

(a) Subject to Section 11.5, the GNSO Council shall consist of:

(i) three representatives selected from the Registries Stakeholder Group;

(ii) three representatives selected from the Registrars Stakeholder Group;

(iii) six representatives selected from the Commercial Stakeholder Group;

(iv) six representatives selected from the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group; and

(v) three representatives selected by the ICANN Nominating Committee, one of which shall be non-voting, but otherwise entitled to participate on equal footing with other members of the GNSO Council including, e.g.
the making and seconding of motions and of serving as Chair if elected. One Nominating Committee appointee voting representative shall be assigned to each House (as described in Section 11.3(h)) by the Nominating Committee.

No individual representative may hold more than one seat on the GNSO Council at the same time.

Stakeholder Groups should, in their charters, ensure their representation on the GNSO Council is as diverse as possible and practicable, including considerations of geography, GNSO Constituency, sector, ability and gender.

There may also be liaisons to the GNSO Council from other ICANN Supporting Organizations and/or Advisory Committees, from time to time. The appointing organization shall designate, revoke, or change its liaison on the GNSO Council by providing written notice to the Chair of the GNSO Council and to the ICANN Secretary. Liaisons shall not be members of or entitled to vote, to make or second motions, or to serve as an officer on the GNSO Council, but otherwise liaisons shall be entitled to participate on equal footing with members of the GNSO Council.

(b) The regular term of each GNSO Council member shall begin at the conclusion of an ICANN annual meeting and shall end at the conclusion of the second ICANN annual meeting thereafter. The regular term of two representatives selected from Stakeholder Groups with three Council seats shall begin in even-numbered years and the regular term of the other representative selected from that Stakeholder Group shall begin in odd-numbered years. The regular term of three representatives selected from Stakeholder Groups with six Council seats shall begin in even-numbered years and the regular term of the other three representatives selected from that Stakeholder Group shall begin in odd-numbered years. The regular term of one of the three members selected by the Nominating Committee shall begin in even-numbered years and the regular term of the other two of the three members selected by the Nominating Committee shall begin in odd-numbered years. Each GNSO Council member shall hold office during his or her regular term and until a successor has been selected and qualified or until that member resigns or is removed in accordance with these Bylaws.

Except in a "special circumstance," such as, but not limited to, meeting geographic or other diversity requirements defined in the Stakeholder Group charters, where no alternative representative is available to serve, no Council member may be selected to serve more than two consecutive terms, in such a special circumstance a Council member may serve one additional term. For these purposes, a person selected to fill a vacancy in a term shall not be
deemed to have served that term. A former Council member who has served two consecutive terms must remain out of office for one full term prior to serving any subsequent term as Council member. A "special circumstance" is defined in the GNSO Operating Procedures.

(c) A vacancy on the GNSO Council shall be deemed to exist in the case of the death, resignation, or removal of any member. Vacancies shall be filled for the unexpired term by the appropriate Nominating Committee or Stakeholder Group that selected the member holding the position before the vacancy occurred by giving the GNSO Secretariat written notice of its selection. Procedures for handling Stakeholder Group-appointed GNSO Council member vacancies, resignations, and removals are prescribed in the applicable Stakeholder Group Charter.

A GNSO Council member selected by the Nominating Committee may be removed for cause: (i) stated by a three-fourths (3/4) vote of all members of the applicable House to which the Nominating Committee appointee is assigned; or (ii) stated by a three-fourths (3/4) vote of all members of each House in the case of the non-voting Nominating Committee appointee (see Section 11.3(h)). Such removal shall be subject to reversal by the ICANN Board on appeal by the affected GNSO Council member.

(d) The GNSO Council is responsible for managing the policy development process of the GNSO. It shall adopt such procedures (the "GNSO Operating Procedures") as it sees fit to carry out that responsibility, provided that such procedures are approved by a majority vote of each House. The GNSO Operating Procedures shall be effective upon the expiration of a twenty-one (21) day public comment period, and shall be subject to Board oversight and review. Until any modifications are recommended by the GNSO Council, the applicable procedures shall be as set forth in Section 11.6.

(e) No more than one officer, director or employee of any particular corporation or other organization (including its subsidiaries and affiliates) shall serve on the GNSO Council at any given time.

(f) The GNSO shall nominate by written ballot or by action at a meeting individuals to fill Seats 13 and 14 on the Board. Each of the two voting Houses of the GNSO, as described in Section 11.3(h), shall make a nomination to fill one of two Board seats, as outlined below; any such nomination must have affirmative votes compromising sixty percent (60%) of all the respective voting House members:

(i) the Contracted Parties House (as described in Section 11.3(h)(i)) shall select a representative to fill Seat 13; and
(ii) the Non-Contracted Parties House (as described in Section 11.3(h)) shall select a representative to fill Seat 14.

Election procedures are defined in the GNSO Operating Procedures.

Notification of the Board seat nominations shall be given by the GNSO Chair in writing to the EC Administration, with a copy to the Secretary, and the EC shall promptly act on it as provided in Section 7.25.

(g) The GNSO Council shall select the GNSO Chair for a term the GNSO Council specifies, but not longer than one year. Each House (as described in Section 11.3(h)) shall select a Vice-Chair, who will be a Vice-Chair of the whole of the GNSO Council, for a term the GNSO Council specifies, but not longer than one year. The procedures for selecting the Chair and any other officers are contained in the GNSO Operating Procedures. In the event that the GNSO Council has not elected a GNSO Chair by the end of the previous Chair’s term, the Vice-Chairs will serve as Interim GNSO Co-Chairs until a successful election can be held.

(h) Except as otherwise required in these Bylaws, for voting purposes, the GNSO Council (see Section 11.3(a)) shall be organized into a bicameral House structure as described below:

(i) the Contracted Parties House includes the Registries Stakeholder Group (three members), the Registrars Stakeholder Group (three members), and one voting member appointed by the ICANN Nominating Committee for a total of seven voting members; and

(ii) the Non Contracted Parties House includes the Commercial Stakeholder Group (six members), the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (six members), and one voting member appointed by the ICANN Nominating Committee to that House for a total of thirteen voting members.

Except as otherwise specified in these Bylaws, each member of a voting House is entitled to cast one vote in each separate matter before the GNSO Council.

(i) Except as otherwise specified in these Bylaws, Annex A, Annex A-1 or Annex A-2 hereto, or the GNSO Operating Procedures, the default threshold to pass a GNSO Council motion or other voting action requires a simple majority vote of each House. The voting thresholds described below shall apply to the following GNSO actions:

(i) Create an Issues Report: requires an affirmative vote of more than one-fourth (1/4) vote of each House or majority of one House.

(ii) Initiate a Policy Development Process ("PDP") Within Scope (as described in Annex A): requires an affirmative vote of more than one-third (1/3) of each House or more than two-thirds (2/3) of one House.

(iii) Initiate a PDP Not Within Scope: requires an affirmative vote of GNSO Supermajority (as defined in Section 11.3(i)(xix)).

(iv) Approve a PDP Team Charter for a PDP Within Scope: requires an affirmative vote of more than one-third (1/3) of each House or more than two-thirds (2/3) of one House.

(v) Approve a PDP Team Charter for a PDP Not Within Scope: requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO Supermajority.

(vi) Changes to an Approved PDP Team Charter: For any PDP Team Charter approved under (iv) or (v) above, the GNSO Council may approve an amendment to the Charter through a simple majority vote of each House.

(vii) Terminate a PDP: Once initiated, and prior to the publication of a Final Report, the GNSO Council may terminate a PDP only for significant cause, upon a motion that passes with a GNSO Supermajority Vote in favor of termination.

(viii) Approve a PDP Recommendation Without a GNSO Supermajority: requires an affirmative vote of a majority of each House and further requires that one GNSO Council member representative of at least 3 of the 4 Stakeholder Groups supports the Recommendation.

(ix) Approve a PDP Recommendation With a GNSO Supermajority: requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO Supermajority.

(x) Approve a PDP Recommendation Imposing New Obligations on Certain Contracting Parties: where an ICANN contract provision specifies that "a two-thirds vote of the council" demonstrates the presence of a consensus, the GNSO Supermajority vote threshold will have to be met or exceeded.

(xi) Modification of Approved PDP Recommendation: Prior to Final Approval by the Board, an Approved PDP Recommendation may be
modified or amended by the GNSO Council with a GNSO Supermajority vote.

(xii) Initiation of an Expedited Policy Development Process ("EPDP"): requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO Supermajority.

(xiii) Approve an EPDP Team Charter: requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO Supermajority.

(xiv) Approval of EPDP Recommendations: requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO Supermajority.

(xv) Approve an EPDP Recommendation Imposing New Obligations on Certain Contracting Parties: where an ICANN contract provision specifies that "a two-thirds vote of the council" demonstrates the presence of a consensus, the GNSO Supermajority vote threshold will have to be met or exceeded.

(xvi) Initiation of a GNSO Guidance Process ("GGP"): requires an affirmative vote of more than one-third (1/3) of each House or more than two-thirds (2/3) of one House.

(xvii) Rejection of Initiation of a GGP Requested by the Board: requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO Supermajority.

(xviii) Approval of GGP Recommendations: requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO Supermajority.

(xix) A "GNSO Supermajority" shall mean: (A) two-thirds (2/3) of the Council members of each House, or (B) three-fourths (3/4) of the Council members of one House and a majority of the Council members of the other House.

Section 11.4. STAFF SUPPORT AND FUNDING

(a) A member of the ICANN staff shall be assigned to support the GNSO, whose work on substantive matters shall be assigned by the Chair of the GNSO Council, and shall be designated as the GNSO Staff Manager ("Staff Manager").

(b) ICANN shall provide administrative and operational support necessary for the GNSO to carry out its responsibilities. Such support shall not include an obligation for ICANN to fund travel expenses incurred by GNSO participants for travel to any meeting of the GNSO or for any other purpose. ICANN may,
at its discretion, fund travel expenses for GNSO participants under any travel support procedures or guidelines that it may adopt from time to time.

Section 11.5. STAKEHOLDER GROUPS

(a) The following "Stakeholder Groups" are hereby recognized as representative of a specific group of one or more "Constituencies" or interest groups:

(i) Registries Stakeholder Group representing all gTLD registries under contract to ICANN;

(ii) Registrars Stakeholder Group representing all registrars accredited by and under contract to ICANN;

(iii) Commercial Stakeholder Group representing the full range of large and small commercial entities of the Internet ("Commercial Stakeholder Group"), which includes the Business Constituency ("Business Constituency"), Intellectual Property Constituency ("Intellectual Property Constituency") and the Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers Constituency ("Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers Constituency"); and

(iv) Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group representing the full range of non-commercial entities of the Internet.

(b) Each Stakeholder Group is assigned a specific number of GNSO Council seats in accordance with Section 11.3(a).

(c) Each Stakeholder Group identified in Section 11.3(a) and each of its associated Constituencies, where applicable, shall maintain recognition with the ICANN Board. Recognition is granted by the Board based upon the extent to which, in fact, the entity represents the global interests of the stakeholder communities it purports to represent and operates to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness. Stakeholder Group and Constituency Charters may be reviewed periodically as prescribed by the Board.

(d) Any group of individuals or entities may petition the Board for recognition as a new or separate Constituency in the Non-Contracted Parties House. Any such petition shall contain:

(i) A detailed explanation of why the addition of such a Constituency will
improve the ability of the GNSO to carry out its policy-development responsibilities;

(ii) A detailed explanation of why the proposed new Constituency adequately represents, on a global basis, the stakeholders it seeks to represent;

(iii) A recommendation for organizational placement within a particular Stakeholder Group; and

(iv) A proposed charter that adheres to the principles and procedures contained in these Bylaws.

Any petition for the recognition of a new Constituency and the associated charter shall be posted for public comment.

(e) The Board may create new Constituencies as described in Section 11.5(c) in response to such a petition, or on its own motion, if the Board determines that such action would serve the purposes of ICANN. In the event the Board is considering acting on its own motion it shall post a detailed explanation of why such action is necessary or desirable, set a reasonable time for public comment, and not make a final decision on whether to create such new Constituency until after reviewing all comments received. Whenever the Board posts a petition or recommendation for a new Constituency for public comment, the Board shall notify the GNSO Council and the appropriate Stakeholder Group affected and shall consider any response to that notification prior to taking action.

Section 11.6. POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

The policy-development procedures to be followed by the GNSO shall be as stated in Annex A to these Bylaws. These procedures may be supplemented or revised in the manner stated in Section 11.3(d).

ARTICLE 12 ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Section 12.1. GENERAL

The Board may create one or more "Advisory Committees" in addition to those set forth in this Article 12. Advisory Committee membership may consist of Directors only, Directors and non-directors, or non-directors only, and may also include non-voting or alternate members. Advisory Committees shall have no legal authority to act for ICANN, but shall report their findings and recommendations to the Board.
Section 12.2. SPECIFIC ADVISORY COMMITTEES

There shall be at least the following Advisory Committees:

(a) Governmental Advisory Committee

(i) The Governmental Advisory Committee should 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.

(ii) Membership in the Governmental Advisory Committee shall be open to all national governments. Membership shall also be open to Distinct Economies as recognized in international fora, and multinational governmental organizations and treaty organizations, on the invitation of the Governmental Advisory Committee through its Chair.

(iii) The Governmental Advisory Committee may adopt its own charter and internal operating principles or procedures to guide its operations, to be published on the Website.

(iv) The chair of the Governmental Advisory Committee shall be elected by the members of the Governmental Advisory Committee pursuant to procedures adopted by such members.

(v) Each member of the Governmental Advisory Committee shall appoint one accredited representative to the Governmental Advisory Committee. The accredited representative of a member must hold a formal official position with the member's public administration. The term "official" includes a holder of an elected governmental office, or a person who is employed by such government, public authority, or multinational governmental or treaty organization and whose primary function with such government, public authority, or organization is to develop or influence governmental or public policies.

(vi) The Governmental Advisory Committee shall annually appoint one Liaison to the Board, without limitation on reappointment, and shall annually appoint one non-voting liaison to the ICANN Nominating Committee.

(vii) The Governmental Advisory Committee may designate a non-voting liaison to each of the Supporting Organization Councils and Advisory Committees, to the extent the Governmental Advisory Committee
(viii) The Board shall notify the Chair of the Governmental Advisory Committee in a timely manner of any proposal raising public policy issues on which it or any of the Supporting Organizations or Advisory Committees seeks public comment, and shall take duly into account any timely response to that notification prior to taking action.

(ix) The Governmental Advisory Committee may put issues to the Board directly, either by way of comment or prior advice, or by way of specifically recommending action or new policy development or revision to existing policies.

(x) 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 Board determines to take an action that is not consistent with Governmental Advisory Committee advice, it shall so inform the Governmental Advisory Committee and state the reasons why it decided not to follow that advice. Any Governmental Advisory Committee advice approved by a full Governmental Advisory Committee consensus, understood to mean the practice of adopting decisions by general agreement in the absence of any formal objection ("GAC Consensus Advice"), may only be rejected by a vote of no less than 60% of the Board, and the Governmental Advisory Committee and the Board will then try, in good faith and in a timely and efficient manner, to find a mutually acceptable solution. The Governmental Advisory Committee will state whether any advice it gives to the Board is GAC Consensus Advice.

(xi) If GAC Consensus Advice is rejected by the Board pursuant to Section 12.2(a)(x) and if no such mutually acceptable solution can be found, the Board will state in its final decision the reasons why the Governmental Advisory Committee 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.

(b) Security and Stability Advisory Committee

(i) The role of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee ("Security and Stability Advisory Committee" or "SSAC") is to advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the security and integrity of the Internet's naming and address allocation systems. It shall have the
following responsibilities:

(A) To communicate on security matters with the Internet technical community and the operators and managers of critical DNS infrastructure services, to include the root name server operator community, the top-level domain registries and registrars, the operators of the reverse delegation trees such as in-addr.arpa and ip6.arpa, and others as events and developments dictate. The SSAC shall gather and articulate requirements to offer to those engaged in technical revision of the protocols related to DNS and address allocation and those engaged in operations planning.

(B) To engage in ongoing threat assessment and risk analysis of the Internet naming and address allocation services to assess where the principal threats to stability and security lie, and to advise the ICANN community accordingly. The SSAC shall recommend any necessary audit activity to assess the current status of DNS and address allocation security in relation to identified risks and threats.

(C) To communicate with those who have direct responsibility for Internet naming and address allocation security matters (IETF, RSSAC (as defined in Section 12.2(c)(i)), RIRs, name registries, etc.), to ensure that its advice on security risks, issues, and priorities is properly synchronized with existing standardization, deployment, operational, and coordination activities. The SSAC shall monitor these activities and inform the ICANN community and Board on their progress, as appropriate.

(D) To report periodically to the Board on its activities.

(E) To make policy recommendations to the ICANN community and Board.

(ii) The SSAC’s chair and members shall be appointed by the Board. SSAC membership appointment shall be for a three-year term, commencing on 1 January and ending the second year thereafter on 31 December. The chair and members may be re-appointed, and there are no limits to the number of terms the chair or members may serve. The SSAC chair may provide recommendations to the Board regarding appointments to the SSAC. The SSAC chair shall stagger appointment recommendations so that approximately one-third (1/3) of the membership of the SSAC is considered for appointment or re-appointment each year. The Board shall also have the power to remove SSAC appointees as recommended by or in consultation with the
(i) The role of the Root Server System Advisory Committee ("Root Server System Advisory Committee" or "RSSAC") is to advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the operation, administration, security, and integrity of the Internet's Root Server System. It shall have the following responsibilities:

(A) Communicate on matters relating to the operation of the Root Servers and their multiple instances with the Internet technical community and the ICANN community. The RSSAC shall gather and articulate requirements to offer to those engaged in technical revision of the protocols and best common practices related to the operation of DNS servers.

(B) Communicate on matters relating to the administration of the Root Zone with those who have direct responsibility for that administration. These matters include the processes and procedures for the production of the Root Zone File.

(C) Engage in ongoing threat assessment and risk analysis of the Root Server System and recommend any necessary audit activity to assess the current status of root servers and the root zone.

(D) Respond to requests for information or opinions from the Board.

(E) Report periodically to the Board on its activities.

(F) Make policy recommendations to the ICANN community and Board.

(ii) The RSSAC shall be led by two co-chairs. The RSSAC's chairs and members shall be appointed by the Board.

(A) RSSAC membership appointment shall be for a three-year term, commencing on 1 January and ending the second year thereafter on 31 December. Members may be re-appointed, and there are no limits to the number of terms the members may serve. The RSSAC chairs shall provide recommendations to the Board regarding appointments to the RSSAC. If the Board declines to appoint a person nominated by the
RSSAC, then it will provide the rationale for its decision. The RSSAC chairs shall stagger appointment recommendations so that approximately one-third (1/3) of the membership of the RSSAC is considered for appointment or re-appointment each year. The Board shall also have the power to remove RSSAC appointees as recommended by or in consultation with the RSSAC.

(B) The RSSAC shall recommend the appointment of the chairs to the Board following a nomination process that it devises and documents.

(iii) The RSSAC shall annually appoint a Liaison to the Board according to Section 7.9.

(d) At-Large Advisory Committee

(i) The At-Large Advisory Committee ("At-Large Advisory Committee" or "ALAC") is the primary organizational home within ICANN for individual Internet users. The role of the ALAC shall be to consider and provide advice on the activities of ICANN, insofar as they relate to the interests of individual Internet users. This includes policies created through ICANN's Supporting Organizations, as well as the many other issues for which community input and advice is appropriate. The ALAC, which plays an important role in ICANN's accountability mechanisms, also coordinates some of ICANN's outreach to individual Internet users.

(ii) The ALAC shall consist of (A) two members selected by each of the Regional At-Large Organizations ("RALOs") established according to Section 12.2(d)(vii), and (B) five members selected by the Nominating Committee. The five members selected by the Nominating Committee shall include one citizen of a country within each of the five Geographic Regions established according to Section 7.5.

(iii) The regular terms of members of the ALAC shall be as follows:

(A) The term of one member selected by each RALO shall begin at the conclusion of an ICANN annual meeting in an even-numbered year.

(B) The term of the other member selected by each RALO shall begin at the conclusion of an ICANN annual meeting in an odd-numbered year.

(C) The terms of three of the members selected by the Nominating Committee shall begin at the conclusion of an annual meeting in an odd-numbered year and the terms of the other two members selected by the Nominating Committee shall begin at the conclusion of an annual
meeting in an even-numbered year.

(D) The regular term of each member shall end at the conclusion of the second ICANN annual meeting after the term began.

(iv) The Chair of the ALAC shall be elected by the members of the ALAC pursuant to procedures adopted by the ALAC.

(v) The ALAC shall, after consultation with each RALO, annually appoint five voting delegates (no two of whom shall be citizens of countries in the same Geographic Region) to the Nominating Committee.

(vi) The At-Large Advisory Committee may designate non-voting liaisons to each of the ccNSO Council and the GNSO Council.

(vii) There shall be one RALO for each Geographic Region established according to Section 7.5. Each RALO shall serve as the main forum and coordination point for public input to ICANN in its Geographic Region and shall be a non-profit organization certified by ICANN according to criteria and standards established by the Board based on recommendations of the At-Large Advisory Committee. An organization shall become the recognized RALO for its Geographic Region upon entering a Memorandum of Understanding with ICANN addressing the respective roles and responsibilities of ICANN and the RALO regarding the process for selecting ALAC members and requirements of openness, participatory opportunities, transparency, accountability, and diversity in the RALO’s structure and procedures, as well as criteria and standards for the RALO’s constituent At-Large Structures (“At-Large Structures”).

(viii) Each RALO shall be comprised of self-supporting At-Large Structures within its Geographic Region that have been certified to meet the requirements of the RALO’s Memorandum of Understanding with ICANN according to Section 12.2(d)(ix). If so provided by its Memorandum of Understanding with ICANN, a RALO may also include individual Internet users who are citizens or residents of countries within the RALO’s Geographic Region.

(ix) Membership in the At-Large Community

(A) The criteria and standards for the certification of At-Large Structures within each Geographic Region shall be established by the Board based on recommendations from the ALAC and shall be stated in the Memorandum of Understanding between ICANN and the RALO for each Geographic Region.

(B) The criteria and standards for the certification of At-Large Structures shall be established in such a way that participation by individual Internet users who are citizens or residents of countries within the Geographic Region of the RALO will predominate in the operation of each At-Large Structure within the RALO, while not necessarily excluding additional participation, compatible with the interests of the individual Internet users within the region, by others.

(C) Each RALO’s Memorandum of Understanding shall also include provisions designed to allow, to the greatest extent possible, every individual Internet user who is a citizen of a country within the RALO’s Geographic Region to participate in at least one of the RALO’s At-Large Structures.

(D) To the extent compatible with these objectives, the criteria and standards should also afford to each RALO the type of structure that best fits the customs and character of its Geographic Region.

(E) Once the criteria and standards have been established as provided in this Section 12.2(d)(ix), the ALAC, with the advice and participation of the RALO where the applicant is based, shall be responsible for certifying organizations as meeting the criteria and standards for At-Large Structure accreditation.

(F) Decisions to certify or decertify an At-Large Structure shall be made as decided by the ALAC in its rules of procedure, save always that any changes made to the rules of procedure in respect of an At-Large Structure applications shall be subject to review by the RALOs and by the Board.

(G) Decisions as to whether to accredit, not to accredit, or disaccredit an At-Large Structure shall be subject to review according to procedures established by the Board.

(H) On an ongoing basis, the ALAC may also give advice as to whether a prospective At-Large Structure meets the applicable criteria and standards.

(x) The ALAC is also responsible, working in conjunction with the RALOs, for coordinating the following activities:

(A) Nominating individuals to fill Seat 15 on the Board. Notification of the At-Large Community’s nomination shall be given by the ALAC Chair in writing to the EC Administration, with a copy to the Secretary, and the
EC shall promptly act on it as provided in Section 7.25.

(B) Keeping the community of individual Internet users informed about the significant news from ICANN;

(C) Distributing (through posting or otherwise) an updated agenda, news about ICANN, and information about items in the ICANN policy-development process;

(D) Promoting outreach activities in the community of individual Internet users;

(E) Developing and maintaining on-going information and education programs, regarding ICANN and its work;

(F) Establishing an outreach strategy about ICANN issues in each RALO’s Geographic Region;

(G) Participating in the ICANN policy development processes and providing input and advice that accurately reflects the views of individual Internet users;

(H) Making public, and analyzing, ICANN’s proposed policies and its decisions and their (potential) regional impact and (potential) effect on individuals in the region;

(I) Offering Internet-based mechanisms that enable discussions among members of At-Large Structures; and

(xi) Establishing mechanisms and processes that enable two-way communication between members of At-Large Structures and those involved in ICANN decision-making, so interested individuals can share their views on pending ICANN issues.

Section 12.3. PROCEDURES

Each Advisory Committee shall determine its own rules of procedure and quorum requirements; provided that each Advisory Committee shall ensure that the advice provided to the Board by such Advisory Committee is communicated in a clear and unambiguous written statement, including the rationale for such advice. The Board will respond in a timely manner to formal advice from all Advisory Committees explaining what action it took and the rationale for doing so.
Section 12.4. TERM OF OFFICE
The chair and each member of an Advisory Committee shall serve until his or her successor is appointed, or until such Advisory Committee is sooner terminated, or until he or she is removed, resigns, or otherwise ceases to qualify as a member of the Advisory Committee.

Section 12.5. VACANCIES
Vacancies on any Advisory Committee shall be filled in the same manner as provided in the case of original appointments.

Section 12.6. COMPENSATION
Advisory Committee members shall receive no compensation for their services as a member of such Advisory Committee. The Board may, however, authorize the reimbursement of actual and necessary expenses incurred by Advisory Committee members, including Directors, performing their duties as Advisory Committee members.

ARTICLE 13 OTHER ADVISORY MECHANISMS

Section 13.1. EXTERNAL EXPERT ADVICE
(a) Purpose. The purpose of seeking external expert advice is to allow the policy-development process within ICANN to take advantage of existing expertise that resides in the public or private sector but outside of ICANN. In those cases where there are relevant public bodies with expertise, or where access to private expertise could be helpful, the Board and constituent bodies should be encouraged to seek advice from such expert bodies or individuals.

(b) Types of Expert Advisory Panels

(i) On its own initiative or at the suggestion of any ICANN body, the Board may appoint, or authorize the President to appoint, Expert Advisory Panels consisting of public or private sector individuals or entities. If the advice sought from such Panels concerns issues of public policy, the provisions of Section 13.1(c) shall apply.

(ii) In addition, in accordance with Section 13.1(c), the Board may refer issues of public policy pertinent to matters within ICANN's Mission to a multinational governmental or treaty organization.

(c) Process for Seeking Advice: Public Policy Matters

(i) The Governmental Advisory Committee may at any time recommend that the Board seek advice concerning one or more issues of public policy from an external source, as set out above.

(ii) In the event that the Board determines, upon such a recommendation or otherwise, that external advice should be sought concerning one or more issues of public policy, the Board shall, as appropriate, consult with the Governmental Advisory Committee regarding the appropriate source from which to seek the advice and the arrangements, including definition of scope and process, for requesting and obtaining that advice.

(iii) The Board shall, as appropriate, transmit any request for advice from a multinational governmental or treaty organization, including specific terms of reference, to the Governmental Advisory Committee, with the suggestion that the request be transmitted by the Governmental Advisory Committee to the multinational governmental or treaty organization.

(d) Process for Seeking and Advice: Other Matters. Any reference of issues not concerning public policy to an Expert Advisory Panel by the Board or President in accordance with Section 13.1(b)(i) shall be made pursuant to terms of reference describing the issues on which input and advice is sought and the procedures and schedule to be followed.

(e) Receipt of Expert Advice and its Effect. External advice pursuant to this Section 13.1 shall be provided in written form. Such advice is advisory and not binding, and is intended to augment the information available to the Board or other ICANN body in carrying out its responsibilities.

(f) Opportunity to Comment. The Governmental Advisory Committee, in addition to the Supporting Organizations and other Advisory Committees, shall have an opportunity to comment upon any external advice received prior to any decision by the Board.

Section 13.2. TECHNICAL LIAISON GROUP

(a) Purpose. The quality of ICANN’s work depends on access to complete and authoritative information concerning the technical standards that underlie ICANN’s activities. ICANN’s relationship to the organizations that produce these standards is therefore particularly important. The Technical Liaison Group (“TLG”) shall connect the Board with appropriate sources of technical advice on specific matters pertinent to ICANN’s activities.
(b) TLG Organizations. The TLG shall consist of four organizations: the European Telecommunications Standards Institute (ETSI), the International Telecommunications Union’s Telecommunication Standardization Sector (ITU-T), the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C), and the Internet Architecture Board (“IAB”).

(c) Role. The role of the TLG organizations shall be to channel technical information and guidance to the Board and to other ICANN entities. This role has both a responsive component and an active “watchdog” component, which involve the following responsibilities:

(i) In response to a request for information, to connect the Board or other ICANN body with appropriate sources of technical expertise. This component of the TLG role covers circumstances in which ICANN seeks an authoritative answer to a specific technical question. Where information is requested regarding a particular technical standard for which a TLG organization is responsible, that request shall be directed to that TLG organization.

(ii) As an ongoing “watchdog” activity, to advise the Board of the relevance and progress of technical developments in the areas covered by each organization's scope that could affect Board decisions or other ICANN actions, and to draw attention to global technical standards issues that affect policy development within the scope of ICANN's Mission. This component of the TLG role covers circumstances in which ICANN is unaware of a new development, and would therefore otherwise not realize that a question should be asked.

(d) TLG Procedures. The TLG shall not have officers or hold meetings, nor shall it provide policy advice to the Board as a committee (although TLG organizations may individually be asked by the Board to do so as the need arises in areas relevant to their individual charters). Neither shall the TLG debate or otherwise coordinate technical issues across the TLG organizations; establish or attempt to establish unified positions; or create or attempt to create additional layers or structures within the TLG for the development of technical standards or for any other purpose.

(e) Technical Work with the IETF. The TLG shall have no involvement with ICANN's work for the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), Internet Research Task Force, or the Internet Architecture Board (IAB), as described in the IETF-ICANN Memorandum of Understanding Concerning the Technical Work of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority ratified by the Board on 10 March 2000 and any supplemental agreements thereto.
(f) Individual Technical Experts. Each TLG organization shall designate two individual technical experts who are familiar with the technical standards issues that are relevant to ICANN's activities. These 8 experts shall be available as necessary to determine, through an exchange of e-mail messages, where to direct a technical question from ICANN when ICANN does not ask a specific TLG organization directly.

ARTICLE 14 BOARD AND TEMPORARY COMMITTEES

Section 14.1. BOARD COMMITTEES

The Board may establish one or more committees of the Board (each, a "Board Committee"), which shall continue to exist until otherwise determined by the Board. Only Directors may be appointed to a Committee of the Board; provided, that a Liaison may be appointed as a liaison to a Committee of the Board consistent with their non-voting capacity. If a person appointed to a Committee of the Board ceases to be a Director, such person shall also cease to be a member of any Committee of the Board. Each Committee of the Board shall consist of two or more Directors. The Board may designate one or more Directors as alternate members of any such committee, who may replace any absent member at any meeting of the committee. Committee members may be removed from a committee at any time by a two-thirds (2/3) majority vote of all Directors; provided, however, that in no event shall a Director be removed from a committee unless such removal is approved by not less than a majority of all Directors.

Section 14.2. POWERS OF BOARD COMMITTEES

(a) The Board may delegate to Committees of the Board all legal authority of the Board except with respect to:

(i) The filling of vacancies on the Board or on any committee;

(ii) The amendment or repeal of Bylaws or the Articles of Incorporation or the adoption of new Bylaws or Articles of Incorporation;

(iii) The amendment or repeal of any resolution of the Board which by its express terms is not so amendable or repealable;

(iv) The appointment of committees of the Board or the members thereof;

(v) The approval of any self-dealing transaction, as such transactions
are defined in Section 5233(a) of the CCC;

(vi) The approval of the ICANN Budget or IANA Budget required by Section 22.4 or the Operating Plan or Strategic Plan required by Section 22.5; or

(vii) The compensation of any Officer described in Article 15.

(b) The Board shall have the power to prescribe the manner in which proceedings of any Committee of the Board shall be conducted. In the absence of any such prescription, such committee shall have the power to prescribe the manner in which its proceedings shall be conducted. Unless these Bylaws, the Board or such committee shall otherwise provide, the regular and special meetings of committees shall be governed by the provisions of Article 7 applicable to meetings and actions of the Board. Each committee shall keep regular minutes of its proceedings and shall report the same to the Board from time to time, as the Board may require.

Section 14.3. TEMPORARY COMMITTEES

The Board may establish such temporary committees as it sees fit, with membership, duties, and responsibilities as set forth in the resolutions or charters adopted by the Board in establishing such committees.

ARTICLE 15 OFFICERS

Section 15.1. OFFICERS

The officers of ICANN (each, an "Officer") shall be a President (who shall serve as Chief Executive Officer), a Secretary, and a Chief Financial Officer. ICANN may also have, at the discretion of the Board, any additional officers that it deems appropriate. Any person, other than the President, may hold more than one office, except that no member of the Board (other than the President) shall simultaneously serve as an officer of ICANN.

Section 15.2. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

The officers of ICANN shall be elected annually by the Board, pursuant to the recommendation of the President or, in the case of the President, of the Chair of the Board. Each such officer shall hold his or her office until he or she resigns, is removed, is otherwise disqualified to serve, or his or her successor is elected.
Section 15.3. REMOVAL OF OFFICERS

Any Officer may be removed, either with or without cause, by a two-thirds (2/3) majority vote of all Directors. Should any vacancy occur in any office as a result of death, resignation, removal, disqualification, or any other cause, the Board may delegate the powers and duties of such office to any Officer or to any Director until such time as a successor for the office has been elected.

Section 15.4. PRESIDENT

The President shall be the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of ICANN in charge of all of its activities and business. All other officers and staff shall report to the President or his or her delegate, unless stated otherwise in these Bylaws. The President shall serve as an ex officio Director, and shall have all the same rights and privileges of any Director. The President shall be empowered to call special meetings of the Board as set forth herein, and shall discharge all other duties as may be required by these Bylaws and from time to time may be assigned by the Board.

Section 15.5. SECRETARY

The Secretary shall keep or cause to be kept the minutes of the Board in one or more books provided for that purpose, shall see that all notices are duly given in accordance with the provisions of these Bylaws or as required by law, and in general shall perform all duties as from time to time may be prescribed by the President or the Board.

Section 15.6. CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

The Chief Financial Officer ("CFO") shall be the chief financial officer of ICANN. If required by the Board, the CFO shall give a bond for the faithful discharge of his or her duties in such form and with such surety or sureties as the Board shall determine. The CFO shall have charge and custody of all the funds of ICANN and shall keep or cause to be kept, in books belonging to ICANN, full and accurate amounts of all receipts and disbursements, and shall deposit all money and other valuable effects in the name of ICANN in such depositories as may be designated for that purpose by the Board. The CFO shall disburse the funds of ICANN as may be ordered by the Board or the President and, whenever requested by them, shall deliver to the Board and the President an account of all his or her transactions as CFO and of the financial condition of ICANN. The CFO shall be responsible for ICANN's financial planning and forecasting and shall assist the President in the preparation of the ICANN Budget, the IANA Budget and Operating Plan. The CFO shall coordinate and oversee ICANN's funding, including any audits or other reviews of ICANN or its Supporting Organizations. The CFO shall be
Section 15.7. ADDITIONAL OFFICERS

In addition to the officers described above, any additional or assistant officers who are elected or appointed by the Board shall perform such duties as may be assigned to them by the President or the Board.

Section 15.8. COMPENSATION AND EXPENSES

The compensation of any Officer of ICANN shall be approved by the Board. Expenses incurred in connection with performance of their officer duties may be reimbursed to Officers upon approval of the President (in the case of Officers other than the President), by another Officer designated by the Board (in the case of the President), or the Board.

Section 15.9. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The Board, through the Board Governance Committee, shall establish a policy requiring a statement from each Officer not less frequently than once a year setting forth all business and other affiliations that relate in any way to the business and other affiliations of ICANN.

ARTICLE 16 POST TRANSITION IANA ENTITY

Section 16.1. DESCRIPTION

ICANN shall maintain as a separate legal entity a California nonprofit public benefit corporation ("PTI") for the purpose of providing IANA services, including providing IANA naming function services pursuant to the IANA Naming Function Contract, as well as other services as determined by ICANN in coordination with the direct and indirect customers of the IANA functions. ICANN shall at all times be the sole member of PTI as that term is defined in Section 5056 of the CCC ("Member"). For the purposes of these Bylaws, the "IANA naming function" does not include the Internet Protocol numbers and Autonomous System numbers services (as contemplated by Section 1.1(a) (iii)), the protocol ports and parameters services and the root zone maintainer function.

Section 16.2. PTI Governance

(a) ICANN, in its capacity as the sole Member of PTI, shall elect the directors of PTI in accordance with the articles of incorporation and bylaws of PTI and have all other powers of a sole Member under the CCC except as otherwise
provided in these Bylaws.

(b) No amendment or modification of the articles of incorporation of PTI shall be effective unless approved by the EC (pursuant to the procedures applicable to Articles Amendments described in Section 25.2, as if such Article Amendment referenced therein refers to an amendment of PTI's articles of incorporation).

(c) ICANN shall not amend or modify the bylaws of PTI in a manner that would effect any of the matters set forth in clauses (i) through (xiv) below (a "PTI Bylaw Amendment") if such PTI Bylaw Amendment has been rejected by the EC pursuant to the procedures described in Section 16.2(e):

(i) any change to the corporate form of PTI to an entity that is not a California nonprofit public benefit corporation organized under the CCC or any successor statute;

(ii) any change in the corporate mission of PTI that is materially inconsistent with ICANN's Mission as set forth in these Bylaws;

(iii) any change to the status of PTI as a corporation with members;

(iv) any change in the rights of ICANN as the sole Member of PTI, including voting, classes of membership, rights, privileges, preferences, restrictions and conditions;

(v) any change that would grant rights to any person or entity (other than ICANN) with respect to PTI as designators or otherwise to: (A) elect or designate directors of PTI; or (B) approve any amendments to the articles of incorporation or bylaws of PTI;

(vi) any change in the number of directors of the board of directors of PTI (the "PTI Board");

(vii) any changes in the allocation of directors on the PTI Board between independent directors and employees of ICANN or employees of PTI or to the definition of "independent" (as used in PTI's bylaws) for purposes of determining whether a director of PTI is independent;

(viii) the creation of any committee of the PTI Board with the power to exercise the authority of the PTI Board;

(ix) any change in the procedures for nominating independent PTI directors;
(x) the creation of classes of PTI directors or PTI directors with different terms or voting rights;

(xi) any change in PTI Board quorum requirements or voting requirements;

(xii) any change to the powers and responsibilities of the PTI Board or the PTI officers;

(xiii) any change to the rights to exculpation and indemnification that is adverse to the exculpated or indemnified party, including with respect to advancement of expenses and insurance, provided to directors, officers, employees or other agents of PTI; or

(xiv) any change to the requirements to amend the articles of incorporation or bylaws of PTI.

(d) ICANN shall not take any of the following actions (together with the PTI Bylaw Amendments, "PTI Governance Actions") if such PTI Governance Action has been rejected by the EC pursuant to the procedures described in Section 16.2(e).

(i) Any resignation by ICANN as sole Member of PTI or any transfer, disposition, cession, expulsion, suspension or termination by ICANN of its membership in PTI or any transfer, disposition, cession, expulsion, suspension or termination by ICANN of any right arising from its membership in PTI.

(ii) Any sale, transfer or other disposition of PTI's assets, other than (A) in the ordinary course of PTI's business, (B) in connection with an IANA Naming Function Separation Process (as defined in Section 19.1(a)) that has been approved in accordance with Article 19 or (C) the disposition of obsolete, damaged, redundant or unused assets.

(iii) Any merger, consolidation, sale or reorganization of PTI.

(iv) Any dissolution, liquidation or winding-up of the business and affairs of PTI or the commencement of any other voluntary bankruptcy proceeding of PTI.

(e) Promptly after the Board approves a PTI Governance Action (a "PTI Governance Action Approval"), the Secretary shall provide a notice of the Board's decision to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants.
A PTI Governance Action shall become effective upon the earliest to occur of the following:

(A)(1) A Rejection Action Petition Notice (as defined in Section 2.2(c)(i) of Annex D) is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant (as defined in Section 2.2(c)(i) of Annex D) to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice (as defined in Section 2.2(c)(ii) of Annex D) is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D, in which case the PTI Governance Action that is the subject of the PTI Governance Action Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Period (as defined in Section 2.2(b) of Annex D) relating to such PTI Governance Action Approval and the effectiveness of such PTI Governance Action shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC’s rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D;

(B)(1) A Rejection Action Supported Petition (as defined in Section 2.2(d)(i) of Annex D) is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D, in which case the PTI Governance Action that is the subject of the PTI Governance Action Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period (as defined in Section 2.2(d)(i) of Annex D) relating to such PTI Governance Action Approval and the effectiveness of such PTI Governance Action shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC’s rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D; and

(C)(1) An EC Rejection Notice (as defined in Section 2.4(b) of Annex D) is not timely delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary...
pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4(c) of Annex D, in which case the PTI Governance Action that is the subject of the PTI Governance Action Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period (as defined in Section 2.4(a) of Annex D) relating to such PTI Governance Action Approval and the effectiveness of such PTI Governance Action shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC's rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D.

(ii) A PTI Governance Action that has been rejected by the EC pursuant to and in compliance with Article 2 of Annex D shall have no force and effect, and shall be void ab initio.

(iii) Following receipt of an EC Rejection Notice relating to a PTI Governance Action, ICANN staff and the Board shall consider the explanation provided by the EC Administration as to why the EC has chosen to reject the PTI Governance Action in determining whether or not to develop a new PTI Governance Action and the substance of such new PTI Governance Action, which shall be subject to the procedures of this Section 16.2.

Section 16.3. IANA NAMING FUNCTION CONTRACT

(a) On or prior to 1 October 2016, ICANN shall enter into a contract with PTI for the performance of the IANA naming function (as it may be amended or modified, the "IANA Naming Function Contract") and a related statement of work (the "IANA Naming Function SOW"). Except as to implement any modification, waiver or amendment to the IANA Naming Function Contract or IANA Naming Function SOW related to an IFR Recommendation or Special IFR Recommendation approved pursuant to Section 18.6 or an SCWG Recommendation approved pursuant to Section 19.4 (which, for the avoidance of doubt, shall not be subject to this Section 16.3(a)), ICANN shall not agree to modify, amend or waive any Material Terms (as defined below) of the IANA Naming Function Contract or the IANA Naming Function SOW if a majority of each of the ccNSO and GNSO Councils reject the proposed modification, amendment or waiver. The following are the "Material Terms" of the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW:

(i) The parties to the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW;
(ii) The initial term and renewal provisions of the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW;

(iii) The manner in which the IANA Naming Function Contract or IANA Naming Function SOW may be terminated;

(iv) The mechanisms that are available to enforce the IANA Naming Function Contract or IANA Naming Function SOW;

(v) The role and responsibilities of the CSC (as defined in Section 17.1), escalation mechanisms and/or the IFR (as defined in Section 18.1);

(vi) The IANA Naming Function Contract's provisions requiring that fees charged by PTI be based on direct costs and resources incurred by PTI;

(vii) The IANA Naming Function Contract's prohibition against subcontracting;

(viii) The availability of the IRP as a point of escalation for claims of PTI's failure to meet defined service level expectations;

(ix) The IANA Naming Function Contract's audit requirements; and

(x) The requirements related to ICANN funding of PTI.

(b) ICANN shall enforce its rights under the IANA Naming Function Contract and the IANA Naming Function SOW.

ARTICLE 17 CUSTOMER STANDING COMMITTEE

Section 17.1. DESCRIPTION

ICANN shall establish a Customer Standing Committee ("CSC") to monitor PTI's performance under the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW.

The mission of the CSC is to ensure continued satisfactory performance of the IANA naming function for the direct customers of the naming services. The direct customers of the naming services are top-level domain registry operators as well as root server operators and other non-root zone functions.

The CSC will achieve this mission through regular monitoring of the performance of the IANA naming function against the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW and through mechanisms to
engage with PTI to remedy identified areas of concern.

The CSC is not authorized to initiate a change in PTI through a Special IFR (as defined in Section 18.1), but may escalate a failure to correct an identified deficiency to the ccNSO and GNSO, which might then decide to take further action using consultation and escalation processes, which may include a Special IFR. The ccNSO and GNSO may address matters escalated by the CSC, pursuant to their operating rules and procedures.

Section 17.2. COMPOSITION, APPOINTMENT, TERM AND REMOVAL

(a) The CSC shall consist of:

(i) Two individuals representing gTLD registry operators appointed by the Registries Stakeholder Group;

(ii) Two individuals representing ccTLD registry operators appointed by the ccNSO; and

(iii) One individual liaison appointed by PTI, each appointed in accordance with the rules and procedures of the appointing organization; provided that such individuals should have direct experience and knowledge of the IANA naming function.

(b) If so determined by the ccNSO and GNSO, the CSC may, but is not required to, include one additional member: an individual representing top-level domain registry operators that are not considered a ccTLD or gTLD, who shall be appointed by the ccNSO and the GNSO. Such representative shall be required to submit a letter of support from the registry operator it represents.

(c) Each of the following organizations may also appoint one liaison to the CSC in accordance with the rules and procedures of the appointing organization: (i) GNSO (from the Registrars Stakeholder Group or the Non-Contracted Parties House), (ii) ALAC, (iii) either the NRO or ASO (as determined by the ASO), (iv) GAC, (v) RSSAC, (vi) SSAC and (vii) any other Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee established under these Bylaws.

(d) The GNSO and ccNSO shall approve the initial proposed members and liaisons of the CSC, and thereafter, the ccNSO and GNSO shall approve each annual slate of members and liaisons being recommended for a new term.
(e) The CSC members and liaisons shall select from among the CSC members who will serve as the CSC’s liaison to the IFRT (as defined in Section 18.1) and any Separation Cross-Community Working Group (“SCWG”).

(f) Any CSC member or liaison may be removed and replaced at any time and for any reason or no reason by the organization that appointed such member or liaison.

(g) In addition, the Chair of the CSC may recommend that a CSC member or liaison be removed by the organization that appointed such member or liaison, upon any of the following: (i) (A) for not attending without sufficient cause a minimum of nine CSC meetings in a one-year period (or at least 75% of all CSC meetings in a one-year period if less than nine meetings were held in such one-year period) or (B) if such member or liaison has been absent for more than two consecutive meetings without sufficient cause; or (ii) for grossly inappropriate behavior.

(h) A vacancy on the CSC shall be deemed to exist in the event of the death, resignation or removal of any CSC member or liaison. Vacancies shall be filled by the organization(s) that appointed such CSC member or liaison. The appointing organization(s) shall provide written notice to the Secretary of its appointment to fill a vacancy, with a notification copy to the Chair of the CSC. The organization(s) responsible for filling such vacancy shall use its reasonable efforts to fill such vacancy within one month after the occurrence of such vacancy.

Section 17.3. CSC CHARTER; PERIODIC REVIEW

(a) The CSC shall act in accordance with its charter (the "CSC Charter").

(b) The effectiveness of the CSC shall be reviewed two years after the first meeting of the CSC; and then every three years thereafter. The method of review will be determined by the ccNSO and GNSO and the findings of the review will be published on the Website.

(c) The CSC Charter shall be reviewed by a committee of representatives from the ccNSO and the Registries Stakeholder Group selected by such organizations. This review shall commence one year after the first meeting of the CSC. Thereafter, the CSC Charter shall be reviewed by such committee of representatives from the ccNSO and the Registries Stakeholder Group selected by such organizations at the request of the CSC, ccNSO, GNSO, the Board and/or the PTI Board and/or by an IFRT in connection with an IFR.

(d) Amendments to the CSC Charter shall not be effective unless ratified by
the vote of a simple majority of each of the ccNSO and GNSO Councils pursuant to each such organizations' procedures. Prior to any action by the ccNSO and GNSO, any recommended changes to the CSC Charter shall be subject to a public comment period that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN. Notwithstanding the foregoing, to the extent any provision of an amendment to the CSC Charter conflicts with the terms of the Bylaws, the terms of the Bylaws shall control.

Section 17.4. ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL SUPPORT

ICANN shall provide administrative and operational support necessary for the CSC to carry out its responsibilities, including providing and facilitating remote participation in all meetings of the CSC.

ARTICLE 18 IANA NAMING FUNCTION REVIEWS

Section 18.1. IANA NAMING FUNCTION REVIEW

The Board, or an appropriate committee thereof, shall cause periodic and/or special reviews (each such review, an "IFR") of PTI's performance of the IANA naming function against the contractual requirements set forth in the IANA Naming Function Contract and the IANA Naming Function SOW to be carried out by an IANA Function Review Team ("IFRT") established in accordance with Article 18, as follows:

(a) Regularly scheduled periodic IFRs, to be conducted pursuant to Section 18.2 below ("Periodic IFRs"); and

(b) IFRs that are not Periodic IFRs, to be conducted pursuant to Section 18.12 below ("Special IFRs").

Section 18.2. FREQUENCY OF PERIODIC IFRS

(a) The first Periodic IFR shall be convened no later than [1 October 2018].

(b) Periodic IFRs after the first Periodic IFR shall be convened no less frequently than every five years, measured from the date the previous IFRT for a Periodic IFR was convened.

(c) In the event a Special IFR is ongoing at the time a Periodic IFR is required to be convened under this Section 18.2, the Board shall cause the convening of the Periodic IFR to be delayed if such delay is approved by the vote of (i) a supermajority of the ccNSO Council (pursuant to the ccNSO's procedures or, if...
such procedures do not define a supermajority, two-thirds (2/3) of the ccNSO Council's members) and (ii) a GNSO Supermajority. Any decision by the ccNSO and GNSO to delay a Periodic IFR must identify the period of delay, which should generally not exceed 12 months after the completion of the Special IFR.

Section 18.3. IFR RESPONSIBILITIES

For each Periodic IFR, the IFRT shall:

(a) Review and evaluate the performance of PTI against the requirements set forth in the IANA Naming Function Contract in relation to the needs of its direct customers and the expectations of the broader ICANN community, and determine whether to make any recommendations with respect to PTI's performance;

(b) Review and evaluate the performance of PTI against the requirements set forth in the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW;

(c) Review the IANA Naming Function SOW and determine whether to recommend any amendments to the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW to account for the needs of the direct customers of the naming services and/or the community at large;

(d) Review and evaluate the openness and transparency procedures of PTI and any oversight structures for PTI's performance, including reporting requirements and budget transparency;

(e) Review and evaluate the performance and effectiveness of the EC with respect to actions taken by the EC, if any, pursuant to Section 16.2, Section 18.6, Section 18.12, Section 19.1, Section 19.4, Section 22.4(b) and Annex D;

(f) Review and evaluate the performance of the IANA naming function according to established service level expectations during the IFR period being reviewed and compared to the immediately preceding Periodic IFR period;

(g) Review and evaluate whether there are any systemic issues that are impacting PTI's performance under the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW;

(h) Initiate public comment periods and other processes for community input on PTI's performance under the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW (such public comment periods shall comply with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN);
(i) Consider input from the CSC and the community on PTI's performance under the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW;

(j) Identify process or other areas for improvement in the performance of the IANA naming function under the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW and the performance of the CSC and the EC as it relates to oversight of PTI; and

(k) Consider and assess any changes implemented since the immediately preceding IFR and their implications for the performance of PTI under the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW.

Section 18.4. IFR REQUIRED INPUTS

In conducting an IFR, the IFRT shall review and analyze the following information:

(a) Reports provided by PTI pursuant to the IANA Naming Function Contract and/or IANA Naming Function SOW during the IFR period being reviewed, any portion of which may be redacted pursuant to the Confidential Disclosure Framework set forth in the Operating Standards in accordance with Section 4.6(a)(vi):

(b) Reports provided by the CSC in accordance with the CSC Charter during the IFR period being reviewed;

(c) Community inputs through public consultation procedures as reasonably determined by the IFRT, including, among other things, public comment periods, input provided at in-person sessions during ICANN meetings, responses to public surveys related to PTI's performance under the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW, and public inputs during meetings of the IFRT;

(d) Recommendations for technical, process and/or other improvements relating to the mandate of the IFR provided by the CSC or the community; and

(e) Results of any site visit conducted by the IFRT, which shall be conducted in consultation with ICANN (i) upon reasonable notice, (ii) in a manner so as not to affect PTI's performance under the IANA Naming Function Contract or the IANA Naming Function SOW and (iii) pursuant to procedures and requirements reasonably developed by ICANN and reasonably acceptable to the IFRT. Any such site visit shall be limited to matters reasonably related to the IFRT's responsibilities pursuant to Section 18.3.
Section 18.5. IFR RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

(a) The results of the IFR are not limited and could include a variety of recommendations or no recommendation; provided, however, that any recommendations must directly relate to the matters discussed in Section 18.3 and comply with this Section 18.5.

(b) Any IFRT recommendations should identify improvements that are supported by data and associated analysis about existing deficiencies and how they could be addressed. Each recommendation of the IFRT shall include proposed remedial procedures and describe how those procedures are expected to address such issues. The IFRT’s report shall also propose timelines for implementing the IFRT’s recommendations. The IFRT shall attempt to prioritize each of its recommendations and provide a rationale for such prioritization.

(c) In any case where a recommendation of an IFRT focuses on a service specific to gTLD registry operators, no such recommendation shall be made by the IFRT in any report to the community (including any report to the Board) if opposition to such recommendation is expressed by any IFRT member appointed by the Registries Stakeholder Group. In any case where a recommendation of an IFRT focuses on a service specific to ccTLD registry operators, no such recommendation shall be made by the IFRT in any report to the community (including any report to the Board) if opposition to such recommendation is expressed by any IFRT member appointed by the ccNSO.

(d) Notwithstanding anything herein to the contrary, the IFRT shall not have the authority to review or make recommendations relating to policy or contracting issues that are not included in the IANA Naming Function Contract or the IANA Naming Function SOW, including, without limitation, policy development, adoption processes or contract enforcement measures between contracted registries and ICANN.

Section 18.6. Recommendations to Amend the IANA Naming Function contract, iana naming function SOW or CSC charter

(a) The IFRT may recommend, among other things to the extent reasonably related to the IFR responsibilities set forth in Section 18.3, amendments to the IANA Naming Function Contract, IANA Naming Function SOW and/or the CSC Charter. The IFRT shall, at a minimum, take the following steps before an amendment to either the IANA Naming Function Contract, IANA Naming Function SOW or CSC Charter is proposed:

(i) Consult with the Board (such consultation to be conducted in parallel
with other processes set forth in this Section 18.6(a) and PTI;

(ii) Consult with the CSC;

(iii) Conduct a public input session for ccTLD and gTLD registry operators; and

(iv) Seek public comment on the amendments that are under consideration by the IFRT through a public comment period that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN.

(b) A recommendation of an IFRT for a Periodic IFR that would amend the IANA Naming Function Contract or IANA Naming Function SOW shall only become effective if, with respect to each such recommendation (each, an "IFR Recommendation"), each of the following occurs:

(i) The IFR Recommendation has been approved by the vote of (A) a supermajority of the ccNSO Council (pursuant to the ccNSO's procedures or, if such procedures do not define a supermajority, two-thirds (2/3) of the ccNSO Council's members) and (B) a GNSO Supermajority;

(ii) After a public comment period that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN, the Board has approved the IFR Recommendation; and

(iii) The EC has not rejected the Board's approval of the IFR Recommendation pursuant to and in compliance with Section 18.6(d).

(c) If the Board (x) rejects an IFR Recommendation that was approved by the ccNSO Council and GNSO Council pursuant to Section 18.6(b)(i) or (y) does not resolve to either accept or reject an IFR Recommendation within 45 days of the later of (1) the date that the condition in Section 18.6(b)(i) is satisfied or (2) the expiration of the public comment period contemplated by Section 18.6(b)(ii), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the applicable IFR Recommendation. ICANN shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants.

(i) ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, convene a
Rejection Action Community Forum (as defined in Section 2.3(a) of Annex D), which Rejection Action Community Forum shall be conducted in accordance with Section 2.3 of Annex D, to discuss the Board Notice; provided, that, for purposes of Section 2.3 of Annex D, (A) the Board Notice shall be treated as the Rejection Action Supported Petition, (B) the EC Administration shall be treated as the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant (and there shall be no Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participants (as defined in Section 2.2(d)(i) of Annex D) and (C) the Rejection Action Community Forum Period shall expire on the 21st day after the date the Secretary provides the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants.

(ii) No later than 45 days after the conclusion of such Rejection Action Community Forum Period, the Board shall resolve to either uphold its rejection of the IFR Recommendation or approve the IFR Recommendation (either, a "Post-Forum IFR Recommendation Decision").

(A) If the Board resolves to approve the IFR Recommendation, such IFR Recommendation will be subject to Section 18.6(d).

(B) For the avoidance of doubt, the Board shall not be obligated to change its decision on the IFR Recommendation as a result of the Rejection Action Community Forum.

(C) The Board’s Post-Forum IFR Recommendation Decision shall be posted on the Website in accordance with the Board’s posting obligations as set forth in Article 3.

(d) Promptly after the Board approves an IFR Recommendation (an "IFR Recommendation Decision"), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the IFR Recommendation that is the subject of the IFR Recommendation Decision. ICANN shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants. The EC Administration shall promptly commence and comply with the procedures and requirements specified in Article 2 of Annex D.

(i) An IFR Recommendation Decision shall become final upon the earliest to occur of the following:

(A) (1) A Rejection Action Petition Notice is not timely delivered by the
Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D, in which case the IFR Recommendation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Period relating to such IFR Recommendation Decision;

(B)(1) A Rejection Action Supported Petition is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D, in which case the IFR Recommendation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period relating to such IFR Recommendation Decision; and

(C)(1) An EC Rejection Notice is not timely delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4(c) of Annex D, in which case the IFR Recommendation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period relating to such IFR Recommendation Decision.

(ii) An IFR Recommendation Decision that has been rejected by the EC pursuant to and in compliance with Article 2 of Annex D shall have no force and effect, and shall be void ab initio.

(e) For the avoidance of doubt, Section 18.6(d) shall not apply when the Board acts in a manner that is consistent with an IFR Recommendation unless such IFR Recommendation relates to an IANA Naming Function Separation Process as described in Article 19.

(f) Timelines for implementing any amendments to the IANA Naming Function Contract or IANA Naming Function SOW shall be reasonably agreed between the IFRT, ICANN and PTI.

(g) A recommendation of an IFRT that would amend the CSC Charter shall only become effective if approved pursuant to Section 17.3(d).
Section 18.7. COMPOSITION OF IFR TEAMS

Each IFRT shall consist of the following members and liaisons to be appointed in accordance with the rules and procedures of the appointing organization:

(a) Two representatives appointed by the ccNSO from its ccTLD registry operator representatives;

(b) One non-ccNSO ccTLD representative who is associated with a ccTLD registry operator that is not a representative of the ccNSO, appointed by the ccNSO; it is strongly recommended that the ccNSO consult with the regional ccTLD organizations (i.e., AfTLD, APTLD, LACTLD, and CENTR) in making its appointment;

(c) Two representatives appointed by the Registries Stakeholder Group;

(d) One representative appointed by the Registrars Stakeholder Group;

(e) One representative appointed by the Commercial Stakeholder Group;

(f) One representative appointed by the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group;

(g) One representative appointed by the GAC;

(h) One representative appointed by the SSAC;

(i) One representative appointed by the RSSAC;

(j) One representative appointed by the ALAC;

(k) One liaison appointed by the CSC;

(l) One liaison who may be appointed by the ASO; and

(m) One liaison who may be appointed by the IAB.

(n) The IFRT shall also include an unlimited number of non-member, non-liaison participants.

(o) The IFRT shall not be a standing body. A new IFRT shall be constituted for each IFR and the IFRT shall automatically dissolve following the end of the process for approving such IFRT’s IFR Recommendations pursuant to Section 18.6.

Section 18.8. MEMBERSHIP; ELECTION OF CO-CHAIRS,
AND LIAISONS

(a) All candidates for appointment to the IFRT as a member or liaison shall submit an expression of interest to the organization that would appoint such candidate as a member or liaison to the IFRT, which shall state: (i) why the candidate is interested in becoming involved in the IFRT, (ii) what particular skills the candidate would bring to the IFRT, (iii) the candidate's knowledge of the IANA functions, (iv) the candidate's understanding of the purpose of the IFRT, and (v) that the candidate understands the time necessary to participate in the IFR process and can commit to the role.

(b) Members, liaisons and participants of the IFRT shall disclose to ICANN and the IFRT any conflicts of interest with a specific complaint or issue under review. The IFRT may exclude from the discussion of a specific complaint or issue any member deemed by the majority of IFRT members to have a conflict of interest. The co-chairs of the IFRT shall record any such conflict of interest in the minutes of the IFRT.

(c) To the extent reasonably possible, the appointing organizations for the IFRT members and liaisons shall work together to achieve an IFRT that is balanced for diversity (including functional, geographic and cultural) and skill, and should seek to broaden the number of individuals participating across the various reviews; provided, that the IFRT should include members from each ICANN Geographic Region, and the ccNSO and Registries Stakeholder Group shall not appoint multiple members who are citizens of countries from the same ICANN Geographic Region.

(d) The IFRT shall be led by two co-chairs: one appointed by the GNSO from one of the members appointed pursuant to clauses (c)-(f) of Section 18.7 and one appointed by the ccNSO from one of the members appointed pursuant to clauses (a)-(b) of Section 18.7.

(e) The PTI Board shall select a PTI staff member to serve as a point of contact to facilitate formal lines of communication between the IFRT and PTI. The Board shall select an ICANN staff member to serve as a point of contact to facilitate formal lines of communication between the IFRT and ICANN.

(f) Liaisons to the IFRT are not members of or entitled to vote on any matters before the IFRT, but otherwise are entitled to participate on equal footing with members of the IFRT.

(g) Other participants are entitled to participate in the IFRT, but are not entitled to vote.

(h) Removal and Replacement of IFRT Members and Liaisons
(i) The IFRT members and liaisons may be removed from the IFRT by their respective appointing organization at any time upon such organization providing written notice to the Secretary and the co-chairs of the IFRT.

(ii) A vacancy on the IFRT shall be deemed to exist in the event of the death, resignation or removal of any IFRT member or liaison. Vacancies shall be filled by the organization that appointed such IFRT member or liaison. The appointing organization shall provide written notice to the Secretary of its appointment to fill a vacancy, with a notification copy to the IFRT co-chairs. The organization responsible for filling such vacancy shall use its reasonable efforts to fill such vacancy within one month after the occurrence of such vacancy.

Section 18.9. MEETINGS

(a) All actions of the IFRT shall be taken by consensus of the IFRT, which is where a small minority may disagree, but most agree. If consensus cannot be reached with respect to a particular issue, actions by the majority of all of the members of the IFRT shall be the action of the IFRT.

(b) Any members of the IFRT not in favor of an action (whether as a result of voting against a matter or objecting to the consensus position) may record a minority dissent to such action, which shall be included in the IFRT minutes and/or report, as applicable.

(c) IFRT meetings, deliberations and other working procedures shall be open to the public and conducted in a transparent manner to the fullest extent possible.

(d) The IFRT shall transmit minutes of its meetings to the Secretary, who shall cause those minutes to be posted to the Website as soon as practicable following each IFRT meeting. Recordings and transcripts of meetings, as well as mailing lists, shall also be posted to the Website.

Section 18.10. COMMUNITY REVIEWS AND REPORTS

(a) The IFRT shall seek community input as to the issues relevant to the IFR through one or more public comment periods that shall comply with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN and through discussions during ICANN’s public meetings in developing and finalizing its recommendations and any report.
(b) The IFRT shall provide a draft report of its findings and recommendations to the community for public comment. The public comment period is required to comply with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN.

(c) After completion of the IFR, the IFRT shall submit its final report containing its findings and recommendations to the Board. ICANN shall thereafter promptly post the IFRT’s final report on the Website.

Section 18.11. ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL SUPPORT

ICANN shall provide administrative and operational support necessary for each IFRT to carry out its responsibilities, including providing and facilitating remote participation in all meetings of the IFRT.

Section 18.12. SPECIAL IFRS

(a) A Special IFR may be initiated outside of the cycle for the Periodic IFRs to address any deficiency, problem or other issue that has adversely affected PTI’s performance under the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW (a "PTI Performance Issue"), following the satisfaction of each of the following conditions:

(i) The Remedial Action Procedures of the CSC set forth in the IANA Naming Function Contract shall have been followed and failed to correct the PTI Performance Issue and the outcome of such procedures shall have been reviewed by the ccNSO and GNSO according to each organization’s respective operating procedures;

(ii) The IANA Problem Resolution Process set forth in the IANA Naming Function Contract shall have been followed and failed to correct the PTI Performance Issue and the outcome of such process shall have been reviewed by the ccNSO and GNSO according to each organization’s respective operating procedures;

(iii) The ccNSO and GNSO shall have considered the outcomes of the processes set forth in the preceding clauses (i) and (ii) and shall have conducted meaningful consultation with the other Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees with respect to the PTI Performance Issue and whether or not to initiate a Special IFR; and

(iv) After a public comment period that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN, if a public comment
period is requested by the ccNSO and the GNSO, a Special IFR shall have been approved by the vote of (A) a supermajority of the ccNSO Council (pursuant to the ccNSO's procedures or if such procedures do not define a supermajority, two-thirds (2/3) of the Council members) and (B) a GNSO Supermajority.

(b) Each Special IFR shall be conducted by an IFRT and shall follow the same procedures and requirements applicable to Periodic IFRs as set forth in this Section 18, except that:

(i) The scope of the Special IFR and the related inputs that are required to be reviewed by the IFRT shall be focused primarily on the PTI Performance Issue, its implications for overall IANA naming function performance by PTI and how to resolve the PTI Performance Issue;

(ii) The IFRT shall review and analyze the information that is relevant to the scope of the Special IFR; and

(iii) Each recommendation of the IFRT relating to the Special IFR, including but not limited to any recommendation to initiate an IANA Naming Function Separation Process, must be related to remediating the PTI Performance Issue or other issue with PTI's performance that is related to the IFRT responsibilities set forth in Section 18.3, shall include proposed remedial procedures and describe how those procedures are expected to address the PTI Performance Issue or other relevant issue with PTI's performance.

(c) A recommendation of an IFRT for a Special IFR shall only become effective if, with respect to each such recommendation (each, a "Special IFR Recommendation"), each of the following occurs:

(i) The Special IFR Recommendation has been approved by the vote of (A) a supermajority of the ccNSO Council (pursuant to the ccNSO's procedures or, if such procedures do not define a supermajority, two-thirds (2/3) of the ccNSO Council's members) and (B) a GNSO Supermajority;

(ii) After a public comment period that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN, the Board has approved the Special IFR Recommendation; and

(iii) The EC has not rejected the Board's approval of the Special IFR Recommendation pursuant to and in compliance with Section 18.12(e).
(d) If the Board (x) rejects a Special IFR Recommendation that was approved by the ccNSO Council and GNSO Council pursuant to Section 18.12(c)(i) or (y) does not resolve to either accept or reject a Special IFR Recommendation within 45 days of the later of (1) the date that the condition in Section 18.12(c)(i) is satisfied or (2) the expiration of the public comment period contemplated by Section 18.12(c)(ii), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the applicable Special IFR Recommendation. ICANN shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants.

(i) ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, convene a Rejection Action Community Forum, which Rejection Action Community Forum shall be conducted in accordance with Section 2.3 of Annex D, to discuss the Board Notice; provided, that, for purposes of Section 2.3 of Annex D, (A) the Board Notice shall be treated as the Rejection Action Supported Petition, (B) the EC Administration shall be treated as the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant (and there shall be no Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participants) and (C) the Rejection Action Community Forum Period shall expire on the 21st day after the date the Secretary provides the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants.

(ii) No later than 45 days after the conclusion of such Rejection Action Community Forum Period, the Board shall resolve to either uphold its rejection of the Special IFR Recommendation or approve the Special IFR Recommendation (either, a "Post-Forum Special IFR Recommendation Decision").

(A) If the Board resolves to approve the Special IFR Recommendation, such Special IFR Recommendation will be subject to Section 18.6(d).

(B) For the avoidance of doubt, the Board shall not be obligated to change its decision on the Special IFR Recommendation as a result of the Rejection Action Community Forum.

(C) The Board's Post-Forum Special IFR Recommendation Decision shall be posted on the Website in accordance with the Board's posting obligations as set forth in Article 3.
(e) Promptly after the Board approves a Special IFR Recommendation (a "Special IFR Recommendation Decision"), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the Special IFR Recommendation that is the subject of the Special IFR Recommendation Decision. ICANN shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants. The EC Administration shall promptly commence and comply with the procedures and requirements specified in Article 2 of Annex D.

(i) A Special IFR Recommendation Decision shall become final upon the earliest to occur of the following:

(A)(1) A Rejection Action Petition Notice is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D, in which case the Special IFR Recommendation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Period relating to such Special IFR Recommendation Decision;

(B)(1) A Rejection Action Supported Petition is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D, in which case the Special IFR Recommendation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period relating to such Special IFR Recommendation Decision; and

(C)(1) An EC Rejection Notice is not timely delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4(c) of Annex D, in which case the Special IFR Recommendation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period relating to such Special IFR Recommendation Decision.
(ii) A Special IFR Recommendation Decision that has been rejected by the EC pursuant to and in compliance with Article 2 of Annex D shall have no force and effect, and shall be void ab initio.

(f) For the avoidance of doubt, Section 18.12(e) shall not apply when the Board acts in a manner that is consistent with a Special IFR Recommendation unless such Special IFR Recommendation relates to an IANA Naming Function Separation Process as described in Article 19.

Section 18.13. PROPOSED SEPARATION PROCESS

The IFRT conducting either a Special IFR or Periodic IFR may, upon conclusion of a Special IFR or Periodic IFR, as applicable, determine that an IANA Naming Function Separation Process is necessary and, if so, it shall recommend the creation of an SCWG pursuant to Article 19.

ARTICLE 19 IANA NAMING FUNCTION SEPARATION PROCESS

Section 19.1. ESTABLISHING AN SCWG

(a) An "IANA Naming Function Separation Process" is the process initiated in accordance with this Article 19 pursuant to which PTI may cease to perform the IANA naming function including, without limitation, the initiation of a request for proposal to select an operator to perform the IANA naming function instead of PTI ("IANA Naming Function RFP"), the selection of an IANA naming function operator other than PTI, termination or non-renewal of the IANA Naming Function Contract, and/or divestiture, or other reorganization of PTI by ICANN.

(b) The Board shall establish an SCWG if each of the following occurs:

(i) The IFRT conducting either a Special IFR or Periodic IFR, upon conclusion of a Special IFR or Periodic IFR, as applicable, has recommended that an IANA Naming Function Separation Process is necessary and has recommended the creation of an SCWG (an "SCWG Creation Recommendation");

(ii) The SCWG Creation Recommendation has been approved by the vote of (A) a supermajority of the ccNSO Council (pursuant to the ccNSO's procedures or, if such procedures do not define a supermajority, two-thirds (2/3) of the ccNSO Council's members) and (B) a GNSO Supermajority;
(iii) After a public comment period that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN, the Board has approved the SCWG Creation Recommendation. A determination by the Board to not approve an SCWG Creation Recommendation, where such creation has been approved by the ccNSO and GNSO Councils pursuant to Section 19.1(b)(ii), shall require a vote of at least two-thirds (2/3) of the Board and the Board shall follow the same consultation procedures set forth in Section 9 of Annex A of these Bylaws that relate to Board rejection of a PDP recommendation that is supported by a GNSO Supermajority; and

(iv) The EC has not rejected the Board's approval of the SCWG Creation Recommendation pursuant to and in compliance with Section 19.1(d).

(c) If the Board (x) rejects an SCWG Creation Recommendation that was approved by the ccNSO Council and GNSO Council pursuant to Section 19.1(b)(ii) or (y) does not resolve to either accept or reject an SCWG Creation Recommendation within 45 days of the later of (1) the date that the condition in Section 19.1(b)(ii) is satisfied or (2) the expiration of the public comment period contemplated by Section 19.1(b)(iii), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the applicable SCWG Creation Recommendation. ICANN shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants.

(i) ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, convene a Rejection Action Community Forum, which Rejection Action Community Forum shall be conducted in accordance with Section 2.3 of Annex D, to discuss the Board Notice; provided, that, for purposes of Section 2.3 of Annex D, (A) the Board Notice shall be treated as the Rejection Action Supported Petition, (B) the EC Administration shall be treated as the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant (and there shall be no Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participants) and (C) the Rejection Action Community Forum Period shall expire on the 21st day after the date the Secretary provides the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants.

(ii) No later than 45 days after the conclusion of such Rejection Action Community Forum Period, the Board shall resolve to either uphold its rejection of the SCWG Creation Recommendation or approve the
SCWG Creation Recommendation (either, a "Post-Forum SCWG Creation Recommendation Decision").

(A) If the Board resolves to approve the SCWG Creation Recommendation, such SCWG Creation Recommendation will be subject to Section 19.1(d).

(B) For the avoidance of doubt, the Board shall not be obligated to change its decision on the SCWG Creation Recommendation as a result of the Rejection Action Community Forum.

(C) The Board’s Post-Forum SCWG Creation Recommendation Decision shall be posted on the Website in accordance with the Board’s posting obligations as set forth in Article 3.

(d) Promptly after the Board approves an SCWG Creation Recommendation (an "SCWG Creation Decision"), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the SCWG Creation Decision. ICANN shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants. The EC Administration shall promptly commence and comply with the procedures and requirements specified in Article 2 of Annex D.

(i) An SCWG Creation Decision shall become final upon the earliest to occur of the following:

(A)(1) A Rejection Action Petition Notice is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D, in which case the SCWG Creation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Period relating to such SCWG Creation Decision;

(B)(1) A Rejection Action Supported Petition is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with
Section 2.2(d) of Annex D, in which case the SCWG Creation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period relating to such SCWG Creation Decision; and

(C)(1) An EC Rejection Notice is not timely delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4(c) of Annex D, in which case the SCWG Creation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period relating to such SCWG Creation Decision.

(ii) An SCWG Creation Decision that has been rejected by the EC pursuant to and in compliance with Article 2 of Annex D shall have no force and effect, and shall be void ab initio.

Section 19.2. SCWG RESPONSIBILITIES

The responsibilities of the SCWG shall be as follows:

(a) The SCWG shall determine how to resolve the PTI Performance Issue(s) which the IFRT that conducted the Special IFR or Periodic IFR, as applicable, identified as triggering formation of this SCWG.

(b) If the SCWG recommends the issuance of an IANA Naming Function RFP, the SCWG shall:

(i) Develop IANA Naming Function RFP guidelines and requirements for the performance of the IANA naming function, in a manner consistent with ICANN's publicly available procurement guidelines (as in effect immediately prior to the formation of the SCWG); and

(ii) Solicit input from ICANN as well as the global Internet community (through community consultation, including public comment opportunities as necessary that comply with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN) on requirements to plan and participate in the IANA Naming Function RFP process.

(c) If an SCWG Recommendation (as defined in Section 19.4(b)) to issue the IANA Naming Function RFP is approved pursuant to Section 19.4(b) and the EC does not reject the relevant SCWG Recommendation Decision pursuant to
Section 19.4(d), the SCWG, in consultation with ICANN, shall:

(i) Issue the IANA Naming Function RFP;

(ii) Review responses from interested candidates to the IANA Naming Function RFP, which may be received from PTI and/or any other entity or person; and

(iii) Recommend the entity that ICANN should contract with to perform the IANA naming function.

(d) If the SCWG recommends an IANA Naming Function Separation Process other than the issuance of an IANA Naming Function RFP, the SCWG shall develop recommendations to be followed with respect to that process and its implementation consistent with the terms of this Article 19. The SCWG shall monitor and manage the implementation of such IANA Naming Function Separation Process.

Section 19.3. COMMUNITY REVIEWS AND REPORTS

(a) The SCWG shall seek community input through one or more public comment periods (such public comment period shall comply with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN) and may recommend discussions during ICANN's public meetings in developing and finalizing its recommendations and any report.

(b) The SCWG shall provide a draft report of its findings and recommendations to the community after convening of the SCWG, which such draft report will be posted for public comment on the Website. The SCWG may post additional drafts of its report for public comment until it has reached its final report.

(c) After completion of its review, the SCWG shall submit its final report containing its findings and recommendations to the Board. ICANN shall promptly post the SCWG's final report on the Website.

Section 19.4. SCWG RECOMMENDATIONS

(a) The recommendations of the SCWG are not limited and could include a variety of recommendations or a recommendation that no action is required; provided, however, that any recommendations must directly relate to the matters discussed in Section 19.2 and comply with this Section 19.4.

(b) ICANN shall not implement an SCWG recommendation (including an SCWG recommendation to issue an IANA Naming Function RFP) unless, with
respect to each such recommendation (each, an "SCWG Recommendation"), each of the following occurs:

(i) The SCWG Recommendation has been approved by the vote of (A) a supermajority of the ccNSO Council (pursuant to the ccNSO’s procedures or, if such procedures do not define a supermajority, two-thirds (2/3) of the ccNSO Council’s members) and (B) a GNSO Supermajority;

(ii) After a public comment period that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN, the Board has approved the SCWG Recommendation. A determination by the Board to not approve an SCWG Recommendation, where such SCWG Recommendation has been approved by the ccNSO and GNSO Councils pursuant to Section 19.4(b)(i), shall require a vote of at least two-thirds (2/3) of the Board and the Board shall follow the same consultation procedures set forth in Section 9 of Annex A of these Bylaws that relate to Board rejection of a PDP recommendation that is supported by a GNSO Supermajority; and

(iii) The EC has not rejected the Board’s approval of the SCWG Recommendation pursuant to and in compliance with Section 19.4(d).

(c) If the Board (x) rejects an SCWG Recommendation that was approved by the ccNSO Council and GNSO Council pursuant to Section 19.4(b)(i) or (y) does not resolve to either accept or reject an SCWG Recommendation within 45 days of the later of (1) the date that the condition in Section 19.4(b)(i) is satisfied or (2) the expiration of the public comment period contemplated by Section 19.4(b)(ii), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the applicable SCWG Recommendation. ICANN shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants.

(i) ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, convene a Rejection Action Community Forum, which Rejection Action Community Forum shall be conducted in accordance with Section 2.3 of Annex D, to discuss the Board Notice; provided, that, for purposes of Section 2.3 of Annex D, (A) the Board Notice shall be treated as the Rejection Action Supported Petition, (B) the EC Administration shall be treated as the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant (and there shall be
no Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participants) and (C) the Rejection Action Community Forum Period shall expire on the 21st day after the date the Secretary provides the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants.

(ii) No later than 45 days after the conclusion of such Rejection Action Community Forum Period, the Board shall resolve to either uphold its rejection of the SCWG Recommendation or approve the SCWG Recommendation (either, a "Post-Forum SCWG Recommendation Decision").

(A) If the Board resolves to approve the SCWG Recommendation, such SCWG Recommendation will be subject to Section 19.4(d).

(B) For the avoidance of doubt, the Board shall not be obligated to change its decision on the SCWG Recommendation as a result of the Rejection Action Community Forum.

(C) The Board's Post-Forum SCWG Recommendation Decision shall be posted on the Website in accordance with the Board's posting obligations as set forth in Article 3.

(d) Promptly after the Board approves an SCWG Recommendation (an "SCWG Recommendation Decision"), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the SCWG Recommendation that is the subject of the SCWG Recommendation Decision. ICANN shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants. The EC Administration shall promptly commence and comply with the procedures and requirements specified in Article 2 of Annex D.

(i) An SCWG Recommendation Decision shall become final upon the earliest to occur of the following:

(A)(1) A Rejection Action Petition Notice is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D, in which case the SCWG Recommendation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Period relating to such SCWG Recommendation Decision.
Recommendation Decision;

(B)(1) A Rejection Action Supported Petition is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D, in which case the SCWG Recommendation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period relating to such SCWG Recommendation Decision; and

(C)(1) An EC Rejection Notice is not timely delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4(c) of Annex D, in which case the SCWG Recommendation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period relating to such SCWG Recommendation Decision.

(ii) An SCWG Recommendation Decision that has been rejected by the EC pursuant to and in compliance with Article 2 of Annex D shall have no force and effect, and shall be void ab initio.

(e) ICANN shall absorb the costs relating to recommendations made by the SCWG, including, without limitation, costs related to the process of selecting or potentially selecting a new operator for the IANA naming function and the operating costs of the successor operator that are necessary for the successor operator's performance of the IANA naming function as ICANN's independent contractor. ICANN shall not be authorized to raise fees from any TLD registry operators to cover the costs associated with implementation of any SCWG Recommendations that specifically relate to the transition to a successor operator. For avoidance of doubt, this restriction shall not apply to collecting appropriate fees necessary to maintain the ongoing performance of the IANA naming function, including those relating to the operating costs of the successor operator.

(f) In the event that (i) an SCWG Recommendation that selects an entity (other than PTI) as a new operator of the IANA naming function is approved pursuant to Section 19.4(b) and (ii) the EC does not reject the relevant SCWG Recommendation Decision pursuant to Section 19.4(d), ICANN shall enter into a contract with the new operator on substantially

the same terms recommended by the SCWG and approved as part of such SCWG Recommendation.

(g) As promptly as practical following an SCWG Recommendation Decision becoming final in accordance with this Section 19.4, ICANN shall take all steps reasonably necessary to effect such SCWG Recommendation Decision as soon as practicable.

Section 19.5. SCWG COMPOSITION

(a) Each SCWG shall consist of the following members and liaisons to be appointed in accordance with the rules and procedures of the appointing organization:

(i) Two representatives appointed by the ccNSO from its ccTLD registry operator representatives;

(ii) One non-ccNSO ccTLD representative who is associated with a ccTLD registry operator that is not a representative of the ccNSO, appointed by the ccNSO; it is strongly recommended that the ccNSO consult with the regional ccTLD organizations (i.e., AfTLD, APTLD, LACTLD and CENTR) in making its appointment;

(iii) Three representatives appointed by the Registries Stakeholder Group;

(iv) One representative appointed by the Registrars Stakeholder Group;

(v) One representative appointed by the Commercial Stakeholder Group;

(vi) One representative appointed by the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group;

(vii) One representative appointed by the GAC;

(viii) One representative appointed by the SSAC;

(ix) One representative appointed by the RSSAC;

(x) One representative appointed by the ALAC;

(xi) One liaison appointed by the CSC;
(xii) One liaison appointed by the IFRT that conducted the Special IFR or Periodic IFR, as applicable, that recommended the creation of the SCWG, who shall be named in the IFRT's recommendation to convene the Special IFR;

(xiii) One liaison who may be appointed by the ASO;

(xiv) One liaison who may be appointed by the IAB; and

(xv) One liaison who may be appointed by the Board.

(xvi) The SCWG may also include an unlimited number of non-member, non-liaison participants.

(b) All candidates for appointment to the SCWG as a member or liaison shall submit an expression of interest to the organization that would appoint such candidate as a member or liaison, which shall state (i) why the candidate is interested in becoming involved in the SCWG, (ii) what particular skills the candidate would bring to the SCWG, (iii) the candidate's knowledge of the IANA naming function, (iv) the candidate's understanding of the purpose of the SCWG, and (v) that the candidate understands the time necessary to participate in the SCWG process and can commit to the role.

(c) Members and liaisons of the SCWG shall disclose to ICANN and the SCWG any conflicts of interest with a specific complaint or issue under review. The SCWG may exclude from the discussion of a specific complaint or issue any member, liaison or participant deemed by the majority of SCWG members to have a conflict of interest. The co-chairs of the SCWG shall record any such conflict of interest in the minutes of the SCWG.

(d) To the extent reasonably possible, the appointing organizations for SCWG members and liaisons shall work together to:

(i) achieve an SCWG that is balanced for diversity (including functional, geographic and cultural) and skill, and should seek to broaden the number of individuals participating across the various reviews; provided, that the SCWG should include members from each ICANN Geographic Region, and the ccNSO and Registries Stakeholder Group shall not appoint multiple members who are citizens of countries from the same ICANN Geographic Region;

(ii) ensure that the SCWG is comprised of individuals who are different from those individuals who comprised the IFRT that conducted the Special IFR or Periodic IFR, as applicable, that recommended the
creation of the SCWG, other than the liaison to the IFRT appointed by the CSC; and

(iii) seek to appoint as representatives of the SCWG as many individuals as practicable with experience managing or participating in RFP processes.

(e) ICANN shall select an ICANN staff member and a PTI staff member to serve as points of contact to facilitate formal lines of communication between the SCWG and ICANN and the SCWG and PTI. Communications between the SCWG and the ICANN and PTI points of contact shall be communicated by the SCWG co-chairs.

(f) The SCWG shall not be a standing body. Each SCWG shall be constituted when and as required under these Bylaws and shall dissolve following the end of the process for approving such SCWG’s SCWG Recommendations pursuant to Section 19.4(d).

Section 19.6. ELECTION OF CO-CHAIRS AND LIAISONS

(a) The SCWG shall be led by two co-chairs: one appointed by the GNSO from one of the members appointed pursuant to clauses (iii)-(vi) of Section 19.5(a) and one appointed by the ccNSO from one of the members appointed pursuant to clauses (i)-(ii) of Section 19.5(a).

(b) Liaisons to the SCWG shall not be members of or entitled to vote on any matters before the SCWG, but otherwise shall be entitled to participate on equal footing with SCWG members.

(c) Removal and Replacement of SCWG Members and Liaisons

(i) The SCWG members and liaisons may be removed from the SCWG by their respective appointing organization at any time upon such organization providing written notice to the Secretary and the co-chairs of the SCWG.

(ii) A vacancy on the SCWG shall be deemed to exist in the event of the death, resignation or removal of any SCWG member or liaison. Vacancies shall be filled by the organization that appointed such SCWG member or liaison. The appointing organization shall provide written notice to the Secretary of its appointment to fill a vacancy, with a notification copy to the SCWG co-chairs. The organization responsible for filling such vacancy shall use its reasonable efforts to fill such vacancy within one month after the occurrence of such vacancy.
Section 19.7. MEETINGS

(a) The SCWG shall act by consensus, which is where a small minority may disagree, but most agree.

(b) Any members of the SCWG not in favor of an action may record a minority dissent to such action, which shall be included in the SCWG minutes and/or report, as applicable.

(c) SCWG meetings and other working procedures shall be open to the public and conducted in a transparent manner to the fullest extent possible.

(d) The SCWG shall transmit minutes of its meetings to the Secretary, who shall cause those minutes to be posted to the Website as soon as practicable following each SCWG meeting, and no later than five business days following the meeting.

(e) Except as otherwise provided in these Bylaws, the SCWG shall follow the guidelines and procedures applicable to ICANN Cross Community Working Groups that will be publicly available and may be amended from time to time.

Section 19.8. ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

ICANN shall provide administrative and operational support necessary for the SCWG to carry out its responsibilities, including providing and facilitating remote participation in all meetings of the SCWG.

Section 19.9. CONFLICTING PROVISIONS

In the event any SCWG Recommendation that is approved in accordance with this Article 19 requires ICANN to take any action that is inconsistent with a provision of the Bylaws (including any action taken in implementing such SCWG Recommendation), the requirements of such provision of these Bylaws shall not apply to the extent of that inconsistency.

ARTICLE 20 INDEMNIFICATION OF DIRECTORS, OFFICERS, EMPLOYEES, AND OTHER AGENTS

Section 20.1. INDEMNIFICATION GENERALLY

ICANN shall, to the maximum extent permitted by the CCC, indemnify each of its agents against expenses, judgments, fines, settlements, and other amounts actually and reasonably incurred in connection with any proceeding arising by
reason of the fact that any such person is or was an agent of ICANN, provided that the indemnified person's acts were done in good faith and in a manner that the indemnified person reasonably believed to be in ICANN's best interests and not criminal. For purposes of this Article 20, an "agent" of ICANN includes any person who is or was a Director, Officer, employee, or any other agent of ICANN (including a member of the EC, the EC Administration, any Supporting Organization, any Advisory Committee, the Nominating Committee, any other ICANN committee, or the Technical Liaison Group) acting within the scope of his or her responsibility; or is or was serving at the request of ICANN as a Director, Officer, employee, or agent of another corporation, partnership, joint venture, trust, or other enterprise. The Board may adopt a resolution authorizing the purchase and maintenance of insurance on behalf of any agent of ICANN against any liability asserted against or incurred by the agent in such capacity or arising out of the agent's status as such, whether or not ICANN would have the power to indemnify the agent against that liability under the provisions of this Article 20.

Section 20.2. INDEMNIFICATION WITH RESPECT TO DIRECTOR REMOVAL

If a Director initiates any proceeding in connection with his or her removal or recall pursuant to the Bylaws, to which a person who is a member of the leadership council (or equivalent body) of a Decisional Participant or representative of a Decisional Participant in the EC Administration is a party or is threatened to be made a party (as a party or witness) (a "Director Removal Proceeding"), ICANN shall, to the maximum extent permitted by the CCC, indemnify any such person, against expenses, judgments, fines, settlements, and other amounts actually and reasonably incurred by such person in connection with such Director Removal Proceeding, for actions taken by such person in his or her representative capacity within his or her Decisional Participant pursuant to the processes and procedures set forth in these Bylaws, provided that all such actions were taken by such person in good faith and in a manner that such person reasonably believed to be in ICANN's best interests and not criminal. The actual and reasonable legal fees of a single firm of counsel and other expenses actually and reasonably incurred by such person in defending against a Director Removal Proceeding shall be paid by ICANN in advance of the final disposition of such Director Removal Proceeding, provided, however, that such expenses shall be advanced only upon delivery to the Secretary of an undertaking (which shall be in writing and in a form provided by the Secretary) by such person to repay the amount of such expenses if it shall ultimately be determined that such person is not entitled to be indemnified by ICANN. ICANN shall not be obligated to indemnify such person against any settlement of a Director Removal Proceeding, unless such settlement is approved in advance by the Board in its
reasonable discretion. Notwithstanding Section 20.1, the indemnification provided in this Section 20.2 shall be ICANN's sole indemnification obligation with respect to the subject matter set forth in this Section 20.2.

ARTICLE 21 GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 21.1. CONTRACTS

The Board may authorize any Officer or Officers, agent or agents, to enter into any contract or execute or deliver any instrument in the name of and on behalf of ICANN, and such authority may be general or confined to specific instances. In the absence of a contrary Board authorization, contracts and instruments may only be executed by the following Officers: President, any Vice President, or the CFO. Unless authorized or ratified by the Board, no other Officer, agent, or employee shall have any power or authority to bind ICANN or to render it liable for any debts or obligations.

Section 21.2. DEPOSITS

All funds of ICANN not otherwise employed shall be deposited from time to time to the credit of ICANN in such banks, trust companies, or other depositories as the Board, or the President under its delegation, may select.

Section 21.3. CHECKS

All checks, drafts, or other orders for the payment of money, notes, or other evidences of indebtedness issued in the name of ICANN shall be signed by such Officer or Officers, agent or agents, of ICANN and in such a manner as shall from time to time be determined by resolution of the Board.

Section 21.4. LOANS

No loans shall be made by or to ICANN and no evidences of indebtedness shall be issued in its name unless authorized by a resolution of the Board. Such authority may be general or confined to specific instances; provided, however, that no loans shall be made by ICANN to its Directors or Officers.

Section 21.5. NOTICES

All notices to be given to the EC Administration, the Decisional Participants, or the Secretary pursuant to any provision of these Bylaws shall be given either (a) in writing at the address of the appropriate party as set forth below or (b) via electronic mail as provided below, unless that party has given a notice of change of postal or email address, as provided in this Section 21.5. Any
change in the contact information for notice below will be given by the party within 30 days of such change. Any notice required by these Bylaws will be deemed to have been properly given (i) if in paper form, when delivered in person or via courier service with confirmation of receipt or (ii) if via electronic mail, upon confirmation of receipt by the recipient’s email server, provided that such notice via electronic mail shall be followed by a copy sent by regular postal mail service within three days. In the event other means of notice become practically achievable, such as notice via a secure website, the EC Administration, the Decisional Participants, and ICANN will work together to implement such notice means.

If to ICANN, addressed to:

Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers
12025 Waterfront Drive, Suite 300
Los Angeles, CA 90094-2536
USA
Email: [___]
Attention: Secretary

If to a Decisional Participant or the EC Administration, addressed to the contact information available at [insert Website reference].

ARTICLE 22 FISCAL AND STRATEGIC MATTERS, INSPECTION AND INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION

Section 22.1. ACCOUNTING
The fiscal year end of ICANN shall be determined by the Board.

Section 22.2. AUDIT
At the end of the fiscal year, the books of ICANN shall be closed and audited by certified public accountants. The appointment of the fiscal auditors shall be the responsibility of the Board.

Section 22.3. ANNUAL REPORT AND ANNUAL STATEMENT
The Board shall publish, at least annually, a report describing its activities, including an audited financial statement, a description of any payments made by ICANN to Directors (including reimbursements of expenses) and a description of ICANN's progress towards the obligations imposed under the Bylaws as revised on 1 October 2016 and the Operating Plan and Strategic Plan. ICANN shall cause the annual report and the annual statement of certain transactions as required by the CCC to be prepared and sent to each member of the Board and to such other persons as the Board may designate, no later than one hundred twenty (120) days after the close of ICANN's fiscal year.

Section 22.4. BUDGETS

(a) ICANN Budget

(i) In furtherance of its Commitment to transparent and accountable budgeting processes, at least forty-five (45) days prior to the commencement of each fiscal year, ICANN staff shall prepare and submit to the Board a proposed annual operating plan and budget of ICANN for the next fiscal year (the "ICANN Budget"), which shall be posted on the Website. The ICANN Budget shall identify anticipated revenue sources and levels and shall, to the extent practical, identify anticipated material expense items by line item.

(ii) Prior to approval of the ICANN Budget by the Board, ICANN staff shall consult with the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees during the ICANN Budget development process, and comply with the requirements of this Section 22.4(a).

(iii) Prior to approval of the ICANN Budget by the Board, a draft of the ICANN Budget shall be posted on the Website and shall be subject to public comment.

(iv) After reviewing the comments submitted during the public comment period, the Board may direct ICANN staff to post a revised draft of the ICANN Budget and may direct ICANN Staff to conduct one or more additional public comment periods of lengths determined by the Board, in accordance with ICANN's public comment processes.

(v) Promptly after the Board approves an ICANN Budget (an "ICANN Budget Approval"), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the ICANN Budget that is the subject of the ICANN Budget Approval. ICANN shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC Administration and the
Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants. The EC Administration shall promptly commence and comply with the procedures and requirements specified in Article 2 of Annex D.

(vi) An ICANN Budget shall become effective upon the earliest to occur of the following:

(A)(1) A Rejection Action Petition Notice is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D, in which case the ICANN Budget that is the subject of the ICANN Budget Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the 28th day following the Rejection Action Board Notification Date (as defined in Section 2.2(a) of Annex D) relating to such ICANN Budget Approval and the effectiveness of such ICANN Budget shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC's rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D;

(B)(1) A Rejection Action Supported Petition is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D, in which case the ICANN Budget that is the subject of the ICANN Budget Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period relating to such ICANN Budget Approval and the effectiveness of such ICANN Budget shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC's rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D; and

(C)(1) An EC Rejection Notice is not timely delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4(c) of Annex D, in which case the ICANN Budget that is the subject of the ICANN Budget Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period relating to such ICANN Budget Approval and the effectiveness of such ICANN Budget shall not be
subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC's rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D.

(vii) An ICANN Budget that has been rejected by the EC pursuant to and in compliance with Article 2 of Annex D shall have no force and effect, and shall be void ab initio.

(viii) Following receipt of an EC Rejection Notice relating to an ICANN Budget, ICANN staff and the Board shall consider the explanation provided by the EC Administration as to why the EC has chosen to reject the ICANN Budget in determining the substance of such new ICANN Budget, which shall be subject to the procedures of this Section 22.4(a).

(ix) If an ICANN Budget has not come into full force and effect pursuant to this Section 22.4(a) on or prior to the first date of any fiscal year of ICANN, the Board shall adopt a temporary budget in accordance with Annex E hereto ("Caretaker ICANN Budget"), which Caretaker ICANN Budget shall be effective until such time as an ICANN Budget has been effectively approved by the Board and not rejected by the EC pursuant to this Section 22.4(a).

(b) IANA Budget

(i) At least 45 days prior to the commencement of each fiscal year, ICANN shall prepare and submit to the Board a proposed annual operating plan and budget of PTI and the IANA department, which budget shall include itemization of the direct costs for ICANN's IANA department, all costs for PTI, direct costs for shared resources between ICANN and PTI and support functions provided by ICANN to PTI and ICANN's IANA department for the next fiscal year (the "IANA Budget"), which shall be posted on the Website. Separately and in addition to the general ICANN planning process, ICANN shall require PTI to prepare and submit to the PTI Board a proposed annual operating plan and budget for PTI's performance of the IANA functions for the next fiscal year ("PTI Budget"). ICANN shall require PTI to consult with the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, as well as the Registries Stakeholder Group, the IAB and RIRs, during the PTI Budget development process, and shall seek public comment on the draft PTI Budget prior to approval of the PTI Budget by PTI. ICANN shall require PTI to submit the PTI Budget to ICANN as an input prior to and for the purpose of being included in the proposed Operating Plan (as defined in Section 22.5(a)) and ICANN Budget.
(ii) Prior to approval of the IANA Budget by the Board, ICANN staff shall consult with the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, as well as the Registries Stakeholder Group, IAB and RIRs, during the IANA Budget development process, and comply with the requirements of this Section 22.4(b).

(iii) Prior to approval of the IANA Budget by the Board, a draft of the IANA Budget shall be posted on the Website and shall be subject to public comment.

(iv) After reviewing the comments submitted during the public comment period, the Board may direct ICANN staff to post a revised draft of the IANA Budget and may direct ICANN staff to conduct one or more additional public comment periods of lengths determined by the Board, in accordance with ICANN's public comment processes.

(v) Promptly after the Board approves an IANA Budget (an "IANA Budget Approval"), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the IANA Budget that is the subject of the IANA Budget Approval. ICANN shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants. The EC Administration shall promptly commence and comply with the procedures and requirements specified in Article 2 of Annex D.

(vi) An IANA Budget shall become effective upon the earliest to occur of the following:

(A)(1) A Rejection Action Petition Notice is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D, in which case the IANA Budget that is the subject of the IANA Budget Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the 28th day following the Rejection Action Board Notification Date relating to such IANA Budget Approval and the effectiveness of such IANA Budget shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC's rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D;

(B)(1) A Rejection Action Supported Petition is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary

pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D, in which case the IANA Budget that is the subject of the IANA Budget Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period relating to such IANA Budget Approval and the effectiveness of such IANA Budget shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC's rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D; and

(C)(1) An EC Rejection Notice is not timely delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4(c) of Annex D, in which case the IANA Budget that is the subject of the IANA Budget Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period relating to such IANA Budget Approval and the effectiveness of such IANA Budget shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC's rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D.

(vii) An IANA Budget that has been rejected by the EC pursuant to and in compliance with Article 2 of Annex D shall have no force and effect, and shall be void ab initio.

(viii) Following receipt of an EC Rejection Notice relating to an IANA Budget, ICANN staff and the Board shall consider the explanation provided by the EC Administration as to why the EC has chosen to reject the IANA Budget in determining the substance of such new IANA Budget, which shall be subject to the procedures of this Section 22.4(b).

(ix) If an IANA Budget has not come into full force and effect pursuant to this Section 22.4(b) on or prior to the first date of any fiscal year of ICANN, the Board shall adopt a temporary budget in accordance with Annex F hereto ("Caretaker IANA Budget"), which Caretaker IANA Budget shall be effective until such time as an IANA Budget has been effectively approved by the Board and not rejected by the EC pursuant to this Section 22.4(b).

(c) If an IANA Budget does not receive an EC Rejection Notice but an ICANN Budget receives an EC Rejection Notice, any subsequent revised ICANN Budget shall not alter the expenditures allocated for the IANA Budget.
(d) If an ICANN Budget does not receive an EC Rejection Notice but an IANA Budget receives an EC Rejection Notice, any subsequent revised IANA Budget shall, once approved, be deemed to automatically modify the ICANN Budget in a manner determined by the Board without any further right of the EC to reject the ICANN Budget.

(e) Under all circumstances, the Board will have the ability to make out-of-budget funding decisions for unforeseen expenses necessary to maintaining ICANN’s Mission or to fulfilling ICANN’s pre-existing legal obligations and protecting ICANN from harm or waste.

(f) To maintain ongoing operational excellence and financial stability of the IANA functions (so long as they are performed by ICANN or pursuant to contract with ICANN) and PTI, ICANN shall be required to plan for and allocate funds to ICANN’s performance of the IANA functions and to PTI, as applicable, that are sufficient to cover future expenses and contingencies to ensure that the performance of those IANA functions and PTI in the future are not interrupted due to lack of funding.

(g) The ICANN Budget and the IANA Budget shall be published on the Website.

Section 22.5. PLANS

(a) Operating Plan

(i) At least 45 days prior to the commencement of each fiscal year, ICANN staff shall prepare and submit to the Board a proposed operating plan of ICANN for the next five fiscal years (the "Operating Plan"), which shall be posted on the Website.

(ii) Prior to approval of the Operating Plan by the Board, ICANN staff shall consult with the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees during the Operating Plan development process, and comply with the requirements of this Section 22.5(a).

(iii) Prior to approval of the Operating Plan by the Board, a draft of the Operating Plan shall be posted on the Website and shall be subject to public comment.

(iv) After reviewing the comments submitted during the public comment period, the Board may direct ICANN staff to post a revised draft of the Operating Plan and may direct ICANN staff to conduct one or more
additional public comment periods of lengths determined by the Board, in accordance with ICANN's public comment processes.

(v) Promptly after the Board approves an Operating Plan (an "Operating Plan Approval"), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the Operating Plan that is the subject of the Operating Plan Approval. ICANN shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants. The EC Administration shall promptly commence and comply with the procedures and requirements specified in Article 2 of Annex D.

(vi) An Operating Plan shall become effective upon the earliest to occur of the following:

(A)(1) A Rejection Action Petition Notice is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D, in which case the Operating Plan that is the subject of the Operating Plan Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the 28th day following the Rejection Action Board Notification Date relating to such Operating Plan Approval and the effectiveness of such Operating Plan shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC's rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D;

(B)(1) A Rejection Action Supported Petition is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D, in which case the Operating Plan that is the subject of the Operating Plan Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period relating to such Operating Plan Approval and the effectiveness of such Operating Plan shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC's rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D; and

(C)(1) An EC Rejection Notice is not timely delivered by the EC
Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4(c) of Annex D, in which case the Operating Plan that is the subject of the Operating Plan Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period relating to such Operating Plan Approval and the effectiveness of such Operating Plan shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC's rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D.

(vii) An Operating Plan that has been rejected by the EC pursuant to and in compliance with Article 2 of Annex D shall have no force and effect, and shall be void ab initio.

(viii) Following receipt of an EC Rejection Notice relating to an Operating Plan, ICANN staff and the Board shall consider the explanation provided by the EC Administration as to why the EC has chosen to reject the Operating Plan in determining the substance of such new Operating Plan, which shall be subject to the procedures of this Section 22.5(a).

(b) Strategic Plan

(i) At least 45 days prior to the commencement of each five fiscal year period, with the first such period covering fiscal years 2021 through 2025, ICANN staff shall prepare and submit to the Board a proposed strategic plan of ICANN for the next five fiscal years (the "Strategic Plan"), which shall be posted on the Website.

(ii) Prior to approval of the Strategic Plan by the Board, ICANN staff shall consult with the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees during the Strategic Plan development process, and comply with the requirements of this Section 22.5(b).

(iii) Prior to approval of the Strategic Plan by the Board, a draft of the Strategic Plan shall be posted on the Website and shall be subject to public comment.

(iv) After reviewing the comments submitted during the public comment period, the Board may direct ICANN staff to submit a revised draft of the Strategic Plan and may direct ICANN staff to conduct one or more additional public comment periods of lengths determined by the Board, in accordance with ICANN's public comment processes.

(v) Promptly after the Board approves a Strategic Plan (a "Strategic Plan Approval"), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the Strategic Plan that is the subject of the Strategic Plan Approval. ICANN shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants. The EC Administration shall promptly commence and comply with the procedures and requirements specified in Article 2 of Annex D.

(vi) A Strategic Plan shall become effective upon the earliest to occur of the following:

(A) (1) A Rejection Action Petition Notice is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D, in which case the Strategic Plan that is the subject of the Strategic Plan Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the 28th day following the Rejection Action Board Notification Date relating to such Strategic Plan Approval and the effectiveness of such Strategic Plan shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC's rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D;

(B) (1) A Rejection Action Supported Petition is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D, in which case the Strategic Plan that is the subject of the Strategic Plan Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period relating to such Strategic Plan Approval and the effectiveness of such Strategic Plan shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC's rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D; and

(C) (1) An EC Rejection Notice is not timely delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in
compliance with Section 2.4(c) of Annex D, in which case the Strategic Plan that is the subject of the Strategic Plan Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period relating to such Strategic Plan Approval and the effectiveness of such Strategic Plan shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC's rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D.

(vii) A Strategic Plan that has been rejected by the EC pursuant to and in compliance with Article 2 of Annex D shall have no force and effect, and shall be void ab initio.

(viii) Following receipt of an EC Rejection Notice relating to a Strategic Plan, ICANN staff and the Board shall consider the explanation provided by the EC Administration as to why the EC has chosen to reject the Strategic Plan in determining the substance of such new Strategic Plan, which shall be subject to the procedures of this Section 22.5(b).

Section 22.6. FEES AND CHARGES

The Board may set fees and charges for the services and benefits provided by ICANN, with the goal of fully recovering the reasonable costs of the operation of ICANN and establishing reasonable reserves for future expenses and contingencies reasonably related to the legitimate activities of ICANN. Such fees and charges shall be fair and equitable, shall be published for public comment prior to adoption, and once adopted shall be published on the Website in a sufficiently detailed manner so as to be readily accessible.

Section 22.7. INSPECTION

(a) A Decisional Participant (the "Inspecting Decisional Participant") may request to inspect the accounting books and records of ICANN, as interpreted pursuant to the provisions of Section 6333 of the CCC, and the minutes of the Board or any Board Committee for a purpose reasonably related to such Inspecting Decisional Participant's interest as a Decisional Participant in the EC. The Inspecting Decisional Participant shall make such a request by providing written notice from the chair of the Inspecting Decisional Participant to the Secretary stating the nature of the documents the Inspecting Decisional Participant seeks to inspect ("Inspection Request"). Any Inspection Request must be limited to the accounting books and records of ICANN relevant to the operation of ICANN as a whole, and shall not extend to the underlying sources of such accounting books or records or to documents only relevant to a small or isolated aspect of ICANN's operations or that relate to the minutiae of ICANN's financial records or details of its management and administration (the
"Permitted Scope"). Unless ICANN declines such request (as provided below), ICANN shall make the records requested under an Inspection Request available for inspection by such Inspecting Decisional Participant within 30 days of the date the Inspection Request is received by the Secretary or as soon as reasonably practicable thereafter. All materials and information made available by ICANN for inspection pursuant to an Inspection Request may only be used by the Inspecting Decisional Participant for purposes reasonably related to such Inspecting Decisional Participant's interest as a Decisional Participant in the EC. ICANN shall post all Inspection Requests to the Website.

(b) ICANN may decline an Inspection Request on the basis that such Inspection Request (i) is motivated by a Decisional Participant's financial, commercial or political interests, or those of one or more of its constituents, (ii) relates to documents that are not reasonably related to the purpose specified in the Inspection Request or the Inspecting Decisional Participant's interest as a Decisional Participant in the EC, (iii) requests identical records provided in a prior request of such Decisional Participant, (iv) is not within the Permitted Scope, (v) relates to personnel records, (vi) relates to documents or communications covered by attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine or other legal privilege or (vii) relates to documents or communications that ICANN may not make available under applicable law because such documents or communications contain confidential information that ICANN is required to protect. If an Inspection Request is overly broad, ICANN may request a revised Inspection Request from the Inspecting Decisional Participant.

(c) Any such inspections shall be conducted at the times and locations reasonably determined by ICANN and shall not be conducted in a manner that unreasonably interferes with ICANN's operations. All such inspections shall be subject to reasonable procedures established by ICANN, including, without limitation, the number of individuals authorized to conduct any such inspection on behalf of the Inspecting Decisional Participant. ICANN may require the inspectors to sign a non-disclosure agreement. The Inspecting Decisional Participant may, at its own cost, copy or otherwise reproduce or make a record of materials inspected. ICANN may redact or determine not to provide requested materials on the same basis that such information is of a category or type described in Section 22.7(b), in which case ICANN will provide the Inspecting Decisional Participant a written rationale for such redactions or determination.

(d) The inspection rights provided to the Decisional Participants pursuant to this Section 22.7 are granted to the Decisional Participants and are not granted or available to any other person or entity. Notwithstanding the
foregoing, nothing in this Section 22.7 shall be construed as limiting the accessibility of ICANN’s document information disclosure policy ("DIDP").

(e) If the Inspecting Decisional Participant believes that ICANN has violated the provisions of this Section 22.7, the Inspecting Decisional Participant may seek one or more of the following remedies: (i) appeal such matter to the Ombudsman and/or the Board for a ruling on the matter, (ii) initiate the Reconsideration Request process in accordance with Section 4.2, (iii) initiate the Independent Review Process in accordance with Section 4.3, or (iv) petition the EC to initiate (A) a Community IRP pursuant to Section 4.2 of Annex D or (B) a Board Recall Process pursuant to Section 3.3 of Annex D. Any determination by the Ombudsman is not binding on ICANN staff, but may be submitted by the Inspecting Decisional Participant when appealing to the Board for a determination, if necessary.

Section 22.8. INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION

If three or more Decisional Participants deliver to the Secretary a joint written certification from the respective chairs of each such Decisional Participant that the constituents of such Decisional Participants have, pursuant to the internal procedures of such Decisional Participants, determined that there is a credible allegation that ICANN has committed fraud or that there has been a gross mismanagement of ICANN’s resources, ICANN shall retain a third-party, independent firm to investigate such alleged fraudulent activity or gross mismanagement. ICANN shall post all such certifications to the Website. The independent firm shall issue a report to the Board. The Board shall consider the recommendations and findings set forth in such report. Such report shall be posted on the Website, which may be in a redacted form as determined by the Board, in order to preserve attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine or other legal privilege or where such information is confidential, in which case ICANN will provide the Decisional Participants that submitted the certification a written rationale for such redactions.

ARTICLE 23 MEMBERS

ICANN shall not have members, as contemplated by Section 5310 of the CCC, notwithstanding the use of the term "member" in these Bylaws, in any ICANN document, or in any action of the Board or staff. For the avoidance of doubt, the EC is not a member of ICANN.

ARTICLE 24 OFFICES AND SEAL

Section 24.1. OFFICES
The principal office for the transaction of the business of ICANN shall be in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, United States of America. ICANN may also have an additional office or offices within or outside the United States of America as it may from time to time establish.

Section 24.2. SEAL
The Board may adopt a corporate seal and use the same by causing it or a facsimile thereof to be impressed or affixed or reproduced or otherwise.

ARTICLE 25 AMENDMENTS

Section 25.1. AMENDMENTS TO THE STANDARD BYLAWS

(a) Except as otherwise provided in the Articles of Incorporation or these Bylaws, these Bylaws may be altered, amended, or repealed and new Bylaws adopted only upon approval by a two-thirds vote of all Directors and in compliance with the terms of this Section 25.1 (a "Standard Bylaw Amendment").

(b) Prior to approval of a Standard Bylaw Amendment by the Board, a draft of the Standard Bylaw Amendment shall be posted on the Website and shall be subject to public comment in accordance with ICANN's public comment processes.

(c) After reviewing the comments submitted during the public comment period, the Board may direct ICANN staff to post a revised draft of the Standard Bylaw Amendment and may conduct one or more additional public comment periods in accordance with ICANN's public comment processes.

(d) Within seven days after the Board's approval of a Standard Bylaw Amendment ("Standard Bylaw Amendment Approval"), the Secretary shall (i) provide a Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall contain the form of the approved amendment and the Board's rationale for adopting such amendment, and (ii) post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website. The steps contemplated in Article 2 of Annex D shall then be followed.

(e) A Standard Bylaw Amendment shall become effective upon the earliest to occur of the following:

(i) (A) A Rejection Action Petition Notice is not timely delivered by the
Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D or (B) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D, in which case the Standard Bylaw Amendment that is the subject of the Standard Bylaw Amendment Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the 30th day following the Rejection Action Board Notification Date relating to such Standard Bylaw Amendment Approval and the effectiveness of such Standard Bylaw Amendment shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC’s rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D;

(ii) (A) A Rejection Action Supported Petition is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D or (B) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D, in which case the Standard Bylaw Amendment that is the subject of the Standard Bylaw Amendment Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period relating to such Standard Bylaw Amendment and the effectiveness of such Standard Bylaw Amendment shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC’s rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D; or

(iii) (A) An EC Rejection Notice is not timely delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D or (B) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4(c) of Annex D, in which case the Standard Bylaw Amendment that is the subject of the Standard Bylaw Amendment Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period relating to such Standard Bylaw Amendment and the effectiveness of such Standard Bylaw Amendment shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC’s rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D.

(f) If an EC Rejection Notice is timely delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D, the Standard Bylaw Amendment contained in the Board Notice shall be deemed to have been rejected by the EC. A Standard Bylaw Amendment that has been rejected by the EC shall be null and void and shall not become part of these
Bylaws, notwithstanding its approval by the Board.

(g) The Secretary shall promptly inform the Board of the receipt and substance of any Rejection Action Petition, Rejection Action Supported Petition or EC Rejection Notice delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant or the EC Administration, as applicable, to the Secretary hereunder.

(h) Following receipt of an EC Rejection Notice pertaining to a Standard Bylaw Amendment, ICANN staff and the Board shall consider the explanation provided by the EC Administration as to why the EC has chosen to reject the Standard Bylaw Amendment in determining whether or not to develop a new Standard Bylaw Amendment and the substance of such new Standard Bylaw Amendment, which shall be subject to the procedures of this Section 25.1.

Section 25.2. AMENDMENTS TO THE FUNDAMENTAL BYLAWS AND ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION

(a) Article 1; Sections 4.2, 4.3 and 4.7; Article 6; Sections 7.1 through 7.5, inclusive, and Sections 7.8, 7.11, 7.12, 7.17, 7.24 and 7.25; those portions of Sections 8.1, 9.2(b), 10.3(i), 11.3(f) and 12.2(d)(x)(A) relating to the provision to the EC of nominations of Directors by the nominating body, Articles 16, 17, 18 and 19, Sections 22.4, 22.5, 22.7 and 22.8, Article 26, Section 27.1; Annexes D, E and F; and this Article 25 are each a "Fundamental Bylaw" and, collectively, are the "Fundamental Bylaws".

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of these Bylaws, a Fundamental Bylaw or the Articles of Incorporation may be altered, amended, or repealed (a "Fundamental Bylaw Amendment" or an "Articles Amendment"), only upon approval by a three-fourths vote of all Directors and the approval of the EC as set forth in this Section 25.2.

(c) Prior to approval of a Fundamental Bylaw Amendment, or an Articles Amendment by the Board, a draft of the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment, as applicable, shall be posted on the Website and shall be subject to public comment in accordance with ICANN's public comment processes.

(d) After reviewing the comments submitted during the public comment period, the Board may direct ICANN staff to submit a revised draft of the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment, as applicable, and may direct ICANN staff to conduct one or more additional public comment periods in accordance with ICANN's public comment processes.
(e) Within seven days after the Board’s approval of a Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment, as applicable, the Secretary shall (i) provide a Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall contain the form of the approved amendment and (ii) post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website. The steps contemplated in Article 1 of Annex D shall then be followed.

(f) If the EC Administration timely delivers an EC Approval Notice (as defined in Section 1.4(b) of Annex D), the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment, as applicable, set forth in the Board Notice shall be deemed approved by the EC, and, as applicable, (i) such Fundamental Bylaw Amendment shall be in full force and effect as part of these Bylaws as of the date immediately following the Secretary’s receipt of the EC Approval Notice; or (ii) the Secretary shall cause such Articles Amendment promptly to be certified by the appropriate officers of ICANN and filed with the California Secretary of State. In the event of such approval, neither the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment nor the Articles Amendment shall be subject to any further review or approval of the EC. The Secretary shall promptly inform the Board of the receipt of an EC Approval Notice.

(g) If an EC Approval Notice is not timely delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary, the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment, as applicable, set forth in the Board Notice shall be deemed not approved by the EC, shall be null and void, and, notwithstanding its approval by the Board, the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment shall not be part of these Bylaws and the Articles Amendment shall not be filed with the Secretary of State.

(h) If a Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment, as applicable, is not approved by the EC, ICANN staff and the Board shall consider the concerns raised by the EC in determining whether or not to develop a new Fundamental Bylaws Amendment or Articles Amendment, as applicable, and the substance thereof, which shall be subject to the procedures of this Section 25.2.

Section 25.3. AMENDMENTS RESULTING FROM A POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

The Board shall not combine an amendment of these Bylaws that was the result of a policy development process of a Supporting Organization (a "PDP Amendment") with any other amendment. The Board shall indicate in the applicable Board Notice whether such amendment is a PDP Amendment.
Section 25.4. OTHER AMENDMENTS

For the avoidance of doubt, these Bylaws can only be amended as set forth in this Article 25. Neither the EC, the Decisional Participants, the Supporting Organizations, the Advisory Committees nor any other entity or person shall have the power to directly propose amendments to these Bylaws.

ARTICLE 26 SALE OR OTHER DISPOSITION OF ALL OR SUBSTANTIALLY ALL OF ICANN'S ASSETS

(a) ICANN may consummate a transaction or series of transactions that would result in the sale or disposition of all or substantially all of ICANN's assets (an "Asset Sale") only upon approval by a three-fourths vote of all Directors and the approval of the EC as set forth in this Article 26.

(b) Prior to approval of an Asset Sale by the Board, a draft of the definitive Asset Sale agreement (an "Asset Sale Agreement"), shall be posted on the Website and shall be subject to public comment in accordance with ICANN's public comment processes.

(c) After reviewing the comments submitted during the public comment period, the Board may direct ICANN staff to submit a revised draft of the Asset Sale Agreement, as applicable, and may direct ICANN staff to conduct one or more additional public comment periods in accordance with ICANN's public comment processes.

(d) Within seven days after the Board's approval of an Asset Sale the Secretary shall (i) provide a Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall contain the form of the Asset Sale Agreement and (ii) post the Board Notice on the Website. The steps contemplated in Article 1 of Annex D shall then be followed.

(e) If the EC Administration timely delivers an EC Approval Notice for the Asset Sale pursuant to and in compliance with the procedures and requirements of Section 1.4(b) of Annex D, the Asset Sale set forth in the Board Notice shall be deemed approved by the EC, and the Asset Sale may be consummated by ICANN, but only under the terms set forth in the Asset Sale Agreement. In the event of such approval, the Asset Sale shall not be subject to any further review or approval of the EC. The Secretary shall promptly inform the Board of the receipt of an EC Approval Notice.

(f) If an EC Approval Notice is not timely delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary, the Asset Sale set forth in the Board Notice shall be deemed not approved by the EC, shall be null and void, and, notwithstanding its approval by the Board, ICANN shall not consummate the Asset Sale.
(g) If an Asset Sale is not approved by the EC, ICANN staff and the Board shall consider the concerns raised by the EC in determining whether or not to consider a new Asset Sale, and the substance thereof, which shall be subject to the procedures of this Article 26.

ARTICLE 27 TRANSITION ARTICLE

Section 27.1. WORK STREAM 2

(a) The Cross-Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability ("CCWG-Accountability") was established pursuant to a charter dated 3 November 2014 ("CCWG-Accountability Charter"). The CCWG-Accountability Charter was subsequently adopted by the GNSO, ALAC, ccNSO, GAC, ASO and SSAC ("CCWG Chartering Organizations"). The CCWG-Accountability Charter as in effect on 3 November 2014 shall remain in effect throughout Work Stream 2 (as defined therein).

(b) The CCWG-Accountability recommended in its Supplemental Final Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations to the Board, dated 23 February 2016 ("CCWG-Accountability Final Report") that the below matters be reviewed and developed following the adoption date of these Bylaws ("Work Stream 2 Matters"), in each case, to the extent set forth in the CCWG-Accountability Final Report:

(i) Improvements to ICANN's standards for diversity at all levels;

(ii) ICANN staff accountability;

(iii) Supporting Organization and Advisory Committee accountability, including but not limited to improved processes for accountability, transparency, and participation that are helpful to prevent capture;

(iv) Improvements to ICANN's transparency, focusing on enhancements to ICANN's existing DIDP, transparency of ICANN's interactions with governments, improvements to ICANN's whistleblower policy and transparency of Board deliberations;

(v) Developing and clarifying the FOI-HR (as defined in Section 27.2);

(vi) Addressing jurisdiction-related questions, including how choice of jurisdiction and applicable laws for dispute settlement impact ICANN's accountability;
(vii) Considering enhancements to the Ombudsman's role and function;

(viii) Guidelines for standards of conduct presumed to be in good faith associated with exercising removal of individual Directors; and

(ix) Reviewing the CEP (as set forth in Section 4.3).

(c) As provided in the CCWG-Accountability Charter and the Board's 2014.10.16.16 resolution, the Board shall consider consensus-based recommendations from the CCWG-Accountability on Work Stream 2 Matters ("Work Stream 2 Recommendations") with the same process and criteria it committed to using to consider the CCWG-Accountability recommendations in the CCWG-Accountability Final Report ("Work Stream 1 Recommendations"). For the avoidance of doubt, that process and criteria includes:

(i) All Work Stream 2 Recommendations must further the following principles:

(A) Support and enhance the multistakeholder model;

(B) Maintain the security, stability and resiliency of the DNS;

(C) Meet the needs and expectations of the global customers and partners of the IANA services;

(D) Maintain the openness of the Internet; and

(E) Not result in ICANN becoming a government-led or an intergovernmental organization.

(ii) If the Board determines, by a vote of a two-thirds majority of the Board, that it is not in the global public interest to implement a Work Stream 2 Recommendation, it must initiate a dialogue with the CCWG-Accountability.

(iii) The Board shall provide detailed rationale to accompany the initiation of dialogue. The Board and the CCWG-Accountability shall mutually agree upon the method (e.g., by teleconference, email or otherwise) by which the dialogue will occur. Discussions shall be held in good faith and in a timely and efficient manner in an effort to find a mutually acceptable solution.

(iv) The CCWG-Accountability shall have an opportunity to address the
Board's concerns and report back to the Board on further deliberations regarding the Board's concerns. The CCWG-Accountability shall discuss the Board's concerns within 30 days of the Board's initiation of the dialogue.

If a Work Stream 2 Recommendation is modified by the CCWG-Accountability, the CCWG-Accountability shall submit the modified Work Stream 2 Recommendation to the Board for further consideration along with detailed rationale on how the modification addresses the concerns raised by the Board.

(v) If, after the CCWG-Accountability modifies a Work Stream 2 Recommendation, the Board still believes it is not in the global public interest to implement the Work Stream 2 Recommendation, the Board may, by a vote of a two-thirds majority of the Board, send the matter back to the CCWG-Accountability for further consideration. The Board shall provide detailed rationale to accompany its action. If the Board determines not to accept a modified version of a Work Stream 2 Recommendation, unless required by its fiduciary obligations, the Board shall not establish an alternative solution on the issue addressed by the Work Stream 2 Recommendation until such time as the CCWG-Accountability and the Board reach agreement.

(d) ICANN shall provide adequate support for work on Work Stream 2 Matters, within budgeting processes and limitations reasonably acceptable to the CCWG-Accountability.

(e) The Work Stream 2 Matters specifically referenced in Section 27.1(b) shall be the only matters subject to this Section 27.1 and any other accountability enhancements should be developed through ICANN's other procedures.

(f) The outcomes of each Work Stream 2 Matter are not limited and could include a variety of recommendations or no recommendation; provided, however, that any resulting recommendations must directly relate to the matters discussed in Section 27.1(b).

Section 27.2. HUMAN RIGHTS

(a) The Core Value set forth in Section 1.2(b)(viii) shall have no force or effect unless and until a framework of interpretation for human rights ("FOI-HR") is (i) approved for submission to the Board by the CCWG-Accountability as a consensus recommendation in Work Stream 2, with the CCWG Chartering Organizations having the role described in the CCWG-Accountability Charter, and (ii) approved by the Board, in each case, using the same process and
criteria as for Work Stream 1 Recommendations.

(b) No person or entity shall be entitled to invoke the reconsideration process provided in Section 4.2, or the independent review process provided in Section 4.3, based solely on the inclusion of the Core Value set forth in Section 1.2(b)(viii) (i) until after the FOI-HR contemplated by Section 27.2(a) is in place or (ii) for actions of ICANN or the Board that occurred prior to the effectiveness of the FOI-HR.

Section 27.3. EXISTING GROUPS AND TASK FORCES

Notwithstanding the adoption or effectiveness of these Bylaws, task forces and other groups in existence prior to the date of these Bylaws shall continue unchanged in membership, scope, and operation unless and until changes are made by ICANN in compliance with the Bylaws.

Section 27.4. CONTRACTS WITH ICANN

Notwithstanding the adoption or effectiveness of these Bylaws, all agreements, including employment and consulting agreements, entered into by ICANN shall continue in effect according to their terms.

Annex A: GNSO Policy Development Process

The following process shall govern the GNSO policy development process ("PDP") until such time as modifications are recommended to and approved by the Board. The role of the GNSO is outlined in Article 11 of these Bylaws. If the GNSO is conducting activities that are not intended to result in a Consensus Policy, the Council may act through other processes.

Section 1. Required Elements of a Policy Development Process

The following elements are required at a minimum to form Consensus Policies as defined within ICANN contracts, and any other policies for which the GNSO Council requests application of this Annex A:

a. Final Issue Report requested by the Board, the GNSO Council ("Council") or Advisory Committee, which should include at a minimum a) the proposed issue raised for consideration, b) the identity of the party submitting the issue, and c) how that party is affected by the issue;

b. Formal initiation of the Policy Development Process by the Council;

c. Formation of a Working Group or other designated work method;
d. Initial Report produced by a Working Group or other designated work method;

e. Final Report produced by a Working Group, or other designated work method, and forwarded to the Council for deliberation;

f. Council approval of PDP Recommendations contained in the Final Report, by the required thresholds;

g. PDP Recommendations and Final Report shall be forwarded to the Board through a Recommendations Report approved by the Council; and

h. Board approval of PDP Recommendations.


The GNSO shall maintain a Policy Development Process Manual ("PDP Manual") within the operating procedures of the GNSO maintained by the GNSO Council. The PDP Manual shall contain specific additional guidance on completion of all elements of a PDP, including those elements that are not otherwise defined in these Bylaws. The PDP Manual and any amendments thereto are subject to a twenty-one (21) day public comment period at minimum, as well as Board oversight and review, as specified at Section 11.3(d).

Section 3. Requesting an Issue Report

Board Request. The Board may request an Issue Report by instructing the GNSO Council ("Council") to begin the process outlined the PDP Manual. In the event the Board makes a request for an Issue Report, the Board should provide a mechanism by which the GNSO Council can consult with the Board to provide information on the scope, timing, and priority of the request for an Issue Report.

Council Request. The GNSO Council may request an Issue Report by a vote of at least one-fourth (1/4) of the members of the Council of each House or a majority of one House.

Advisory Committee Request. An Advisory Committee may raise an issue for policy development by action of such committee to request an Issue Report, and transmission of that request to the Staff Manager and GNSO Council.

Section 4. Creation of an Issue Report

Within forty-five (45) calendar days after receipt of either (i) an instruction from
the Board; (ii) a properly supported motion from the GNSO Council; or (iii) a properly supported motion from an Advisory Committee, the Staff Manager will create a report (a "Preliminary Issue Report"). In the event the Staff Manager determines that more time is necessary to create the Preliminary Issue Report, the Staff Manager may request an extension of time for completion of the Preliminary Issue Report.

The following elements should be considered in the Issue Report:

a. The proposed issue raised for consideration;

b. The identity of the party submitting the request for the Issue Report;

c. How that party is affected by the issue, if known;

d. Support for the issue to initiate the PDP, if known;

e. The opinion of the ICANN General Counsel regarding whether the issue proposed for consideration within the Policy Development Process is properly within the scope of the Mission, policy process and more specifically the role of the GNSO as set forth in the Bylaws.

f. The opinion of ICANN Staff as to whether the Council should initiate the PDP on the issue.

Upon completion of the Preliminary Issue Report, the Preliminary Issue Report shall be posted on the Website for a public comment period that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN.

The Staff Manager is responsible for drafting a summary and analysis of the public comments received on the Preliminary Issue Report and producing a Final Issue Report based upon the comments received. The Staff Manager should forward the Final Issue Report, along with any summary and analysis of the public comments received, to the Chair of the GNSO Council for consideration for initiation of a PDP.

Section 5. Initiation of the PDP

The Council may initiate the PDP as follows:

**Board Request**: If the Board requested an Issue Report, the Council, within the timeframe set forth in the PDP Manual, shall initiate a PDP. No vote is required for such action.

**GNSO Council or Advisory Committee Requests**: The Council may only initiate the PDP by a vote of the Council. Initiation of a PDP requires a vote as set
forth in Section 11.3(i)(ii) and Section 11.3(i)(iii) in favor of initiating the PDP.

Section 6. Reports

An Initial Report should be delivered to the GNSO Council and posted for a public comment period that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN, which time may be extended in accordance with the PDP Manual. Following the review of the comments received and, if required, additional deliberations, a Final Report shall be produced for transmission to the Council.

Section 7. Council Deliberation

Upon receipt of a Final Report, whether as the result of a working group or otherwise, the Council chair will (i) distribute the Final Report to all Council members; and (ii) call for Council deliberation on the matter in accordance with the PDP Manual.

The Council approval process is set forth in Section 11.3(i)(iv) through Section 11.3(vii), as supplemented by the PDP Manual.

Section 8. Preparation of the Board Report

If the PDP recommendations contained in the Final Report are approved by the GNSO Council, a Recommendations Report shall be approved by the GNSO Council for delivery to the Board.

Section 9. Board Approval Processes

The Board will meet to discuss the GNSO Council recommendation as soon as feasible, but preferably not later than the second meeting after receipt of the Board Report from the Staff Manager. Board deliberation on the PDP Recommendations contained within the Recommendations Report shall proceed as follows:

a. Any PDP Recommendations approved by a GNSO Supermajority Vote shall be adopted by the Board unless, by a vote of more than two-thirds (2/3) of the Board, the Board determines that such policy is not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN. If the GNSO Council recommendation was approved by less than a GNSO Supermajority Vote, a majority vote of the Board will be sufficient to determine that such policy is not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN.

b. In the event that the Board determines, in accordance with paragraph a
above, that the policy recommended by a GNSO Supermajority Vote or less than a GNSO Supermajority vote is not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN (the Corporation), the Board shall (i) articulate the reasons for its determination in a report to the Council (the "Board Statement"); and (ii) submit the Board Statement to the Council.

c. The Council shall review the Board Statement for discussion with the Board as soon as feasible after the Council's receipt of the Board Statement. The Board shall determine the method (e.g., by teleconference, e-mail, or otherwise) by which the Council and Board will discuss the Board Statement.

d. At the conclusion of the Council and Board discussions, the Council shall meet to affirm or modify its recommendation, and communicate that conclusion (the "Supplemental Recommendation") to the Board, including an explanation for the then-current recommendation. In the event that the Council is able to reach a GNSO Supermajority Vote on the Supplemental Recommendation, the Board shall adopt the recommendation unless more than two-thirds (2/3) of the Board determines that such policy is not in the interests of the ICANN community or ICANN. For any Supplemental Recommendation approved by less than a GNSO Supermajority Vote, a majority vote of the Board shall be sufficient to determine that the policy in the Supplemental Recommendation is not in the best interest of the ICANN community or ICANN.

Section 10. Implementation of Approved Policies

Upon a final decision of the Board adopting the policy, the Board shall, as appropriate, give authorization or direction to ICANN staff to work with the GNSO Council to create an implementation plan based upon the implementation recommendations identified in the Final Report, and to implement the policy. The GNSO Council may, but is not required to, direct the creation of an implementation review team to assist in implementation of the policy.

Section 11. Maintenance of Records

Throughout the PDP, from policy suggestion to a final decision by the Board, ICANN will maintain on the Website, a status web page detailing the progress of each PDP issue. Such status page will outline the completed and upcoming steps in the PDP process, and contain links to key resources (e.g. Reports, Comments Fora, WG Discussions, etc.).
Section 12. Additional Definitions

"Comment Site", "Comment Forum", "Comments For a" and "Website" refer to one or more websites designated by ICANN on which notifications and comments regarding the PDP will be posted.

"Supermajority Vote" means a vote of more than sixty-six (66) percent of the members present at a meeting of the applicable body, with the exception of the GNSO Council.

"Staff Manager" means an ICANN staff person(s) who manages the PDP.

"GNSO Supermajority Vote" shall have the meaning set forth in the Bylaws.

Section 13. Applicability

The procedures of this Annex A shall be applicable to all requests for Issue Reports and PDPs initiated after 8 December 2011. For all ongoing PDPs initiated prior to 8 December 2011, the Council shall determine the feasibility of transitioning to the procedures set forth in this Annex A for all remaining steps within the PDP. If the Council determines that any ongoing PDP cannot be feasibly transitioned to these updated procedures, the PDP shall be concluded according to the procedures set forth in Annex A in force on 7 December 2011.

Annex A-1: GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process

The following process shall govern the specific instances where the GNSO Council invokes the GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process ("EPDP"). The GNSO Council may invoke the EPDP in the following limited circumstances: (1) to address a narrowly defined policy issue that was identified and scoped after either the adoption of a GNSO policy recommendation by the Board or the implementation of such an adopted recommendation; or (2) to create new or additional recommendations for a specific policy issue that had been substantially scoped previously such that extensive, pertinent background information already exists, e.g. (a) in an Issue Report for a possible PDP that was not initiated; (b) as part of a previous PDP that was not completed; or (c) through other projects such as a GGP. The following process shall be in place until such time as modifications are recommended to and approved by the Board. Where a conflict arises in relation to an EPDP between the PDP Manual (see Annex 2 of the GNSO Operating Procedures) and the procedures described in this Annex A-1, the
provisions of this Annex A-1 shall prevail.

The role of the GNSO is outlined in Article 11 of these Bylaws. Provided the Council believes and documents via Council vote that the above-listed criteria are met, an EPDP may be initiated to recommend an amendment to an existing Consensus Policy; however, in all cases where the GNSO is conducting policy-making activities that do not meet the above criteria as documented in a Council vote, the Council should act through a Policy Development Process (see Annex A).

Section 1. Required Elements of a GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process

The following elements are required at a minimum to develop expedited GNSO policy recommendations, including recommendations that could result in amendments to an existing Consensus Policy, as part of a GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process:

a. Formal initiation of the GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process by the GNSO Council, including an EPDP scoping document;

b. Formation of an EPDP Team or other designated work method;

c. Initial Report produced by an EPDP Team or other designated work method;

d. Final EPDP Policy Recommendation(s) Report produced by an EPDP Team, or other designated work method, and forwarded to the Council for deliberation;

e. GNSO Council approval of EPDP Policy Recommendations contained in the Final EPDP Policy Recommendation(s) Report, by the required thresholds;

f. EPDP Recommendations and Final EPDP Recommendation(s) Report forwarded to the Board through a Recommendations Report approved by the Council; and

g. Board approval of EPDP Recommendation(s).

Section 2. Expedited Policy Development Process Manual

The GNSO shall include a specific section(s) on the EPDP process as part of its maintenance of the GNSO Policy Development Process Manual (PDP Manual), described in Annex 5 of the GNSO Operating Procedures. The EPDP Manual shall contain specific additional guidance on completion of all
elements of an EPDP, including those elements that are not otherwise defined in these Bylaws. The EPDP Manual and any amendments thereto are subject to a twenty-one (21) day public comment period at minimum, as well as Board oversight and review, as specified at Section 11.3(d).

Section 3. Initiation of the EPDP

The Council may initiate an EPDP as follows:

The Council may only initiate the EPDP by a vote of the Council. Initiation of an EPDP requires an affirmative Supermajority vote of the Council (as defined in Section 11.3(i)(xii) of these Bylaws) in favor of initiating the EPDP.

The request to initiate an EPDP must be accompanied by an EPDP scoping document, which is expected to include at a minimum the following information:

1. Name of Council Member / SG / C;
2. Origin of issue (e.g. previously completed PDP);
3. Scope of the effort (detailed description of the issue or question that the EPDP is expected to address);
4. Description of how this issue meets the criteria for an EPDP, i.e. how the EPDP will address either: (1) a narrowly defined policy issue that was identified and scoped after either the adoption of a GNSO policy recommendation by the Board or the implementation of such an adopted recommendation, or (2) new or additional policy recommendations on a specific GNSO policy issue that had been scoped previously as part of a PDP that was not completed or other similar effort, including relevant supporting information in either case;
5. If not provided as part of item 4, the opinion of the ICANN General Counsel as to whether the issue proposed for consideration is properly within the scope of the Mission, policy process and more specifically the role of the GNSO;
6. Proposed EPDP mechanism (e.g. WG, DT, individual volunteers);
7. Method of operation if different from GNSO Working Group Guidelines;
8. Decision-making methodology for EPDP mechanism, if different from GNSO Working Group Guidelines;
9. Target completion date.
Section 4. Council Deliberation

Upon receipt of an EPDP Final Recommendation(s) Report, whether as the result of an EPDP Team or otherwise, the Council chair will (i) distribute the Final EPDP Recommendation(s) Report to all Council members; and (ii) call for Council deliberation on the matter in accordance with the PDP Manual.

Approval of EPDP Recommendation(s) requires an affirmative vote of the Council meeting the thresholds set forth in Section 11.3(i)(xiv) and (xv), as supplemented by the PDP Manual.

Section 5. Preparation of the Board Report

If the EPDP Recommendation(s) contained in the Final EPDP Recommendation(s) Report are approved by the GNSO Council, a Recommendation(s) Report shall be approved by the GNSO Council for delivery to the Board.

Section 6. Board Approval Processes

The Board will meet to discuss the EPDP recommendation(s) as soon as feasible, but preferably not later than the second meeting after receipt of the Recommendations Report from the Staff Manager. Board deliberation on the EPDP Recommendations contained within the Recommendations Report shall proceed as follows:

a. Any EPDP Recommendations approved by a GNSO Supermajority Vote shall be adopted by the Board unless, by a vote of more than two-thirds (2/3) of the Board, the Board determines that such policy is not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN. If the GNSO Council recommendation was approved by less than a GNSO Supermajority Vote, a majority vote of the Board will be sufficient to determine that such policy is not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN.

b. In the event that the Board determines, in accordance with paragraph a above, that the proposed EPDP Recommendations are not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN (the Corporation), the Board shall (i) articulate the reasons for its determination in a report to the Council (the "Board Statement"); and (ii) submit the Board Statement to the Council.

c. The Council shall review the Board Statement for discussion with the Board as soon as feasible after the Council's receipt of the Board Statement. The Board shall determine the method (e.g., by
teleconference, e-mail, or otherwise) by which the Council and Board will discuss the Board Statement.

At the conclusion of the Council and Board discussions, the Council shall meet to affirm or modify its recommendation, and communicate that conclusion (the "Supplemental Recommendation") to the Board, including an explanation for the then-current recommendation. In the event that the Council is able to reach a GNSO Supermajority Vote on the Supplemental Recommendation, the Board shall adopt the recommendation unless more than two-thirds (2/3) of the Board determines that such guidance is not in the interests of the ICANN community or ICANN. For any Supplemental Recommendation approved by less than a GNSO Supermajority Vote, a majority vote of the Board shall be sufficient to determine that the guidance in the Supplemental Recommendation is not in the best interest of the ICANN community or ICANN.

Section 7. Implementation of Approved Policies

Upon a final decision of the Board adopting the EPDP recommendations, the Board shall, as appropriate, give authorization or direction to ICANN staff to implement the EPDP Recommendations. If deemed necessary, the Board shall direct ICANN staff to work with the GNSO Council to create a guidance implementation plan, based upon the guidance recommendations identified in the Final EPDP Recommendation(s) Report.

Section 8. Maintenance of Records

Throughout the EPDP, from initiation to a final decision by the Board, ICANN will maintain on the Website, a status web page detailing the progress of each EPDP issue. Such status page will outline the completed and upcoming steps in the EPDP process, and contain links to key resources (e.g. Reports, Comments Fora, EPDP Discussions, etc.).

Section 9. Applicability

The procedures of this Annex A-1 shall be applicable from 28 September 2015 onwards.

Annex A-2: GNSO Guidance Process

The following process shall govern the GNSO guidance process ("GGP") until such time as modifications are recommended to and approved by the Board. The role of the GNSO is outlined in Article 11 of these Bylaws. If the GNSO is conducting activities that are intended to result in a Consensus Policy, the
Council should act through a Policy Development Process (see Annex A).

Section 1. **Required Elements of a GNSO Guidance Process**

The following elements are required at a minimum to develop GNSO guidance:

1. Formal initiation of the GNSO Guidance Process by the Council, including a GGP scoping document;

2. Identification of the types of expertise needed on the GGP Team;

3. Recruiting and formation of a GGP Team or other designated work method;

4. Proposed GNSO Guidance Recommendation(s) Report produced by a GGP Team or other designated work method;

5. Final GNSO Guidance Recommendation(s) Report produced by a GGP Team, or other designated work method, and forwarded to the Council for deliberation;

6. Council approval of GGP Recommendations contained in the Final Recommendation(s) Report, by the required thresholds;

7. GGP Recommendations and Final Recommendation(s) Report shall be forwarded to the Board through a Recommendations Report approved by the Council; and

8. Board approval of GGP Recommendation(s).

Section 2. **GNSO Guidance Process Manual**

The GNSO shall maintain a GNSO Guidance Process (GGP Manual) within the operating procedures of the GNSO maintained by the GNSO Council. The GGP Manual shall contain specific additional guidance on completion of all elements of a GGP, including those elements that are not otherwise defined in these Bylaws. The GGP Manual and any amendments thereto are subject to a twenty-one (21) day public comment period at minimum, as well as Board oversight and review, as specified at Section 11.3(d).

Section 3. **Initiation of the GGP**

The Council may initiate a GGP as follows:

The Council may only initiate the GGP by a vote of the Council or at the formal request of the ICANN Board. Initiation of a GGP requires a vote as set forth in
Section 11.3(i)(xvi) in favor of initiating the GGP. In the case of a GGP requested by the Board, a GGP will automatically be initiated unless the GNSO Council votes against the initiation of a GGP as set forth in Section 11.3(i)(xvii).

The request to initiate a GGP must be accompanied by a GGP scoping document, which is expected to include at a minimum the following information:

1. Name of Council Member / SG / C
2. Origin of issue (e.g., board request)
3. Scope of the effort (detailed description of the issue or question that the GGP is expected to address)
4. Proposed GGP mechanism (e.g. WG, DT, individual volunteers)
5. Method of operation, if different from GNSO Working Group Guidelines
6. Decision-making methodology for GGP mechanism, if different from GNSO Working Group Guidelines
7. Desired completion date and rationale

In the event the Board makes a request for a GGP, the Board should provide a mechanism by which the GNSO Council can consult with the Board to provide information on the scope, timing, and priority of the request for a GGP.

Section 4. Council Deliberation

Upon receipt of a Final Recommendation(s) Report, whether as the result of a GGP Team or otherwise, the Council chair will (i) distribute the Final Recommendation(s) Report to all Council members; and (ii) call for Council deliberation on the matter in accordance with the GGP Manual.

The Council approval process is set forth in Section 11.3(xviii) as supplemented by the GGP Manual.

Section 5. Preparation of the Board Report

If the GGP recommendations contained in the Final Recommendation(s) Report are approved by the GNSO Council, a Recommendations Report shall be approved by the GNSO Council for delivery to the Board.

Section 6. Board Approval Processes
The Board will meet to discuss the GNSO Guidance recommendation(s) as soon as feasible, but preferably not later than the second meeting after receipt of the Board Report from the Staff Manager. Board deliberation on the GGP Recommendations contained within the Recommendations Report shall proceed as follows:

a. Any GGP Recommendations approved by a GNSO Supermajority Vote shall be adopted by the Board unless, by a vote of more than two-thirds (2/3) of the Board, the Board determines that such guidance is not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN.

b. In the event that the Board determines, in accordance with paragraph a above, that the proposed GNSO Guidance recommendation(s) adopted by a GNSO Supermajority Vote is not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN (the Corporation), the Board shall (i) articulate the reasons for its determination in a report to the Council (the "Board Statement"); and (ii) submit the Board Statement to the Council.

c. The Council shall review the Board Statement for discussion with the Board as soon as feasible after the Council's receipt of the Board Statement. The Board shall determine the method (e.g., by teleconference, e-mail, or otherwise) by which the Council and Board will discuss the Board Statement.

d. At the conclusion of the Council and Board discussions, the Council shall meet to affirm or modify its recommendation, and communicate that conclusion (the "Supplemental Recommendation") to the Board, including an explanation for the then-current recommendation. In the event that the Council is able to reach a GNSO Supermajority Vote on the Supplemental Recommendation, the Board shall adopt the recommendation unless more than two-thirds (2/3) of the Board determines that such guidance is not in the interests of the ICANN community or ICANN.

Section 7. Implementation of Approved GNSO Guidance

Upon a final decision of the Board adopting the guidance, the Board shall, as appropriate, give authorization or direction to ICANN staff to implement the GNSO Guidance. If deemed necessary, the Board may direct ICANN Staff to work with the GNSO Council to create a guidance implementation plan, if deemed necessary, based upon the guidance recommendations identified in the Final Recommendation(s) Report.

Section 8. Maintenance of Records
Throughout the GGP, from initiation to a final decision by the Board, ICANN will maintain on the Website, a status web page detailing the progress of each GGP issue. Such status page will outline the completed and upcoming steps in the GGP process, and contain links to key resources (e.g. Reports, Comments Fora, GGP Discussions, etc.).

Section 9. **Additional Definitions**

"Comment Site", "Comment Forum", "Comments Fora" and "Website" refer to one or more websites designated by ICANN on which notifications and comments regarding the GGP will be posted.

"GGP Staff Manager" means an ICANN staff person(s) who manages the GGP.

**Annex B: ccNSO Policy-Development Process (ccPDP)**

The following process shall govern the ccNSO policy-development process ("PDP").

**1. Request for an Issue Report**

An Issue Report may be requested by any of the following:

a. **Council.** The ccNSO Council (in this Annex B, the "Council") may call for the creation of an Issue Report by an affirmative vote of at least seven of the members of the Council present at any meeting or voting by e-mail.

b. **Board.** The Board may call for the creation of an Issue Report by requesting the Council to begin the policy-development process.

c. **Regional Organization.** One or more of the Regional Organizations representing ccTLDs in the ICANN recognized Regions may call for creation of an Issue Report by requesting the Council to begin the policy-development process.

d. **ICANN Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee.** An ICANN Supporting Organization or an ICANN Advisory Committee may call for creation of an Issue Report by requesting the Council to begin the policy-development process.

e. **Members of the ccNSO.** The members of the ccNSO may call for the creation of an Issue Report by an affirmative vote of at least ten members of the ccNSO present at any meeting or voting by e-mail.
Any request for an Issue Report must be in writing and must set out the issue upon which an Issue Report is requested in sufficient detail to enable the Issue Report to be prepared. It shall be open to the Council to request further information or undertake further research or investigation for the purpose of determining whether or not the requested Issue Report should be created.

2. Creation of the Issue Report and Initiation Threshold

Within seven days after an affirmative vote as outlined in Item 1(a) above or the receipt of a request as outlined in Items 1(b), (c), or (d) above the Council shall appoint an Issue Manager. The Issue Manager may be a staff member of ICANN (in which case the costs of the Issue Manager shall be borne by ICANN) or such other person or persons selected by the Council (in which case the ccNSO shall be responsible for the costs of the Issue Manager).

Within fifteen (15) calendar days after appointment (or such other time as the Council shall, in consultation with the Issue Manager, deem to be appropriate), the Issue Manager shall create an Issue Report. Each Issue Report shall contain at least the following:

a. The proposed issue raised for consideration;

b. The identity of the party submitting the issue;

c. How that party is affected by the issue;

d. Support for the issue to initiate the PDP;

e. A recommendation from the Issue Manager as to whether the Council should move to initiate the PDP for this issue (the "Manager Recommendation"). Each Manager Recommendation shall include, and be supported by, an opinion of the ICANN General Counsel regarding whether the issue is properly within the scope of the ICANN policy process and within the scope of the ccNSO. In coming to his or her opinion, the General Counsel shall examine whether:

1) The issue is within the scope of the Mission;

2) Analysis of the relevant factors according to Section 10.6(b) and Annex C affirmatively demonstrates that the issue is within the scope of the ccNSO;

In the event that the General Counsel reaches an opinion in the affirmative with respect to points 1 and 2 above then the General Counsel shall also consider whether the issue:

3) Implicates or affects an existing ICANN policy;
4) Is likely to have lasting value or applicability, albeit with the need for occasional updates, and to establish a guide or framework for future decision-making.

In all events, consideration of revisions to the ccPDP (this Annex B) or to the scope of the ccNSO (Annex C) shall be within the scope of ICANN and the ccNSO.

In the event that General Counsel is of the opinion the issue is not properly within the scope of the ccNSO Scope, the Issue Manager shall inform the Council of this opinion. If after an analysis of the relevant factors according to Section 10.6 and Annex C a majority of 10 or more Council members is of the opinion the issue is within scope the Chair of the ccNSO shall inform the Issue Manager accordingly. General Counsel and the ccNSO Council shall engage in a dialogue according to agreed rules and procedures to resolve the matter. In the event no agreement is reached between General Counsel and the Council as to whether the issue is within or outside Scope of the ccNSO then by a vote of 15 or more members the Council may decide the issue is within scope. The Chair of the ccNSO shall inform General Counsel and the Issue Manager accordingly. The Issue Manager shall then proceed with a recommendation whether or not the Council should move to initiate the PDP including both the opinion and analysis of General Counsel and Council in the Issues Report.

f. In the event that the Manager Recommendation is in favor of initiating the PDP, a proposed time line for conducting each of the stages of PDP outlined herein ("PDP Time Line").

g. If possible, the issue report shall indicate whether the resulting output is likely to result in a policy to be approved by the Board. In some circumstances, it will not be possible to do this until substantive discussions on the issue have taken place. In these cases, the issue report should indicate this uncertainty. Upon completion of the Issue Report, the Issue Manager shall distribute it to the full Council for a vote on whether to initiate the PDP.

3. Initiation of PDP

The Council shall decide whether to initiate the PDP as follows:

a. Within 21 days after receipt of an Issue Report from the Issue Manager, the Council shall vote on whether to initiate the PDP. Such vote should be taken at a meeting held in any manner deemed appropriate by the
Council, including in person or by conference call, but if a meeting is not feasible the vote may occur by e-mail.

b. A vote of ten or more Council members in favor of initiating the PDP shall be required to initiate the PDP provided that the Issue Report states that the issue is properly within the scope of the Mission and the ccNSO Scope.

4. Decision Whether to Appoint Task Force; Establishment of Time Line

At the meeting of the Council where the PDP has been initiated (or, where the Council employs a vote by e-mail, in that vote) pursuant to Item 3 above, the Council shall decide, by a majority vote of members present at the meeting (or voting by e-mail), whether or not to appoint a task force to address the issue. If the Council votes:

a. In favor of convening a task force, it shall do so in accordance with Item 7 below.

b. Against convening a task force, then it shall collect information on the policy issue in accordance with Item 8 below.

The Council shall also, by a majority vote of members present at the meeting or voting by e-mail, approve or amend and approve the PDP Time Line set out in the Issue Report.

5. Composition and Selection of Task Forces

a. Upon voting to appoint a task force, the Council shall invite each of the Regional Organizations (see Section 10.5) to appoint two individuals to participate in the task force (the "Representatives"). Additionally, the Council may appoint up to three advisors (the "Advisors") from outside the ccNSO and, following formal request for GAC participation in the Task Force, accept up to two Representatives from the Governmental Advisory Committee to sit on the task force. The Council may increase the number of Representatives that may sit on a task force in its discretion in circumstances that it deems necessary or appropriate.

b. Any Regional Organization wishing to appoint Representatives to the task force must provide the names of the Representatives to the Issue Manager within ten (10) calendar days after such request so that they are included on the task force. Such Representatives need not be members of the Council, but each must be an individual who has an interest, and ideally knowledge and expertise, in the subject matter, coupled with the ability to devote a substantial amount of time to the
task force’s activities.

c. The Council may also pursue other actions that it deems appropriate to assist in the PDP, including appointing a particular individual or organization to gather information on the issue or scheduling meetings for deliberation or briefing. All such information shall be submitted to the Issue Manager in accordance with the PDP Time Line.

6. Public Notification of Initiation of the PDP and Comment Period

After initiation of the PDP, ICANN shall post a notification of such action to the Website and to the other ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees. A comment period (in accordance with the PDP Time Line, and ordinarily at least 21 days long) shall be commenced for the issue. Comments shall be accepted from ccTLD managers, other Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees, and from the public. The Issue Manager, or some other designated Council representative shall review the comments and incorporate them into a report (the "Comment Report") to be included in either the Preliminary Task Force Report or the Initial Report, as applicable.

7. Task Forces

a. Role of Task Force. If a task force is created, its role shall be responsible for (i) gathering information documenting the positions of the ccNSO members within the Geographic Regions and other parties and groups; and (ii) otherwise obtaining relevant information that shall enable the Task Force Report to be as complete and informative as possible to facilitate the Council’s meaningful and informed deliberation.

The task force shall not have any formal decision-making authority. Rather, the role of the task force shall be to gather information that shall document the positions of various parties or groups as specifically and comprehensively as possible, thereby enabling the Council to have a meaningful and informed deliberation on the issue.

b. Task Force Charter or Terms of Reference. The Council, with the assistance of the Issue Manager, shall develop a charter or terms of reference for the task force (the "Charter") within the time designated in the PDP Time Line. Such Charter shall include:

1. The issue to be addressed by the task force, as such issue was articulated for the vote before the Council that initiated the PDP;

2. The specific time line that the task force must adhere to, as set forth below, unless the Council determines that there is a compelling reason
to extend the timeline; and

3. Any specific instructions from the Council for the task force, including whether or not the task force should solicit the advice of outside advisors on the issue.

The task force shall prepare its report and otherwise conduct its activities in accordance with the Charter. Any request to deviate from the Charter must be formally presented to the Council and may only be undertaken by the task force upon a vote of a majority of the Council members present at a meeting or voting by e-mail. The quorum requirements of Section 10.3(n) shall apply to Council actions under this Item 7(b).

c. Appointment of Task Force Chair. The Issue Manager shall convene the first meeting of the task force within the time designated in the PDP Time Line. At the initial meeting, the task force members shall, among other things, vote to appoint a task force chair. The chair shall be responsible for organizing the activities of the task force, including compiling the Task Force Report. The chair of a task force need not be a member of the Council.

d. Collection of Information.

1. Regional Organization Statements. The Representatives shall each be responsible for soliciting the position of the Regional Organization for their Geographic Region, at a minimum, and may solicit other comments, as each Representative deems appropriate, including the comments of the ccNSO members in that region that are not members of the Regional Organization, regarding the issue under consideration. The position of the Regional Organization and any other comments gathered by the Representatives should be submitted in a formal statement to the task force chair (each, a "Regional Statement") within the time designated in the PDP Time Line. Every Regional Statement shall include at least the following:

   (i) If a Supermajority Vote (as defined by the Regional Organization) was reached, a clear statement of the Regional Organization's position on the issue;

   (ii) If a Supermajority Vote was not reached, a clear statement of all positions espoused by the members of the Regional Organization;

   (iii) A clear statement of how the Regional Organization arrived at its position(s). Specifically, the statement should detail specific meetings, teleconferences, or other means of deliberating an issue, and a list of all members who participated or otherwise submitted their views;
(iv) A statement of the position on the issue of any ccNSO members that are not members of the Regional Organization;

(v) An analysis of how the issue would affect the Region, including any financial impact on the Region; and

(vi) An analysis of the period of time that would likely be necessary to implement the policy.

2. Outside Advisors. The task force may, in its discretion, solicit the opinions of outside advisors, experts, or other members of the public. Such opinions should be set forth in a report prepared by such outside advisors, and (i) clearly labeled as coming from outside advisors; (ii) accompanied by a detailed statement of the advisors' (a) qualifications and relevant experience and (b) potential conflicts of interest. These reports should be submitted in a formal statement to the task force chair within the time designated in the PDP Time Line.

e. Task Force Report. The chair of the task force, working with the Issue Manager, shall compile the Regional Statements, the Comment Report, and other information or reports, as applicable, into a single document ("Preliminary Task Force Report") and distribute the Preliminary Task Force Report to the full task force within the time designated in the PDP Time Line. The task force shall have a final task force meeting to consider the issues and try and reach a Supermajority Vote. After the final task force meeting, the chair of the task force and the Issue Manager shall create the final task force report (the "Task Force Report") and post it on the Website and to the other ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees. Each Task Force Report must include:

1. A clear statement of any Supermajority Vote (being 66% of the task force) position of the task force on the issue;

2. If a Supermajority Vote was not reached, a clear statement of all positions espoused by task force members submitted within the time line for submission of constituency reports. Each statement should clearly indicate (i) the reasons underlying the position and (ii) the Regional Organizations that held the position;

3. An analysis of how the issue would affect each Region, including any financial impact on the Region;

4. An analysis of the period of time that would likely be necessary to implement the policy; and

5. The advice of any outside advisors appointed to the task force by the
Council, accompanied by a detailed statement of the advisors’ (i) qualifications and relevant experience and (ii) potential conflicts of interest.

8. Procedure if No Task Force is Formed

a. If the Council decides not to convene a task force, each Regional Organization shall, within the time designated in the PDP Time Line, appoint a representative to solicit the Region's views on the issue. Each such representative shall be asked to submit a Regional Statement to the Issue Manager within the time designated in the PDP Time Line.

b. The Council may, in its discretion, take other steps to assist in the PDP, including, for example, appointing a particular individual or organization, to gather information on the issue or scheduling meetings for deliberation or briefing. All such information shall be submitted to the Issue Manager within the time designated in the PDP Time Line.

c. The Council shall formally request the Chair of the GAC to offer opinion or advice.

d. The Issue Manager shall take all Regional Statements, the Comment Report, and other information and compile (and post on the Website) an Initial Report within the time designated in the PDP Time Line. Thereafter, the Issue Manager shall, in accordance with Item 9 below, create a Final Report.

9. Comments to the Task Force Report or Initial Report

a. A comment period (in accordance with the PDP Time Line, and ordinarily at least 21 days long) shall be opened for comments on the Task Force Report or Initial Report. Comments shall be accepted from ccTLD managers, other Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees, and from the public. All comments shall include the author's name, relevant experience, and interest in the issue.

b. At the end of the comment period, the Issue Manager shall review the comments received and may, in the Issue Manager's reasonable discretion, add appropriate comments to the Task Force Report or Initial Report, to prepare the "Final Report". The Issue Manager shall not be obligated to include all comments made during the comment period, nor shall the Issue Manager be obligated to include all comments submitted by any one individual or organization.

c. The Issue Manager shall prepare the Final Report and submit it to the
10. Council Deliberation

a. Upon receipt of a Final Report, whether as the result of a task force or otherwise, the Council chair shall (i) distribute the Final Report to all Council members; (ii) call for a Council meeting within the time designated in the PDP Time Line wherein the Council shall work towards achieving a recommendation to present to the Board; and (iii) formally send to the GAC Chair an invitation to the GAC to offer opinion or advice. Such meeting may be held in any manner deemed appropriate by the Council, including in person or by conference call. The Issue Manager shall be present at the meeting.

b. The Council may commence its deliberation on the issue prior to the formal meeting, including via in-person meetings, conference calls, e-mail discussions, or any other means the Council may choose.

c. The Council may, if it so chooses, solicit the opinions of outside advisors at its final meeting. The opinions of these advisors, if relied upon by the Council, shall be (i) embodied in the Council's report to the Board, (ii) specifically identified as coming from an outside advisor; and (iii) accompanied by a detailed statement of the advisor's (a) qualifications and relevant experience and (b) potential conflicts of interest.

11. Recommendation of the Council

In considering whether to make a recommendation on the issue (a "Council Recommendation"), the Council shall seek to act by consensus. If a minority opposes a consensus position, that minority shall prepare and circulate to the Council a statement explaining its reasons for opposition. If the Council's discussion of the statement does not result in consensus, then a recommendation supported by 14 or more of the Council members shall be deemed to reflect the view of the Council, and shall be conveyed to the Members as the Council's Recommendation. Notwithstanding the foregoing, as outlined below, all viewpoints expressed by Council members during the PDP must be included in the Members Report.

12. Council Report to the Members

In the event that a Council Recommendation is adopted pursuant to Item 11 then the Issue Manager shall, within seven days after the Council meeting, incorporate the Council's Recommendation together with any other viewpoints of the Council members into a Members Report to be approved by the Council.
and then to be submitted to the Members (the "Members Report"). The Members Report must contain at least the following:

a. A clear statement of the Council's recommendation;

b. The Final Report submitted to the Council; and

c. A copy of the minutes of the Council's deliberation on the policy issue (see Item 10), including all the opinions expressed during such deliberation, accompanied by a description of who expressed such opinions.

13. Members Vote

Following the submission of the Members Report and within the time designated by the PDP Time Line, the ccNSO members shall be given an opportunity to vote on the Council Recommendation. The vote of members shall be electronic and members' votes shall be lodged over such a period of time as designated in the PDP Time Line (at least 21 days long).

In the event that at least 50% of the ccNSO members lodge votes within the voting period, the resulting vote will be employed without further process. In the event that fewer than 50% of the ccNSO members lodge votes in the first round of voting, the first round will not be employed and the results of a final, second round of voting, conducted after at least thirty days notice to the ccNSO members, will be employed if at least 50% of the ccNSO members lodge votes. In the event that more than 66% of the votes received at the end of the voting period shall be in favor of the Council Recommendation, then the recommendation shall be conveyed to the Board in accordance with Item 14 below as the ccNSO Recommendation.

14. Board Report

The Issue Manager shall within seven days after a ccNSO Recommendation being made in accordance with Item 13 incorporate the ccNSO Recommendation into a report to be approved by the Council and then to be submitted to the Board (the "Board Report"). The Board Report must contain at least the following:

a. A clear statement of the ccNSO recommendation;

b. The Final Report submitted to the Council; and

c. the Members' Report.

15. Board Vote
a. The Board shall meet to discuss the ccNSO Recommendation as soon as feasible after receipt of the Board Report from the Issue Manager, taking into account procedures for Board consideration.

b. The Board shall adopt the ccNSO Recommendation unless by a vote of more than 66% the Board determines that such policy is not in the best interest of the ICANN community or of ICANN.

1. In the event that the Board determines not to act in accordance with the ccNSO Recommendation, the Board shall (i) state its reasons for its determination not to act in accordance with the ccNSO Recommendation in a report to the Council (the "Board Statement"); and (ii) submit the Board Statement to the Council.

2. The Council shall discuss the Board Statement with the Board within thirty days after the Board Statement is submitted to the Council. The Board shall determine the method (e.g., by teleconference, e-mail, or otherwise) by which the Council and Board shall discuss the Board Statement. The discussions shall be held in good faith and in a timely and efficient manner, to find a mutually acceptable solution.

3. At the conclusion of the Council and Board discussions, the Council shall meet to affirm or modify its Council Recommendation. A recommendation supported by 14 or more of the Council members shall be deemed to reflect the view of the Council (the Council's "Supplemental Recommendation"). That Supplemental Recommendation shall be conveyed to the Members in a Supplemental Members Report, including an explanation for the Supplemental Recommendation. Members shall be given an opportunity to vote on the Supplemental Recommendation under the same conditions outlined in Item 13. In the event that more than 66% of the votes cast by ccNSO Members during the voting period are in favor of the Supplemental Recommendation then that recommendation shall be conveyed to Board as the ccNSO Supplemental Recommendation and the Board shall adopt the recommendation unless by a vote of more than 66% the Board determines that acceptance of such policy would constitute a breach of the fiduciary duties of the Board to the Company.

4. In the event that the Board does not accept the ccNSO Supplemental Recommendation, it shall state its reasons for doing so in its final decision ("Supplemental Board Statement").

5. In the event the Board determines not to accept a ccNSO Supplemental Recommendation, then the Board shall not be entitled to
set policy on the issue addressed by the recommendation and the status quo shall be preserved until such time as the ccNSO shall, under the ccPDP, make a recommendation on the issue that is deemed acceptable by the Board.

16. Implementation of the Policy

Upon adoption by the Board of a ccNSO Recommendation or ccNSO Supplemental Recommendation, the Board shall, as appropriate, direct or authorize ICANN staff to implement the policy.

17. Maintenance of Records

With respect to each ccPDP for which an Issue Report is requested (see Item 1), ICANN shall maintain on the Website a status web page detailing the progress of each ccPDP, which shall provide a list of relevant dates for the ccPDP and shall also link to the following documents, to the extent they have been prepared pursuant to the ccPDP:

a. Issue Report;
b. PDP Time Line;
c. Comment Report;
d. Regional Statement(s);
e. Preliminary Task Force Report;
f. Task Force Report;
g. Initial Report;
h. Final Report;
i. Members’ Report;
j. Board Report;
k. Board Statement;
l. Supplemental Members’ Report; and
m. Supplemental Board Statement.

In addition, ICANN shall post on the Website comments received in electronic written form specifically suggesting that a ccPDP be initiated.
Annex C: The Scope of the ccNSO

This annex describes the scope and the principles and method of analysis to be used in any further development of the scope of the ccNSO’s policy-development role. As provided in Section 10.6(b) of the Bylaws, that scope shall be defined according to the procedures of the ccPDP.

The scope of the ccNSO’s authority and responsibilities must recognize the complex relation between ICANN and ccTLD managers/registries with regard to policy issues. This annex shall assist the ccNSO, the ccNSO Council, and the Board and staff in delineating relevant global policy issues.

Policy areas

The ccNSO’s policy role should be based on an analysis of the following functional model of the DNS:

1. Data is registered/maintained to generate a zone file,
2. A zone file is in turn used in TLD name servers.

Within a TLD two functions have to be performed (these are addressed in greater detail below):

1. Entering data into a database (“Data Entry Function”) and
2. Maintaining and ensuring upkeep of name-servers for the TLD (“Name Server Function”).

These two core functions must be performed at the ccTLD registry level as well as at a higher level (IANA function and root servers) and at lower levels of the DNS hierarchy. This mechanism, as RFC 1591 points out, is recursive:

There are no requirements on sub domains of top-level domains beyond the requirements on higher-level domains themselves. That is, the requirements in this memo are applied recursively. In particular, all sub domains shall be allowed to operate their own domain name servers, providing in them whatever information the sub domain manager sees fit (as long as it is true and correct).

The Core Functions

1. Data Entry Function (DEF):

Looking at a more detailed level, the first function (entering and maintaining data in a database) should be fully defined by a naming policy. This naming
policy must specify the rules and conditions:

a. under which data will be collected and entered into a database or data changed (at the TLD level among others, data to reflect a transfer from registrant to registrant or changing registrar) in the database.

b. for making certain data generally and publicly available (be it, for example, through Whois or nameservers).

2. The Name-Server Function (NSF)

The name-server function involves essential interoperability and stability issues at the heart of the domain name system. The importance of this function extends to nameservers at the ccTLD level, but also to the root servers (and root-server system) and nameservers at lower levels.

On its own merit and because of interoperability and stability considerations, properly functioning nameservers are of utmost importance to the individual, as well as to the local and the global Internet communities.

With regard to the nameserver function, therefore, policies need to be defined and established. Most parties involved, including the majority of ccTLD registries, have accepted the need for common policies in this area by adhering to the relevant RFCs, among others RFC 1591.

Respective Roles with Regard to Policy, Responsibilities, and Accountabilities

It is in the interest of ICANN and ccTLD managers to ensure the stable and proper functioning of the domain name system. ICANN and the ccTLD registries each have a distinctive role to play in this regard that can be defined by the relevant policies. The scope of the ccNSO cannot be established without reaching a common understanding of the allocation of authority between ICANN and ccTLD registries.

Three roles can be distinguished as to which responsibility must be assigned on any given issue:

- Policy role: i.e. the ability and power to define a policy;
- Executive role: i.e. the ability and power to act upon and implement the policy; and
- Accountability role: i.e. the ability and power to hold the responsible entity accountable for exercising its power.

Firstly, responsibility presupposes a policy and this delineates the policy role.
Depending on the issue that needs to be addressed those who are involved in defining and setting the policy need to be determined and defined. Secondly, this presupposes an executive role defining the power to implement and act within the boundaries of a policy. Finally, as a counter-balance to the executive role, the accountability role needs to defined and determined.

The information below offers an aid to:

1. delineate and identify specific policy areas;
2. define and determine roles with regard to these specific policy areas.

This annex defines the scope of the ccNSO with regard to developing policies. The scope is limited to the policy role of the ccNSO policy-development process for functions and levels explicitly stated below. It is anticipated that the accuracy of the assignments of policy, executive, and accountability roles shown below will be considered during a scope-definition ccPDP process.

**Name Server Function (as to ccTLDs)**

**Level 1: Root Name Servers**  
Policy role: IETF, RSSAC (ICANN)  
Executive role: Root Server System Operators  
Accountability role: RSSAC (ICANN)

**Level 2: ccTLD Registry Name Servers in respect to interoperability**  
Policy role: ccNSO Policy Development Process (ICANN), for best practices a ccNSO process can be organized  
Executive role: ccTLD Manager  
Accountability role: part ICANN (IANA), part Local Internet Community, including local government

**Level 3: User's Name Servers**  
Policy role: ccTLD Manager, IETF (RFC)  
Executive role: Registrant  
Accountability role: ccTLD Manager

**Data Entry Function (as to ccTLDs)**

**Level 1: Root Level Registry**  
Policy role: ccNSO Policy Development Process (ICANN)  
Executive role: ICANN (IANA)  
Accountability role: ICANN community, ccTLD Managers, (national authorities in some cases)
ANNEX D: EC MECHANISM

ARTICLE 1 PROCEDURE FOR EXERCISE OF EC’S RIGHTS TO APPROVE APPROVAL ACTIONS

Section 1.1. APPROVAL ACTIONS

The processes set forth in this Article 1 shall govern the escalation procedures for the EC's exercise of its right to approve the following (each, an "Approval Action") under the Bylaws:

a. Fundamental Bylaw Amendments, as contemplated by Section 25.2 of the Bylaws;

b. Articles Amendments, as contemplated by Section 25.2 of the Bylaws; and

c. Asset Sales, as contemplated by Article 26 of the Bylaws.

Section 1.2. APPROVAL PROCESS

Following the delivery of a Board Notice for an Approval Action ("Approval Action Board Notice") by the Secretary to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants (which delivery date shall be referred to herein as the "Approval Action Board Notification Date"), the Decisional Participants shall thereafter promptly inform their constituents of the delivery of the Approval Action Board Notice. Any Approval Action Board Notice relating to a Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment shall include a statement, if applicable, that the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment, as applicable, is based solely on the outcome of a PDP, citing the specific PDP and the provision in the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment subject to the Approval Action Board Notice that implements such PDP (as applicable, a "PDP Fundamental Bylaw..."
Statement" or "PDP Articles Statement") and the name of the Supporting Organization that is a Decisional Participant that undertook the PDP relating to the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment, as applicable (as applicable, the "Fundamental Bylaw Amendment PDP Decisional Participant" or "Articles Amendment PDP Decisional Participant"). The process set forth in this Section 1.2 of this Annex D as it relates to a particular Approval Action is referred to herein as the "Approval Process."

Section 1.3. APPROVAL ACTION COMMUNITY FORUM

a. ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, convene a forum at which the Decisional Participants and interested parties may discuss the Approval Action (an "Approval Action Community Forum").

b. If the EC Administration requests a publicly-available conference call by providing a notice to the Secretary, ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, schedule such call prior to any Approval Action Community Forum, and inform the Decisional Participants of the date, time and participation methods of such conference call, which ICANN shall promptly post on the Website.

c. The Approval Action Community Forum shall be convened and concluded during the period beginning upon the Approval Action Board Notification Date and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN’s principal office) on the 30th day after the Approval Action Board Notification Date ("Approval Action Community Forum Period"). If the EC Administration requests that the Approval Action Community Forum be held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting, the Approval Action Community Forum shall be held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting on the date and at the time determined by ICANN, taking into account any date and/or time requested by the EC Administration. If the Approval Action Community Forum is held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting and that public meeting is held after 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN’s principal office) on the 30th day after the Approval Action Board Notification Date, the Approval Action Community Forum Period for the Approval Action shall expire at 11:59 p.m., local time of the city hosting such ICANN public meeting on the official last day of such ICANN public meeting.

d. The Approval Action Community Forum shall be conducted via remote participation methods such as teleconference, web-based meeting room and/or such other form of remote participation as the EC Administration selects, and/or, only if the Approval Action Community Forum is held during an ICANN public meeting, face-to-face meetings.
If the Approval Action Community Forum will not be held during an ICANN public meeting, the EC Administration shall promptly inform ICANN of the date, time and participation methods of such Approval Action Community Forum, which ICANN shall promptly post on the Website.

e. The EC Administration shall manage and moderate the Approval Action Community Forum in a fair and neutral manner.

f. ICANN and any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee (including Decisional Participants) may deliver to the EC Administration in writing its views and questions on the Approval Action prior to the convening of and during the Approval Action Community Forum. Any written materials delivered to the EC Administration shall also be delivered to the Secretary for prompt posting on the Website in a manner deemed appropriate by ICANN.

g. ICANN staff and Directors representing the Board are expected to attend the Approval Action Community Forum in order to address any questions or concerns regarding the Approval Action.

h. For the avoidance of doubt, the Approval Action Community Forum is not a decisional body.

i. During the Approval Action Community Forum Period, an additional one or two Community Forums may be held at the discretion of the Board or the EC Administration. If the Board decides to hold an additional one or two Approval Action Community Forums, it shall provide a rationale for such decision, which rationale ICANN shall promptly post on the Website.

j. ICANN will provide support services for the Approval Action Community Forum and shall promptly post on the Website a public record of the Approval Action Community Forum as well as all written submissions of ICANN and any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee (including Decisional Participants) related to the Approval Action Community Forum.

Section 1.4. DECISION WHETHER TO APPROVE AN APPROVAL ACTION

(a) Following the expiration of the Approval Action Community Forum Period, at any time or date prior to 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Approval Action Community Forum Period (such period, the "Approval Action Decision Period"), with respect to each Approval Action, each Decisional Participant shall inform the EC Administration in writing as to whether such
Decisional Participant (i) supports such Approval Action, (ii) objects to such Approval Action or (iii) has determined to abstain from the matter (which shall not count as supporting or objecting to such Approval Action), and each Decisional Participant shall forward such notice to the Secretary for ICANN to promptly post on the Website. If a Decisional Participant does not inform the EC Administration of any of the foregoing prior to the expiration of the Approval Action Decision Period, the Decisional Participant shall be deemed to have abstained from the matter (even if such Decisional Participant informs the EC Administration of its support or objection following the expiration of the Approval Action Decision Period).

(b) The EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Approval Action Decision Period, deliver a written notice (“EC Approval Notice”) to the Secretary certifying that, pursuant to and in compliance with the procedures and requirements of this Article 1 of this Annex D, the EC has approved the Approval Action if:

(i) The Approval Action does not relate to a Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment and is (A) supported by three or more Decisional Participants and (B) not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant;

(ii) The Approval Action relates to a Fundamental Bylaw Amendment and is (A) supported by three or more Decisional Participants (including the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment PDP Decisional Participant if the Board Notice included a PDP Fundamental Bylaw Statement) and (B) not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant; or

(iii) The Approval Action relates to an Articles Amendment and is (A) supported by three or more Decisional Participants (including the Articles Amendment PDP Decisional Participant if the Board Notice included a PDP Articles Statement) and (B) not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant.

(c) If the Approval Action does not obtain the support required by Section 1.4(b)(i), (ii) or (iii) of this Annex D, as applicable, the Approval Process will automatically be terminated and the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Approval Action Decision Period, deliver to the Secretary a notice certifying that the Approval Process has been terminated with respect to the Approval Action (“Approval Process Termination Notice”).

(d) ICANN shall promptly post to the Website any (i) Approval Action Board Notice, (ii) EC Approval Notice, (iii) Approval Process Termination Notice, (iv)
written explanation provided by the EC Administration related to any of the foregoing, and (v) other notices the Secretary receives under this Article 1.

ARTICLE 2 PROCEDURE FOR EXERCISE OF EC’S RIGHTS TO REJECT SPECIFIED ACTIONS

Section 2.1. Rejection Actions

The processes set forth in this Article shall govern the escalation procedures for the EC’s exercise of its right to reject the following (each, a "Rejection Action") under the Bylaws:

a. PTI Governance Actions, as contemplated by Section 16.2(d) of the Bylaws;
b. IFR Recommendation Decisions, as contemplated by Section 18.6(d) of the Bylaws;
c. Special IFR Recommendation Decisions, as contemplated by Section 18.12(e) of the Bylaws;
d. SCWG Creation Decisions, as contemplated by Section 19.1(d) of the Bylaws;
e. SCWG Recommendation Decisions, as contemplated by Section 19.4(d) of the Bylaws;
f. ICANN Budgets, as contemplated by Section 22.4(a)(v) of the Bylaws;
g. IANA Budgets, as contemplated by Section 22.4(b)(v) of the Bylaws;
h. Operating Plans, as contemplated by Section 22.5(a)(v) of the Bylaws;
i. Strategic Plans, as contemplated by Section 22.5(b)(v) of the Bylaws; and
j. Standard Bylaw Amendments, as contemplated by Section 25.1(e) of the Bylaws.

Section 2.2. PETITION PROCESS FOR SPECIFIED ACTIONS

(a) Following the delivery of a Board Notice for a Rejection Action ("Rejection Action Board Notice") by the Secretary to the EC Administration and Decisional Participants (which delivery date shall be referred to herein as the "Rejection Action Board Notification Date"), the Decisional Participants shall thereafter promptly inform their constituents of the delivery of the Rejection Action Board Notice. The process set forth in this Section 2.2 of this
Annex D as it relates to a particular Rejection Action is referred to herein as the "Rejection Process."

(b) During the period beginning on the Rejection Action Board Notification Date and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN’s principal office) on the date that is the 21st day after the Rejection Action Board Notification Date (as it relates to a particular Rejection Action, the "Rejection Action Petition Period"), subject to the procedures and requirements developed by the applicable Decisional Participant, an individual may submit a petition to a Decisional Participant, seeking to reject the Rejection Action and initiate the Rejection Process (a "Rejection Action Petition").

(c) A Decisional Participant that has received a Rejection Action Petition shall either accept or reject such Rejection Action Petition; provided that a Decisional Participant may only accept such Rejection Action Petition if it was received by such Decisional Participant during the Rejection Action Petition Period.

(i) If, in accordance with the requirements of Section 2.2(c) of this Annex D, a Decisional Participant accepts a Rejection Action Petition during the Rejection Action Petition Period, the Decisional Participant shall promptly provide to the EC Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary written notice ("Rejection Action Petition Notice") of such acceptance (such Decisional Participant, the "Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant"), and ICANN shall promptly post such Rejection Action Petition Notice on the Website. The Rejection Action Petition Notice shall also include:

(A) the rationale upon which rejection of the Rejection Action is sought. Where the Rejection Action Petition Notice relates to an ICANN Budget, an IANA Budget, an Operating Plan or a Strategic Plan, the Rejection Action Petition Notice shall not be valid and shall not be accepted by the EC Administration unless the rationale set forth in the Rejection Action Petition Notice is based on one or more significant issues that were specifically raised in the applicable public comment period(s) relating to perceived inconsistencies with the Mission, purpose and role set forth in ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, the global public interest, the needs of ICANN’s stakeholders, financial stability, or other matter of concern to the community; and

(B) where the Rejection Action Petition Notice relates to a Standard Bylaw Amendment, a statement, if applicable, that the Standard Bylaw Amendment is based solely on the outcome of a PDP, citing the specific
PDP and the provision in the Standard Bylaw Amendment subject to the Board Notice that implements such PDP ("PDP Standard Bylaw Statement") and the name of the Supporting Organization that is a Decisional Participant that undertook the PDP relating to the Standard Bylaw Amendment ("Standard Bylaw Amendment PDP Decisional Participant").

The Rejection Process shall thereafter continue pursuant to Section 2.2(d) of this Annex D.

(ii) If the EC Administration has not received a Rejection Action Petition Notice pursuant to Section 2.2(c)(i) of this Annex D during the Rejection Action Petition Period, the Rejection Process shall automatically be terminated and the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Period, deliver to the Secretary a notice certifying that the Rejection Process has been terminated with respect to the Rejection Action contained in the Approval Notice ("Rejection Process Termination Notice"). ICANN shall promptly post such Rejection Process Termination Notice on the Website.

(d) Following the delivery of a Rejection Action Petition Notice to the EC Administration pursuant to Section 2.2(c)(i) of this Annex D, the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant shall contact the EC Administration and the other Decisional Participants to determine whether any other Decisional Participants support the Rejection Action Petition. The Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant shall forward such communication to the Secretary for ICANN to promptly post on the Website.

(i) If the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant obtains the support of at least one other Decisional Participant (a "Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participant") during the period beginning upon the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Period and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN’s principal office) on the 7th day after the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Period (the "Rejection Action Petition Support Period"), the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant shall provide a written notice to the EC Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary ("Rejection Action Supported Petition") within twenty-four (24) hours of receiving the support of at least one Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participant, and ICANN shall promptly post such Rejection Action Supported Petition on the Website. Each Rejection Action Supporting
Decisional Participant shall provide a written notice to the EC Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary within twenty-four (24) hours of providing support to the Rejection Action Petition, and ICANN shall promptly post each such notice on the Website. Such Rejection Action Supported Petition shall include:

(A) a supporting rationale in reasonable detail;

(B) contact information for at least one representative who has been designated by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant who shall act as a liaison with respect to the Rejection Action Supported Petition;

(C) a statement as to whether or not the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant and/or the Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participant requests that ICANN organize a publicly-available conference call prior to the Rejection Action Community Forum (as defined in Section 2.3 of this Annex D) for the community to discuss the Rejection Action Supported Petition;

(D) a statement as to whether the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participant have determined to hold the Rejection Action Community Forum during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting, taking into account the limitation on holding such a Rejection Action Community Forum when the Rejection Action Supported Petition relates to an ICANN Budget or IANA Budget as described in Section 2.3(c) of this Annex D; and

(E) a PDP Standard Bylaw Statement, if applicable.

The Rejection Process shall thereafter continue for such Rejection Action Supported Petition pursuant to Section 2.3 of this Annex D. The foregoing process may result in more than one Rejection Action Supported Petition relating to the same Rejection Action.

(ii) The Rejection Process shall automatically be terminated and the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period, deliver to the Secretary a Rejection Process Termination Notice, which ICANN shall promptly post on the Website, if:

(A) no Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant is able to obtain the support of at least one other Decisional Participant for its Rejection Action Petition during the Rejection Action Petition Support Period.
(B) where the Rejection Action Supported Petition includes a PDP Standard Bylaw Statement, the Standard Bylaw Amendment PDP Decisional Participant is not (x) the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant or (y) one of the Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participants.

Section 2.3. REJECTION ACTION COMMUNITY FORUM

a. If the EC Administration receives a Rejection Action Supported Petition under Section 2.2(d) of this Annex D during the Rejection Action Petition Support Period, ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, convene a forum at which the Decisional Participants and interested parties may discuss the Rejection Action Supported Petition ("Rejection Action Community Forum"). If the EC Administration receives more than one Rejection Action Supported Petition relating to the same Rejection Action, all such Rejection Action Supported Petitions shall be discussed at the same Rejection Action Community Forum.

b. If a publicly-available conference call has been requested in a Rejection Action Supported Petition, ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, schedule such call prior to any Rejection Action Community Forum relating to that Rejection Action Supported Petition, and inform the Decisional Participants of the date, time and participation methods of such conference call, which ICANN shall promptly post on the Website. If a conference call has been requested in relation to more than one Rejection Action Supported Petition relating to the same Rejection Action, all such Rejection Action Supported Petitions shall be discussed during the same conference call.

c. The Rejection Action Community Forum shall be convened and concluded during the period beginning upon the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period ("Rejection Action Community Forum Period") unless all Rejection Action Supported Petitions relating to the same Rejection Action requested that the Rejection Action Community Forum be held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting, in which case the Rejection Action Community Forum shall be held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting (except as otherwise provided below.

with respect to a Rejection Action Supported Petition relating to an ICANN Budget or IANA Budget) on the date and at the time determined by ICANN, taking into account any date and/or time requested by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant(s) and the Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participant(s). If the Rejection Action Community Forum is held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting and that public meeting is held after 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period, the Rejection Action Community Forum Period shall expire at 11:59 p.m., local time of the city hosting such ICANN public meeting on the official last day of such ICANN public meeting. Notwithstanding the foregoing and notwithstanding any statement in the Rejection Action Supported Petition, a Rejection Action Community Forum to discuss a Rejection Action Supported Petition relating to an ICANN Budget or IANA Budget may only be held at a scheduled ICANN public meeting if such Rejection Action Community Forum occurs during the Rejection Action Community Forum Period, without any extension of such Rejection Action Community Forum Period.

d. The Rejection Action Community Forum shall be conducted via remote participation methods such as teleconference, web-based meeting room and/or such other form of remote participation as the EC Administration selects, and/or, only if the Rejection Action Community Forum is held during an ICANN public meeting, face-to-face meetings. If the Rejection Action Community Forum will not be held during an ICANN public meeting, the EC Administration shall promptly inform ICANN of the date, time and participation methods of such Rejection Action Community Forum, which ICANN shall promptly post on the Website.

e. The EC Administration shall manage and moderate the Rejection Action Community Forum in a fair and neutral manner.

f. ICANN and any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee (including Decisional Participants) may deliver to the EC Administration in writing its views and questions on the Rejection Action Supported Petition prior to the convening of and during the Rejection Action Community Forum. Any written materials delivered to the EC Administration shall also be delivered to the Secretary for prompt posting on the Website in a manner deemed appropriate by ICANN.

g. ICANN staff (including the CFO when the Rejection Action Supported Petition relates to an ICANN Budget, IANA Budget or Operating Plan) and Directors representing the Board are expected to attend the
Rejection Action Community Forum in order to address the concerns raised in the Rejection Action Supported Petition.

h. If the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant and each of the Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participants for an applicable Rejection Action Supported Petition agree before, during or after the Rejection Action Community Forum that the issue raised in such Rejection Action Supported Petition has been resolved, such Rejection Action Supported Petition shall be deemed withdrawn and the Rejection Process with respect to such Rejection Action Supported Petition will be terminated. If all Rejection Action Supported Petitions relating to a Rejection Action are withdrawn, the Rejection Process will automatically be terminated. If a Rejection Process is terminated, the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the resolution of the issue raised in the Rejection Action Supported Petition, deliver to the Secretary a Rejection Process Termination Notice. For the avoidance of doubt, the Rejection Action Community Forum is not a decisional body and the foregoing resolution process shall be handled pursuant to the internal procedures of the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participant(s).

i. During the Rejection Action Community Forum Period, an additional one or two Rejection Action Community Forums may be held at the discretion of a Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant and a related Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participant, or the EC Administration.

j. ICANN will provide support services for the Rejection Action Community Forum and shall promptly post on the Website a public record of the Rejection Action Community Forum as well as all written submissions of ICANN and any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee (including Decisional Participants) related to the Rejection Action Community Forum.

Section 2.4. DECISION WHETHER TO REJECT A REJECTION ACTION

(a) Following the expiration of the Rejection Action Community Forum Period, at any time or date prior to 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Rejection Action Community Forum Period (such period, the "Rejection Action Decision Period"), with respect to each Rejection Action Supported Petition, each Decisional Participant shall inform the EC Administration in writing as to whether such Decisional Participant (i) supports such Rejection Action Supported Petition and has determined to reject the Rejection Action,
(ii) objects to such Rejection Action Supported Petition or (iii) has determined to abstain from the matter (which shall not count as supporting or objecting to such Rejection Action Supported Petition), and each Decisional Participant shall forward such notice to the Secretary for ICANN to promptly post on the Website. If a Decisional Participant does not inform the EC Administration of any of the foregoing prior to expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period, the Decisional Participant shall be deemed to have abstained from the matter (even if such Decisional Participant informs the EC Administration of its support or objection following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period).

(b) The EC Administration, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period, shall promptly deliver a written notice ("EC Rejection Notice") to the Secretary certifying that, pursuant to and in compliance with the procedures and requirements of this Article 2 of Annex D, the EC has resolved to reject the Rejection Action if (after accounting for any adjustments to the below as required by the GAC Carve-out pursuant to Section 3.6(e) of the Bylaws if the Rejection Action Supported Petition included a GAC Consensus Statement):

1. A Rejection Action Supported Petition relating to a Rejection Action other than a Standard Bylaw Amendment is (A) supported by four or more Decisional Participants and (B) not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant; or

2. A Rejection Action Supported Petition relating to a Standard Bylaw Amendment that is (A) supported by three or more Decisional Participants (including the Standard Bylaw Amendment PDP Decisional Participant if the Rejection Action Supported Petition included a PDP Standard Bylaw Statement) and (B) not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant.

(c) If no Rejection Action Supported Petition obtains the support required by Section 2.4(b)(i) or (ii) of this Annex D, as applicable, the Rejection Process will automatically be terminated and the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period, deliver to the Secretary a Rejection Process Termination Notice.

(d) ICANN shall promptly post to the Website any (i) Rejection Action Board Notice, (ii) Rejection Action Petition, (iii) Rejection Action Petition Notice, (iv) Rejection Action Supported Petition, (v) EC Rejection Notice and the written explanation provided by the EC Administration as to why the EC has chosen to reject the Rejection Action, (vi) Rejection Process Termination Notice, and
(vii) other notices the Secretary receives under this Article 2.

ARTICLE 3 PROCEDURE FOR EXERCISE OF EC’S RIGHTS TO REMOVE DIRECTORS AND RECALL THE BOARD

Section 3.1. NOMINATING COMMITTEE DIRECTOR REMOVAL PROCESS

(a) Subject to the procedures and requirements developed by the applicable Decisional Participant, an individual may submit a petition to a Decisional Participant seeking to remove a Director holding Seats 1 through 8 and initiate the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process ("Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition"). Each Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition shall set forth the rationale upon which such individual seeks to remove such Director. The process set forth in this Section 3.1 of Annex D is referred to herein as the "Nominating Committee Director Removal Process."

(b) During the period beginning on the date that the Decisional Participant received the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition (such date of receipt, the "Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Date") and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN’s principal office) on the date that is the 21st day after the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Date (as it relates to a particular Director, the "Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Period"), the Decisional Participant that has received a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition ("Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioned Decisional Participant") shall either accept or reject such Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition; provided that a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioned Decisional Participant shall not accept a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition if, during the same term, the Director who is the subject of such Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition had previously been subject to a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition that led to a Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum (as discussed in Section 3.1(e) of this Annex D).

(c) During the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Period, the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioned Decisional Participant shall invite the Director subject to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition and the Chair of the Board (or the Vice Chair of the Board if the Chair is the affected Director) to a dialogue with the individual(s) bringing the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition and the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioned Decisional Participant’s representative on the EC Administration. The Nominating Committee Director Removal

Petition may not be accepted unless this invitation has been extended upon reasonable notice and accommodation to the affected Director's availability. If the invitation is accepted by either the Director who is the subject of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition or the Chair of the Board (or the Vice Chair of the Board if the Chair is the affected Director), the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioned Decisional Participant shall not accept the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition until the dialogue has occurred or there have been reasonable efforts to have the dialogue.

(i) If, in accordance with Section 3.1(b) of this Annex D, a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioned Decisional Participant accepts a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition during the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Period (such Decisional Participant, the "Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant"), the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of its acceptance of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition, provide written notice ("Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Notice") of such acceptance to the EC Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary. The Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Notice shall include the rationale upon which removal of the affected Director is sought. The Nominating Committee Director Removal Process shall thereafter continue pursuant to Section 3.1(d) of this Annex D.

(ii) If the EC Administration has not received a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Notice pursuant to Section 3.1(c)(i) of this Annex D during the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Period, the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process shall automatically be terminated with respect to the applicable Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition and the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Period, deliver to the Secretary a notice certifying that the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process has been terminated with respect to the applicable Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition ("Nominating Committee Director Removal Process Termination Notice").

(d) Following the delivery of a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Notice to the EC Administration by a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant pursuant to Section 3.1(c)(i) of this Annex D, the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant shall...
Participant shall contact the EC Administration and the other Decisional Participants to determine whether any other Decisional Participants support the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition. The Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant shall forward such communication to the Secretary for ICANN to promptly post on the Website.

(i) If the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant obtains the support of at least one other Decisional Participant (a "Nominating Committee Director Removal Supporting Decisional Participant") during the period beginning upon the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Period and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 7th day after the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Period (the "Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Support Period"), the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant shall provide a written notice to the EC Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary ("Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition") within twenty-four (24) hours of receiving the support of at least one Nominating Committee Director Removal Supporting Decisional Participant. Each Nominating Committee Director Removal Supporting Decisional Participant shall provide a written notice to the EC Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary within twenty-four (24) hours of providing support to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition. Such Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition shall include:

(A) a supporting rationale in reasonable detail;

(B) contact information for at least one representative who has been designated by the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant who shall act as a liaison with respect to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition;

(C) a statement as to whether or not the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant and/or the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supporting Decisional Participant requests that ICANN organize a publicly-available conference call prior to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum (as defined in Section 3.1(e) of this Annex D) for the community to discuss the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition; and
(D) a statement as to whether the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supporting Decisional Participant have determined to hold the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting.

The Nominating Committee Director Removal Process shall thereafter continue for such Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition pursuant to Section 3.1(e) of this Annex D.

(ii) The Nominating Committee Director Removal Process shall automatically be terminated and the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Support Period, deliver to the Secretary a Nominating Committee Director Removal Process Termination Notice if the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant is unable to obtain the support of at least one other Decisional Participant for its Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition during the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Support Period.

(e) If the EC Administration receives a Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition under Section 3.1(d) of this Annex D during the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Support Period, ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, convene a forum at which the Decisional Participants and interested parties may discuss the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition ("Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum").

(i) If a publicly-available conference call has been requested in a Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition, ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, schedule such call prior to any Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum, and inform the Decisional Participants of the date, time and participation methods of such conference call, which ICANN shall promptly post on the Website. The date and time of any such conference call shall be determined after consultation with the Director who is the subject of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition regarding his or her availability.

(ii) The Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum shall be convened and concluded during the period beginning upon the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition
Support Period and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Support Period ("Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum Period") unless the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition requested that the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum be held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting, in which case the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum shall be held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting on the date and at the time determined by ICANN, taking into account any date and/or time requested by the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supporting Decisional Participant(s); provided, that, the date and time of any Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum shall be determined after consultation with the Director who is the subject of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition regarding his or her availability. If the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum is held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting and that public meeting is held after 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Support Period, the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum Period shall expire at 11:59 p.m., local time of the city hosting such ICANN public meeting on the official last day of such ICANN public meeting.

(iii) The Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum shall be conducted via remote participation methods such as teleconference, web-based meeting room and/or such other form of remote participation as the EC Administration selects, and/or, only if the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum is held during an ICANN public meeting, face-to-face meetings. If the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum will not be held during an ICANN public meeting, the EC Administration shall promptly inform ICANN of the date, time and participation methods of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum, which ICANN shall promptly post on the Website.

(iv) The EC Administration shall manage and moderate the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum in a fair and neutral manner; provided that no individual from the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant or the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supporting Decisional Participant, nor the
individual who initiated the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition, shall be permitted to participate in the management or moderation of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum.

(v) The Director subject to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition, ICANN and any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee (including Decisional Participants) may deliver to the EC Administration in writing its views and questions on the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition prior to the convening of and during the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum. Any written materials delivered to the EC Administration shall also be delivered to the Secretary for prompt posting on the Website in a manner deemed appropriate by ICANN.

(vi) The Director who is the subject of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition and the Chair of the Board (or the Vice Chair of the Board if the Chair is the affected Director) are expected to attend the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum in order to address the issues raised in the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition.

(vii) If the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant and each of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supporting Decisional Participants for an applicable Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition agree before, during or after the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum that the issue raised in such Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition has been resolved, such Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition shall be deemed withdrawn and the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process with respect to such Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition will be terminated. If a Nominating Committee Director Removal Process is terminated, the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the resolution of the issue raised in the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition, deliver to the Secretary a Nominating Committee Director Removal Process Termination Notice. For the avoidance of doubt, the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum is not a decisional body and the foregoing resolution process shall be handled pursuant to the internal procedures of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supporting Decisional Participant(s).
(viii) During the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum Period, an additional one or two Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forums may be held at the discretion of a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant and a related Nominating Committee Director Removal Supporting Decisional Participant, or the EC Administration.

(ix) ICANN will provide support services for the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum and shall promptly post on the Website a public record of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum as well as all written submissions of the Director who is the subject of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition, ICANN and any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee (including Decisional Participants) related to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum.

(f) Following the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum Period, at any time or date prior to 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN’s principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum Period (such period, the "Nominating Committee Director Removal Decision Period"), each Decisional Participant shall inform the EC Administration in writing as to whether such Decisional Participant (i) supports such Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition, (ii) objects to such Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition or (iii) has determined to abstain from the matter (which shall not count as supporting or objecting to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition), and each Decisional Participant shall forward such notice to the Secretary for ICANN to promptly post on the Website. If a Decisional Participant does not inform the EC Administration of any of the foregoing prior to the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Decision Period, the Decisional Participant shall be deemed to have abstained from the matter (even if such Decisional Participant informs the EC Administration of its support or objection following the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Decision Period).

(g) The EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Decision Period, deliver a written notice ("Nominating Committee Director Removal Notice") to the Secretary certifying that, pursuant to and in compliance with the procedures and requirements of Section 3.1 of this Annex D, the EC has approved of the removal of the Director who is subject to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process if the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition is (i) supported by three or more Decisional Participants and (ii) not...
objected to by more than one Decisional Participant.

(h) Upon the Secretary’s receipt of a Nominating Committee Director Removal Notice, the Director subject to such Nominating Committee Director Removal Notice shall be effectively removed from office and shall no longer be a Director and such Director’s vacancy shall be filled in accordance with Section 7.12 of the Bylaws.

(i) If the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition does not obtain the support required by Section 3.1(g) of this Annex D, the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process will automatically be terminated and the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Decision Period, deliver to the Secretary a Nominating Committee Director Removal Process Termination Notice. The Director who was subject to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process shall remain on the Board and not be subject to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process for the remainder of the Director’s current term.

(j) If neither a Nominating Committee Director Removal Notice nor a Nominating Committee Director Removal Process Termination Notice are received by the Secretary prior to 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN’s principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum Period, the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process shall automatically terminate and the Director who was subject to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process shall remain on the Board and shall not be subject to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process for the remainder of the Director’s current term.

(k) Notwithstanding anything in this Section 3.1 to the contrary, if, for any reason, including due to resignation, death or disability, a Director who is the subject of a Nominating Committee Director Removal Process ceases to be a Director, the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process for such Director shall automatically terminate without any further action of ICANN or the EC Administration.

(l) ICANN shall promptly post to the Website any (i) Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition, (ii) Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Notice, (iii) Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition, (iv) Nominating Committee Director Removal Notice and the written explanation provided by the EC Administration as to why the EC has chosen to remove the relevant Director, (v) Nominating Committee Director Removal Process Termination Notice, and (vi) other notices the Secretary receives
under this Section 3.1.

Section 3.2. SO/AC DIRECTOR REMOVAL PROCESS

(a) Subject to the procedures and requirements developed by the applicable Decisional Participant, an individual may submit a petition to the ASO, ccNSO, GNSO or At-Large Community (as applicable, the "Applicable Decisional Participant") seeking to remove a Director who was nominated by that Supporting Organization or the At-Large Community in accordance with Section 7.2(a) of the Bylaws, and initiate the SO/AC Director Removal Process ("SO/AC Director Removal Petition"). The process set forth in this Section 3.2 of this Annex D is referred to herein as the "SO/AC Director Removal Process."

(b) During the period beginning on the date that the Applicable Decisional Participant received the SO/AC Director Removal Petition (such date of receipt, the "SO/AC Director Removal Petition Date") and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the date that is the 21st day after the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Date (as it relates to a particular Director, the "SO/AC Director Removal Petition Period"), the Applicable Decisional Participant shall either accept or reject such SO/AC Director Removal Petition pursuant to the internal procedures of the Applicable Decisional Participant for the SO/AC Director Removal Petition; provided that the Applicable Decisional Participant shall not accept an SO/AC Director Removal Petition if, during the same term, the Director who is the subject of such SO/AC Director Removal Petition had previously been subject to an SO/AC Director Removal Petition that led to an SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum (as defined in Section 3.2(d) of this Annex D).

(c) During the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Period, the Applicable Decisional Participant shall invite the Director subject to the SO/AC Director Removal Petition and the Chair of the Board (or the Vice Chair of the Board if the Chair is the affected Director) to a dialogue with the individual(s) bringing the SO/AC Director Removal Petition and the Applicable Decisional Participant's representative on the EC Administration. The SO/AC Director Removal Petition may not be accepted unless this invitation has been extended upon reasonable notice and accommodation to the affected Director's availability. If the invitation is accepted by either the Director who is the subject of the SO/AC Director Removal Petition or the Chair of the Board (or the Vice Chair of the Board if the Chair is the affected Director), the Applicable Decisional Participant shall not accept the SO/AC Director Removal Petition until the dialogue has occurred or there have been reasonable efforts to have the dialogue.
(i) If, in accordance with Section 3.2(b), the Applicable Decisional Participant accepts an SO/AC Director Removal Petition during the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Period, the Applicable Decisional Participant shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the Applicable Decisional Participant's acceptance of the SO/AC Director Removal Petition, provide written notice ("SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice") of such acceptance to the EC Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary. Such SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice shall include:

(A) a supporting rationale in reasonable detail;

(B) contact information for at least one representative who has been designated by the Applicable Decisional Participant who shall act as a liaison with respect to the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice;

(C) a statement as to whether or not the Applicable Decisional Participant requests that ICANN organize a publicly-available conference call prior to the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum (as defined in Section 3.2(d) of this Annex D) for the community to discuss the SO/AC Director Removal Petition; and

(D) a statement as to whether the Applicable Decisional Participant has determined to hold the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting.

The SO/AC Director Removal Process shall thereafter continue for such SO/AC Director Removal Petition pursuant to Section 3.2(d) of this Annex D.

(ii) If the EC Administration has not received an SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice pursuant to Section 3.2(c)(i) during the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Period, the SO/AC Director Removal Process shall automatically be terminated with respect to the applicable SO/AC Director Removal Petition and the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Period, deliver to the Secretary a notice certifying that the SO/AC Director Removal Process has been terminated with respect to the applicable SO/AC Director Removal Petition ("SO/AC Director Removal Process Termination Notice").

(d) If the EC Administration receives an SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice under Section 3.2(c) of this Annex D during the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Period, ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC
Administration, convene a forum at which the Decisional Participants and interested parties may discuss the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice ("SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum").

(i) If a publicly-available conference call has been requested in an SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice, ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, schedule such call prior to any SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum, and inform the Decisional Participants of the date, time and participation methods of such conference call, which ICANN shall promptly post on the Website. The date and time of any such conference call shall be determined after consultation with the Director who is the subject of the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice regarding his or her availability.

(ii) The SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum shall be convened and concluded during the period beginning upon the expiration of the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Period and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN’s principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Period ("SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum Period") unless the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice requested that the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum be held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting, in which case the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum shall be held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting on the date and at the time determined by ICANN, taking into account any date and/or time requested by the Applicable Decisional Participant; provided, that the date and time of any SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum shall be determined after consultation with the Director who is the subject of the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice regarding his or her availability. If the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum is held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting and that public meeting is held after 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN’s principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum Period, the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum Period shall expire at 11:59 p.m., local time of the city hosting such ICANN public meeting on the official last day of such ICANN public meeting.

(iii) The SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum shall be conducted via remote participation methods such as teleconference, web-based meeting room and/or such other form of remote participation as the EC Administration selects, and/or, only if the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum is held during an ICANN public meeting, face-to-face
meetings. If the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum will not be held during an ICANN public meeting, the EC Administration shall promptly inform ICANN of the date, time and participation methods of the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum, which ICANN shall promptly post on the Website.

(iv) The EC Administration shall manage and moderate the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum in a fair and neutral manner; provided that no individual from the Applicable Decisional Participant, nor the individual who initiated the SO/AC Director Removal Petition, shall be permitted to participate in the management or moderation of the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum.

(v) The Director subject to the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice, ICANN and any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee (including Decisional Participants) may deliver to the EC Administration in writing its views and questions on the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice prior to the convening of and during the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum. Any written materials delivered to the EC Administration shall also be delivered to the Secretary for prompt posting on the Website in a manner deemed appropriate by ICANN.

(vi) The Director who is the subject of the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice and the Chair of the Board (or the Vice Chair of the Board if the Chair is the affected Director) are expected to attend the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum in order to address the issues raised in the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice.

(vii) If the Applicable Decisional Participant agrees before, during or after the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum that the issue raised in such SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice has been resolved, such SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice shall be deemed withdrawn and the SO/AC Director Removal Process with respect to such SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice will be terminated. If an SO/AC Director Removal Process is terminated, the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the resolution of the issue raised in the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice, deliver to the Secretary an SO/AC Director Removal Process Termination Notice. For the avoidance of doubt, the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum is not a decisional body and the foregoing resolution process shall be handled pursuant to the internal procedures of the Applicable Decisional Participant.

(viii) During the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum Period, an
additional one or two SO/AC Director Removal Community Forums may be held at the discretion of the Applicable Decisional Participant or the EC Administration.

(ix) ICANN will provide support services for the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum and shall promptly post on the Website a public record of the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum as well as all written submissions of the Director who is the subject of the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice, ICANN and any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee (including Decisional Participants) related to the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum.

(e) Following the expiration of the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum Period, ICANN shall, at the request of the EC Administration, issue a request for comments and recommendations from the community, which shall be delivered to the Secretary for prompt posting on the Website along with a means for comments and recommendations to be submitted to ICANN on behalf of the EC Administration. This comment period shall remain open until 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN’s principal office) on the 7th day after the request for comments and recommendations was posted on the Website (the "SO/AC Director Removal Comment Period"). ICANN shall promptly post on the Website all comments and recommendations received by ICANN during the SO/AC Director Removal Comment Period.

(f) Following the expiration of the SO/AC Director Removal Comment Period, at any time or date prior to 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN’s principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the SO/AC Director Removal Comment Period (such period, the "SO/AC Director Removal Decision Period"), the Applicable Decisional Participant shall inform the EC Administration in writing as to whether the Applicable Decisional Participant has support for the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice within the Applicable Decisional Participant of a three-quarters majority as determined pursuant to the internal procedures of the Applicable Decisional Participant ("SO/AC Director Removal Notice"). The Applicable Decisional Participant shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of obtaining such support, deliver the SO/AC Director Removal Notice to the EC Administration, the other Decisional Participants and Secretary, and ICANN shall, at the direction of the Applicable Decisional Participant, concurrently post on the Website an explanation provided by the Applicable Decisional Participant as to why the Applicable Decisional Participant has chosen to remove the affected Director. Upon the Secretary’s receipt of the SO/AC Director Removal Notice from the EC Administration, the Director subject to such SO/AC Director Removal Notice shall be effectively removed from office and shall no longer be a
Director and such Director's vacancy shall be filled in accordance with Section 7.12 of the Bylaws.

(g) If the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice does not obtain the support required by Section 3.2(f) of this Annex D, the SO/AC Director Removal Process will automatically be terminated and the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the failure to obtain such support, deliver to the Secretary an SO/AC Director Removal Process Termination Notice. The Director who was subject to the SO/AC Director Removal Process shall remain on the Board and shall not be subject to the SO/AC Director Removal Process for the remainder of the Director's current term.

(h) If neither an SO/AC Director Removal Notice nor an SO/AC Director Removal Process Termination Notice are received by the Secretary prior to the expiration of the SO/AC Director Removal Decision Period, the SO/AC Director Removal Process shall automatically terminate and the Director who was subject to the SO/AC Director Removal Process shall remain on the Board and shall not be subject to the SO/AC Director Removal Process for the remainder of the Director's current term.

(i) Notwithstanding anything in this Section 3.2 to the contrary, if, for any reason, including due to resignation, death or disability, a Director who is the subject of an SO/AC Director Removal Process ceases to be a Director, the SO/AC Director Removal Process for such Director shall automatically terminate without any further action of ICANN or the EC Administration.

(j) ICANN shall promptly post to the Website any (i) SO/AC Director Removal Petition, (ii) SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice, (iii) SO/AC Director Removal Notice and the written explanation provided by the EC Administration as to why the EC has chosen to remove the relevant Director, (iv) SO/AC Director Removal Process Termination Notice, and (v) other notices the Secretary receives under this Section 3.2.

Section 3.3. BOARD RECALL PROCESS

(a) Subject to the procedures and requirements developed by the applicable Decisional Participant, an individual may submit a petition to a Decisional Participant seeking to remove all Directors (other than the President) at the same time and initiate the Board Recall Process ("Board Recall Petition"), provided that a Board Recall Petition cannot be submitted solely on the basis of a matter decided by a Community IRP if (i) such Community IRP was initiated in connection with the Board's implementation of GAC Consensus Advice and (ii) the EC did not prevail in such Community IRP. Each Board Recall Petition shall include a rationale setting forth the reasons why such individual seeks to recall the Board. The process set forth in this Section 3.3 of
this Annex D is referred to herein as the "Board Recall Process."

(b) A Decisional Participant that has received a Board Recall Petition shall either accept or reject such Board Recall Petition during the period beginning on the date the Decisional Participant received the Board Recall Petition ("Board Recall Petition Date") and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the date that is the 21st day after the Board Recall Petition Date (the "Board Recall Petition Period").

(i) If, in accordance with Section 3.3(b) of this Annex D, a Decisional Participant accepts a Board Recall Petition during the Board Recall Petition Period (such Decisional Participant, the "Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant"), the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of its acceptance of the Board Recall Petition, provide written notice ("Board Recall Petition Notice") of such acceptance to the EC Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary. The Board Recall Petition Notice shall include the rationale upon which removal of the Board is sought. The Board Recall Process shall thereafter continue pursuant to Section 3.3(c) of this Annex D.

(ii) If the EC Administration has not received a Board Recall Petition Notice pursuant to Section 3.3(b)(i) of this Annex D during the Board Recall Petition Period, the Board Recall Process shall automatically be terminated with respect to the Board Recall Petition and the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Board Recall Petition Period, deliver to the Secretary a notice certifying that the Board Recall Process has been terminated with respect to the Board Recall Petition ("Board Recall Process Termination Notice").

(c) Following the delivery of a Board Recall Petition Notice to the EC Administration by a Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant pursuant to Section 3.3(b)(i) of this Annex D, the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant shall contact the EC Administration and the other Decisional Participants to determine whether any other Decisional Participants support the Board Recall Petition. The Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant shall forward such communication to the Secretary for ICANN to promptly post on the Website.

(i) If the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant obtains the support of at least two other Decisional Participants (each, a "Board Recall Supporting Decisional Participant") during the period
beginning upon the expiration of the Board Recall Petition Period and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 7th day after the expiration of the Board Recall Petition Period (the "Board Recall Petition Support Period"), the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant shall provide a written notice to the EC Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary ("Board Recall Supported Petition") within twenty-four hours of receiving the support of at least two Board Recall Supporting Decisional Participants. Each Board Recall Supporting Decisional Participant shall provide a written notice to the EC Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary within twenty-four (24) hours of providing support to the Board Recall Petition. Such Board Recall Supported Petition shall include:

(A) a supporting rationale in reasonable detail;

(B) contact information for at least one representative who has been designated by the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant who shall act as a liaison with respect to the Board Recall Supported Petition;

(C) a statement as to whether or not the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant and/or the Board Recall Supporting Decisional Participants requests that ICANN organize a publicly-available conference call prior to the Board Recall Community Forum (as defined in Section 3.3(d) of this Annex D) for the community to discuss the Board Recall Supported Petition; and

(D) a statement as to whether the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Board Recall Supporting Decisional Participants have determined to hold the Board Recall Community Forum during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting.

The Board Recall Process shall thereafter continue for such Board Recall Supported Petition pursuant to Section 3.3(d) of this Annex D.

(ii) The Board Recall Process shall automatically be terminated and the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Board Recall Petition Support Period, deliver to the Secretary a Board Recall Process Termination Notice if the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant is unable to obtain the support of at least two other Decisional Participants for its Board Recall Petition during the Board Recall Petition Support Period.
(d) If the EC Administration receives a Board Recall Supported Petition under Section 3.3(c) of this Annex D during the Board Recall Petition Support Period, ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, convene a forum at which the Decisional Participants and interested parties may discuss the Board Recall Supported Petition ("Board Recall Community Forum").

(i) If a publicly-available conference call has been requested in a Board Recall Supported Petition, ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, schedule such call prior to any Board Recall Community Forum, and inform the Decisional Participants of the date, time and participation methods of such conference call, which ICANN shall promptly post on the Website. The date and time of any such conference call shall be determined after consultation with the Board regarding the availability of the Directors.

(ii) The Board Recall Community Forum shall be convened and concluded during the period beginning upon the expiration of the Board Recall Petition Support Period and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Board Recall Petition Support Period ("Board Recall Community Forum Period") unless the Board Recall Supported Petition requested that the Board Recall Community Forum be held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting, in which case the Board Recall Community Forum shall be held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting on the date and at the time determined by ICANN, taking into account any date and/or time requested by the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Board Recall Supporting Decisional Participants; provided, that, the date and time of any Board Recall Community Forum shall be determined after consultation with the Board regarding the availability of the Directors. If the Board Recall Community Forum is held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting and that public meeting is held after 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Board Recall Petition Support Period, the Board Recall Community Forum Period shall expire at 11:59 p.m., local time of the city hosting such ICANN public meeting on the official last day of such ICANN public meeting.

(iii) The Board Recall Community Forum shall have at least one face-to-face meeting and may also be conducted via remote participation methods such as teleconference, web-based meeting room and/or such other form of remote participation as the EC Administration selects. If the Board Recall Community Forum will not be held during an ICANN public meeting, the EC Administration shall promptly inform ICANN of
the date, time and participation methods of the Board Recall Community Forum, which ICANN shall promptly post on the Website.

(iv) The EC Administration shall manage and moderate the Board Recall Community Forum in a fair and neutral manner; provided that no individual from the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant or a Board Recall Supporting Decisional Participant, nor the individual who initiated the Board Recall Petition, shall be permitted to participate in the management or moderation of the Board Recall Community Forum.

(v) ICANN and any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee (including Decisional Participants) may deliver to the EC Administration in writing its views and questions on the Board Recall Supported Petition prior to the convening of and during the Board Recall Community Forum. Any written materials delivered to the EC Administration shall also be delivered to the Secretary for prompt posting on the Website in a manner deemed appropriate by ICANN.

(vi) ICANN staff and the full Board are expected to attend the Board Recall Community Forum in order to address the issues raised in the Board Recall Supported Petition.

(vii) If the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant and each of the Board Recall Supporting Decisional Participants for the Board Recall Supported Petition agree before, during or after the Board Recall Community Forum that the issue raised in such Board Recall Supported Petition has been resolved, such Board Recall Supported Petition shall be deemed withdrawn and the Board Recall Process with respect to such Board Recall Supported Petition will be terminated. If a Board Recall Process is terminated, the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the resolution of the issue raised in the Board Recall Supported Petition, deliver to the Secretary a Board Recall Process Termination Notice. For the avoidance of doubt, the Board Recall Community Forum is not a decisional body and the foregoing resolution process shall be handled pursuant to the internal procedures of the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Board Recall Supporting Decisional Participants.

(viii) During the Board Recall Community Forum Period, an additional one or two Board Recall Community Forums may be held at the discretion of the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Board Recall Supporting Decisional Participants, or the EC Administration.

(ix) ICANN will provide support services for the Board Recall...
Community Forum and shall promptly post on the Website a public record of the Board Recall Community Forum as well as all written submissions of ICANN and any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee (including Decisional Participants) related to the Board Recall Community Forum.

(e) Following the expiration of the Board Recall Community Forum Period, at any time or date prior to 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN’s principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Board Recall Community Forum Period (such period, the “Board Recall Decision Period”), each Decisional Participant shall inform the EC Administration in writing as to whether such Decisional Participant (i) supports such Board Recall Supported Petition, (ii) objects to such Board Recall Supported Petition or (iii) has determined to abstain from the matter (which shall not count as supporting or objecting to such Board Recall Supported Petition), and each Decisional Participant shall forward such notice to the Secretary for ICANN to promptly post on the Website. If a Decisional Participant does not inform the EC Administration of any of the foregoing prior to expiration of the Board Recall Decision Period, the Decisional Participant shall be deemed to have abstained from the matter (even if such Decisional Participant informs the EC Administration of its support or objection following the expiration of the Board Recall Decision Period).

(f) The EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Board Recall Decision Period, deliver a written notice (“EC Board Recall Notice”) to the Secretary certifying that, pursuant to and in compliance with the procedures and requirements of this Section 3.3 of this Annex D, the EC has resolved to remove all Directors (other than the President) if (after accounting for any adjustments to the below as required by the GAC Carve-out pursuant to Section 3.6(e) of the Bylaws if an IRP Panel found that, in implementing GAC Consensus Advice, the Board acted inconsistently with the Articles or Bylaws) a Board Recall Supported Petition (i) is supported by four or more Decisional Participants, and (ii) is not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant.

(g) Upon the Secretary’s receipt of an EC Board Recall Notice, all Directors (other than the President) shall be effectively removed from office and shall no longer be Directors and such vacancies shall be filled in accordance with Section 7.12 of the Bylaws.

(h) If the Board Recall Supported Petition does not obtain the support required by Section 3.3(f) of this Annex D, the Board Recall Process will automatically be terminated and the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Board Recall Decision Period, deliver to the Secretary a
Board Recall Process Termination Notice. All Directors shall remain on the Board.

(i) If neither an EC Board Recall Notice nor a Board Recall Process Termination Notice are received by the Secretary prior to the expiration of the Board Recall Decision Period, the Board Recall Process shall automatically terminate and all Directors shall remain on the Board.

(j) ICANN shall promptly post to the Website any (i) Board Recall Petition, (ii) Board Recall Petition Notice, (iii) Board Recall Supported Petition, (iv) EC Board Recall Notice and the written explanation provided by the EC Administration as to why the EC has chosen to recall the Board, (v) Board Recall Process Termination Notice, and (vi) other notices the Secretary receives under this Section 3.3.

Article 4 PROCEDURE FOR EXERCISE OF EC’S RIGHTS TO INITIATE MEDIATION, A COMMUNITY IRP OR RECONSIDERATION REQUEST

Section 4.1. MEDIATION INITIATION

(a) If the Board refuses or fails to comply with a decision by the EC delivered to the Secretary pursuant to an EC Approval Notice, EC Rejection Notice, Nominating Committee Director Removal Notice, SO/AC Director Removal Notice or EC Board Recall Notice pursuant to and in compliance with Article 1, Article 2 or Article 3 of this Annex D, or rejects or otherwise does not take action that is consistent with a final IFR Recommendation, Special IFR Recommendation, SCWG Creation Recommendation or SCWG Recommendation, as applicable (each, an "EC Decision"), the EC Administration representative of any Decisional Participant who supported the exercise by the EC of its rights in the applicable EC Decision during the applicable decision period may request that the EC initiate mediation with the Board in relation to that EC Decision as contemplated by Section 4.7 of the Bylaws, by delivering a notice to the EC Administration, the Decisional Participants and the Secretary requesting the initiation of a mediation ("Mediation Initiation Notice"). ICANN shall promptly post to the Website any Mediation Initiation Notice.

(b) As soon as practicable after receiving a Mediation Initiation Notice, the EC Administration and the Secretary shall initiate mediation, which shall proceed in accordance with Section 4.7 of the Bylaws.

Section 4.2. COMMUNITY IRP
(a) After completion of a mediation under Section 4.7 of the Bylaws, the EC Administration representative of any Decisional Participant who supported the exercise by the EC of its rights in the applicable EC Decision during the applicable decision period may request that the EC initiate a Community IRP (a "Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant"), as contemplated by Section 4.3 of the Bylaws, by delivering a notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants requesting the initiation of a Community IRP ("Community IRP Petition"). The Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant shall forward such notice to the Secretary for ICANN to promptly post on the Website. The process set forth in this Section 4.2 of this Annex D as it relates to a particular Community IRP Petition is referred to herein as the "Community IRP Initiation Process."

(b) Following the delivery of a Community IRP Petition to the EC Administration by a Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant pursuant to Section 4.2(a) of this Annex D (which delivery date shall be referred to herein as the "Community IRP Notification Date"), the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant shall contact the EC Administration and the other Decisional Participants to determine whether any other Decisional Participants support the Community IRP Petition. The Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant shall forward such communication to the Secretary for ICANN to promptly post on the Website.

(i) If the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant obtains the support of at least one other Decisional Participant (a "Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participant") during the period beginning on the Community IRP Notification Date and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 21st day after the Community IRP Notification Date (the "Community IRP Petition Support Period"), the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant shall provide a written notice to the EC Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary ("Community IRP Supported Petition") within twenty-four (24) hours of receiving the support of at least one Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participant. Each Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participant shall provide a written notice to the EC Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary within twenty-four (24) hours of providing support to the Community IRP Petition. Such Community IRP Supported Petition shall include:

(A) a supporting rationale in reasonable detail;

(B) contact information for at least one representative who has been designated by the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant
who shall act as a liaison with respect to the Community IRP Supported Petition;

(C) a statement as to whether or not the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant and/or the Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participant requests that ICANN organize a publicly-available conference call prior to the Community IRP Community Forum (as defined in Section 4.2(c) of this Annex D) for the community to discuss the Community IRP Supported Petition;

(D) a statement as to whether the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participant have determined to hold the Community IRP Community Forum during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting;

(E) where the Community IRP Supported Petition relates to a Fundamental Bylaw Amendment, a PDP Fundamental Bylaw Statement if applicable and, if so, the name of the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment PDP Decisional Participant;

(F) where the Community IRP Supported Petition relates to an Articles Amendment, a PDP Articles Statement if applicable and, if so, the name of the Articles Amendment PDP Decisional Participant;

(G) where the Community IRP Supported Petition relates to a Standard Bylaw Amendment, a PDP Standard Bylaw Statement if applicable and, if so, the name of the Standard Bylaw Amendment PDP Decisional Participant; and

(H) where the Community IRP Supported Petition relates to a policy recommendation of a cross community working group chartered by more than one Supporting Organization ("CCWG Policy Recommendation"), a statement citing the specific CCWG Policy Recommendation and related provision in the Community IRP Supported Petition ("CCWG Policy Recommendation Statement"), and, if so, the name of any Supporting Organization that is a Decisional Participant that approved the CCWG Policy Recommendation ("CCWG Policy Recommendation Decisional Participant").

The Community IRP Initiation Process shall thereafter continue for such Community IRP Supported Petition pursuant to Section 4.2(c) of this Annex D.

(ii) The Community IRP Initiation Process shall automatically be terminated and the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24)
hours of the expiration of the Community IRP Petition Support Period, deliver to the Secretary a notice certifying that the Community IRP Initiation Process has been terminated with respect to the Community IRP included in the Community IRP Petition ("Community IRP Termination Notice") if:

(A) no Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant is able to obtain the support of at least one other Decisional Participant for its Community IRP Petition during the Community IRP Petition Support Period;

(B) where the Community IRP Supported Petition includes a PDP Fundamental Bylaw Statement, the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment PDP Decisional Participant is not (x) the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant or (y) one of the Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participants;

(C) where the Community IRP Supported Petition includes a PDP Articles Statement, the Articles Amendment PDP Decisional Participant is not (x) the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant or (y) one of the Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participants;

(D) where the Community IRP Supported Petition includes a PDP Standard Bylaw Statement, the Standard Bylaw Amendment PDP Decisional Participant is not (x) the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant or (y) one of the Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participants; or

(E) where the Community IRP Supported Petition includes a CCWG Policy Recommendation Statement, the CCWG Policy Recommendation Decisional Participant is not (x) the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant or (y) one of the Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participants.

(c) If the EC Administration receives a Community IRP Supported Petition under Section 4.2(b) of this Annex D during the Community IRP Petition Support Period, ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, convene a forum at which the Decisional Participants and interested third parties may discuss the Community IRP Supported Petition ("Community IRP Community Forum").

(i) If a publicly-available conference call has been requested in a Community IRP Supported Petition, ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, schedule such call prior to any Community IRP
Community Forum, and inform the Decisional Participants of the date, time and participation methods of such conference call, which ICANN shall promptly post on the Website.

(ii) The Community IRP Community Forum shall be convened and concluded during the period beginning on the expiration of the Community IRP Petition Support Period and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 30th day after the expiration of the Community IRP Petition Support Period (“Community IRP Community Forum Period”) unless the Community IRP Supported Petition requested that the Community IRP Community Forum be held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting, in which case the Community IRP Community Forum shall be held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting on the date and at the time determined by ICANN, taking into account any date and/or time requested by the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participant(s). If the Community IRP Community Forum is held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting and that public meeting is held after 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 30th day after the expiration of the Community IRP Petition Support Period, the Community IRP Community Forum Period shall expire at 11:59 p.m., local time of the city hosting such ICANN public meeting on the official last day of such ICANN public meeting.

(iii) The Community IRP Community Forum shall be conducted via remote participation methods such as teleconference, web-based meeting room and/or such other form of remote participation as the EC Administration selects and/or, only if the Community IRP Community Forum is held during an ICANN public meeting, face-to-face meetings. If the Community IRP Community Forum will not be held during an ICANN public meeting, the EC Administration shall promptly inform ICANN of the date, time and participation methods of such Community IRP Community Forum, which ICANN shall promptly post on the Website.

(iv) The EC Administration shall manage and moderate the Community IRP Community Forum in a fair and neutral manner.

(v) ICANN and any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee (including Decisional Participants) may deliver to the EC Administration in writing its views and questions on the Community IRP Supported Petition prior to the convening of and during the Community IRP Community Forum. Any written materials delivered to the EC Administration shall also be delivered to the Secretary for prompt
posting on the Website in a manner deemed appropriate by ICANN.

(vi) ICANN staff and Directors representing the Board are expected to attend the Community IRP Community Forum in order to discuss the Community IRP Supported Petition.

(vii) If the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant and each of the Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participants for the Community IRP Supported Petition agree before, during or after a Community IRP Community Forum that the issue raised in such Community IRP Supported Petition has been resolved, such Community IRP Supported Petition shall be deemed withdrawn and the Community IRP Initiation Process with respect to such Community IRP Supported Petition will be terminated. If a Community IRP Initiation Process is terminated, the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the resolution of the issue raised in the Community IRP Supported Petition, deliver to the Secretary a Community IRP Termination Notice. For the avoidance of doubt, the Community IRP Community Forum is not a decisional body and the foregoing resolution process shall be handled pursuant to the internal procedures of the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participant(s).

(viii) During the Community IRP Community Forum Period, an additional one or two Community IRP Community Forums may be held at the discretion of a Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant and a related Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participant, or the EC Administration.

(ix) ICANN will provide support services for the Community IRP Community Forum and shall promptly post on the Website a public record of the Community IRP Community Forum as well as all written submissions of ICANN and any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee (including Decisional Participants) related to the Community IRP Community Forum.

(d) Following the expiration of the Community IRP Community Forum Period, at any time or date prior to 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN’s principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Community IRP Community Forum Period (such period, the "Community IRP Decision Period"), each Decisional Participant shall inform the EC Administration in writing as to whether such Decisional Participant (i) supports such Community IRP Supported Petition, (ii) objects to such Community IRP Supported Petition or (iii) has determined to abstain from the matter (which
shall not count as supporting or objecting to the Community IRP Supported Petition), and each Decisional Participant shall forward such notice to the Secretary for ICANN to promptly post on the Website. If a Decisional Participant does not inform the EC Administration of any of the foregoing prior to the expiration of the Community IRP Decision Period, the Decisional Participant shall be deemed to have abstained from the matter (even if such Decisional Participant informs the EC Administration of its support or objection following the expiration of the Community IRP Decision Period).

(e) The EC Administration, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Community IRP Decision Period, shall promptly deliver a written notice ("EC Community IRP Initiation Notice") to the Secretary certifying that, pursuant to and in compliance with the procedures and requirements of this Section 4.2 of this Annex D, the EC has resolved to accept the Community IRP Supported Petition if:

(i) A Community IRP Supported Petition that does not include a PDP Fundamental Bylaw Statement, a PDP Articles Statement, a PDP Standard Bylaw Statement or a CCWG Policy Recommendation Statement (A) is supported by three or more Decisional Participants, and (B) is not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant;

(ii) A Community IRP Supported Petition that (A) includes a PDP Fundamental Bylaw Statement, (B) is supported by three or more Decisional Participants (including the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment PDP Decisional Participant), and (C) is not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant;

(iii) A Community IRP Supported Petition that (A) includes a PDP Articles Statement, (B) is supported by three or more Decisional Participants (including the Articles Amendment PDP Decisional Participant), and (C) is not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant;

(iv) A Community IRP Supported Petition that (A) includes a PDP Standard Bylaw Statement, (B) is supported by three or more Decisional Participants (including the Standard Bylaw Amendment PDP Decisional Participant), and (C) is not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant; or

(v) A Community IRP Supported Petition that (A) includes a CCWG Policy Recommendation Statement, (B) is supported by three or more Decisional Participants (including the CCWG Policy Recommendation Decisional Participant), and (C) is not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant;
(f) If the Community IRP Supported Petition does not obtain the support required by Section 4.2(e) of this Annex D, the Community IRP Initiation Process will automatically be terminated and the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Community IRP Decision Period, deliver to the Secretary a Community IRP Termination Notice.

(g) ICANN shall promptly post to the Website any (i) Community IRP Petition, (ii) Community IRP Supported Petition, (iii) EC Community IRP Initiation Notice, (iv) Community IRP Termination Notice, (v) written explanation provided by the EC Administration related to any of the foregoing, and (vi) other notices the Secretary receives under this Section 4.2.

Section 4.3. COMMUNITY RECONSIDERATION REQUEST

(a) Any Decisional Participant may request that the EC initiate a Reconsideration Request (a "Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant"), as contemplated by Section 4.2(b) of the Bylaws, by delivering a notice to the EC Administration and the other Decisional Participants, with a copy to the Secretary for ICANN to promptly post on the Website, requesting the review or reconsideration of an action or inaction of the ICANN Board or staff ("Community Reconsideration Petition"). A Community Reconsideration Petition must be delivered within 30 days after the occurrence of any of the conditions set forth in Section 4.2(g)(i)(A), (B) or (C) of the Bylaws. In that instance, the Community Reconsideration Petition must be delivered within 30 days from the initial posting of the rationale. The process set forth in this Section 4.3 of this Annex D as it relates to a particular Community Reconsideration Petition is referred to herein as the "Community Reconsideration Initiation Process."

(b) Following the delivery of a Community Reconsideration Petition to the EC Administration by a Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant pursuant to Section 4.3(a) of this Annex D (which delivery date shall be referred to herein as the "Community Reconsideration Notification Date"), the Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant shall contact the EC Administration and the other Decisional Participants to determine whether any other Decisional Participants support the Community Reconsideration Petition. The Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant shall forward such communication to the Secretary for ICANN to promptly post on the Website.

(i) If the Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant obtains the support of at least one other Decisional Participant (a
"Community Reconsideration Supporting Decisional Participant"

during the period beginning on the Community Reconsideration Notification Date and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 21st day after the Community Reconsideration Notification Date (the "Community Reconsideration Petition Support Period"), the Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant shall provide a written notice to the EC Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary ("Community Reconsideration Supported Petition") within twenty-four (24) hours of receiving the support of at least one Community Reconsideration Supporting Decisional Participant. Each Community Reconsideration Supporting Decisional Participant shall provide a written notice to the EC Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary within twenty-four (24) hours of providing support to the Community Reconsideration Petition. Such Community Reconsideration Supported Petition shall include:

(A) a supporting rationale in reasonable detail;

(B) contact information for at least one representative who has been designated by the Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant who shall act as a liaison with respect to the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition;

(C) a statement as to whether or not the Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant and/or the Community Reconsideration Supporting Decisional Participant requests that ICANN organize a publicly-available conference call prior to the Community Reconsideration Community Forum (as defined in Section 4.3(c) of this Annex D) for the community to discuss the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition; and

(D) a statement as to whether the Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Community Reconsideration Supporting Decisional Participant have determined to hold the Community Reconsideration Community Forum during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting.

The Community Reconsideration Initiation Process shall thereafter continue for such Community Reconsideration Supported Petition pursuant to Section 4.3(c) of this Annex D.

(ii) The Community Reconsideration Initiation Process shall automatically be terminated and the EC Administration shall, within
twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Community
Reconsideration Petition Support Period, deliver to the Secretary a
notice certifying that the Community Reconsideration Initiation Process
has been terminated with respect to the Reconsideration Request
included in the Community Reconsideration Petition ("Community
Reconsideration Termination Notice") if the Community
Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant is unable to obtain
the support of at least one other Decisional Participant for its
Community Reconsideration Petition during the Community
Reconsideration Petition Support Period.

(c) If the EC Administration receives a Community Reconsideration Supported
Petition under Section 4.3(b) of this Annex D during the Community
Reconsideration Petition Support Period, ICANN shall, at the direction of the
EC Administration, convene a forum at which the Decisional Participants and
interested third parties may discuss the Community Reconsideration
Supported Petition ("Community Reconsideration Community Forum").

(i) If a publicly-available conference call has been requested in a
Community Reconsideration Supported Petition, ICANN shall, at the
direction of the EC Administration, schedule such call prior to any
Community Reconsideration Community Forum, and inform the
Decisional Participants of the date, time and participation methods of
such conference call, which ICANN shall promptly post on the Website.

(ii) The Community Reconsideration Community Forum shall be
convened and concluded during the period beginning on the expiration
of the Community Reconsideration Petition Support Period and ending
at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's
principal office) on the 30th day after the expiration of the Community
Reconsideration Petition Support Period ("Community
Reconsideration Forum Period") unless the Community
Reconsideration Supported Petition requested that the Community
Reconsideration Community Forum be held during the next scheduled
ICANN public meeting, in which case the Community Reconsideration
Community Forum shall be held during the next scheduled ICANN
public meeting on the date and at the time determined by ICANN, taking
into account any date and/or time requested by the Community
Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Community
Reconsideration Supporting Decisional Participant(s). If the Community
Reconsideration Community Forum is held during the next scheduled
ICANN public meeting and that public meeting is held after 11:59 p.m.
(as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office)
on the 30 day after the expiration of the Community Reconsideration Petition Support Period, the Community Reconsideration Community Forum Period shall expire at 11:59 p.m., local time of the city hosting such ICANN public meeting on the official last day of such ICANN public meeting.

(iii) The Community Reconsideration Community Forum shall be conducted via remote participation methods such as teleconference, web-based meeting room and/or such other form of remote participation as the EC Administration selects and/or, only if the Community Reconsideration Community Forum is held during an ICANN public meeting, face-to-face meetings. If the Community Reconsideration Community Forum will not be held during an ICANN public meeting, the EC Administration shall promptly inform ICANN of the date, time and participation methods of such Community Reconsideration Community Forum, which ICANN shall promptly post on the Website.

(iv) The EC Administration shall manage and moderate the Community Reconsideration Community Forum in a fair and neutral manner.

(v) ICANN and any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee (including Decisional Participants) may deliver to the EC Administration in writing its views and questions on the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition prior to the convening of and during the Community Reconsideration Community Forum. Any written materials delivered to the EC Administration shall also be delivered to the Secretary for prompt posting on the Website in a manner deemed appropriate by ICANN.

(vi) ICANN staff and Directors representing the Board are expected to attend the Community Reconsideration Community Forum in order to discuss the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition.

(vii) If the Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant and each of the Community Reconsideration Supporting Decisional Participants for a Community Reconsideration Supported Petition agree before, during or after the Community Reconsideration Community Forum that the issue raised in such Community Reconsideration Supported Petition has been resolved, such Community Reconsideration Supported Petition shall be deemed withdrawn and the Community Reconsideration Initiation Process with respect to such Community Reconsideration Supported Petition will be terminated. If a Community Reconsideration Initiation Process is terminated, the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the resolution of
the issue raised in the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition, deliver to the Secretary a Community Reconsideration Termination Notice. For the avoidance of doubt, the Community Reconsideration Community Forum is not a decisional body and the foregoing resolution process shall be handled pursuant to the internal procedures of the Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Community Reconsideration Supporting Decisional Participant(s).

(viii) During the Community Reconsideration Community Forum Period, an additional one or two Community Reconsideration Community Forums may be held at the discretion of a Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant and a related Community Reconsideration Supporting Decisional Participant, or the EC Administration.

(ix) ICANN will provide support services for the Community Reconsideration Community Forum and shall promptly post on the Website a public record of the Community Reconsideration Community Forum as well as all written submissions of ICANN and any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee (including Decisional Participants) related to the Community Reconsideration Community Forum.

(d) Following the expiration of the Community Reconsideration Community Forum Period, at any time or date prior to 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN’s principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Community Reconsideration Community Forum Period (such period, the "Community Reconsideration Decision Period"), each Decisional Participant shall inform the EC Administration in writing as to whether such Decisional Participant (i) supports such Community Reconsideration Supported Petition, (ii) objects to such Community Reconsideration Supported Petition or (iii) has determined to abstain from the matter (which shall not count as supporting or objecting to the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition), and each Decisional Participant shall forward such notice to the Secretary for ICANN to promptly post on the Website. If a Decisional Participant does not inform the EC Administration of any of the foregoing prior to the expiration of the Community Reconsideration Decision Period, the Decisional Participant shall be deemed to have abstained from the matter (even if such Decisional Participant informs the EC Administration of its support or objection following the expiration of the Community Reconsideration Decision Period).

(e) If (i) three or more Decisional Participants support the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition and (ii) no more than one Decisional Participant objects to the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition, then
the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Community Reconsideration Decision Period, deliver a notice to the Secretary certifying that, pursuant to and in compliance with the procedures and requirements of this Section 4.3 of this Annex D, the EC has resolved to accept the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition ("EC Reconsideration Initiation Notice"). The Reconsideration Request shall then proceed in accordance with Section 4.2 of the Bylaws.

(f) If the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition does not obtain the support required by Section 4.3(e) of this Annex D, the Community Reconsideration Initiation Process will automatically be terminated and the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Community Reconsideration Decision Period, deliver to the Secretary a Community Reconsideration Termination Notice.

(g) ICANN shall promptly post to the Website any (i) Community Reconsideration Petition, (ii) Community Reconsideration Supported Petition, (iii) EC Reconsideration Initiation Notice, (iv) Community Reconsideration Termination Notice, (v) written explanation provided by the EC Administration related to any of the foregoing, and (vi) other notices the Secretary receives under this Section 4.3.

Annex E: Caretaker ICANN Budget Principles

1. Principles

The caretaker ICANN budget (the "Caretaker ICANN Budget") is defined as an annual operating plan and budget that is established by the CFO in accordance with the following principles (the "Caretaker ICANN Budget Principles"): 

a. It is based on then-current ICANN operations;

b. It allows ICANN to "take good care" and not expose itself to additional enterprise risk(s) as a result of the rejection of an ICANN Budget by the EC pursuant to the Bylaws;

c. It allows ICANN to react to emergency situations in a fashion that preserves the continuation of its operations;

d. It allows ICANN to abide by its existing obligations (including Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and contracts, as well as those imposed under law);

e. It enables ICANN to avoid waste of its resources during the rejection period (i.e., the period between when an ICANN Budget is
rejected by the EC pursuant to the Bylaws and when an ICANN Budget becomes effective in accordance with the Bylaws) or immediately thereafter, by being able to continue activities during the rejection period that would otherwise need to be restarted at a materially incremental cost; and

f. Notwithstanding any other principle listed above, it prevents ICANN from initiating activities that remains subject to community consideration (or for which that community consideration has not concluded) with respect to the applicable ICANN Budget, including without limitation, preventing implementation of any expenditure or undertaking any action that was the subject of the ICANN Budget that was rejected by the EC that triggered the need for the Caretaker ICANN Budget.

1. Examples

Below is a non-exhaustive list of examples, to assist with the interpretation of the Caretaker ICANN Budget Principles, of what a Caretaker ICANN Budget would logically include:

i. the functioning of the EC, the Decisional Participants, and any Supporting Organizations or Advisory Committees that are not Decisional Participants;

ii. the functioning of all redress mechanisms, including without limitation the office of the Ombudsman, the IRP, and mediation;

iii. employment of staff (i.e., employees and individual long term paid contractors serving in locations where ICANN does not have the mechanisms to employ such contractors) across all locations, including all related compensation, benefits, social security, pension, and other employment costs;

iv. hiring staff (i.e., employees and individual long term paid contractors serving in locations where ICANN does not have the mechanisms to employ such contractors) in the normal course of business;

v. necessary or time-sensitive travel costs for staff (i.e., employees and individual long term paid contractors serving in locations where ICANN does not have the mechanisms to employ such contractors) or vendors as needed in the normal course of business;

vi. operating all existing ICANN offices, and continuing to assume obligations relative to rent, utilities, maintenance, and similar matters;

vii. contracting with vendors as needed in the normal course of business;
viii. conducting ICANN meetings and ICANN intercessional meetings previously contemplated; and

ix. participating in engagement activities in furtherance of the approved Strategic Plan.

b. Below is a non-limitative list of examples, to assist with the interpretation of the Caretaker ICANN Budget Principles, of what a Caretaker ICANN Budget would logically exclude:

i. hiring staff (i.e., employees and individual long term paid contractors serving in locations where ICANN does not have the mechanisms to employ such contractors) or entering into new agreements in relation to activities that are the subject of the rejection of the ICANN Budget by the EC pursuant to the Bylaws, unless excluding these actions would violate any of the Caretaker ICANN Budget Principles;

ii. in the normal course of business, travel not deemed indispensable during the rejection period, unless the lack of travel would violate any of the Caretaker ICANN Budget Principles;

iii. entering into new agreements in relation to opening or operating new ICANN locations/offices, unless the lack of commitment would violate any of the Caretaker ICANN Budget Principles;

iv. entering into new agreements with governments (or their affiliates), unless the lack of commitment would violate any of the Caretaker ICANN Budget Principles; and

v. the proposed expenditure that was the basis for the rejection by the EC that triggered the need for the Caretaker ICANN Budget.

Annex F: Caretaker IANA Budget Principles

1. Principles

The caretaker IANA Budget (the "Caretaker IANA Budget") is defined as an annual operating plan and budget that is established by the CFO in accordance with the following principles (the "Caretaker IANA Budget Principles"):

a. It is based on then-current operations of the IANA functions;

b. It allows ICANN, in its responsibility to fund the operations of the IANA functions, to "take good care" and not expose itself to
additional enterprise risk(s) as a result of the rejection of an IANA Budget by the EC pursuant to the Bylaws;

c. It allows ICANN, in its responsibility to fund the operations of the IANA functions, to react to emergency situations in a fashion that preserves the continuation of its operations;

d. It allows ICANN, in its responsibility to fund the operations of the IANA functions, to abide by its existing obligations (including Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and contracts, as well as those imposed under law);

e. It allows ICANN, in its responsibility to fund the operations of the IANA functions, to avoid waste of its resources during the rejection period (i.e., the period between when an IANA Budget is rejected by the EC pursuant to the Bylaws and when an IANA Budget becomes effective in accordance with the Bylaws) or immediately thereafter, by being able to continue activities during the rejection period that would have otherwise need to be restarted at an incremental cost; and

f. Notwithstanding any other principle listed above, it prevents ICANN, in its responsibility to fund the operations of the IANA functions, from initiating activities that remain subject to community consideration (or for which that community consultation has not concluded) with respect to the applicable IANA Budget, including without limitation, preventing implementation of any expenditure or undertaking any action that was the subject of the IANA Budget that was rejected by the EC that triggered the need for the Caretaker IANA Budget.

1. Examples

a. Below is a non-exhaustive list of examples, to assist with the interpretation of the Caretaker IANA Budget Principles, of what a Caretaker IANA Budget would logically include:

i. employment of staff (i.e., employees and individual long term paid contractors serving in locations where the entity or entities performing the IANA functions does not have the mechanisms to employ such contractors) across all locations, including all related compensation, benefits, social security, pension, and other employment costs;

ii. hiring staff (i.e., employees and individual long term paid contractors serving in locations where the entity or entities performing the IANA functions does not have the mechanisms to employ such contractors) in the normal course of
business;

iii. necessary or time-sensitive travel costs for staff (i.e., employees and individual long term paid contractors serving in locations where the entity or entities performing the IANA functions does not have the mechanisms to employ such contractors) or vendors as needed in the normal course of business;

iv. operating all existing offices used in the performance of the IANA functions, and continuing to assume obligations relative to rent, utilities, maintenance, and similar matters;

v. contracting with vendors as needed in the normal course of business;

vi. participating in meetings and conferences previously contemplated;

vii. participating in engagement activities with ICANN's Customer Standing Committee or the customers of the IANA functions;

viii. fulfilling obligations (including financial obligations under agreements and memoranda of understanding to which ICANN or its affiliates is a party that relate to the IANA functions; and

ix. participating in engagement activities in furtherance of the approved Strategic Plan.

b. Below is a non-limitative list of examples, to assist with the interpretation of the Caretaker IANA Budget Principles, of what a Caretaker IANA Budget would logically exclude:

i. hiring staff (i.e., employees and individual long term paid contractors serving in locations where the entity or entities performing the IANA functions does not have the mechanisms to employ such contractors) or entering into new agreements in relation to activities that are the subject of the rejection of the IANA Budget by the EC pursuant to the Bylaws, unless excluding these actions would violate any of the Caretaker IANA Budget Principles;

ii. in the normal course of business, travel not deemed indispensable during the rejection period, unless the lack of travel would violate any of the Caretaker IANA Budget Principles;

iii. entering into new agreements in relation to opening or operating new locations/offices where the IANA functions shall be performed, unless the lack of commitment would violate any of the Caretaker IANA Budget Principles;
iv. entering into new agreements with governments (or their affiliates), unless the lack of commitment would violate any of the Caretaker IANA Budget Principles; and

v. the proposed expenditure that was the basis for the rejection by the EC that triggered the need for the Caretaker IANA Budget.

ANNEX G-1

The topics, issues, policies, procedures and principles referenced in Section 1.1(a)(i) with respect to gTLD registrars are:

- issues for which uniform or coordinated resolution is reasonably necessary to facilitate interoperability, security and/or stability of the Internet, registrar services, registry services, or the DNS;
- functional and performance specifications for the provision of registrar services;
- registrar policies reasonably necessary to implement Consensus Policies relating to a gTLD registry;
- resolution of disputes regarding the registration of domain names (as opposed to the use of such domain names, but including where such policies take into account use of the domain names); or
- restrictions on cross-ownership of registry operators and registrars or resellers and regulations and restrictions with respect to registrar and registry operations and the use of registry and registrar data in the event that a registry operator and a registrar or reseller are affiliated.

Examples of the above include, without limitation:

- principles for allocation of registered names in a TLD (e.g., first-come/first-served, timely renewal, holding period after expiration);
- prohibitions on warehousing of or speculation in domain names by registries or registrars;
- reservation of registered names in a TLD that may not be registered initially or that may not be renewed due to reasons reasonably related to (i) avoidance of confusion among or misleading of users, (ii) intellectual property, or (iii) the technical management of the DNS or the Internet (e.g., establishment of reservations of names from registration);
- maintenance of and access to accurate and up-to-date information concerning registered names and name servers;
- procedures to avoid disruptions of domain name registrations due to suspension or termination of operations by a registry operator or a registrar, including procedures for allocation of responsibility among continuing registrars of the registered names sponsored in a TLD by a registrar losing accreditation; and

- the transfer of registration data upon a change in registrar sponsoring one or more registered names.

ANNEX G-2

The topics, issues, policies, procedures and principles referenced in Section 1.1(a)(i) with respect to gTLD registries are:

- issues for which uniform or coordinated resolution is reasonably necessary to facilitate interoperability, security and/or stability of the Internet or DNS;

- functional and performance specifications for the provision of registry services;

- security and stability of the registry database for a TLD;

- registry policies reasonably necessary to implement Consensus Policies relating to registry operations or registrars;

- resolution of disputes regarding the registration of domain names (as opposed to the use of such domain names); or

- restrictions on cross-ownership of registry operators and registrars or registrar resellers and regulations and restrictions with respect to registry operations and the use of registry and registrar data in the event that a registry operator and a registrar or registrar reseller are affiliated.

Examples of the above include, without limitation:

- principles for allocation of registered names in a TLD (e.g., first-come/first-served, timely renewal, holding period after expiration);

- prohibitions on warehousing of or speculation in domain names by registries or registrars;

- reservation of registered names in the TLD that may not be registered initially or that may not be renewed due to reasons reasonably related to (i) avoidance of confusion among or misleading of users, (ii) intellectual property, or (iii) the technical management of the DNS or the Internet.
(e.g., establishment of reservations of names from registration);

- maintenance of and access to accurate and up-to-date information concerning domain name registrations; and

- procedures to avoid disruptions of domain name registrations due to suspension or termination of operations by a registry operator or a registrar, including procedures for allocation of responsibility for serving registered domain names in a TLD affected by such a suspension or termination.

[1] When "1 October 2016" is used, that signals that the date that will be used is the effective date of the Bylaws.
New gTLD Application Submitted to ICANN by: Afilias Limited

String: MEET

Originally Posted: 13 June 2012

Application ID: 1-868-85241

Applicant Information

1. Full legal name

Afilias Limited

2. Address of the principal place of business

Contact Information Redacted

3. Phone number

Contact Information Redacted

4. Fax number

Contact Information Redacted

5. If applicable, website or URL
16. Describe the applicant's efforts to ensure that there are no known operational or rendering problems concerning the applied-for gTLD string. If such issues are known, describe steps that will be taken to mitigate these issues in software and other applications.

Afilias anticipates the introduction of this TLD without operational or rendering problems. Based on a decade of experience launching and operating new TLDs, Afilias, the back-end provider of registry services for this TLD, is confident the launch and operation of this TLD presents no known challenges. The rationale for this opinion includes:

- The string is not complex and is represented in standard ASCII characters and follows relevant technical, operational and policy standards;
- The string length is within lengths currently supported in the root and by ubiquitous Internet programs such as web browsers and mail applications;
- There are no new standards required for the introduction of this TLD;
- No onerous requirements are being made on registrars, registrants or Internet users, and;
- The existing secure, stable and reliable Afilias SRS, DNS, WHOIS and supporting systems and staff are amply provisioned and prepared to meet the needs of this TLD.

17. (OPTIONAL) Provide a representation of the label according to the International Phonetic Alphabet (http://www.langsci.ucl.ac.uk/ipa/).

Mission/Purpose

18(a). Describe the mission/purpose of your proposed gTLD.

Mission and purpose

There is currently a proliferation of online dating and companionship services on the Internet. Research shows that there are over 1,500 Internet dating sites in the U.S. alone, creating confusing choices for consumers. Most consumers do not have the time, money, or desire to use the services of more than a few dating services. As a result of this fragmented industry, consumers have limited choices of people to select from when they seek their ideal date or the perfect companion.

The purpose of .MEET is to create an Internet namespace which could be used by visionary entrepreneurs and/or the existing online dating and companionship matching providers to become the gathering place on the Internet for many of the more than 40 million online companionship seekers.

This new online namespace could be used to create a .MEET portal destination to facilitate the creation of secure, confidential and easily accessible Internet identities to enable Internet users to find registrars to become registrants of .MEET.

.MEET domains could also appeal to organizations supporting the online dating and companion industry. Online dating and companionship services may be interested in obtaining a .MEET domain to differentiate their services from other businesses that are now using a .COM, .NET, .INFO or other all-purpose TLD.

Registrars could collaborate with leading industry vendors to create new and never-before possible services to leverage the unique and easily identifiable .MEET registrant. Using existing or new offerings, .MEET registrants may want to create personalized, secure and anonymous Internet identities to make themselves easily discoverable by the entire universe of online relationship seekers.
The .MEET domain name and the registrants that obtain the .MEET TLD would help to catalyze a more efficient online dating and companionship service on the Internet. Using simple match-making features, large numbers of .MEET registrants, over time, could motivate visionary entrepreneurs or a visionary industry player to provide a more complete, market-driven service for consumers.

People would quickly come to know that others are actively seeking relationships and they can become easily discoverable under a .MEET domain. Over time, facilitated by new apps and virtual communities, visionary entrepreneurs, registrars and new and existing industry players, using proven social media capabilities, could help .MEET registrants to create more and better content to expand the size of the virtual community they serve. As the .MEET TLD is increasingly adopted and content accrues, search engines could modify their algorithms to specifically target .MEET sites and content, making the TLD even more accessible, relevant and useful. Due to these dynamics, we anticipate that we could have 15,000 domains under management (DUMs) after three years.

18(b). How do you expect that your proposed gTLD will benefit registrants, Internet users, and others?

Afilias plans to make the .MEET namespace the most popular, accessible, and innovative destination on the Internet where people seeking online dating and companionship services can learn about dating, companionship services and registrars that offer .MEET domain names. The .MEET destination portal shall be designed to facilitate communications, e-commerce and to catalyze relationships between registrars, registrants and vendors serving the new .MEET ecosystem.

Internet users and registrants shall benefit from learning from experts and each other about joining and accessing the various online dating and companionship services, where to find certified registrars that offer .MEET domain names.

.MEET vendors shall have a ready-made portal destination to sponsor venues and to recruit and sell their services to .MEET registrants and members.

In the future, new business models, infomediary services and advertising models can be created where, for instance, .MEET members could be offered rewards or additional value added services for watching relevant commercials. Additionally, new rating services and aggregated buying services could be enabled by online entrepreneurs and app developers.

1. General goals

Afilias intends to launch and sustain the .MEET portal and the business ecosystem it supports so registrants, registrars and key industry players can benefit from the sustainable growth of this new TLD. The initial investments may include logo and brand development, the .MEET portal development, and business development meetings with key industry players and other stakeholders.

Afilias then intends to sign up key registrars to register the first waves of .MEET registrants. We intend to invest in a new TLD launch, complete with media outreach, PR campaigns and social media programs. To support the new TLD launch and to sustain ongoing marketing investments, Afilias intends to work closely specific online dating services to showcase the benefits of a .MEET domain.

ii. How .MEET adds to the current space

.MEET will create an instantly recognizable and easily accessed set of domains with a clearly articulated purpose for online relationship seekers. This could potentially alleviate the state of confusion in the current proliferation of online dating services, randomly scattered throughout the existing, all-purpose TLDs.

iii. User experience goals

.MEET shall be designed with user experiences and concerns in mind as the main design goals.

While registrants may design and operate their domains under this TLD as they see fit, it is anticipated that the level of professionalism, creativity and quality of experience for consumers will be voluntarily enhanced by registrants. One of the primary benefits to registrants of
participation in the .MEET TLD would be that they can build a clear, easily accessible identity that would facilitate potential relationship seekers to be more likely to find the information they are seeking.

iv. Registry policies

.MEET will be an open TLD, generally available to all registrants (except in the Sunrise period).

In general, domains will be offered for periods of one to ten years, but no greater than ten years. Initial registrations made in the Sunrise period may have a minimum number of years required. For example, there may be a policy that all Sunrise names must be registered for an initial term of at least one year.

The roll-out of our TLD is anticipated to feature the following phases:

- Reservation of reserved names and premium names, which will be distributed through special mechanisms (detailed below).
- Sunrise — the required period for trademark owners to secure their domains before availability to the general public. This phase will feature applications for domain strings, verification of trademarks via Trademark Clearinghouse and a trademark verification agent, auctions between qualified parties who wish to secure the same string, and a Trademark Claims Service.
- General Availability period — real-time registrations, made on a first-come first-served basis. Trademark Claims Service will be in use at least for the first 60 days after General Availability applications open.

The registration of domain names in the .MEET TLD will follow the standard practices, procedures and policies Afilias, the back-end provider of registry services, currently has in place. This includes the following:

- Domain registration policies (for example, grace periods, transfer policies, etc.) are defined in response #27.
- Abuse prevention tools and policies, for example, measures to promote WHOIS accuracy and efforts to reduce phishing and pharming, are discussed in detail in our response #28.
- Rights protection mechanisms and dispute resolution mechanism policies (for example, UDRP, URS) are detailed in #29.

Other detailed policies for this domain include policies for reserved names.

Reserved names

Registry reserved names

We will reserve the following classes of domain names, which will not be made generally available to registrants via the Sunrise or subsequent periods:

- All of the reserved names required in Specification 5 of the new gTLD Registry Agreement;
- The geographic names required in Specification 5 of the new gTLD Registry Agreement, and may be released to the extent that Registry Operator reaches agreement with the government and country-code manager;
- The registry operator’s own name and variations thereof, and registry operations names (such as registry.tld, and www.tld), for internal use;
- Names related to ICANN and Internet standards bodies (iana.tld, ietf.tld, w3c.tld, etc.), and may be released to the extent that Registry Operator reaches agreement with ICANN.

The list of reserved names will be published publicly before the Sunrise period begins, so that registrars and potential registrants will know which names have been set aside.

Premium names

The registry will also designate a set of premium domain names, set aside for distribution via special mechanisms. The list of premium names will be published publicly before the Sunrise period begins, so that registrars and potential registrants will know that these names are not available. Premium names may be distributed via mechanisms such as requests for proposals, contests, direct sales, and auctions.
For the auctioning of premium names, we intend to contract with an established auction provider that has successfully conducted domain auctions. This will ensure that there is a tested, trustworthy technical platform for the auctions, auditable records, and reliable collection mechanisms. With our chosen auction provider, we will create and post policies and procedures that ensure clear, fair, and ethical auctions. As an example of such a policy, all employees of the registry operator and its contractors will be strictly prohibited from bidding in auctions for domains in the TLD. We expect a comprehensive and robust set of auction rules to cover possible scenarios, such as how domains will be awarded if the winning bidder does not make payment.

v. Privacy and confidential information protection
As per the New gTLD Registry Agreement, we will make domain contact data (and other fields) freely and publicly available via a Web-based WHOIS server. This default set of fields includes the mandatory publication of registrant data. Our Registry-Registrar Agreement will require that registrants consent to this publication.

We shall notify each of our registrars regarding the purposes for which data about any identified or identifiable natural person (“Personal Data”) submitted to the Registry Operator by such registrar is collected and used, and the intended recipients (or categories of recipients) of such Personal Data (the data in question is essentially the registrant and contact data required to be published in the WHOIS). We will require each registrar to obtain the consent of each registrant in the TLD for the collection and use of such Personal Data. The policies will be posted publicly on our TLD website. As the registry operator, we shall not use or authorize the use of Personal Data in any way that is incompatible with the notice provided to registrars.

Our privacy and data use policies are as follows:
- As registry operator, we do not plan on selling bulk WHOIS data. We will not sell contact data in any way. We will not allow, enable, or otherwise support the transmission by e-mail, telephone, or facsimile of unsolicited, commercial advertising or solicitations.
- We may use registration data in the aggregate for marketing purposes.
- DNS query data will never be sold in a way that is personally identifiable.
- We may from time to time use the demographic data collected for statistical analysis, provided that this analysis will not disclose individual Personal Data and provided that such use is compatible with the notice provided to registrars regarding the purpose and procedures for such use.

As the registry operator we shall take significant steps to protect Personal Data collected from registrars from loss, misuse, unauthorized disclosure, alteration, or destruction. In our responses to Question 30 (“Security Policy”) and Question 38 (“Escrow”) we detail the security policies and procedures we will use to protect the registry system and the data contained therein from unauthorized access and loss.

Please see our response to Question 26 (“WHOIS”) regarding “searchable WHOIS” and rate-limiting. That section contains details about how we will limit the mining of WHOIS data by spammers and other parties who abuse access to the WHOIS.

In order to acquire and maintain accreditation for our TLD, we will require registrars to adhere to certain information technology policies designed to help protect registrant data. These will include standards for access to the registry system and password management protocols. Our response to Question 30, “Security Policy” provides details of implementation.

We will allow the use of proxy and privacy services, which can protect the personal data of registrants from spammers and other parties that mine zone files and WHOIS data. We are aware that there are parties who may use privacy services to protect their free speech rights, or to avoid religious or political persecution.

18(c). What operating rules will you adopt to eliminate or minimize social costs?

Affilias has adopted the above-mentioned and other policies to ensure fair and equitable access and cost structures to the Internet community, including:
- no new burdens placed on the Internet community to resolve name disputes
- utilization of standard registration practices and policies (as detailed in responses to questions #27, #28, #29)
- protection of trademarks at launch and on-going operations (as detailed in the response to question
• fair and reasonable wholesale prices
• fair and equitable treatment of registrars

As per the ICANN Registry Agreement, we will use only ICANN-accredited registrars, and will provide non-discriminatory access to registry services to those registrars.

Pricing Policies and Commitments

Pricing for domain names at General Availability will be $12 per domain year for the first year. Applicant reserves the right to reduce this pricing for promotional purposes in a manner available to all accredited registrars. Registry Operator reserves the right to work with ICANN to initiate an increase in the wholesale price of domains if required. Registry Operator will provide reasonable notice to the registrars of any approved price increase.

Community-based Designation

19. Is the application for a community-based TLD?

No

20(a). Provide the name and full description of the community that the applicant is committing to serve.

20(b). Explain the applicant's relationship to the community identified in 20(a).

20(c). Provide a description of the community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD.

20(d). Explain the relationship between the applied-for gTLD string and the community identified in 20(a).

20(e). Provide a description of the applicant's intended registration policies in support of the community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD.
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UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RUBY GLEN, LLC

Plaintiff,

vs.

INTERNET CORPORATION FOR
ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS
AND DOES 1-10

Defendant.

Case No.: 2:16-cv-05505-PA-AS

PLAINTIFF’S AMENDED
COMPLAINT FOR:

1) BREACH OF CONTRACT
2) BREACH OF IMPLIED
COVENANT OF GOOD FAITH
AND FAIR DEALING
3) NEGLIGENCE
4) UNFAIR COMPETITION
(VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA
BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS
CODE § 17200)
5) DECLARATORY RELIEF
Plaintiff RUBY GLEN, LLC (hereinafter, “Plaintiff”) alleges as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff was formed for the purpose of applying to the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (“ICANN”) for the right to operate the .WEB generic top-level domain (“gTLD”). In reliance on ICANN’s agreement to administer the bid process in accordance with the rules and guidelines contained in its gTLD Applicant Guidebook (“Applicant Guidebook”), Plaintiff paid ICANN a mandatory $185,000 application fee for the opportunity to secure the rights to the .WEB gTLD.

2. Throughout every stage of the four years it has taken to bring the .WEB gTLD to market, Plaintiff worked diligently to follow the rules and procedures promulgated by ICANN. In the past month, ICANN has done just the opposite. Instead of functioning as a disinterested regulator of a fair and transparent gTLD bid process, ICANN used its authority and oversight to unfairly benefit an applicant who is in admitted violation of a number of provisions of the Applicant Guidebook. ICANN’s conduct, tainted by an inherent conflict of interest, ensured that it would be the sole beneficiary of the $135 million proceeds from the .WEB auction—a result that ICANN’s own guidelines identify as a “last resort” outcome. Even more problematic, ICANN allowed a third party to make an eleventh-hour end run around the application process to the detriment of Plaintiff, the other legitimate applicants for the .WEB gTLD and the Internet community at large.

3. ICANN’s failure to administer the gTLD application process in a fair, proper, and transparent manner is not unique to the .WEB gTLD applicants. To the contrary, in the days following the filing of this action, ICANN was publicly rebuked by an independent review panel for its “cavalier” and seemingly routine dismissal of concerns raised by gTLD applicants without “mak[ing] any reasonable investigation” into the facts underlying those concerns as required by ICANN’s Bylaws, Articles of
Incorporation and the Applicant Guidebook. The independent review panel also highlighted what it deemed to be improper influence by ICANN staff on purportedly independent ICANN accountability mechanisms established to handle concerns raised by gTLD applicants.

4. As set forth more fully herein, ICANN deprived Plaintiff and the other applicants for the .WEB gTLD of the right to compete for the .WEB gTLD in accordance with established ICANN policy and guidelines. Court intervention is necessary to ensure ICANN’s compliance with its own accountability and transparency mechanisms in the ongoing .WEB bid process and to prevent the assignment of the .WEB gTLD to an entity that is in admitted violation of ICANN’s own policies.

PARTIES

5. Plaintiff Ruby Glen, LLC is a limited liability company, duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware and operated by Donuts Inc., an affiliate located in Bellevue, Washington. The sole member of Ruby Glen, LLC is Covered TLD, LLC (“Covered TLD”). Covered TLD is a limited liability company, duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware. Covered TLD has a sole member, Donuts Inc. (“Donuts”). Donuts is a for-profit corporation, duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, with its principal place of business in Bellevue, Washington.

6. Defendant Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (“ICANN”) is a nonprofit corporation, organized and existing under the laws of the State of California, with its principal place of business in Los Angeles, California.

7. Defendants Does 1-10 are persons who instigated, encouraged, facilitated, acted in concert or conspiracy with, aided and abetted, and/or are otherwise responsible in some manner or degree for the breaches and wrongful conduct averred herein. Plaintiff is presently ignorant of the true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise, of DOES 1 through 10, and will amend this
Complaint to allege their true names and capacities when the same have been ascertained.

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

8. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a) as the parties are completely diverse in citizenship and the amount in controversy exceeds $75,000.

9. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c), in that Defendant ICANN resides and transacts business in this judicial district. Moreover, a substantial part of the events, omissions, and acts that are the subject matter of this action occurred within the Central District of California.

**FACTS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION**

A. **ICANN’S FORMATION AND PURPOSE**

10. ICANN is a non-profit corporation originally established to assist in the transition of the Internet domain name system from one of a single domain name operator to one with multiple companies competing to provide domain name registration services to Internet users “in a manner that w[ould] permit market mechanisms to support competition and consumer choice in the technical management of the [domain name system].”

11. ICANN’s ongoing role is to provide technical coordination of the Internet’s domain name system by introducing and promoting competition in the registration of domain names, while ensuring the security and stability of the domain name system. In that role, and as relevant here, ICANN was delegated the task of administering generic top level domains (“gTLDs”) such as .COM, .ORG, or, in this case, .WEB.

12. Article 4 of ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation requires ICANN to “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.” A true and correct copy of ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation is attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference.

13. ICANN is accountable to the Internet community for operating in a manner consistent with its Bylaws and Articles of Incorporation as a whole. ICANN’s Bylaws require ICANN, its Board of Directors and its staff to act in an open, transparent and fair manner with integrity. A true and correct copy of ICANN’s Bylaws are attached hereto as Exhibit B and incorporated herein by reference. Specifically, the ICANN Bylaws require ICANN, its Board of Directors, and staff to:

a. “Mak[e] decisions by applying documented policies neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness.”

b. “[A]ct with a speed that is responsive to the needs of the Internet while, as part of the decision-making process, obtaining informed input from those entities most affected.”

c. “Remain[] accountable to the Internet community through mechanisms that enhance ICANN’s effectiveness.”

d. Ensure that it does “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.”

e. “[O]perate to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner and consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness.”

///

///
B. **THE NEW gTLD PROGRAM AND APPLICANT GUIDEBOOK**

14. ICANN is the sole organization worldwide with the power and ability to administer the bid processes for, and assign rights to, gTLDS. As of 2011, there were only 22 gTLDS in existence; the most common of which are .COM, .NET, and .ORG.

15. In or about 2011, ICANN approved the expansion of a number of the gTLDS available to eligible applicants as part of its 2012 Generic Top Level Domains Internet Expansion Program (the “New gTLD Program”).

16. In January 2012, as part of the New gTLD Program, ICANN invited eligible parties to submit applications to obtain the rights to operate various new gTLDS, including, the .WEB and .WEBS gTLDS (collectively referred to herein as “.WEB” or the “.WEB gTLD”). In return, ICANN agreed to (a) conduct the bid process in a transparent manner and (b) abide by its own bylaws and the rules and guidelines set forth in ICANN’s gTLD Applicant Guidebook (“Applicant Guidebook”). A true and correct copy of the Applicant Guidebook is attached hereto as Exhibit C and incorporated herein by reference.

17. The Applicant Guidebook obligates ICANN to, among other things, conduct a thorough investigation into each of the applicants’ backgrounds. This investigation is necessary to ensure the integrity of the application process, including a potential auction of last resort, and the existence of a level playing field among those competing to secure the rights to a particular new gTLD. It also ensures that each applicant is capable of administering any new gTLD, whether secured at the auction of last resort or privately beforehand, thereby benefiting the public at large.

18. ICANN has broad authority to investigate all applicants who apply to participate in the New gTLD Program. This investigative authority, willingly provided by each applicant as part of the terms and conditions in the guidelines contained in the Applicant Guidebook, is set forth in relevant part in Section 6 as follows:

///
8. ... In addition, Applicant acknowledges that [sic] to allow ICANN to conduct thorough background screening investigations:

... 

c. Additional identifying information may be required to resolve questions of identity of individuals within the applicant organization; ... 

...

11. Applicant authorizes ICANN to:

a. Contact any person, group, or entity to request, obtain, and discuss any documentation or other information that, in ICANN’s sole judgment, may be pertinent to the application;

b. Consult with persons of ICANN’s choosing regarding the information in the application or otherwise coming into ICANN’s possession...

19. To aid ICANN in fulfilling its investigatory obligations, “applicant[s] (including all parent companies, subsidiaries, affiliates, agents, contractors, employees and any and all others acting on [their] behalf)” are required to provide extensive background information in their respective applications. In addition to serving the purposes noted above, this information also allows ICANN to determine whether an entity applicant or individuals associated with an entity applicant have engaged in the automatically disqualifying conduct set forth in Section 1.2.1 of the Applicant Guidebook, including convictions of certain crimes or disciplinary actions by governments or regulatory bodies. Finally, this background information is important to provide transparency to other applicants competing for the same gTLD.

20. Indeed, ICANN deemed transparency into an applicant’s background so important when drafting the Applicant Guidebook that applicants submitting a new
gTLD application are required to undertake a continuing obligation to notify ICANN of “any change in circumstances that would render any information provided in the application false or misleading,” including “applicant-specific information such as changes in financial position and changes in ownership or control of the applicant.”

21. As a further condition of participating in the .WEB auction, ICANN required Plaintiff and other applicants to agree to a broad covenant not to sue in order to apply for the .WEB contention set (the “Purported Release”). The Purported Release applies to all new gTLD applicants and states, in relevant part:

   Applicant hereby releases ICANN . . . from any and all claims by applicant that arise out of, are based upon, or are in any way related to, any action, or failure to act, by ICANN . . . in connection with ICANN’s . . . review of this application. . . . Applicant agrees not to challenge . . . and irrevocably waives any right to sue or proceed in court.

22. The Purported Release is not subject to negotiation. If a potential applicant does not agree to the release, it cannot be considered for participation in the .WEB auction. The Purported Release is also entirely one-sided in that it allows ICANN to absolve itself of wrongdoing while affording no remedy to applicants. Moreover, the Purported Release does not apply equally as between ICANN and the applicants because it does not prevent ICANN from proceeding with litigation against an applicant.

23. In lieu of the rights ICANN claims are waived by the Purported Release, ICANN purports to provide applicants with an independent review process, as a means to challenge ICANN’s actions with respect to a gTLD application. The IRP is effectively an arbitration, operated by the International Centre for Dispute Resolution of the American Arbitration Association, comprised of an independent panel of arbitrators. The IRP is officially identified by ICANN as an Accountability Mechanism.

24. In accordance with the IRP, any entity materially affected by a decision or action by the Board that the entity believes is inconsistent with the Articles of
Incorporation or Bylaws may submit a request for independent review of that decision or action. In order to be materially affected, the person must suffer injury or harm that is directly and causally connected to the Board’s alleged violation of the Bylaws or the Articles of Incorporation, and not as a result of third parties acting in line with the Board’s action.

C. THE AUCTION PROCESS FOR NEW gTLDs

25. A large number of new gTLDs made available by ICANN in 2012 received multiple applications. In accordance with the Applicant Guidebook, where multiple new gTLD applicants apply to obtain the rights to operate the same new gTLD, those applicants are grouped into a “contention set.”

26. Pursuant to the Applicant Guidebook, a contention set may be resolved privately among the members of a contention set or facilitated by ICANN as an auction of last resort. Applicants are encouraged to privately resolve a new gTLD contention set (i.e., reach a determination as to which applicant will ultimately be assigned the right to operate the new gTLD at issue). An ICANN auction of last resort will only be conducted when the members of a contention cannot reach agreement privately. By refusing to agree to resolve a contention set privately, one member of a contention set has the ability to force the other members, all of whom may be willing to resolve the contention set privately, to an ICANN auction of last resort.

27. For purposes of this matter, it is important to understand that the manner in which a contention set is resolved—whether by private agreement or ICANN auction—determines which entities will receive the proceeds from the winning bid. When a contention set is resolved privately, ICANN receives no financial benefit; in an ICANN auction, the entirety of the auction proceeds go to ICANN.

///
///
///
D.  **PLAINTIFF’S APPLICATION FOR THE .WEB gTLD**

28. In May 2012, Plaintiff submitted application 1-1527-54849 for the .WEB contention set. Plaintiff also submitted with its application the sum of $185,000—the mandatory application fee.

29. In consideration of Plaintiff paying the $185,000 application fee, ICANN agreed to conduct the application process for the .WEB gTLD in a manner consistent with its own Bylaws, Articles of Incorporation, and the rules and procedures set forth in both the Applicant Guidebook and the Auction Rules, and in conformity with the laws of fair competition. Plaintiff would not have paid the $185,000 mandatory application fee absent the mutual consideration and promises set forth above.

30. Plaintiff’s application passed ICANN’s “Initial Evaluation” process on July 19, 2013. It is an approved member of the .WEB contention set and qualified to participate in the ICANN auction process for .WEB.

E.  **NDC’S APPLICATION FOR THE .WEB gTLD**


32. Among other things, the application required NDC to provide “the identification of directors, officers, partners, and major shareholders of that entity.” As relevant here, NDC provided the following response to Sections 7 and 11 of the application:

```
Secondary Contact

7(a). Name
Mr. Nicolai Beisonoff

7(b). Title
Manager
```
33. By submitting its application for the .WEB gTLD and electing to participate in the .WEB contention set, NDC expressly agreed to the terms and conditions set forth in the Applicant Guidebook as well as Auction Rules, including specifically, and without limitation, Sections 1.2.1, 1.2.7, 6.1 and 6.10 of the Applicant Guidebook.

34. The Applicant Guidebook requires an applicant to notify ICANN of any changes to its application, including the applicant background screening information required under Section 1.2.1; the failure to do so can result in the denial of an application. For example, Section 1.2.7 imposes an ongoing duty to update “applicant-specific information such as changes in financial position and changes in ownership or control of the applicant.” Similarly, pursuant to Section 6.1, “[a]pplicant agrees to notify ICANN in writing of any change in circumstances that would render any information provided in the application false or misleading.”

35. In addition to a continuing obligation to provide complete, updated, and accurate information related to its application, Section 6.10 of the Applicant Guidebook,
strictly prohibits an applicant from “resell[ing], assign[ing], or transfer[ring] any of applicant’s rights or obligations in connection with the application.” An applicant that violates this prohibition is subject to disqualification from the contention set.

36. ICANN failed to investigate credible evidence supporting a determination that NDC violated each of these guidelines—evidence that it held for over a month prior to the .WEB auction date. Despite the urging of multiple .WEB applicants and NDC’s written admissions of potentially disqualifying changes to NDC’s application, ICANN continues to turn a blind eye to the direct detriment of other .WEB applicants and to ICANN’s foundational duties to administer the New gTLD Program with fairness and transparency.

F. NDC’S FAILURE TO NOTIFY ICANN OF CHANGES TO ITS APPLICATION

37. On or about June 1, 2016, Plaintiff learned that NDC was the only member of the .WEB contention set unwilling to resolve the contention set in advance and in lieu of the ICANN auction.

38. At the time, Plaintiff found the decision unusual given NDC’s historical willingness and enthusiasm to participate in the private resolution process. Overall, NDC has applied for 13 gTLDs in the New gTLD Program; nine of those gTLDs were resolved privately with NDC’s agreement. The auction for the .WEB gTLD is the first auction in which NDC has pushed for an ICANN auction of last resort.

39. On June 7, 2016, Plaintiff contacted NDC in writing to inquire as to whether NDC might reconsider its recent decision to forego resolution of the .WEB contention set prior to ICANN’s auction of last resort. In response, NDC stated that its position had not changed. NDC also advised, however, that Nicolai Bezsonoff, who is identified on NDC’s .WEB application as Secondary Contact, Manager, and COO, is “no longer involved with [NDC’s] applications.” NDC also made statements indicating a potential change in the ownership of NDC, including an admission that the board of
NDC had changed to add “several others” and that he had to check with the “powers that be,” implying that he and his associate on the email were no longer in control. The email communication containing these statements is set forth in pertinent part below:

From: Jose Ignacio Rasco <j@straat.co>
Subject: Re: .web
Date: June 7, 2016 at 11:32:17 AM EDT
To: Jon Nevett <jon@donuts.email>
Cc: Juan Diego Calle <j@straat.co>

Jon,

[Redacted]

Nicola is at NSR full time and no longer involved with our TLD applications. I’m still running our program and Juan sits on the board with me and several others.

[Redacted]

Best,
Jose

40. Noting that NDC’s conduct and statements (a) appeared to directly contradict information in NDC’s .WEB application and (b) suggested that NDC had either resold, assigned, or transferred its rights in the application in violation of its duties under the Applicant Guidebook, Plaintiff diligently contacted ICANN staff in writing with the discrepancy on or about June 22, 2016 to understand who it was competing against for .WEB and to improve transparency over the process for ICANN and the other .WEB applicants.

41. After engaging in a series of discussions with ICANN staff, Plaintiff decided to formally raise the issue with the ICANN Ombudsman on or about June 30, 2016; as of the initiation of this lawsuit, Plaintiff’s most recent correspondence with the ICANN Ombudsman, dated July 10, 2016, in which it provided further information related to the statements made by NDC, remains unanswered.

42. At every opportunity, Plaintiff raised the need for a postponement of the .WEB auction to allow ICANN time to fulfill its obligations to (a) investigate the
contradictory representations made by NDC in relation to its pending application; (b) address NDC’s continued status as an auction participant; and (c) provide all the other .WEB applicants the necessary transparency into who they were competing against. It also discussed the matter with ICANN staff and the Ombudsman at ICANN’s most recent meeting in Helsinki, Finland, which took place from June 27-30, 2016.

43. On July 11, 2016, Radix FZC (on behalf of DotWeb Inc.) and Schlund Technologies GmbH, each members of the .WEB contention set, sent correspondence to ICANN stating their own concerns in proceeding with the auction of last resort scheduled for July 27, 2016. The correspondence stated:

We support a postponement of the auction, to give ICANN and the other applicants time to investigate whether there has been a change of leadership and/or control of another applicant, NU DOT CO LLC. To do otherwise would be unfair, as we do not have transparency into who leads and controls that applicant as the auction approaches.

G. ICANN’S DECISION TO PROCEED WITH THE .WEB AUCTION

44. On July 13, 2016, ICANN issued a statement denying the collective request of multiple members of the .WEB contention set to postpone the July 27, 2016 auction to allow for a full and transparent investigation into apparent discrepancies in the NDC application, as highlighted by NDC’s own statements. Without providing any detail, ICANN simply stated as follows:

Secondly, in regards to potential changes of control of NU DOT CO LLC, we have investigated the matter, and to date we have found no basis to initiate the application change request process or postpone the auction.

45. Contrary to its obligations of accountability and transparency, ICANN’s decision did not address the manner or scope of the claimed investigation nor did it address whether a specific inquiry was made into (a) Mr. Bezsonoff’s current status, if any, with NDC, (b) the identity of “several other[]” new and unvetted members of
NDC’s board, or (c) any change in ownership—the very issues raised by NDC’s own statements. The correspondence was also silent as to any investigation into whether NDC had either resold, assigned, or transferred all or some of the rights to its .WEB application.

46. Plaintiff was unable to learn any further information regarding the extent of the investigation undertaken by ICANN, other than it was limited to inquiries only to NDC and no independent corroboration was sought or obtained.

47. Despite the clear credibility issues raised by NDC’s own contradictory statements, ICANN conducted no further investigation. Indeed, ICANN informed Plaintiff that it never even contacted Mr. Bezsonoff or interviewed the other individuals identified in Sections 7 and 11 of NDC’s application prior to reaching its conclusion.

48. To be clear, the financial benefit to ICANN of resolving the .WEB contention set by way of an ICANN auction is no small matter—as of the filing of this lawsuit, ICANN’s stated net proceeds from the 15 ICANN auctions conducted since June 2014 total $101,357,812. The most profitable gTLDs from those auctions commanded winning bids of $41,501,000 (.SHOP), $25,001,000 (.APP), $6,706,000 (.TECH), $5,588,888 (.REALTY), $5,100,175 (.SALON) and $3,359,000 (.MLS). ICANN has not yet determined what it will do with the enormous proceeds from these auctions.

H. PLAINTIFF’S REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

49. ICANN’s Bylaws provide an established accountability mechanism by which an entity that believes it was materially affected by an action or inaction by ICANN staff that contravened established policies and procedures may submit a request for reconsideration or review of the conduct at issue. The review is conducted by ICANN’s Board Governance Committee.

50. On July 17, 2016, Plaintiff and Radix FZC, an affiliate of another member of the .WEB contention set, jointly submitted a Reconsideration Request to ICANN, in
response to the actions and inactions of ICANN staff in connection with the decision set forth in the ICANN’s July 13, 2016 correspondence.

51. The Reconsideration Request sought reconsideration of (a) ICANN’s determination that it “found no basis to initiate the application change request process” in response to the contradictory statements of NDC and (b) ICANN’s improper denial of the request made by multiple contention set members to postpone the .WEB auction of last resort, which would have provided ICANN the time necessary to conduct a full and transparent investigation into material discrepancies in NDC’s application and its eligibility as a contention set member.

52. The Reconsideration Request highlighted the following issues:
   a. ICANN’s failure to forego a full and transparent investigation into the material representations made by NDC is a clear violation of the principles and procedures set forth in the ICANN Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws and the Applicant Guidebook.
   b. ICANN is the party with the power and resources necessary to delay the ICANN auction of last resort while the accuracy of NDC’s current application is evaluated utilizing the broad investigatory controls contained in the Applicant Guidebook, to which all applicants, including NDC, agreed.
   c. Postponement of the .WEB auction of last resort provides the most efficient manner for resolving the current dispute for all parties by (i) sparing ICANN and the many aggrieved applicants the time and expense of legal action while (ii) avoiding the very real likelihood of a court-mandated unwinding of the ICANN auction of last resort should it proceed.
   d. ICANN’S July 13, 2016 decision raises serious concerns as to whether the scope of ICANN’s investigation was impacted by the
inherent conflict of interest arising from a perceived financial benefit to ICANN if the Auction goes forward as scheduled.

e. ICANN’s New gTLD Program Auctions guidelines state that a contention set would only proceed to auction where all active applications in the contention set have “no pending ICANN Accountability Mechanisms,” i.e., no pending Ombudsman complaints, Reconsideration Requests or IRPs.

53. The issues raised by Plaintiff were similar to those raised by applicants for other gTLDs in similar contexts; issues that were deemed well-founded by an independent panel assigned to review ICANN’s compliance with its mandatory obligations and bylaws in relation to its administration of the application processes for the New gTLD Program.

54. On July 21, 2016, ICANN denied the Request for Reconsideration. In doing so, ICANN relied solely on statements from NDC that directly contradicted those contained in NDC’s earlier correspondence—a clear red flag. Once again, despite the credibility issues raised by NDC’s own contradictory statements, ICANN failed and refused to contact Mr. Bezsonoff or interview the other individuals identified in Sections 7 and 11 of NDC’s application prior to reaching its conclusion. ICANN also failed to investigate whether NDC had either resold, assigned, or transferred all or some of its rights to its .WEB application.


I. THE .WEB AUCTION RESULTS

56. On July 27, 2016, the .WEB auction proceeded as scheduled. The following day, ICANN reported NDC as the winning bidder of the .WEB gTLD. According to ICANN, NDC’s winning bid amount was $135 million, more than triple
the previous highest price paid for a new gTLD and a sum greater than all of the prior ICANN auction proceeds combined.

57. On July 28, 2016, non-party VeriSign, Inc. (“VeriSign”), the registry operator for the .COM and .NET gTLDs, filed a Form 10-Q with the Securities and Exchange Commission in which it disclosed that “[s]ubsequent to June 30, 2016, the Company incurred a commitment to pay approximately $130.0 million for the future assignment of contractual rights, which are subject to third-party consent. The payment is expected to occur during the third quarter of 2016.”

58. On August 1, 2016, VeriSign confirmed via a press release that the approximately $130 million “commitment” referred to in its Form 10-Q was, in fact, an agreement entered into with NDC “wherein [VeriSign] provided funds for [NDC]’s bid for the .web TLD” in an effort to acquire the rights to the .WEB gTLD. VeriSign stated that its acquisition of the .WEB gTLD would be complete after NDC “execute[s] the .web Registry Agreement with [ICANN]” and then “assign[s] the Registry Agreement to VeriSign upon consent from ICANN.”

59. VeriSign did not apply for the .WEB gTLD and was not a disclosed member of the .WEB contention set. At no point prior to the .WEB auction did NDC disclose (a) its relationship with VeriSign; (b) the fact that NDC had effectively become a proxy for VeriSign as a result of VeriSign agreeing to fund NDC’s .WEB auction bids; or (c) the fact that NDC had either resold, assigned, or transferred all or some of its rights to its .WEB application to VeriSign.

60. As alleged above, VeriSign is the registry operator for the .COM and .NET gTLDs, which together account for the greatest market share among all gTLDs. Indeed, on July 28, 2016, VeriSign reported combined registrations for the .COM and .NET registries of 143.2 million domains, more than six times greater than the combined total registrations of approximately 23 million for all other existing gTLDs.

///
61. On information and belief, VeriSign did not apply for, or disclose its interest in, the .WEB gTLD in an effort to avoid heightened scrutiny of its application by ICANN, the other .WEB applicants, the domain name industry at large and, most importantly, the U.S. Department of Justice; specifically, VeriSign’s apparent acquisition of NDC’s application rights was an attempt to avoid allegations of anti-competitive conduct and antitrust violations in applying to operate the .WEB gTLD, which is widely viewed by industry analysts as the strongest competitor to the .COM and .NET gTLDs.

62. Had VeriSign’s apparent acquisition of NDC’s application rights been fully disclosed to ICANN by NDC, as required by Sections 1.2.7, 6.1 and 6.10 of the Applicant Guidebook, among other provisions, the relationship would have also triggered heightened scrutiny of VeriSign’s Registry Agreements with ICANN for .COM and .NET, as well as its Cooperative Agreement with the Department of Commerce.

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

*(Breach of Contract against Defendant ICANN)*

63. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 – 62 above as though fully set forth herein.

64. In June 2012, ICANN invited eligible parties to submit applications to obtain the rights to, among others, the .WEB gTLD as part of the New gTLD Program. In doing so, ICANN promised the potential applicants that it would (a) conduct the bid process in a transparent manner, (b) ensure competition, and (c) abide by its own Bylaws and the rules set forth in the Applicant Guidebook.

65. On or about June 13, 2012, Plaintiff submitted an application to ICANN to obtain the rights to the .WEB gTLD. In consideration of ICANN’s promise to abide by its own Bylaws, Articles of Incorporation, and the rules and procedures set forth in
the Applicant Guidebook in its administration of the .WEB auction process, Plaintiff paid ICANN a sum of $185,000—the mandatory application fee.

66. In consideration of Plaintiff paying the sum of $185,000, ICANN promised to conduct the application process for the .WEB gTLD in a manner consistent with its own Bylaws, Articles of Incorporation, and the rules and procedures set forth in both the Applicant Guidebook and the Auction Rules, and in conformity with the laws of fair competition.

67. Plaintiff would not have paid the $185,000 mandatory application fee or spent time and other resources absent the mutual consideration and promises set forth above. Plaintiff performed all conditions, covenants, and promises on its part to be performed in accordance with the agreed upon terms of participating in the New gTLD Program, except those obligations, if any, that it has been prevented or excused from performing as a result of the misconduct set forth in this Complaint.

68. ICANN has materially breached its obligations to Plaintiff, as set forth in ICANN’s Bylaws and Articles of Incorporation, and the Applicant Guidebook by (a) failing to thoroughly investigate the issues raised by NDC’s own statements and (b) refusing to postpone the .WEB auction of last resort to allow for a full and transparent investigation into the apparent discrepancies in NDC’s .WEB application.

69. Specifically, ICANN’s acts and omission violated, among other things:

a. Article 1, section 2.8 and Article III, Section 1 of ICANN’s Bylaws, which require ICANN to “[m]ak[e] decisions by applying documented policies neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness” and “operate to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner and consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness.” ICANN obligates each applicant who seeks to participate in the New gTLD auction process to affirm that the statements and representations contained in the application are true
and accurate; applicants also undertake a continuing obligation to update their application when changes in circumstance affect an application’s accuracy. By failing to engage in a thorough, open, and transparent investigation of the contradictory statements made by NDC in relation to its application, as well as an apparent change of control with potential antitrust implications, ICANN plainly—and inexplicably—failed to reach its decisions by “applying documented policies neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness.”

b. **Article 1, section 2.9 of ICANN’s Bylaws**, which requires ICANN to “[a]ct with a speed that is responsive to the needs of the Internet while, as part of the decision-making process, obtaining informed input from those entities most affected.” In undertaking only a cursory examination of the contradictory statements made by NDC and the apparent change in NDC’s rights to its application, ICANN failed to balance ICANN’s interest in a swift resolution of the concerns raised by the members of the .WEB contention set with its obligation to obtain sufficient assurances and information from the individuals and entities at the center of the statements made by NDC; at the very least, ICANN should have (a) conducted interviews with Mr. Bezsonoff and all other individuals identified in Section 11 of NDC’s application prior to reaching its conclusion and (b) investigated whether NDC had either resold, assigned, or transferred all or some of its rights to its .WEB application.

c. **Article 1, section 2.10 of ICANN’s Bylaws**, which requires ICANN to “[r]emain[] accountable to the Internet community through mechanisms that enhance ICANN’s effectiveness.” By failing to
make use of the processes established in Sections 6.8 and 6.11 to the Applicant Guidebook in investigating an admitted failure by NDC to abide by its continuing obligation to update its application, ICANN staff disregarded the very accountability mechanisms put in place to serve and protect the .WEB contention set, the Internet community, and the public at large. This error was compounded by the cursory dismissal of the concerns raised by multiple members of the .WEB contention set relating to the accuracy of the representations made in NDC’s application. By failing to apprise the members of the contention set as to the manner and scope of the investigation conducted by ICANN staff, ICANN failed to ensure that it would hold itself accountable to any gTLD applicant, let alone the Internet community and the public.

d. Article II, section 3 of ICANN’s Bylaws, which states 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.” There can be no questioning the fact that the Staff Action resulted in disparate treatment in favor of NDC. On one hand, there are clear statements from NDC that representations made in its application are inaccurate and there is ample evidence that NDC has either resold, assigned, or transferred all or some of its rights to its .WEB application. On the other hand, when pressed by multiple members of the contention set to fully investigate the matter, ICANN provided only a conclusory statement that raises more questions than it resolves. To the extent it had reason to engage in such disparate treatment of the members
of the .WEB contention set, ICANN failed to provide such a reason in reaching the determinations at issue in this Request.

70. ICANN also promised that a contention set would only proceed to auction where all active applications in the contention set have “no pending ICANN Accountability Mechanisms.” ICANN breached this promise by refusing to postpone the .WEB auction of last resort while Plaintiff’s Reconsideration Request remains pending and its Ombudsman complaint remains unresolved. ICANN further breached this promise by moving forward with the .WEB auction of last resort while Plaintiff’s IRP, initiated on July 22, 2016, remains pending.

71. On information and belief, Plaintiff alleges that the breaches set forth above resulted from a pre-textual “investigation” into the admissions made by NDC and ICANN’s issuance of its subsequent July 13, 2016 decision. Specifically, Plaintiff alleges that ICANN intentionally failed to abide by its contractual obligations to conduct a full and open investigation into NDC’s admission because it was in ICANN’s interest that the .WEB contention set be resolved by way of an ICANN auction. As such, Plaintiff alleges that ICANN willfully and intentionally committed the wrongful acts described above.

72. As a direct and proximate result of ICANN’s breaches, Plaintiff has suffered, and will continue to suffer, without limitation, losses of revenue from third parties, profits, consequential costs and expenses, market share, reputation, and goodwill, in an amount to be determined at trial but not less than twenty-two million, five hundred thousand dollars ($22,500,000) plus interest.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
(Breach of the Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing against Defendant ICANN)

73. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 – 62 above as though fully set forth herein.
74. An implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing exists between Plaintiff and ICANN as a result of the contractual relationship entered into as part of the .WEB gTLD application process.

75. ICANN breached the covenant of good faith and fair dealing when it acted in a way that deprived Plaintiff of the benefits of the agreement as set forth in the Applicant Guidebook, namely that the administration of the bid process for the .WEB gTLD would be founded on the principles of fairness and transparency.

76. ICANN breached the covenant of good faith and fair dealing when it:
   a. Failed to conduct due diligence and an adequate investigation into apparent violations of the Applicant Guidebook raised by NDC’s admissions, including but not limited to failing to investigate whether NDC had either resold, assigned, or transferred all or some of its rights to its .WEB application;
   b. Failed to conduct interviews with Mr. Bezsonoff and all other individuals identified in Sections 7 and 11 of NDC’s application as part of an investigation into apparent violations of the Applicant Guidebook raised by NDC’s admissions;
   c. Failed to provide a necessary level of transparency into the identity and leadership of a competing applicant;
   d. Refused to postpone the ICANN auction of last resort to allow for a full and transparent investigation into the apparent violations of the Applicant Guidebook raised by NDC’s admissions; and
   e. Failed to conduct a reasonable inquiry into NDC’s impermissible resale, transfer, or assignment of its rights in the .WEB application to VeriSign.

77. On information and belief, Plaintiff alleges that the breaches set forth above resulted from a pre-textual “investigation” into the admissions made by NDC and
ICANN’s issuance of its subsequent July 13, 2016 decision. Specifically, Plaintiff alleges that ICANN intentionally failed to abide by its obligations to conduct a full and open investigation into NDC’s admission because it was in ICANN’s interest that the .WEB contention set be resolved by way of an ICANN auction. As such, Plaintiff alleges that ICANN willfully and intentionally committed the wrongful acts described above.

78. As a direct and proximate result of ICANN’s breaches as set forth above, Plaintiff has suffered, and will continue to suffer, without limitation, losses of revenue from third parties, profits, consequential costs and expenses, market share, reputation, and good will.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Negligence against Defendant ICANN)

79. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 – 62 above as though fully set forth herein.

80. ICANN owed Plaintiff a duty to act with proper care and diligence in administering the .WEB auction process in accordance with its own Bylaws, Articles of Incorporation, and the rules and procedures as stated in the Applicant Guidebook.

81. ICANN breached the duty owed Plaintiff by, among other things:

a. Failing to conduct due diligence and an adequate investigation into apparent violations of the Applicant Guidebook raised by NDC’s admissions, including whether NDC resold, assigned or transferred any of its rights or obligations in connection with the application to VeriSign;

b. Failing to conduct interviews with Mr. Bezsonoff and all other individuals identified in Sections 7 and 11 of NDC’s application as part of an investigation into apparent violations of the Applicant Guidebook raised by NDC’s admissions;
c. Refusing to postpone the ICANN auction of last resort to allow for a full and transparent investigation into the apparent violations of the Applicant Guidebook raised by NDC’s admissions; and

d. Failing to provide a rationale for the decision set forth in the July 13, 2016 correspondence.

82. As a direct and proximate result of ICANN’s breaches as set forth above, Plaintiff has suffered, and will continue to suffer, without limitation, losses of revenue from third parties, profits, consequential costs and expenses, market share, reputation, and good will.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
(Unfair Competition in Violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17200 against Defendant ICANN)

83. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 – 62 above as though fully set forth herein.

84. The California Unfair Competition Law (“UCL”) protects both consumers and competitors by prohibiting “unfair competition,” which is defined, in the disjunctive, by Business and Professions Code section 17200 as including “any unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice” as well as “unfair, deceptive, untrue or misleading advertising.”

85. Plaintiff has standing to pursue this claim under Business and Professions Code section 17204 because Plaintiff has suffered injury in fact and has lost money or property as a result of ICANN’s actions as set forth above. The losses include, but are not limited to, expenses incurred by Plaintiff in exhausting every available formal and informal avenue of recourse with ICANN prior to the filing of the above-captioned action, including legal fees related to the preparation and submission of the Reconsideration Request. Losses also include the $185,000 application fee paid to ICANN to participate as an application in the .WEB contention set.
86. The following acts and omissions of ICANN, among others, were unlawful under the UCL:

a. ICANN’s imposition of the unenforceable contract terms contained in the Purported Release, in violation of California Civil Code section 1668, which declares violative of public policy those contracts that “have for their object, directly or indirectly, to exempt anyone from the responsibility for his own fraud, or willful injury to the person or property of another, or violation of law, whether willful or negligent….”

b. ICANN’s imposition of the unenforceable contract terms contained in the Purported Release, in violation of California Civil Code § 1770(a)(19), which defines as unlawful, the “[i]nsert[j]ion of an unconscionable provision in [a] contract.”

87. The following acts and omissions of ICANN, among others, were unfair under the UCL:

a. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by this reference the allegations of Paragraph 86 and its subparts as stated herein; each act therein alleged is also an unfair act or practice under the UCL;

b. ICANN’s decision to conduct a cursory investigation into the apparent violations of the Applicant Guidebook raised by NDC’s admissions without regard for rights of the other .WEB contention set members;

c. ICANN’s decision to forego a postponement of the ICANN auction of last resort scheduled for July 27, 2016 without conducting an open and transparent investigation into the apparent violations of the Applicant Guidebook raised by NDC’s admissions; and

d. ICANN’s decision to allow NDC to continue to participate as a
.WEB contention set member despite NDC’s own admission of inaccuracies contained in its application, in violation of the guidelines contained in the Applicant Guidebook.

88. The following acts and omissions of ICANN, among others, were fraudulent under the UCL in that they were likely to deceive, and in fact did deceive, members of the public:

a. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by this reference the allegations of Paragraph 86 and its subparts as if restated herein; each is also a fraudulent act or practice under the UCL;

b. ICANN’s false representation that it would make all decisions in administering the .WEB auction process “by applying documented policies neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness”;

c. ICANN’s false representation that in administering the .WEB auction process, it would “[act] with a speed that is responsive to the needs of the Internet while, as part of the decision-making process, obtaining informed input from those entities most affected”;

d. ICANN’s false representation that in administering the .WEB auction process, it would “[r]emain[] accountable to the Internet community through mechanisms that enhance ICANN’s effectiveness”;

e. ICANN’s false representation that in administering the .WEB auction process, it would “apply its standards, policies, procedures, or practices inequitably or single out any particular party for disparate treatment”;

f. ICANN’s false representation that all applicants would be subject to the same agreement, rules, and procedures;

g. ICANN’s false representation that it would require applicants to
update their applications with “any change in circumstances that would render any information provided in the application false or misleading,” including “applicant-specific information such as changes in financial position and changes in ownership or control of the applicant”;

h. ICANN’s false representation that a contention set would only proceed to auction where all active applications in the contention set have “no pending ICANN Accountability Mechanisms”; and

i. ICANN’s false representation that an applicant would be disqualified from participating in the .WEB contention set for “resell[ing], assign[ing], or transfer[ring] any of [the] applicant’s rights or obligations in connection with the application.”

89. On information and belief, the conduct identified in Paragraphs 86-88 and their subparts resulted from the intentional conduct of ICANN.

90. With specific reference to the conduct identified in Paragraphs 87-88 and their subparts above, Plaintiff alleges that ICANN’s “investigation” into the admissions made by NDC and ICANN’s subsequent issuance of its July 13, 2016 decision were pre-textual in nature, the goal of which was to ensure ICANN secured a windfall from the .WEB contention set being resolved by way of an ICANN auction of last resort. Specifically, Plaintiff alleges that ICANN intentionally failed to abide by its contractual obligations to conduct a full and open investigation into NDC’s admission because it was in ICANN’s interest that the .WEB contention set be resolved by way of an ICANN auction. As such, Plaintiff alleges that it was in ICANN’s interest to willfully and intentionally commit the wrongful acts described above. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 17203 and the equitable powers of the Court, Plaintiff seeks an order (a) enjoining ICANN from proceeding with the .WEB ICANN auction of last resort until the claims presented by way of the above-captioned action are resolved; (b)
enjoining ICANN from entering into a Registry Agreement with any party for the .WEB gTLD pending a final decision on the merits of this matter; and (c) enjoining ICANN from engaging in the unlawful, unfair and fraudulent business acts and practices described above. Plaintiff also seeks an order requiring ICANN to comply with its own Bylaws, Articles of Incorporation, and the rules and procedures set forth in the Applicant Guidebook, in the continued administration of the .WEB contention set process and to take such corrective actions and adopt such remedial measures as are necessary to prevent the further occurrence of the acts or practices alleged herein.

91. Plaintiff also seeks an order requiring restitution of any and all monies obtained by ICANN from Plaintiff as a result of the intentionally unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent described above. Plaintiff’s request includes, but is not limited to, the restitution of any and all fees paid by or monies received from Plaintiff in relation to the .WEB contention set process.

92. Preventing the unlawful business practices engaged in by ICANN will ensure a significant benefit to the other .WEB contention set members as well as the public at large. Moreover, the financial burden of pursuing private enforcement substantially exceeds the financial benefit to Plaintiff. Thus, in the interest of justice, Plaintiff seeks attorneys’ fees in bringing this private attorney general claim pursuant to Civil Code section 1021.5 in an amount subject to proof.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Declaratory Relief—Against Defendant ICANN)

93. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 – 62 above as though fully set forth herein.

94. An actual and justiciable controversy has arisen, and now exists, between Plaintiff, on one hand, and ICANN, on the other, regarding the legality and effect of the Purported Release contained in the Applicant Guidebook.
95. As a condition of participating in the .WEB contention set process, ICANN required Plaintiff and other applicants to sign the Applicant Guidebook, which contained a covenant not to sue in order to apply for the .WEB contention set. The Purported Release applies to all New gTLD applicants and states, in relevant part:

Applicant hereby releases ICANN . . . from any and all claims by applicant that arise out of, are based upon, or are in any way related to, any action, or failure to act, by ICANN . . . in connection with ICANN’s . . . review of this application. . . . Applicant agrees not to challenge . . . and irrevocably waives any right to sue or proceed in court.

96. The Purported Release is not subject to negotiation: If a potential applicant does not agree to the release, it cannot be considered for participation in the .WEB contention set process. The Purported Release is also entirely unilateral in that it allows ICANN to absolve itself of wrongdoing while affording no remedy to applicants. Moreover, the Purported Release does not apply equally as between ICANN and the applicants because it does not prevent ICANN from proceeding with litigation against an applicant.

97. Plaintiff seeks a declaration of its rights regarding the enforceability of the Purported Release in light of California Civil Code Section 1668, which prohibits the type of broad exculpatory clauses contained in the Purported Release: “All contracts which have for their object, directly or indirectly, to exempt anyone from responsibility for his own fraud, or willful injury to the person or property or another, or violation of law, whether willful or negligent, are against the policy of the law.”

98. Plaintiff maintains that, on its face, the Release is “against the policy of the law” because it exempts ICANN from any and all claims arising out of the application process, even those arising from fraudulent or willful conduct.

99. As such, an actual controversy has arisen and now exists between Plaintiff and ICANN as to the enforceability of the Purported Release. Plaintiff desires a judicial
determination and declaration that the Purported Release is unenforceable, unconscionable, and/or void as a matter of public policy. Such a declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time so that Plaintiff may ascertain its rights with respect to the enforceability of the Purported Release.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff RUBY GLEN, LLC prays for relief as follows:

1. For compensatory damages according to proof at the time trial;
2. For general damages according to proof;
3. For restitutionary damages according to proof;
4. An injunction requiring ICANN to refrain from conducting the auction of last resort for the .WEB gTLD pending a final decision on the merits of this matter;
5. An injunction requiring ICANN to refrain from entering into a Registry Agreement with any party for the .WEB gTLD pending a final decision on the merits of this matter;
6. An injunction requiring ICANN to refrain from assigning the rights to the .WEB gTLD to any party pending a final decision on the merits of this matter;
7. Attorneys’ fees and costs to the extent permitted by law; and
8. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper against all Defendants.
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[PLEASE NOTE EMERGENCY REQUEST FOR RELIEF CONTAINED IN SECTION 9]

Reconsideration Request by Ruby Glen, LLC and Radix FZC

Regarding Staff Action Taken in Response to Concerns Raised by Multiple Members of the .WEB/.WEBS Contention Set in Relation to Apparent Discrepancies in the Application of Contention Set Member, NU DOT CO LLC

Introductory Summary

Ruby Glen, LLC and Radix FZC (on behalf of its applicant affiliate DotWeb Inc.), applicants for the .WEB/.WEBS gTLD contention set (hereinafter, the "Applicants"), submit this Request for Reconsideration (the "Request") to provide ICANN with an opportunity to correct the actions and inactions of its staff (collectively, the "Staff Action") that (a) violate established ICANN policy and guidelines, (b) materially affect the rights of the contention set members, and (c) compromise the integrity of ICANN’s administration of the .WEB/.WEBS auction.

The Staff Action at issue arises from apparent discrepancies in the application of NU DOT CO LLC ("NDC") to participate in the upcoming .WEB/.WEBS contention set auction. Specifically, on June 7, 2016, when explaining NDC’s decision to forego agreement to resolve the .WEB/.WEBS contention set prior to ICANN auction (as it had done before with its other applied-for gTLDs), NDC stated that (a) Nicolai Bezsonoff, who is identified as NDC’s Secondary Contact, Manager, and COO, is "no longer involved with [NDC’s] applications" and (b) there were "several other[]" new members of the NDC "board" not listed in its application. NDC also advised of a potential change in the ownership and/or leadership of NDC.¹ Noting that NDC’s statements directly

¹ In the time since NDC made these statements, Applicants have learned of speculation within the industry that NDC has sold its application to Neustar, Inc. or Verisign, Inc. See e.g., Kevin Murphy, Is Verisign .web applicant’s secret sugar
contradict information contained in its application. Applicants and other members of the contention set diligently reached out to alert both ICANN staff and the ICANN ombudsman to the apparent changes in leadership and/or control of NDC.

On July 13, 2016, in response to the concerns raised by multiple .WEB applicants, ICANN staff issued a statement acknowledging that it had received multiple requests to investigate "potential changes of control of [NDC]" and postpone the .WEB/.WEBS auction of last resort. Despite the gravity of the concerns raised by these applicants, ICANN staff summarily dismissed the requests with a blunt three-line statement that ICANN had "investigated the matter" and "found no basis to initiate the application change request process or postpone the auction." Notably, ICANN's statement made no mention of having conducted an inquiry into (a) Mr. Bezsonoff's current status, if any, with NDC; (b) any new board members or managers not listed in the application; or (c) any change in ownership or leadership of NDC.

The decision by ICANN staff to forego a full and transparent investigation into the material representations made by NDC is a clear violation of the principles and procedures set forth in the ICANN Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws (the "ICANN Bylaws") and the ICANN gTLD Applicant Guidebook (the "Applicant Guidebook"). Indeed, the unceremonious nature of the statement provided by ICANN raises serious issues as to the thoroughness of any investigation undertaken by ICANN staff and the impartiality with which ICANN administers its own guidelines and policies. The curt

donny?", DOMAIN INCITE (July 14, 2016) http://domainincite.com/20748-is-verisign-web-applicants-secret-sugar-daddy. Although Applicants are unaware of the legitimacy of these reports, they cannot help but observe that such a transfer would explain NDC's statements regarding an apparent change of control and its decision to deviate from prior auction behavior by pushing the .WEB/WEBS contention set to an ICANN auction of last resort.
dismissal also provokes suspicion as to whether the inherent conflict of interest presented by the benefit to ICANN of conducting an auction of last resort impacted the manner in which NDC's change of leadership and control was "investigated."

The Staff Action has placed ICANN in a position of having to defend against questions of accountability and self-interest in the face of clearly contradictory statements provided by a gTLD applicant in the .WEB/.WEBS contention set. Applicants respectfully request that the Board remedy the missteps presented by the Staff Action and restore integrity to the transparency, accountability mechanisms, and rules upon which Applicants relied in applying to participate in the .WEB/.WEBS auction.

1. Requester Information

   **Name:** Ruby Glen, LLC ("Ruby Glen")

   **Address:** c/o Donuts Inc., [Contact Information Redacted]

   **Email:** [Contact Information Redacted]

   **Counsel:** Alvaro Alvarez – Donuts Inc. SVP, General Counsel & Secretary

   **Name:** Radix FZC on behalf of applicant affiliate DotWeb Inc. ("Radix")

   **Address:** c/o Brijesh Joshi, [Contact Information Redacted]

   **Email:** [Contact Information Redacted]

2. Request for Reconsideration of (check one only):

   ___ Board action/inaction

   **X** Staff action/inaction

3. Description of specific action you are seeking to have reconsidered.
Applicants seek reconsideration of (a) ICANN’s determination that it “found no basis to initiate the application change request process” in response to the contradictory statements of NDC and (b) ICANN’s improper denial of Applicants’ (and at least one other .WEB applicant’s) request to postpone the .WEB/.WEBS auction, currently scheduled for July 27, 2016. The requested postponement would have provided ICANN and the .WEB/.WEBS applicants the time necessary to conduct a full and transparent investigation into material discrepancies in NDC’s application and its eligibility as a contention set member.

4. **Date of action/inaction:**

July 13, 2016. The Staff Action was set forth in a statement from Christine Willett, Vice President of gTLD Operations for ICANN to the members of the .WEB/.WEBS contention set.

5. **On what date did you became aware of the action or that action would not be taken?**

July 13, 2016. Notice of the Staff Action was provided to the .WEB/.WEBS contention set members via electronic mail.

6. **Describe how you believe you are materially affected by the action or inaction:**

Applicants and other members of the .WEB/.WEBS contention set, with the exception of NDC, continue to be adversely affected by ICANN’s (a) failure to thoroughly investigate the issues raised by NDC’s own statements and (b) refusal to postpone the .WEB/.WEBS auction of last resort to allow for a full and transparent investigation into the apparent discrepancies in NDC’s .WEB/.WEBS application.
Applicants applied for the .WEB gTLD in reliance on ICANN’s representations that, in accordance with well-established ICANN policies and procedures, the application, evaluation, and auction processes would be administered in a fair and transparent manner. Applicants also relied on ICANN’s representations that applicants would be held accountable for the accuracy of their submissions. Just as Applicants understood that they were bound to the obligations set forth in the Applicant Guidebook to preserve a level playing field, Applicants understood and relied upon ICANN’s representations that each of the other members of the contention set would be required to abide by the same obligations. By failing to hold NDC accountable for its own contradictory statements, ICANN has placed all other .WEB applicants in a situation where they will be forced to bid against a party that has violated ICANN guidelines by being less than transparent as to changes in its ownership and/or leadership and, as a result, may be subject to disqualification.

Proceeding to the ICANN auction of last resort now would also ensure that Applicants and the remaining members continue to face an unsettled result. Applicants anticipate that if NDC is the successful bidder at the .WEB/.WEBS auction, multiple members of the contention set will renew their calls for ICANN to investigate and perhaps even take legal action to enforce their rights. This is especially true if it later comes to light that there was any truth to the rumors that NDC has sold or otherwise transferred its interest in the .WEB application to an ineligible third party—rumors that could be easily vetted by ICANN in the process of investigating NDC’s recent and undisputed statements at issue in this Request. There exists the very real likelihood that ICANN will be forced to unwind the transaction, further delaying the release of the
.WEB/.WEBS gTLD to the public, eroding ICANN's legitimacy and reputation, and causing ICANN and the members of the contention set to expend additional time, money, and resources in resolving an issue that could have easily been addressed at this juncture with a modest delay.

7. **Describe how others may be adversely affected by the action or inaction, if you believe that this is a concern.**

   The damage caused by ICANN's failure to adhere to the accountability and transparency mechanisms by which it agreed to administer the .WEB/.WEBS auction is not limited to Applicants and the members of the contention set. As stated above, it is more than likely that absent an investigation into the contradictory statements made by NDC, a successful bid by NDC at an auction of last resort will ultimately be challenged by way of an appeal within the ICANN process, a multi-party lawsuit filed in the court system, and potentially, an antitrust review conducted by the U.S. Department of Justice. By proceeding with the .WEB/.WEBS auction, in the face of admissions by NDC and other credible evidence of discrepancies in NDC's application and an apparent change of control, leadership and/or ownership, there is a strong likelihood of a further and more significant delay in releasing these domains, thereby adversely affecting the public at large.

   More fundamentally, ICANN's decision to forego a harmless postponement of the .WEB/.WEBS auction to conduct a transparent investigation into these issues does nothing to dispel questions surrounding ICANN's ability to be accountable and transparent in its administration of the gTLD program—questions that were raised recently by a federal court in California regarding the .AFRICA gTLD. The ramifications
of yet another breakdown in ICANN’s transparency and accountability obligations will further harm ICANN and the Internet community at large by (a) broadening the public perception that ICANN lacks either the ability or the willingness to effectively combat the appearance of disparate treatment among gTLD applicants and (b) advising gTLD applicants that there will be neither penalty nor recourse for failing to abide by the obligations set forth in the Application Guidebook. Each of these results will severely affect ICANN, the Internet community, and the public at large.

8. **Detail of Board or Staff Action – Required Information**

The Staff Action at issue arises from apparent discrepancies in NDC’s .WEB/.WEBS application and recent statements regarding an apparent change of control, leadership and/or ownership over its application. As relevant here, Section 1.2.7 of the Applicant Guidebook requires an applicant to notify ICANN of any changes to its application; the failure to do so can result in the denial of an application. See e.g., Applicant Guidebook at § 1.2.7 (stating ongoing duty to update “applicant-specific information such as changes in financial position and changes in ownership or control of the applicant”); § 6.1 (confirming that “[a]pplicant agrees to notify ICANN in writing of any change in circumstances that would render any information provided in the application false or misleading”). Similarly, under Section 6.10 of the Applicant Guidebook, an applicant may not “resell, assign, or transfer any of applicant’s rights or obligations in connection with the application”; violating this provision may result in the disqualification of an active application. *Id.* at § 6.10. As set forth below, there is significant evidence that NDC may have violated each of these guidelines.

On June 13, 2012, NDC submitted application number 1-1296-36138 for the
.WEB/.WEBS contention set. Among other things, the application required NDC to provide “the identification of directors, officers, partners, and major shareholders of that entity.” See Applicant Guidebook at § 1.2.1. As relevant here, NDC provided the following response to Sections 7 and 11 of the application:

**Secondary Contact**

7(a). Name
Mr. Nicolai Bezsonoff

7(b). Title
Manager

**Applicant Background**

11(a). Name(s) and position(s) of all directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jose Ignacio Rasco III</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Diego Celle</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolai Bezsonoff</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11(b). Name(s) and position(s) of all officers and partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jose Ignacio Rasco III</td>
<td>CTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Diego Celle</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolai Bezsonoff</td>
<td>CCO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11(c). Name(s) and position(s) of all shareholders holding at least 15% of shares

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain Marketing Holdings, LLC</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACO IP, LLC</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By submitting its application for the .WEB gTLD and electing to participate in the .WEB/.WEBS auction, NDC expressly agreed to the terms and conditions set forth in the Applicant Guidebook as well as ICANN’s Auction Rules for New gTLDs ("Auction Rules"), including specifically, and without limitation, Sections 1.2.1, 1.2.7, 6.1 and 6.10
of the Applicant Guidebook.

On June 7, 2018, Ruby Glen contacted NDC to inquire as to whether NDC might reconsider its then-recent decision to forego resolution of the .WEB/.WEBS contention prior to ICANN's auction of last resort. In response, NDC stated that its position had not changed. NDC also advised, however, that Nikolai Bezsonoff, who is identified on NDC's .WEB application (see above) as Secondary Contact, Manager, and COO, is "no longer involved with [NDC's] applications." NDC also made statements indicating a potential change in the ownership of NDC, including an admission that the board of NDC had changed to add "several others." The email communication containing these statements is set forth in pertinent part below:

From: Jose Ignacio Rasco <j@straat.co>
Subject: Re: .web
Date: June 7, 2018 at 11:32:17 AM EDT
To: Jon Nevett <jon@donuts.email>
Cc: Juan Diego Calle <j@straat.co>

Jon,

[Redacted]

Nicolai is at NSR full time and no longer involved with our TLD applications. I'm still running our program and Juan sits on the board with me and several others.

[Redacted]

Best,
Jose

Noting that (a) NDC's statements appeared to directly contradict information in

---

2 To the extent it may be relevant to this Request, NDC applied for 13 gTLDs in the New gTLD Program. As of the date of this submission, nine of those gTLDs were resolved with NDC's agreement to participate in a private resolution. NDC did not become the registry operator for any of the gTLDs it resolved to date. The auction for the .WEB gTLD is the first auction in which NDC has pushed for an ICANN auction of last resort.

3 An unredacted copy of the embedded email was previously provided by Ruby Glen to the ICANN Ombudsman.
NDC's .WEB application and (b) strong direct and circumstantial evidence shows that NDC has either resold, assigned or transferred its rights in the application in violation of its duties under the Applicant Guidebook, Ruby Glen diligently contacted ICANN staff in writing with the discrepancy on or about June 22. Ruby Glen also formally raised the issue with the ICANN Ombudsman on or about June 30, 2016. It also discussed the matter with ICANN staff and the Ombudsman at ICANN's most recent meeting in Helsinki, Finland. At the time of submission of this Request, Ruby Glen's most recent correspondence with the ICANN Ombudsman, dated July 10, 2016, in which it provided further information related to the statements made by NDC, remains unanswered.

At every opportunity, Ruby Glen raised the need for a postponement of the .WEB/.WEBS auction to allow ICANN (and the other applicants) time to investigate and address the contradictory representations made by NDC in relation to its pending application and status as an auction participant. On July 11, 2016, Radix (on behalf of DotWeb Inc.) and Schlund Technologies GmbH, each member of the .WEB/.WEBS contention set, sent correspondence to ICANN stating their own concerns in proceeding with the .WEB/.WEBS auction as currently scheduled. The correspondence stated:

We support a postponement of the auction, to give ICANN and the other applicants time to investigate whether there has been a change of leadership and/or control of another applicant, NU DOT CO LLC. To do otherwise would be unfair, as we do not have transparency into who leads and controls that applicant as the auction approaches.

On July 13, 2016, ICANN issued a statement denying the collective request of multiple members of the .WEB/.WEBS contention set to postpone the July 27, 2016 auction to allow for a full and transparent investigation into apparent discrepancies in the NDC application, as highlighted by NDC's own statements. Without providing any
detail, ICANN simply stated as follows:

Secondly, in regards to potential changes of control of NU DOT CO LLC, we have investigated the matter, and to date we have found no basis to initiate the application change request process or postpone the auction.

ICANN’s decision did not address the manner or scope of the claimed investigation nor did it specifically address whether specific inquiry was made into (a) Mr. Bezsonoff’s current status, if any, with NDC, (b) the identity of “several other[]” new and unvetted members of NDC’s board or (c) any change in ownership—the very issues raised by NDC’s own statements.

As set forth more fully in Section 10, infra, the brief statement provided by ICANN in response to the applicants’ concerns—without any explanation to resolve the issues presented by NDC’s provision of contradictory information or to address the failure to grant the requested postponement—is inconsistent with ICANN’s stated commitment to accountability and transparency in the auction process, and innumerable provisions of the rules and regulations governing ICANN’s administration of the New gTLD Program.

9. What are you asking ICANN to do now?

Applicants respectfully request ICANN (1) delay the ICANN auction of last resort for the .WEB/.WEBS contention set on an emergency basis and (2) conduct a thorough and transparent investigation into the apparent discrepancies and/or changes in NDC’s .WEB/.WEBS application in accordance with ICANN’s Bylaws (including ICANN’s guiding principles to ensure transparency, openness and accountability), the Auction Rules, and the Applicant Guidebook.

A. Urgent Request for Immediate Stay of .WEB/.WEBS Auction

In light of the rapidly approaching .WEB/.WEBS auction date, Applicants request
a stay of the pending .WEB/.WEBS auction of last resort until (45) days after the issuance of a ruling on the merits of this Request. This Request for stay is supported by the factual background underlying the Staff Action, the grounds upon which the Request is based, and the ongoing harm to the affected parties. See supra Sections 6-8 and infra Section 10.

More to the point, the stay requested by Applicants is mandated by ICANN's own rules governing Auction Eligibility given the pendency of (a) Ruby Glen's complaint to the ICANN Ombudsman and (b) this Request. As plainly stated on ICANN's "New gTLD Program Auctions", a string contention set will be eligible to enter into a New gTLD Program auction only where all active applications in the contention set have "no pending ICANN Accountability Mechanisms." See ICANN's New gTLD Program Auctions page, available at https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/auctions (emphasis added). 4

Pursuant to Article IV of ICANN's Bylaws, entitled "Accountability and Review of ICANN's By-Laws," both the ongoing Ombudsman investigation and the Reconsideration Request process constitute ICANN Accountability Mechanisms. As

4 Applicants are aware of the position taken by ICANN with regard to a similar argument advanced in connection with the "DETERMINATION OF THE BOARD GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE (BGC) RECONSIDERATION REQUESTS 16-1 AND 16-2" dated 25 February 2016. As an initial matter, Applicants believe that the position taken by ICANN in response to Requests 16-1 and 16-2 is limited to the facts presented by the underlying request, which are wholly distinguishable from those presented here. Specifically, Applicants' Request is supported by (a) good cause, as established by NDC's own contradictory statements, and (b) Applicants' diligent efforts to address this issue in the month and half preceding the July 27, 2016 auction date. Moreover, Applicants respectfully disagree with ICANN's awkward attempt to rewrite the phrase "enter into a New gTLD Program Auction" as "enter[] into the auction process." ICANN's argument in support of the proffered interpretation is contradicted not only by the plain language of the Auction Eligibility statement, but also by ICANN's historical administration of the New gTLD Program. It is also unlikely to pass legal muster.
such, ICANN must refrain from proceeding with the .WEB/.WEBS auction until the resolution of Ruby Glen’s Ombudsman complaint, this Request and any other ICANN Accountability Mechanisms that may currently be in process or outstanding.

The stay is further supported by the fact that NDC’s statements have called into question whether, under the New gTLD Auction Bidder Agreement for the .WEB/.WEBS contention set (the “ICANN Auction Agreement”), NDC meets the standard of a “Qualified Applicant.” In light of these questions, the requested stay will also allow ICANN the opportunity to “conduct due diligence on the Qualified Applicant...in an effort to ensure compliance with all applicable laws, regulations and rules governing the [ICANN auction of last resort].” See ICANN Auction Agreement at § 2.7.

Applicants’ request to stay the .WEB/.WEBS auction of last resort for an additional (45) days after the issuance of a ruling on the merits of this Request will provide the members of the contention set, as well as ICANN, with a reasonable opportunity to re-engage with each other in advance of the auction and give ICANN the time it needs to conduct the investigation this matter deserves. As addressed above, the failure to grant the requested stay will have wide-ranging repercussions that extend far beyond the .WEB/.WEBS auction.

B. Request for ICANN to Conduct Thorough Investigation Into Issues Raised by NDC’s Contradictory Statements

Concurrent with the above request, Applicants ask ICANN to utilize the broad investigatory controls described in the Applicant Guidebook—notably, those under Sections 6.8 and 6.11 that seemingly exist precisely for situations such as this—to investigate (a) changes in Mr. Bezsonoff's status, if any, with NDC and (b) changes in
the control, ownership, or leadership of NDC since the time of NDC’s original gTLD application. Such inquiry should include, at the very least, interviews with Mr. Bezsonoff and all other individuals identified in Section 11 of NDC’s application.

10. Please state specifically the grounds under which you have the standing and the right to assert this Request for Reconsideration, and the grounds or justifications that support your request.

Applicants are a approved members of the .WEB/.WEBS contention set, with a scheduled auction for July 27, 2016. As approved members, and as set forth more fully throughout this Request, Applicants have been “adversely affected by ... one or more staff actions or inactions that contradict established ICANN policy.” ICANN Bylaws, Art. IV, § 2.2(a). Specifically, the Staff Action was taken in contradiction of various policy provisions contained in ICANN’s Bylaws (including ICANN’s guiding principles to ensure transparency, openness and accountability), the Auction Rules, and the Applicant Guidebook, all of which require a full and transparent investigation into the discrepancies presented by NDC’s application and its current status as an auction participant.

A. The Staff Action Contradicted Established Policy By Failing to Utilize the Broad Investigative Powers at ICANN’s Disposal in Investigating NDC’s Potential Violation of Guidelines Contained in the Applicant Guidebook

As set forth in the Applicant Guidebook, ICANN has broad authority to investigate all applicants who apply to participate in the New gTLD Auction Program. This investigative authority, willingly provided by each applicant as part of the terms and
conditions set forth in the guidelines contained in the Applicant Guidebook, is set forth in relevant part below:

8. ... In addition, Applicant acknowledges that [sic] to allow ICANN to conduct thorough background screening investigations:

     ...  

     c. Additional identifying information may be required to resolve questions of identity of individuals within the applicant organization; ...  

     ...  

11. Applicant authorizes ICANN to:

     a. Contact any person, group, or entity to request, obtain, and discuss any documentation or other information that, in ICANN's sole judgment, may be pertinent to the application;

     b. Consult with persons of ICANN's choosing regarding the information in the application or otherwise coming into ICANN's possession . . .

See Applicant Guidebook at §§ 6.8, 6.10 (emphasis added).

ICANN's obligation to conduct a thorough investigation is necessary to ensure the integrity of the auction process and the existence of a level playing field among the ultimate members of a contention set. Background investigations into "applicants (including all parent companies, subsidiaries, affiliates, agents, contractors, employees and any all others acting on [their] behalf)" also ensure that each applicant is capable of administering any new gTLD that it may secure at auction, thereby benefiting the public at large. See Applicant Guidebook, § 6 at Introduction. This information also allows ICANN to determine whether an entity applicant, or an individual associated with an entity applicant, has engaged in the automatically disqualifying conduct set forth in Section 1.2.1 of the Applicant Guidebook. Indeed, ICANN requires those submitting a
gTLD application to provide warranties as to the truth and accuracy of their representations, even going so far as to mandate a continuing obligation to notify ICANN of "any change in circumstances that would render any information provided in the application false or misleading." See id. at 1.

In spite of the above, when faced with recent statements by NDC that expressly contradict those contained in its gTLD application—and directly affect its ability to participate in the .WEB/.WEBS auction—ICANN appears to have engaged in only a cursory examination of the issue. The only available conclusion is that the Staff Action was taken without attention to, in contravention of, and with apparent disregard for its obligation to investigate the veracity of the representations made by NDC and its potential changes of control, leadership, and/or ownership.  

In light of the noted deficiencies identified in relation to the Staff Action, Applicants respectfully request ICANN now take the time to engage in a full and transparent investigation into material discrepancies in NDC's application and its status as a contention set member and postpone the .WEB/.WEBS auction, currently scheduled for July 27, 2016. All .WEB/.WEBS applicants deserve to participate in an auction with transparency as to the competition and integrity as to the process.

B. The Staff Action Contradicted Established Policy By Failing to Adhere to the Transparency and Accountability Guidelines Set Forth in ICANN's Bylaws

---

5 Because the Staff Action also contradicted established policy relating to transparency, as set forth infra, Applicants are unfortunately forced to presume that a thorough background investigation of the nature described in Sections 6.8 and 6.11 of the Applicant Guidebook did not occur during the course of the decision-making process.
In addition to ICANN's failure to adhere to the specific guidelines established for the administration of gTLD auctions, the Staff Action (and the events leading thereto) were taken in contravention of multiple provisions of the ICANN Bylaws, all of which require ICANN to administer the .WEB/.WEBS auction process with transparency, accountability, good faith and fair dealing. Collectively, these violations not only provide a solid basis for granting this Request but also revive serious doubts as to ICANN's ability to process and manage the New gTLD Program in a transparent and accountable manner.

1. The Staff Action Contradicts ICANN Bylaws, Art. I, § 2.8:

   Article 1, section 2.8 of ICANN's Bylaws requires ICANN to "[m]ak[e] decisions by applying documented policies neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness." As set forth above, ICANN obligates each applicant who seeks to participate in the gTLD auction process to affirm that the statements and representations contained in the application are true and accurate; applicants also undertake a continuing obligation to update their application when changes in circumstance affect an application's accuracy. See Applicant Guidebook at § 6.1. In turn, ICANN represents to the applicants that it will safeguard the entire gTLD application process, including any auctions of last resort, by taking steps to diligently investigate the information provided by each applicant to ensure its accuracy. By failing to engage in a thorough, open and transparent investigation of the contradictory statements made by NDC in relation to its application, as well as an apparent change of control with potential antitrust implications, the Staff Action plainly—and inexplicably—failed to reach its decisions by "applying documented policies neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness." See ICANN Bylaws, Art. I,
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§ 2.8.

ii. The Staff Action Contradicts ICANN Bylaws, Art. I, § 2.9:

Article 1, section 2.9 of ICANN's Bylaws requires ICANN to “[a]ct with a speed that is responsive to the needs of the Internet while, as part of the decision-making process, obtaining informed input from those entities most affected.” In undertaking only a cursory examination of the contradictory statements made by NDC and the apparent change in NDC’s rights to its application, the Staff Action failed to balance ICANN’s interest in a swift resolution of the concerns raised by the members of the .WEB/.WEBS contention set with its obligation to obtain sufficient assurances and information from the individuals and entities at the center of the statements made by NDC; at the very least, ICANN staff should have conducted interviews with Mr. Bezsonoff and all other individuals identified in Section 11 of NDC’s application prior to reaching its conclusion.

iii. The Staff Action Contradicts ICANN Bylaws, Art. I, § 2.10

Article 1, section 2.10 of ICANN’s Bylaws requires ICANN to “[r]emain[] accountable to the Internet community through mechanisms that enhance ICANN's effectiveness.” By failing to make use of the processes established in Sections 6.8 and 6.10 to the Applicant Guidebook in investigating an admitted failure by NDC to abide by its continuing obligation to update its application, ICANN staff disregarded the very accountability mechanisms put in place to serve and protect not only the Internet community but the public at large. This error was compounded by the cursory dismissal of the concerns raised by multiple members of the .WEB/.WEBS contention set relating to the accuracy of the representations made in NDC’s application. By failing to apprise
the members of the contention set as to the manner and scope of the investigation
conducted by ICANN staff, ICANN failed to ensure that it would hold itself accountable
to any gTLD applicant, let alone the broader Internet community.

iv. The Staff Action Contradicts ICANN Bylaws, Art. II, § 3:

Article II, section 3 of ICANN’s Bylaws states 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.” There can be no questioning the fact that the
Staff Action resulted in disparate treatment in favor of NDC. On one hand, there are
clear statements from NDC that representations made in its application are, at best,
misleading and there is ample evidence that NDC has either resold, assigned or
transferred all or some of its rights to the application. On the other hand, when pressed
by multiple members of the contention set to fully investigate the matter, ICANN
provided only a conclusory statement that raises more questions than it resolves. To
the extent it had reason to engage in such disparate treatment of the members of the
.WEB/.WEBS contention set, ICANN failed to provide such a reason in reaching the
determinations at issue in this Request. Certainly, Applicants can think of no
“substantial and reasonable cause,” to justify the Staff Action. Id. at ICANN Bylaws, Art.
II, § 3.

v. The Staff Action Contradicts ICANN Bylaws, Art. III, § 1:

Article 3, section 1 ICANN’s Bylaws states the “ICANN and its constituent bodies
shall operate to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner and
consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness.” Over the course of its
existence, ICANN has repeatedly prevailed upon the stakeholders in the ICANN policy process to trust that it will administer its obligations in a fair and transparent manner. The continued trust of ICANN's stakeholders, however, can only extend as far as ICANN is willing to honor its stated commitments to accountability and transparency in every aspect of its work.

If any situation demanded the full transparency to which ICANN has repeatedly committed itself, it must certainly be the one presented here, where a single, hasty backroom decision effectively ensures that the proceeds from the .WEB/.WEBS auction will flow to ICANN under an unfortunate cloud of suspected conflicts of interest and disparate treatment. Applicants respectfully request that ICANN reconsider the Staff Action and provide relief in the manner set forth in Section 8 of its Request.

11. Are you bringing this Reconsideration Request on behalf of multiple persons or entities? (Check one)

   ___ Yes
   _____ No

11a. If yes, is the causal connection between the circumstances of the Reconsideration Request and the harm the same for all of the complaining parties? Explain.

   Applicants have joined together to submit this Request. Moreover, as of date of the submission of this Request, Applicants are aware that other members of the .WEB/WEBS contention set also may join in Applicants’ Request. With the exception of NDC, both the circumstances of this Request and the harm described herein is the same for Applicants and all other contention members.
Terms and Conditions for Submission of Reconsideration Requests

The Board Governance Committee has the ability to consolidate the consideration of Reconsideration Requests if the issues stated within are sufficiently similar. The Board Governance Committee may dismiss Reconsideration Requests that are querulous or vexatious. Hearings are not required in the Reconsideration Process, however Requestors may request a hearing. The BGC retains the absolute discretion to determine whether a hearing is appropriate, and to call people before it for a hearing. The BGC may take a decision on reconsideration of requests relating to staff action/inaction without reference to the full ICANN Board. Whether recommendations will issue to the ICANN Board is within the discretion of the BGC. The ICANN Board of Director’s decision on the BGC’s reconsideration recommendation is final and not subject to a reconsideration request.

DATED: 17 July 2016

Respectfully submitted,

/amal/

Alvaro Alvarez
SVP, General Counsel & Secretary
Donuts Inc.

/bj/

Brijesh Joshi
Director, Radix FZC, on behalf of its applicant affiliate DotWeb Inc.
DETERMINATION
OF THE BOARD GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE (BGC)
RECONSIDERATION REQUEST 16-9

21 JULY 2016

The Requesters, Ruby Glen, LLC and Radix FZC, submitted a reconsideration request seeking urgent reconsideration of ICANN’s decision not to delay the .WEB/.WEBS auction (scheduled for 27 July 2016) following ICANN’s investigation into alleged material changes in Nu Dot Co LLC’s (Nu Dot’s) application for .WEB.

I. Brief Summary.

Seven applications for .WEB and one application for .WEBS are currently in a contention set (.WEB/.WEBS Contention Set) and scheduled to participate in an auction of last resort on 27 July 2016 (Auction). The Requesters and Nu Dot each submitted an application for .WEB and are Auction participants. The Requesters contacted ICANN staff on or about 23 June 2016 and submitted a complaint to the Ombudsman during ICANN56 in June 2016 alleging that Nu Dot had experienced changes in leadership and/or control without notifying ICANN, as it is obligated to do. The Requesters then submitted an urgent Reconsideration Request on 17 July 2016 (Request 16-9) claiming that: (a) the Auction should be postponed because there are pending accountability mechanisms (initiated by the Requesters); and (b) reconsideration is warranted because ICANN’s investigation of the alleged changes in Nu Dot’s application was insufficient and, in the Requesters’ view, comprises “a clear violation of the principles and procedures set forth in the ICANN Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws[,] and the ICANN gTLD Applicant Guidebook.”

\[1\] Request, Pg. 2.
The Requesters’ claims do not warrant postponement of the Auction or reconsideration. First, the Requesters argue that their pending complaint with the Ombudsman and initiation of Request 16-9 require ICANN to postpone the Auction. However, there is no policy requiring ICANN to postpone the Auction here because these accountability mechanisms were not initiated before the .WEB/.WEBS Contention Set entered into the Auction process on 27 April 2016. Indeed, the timing parameters within the auction rules were established specifically so that auction participants could not game the system by filing last-minute accountability mechanisms. Second, reconsideration is not warranted because the Requesters do not identify any misapplication of policy or procedure by ICANN staff in its investigation of the allegations regarding Nu Dot’s application.

Contrary to the Requesters’ claims, ICANN diligently investigated the alleged potential changes to Nu Dot’s application and found no basis to initiate the application change request process.\(^2\) Because the Requesters have failed to show that ICANN staff acted in contravention of established policy or procedure, the BGC concludes that Request 16-9 be denied.

II. Facts.

A. Background Facts.

In June 2012, Ruby Glen, LLC, DotWeb Inc. (an affiliate of Radix FZC), Nu Dot, Charleston Road Registry, Inc., Web.com Group, Inc., Afilias Domains No. 3 Limited, and Schlund Technologies GmbH each submitted an application for .WEB; Vistaprint Limited filed two applications for .WEBS (one standard, and one community-based that was later withdrawn).

\(^2\) Furthermore, even if ICANN had determined that an applicant change request was necessary, ICANN has discretion to determine whether a change request warrants postponing an auction.
Nu Dot’s application listed three officers/directors: Jose Ignacio Rasco II, CFO; Juan Diego Calle, CEO; and Nicolai Bezsonoff, COO.3

The seven applications for .WEB and the remaining application for .WEBS are in the .WEB/.WEBS Contention Set.4

On 27 April 2016, ICANN initiated the Auction process by notifying all active members of the .WEB/.WEBS Contention Set that the Auction had been scheduled and providing instructions and deadlines to participate in the Auction.

According to the Requesters, on or about 7 June 2016 they contacted Nu Dot and asked Nu Dot to reconsider its decision to forego private resolution of the .WEB/.WEBS Contention Set. The Requesters have indicated that Nu Dot’s reply included the following statement: “Nicolai [Bezsonoff] is at NSR full-time and is no longer involved with our TLD applications. [Jose Ignacio Rasco II is] still running our program and Juan [Diego Calle] sits on the board with me and several others.”5 This communication apparently led the Requesters to believe that Nu Dot had experienced some change in ownership and/or leadership. Thereafter, on or about 23 June 2016, the Requesters contacted ICANN staff regarding their apparent belief that changes to Nu Dot’s application were required. The Requesters also formally raised the issue with the ICANN Ombudsman during ICANN56 in June 2016.

After receiving the Requesters’ notification that they believed Nu Dot’s application needed to be changed, ICANN staff proceeded to investigate the claims. On 27 June 2016, ICANN sent Nu Dot’s authorized primary contact a message to determine whether there had been any “changes to your application or the [Nu Dot] organization that need to be reported to

---

5 Request, § 8, Pg. 9.
ICANN. This may include any information that is no longer true and accurate in the application, including changes that occur as part of regular business operations (e.g., changes to officers and directors, application contacts).” Jose Ignacio Rasco, CFO of Nu Dot, replied that same day to “confirm that there have been no changes to the [Nu Dot] organization that would need to be reported to ICANN.”

Subsequently, both ICANN staff and the Ombudsman reached out to Mr. Rasco to again inquire about the claims of potential changes in Nu Dot’s organization that the Requesters believed required notification to ICANN. Specifically, ICANN staff conducted a telephone conversation with Mr. Rasco on 8 July 2016 regarding the allegations. During that call, and later in a confirming email on 11 July 2016, Mr. Rasco stated that: “Neither the ownership nor the control of Nu Dotco, LLC has changed since we filed our application. The Managers designated pursuant to the company’s LLC operating agreement (the LLC equivalent of a corporate Board) have not changed. And there have been no changes to the membership of the LLC either.” Mr. Rasco also confirmed to ICANN that he provided this same information to the ICANN Ombudsman in responding to the Ombudsman’s investigation of the complaint lodged with him. According to Mr. Rasco, he informed the Ombudsman that there had been no changes to Nu Dot’s ownership, operating agreement, or LLC membership. After receiving information from Nu Dot and ICANN, the Ombudsman informed ICANN that, in his opinion, there was nothing to justify a postponement of the .WEB/.WEBS Auction based on unfairness to the other applicants.

On 11 July 2016, the Requesters sent an email to ICANN “support[ing] a postponement of the .WEB auction to give ICANN and the other applicants time to investigate whether there has been a change of leadership and/or control of another applicant, [Nu Dot,]” and stating that,
“[t]o do otherwise would be unfair, as we do not have transparency into who leads and controls that applicant as the auction approaches.”

After completing its investigation of the allegations regarding Nu Dot’s application, ICANN sent a letter to the members of the .WEB/.WEBS Contention Set on 13 July 2016 stating, among other things, that “in regards to potential changes of control of [Nu Dot], we have investigated the matter, and to date we have found no basis to initiate the application change request process or postpone the auction.”

On 17 July 2016, the Requesters filed Request 16-9, seeking postponement of the .WEB/.WEBS Auction and requesting a “thorough and transparent investigation into the apparent discrepancies and/or changes in [Nu Dot’s] .WEB/.WEBS application.”

The .WEB/.WEBS Auction is scheduled to occur on 27 July 2016.

B. Relief Requested.

The Requesters ask ICANN to:

1. “[D]elay the ICANN auction of last resort for the .WEB/.WEBS contention set on an emergency basis”, and;

2. “[C]onduct a thorough and transparent investigation into the apparent discrepancies and/or changes in [Nu Dot’s] .WEB/.WEBS application in accordance with ICANN’s Bylaws (including ICANN’s guiding principles to ensure transparency, openness and accountability), the Auction Rules, and the

---

8 Request, § 9, Pg. 11. On 20 July 2016, ICANN received a letter of support from Donuts Inc. regarding Request 16-9. Donuts requested that the letter not be published.
III. The Relevant Standard For Reconsideration Requests.

ICANN’s Bylaws provide for reconsideration of a Board or staff action or inaction in accordance with specified criteria. The Requesters challenge staff action. Dismissal of a request for reconsideration of staff action or inaction is appropriate only if the BGC concludes, and the Board agrees to the extent that the BGC deems that further consideration by the Board is necessary, that the requesting party does not have standing because the party failed to satisfy the reconsideration criteria set forth in the Bylaws.

IV. Analysis and Rationale.

A. No Established Policy Requires ICANN to Postpone the .WEB/.WEBS Auction.

The Requesters argue that the Auction should be postponed because of the pending accountability mechanisms. Those accountability mechanisms, however, were not pending at the required time—namely, the time when the .WEB/.WEBS Contention Set entered into the Auction process—and do not warrant postponement of the Auction.

The Requesters argue that a stay is “mandated by ICANN’s own rules governing Auction Eligibility given the pendency of (a) [the Requesters’] complaint to the ICANN Ombudsman and (b) this Request.” In particular, the Requesters assert that “[a]s plainly stated on ICANN’s ‘New gTLD Program Auctions’, a string contention set will be eligible to enter into a New gTLD

---

10 Request, § 9, Pg. 11 (emphasis in original).
11 Bylaws, Art. IV, § 2. Article IV, § 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
   (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.
12 Request, § 9, Pg. 12.
Program auction only where all active applications in the contention set have ‘no pending ICANN Accountability Mechanisms.’”

Contrary to what the Requesters argue, there were no pending accountability mechanisms when the .WEB/.WEBS Contention Set entered into the Auction process. ICANN initiated the Auction process on 27 April 2016 by notifying all active members of the .WEB/.WEBS Contention Set that the Auction had been scheduled and providing instructions and deadlines to participate in the Auction. The Requesters did not lodge a complaint with the Ombudsman until two months later (and less than one month before the Auction) during ICANN56 in June 2016. Similarly, Request 16-9 was not filed until 17 July 2016. As such, there were no accountability mechanisms pending on the date that the .WEB/.WEBS Contention Set entered the Auction process. Indeed, the auction rules were designed to, among other things, prevent exactly this sort of last-minute attempt to delay. The Requesters have not identified any violation of process or procedure. The .WEB/.WEBS Auction will therefore proceed as scheduled on 27 July 2016.

B. ICANN Staff Complied with Established Policy when Investigating the Requesters’ Allegations Regarding Nu Dot.

The Requesters contend that ICANN’s investigation regarding Nu Dot “was taken without attention to, in contravention of, and with apparent disregard for its obligation to investigate the veracity of the representations made by [Nu Dot] and its potential changes of control, leadership, and/or ownership.” However, there is no established policy or procedure requiring ICANN to undertake an investigation in the manner that the Requesters would prefer. Nevertheless, ICANN did diligently investigate the Requesters’ claims and found nothing to support them.

14 Request, § 10, Pg. 16.
The Requesters cite the “Top-Level Domain Application – Terms and Conditions” (Guidebook Terms and Conditions) in which gTLD applicants authorize ICANN to:

8. … [C]onduct thorough background screening[s] … [including] identifying information may be required to resolve questions of identity of individuals within the applicant organization investigations[; and]

10. (a) Contact any person, group, or entity to request, obtain, and discuss any documentation or other information that, in ICANN’s sole judgment, may be pertinent to the application; (b) Consult with persons of ICANN’s choosing regarding the information in the application or otherwise coming into ICANN’s possession, provided, however, that ICANN will use reasonable efforts to ensure that such persons maintain the confidentiality of information in the application that this Applicant Guidebook expressly states will be kept confidential.15

These provisions of the Guidebook Terms and Conditions do not support the Requesters’ argument. In the course of evaluating Nu Dot’s application, ICANN performed the above referenced background screening in accordance with the Applicant Guidebook and standard procedures, and the results were released with the Initial Evaluation Report on 7 June 2013.16 Thus, there is no dispute that ICANN performed all necessary checks of the application.

Rather, just one month before the scheduled Auction, the Requesters seemingly are suggesting that ICANN should have conducted another in-depth investigation and background check of Nu Dot because, according to the Requesters, certain unknown changes may have occurred with respect to Nu Dot’s organization which might require changes to Nu Dot’s application. Specifically, the Requesters claim that ICANN was obligated to investigate Nu Dot because the Applicant Guidebook grants ICANN “broad authority to investigate all applicants who apply to participate in the New gTLD Auction Program.”17 But the Requesters’ proposed level of investigation is not what is required at this stage of the process. While the Requesters

15 Guidebook, §§ 6.8, 6.10 (emphasis supplied).
17 Request, § 10, Pg. 14.
are correct that the Applicant Guidebook gives ICANN the authority to conduct investigations, the Applicant Guidebook does not require ICANN to investigate the Requesters’ claims regarding Nu Dot in the manner that the Requesters suggest. Furthermore, the Guidebook Terms and Conditions cited by the Requesters confirm that it is within “ICANN’s sole judgment” to determine whether additional information may be pertinent to an application and, consequently, to determine whether any investigation is warranted. Accordingly, the Requesters fail to identify any policy or procedure that would require ICANN to investigate their claims.

Nevertheless, in response to the Requesters’ allegations, ICANN did diligently investigate the claims regarding potential changes to Nu Dot’s leadership and/or ownership. Indeed, on several occasions, ICANN staff communicated with the primary contact for Nu Dot both through emails and a phone conversation to determine whether there had been any changes to the Nu Dot organization that would require an application change request. On each occasion, Nu Dot confirmed that no such changes had occurred, and ICANN is entitled to rely upon those representations. For example, on 27 June 2016, ICANN sent Nu Dot’s authorized primary contact a message to determine whether there had been any “changes to your application or the [Nu Dot] organization that need to be reported to ICANN … [including] changes to officers and directors, [or] application contacts.” Jose Ignacio Rasco, CFO of Nu Dot, replied that same day to “confirm that there have been no changes to the [Nu Dot] organization that would need to be reported to ICANN.” Shortly thereafter, both ICANN staff and the Ombudsman reached out to Mr. Rasco to again inquire about the claims of potential changes requiring notification to ICANN. Specifically, ICANN staff conducted a telephone conversation with Mr. Rasco on 8 July 2016 regarding the allegations. During that call, and later in a confirming email on 11 July 2016, Mr. Rasco stated that “[n]either the ownership nor the control of Nu Dotco, LLC has

---

\(^{18}\) Guidebook, §§ 6.8, 6.10.
changed since we filed our application. The Managers designated pursuant to the company’s LLC operating agreement (the LLC equivalent of a corporate Board) have not changed. And there have been no changes to the membership of the LLC either.” Mr. Rasco also confirmed that he had provided this same information to the ICANN Ombudsman in responding to the Ombudsman’s investigation of the complaint lodged with him. After completing its investigation of the Requesters’ allegations regarding Nu Dot’s organization, ICANN informed the Requesters that “we have investigated the matter, and to date we have found no basis to initiate the application change request process or postpone the auction.”

C. ICANN Staff Complied with Established Policy when Determining that No Changes Were Necessary to Nu Dot’s Application.

The Requesters also suggest that ICANN violated its established policy of non-discriminatory treatment by allowing Nu Dot’s application to proceed without a change request. Specifically, the Requesters claim that ICANN engaged in “disparate treatment in favor of Nu Dot” by allowing Nu Dot’s application to proceed despite “clear statements from [Nu Dot] that representations made in its application are, at best, misleading.”

The Applicant Guidebook provides that, “[i]f at any time during the evaluation process information previously submitted by an applicant becomes untrue or inaccurate, the applicant must promptly notify ICANN.” First, Nu Dot never notified ICANN that there were any changes to the information provided in the application. Second, as discussed above, after investigating the Requesters’ allegations that there were changes in Nu Dot’s organization requiring changes to the application, ICANN concluded that there was no evidence to suggest

---

20 Bylaws, Article II, § 3 (“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.”)
21 Request, § 10, Pg. 20.
22 Guidebook, § 1.2.7.
that Nu Dot’s application was no longer accurate. Thus, as ICANN explained to the Requesters, there was no need for Nu Dot to “initiate the application change request process.”

Finally, the Requesters’ claims rest upon one email (provided in redacted form), purportedly received from Nu Dot, stating that: “Nicolai [Bezsonoff] is at NSR full-time and is no longer involved with our TLD applications. [Jose Ignacio Rasco II is] still running our program and Juan [Diego Calle] sits on the board with me and several others.” This email does not indicate that these persons have left the organization or that the organization has “resold, assigned or transferred its rights in the application.” Moreover, after investigating the Requesters’ allegations, ICANN found no evidence to suggest that Nu Dot experienced a change of leadership and/or control, and in fact received explicit confirmation from the primary contact for Nu Dot, Jose Ignacio Rasco, that no such changes had occurred, which ICANN is entitled to rely upon. Thus, there appears to be no need for an application change request, and ICANN acted in accordance with established policy and procedure in reaching this conclusion.

V. Determination.

Based on the foregoing, the BGC concludes that the Requesters have not stated proper grounds for reconsideration, and therefore denies Request 16-9. If the Requesters believe that they have somehow been treated unfairly here, they are free to ask the Ombudsman to review this matter.

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 no Board consideration is required. As discussed above, Request 16-9 seeks reconsideration of a staff

---

24 Request, § 8, Pg. 9.
25 Id at 10.
action or inaction. As such, after consideration of Request 16-9, the BGC concludes that this determination is final and that no further consideration by the Board is warranted.

In terms of the timing, because the BGC agreed to consider the matter on an urgent basis, Section 2.19 of Article IV of the Bylaws provides that the BGC shall make a final determination or recommendation with respect to a reconsideration request within seven days, or as soon thereafter as feasible.\textsuperscript{26} The Requesters submitted this Request on 17 July 2016. By issuing its Determination on 21 July 2016, the BGC has acted within the established time limit for urgent reconsideration requests.

\textsuperscript{26} Bylaws Article IV, Section 2.19.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Filed</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Docket Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/22/2016</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>COMPLAINT with filing fee previously paid ($400.00 paid on 07/22/2016, receipt number 18234524), filed by Plaintiff Ruby Glen, LLC. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit A, # 2 Exhibit B, # 3 Exhibit C) (Attorney Paula L Zecchini added to party Ruby Glen, LLC(pty:pla))(Zecchini, Paula) (Entered: 07/22/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/22/2016</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Request for Clerk to Issue Summons on Complaint (Attorney Civil Case Opening), 1 filed by Plaintiff Ruby Glen, LLC. (Zecchini, Paula) (Entered: 07/22/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/22/2016</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CIVIL COVER SHEET filed by Plaintiff Ruby Glen, LLC. (Zecchini, Paula) (Entered: 07/22/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/22/2016</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT filed by Plaintiff Ruby Glen, LLC identifying Covered TLD, LLC as Corporate Parent. (Zecchini, Paula) (Entered: 07/22/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/22/2016</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NOTICE of Interested Parties filed by Plaintiff Ruby Glen, LLC, identifying Covered TLD, LLC. (Zecchini, Paula) (Entered: 07/22/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/22/2016</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>EX PARTE APPLICATION for Temporary Restraining Order filed by Plaintiff Ruby Glen, LLC. (Zecchini, Paula) (Entered: 07/22/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/22/2016</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>DECLARATION of Paula Zecchini re EX PARTE APPLICATION for Temporary Restraining Order 6 filed by Plaintiff Ruby Glen, LLC. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit A, # 2 Exhibit B, # 3 Exhibit C, # 4 Exhibit D, # 5 Exhibit E, # 6 Exhibit F, # 7 Exhibit G, # 8 Exhibit H, # 9 Exhibit I, # 10 Exhibit J)(Zecchini, Paula) (Entered: 07/22/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/22/2016</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>DECLARATION of Jonathon Nevett re EX PARTE APPLICATION for Temporary Restraining Order 6 filed by Plaintiff Ruby Glen, LLC. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit A)(Zecchini, Paula) (Entered: 07/22/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/25/2016</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT to District Judge Percy Anderson and Magistrate Judge Alka Sagar. (car) (Entered: 07/25/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/25/2016</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NOTICE TO PARTIES OF COURT–DIRECTED ADR PROGRAM filed. (car) (Entered: 07/25/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/25/2016</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>NOTICE OF PRO HAC VICE APPLICATION DUE for Non–Resident Attorney Jeffrey M. Monhait. A document recently filed in this case lists you as an out–of–state attorney of record. However, the Court has not been able to locate any record that you are admitted to the Bar of this Court, and you have not filed an application to appear Pro Hac Vice in this case. Accordingly, within 5 business days of the date of this notice, you must either (1) have your local counsel file an application to appear Pro Hac Vice (Form G–64) and pay the applicable fee, or (2) complete the next section of this form and return it to the court at <a href="mailto:cacd_attyadm@cacd.uscourts.gov">cacd_attyadm@cacd.uscourts.gov</a>. You have been removed as counsel of record from the docket in this case, and you will not be added back to the docket until your Pro Hac Vice status has been resolved. (car) (Entered: 07/25/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/25/2016</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21 DAY Summons Issued re Complaint (Attorney Civil Case Opening), 1 as to Defendant Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers. (car) (Entered: 07/25/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/25/2016</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>NOTICE of Appearance filed by attorney Eric P Enson on behalf of Defendant Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (Attorney Eric P Enson added to party Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers(pty:dft))(Enson, Eric) (Entered: 07/25/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/25/2016</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT filed by Defendant Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (Enson, Eric)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/25/2016</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>NOTICE OF INTENT TO FILE OPPOSITION TO EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR TRO filed by Defendant Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers. (Enson, Eric)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/25/2016</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>NOTICE of Appearance filed by attorney Jeffrey A LeVee on behalf of Defendant Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (Attorney Jeffrey A LeVee added to party Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) (LeVee, Jeffrey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/25/2016</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>NOTICE of Appearance filed by attorney Charlotte Wasserstein on behalf of Defendant Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (Attorney Charlotte Wasserstein added to party Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) (Wasserstein, Charlotte)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/25/2016</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Opposition re: EX PARTE APPLICATION for Temporary Restraining Order filed by Defendant Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers. (Attachments: # 1 Willett Decl., # 2 Exs. to Willett Decl., # 3 Weinstein Decl., # 4 Exs. to Weinstein Decl., # 5 Bezsonoff Decl., # 6 Rasco Decl., # 7 Proof of Service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/26/2016</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>PROOF OF SERVICE Executed by Plaintiff Ruby Glen, LLC, upon Defendant Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers served on 7/25/2016, answer due 8/15/2016. Service of the Summons and Complaint were executed upon Gladys Aguilera, CT Corporation Systems in compliance with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure by service on a domestic corporation, unincorporated association, or public entity. Original Summons NOT returned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/26/2016</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>NOTICE Of Service Of Process filed by Defendant Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/26/2016</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>MINUTE ORDER (IN CHAMBERS) – COURT ORDER by Judge Percy Anderson denying 6 EX PARTE APPLICATION for TRO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/26/2016</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>STANDING ORDER by Judge Percy Anderson. READ THIS ORDER CAREFULLY. IT CONTROLS THE CASE AND DIFFERS IN SOME RESPECTS FROM THE LOCAL RULES.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/08/2016</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>First AMENDED COMPLAINT against Defendant Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers amending Complaint (Attorney Civil Case Opening), filed by Plaintiff Ruby Glen, LLC (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit A, # 2 Exhibit B, # 3 Exhibit C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/22/2016</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Joint STIPULATION Extending Time to Answer the complaint as to Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers answer now due 9/26/2016, re Amended Complaint/Petition, filed by Defendant Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order Proposed Order)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/23/2016</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>ORDER ON STIPULATION ON DEFENDANTS RESPONSE DATE TO AMENDED COMPLAINT by Judge Percy Anderson, re Stipulation Extending Time to Answer, Defendants time to answer, move to dismiss or otherwise respond to the Amended Complaint shall be extended by thirty (30) days to Monday, September 26, 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/16/2016</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Second STIPULATION for Extension of Time to File Answer re Amended Complaint/Petition, filed by Defendant Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/16/2016</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>ORDER ON SECOND STIPULATION ON DEFENDANTS RESPONSE DATE TO AMENDED COMPLAINT by Judge Percy Anderson, re Stipulation to Extend Time to Answer, Defendants time to answer, move to dismiss or otherwise respond to the Amended Complaint shall be extended by an additional thirty (30) days, to Wednesday, October 26, 2016. There will be no further extensions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/26/2016</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>[DOCUMENT ORDER STRICKEN PER DOC. NO. 35] NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION to FOR LEAVE TO TAKE THIRD PARTY DISCOVERY OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, MOTION FOR THE COURT TO ISSUE A SCHEDULING ORDER filed by Plaintiff Ruby Glen, LLC. (Zecchini, Paula) (Entered: 10/26/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/26/2016</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>DECLARATION of Paula Zecchini in Support of NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION to FOR LEAVE TO TAKE THIRD PARTY DISCOVERY OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, MOTION FOR THE COURT TO ISSUE A SCHEDULING ORDER 28 filed by Plaintiff Ruby Glen, LLC. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit A, # 2 Exhibit B, # 3 Exhibit C)(Zecchini, Paula) (Entered: 10/26/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/26/2016</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION to Dismiss Case filed by Defendant Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers. Motion set for hearing on 11/28/2016 at 01:30 PM before Judge Percy Anderson. (Attachments: # 1 Memorandum of Points and Authorities, # 2 Proposed Order) (Enson, Eric) (Entered: 10/26/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/27/2016</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>NOTICE TO FILER OF DEFICIENCIES in Electronically Filed Documents RE: NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION to FOR LEAVE TO TAKE THIRD PARTY DISCOVERY OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, MOTION FOR THE COURT TO ISSUE A SCHEDULING ORDER 28. The following error(s) was found: Hearing information is missing, incorrect, or not timely. In response to this notice the court may order (1) an amended or correct document to be filed (2) the document stricken or (3) take other action as the court deems appropriate. You need not take any action in response to this notice unless and until the court directs you to do so. (mrgo) (Entered: 10/27/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/28/2016</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION to to Take Third Party Discovery or, in the Alternative, Motion for the Court to Issue a Scheduling Order filed by Plaintiff Ruby Glen, LLC. Motion set for hearing on 11/28/2016 at 01:30 PM before Judge Percy Anderson. (Zecchini, Paula) (Entered: 10/28/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/28/2016</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>NOTICE filed by Plaintiff Ruby Glen, LLC. of Errata (Attachments: # 1 Attachment)(Zecchini, Paula) (Entered: 10/28/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/28/2016</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>RESPONSE BY THE COURT TO NOTICE TO FILER OF DEFICIENCIES IN ELECTRONICALLY FILED DOCUMENTS RE: NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION to Dismiss Case 30 by Clerk of Court. The document is stricken and counsel is ordered to file an amended or corrected document by 10/31/16. (mrgo) (Entered: 10/28/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/28/2016</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>AMENDED RESPONSE BY THE COURT TO NOTICE TO FILER OF DEFICIENCIES IN ELECTRONICALLY FILED DOCUMENTS RE: Response By Court to Notice of Deficiencies (G−112B), 34 by Clerk of Court. The document is stricken and counsel is ordered to file an amended or corrected document by 10/31/16. (mrgo) (Entered: 10/31/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/2016</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>NOTICE TO FILER OF DEFICIENCIES in Electronically Filed Documents RE: NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION to to Take Third Party Discovery or, in the Alternative, Motion for the Court to Issue a Scheduling Order 32. The following error(s) was found: Proposed Document was not submitted as separate attachment. In response to this notice the court may order (1) an amended or correct document to be filed (2) the document stricken or (3) take other action as the court deems appropriate. You need not take any action in response to this notice unless and until the court directs you to do so. (mrgo) (Entered: 10/31/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/01/2016</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>RESPONSE BY THE COURT TO NOTICE TO FILER OF DEFICIENCIES IN ELECTRONICALLY FILED DOCUMENTS RE: Notice of Deficiency in Electronically Filed Documents (G−112A), 36 by Judge Percy Anderson. The document is accepted as filed. Plaintiff must file the missing proposed order as an attachment to an efiled notice of lodging. (mrgo) (Entered: 11/01/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/01/2016</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>NOTICE OF LODGING filed re NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION to to Take Third Party Discovery or, in the Alternative, Motion for the Court to Issue a Scheduling Order 32 (Attachments: # 1 Attachment)(Zecchini, Paula) (Entered: 11/01/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Type of Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/07/16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>OPPOSITION to NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION to Dismiss Case 30 filed by Plaintiff Ruby Glen, LLC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/07/16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE in Support of Plaintiff Ruby Glen, LLC's Opposition to Defendant Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers' Motion to Dismiss First Amended Complaint filed by Plaintiff Ruby Glen, LLC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/07/16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>OPPOSITION re: NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION to to Take Third Party Discovery or, in the Alternative, Motion for the Court to Issue a Scheduling Order 32 filed by Defendant Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/07/16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>NOTICE OF LODGING filed re Response in Opposition to Motion 39 (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order)(Zecchini, Paula) (Entered: 11/07/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/10/16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>NOTICE OF ERRATA filed by Defendant Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers. correcting NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION to Dismiss Case 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>REPLY IN SUPPORT OF NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION to Dismiss Case 30 filed by Defendant Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/16</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>REPLY in Support of NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION to to Take Third Party Discovery or, in the Alternative, Motion for the Court to Issue a Scheduling Order 32 filed by Plaintiff Ruby Glen, LLC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/16</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>NOTICE TO PARTIES by District Judge Percy Anderson. Effective November 21, 2016, Judge Anderson will be located at the 1st Street Courthouse, COURTROOM 9A on the 9th floor, located at 350 W. 1st Street, Los Angeles, California 90012. All Court appearances shall be made in Courtroom 9A of the 1st Street Courthouse, and all mandatory chambers copies shall be hand delivered to the judge's mail box outside the Clerk's Office on the 4th floor of the 1st Street Courthouse. The location for filing civil documents in paper format exempted from electronic filing and for viewing case files and other records services remains at the United States Courthouse, 312 North Spring Street, Room G–8, Los Angeles, California 90012. The location for filing criminal documents in paper format exempted from electronic filing remains at Edward R. Roybal Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse, 255 East Temple Street, Room 178, Los Angeles, California 90012. THERE IS NO PDF DOCUMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THIS ENTRY.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/23/16</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>TEXT ONLY ENTRY by Judge Percy Anderson. On the Court's own motion, the Court vacates the hearing on the Motion to Dismiss 30 and the Motion to Take Third Party Discovery or, in the Alternative, Motion for the Court to Issue a Scheduling Order 32, both previously scheduled for 11/28/2016 at 1:30 p.m. No appearance is necessary. THERE IS NO PDF DOCUMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THIS ENTRY.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/28/16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>MINUTES (IN CHAMBERS) − COURT ORDER by Judge Percy Anderson re: 30 MOTION to Dismiss Case 32. The Court declines to address the additional arguments contained in ICANN's Motion to Dismiss. Plaintiff's Motion to Begin Discovery is denied as moot. The Court will issue a Judgment consistent with this Order. (See document for specifics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/28/16</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>JUDGMENT by Judge Percy Anderson, Related to: Order on Motion to Dismiss Case., Order on Motion for Leave, 48. IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that ICANN shall have judgment in its favor against Plaintiff. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that Plaintiff's claims are dismissed with prejudice. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that Plaintiff take nothing and that ICANN shall have its costs of suit. (MD JS–6, Case Terminated).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/22/16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>NOTICE OF APPEAL to the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals filed by Plaintiff Ruby Glen, LLC. Appeal of Judgment, 49.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/23/2016</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Notice of Appearance or Withdrawal of Counsel: for attorney Charlotte Wasserstein counsel for Defendant Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers. Charlotte S. Wasserstein is no longer counsel of record for the aforementioned party in this case for the reason indicated in the G−123 Notice. Filed by defendant Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers. (Wasserstein, Charlotte) (Entered: 12/23/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/23/2016</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>NOTIFICATION from Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals of case number assigned and briefing schedule. Appeal Docket No. 16−56890 assigned to Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals 50 as to Plaintiff Ruby Glen, LLC. (mat) (Entered: 12/28/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/2018</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>MEMORANDUM from Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals filed re: Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals 50 filed by Ruby Glen, LLC, CCA # 16–56890. The decision of the district court is AFFIRMED. (mrgo) (Entered: 10/17/2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/06/2018</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>MANDATE of Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals filed re: Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals 50, CCA # 16–56890. The judgment of the 9th Circuit Court, entered October 15, 2018, takes effect this date. This constitutes the formal mandate of the 9th CCA issued pursuant to Rule 41(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. [See USCA Memorandum 53, AFFIRMED.] (mat) (Entered: 11/08/2018)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Ruby Glen LLC and six other applicants are all vying to operate the “.WEB” Internet generic top-level domain (“gTLD”). After a detailed review, started in 2012, the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (“ICANN”), the nonprofit public benefit corporation responsible for evaluating such applications, determined that all .WEB applications met the established criteria. But, because each unique gTLD can only have one operator, ICANN placed the .WEB applications into a “Contention Set” according to procedures in place since 2012. On April 27, 2016, again according to procedures in place since 2012, ICANN scheduled an auction for July 27, 2016 (“Auction”) to resolve which application in the Contention Set will proceed. Now, to avoid this competition and the auction procedures it agreed to, Plaintiff seeks a temporary restraining order (“TRO”) against ICANN to halt the Auction.1 But there is no basis in either the Auction procedures, the law or the evidence to grant Plaintiff the relief it seeks.

In submitting their applications, Plaintiff and all other applicants agreed to a detailed set of procedures for the application process, which ICANN developed over several years with extensive public participation, including from Plaintiff’s ultimate parent company Donuts, Inc., which through its subsidiaries like Plaintiff, submitted over 300 new gTLD applications. Those procedures are embodied in a 338-page New gTLD Applicant Guidebook (“Guidebook”) and, of particular importance here, a 22-page set of “Auction Rules.” Per the Auction Rules, an auction may be postponed if all participants agree and each submits such a request to ICANN at least 45 days before the auction. In addition, an ICANN auction can

1 Despite filing over three days ago, Plaintiff still has not served ICANN with the Complaint or TRO application. ICANN’s counsel had to obtain copies on PACER. Moreover, it is inexplicable why Plaintiff, with its claims of such urgency, would not serve ICANN in the hope of making its TRO application ripe for decision under the Court’s Standing Order, which requires such service. (Standing Order at ¶ 11 (“The Court will not rule on any application for [TRO] for at least 24 hours after the party subject to the requested order has been served; such party may file opposing or responding papers in the interim.”).)
be avoided altogether, as ICANN encourages in the Guidebook, if all participants agree to private resolution of a contention set.

Here, at least one Auction participant, Nu Dotco LLC (“Nu Dotco”), refused to agree to postpone the Auction or private resolution of the Contention Set. As a result, no postponement request was made by the deadline, and ultimately only three participants requested a delay after the deadline. Plaintiff has nonetheless sought to delay, and perhaps ultimately avoid, the Auction by making unsubstantiated claims regarding Nu Dotco’s application for .WEB, arguing that ICANN’s investigation of those claims was insufficient. Specifically, Plaintiff asserts that, on June 7, 2016, it received an email from Nu Dotco’s CFO that, according to Plaintiff, “indicated a potential change in both [Nu Dotco’s] management and ownership.” Plaintiff contends that this – and this alone – should have caused ICANN to postpone the Auction for further investigation.

But three separate ICANN bodies – ICANN’s staff, ICANN’s Ombudsman, and ICANN’s Board – have already looked into the alleged change in Nu Dotco’s ownership or management. All three found no credible evidence that any such change had occurred within Nu Dotco, and therefore nothing supported a delay of the Auction. Plaintiff’s TRO application, filed nearly three months after the Auction was scheduled and just two business days before bidding is set to officially begin, relies solely on a strained, and now completely discredited, interpretation of the Nu Dotco CFO’s June 7 email. However, the evidence accompanying this opposition – sworn declarations from ICANN and Nu Dotco executives – confirms that Nu Dotco has not made any change in its ownership or management, much less a “disqualifying” change that should derail the Auction processes already under way or the official start of bidding.

Separate and apart from the fact that ICANN performed a thorough investigation of Plaintiff’s allegations and confirmed that nothing had changed, Plaintiff’s TRO application is deficient for other reasons. First, the “emergency”
that Plaintiff invokes is an emergency of Plaintiff’s own making. **By June 7, 2016,**

Plaintiff had the email from Nu Dotco’s CFO that forms the entire basis of this suit,
and which made clear that Nu Dotco did not consent to private resolution or
postponement. Yet Plaintiff waited over two weeks to raise the matter with
ICANN. **By July 13, 2016,** Plaintiff was well aware that, based on its investigation,
ICANN concluded that the Auction should proceed as scheduled. Yet Plaintiff
waited over another week to bring this action. Second, Plaintiff fails to satisfy any
of the four requirements for emergency injunctive relief: (1) Plaintiff is not likely
to succeed on the merits of its claims because its claims have no merit, particularly
since Plaintiff agreed to the Auction Rules that it now seeks to avoid; (2) Plaintiff
will not suffer irreparable harm in the absence of injunctive relief because the
Auction Rules provide means to address these issues post-Auction and any injuries
can be compensated by financial adjustments; (3) the balance of equities weighs
against injunctive relief because it would disrupt long-agreed gTLD-assignment
procedures that provide needed certainty to applicants; and (4) the public interest
strongly favors denying the TRO because the Guidebook and Auction Rules that
Plaintiff now seeks to upend have been in place for years and have been relied upon
by hundreds of applicants. Third, in its application for .WEB, like the over 300
applications submitted by other subsidiaries of Plaintiff’s ultimate parent, Plaintiff
agreed to a covenant not to sue ICANN for claims associated with Plaintiff’s
application. This lawsuit plainly violates Plaintiff’s contractual obligation and bars
the relief sought.

To be clear, everything that Plaintiff complains about in this suit is an
express term or aspect of the New gTLD Program agreed to by Plaintiff when it
applied for .WEB in 2012. For instance, the contention set procedures, the auction
provisions, and the covenant not to sue ICANN, were acknowledged and accepted
by Plaintiff when it submitted its application pursuant to the Guidebook. Likewise,
the principle that ICANN will consider postponing an auction only when all
participants make such a request is express in the very Auction Rules that Plaintiff
accepted when it executed a “Bidder Agreement,” in May 2016, stating that
Plaintiff agrees to be bound by the Auction Rules.

ICANN, as a nonprofit, has no financial motivation in the Auction
proceeding. As has been widely publicized, all auction funds will be utilized for
charitable goals to be determined by the broader Internet community. ICANN’s
only motivation in the Auction proceeding is ensuring that the Guidebook and
Auction Rules are followed, as Plaintiff and all applicants agreed long ago.

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A. ICANN AND THE NEW GTLD PROCESS.

ICANN is a California non-profit public benefit corporation that oversees the
technical coordination of the Internet’s domain name system (“DNS”) on behalf of
the Internet community, ensuring the DNS’s continued security, stability and
integrity. See Name.Space, Inc. v. Internet Corp. for Assigned Names & Nos., 795
F. 3d 1124, 1127–28 (9th Cir. 2015). The DNS’s essential function is to convert
easily-remembered domain names, such as “uscourts.gov” or “icann.org,” into
numeric IP addresses understood by computers. (Willett Decl. ¶ 2.) The portion of
a domain name to the right of the last dot (such as, “.gov” and “.org”) is known as a
generic top-level domain (“gTLD”). Name.Space, Inc., 795 F. 3d at 1127.

Throughout its history, ICANN has sought to expand the number of gTLDs
to promote consumer choice and competition. (Willett Decl. ¶ 3.) In 2012, ICANN
launched a “New gTLD Program” application round, in which it invited any
interested party to apply for the creation of a new gTLD and for the opportunity to
be designated as the operator of that gTLD. (Willett Decl. ¶ 3.) As the operator,
the applicant would be responsible for managing the assignment of names within
the gTLD and maintaining the gTLD’s database of names and IP addresses.
(Willett Decl. ¶ 3.)

In connection with the New gTLD Program, ICANN published the
Guidebook, which prescribes the requirements for new gTLD applications to be approved, and the criteria by which they are evaluated. (Willett Decl. ¶ 4.) The Guidebook was developed in a years-long public consultation process in which numerous versions were published for public comment and revised based on comments received from the public. (Willett Decl. ¶ 4.)

Because technical, operational and financial capabilities are critical to an applicant’s suitability to run a gTLD, applicants are required to identify the entities and people who will be involved in the management of the gTLD applied for. (Zecchini Decl., Ex. C [Guidebook § 2].) Each applicant must also be screened and submit to certain background checks. (Id., §§ 1.2.1, 2.1.) Important to this lawsuit is the Guidebook’s provision that, “[i]f at any time during the evaluation process information previously submitted by an applicant becomes untrue or inaccurate, the applicant must promptly notify ICANN.” (Id., § 1.2.7.)

In the event that more than one application for the same or similar gTLDs passes all of the prescribed levels of evaluation, the applications are placed in a string contention set (since only one registry operator can operate a gTLD consisting of the exact same letters) that can be resolved through a number of processes. (Zecchini Decl., Ex. C [Guidebook § 1.1.2.10].) The Guidebook “encourage[s applicants] to resolve string contention cases among themselves prior to the string contention resolution stage.” (Id.) Should such a private resolution not occur, the contention set will proceed to an auction of last resort governed by the Auction Rules that all applicants agreed to by applying. (Id.)

The Auction Rules provide that an auction will be scheduled after ICANN reviews and investigates the applications in a contention set. Then, to facilitate private resolution, “if each and every member of the Contention Set submits a postponement request through the ICANN Customer Portal, ICANN at its sole discretion may postpone the Auction for that Contention Set to a future date.” (Zecchini Decl., Ex. J [Auction Rules ¶ 10].) The Auction Rules elaborate that the
request “must be submitted at least 45 days prior to the scheduled Auction Date [in this instance, June 13, 2016] and ICANN must receive a request from each member of the contention set.”

Any financial proceeds of such an auction initially flow to ICANN. (Id. § 4.3.) However, these auction proceeds have been fully segregated in separate bank and investment accounts, and earmarked until the community develops and the ICANN Board authorizes a plan for the appropriate use of the funds. (Weinstein Decl. ¶ 12; see also Zecchini Decl., Ex. C [Guidebook § 4.3, n.1].) The ICANN community has indicated that it will create a Cross-Community Working Group to develop a proposal for eventual consideration by the ICANN Board on the manner in which the new gTLD auction proceeds should be allocated, and the formation of that working group was discussed at a June 28, 2016 meeting during the ICANN56 Public Meeting in Helsinki. (Weinstein Decl. ¶ 13.)

The Guidebook includes critical terms and conditions that all applicants, including Plaintiff, acknowledged and accepted by submitting a gTLD application. (Zecchini Decl., Ex. C [Guidebook § 6].) For instance, the Guidebook contains a release (the “Covenant Not to Sue”), which bars lawsuits against ICANN arising out of its evaluation of any new gTLD application:

Applicant hereby releases ICANN and the ICANN Affiliated Parties from any and all claims by applicant that arise out of, are based upon, or are in any way related to, any action, or failure to act, by ICANN or any ICANN Affiliated Party in connection with ICANN’s or an ICANN Affiliated Party’s review of this application, investigation or verification, any characterization or description of applicant or the information in this application, any withdrawal of this application or

2 See https://icann562016.sched.org/event/7NE0/cross-community-session-charter-for-the-ccwg-on-auction-proceeds?iframe=no&w=i:100;&sidebar=yes&bg=no.
the decision by ICANN to recommend, or not to recommend, the approval of applicant’s gTLD application. APPLICANT AGREES NOT TO CHALLENGE, IN COURT OR IN ANY OTHER JUDICIAL FORA, ANY FINAL DECISION MADE BY ICANN WITH RESPECT TO THE APPLICATION, AND IRREVOCABLY WAIVES ANY RIGHT TO SUE OR PROCEED IN COURT OR ANY OTHER JUDICIAL FORA ON THE BASIS OF ANY OTHER LEGAL CLAIM AGAINST ICANN AND ICANN AFFILIATED PARTIES WITH RESPECT TO THE APPLICATION. . . .

(Id. § 6.6 (emphasis in original).)

Although all gTLD applicants agreed not to file lawsuits against ICANN related to their applications, applicants are not left without recourse. ICANN’s Bylaws provide for several accountability mechanisms to ensure that ICANN operates in accordance with its Articles of Incorporation (“Articles”), Bylaws, policies and procedures. (Zecchini Decl., Ex. B [Bylaws, Art. IV].) One such provision establishes an Ombudsman to informally resolve disputes. In addition, reconsideration requests may be used to challenge ICANN Board actions alleged to have been undertaken “without consideration of material information” or with “reliance on false or inaccurate material information,” or may be used to challenge staff action alleged to contravene ICANN’s established policies. (Id., Art. IV, § 2].)

Another accountability mechanism provided for in ICANN’s Bylaws is a request for an independent review process (“IRP”), under which an aggrieved applicant can ask independent panelists to evaluate whether an action of ICANN’s Board was inconsistent with ICANN’s Articles and Bylaws. (Id., Art. IV, § 2.)

B. THE APPLICATIONS FOR .WEB AND PLAINTIFF’S CLAIMS REGARDING NU DOTCO.

In June 2012, Plaintiff, Nu Dotco, and five other applicants applied for .WEB. Another applicant applied for .WEBS. The seven applications for .WEB and the
remaining application for .WEBS passed all applicable evaluations and were placed in the Contention Set, pursuant to the procedures set forth in the Guidebook.

(Willett Decl. ¶ 6.)

Nu Dotco’s application stated that it was a Delaware Limited Liability Company, and listed three people as its officers: Jose Ignacio Rasco III, CFO; Juan Diego Calle, CEO; and Nicolai Bezsonoff, COO. (Zecchini Decl., Ex. E.) It listed Mr. Rasco as its “Primary Contact” and Mr. Bezsonoff as its “Secondary Contact.” (Id.) It identified two owners having at least 15% interests: Domain Marketing Holdings, LLC and Nuco LP, LLC. (Id.)

On April 27, 2016, ICANN scheduled the Auction, notified all active members of the Contention Set, and provided them with instructions and deadlines to participate in the Auction. (Willett Decl. ¶ 7.) On May 24, 2016, Plaintiff executed the Bidder Agreement thereby “agree[ing] to be bound by the Auction Rules as published on ICANN’s website.” (Weinstein Decl., Exs. B-C.) Plaintiff alleges that Nu Dotco is the only applicant in the Contention Set that did not agree to resolve the Contention Set privately. (Compl. ¶ 36.) Thus, on or about June 7, 2016, Plaintiff contacted Nu Dotco and asked it to reconsider its decision to forego private resolution of the Contention Set.

On June 7, 2016, Mr. Rasco, Nu Dotco’s CFO, made clear in his response that Nu Dotco would not be changing its position, explaining: “Nicolai [Bezsonoff] is at NSR full-time and is no longer involved with our TLD applications. I am still running our program and Juan [Diego Calle] sits on the board with me and several others. Based on your request, I went back to check with all the powers that be and there was no change in response and will not be seeking an extension.” (Nevett Decl., Ex. A.) Over two weeks later, on June 23, 2016, based solely on this email from Nu Dotco’s CFO, Plaintiff suggested to ICANN that Nu Dotco had changed its ownership and/or management structure, but had not reported the change to ICANN, as required. (Willett Decl. ¶ 12.) Plaintiff requested that the Auction be
delayed pending further investigation. Plaintiff also formally raised the issue with the ICANN Ombudsman during the ICANN56 Public Meeting in late June 2016. (Compl. ¶ 40; Willet Decl. ¶ 16.)

After receiving Plaintiff’s allegations regarding Nu Dotco and the request to postpone the Auction, ICANN investigated Plaintiff’s claims. (Willett Decl. ¶¶ 12-13.) On June 27, 2016, ICANN sent an email to Nu Dotco, asking it to confirm that there had not been any “changes to your application or the [Nu Dotco] organization that need to be reported to ICANN. This may include any information that is no longer true and accurate in the application, including changes that occur as part of regular business operations (e.g., changes to officers and directors, application contacts).” (Willett Decl. ¶ 13, Ex. B.) Mr. Rasco responded that same day to “confirm that there have been no changes to the [Nu Dotco] organization that would need to be reported to ICANN.” (Willett Decl. ¶ 13, Ex. B.)

Subsequently, both ICANN staff and the Ombudsman contacted Mr. Rasco to again inquire about the claims of potential changes in Nu Dotco’s organization. Specifically, ICANN staff interviewed Mr. Rasco by telephone on July 8, 2016 regarding the allegations. (Willett Decl. ¶ 18.) During that call, and later in a confirming email on July 11, 2016, Mr. Rasco stated that: “Neither the ownership nor the control of Nu Dotco, LLC has changed since we filed our application. The Managers designated pursuant to the company’s LLC operating agreement (the LLC equivalent of a corporate Board) have not changed. And there have been no changes to the membership of the LLC either.” (Willett Decl. ¶ 18, Ex. F.) Mr. Rasco also stated that he had already provided this same information to the ICANN Ombudsman in responding to the Ombudsman’s investigation of the complaint lodged with him. (Willett Decl. ¶ 18.) After receiving information from Nu Dotco and ICANN, the Ombudsman informed ICANN that, in his opinion, there was nothing to justify a postponement of the Auction based on unfairness to the other applicants. (Willett Decl. ¶ 21, Ex. G.)
After completing its investigation of the allegations regarding Nu Dotco’s application, on July 13, 2016, ICANN sent a letter to the members of the Contention Set stating, among other things, that “in regards to potential changes of control of [Nu Dotco], we have investigated the matter, and to date we have found no basis to initiate the application change request process or postpone the auction.” (Zecchini Decl., Ex. G.)

On 17 July 2016, Plaintiff filed a reconsideration request (“Reconsideration Request”), seeking postponement of the Auction and requesting a “thorough and transparent investigation into the apparent discrepancies and/or changes in [Nu Dotco’s] .WEB/.WEBS application.” (Zecchini Decl., Ex. H., § 9, Pg. 11.) On July 21, 2016, ICANN’s Board Governance Committee (“BGC”) issued a twelve-page determination denying Plaintiff’s Reconsideration Request. (“Reconsideration Request Determination,” Zecchini Decl., Ex. I.) The Reconsideration Request Determination explained that no postponement of the Auction was warranted because: (1) ICANN had thoroughly investigated Plaintiff’s claims and found that Nu Dotco had not undergone a change in leadership or control; and (2) there was no pending accountability mechanism (i.e., a reconsideration request or IRP) that could support a postponement of the Auction, because the accountability mechanisms were not initiated before April 27, 2016, the day on which the Auction was scheduled. As the BGC pointed out, under the agreed-upon Auction Rules, an auction postponement is only warranted if there is a pending accountability mechanism “prior to the scheduling of an Auction.” (Zecchini Decl., Ex. J ¶ 10.)

Plaintiff is correct that the Auction is scheduled to officially begin on July 27, 2016 at 6:00 am Pacific time. But as Plaintiff knows well, many facets of the Auction process are already underway. For instance, by July 20, the Auction participants transferred deposits into escrow accounts overseen by the Auction provider, which may amount to as much as $16 million in total. (Weinstein Decl. ¶ 7.) Likewise, on July 20, the “blackout period” began, which is a period of time
called for in the Auction Rules during which auction participants are prohibited from communicating, or cooperating, with one another in terms of the auction. (Weinstein Decl. ¶ 7.) Tomorrow, on July 26, around 6:00 am Pacific time, the Auction provider will conduct a “mock auction” in order to allow participants to test connectivity and familiarize themselves with the system, if they are not already familiar with it. (Weinstein Decl. ¶ 7.) About an hour later, the Auction provider will open “early bidding,” which allows participants to submit their first round bids in preparation for the start of the Auction. (Weinstein Decl. ¶ 7.) These early bids, however, will not be accepted until after the Auction officially begins at 6:00 am Pacific time on July 27. (Weinstein Decl. ¶ 7.)

III. LEGAL STANDARD

“The opportunities for legitimate ex parte applications are extremely limited.” Horne v. Wells Fargo Bank, 969 F. Supp. 2d 1203, 1205 (C.D. Cal. 2013) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted). A successful ex parte application must demonstrate that there is good cause to allow the moving party to “go to the head of the line in front of all other litigants and receive special treatment.” Mission Power Eng’g Co. v. Cont’l Cas. Co., 883 F. Supp. 488, 492 (C.D. Cal. 1995). “The use of such a procedure is justified only when (1) there is a threat of immediate or irreparable injury; (2) there is danger that notice to the other party may result in the destruction of evidence or the party’s flight; or (3) the party seeks a routine procedural order that cannot be obtained through a regularly noticed motion (i.e., to file an overlong brief or shorten the time within which a motion may be brought).” Horne, 969 F. Supp. 2d at 1205.

A temporary restraining order is available when the applicant may suffer irreparable injury before the court can hear the application for a preliminary injunction. 11A Charles Alan Wright, Arthur R. Miller & Mary Kay Kane, Federal Practice and Procedure § 2951 (3d. 1998); see Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(b). But requests for temporary restraining orders are governed by the same general standards that

A preliminary injunction is an “extraordinary and drastic remedy” that is never awarded as of right. Munaf v. Geren, 553 U.S. 674, 689-90 (2008) (citation omitted). The court must determine whether the plaintiff has established all of the following: (1) it is likely to succeed on the merits; (2) it is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief; (3) the balance of equities tips in its favor; and (4) an injunction is in the public interest. Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc., 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008).

Before these standards were announced in Winter, courts in the Ninth Circuit applied an alternative “sliding-scale” test for evaluating preliminary injunctions that allowed the movant to offset the weakness of a showing on one factor with the strength of another, which is what Plaintiff erroneously relies upon as an “alternative” test. See Mot. at 20-21; Alliance for Wild Rockies v. Cottrell, 632 F.3d 1127, 1132-35 (9th Cir. 2011). The Ninth Circuit has since held, however, that “[t]o the extent our cases have suggested a lesser standard, they are no longer controlling, or even viable.” Am. Trucking Assocs. v. City of L.A., 559 F.3d 1046, 1052 (9th Cir. 2009). Accordingly, Plaintiff must show it can meet all four of the preliminary injunction requirements set forth above. Plaintiff has not.

IV. ARGUMENT

A. PLAINTIFF SEEKS EMERGENCY RELIEF ONLY BECAUSE OF ITS OWN DELAY.

Ex parte relief may not be awarded if the “emergency” nature of the request is of the plaintiff’s “own making.” See, e.g., Pascascio v. New Century Mortg. Corp., No. CV 12-839 PSG (FMOx), 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 68533, at *7 (C.D. Cal. May 16, 2012) (denying temporary restraining order). Here, the urgent timing of Plaintiff’s ex parte TRO was caused by its own delay.
Plaintiff’s Complaint squarely admits that as of June 7, 2016, it was in possession of all facts that it now submits as support for this dispute. Namely, that as of at least June 7, 2016, Plaintiff purportedly believed there was a discrepancy between Nu Dotco’s application and its current ownership or management, and that Nu Dotco would not agree to postpone the Auction. (Compl. ¶ 38.) On June 29, 2016, ICANN met with Mr. Nevett to discuss a number of business matters, including his claims regarding Nu Dotco’s management. (Willett Decl. ¶ 15.) During that meeting, Mr. Nevett requested that the Auction be postponed because of his claimed concerns that Nu Dotco had undergone a change in ownership or management. (Willett Decl. ¶ 15.) ICANN informed him that it had already investigated the alleged management changes with Nu Dotco’s representative, who had confirmed that no such changes had occurred. (Willett Decl. ¶ 15.) Based on the fact that ICANN had no evidence of such a management change, ICANN was continuing to proceed with the Auction as scheduled. Thus, in early June Plaintiff could have filed its action and sought the relief it now seeks on an ex parte basis. And at the very latest, Plaintiff could have sought relief shortly after ICANN informed Plaintiff, on July 13, 2016, that ICANN “has investigated the matter” and had no intention of postponing the Auction. (Compl. ¶ 43.) Instead, Plaintiff waited until July 22 to file this matter, after many facets of the Auction process had already begun (see Weinstein Decl. ¶ 7), and just two business days before bidding officially begins.

ICANN and the Court are both therefore forced to rush into this matter, which Plaintiff could have commenced weeks earlier. Because the emergency Plaintiff invokes is entirely of Plaintiff’s own making, the relief must be denied. See, e.g., Carnero v. Wash. Mut., No. C 09-5330 JF (RS), 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 123532, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 30, 2009) (“Plaintiffs would have had to receive notice of any sale some time ago; accordingly, the ‘emergency’ nature of their application appears to be of their own making.”).
B. PLAINTIFF DOES NOT MEET THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE ISSUANCE OF A TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER.


Plaintiff is not likely to succeed on the merits of its claims. Each of Plaintiff’s causes of action is completely dependent on the assertion that there was a change to Nu Dotco’s ownership or management that required ICANN to halt the Auction. The evidence submitted by ICANN with this Opposition—in particular, the sworn declarations of Nu Dotco’s officers—demonstrate that Plaintiff’s assertion is false and that ICANN reached the correct conclusion in finding no basis to delay the Auction. For instance, Nu Dotco’s CFO, Mr. Rasco, has again confirmed, now under penalty of perjury, that “[t]here have been no changes or amendments made to Nu Dotco’s management since the time that Nu Dotco submitted its .WEB application to ICANN” and that “[t]here have been no changes or amendments made to Nu Dotco’s membership, nor has any transfer of membership otherwise occurred, since the time that Nu Dotco submitted its application to ICANN.” (Rasco Decl. ¶¶ 6, 8.) Nu Dotco’s COO, Mr. Bezsonoff, confirms the same in his declaration and explains that even though he is employed by another company currently, he is still performing his duties as an officer of Nu Dotco while they await resolution of the .WEB Contention Set. (Bezsonoff Decl. ¶¶ 5-6, 8-9.) Finally, Mr. Rasco explains in his declaration that the single email Plaintiff relies upon to support its claims was taken completely out of context and in no way communicated a change of ownership or management at Nu Dotco because there was no such change. (Rasco Decl. ¶¶ 11-15.)

Because there is no evidence justifying postponement of the Auction, each of Plaintiff’s claims fail. And each claim is further deficient for the following reasons.

(a) Plaintiff Is Unlikely To Succeed On The Merits Of The Contract Claim.

Plaintiff’s breach of contract claim alleges that ICANN did not fulfill its
obligations set forth in the Bylaws, Articles or Guidebook in two ways, yet Plaintiff will not succeed on the merits of either. (Compl. ¶¶ 54-63.)

First, Plaintiff alleges that ICANN breached its commitments under the Bylaws to operate in a transparent, expedient, neutral and prompt manner. (Compl. ¶ 60.) To start, the only contractual relationship between ICANN and Plaintiff is by virtue of its status as an applicant for .WEB; Plaintiff does not cite any reasoning or authority that suggests the terms of ICANN’s Bylaws are incorporated into the contractual relationship between Plaintiffs and ICANN. See Klein v. Chevron U.S.A., Inc., 202 Cal. App. 4th 1342, 1384 (2012) (courts “must determine whether the alleged agreement is ‘reasonably susceptible’ to the meaning ascribed to it in the complaint” for breach of contract claims) (citation omitted); Republic Bank v. Marine Nat’l Bank, 45 Cal. App. 4th 919, 923 (1996) (“A secondary document becomes part of a contract as though recited verbatim when it is incorporated into the contract by reference provided that the terms of the incorporated document are readily available to the other party.”) (emphasis added and citation omitted).

Indeed, this Court has considered this precise issue in connection with another case filed by a disappointed applicant against ICANN, and held that ICANN is only bound by the contractual obligations set forth in the application documents to which ICANN agreed to be bound, not other extraneous materials. See Image Online Design, Inc. v. Internet Corp. for Assigned Names & Nos., No. CV 12-08968 DDP (JCx), 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16896, at *9, 11 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 7, 2013) (dismissing breach of contract claim because the contract’s “provisions give ICANN no responsibilities with respect to [the plaintiff’s new gTLD] Application beyond its initial consideration of the Application . . . [the applicant] has pointed to no contract terms that ICANN has breached.”) (Pregerson, J.).

Moreover, ICANN did not breach any of the cited Bylaws. As discussed above, and as is replete in the evidence, ICANN engaged in a thorough and transparent investigation of Plaintiff’s claims about Nu Dotco’s ownership or
management. Through multiple steps, ICANN staff verified that this claim was factually inaccurate, and transparently informed Plaintiff of the results of its investigation in its July 13, 2016 letter. (Compl. ¶ 43.) In addition, ICANN’s Ombudsman investigated Plaintiff’s claims and found there was no support for them. (Willett Decl. ¶¶ 11, 17, 19, 21.) Finally, ICANN’s BGC independently evaluated Plaintiff’s assertions and concluded that there was no evidence showing that postponement was necessary. (Zecchini Decl., Ex. I.) And, tellingly, each of these separate findings have been confirmed by the declarations of Nu Dotco executives stating, under penalty of perjury, that no ownership or management change has occurred. (See generally Rasco Decl.; Bezsonoff Decl.)

As to the second portion of Plaintiff’s breach of contract claim, Plaintiff alleges that “ICANN also promised that a contention set would only proceed to auction where all active applications in the contention set have ‘no pending ICANN Accountability Mechanisms’.” (Compl. ¶ 61.) This argument ignores the plain text of the Auction Rules. All applicants agreed to the terms of the Guidebook when they applied, and Plaintiff has recently signed a Bidder’s Agreement agreeing that the Auction is governed by the Auction Rules. The operative Auction Rules, dated February 24, 2015, state that all “pending ICANN Accountability Mechanisms” must be resolved “prior to the scheduling of an Auction.” (Zecchini Decl., Ex. J ¶ 10 (emphasis added).) Here, the Auction was scheduled on April 27, well before Plaintiff invoked any ICANN accountability mechanism. Plaintiff did not lodge a complaint with the Ombudsman until late June, two months after the Auction was scheduled. (Compl. ¶ 40.) Similarly, Plaintiff did not submit a Reconsideration Request until July 17. (Compl. ¶ 49.) And Plaintiff did not even attempt to initiate a Request for Independent Review until July 22, 2016. (Nevett Decl. ¶ 9.) Thus, no ICANN accountability mechanisms were pending on April 27, 2016 when the Auction was scheduled. Indeed, the Auction Rules were designed to, among other things, prevent exactly this sort of late, unilateral attempt to delay an auction.
Finally, Plaintiff’s allegation that ICANN was motivated by money to not investigate Plaintiff’s claims regarding Nu Dotco because ICANN receives the financial proceeds of all new gTLD auctions (Compl. ¶ 62), is misguided. As a nonprofit, ICANN has no interest in financial gain for its own sake. The plain text of the Guidebook makes clear that ICANN will put all proceeds stemming from new gTLD auctions toward charitable purposes: “Any proceeds from auctions will be reserved and earmarked until the uses of funds are determined. Funds must be used in a manner that supports directly ICANN’s Mission and Core Values and also allows ICANN to maintain its not for profit status.” (Guidebook § 4.3, n.1.) More specifically, the Guidebook provides that “[p]ossible uses of auction funds include formation of a foundation with a clear mission and a transparent way to allocate funds to projects that are of interest to the greater Internet community . . . .” (Id.) As has been widely publicized, the auction proceeds will be utilized in a manner to be determined by the community, which is likely to predominantly include various global charitable purposes, as the Guidebook suggests. These auction proceeds have been reserved until the ICANN Board authorizes a plan for the appropriate use of the funds. (Weinstein Decl. ¶ 7.) The ICANN community has indicated that it wants to create a Cross-Community Working Group to develop proposals for eventual consideration by the ICANN Board. (Weinstein Decl. ¶ 7.) During the ICANN56 Public Meeting, a meeting took place on June 28, 2016 to discuss the formation of that Cross-Community Working Group.3

(b) Plaintiff Is Unlikely To Succeed On The Merits Of The Breach Of Implied Covenant Of Good Faith And Fair Dealing Claim.

Plaintiff’s breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing claim relies on the same allegations asserted in the breach of contract claims—that

---

3 See https://icann562016.sched.org/event/7NE0/cross-community-session-charter-for-the-ccwg-on-auction-proceeds?iframe=no&w=i:100;&sidebar=yes&bg=no.
ICANN did not conduct an “adequate investigation” of Nu Dotco and improperly failed to postpone the Auction. (Compl. ¶ 67.) Thus, Plaintiff’s breach of the implied covenant claims is as deficient as its breach of contract claim.

(c) Plaintiff Is Unlikely To Succeed On The Merits Of The Negligence Claim.

Plaintiff is on even less firm footing with respect to its negligence claim. “Actionable negligence is traditionally regarded as involving the following: (a) a legal duty to use due care; (b) a breach of such legal duty; (c) the breach as the proximate or legal cause of the resulting injury.” *Jackson v. AEG Live, Inc.*, 233 Cal. App. 4th 1156, 1173 (2015) (citation omitted). ICANN, however, owes Plaintiff no legal duty of care, and, in any event, ICANN did not breach any duty owed to Plaintiff.

To start, the economic loss rule bars Plaintiff’s negligence claim, because ICANN owes no legal duty to Plaintiff above and beyond its contractual obligations. As the California Supreme Court has recognized, “[t]he economic loss rule requires a [contractual party] to recover in contract for purely economic loss due to disappointed expectations, unless he can demonstrate harm above and beyond a broken contractual promise.” *Robinson Helicopter Co. v. Dana Corp.*, 34 Cal. 4th 979, 988 (2004); *In re iPhone Application Litig.*, 844 F. Supp. 2d 1040, 1064 (N.D. Cal. 2012) (“Purely economic damages to a plaintiff which stem from disappointed expectations from a commercial transaction must be addressed through contract law; negligence is not a viable cause of action for such claims.”). Plaintiff has not alleged any harm other than purported damages stemming from its contractual relationship with ICANN. The negligence claim must therefore fail as a matter of law. *See In re Sony Gaming Networks & Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, 996 F. Supp. 2d 942, 973 (S.D. Cal. 2014) (granting motion to dismiss negligence claim with prejudice based on economic loss rule).
(d) Plaintiff Is Unlikely To Succeed On The Merits Of The Unfair Competition Claim.

Plaintiff makes allegations under all three prongs of Section 17200. First, Plaintiff claims that ICANN acted in an “unlawful” manner by including the Covenant Not to Sue in the Guidebook. (Compl. ¶ 77.) Second, Plaintiff alleges that ICANN acted “unfair[ly]” when it conducted what Plaintiff views as a “cursory investigation” into Plaintiff’s claims about Nu Dotco, and decided based on that investigation not to postpone the Auction. (Compl. ¶ 78.) Third, Plaintiff alleges that ICANN acted in a fraudulent manner when it represented that it would adhere to the terms of its Bylaws and the Auction Rules. (Compl. ¶ 79.) All three claims fail because there is nothing unlawful about the Covenant Not to Sue, as discussed below, ICANN fully investigated Plaintiff’s claims regarding Nu Dotco and ICANN’s conduct at all times complied with its obligations under its Bylaws and the Guidebook. In addition, Plaintiff has not established standing to assert its Section 17200 claim because Plaintiff has not “lost money or property” because of the alleged violations of the statute, as required. Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203.

(e) Plaintiff Is Unlikely To Succeed On The Merits Of The Declaratory Relief Claim.

Plaintiff’s declaratory relief claim seeks a judicial declaration concerning one and only one matter: “the legality and effect” of the Covenant Not to Sue. Yet for all of the reasons discussed below, the Covenant Not to Sue is fully enforceable. See generally Commercial Connect v. Internet Corp. for Assigned Names & Nos., No. 3:16-cv-00012-JHM, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8550 (W.D. Ky. Jan. 26, 2016) (denying an application for emergency injunctive relief seeking to prevent a new gTLD auction from taking place the next day). Moreover, the enforceability of the Covenant Not to Sue has no bearing on whether the Auction should proceed. Even if Plaintiff were successful in challenging the Covenant Not to Sue, Plaintiff has no cause of action against ICANN. In other words, the Auction could and should
proceed while Plaintiff litigates whether it can litigate with ICANN.

2. **Plaintiff Will Not Suffer Irreparable Harm In The Absence Of The Requested Injunctive Relief.**

Plaintiff will *not* suffer irreparable harm in the absence of the requested injunctive relief. To start, monetary loss does not comprise irreparable injury for purposes of assessing the propriety of injunctive relief. *Amylin Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.*, 456 F. App’x 676, 678 (9th Cir. 2011) (affirming denial of preliminary injunction because “harm that is fully compensable through money damages . . . does not support injunctive relief”). Whatever the results of the Auction, any harm Plaintiff might claim to have suffered is purely financial. Indeed, Plaintiff may well win the Auction for .WEB. Should that occur, its only claim would arise from the presence of Nu Dotco in the Auction, possibly raising Plaintiff’s winning bid. But the risk that an auction might include a participant subject to later disqualification is already fully addressed in the agreed Auction Rules. In particular, paragraph 62 of the Auction Rules concerns “Effect of Ineligibility of Winner To Sign a Registry Agreement or To Be Delegated the Contention String.” It provides mechanisms to address the situation when an auction took place with a participant that is later disqualified. Having agreed to these mechanisms, Plaintiff has no basis to assert that losses from such circumstances are irreparable. To the extent it is concerned about “disclosure of how each of the applicant’s [sic] valued .WEB as well as the bidding strategies for each bidder,” (Mot. at 28) it has already agreed that such disclosure does not justify cancelling an auction.

Moreover, the results of an auction “could be undone” if a disqualification is discovered even long afterward. (*Cf.* Mot. at 28.) There is no technological barrier that would prevent the transfer of the Registry Agreement for a gTLD from one registry operator to another after the gTLD is contracted or even delegated into the root zone and in operation. (Weinstein Decl. ¶ 15.) In fact, Section 7.5 of the Registry Agreement defines the rules and regulations regarding the process for
transferring a gTLD from one registry operator to another. (Weinstein Decl. ¶ 15.)

For that reason as well, Plaintiff cannot demonstrate that it will suffer irreparable harm if the Auction goes forward.

Plaintiff has not shown irreparable harm, and that failure alone serves as a basis to deny the requested relief. *ET Trading, Ltd. v. ClearPlex Direct, LLC*, No. 15-CV-00426-LHK, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 25894, at *8 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 2, 2015) (“The Court need not address all of the *Winter* factors because the Court finds that Plaintiff has failed to carry its burden of demonstrating that it would be irreparably harmed absent a temporary restraining order”).

3. **The Balance Of The Equities Weighs Against The Issuance Of Injunctive Relief.**

As for the balance of the harms, Plaintiff claims that “ICANN cannot claim any actual harm” were the Auction to be postponed. Not so. If ICANN postpones the Auction with no basis (and there is none here), it would be manifestly unfair to the other applicants that have invested time and money in their applications, and have deposited funds into an escrow account in preparation for the Auction. In addition, should the Auction be cancelled, ICANN would suffer a monetary loss of at least $10,000, in the form of a fee the Auction provider would charge ICANN, and then pay more fees and invest more administrative expense when the Auction is almost certainly re-scheduled. *(See Weinstein Decl. ¶ 13.)* Others of the scheduled participants, many of which did not join Plaintiff’s request to postpone, would also be harmed by delay. They have made large deposits (up to $2 million each) in anticipation of the auction and have otherwise engaged in significant preparation. *(Weinstein Decl. ¶ 7.)* In short, a delay in the Auction and resolution of the Contention Set will disrupt the orderly progression of the New gTLD Program.

4. **The Public Interest Strongly Favors Denying Plaintiff’s Application For A Temporary Restraining Order.**

Plaintiff bears the burden of showing that its requested injunctive relief is in
the public interest. *Stormans, Inc. v. Selecky*, 586 F.3d 1109, 1139 (9th Cir. 2009).

Indeed, where rules are at play that all relevant parties have relied upon, the public interest weighs in favor of enforcing those rules. *Id.* at 1140. Here, there is no authority in the Guidebook, Auction Rules, elsewhere that requires ICANN to postpone the Auction. Such delay would set a precedent that would upset the orderly expansion of gTLDs. Should the Court award Plaintiff the relief it seeks, any applicant headed to auction could concoct a minor discrepancy it claims exists with respect to another applicant within the same contention set, and seek to rely on this Court’s ruling to support postponement of the auction. When such widespread harm could result from the issuance of injunctive relief, affecting public rights as well as those of the parties to the lawsuit, “the court may in the public interest withhold relief until a final determination of the rights of the parties, though the postponement [of the requested relief] may be burdensome to the plaintiff.” *Weinberger v. Romero-Barcelo*, 456 U.S. 305, 312 (1982) (citation omitted).

C. THE COVENANT NOT TO SUE BARS THIS LAWSUIT.

Apart from Plaintiff’s delay in bring this action and Plaintiff’s inability to satisfy the elements required for issuance of the TRO, Plaintiff’s claims against ICANN are barred by the Covenant Not to Sue, which Plaintiff acknowledged and Plaintiff’s ultimate parent company accepted over 300 times through its subsidiaries. Indeed, as the district court in the Western District of Kentucky recently held under nearly identical circumstances, the Covenant Not to Sue is “clear and comprehensive” and bars claims “aris[ing] out of ICANN’s review of [a new gTLD application] . . . .” *Commercial Connect*, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8550, at *9-10.

A written release extinguishes any claim covered by its terms. *Skrbina v. Fleming Cos.*, 45 Cal. App. 4th 1353, 1366 (1996). Further, “a general release can be completely enforceable and act as a complete bar to all claims (known or unknown at the time of the release) despite protestations by one of the parties that

Plaintiff recognizes these principles, and argues that the Covenant Not to Sue is unenforceable for one and only one reason: California Civil Code § 1668 (“Section 1668”). *(See Mot. at 25, 27.)* But Section 1668 only invalidates contracts that “exempt anyone from responsibility for his own fraud, or willful injury to the person or property of another.” Cal. Civ. Code § 1668. Courts have interpreted Section 1668’s phrase “willful injury to the person or property of another” to mean more than merely intentional conduct (such as breach of the contract), but instead “*intentional wrongs.*” *Frittelli, Inc. v. 350 N. Canon Drive, LP*, 202 Cal. App. 4th 35, 43 (2011) (“Ordinarily, the statute invalidates contracts that purport to exempt an individual or entity from liability for future intentional wrongs and gross negligence.”) (emphasis added and citations omitted).

The most Plaintiff alleges in its Complaint is that ICANN failed to thoroughly investigate Nu Dotco’s ownership and management because ICANN preferred the Auction to proceed. *(Compl. ¶ 68.)* But even such wild accusations do not comprise the kind of intentional wrongs covered by Section 1668. Indeed, *Food Safety Net Servs. v. Eco Safe Sys. USA, Inc.*, 209 Cal. App. 4th 1118 (2012), is on point. There, a food-disinfectant equipment manufacturer alleged that a food-safety equipment tester failed to test the equipment using agreed-upon standards, in bad faith, and employed “slovenly procedures which seemed to be slanted towards a preconceived conclusion.” *(Id. at 1125 (citation omitted).* Despite these allegations and an invocation of Section 1668, the court held that a limitation of liability clause in the parties’ contract was enforceable and barred not only the plaintiff’s claim for breach of contract but also plaintiff’s “bad faith” claim. *(Id. at 1125–27, 1130.*

In addition, interpreting Section 1668 to invalidate the Covenant Not to Sue runs contrary to the public interest. The Guidebook is not merely a contract
between two parties. It was adopted through an extensive public comment process
to govern the nearly 2,000 applications that ICANN received and was tasked with
evaluating—including competing applications for the same gTLD such as those of
Plaintiff and Nu Dotco. The Covenant Not to Sue ensures that the processing of
these applications does not get ensnared in endless litigation by disappointed
applicants. If Plaintiff’s argument is accepted, the Covenant Not to Sue could
become dead letter—and the important purposes it serves frustrated.

Plaintiff argues that the recent, unpublished district court decision in
_DotConnectAfrica Trust v. ICANN_ supports its position. (See Mot. at 9 (citing
_DotConnectAfrica Trust v. Internet Corporation for Assigned Names & Nos., et al.,
argument is unavailing for three reasons. First, it cannot be squared with another
recent ruling upholding the Covenant Not to Sue, namely _Commercial Connect,
LLC v. Internet Corp. for Assigned Names and Numbers_, No. 3:16CV-00012-JHM,
Connect_—which, unlike _DCA_, involved an effort to enjoin an auction – the court
denied a temporary restraining order requested by an applicant for the .SHOP gTLD
one day before the auction was to take place. _Id._ at *1, 11. The district court ruled
that the Covenant Not to Sue appeared enforceable and for that reason denied the
requested injunctive relief. _Id._ at *10-11. That Plaintiff does not cite the case from
Kentucky in its TRO is telling; it comprises a well-reasoned, directly on point
decision. Second, the district court’s ruling in _DCA_ was issued at the preliminary
injunction stage, so it is merely the view of one court that there are “serious
questions” as to its enforceability. Third, that very ruling is currently on appeal to
the Ninth Circuit on an expedited basis.

V. **PLAINTIFF’S EXPEDITED DISCOVERY REQUEST MUST ALSO BE DENIED.**

Plaintiff’s request for expedited discovery, from both ICANN and non-
parties alike, is unjustifiably onerous and there is no legal basis for the request.

Such an extreme demand may only be granted with good cause, which exists only where the need for expedited discovery, in consideration of the administration of justice, outweighs the prejudice to the responding party. *Semitool, Inc. v. Tokyo Electron Am., Inc.*, 208 F.R.D. 273, 276 (N.D. Cal. 2002).

Here there is no good cause. To put it simply, whether Nu Dotco changed ownership or management is a yes or no question. After a reasonable investigation, ICANN determined that the answer is no.⁴ Now, Nu Dotco’s managers have declared the same under penalty of perjury. No discovery could possibly aid the Court in resolving the baseless claims Plaintiff raises here, and the request for expedited discovery should therefore be denied, along with the TRO application. *See Dimension Data N. Am., Inc. v. Netstar-1, Inc.*, 226 F.R.D. 528, 532 (E.D.N.C. 2005) (denying expedited discovery where requests not narrowly tailored to obtain information relevant to requested preliminary injunction).

VI. **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff’s TRO application must be denied.

Dated: July 25, 2016

JONES DAY

By: /s/ Eric P. Enson

Eric P. Enson

Attorneys for Defendant

INTERNET CORPORATION FOR ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS

⁴ Even if the answer were “yes,” the ordinary response would be to allow Nu Dotco to amend its application. And even if Nu Dotco had submitted a change request because it had undergone a change of control or ownership, it would not have been disqualified from the auction set to take place on July 27, 2016. (Willett Decl. ¶ 11.) In fact, a large number of applications have made a change the questions pertaining to ownership or control of the applicant, and no application has been disqualified to date over one of these changes. (Willett Decl. ¶ 11.) The Auction Rules also provide that “ICANN reserves the right . . . to postpone a scheduled Auction if a change request by one or more applicants in the Contention Set is pending, but believes that in most instances the Auction should be able to proceed without further delay.” (Zecchini Decl., Ex. C ¶ 8 (emphasis added).)
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RESPONDENT’S EXHIBIT
Before the Court is an Ex Parte Application for Temporary Restraining Order (“Application for TRO”) filed by plaintiff Ruby Glen, LLC (“Plaintiff”). Plaintiff seeks to temporarily enjoin defendant Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (“ICANN”) from conducting an auction for the rights to operate the registry for the generic top level domain (“gTLD”) for .web. Currently, that auction is set for 6:00 a.m. on July 27, 2016. Pursuant to Rule 78 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rule 7-15, the Court finds that this matter is appropriate for decision without oral argument.

Plaintiff applied to ICANN in 2012 to operate the registry for the .web gTLD. Because other entities also applied to operate the .web gTLD, ICANN’s procedures require all of the applicants, what are referred to as “contention sets,” to first attempt to resolve their competing claims, but if they cannot do so, ICANN will conduct an auction and award the rights to operate the registry to the winning bidder. According to Plaintiff, one of the competing entities, Nu Dotco, LLC (“NDC”) is unwilling to informally resolve the competing claims and has instead insisted on proceeding to an auction. Plaintiff asserts that it learned on June 7, 2016, that NDC has experienced recent changes in its management and ownership since it initially submitted its application to ICANN but that NDC has not provided ICANN with updated information as required by ICANN’s application requirements. Specifically, the email from NDC’s Jose Ignacio Rasco stated:

The three of us are still technically the managers of the LLC, but the decision goes beyond just us. Nicolai [Bezsonoff] is at Neustar, Inc.] full time and no longer involved with our TLD applications. I’m still running our program and Juan [Diego Calle] sits on the board with me and several others. Based on your request, I went back to check with all the powers that be and there was no change in the response and [we] will not be seeking an extension.

(Docket No. 8, Decl. of Jonathon Nevett, Ex. A.)

\footnote{According to Plaintiff, Bezsonoff was identified on NDC’s ICANN application as NDC’s “secondary contact.”}
Plaintiff alleges that it requested that ICANN conduct an investigation regarding the discrepancies in NDC’s application beginning on June 22, 2016 and requested a postponement of the auction. At least one other applicant seeking to operate the .web registry has also requested that ICANN postpone the auction and investigate NDC’s current management and ownership structure. ICANN denied the requests on July 13, 2016, and stated that “in regards to potential changes of control of NuDOT CO LLC, we have investigated the matter and to date we have found no basis to initiate the application change request process or postpone the auction.” Plaintiff and another of the applicants then submitted a request for reconsideration to ICANN on July 17, 2016. ICANN denied the request for reconsideration on July 21, 2016.

Plaintiff, relying on the Court’s diversity jurisdiction, filed this action in this Court on July 22, 2016. According to the Complaint, Plaintiff “is a limited liability company, duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware and operated by an affiliate located in Bellevue, Washington.” (Compl. ¶ 4.) The Complaint alleges that ICANN “is a nonprofit corporation, organized and existing under the laws of the State of California, with its principal place of business in Los Angeles, California.” (Id. ¶ 5.) Plaintiff asserts claims for: (1) breach of contract; (2) breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing; (3) negligence; (4) unfair competition pursuant to California Business and Professions Code section 17200; and (5) declaratory relief. Plaintiff filed its Application for TRO at the same time it filed its Complaint.

As an initial matter, the Court notes that the Application for TRO fails to satisfy the requirements for a valid Ex Parte Application. Specifically, under Local Rule 7-19.1, an attorney making an ex parte application has a duty to give notice by making reasonable good faith efforts to orally advise counsel for the other parties, if known, of the proposed ex parte application, and “to advise the Court in writing of efforts to contact other counsel and whether any other counsel, after such advice, opposes the application or has requested to be present when the application is presented to the Court.” Here, Plaintiff did not notify the Court in writing of its efforts to notify opposing counsel of the Application for TRO or if ICANN intended to file an Opposition. These violations of the Local Rules are themselves sufficient to deny Plaintiff’s Application for TRO. See Standing Order 6:5-7 (“Applications which fail to conform with Local Rules 7-19 and 7-19.1, including a statement of opposing counsel’s position, will not be considered.”). Additionally, Plaintiff did not submit a proposed order with the Application for TRO as required by Local Rule 7-20. See Local Rule 7-20 (“A separate proposed order shall be lodged with any motion or application requiring an order of the Court, pursuant to L.R. 52-4.1.”). Finally, the Application for TRO was not accompanied by a proof of service as required by Local Rule 5-3.1. Indeed, according to ICANN, as of July 25, 2016, Plaintiff had not served ICANN with the Complaint or Application for TRO. Had ICANN not filed its Notice of Intent to File Opposition, the Court would have denied the Application for TRO as a result of these procedural deficiencies and violations of the Local Rules. See, e.g., Reno Air Racing Ass’n, Inc. v. McCord, 452 F.3d 1126, 1131 (9th Cir. 2006) (“[C]ourts have recognized very few circumstances justifying the issuance of an ex parte TRO [without notice].”). Despite these violations of the Local Rules, the Court will address the merits of Plaintiff’s Application for TRO because ICANN filed an Opposition. Future violations of the Local Rules, this Court’s Orders, or the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure may result in the striking of the offending documents or the imposition of sanctions.
The standard for issuing a temporary restraining order is identical to the standard for issuing a preliminary injunction. See Lockheed Missile & Space Co., Inc. v. Hughes Aircraft Co., 887 F. Supp. 1320, 1323 (N.D. Cal. 1995). “A plaintiff seeking a preliminary injunction must establish that he is likely to succeed on the merits, that he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, that the balance of equities tips in his favor, and that an injunction is in the public interest.” Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council, 555 U.S. 7, 20, 129 S. Ct. 365, 374, 172 L. Ed. 2d 249 (2008). “A preliminary injunction is an extraordinary remedy never awarded as of right.” Id. The Ninth Circuit employs a “sliding scale” approach to preliminary injunctions as part of this four-element test. Alliance for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell, 632 F.3d 1127, 1135 (9th Cir. 2011). Under this “sliding scale,” a preliminary injunction may issue “when a plaintiff demonstrates . . . that serious questions going to the merits were raised and the balance of hardships tips sharply in the plaintiff’s favor,” as long as the other two Winter factors have also been met. Id. (internal citations omitted). “[A] preliminary injunction is an extraordinary and drastic remedy, one that should not be granted unless the movant, by a clear showing, carries the burden of persuasion.” Mazurek v. Armstrong, 520 U.S. 968, 972, 117 S. Ct. 1865, 1867, 138 L. Ed. 2d 162 (1997).

Plaintiff’s breach of contract, breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing, and negligence claims are all based on provisions in ICANN’s bylaws and the ICANN Applicant Guidebook stating, for instance, that ICANN will make “decisions by applying documented policies neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness,” that ICANN will remain “accountable to the Internet community through mechanisms that enhance ICANN’s effectiveness,” and that no contention set will proceed to auction unless there is “no pending ICANN accountability mechanism.” Plaintiff’s unlawful business practices act and declaratory relief claims allege that a covenant not to sue contained in the ICANN Application Guidebook is invalid and unlawful under California law. That release states:

Applicant hereby releases ICANN and the ICANN Affiliated Parties from any and all claims by applicant that arise out of, are based upon, or are in any way related to, any action, or failure to act, by ICANN or any ICANN Affiliated Party in connection with ICANN’s or an ICANN Affiliated Party’s review of this application, investigation or verification, any characterization or description of applicant or the information in this application, any withdrawal of this application or the decision by ICANN to recommend, or not to recommend, the approval of applicant’s gTLD application. APPLICANT AGREES NOT TO CHALLENGE, IN COURT OR IN ANY OTHER JUDICIAL FORA, ANY FINAL DECISION MADE BY ICANN WITH RESPECT TO THE APPLICATION, AND IRREVOCABLY WAIVES ANY RIGHT TO SUE OR PROCEED IN COURT OR ANY OTHER JUDICIAL FORA ON THE BASIS OF ANY OTHER LEGAL CLAIM AGAINST ICANN AND ICANN AFFILIATED PARTIES WITH RESPECT TO THE APPLICATION . . .
Even if, as Plaintiff contends, this release is not valid, and Plaintiff could therefore be considered likely to prevail on its unlawful business practices and declaratory relief claims, the potential invalidity of the release — an issue the Court does not reach — is a separate issue that is not related to the propriety of proceeding with the auction for the .web registry. As a result, those claims, and Plaintiff’s likelihood of success on them, are not relevant to Plaintiff’s Application for TRO and do not provide a basis for enjoining the .web auction.

In its Opposition to the Application for TRO, ICANN contends that Plaintiff has not established the requisite likelihood of success on the merits or irreparable harm to justify the issuance of the preliminary injunctive relief it seeks. Specifically, ICANN has provided evidence that it has conducted investigations into Plaintiff’s allegations concerning potential changes in NDC’s management and ownership structure at each level of Plaintiff’s appeals to ICANN for an investigation and postponement of the auction. During those investigations, NDC provided evidence to ICANN that it had made no material changes to its management and ownership structure. Additionally, ICANN’s Opposition is supported by the Declarations of Nicolai Bezsonoff and Jose Ignacio Rasco, who declare under penalty of perjury that there have been no changes to NDC’s management, membership, or ownership since NDC first filed its application with ICANN.

Based on the strength of ICANN’s evidence submitted in opposition to the Application for TRO, and the weakness of Plaintiff’s efforts to enforce vague terms contained in the ICANN bylaws and Applicant Guidebook, the Court concludes that Plaintiff has failed to establish that it is likely to succeed on the merits, raise serious issues, or show that the balance of hardships tips sharply in its favor on its breach of contract, breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing, and negligence claims. Moreover, because the results of the auction could be unwound, Plaintiff has not met its burden to establish that it will suffer irreparable harm in the absence of the preliminary injunctive relief it seeks. The Court additionally concludes that the public interest does not favor the postponement of the auction.

Finally, the Court notes that Plaintiff’s Complaint has not adequately alleged a basis for this Court’s jurisdiction. Jurisdiction may be based on complete diversity of citizenship, requiring all plaintiffs to have a different citizenship from all defendants and for the amount in controversy to exceed $75,000.00. See 28 U.S.C. § 1332; Owen Equip. & Erection Co. v. Kroger, 437 U.S. 365, 373, 98 S. Ct. 2396, 2402, 57 L. Ed. 2d 274 (1978). To establish citizenship for diversity purposes, a natural person must be a citizen of the United States and be domiciled in a particular state. Kantor v. Wellesley Galleries, Ltd., 704 F.2d 1088, 1090 (9th Cir. 1983). Persons are domiciled in the places they reside with the intent to remain or to which they intend to return. See Kanter v. Warner-Lambert Co., 265 F.3d 853, 857 (9th Cir. 2001). “A person residing in a given state is not necessarily domiciled there, and thus is not necessarily a citizen of that state.” Id. A corporation is a citizen of both its state of incorporation and the state in which it has its principal place of business. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(c)(1); see also New Alaska Dev. Corp. v. Guetschow, 869 F.2d 1298, 1300-01 (9th Cir. 1989). Finally, the citizenship of a partnership or other unincorporated entity is the citizenship of its members. See Johnson v. Columbia Props. Anchorage, LP, 437 F.3d 894, 899 (9th Cir. 2006) (“[I]ke a partnership, an LLC is a citizen of every state of which its owners/members are citizens.”); Marseilles Hydro Power, LLC v. Marseilles Land & Water Co., 299 F.3d 643, 652 (7th Cir. 2002) (“the relevant citizenship [of an LLC] for
The Complaint fails to establish that the parties are completely diverse. Specifically, by failing to identify and allege the citizenship of its own members, Plaintiff, a limited liability company, has not properly alleged its own citizenship. Accordingly, the Court is unable to ascertain whether it may exercise subject matter jurisdiction over this action. Without Plaintiff having adequately alleged a proper jurisdictional basis, the Court would not grant Plaintiff’s Application for TRO even if Plaintiff had otherwise satisfied the requirements for injunctive relief.

Despite Plaintiff’s failure to properly allege the Court’s subject matter jurisdiction, a district court may, and should, grant leave to amend when it appears that subject matter jurisdiction may exist, even though the complaint inadequately alleges jurisdiction. See 28 U.S.C. § 1653; Trentacosta v. Frontier Pacific Aircraft Industries, Inc., 813 F.2d 1553, 1555 (9th Cir. 1987). Therefore, the Court grants Plaintiff leave to amend the Complaint to attempt to establish federal subject matter jurisdiction. Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint, if any, is to be filed by August 8, 2016. The failure to file a First Amended Complaint by that date or to adequately allege the Court’s jurisdiction may result in the dismissal of this action without prejudice.

For all of the foregoing reasons, the Court concludes that Plaintiff is not entitled to the injunctive relief it seeks. The Court therefore denies the Application for TRO.

IT IS SO ORDERED.
ICANN New gTLD Contention Set Resolution Auction
Final Results for WEB / WEBS

Winners:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>String Won</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Application ID</th>
<th>Winning Price</th>
<th>Date of Auction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WEB</td>
<td>NU DOT CO LLC</td>
<td>1-1296-36138</td>
<td>$135,000,000</td>
<td>27-July-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEBS</td>
<td>Vistaprint Limited</td>
<td>1-1033-73917</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>27-July-2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applicants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Application ID</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Submitted Deposit (Participated In Auction)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afilias Domains No. 3 Limited</td>
<td>1-1013-6638</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston Road Registry Inc.</td>
<td>1-1681-58699</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DotWeb Inc.</td>
<td>1-956-26846</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU DOT CO LLC</td>
<td>1-1296-36138</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruby Glen, LLC</td>
<td>1-1527-54849</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schlund Technologies GmbH</td>
<td>1-1013-77165</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vistaprint Limited</td>
<td>1-1033-73917</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web.com Group, Inc.</td>
<td>1-1009-97005</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Round Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round #</th>
<th>Start of Round Price</th>
<th>End of Round Price</th>
<th>Number of Eligible Bidders</th>
<th>Aggregate Demand</th>
<th>Enduring Applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$5,400,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$5,400,000</td>
<td>$7,200,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$7,200,000</td>
<td>$9,600,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$9,600,000</td>
<td>$12,000,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$12,000,000</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$18,800,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>$18,800,000</td>
<td>$23,500,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$23,500,000</td>
<td>$29,400,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>$29,400,000</td>
<td>$36,800,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>$36,800,000</td>
<td>$46,000,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>$46,000,000</td>
<td>$57,500,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Previous Price</td>
<td>Rounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>$57,500,000</td>
<td>$71,900,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>$71,900,000</td>
<td>$82,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>$82,000,000</td>
<td>$92,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>$92,000,000</td>
<td>$102,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>$102,000,000</td>
<td>$112,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>$112,000,000</td>
<td>$122,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>$122,000,000</td>
<td>$132,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>$132,000,000</td>
<td>$142,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

- This was an Indirect Contention.
- Aggregate Demand: The number of Bids placed at the End of Round Price. The Aggregate Demand is available for all Rounds except the final Round.
- Enduring Application: An Application for which a Continue Bid has been submitted or which satisfies the condition of clause 34(c) of the Auction Rules (Version 2015-02-24), but which has not been deemed to be a Winning Application pursuant to clause 35(b). The number of Enduring Applications is available for all Rounds except the final Round.
- All prices are displayed in United States Dollars (USD) with a comma denoting the thousands separator.
- The results shown reflect the outcome of the Auction commenced on 27 July 2016 and do not necessarily reflect the final resolution of the Contention Set. Being declared the ultimate winner of the Contention String is contingent upon timely payment of the Winning Price per the Auction Rules and eligibility to sign a Registry Agreement as determined by ICANN.
- The Application in the “B” position was eliminated after Round 10, causing the Contention Set to divide and causing the Application of Vistaprint Limited to be deemed a Winning Application.
- The outcome of the Auction does not guarantee that Registry Agreements will be signed or that the TLDs will be delegated. These results do not constitute a waiver or amendment of any provision of the Applicant Guidebook, the Registry Agreement, the Bidder Agreement or the Auction Rules.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Date</th>
<th>Requestor</th>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17-Feb-2014</td>
<td>GCCIX, W.L.L.</td>
<td>.GCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Jan-2015</td>
<td>Asia Green IT System Ltd.</td>
<td>.PERSIANGULF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Jan-2016</td>
<td>Donuts Inc.</td>
<td>.SPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Jul-2016</td>
<td>American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA)</td>
<td>.CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-Jul-2016</td>
<td>CPA Australia Ltd.</td>
<td>.CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Sep-2016</td>
<td>DotMusic Limited</td>
<td>.MUSIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Oct-2017</td>
<td>dotgay LLC</td>
<td>.GAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Nov-2017</td>
<td>Afilias plc and Afilias Domains No. 3 Limited</td>
<td>.WEB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The Cooperative Engagement Process (CEP) is a process voluntarily invoked by a complainant prior to the filing of an Independent Review Process (IRP) for the purpose of resolving or narrowing the issues that are contemplated to be brought to the IRP. (See Bylaws, Art. 4 § 4.3(e).) The requesting party may invoke the CEP by providing written notice to ICANN, noting the invocation of the process, identifying the Board action(s) at issue, identifying the provisions of the ICANN Bylaws or Articles of Incorporation that are alleged to be violated, and designating a single point of contact for the resolution of the issue. Further information regarding the CEP is available at: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/cep-11apr13-en.pdf.
RECENTLY CLOSED COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT PROCESS (CEP) PROCEEDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Date</th>
<th>Requestor</th>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
<th>IRP Filing Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-Aug-2016</td>
<td>Donuts Inc. and Ruby Glen, LLC</td>
<td>.WEB</td>
<td>14-Feb-2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 The CEP process provides that “[i]f ICANN and the requestor have not agreed to a resolution of the issues upon the conclusion of the cooperative engagement process, or if issues remain for a request for independent review, the requestor’s time to file a request for independent review designated in the Bylaws shall be extended for each day of the cooperative engagement process, but in no event, absent mutual written agreement by the parties, shall the extension be for more than fourteen (14) days.” (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/cep-11apr13-en.pdf)
ACTIVE INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESS (IRP) PROCEEDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date ICANN Received Notice of IRP</th>
<th>Date IRP Commenced by ICDR</th>
<th>Requestor</th>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no active IRPs

---

3 IRP proceedings initiated before 1 October 2016 are subject to the Bylaws in effect before 1 October 2016: The Independent Review Process (IRP) is a process by which any person materially affected by a decision or action by the Board that he or she asserts is inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws may submit a request for independent review of that decision or action. (See Bylaws, Art. IV, § 3.) In order to be materially affected, the person must suffer injury or harm that is directly and causally connected to the Board's alleged violation of the Bylaws or the Articles of Incorporation, and not as a result of third parties acting in line with the Board's action. Further information regarding the IRP is available at: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/mechanisms-2014-03-20-en.

IRP proceedings initiated on or after 1 October 2016 are subject to the Bylaws in effect as of 1 October 2016: The IRP is intended to hear and resolve Disputes for the following purposes: (i) ensure that ICANN does not exceed the scope of its Mission and otherwise complies with its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws; (ii) empower the global Internet community and Claimants to enforce compliance with the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws through meaningful, affordable and accessible expert review of Covered Actions (as defined in § 4.3(b)(i)); (iii) ensure that ICANN is accountable to the global Internet community and Claimants; (iv) address claims that ICANN has failed to enforce its rights under the IANA Naming Function Contract (as defined in Section 16.3(a)); (v) provide a mechanism by which direct customers of the IANA naming functions may seek resolution of PTI (as defined in Section 16.1) service complaints that are not resolved through mediation; (vi) reduce Disputes by creating precedent to guide and inform the Board, Officers (as defined in Section 15.1), Staff members, Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees, and the global Internet community in connection with policy development and implementation; (vii) secure the accessible, transparent, efficient, consistent, coherent, and just resolution of Disputes; (viii) lead to binding, final resolutions consistent with international arbitration norms that are enforceable in any court with proper jurisdiction; and (ix) provide a mechanism for the resolution of Disputes, as an alternative to legal action in the civil courts of the United States or other jurisdictions. (See Bylaws, Art. 4, § 4.3)
## RECENTLY CLOSED INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESS (IRP) PROCEEDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date ICANN Received Notice of IRP</th>
<th>Date IRP Commenced by ICDR</th>
<th>Requestor</th>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
<th>Date IRP Closed</th>
<th>Date of Board Consideration of IRP Panel’s Final Declaration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

4 IRP proceedings initiated before 1 October 2016 are subject to the Bylaws in effect before 1 October 2016. Pursuant to Article IV, Section 3.21 of the ICANN Bylaws, “[w]here feasible, the Board shall consider the IRP Panel declaration at the Board’s next meeting. The declarations of the IRP Panel, and the Board’s subsequent action on those declarations, are final and have precedential value.” (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en#IV)

IRP proceedings initiated on or after 1 October 2016 are subject to the Bylaws as of 1 October 2016: IRP proceedings initiated Pursuant to Article 4, § 4.3(x)(iiii)(A) of the ICANN Bylaws, “[w]here feasible, the Board shall consider its response to IRP Panel decisions at the Board’s next meeting, and shall affirm or reject compliance with the decision of the public record based on an expressed rationale. The decision by the IRP Panel, or en banc Standing Panel, shall be final regardless of such Board action, to the fullest extent allowed by law.” (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en#article4)

---

[See here](https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en#IV)
R-12
9 September 2016

Via E-Mail

Mr Akram Atallah
President, Global Domains Division
Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers
12025 Waterfront Drive, Suite 300
Los Angeles, CA 90094

Re: .WEB auction

Dear Mr. Atallah:

On behalf of Afilias Domains No. 3 Limited ("Afilias"), a wholly-owned subsidiary of Afilias plc, I write with reference to our letter of 8 August 2016, in which we requested that ICANN disqualify and reject Nu Dot Co LLC’s ("NDC") application for .WEB.

Specifically, NDC entered into an agreement to transfer any rights it acquired in connection with its application for .WEB to VeriSign, Inc. ("VeriSign"), which it did not disclose prior to the .WEB auction. The evidence strongly suggests that NDC acted as a front for and participated in the .WEB auction (the "Auction") for and on behalf of VeriSign. Given ICANN’s failure to respond to our prior letter, we request that ICANN promptly, and by no later than 16 September, 2016, (1) disclose the steps (if any) that it has taken to disqualify NDC’s bid on the basis that NDC violated the rules applicable to its application; and (2) provide an undertaking that it has not, and will not, enter into a registry agreement for .WEB with NDC until (a) the Ombudsman has completed his investigation; (b) ICANN’s Board has reviewed NDC’s conduct and determined whether or not to disqualify NDC’s bid and reject its application; and, (c) to the extent Afilias seeks review of any decision of ICANN relating to .WEB through ICANN’s accountability mechanisms, such mechanisms are completed. We nonetheless emphasize that Afilias reserves all of its rights to pursue any and all rights or remedies available to it in any forum against ICANN, NDC or VeriSign in connection with the delegation of the .WEB gTLD.

We take the opportunity of this letter to further explain the reasons why ICANN must disqualify NDC’s application for .WEB and proceed to contract for .WEB with Afilias, the next highest bidder in the Auction, in compliance with its obligations under ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws (as well as principles of international law and California law), as set forth below.
NDC violated the New gTLD Applicant Guidebook and the Auction Rules for New gTLDs

First, NDC violated Paragraph 10 of the Terms and Conditions in Module 6 of the New gTLD Applicant Guidebook (the “Guidebook”), which expressly prohibits any applicant for a gTLD to “resell, assign or transfer any of applicant’s rights or obligations in connection with the application“. As we explained in our letter of August 8, 2016, Verisign publicly disclosed that it “provided funds” for NDC’s bid for .WEB and that NDC would “seek to assign the Registry Agreement to VeriSign.” Although the specific terms of the agreement between VeriSign and NDC have not been disclosed, it is clear from Verisign’s own press release and its disclosure in its Form 10-Q filed with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission for the quarter ended June 30, 2016, that both companies entered into an arrangement well in advance of the Auction to transfer NDC’s rights and obligations regarding its .WEB application to VeriSign.

Second, NDC violated Section 1.2.7 of the Guidebook, which requires applicants to “promptly notify ICANN via submission of the appropriate forms” “if at any time during the evaluation process information previously submitted by an applicant becomes untrue or inaccurate,” including “changes in financial position and changes in ownership or control of the applicant”. In this regard, we find remarkable that the Form 10-Q VeriSign filed with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission on 28 July, 2016—the day after the Auction—contained the following statement: “Subsequent to June 30, 2016, the Company incurred a commitment to pay approximately $130.0 million for the future assignment of contractual rights, which are subject to third-party consent. The payment is expected to occur during the third quarter of 2016.” When rumors surfaced that another company was behind NDC’s application for .WEB, NDC sent a note to ICANN’s Ombudsman on 8 July 2016, stating merely that “neither the governance, management nor the ownership in NuDotcoco [sic] has changed.” Clearly, by then, relevant changes concerning NDC’s financial position had, at a minimum, been agreed to and should have been reported to ICANN, namely, that the VeriSign had agreed to fund NDC’s bid for .WEB.

Third, NDC violated the Auction Rules for New gTLDs (“Auction Rules”). Rule 12 provides that “participation in an Auction is limited to Bidders, which is defined by the Auction Rules as a “Qualified Applicant” or a “party designated by a Qualified Applicant to bid on its behalf“. This rule prohibits bids placed on behalf of a third-party that is not a “Qualified Applicant”, defined by the Auction Rules as “an entity that has submitted an Application for a new gTLD, has received all necessary approvals from ICANN, and which is included within a Contention Set to be resolved by an Auction.” Accordingly, Rule 40(b) provides that “in order to be valid” “a Bid must be placed by a Bidder for its Application in an Open Contention Set.”
ICANN has the duty to deny NDC's application, disqualify its bid and proceed to contract with the next highest bidder in the Auction

ICANN's governing documents clearly dictate the appropriate response ICANN should take in connection with NDC's improper conduct:

- ICANN is required to "...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." [Articles of Incorporation, Art. 4]
- ICANN is required to "mak[e] decisions by applying documented policies neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness" [Bylaws, Art.I § 2 (8)]
- ICANN is required to "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." [Bylaws, Art. II3]
- ICANN is required to "Act[ ] with a speed that is responsive to the needs of the Internet while, as part of the decision-making process, obtaining informed input from those entities most affected." [Bylaws, Art. I § 2 (9)]
- ICANN is directed to "operate to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner and consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness" [Bylaws, Art. III § 1].
- ICANN is required to "promot[e] competition in the registration of domain names where practicable and beneficial in the public interest" [Bylaws, Art. I. § 2 (6)]
- ICANN is required to "Remain[ ] accountable to the Internet community through mechanisms that enhance ICANN's effectiveness." [Bylaws, Art. I. § 2 (10)]

VeriSign chose not to apply for .WEB, as it could have done. Instead, VeriSign improperly and surreptitiously funded NDC's application. NDC's and VeriSign's attempt to game the system and obtain control over .WEB for VeriSign (which already controls.COM), must be sanctioned by ICANN by disqualifying NDC's bid and rejecting its application.

In these circumstances, we submit that ICANN should disqualify NDC's bid and offer to accept the application of Afilias, which placed the second highest exit bid. Consistent with Auction Rules No. 46 and No. 47, the winning price should be deemed to be the second-highest remaining exit bid after disqualifying NDC and striking its exit bid as invalid.

This course of action is consistent not only with ICANN’s Guidebook and Auction Rules, but also with the principles of due process and fairness that ICANN is obligated to observe pursuant to its governing documents. In this regard, we note that NDC’s violations must not affect the rights of other applicants that participated in the Auction in full compliance with the applicable rules, and that a new auction would be improper since the bidders have already
seen the outcome of the first Auction. Thus, ICANN must protect the integrity of the gTLD auction and delegation process from being tainted by the actions of one bidder. The only way to do this is to disqualify NDC and proceed as we have outlined above.

Finally, we remind ICANN that “ICANN’s Board of Directors has ultimate responsibility for the New gTLD Program” (Bylaws, Art. II, § 1; Guidebook, Section 5.1), and that “material changes in circumstances” require “additional Board review” before “formal approval” of a registry agreement for the delegation of a gTLD. We therefore request that ICANN provide us with an undertaking that it has not, and will not, enter into a registry agreement for .WEB with NDC until ICANN’s Board has reviewed NDC’s conduct and reached a considered decision on whether or not to disqualify NDC’s bid and reject its application; the Ombudsman has completed his investigation and the Board has considered and reached a decision on his report; and, to the extent Affilias seeks review of any decision of ICANN relating to .WEB through ICANN’s accountability mechanisms, Affilias has exhausted such mechanisms.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, ICANN’s Board and officers are obligated under the Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws and the Guidebook (as well as international law and California law) to disqualify NDC’s bid immediately and proceed with the contracting of a registry agreement with Affilias, the second highest bidder. We look forward to receiving a response from ICANN by no later than 16 September 2016.

Affilias reserves all of its rights at law and in equity, including, without limitation, relating to the issues raised in this letter.

Sincerely,

M. Scott Hemphill
Vice President & General Counsel

cc: Steve Crocker, Chairman of the ICANN Board
    Göran Marby, President and Chief Executive Officer
    Arif Hyder Ali, Dechert LLP
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ITEM 2. PROPERTIES

Our corporate headquarters are located in Reston, Virginia. We have administrative, sales, marketing, research and development and operations facilities located in the U.S., Europe, Asia, and Australia. As of December 31, 2007, we owned approximately 454,000 square feet of space, which includes facilities in Reston and Dulles, Virginia and New Castle, Delaware. As of December 31, 2007, we leased approximately 7,000 square feet of space in Europe, Australia and Asia. These facilities are under lease agreements that expire at various dates through 2022.

We believe that our existing facilities are well maintained and in good operating condition, and are sufficient for our needs for the foreseeable future. The following table lists our major locations and primary use as of December 31, 2007:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Locations</th>
<th>Approximate Square Footage</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reston, Virginia</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>Corporate Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Castle, Delaware</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Data Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulles, Virginia</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>Data Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fribourg, Switzerland</td>
<td>0,000</td>
<td>Data Center and Corporate Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above does not include approximately 68,000 square feet of space owned by us and leased to third parties.

ITEM 3. LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

On January 8, 2007, the Company received a Civil Investigative Demand from the Antitrust Division of the United States Department of Justice (“DOJ”) requesting certain material related to the Company becoming the registry operator for the .web gTLD. On January 9, 2008, the DOJ notified the Company that this investigation was closed.

ITEM 4. MINE SAFETY DISCLOSURES

Not applicable
Ruby Glen, LLC (“Ruby Glen”) appeals the district court’s dismissal of its First Amended Complaint (“FAC”) against Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (“ICANN”). We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. “We review de novo dismissals for failure to state a claim under Rule 12(b)(6).”

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.
We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed the FAC on the ground that Ruby Glen’s claims are barred by the covenant not to sue contained in the Applicant Guidebook. As the district court found, the covenant not to sue is not void under California Civil Code section 1668. Ruby Glen is not without recourse—it can challenge ICANN’s actions through the Independent Review Process, which Ruby Glen concedes “is effectively an arbitration, operated by the International Centre for Dispute Resolution of the American Arbitration Association, comprised of an independent panel of arbitrators.” Thus, the covenant not to sue does not exempt ICANN from liability, but instead is akin to an alternative dispute resolution agreement falling outside the scope of section 1668. See Cal. Civ. Code. § 1668 (“All contracts which have for their object . . . to exempt anyone from responsibility for his own fraud, or willful injury . . ., or violation of law . . . are against the policy of the law.” (emphasis added)); see also Cont’l Airlines, Inc. v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., 819 F.2d 1519, 1527 (9th Cir. 1987) (holding that an “exculpatory clause” does not violate California Civil Code section 1668 where the clause bars suit, but “[o]ther sanctions remain in place”); Mitsubishi Motors Corp. v. Soler Chrysler-Plymouth, Inc., 473 U.S. 614, 628 (1985) (“By agreeing to
arbitrate . . . , a party does not forgo [its] substantive rights . . . ; it only submits to their resolution in an arbitral, rather than a judicial, forum.”).

The district court also properly rejected Ruby Glen’s argument that the covenant not to sue is unconscionable. Even assuming that the adhesive nature of the Guidebook renders the covenant not to sue procedurally unconscionable, it is not substantively unconscionable. See Sanchez v. Valencia Holding Co., 61 Cal. 4th 899, 910 (2015) (explaining that procedural and substantive unconscionability “must both be present in order for a court to exercise its discretion to refuse to enforce a contract or clause under the doctrine of unconscionability” (emphasis in original) (internal quotation marks omitted)); Grand Prospect Partners, L.P. v. Ross Dress for Less, Inc., 232 Cal. App. 4th 1332, 1347–48 (2015) (holding that procedural unconscionability “may be established by showing the contract is one of adhesion”). Because Ruby Glen may pursue its claims through the Independent Review Process, the covenant not to sue is not “so one-sided as to shock the conscience.” See Walnut Producers of Cal. v. Diamond Foods, Inc., 187 Cal. App. 4th 634, 647–48 (2010) (internal quotation marks omitted).
Finally, the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Ruby Glen leave to amend because any amendment would have been futile. See *Carrico v. City & Cty. of San Francisco*, 656 F.3d 1002, 1008 (9th Cir. 2011).¹

**AFFIRMED.**

¹ Ruby Glen raises several additional arguments that it failed to raise below. We decline to consider those arguments because they were raised for the first time on appeal. See *Dream Palace v. Cty. of Maricopa*, 384 F.3d 990, 1005 (9th Cir. 2004).
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DECLARATION

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

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This Declaration is issued in the context of an Independent Review Process ("IRP") as provided for in Article IV, Section 3 of the Bylaws of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers ("ICANN"; "ICANN Bylaws" or "Bylaws"). In accordance with those Bylaws, the conduct of this IRP is governed by the International Arbitration Rules of the International Centre for Dispute Resolution (ICDR; "ICDR Rules") as supplemented by the Supplementary Procedures for Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) Independent Review Process ("Supplementary Procedures").

2. The subject matter of the dispute here concerns alleged conduct by the ICANN Board in relation to one particular facet of the process by which new generic top-level domains ("gTLDs", also known as gTLD "strings") are applied for, reviewed and delegated into the Internet's domain name system ("DNS") root zone.

3. As explained in this Declaration, the Applicant, Booking.com, alleges that, in establishing and overseeing the process by which so-called string similarity reviews are conducted, and in refusing to reconsider and overturn a decision to place Booking.com's applied-for gTLD string .hotels in a so-called string contention set, the Board acted in a manner inconsistent with applicable policies, procedures and rules as set out in ICANN's Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws and gTLD Applicant Guidebook ("Guidebook").

4. Reading between the lines of the parties' submissions, the Panel senses that both sides would welcome the opportunity to contribute to an exchange that might result in enabling disputants in future cases to avoid having to resort to an IRP to resolve issues such as have arisen here. Certainly the Panel considers that the present matter would ideally have been resolved amicably by the parties. This is particularly true given that the matter here concerns two of ICANN's guiding principles – transparency and fairness – as applied to one of ICANN's most essential activities – the delegation of new gTLDs – in circumstances in which various members of the Internet community, including certain members of the ICANN Board's New gTLD Program Committee, have expressed their own concerns regarding the string similarity review process. That being the case, though, the Panel does not shy away from the duty imposed by the Bylaws to address the questions before it and to render the

---

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

2 As stated in the very first sentence of the Guidebook: "New gTLDs have been in the forefront of ICANN's agenda since its creation."
present Declaration, in accordance with, and within the constraints of the Bylaws, the ICDR Rules and the Supplementary Procedures.

II. THE PARTIES

A. The Applicant: Booking.com

5. The Applicant, Booking.com, is a limited liability company established under the law of the Netherlands. Booking.com describes itself as “the number one online hotel reservation service in the world, offering over 435,605 hotels and accommodations.”\(^3\) Booking.com’s primary focus is on the U.S. and other English-language markets.

6. Booking.com is represented in this IRP by Mr. Flip Petillion and Mr. Jan Janssen of the law firm Crowell & Moring in Brussels, Belgium.

B. The Respondent: ICANN

7. The Respondent, ICANN, is a California not-for-profit public benefit corporation, formed in 1998. As set forth in Article I, Section 1 of its Bylaws, ICANN’s mission is “to coordinate, at the overall level, the global Internet’s system of unique identifiers, and in particular to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet’s unique identifier systems.” ICANN describes itself as “a complex organization that facilitates input from a wide variety of Internet stakeholders. ICANN has a Board of Directors and staff members from around the globe, as well as an Ombudsman. ICANN, however, is much more than just the corporation—it is a community of participants.”\(^4\)

8. ICANN is represented in this IRP by Mr. Jeffrey A. LeVee, Esq. and Ms. Kate Wallace, Esq. of the law firm Jones Day in Los Angeles, California, USA.

III. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND – IN BRIEF

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

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

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

\(^3\) Request, ¶ 10.

\(^4\) Response, ¶ 11-12.

\(^5\) Request, ¶ 12; see also Guidebook, Preamble.
11. The Program has its origins in what the Guidebook refers to as “carefully deliberated policy development work” by the ICANN community.  

12. In 2005, ICANN’s Generic Names Supporting Organization (“GNSO”), one of the groups that coordinates global Internet policy at ICANN, commenced a policy development process to consider the introduction of new gTLDs. As noted in the Guidebook:

Representatives from a wide variety of stakeholder groups – governments, individuals, civil society, business and intellectual property constituencies, and the technology community – were engaged in discussions for more than 18 months on such questions as the demand, benefits and risks of new gTLDs, the selection criteria that should be applied, how gTLDs should be allocated, and the contractual conditions that should be required for new gTLD registries going forward.

13. In October 2007, the GNSO formally completed its policy development work on new gTLDs and approved a set of 19 policy recommendations.

14. In June 2008, the ICANN Board decided to adopt the policies recommended by the GNSO. As explained in the Guidebook, ICANN’s work next focused on implementation of these recommendations, which it saw as “creating an application and evaluation process for new gTLDs that is aligned with the policy recommendations and provides a clear roadmap for applicants to reach delegation, including Board approval.”

15. This process concluded with the decision by the ICANN Board in June 2011 to implement the New gTLD Program and its foundational instrument, the Guidebook.

16. As described by ICANN in these proceedings, the Program “constitutes by far ICANN’s most ambitious expansion of the Internet’s naming system. The Program’s goals include

---

6 Guidebook, Preamble

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

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

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

10 RM 10 (ICANN resolution). The Guidebook (in its 30 May 2011 version) is one of seven “elements” of the Program implemented in 2011. The other elements were: a draft communications plan; “operational readiness activities”; a program to ensure support for applicants from developing countries; “a process for handling requests for removal of cross-ownership restrictions on operators of existing gTLDs who want to participate in the Program”; budgeted expenditures; and a timetable.
enhancing competition and consumer choice, and enabling the benefits of innovation via the introduction of new gTLDs ...".11

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

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

18. In accordance with the process set out in the Guidebook, Booking.com filed an application (Application ID 1-1016-75482) for the gTLD string .hotels.

19. At the same time, Despegar Online SRL (“Despegar”), a corporation established under the law of Uruguay, applied (Application ID 1-1249-87712) for the string .hotels.

20. “Hotéis” is the Portuguese word for “hotels”.

21. According to Booking.com, Despegar is “a competitor of Booking.com”.14 Booking.com claims that it intends “to operate .hotels as a secure Internet environment providing hotel reservation services for consumers, hotels, and other stakeholders,”15 while Despegar similarly intends .hotels to be dedicated primarily to “individuals that are interested in, and businesses that offer, hotel- and travel-related content.”16 That being said, a key difference between the two applications, as Booking.com acknowledges, is that Booking.com intends to focus the services it will offer under its proposed gTLD “on the U.S. (with its strongly Anglos- Saxon traditions) and other English-language markets,”17 whereas Despegar intends to target “Portuguese-speaking” markets.18

22. As part of the Initial Evaluation to which all applied-for gTLDs were subject, .hotels and .hotels were each required to undergo so-called string review in accordance with the Guidebook, the first component of which is a process known as string similarity review. As provided by the Guidebook, the string similarity review was conducted by an independent

11 Response, ¶ 14.

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

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

14 Request, ¶ 17.

15 Request, ¶ 5.

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

17 Request, ¶ 16.

18 Request, ¶ 17. See also Despegar Application for .hotels (Request, Annex 2), ¶ 18(a).
String Similarity Panel ("SSP") selected and engaged by ICANN for this purpose. (Extracts of the relevant provisions of the Guidebook can be found below, at Part IV of this Declaration.) ICANN engaged InterConnect Communications Ltd. ("ICC"), a company registered under the law of England and Wales, specializing in communications sector strategy, policy and associated regulatory frameworks, in cooperation with University College London, to act as the SSP.

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

24. The results of the string similarity review were notified to Booking.com by ICANN that same day. In its letter of 26 February 2013 ICANN wrote:

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

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

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

C. **DIDP Request and Request for Reconsideration**

26. On 28 March 2013 Booking.com submitted a request for information under ICANN’s Documentary Information Disclosure Policy ("DIDP Request") asking for “all documents directly and indirectly relating to (1) the standard used to determine whether gTLD strings are confusingly similar, and (2) the specific determination that .hotels and .hoteis are confusingly similar.”

27. On the same date, Booking.com also filed a formal Request for Reconsideration ("Request for Reconsideration"). The “specific action(s)” that Booking.com asked to be reconsidered were: the decision to place .hotels and .hoteis in a contention set; and the decision not to

---

19 See [http://www.icc-uk.com/](http://www.icc-uk.com/)

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


22 Request, ¶ 30 and Annex 3.
provide a “detailed analysis or a reasoned basis” for the decision to place .hotels in contention.  

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

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

29. By letter dated 9 May 2013 Booking.com replied to ICANN, writing that “ICANN’s response fails to provide any additional information or address any of Booking.com’s concerns as conveyed in its DIDP Request or Request for Reconsideration.” On 14 May 2013, ICANN answered that it “intends to post the string similarity process documentation on or before ... 17 May 2013.” ICANN further informed Booking.com that “ICANN will afford you 30 days from the posting of the process document for the submission of a revised Request for Reconsideration.”

30. On 7 June 2013, ICANN published the “String Similarity New gTLD Evaluation Panel [i.e., the SSP] – Process Description” ("SSP Process Description").

31. On 28 June 2013 Booking.com wrote to ICANN regarding both its DIDP Request and its 28 March 2013 Request for Reconsideration. In its letter, Booking.com noted among other things that “the generalized information ICANN thus far has provided does not explain a rationale for or analysis for the decision to put .hotels and .hotels in a contention set and therefore does not allow Booking.com to appropriately amend its Request for Reconsideration.” The letter concluded by stating: “Considering ICANN’s obligations of transparency and accountability, there cannot be any ‘compelling reason for confidentiality’.

---

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

24 Request, Annex 5.


26 Request, Annex 7.

27 Request, Annex 7.

28 Request, Annex 8.
And ... there are numerous compelling reasons for publication of [the information requested by Booking.com].

32. ICANN responded on 25 July 2013, explaining among other things that “the evaluation of the .hotels string by the SSP panel was performed according to the [SSP Process Description] ...” and “[the SSP’s work was subjected to quality review, as has been publicly discussed.” Approximately six months later, on 9 January 2014, ICANN posted a letter dated 18 December 2013 addressed to ICANN by the SSP Manager at ICC (Mr. Mark McFadden) providing a further “summary of the process, quality control mechanisms and some considerations surrounding the non-exact contention sets for the string similarity evaluation ...” (“SSP Manager’s Letter”). According to that Letter:

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

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

  o For example m-m & l-i

33. Meanwhile, on 7 July 2013 Booking.com had submitted its amended Request for Reconsideration. In its letter attaching the amended Request for Reconsideration, Booking.com stated: “Booking.com reserves the right to further amend its Request for Reconsideration upon receipt of the information it previously requested and urges ICANN to publish the requested information as specified in our letter of 26 June 2013.”

34. By virtue of Article IV, Section 3 of the Bylaws, ICANN’s Board Governance Committee (“BGC”) is charged with evaluating and making recommendation to the Board with respect to requests for reconsideration. The Board’s New gTLD Program Committee (“NGPC”) receives and acts on such recommendations on behalf of the ICANN Board. In accordance with this procedure, Booking.com’s Request for Reconsideration was evaluated by the BGC. In a detailed analysis dated 1 August 2013, the BGC “conclude[d] that Booking.com has not
stated proper grounds for reconsideration and we therefore recommend that Booking.com’s request be denied” (“BGC Recommendation”).

35. At a telephone meeting held on 10 September 2013 the NGPC, “bestowed with the powers of the Board”, considered, discussed and accepted the BGC Recommendation. Booking.com’s Request for Reconsideration was denied.\(^{34}\)

D. The Cooperative Engagement Process

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

Booking.com is of the opinion that Resolution 2013.09.10.NGO2 [the Board resolution denying its Request for Reconsideration] violates various provisions of ICANN’s Bylaws and Articles of incorporation. In particular Booking.com considers that ICANN’s adoption of [the Resolution] is in violation of Articles I, II(3), II and IV of the ICANN Bylaws as well as Article 4 of ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation. In addition, Booking.com considers that ICANN has acted in violation of Articles 3, 5, 7 and 9 of ICANN’s Affirmation of Commitment ... \(^{35}\)

37. The CEP ultimately did not result in a resolution, and Booking.com duly commenced the present IRP.

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

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

\(^{34}\) Request, Annex 15, NGPC Resolution dated 10 September 2013.

\(^{35}\) Request, Annex 17.
whose strings were not put into a contention set are able to establish themselves as pioneer providers of hotel- and travel-related services under a different new gTLD).

E. The IRP Proceedings


40. In accordance with Article IV, Section 3(9) of the ICANN Bylaws, Booking.com requested that a three-member IRP panel be constituted to consider and determine the Request. As the omnibus standing panel referred to in Article IV, Section 3(6) of the ICANN Bylaws had yet to be established, Booking.com further proposed, in accordance with Article 6 of the ICDR Rules, that each party appoint one panelist, with the third (the Chair of the panel) to be appointed by the two party-appointed panelists.

41. On 25 April 2014, ICANN submitted a Response to ICANN’s Request with supporting documents ("Response").

42. The parties having thereafter agreed on the number of panelists and the method of their appointment, David H. Bernstein, Esq. was duly appointed as panelist by Booking.com on 1 May 2014, and the Hon. A Howard Matz was duly appointed as panelist by ICANN on 30 May 2014.

43. On 17 July 2014, the ICDR notified the parties that Mr. Stephen L. Drymer had been duly nominated by the two party-appointed panelists as Chair of the Panel. Mr. Drymer’s appointment became effective and the Panel was duly constituted as of 1 August 2014.

44. On 21 August 2014, further to consultations among the panelists and between the Panel and the parties, the Panel convened a preparatory conference with the parties (by telephone) for the purpose of discussing organizational matters, including a timetable for any further written statements or oral argument. Both parties requested the opportunity to make supplemental submissions and to present oral argument.

45. On 22 August 2014 the Panel issued Procedural Order No. 1 in which, among other things, it established a Procedural Timetable for the IRP. As specifically requested by the parties, the Procedural Order and Timetable provided for the submission of additional written statements by the parties as well as for a brief oral hearing to take place by telephone, all on dates proposed by and agreed between the parties.36

46. In accordance with the Procedural Timetable, on 6 October 2014 Booking.com submitted its Reply to ICANN’s Response, accompanied by additional documents ("Reply").

36 Paragraph 6 of Procedural Order No. 1 provided that in its forthcoming Reply to ICANN’s Response, “Booking.com shall only address two issues raised in Respondent’s Response: (1) the nature and scope of the IRP requested; (2) the nature of the relief sought by Claimant.” Paragraph 7 of Procedural Order No. 1 provided that “Respondent’s Sur-Reply … shall address only the issues raised in the Reply.”
47. In accordance with the Procedural Timetable, ICANN submitted a Sur-Reply on 20 November 2014 ("Sur-Reply").

F. The Hearing

48. As provided by Procedural Order No. 1 and the Procedural Timetable, a hearing was held (by telephone) on 10 December 2011, commencing at 9:00 PST/18:00 CET.

49. In the light of the significance of the issues raised by the parties, and given the many questions prompted by those issues and by the parties' extensive written submissions and supporting materials, the Panel indicated that it would allow the hearing to continue beyond the approximately one hour originally envisaged. The hearing ultimately lasted two and one-half hours. Counsel for each party made extensive oral submissions, including rebuttal and sur-rebuttal submissions, and responded to the panelists' questions.

50. Prior to the close of the hearing each party declared that it had no objection concerning the conduct of the proceedings, that it had no further oral submissions that it wished to make, and that it considered that it had had a full opportunity to present its case and to be heard.

51. As agreed and ordered prior to the close of the hearing, the parties were provided the opportunity to file limited additional materials post-hearing, in relation to a certain question asked of them by the Panel. This was done, and, on 13 December 2014, the proceedings were declared closed.

IV. ICANN ARTICLES, BYLAWS AND POLICIES – KEY ELEMENTS

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

A. Articles of Association

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

[Underlining added]

B. Bylaws

ARTICLE I: MISSION AND CORE VALUES

Section 1. MISSION

The mission of The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers ("ICANN") is to coordinate, at the overall level, the global Internet's systems of unique identifiers,
and in particular to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems.

(...)

Section 2. CORE VALUES

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

1. Preserving and enhancing the operational stability, reliability, security, and global interoperability of the Internet.

2. Respecting the creativity, innovation, and flow of information made possible by the Internet by limiting ICANN's activities to those matters within ICANN's mission requiring or significantly benefiting from global coordination.

3. To the extent feasible and appropriate, delegating coordination functions to or recognizing the policy role of other responsible entities that reflect the interests of affected parties.

4. Seeking and supporting broad, informed participation reflecting the functional, geographic, and cultural diversity of the Internet at all levels of policy development and decision-making.

5. Where feasible and appropriate, depending on market mechanisms to promote and sustain a competitive environment.

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

7. Employing open and transparent policy development mechanisms that (i) promote well-informed decisions based on expert advice, and (ii) ensure that those entities most affected can assist in the policy development process.

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

9. Acting with a speed that is responsive to the needs of the Internet while, as part of the decision-making process, obtaining informed input from those entities most affected.

10. Remaining accountable to the Internet community through mechanisms that enhance ICANN's effectiveness.

11. While remaining rooted in the private sector, recognizing that governments and public authorities are responsible for public policy and duly taking into account governments' or public authorities' recommendations.

These core values are deliberately expressed in very general terms, so that they may provide useful and relevant guidance in the broadest possible range of circumstances. Because they are not narrowly prescriptive, the specific way in which they apply, individually and collectively, to each new situation will necessarily depend on many factors that cannot be fully anticipated or enumerated; and because they are statements of principle rather than practice, situations will inevitably arise in which perfect fidelity to all eleven core values simultaneously is not possible. Any ICANN
body making a recommendation or decision shall exercise its judgment to determine which core values are most relevant and how they apply to the specific circumstances of the case at hand, and to determine, if necessary, an appropriate and defensible balance among competing values.

[...]

ARTICLE III: TRANSPARENCY

Section 1. PURPOSE

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

[...]

ARTICLE IV: ACCOUNTABILITY AND REVIEW

Section 1. PURPOSE

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

Section 2. RECONSIDERATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

   a. evaluate requests for review or reconsideration;
b. summarily dismiss insufficient requests;

c. evaluate requests for urgent consideration;

d. conduct whatever factual investigation is deemed appropriate;

e. request additional written submissions from the affected party, or from other parties;

f. make a final determination on Reconsideration Requests regarding staff action or inaction, without reference to the Board of Directors; and

g. make a recommendation to the Board of Directors on the merits of the request, as necessary.

[...]

Section 3. INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF BOARD ACTIONS

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

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

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

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

   a. did the Board act without conflict of interest in taking its decision?;

   b. did the Board exercise due diligence and care in having a reasonable amount of facts in front of them?; and

   c. did the Board members exercise independent judgment in taking the decision, believed to be in the best interests of the company [ICANN]?

[...]

11. The IRP Panel shall have the authority to:
a. summarily dismiss requests brought without standing, lacking in substance, or that are frivolous or vexatious;

b. request additional written submissions from the party seeking review, the Board, the Supporting Organizations, or from other parties;

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

d. recommend that the Board stay any action or decision, or that the Board take any interim action, until such time as the Board reviews and acts upon the opinion of the IRP;

e. consolidate requests for independent review if the facts and circumstances are sufficiently similar; and

f. determine the timing for each proceeding.

[...]

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

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

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

[...]

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

[Underlining added]

53. Lest there be any misunderstanding as regards the proper subject matter of IRP proceedings or the role of the Panel, we note that, as was clearly established during the hearing, it is common ground between the parties that the term “action” (or “actions”) as used in Article IV, Section 3 of the Bylaws is to be understood as action(s) or inaction(s) by the ICANN Board. The Panel observes that this understanding comports not only with the provisions of Article
IV, Section 2 of the Bylaws concerning “Reconsideration”, which expressly refer to “actions or inactions of the ICANN Board”, but with the clear intent of Section 3 itself, which stipulates at sub-section 11 that “[t]he IRP Panel shall have the authority to: ... (c) declare whether an action or inaction of the Board was inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws.”

C. The gTLD Applicant Guidebook

54. As noted above and as understood by all, the Guidebook is (to borrow Booking.com’s phrase) “the crystallization of Board-approved consensus policy concerning the introduction of new gTLDs.”

55. The Guidebook is divided into “Modules”, each of which contains various sections and subsections. The three Modules of primary relevance here are Modules 1, 2 and 4. Module 1, titled “Introduction to the gTLD Application Process,” provides an “overview of the process for applying for a new generic top-level domains.” Module 2, titled “Evaluation Procedures,” describes the “evaluation procedures and criteria used to determine whether applied-for gTLDs are approved for delegation.” Module 4, titled “String Contention Procedures,” concerns “situations in which contention over applied-for gTLD strings occurs, and the methods available to applicants for resolving such contention cases.”

(i) Initial Evaluation

56. As explained in Module 1, “[i]mediately following the close of the application submission period, ICANN will begin checking all applications for completeness.” Initial Evaluation begins “immediately after the administrative completeness check concludes. All complete applications will be reviewed during Initial Evaluation.”

57. Initial Evaluation is comprised of two main elements or types or review: string review, which concerns the applied-for gTLD string; and applicant review, which concerns the entity applying for the gTLD and its proposed registry services. It is the first of these — string review, including more specifically the component known as string similarity review — that is particularly relevant.

(ii) String Review, including String Similarity Review

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

The following assessments are performed in the Initial Evaluation:

---

37 Request, ¶13.
39 Module 2-2.
40 Guidebook, §1.2.2: “Administrative Completeness Check”, Module 1-5.
41 Guidebook, §1.2.5: “Initial Evaluation”, Module 1-8 (underlining added).
• String Reviews
  • String similarity
  • Reserved names
  • DNS stability
  • Geographic names

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

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

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

• Whether the applied-for gTLD string is so similar to other strings that it would create a probability of user confusion;

• Whether the applied-for gTLD string might adversely affect DNS security or stability; and

• Whether evidence of requisite government approval is provided in the case of certain geographic names.43

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

2.2.1.1 String Similarity Review

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

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

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

43 Guidebook, §2: “Initial Evaluation”, Module 2-4 (underlining added). See also Module 1-9: “String reviews include a determination that the applied-for gTLD string is not likely to cause security or stability problems in the DNS ....”
The visual similarity check that occurs during Initial Evaluation is intended to augment the objection and dispute resolution process (see Module 3, Dispute Resolution Procedures) that addresses all types of similarity.

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

2.2.1.1.1 Reviews Performed

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

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

[...]

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

[...]

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

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

[...]

2.2.1.1.2 Review Methodology

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

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

[...]

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

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

2.2.1.1.3 Outcomes of the String Similarity Review

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

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

[Underlining added]

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

4.1 String Contention

String contention occurs when either:

1. Two or more applicants for an identical gTLD string successfully complete all previous stages of the evaluation and dispute resolution processes; or

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

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

---

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

4.1.1 Identification of Contention Sets

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

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

[...]

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

[...]

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

[...]

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

4.1.3 Self-Resolution of String Contention

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

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

[...]

4.3 Auction: Mechanism of Last Resort

It is expected that most cases of contention will be resolved by the community priority evaluation, or through voluntary agreement among the involved applicants. Auction is a tie-breaker method for resolving string contention among the applications within a contention set, if the contention has not been resolved by other means.
Module 5 of the Guidebook, titled Transition to Delegation, describes “the final steps required of an applicant for completion of the process, including execution of a registry agreement with ICANN and preparing for delegation of the new gTLD into the root zone.” Section 5.1 states:

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

Underlining added]

V. SUMMARY OF THE PARTIES’ POSITIONS

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

A. Booking.com’s position

(i) The Panel’s Authority

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

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

45 Module 5-2.
46 Module 5-4.
47 Reply, ¶ 3.
48 Reply, ¶ 3.
66. Booking.com submits that IRP panels have broad authority to evaluate actions of the ICANN Board. An overly restrictive interpretation of the standard of review, such as proposed by ICANN in these proceedings, would, says Booking.com, "fail to ensure accountability on the part of ICANN and would be incompatible with ICANN’s commitment to maintain (and improve) robust mechanisms for accountability, as required by Article 9.1 of ICANN’s Affirmation of Commitments and ICANN’s core values."

(ii) Booking.com’s Claims

67. The purpose of the IRP initiated by Booking.com is, in its own words, “to challenge the ICANN Board’s handling of Booking.com’s application for the new gTLD .hotels.” This includes the determination of the SSP to place .hotels and .hotels in contention and the refusal of the Board (and its committees) to revise that determination. Elsewhere in its submissions, Booking.com makes an even broader claim; it asserts that it challenges the conduct of the ICANN Board in relation to what Booking.com refers to as the setting up, implementation, supervision and review of the entire of string similarity review process, and the Board’s alleged failure “to ensure due process and to respect its fundamental obligations to ensure good faith, transparency, fairness and non-discrimination” throughout.

68. In effect, Booking.com’s specific claims can be divided into two broad categories: claims related to the string similarity review process generally; and claims related to the particular case of .hotels.

69. Booking.com professes that this case “is not about challenging a decision on the merits [i.e., the decision to place .hotels in contention]”; it is about “ICANN’s failure to respect fundamental [procedural] rights and principles in handling New gTLD applications, in particular in the context of String Similarity Review.”

70. Booking.com also repeatedly emphasizes — and this is crucial — that it does not challenge the validity or fairness of the process as set out in the Guidebook. Rather, as indicated, it contests "the way in which that process was established, implemented and supervised by (or under the authority of) the ICANN Board." Equally crucial, as will be seen, is Booking.com’s acknowledgment that the established process was followed in the case of the review of .hotels.

a. The string similarity review process

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

---

49 Reply, ¶ 6.
50 Reply, ¶ 7.
51 Reply, ¶ 15.
52 Reply, ¶ 14.
53 Reply, ¶ 17.
[ICANN] would evaluate candidate responses or how it ultimately did so. The problem was compounded by the selection of ICC/University College London to perform string similarity reviews as the independent SSP. In Booking.com’s words:

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

72. Booking.com also faults ICANN for “allowing the appointed SSP to develop and perform an unfair and arbitrary review process”, specifically, by allowing the SSP “to perform the String Similarity Review (i) without any (documented) plan or methodology ... (ii) without providing any transparency regarding the evaluators or the evaluation criteria ... and (iii) without informing applicants of its reasoning ...”.

73. Among other things, Booking.com takes ICANN to task for establishing and posting the SSP Process Description and the SSP Manager’s Letter (see Part III.C above) only long after the string similarity review process had ended.

74. It also alleges that the factors identified in the SSP Manager’s Letter are “arbitrary and baseless ... not supported by any methodology capable of producing compelling and defensible conclusions ... [which] has allowed applications with at least equally serious visual string similarity concerns – such as .parts/.paris, .maiff.mail, .srft/srl, .vote/voto and .date/.data ... – to proceed while singling out .hotels/.hoteis.” According to Booking.com: “The failure to take actual human performance into account is at odds with the standard for assessment, i.e., the likelihood of confusion on the part of the average Internet user. Hence, the approach is directly contrary to ICANN’s own policy.”

75. Booking.com further contends that the SSP process is unfair and non-transparent due to the fact that the identity of SSP members has never been publicly disclosed.

76. Further, Booking.com argues that the process is unfair, non-transparent and arbitrary – and thus violates ICANN policy – for failing to provide for a “well-documented rationale” for each

---
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SSP determination. In the absence of reasons for each string similarity determination, says Booking.com, "there is no basis on which decisions can be evaluated and, where appropriate, challenged."\(^{61}\)

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

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

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

b. *The case of .hotels*

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

---

\(^{61}\) Reply, ¶ 28-29.

\(^{62}\) Reply, ¶ 30.

\(^{63}\) Reply, ¶ 31. Booking.com states that it "doubts" that any quality review was in fact performed, whether by JAS Advisers or any other entity.

\(^{64}\) Response, ¶ 3C.

\(^{65}\) Reply, ¶ 34.

\(^{66}\) Reply, ¶ 38.

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

\(^{68}\) Request, ¶ 58.
Since .hotels and .hoteis are not confusingly similar, the determination that they are is contradictory to ICANN policy as established in the Applicant Guidebook. Acceptance of the determination, and repeated failure to remedy the wrongful determination, is a failure to act with due diligence and independent judgment, and a failure to neutrally and fairly apply established policies as required by Bylaws and Articles of Incorporation.  

80. According to Booking.com, the Board should have acted to overturn the determination of the SSP either in the context of the Request for Reconsideration or under the authority accorded it by Module 5-4 of the Guidebook to “individually consider a gTLD application”.  

81. Booking.com claims that its DIDP Request alerted the Board to the need to intervene to “correct the errors in the process” related to .hotels, and that its Request for Reconsideration of the SSP determination further informed the Board of the many errors in the SSP’s review of .hotels, “giving the Board ample opportunity to correct those errors.” Booking.com claims that the Board’s failure, when responding to the DIDP Request, “to offer any insight into the SSP’s reasoning”, its refusal to reconsider and overturn the SSP determination regarding .hotels on the sole ground (says Booking.com) that “the Reconsideration process ‘is not available as a mechanism to re-try the decisions of evaluation panels’”, and its failure to investigate Booking.com’s complaints of a lack of fairness and transparency in the SSP process, constitute violations of ICANN’s governing rules regarding string similarity review.  

82. According to Booking.com, among the most compelling evidence of ICANN’s failure in this regard are the statements made on the record by several members of the NGPC during its 10 September 2013 meeting at which Booking.com’s Request for Reconsideration was denied. Given the importance that the Panel attaches to these statements, they are addressed in some detail in the Analysis in Part VI, below.  

83. In its written submissions Booking.com asks the Panel to grant the following relief:  

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

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

Awarding Booking.com its costs in this proceeding; and  

69 Request, ¶ 59.  
70 Reply, ¶ 39.  
71 Reply, ¶ 41.  
72 Reply, ¶ 41. In the passage of Booking.com’s submissions referred to here (as elsewhere), Booking.com speaks of violations of ICANN’s obligations of “due process”, which, it says, comprise concepts such as the right to be heard, the right to receive reasons for decisions, publicity, etc. For reasons explained in Part VI, below, the Panel prefers to use the terms fairness and transparency to connote the essence of ICANN’s obligations under review in this IRP.  
73 See Part II.C, above.
84. At the hearing Booking.com further requested that the Panel not only require ICANN to disregard the SSP determination regarding .hotels/.hoteis, but also order ICANN to “delegate both .hotels and .hoteis.”

B. ICANN’s position

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

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

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

(i) The Panel’s Authority

87. Throughout its submissions ICANN repeatedly stresses what it says is the very limited authority enjoyed by IRP panels.

88. As provided in Article IV, Section 3(4) of ICANN’s Bylaws, ICANN observes that this Panel (as all IRP panels) is charged only with “comparing contested actions of the Board to the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, and with declaring whether the Board has acted consistently with the provisions of those Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws.”76

89. ICANN notes that, in undertaking this compare-and-declare mission, the Panel is further constrained to apply the very specific “standard of review” set out in Bylaw Article IV, Section 3(4), which requires the Panel to focus on three particular questions: “did the Board act without conflict of interest in taking its decision?”; “did the Board exercise due diligence and care in having a reasonable amount of facts in front of them?”; and “did the Board members exercise independent judgment in taking the decision, believed to be in the best interests of the company [ICANN]?”.77

74 Response, ¶ 9.
75 Response, ¶ 8. Both parties agree that, as submitted by Booking.com, the “rules” at issue, against which the conduct of the ICANN Board is to be assessed, include the relevant provisions of the Guidebook.
76 See for example Response, ¶ 2; ¶ 9.
77 Response, ¶ 2.
90. ICANN further asserts that the IRP process “is not available as a mechanism to challenge the actions or inactions of ICANN staff or third parties that may be involved in ICANN activities,” such as the action of the SSP which resulted in .hotels and .hoteis being placed in contention. Nor, says ICANN, may the IRP process be used as an “appeal mechanism” by which to overturn substantive decisions—such as the determination that .hotels and .hoteis are confusingly visually similar—with which an applicant may disagree.

91. In this regard ICANN states that the affirmative relief sought by Booking.com—specifically, a declaration requiring that ICANN “reject the determination that .hotels and .hoteis are confusingly similar and disregard the resulting contention set” and (as requested at the hearing) that ICANN “delegate both .hotels and .hoteis”—exceeds the authority of the Panel.

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

a. The string similarity review process

92. According to ICANN, “[e]arly on in the iterations of the Guidebook, it was determined that, in the initial evaluation stage, the String Similarity Panel would only examine strings for visual confusion,” and “[i]f applied-for strings are determined to so nearly resemble each other visually that it is likely to deceive or cause confusion, the string will be placed in a contention set, which is then resolved pursuant to the contention set resolution processes in Module 4 of the Guidebook.”

93. According to ICANN, it was also determined early on that, as stated in Section 2.2.1.1 of the Guidebook, “[t]his similarity review will be conducted by an independent String Similarity Panel,” not by ICANN itself. ICC was duly selected to perform the string similarity review further to “an open and public request for proposals,” pursuant to which, as the successful bidder, “ICC was responsible for the development of its own process documents and methodology for performing the String Similarity Review consistent with the provisions of the Guidebook.” ICANN emphasizes that “the Guidebook does not provide for any process by which ICANN (or anyone else) may conduct a substantive review of ICC’s results.”

94. In ICANN’s submission, the alternative proposed by Booking.com, that “the ICANN Board—and the ICANN Board alone—was obligated to perform the String Similarity Review for the more than 1,900 new gTLD applications submitted,” is “untenable and is not supported by ICANN’s Bylaws or Articles.” As noted by ICANN, the Guidebook defines six distinct
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78 Response, ¶ 3.
79 Response, ¶ 45.
80 Response, ¶ 55.
81 Response, ¶ 15 (underlining in original).
82 Response, ¶ 16.
83 Response, ¶ 17.
84 Sur-Reply, ¶ 7.
review processes that every gTLD application is required to go through, including string similarity review; each of those review processes was conducted by independent experts specifically engaged by ICANN staff for the purpose.

95. ICANN submits that "there simply is no requirement – under ICANN's governing documents or imposed by law – that would mandate that the ICANN Board inject itself into the day-to-day affairs of the evaluation process in the manner Booking.com proposes."\(^{95}\) It asserts that, consistent with well-settled legal principles, "neither ICANN's Bylaws, nor the Articles, nor the Guidebook requires the ICANN Board to conduct any analysis of the decisions of third party experts retained to evaluate string similarity."\(^{96}\)

96. Moreover, ICANN asserts that "[s]imply because the ICANN Board has the discretion [under Section 5.1 (Module 5-4) of the Guidebook] to consider individual applications does not mean it is required to do so or that it should do so, particularly at an initial evaluation stage."\(^{97}\)

97. ICANN claims that that Booking.com's repeated invocation of the Board's so-called obligation to ensure "due process" in the administration of the New gTLD Program is misplaced. First, neither applicable California law nor any provision of the Bylaws, Articles of Incorporation or Guidebook "specifically affords any gTLD applicant a right to procedural 'due process' similar to that which is afforded in courts of law."\(^{98}\) Second, because ICANN conducts its activities in the public interest it nevertheless provides "more opportunity for parties to be heard and to dispute actions taken"\(^{99}\) than most private corporate entities. Third, the "decision to proceed with the New gTLD Program followed many years of discussion, debate and deliberation within the ICANN community, including participation from end users, civil society, technical experts, business groups, governments and others."\(^{100}\) Fourth, and perhaps most importantly, "ICANN adhered to the policies and procedures articulated in its Bylaws, Articles of Incorporation, and the Guidebook, the latter of which was adopted only after being publicly vetted with ICANN's stakeholders and the broader Internet community."\(^{101}\)

98. ICANN's response to Booking.com's various allegations regarding particular elements of the string similarity review process – including for example the selection of the SSP, the publication of the SSP's methodology, the anonymity of the individuals SSP members, the supposed lack of quality control – is essentially three-fold: first, the actions challenged by Booking.com are not Board actions, but actions of ICANN staff or third parties, which cannot

\(^{95}\) Sur-Reply, ¶ 10. 
\(^{96}\) Sur-Reply, ¶ 10. 
\(^{97}\) Sur-Reply, ¶ 11. It was established during the hearing that the several references to this discretionary authority in ICANN's written and oral submissions refer specifically to the authority conferred by Section 5.1 (Module 5-4) of the Guidebook. 
\(^{98}\) Sur-Reply, ¶ 18. 
\(^{99}\) Sur-Reply, ¶ 18. 
\(^{100}\) Sur-Reply, ¶ 18 fn 18. 
\(^{101}\) Sur-Reply, ¶ 18 fn 18.
be challenged by means of IRP proceedings; second, in any case, Booking.com's claims are factually incorrect, and there has been no violation of the Bylaws, Articles of Incorporation or Guidebook; third, Booking.com's claims are time-barred given that Article IV, Section 3(3) of the Bylaws requires that IRP requests "must be filed within thirty days of the posting of the minutes of the Board meeting ... that the requesting party contends demonstrates that ICANN violated its Bylaws or Articles of Incorporation."\textsuperscript{92}

b. The case of hotels

99. ICANN's position as regards the determination to place .hotels and .hoteis in contention is similar in many respects to its position regarding the string similarity review process generally. ICANN argues that the Board played no role whatsoever in performing the review of .hoteis; that the SSP's determination was in any event well supported and there was no violation of applicable rules; and that the Guidebook does not provide for any process by which ICANN (or any other body, including an IRP panel) may conduct a substantive review of a string similarity determination.

100. In any event, ICANN asserts that .hotels and .hoteis in fact meet every one of the visual similarity criteria applied by the SSP, as set out in the SSP Manager's Letter. Moreover, .hotels and .hoteis scored a stunning 99% for visual similarity under the publicly available SWORD algorithm which, as provided by Section 2.2.1.1.2 (Module 2-7) of the Guidebook, establishes "one objective measure for consideration by the [SSP]". According to ICANN (in response to a question posed by the Panel during the hearing), this was the highest algorithmic score among the comparison of all non-identical pairs within the 1917 new gTLD applications received by ICANN;\textsuperscript{93} the only other pair of non-exact match strings found to be confusingly visually similar – .unicom and .unicom – scored only 94%.\textsuperscript{94}

101. According to ICANN, "it was not clearly 'wrong.' as Booking.com argues, for the [SSP] to find that .hotels/.hoteis are confusingly similar.\textsuperscript{95}

102. In conclusion, ICANN states that its conduct with respect to Booking.com's application for .hotels, including in evaluating Booking.com's Request for Reconsideration, was fully consistent with ICANN's Articles of Incorporation, its Bylaws and the procedures established in the Guidebook; and the fact that Booking.com disagrees with the SSP's determination to put .hotels and .hoteis in a contention set does not give rise to an IRP.

103. ICANN asks the Panel to deny Booking.com's IRP Request.

VI. ANALYSIS

A. The Panel's Authority

\textsuperscript{92} Sur-Reply, ¶ 20-42.

\textsuperscript{93} A number of these applications were subsequently withdrawn.

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

\textsuperscript{95} Response, ¶ 53.
104. The jurisdiction and authority of an IRP panel is expressly prescribed — and expressly limited — by the ICANN Bylaws. To recap, Article IV, Section 3 of the Bylaws provides:

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

a. did the Board act without conflict of interest in taking its decision?

b. did the Board exercise due diligence and care in having a reasonable amount of facts in front of them?; and

c. did the Board members exercise independent judgment in taking the decision, believed to be in the best interests of the company [ICANN]?

[...]

11. The IRP Panel shall have the authority to:

[...]

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

d. recommend that the Board stay any action or decision, or that the Board take any interim action, until such time as the Board reviews and acts upon the opinion of the IRP;

[...]

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

[Underlining added]

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

8. Standard of Review

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

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

106. There is no dispute as regards the Panel’s duty to compare the actions of the Board to ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws (and, in this case, Guidebook) with a view to
declaring whether those actions are inconsistent with applicable policies. Where the parties disagree is with respect to the standard of review to be applied by the Panel in assessing Board conduct.

107. ICANN submits that its Bylaws "specify that a deferential standard of review be applied when evaluating the actions of the ICANN Board ... the rules are clear that the appointed IRP Panel is neither asked to, nor allowed to, substitute its judgment for that of the Board." Booking.com argues that this "is simply wrong. No such specification is made in ICANN's Bylaws or elsewhere, and a restrictive interpretation of the standard of review would ... fail to ensure accountability on the part of ICANN and would be incompatible with ICANN's commitment to maintain (and improve) robust mechanisms for accountability."  

108. In the opinion of the Panel, there can be no question but that the provisions of the ICANN Bylaws establishing the Independent Review Process and defining the role of an IRP panel specify that the ICANN Board enjoys a large degree of discretion in its decisions and actions. So long as the Board acts without conflict of interest and with due care, it is entitled – indeed, required – to exercise its independent judgment in acting in what it believes to be the best interests of ICANN. The only substantive check on the conduct of the ICANN Board is that such conduct may not be inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws – or, the parties agree, with the Guidebook. In that connection, the Panel notes that Article 1, Section 2 of the Bylaws also clearly states that in exercising its judgment, the Board (indeed "[a]ny ICANN body making a recommendation or decision") shall itself "determine which core values are most relevant and how they apply to the specific circumstances of the case at hand."

109. In other words, in making decisions the Board is required to conduct itself reasonably in what it considers to be ICANN's best interests; where it does so, the only question is whether its actions are or are not consistent with the Articles, Bylaws and, in this case, with the policies and procedures established in the Guidebook.

110. There is also no question but that the authority of an IRP panel to compare contested actions of the Board to the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, and to declare whether the Board has acted consistently with the Articles and Bylaws, does not extend to opining on the nature of those instruments. Nor, in this case, does our authority extend to opining on the nature of the policies or procedures established in the Guidebook. In this regard it is recalled that Booking.com itself repeatedly stresses that it does not contest the validity or fairness of the string similarity review process as set out in the Guidebook, but merely whether ICANN's actions were consistent with various elements of that process. Stated differently, our role in this IRP includes assessing whether the applicable rules – in this case, the rules regarding string similarity review – were followed, not whether such rules are appropriate or advisable.

111. Nevertheless, this does not mean that the IRP Panel may only review ICANN Board actions or inactions under the deferential standard advocated by ICANN in these proceedings. Rather, as explained below, the IRP Panel is charged with "objectively" determining whether
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96 Response, ¶ 24.
97 Reply, ¶ 16.
or not the Board’s actions are in fact consistent with the Articles, Bylaws and Guidebook, which the Panel understands as requiring that the Board’s conduct be appraised independently, and without any presumption of correctness.

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

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

[Underlining added.]

113. While on no way bound by that decision, we agree with its conclusions in this respect.

114. At the end of the day we fail to see any significant difference between the parties’ positions in this regard. The process is clear, and both parties acknowledge, that the Panel is tasked with determining whether or not the Board’s actions are consistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws and the Guidebook. Such a determination calls for what the panel in

---

98 ICDR Case No. 50 117 T 00224 08, ICM Registry, LLC v. ICANN, Declaration dated 19 February 2010 (“ICM Registry”), ¶ 136.
the ICM Registry matter called an "objective" appraisal of Board conduct as measured against the policies and rules set out in those instruments; all agree that it is the Articles, Bylaws and Guidebook which are determinative.

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

116. With the foregoing firmly in mind, the Panel turns now to the issues to be determined in order to resolve the present dispute.

B. The String Similarity Review Process

117. The Panel is not unsympathetic to Booking.com’s complaints regarding the string similarity review process as established by the Guidebook. There is no question but that that process lacks certain elements of transparency and certain practices that are widely associated with requirements of fairness. For example, the Guidebook provides no means for applicants to provide evidence or make submissions to the SSP (or any other ICANN body) and so be fully "heard" on the substantive question of the similarity of their applied-for gTLD strings to others.

118. Indeed, as stated at the outset of this Declaration, these observations and the concerns that they engender were voiced by several members of the ICANN Board’s New gTLD Program Committee which voted to accept the BGC’s Recommendation to deny Booking.com’s Request for Reconsideration. The Panel can do no better than reproduce the statements made by the NGPC members in this respect, as recorded in the minutes of the NGPC’s 10 September 2013 meeting.100

---

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

100 Request, Annex 16.
- Mr. George Sadowski stated his intention to abstain from the vote because, although "he understood that the BGC did the right thing, [he] thought the end result that was contrary to ICANN's ... and the user's best interests."

- Ms. Olga Madruza-Forti also stated her intention to abstain from voting on the BGC recommendation "because there was not sufficient rationale provided for why the string similarity review panel made its determination."

- In response to a comment by the Chair that the Request for Reconsideration deserved to be denied "[b]ecause the process was followed," Mr. Ray Plzak "agreed that the process was followed, but noted that the process needs to be reviewed to potentially add a mechanism that would allow persons who don't agree with the outcome to make an objection, other than using a Reconsideration Request."

- Mr. Plzak "recommended the Committee send a strong signal to the BGC, or adopt a resolution recommending that the BGC consider development of a different mechanism to provide an avenue for the community to appeal the outcome of a decision based on the merits."

- Ms. Madruza-Forti agreed and "recommended that in the future, a remand or appeals mechanism may help alleviate the concerns noted."

- Mr. Bill Graham also agreed with Mr. Plzak's suggestion, and noted that "generally, there is a considerable level of discomfort and dissatisfaction with the process as expressed by Committee members."

- The Chair "agreed with [Mr. Graham's] sentiment."

- The General Counsel and Secretary noted that ICANN ... "has tried to encourage more use of the ombudsman, or other accountability mechanisms for these types of concerns."

119. Ultimately, five members of the NGPC voted in favour of the resolution accepting the BGC's Recommendation; two members were unavailable to vote; and four members abstained. The abstaining members offered the following voting statements:

- Mr. Plzak stated that he abstained from voting "because he is disappointed in what is being done to remedy the situation. [He] would like to see more resolve to fix the process."

- Ms. Madruza-Forti stated that:

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

- Mr. Kuo-Wei Wu agreed with Ms. Madruga-Forti’s and Mr. Plzak’s voting statements.

- Mr. Sadowsky provided the following detailed statement:

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

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

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

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

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

I cannot and will not vote in favor of a motion that reflects, directly or indirectly, an unwillingness to depart from what I see as such a flawed position and which does not reflect in my opinion an understanding of the current reality of the situation.
120. These statements reflect to an important degree the Panel's own analysis.

121. The elements of the string similarity review process were established and widely published several years ago, after extensive consultation and debate among ICANN stakeholders and the Internet community. Booking.com correctly describes the process established (or "crystallized") in the Guidebook as a component of "a consensus policy" concerning the introduction of new gTLDs.\textsuperscript{101}

122. The Guidebook makes clear that, as part of the initial evaluation to which all applied-for gTLDs are subject, each string would be reviewed for a number of factors, one of which is "string similarity", which involves a determination of "whether the applied-for gTLD string is so similar to other strings that it would create a probability of user confusion."\textsuperscript{102} The term "user" is elaborated elsewhere in the Guidebook, which speaks of confusion arising "in the mind of the average, reasonable Internet user."\textsuperscript{103}

123. The Guidebook explains that string similarity review comprises merely a "visual similarity check,"\textsuperscript{104} with a view to identifying only "visual string similarities" that would create a probability of user confusion.\textsuperscript{105}

124. The Guidebook makes clear that string similarity reviews would be conducted by an independent third party – the SSP – that would have wide (though not complete) discretion both in formulating its methodology and in determining string similarity on the basis of that methodology.

125. Section 2.2.1.1.2 of the Guidebook, titled "Review Methodology", provides that the SSP "is informed in part by an algorithmic score for ... visual similarity," which "will provide one objective measure for consideration by the [SSP]." Section 2.2.1.1.2 further states that, in addition to "examining all the algorithm data," the SSP will "perform its own review of similarities between strings and whether they rise to the level of string confusion." It is noted that the objective algorithmic score is to be treated as "only indicative". Crucially, "the final determination of similarity is entirely up to the [SSP's] judgment." (Underlining added)

126. In sum, the Guidebook calls for the SSP to determine whether two strings are so "visually similar" as to create a "probability of confusion" in the mind of an "average, reasonable Internet user." In making this determination, the SSP is informed by an "algorithmic score", to ensure that the process comprises at least one "objective measure". However, the algorithmic score is not determinative. The SSP also develops and performs "its own review". At the end of the day, the determination is entirely a matter of "the [SSP's] judgment."

\textsuperscript{101} Request, ¶ 13.
\textsuperscript{102} Guidebook, §2.2 (Module 2.4).
\textsuperscript{103} Guidebook, §2.2.1.1.2. (Underlining added)
\textsuperscript{104} Guidebook, §2.2.1.1. (Underlining added)
\textsuperscript{105} Guidebook, §2.2.1.1. (Underlining added)
127. By its very nature this process is highly discretionary. It is also, to an important degree, subjective. The Guidebook provides no definition of "visual similarity", nor any indication of how such similarity is to be objectively measured other than by means of the SWORD algorithm. The Guidebook provides no definition of "confusion," nor any definition or description of an "average, reasonable Internet user." As Mr. Sadowski of the NGPC put it: "Confusion is a perceptual issue." (Mr. Sadowski further noted; "String similarity is only one consideration in thinking about perceptual confusion, and in fact it is not always an issue.) The Guidebook mandates the SSP to develop and apply "its own review" of visual similarity and "whether similarities rise to the level of user confusion", in addition to SWORD algorithm, which is intended to be merely "indicative", yet provides no substantive guidelines in this respect.

128. Nor does the process as it exists provide for gTLD applicants to benefit from the sort of procedural mechanisms – for example, to inform the SSP’s review, to receive reasoned determinations from the SSP, or to appeal the merits of those determinations – which Booking.com claims are required under the applicable rules. Clearly, certain ICANN NGPC members themselves consider that such input would be desirable and that changes to the process are required in order for the string similarity review process to attain its true goal, which Mr. Sadowsky referred to as “the minimization of user confusion and ensuring user trust in using the DNS”. However, as even the abstaining members of the NGPC conceded, the fact is that the sort of mechanisms that Booking.com asserts are required (and which those NGPC members believe should be required) are simply not part of the string similarity review process as currently established. As to whether they should be, it is not our place to express an opinion, though we note that such additional mechanisms surely would be consistent with the principles of transparency and fairness.

129. We add that we agree with ICANN that the time has long since passed for Booking.com or any other interested party to ask an IRP panel to review the actions of the ICANN Board in relation to the establishment of the string similarity review process, including Booking.com’s claims that specific elements of the process and the Board decisions to implement those elements are inconsistent with ICANN’s Articles and Bylaws. Any such claims, even if they had any merit, are long since time-barred by the 30-day limitation period set out in Article IV, Section 3(3) of the Bylaws. As ICANN expressed during the hearing, if Booking.com believed that there were problems with the Guidebook, it should have objected at the time the Guidebook was first implemented.

130. When asked during the hearing about its failure to object timely, Booking.com argued that it could not have known how the Board’s actions – that is, how the process established in the Guidebook – would affect it prior to the submission of its application for .hotels. However, that is not a persuasive or meritorious answer. As did all stakeholders, Booking.com had the opportunity to challenge the Board’s adoption of the Guidebook, at the time, if it considered any of its elements to be inconsistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws.

C. The Case of .hotels

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

132. There are two principal elements to this part of Booking.com’s case: a challenge in relation to the process followed by the SSP; and a challenge in relation to the Board’s handling of Booking.com’s Request for Reconsideration of the SSP’s determination. However, the fundamental obstacle to Booking.com’s case is that the established process was followed in all respects.

133. Booking.com itself acknowledges that “the process was followed” by the SSP, which determined that .hotels and .hoteis were so visually similar as to warrant being placed in a contention set. So too did all of the NGPC members who commented on the matter recognize that “the process was followed” – for all their stated misgivings concerning the outcome of the process.

134. The same is true of the Request for Reconsideration. The Panel is struck by the extent and thoughtfulness not only of the NGPC’s consideration of the issue, certain aspects of which are discussed above, but of the BGC’s detailed analysis and its Recommendation to the NGPC, on the basis of which Booking.com’s Request for Reconsideration was denied. Contrary to Booking.com’s allegations, in neither instance was this merely a blind acceptance of a decision of a subordinate body. In fact, the reconsideration process itself, however limited and perhaps imperfect it may be, is inconsistent with Booking.com’s claims of lack of “due process”.

135. Although not addressed in great detail by the parties, the Panel considers several observations made by the BGC in its 1 August 2013 Recommendation to be particularly apposite:

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

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

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

\textsuperscript{106} BGC Recommendation, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{107} BGC Recommendation, p. 4. The BGC explains that “Because the basis for the Request is not Board conduct, regardless of whether the 20 December 2012 version, or the 11 April 2013 version, of the Reconsideration Bylaws is operative, the BGC’s analysis and recommendation below would not change.”
methodology for assessing visual similarity should have been, as opposed to the methodology set out at Section 2.2.1.2 of the Applicant Guidebook. In asserting a new review methodology, Booking.com is asking the BGC (and the Board through the New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC)) to make a substantive evaluation of the confusability of the strings and to reverse the decision. In the context of the New gTLD Program, the Reconsideration process is not however intended for the Board to perform a substantive review of [SSP] decisions. While Booking.com may have multiple reasons as to why it believes that its application for .hotels should not be in contention set with .hotels, Reconsideration is not available as a mechanism to re-try the decisions of the evaluation panels.\footnote{68}

- Booking.com also claims that its assertions regarding the non-confusability of the .hotels and .hotels strings demonstrate that “it is contrary to ICANN policy to put them in a contention set.” (Request, pages 6-7.) This is just a differently worded attempt to reverse the decision of the [SSP]. No actual policy or process is cited by Booking.com, only the suggestion that – according to Booking.com – the standards within the Applicant Guidebook on visual similarity should have resulted in a different outcome for the .hotels string. This is not enough for Reconsideration.\footnote{69}

- Booking.com argues that the contention set decision was taken without material information, including Booking.com’s linguistic expert’s opinion, or other “information that would refute the mistaken contention that there is likely to be consumer confusion between ‘hotels’ and ‘hotels.’” (Request, page 7.) However, there is no process point in the String Similarity Review for applicants to submit additional information. This is in stark contrast to the reviews set out in Section 2.2.2 of the Applicant Guidebook, including the Technical/Operational review and the Financial Review, which allow for the evaluators to seek clarification or additional information through the issuance of clarifying questions. (AGB, Section 2.2.2.3 (Evaluation Methodology)).\footnote{70}

- Just as the process does not call for additional applicant inputs into the visual similarity review, Booking.com’s call for further information on the decision to place .hotels and .hotels in a contention set ... is similarly not rooted in any established ICANN process at issue.[...]. While applicants may avail themselves of accountability mechanism to challenge decisions, the use of an accountability mechanism when there is no proper ground to bring a request for review under the selected mechanism does not then provide opportunity for additional substantive review of decisions already taken.\footnote{71}

- [While we understand the impact that Booking.com faces by being put in a contention set, and that it wishes for more narrative information regarding the [SSP’s] decision, no such narrative is called for in the process.]\footnote{72}

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

\footnote{68}{BGC Recommendation, p. 5.}
\footnote{69}{BGC Recommendation, p. 6.}
\footnote{70}{BGC Recommendation, p. 6.}
\footnote{71}{BGC Recommendation, pp. 6-7.}
\footnote{72}{BGC Recommendation, p. 7.}
set out in the Applicant Guidebook. ICANN then coordinates a quality assurance review over a random selection of [SSP's] reviews to gain confidence that the methodology and process were followed. That is the process used for a making and assessing a determination of visual similarity. Booking.com's disagreement as to whether the methodology should have resulted in a finding of visual similarity does not mean that ICANN (including the third party vendors performing String Similarity Review) violated any policy in reaching the decision (nor does it support a conclusion that the decision was actually wrong).\textsuperscript{135}

- The [SSP] reviewed all applied for strings according to the standards and methodology of the visual string similarity review set out in the Applicant Guidebook. The Guidebook clarifies that once contention sets are formed by the [SSP], ICANN will notify the applicants and will publish results on its website. (AGB, Section 2.2.1.1.1.) That the [SSP] considered its output as "advice" to ICANN (as stated in its process documentation) is not the end of the story. Whether the results are transmitted as "advice" or "outcomes" or "reports", the important query is what ICANN was expected to do with that advice once it was received. ICANN had always made clear that it would rely on the advice of its evaluators in the initial evaluation stage of the New gTLD Program, subject to quality assurance measures. Therefore, Booking.com is actually proposing a new and different process when it suggests that ICANN should perform substantive review (instead of process testing) over the results of the String Similarity Review Panel's outcomes prior to the finalization of contention sets.\textsuperscript{134}

- As there is no indication that either the [SSP] or ICANN staff violated any established ICANN policy in reaching or accepting the decision on the placement of .hotels and .hoteis in a non-exact contention set, this Request should not proceed.\textsuperscript{136}

136. These excerpts of the BGC Recommendation not only illustrate the seriousness with which Booking.com's Request for Reconsideration was heard, they mirror considerations to which we fully subscribe and which we find apply as well, with equal force and effect, in the context of Booking.com's IRP Request.

137. It simply cannot be said — indeed, it is not even alleged by Booking.com — that the established process was not followed by the ICANN Board or any third party either in the initial string similarity review of .hotels or in the reconsideration process.

138. Booking.com was asked at the hearing to identify with particularity the ICANN Board's actions (including inactions) in this case that it claims are inconsistent with ICANN's Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws or the Guidebook and regarding which it asks the Panel to render a declaration. It identified four:

- The Board's adoption of certain provisions of the Guidebook, including the allegedly ill-defined, unfair and non-transparent procedures for selecting the SSP and supervising the SSP's performance of the string similarity review process. As discussed, any claims in this regard are time-barred.

\textsuperscript{133} BGC Recommendation, p. 7.
\textsuperscript{134} BGC Recommendation, p. 8.
\textsuperscript{135} BGC Recommendation, p. 10.
The Board’s acceptance of the SSP determination. As ICANN argues, there was no action (or inaction) by the Board here, no decision made (or not made) by the Board or any other body to accept the SSP’s determination. The Guidebook provides that applied-for strings “will be placed in contention set” where the SSP determines the existence of visual similarity likely to give rise to user confusion. Simply put, under the Guidebook the Board is neither required nor entitled to intervene at this stage to accept or not accept the SSP’s determination. Booking.com is correct that the Board could nevertheless have stepped in and reversed the SSP determination under Section 5.1 (Module 5-4) of the Guidebook, but did not do so; that inaction is addressed below.

The Board’s denial of Booking.com’s Request for Reconsideration. As discussed above, there is nothing in the evidence that even remotely suggests that ICANN’s conduct in this regard was inconsistent with its Articles, Bylaws or the Guidebook. On the contrary, we have already stated that the detailed analysis performed by the BGC and the extensive consideration of the BGC Recommendation by the NGCP undermine any claim that ICANN failed to exercise due care and independent judgment, or that its handling of the Request for Reconsideration was inconsistent with applicable rules or policy. As discussed above, just as in the present IRP, the question in the reconsideration process is whether the established process was followed. This was the question that the BGC and NGPC asked themselves in considering Booking.com’s Request for Reconsideration, and which they properly answered in the affirmative in denying Booking.com’s request.

The Board’s refusal to “step in” and exercise its authority under Section 5.1 (Module 5-4) of the Guidebook to “individually consider an application for a new gTLD to determine whether approval would be in the best interest of the Internet community.” As pointed out by ICANN during the hearing, the fact that the ICANN Board enjoys such discretion and may choose to exercise it any time does not mean that it is bound to exercise it, let alone at the time and in the manner demanded by Booking.com. In any case, the Panel does not believe that the Board’s inaction in this respect was inconsistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws or indeed with ICANN’s guiding principles of transparency and fairness, given (1) Booking.com’s concession that the string similarity review process was followed; (2) the indisputable conclusion that any challenge to the adoption of the SSP process itself is time-barred; (3) the manifestly thoughtful consideration given to Booking.com’s Request for Reconsideration by the BGC; and (4), the fact that, notwithstanding its protestations to the contrary, Booking.com’s real dispute seems to be with the process itself rather than how the process was applied in this case (given that, as noted, Booking.com concedes that the process was indeed followed).

The Panel further considers that these – in addition to any and all other potential (and allegedly reviewable) actions identified by Booking.com during the course of these proceedings – fail on the basis of Booking.com’s dual acknowledgement that it does not challenge the validity or fairness of the string similarity review process, and that that process was duly followed in this case.
140. Finally, the panel notes that Booking.com's claim — largely muted during the hearing — regarding alleged "discrimination" as regards the treatment of its application for .hotels also founders on the same ground. Booking.com acknowledges that the established string similarity review process was followed; and there is absolutely no evidence whatsoever that .hotels was treated any differently than any other applied-for gTLD string in this respect. The mere fact that the result of the string similarity review of .hotels differed from the results of the reviews of the vast majority of other applied-for strings does not suggest discriminatory treatment. In any event, the Panel cannot but note the obvious, which is that .hotels is not alone in having been placed in contention by the SSP. So too was .hoteis; and so too were .unicom and .unicom. Moreover, and once again, it is recalled that Booking.com does not claim to challenge the merits of the string similarity review, that is, the determination that .hotels and .hoteis are so visually similar as to warrant placement in a contention set.

D. Conclusion

141. In launching this IRP, Booking.com no doubt realized that it faced an uphill battle. The very limited nature of IRP proceedings is such that any IRP applicant will face significant obstacles in establishing that the ICANN Board acted inconsistently with ICANN's Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws. In fact, Booking.com acknowledges those obstacles, albeit inconsistently and at times indirectly.

142. Booking.com purports to challenge "the way in which the [string similarity review] process was established, implemented and supervised by (or under the authority of) the ICANN Board"; yet it also claims that it does not challenge the validity or fairness of the string similarity review process as set out in the Guidebook. It asks the Panel to overturn the SSP's determination in this case and to substitute an alternate result, in part on the basis of its own "expert evidence" regarding similarity and the probability of user confusion as between .hotels and .hoteis; yet it claims that it does not challenge the merits of the SSP determination and it acknowledges that the process set out in the Guidebook was duly followed in the case of its application for .hotels.

143. In sum, Booking.com has failed to overcome the very obstacles that it recognizes exist.

144. The Panel finds that Booking.com has failed to identify any instance of Board action or inaction, including any action or inaction of ICANN staff or a third party (such as ICC, acting as the SSP), that could be considered to be inconsistent with ICANN's Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws or with the policies and procedures established in the Guidebook. This includes the challenged actions of the Board (or any staff or third party) in relation to what Booking.com calls the implementation and supervision of the string similarity review process generally, as well as the challenged actions of the Board (or any staff or third party) in relation to the string similarity review of .hotels in particular.

145. More particularly, the Panel finds that the string similarity review performed in the case of .hotels was not inconsistent with the Articles or Bylaws or with what Booking.com refers to as the "applicable rules" as set out in the Guidebook.

146. To the extent that the Board's adoption and implementation of specific elements of the new gTLD Program and Guidebook, including the string similarity review process, could
potentially be said to be inconsistent with the principles of transparency or fairness that
underlie ICANN's Articles and Incorporation and Bylaws (which the Panel does not say is the
case), the time to challenge such action has long since passed.

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

VII. THE PREVAILING PARTY; COSTS

148. Article IV, Section 3(18) of the Bylaws requires that the Panel "specifically designate the
prevailing party." This designation is germane to the allocation of costs, given that Article
IV, Section 3(18) provides that the "party not prevailing shall ordinarily be responsible for
bearing all costs of the IRP Provider."

149. The same provision of the Bylaws also states that "in an extraordinary case the IRP
Panel may in its declaration allocate up to half of the costs of the IRP Provider to the
prevailing party based upon the circumstances, including a consideration of the
reasonableness of the parties' positions and their contribution to the public interest.
Each party to the IRP proceedings shall bear its own expenses."

150. Similarly, the Supplementary Procedures state, at Article 11:

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

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

151. The "IRP Provider" is the ICDR, and, in accordance with the ICDR Rules, the costs to be
allocated between the parties – what the Bylaws call the "costs of the IRP Provider", and
the Supplementary Procedures call the "costs of the proceedings" – include the fees and
expenses of the Panel members and of the ICDR (we refer to all of these costs as "IRP
costs").

152. ICANN is undoubtedly the prevailing party in this case. That being said, the Panel
considers that the nature and significance of the issues raised by Booking.com, and the
contribution to the "public interest" of its submissions, are such that it is appropriate and
reasonable that the IRP costs be shared equally by the parties. We consider that the
extraordinary circumstances of case – in which some members of ICANN's New gTLD
Program Committee have publicly declared that, in their view, the rules on the basis of
which Booking.com's claims fail should be reconsidered by ICANN – warrants such a
holding.

153. The Panel cannot grant Booking.com the relief that it seeks. A panel such as ours can
only declare whether, on the facts as we find them, the challenged actions of ICANN are
or are not inconsistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws. We have found that the actions in question are not inconsistent with those instruments. The process established by ICANN under its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws and set out in the Guidebook was followed, and the time to challenge that process (which Booking.com asserts is not its intention in these proceedings in any event) has long passed.

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

FOR THE FOREGOING REASONS, the Panel hereby declares:

(1) Booking.com’s IRP Request is denied;

(2) ICANN is the prevailing party;

(3) In view of the circumstances, each party shall bear one-half of the costs of the IRP Provider, including the fees and expenses of the Panel members and the fees and expenses of the ICDR. As a result, the administrative fees and expenses of the ICDR, totaling US$4,600.00, as well as the compensation and expenses of the Panelists totaling US$163,010.05 are to be borne equally. Therefore, ICANN shall pay to Booking.com the amount of US$2,300.00 representing that portion of said fees and expenses in excess of the apportioned costs previously incurred by Booking.com.

(4) This Final Declaration may be executed in any number of counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, and all of which together shall constitute the Final Declaration of this IRP Panel.

Hon. A. Howard Matz
Date: March 7, 2015

David H. Bernstein
Date:

Stephen L. Drymer,
Chair of the IRP Panel
Date:
I, Hon. A. Howard Matz, do hereby affirm upon my oath as Arbitrator that I am the individual described in and who executed this instrument, which is the Final Declaration of the IRP Panel.
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[Signature]

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

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

FOR THE FOREGOING REASONS, the Panel hereby declares:

(1) Booking.com’s IRP Request is denied;

(2) ICANN is the prevailing party;

(3) In view of the circumstances, each party shall bear one-half of the costs of the IRP Provider, including the fees and expenses of the Panel members and the fees and expenses of the ICDR. As a result, the administrative fees and expenses of the ICDR, totaling US$4,600.00, as well as the compensation and expenses of the Panelists totaling US$163,010.05 are to be borne equally. Therefore, ICANN shall pay to Booking.com the amount of US$2,300.00 representing that portion of said fees and expenses in excess of the apportioned costs previously incurred by Booking.com.

(4) This Final Declaration may be executed in any number of counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, and all of which together shall constitute the Final Declaration of this IRP Panel.

Hon. A. Howard Matz
Date: __________________________

David H. Bernstein
Date: March 7, 2015

Stephen L. Drymer,
Chair of the IRP Panel
Date: __________________________
I, Hon. A. Howard Matz, do hereby affirm upon my oath as Arbitrator that I am the individual described in and who executed this instrument, which is the Final Declaration of the IRP Panel.
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I, David H. Bernstein, do hereby affirm upon my oath as Arbitrator that I am the individual described in and who executed this instrument, which is the Final Declaration of the IRP Panel.

March 2, 2015
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David H. Bernstein

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

Date

Stephen L. Drymer
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Date                          Hon. A. Howard Matz
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ARTICLE 1 MISSION, COMMITMENTS AND CORE VALUES

Section 1.1. MISSION
(a) The mission of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers ("ICANN") is to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems as described in this Section 1.1(a) (the "Mission"). Specifically, ICANN:

(i) Coordinates the allocation and assignment of names in the root zone of the Domain Name System ("DNS") and coordinates the development and implementation of policies concerning the registration of second-level domain names in generic top-level domains ("gTLDs"). In this role, ICANN's scope is to coordinate the development and implementation of policies:

- For which uniform or coordinated resolution is reasonably necessary to facilitate the openness, interoperability, resilience, security and/or stability of the DNS including, with respect to gTLD registrars and registries, policies in the areas described in Annex G-1 and Annex G-2; and
- That are developed through a bottom-up consensus-based multistakeholder process and designed to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique names systems.

The issues, policies, procedures, and principles addressed in Annex G-1 and Annex G-2 with respect to gTLD registrars and registries shall be deemed to be within ICANN's Mission.

(ii) Facilitates the coordination of the operation and evolution of the DNS root name server system.

(iii) Coordinates the allocation and assignment at the top-most level of Internet Protocol numbers and Autonomous System numbers. In service of its Mission, ICANN (A) provides registration services and open access for global number registries as requested by the Internet Engineering Task Force ("IETF") and the Regional Internet Registries ("RIRs") and (B) facilitates the development of global number registry policies by the affected community and other related tasks as agreed with the RIRs.
(iv) Collaborates with other bodies as appropriate to provide registries needed for the functioning of the Internet as specified by Internet protocol standards development organizations. In service of its Mission, ICANN's scope is to provide registration services and open access for registries in the public domain requested by Internet protocol development organizations.

(b) ICANN shall not act outside its Mission.

(c) ICANN shall not regulate (i.e., impose rules and restrictions on) services that use the Internet's unique identifiers or the content that such services carry or provide, outside the express scope of Section 1.1(a). For the avoidance of doubt, ICANN does not hold any governmentally authorized regulatory authority.

(d) For the avoidance of doubt and notwithstanding the foregoing:

(i) the foregoing prohibitions are not intended to limit ICANN's authority or ability to adopt or implement policies or procedures that take into account the use of domain names as natural-language identifiers;

(ii) Notwithstanding any provision of the Bylaws to the contrary, the terms and conditions of the documents listed in subsections (A) through (C) below, and ICANN's performance of its obligations or duties thereunder, may not be challenged by any party in any proceeding against, or process involving, ICANN (including a request for reconsideration or an independent review process pursuant to Article 4) on the basis that such terms and conditions conflict with, or are in violation of, ICANN's Mission or otherwise exceed the scope of ICANN's authority or powers pursuant to these Bylaws ("Bylaws") or ICANN's Articles of Incorporation ("Articles of Incorporation"):  

(A)

(1) all registry agreements and registrar accreditation agreements between ICANN and registry operators or registrars in force on 1 October 2016 [1], including, in each case, any terms or conditions therein that are not contained in the underlying form of registry agreement and registrar accreditation agreement;
(2) any registry agreement or registrar accreditation agreement not encompassed by (1) above to the extent its terms do not vary materially from the form of registry agreement or registrar accreditation agreement that existed on 1 October 2016;

(B) any renewals of agreements described in subsection (A) pursuant to their terms and conditions for renewal; and

(C) ICANN's Five-Year Strategic Plan and Five-Year Operating Plan existing on 10 March 2016.

(iii) Section 1.1(d)(ii) does not limit the ability of a party to any agreement described therein to challenge any provision of such agreement on any other basis, including the other party's interpretation of the provision, in any proceeding or process involving ICANN.

(iv) ICANN shall have the ability to negotiate, enter into and enforce agreements, including public interest commitments, with any party in service of its Mission.

Section 1.2. COMMITMENTS AND CORE VALUES

In performing its Mission, ICANN will act in a manner that complies with and reflects ICANN's Commitments and respects ICANN's Core Values, each as described below.

(a) COMMITMENTS

In performing its Mission, ICANN must operate in a manner consistent with these Bylaws for the benefit of the Internet community as a whole, carrying out its activities in conformity with relevant principles of international law and international conventions and applicable local law, through open and transparent processes that enable competition and open entry in Internet-related markets. Specifically, ICANN commits to do the following (each, a "Commitment," and collectively, the "Commitments");

(i) Preserve and enhance the administration of the DNS and the operational stability, reliability, security, global interoperability, resilience, and openness of the DNS and the Internet;
(ii) Maintain the capacity and ability to coordinate the DNS at the overall level and work for the maintenance of a single, interoperable Internet;

(iii) Respect the creativity, innovation, and flow of information made possible by the Internet by limiting ICANN's activities to matters that are within ICANN's Mission and require or significantly benefit from global coordination;

(iv) Employ open, transparent and bottom-up, multistakeholder policy development processes that are led by the private sector (including business stakeholders, civil society, the technical community, academia, and end users), while duly taking into account the public policy advice of governments and public authorities. These processes shall (A) seek input from the public, for whose benefit ICANN in all events shall act, (B) promote well-informed decisions based on expert advice, and (C) ensure that those entities most affected can assist in the policy development process;

(v) Make decisions by applying documented policies consistently, neutrally, objectively, and fairly, without singling out any particular party for discriminatory treatment (i.e., making an unjustified prejudicial distinction between or among different parties); and

(vi) Remain accountable to the Internet community through mechanisms defined in these Bylaws that enhance ICANN's effectiveness.

(b) CORE VALUES

In performing its Mission, the following "Core Values" should also guide the decisions and actions of ICANN:

(i) To the extent feasible and appropriate, delegating coordination functions to or recognizing the policy role of, other responsible entities that reflect the interests of affected parties and the roles of bodies internal to ICANN and relevant external expert bodies;

(ii) 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 to ensure that the bottom-up, multistakeholder policy development process is used to ascertain the global public interest and that those processes are accountable and transparent;

(iii) Where feasible and appropriate, depending on market mechanisms to
promote and sustain a competitive environment in the DNS market;

(iv) Introducing and promoting competition in the registration of domain names where practicable and beneficial to the public interest as identified through the bottom-up, multistakeholder policy development process;

(v) Operating with efficiency and excellence, in a fiscally responsible and accountable manner and, where practicable and not inconsistent with ICANN's other obligations under these Bylaws, at a speed that is responsive to the needs of the global Internet community;

(vi) While remaining rooted in the private sector (including business stakeholders, civil society, the technical community, academia, and end users), recognizing that governments and public authorities are responsible for public policy and duly taking into account the public policy advice of governments and public authorities;

(vii) Striving to achieve a reasonable balance between the interests of different stakeholders, while also avoiding capture; and

(viii) Subject to the limitations set forth in Section 27.2, within the scope of its Mission and other Core Values, respecting internationally recognized human rights as required by applicable law. This Core Value does not create, and shall not be interpreted to create, any obligation on ICANN outside its Mission, or beyond obligations found in applicable law. This Core Value does not obligate ICANN to enforce its human rights obligations, or the human rights obligations of other parties, against other parties.

(c) The Commitments and Core Values are intended to apply in the broadest possible range of circumstances. The Commitments reflect ICANN's fundamental compact with the global Internet community and are intended to apply consistently and comprehensively to ICANN's activities. The specific way in which Core Values are applied, individually and collectively, to any given situation may depend on many factors that cannot be fully anticipated or enumerated. Situations may arise in which perfect fidelity to all Core Values simultaneously is not possible. Accordingly, in any situation where one Core Value must be balanced with another, potentially competing Core Value, the result of the balancing must serve a policy developed through the bottom-up multistakeholder process or otherwise best serve ICANN's Mission.

ARTICLE 2 POWERS
Section 2.1. GENERAL POWERS

Except as otherwise provided in the Articles of Incorporation or these Bylaws, the powers of ICANN shall be exercised by, and its property controlled and its business and affairs conducted by or under the direction of, the Board (as defined in Section 7.1). With respect to any matters that would fall within the provisions of Section 3.6(a)-(c), the Board may act only by a majority vote of all Directors. In all other matters, except as otherwise provided in these Bylaws or by law, the Board may act by majority vote of the Directors present at any annual, regular, or special meeting of the Board. Any references in these Bylaws to a vote of the Board shall mean the vote of only those Directors present at the meeting where a quorum is present unless otherwise specifically provided in these Bylaws by reference to "of all Directors."

Section 2.2. RESTRICTIONS

ICANN shall not act as a Domain Name System Registry or Registrar or Internet Protocol Address Registry in competition with entities affected by the policies of ICANN. Nothing in this Section 2.2 is intended to prevent ICANN from taking whatever steps are necessary to protect the operational stability of the Internet in the event of financial failure of a Registry or Registrar or other emergency.

Section 2.3. NON-DISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT

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.

ARTICLE 3 TRANSPARENCY

Section 3.1. OPEN AND TRANSPARENT

ICANN and its constituent bodies shall operate to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner and consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness, including implementing procedures to (a) provide advance notice to facilitate stakeholder engagement in policy development decision-making and cross-community deliberations, (b) maintain responsive consultation procedures that provide detailed explanations of the basis for decisions (including how comments have influenced the development of policy considerations), and (c) encourage fact-based policy development work. ICANN shall also implement procedures for the documentation and public disclosure of the rationale for decisions made by the Board and ICANN's constituent bodies (including the detailed explanations discussed above).
Section 3.2. WEBSITE
ICANN shall maintain a publicly-accessible Internet World Wide Web site (the "Website"), which may include, among other things, (a) a calendar of scheduled meetings of the Board, the EC (as defined in Section 6.1(a)), Supporting Organizations (as defined in Section 11.1), and Advisory Committees (as defined in Section 12.1); (b) a docket of all pending policy development matters, including their schedule and current status; (c) specific meeting notices and agendas as described below; (d) information on the ICANN Budget (as defined in Section 22.4(a)(ii)), the IANA Budget (as defined in Section 22.4(b)(ii)), annual audit, financial contributors and the amount of their contributions, and related matters; (e) information about the availability of accountability mechanisms, including reconsideration, independent review, and Ombudsman activities, as well as information about the outcome of specific requests and complaints invoking these mechanisms; (f) announcements about ICANN activities of interest to significant segments of the ICANN community; (g) comments received from the community on policies being developed and other matters; (h) information about ICANN's physical meetings and public forums; and (i) other information of interest to the ICANN community.

Section 3.3. MANAGER OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
There shall be a staff position designated as Manager of Public Participation, or such other title as shall be determined by the President, that shall be responsible, under the direction of the President, for coordinating the various aspects of public participation in ICANN, including the Website and various other means of communicating with and receiving input from the general community of Internet users.

Section 3.4. MEETING NOTICES AND AGENDAS
At least seven days in advance of each Board meeting (or if not practicable, as far in advance as is practicable), a notice of such meeting and, to the extent known, an agenda for the meeting shall be posted.

Section 3.5. MINUTES AND PRELIMINARY REPORTS
a. All minutes of meetings of the Board, the Advisory Committees and Supporting Organizations (and any councils thereof) shall be approved promptly by the originating body and provided to the ICANN Secretary ("Secretary") for posting on the Website. All proceedings of the EC Administration (as defined in Section 6.3) and the EC shall be provided to the Secretary for posting on the Website.
b. No later than 11:59 p.m. on the second business day after the conclusion of each meeting (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office), any resolutions passed by the Board at that meeting shall be made publicly available on the Website; provided, however, that any actions relating to personnel or employment matters, legal matters (to the extent the Board determines it is necessary or appropriate to protect the interests of ICANN), matters that ICANN is prohibited by law or contract from disclosing publicly, and other matters that the Board determines, by a three-quarters (3/4) vote of Directors present at the meeting and voting, are not appropriate for public distribution, shall not be included in the resolutions made publicly available. The Secretary shall send notice to the Board and the Chairs of the Supporting Organizations (as set forth in Article 9 through Article 11) and Advisory Committees (as set forth in Article 12) informing them that the resolutions have been posted.

c. No later than 11:59 p.m. on the seventh business days after the conclusion of each meeting (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office), any actions taken by the Board shall be made publicly available in a preliminary report on the Website, subject to the limitations on disclosure set forth in Section 3.5(b) above. For any matters that the Board determines not to disclose, the Board shall describe in general terms in the relevant preliminary report the reason for such nondisclosure.

d. No later than the day after the date on which they are formally approved by the Board (or, if such day is not a business day, as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office, then the next immediately following business day), the minutes of the Board shall be made publicly available on the Website; provided, however, that any minutes of the Board relating to personnel or employment matters, legal matters (to the extent the Board determines it is necessary or appropriate to protect the interests of ICANN), matters that ICANN is prohibited by law or contract from disclosing publicly, and other matters that the Board determines, by a three-quarters (3/4) vote of Directors present at the meeting and voting, are not appropriate for public distribution, shall not be included in the minutes made publicly available. For any matters that the Board determines not to disclose, the Board shall describe in general terms in the relevant minutes the reason for such nondisclosure.

Section 3.6. NOTICE AND COMMENT ON POLICY ACTIONS

(a) With respect to any policies that are being considered by the Board for adoption that substantially affect the operation of the Internet or third parties, including the imposition of any fees or charges, ICANN shall:
(i) provide public notice on the Website explaining what policies are being considered for adoption and why, at least twenty-one days (and if practical, earlier) prior to any action by the Board;

(ii) provide a reasonable opportunity for parties to comment on the adoption of the proposed policies, to see the comments of others, and to reply to those comments (such comment period to be aligned with ICANN's public comment practices), prior to any action by the Board; and

(iii) in those cases where the policy action affects public policy concerns, to request the opinion of the Governmental Advisory Committee ("GAC" or "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.

(b) Where both practically feasible and consistent with the relevant policy development process, an in-person public forum shall also be held for discussion of any proposed policies as described in Section 3.6(a)(ii), prior to any final Board action.

(c) After taking action on any policy subject to this Section 3.6, the Board shall publish in the meeting minutes the rationale for any resolution adopted by the Board (including the possible material effects, if any, of its decision on the global public interest, including a discussion of the material impacts to the security, stability and resiliency of the DNS, financial impacts or other issues that were considered by the Board in approving such resolutions), the vote of each Director voting on the resolution, and the separate statement of any Director desiring publication of such a statement.

(d) Where a Board resolution is consistent with GAC Consensus Advice (as defined in Section 12.2(a)(x)), the Board shall make a determination whether the GAC Consensus Advice was a material factor in the Board's adoption of such resolution, in which case the Board shall so indicate in such resolution approving the decision (a "GAC Consensus Board Resolution") and shall cite the applicable GAC Consensus Advice. To the extent practical, the Board shall ensure that GAC Consensus Board Resolutions only relate to the matters that were the subject of the applicable GAC Consensus Advice and not matters unrelated to the applicable GAC Consensus Advice. For the avoidance of doubt: (i) a GAC Consensus Board Resolution shall not have the effect of making any other Board resolutions in the same set or series so designated, unless other resolutions are
specifically identified as such by the Board; and (ii) a Board resolution approving an action consistent with GAC Consensus Advice received during a standard engagement process in which input from all Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees has been requested shall not be considered a GAC Consensus Board Resolution based solely on that input, unless the GAC Consensus Advice was a material factor in the Board's adoption of such resolution.

(e) GAC Carve-out

(i) Where a Board resolution is consistent with GAC Consensus Advice and the Board has determined that the GAC Consensus Advice was a material factor in the Board's adoption of such resolution as described in the relevant GAC Consensus Board Resolution, the Governmental Advisory Committee shall not participate as a decision-maker in the EC's exercise of its right to challenge the Board's implementation of such GAC Consensus Advice. In such cases, the Governmental Advisory Committee may participate in the EC in an advisory capacity only with respect to the applicable processes described in Annex D, but its views will not count as support or an objection for purposes of the thresholds needed to convene a community forum or exercise any right of the EC ("GAC Carve-out"). In the case of a Board Recall Process (as defined in Section 3.3 of Annex D), the GAC Carve-out shall only apply if an IRP Panel has found that, in implementing GAC Consensus Advice, the Board acted inconsistently with the Articles of Incorporation or these Bylaws.

(ii) When the GAC Carve-out applies (A) any petition notice provided in accordance with Annex D or Approval Action Board Notice (as defined in Section 1.2 of Annex D) shall include a statement that cites the specific GAC Consensus Board Resolution and the line item or provision that implements such specific GAC Consensus Board Resolution ("GAC Consensus Statement"), (B) the Governmental Advisory Committee shall not be eligible to support or object to any petition pursuant to Annex D or Approval Action (as defined in Section 1.1 of Annex D), and (C) any EC Decision (as defined in Section 4.1(a) of Annex D) that requires the support of four or more Decisional Participants (as defined in Section 6.1(a)) pursuant to Annex D shall instead require the support of three or more Decisional Participants with no more than one Decisional Participant objecting.

(iii) For the avoidance of doubt, the GAC Carve-out shall not apply to the exercise of the EC's rights where a material factor in the Board's decision
Section 3.7. TRANSLATION OF DOCUMENTS
As appropriate and to the extent provided in the ICANN Budget, ICANN shall facilitate the translation of final published documents into various appropriate languages.

ARTICLE 4 ACCOUNTABILITY AND REVIEW

Section 4.1. PURPOSE
In carrying out its Mission, ICANN shall be accountable to the community for operating in accordance with the Articles of Incorporation and these Bylaws, including the Mission set forth in Article 1 of these Bylaws. This Article 4 creates reconsideration and independent review processes for certain actions as set forth in these Bylaws and procedures for periodic review of ICANN's structure and operations, which are intended to reinforce the various accountability mechanisms otherwise set forth in these Bylaws, including the transparency provisions of Article 3 and the Board and other selection mechanisms set forth throughout these Bylaws.

Section 4.2. RECONSIDERATION
(a) ICANN shall have in place a process by which any person or entity materially affected by an action or inaction of the ICANN Board or Staff may request ("Requestor") the review or reconsideration of that action or inaction by the Board. For purposes of these Bylaws, "Staff" includes employees and individual long-term paid contractors serving in locations where ICANN does not have the mechanisms to employ such contractors directly.

(b) The EC may file a Reconsideration Request (as defined in Section 4.2(c)) if approved pursuant to Section 4.3 of Annex D ("Community Reconsideration Request") and if the matter relates to the exercise of the powers and rights of the EC of these Bylaws. The EC Administration shall act as the Requestor for such a Community Reconsideration Request and shall act on behalf of the EC for such Community Reconsideration Request as directed by the Decisional Participants, as further described in Section 4.3 of Annex D.

(c) A Requestor may submit a request for reconsideration or review of an ICANN action or inaction ("Reconsideration Request") to the extent that the Requestor
has been adversely affected by:

(i) One or more Board or Staff actions or inactions that contradict ICANN's Mission, Commitments, Core Values and/or established ICANN policy(ies);

(ii) One or more actions or inactions of the Board or Staff that have been taken or refused to be taken without consideration of material information, except where the Requestor could have submitted, but did not submit, the information for the Board's or Staff's consideration at the time of action or refusal to act; or

(iii) One or more actions or inactions of the Board or Staff that are taken as a result of the Board's or staff's reliance on false or inaccurate relevant information.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision in this Section 4.2, the scope of reconsideration shall exclude the following:

(i) Disputes relating to country code top-level domain ("ccTLD") delegations and re-delegations;

(ii) Disputes relating to Internet numbering resources; and

(iii) Disputes relating to protocol parameters.

(e) The Board has designated the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee to review and consider Reconsideration Requests. The Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee shall have the authority to:

(i) Evaluate Reconsideration Requests;

(ii) Summarily dismiss insufficient or frivolous Reconsideration Requests;

(iii) Evaluate Reconsideration Requests for urgent consideration;

(iv) Conduct whatever factual investigation is deemed appropriate;

(v) Request additional written submissions from the affected party, or from
other parties; and

(vi) Make a recommendation to the Board on the merits of the Reconsideration Request, if it has not been summarily dismissed.

(f) ICANN shall absorb the normal administrative costs of the Reconsideration Request process. Except with respect to a Community Reconsideration Request, ICANN reserves the right to recover from a party requesting review or reconsideration any costs that are deemed to be extraordinary in nature. When such extraordinary costs can be foreseen, that fact and the reasons why such costs are necessary and appropriate to evaluating the Reconsideration Request shall be communicated to the Requestor, who shall then have the option of withdrawing the request or agreeing to bear such costs.

(g) All Reconsideration Requests must be submitted by the Requestor to an email address designated by the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee:

(i) For Reconsideration Requests that are not Community Reconsideration Requests, such Reconsideration Requests must be submitted:

(A) for requests challenging Board actions, within 30 days after the date on which information about the challenged Board action is first published in a resolution, unless the posting of the resolution is not accompanied by a rationale. In that instance, the request must be submitted within 30 days from the initial posting of the rationale;

(B) for requests challenging Staff actions, within 30 days after the date on which the Requestor became aware of, or reasonably should have become aware of, the challenged Staff action; or

(C) for requests challenging either Board or Staff inaction, within 30 days after the date on which the Requestor reasonably concluded, or reasonably should have concluded, that action would not be taken in a timely manner.

(ii) For Community Reconsideration Requests, such Community Reconsideration Requests must be submitted in accordance with the timeframe set forth in Section 4.3 of Annex D.

(h) To properly initiate a Reconsideration Request, all Requestors must review, complete and follow the Reconsideration Request form posted on the Website at
Requestors must also acknowledge and agree to the terms and conditions set forth in the form when filing.

(i) Requestors shall not provide more than 25 pages (double-spaced, 12-point font) of argument in support of a Reconsideration Request, not including exhibits. Requestors may submit all documentary evidence necessary to demonstrate why the action or inaction should be reconsidered, without limitation.

(j) Reconsideration Requests from different Requestors may be considered in the same proceeding so long as: (i) the requests involve the same general action or inaction; and (ii) the Requestors are similarly affected by such action or inaction. In addition, consolidated filings may be appropriate if the alleged causal connection and the resulting harm is substantially the same for all of the Requestors. Every Requestor must be able to demonstrate that it has been materially harmed and adversely impacted by the action or inaction giving rise to the request.

(k) The Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee shall review each Reconsideration Request upon its receipt to determine if it is sufficiently stated. The Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee may summarily dismiss a Reconsideration Request if: (i) the Requestor fails to meet the requirements for bringing a Reconsideration Request; or (ii) it is frivolous. The Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee’s summary dismissal of a Reconsideration Request shall be documented and promptly posted on the Website.

(l) For all Reconsideration Requests that are not summarily dismissed, except Reconsideration Requests described in Section 4.2(l)(iii) and Community Reconsideration Requests, the Reconsideration Request shall be sent to the Ombudsman, who shall promptly proceed to review and consider the Reconsideration Request.

(i) The Ombudsman shall be entitled to seek any outside expert assistance as the Ombudsman deems reasonably necessary to perform this task to the extent it is within the budget allocated to this task.

(ii) The Ombudsman shall submit to the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee his or her substantive evaluation of the Reconsideration Request within 15 days of the Ombudsman's receipt of the Reconsideration Request. The Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee shall thereafter promptly proceed to review and consideration.

(iii) For those Reconsideration Requests involving matters for which the
Ombudsman has, in advance of the filing of the Reconsideration Request, taken a position while performing his or her role as the Ombudsman pursuant to Article 5 of these Bylaws, or involving the Ombudsman's conduct in some way, the Ombudsman shall recuse himself or herself and the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee shall review the Reconsideration Request without involvement by the Ombudsman.

(m) The Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee may ask ICANN Staff for its views on a Reconsideration Request, which comments shall be made publicly available on the Website.

(n) The Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee may request additional information or clarifications from the Requestor, and may elect to conduct a meeting with the Requestor by telephone, email or, if acceptable to the Requestor, in person. A Requestor may also ask for an opportunity to be heard. The Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee's decision on any such request is final. To the extent any information gathered in such a meeting is relevant to any recommendation by the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee, it shall so state in its recommendation.

(o) The Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee may also request information relevant to the Reconsideration Request from third parties. To the extent any information gathered is relevant to any recommendation by the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee, it shall so state in its recommendation. Any information collected by ICANN from third parties shall be provided to the Requestor.

(p) The Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee shall act on a Reconsideration Request on the basis of the public written record, including information submitted by the Requestor, by the ICANN Staff, and by any third party.

(q) The Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee shall make a final recommendation to the Board with respect to a Reconsideration Request within 30 days following its receipt of the Ombudsman's evaluation (or 30 days following receipt of the Reconsideration Request involving those matters for which the Ombudsman recuses himself or herself or the receipt of the Community Reconsideration Request, if applicable), unless impractical, in which case it shall report to the Board the circumstances that prevented it from making a final recommendation and its best estimate of the time required to produce such a final recommendation. In any event, the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee shall endeavor to produce its final recommendation to the Board within 90 days of
receipt of the Reconsideration Request. The final recommendation of the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee shall be documented and promptly (i.e., as soon as practicable) posted on the Website and shall address each of the arguments raised in the Reconsideration Request. The Requestor may file a 10-page (double-spaced, 12-point font) document, not including exhibits, in rebuttal to the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee's recommendation within 15 days of receipt of the recommendation, which shall also be promptly (i.e., as soon as practicable) posted to the Website and provided to the Board for its evaluation; provided, that such rebuttal shall: (i) be limited to rebutting or contradicting the issues raised in the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee's final recommendation; and (ii) not offer new evidence to support an argument made in the Requestor's original Reconsideration Request that the Requestor could have provided when the Requestor initially submitted the Reconsideration Request.

(r) The Board shall not be bound to follow the recommendations of the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee. The final decision of the Board and its rationale shall be made public as part of the preliminary report and minutes of the Board meeting at which action is taken. The Board shall issue its decision on the recommendation of the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee within 45 days of receipt of the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee's recommendation or as soon thereafter as feasible. Any circumstances that delay the Board from acting within this timeframe must be identified and posted on the Website. In any event, the Board's final decision shall be made within 135 days of initial receipt of the Reconsideration Request by the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee. The Board's decision on the recommendation shall be posted on the Website in accordance with the Board's posting obligations as set forth in Article 3 of these Bylaws. If the Requestor so requests, the Board shall post both a recording and a transcript of the substantive Board discussion from the meeting at which the Board considered the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee's recommendation. All briefing materials supplied to the Board shall be provided to the Requestor. The Board may redact such briefing materials and the recording and transcript on the basis that such information (i) relates to confidential personnel matters, (ii) is covered by attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine or other recognized legal privilege, (iii) is subject to a legal obligation that ICANN maintain its confidentiality, (iv) would disclose trade secrets, or (v) would present a material risk of negative impact to the security, stability or resiliency of the Internet. In the case of any redaction, ICANN will provide the Requestor a written rationale for such redaction. If a Requestor believes that a redaction was improper, the Requestor may use an appropriate accountability mechanism to challenge the scope of ICANN's redaction.

(s) If the Requestor believes that the Board action or inaction for which a Reconsideration Request is submitted is so urgent that the timing requirements of the process set forth in this Section 4.2 are too long, the Requestor may apply to
the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee for urgent consideration. Any request for urgent consideration must be made within two business days (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN’s principal office) of the posting of the resolution at issue. A request for urgent consideration must include a discussion of why the matter is urgent for reconsideration and must demonstrate a likelihood of success with the Reconsideration Request.

(t) The Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee shall respond to the request for urgent consideration within two business days after receipt of such request. If the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee agrees to consider the matter with urgency, it will cause notice to be provided to the Requestor, who will have two business days after notification to complete the Reconsideration Request. The Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee shall issue a recommendation on the urgent Reconsideration Request within seven days of the completion of the filing of the Reconsideration Request, or as soon thereafter as feasible. If the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee does not agree to consider the matter with urgency, the Requestor may still file a Reconsideration Request within the regular time frame set forth within these Bylaws.

(u) The Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee shall submit a report to the Board on an annual basis containing at least the following information for the preceding calendar year:

(i) the number and general nature of Reconsideration Requests received, including an identification if the Reconsideration Requests were acted upon, summarily dismissed, or remain pending;

(ii) for any Reconsideration Requests that remained pending at the end of the calendar year, the average length of time for which such Reconsideration Requests have been pending, and a description of the reasons for any Reconsideration Request pending for more than ninety (90) days;

(iii) an explanation of any other mechanisms available to ensure that ICANN is accountable to persons materially affected by its decisions; and

(iv) whether or not, in the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee’s view, the criteria for which reconsideration may be requested should be revised, or another process should be adopted or modified, to ensure that all persons materially affected by ICANN decisions have meaningful access to a review process that ensures fairness while limiting frivolous claims.
Section 4.3. INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESS FOR COVERED ACTIONS

(a) In addition to the reconsideration process described in Section 4.2, ICANN shall have a separate process for independent third-party review of Disputes (defined in Section 4.3(b)(iii)) alleged by a Claimant (as defined in Section 4.3(b)(i)) to be within the scope of the Independent Review Process ("IRP"). The IRP is intended to hear and resolve Disputes for the following purposes ("Purposes of the IRP"): 

(i) Ensure that ICANN does not exceed the scope of its Mission and otherwise complies with its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws.

(ii) Empower the global Internet community and Claimants to enforce compliance with the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws through meaningful, affordable and accessible expert review of Covered Actions (as defined in Section 4.3(b)(i)).

(iii) Ensure that ICANN is accountable to the global Internet community and Claimants.

(iv) Address claims that ICANN has failed to enforce its rights under the IANA Naming Function Contract (as defined in Section 16.3(a)).

(v) Provide a mechanism by which direct customers of the IANA naming functions may seek resolution of PTI (as defined in Section 16.1) service complaints that are not resolved through mediation.

(vi) Reduce Disputes by creating precedent to guide and inform the Board, Officers (as defined in Section 15.1), Staff members, Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees, and the global Internet community in connection with policy development and implementation.

(vii) Secure the accessible, transparent, efficient, consistent, coherent, and just resolution of Disputes.

(viii) Lead to binding, final resolutions consistent with international arbitration norms that are enforceable in any court with proper jurisdiction.

(ix) Provide a mechanism for the resolution of Disputes, as an alternative to legal action in the civil courts of the United States or other jurisdictions.
This Section 4.3 shall be construed, implemented, and administered in a manner consistent with these Purposes of the IRP.

(b) The scope of the IRP is defined with reference to the following terms:

(i) A "Claimant" is any legal or natural person, group, or entity including, but not limited to the EC, a Supporting Organization, or an Advisory Committee that has been materially affected by a Dispute. To be materially affected by a Dispute, the Claimant must suffer an injury or harm that is directly and causally connected to the alleged violation.

(A) The EC is deemed to be materially affected by all Covered Actions. ICANN shall not assert any defenses of standing or capacity against the EC in any forum.

(B) ICANN shall not object to the standing of the EC, a Supporting Organization, or an Advisory Committee to participate in an IRP, to compel an IRP, or to enforce an IRP decision on the basis that it is not a legal person with capacity to sue. No special pleading of a Claimant’s capacity or of the legal existence of a person that is a Claimant shall be required in the IRP proceedings. No Claimant shall be allowed to proceed if the IRP Panel (as defined in Section 4.3(g)) concludes based on evidence submitted to it that the Claimant does not fairly or adequately represent the interests of those on whose behalf the Claimant purports to act.

(ii) "Covered Actions" are defined as any actions or failures to act by or within ICANN committed by the Board, individual Directors, Officers, or Staff members that give rise to a Dispute.

(iii) "Disputes" are defined as:

(A) Claims that Covered Actions constituted an action or inaction that violated the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws, including but not limited to any action or inaction that:

(1) exceeded the scope of the Mission;

(2) resulted from action taken in response to advice or input from any Advisory Committee or Supporting Organization that are claimed to be inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws;
(3) resulted from decisions of process-specific expert panels that are claimed to be inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws;

(4) resulted from a response to a DIDP (as defined in Section 22.7(d)) request that is claimed to be inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws; or

(5) arose from claims involving rights of the EC as set forth in the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws.

(B) Claims that ICANN, the Board, individual Directors, Officers or Staff members have not enforced ICANN's contractual rights with respect to the IANANaming Function Contract, and

(C) Claims regarding PTI service complaints by direct customers of the IANA naming functions that are not resolved through mediation.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision in this Section 4.3, the IRP's scope shall exclude all of the following:

(i) EC challenges to the result(s) of a PDP, unless the Supporting Organization(s) that approved the PDP supports the EC bringing such a challenge;

(ii) Claims relating to ccTLD delegations and re-delegations;

(iii) Claims relating to Internet numbering resources, and

(iv) Claims relating to protocol parameters.

(d) An IRP shall commence with the Claimant's filing of a written statement of a Dispute (a "Claim") with the IRP Provider (described in Section 4.3(m) below). For the EC to commence an IRP ("Community IRP"), the EC shall first comply with the procedures set forth in Section 4.2 of Annex D.

(e) Cooperative Engagement Process

(i) Except for Claims brought by the EC in accordance with this Section 4.3 and Section 4.2 of Annex D, prior to the filing of a Claim, the parties are strongly encouraged to participate in a non-binding Cooperative Engagement Process ("CEP") for the purpose of attempting to resolve
and/or narrow the Dispute. CEPs shall be conducted pursuant to the CEP Rules to be developed with community involvement, adopted by the Board, and as amended from time to time.

(ii) The CEP is voluntary. However, except for Claims brought by the EC in accordance with this Section 4.3 and Section 4.2 of Annex D, if the Claimant does not participate in good faith in the CEP and ICANN is the prevailing party in the IRP, the IRP Panel shall award to ICANN all reasonable fees and costs incurred by ICANN in the IRP, including legal fees.

(iii) Either party may terminate the CEP efforts if that party: (A) concludes in good faith that further efforts are unlikely to produce agreement; or (B) requests the inclusion of an independent dispute resolution facilitator ("IRP Mediator") after at least one CEP meeting.

(iv) Unless all parties agree on the selection of a particular IRP Mediator, any IRP Mediator appointed shall be selected from the members of the Standing Panel (described in Section 4.3(j) below) by its Chair, but such IRP Mediator shall not thereafter be eligible to serve as a panelist presiding over an IRP on the matter.

(f) ICANN hereby waives any defenses that may be afforded under Section 5141 of the California Corporations Code ("CCC") against any Claimant, and shall not object to the standing of any such Claimant to participate in or to compel an IRP, or to enforce an IRP decision on the basis that such Claimant may not otherwise be able to assert that a Covered Action is ultra vires.

(g) Upon the filing of a Claim, an Independent Review Process Panel ("IRP Panel", described in Section 4.3(k) below) shall be selected in accordance with the Rules of Procedure (as defined in Section 4.3(n)(i)). Following the selection of an IRP Panel, that IRP Panel shall be charged with hearing and resolving the Dispute, considering the Claim and ICANN’s written response ("Response") in compliance with the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, as understood in light of prior IRP Panel decisions decided under the same (or an equivalent prior) version of the provision of the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws at issue, and norms of applicable law. If no Response is timely filed by ICANN, the IRP Panel may accept the Claim as unopposed and proceed to evaluate and decide the Claim pursuant to the procedures set forth in these Bylaws.

(h) After a Claim is referred to an IRP Panel, the parties are urged to participate in conciliation discussions for the purpose of attempting to narrow the issues that are to be addressed by the IRP Panel.
(i) Each IRP Panel shall conduct an objective, de novo examination of the Dispute.

(i) With respect to Covered Actions, the IRP Panel shall make findings of fact to determine whether the Covered Action constituted an action or inaction that violated the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws.

(ii) All Disputes shall be decided in compliance with the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, as understood in the context of the norms of applicable law and prior relevant IRP decisions.

(iii) For Claims arising out of the Board's exercise of its fiduciary duties, the IRP Panel shall not replace the Board's reasonable judgment with its own so long as the Board's action or inaction is within the realm of reasonable business judgment.

(iv) With respect to claims that ICANN has not enforced its contractual rights with respect to the IANA Naming Function Contract, the standard of review shall be whether there was a material breach of ICANN's obligations under the IANA Naming Function Contract, where the alleged breach has resulted in material harm to the Claimant.

(v) For avoidance of doubt, IRPs initiated through the mechanism contemplated at Section 4.3(a)(iv) above, shall be subject to a separate standard of review as defined in the IANA Naming Function Contract.

(j) Standing Panel

(i) There shall be an omnibus standing panel of at least seven members (the "Standing Panel") each of whom shall possess significant relevant legal expertise in one or more of the following areas: international law, corporate governance, judicial systems, alternative dispute resolution and/or arbitration. Each member of the Standing Panel shall also have knowledge, developed over time, regarding the DNS and ICANN's Mission, work, policies, practices, and procedures. Members of the Standing Panel shall receive at a minimum, training provided by ICANN on the workings and management of the Internet's unique identifiers and other appropriate training as recommended by the IRP Implementation Oversight Team (described in Section 4.3(n)(i)).
ICANN shall, in consultation with the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, initiate a four-step process to establish the Standing Panel to ensure the availability of a number of IRP panelists that is sufficient to allow for the timely resolution of Disputes consistent with the Purposes of the IRP.

(A) ICANN, in consultation with the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, shall initiate a tender process for an organization to provide administrative support for the IRP Provider (as defined in Section 4.3(m)), beginning by consulting the "IRP Implementation Oversight Team" (described in Section 4.3(n)(i)) on a draft tender document.

(B) ICANN shall issue a call for expressions of interest from potential panelists, and work with the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees and the Board to identify and solicit applications from well-qualified candidates, and to conduct an initial review and vetting of applications.

(C) The Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees shall nominate a slate of proposed panel members from the well-qualified candidates identified per the process set forth in Section 4.3(j)(ii)(B).

(D) Final selection shall be subject to Board confirmation, which shall not be unreasonably withheld.

(iii) Appointments to the Standing Panel shall be made for a fixed term of five years with no removal except for specified cause in the nature of corruption, misuse of position, fraud or criminal activity. The recall process shall be developed by the IRP Implementation Oversight Team.

(iv) Reasonable efforts shall be taken to achieve cultural, linguistic, gender, and legal tradition diversity, and diversity by Geographic Region (as defined in Section 7.5).

(k) IRP Panel

(i) A three-member IRP Panel shall be selected from the Standing Panel to hear a specific Dispute.

(ii) The Claimant and ICANN shall each select one panelist from the Standing Panel, and the two panelists selected by the parties will select the third panelist from the Standing Panel. In the event that a Standing Panel is
not in place when an IRP Panel must be convened for a given proceeding or is in place but does not have capacity due to other IRP commitments or the requisite diversity of skill and experience needed for a particular IRP proceeding, the Claimant and ICANN shall each select a qualified panelist from outside the Standing Panel and the two panelists selected by the parties shall select the third panelist. In the event that no Standing Panel is in place when an IRP Panel must be convened and the two party-selected panelists cannot agree on the third panelist, the IRP Provider's rules shall apply to selection of the third panelist.

(iii) Assignment from the Standing Panel to IRP Panels shall take into consideration the Standing Panel members' individual experience and expertise in issues related to highly technical, civil society, business, diplomatic, and regulatory skills as needed by each specific proceeding, and such requests from the parties for any particular expertise.

(iv) Upon request of an IRP Panel, the IRP Panel shall have access to independent skilled technical experts at the expense of ICANN, although all substantive interactions between the IRP Panel and such experts shall be conducted on the record, except when public disclosure could materially and unduly harm participants, such as by exposing trade secrets or violating rights of personal privacy.

(v) IRP Panel decisions shall be made by a simple majority of the IRP Panel.

(i) All IRP proceedings shall be administered in English as the primary working language, with provision of translation services for Claimants if needed.

(m) IRP Provider

(i) All IRP proceedings shall be administered by a well-respected international dispute resolution provider ("IRP Provider"). The IRP Provider shall receive and distribute IRP Claims, Responses, and all other submissions arising from an IRP at the direction of the IRP Panel, and shall function independently from ICANN.

(n) Rules of Procedure

(i) An IRP Implementation Oversight Team shall be established in consultation with the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees and comprised of members of the global Internet community. The IRP
Implementation Oversight Team, and once the Standing Panel is established the IRP Implementation Oversight Team in consultation with the Standing Panel, shall develop clear published rules for the IRP ("Rules of Procedure") that conform with international arbitration norms and are streamlined, easy to understand and apply fairly to all parties. Upon request, the IRP Implementation Oversight Team shall have assistance of counsel and other appropriate experts.

(ii) The Rules of Procedure shall be informed by international arbitration norms and consistent with the Purposes of the IRP. Specialized Rules of Procedure may be designed for reviews of PTI service complaints that are asserted by direct customers of the IANA naming functions and are not resolved through mediation. The Rules of Procedure shall be published and subject to a period of public comment that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN, and take effect upon approval by the Board, such approval not to be unreasonably withheld.

(iii) The Standing Panel may recommend amendments to such Rules of Procedure as it deems appropriate to fulfill the Purposes of the IRP, however no such amendment shall be effective without approval by the Board after publication and a period of public comment that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN.

(iv) The Rules of Procedure are intended to ensure fundamental fairness and due process and shall at a minimum address the following elements:

(A) The time within which a Claim must be filed after a Claimant becomes aware or reasonably should have become aware of the action or inaction giving rise to the Dispute;

(B) Issues relating to joinder, intervention, and consolidation of Claims;

(C) Rules governing written submissions, including the required elements of a Claim, other requirements or limits on content, time for filing, length of statements, number of supplemental statements, if any, permitted evidentiary support (factual and expert), including its length, both in support of a Claimant's Claim and in support of ICANN's Response;

(D) Availability and limitations on discovery methods;

(E) Whether hearings shall be permitted, and if so what form and structure such hearings would take;
(F) Procedures if ICANN elects not to respond to an IRP; and

(G) The standards and rules governing appeals from IRP Panel decisions, including which IRP Panel decisions may be appealed.

(o) Subject to the requirements of this Section 4.3, each IRP Panel shall have the authority to:

(i) Summarily dismiss Disputes that are brought without standing, lack substance, or are frivolous or vexatious;

(ii) Request additional written submissions from the Claimant or from other parties;

(iii) Declare whether a Covered Action constituted an action or inaction that violated the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws, declare whether ICANN failed to enforce ICANN's contractual rights with respect to the IANA Naming Function Contract or resolve PTI service complaints by direct customers of the IANA naming functions, as applicable;

(iv) Recommend that ICANN stay any action or decision, or take necessary interim action, until such time as the opinion of the IRP Panel is considered;

(v) Consolidate Disputes if the facts and circumstances are sufficiently similar, and take such other actions as are necessary for the efficient resolution of Disputes;

(vi) Determine the timing for each IRP proceeding; and

(vii) Determine the shifting of IRP costs and expenses consistent with Section 4.3(r).

(p) A Claimant may request interim relief. Interim relief may include prospective relief, interlocutory relief, or declaratory or injunctive relief, and specifically may include a stay of the challenged ICANN action or decision until such time as the opinion of the IRP Panel is considered as described in Section 4.3(o)(iv), in order to maintain the status quo. A single member of the Standing Panel ("Emergency Panelist") shall be selected to adjudicate requests for interim relief. In the event that no Standing Panel is in place when an Emergency Panelist must be selected, the IRP Provider's rules shall apply to the selection of the Emergency Panelist. Interim relief may only be provided if the Emergency Panelist determines that the Claimant has established all of the following factors:
(i) A harm for which there will be no adequate remedy in the absence of such relief;

(ii) Either: (A) likelihood of success on the merits; or (B) sufficiently serious questions related to the merits; and

(iii) A balance of hardships tipping decidedly toward the party seeking relief.

(q) Conflicts of Interest

(i) Standing Panel members must be independent of ICANN and its Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, and so must adhere to the following criteria:

(A) Upon consideration for the Standing Panel and on an ongoing basis, Panelists shall have an affirmative obligation to disclose any material relationship with ICANN, a Supporting Organization, an Advisory Committee, or any other participant in an IRP proceeding.

(B) Additional independence requirements to be developed by the IRP Implementation Oversight Team, including term limits and restrictions on post-term appointment to other ICANN positions.

(ii) The IRP Provider shall disclose any material relationship with ICANN, a Supporting Organization, an Advisory Committee, or any other participant in an IRP proceeding.

(r) ICANN shall bear all the administrative costs of maintaining the IRP mechanism, including compensation of Standing Panel members. Except as otherwise provided in Section 4.3(e)(ii), each party to an IRP proceeding shall bear its own legal expenses, except that ICANN shall bear all costs associated with a Community IRP, including the costs of all legal counsel and technical experts. Nevertheless, except with respect to a Community IRP, the IRP Panel may shift and provide for the losing party to pay administrative costs and/or fees of the prevailing party in the event it identifies the losing party's Claim or defense as frivolous or abusive.

(s) An IRP Panel should complete an IRP proceeding expeditiously, issuing an
early scheduling order and its written decision no later than six months after the filing of the Claim, except as otherwise permitted under the Rules of Procedure. The preceding sentence does not provide the basis for a Covered Action.

(t) Each IRP Panel shall make its decision based solely on the documentation, supporting materials, and arguments submitted by the parties, and in its decision shall specifically designate the prevailing party as to each part of a Claim.

(u) All IRP Panel proceedings shall be conducted on the record, and documents filed in connection with IRP Panel proceedings shall be posted on the Website, except for settlement negotiation or other proceedings that could materially and unduly harm participants if conducted publicly. The Rules of Procedure, and all Claims, petitions, and decisions shall promptly be posted on the Website when they become available. Each IRP Panel may, in its discretion, grant a party’s request to keep certain information confidential, such as trade secrets, but only if such confidentiality does not materially interfere with the transparency of the IRP proceeding.

(v) Subject to this Section 4.3, all IRP decisions shall be written and made public, and shall reflect a well-reasoned application of how the Dispute was resolved in compliance with the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, as understood in light of prior IRP decisions decided under the same (or an equivalent prior) version of the provision of the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws at issue, and norms of applicable law.

(w) Subject to any limitations established through the Rules of Procedure, an IRP Panel decision may be appealed to the full Standing Panel sitting en banc within sixty (60) days of issuance of such decision.

(x) The IRP is intended as a final, binding arbitration process.

(i) IRP Panel decisions are binding final decisions to the extent allowed by law unless timely and properly appealed to the en banc Standing Panel. En banc Standing Panel decisions are binding final decisions to the extent allowed by law.

(ii) IRP Panel decisions and decisions of an en banc Standing Panel upon an appeal are intended to be enforceable in any court with jurisdiction over ICANN without a de novo review of the decision of the IRP Panel or en banc Standing Panel, as applicable, with respect to factual findings or conclusions of law.

(iii) ICANN intends, agrees, and consents to be bound by all IRP Panel
decisions of Disputes of Covered Actions as a final, binding arbitration.

(A) Where feasible, the Board shall consider its response to IRP Panel decisions at the Board's next meeting, and shall affirm or reject compliance with the decision on the public record based on an expressed rationale. The decision of the IRP Panel, or en banc Standing Panel, shall be final regardless of such Board action, to the fullest extent allowed by law.

(B) If an IRP Panel decision in a Community IRP is in favor of the EC, the Board shall comply within 30 days of such IRP Panel decision.

(C) If the Board rejects an IRP Panel decision without undertaking an appeal to the en banc Standing Panel or rejects an en banc Standing Panel decision upon appeal, the Claimant or the EC may seek enforcement in a court of competent jurisdiction. In the case of the EC, the EC Administration may convene as soon as possible following such rejection and consider whether to authorize commencement of such an action.

(iv) By submitting a Claim to the IRP Panel, a Claimant thereby agrees that the IRP decision is intended to be a final, binding arbitration decision with respect to such Claimant. Any Claimant that does not consent to the IRP being a final, binding arbitration may initiate a non-binding IRP if ICANN agrees; provided that such a non-binding IRP decision is not intended to be and shall not be enforceable.

(y) ICANN shall seek to establish means by which community, non-profit Claimants and other Claimants that would otherwise be excluded from utilizing the IRP process may meaningfully participate in and have access to the IRP process.

Section 4.4. PERIODIC REVIEW OF ICANN STRUCTURE AND OPERATIONS

(a) The Board shall cause a periodic review of the performance and operation of each Supporting Organization, each Supporting Organization Council, each Advisory Committee (other than the Governmental Advisory Committee), and the Nominating Committee (as defined in Section 8.1) by an entity or entities independent of the organization under review. The goal of the review, to be undertaken pursuant to such criteria and standards as the Board shall direct, shall be to determine (i) whether that organization, council or committee has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure, (ii) if so, whether any change in structure or operations is desirable to improve its effectiveness and (iii) whether that organization, council or committee is accountable to its constituencies.
stakeholder groups, organizations and other stakeholders.

These periodic reviews shall be conducted no less frequently than every five years, based on feasibility as determined by the Board. Each five-year cycle will be computed from the moment of the reception by the Board of the final report of the relevant review Working Group.

The results of such reviews shall be posted on the Website for public review and comment, and shall be considered by the Board no later than the second scheduled meeting of the Board after such results have been posted for 30 days. The consideration by the Board includes the ability to revise the structure or operation of the parts of ICANN being reviewed by a two-thirds vote of all Directors, subject to any rights of the EC under the Articles of Incorporation and these Bylaws.

(b) The Governmental Advisory Committee shall provide its own review mechanisms.

Section 4.5. ANNUAL REVIEW

ICANN will produce an annual report on the state of the accountability and transparency reviews, which will discuss the status of the implementation of all review processes required by Section 4.6 and the status of ICANN’s implementation of the recommendations set forth in the final reports issued by the review teams to the Board following the conclusion of such review (“Annual Review Implementation Report”). The Annual Review Implementation Report will be posted on the Website for public review and comment. Each Annual Review Implementation Report will be considered by the Board and serve as an input to the continuing process of implementing the recommendations from the review teams set forth in the final reports of such review teams required in Section 4.6.

Section 4.6. SPECIFIC REVIEWS

(a) Review Teams and Reports

(i) Review teams will be established for each applicable review, which will include both a limited number of members and an open number of observers. The chairs of the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees participating in the applicable review shall select a group of up to 21 review team members from among the prospective members nominated by the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees,
balanced for diversity and skill. In addition, the Board may designate one Director or Liaison to serve as a member of the review team. Specific guidance on the selection process is provided within the operating standards developed for the conduct of reviews under this Section 4.6 (the "Operating Standards"). The Operating Standards shall be developed through community consultation, including public comment opportunities as necessary that comply with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN. The Operating Standards must be aligned with the following guidelines:

(A) Each Supporting Organization and Advisory Committee participating in the applicable review may nominate up to seven prospective members for the review team;

(B) Any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee nominating at least one, two or three prospective review team members shall be entitled to have those one, two or three nominees selected as members to the review team, so long as the nominees meet any applicable criteria for service on the team; and

(C) If any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee has not nominated at least three prospective review team members, the Chairs of the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees shall be responsible for the determination of whether all 21 SO/AC member seats shall be filled and, if so, how the seats should be allocated from among those nominated.

(ii) Members and liaisons of review teams shall disclose to ICANN and their applicable review team any conflicts of interest with a specific matter or issue under review in accordance with the most recent Board-approved practices and Operating Standards. The applicable review team may exclude from the discussion of a specific complaint or issue any member deemed by the majority of review team members to have a conflict of interest. Further details on the conflict of interest practices are included in the Operating Standards.

(iii) Review team decision-making practices shall be specified in the Operating Standards, with the expectation that review teams shall try to operate on a consensus basis. In the event a consensus cannot be found among the members of a review team, a majority vote of the members may be taken.

(iv) Review teams may also solicit and select independent experts to render advice as requested by the review team. ICANN shall pay the reasonable
fees and expenses of such experts for each review contemplated by this Section 4.6 to the extent such fees and costs are consistent with the budget assigned for such review. Guidelines on how review teams are to work with and consider independent expert advice are specified in the Operating Standards.

(v) Each review team may recommend that the applicable type of review should no longer be conducted or should be amended.

(vi) Confidential Disclosure to Review Teams

(A) To facilitate transparency and openness regarding ICANN's deliberations and operations, the review teams, or a subset thereof, shall have access to ICANN internal information and documents pursuant to the Confidential Disclosure Framework set forth in the Operating Standards (the "Confidential Disclosure Framework"). The Confidential Disclosure Framework must be aligned with the following guidelines:

(1) ICANN must provide a justification for any refusal to reveal requested information. ICANN's refusal can be appealed to the Ombudsman and/or the ICANN Board for a ruling on the disclosure request.

(2) ICANN may designate certain documents and information as "for review team members only" or for a subset of the review team members based on conflict of interest. ICANN's designation of documents may also be appealed to the Ombudsman and/or the ICANN Board.

(3) ICANN may require review team members to sign a non-disclosure agreement before accessing documents.

(vii) Reports

(A) Each report of the review team shall describe the degree of consensus or agreement reached by the review team on each recommendation contained in such report. Any member of a review team not in favor of a recommendation of its review team (whether as a result of voting against a matter or objecting to the consensus position) may record a minority dissent to such recommendation, which shall be included in the report of the review team. The review team shall attempt to prioritize each of its recommendations and provide a rationale for such prioritization.

(B) At least one draft report of the review team shall be posted on the Website for public review and comment. The review team must consider the public comments received in response to any posted draft report and shall
amend the report as the review team deems appropriate and in the public interest before submitting its final report to the Board. The final report should include an explanation of how public comments were considered as well as a summary of changes made in response to public comments.

(C) Each final report of a review team shall be published for public comment in advance of the Board's consideration. Within six months of receipt of a final report, the Board shall consider such final report and the public comments on the final report, and determine whether to approve the recommendations in the final report. If the Board does not approve any or all of the recommendations, the written rationale supporting the Board's decision shall include an explanation for the decision on each recommendation that was not approved. The Board shall promptly direct implementation of the recommendations that were approved.

(b) Accountability and Transparency Review

(i) The Board shall cause a periodic review of ICANN's execution of its commitment to maintain and improve robust mechanisms for public input, accountability, and transparency so as to ensure that the outcomes of its decision-making reflect the public interest and are accountable to the Internet community ("Accountability and Transparency Review").

(ii) The issues that the review team for the Accountability and Transparency Review (the "Accountability and Transparency Review Team") may assess include, but are not limited to, the following:

(A) assessing and improving Board governance which shall include an ongoing evaluation of Board performance, the Board selection process, the extent to which the Board's composition and allocation structure meets ICANN’s present and future needs, and the appeal mechanisms for Board decisions contained in these Bylaws;

(B) assessing the role and effectiveness of the GAC's interaction with the Board and with the broader ICANN community, and making recommendations for improvement to ensure effective consideration by ICANN of GAC input on the public policy aspects of the technical coordination of the DNS;

(C) assessing and improving the processes by which ICANN receives public input (including adequate explanation of decisions taken and the rationale
(D) assessing the extent to which ICANN's decisions are supported and accepted by the Internet community;

(E) assessing the policy development process to facilitate enhanced cross community deliberations, and effective and timely policy development; and

(F) assessing and improving the Independent Review Process.

(iii) The Accountability and Transparency Review Team shall also assess the extent to which prior Accountability and Transparency Review recommendations have been implemented and the extent to which implementation of such recommendations has resulted in the intended effect.

(iv) The Accountability and Transparency Review Team may recommend to the Board the termination or amendment of other periodic reviews required by this Section 4.6, and may recommend to the Board the creation of additional periodic reviews.

(v) The Accountability and Transparency Review Team should issue its final report within one year of convening its first meeting.

(vi) The Accountability and Transparency Review shall be conducted no less frequently than every five years measured from the date the previous Accountability and Transparency Review Team was convened.

(c) Security, Stability, and Resiliency Review

(i) The Board shall cause a periodic review of ICANN's execution of its commitment to enhance the operational stability, reliability, resiliency, security, and global interoperability of the systems and processes, both internal and external, that directly affect and/or are affected by the Internet's system of unique identifiers that ICANN coordinates ("SSR Review").

(ii) The issues that the review team for the SSR Review ("SSR Review Team") may assess are the following:

(A) security, operational stability and resiliency matters, both physical and network, relating to the coordination of the Internet's system of unique identifiers;
(B) conformance with appropriate security contingency planning framework for the Internet's system of unique identifiers; and

(C) maintaining clear and globally interoperable security processes for those portions of the Internet's system of unique identifiers that ICANN coordinates.

(iii) The SSR Review Team shall also assess the extent to which ICANN has successfully implemented its security efforts, the effectiveness of the security efforts to deal with actual and potential challenges and threats to the security and stability of the DNS, and the extent to which the security efforts are sufficiently robust to meet future challenges and threats to the security, stability and resiliency of the DNS, consistent with ICANN's Mission.

(iv) The SSR Review Team shall also assess the extent to which prior SSR Review recommendations have been implemented and the extent to which implementation of such recommendations has resulted in the intended effect.

(v) The SSR Review shall be conducted no less frequently than every five years, measured from the date the previous SSR Review Team was convened.

(d) Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review

(i) ICANN will ensure that it will adequately address issues of competition, consumer protection, security, stability and resiliency, malicious abuse issues, sovereignty concerns, and rights protection prior to, or concurrent with, authorizing an increase in the number of new top-level domains in the root zone of the DNS pursuant to an application process initiated on or after the date of these Bylaws ("New gTLD Round").

(ii) After a New gTLD Round has been in operation for one year, the Board shall cause a competition, consumer trust and consumer choice review as specified in this Section 4.6(d) ("CCT Review").

(iii) The review team for the CCT Review ("CCT Review Team") will examine (A) the extent to which the expansion of gTLDs has promoted competition, consumer trust and consumer choice and (B) the effectiveness of the New gTLD Round's application and evaluation process and
safeguards put in place to mitigate issues arising from the New gTLD Round.

(iv) For each of its recommendations, the CCT Review Team should indicate whether the recommendation, if accepted by the Board, must be implemented before opening subsequent rounds of new generic top-level domain applications periods.

(v) The CCT Review Team shall also assess the extent to which prior CCT Review recommendations have been implemented and the extent to which implementation of such recommendations has resulted in the intended effect.

(e) Registration Directory Service Review

(i) Subject to applicable laws, ICANN shall use commercially reasonable efforts to enforce its policies relating to registration directory services and shall work with Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees to explore structural changes to improve accuracy and access to generic top-level domain registration data, as well as consider safeguards for protecting such data.

(ii) The Board shall cause a periodic review to assess the effectiveness of the then current gTLD registry directory service and whether its implementation meets the legitimate needs of law enforcement, promoting consumer trust and safeguarding registrant data ("Directory Service Review").

(iii) The review team for the Directory Service Review ("Directory Service Review Team") will consider the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development ("OECD") Guidelines on the Protection of Privacy and Transborder Flows of Personal Data as defined by the OECD in 1980 and amended in 2013 and as may be amended from time to time.

(iv) The Directory Service Review Team shall assess the extent to which prior Directory Service Review recommendations have been implemented and the extent to which implementation of such recommendations has resulted in the intended effect.

(v) The Directory Service Review shall be conducted no less frequently than every five years, measured from the date the previous Directory Service
Section 4.7. COMMUNITY MEDIATION

(a) If the Board refuses or fails to comply with a duly authorized and valid EC Decision under these Bylaws, the EC Administration representative of any Decisional Participant who supported the exercise by the EC of its rights in the applicable EC Decision during the applicable decision period may request that the EC initiate a mediation process pursuant to this Section 4.7. The Board shall be deemed to have refused or failed to comply with a duly authorized and valid EC Decision if the Board has not complied with the EC Decision within 30 days of being notified of the relevant EC Decision.

(b) If a Mediation Initiation Notice (as defined in Section 4.1(a) of Annex D) is delivered to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 4.1(a) of Annex D, as soon as reasonably practicable thereafter, the EC Administration shall designate individuals to represent the EC in the mediation ("Mediation Administration") and the Board shall designate representatives for the mediation ("Board Mediation Representatives"). Members of the EC Administration and the Board can designate themselves as representatives. ICANN shall promptly post the Mediation Initiation Notice on the Website.

(c) There shall be a single mediator who shall be selected by the agreement of the Mediation Administration and Board Mediation Representatives. The Mediation Administration shall propose a slate of at least five potential mediators, and the Board Mediation Representatives shall select a mediator from the slate or request a new slate until a mutually-agreed mediator is selected. The Board Mediation Representatives may recommend potential mediators for inclusion on the slates selected by the Mediation Administration. The Mediation Administration shall not unreasonably decline to include mediators recommended by the Board Mediation Representatives on proposed slates and the Board Mediation Representatives shall not unreasonably withhold consent to the selection of a mediator on slates proposed by the Mediation Administration.

(d) The mediator shall be a licensed attorney with general knowledge of contract law and general knowledge of the DNS and ICANN. The mediator may not have any ongoing business relationship with ICANN, any Supporting Organization (or constituent thereof), any Advisory Committee (or constituent thereof), the EC Administration or the EC. The mediator must confirm in writing that he or she is
not, directly or indirectly, and will not become during the term of the mediation, an employee, partner, executive officer, director, consultant or advisor of ICANN, any Supporting Organization (or constituent thereof), any Advisory Committee (or constituent thereof), the EC Administration or the EC.

(e) The mediator shall conduct the mediation in accordance with these Bylaws, the laws of California and the rules and procedures of a well-respected international dispute resolution provider, which may be the IRP Provider. The arbitration will be conducted in the English language consistent with the provisions relevant for mediation under the IRP Rules of Procedure and will occur in Los Angeles County, California, unless another location is mutually-agreed between the Mediation Administration and Board Mediation Representatives.

(f) The Mediation Administration and the Board Mediation Representatives shall discuss the dispute in good faith and attempt, with the mediator's assistance, to reach an amicable resolution of the dispute.

(g) ICANN shall bear all costs of the mediator.

(h) If the Mediation Administration and the Board Mediation Representatives have engaged in good faith participation in the mediation but have not resolved the dispute for any reason, the Mediation Administration or the Board Mediation Representatives may terminate the mediation at any time by declaring an impasse.

(i) If a resolution to the dispute is reached by the Mediation Administration and the Board Mediation Representatives, the Mediation Administration and the Board Mediation Representatives shall document such resolution including recommendations ("Mediation Resolution" and the date of such resolution, the "Mediation Resolution Date"). ICANN shall promptly post the Mediation Resolution on the Website (in no event later than 14 days after mediation efforts are completed) and the EC Administration shall promptly notify the Decisional Participants of the Mediation Resolution.

(j) The EC shall be deemed to have accepted the Mediation Resolution if it has not delivered an EC Community IRP Initiation Notice (as defined in Section 4.2(e) of Annex D) pursuant to and in compliance with Section 4.2 of Annex D within eighty (80) days following the Mediation Resolution Date.

ARTICLE 5 OMBUDSMAN

Section 5.1. OFFICE OF OMBUDSMAN

(a) ICANN shall maintain an Office of Ombudsman ("Office of Ombudsman"), to
be managed by an ombudsman ("Ombudsman") and to include such staff support as the Board determines is appropriate and feasible. The Ombudsman shall be a full-time position, with salary and benefits appropriate to the function, as determined by the Board.

(b) The Ombudsman shall be appointed by the Board for an initial term of two years, subject to renewal by the Board.

(c) The Ombudsman shall be subject to dismissal by the Board only upon a three-fourths (3/4) vote of the entire Board.

(d) The annual budget for the Office of Ombudsman shall be established by the Board as part of the annual ICANN Budget process. The Ombudsman shall submit a proposed budget to the President, and the President shall include that budget submission in its entirety and without change in the general ICANN Budget recommended by the ICANN President to the Board. Nothing in this Section 5.1 shall prevent the President from offering separate views on the substance, size, or other features of the Ombudsman's proposed budget to the Board.

Section 5.2. CHARTER

The charter of the Ombudsman shall be to act as a neutral dispute resolution practitioner for those matters for which the provisions of the Independent Review Process set forth in Section 4.3 have not been invoked. The principal function of the Ombudsman shall be to provide an independent internal evaluation of complaints by members of the ICANN community who believe that the ICANN staff, Board or an ICANN constituent body has treated them unfairly. The Ombudsman shall serve as an objective advocate for fairness, and shall seek to evaluate and where possible resolve complaints about unfair or inappropriate treatment by ICANN staff, the Board, or ICANN constituent bodies, clarifying the issues and using conflict resolution tools such as negotiation, facilitation, and "shuttle diplomacy" to achieve these results. With respect to the Reconsideration Request Process set forth in Section 4.2, the Ombudsman shall serve the function expressly provided for in Section 4.2.

Section 5.3. OPERATIONS

The Office of Ombudsman shall:

(a) facilitate the fair, impartial, and timely resolution of problems and complaints that affected members of the ICANN community (excluding employees and vendors/suppliers of ICANN) may have with specific actions or failures to act by the Board or ICANN staff which have not otherwise become the subject of either a Reconsideration Request or Independent Review Process;
(b) perform the functions set forth in Section 4.2 relating to review and consideration of Reconsideration Requests;

(c) exercise discretion to accept or decline to act on a complaint or question, including by the development of procedures to dispose of complaints that are insufficiently concrete, substantive, or related to ICANN's interactions with the community so as to be inappropriate subject matters for the Ombudsman to act on. In addition, and without limiting the foregoing, the Ombudsman shall have no authority to act in any way with respect to internal administrative matters, personnel matters, issues relating to membership on the Board, or issues related to vendor/supplier relations;

(d) have the right to have access to (but not to publish if otherwise confidential) all necessary information and records from ICANN staff and constituent bodies to enable an informed evaluation of the complaint and to assist in dispute resolution where feasible (subject only to such confidentiality obligations as are imposed by the complainant or any generally applicable confidentiality policies adopted by ICANN);

(e) heighten awareness of the Ombudsman program and functions through routine interaction with the ICANN community and online availability;

(f) maintain neutrality and independence, and have no bias or personal stake in an outcome; and

(g) comply with all ICANN conflicts of interest and confidentiality policies.

Section 5.4. INTERACTION WITH ICANN AND OUTSIDE ENTITIES

(a) No ICANN employee, Board member, or other participant in Supporting Organizations or Advisory Committees shall prevent or impede the Ombudsman's contact with the ICANN community (including employees of ICANN). ICANN employees and Board members shall direct members of the ICANN community who voice problems, concerns, or complaints about ICANN to the Ombudsman, who shall advise complainants about the various options available for review of such problems, concerns, or complaints.

(b) ICANN staff and other ICANN participants shall observe and respect determinations made by the Office of Ombudsman concerning confidentiality of any complaints received by that Office.

(c) Contact with the Ombudsman shall not constitute notice to ICANN of any
particular action or cause of action.

(d) The Ombudsman shall be specifically authorized to make such reports to the Board as he or she deems appropriate with respect to any particular matter and its resolution or the inability to resolve it. Absent a determination by the Ombudsman, in his or her sole discretion, that it would be inappropriate, such reports shall be posted on the Website.

(e) The Ombudsman shall not take any actions not authorized in these Bylaws, and in particular shall not institute, join, or support in any way any legal actions challenging ICANN structure, procedures, processes, or any conduct by the ICANN Board, staff, or constituent bodies.

Section 5.5. ANNUAL REPORT
The Office of Ombudsman shall publish on an annual basis a consolidated analysis of the year's complaints and resolutions, appropriately dealing with confidentiality obligations and concerns. Such annual report should include a description of any trends or common elements of complaints received during the period in question, as well as recommendations for steps that could be taken to minimize future complaints. The annual report shall be posted on the Website.

ARTICLE 6 EMPOWERED COMMUNITY

Section 6.1. COMPOSITION AND ORGANIZATION OF THE EMPOWERED COMMUNITY

(a) The Empowered Community ("EC") shall be a nonprofit association formed under the laws of the State of California consisting of the ASO, the ccNSO (as defined in Section 10.1), the GNSO (as defined in Section 11.1), the ALAC (as defined in Section 12.2(d)(i)) and the GAC (each a "Decisional Participant" or "associate," and collectively, the "Decisional Participants").

(b) This Article 6 shall constitute the articles of association of the EC and shall be considered the formational "governing document" (as defined in Section 18008 of the CCC) of the EC, and the terms contained herein and in these Bylaws relating to the EC shall be the EC's "governing principles" (as defined in Section 18010 of the CCC), which may only be amended as set forth in Section 25.2. Where necessary for purposes of interpretation of these Bylaws, an "associate" shall be deemed to be a "member" of the EC as defined in Section 18015 of the CCC. Any change in the number and/or identity of Decisional Participants for any reason (including the resignation of any Decisional Participant or the addition of new Decisional Participants as a result of the creation of additional Supporting Organizations or Advisory Committees), and any corresponding changes in the
voting thresholds for exercise of the EC’s rights described in Annex D of these Bylaws, will only be effective following the completion of the process for amending Fundamental Bylaws described in Section 25.2 and Annex D. The EC may not be dissolved except upon the completion of the process for amending Fundamental Bylaws described in Section 25.2 and Annex D.

(c) The sole purpose of the EC is to exercise its rights and perform its obligations under ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and these Bylaws, and the EC shall have no other powers or rights except as expressly provided therein. The EC may only act as provided in these Bylaws. Any act of the EC that is not in accordance with these Bylaws shall not be effective.

(d) The EC shall not acquire, hold, manage, encumber or transfer any interest in real or personal property, nor have any directors, officers or employees. The EC shall not merge with or into another entity nor shall it dissolve, except with the approval of the Board and as part of a Fundamental Bylaw Amendment (as defined in Section 25.2(b)).

(e) Decisional Participants shall not transfer their right to be an associate of the EC. Any attempted transfer by any Decisional Participant of its right to be an associate of the EC shall be void ab initio.

(f) The location and street address of the EC shall be the principal office of ICANN.

(g) Each Decisional Participant shall, except as otherwise provided in Annex D, adopt procedures for exercising the rights of such Decisional Participant pursuant to the procedures set forth in Annex D, including (i) who can submit a petition to such Decisional Participant, (ii) the process for an individual to submit a petition to such Decisional Participant, including whether a petition must be accompanied by a rationale, (iii) how the Decisional Participant determines whether to accept or reject a petition, (iv) how the Decisional Participant determines whether an issue subject to a petition has been resolved, (v) how the Decisional Participant determines whether to support or object to actions supported by another Decisional Participant, and (vi) the process for the Decisional Participant to notify its constituents of relevant matters.

Section 6.2. POWERS AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

(a) Pursuant to and in compliance with the terms and conditions of these Bylaws, the EC shall have the powers and rights, as set forth more fully elsewhere in these Bylaws, to:
(i) Appoint and remove individual Directors (other than the President);

(ii) Recall the entire Board;

(iii) Reject ICANN Budgets, IANA Budgets, Operating Plans (as defined in Section 22.5(a)(i)) and Strategic Plans (as defined in Section 22.5(b)(i));

(iv) Reject Standard Bylaw Amendments (as defined in Section 25.1(a));

(v) Approve Fundamental Bylaw Amendments, Articles Amendments (as defined in Section 25.2(b)), and Asset Sales (as defined in Article 26(a));

(vi) Reject PTI Governance Actions (as defined in Section 16.2(d));

(vii) Require the ICANN Board to re-review its rejection of IFR Recommendation Decisions (as defined in Section 18.6(d)), Special IFR Recommendation Decisions (as defined in Section 18.12(e)), SCWG Creation Decisions (as defined in Section 19.1(d)) and SCWG Recommendation Decisions (as defined in Section 19.4(d));

(viii) Initiate a Community Reconsideration Request, mediation or a Community IRP; and

(ix) Take necessary and appropriate action to enforce its powers and rights, including through the community mechanism contained in Annex D or an action filed in a court of competent jurisdiction.

(b) The EC may pursue an action in any court with jurisdiction over ICANN to enforce the EC’s rights under these Bylaws. ICANN acknowledges the EC’s legal personhood and shall not raise the EC’s legal personhood as a defense in any proceeding between ICANN and the EC. ICANN shall not assert as a defense that prior filing or completion of a Reconsideration Request or an IRP Claim was a prerequisite to an action in court regarding the EC’s power to appoint or remove an individual Director or recall the Board (except to the extent an IRP Panel award is applicable pursuant to Section 3.6(e)).

(c) By nominating a Director for designation by the EC or exercising the community mechanism contained in Annex D with respect to any rights granted to the EC pursuant to these Bylaws, the EC and each of its Decisional Participants agrees and consents to the terms of these Bylaws and intends to be legally bound hereby.
Section 6.3. EC ADMINISTRATION

(a) The Decisional Participants shall act through their respective chairs or such other persons as may be designated by the Decisional Participants (collectively, such persons are the "EC Administration"). Each Decisional Participant shall deliver annually a written certification from its chair or co-chairs to the Secretary designating the individual who shall represent the Decisional Participant on the EC Administration.

(b) In representing a Decisional Participant on the EC Administration, the representative individual shall act solely as directed by the represented Decisional Participant and in accordance with processes developed by such Decisional Participant in accordance with Section 6.1(g).

(c) In representing the EC Administration, the individuals serving thereon shall act as required for the EC to follow the applicable procedures in Annex D, and to implement EC decisions made in accordance with such procedures.

(d) All communications and notices required or permitted to be given under these Bylaws by a Decisional Participant shall be provided by the Decisional Participant's representative on the EC Administration. All communications and notices required or permitted to be given under these Bylaws by the EC shall be provided by any member of the EC Administration. Where a particular Bylaws notice provision does not require notice to the Secretary, the EC and the Decisional Participants shall provide a copy of the notice to the Secretary in accordance with Section 21.5, and ICANN shall post it on the Website.

(e) ICANN shall be entitled to rely on notices from a Decisional Participant's representative or an individual serving on the EC Administration delivered in accordance with Section 21.5 as evidence that the actions set forth therein have been approved by or are the actions of the Decisional Participant, the EC or the EC Administration, as applicable, pursuant to and in compliance with the requirements of these Bylaws (including Annex D).

(f) No person participating in the EC, the EC Administration or a Decisional Participant shall be liable for any debt, obligation or liability of ICANN or the EC, other than in the case of a fraudulent act committed by such person.

Section 6.4. CONSENT TO BOARD-INITIATED REMOVAL OF DIRECTOR WITHOUT CAUSE

In the event the EC Administration receives from the Secretary a valid notice as described in Section 7.11(a)(i)(B), indicating that the Board has voted to remove a Director without cause pursuant to Section 7.11(a)(i)(B), the EC shall without
deliberation consent to such removal, and the EC Administration shall provide notice to the Secretary of such consent.

ARTICLE 7 BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Section 7.1. COMPOSITION OF THE BOARD
The ICANN Board of Directors ("Board") shall consist of sixteen voting directors ("Directors"). In addition, four non-voting liaisons ("Liaisons") shall be appointed for the purposes set forth in Section 7.9. Only Directors shall be included in determining the existence of quorums, and in establishing the validity of votes taken by the Board.

Section 7.2. DIRECTORS AND THEIR SELECTION; ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR
(a) As of the effective date of the amendment and restatement of these Bylaws on 1 October 2016, the EC shall be the sole designator of ICANN and shall designate, within the meaning of Section 5220 of the CCC, all Directors except for the President ex officio. The EC shall notify promptly the Secretary in writing of the following designations:

(i) Eight Directors nominated by the Nominating Committee to be designated as Directors by the EC. These seats on the Board are referred to in these Bylaws as Seats 1 through 8.

(ii) Two Directors nominated by the ASO to be designated as Directors by the EC. These seats on the Board are referred to in these Bylaws as Seat 9 and Seat 10.

(iii) Two Directors nominated by the ccNSO to be designated as Directors by the EC. These seats on the Board are referred to in these Bylaws as Seat 11 and Seat 12.

(iv) Two Directors nominated by the GNSO to be designated as Directors by the EC. These seats on the Board are referred to in these Bylaws as Seat 13 and Seat 14.

(v) One Director nominated by the At-Large Community to be designated as Directors by the EC. This seat on the Board is referred to in these Bylaws as Seat 15.
In addition to the Directors designated by the EC, the President shall serve ex officio as a Director. The seat held by the President on the Board is referred to in these Bylaws as Seat 16.

(b) In carrying out its responsibilities to nominate the Directors for Seats 1 through 8 for designation by the EC, the Nominating Committee shall ensure that the Board is composed of Directors who, in the aggregate, display diversity in geography, culture, skills, experience, and perspective, by applying the criteria set forth in Section 7.3, Section 7.4 and Section 7.5. At no time when it makes its nomination shall the Nominating Committee nominate a Director to fill any vacancy or expired term whose designation would cause the total number of Directors (not including the President) from countries in any one Geographic Region to exceed five; and the Nominating Committee shall ensure when it makes its nominations that the Board includes at least one Director who is from a country in each ICANN Geographic Region ("Diversity Calculation"). For purposes of this Section 7.2(b), if any candidate for director maintains citizenship of more than one country, or has been domiciled for more than five years in a country of which the candidate does not maintain citizenship ("Domicile"), that candidate may be deemed to be from either country and must select in his or her Statement of Interest the country of citizenship or Domicile that he or she wants the Nominating Committee to use for Diversity Calculation purposes. For purposes of this Section 7.2(b), a person can only have one Domicile, which shall be determined by where the candidate has a permanent residence and place of habitation.

(c) In carrying out their responsibilities to nominate Directors for Seats 9 through 15 for designation by the EC, the Supporting Organizations and the At-Large Community shall seek to ensure that the Board is composed of Directors who, in the aggregate, display diversity in geography, culture, skills, experience, and perspective, by applying the criteria set forth in Section 7.3, Section 7.4 and Section 7.5. The Supporting Organizations shall ensure that, at any given time, no two Directors nominated by a Supporting Organization are citizens from the same country or of countries located in the same Geographic Region. For purposes of this Section 7.2(c), if any candidate for Director maintains citizenship or Domicile of more than one country, that candidate may be deemed to be from either country and must select in his or her Statement of Interest the country of citizenship or Domicile that he or she wants the Supporting Organization or the At-Large Community, as applicable, to use for nomination purposes. For purposes of this Section 7.2(c), a person can only have one Domicile, which shall be determined by where the candidate has a permanent residence and place of habitation.

(d) The Board shall annually elect a Chair and a Vice-Chair from among the Directors, not to include the President.
(e) The EC shall designate each person nominated as a Director by the Nominating Committee, the ASO, the ccNSO, the GNSO and the At-Large Community in accordance with this Section 7.2.

(f) As a condition to sitting on the Board, each Director other than the President ex officio shall sign a pre-service letter pursuant to which such Director:

(i) acknowledges and agrees to the EC’s right to remove the Director at any time and for any reason following the processes set forth in these Bylaws;

(ii) acknowledges and agrees that serving as a Director shall not establish any employment or other relationship (whether to ICANN, the EC, any body entitled to nominate a Director, or any of their agents) that provides any due process rights related to termination of service as a Director; and

(iii) conditionally and irrevocably resigns as a Director automatically effective upon communication to the Director or, in the case of Board recall, communication to the Board of a final determination of removal following the processes set forth in these Bylaws.

Section 7.3.CRITERIA FOR NOMINATION OF DIRECTORS

Directors shall be:

(a) Accomplished persons of integrity, objectivity, and intelligence, with reputations for sound judgment and open minds, and a demonstrated capacity for thoughtful group decision-making;

(b) Persons with an understanding of ICANN’s Mission and the potential impact of ICANN decisions on the global Internet community, and committed to the success of ICANN;

(c) Persons who will produce the broadest cultural and geographic diversity on the Board consistent with meeting the other criteria set forth in this Section 7.3;

(d) Persons who, in the aggregate, have personal familiarity with the operation of gTLD registries and registrars; with ccTLD registries; with IP address registries; with Internet technical standards and protocols; with policy-development procedures, legal traditions, and the public interest; and with the broad range of business, individual, academic, and non-commercial users of the Internet; and
(e) Persons who are able to work and communicate in written and spoken English.

Section 7.4. ADDITIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

(a) Notwithstanding anything herein to the contrary, no official of a national government or a multinational entity established by treaty or other agreement between national governments may serve as a Director. As used herein, the term "official" means a person (i) who holds an elective governmental office or (ii) who is employed by such government or multinational entity and whose primary function with such government or entity is to develop or influence governmental or public policies.

(b) No person who serves in any capacity (including as a liaison) on any Supporting Organization Council shall simultaneously serve as a Director or Liaison to the Board. If such a person is identified by, or presents themselves to, the Supporting Organization Council or the At-Large Community for consideration for nomination to serve as a Director, the person shall not thereafter participate in any discussion of, or vote by, the Supporting Organization Council or the committee designated by the At-Large Community relating to the nomination of Directors by the Council or At-Large Community, until the Council or committee(s) specified by the At-Large Community has nominated the full complement of Directors it is responsible for nominating. In the event that a person serving in any capacity on a Supporting Organization Council is considered for nomination to serve as a Director, the constituency group or other group or entity that selected the person may select a replacement for purposes of the Council’s nomination process. In the event that a person serving in any capacity on the At-Large Advisory Committee is identified as or accepts a nomination to be considered for nomination by the At-Large Community as a Director, the Regional At-Large Organization or other group or entity that selected the person may select a replacement for purposes of the At-Large Community’s nomination process.

(c) Persons serving in any capacity on the Nominating Committee shall be ineligible for nomination or designation to positions on the Board as provided by Section 8.8.

(d) No person who serves on the EC Administration while serving in that capacity shall be considered for nomination or designated to the Board, nor serve simultaneously on the EC Administration and as a Director or Liaison to the Board.

Section 7.5. INTERNATIONAL REPRESENTATION

In order to ensure broad international representation on the Board, the nomination of Directors by the Nominating Committee, each Supporting Organization and the At-Large Community shall comply with all applicable diversity provisions of these
Bylaws or of any memorandum of understanding referred to in these Bylaws concerning the Supporting Organization. One intent of these diversity provisions is to ensure that at all times each Geographic Region shall have at least one Director, and at all times no Geographic Region shall have more than five Directors on the Board (not including the President). As used in these Bylaws, each of the following is considered to be a "Geographic Region": (a) Europe; (b) Asia/Australia/Pacific; (c) Latin America/Caribbean islands; (d) Africa; and (e) North America. The specific countries included in each Geographic Region shall be determined by the Board, and this Section 7.5 shall be reviewed by the Board from time to time (and in any event at least once every three years) to determine whether any change is appropriate, taking account of the evolution of the Internet.

Section 7.6. DIRECTORS' CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The Board, through the Board Governance Committee, shall require a statement from each Director not less frequently than once a year setting forth all business and other affiliations that relate in any way to the business and other affiliations of ICANN. Each Director shall be responsible for disclosing to ICANN any matter that could reasonably be considered to make such Director an "interested director" within the meaning of Section 5233 of the CCC. In addition, each Director shall disclose to ICANN any relationship or other factor that could reasonably be considered to cause the Director to be considered to be an "interested person" within the meaning of Section 5227 of the CCC. The Board shall adopt policies specifically addressing Director, Officer, EC and Supporting Organization conflicts of interest. No Director shall vote on any matter in which he or she has a material and direct financial interest that would be affected by the outcome of the vote.

Section 7.7. DUTIES OF DIRECTORS

Directors shall serve as individuals who have the duty to act in what they reasonably believe are the best interests of ICANN and not as representatives of the EC, the Nominating Committee, Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee that nominated them, as applicable, their employers, or any other organizations or constituencies.

Section 7.8. TERMS OF DIRECTORS

(a) The regular term of office of Director Seats 1 through 15 shall begin as follows:

(i) The regular terms of Seats 1 through 3 shall begin at the conclusion of each ICANN annual meeting every third year after 2003;
(ii) The regular terms of Seats 4 through 6 shall begin at the conclusion of each ICANN annual meeting every third year after 2004;

(iii) The regular terms of Seats 7 and 8 shall begin at the conclusion of each ICANN annual meeting every third year after 2005;

(iv) The terms of Seats 9 and 12 shall begin at the conclusion of each ICANN annual meeting every third year after 2015;

(v) The terms of Seats 10 and 13 shall begin at the conclusion of each ICANN annual meeting every third year after 2013; and

(vi) The terms of Seats 11, 14 and 15 shall begin at the conclusion of each ICANN annual meeting every third year after 2014.

(b) Each Director holding any of Seats 1 through 15, including a Director nominated and designated to fill a vacancy, shall hold office for a term that lasts until the next term for that Seat commences and until a successor has been designated and qualified or until that Director resigns or is removed in accordance with these Bylaws. For the avoidance of doubt, the new governance provisions effective as of the amendment and restatement of these Bylaws on 1 October 2016 shall not have the effect of shortening or terminating the terms of any Directors serving at the time of the amendment and restatement.

(c) At least two months before the commencement of each annual meeting, the Nominating Committee shall give the EC Administration (with a copy to the Decisional Participants and Secretary) written notice of its nomination of Directors for seats with terms beginning at the conclusion of the annual meeting, and the EC Administration shall promptly provide the Secretary (with a copy to the Decisional Participants) with written notice of the designation of those Directors. All such notices shall be posted promptly to the Website.

(d) At least six months before the date specified for the commencement of the term as specified in Section 7.8(a)(iv) through Section 7.8(a)(vi) above, any Supporting Organization or the At-Large Community entitled to nominate a Director for a Seat with a term beginning that year shall give the EC Administration (with a copy to the Secretary and the Decisional Participants) written notice of its nomination of Directors for seats with terms beginning at the conclusion of the annual meeting, and the EC Administration shall promptly provide the Secretary (with a copy to the Decisional Participants) with written notice of the designation of those Directors. All such notices shall be posted promptly to the Website.

(e) No Director may serve more than three consecutive terms. For these
purposes, a person designated to fill a vacancy in a term shall not be deemed to have served that term.

(f) The term as Director of the person holding the office of President shall be for as long as, and only for as long as, such person holds the office of President.

Section 7.9. NON-VOTING LIAISONS

(a) The non-voting Liaisons shall include:

(i) One appointed by the Governmental Advisory Committee;

(ii) One appointed by the Root Server System Advisory Committee established by Section 12.2(c);

(iii) One appointed by the Security and Stability Advisory Committee established by Section 12.2(b); and

(iv) One appointed by the Internet Engineering Task Force.

(b) The Liaisons shall serve terms that begin at the conclusion of each annual meeting. At least one month before the commencement of each annual meeting, each body entitled to appoint a Liaison shall give the Secretary written notice of its appointment.

(c) Each Liaison may be reappointed, and shall remain in that position until a successor has been appointed or until the Liaison resigns or is removed in accordance with these Bylaws.

(d) The Liaisons shall be entitled to attend Board meetings, participate in Board discussions and deliberations, and have access (under conditions established by the Board) to materials provided to Directors for use in Board discussions, deliberations and meetings, but shall otherwise not have any of the rights and privileges of Directors. Liaisons shall be entitled (under conditions established by the Board) to use any materials provided to them pursuant to this Section 7.9(d) for the purpose of consulting with their respective committee or organization.

Section 7.10. RESIGNATION OF A DIRECTOR OR NON-VOTING LIAISON

Subject to Section 5226 of the CCC, any Director or Liaison may resign at any
time by giving written notice thereof to the Chair of the Board, the President, the Secretary, or the Board. Such resignation shall take effect at the time specified, and, unless otherwise specified, the acceptance of such resignation shall not be necessary to make it effective.

Section 7.11. REMOVAL OF A DIRECTOR OR NON-VOTING LIAISON

(a) Directors

(i) Any Director designated by the EC may be removed without cause:

(A) by the EC pursuant to and in compliance with procedures in Section 3.1 or Section 3.2 of Annex D, as applicable, or

(B) following notice to that Director, by a three-fourths (3/4) majority vote of all Directors; provided, however, that (x) each vote to remove a Director shall be a separate vote on the sole question of the removal of that particular Director; and (y) such removal shall not be effective until the Secretary has provided notice to the EC Administration of the Board's removal vote and the requirements of Section 6.4 have been met.

(ii) The Board may remove any Director who has been declared of unsound mind by a final order of court, or convicted of a felony, or been found by a final order or judgment of any court to have breached any duty under Sections 5230 through 5239 of the CCC, and in the case of such removal, the Secretary shall promptly notify the EC Administration in writing, with a copy to the body that nominated such Director, and shall promptly post such notification to the Website. The vacancies created by such removal shall be filled in accordance with Section 7.12(a).

(iii) All Directors (other than the President) may be removed at the same time by the EC by the EC Administration delivering an EC Board Recall Notice to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 3.3 of Annex D. The vacancies created by such removal shall be filled by the EC in accordance with Section 7.12(b).

(b) With the exception of the Liaison appointed by the Governmental Advisory Committee, any Liaison may be removed following notice to that Liaison and to the organization which selected that Liaison, by a three-fourths (3/4) majority vote of all Directors if the selecting organization fails to promptly remove that Liaison.
following such notice. The vacancies created by such removal shall be filled in accordance with Section 7.12. The Board may request the Governmental Advisory Committee to consider the replacement of the Governmental Advisory Committee Liaison if the Board, by a three-fourths (3/4) majority vote of all Directors, determines that such an action is appropriate.

Section 7.12. VACANCIES

(a) This Section 7.12(a) shall apply to Board vacancies other than those occurring by recall of all Directors (other than the President). A vacancy or vacancies in the Board shall be deemed to exist in the case of the death, resignation, or removal of any Director or Interim Director (as defined in Section 7.12(b)), or if the authorized number of Directors is increased. Vacancies occurring in Seats 1 through 15 shall be filled by the EC after nomination as provided in Section 7.2 and Articles 8 through 12. A vacancy in Seat 16 shall be filled as provided in Article 15. A Director designated by the EC to fill a vacancy on the Board shall serve for the unexpired term of his or her predecessor in office and until a successor has been designated and qualified. No reduction of the authorized number of Directors shall have the effect of removing a Director prior to the expiration of the Director's term of office.

(b) This Section 7.12(b) shall apply to Board vacancies occurring when all Directors (other than the President) are recalled as provided by Section 7.11(a) (iii). Concurrently with delivery of any EC Board Recall Notice (as defined in Section 3.3(f) of Annex D), the EC Administration shall provide written notice of the EC’s designation of individuals to fill such vacancies (each such individual, an "Interim Director") to the Decisional Participants and to the Secretary, who shall cause such notice to be promptly posted to the Website. An Interim Director must meet the criteria specified in Section 7.3, Section 7.4 and Section 7.5, as applicable. An Interim Director shall hold office until the EC designates the Interim Director's successor in accordance with Section 7.12(a), and the successor's designation shall occur within 120 days of the Interim Director's designation. For avoidance of doubt, persons designated as Interim Directors may be eligible for designation as Directors as well.

(c) The organizations selecting the Liaisons identified in Section 7.9 are responsible for determining the existence of, and filling, any vacancies in those positions. Such organizations shall give the Secretary written notice of their appointments to fill any such vacancies, subject to the requirements set forth in Section 7.4, as applicable.

Section 7.13. ANNUAL MEETINGS

Annual meetings of ICANN shall be held for the purpose of electing Officers and
for the transaction of such other business as may come before the meeting. Each annual meeting of ICANN shall be held at the principal office of ICANN, or any other appropriate place of the Board’s time and choosing, provided such annual meeting is held within 14 months of the immediately preceding annual meeting. If the Board determines that it is practical, the annual meeting should be distributed in real-time and archived video and audio formats on the Internet.

Section 7.14. REGULAR MEETINGS

Regular meetings of the Board shall be held on dates to be determined by the Board. In the absence of other designation, regular meetings shall be held at the principal office of ICANN.

Section 7.15. SPECIAL MEETINGS

Special meetings of the Board may be called by or at the request of one-quarter (1/4) of the Directors, by the Chair of the Board or the President. A call for a special meeting shall be made by the Secretary. Special meetings shall be held at the principal office of ICANN unless otherwise specified in the notice of the meeting.

Section 7.16. NOTICE OF MEETINGS

Notice of time and place of all meetings shall be delivered personally or by telephone or by electronic mail to each Director and Liaison, or sent by first-class mail (air mail for addresses outside the United States) or facsimile, charges prepaid, addressed to each Director and Liaison at the Director’s or Liaison’s address as it is shown on the records of ICANN. In case the notice is mailed, it shall be deposited in the United States mail at least fourteen (14) days before the time of the holding of the meeting. In case the notice is delivered personally or by telephone or facsimile or electronic mail it shall be delivered personally or by telephone or facsimile or electronic mail at least forty-eight (48) hours before the time of the holding of the meeting. Notwithstanding anything in this Section 7.16 to the contrary, notice of a meeting need not be given to any Director or Liaison who signed a waiver of notice or a Director who signed a written consent to holding the meeting or an approval of the minutes thereof, whether before or after the meeting, or who attends the meeting without protesting, prior thereto or at its commencement, the lack of notice to such Director. All such waivers, consents and approvals shall be filed with the corporate records or made a part of the minutes of the meetings.

Section 7.17. QUORUM
At all annual, regular, and special meetings of the Board, a majority of the total number of Directors then in office shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, and the act of a majority of the Directors present at any meeting at which there is a quorum shall be the act of the Board, unless otherwise provided herein or by law. If a quorum shall not be present at any meeting of the Board, the Directors present thereat may adjourn the meeting from time to time to another place, time or date. If the meeting is adjourned for more than twenty-four (24) hours, notice shall be given to those Directors not at the meeting at the time of the adjournment.

Section 7.18. ACTIONS BY TELEPHONE MEETING OR BY OTHER COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT

Directors and Liaisons may participate in a meeting of the Board or Board Committee (as defined in Section 14.1) through use of (a) conference telephone or similar communications equipment, provided that all Directors participating in such a meeting can speak to and hear one another or (b) electronic video screen communication or other communication equipment; provided that (i) all Directors participating in such a meeting can speak to and hear one another, (ii) all Directors are provided the means of fully participating in all matters before the Board or Board Committee, and (iii) ICANN adopts and implements means of verifying that (A) a person participating in such a meeting is a Director or other person entitled to participate in the meeting and (B) all actions of, or votes by, the Board or Board Committee are taken or cast only by Directors and not persons who are not Directors. Participation in a meeting pursuant to this Section 7.18 constitutes presence in person at such meeting. ICANN shall make available at the place of any meeting of the Board the telecommunications equipment necessary to permit Directors and Liaisons to participate by telephone.

Section 7.19. ACTION WITHOUT MEETING

Any action required or permitted to be taken by the Board or a Committee of the Board may be taken without a meeting if all of the Directors entitled to vote thereat shall individually or collectively consent in writing to such action. Such written consent shall have the same force and effect as the unanimous vote of such Directors. Such written consent or consents shall be filed with the minutes of the proceedings of the Board.

Section 7.20. ELECTRONIC MAIL

If permitted by applicable law, communication by electronic mail shall be considered equivalent to any communication otherwise required to be in writing. ICANN shall take such steps as it deems appropriate under the circumstances to
Section 7.21. BOARD RIGHTS OF INSPECTION

(a) Every Director shall have the right at any reasonable time to inspect and copy all books, records and documents of every kind, and to inspect the physical properties of ICANN.

(b) ICANN shall establish reasonable procedures to protect against the inappropriate disclosure of confidential information.

Section 7.22. COMPENSATION

(a) Except for the President of ICANN, who serves ex officio as a Director, each of the Directors shall be entitled to receive compensation for his or her services as a Director. The President shall receive only his or her compensation for service as President and shall not receive additional compensation for service as a Director.

(b) If the Board determines to offer a compensation arrangement to one or more Directors (other than the President) for services to ICANN as Directors, the Board shall follow the process that is calculated to pay an amount for service as a Director that is not an excess benefit under the standards set forth in Section 4958 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (the "Code").

(c) As part of the process, the Board shall retain an Independent Valuation Expert (as defined in Section 7.22(g)(i)) to consult with and to advise the Board regarding Director compensation arrangements and to issue to the Board a Reasoned Written Opinion (as defined in Section 7.22(g)(ii)) from such expert regarding the ranges of Reasonable Compensation (as defined in Section 7.22(g)(iii)) for any such services by a Director. The expert's opinion shall address all relevant factors affecting the level of compensation to be paid a Director, including offices held on the Board, attendance at Board and Board Committee meetings, the nature of service on the Board and on Board Committees, and appropriate data as to comparability regarding director compensation arrangements for U.S.-based, nonprofit, tax-exempt organizations possessing a global employee base.

(d) After having reviewed the Independent Valuation Expert's Reasoned Written Opinion, the Board shall meet with the expert to discuss the expert's opinion and to ask questions of the expert regarding the expert's opinion, the comparability data obtained and relied upon, and the conclusions reached by the expert.

(e) The Board shall adequately document the basis for any determination the Board makes regarding a Director compensation arrangement concurrently with making that determination.
(f) In addition to authorizing payment of compensation for services as Directors as set forth in this Section 7.22, the Board may also authorize the reimbursement of actual and necessary reasonable expenses incurred by any Director and by Liaisons performing their duties as Directors or Liaisons.

(g) As used in this Section 7.22, the following terms shall have the following meanings:

(i) An "Independent Valuation Expert" means a person retained by ICANN to value compensation arrangements that: (A) holds itself out to the public as a compensation consultant; (B) performs valuations regarding compensation arrangements on a regular basis, with a majority of its compensation consulting services performed for persons other than ICANN; (C) is qualified to make valuations of the type of services involved in any engagement by and for ICANN; (D) issues to ICANN a Reasoned Written Opinion regarding a particular compensation arrangement; and (E) includes in its Reasoned Written Opinion a certification that it meets the requirements set forth in (A) through (D) of this definition.

(ii) A "Reasoned Written Opinion" means a written opinion of a valuation expert who meets the requirements of Section 7.22(g)(i)(A) through (D). To be reasoned, the opinion must be based upon a full disclosure by ICANN to the valuation expert of the factual situation regarding the compensation arrangement that is the subject of the opinion, the opinion must articulate the applicable valuation standards relevant in valuing such compensation arrangement, the opinion must apply those standards to such compensation arrangement, and the opinion must arrive at a conclusion regarding whether the compensation arrangement is within the range of Reasonable Compensation for the services covered by the arrangement. A written opinion is reasoned even though it reaches a conclusion that is subsequently determined to be incorrect so long as the opinion addresses itself to the facts and the applicable standards. However, a written opinion is not reasoned if it does nothing more than recite the facts and express a conclusion.

(iii) "Reasonable Compensation" shall have the meaning set forth in §53.4958-4(b)(1)(ii) of the Regulations issued under §4958 of the Code.

(h) Each of the Liaisons, with the exception of the Governmental Advisory Committee Liaison, shall be entitled to receive compensation for his or her
services as a Liaison. If the Board determines to offer a compensation
arrangement to one or more Liaisons, the Board shall approve that arrangement
by a required three-fourths (3/4) vote.

Section 7.23. PRESUMPTION OF ASSENT
A Director present at a Board meeting at which action on any corporate matter is
taken shall be presumed to have assented to the action taken unless his or her
dissent or abstention is entered in the minutes of the meeting, or unless such
Director files a written dissent or abstention to such action with the person acting
as the secretary of the meeting before the adjournment thereof, or forwards such
dissent or abstention by registered mail to the Secretary immediately after the
adjournment of the meeting. Such right to dissent or abstain shall not apply to a
Director who voted in favor of such action.

Section 7.24 INTERIM BOARD
Except in circumstances in which urgent decisions are needed to protect the
security, stability or resilience of the DNS or to the extent necessary to comply
with its fiduciary obligations under applicable law, a Board that consists of a
majority or more of Interim Directors (an "Interim Board") shall (a) consult with the
chairs of the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees before making
major decisions and (b) consult through a community forum (in a manner
consistent with the process for a Rejection Action Community Forum pursuant to
Section 2.3 of Annex D) prior to taking any action that would, if implemented,
materially change ICANN's strategy, policies or management, including
replacement of the then-serving President. Interim Directors shall be entitled to
compensation as provided in this Article 7.

Section 7.25 COMMUNICATION OF DESIGNATION
Upon its receipt of nominations as provided in Articles 7 through 12, the EC
Administration, on behalf of the EC, shall promptly notify the Secretary of the EC's
designation of individuals to fill seats on the Board. ICANN shall post all such
designations promptly to the Website.

ARTICLE 8 NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Section 8.1. DESCRIPTION
There shall be a Nominating Committee of ICANN ("Nominating Committee"),
responsible for nominating all Directors except the President and those Directors
nominated by Decisional Participants; for nominating two directors of PTI (in
accordance with the articles of incorporation and bylaws of PTI); and for such
other selections as are set forth in these Bylaws. Notification of the Nominating
Committee’s Director nominations shall be given by the Nominating Committee
Chair in writing to the EC Administration, with a copy to the Secretary, and the EC
shall promptly act on it as provided in Section 7.25. Notification of the Nominating
Committee’s PTI director nomination shall be given to the Secretary.

Section 8.2. COMPOSITION
The Nominating Committee shall be composed of the following persons:

(a) A non-voting Chair, appointed by the Board;

(b) A non-voting Chair-Elect, appointed by the Board as a non-voting advisor;

(c) A non-voting liaison appointed by the Root Server System Advisory Committee
   established by Section 12.2(c);

(d) A non-voting liaison appointed by the Security and Stability Advisory
   Committee established by Section 12.2(b);

(e) A non-voting liaison appointed by the Governmental Advisory Committee;

(f) Five voting delegates selected by the At-Large Advisory Committee established
   by Section 12.2(d);

(g) Voting delegates to the Nominating Committee shall be selected from the
Generic Names Supporting Organization established by Article 11, as follows:

   (i) One delegate from the Registries Stakeholder Group;

   (ii) One delegate from the Registrars Stakeholder Group;

   (iii) Two delegates from the Business Constituency, one representing small
business users and one representing large business users;

   (iv) One delegate from the Internet Service Providers and Connectivity
Providers Constituency (as defined in Section 11.5(a)(iii));

   (v) One delegate from the Intellectual Property Constituency; and

   (vi) One delegate from consumer and civil society groups, selected by the
Non-Commercial Users Constituency.
(h) One voting delegate each selected by the following entities:

(i) The Council of the Country Code Names Supporting Organization established by Section 10.3;

(ii) The Council of the Address Supporting Organization established by Section 9.2; and

(iii) The Internet Engineering Task Force.

(i) A non-voting Associate Chair, who may be appointed by the Chair, at his or her sole discretion, to serve during all or part of the term of the Chair. The Associate Chair may not be a person who is otherwise a member of the same Nominating Committee. The Associate Chair shall assist the Chair in carrying out the duties of the Chair, but shall not serve, temporarily or otherwise, in the place of the Chair.

Section 8.3. TERMS

(a) Each voting delegate shall serve a one-year term. A delegate may serve at most two successive one-year terms, after which at least two years must elapse before the individual is eligible to serve another term.

(b) The regular term of each voting delegate shall begin at the conclusion of an ICANN annual meeting and shall end at the conclusion of the immediately following ICANN annual meeting.

(c) Non-voting liaisons shall serve during the term designated by the entity that appoints them. The Chair, the Chair-Elect, and any Associate Chair shall serve as such until the conclusion of the next ICANN annual meeting.

(d) It is anticipated that upon the conclusion of the term of the Chair-Elect, the Chair-Elect will be appointed by the Board to the position of Chair. However, the Board retains the discretion to appoint any other person to the position of Chair. At the time of appointing a Chair-Elect, if the Board determines that the person identified to serve as Chair shall be appointed as Chair for a successive term, the Chair-Elect position shall remain vacant for the term designated by the Board.

(e) Vacancies in the positions of delegate, non-voting liaison, Chair or Chair-Elect shall be filled by the entity entitled to select the delegate, non-voting liaison, Chair or Chair-Elect involved. For any term that the Chair-Elect position is vacant
pursuant to Section 8.3(d), or until any other vacancy in the position of Chair-Elect can be filled, a non-voting advisor to the Chair may be appointed by the Board from among persons with prior service on the Board or a Nominating Committee, including the immediately previous Chair of the Nominating Committee. A vacancy in the position of Associate Chair may be filled by the Chair in accordance with the criteria established by Section 8.2(i).

(f) The existence of any vacancies shall not affect the obligation of the Nominating Committee to carry out the responsibilities assigned to it in these Bylaws.

Section 8.4. CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF NOMINATING COMMITTEE DELEGATES

Delegates to the ICANN Nominating Committee shall be:

(a) Accomplished persons of integrity, objectivity, and intelligence, with reputations for sound judgment and open minds, and with experience and competence with collegial large group decision-making;

(b) Persons with wide contacts, broad experience in the Internet community, and a commitment to the success of ICANN;

(c) Persons whom the selecting body is confident will consult widely and accept input in carrying out their responsibilities;

(d) Persons who are neutral and objective, without any fixed personal commitments to particular individuals, organizations, or commercial objectives in carrying out their Nominating Committee responsibilities;

(e) Persons with an understanding of ICANN's mission and the potential impact of ICANN's activities on the broader Internet community who are willing to serve as volunteers, without compensation other than the reimbursement of certain expenses; and

(f) Persons who are able to work and communicate in written and spoken English.

Section 8.5. DIVERSITY

In carrying out its responsibilities to nominate Directors to fill Seats 1 through 8 (and selections to any other ICANN bodies as the Nominating Committee is responsible for under these Bylaws), the Nominating Committee shall take into account the continuing membership of the Board (and such other bodies), and seek to ensure that the persons it nominates to serve as Director and selects shall, to the extent feasible and consistent with the other criteria required to be
Section 8.6. ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL SUPPORT

ICANN shall provide administrative and operational support necessary for the Nominating Committee to carry out its responsibilities.

Section 8.7. PROCEDURES

The Nominating Committee shall adopt such operating procedures as it deems necessary, which shall be published on the Website.

Section 8.8. INELIGIBILITY FOR SELECTION BY NOMINATING COMMITTEE

No person who serves on the Nominating Committee in any capacity shall be eligible for nomination by any means to any position on the Board or any other ICANN body having one or more membership positions that the Nominating Committee is responsible for filling, until the conclusion of an ICANN annual meeting that coincides with, or is after, the conclusion of that person’s service on the Nominating Committee.

Section 8.9. INELIGIBILITY FOR SERVICE ON NOMINATING COMMITTEE

No person who is an employee of or paid consultant to ICANN (including the Ombudsman) shall simultaneously serve in any of the Nominating Committee positions described in Section 8.2.

ARTICLE 9 ADDRESS SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

Section 9.1. DESCRIPTION

(a) The Address Supporting Organization ("Address Supporting Organization" or "ASO") shall advise the Board with respect to policy issues relating to the operation, assignment, and management of Internet addresses.

(b) The ASO shall be the entity established by the Memorandum of Understanding entered on 21 October 2004 between ICANN and the Number Resource Organization ("NRO"), an organization of the existing RIRs.

Section 9.2. ADDRESS COUNCIL
(a) The ASO shall have an Address Council, consisting of the members of the NRO Number Council.

(b) The Address Council shall nominate individuals to fill Seats 9 and 10 on the Board. Notification of the Address Council's nominations shall be given by the Address Council in writing to the EC Administration, with a copy to the Secretary, and the EC shall promptly act on it as provided in Section 7.25.

ARTICLE 10 COUNTRY-CODE NAMES SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

Section 10.1. DESCRIPTION

There shall be a policy-development body known as the Country-Code Names Supporting Organization ("ccNSO"), which shall be responsible for:

(a) developing and recommending to the Board global policies relating to country-code top-level domains;

(b) Nurturing consensus across the ccNSO's community, including the name-related activities of ccTLDs;

(c) Coordinating with other ICANN Supporting Organizations, committees, and constituencies under ICANN;

(d) Nominating individuals to fill Seats 11 and 12 on the Board; and

(e) Other responsibilities of the ccNSO as set forth in these Bylaws.

Policies that apply to ccNSO members by virtue of their membership are only those policies developed according to Section 10.4(j) and Section 10.4(k). However, the ccNSO may also engage in other activities authorized by its members. Adherence to the results of these activities will be voluntary and such activities may include: seeking to develop voluntary best practices for ccTLD managers, assisting in skills building within the global community of ccTLD managers, and enhancing operational and technical cooperation among ccTLD managers.

Section 10.2. ORGANIZATION

The ccNSO shall consist of (a) ccTLD managers that have agreed in writing to be members of the ccNSO (see Section 10.4(b)) and (b) a ccNSO Council responsible for managing the policy-development process of the ccNSO.
Section 10.3. ccNSO COUNCIL

(a) The ccNSO Council shall consist of three ccNSO Council members selected by the ccNSO members within each of ICANN’s Geographic Regions in the manner described in Section 10.4(g) through Section 10.4(i); (ii) three ccNSO Council members selected by the ICANN Nominating Committee; (iii) liaisons as described in Section 10.3(b); and (iv) observers as described in Section 10.3(c).

(b) There shall also be one liaison to the ccNSO Council from each of the following organizations, to the extent they choose to appoint such a liaison: (i) the Governmental Advisory Committee; (ii) the At-Large Advisory Committee; and (iii) each of the Regional Organizations described in Section 10.5. These liaisons shall not be members of or entitled to vote on the ccNSO Council, but otherwise shall be entitled to participate on equal footing with members of the ccNSO Council. Appointments of liaisons shall be made by providing written notice to the ICANN Secretary, with a notification copy to the ccNSO Council Chair, and shall be for the term designated by the appointing organization as stated in the written notice. The appointing organization may recall from office or replace its liaison at any time by providing written notice of the recall or replacement to the ICANN Secretary, with a notification copy to the ccNSO Council Chair.

(c) The ccNSO Council may agree with the Council of any other ICANN Supporting Organization to exchange observers. Such observers shall not be members of or entitled to vote on the ccNSO Council, but otherwise shall be entitled to participate on equal footing with members of the ccNSO Council. The appointing Council may designate its observer (or revoke or change the designation of its observer) on the ccNSO Council at any time by providing written notice to the ICANN Secretary, with a notification copy to the ccNSO Council Chair.

(d) (i) the regular term of each ccNSO Council member shall begin at the conclusion of an ICANN annual meeting and shall end at the conclusion of the third ICANN annual meeting thereafter; (ii) the regular terms of the three ccNSO Council members selected by the ccNSO members within each ICANN Geographic Region shall be staggered so that one member’s term begins in a year divisible by three, a second member’s term begins in the first year following a year divisible by three, and the third member’s term begins in the second year following a year divisible by three; and (iii) the regular terms of the three ccNSO Council members selected by the Nominating Committee shall be staggered in the same manner. Each ccNSO Council member shall hold office during his or her regular term and until a successor has been selected and qualified or until that member resigns or is removed in accordance with these Bylaws.
(e) A ccNSO Council member may resign at any time by giving written notice to the ICANN Secretary, with a notification copy to the ccNSO Council Chair.

(f) ccNSO Council members may be removed for not attending three consecutive meetings of the ccNSO Council without sufficient cause or for grossly inappropriate behavior, both as determined by at least a 66% vote of all of the members of the ccNSO Council.

(g) A vacancy on the ccNSO Council shall be deemed to exist in the case of the death, resignation, or removal of any ccNSO Council member. Vacancies in the positions of the three members selected by the Nominating Committee shall be filled for the unexpired term involved by the Nominating Committee giving the ICANN Secretary written notice of its selection, with a notification copy to the ccNSO Council Chair. Vacancies in the positions of the ccNSO Council members selected by ccNSO members shall be filled for the unexpired term by the procedure described in Section 10.4(g) through (i).

(h) The role of the ccNSO Council is to administer and coordinate the affairs of the ccNSO (including coordinating meetings, including an annual meeting, of ccNSO members as described in Section 10.4(f)) and to manage the development of policy recommendations in accordance with Section 10.6(a). The ccNSO Council shall also undertake such other roles as the members of the ccNSO shall decide from time to time.

(i) The ccNSO Council shall nominate individuals to fill Seats 11 and 12 on the Board by written ballot or by action at a meeting; any such nomination must have affirmative votes of a majority of all the members of the ccNSO Council then in office. Notification of the ccNSO Council's nominations shall be given by the ccNSO Council Chair in writing to the EC Administration, with a copy to the Secretary, and the EC shall promptly act on it as provided in Section 7.25.

(j) The ccNSO Council shall select from among its members the ccNSO Council Chair and such Vice Chair(s) as it deems appropriate. Selections of the ccNSO Council Chair and Vice Chair(s) shall be by written ballot or by action at a meeting; any such selection must have affirmative votes of a majority of all the members of the ccNSO Council then in office. The term of office of the ccNSO Council Chair and any Vice Chair(s) shall be as specified by the ccNSO Council at or before the time the selection is made. The ccNSO Council Chair or any Vice Chair(s) may be recalled from office by the same procedure as used for selection.

(k) The ccNSO Council, subject to direction by the ccNSO members, shall adopt such rules and procedures for the ccNSO as it deems necessary, provided they are consistent with these Bylaws. Rules for ccNSO membership and operating procedures adopted by the ccNSO Council shall be published on the Website.
(l) Except as provided by Section 10.3(i) and Section 10.3(j), the ccNSO Council shall act at meetings. The ccNSO Council shall meet regularly on a schedule it determines, but not fewer than four times each calendar year. At the discretion of the ccNSO Council, meetings may be held in person or by other means, provided that all ccNSO Council members are permitted to participate by at least one means described in Section 10.3(n). Except where determined by a majority vote of the members of the ccNSO Council present that a closed session is appropriate, physical meetings shall be open to attendance by all interested persons. To the extent practicable, ccNSO Council meetings should be held in conjunction with meetings of the Board, or of one or more of ICANN’s other Supporting Organizations.

(m) Notice of time and place (and information about means of participation other than personal attendance) of all meetings of the ccNSO Council shall be provided to each ccNSO Council member, liaison, and observer by e-mail, telephone, facsimile, or a paper notice delivered personally or by postal mail. In case the notice is sent by postal mail, it shall be sent at least 21 days before the day of the meeting. In case the notice is delivered personally or by telephone, facsimile, or e-mail it shall be provided at least seven days before the day of the meeting. At least seven days in advance of each ccNSO Council meeting (or if not practicable, as far in advance as is practicable), a notice of such meeting and, to the extent known, an agenda for the meeting shall be posted.

(n) Members of the ccNSO Council may participate in a meeting of the ccNSO Council through personal attendance or use of electronic communication (such as telephone or video conference), provided that (i) all ccNSO Council members participating in the meeting can speak to and hear one another, (ii) all ccNSO Council members participating in the meeting are provided the means of fully participating in all matters before the ccNSO Council, and (iii) there is a reasonable means of verifying the identity of ccNSO Council members participating in the meeting and their votes. A majority of the ccNSO Council members (i.e. those entitled to vote) then in office shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, and actions by a majority vote of the ccNSO Council members present at any meeting at which there is a quorum shall be actions of the ccNSO Council, unless otherwise provided in these Bylaws. The ccNSO Council shall transmit minutes of its meetings to the ICANN Secretary, who shall cause those minutes to be posted to the Website as soon as practicable following the meeting, and no later than 21 days following the meeting.

Section 10.4. MEMBERSHIP

(a) The ccNSO shall have a membership consisting of ccTLD managers. Any ccTLD manager that meets the membership qualifications stated in Section
10.4(b) shall be entitled to be members of the ccNSO. For purposes of this Article 10, a ccTLD manager is the organization or entity responsible for managing an ISO 3166 country-code top-level domain, or under any later variant, for that country-code top-level domain.

(b) Any ccTLD manager may become a ccNSO member by submitting an application to a person designated by the ccNSO Council to receive applications. The application shall be in writing in a form designated by the ccNSO Council. The application shall include the ccTLD manager's recognition of the role of the ccNSO within the ICANN structure as well as the ccTLD manager's agreement, for the duration of its membership in the ccNSO, (i) to adhere to rules of the ccNSO, including membership rules, (ii) to abide by policies developed and recommended by the ccNSO and adopted by the Board in the manner described by Section 10.4(j) and Section 10.4(k), and (ii) to pay ccNSO membership fees established by the ccNSO Council under Section 10.7(c). A ccNSO member may resign from membership at any time by giving written notice to a person designated by the ccNSO Council to receive notices of resignation. Upon resignation the ccTLD manager ceases to agree to (A) adhere to rules of the ccNSO, including membership rules, (B) to abide by policies developed and recommended by the ccNSO and adopted by the Board in the manner described by Section 10.4(j) and Section 10.4(k), and (C) to pay ccNSO membership fees established by the ccNSO Council under Section 10.7(c). In the absence of designation by the ccNSO Council of a person to receive applications and notices of resignation, they shall be sent to the ICANN Secretary, who shall notify the ccNSO Council of receipt of any such applications and notices.

(c) Neither membership in the ccNSO nor membership in any Regional Organization described in Section 10.5 shall be a condition for access to or registration in the IANA database. Any individual relationship a ccTLD manager has with ICANN or the ccTLD manager's receipt of IANA services is not in any way contingent upon membership in the ccNSO.

(d) The Geographic Regions of ccTLDs shall be as described in Section 7.5. For purposes of this Article 10, managers of ccTLDs within a Geographic Region that are members of the ccNSO are referred to as ccNSO members "within" the Geographic Region, regardless of the physical location of the ccTLD manager. In cases where the Geographic Region of a ccNSO member is unclear, the ccTLD member should self-select according to procedures adopted by the ccNSO Council.

(e) Each ccTLD manager may designate in writing a person, organization, or entity to represent the ccTLD manager. In the absence of such a designation, the ccTLD manager shall be represented by the person, organization, or entity listed as the administrative contact in the IANA database.
(f) There shall be an annual meeting of ccNSO members, which shall be coordinated by the ccNSO Council. Annual meetings should be open for all to attend, and a reasonable opportunity shall be provided for ccTLD managers that are not members of the ccNSO as well as other non-members of the ccNSO to address the meeting. To the extent practicable, annual meetings of the ccNSO members shall be held in person and should be held in conjunction with meetings of the Board, or of one or more of ICANN's other Supporting Organizations.

(g) The ccNSO Council members selected by the ccNSO members from each Geographic Region (see Section 10.3(a)(i)) shall be selected through nomination, and if necessary election, by the ccNSO members within that Geographic Region. At least 90 days before the end of the regular term of any ccNSO-member-selected member of the ccNSO Council, or upon the occurrence of a vacancy in the seat of such a ccNSO Council member, the ccNSO Council shall establish a nomination and election schedule, which shall be sent to all ccNSO members within the Geographic Region and posted on the Website.

(h) Any ccNSO member may nominate an individual to serve as a ccNSO Council member representing the ccNSO member's Geographic Region. Nominations must be seconded by another ccNSO member from the same Geographic Region. By accepting their nomination, individuals nominated to the ccNSO Council agree to support the policies committed to by ccNSO members.

(i) If at the close of nominations there are no more candidates nominated (with seconds and acceptances) in a particular Geographic Region than there are seats on the ccNSO Council available for that Geographic Region, then the nominated candidates shall be selected to serve on the ccNSO Council. Otherwise, an election by written ballot (which may be by e-mail) shall be held to select the ccNSO Council members from among those nominated (with seconds and acceptances), with ccNSO members from the Geographic Region being entitled to vote in the election through their designated representatives. In such an election, a majority of all ccNSO members in the Geographic Region entitled to vote shall constitute a quorum, and the selected candidate must receive the votes of a majority of those cast by ccNSO members within the Geographic Region. The ccNSO Council Chair shall provide the ICANN Secretary prompt written notice of the selection of ccNSO Council members under this paragraph.

(j) Subject to Section 10.4(k), ICANN policies shall apply to ccNSO members by virtue of their membership to the extent, and only to the extent, that the policies (i) only address issues that are within scope of the ccNSO according to Section 10.6(a) and Annex C; (ii) have been developed through the ccPDP as described in Section 10.6, and (iii) have been recommended as such by the ccNSO to the Board, and (iv) are adopted by the Board as policies, provided that such policies
do not conflict with the law applicable to the ccTLD manager which shall, at all
times, remain paramount. In addition, such policies shall apply to ICANN in its
activities concerning ccTLDs.

(k) A ccNSO member shall not be bound if it provides a declaration to the ccNSO
Council stating that (i) implementation of the policy would require the member to
breach custom, religion, or public policy (not embodied in the applicable law
described in Section 10.4(j)), and (ii) failure to implement the policy would not
impair DNS operations or interoperability, giving detailed reasons supporting its
statements. After investigation, the ccNSO Council will provide a response to the
ccNSO member’s declaration. If there is a ccNSO Council consensus disagreeing
with the declaration, which may be demonstrated by a vote of 14 or more
members of the ccNSO Council, the response shall state the ccNSO Council’s
disagreement with the declaration and the reasons for disagreement. Otherwise,
the response shall state the ccNSO Council’s agreement with the declaration. If
the ccNSO Council disagrees, the ccNSO Council shall review the situation after a
six-month period. At the end of that period, the ccNSO Council shall make findings
as to (A) whether the ccNSO members’ implementation of the policy would require
the member to breach custom, religion, or public policy (not embodied in the
applicable law described in Section 10.4(j)) and (B) whether failure to implement
the policy would impair DNS operations or interoperability. In making any findings
disagreeing with the declaration, the ccNSO Council shall proceed by consensus,
which may be demonstrated by a vote of 14 or more members of the ccNSO
Council.

Section 10.5. REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

The ccNSO Council may designate a Regional Organization for each ICANN
Geographic Region, provided that the Regional Organization is open to full
membership by all ccNSO members within the Geographic Region. Decisions to
designate or de-designate a Regional Organization shall require a 66% vote of all
of the members of the ccNSO Council and shall be subject to review according to
procedures established by the Board.

Section 10.6. ccNSO POLICY-DEVELOPMENT PROCESS
AND SCOPE

(a) The scope of the ccNSO’s policy-development role shall be as stated in Annex
C to these Bylaws; any modifications to the scope shall be recommended to the
Board by the ccNSO by use of the procedures of the ccPDP, and shall be subject
to approval by the Board.

(b) In developing global policies within the scope of the ccNSO and
recommending them to the Board, the ccNSO shall follow the ccNSO Policy-Development Process ("ccPDP"). The ccPDP shall be as stated in Annex B to these Bylaws; modifications shall be recommended to the Board by the ccNSO by use of the procedures of the ccPDP, and shall be subject to approval by the Board.

Section 10.7. STAFF SUPPORT AND FUNDING

(a) Upon request of the ccNSO Council, a member of the ICANN staff may be assigned to support the ccNSO and shall be designated as the ccNSO Staff Manager. Alternatively, the ccNSO Council may designate, at ccNSO expense, another person to serve as ccNSO Staff Manager. The work of the ccNSO Staff Manager on substantive matters shall be assigned by the Chair of the ccNSO Council, and may include the duties of ccPDP Issue Manager.

(b) Upon request of the ccNSO Council, ICANN shall provide administrative and operational support necessary for the ccNSO to carry out its responsibilities. Such support shall not include an obligation for ICANN to fund travel expenses incurred by ccNSO participants for travel to any meeting of the ccNSO or for any other purpose. The ccNSO Council may make provision, at ccNSO expense, for administrative and operational support in addition or as an alternative to support provided by ICANN.

(c) The ccNSO Council shall establish fees to be paid by ccNSO members to defray ccNSO expenses as described in Section 10.7(a) and Section 10.7(b), as approved by the ccNSO members.

(d) Written notices given to the Secretary under this Article 10 shall be permanently retained, and shall be made available for review by the ccNSO Council on request. The Secretary shall also maintain the roll of members of the ccNSO, which shall include the name of each ccTLD manager’s designated representative, and which shall be posted on the Website.

ARTICLE 11 GENERIC NAMES SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

Section 11.1. DESCRIPTION

There shall be a policy-development body known as the Generic Names Supporting Organization (the "Generic Names Supporting Organization" or "GNSO", and collectively with the ASO and ccNSO, the "Supporting Organizations"), which shall be responsible for developing and recommending to the Board substantive policies relating to generic top-level domains and other responsibilities of the GNSO as set forth in these Bylaws.
Section 11.2. ORGANIZATION

The GNSO shall consist of:

(a) A number of Constituencies, where applicable, organized within the Stakeholder Groups as described in Section 11.5;

(b) Four Stakeholder Groups organized within Houses as described in Section 11.5;

(c) Two Houses within the GNSO Council as described in Section 11.3(h);

(d) A GNSO Council responsible for managing the policy development process of the GNSO, as described in Section 11.3; and

(e) Except as otherwise defined in these Bylaws, the four Stakeholder Groups and the Constituencies will be responsible for defining their own charters with the approval of their members and of the Board.

Section 11.3. GNSO COUNCIL

(a) Subject to Section 11.5, the GNSO Council shall consist of:

(i) three representatives selected from the Registries Stakeholder Group;

(ii) three representatives selected from the Registrars Stakeholder Group;

(iii) six representatives selected from the Commercial Stakeholder Group;

(iv) six representatives selected from the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group; and

(v) three representatives selected by the ICANN Nominating Committee, one of which shall be non-voting, but otherwise entitled to participate on equal footing with other members of the GNSO Council including, e.g. the making and seconding of motions and of serving as Chair if elected. One Nominating Committee appointee voting representative shall be assigned to each House (as described in Section 11.3(h)) by the Nominating Committee.

No individual representative may hold more than one seat on the GNSO Council.
at the same time.

Stakeholder Groups should, in their charters, ensure their representation on the GNSO Council is as diverse as possible and practicable, including considerations of geography, GNSO Constituency, sector, ability and gender.

There may also be liaisons to the GNSO Council from other ICANN Supporting Organizations and/or Advisory Committees, from time to time. The appointing organization shall designate, revoke, or change its liaison on the GNSO Council by providing written notice to the Chair of the GNSO Council and to the ICANN Secretary. Liaisons shall not be members of or entitled to vote, to make or second motions, or to serve as an officer on the GNSO Council, but otherwise liaisons shall be entitled to participate on equal footing with members of the GNSO Council.

(b) The regular term of each GNSO Council member shall begin at the conclusion of an ICANN annual meeting and shall end at the conclusion of the second ICANN annual meeting thereafter. The regular term of two representatives selected from Stakeholder Groups with three Council seats shall begin in even-numbered years and the regular term of the other representative selected from that Stakeholder Group shall begin in odd-numbered years. The regular term of three representatives selected from Stakeholder Groups with six Council seats shall begin in even-numbered years and the regular term of the other three representatives selected from that Stakeholder Group shall begin in odd-numbered years. The regular term of one of the three members selected by the Nominating Committee shall begin in even-numbered years and the regular term of the other two of the three members selected by the Nominating Committee shall begin in odd-numbered years. Each GNSO Council member shall hold office during his or her regular term and until a successor has been selected and qualified or until that member resigns or is removed in accordance with these Bylaws.

Except in a "special circumstance," such as, but not limited to, meeting geographic or other diversity requirements defined in the Stakeholder Group charters, where no alternative representative is available to serve, no Council member may be selected to serve more than two consecutive terms, in such a special circumstance a Council member may serve one additional term. For these purposes, a person selected to fill a vacancy in a term shall not be deemed to have served that term. A former Council member who has served two consecutive terms must remain out of office for one full term prior to serving any subsequent term as Council member. A "special circumstance" is defined in the GNSO Operating Procedures.

(c) A vacancy on the GNSO Council shall be deemed to exist in the case of the
death, resignation, or removal of any member. Vacancies shall be filled for the unexpired term by the appropriate Nominating Committee or Stakeholder Group that selected the member holding the position before the vacancy occurred by giving the GNSO Secretariat written notice of its selection. Procedures for handling Stakeholder Group-appointed GNSO Council member vacancies, resignations, and removals are prescribed in the applicable Stakeholder Group Charter.

A GNSO Council member selected by the Nominating Committee may be removed for cause: (i) stated by a three-fourths (3/4) vote of all members of the applicable House to which the Nominating Committee appointee is assigned; or (ii) stated by a three-fourths (3/4) vote of all members of each House in the case of the non-voting Nominating Committee appointee (see Section 11.3(h)). Such removal shall be subject to reversal by the ICANN Board on appeal by the affected GNSO Council member.

(d) The GNSO Council is responsible for managing the policy development process of the GNSO. It shall adopt such procedures (the "GNSO Operating Procedures") as it sees fit to carry out that responsibility, provided that such procedures are approved by a majority vote of each House. The GNSO Operating Procedures shall be effective upon the expiration of a twenty-one (21) day public comment period, and shall be subject to Board oversight and review. Until any modifications are recommended by the GNSO Council, the applicable procedures shall be as set forth in Section 11.6.

(e) No more than one officer, director or employee of any particular corporation or other organization (including its subsidiaries and affiliates) shall serve on the GNSO Council at any given time.

(f) The GNSO shall nominate by written ballot or by action at a meeting individuals to fill Seats 13 and 14 on the Board. Each of the two voting Houses of the GNSO, as described in Section 11.3(h), shall make a nomination to fill one of two Board seats, as outlined below; any such nomination must have affirmative votes compromising sixty percent (60%) of all the respective voting House members:

(i) the Contracted Parties House (as described in Section 11.3(h)(i)) shall select a representative to fill Seat 13; and

(ii) the Non-Contracted Parties House (as described in Section 11.3(h)(ii)) shall select a representative to fill Seat 14.
Election procedures are defined in the GNSO Operating Procedures.

Notification of the Board seat nominations shall be given by the GNSO Chair in writing to the EC Administration, with a copy to the Secretary, and the EC shall promptly act on it as provided in Section 7.25.

(g) The GNSO Council shall select the GNSO Chair for a term the GNSO Council specifies, but not longer than one year. Each House (as described in Section 11.3(h)) shall select a Vice-Chair, who will be a Vice-Chair of the whole of the GNSO Council, for a term the GNSO Council specifies, but not longer than one year. The procedures for selecting the Chair and any other officers are contained in the GNSO Operating Procedures. In the event that the GNSO Council has not elected a GNSO Chair by the end of the previous Chair’s term, the Vice-Chairs will serve as Interim GNSO Co-Chairs until a successful election can be held.

(h) Except as otherwise required in these Bylaws, for voting purposes, the GNSO Council (see Section 11.3(a)) shall be organized into a bicameral House structure as described below:

(i) the Contracted Parties House includes the Registries Stakeholder Group (three members), the Registrars Stakeholder Group (three members), and one voting member appointed by the ICANN Nominating Committee for a total of seven voting members; and

(ii) the Non Contracted Parties House includes the Commercial Stakeholder Group (six members), the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (six members), and one voting member appointed by the ICANN Nominating Committee to that House for a total of thirteen voting members.

Except as otherwise specified in these Bylaws, each member of a voting House is entitled to cast one vote in each separate matter before the GNSO Council.

(i) Except as otherwise specified in these Bylaws, Annex A, Annex A-1 or Annex A-2 hereto, or the GNSO Operating Procedures, the default threshold to pass a GNSO Council motion or other voting action requires a simple majority vote of each House. The voting thresholds described below shall apply to the following GNSO actions:

(i) Create an Issues Report: requires an affirmative vote of more than one-fourth (1/4) vote of each House or majority of one House.
(ii) Initiate a Policy Development Process ("PDP") Within Scope (as described in Annex A): requires an affirmative vote of more than one-third (1/3) of each House or more than two-thirds (2/3) of one House.

(iii) Initiate a PDP Not Within Scope: requires an affirmative vote of GNSO Supermajority (as defined in Section 11.3(i)(xix)).

(iv) Approve a PDP Team Charter for a PDP Within Scope: requires an affirmative vote of more than one-third (1/3) of each House or more than two-thirds (2/3) of one House.

(v) Approve a PDP Team Charter for a PDP Not Within Scope: requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO Supermajority.

(vi) Changes to an Approved PDP Team Charter: For any PDP Team Charter approved under (iv) or (v) above, the GNSO Council may approve an amendment to the Charter through a simple majority vote of each House.

(vii) Terminate a PDP: Once initiated, and prior to the publication of a Final Report, the GNSO Council may terminate a PDP only for significant cause, upon a motion that passes with a GNSO Supermajority Vote in favor of termination.

(viii) Approve a PDP Recommendation Without a GNSO Supermajority: requires an affirmative vote of a majority of each House and further requires that one GNSO Council member representative of at least 3 of the 4 Stakeholder Groups supports the Recommendation.

(ix) Approve a PDP Recommendation With a GNSO Supermajority: requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO Supermajority,

(x) Approve a PDP Recommendation Imposing New Obligations on Certain Contracting Parties: where an ICANN contract provision specifies that "a two-thirds vote of the council" demonstrates the presence of a consensus, the GNSO Supermajority vote threshold will have to be met or exceeded.

(xi) Modification of Approved PDP Recommendation: Prior to Final Approval by the Board, an Approved PDP Recommendation may be modified or amended by the GNSO Council with a GNSO Supermajority vote.

(xii) Initiation of an Expedited Policy Development Process ("EPDP"): requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO Supermajority.

(xiii) Approve an EPDP Team Charter: requires an affirmative vote of a
GNSO Supermajority.

(xiv) Approval of EPDP Recommendations: requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO Supermajority.

(xv) Approve an EPDP Recommendation Imposing New Obligations on Certain Contracting Parties: where an ICANN contract provision specifies that "a two-thirds vote of the council" demonstrates the presence of a consensus, the GNSO Supermajority vote threshold will have to be met or exceeded.

(xvi) Initiation of a GNSO Guidance Process ("GGP"): requires an affirmative vote of more than one-third (1/3) of each House or more than two-thirds (2/3) of one House.

(xvii) Rejection of Initiation of a GGP Requested by the Board: requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO Supermajority.

(xviii) Approval of GGP Recommendations: requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO Supermajority.

(xix) A "GNSO Supermajority" shall mean: (A) two-thirds (2/3) of the Council members of each House, or (B) three-fourths (3/4) of the Council members of one House and a majority of the Council members of the other House.

(j) The voting thresholds described below shall apply to the following GNSO actions as a Decisional Participant in the Empowered Community. For any action not listed, the default threshold for the GNSO to act as a Decisional Participant in the Empowered community requires a simple majority vote of each House:

(i) Amendment of PTI Articles of Incorporation as contemplated in Section 16.2: requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO Supermajority.

(ii) GNSO Council Inspection Request as contemplated in Section 22.7: requires an affirmative vote of more than one-fourth (1/4) vote of each House or majority of one House.

(iii) GNSO Council Inspection Remedy, as contemplated in Section 22.7 - e, and Stakeholder Group / Constituency Inspection Remedy, as contemplated in Section 22.7 – e(ii) and e(iii), for an inspection requested by the GNSO as a Decisional Participant in the Empowered Community: requires an
affirmative vote of more than one-fourth (1/4) vote of each House or majority of one House.

(iv) Amendments to Fundamental Bylaws and Article Amendments as contemplated by Section 25.2 of the Bylaws, Asset Sales, as contemplated by Article 26 of the Bylaws, amendments to ICANN Articles of Incorporation: requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO Supermajority.

(v) Approval of a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition as contemplated in Annex D, Article 3, Section 3.1(b) and support for a petition submitted by a Petitioning Decisional Participant as contemplated in Section 3.2(d): requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO Supermajority.

(vi) Approval of a Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition as contemplated in Annex D, Article 3, Section 3.1(f): requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO Supermajority.

(vii) Approval of a petition to remove a director holding seat 13 or 14 as contemplated in Annex D, Article 3, Section 3.2(a): requires an affirmative vote of at least three-fourths (3/4) of the House that appointed that Director.

(viii) Approval of a petition notice to remove a director holding seat 13 or 14 as contemplated in Annex D, Article 3, Section 3.2(f): requires an affirmative vote of at least three-fourths (3/4) of the GNSO Council and at least three-fourths (3/4) of the House that appointed that Director.

(ix) Approval of a Board Recall Petition as contemplated in Annex D, Article 3, Section 3.3(b) and support for another Petitioning Decisional Participant: requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO Supermajority.

(x) Approval of a Board Recall Supported Petition as contemplated in Annex D, Article 3, Section 3.3(e): requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO Supermajority.

Section 11.4. STAFF SUPPORT AND FUNDING

(a) A member of the ICANN staff shall be assigned to support the GNSO, whose work on substantive matters shall be assigned by the Chair of the GNSO Council, and shall be designated as the GNSO Staff Manager ("Staff Manager").

(b) ICANN shall provide administrative and operational support necessary for the GNSO to carry out its responsibilities. Such support shall not include an obligation for ICANN to fund travel expenses incurred by GNSO participants for travel to any
meeting of the GNSO or for any other purpose. ICANN may, at its discretion, fund travel expenses for GNSO participants under any travel support procedures or guidelines that it may adopt from time to time.

Section 11.5. STAKEHOLDER GROUPS

(a) The following "Stakeholder Groups" are hereby recognized as representative of a specific group of one or more "Constituencies" or interest groups:

(i) Registries Stakeholder Group representing all gTLD registries under contract to ICANN;

(ii) Registrars Stakeholder Group representing all registrars accredited by and under contract to ICANN;

(iii) Commercial Stakeholder Group representing the full range of large and small commercial entities of the Internet ("Commercial Stakeholder Group"), which includes the Business Constituency ("Business Constituency"), Intellectual Property Constituency ("Intellectual Property Constituency") and the Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers Constituency ("Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers Constituency"); and

(iv) Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group representing the full range of non-commercial entities of the Internet.

(b) Each Stakeholder Group is assigned a specific number of GNSO Council seats in accordance with Section 11.3(a).

(c) Each Stakeholder Group identified in Section 11.3(a) and each of its associated Constituencies, where applicable, shall maintain recognition with the ICANN Board. Recognition is granted by the Board based upon the extent to which, in fact, the entity represents the global interests of the stakeholder communities it purports to represent and operates to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness. Stakeholder Group and Constituency Charters may be reviewed periodically as prescribed by the Board.

(d) Any group of individuals or entities may petition the Board for recognition as a new or separate Constituency in the Non-Contracted Parties House. Any such petition shall contain:
(i) A detailed explanation of why the addition of such a Constituency will improve the ability of the GNSO to carry out its policy-development responsibilities;

(ii) A detailed explanation of why the proposed new Constituency adequately represents, on a global basis, the stakeholders it seeks to represent;

(iii) A recommendation for organizational placement within a particular Stakeholder Group; and

(iv) A proposed charter that adheres to the principles and procedures contained in these Bylaws.

Any petition for the recognition of a new Constituency and the associated charter shall be posted for public comment.

(e) The Board may create new Constituencies as described in Section 11.5(c) in response to such a petition, or on its own motion, if the Board determines that such action would serve the purposes of ICANN. In the event the Board is considering acting on its own motion it shall post a detailed explanation of why such action is necessary or desirable, set a reasonable time for public comment, and not make a final decision on whether to create such new Constituency until after reviewing all comments received. Whenever the Board posts a petition or recommendation for a new Constituency for public comment, the Board shall notify the GNSO Council and the appropriate Stakeholder Group affected and shall consider any response to that notification prior to taking action.

Section 11.6. POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

The policy-development procedures to be followed by the GNSO shall be as stated in Annex A to these Bylaws. These procedures may be supplemented or revised in the manner stated in Section 11.3(d).

ARTICLE 12 ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Section 12.1. GENERAL

The Board may create one or more "Advisory Committees" in addition to those set forth in this Article 12. Advisory Committee membership may consist of Directors only, Directors and non-directors, or non-directors only, and may also
Section 12.2. SPECIFIC ADVISORY COMMITTEES

There shall be at least the following Advisory Committees:

(a) Governmental Advisory Committee

(i) The Governmental Advisory Committee should 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.

(ii) Membership in the Governmental Advisory Committee shall be open to all national governments. Membership shall also be open to Distinct Economies as recognized in international fora, and multinational governmental organizations and treaty organizations, on the invitation of the Governmental Advisory Committee through its Chair.

(iii) The Governmental Advisory Committee may adopt its own charter and internal operating principles or procedures to guide its operations, to be published on the Website.

(iv) The chair of the Governmental Advisory Committee shall be elected by the members of the Governmental Advisory Committee pursuant to procedures adopted by such members.

(v) Each member of the Governmental Advisory Committee shall appoint one accredited representative to the Governmental Advisory Committee. The accredited representative of a member must hold a formal official position with the member's public administration. The term "official" includes a holder of an elected governmental office, or a person who is employed by such government, public authority, or multinational governmental or treaty organization and whose primary function with such government, public authority, or organization is to develop or influence governmental or public policies.

(vi) The Governmental Advisory Committee shall annually appoint one Liaison to the Board, without limitation on reappointment, and shall annually appoint one non-voting liaison to the ICANN Nominating Committee.
(vii) The Governmental Advisory Committee may designate a non-voting liaison to each of the Supporting Organization Councils and Advisory Committees, to the extent the Governmental Advisory Committee deems it appropriate and useful to do so.

(viii) The Board shall notify the Chair of the Governmental Advisory Committee in a timely manner of any proposal raising public policy issues on which it or any of the Supporting Organizations or Advisory Committees seeks public comment, and shall take duly into account any timely response to that notification prior to taking action.

(ix) The Governmental Advisory Committee may put issues to the Board directly, either by way of comment or prior advice, or by way of specifically recommending action or new policy development or revision to existing policies.

(x) 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 Board determines to take an action that is not consistent with Governmental Advisory Committee advice, it shall so inform the Governmental Advisory Committee and state the reasons why it decided not to follow that advice. Any Governmental Advisory Committee advice approved by a full Governmental Advisory Committee consensus, understood to mean the practice of adopting decisions by general agreement in the absence of any formal objection ("GAC Consensus Advice"), may only be rejected by a vote of no less than 60% of the Board, and the Governmental Advisory Committee and the Board will then try, in good faith and in a timely and efficient manner, to find a mutually acceptable solution. The Governmental Advisory Committee will state whether any advice it gives to the Board is GAC Consensus Advice.

(xi) If GAC Consensus Advice is rejected by the Board pursuant to Section 12.2(a)(x) and if no such mutually acceptable solution can be found, the Board will state in its final decision the reasons why the Governmental Advisory Committee 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.

(b) Security and Stability Advisory Committee
(i) The role of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee ("Security and Stability Advisory Committee" or "SSAC") is to advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the security and integrity of the Internet's naming and address allocation systems. It shall have the following responsibilities:

(A) To communicate on security matters with the Internet technical community and the operators and managers of critical DNS infrastructure services, to include the root name server operator community, the top-level domain registries and registrars, the operators of the reverse delegation trees such as in-addr.arpa and ip6.arpa, and others as events and developments dictate. The SSAC shall gather and articulate requirements to offer to those engaged in technical revision of the protocols related to DNS and address allocation and those engaged in operations planning.

(B) To engage in ongoing threat assessment and risk analysis of the Internet naming and address allocation services to assess where the principal threats to stability and security lie, and to advise the ICANN community accordingly. The SSAC shall recommend any necessary audit activity to assess the current status of DNS and address allocation security in relation to identified risks and threats.

(C) To communicate with those who have direct responsibility for Internet naming and address allocation security matters (IETF, RSSAC (as defined in Section 12.2(c)(i)), RIRs, name registries, etc.), to ensure that its advice on security risks, issues, and priorities is properly synchronized with existing standardization, deployment, operational, and coordination activities. The SSAC shall monitor these activities and inform the ICANN community and Board on their progress, as appropriate.

(D) To report periodically to the Board on its activities.

(E) To make policy recommendations to the ICANN community and Board.

(ii) The SSAC's chair and members shall be appointed by the Board. SSAC membership appointment shall be for a three-year term, commencing on 1 January and ending the second year thereafter on 31 December. The chair and members may be re-appointed, and there are no limits to the number of terms the chair or members may serve. The SSAC chair may provide recommendations to the Board regarding appointments to the SSAC. The SSAC chair shall stagger appointment recommendations so that approximately one-third (1/3) of the membership of the SSAC is considered for appointment or re-appointment each year. The Board shall also have the power to remove SSAC appointees as recommended by or in consultation
(iii) The SSAC shall annually appoint a Liaison to the Board according to Section 7.9.

(c) Root Server System Advisory Committee

(i) The role of the Root Server System Advisory Committee ("Root Server System Advisory Committee" or "RSSAC") is to advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the operation, administration, security, and integrity of the Internet's Root Server System. It shall have the following responsibilities:

(A) Communicate on matters relating to the operation of the Root Servers and their multiple instances with the Internet technical community and the ICANN community. The RSSAC shall gather and articulate requirements to offer to those engaged in technical revision of the protocols and best common practices related to the operation of DNS servers.

(B) Communicate on matters relating to the administration of the Root Zone with those who have direct responsibility for that administration. These matters include the processes and procedures for the production of the Root Zone File.

(C) Engage in ongoing threat assessment and risk analysis of the Root Server System and recommend any necessary audit activity to assess the current status of root servers and the root zone.

(D) Respond to requests for information or opinions from the Board.

(E) Report periodically to the Board on its activities.

(F) Make policy recommendations to the ICANN community and Board.

(ii) The RSSAC shall be led by two co-chairs. The RSSAC's chairs and members shall be appointed by the Board.

(A) RSSAC membership appointment shall be for a three-year term, commencing on 1 January and ending the second year thereafter on 31 December. Members may be re-appointed, and there are no limits to the number of terms the members may serve. The RSSAC chairs shall provide recommendations to the Board regarding appointments to the RSSAC. If
the Board declines to appoint a person nominated by the RSSAC, then it will provide the rationale for its decision. The RSSAC chairs shall stagger appointment recommendations so that approximately one-third (1/3) of the membership of the RSSAC is considered for appointment or re-appointment each year. The Board shall also have the power to remove RSSAC appointees as recommended by or in consultation with the RSSAC.

(B) The RSSAC shall recommend the appointment of the chairs to the Board following a nomination process that it devises and documents.

(iii) The RSSAC shall annually appoint a Liaison to the Board according to Section 7.9.

(d) At-Large Advisory Committee

(i) The At-Large Advisory Committee ("At-Large Advisory Committee" or "ALAC") is the primary organizational home within ICANN for individual Internet users. The role of the ALAC shall be to consider and provide advice on the activities of ICANN, insofar as they relate to the interests of individual Internet users. This includes policies created through ICANN's Supporting Organizations, as well as the many other issues for which community input and advice is appropriate. The ALAC, which plays an important role in ICANN's accountability mechanisms, also coordinates some of ICANN's outreach to individual Internet users.

(ii) The ALAC shall consist of (A) two members selected by each of the Regional At-Large Organizations ("RALOs") established according to Section 12.2(d)(vii), and (B) five members selected by the Nominating Committee. The five members selected by the Nominating Committee shall include one citizen of a country within each of the five Geographic Regions established according to Section 7.5.

(iii) The regular terms of members of the ALAC shall be as follows:

(A) The term of one member selected by each RALO shall begin at the conclusion of an ICANN annual meeting in an even-numbered year.

(B) The term of the other member selected by each RALO shall begin at the conclusion of an ICANN annual meeting in an odd-numbered year.

(C) The terms of three of the members selected by the Nominating
Committee shall begin at the conclusion of an annual meeting in an odd-numbered year and the terms of the other two members selected by the Nominating Committee shall begin at the conclusion of an annual meeting in an even-numbered year.

(D) The regular term of each member shall end at the conclusion of the second ICANN annual meeting after the term began.

(iv) The Chair of the ALAC shall be elected by the members of the ALAC pursuant to procedures adopted by the ALAC.

(v) The ALAC shall, after consultation with each RALO, annually appoint five voting delegates (no two of whom shall be citizens of countries in the same Geographic Region) to the Nominating Committee.

(vi) The At-Large Advisory Committee may designate non-voting liaisons to each of the ccNSO Council and the GNSO Council.

(vii) There shall be one RALO for each Geographic Region established according to Section 7.5. Each RALO shall serve as the main forum and coordination point for public input to ICANN in its Geographic Region and shall be a non-profit organization certified by ICANN according to criteria and standards established by the Board based on recommendations of the At-Large Advisory Committee. An organization shall become the recognized RALO for its Geographic Region upon entering a Memorandum of Understanding with ICANN addressing the respective roles and responsibilities of ICANN and the RALO regarding the process for selecting ALAC members and requirements of openness, participatory opportunities, transparency, accountability, and diversity in the RALO’s structure and procedures, as well as criteria and standards for the RALO’s constituent At-Large Structures (“At-Large Structures”).

(viii) Each RALO shall be comprised of self-supporting At-Large Structures within its Geographic Region that have been certified to meet the requirements of the RALO’s Memorandum of Understanding with ICANN according to Section 12.2(d)(ix). If so provided by its Memorandum of Understanding with ICANN, a RALO may also include individual Internet users who are citizens or residents of countries within the RALO's Geographic Region.

(ix) Membership in the At-Large Community

(A) The criteria and standards for the certification of At-Large Structures within each Geographic Region shall be established by the Board based on
recommendations from the ALAC and shall be stated in the Memorandum of Understanding between ICANN and the RALO for each Geographic Region.

(B) The criteria and standards for the certification of At-Large Structures shall be established in such a way that participation by individual Internet users who are citizens or residents of countries within the Geographic Region of the RALO will predominate in the operation of each At-Large Structure within the RALO, while not necessarily excluding additional participation, compatible with the interests of the individual Internet users within the region, by others.

(C) Each RALO’s Memorandum of Understanding shall also include provisions designed to allow, to the greatest extent possible, every individual Internet user who is a citizen of a country within the RALO’s Geographic Region to participate in at least one of the RALO’s At-Large Structures.

(D) To the extent compatible with these objectives, the criteria and standards should also afford to each RALO the type of structure that best fits the customs and character of its Geographic Region.

(E) Once the criteria and standards have been established as provided in this Section 12.2(d)(ix), the ALAC, with the advice and participation of the RALO where the applicant is based, shall be responsible for certifying organizations as meeting the criteria and standards for At-Large Structure accreditation.

(F) Decisions to certify or decertify an At-Large Structure shall be made as decided by the ALAC in its rules of procedure, save always that any changes made to the rules of procedure in respect of an At-Large Structure applications shall be subject to review by the RALOs and by the Board.

(G) Decisions as to whether to accredit, not to accredit, or disaccredit an At-Large Structure shall be subject to review according to procedures established by the Board.

(H) On an ongoing basis, the ALAC may also give advice as to whether a prospective At-Large Structure meets the applicable criteria and standards.

(x) The ALAC is also responsible, working in conjunction with the RALOs, for coordinating the following activities:

(A) Nominating individuals to fill Seat 15 on the Board. Notification of the At-
Large Community's nomination shall be given by the ALAC Chair in writing to the EC Administration, with a copy to the Secretary, and the EC shall promptly act on it as provided in Section 7.25.

(B) Keeping the community of individual Internet users informed about the significant news from ICANN;

(C) Distributing (through posting or otherwise) an updated agenda, news about ICANN, and information about items in the ICANN policy-development process;

(D) Promoting outreach activities in the community of individual Internet users;

(E) Developing and maintaining on-going information and education programs, regarding ICANN and its work;

(F) Establishing an outreach strategy about ICANN issues in each RALO’s Geographic Region;

(G) Participating in the ICANN policy development processes and providing input and advice that accurately reflects the views of individual Internet users;

(H) Making public, and analyzing, ICANN’s proposed policies and its decisions and their (potential) regional impact and (potential) effect on individuals in the region;

(I) Offering Internet-based mechanisms that enable discussions among members of At-Large Structures; and

(xi) Establishing mechanisms and processes that enable two-way communication between members of At-Large Structures and those involved in ICANN decision-making, so interested individuals can share their views on pending ICANN issues.

Section 12.3. PROCEDURES

Each Advisory Committee shall determine its own rules of procedure and quorum requirements; provided that each Advisory Committee shall ensure that the advice provided to the Board by such Advisory Committee is communicated in a clear and unambiguous written statement, including the rationale for such advice. The Board will respond in a timely manner to formal advice from all Advisory
Committees explaining what action it took and the rationale for doing so.

Section 12.4. TERM OF OFFICE
The chair and each member of an Advisory Committee shall serve until his or her successor is appointed, or until such Advisory Committee is sooner terminated, or until he or she is removed, resigns, or otherwise ceases to qualify as a member of the Advisory Committee.

Section 12.5. VACANCIES
Vacancies on any Advisory Committee shall be filled in the same manner as provided in the case of original appointments.

Section 12.6. COMPENSATION
Advisory Committee members shall receive no compensation for their services as a member of such Advisory Committee. The Board may, however, authorize the reimbursement of actual and necessary expenses incurred by Advisory Committee members, including Directors, performing their duties as Advisory Committee members.

ARTICLE 13 OTHER ADVISORY MECHANISMS

Section 13.1. EXTERNAL EXPERT ADVICE
(a) Purpose. The purpose of seeking external expert advice is to allow the policy-development process within ICANN to take advantage of existing expertise that resides in the public or private sector but outside of ICANN. In those cases where there are relevant public bodies with expertise, or where access to private expertise could be helpful, the Board and constituent bodies should be encouraged to seek advice from such expert bodies or individuals.

(b) Types of Expert Advisory Panels

(i) On its own initiative or at the suggestion of any ICANN body, the Board may appoint, or authorize the President to appoint, Expert Advisory Panels consisting of public or private sector individuals or entities. If the advice sought from such Panels concerns issues of public policy, the provisions of Section 13.1(c) shall apply.

(ii) In addition, in accordance with Section 13.1(c), the Board may refer
issues of public policy pertinent to matters within ICANN's Mission to a multinational governmental or treaty organization.

(c) Process for Seeking Advice: Public Policy Matters

(i) The Governmental Advisory Committee may at any time recommend that the Board seek advice concerning one or more issues of public policy from an external source, as set out above.

(ii) In the event that the Board determines, upon such a recommendation or otherwise, that external advice should be sought concerning one or more issues of public policy, the Board shall, as appropriate, consult with the Governmental Advisory Committee regarding the appropriate source from which to seek the advice and the arrangements, including definition of scope and process, for requesting and obtaining that advice.

(iii) The Board shall, as appropriate, transmit any request for advice from a multinational governmental or treaty organization, including specific terms of reference, to the Governmental Advisory Committee, with the suggestion that the request be transmitted by the Governmental Advisory Committee to the multinational governmental or treaty organization.

(d) Process for Seeking and Advice: Other Matters. Any reference of issues not concerning public policy to an Expert Advisory Panel by the Board or President in accordance with Section 13.1(b)(i) shall be made pursuant to terms of reference describing the issues on which input and advice is sought and the procedures and schedule to be followed.

(e) Receipt of Expert Advice and its Effect. External advice pursuant to this Section 13.1 shall be provided in written form. Such advice is advisory and not binding, and is intended to augment the information available to the Board or other ICANN body in carrying out its responsibilities.

(f) Opportunity to Comment. The Governmental Advisory Committee, in addition to the Supporting Organizations and other Advisory Committees, shall have an opportunity to comment upon any external advice received prior to any decision by the Board.

Section 13.2. TECHNICAL LIAISON GROUP
(a) Purpose. The quality of ICANN’s work depends on access to complete and authoritative information concerning the technical standards that underlie ICANN’s activities. ICANN’s relationship to the organizations that produce these standards is therefore particularly important. The Technical Liaison Group ("TLG") shall connect the Board with appropriate sources of technical advice on specific matters pertinent to ICANN’s activities.

(b) TLG Organizations. The TLG shall consist of four organizations: the European Telecommunications Standards Institute (ETSI), the International Telecommunications Union’s Telecommunication Standardization Sector (ITU-T), the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C), and the Internet Architecture Board ("IAB").

(c) Role. The role of the TLG organizations shall be to channel technical information and guidance to the Board and to other ICANN entities. This role has both a responsive component and an active "watchdog" component, which involve the following responsibilities:

(i) In response to a request for information, to connect the Board or other ICANN body with appropriate sources of technical expertise. This component of the TLG role covers circumstances in which ICANN seeks an authoritative answer to a specific technical question. Where information is requested regarding a particular technical standard for which a TLG organization is responsible, that request shall be directed to that TLG organization.

(ii) As an ongoing "watchdog" activity, to advise the Board of the relevance and progress of technical developments in the areas covered by each organization’s scope that could affect Board decisions or other ICANN actions, and to draw attention to global technical standards issues that affect policy development within the scope of ICANN’s Mission. This component of the TLG role covers circumstances in which ICANN is unaware of a new development, and would therefore otherwise not realize that a question should be asked.

(d) TLG Procedures. The TLG shall not have officers or hold meetings, nor shall it provide policy advice to the Board as a committee (although TLG organizations may individually be asked by the Board to do so as the need arises in areas relevant to their individual charters). Neither shall the TLG debate or otherwise coordinate technical issues across the TLG organizations; establish or attempt to establish unified positions; or create or attempt to create additional layers or
structures within the TLG for the development of technical standards or for any other purpose.

(e) Technical Work with the IETF. The TLG shall have no involvement with ICANN's work for the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), Internet Research Task Force, or the Internet Architecture Board (IAB), as described in the IETF-ICANN Memorandum of Understanding Concerning the Technical Work of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority ratified by the Board on 10 March 2000 and any supplemental agreements thereto.

(f) Individual Technical Experts. Each TLG organization shall designate two individual technical experts who are familiar with the technical standards issues that are relevant to ICANN's activities. These 8 experts shall be available as necessary to determine, through an exchange of e-mail messages, where to direct a technical question from ICANN when ICANN does not ask a specific TLG organization directly.

ARTICLE 14 BOARD AND TEMPORARY COMMITTEES

Section 14.1. BOARD COMMITTEES

The Board may establish one or more committees of the Board (each, a "Board Committee"), which shall continue to exist until otherwise determined by the Board. Only Directors may be appointed to a Committee of the Board; provided, that a Liaison may be appointed as a liaison to a Committee of the Board consistent with their non-voting capacity. If a person appointed to a Committee of the Board ceases to be a Director, such person shall also cease to be a member of any Committee of the Board. Each Committee of the Board shall consist of two or more Directors. The Board may designate one or more Directors as alternate members of any such committee, who may replace any absent member at any meeting of the committee. Committee members may be removed from a committee at any time by a two-thirds (2/3) majority vote of all Directors; provided, however, that in no event shall a Director be removed from a committee unless such removal is approved by not less than a majority of all Directors.

Section 14.2. POWERS OF BOARD COMMITTEES

(a) The Board may delegate to Committees of the Board all legal authority of the Board except with respect to:

(i) The filling of vacancies on the Board or on any committee;
(ii) The amendment or repeal of Bylaws or the Articles of Incorporation or the adoption of new Bylaws or Articles of Incorporation;

(iii) The amendment or repeal of any resolution of the Board which by its express terms is not so amendable or repealable;

(iv) The appointment of committees of the Board or the members thereof;

(v) The approval of any self-dealing transaction, as such transactions are defined in Section 5233(a) of the CCC;

(vi) The approval of the ICANN Budget or IANA Budget required by Section 22.4 or the Operating Plan or Strategic Plan required by Section 22.5; or

(vii) The compensation of any Officer described in Article 15.

(b) The Board shall have the power to prescribe the manner in which proceedings of any Committee of the Board shall be conducted. In the absence of any such prescription, such committee shall have the power to prescribe the manner in which its proceedings shall be conducted. Unless these Bylaws, the Board or such committee shall otherwise provide, the regular and special meetings of committees shall be governed by the provisions of Article 7 applicable to meetings and actions of the Board. Each committee shall keep regular minutes of its proceedings and shall report the same to the Board from time to time, as the Board may require.

Section 14.3. TEMPORARY COMMITTEES

The Board may establish such temporary committees as it sees fit, with membership, duties, and responsibilities as set forth in the resolutions or charters adopted by the Board in establishing such committees.

ARTICLE 15 OFFICERS

Section 15.1. OFFICERS

The officers of ICANN (each, an "Officer") shall be a President (who shall serve as Chief Executive Officer), a Secretary, and a Chief Financial Officer. ICANN may also have, at the discretion of the Board, any additional officers that it deems appropriate. Any person, other than the President, may hold more than one office, except that no member of the Board (other than the President) shall simultaneously serve as an officer of ICANN.
Section 15.2. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

The officers of ICANN shall be elected annually by the Board, pursuant to the recommendation of the President or, in the case of the President, of the Chair of the Board. Each such officer shall hold his or her office until he or she resigns, is removed, is otherwise disqualified to serve, or his or her successor is elected.

Section 15.3. REMOVAL OF OFFICERS

Any Officer may be removed, either with or without cause, by a two-thirds (2/3) majority vote of all Directors. Should any vacancy occur in any office as a result of death, resignation, removal, disqualification, or any other cause, the Board may delegate the powers and duties of such office to any Officer or to any Director until such time as a successor for the office has been elected.

Section 15.4. PRESIDENT

The President shall be the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of ICANN in charge of all of its activities and business. All other officers and staff shall report to the President or his or her delegate, unless stated otherwise in these Bylaws. The President shall serve as an ex officio Director, and shall have all the same rights and privileges of any Director. The President shall be empowered to call special meetings of the Board as set forth herein, and shall discharge all other duties as may be required by these Bylaws and from time to time may be assigned by the Board.

Section 15.5. SECRETARY

The Secretary shall keep or cause to be kept the minutes of the Board in one or more books provided for that purpose, shall see that all notices are duly given in accordance with the provisions of these Bylaws or as required by law, and in general shall perform all duties as from time to time may be prescribed by the President or the Board.

Section 15.6. CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

The Chief Financial Officer ("CFO") shall be the chief financial officer of ICANN. If required by the Board, the CFO shall give a bond for the faithful discharge of his or her duties in such form and with such surety or sureties as the Board shall determine. The CFO shall have charge and custody of all the funds of ICANN and shall keep or cause to be kept, in books belonging to ICANN, full and accurate amounts of all receipts and disbursements, and shall deposit all money and other valuable effects in the name of ICANN in such depositories as may be designated.
for that purpose by the Board. The CFO shall disburse the funds of ICANN as may be ordered by the Board or the President and, whenever requested by them, shall deliver to the Board and the President an account of all his or her transactions as CFO and of the financial condition of ICANN. The CFO shall be responsible for ICANN’s financial planning and forecasting and shall assist the President in the preparation of the ICANN Budget, the IANA Budget and Operating Plan. The CFO shall coordinate and oversee ICANN’s funding, including any audits or other reviews of ICANN or its Supporting Organizations. The CFO shall be responsible for all other matters relating to the financial operation of ICANN.

Section 15.7. ADDITIONAL OFFICERS

In addition to the officers described above, any additional or assistant officers who are elected or appointed by the Board shall perform such duties as may be assigned to them by the President or the Board.

Section 15.8. COMPENSATION AND EXPENSES

The compensation of any Officer of ICANN shall be approved by the Board. Expenses incurred in connection with performance of their officer duties may be reimbursed to Officers upon approval of the President (in the case of Officers other than the President), by another Officer designated by the Board (in the case of the President), or the Board.

Section 15.9. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The Board, through the Board Governance Committee, shall establish a policy requiring a statement from each Officer not less frequently than once a year setting forth all business and other affiliations that relate in any way to the business and other affiliations of ICANN.

ARTICLE 16 POST-TRANSITION IANA ENTITY

Section 16.1. DESCRIPTION

ICANN shall maintain as a separate legal entity a California nonprofit public benefit corporation ("PTI") for the purpose of providing IANA services, including providing IANA naming function services pursuant to the IANA Naming Function Contract, as well as other services as determined by ICANN in coordination with the direct and indirect customers of the IANA functions. ICANN shall at all times be the sole member of PTI as that term is defined in Section 5056 of the CCC ("Member"). For the purposes of these Bylaws, the "IANA naming function" does not include the Internet Protocol numbers and Autonomous System numbers.
services (as contemplated by Section 1.1(a)(iii)), the protocol ports and parameters services and the root zone maintainer function.

Section 16.2. PTI Governance

(a) ICANN, in its capacity as the sole Member of PTI, shall elect the directors of PTI in accordance with the articles of incorporation and bylaws of PTI and have all other powers of a sole Member under the CCC except as otherwise provided in these Bylaws.

(b) No amendment or modification of the articles of incorporation of PTI shall be effective unless approved by the EC (pursuant to the procedures applicable to Articles Amendments described in Section 25.2, as if such Article Amendment referenced therein refers to an amendment of PTI's articles of incorporation).

(c) ICANN shall not amend or modify the bylaws of PTI in a manner that would effect any of the matters set forth in clauses (i) through (xiv) below (a "PTI Bylaw Amendment") if such PTI Bylaw Amendment has been rejected by the EC pursuant to the procedures described in Section 16.2(e):

(i) any change to the corporate form of PTI to an entity that is not a California nonprofit public benefit corporation organized under the CCC or any successor statute;

(ii) any change in the corporate mission of PTI that is materially inconsistent with ICANN's Mission as set forth in these Bylaws;

(iii) any change to the status of PTI as a corporation with members;

(iv) any change in the rights of ICANN as the sole Member of PTI, including voting, classes of membership, rights, privileges, preferences, restrictions and conditions;

(v) any change that would grant rights to any person or entity (other than ICANN) with respect to PTI as designators or otherwise to: (A) elect or designate directors of PTI; or (B) approve any amendments to the articles of incorporation or bylaws of PTI;

(vi) any change in the number of directors of the board of directors of PTI (the "PTI Board");

(vii) any changes in the allocation of directors on the PTI Board between independent directors and employees of ICANN or employees of PTI or to
the definition of "independent" (as used in PTI's bylaws) for purposes of determining whether a director of PTI is independent;

(viii) the creation of any committee of the PTI Board with the power to exercise the authority of the PTI Board;

(ix) any change in the procedures for nominating independent PTI directors;

(x) the creation of classes of PTI directors or PTI directors with different terms or voting rights;

(xi) any change in PTI Board quorum requirements or voting requirements;

(xii) any change to the powers and responsibilities of the PTI Board or the PTI officers;

(xiii) any change to the rights to exculpation and indemnification that is adverse to the exculpated or indemnified party, including with respect to advancement of expenses and insurance, provided to directors, officers, employees or other agents of PTI; or

(xiv) any change to the requirements to amend the articles of incorporation or bylaws of PTI.

(d) ICANN shall not take any of the following actions (together with the PTI Bylaw Amendments, "PTI Governance Actions") if such PTI Governance Action has been rejected by the EC pursuant to the procedures described in Section 16.2(e).

(i) Any resignation by ICANN as sole Member of PTI or any transfer, disposition, cession, expulsion, suspension or termination by ICANN of its membership in PTI or any transfer, disposition, cession, expulsion, suspension or termination by ICANN of any right arising from its membership in PTI.

(ii) Any sale, transfer or other disposition of PTI's assets, other than (A) in the ordinary course of PTI's business, (B) in connection with an IANA Naming Function Separation Process (as defined in Section 19.1(a)) that has been approved in accordance with Article 19 or (C) the disposition of obsolete, damaged, redundant or unused assets.

(iii) Any merger, consolidation, sale or reorganization of PTI.
(iv) Any dissolution, liquidation or winding-up of the business and affairs of PTI or the commencement of any other voluntary bankruptcy proceeding of PTI.

(e) Promptly after the Board approves a PTI Governance Action (a "PTI Governance Action Approval"), the Secretary shall provide a notice of the Board's decision to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants ("Board Notice"), which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the PTI Governance Action that is the subject of the PTI Governance Action Approval. ICANN shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants. The EC Administration shall promptly commence and comply with the procedures and requirements specified in Article 2 of Annex D.

(i) A PTI Governance Action shall become effective upon the earliest to occur of the following:

(A)(1) A Rejection Action Petition Notice (as defined in Section 2.2(c)(i) of Annex D) is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant (as defined in Section 2.2(c)(i) of Annex D) to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice (as defined in Section 2.2(c)(ii) of Annex D) is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D, in which case the PTI Governance Action that is the subject of the PTI Governance Action Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Period (as defined in Section 2.2(b) of Annex D) relating to such PTI Governance Action Approval and the effectiveness of such PTI Governance Action shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC's rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D;

(B)(1) A Rejection Action Supported Petition (as defined in Section 2.2(d)(i) of Annex D) is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D, in which case the PTI Governance Action that is the subject of the PTI Governance Action Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following
the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period (as defined in Section 2.2(d)(i) of Annex D) relating to such PTI Governance Action Approval and the effectiveness of such PTI Governance Action shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC's rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D; and

(C)(1) An EC Rejection Notice (as defined in Section 2.4(b) of Annex D) is not timely delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4(c) of Annex D, in which case the PTI Governance Action that is the subject of the PTI Governance Action Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period (as defined in Section 2.4(a) of Annex D) relating to such PTI Governance Action Approval and the effectiveness of such PTI Governance Action shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC's rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D.

(ii) A PTI Governance Action that has been rejected by the EC pursuant to and in compliance with Article 2 of Annex D shall have no force and effect, and shall be void ab initio.

(iii) Following receipt of an EC Rejection Notice relating to a PTI Governance Action, ICANN staff and the Board shall consider the explanation provided by the EC Administration as to why the EC has chosen to reject the PTI Governance Action in determining whether or not to develop a new PTI Governance Action and the substance of such new PTI Governance Action, which shall be subject to the procedures of this Section 16.2.

---

Section 16.3. IANA NAMING FUNCTION CONTRACT

(a) On or prior to 1 October 2016, ICANN shall enter into a contract with PTI for the performance of the IANA naming function (as it may be amended or modified, the "IANA Naming Function Contract") and a related statement of work (the "IANA Naming Function SOW"). Except as to implement any modification, waiver or amendment to the IANA Naming Function Contract or IANA Naming Function SOW related to an IFR Recommendation or Special IFR Recommendation approved pursuant to Section 18.6 or an SCWG Recommendation approved pursuant to Section 19.4 (which, for the avoidance of doubt, shall not be subject to this Section 16.3(a)), ICANN shall not agree to modify, amend or waive any...
Material Terms (as defined below) of the IANA Naming Function Contract or the IANA Naming Function SOW if a majority of each of the ccNSO and GNSO Councils reject the proposed modification, amendment or waiver. The following are the "Material Terms" of the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW:

(i) The parties to the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW;

(ii) The initial term and renewal provisions of the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW;

(iii) The manner in which the IANA Naming Function Contract or IANA Naming Function SOW may be terminated;

(iv) The mechanisms that are available to enforce the IANA Naming Function Contract or IANA Naming Function SOW;

(v) The role and responsibilities of the CSC (as defined in Section 17.1), escalation mechanisms and/or the IFR (as defined in Section 18.1);

(vi) The IANA Naming Function Contract's provisions requiring that fees charged by PTI be based on direct costs and resources incurred by PTI;

(vii) The IANA Naming Function Contract's prohibition against subcontracting;

(viii) The availability of the IRP as a point of escalation for claims of PTI's failure to meet defined service level expectations;

(ix) The IANA Naming Function Contract's audit requirements; and

(x) The requirements related to ICANN funding of PTI.

(b) ICANN shall enforce its rights under the IANA Naming Function Contract and the IANA Naming Function SOW.

ARTICLE 17 CUSTOMER STANDING COMMITTEE

Section 17.1. DESCRIPTION

ICANN shall establish a Customer Standing Committee ("CSC") to monitor PTI's
The mission of the CSC is to ensure continued satisfactory performance of the IANA naming function for the direct customers of the naming services. The direct customers of the naming services are top-level domain registry operators as well as root server operators and other non-root zone functions.

The CSC will achieve this mission through regular monitoring of the performance of the IANA naming function against the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW and through mechanisms to engage with PTI to remedy identified areas of concern.

The CSC is not authorized to initiate a change in PTI through a Special IFR (as defined in Section 18.1), but may escalate a failure to correct an identified deficiency to the ccNSO and GNSO, which might then decide to take further action using consultation and escalation processes, which may include a Special IFR. The ccNSO and GNSO may address matters escalated by the CSC, pursuant to their operating rules and procedures.

Section 17.2. COMPOSITION, APPOINTMENT, TERM AND REMOVAL

(a) The CSC shall consist of:

(i) Two individuals representing gTLD registry operators appointed by the Registries Stakeholder Group;

(ii) Two individuals representing ccTLD registry operators appointed by the ccNSO; and

(iii) One individual liaison appointed by PTI,

each appointed in accordance with the rules and procedures of the appointing organization; provided that such individuals should have direct experience and knowledge of the IANA naming function.

(b) If so determined by the ccNSO and GNSO, the CSC may, but is not required to, include one additional member: an individual representing top-level domain registry operators that are not considered a ccTLD or gTLD, who shall be appointed by the ccNSO and the GNSO. Such representative shall be required to
submit a letter of support from the registry operator it represents.

(c) Each of the following organizations may also appoint one liaison to the CSC in accordance with the rules and procedures of the appointing organization: (i) GNSO (from the Registrars Stakeholder Group or the Non-Contracted Parties House), (ii) ALAC, (iii) either the NRO or ASO (as determined by the ASO), (iv) GAC, (v) RSSAC, (vi) SSAC and (vii) any other Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee established under these Bylaws.

(d) The GNSO and ccNSO shall approve the initial proposed members and liaisons of the CSC, and thereafter, the ccNSO and GNSO shall approve each annual slate of members and liaisons being recommended for a new term.

(e) The CSC members and liaisons shall select from among the CSC members who will serve as the CSC’s liaison to the IFRT (as defined in Section 18.1) and any Separation Cross-Community Working Group (“SCWG”).

(f) Any CSC member or liaison may be removed and replaced at any time and for any reason or no reason by the organization that appointed such member or liaison.

(g) In addition, the Chair of the CSC may recommend that a CSC member or liaison be removed by the organization that appointed such member or liaison, upon any of the following: (i) (A) for not attending without sufficient cause a minimum of nine CSC meetings in a one-year period (or at least 75% of all CSC meetings in a one-year period if less than nine meetings were held in such one-year period) or (B) if such member or liaison has been absent for more than two consecutive meetings without sufficient cause; or (ii) for grossly inappropriate behavior.

(h) A vacancy on the CSC shall be deemed to exist in the event of the death, resignation or removal of any CSC member or liaison. Vacancies shall be filled by the organization(s) that appointed such CSC member or liaison. The appointing organization(s) shall provide written notice to the Secretary of its appointment to fill a vacancy, with a notification copy to the Chair of the CSC. The organization(s) responsible for filling such vacancy shall use its reasonable efforts to fill such vacancy within one month after the occurrence of such vacancy.

Section 17.3.CSC CHARTER; PERIODIC REVIEW

(a) The CSC shall act in accordance with its charter (the "CSC Charter").

(b) The effectiveness of the CSC shall be reviewed two years after the first meeting of the CSC; and then every three years thereafter. The method of review
will be determined by the ccNSO and GNSO and the findings of the review will be published on the Website.

(c) The CSC Charter shall be reviewed by a committee of representatives from the ccNSO and the Registries Stakeholder Group selected by such organizations. This review shall commence one year after the first meeting of the CSC. Thereafter, the CSC Charter shall be reviewed by such committee of representatives from the ccNSO and the Registries Stakeholder Group selected by such organizations at the request of the CSC, ccNSO, GNSO, the Board and/or the PTI Board and/or by an IFRT in connection with an IFR.

(d) Amendments to the CSC Charter shall not be effective unless ratified by the vote of a simple majority of each of the ccNSO and GNSO Councils pursuant to each such organizations' procedures. Prior to any action by the ccNSO and GNSO, any recommended changes to the CSC Charter shall be subject to a public comment period that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN. Notwithstanding the foregoing, to the extent any provision of an amendment to the CSC Charter conflicts with the terms of the Bylaws, the terms of the Bylaws shall control.

Section 17.4. ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL SUPPORT

ICANN shall provide administrative and operational support necessary for the CSC to carry out its responsibilities, including providing and facilitating remote participation in all meetings of the CSC.

ARTICLE 18 IANA NAMING FUNCTION REVIEWS

Section 18.1. IANA NAMING FUNCTION REVIEW

The Board, or an appropriate committee thereof, shall cause periodic and/or special reviews (each such review, an "IFR") of PTI's performance of the IANA naming function against the contractual requirements set forth in the IANA Naming Function Contract and the IANA Naming Function SOW to be carried out by an IANA Function Review Team ("IFRT") established in accordance with Article 18, as follows:

(a) Regularly scheduled periodic IFRs, to be conducted pursuant to Section 18.2 below ("Periodic IFRs"); and

(b) IFRs that are not Periodic IFRs, to be conducted pursuant to Section 18.12 below ("Special IFRs").
Section 18.2. FREQUENCY OF PERIODIC IFRS

(a) The first Periodic IFR shall be convened no later than [1 October 2018].

(b) Periodic IFRs after the first Periodic IFR shall be convened no less frequently than every five years, measured from the date the previous IFRT for a Periodic IFR was convened.

(c) In the event a Special IFR is ongoing at the time a Periodic IFR is required to be convened under this Section 18.2, the Board shall cause the convening of the Periodic IFR to be delayed if such delay is approved by the vote of (i) a supermajority of the ccNSO Council (pursuant to the ccNSO's procedures or, if such procedures do not define a supermajority, two-thirds (2/3) of the ccNSO Council's members) and (ii) a GNSO Supermajority. Any decision by the ccNSO and GNSO to delay a Periodic IFR must identify the period of delay, which should generally not exceed 12 months after the completion of the Special IFR.

Section 18.3. IFR RESPONSIBILITIES

For each Periodic IFR, the IFRT shall:

(a) Review and evaluate the performance of PTI against the requirements set forth in the IANA Naming Function Contract in relation to the needs of its direct customers and the expectations of the broader ICANN community, and determine whether to make any recommendations with respect to PTI's performance;

(b) Review and evaluate the performance of PTI against the requirements set forth in the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW;

(c) Review the IANA Naming Function SOW and determine whether to recommend any amendments to the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW to account for the needs of the direct customers of the naming services and/or the community at large;

(d) Review and evaluate the openness and transparency procedures of PTI and any oversight structures for PTI's performance, including reporting requirements and budget transparency;

(e) Review and evaluate the performance and effectiveness of the EC with respect to actions taken by the EC, if any, pursuant to Section 16.2, Section 18.6, Section 18.12, Section 19.1, Section 19.4, Section 22.4(b) and Annex D;

(f) Review and evaluate the performance of the IANA naming function according to established service level expectations during the IFR period being reviewed and
compared to the immediately preceding Periodic IFR period;

(g) Review and evaluate whether there are any systemic issues that are impacting PTI's performance under the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW;

(h) Initiate public comment periods and other processes for community input on PTI's performance under the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW (such public comment periods shall comply with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN);

(i) Consider input from the CSC and the community on PTI's performance under the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW;

(j) Identify process or other areas for improvement in the performance of the IANA naming function under the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW and the performance of the CSC and the EC as it relates to oversight of PTI; and

(k) Consider and assess any changes implemented since the immediately preceding IFR and their implications for the performance of PTI under the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW.

Section 18.4. IFR REQUIRED INPUTS

In conducting an IFR, the IFRT shall review and analyze the following information:

(a) Reports provided by PTI pursuant to the IANA Naming Function Contract and/or IANA Naming Function SOW during the IFR period being reviewed, any portion of which may be redacted pursuant to the Confidential Disclosure Framework set forth in the Operating Standards in accordance with Section 4.6(a)(vi);

(b) Reports provided by the CSC in accordance with the CSC Charter during the IFR period being reviewed;

(c) Community inputs through public consultation procedures as reasonably determined by the IFRT, including, among other things, public comment periods, input provided at in-person sessions during ICANN meetings, responses to public surveys related to PTI's performance under the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW, and public inputs during meetings of the IFRT;

(d) Recommendations for technical, process and/or other improvements relating to the mandate of the IFR provided by the CSC or the community; and
(e) Results of any site visit conducted by the IFRT, which shall be conducted in consultation with ICANN (i) upon reasonable notice, (ii) in a manner so as to not affect PTI's performance under the IANA Naming Function Contract or the IANA Naming Function SOW and (iii) pursuant to procedures and requirements reasonably developed by ICANN and reasonably acceptable to the IFRT. Any such site visit shall be limited to matters reasonably related to the IFRT's responsibilities pursuant to Section 18.3.

Section 18.5. IFR RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

(a) The results of the IFR are not limited and could include a variety of recommendations or no recommendation; provided, however, that any recommendations must directly relate to the matters discussed in Section 18.3 and comply with this Section 18.5.

(b) Any IFRT recommendations should identify improvements that are supported by data and associated analysis about existing deficiencies and how they could be addressed. Each recommendation of the IFRT shall include proposed remedial procedures and describe how those procedures are expected to address such issues. The IFRT's report shall also propose timelines for implementing the IFRT's recommendations. The IFRT shall attempt to prioritize each of its recommendations and provide a rationale for such prioritization.

(c) In any case where a recommendation of an IFRT focuses on a service specific to gTLD registry operators, no such recommendation shall be made by the IFRT in any report to the community (including any report to the Board) if opposition to such recommendation is expressed by any IFRT member appointed by the Registries Stakeholder Group. In any case where a recommendation of an IFRT focuses on a service specific to ccTLD registry operators, no such recommendation shall be made by the IFRT in any report to the community (including any report to the Board) if opposition to such recommendation is expressed by any IFRT member appointed by the ccNSO.

(d) Notwithstanding anything herein to the contrary, the IFRT shall not have the authority to review or make recommendations relating to policy or contracting issues that are not included in the IANA Naming Function Contract or the IANA Naming Function SOW, including, without limitation, policy development, adoption processes or contract enforcement measures between contracted registries and ICANN.

Section 18.6. Recommendations to Amend the IANA Naming Function contract, iana naming function SOW or CSC charter
(a) The IFRT may recommend, among other things to the extent reasonably related to the IFR responsibilities set forth in Section 18.3, amendments to the IANA Naming Function Contract, IANA Naming Function SOW and/or the CSC Charter. The IFRT shall, at a minimum, take the following steps before an amendment to either the IANA Naming Function Contract, IANA Naming Function SOW or CSC Charter is proposed:

(i) Consult with the Board (such consultation to be conducted in parallel with other processes set forth in this Section 18.6(a)) and PTI;

(ii) Consult with the CSC;

(iii) Conduct a public input session for ccTLD and gTLD registry operators; and

(iv) Seek public comment on the amendments that are under consideration by the IFRT through a public comment period that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN.

(b) A recommendation of an IFRT for a Periodic IFR that would amend the IANA Naming Function Contract or IANA Naming Function SOW shall only become effective if, with respect to each such recommendation (each, an "IFR Recommendation"), each of the following occurs:

(i) The IFR Recommendation has been approved by the vote of (A) a supermajority of the ccNSO Council (pursuant to the ccNSO’s procedures or, if such procedures do not define a supermajority, two-thirds (2/3) of the ccNSO Council’s members) and (B) a GNSO Supermajority;

(ii) After a public comment period that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN, the Board has approved the IFR Recommendation; and

(iii) The EC has not rejected the Board's approval of the IFR Recommendation pursuant to and in compliance with Section 18.6(d).

(c) If the Board (x) rejects an IFR Recommendation that was approved by the ccNSO Council and GNSO Council pursuant to Section 18.6(b)(i) or (y) does not resolve to either accept or reject an IFR Recommendation within 45 days of the
later of (1) the date that the condition in Section 18.6(b)(i) is satisfied or (2) the expiration of the public comment period contemplated by Section 18.6(b)(ii), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the applicable IFR Recommendation. ICANN shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants.

(i) ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, convene a Rejection Action Community Forum (as defined in Section 2.3(a) of Annex D), which Rejection Action Community Forum shall be conducted in accordance with Section 2.3 of Annex D, to discuss the Board Notice; provided, that, for purposes of Section 2.3 of Annex D, (A) the Board Notice shall be treated as the Rejection Action Supported Petition, (B) the EC Administration shall be treated as the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant (and there shall be no Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participants (as defined in Section 2.2(d)(i) of Annex D) and (C) the Rejection Action Community Forum Period shall expire on the 21st day after the date the Secretary provides the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants.

(ii) No later than 45 days after the conclusion of such Rejection Action Community Forum Period, the Board shall resolve to either uphold its rejection of the IFR Recommendation or approve the IFR Recommendation (either, a "Post-Forum IFR Recommendation Decision").

(A) If the Board resolves to approve the IFR Recommendation, such IFR Recommendation will be subject to Section 18.6(d).

(B) For the avoidance of doubt, the Board shall not be obligated to change its decision on the IFR Recommendation as a result of the Rejection Action Community Forum.

(C) The Board's Post-Forum IFR Recommendation Decision shall be posted on the Website in accordance with the Board's posting obligations as set forth in Article 3.

(d) Promptly after the Board approves an IFR Recommendation (an "IFR Recommendation Decision"), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall
enclose a copy of the IFR Recommendation that is the subject of the IFR Recommendation Decision. ICANN shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants. The EC Administration shall promptly commence and comply with the procedures and requirements specified in Article 2 of Annex D.

(i) An IFR Recommendation Decision shall become final upon the earliest to occur of the following:

(A)(1) A Rejection Action Petition Notice is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D, in which case the IFR Recommendation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Period relating to such IFR Recommendation Decision;

(B)(1) A Rejection Action Supported Petition is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D, in which case the IFR Recommendation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period relating to such IFR Recommendation Decision; and

(C)(1) An EC Rejection Notice is not timely delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4(c) of Annex D, in which case the IFR Recommendation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period relating to such IFR Recommendation Decision.

(ii) An IFR Recommendation Decision that has been rejected by the EC pursuant to and in compliance with Article 2 of Annex D shall have no force and effect, and shall be void ab initio.
(e) For the avoidance of doubt, Section 18.6(d) shall not apply when the Board acts in a manner that is consistent with an IFR Recommendation unless such IFR Recommendation relates to an IANA Naming Function Separation Process as described in Article 19.

(f) Timelines for implementing any amendments to the IANA Naming Function Contract or IANA Naming Function SOW shall be reasonably agreed between the IFRT, ICANN and PTI.

(g) A recommendation of an IFRT that would amend the CSC Charter shall only become effective if approved pursuant to Section 17.3(d).

Section 18.7. COMPOSITION OF IFR TEAMS

Each IFRT shall consist of the following members and liaisons to be appointed in accordance with the rules and procedures of the appointing organization:

(a) Two representatives appointed by the ccNSO from its ccTLD registry operator representatives;

(b) One non-ccNSO ccTLD representative who is associated with a ccTLD registry operator that is not a representative of the ccNSO, appointed by the ccNSO; it is strongly recommended that the ccNSO consult with the regional ccTLD organizations (i.e., AfTLD, APTLD, LACTLD, and CENTR) in making its appointment;

(c) Two representatives appointed by the Registries Stakeholder Group;

(d) One representative appointed by the Registrars Stakeholder Group;

(e) One representative appointed by the Commercial Stakeholder Group;

(f) One representative appointed by the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group;

(g) One representative appointed by the GAC;

(h) One representative appointed by the SSAC;

(i) One representative appointed by the RSSAC;

(j) One representative appointed by the ALAC;

(k) One liaison appointed by the CSC;
(l) One liaison who may be appointed by the ASO; and

(m) One liaison who may be appointed by the IAB.

(n) The IFRT shall also include an unlimited number of non-member, non-liaison participants.

(o) The IFRT shall not be a standing body. A new IFRT shall be constituted for each IFR and the IFRT shall automatically dissolve following the end of the process for approving such IFRT's IFR Recommendations pursuant to Section 18.6.

Section 18.8. MEMBERSHIP; ELECTION OF CO-CHAIRS, AND LIAISONS

(a) All candidates for appointment to the IFRT as a member or liaison shall submit an expression of interest to the organization that would appoint such candidate as a member or liaison to the IFRT, which shall state: (i) why the candidate is interested in becoming involved in the IFRT, (ii) what particular skills the candidate would bring to the IFRT, (iii) the candidate’s knowledge of the IANA functions, (iv) the candidate’s understanding of the purpose of the IFRT, and (v) that the candidate understands the time necessary to participate in the IFR process and can commit to the role.

(b) Members, liaisons and participants of the IFRT shall disclose to ICANN and the IFRT any conflicts of interest with a specific complaint or issue under review. The IFRT may exclude from the discussion of a specific complaint or issue any member deemed by the majority of IFRT members to have a conflict of interest. The co-chairs of the IFRT shall record any such conflict of interest in the minutes of the IFRT.

(c) To the extent reasonably possible, the appointing organizations for the IFRT members and liaisons shall work together to achieve an IFRT that is balanced for diversity (including functional, geographic and cultural) and skill, and should seek to broaden the number of individuals participating across the various reviews; provided, that the IFRT should include members from each ICANN Geographic Region, and the ccNSO and Registries Stakeholder Group shall not appoint multiple members who are citizens of countries from the same ICANN Geographic Region.

(d) The IFRT shall be led by two co-chairs: one appointed by the GNSO from one of the members appointed pursuant to clauses (c)-(f) of Section 18.7 and one appointed by the ccNSO from one of the members appointed pursuant to clauses (a)-(b) of Section 18.7.
(e) The PTI Board shall select a PTI staff member to serve as a point of contact to facilitate formal lines of communication between the IFRT and PTI. The Board shall select an ICANN staff member to serve as a point of contact to facilitate formal lines of communication between the IFRT and ICANN.

(f) Liaisons to the IFRT are not members of or entitled to vote on any matters before the IFRT, but otherwise are entitled to participate on equal footing with members of the IFRT.

(g) Other participants are entitled to participate in the IFRT, but are not entitled to vote.

(h) Removal and Replacement of IFRT Members and Liaisons

(i) The IFRT members and liaisons may be removed from the IFRT by their respective appointing organization at any time upon such organization providing written notice to the Secretary and the co-chairs of the IFRT.

(ii) A vacancy on the IFRT shall be deemed to exist in the event of the death, resignation or removal of any IFRT member or liaison. Vacancies shall be filled by the organization that appointed such IFRT member or liaison. The appointing organization shall provide written notice to the Secretary of its appointment to fill a vacancy, with a notification copy to the IFRT co-chairs. The organization responsible for filling such vacancy shall use its reasonable efforts to fill such vacancy within one month after the occurrence of such vacancy.

Section 18.9. MEETINGS

(a) All actions of the IFRT shall be taken by consensus of the IFRT, which is where a small minority may disagree, but most agree. If consensus cannot be reached with respect to a particular issue, actions by the majority of all of the members of the IFRT shall be the action of the IFRT.

(b) Any members of the IFRT not in favor of an action (whether as a result of voting against a matter or objecting to the consensus position) may record a minority dissent to such action, which shall be included in the IFRT minutes and/or report, as applicable.

(c) IFRT meetings, deliberations and other working procedures shall be open to the public and conducted in a transparent manner to the fullest extent possible.
(d) The IFRT shall transmit minutes of its meetings to the Secretary, who shall cause those minutes to be posted to the Website as soon as practicable following each IFRT meeting. Recordings and transcripts of meetings, as well as mailing lists, shall also be posted to the Website.

Section 18.10. COMMUNITY REVIEWS AND REPORTS

(a) The IFRT shall seek community input as to the issues relevant to the IFR through one or more public comment periods that shall comply with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN and through discussions during ICANN’s public meetings in developing and finalizing its recommendations and any report.

(b) The IFRT shall provide a draft report of its findings and recommendations to the community for public comment. The public comment period is required to comply with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN.

(c) After completion of the IFR, the IFRT shall submit its final report containing its findings and recommendations to the Board. ICANN shall thereafter promptly post the IFRT’s final report on the Website.

Section 18.11. ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL SUPPORT

ICANN shall provide administrative and operational support necessary for each IFRT to carry out its responsibilities, including providing and facilitating remote participation in all meetings of the IFRT.

Section 18.12. SPECIAL IFRS

(a) A Special IFR may be initiated outside of the cycle for the Periodic IFRs to address any deficiency, problem or other issue that has adversely affected PTI’s performance under the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW (a “PTI Performance Issue”), following the satisfaction of each of the following conditions:

(i) The Remedial Action Procedures of the CSC set forth in the IANA Naming Function Contract shall have been followed and failed to correct the PTI Performance Issue and the outcome of such procedures shall have been reviewed by the ccNSO and GNSO according to each organization’s respective operating procedures;
(ii) The IANA Problem Resolution Process set forth in the IANA Naming Function Contract shall have been followed and failed to correct the PTI Performance Issue and the outcome of such process shall have been reviewed by the ccNSO and GNSO according to each organization's respective operating procedures;

(iii) The ccNSO and GNSO shall have considered the outcomes of the processes set forth in the preceding clauses (i) and (ii) and shall have conducted meaningful consultation with the other Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees with respect to the PTI Performance Issue and whether or not to initiate a Special IFR; and

(iv) After a public comment period that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN, if a public comment period is requested by the ccNSO and the GNSO, a Special IFR shall have been approved by the vote of (A) a supermajority of the ccNSO Council (pursuant to the ccNSO's procedures or if such procedures do not define a supermajority, two-thirds (2/3) of the Council members) and (B) a GNSO Supermajority.

(b) Each Special IFR shall be conducted by an IFRT and shall follow the same procedures and requirements applicable to Periodic IFRs as set forth in this Section 18, except that:

(i) The scope of the Special IFR and the related inputs that are required to be reviewed by the IFRT shall be focused primarily on the PTI Performance Issue, its implications for overall IANA naming function performance by PTI and how to resolve the PTI Performance Issue;

(ii) The IFRT shall review and analyze the information that is relevant to the scope of the Special IFR; and

(iii) Each recommendation of the IFRT relating to the Special IFR, including but not limited to any recommendation to initiate an IANA Naming Function Separation Process, must be related to remediating the PTI Performance Issue or other issue with PTI's performance that is related to the IFRT responsibilities set forth in Section 18.3, shall include proposed remedial procedures and describe how those procedures are expected to address the PTI Performance Issue or other relevant issue with PTI's performance.
(c) A recommendation of an IFRT for a Special IFR shall only become effective if, with respect to each such recommendation (each, a "Special IFR Recommendation"), each of the following occurs:

(i) The Special IFR Recommendation has been approved by the vote of (A) a supermajority of the ccNSO Council (pursuant to the ccNSO's procedures or, if such procedures do not define a supermajority, two-thirds (2/3) of the ccNSO Council's members) and (B) a GNSO Supermajority;

(ii) After a public comment period that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN, the Board has approved the Special IFR Recommendation; and

(iii) The EC has not rejected the Board's approval of the Special IFR Recommendation pursuant to and in compliance with Section 18.12(e).

(d) If the Board (x) rejects a Special IFR Recommendation that was approved by the ccNSO Council and GNSO Council pursuant to Section 18.12(c)(i) or (y) does not resolve to either accept or reject a Special IFR Recommendation within 45 days of the later of (1) the date that the condition in Section 18.12(c)(i) is satisfied or (2) the expiration of the public comment period contemplated by Section 18.12(c)(ii), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the applicable Special IFR Recommendation. ICANN shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants.

(i) ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, convene a Rejection Action Community Forum, which Rejection Action Community Forum shall be conducted in accordance with Section 2.3 of Annex D, to discuss the Board Notice; provided, that, for purposes of Section 2.3 of Annex D, (A) the Board Notice shall be treated as the Rejection Action Supported Petition, (B) the EC Administration shall be treated as the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant (and there shall be no Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participants) and (C) the Rejection Action Community Forum Period shall expire on the 21st day after the date the Secretary provides the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants.
(ii) No later than 45 days after the conclusion of such Rejection Action Community Forum Period, the Board shall resolve to either uphold its rejection of the Special IFR Recommendation or approve the Special IFR Recommendation (either, a "Post-Forum Special IFR Recommendation Decision").

(A) If the Board resolves to approve the Special IFR Recommendation, such Special IFR Recommendation will be subject to Section 18.6(d).

(B) For the avoidance of doubt, the Board shall not be obligated to change its decision on the Special IFR Recommendation as a result of the Rejection Action Community Forum.

(C) The Board's Post-Forum Special IFR Recommendation Decision shall be posted on the Website in accordance with the Board's posting obligations as set forth in Article 3.

(e) Promptly after the Board approves a Special IFR Recommendation (a "Special IFR Recommendation Decision"), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the Special IFR Recommendation that is the subject of the Special IFR Recommendation Decision. ICANN shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants. The EC Administration shall promptly commence and comply with the procedures and requirements specified in Article 2 of Annex D.

(i) A Special IFR Recommendation Decision shall become final upon the earliest to occur of the following:

(A)(1) A Rejection Action Petition Notice is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D, in which case the Special IFR Recommendation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Period relating to such Special IFR Recommendation Decision;

(B)(1) A Rejection Action Supported Petition is not timely delivered by the
Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant
to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection
Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the
Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D, in
which case the Special IFR Recommendation Decision shall be final as of
the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition
Support Period relating to such Special IFR Recommendation Decision; and

(C)(1) An EC Rejection Notice is not timely delivered by the EC
Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section
2.4 of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered
by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance
with Section 2.4(c) of Annex D, in which case the Special IFR
Recommendation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately
following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period relating to
such Special IFR Recommendation Decision.

(ii) A Special IFR Recommendation Decision that has been rejected by the
EC pursuant to and in compliance with Article 2 of Annex D shall have no
force and effect, and shall be void ab initio.

(f) For the avoidance of doubt, Section 18.12(e) shall not apply when the Board
acts in a manner that is consistent with a Special IFR Recommendation unless
such Special IFR Recommendation relates to an IANA Naming Function
Separation Process as described in Article 19.

Section 18.13. PROPOSED SEPARATION PROCESS
The IFRT conducting either a Special IFR or Periodic IFR may, upon conclusion of
a Special IFR or Periodic IFR, as applicable, determine that an IANA Naming Function
Separation Process is necessary and, if so, it shall recommend the
creation of an SCWG pursuant to Article 19.

ARTICLE 19 IANA NAMING FUNCTION SEPARATION
PROCESS

Section 19.1. ESTABLISHING AN SCWG
(a) An "IANA Naming Function Separation Process" is the process initiated in
accordance with this Article 19 pursuant to which PTI may cease to perform the
IANA naming function including, without limitation, the initiation of a request for
proposal to select an operator to perform the IANA naming function instead of PTI
the selection of an IANA naming function operator other than PTI, termination or non-renewal of the IANA Naming Function Contract, and/or divestiture, or other reorganization of PTI by ICANN.

(b) The Board shall establish an SCWG if each of the following occurs:

(i) The IFRT conducting either a Special IFR or Periodic IFR, upon conclusion of a Special IFR or Periodic IFR, as applicable, has recommended that an IANA Naming Function Separation Process is necessary and has recommended the creation of an SCWG (an "SCWG Creation Recommendation");

(ii) The SCWG Creation Recommendation has been approved by the vote of (A) a supermajority of the ccNSO Council (pursuant to the ccNSO’s procedures or, if such procedures do not define a supermajority, two-thirds (2/3) of the ccNSO Council's members) and (B) a GNSO Supermajority;

(iii) After a public comment period that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN, the Board has approved the SCWG Creation Recommendation. A determination by the Board to not approve an SCWG Creation Recommendation, where such creation has been approved by the ccNSO and GNSO Councils pursuant to Section 19.1(b)(ii), shall require a vote of at least two-thirds (2/3) of the Board and the Board shall follow the same consultation procedures set forth in Section 9 of Annex A of these Bylaws that relate to Board rejection of a PDP recommendation that is supported by a GNSO Supermajority; and

(iv) The EC has not rejected the Board's approval of the SCWG Creation Recommendation pursuant to and in compliance with Section 19.1(d).

(c) If the Board (x) rejects an SCWG Creation Recommendation that was approved by the ccNSO Council and GNSO Council pursuant to Section 19.1(b)(ii) or (y) does not resolve to either accept or reject an SCWG Creation Recommendation within 45 days of the later of (1) the date that the condition in Section 19.1(b)(ii) is satisfied or (2) the expiration of the public comment period contemplated by Section 19.1(b)(iii), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the applicable SCWG Creation Recommendation. ICANN shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants.
Participants.

(i) ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, convene a Rejection Action Community Forum, which Rejection Action Community Forum shall be conducted in accordance with Section 2.3 of Annex D, to discuss the Board Notice; provided, that, for purposes of Section 2.3 of Annex D, (A) the Board Notice shall be treated as the Rejection Action Supported Petition, (B) the EC Administration shall be treated as the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant (and there shall be no Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participants) and (C) the Rejection Action Community Forum Period shall expire on the 21st day after the date the Secretary provides the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants.

(ii) No later than 45 days after the conclusion of such Rejection Action Community Forum Period, the Board shall resolve to either uphold its rejection of the SCWG Creation Recommendation or approve the SCWG Creation Recommendation (either, a "Post-Forum SCWG Creation Recommendation Decision").

(A) If the Board resolves to approve the SCWG Creation Recommendation, such SCWG Creation Recommendation will be subject to Section 19.1(d).

(B) For the avoidance of doubt, the Board shall not be obligated to change its decision on the SCWG Creation Recommendation as a result of the Rejection Action Community Forum.

(C) The Board's Post-Forum SCWG Creation Recommendation Decision shall be posted on the Website in accordance with the Board's posting obligations as set forth in Article 3.

(d) Promptly after the Board approves an SCWG Creation Recommendation (an "SCWG Creation Decision"), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the SCWG Creation Decision. ICANN shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants. The EC Administration shall promptly commence and comply with the procedures and requirements specified in Article 2 of Annex D.
(i) An SCWG Creation Decision shall become final upon the earliest to occur of the following:

(A)(1) A Rejection Action Petition Notice is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D, in which case the SCWG Creation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Period relating to such SCWG Creation Decision;

(B)(1) A Rejection Action Supported Petition is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D, in which case the SCWG Creation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period relating to such SCWG Creation Decision; and

(C)(1) An EC Rejection Notice is not timely delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4(c) of Annex D, in which case the SCWG Creation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period relating to such SCWG Creation Decision.

(ii) An SCWG Creation Decision that has been rejected by the EC pursuant to and in compliance with Article 2 of Annex D shall have no force and effect, and shall be void ab initio.

Section 19.2. SCWG RESPONSIBILITIES
The responsibilities of the SCWG shall be as follows:

(a) The SCWG shall determine how to resolve the PTI Performance Issue(s) which the IFRT that conducted the Special IFR or Periodic IFR, as applicable, identified as triggering formation of this SCWG.

(b) If the SCWG recommends the issuance of an IANA Naming Function RFP, the
SCWG shall:

(i) Develop IANA Naming Function RFP guidelines and requirements for the performance of the IANA naming function, in a manner consistent with ICANN’s publicly available procurement guidelines (as in effect immediately prior to the formation of the SCWG); and

(ii) Solicit input from ICANN as well as the global Internet community (through community consultation, including public comment opportunities as necessary that comply with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN) on requirements to plan and participate in the IANA Naming Function RFP process.

(c) If an SCWG Recommendation (as defined in Section 19.4(b)) to issue the IANA Naming Function RFP is approved pursuant to Section 19.4(b) and the EC does not reject the relevant SCWG Recommendation Decision pursuant to Section 19.4(d), the SCWG, in consultation with ICANN, shall:

(i) Issue the IANA Naming Function RFP;

(ii) Review responses from interested candidates to the IANA Naming Function RFP, which may be received from PTI and/or any other entity or person; and

(iii) Recommend the entity that ICANN should contract with to perform the IANA naming function.

(d) If the SCWG recommends an IANA Naming Function Separation Process other than the issuance of an IANA Naming Function RFP, the SCWG shall develop recommendations to be followed with respect to that process and its implementation consistent with the terms of this Article 19. The SCWG shall monitor and manage the implementation of such IANA Naming Function Separation Process.

Section 19.3. COMMUNITY REVIEWS AND REPORTS

(a) The SCWG shall seek community input through one or more public comment periods (such public comment period shall comply with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN) and may recommend discussions during
ICANN’s public meetings in developing and finalizing its recommendations and any report.

(b) The SCWG shall provide a draft report of its findings and recommendations to the community after convening of the SCWG, which such draft report will be posted for public comment on the Website. The SCWG may post additional drafts of its report for public comment until it has reached its final report.

(c) After completion of its review, the SCWG shall submit its final report containing its findings and recommendations to the Board. ICANN shall promptly post the SCWG’s final report on the Website.

Section 19.4. SCWG RECOMMENDATIONS

(a) The recommendations of the SCWG are not limited and could include a variety of recommendations or a recommendation that no action is required; provided, however, that any recommendations must directly relate to the matters discussed in Section 19.2 and comply with this Section 19.4.

(b) ICANN shall not implement an SCWG recommendation (including an SCWG recommendation to issue an IANA Naming Function RFP) unless, with respect to each such recommendation (each, an "SCWG Recommendation"), each of the following occurs:

(i) The SCWG Recommendation has been approved by the vote of (A) a supermajority of the ccNSO Council (pursuant to the ccNSO’s procedures or, if such procedures do not define a supermajority, two-thirds (2/3) of the ccNSO Council’s members) and (B) a GNSO Supermajority;

(ii) After a public comment period that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN, the Board has approved the SCWG Recommendation. A determination by the Board to not approve an SCWG Recommendation, where such SCWG Recommendation has been approved by the ccNSO and GNSO Councils pursuant to Section 19.4(b)(i), shall require a vote of at least two-thirds (2/3) of the Board and the Board shall follow the same consultation procedures set forth in Section 9 of Annex A of these Bylaws that relate to Board rejection of a PDP recommendation that is supported by a GNSO Supermajority; and

(iii) The EC has not rejected the Board’s approval of the SCWG Recommendation pursuant to and in compliance with Section 19.4(d).
(c) If the Board (x) rejects an SCWG Recommendation that was approved by the ccNSO Council and GNSO Council pursuant to Section 19.4(b)(i) or (y) does not resolve to either accept or reject an SCWG Recommendation within 45 days of the later of (1) the date that the condition in Section 19.4(b)(i) is satisfied or (2) the expiration of the public comment period contemplated by Section 19.4(b)(ii), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the applicable SCWG Recommendation. ICANN shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants.

(i) ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, convene a Rejection Action Community Forum, which Rejection Action Community Forum shall be conducted in accordance with Section 2.3 of Annex D, to discuss the Board Notice; provided, that, for purposes of Section 2.3 of Annex D, (A) the Board Notice shall be treated as the Rejection Action Supported Petition, (B) the EC Administration shall be treated as the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant (and there shall be no Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participants) and (C) the Rejection Action Community Forum Period shall expire on the 21st day after the date the Secretary provides the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants.

(ii) No later than 45 days after the conclusion of such Rejection Action Community Forum Period, the Board shall resolve to either uphold its rejection of the SCWG Recommendation or approve the SCWG Recommendation (either, a "Post-Forum SCWG Recommendation Decision").

(A) If the Board resolves to approve the SCWG Recommendation, such SCWG Recommendation will be subject to Section 19.4(d).

(B) For the avoidance of doubt, the Board shall not be obligated to change its decision on the SCWG Recommendation as a result of the Rejection Action Community Forum.

(C) The Board's Post-Forum SCWG Recommendation Decision shall be posted on the Website in accordance with the Board's posting obligations as set forth in Article 3.
(d) Promptly after the Board approves an SCWG Recommendation (an "SCWG Recommendation Decision"), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the SCWG Recommendation that is the subject of the SCWG Recommendation Decision. ICANN shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants. The EC Administration shall promptly commence and comply with the procedures and requirements specified in Article 2 of Annex D.

(i) An SCWG Recommendation Decision shall become final upon the earliest to occur of the following:

(A)(1) A Rejection Action Petition Notice is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D, in which case the SCWG Recommendation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Period relating to such SCWG Recommendation Decision;

(B)(1) A Rejection Action Supported Petition is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D, in which case the SCWG Recommendation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period relating to such SCWG Recommendation Decision; and

(C)(1) An EC Rejection Notice is not timely delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4(c) of Annex D, in which case the SCWG Recommendation Decision shall be final as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period relating to such SCWG Recommendation Decision.

(ii) An SCWG Recommendation Decision that has been rejected by the EC
pursuant to and in compliance with Article 2 of Annex D shall have no force and effect, and shall be void ab initio.

(e) ICANN shall absorb the costs relating to recommendations made by the SCWG, including, without limitation, costs related to the process of selecting or potentially selecting a new operator for the IANA naming function and the operating costs of the successor operator that are necessary for the successor operator's performance of the IANA naming function as ICANN's independent contractor. ICANN shall not be authorized to raise fees from any TLD registry operators to cover the costs associated with implementation of any SCWG Recommendations that specifically relate to the transition to a successor operator. For avoidance of doubt, this restriction shall not apply to collecting appropriate fees necessary to maintain the ongoing performance of the IANA naming function, including those relating to the operating costs of the successor operator.

(f) In the event that (i) an SCWG Recommendation that selects an entity (other than PTI) as a new operator of the IANA naming function is approved pursuant to Section 19.4(b) and (ii) the EC does not reject the relevant SCWG Recommendation Decision pursuant to Section 19.4(d), ICANN shall enter into a contract with the new operator on substantially the same terms recommended by the SCWG and approved as part of such SCWG Recommendation.

(g) As promptly as practical following an SCWG Recommendation Decision becoming final in accordance with this Section 19.4, ICANN shall take all steps reasonably necessary to effect such SCWG Recommendation Decision as soon as practicable.

Section 19.5. SCWG COMPOSITION

(a) Each SCWG shall consist of the following members and liaisons to be appointed in accordance with the rules and procedures of the appointing organization:

(i) Two representatives appointed by the ccNSO from its ccTLD registry operator representatives;

(ii) One non-ccNSO ccTLD representative who is associated with a ccTLD registry operator that is not a representative of the ccNSO, appointed by the ccNSO; it is strongly recommended that the ccNSO consult with the
regional ccTLD organizations (i.e., AfTLD, APTLD, LACTLD and CENTR) in making its appointment;

(iii) Three representatives appointed by the Registries Stakeholder Group;

(iv) One representative appointed by the Registrars Stakeholder Group;

(v) One representative appointed by the Commercial Stakeholder Group;

(vi) One representative appointed by the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group;

(vii) One representative appointed by the GAC;

(viii) One representative appointed by the SSAC;

(ix) One representative appointed by the RSSAC;

(x) One representative appointed by the ALAC;

(xi) One liaison appointed by the CSC;

(xii) One liaison appointed by the IFRT that conducted the Special IFR or Periodic IFR, as applicable, that recommended the creation of the SCWG, who shall be named in the IFRT's recommendation to convene the Special IFR;

(xiii) One liaison who may be appointed by the ASO;

(xiv) One liaison who may be appointed by the IAB; and

(xv) One liaison who may be appointed by the Board.

(xvi) The SCWG may also include an unlimited number of non-member, non-liaison participants.

(b) All candidates for appointment to the SCWG as a member or liaison shall submit an expression of interest to the organization that would appoint such candidate as a member or liaison, which shall state (i) why the candidate is interested in becoming involved in the SCWG, (ii) what particular skills the candidate would bring to the SCWG, (iii) the candidate's knowledge of the IANA naming function, (iv) the candidate's understanding of the purpose of the SCWG, and (v) that the candidate understands the time necessary to participate in the
SCWG process and can commit to the role.

(c) Members and liaisons of the SCWG shall disclose to ICANN and the SCWG any conflicts of interest with a specific complaint or issue under review. The SCWG may exclude from the discussion of a specific complaint or issue any member, liaison or participant deemed by the majority of SCWG members to have a conflict of interest. The co-chairs of the SCWG shall record any such conflict of interest in the minutes of the SCWG.

(d) To the extent reasonably possible, the appointing organizations for SCWG members and liaisons shall work together to:

(i) achieve an SCWG that is balanced for diversity (including functional, geographic and cultural) and skill, and should seek to broaden the number of individuals participating across the various reviews; provided, that the SCWG should include members from each ICANN Geographic Region, and the ccNSO and Registries Stakeholder Group shall not appoint multiple members who are citizens of countries from the same ICANN Geographic Region;

(ii) ensure that the SCWG is comprised of individuals who are different from those individuals who comprised the IFRT that conducted the Special IFR or Periodic IFR, as applicable, that recommended the creation of the SCWG, other than the liaison to the IFRT appointed by the CSC; and

(iii) seek to appoint as representatives of the SCWG as many individuals as practicable with experience managing or participating in RFP processes.

(e) ICANN shall select an ICANN staff member and a PTI staff member to serve as points of contact to facilitate formal lines of communication between the SCWG and ICANN and the SCWG and PTI. Communications between the SCWG and the ICANN and PTI points of contact shall be communicated by the SCWG co-chairs.

(f) The SCWG shall not be a standing body. Each SCWG shall be constituted when and as required under these Bylaws and shall dissolve following the end of the process for approving such SCWG’s SCWG Recommendations pursuant to Section 19.4(d).

Section 19.6. ELECTION OF CO-CHAIRS AND LIAISONS
(a) The SCWG shall be led by two co-chairs: one appointed by the GNSO from one of the members appointed pursuant to clauses (iii)-(vi) of Section 19.5(a) and one appointed by the ccNSO from one of the members appointed pursuant to clauses (i)-(ii) of Section 19.5(a).

(b) Liaisons to the SCWG shall not be members of or entitled to vote on any matters before the SCWG, but otherwise shall be entitled to participate on equal footing with SCWG members.

(c) Removal and Replacement of SCWG Members and Liaisons

(i) The SCWG members and liaisons may be removed from the SCWG by their respective appointing organization at any time upon such organization providing written notice to the Secretary and the co-chairs of the SCWG.

(ii) A vacancy on the SCWG shall be deemed to exist in the event of the death, resignation or removal of any SCWG member or liaison. Vacancies shall be filled by the organization that appointed such SCWG member or liaison. The appointing organization shall provide written notice to the Secretary of its appointment to fill a vacancy, with a notification copy to the SCWG co-chairs. The organization responsible for filling such vacancy shall use its reasonable efforts to fill such vacancy within one month after the occurrence of such vacancy.

Section 19.7. MEETINGS

(a) The SCWG shall act by consensus, which is where a small minority may disagree, but most agree.

(b) Any members of the SCWG not in favor of an action may record a minority dissent to such action, which shall be included in the SCWG minutes and/or report, as applicable.

(c) SCWG meetings and other working procedures shall be open to the public and conducted in a transparent manner to the fullest extent possible.

(d) The SCWG shall transmit minutes of its meetings to the Secretary, who shall cause those minutes to be posted to the Website as soon as practicable following each SCWG meeting, and no later than five business days following the meeting.

(e) Except as otherwise provided in these Bylaws, the SCWG shall follow the
guidelines and procedures applicable to ICANN Cross Community Working Groups that will be publicly available and may be amended from time to time.

Section 19.8. ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

ICANN shall provide administrative and operational support necessary for the SCWG to carry out its responsibilities, including providing and facilitating remote participation in all meetings of the SCWG.

Section 19.9. CONFLICTING PROVISIONS

In the event any SCWG Recommendation that is approved in accordance with this Article 19 requires ICANN to take any action that is inconsistent with a provision of the Bylaws (including any action taken in implementing such SCWG Recommendation), the requirements of such provision of these Bylaws shall not apply to the extent of that inconsistency.

ARTICLE 20 INDEMNIFICATION OF DIRECTORS, OFFICERS, EMPLOYEES, AND OTHER AGENTS

Section 20.1. INDEMNIFICATION GENERALLY

ICANN shall, to the maximum extent permitted by the CCC, indemnify each of its agents against expenses, judgments, fines, settlements, and other amounts actually and reasonably incurred in connection with any proceeding arising by reason of the fact that any such person is or was an agent of ICANN, provided that the indemnified person's acts were done in good faith and in a manner that the indemnified person reasonably believed to be in ICANN’s best interests and not criminal. For purposes of this Article 20, an “agent” of ICANN includes any person who is or was a Director, Officer, employee, or any other agent of ICANN (including a member of the EC, the EC Administration, any Supporting Organization, any Advisory Committee, the Nominating Committee, any other ICANN committee, or the Technical Liaison Group) acting within the scope of his or her responsibility; or is or was serving at the request of ICANN as a Director, Officer, employee, or agent of another corporation, partnership, joint venture, trust, or other enterprise. The Board may adopt a resolution authorizing the purchase and maintenance of insurance on behalf of any agent of ICANN against any liability asserted against or incurred by the agent in such capacity or arising out of the agent's status as such, whether or not ICANN would have the power to indemnify the agent against that liability under the provisions of this Article 20.

Section 20.2. INDEMNIFICATION WITH RESPECT TO DIRECTOR REMOVAL
If a Director initiates any proceeding in connection with his or her removal or recall pursuant to the Bylaws, to which a person who is a member of the leadership council (or equivalent body) of a Decisional Participant or representative of a Decisional Participant in the EC Administration is a party or is threatened to be made a party (as a party or witness) (a "Director Removal Proceeding"), ICANN shall, to the maximum extent permitted by the CCC, indemnify any such person, against expenses, judgments, fines, settlements, and other amounts actually and reasonably incurred by such person in connection with such Director Removal Proceeding, for actions taken by such person in his or her representative capacity within his or her Decisional Participant pursuant to the processes and procedures set forth in these Bylaws, provided that all such actions were taken by such person in good faith and in a manner that such person reasonably believed to be in ICANN's best interests and not criminal. The actual and reasonable legal fees of a single firm of counsel and other expenses actually and reasonably incurred by such person in defending against a Director Removal Proceeding shall be paid by ICANN in advance of the final disposition of such Director Removal Proceeding, provided, however, that such expenses shall be advanced only upon delivery to the Secretary of an undertaking (which shall be in writing and in a form provided by the Secretary) by such person to repay the amount of such expenses if it shall ultimately be determined that such person is not entitled to be indemnified by ICANN. ICANN shall not be obligated to indemnify such person against any settlement of a Director Removal Proceeding, unless such settlement is approved in advance by the Board in its reasonable discretion. Notwithstanding Section 20.1, the indemnification provided in this Section 20.2 shall be ICANN's sole indemnification obligation with respect to the subject matter set forth in this Section 20.2.

ARTICLE 21 GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 21.1. CONTRACTS

The Board may authorize any Officer or Officers, agent or agents, to enter into any contract or execute or deliver any instrument in the name of and on behalf of ICANN, and such authority may be general or confined to specific instances. In the absence of a contrary Board authorization, contracts and instruments may only be executed by the following Officers: President, any Vice President, or the CFO. Unless authorized or ratified by the Board, no other Officer, agent, or employee shall have any power or authority to bind ICANN or to render it liable for any debts or obligations.

Section 21.2. DEPOSITS

All funds of ICANN not otherwise employed shall be deposited from time to time to
the credit of ICANN in such banks, trust companies, or other depositories as the Board, or the President under its delegation, may select.

Section 21.3. CHECKS

All checks, drafts, or other orders for the payment of money, notes, or other evidences of indebtedness issued in the name of ICANN shall be signed by such Officer or Officers, agent or agents, of ICANN and in such a manner as shall from time to time be determined by resolution of the Board.

Section 21.4. LOANS

No loans shall be made by or to ICANN and no evidences of indebtedness shall be issued in its name unless authorized by a resolution of the Board. Such authority may be general or confined to specific instances; provided, however, that no loans shall be made by ICANN to its Directors or Officers.

Section 21.5. NOTICES

All notices to be given to the EC Administration, the Decisional Participants, or the Secretary pursuant to any provision of these Bylaws shall be given either (a) in writing at the address of the appropriate party as set forth below or (b) via electronic mail as provided below, unless that party has given a notice of change of postal or email address, as provided in this Section 21.5. Any change in the contact information for notice below will be given by the party within 30 days of such change. Any notice required by these Bylaws will be deemed to have been properly given (i) if in paper form, when delivered in person or via courier service with confirmation of receipt or (ii) if via electronic mail, upon confirmation of receipt by the recipient's email server, provided that such notice via electronic mail shall be followed by a copy sent by regular postal mail service within three days. In the event other means of notice become practically achievable, such as notice via a secure website, the EC Administration, the Decisional Participants, and ICANN will work together to implement such notice means.

If to ICANN, addressed to:

Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers

12025 Waterfront Drive, Suite 300

Los Angeles, CA 90094-2536

USA
ARTICLE 22 FISCAL AND STRATEGIC MATTERS, INSPECTION AND INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION

Section 22.1. ACCOUNTING
The fiscal year end of ICANN shall be determined by the Board.

Section 22.2. AUDIT
At the end of the fiscal year, the books of ICANN shall be closed and audited by certified public accountants. The appointment of the fiscal auditors shall be the responsibility of the Board.

Section 22.3. ANNUAL REPORT AND ANNUAL STATEMENT
The Board shall publish, at least annually, a report describing its activities, including an audited financial statement, a description of any payments made by ICANN to Directors (including reimbursements of expenses) and a description of ICANN's progress towards the obligations imposed under the Bylaws as revised on 1 October 2016 and the Operating Plan and Strategic Plan. ICANN shall cause the annual report and the annual statement of certain transactions as required by the CCC to be prepared and sent to each member of the Board and to such other persons as the Board may designate, no later than one hundred twenty (120) days after the close of ICANN's fiscal year.

Section 22.4. BUDGETS
(a) ICANN Budget

(i) In furtherance of its Commitment to transparent and accountable budgeting processes, at least forty-five (45) days prior to the commencement of each fiscal year, ICANN staff shall prepare and submit to the Board a proposed annual operating plan and budget of ICANN for the next fiscal year (the "ICANN Budget"), which shall be posted on the
Website. The ICANN Budget shall identify anticipated revenue sources and levels and shall, to the extent practical, identify anticipated material expense items by line item.

(ii) Prior to approval of the ICANN Budget by the Board, ICANN staff shall consult with the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees during the ICANN Budget development process, and comply with the requirements of this Section 22.4(a).

(iii) Prior to approval of the ICANN Budget by the Board, a draft of the ICANN Budget shall be posted on the Website and shall be subject to public comment.

(iv) After reviewing the comments submitted during the public comment period, the Board may direct ICANN staff to post a revised draft of the ICANN Budget and may direct ICANN Staff to conduct one or more additional public comment periods of lengths determined by the Board, in accordance with ICANN's public comment processes.

(v) Promptly after the Board approves an ICANN Budget (an "ICANN Budget Approval"), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the ICANN Budget that is the subject of the ICANN Budget Approval. ICANN shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants. The EC Administration shall promptly commence and comply with the procedures and requirements specified in Article 2 of Annex D.

(vi) An ICANN Budget shall become effective upon the earliest to occur of the following:

(A)(1) A Rejection Action Petition Notice is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D, in which case the ICANN Budget that is the subject of the ICANN Budget Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the 28th day following the Rejection Action Board Notification Date (as defined in Section 2.2(a) of Annex D) relating to such ICANN Budget Approval and the effectiveness of such ICANN Budget shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC's rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D;
(B)(1) A Rejection Action Supported Petition is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D, in which case the ICANN Budget that is the subject of the ICANN Budget Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period relating to such ICANN Budget Approval and the effectiveness of such ICANN Budget shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC's rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D; and

(C)(1) An EC Rejection Notice is not timely delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4(c) of Annex D, in which case the ICANN Budget that is the subject of the ICANN Budget Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period relating to such ICANN Budget Approval and the effectiveness of such ICANN Budget shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC's rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D.

(vii) An ICANN Budget that has been rejected by the EC pursuant to and in compliance with Article 2 of Annex D shall have no force and effect, and shall be void ab initio.

(viii) Following receipt of an EC Rejection Notice relating to an ICANN Budget, ICANN staff and the Board shall consider the explanation provided by the EC Administration as to why the EC has chosen to reject the ICANN Budget in determining the substance of such new ICANN Budget, which shall be subject to the procedures of this Section 22.4(a).

(ix) If an ICANN Budget has not come into full force and effect pursuant to this Section 22.4(a) on or prior to the first date of any fiscal year of ICANN, the Board shall adopt a temporary budget in accordance with Annex E hereto ("Caretaker ICANN Budget"), which Caretaker ICANN Budget shall be effective until such time as an ICANN Budget has been effectively approved by the Board and not rejected by the EC pursuant to this Section 22.4(a).
(i) At least 45 days prior to the commencement of each fiscal year, ICANN shall prepare and submit to the Board a proposed annual operating plan and budget of PTI and the IANA department, which budget shall include itemization of the direct costs for ICANN's IANA department, all costs for PTI, direct costs for shared resources between ICANN and PTI and support functions provided by ICANN to PTI and ICANN's IANA department for the next fiscal year (the "IANA Budget"), which shall be posted on the Website. Separately and in addition to the general ICANN planning process, ICANN shall require PTI to prepare and submit to the PTI Board a proposed annual operating plan and budget for PTI's performance of the IANA functions for the next fiscal year ("PTI Budget"). ICANN shall require PTI to consult with the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, as well as the Registries Stakeholder Group, the IAB and RIRs, during the PTI Budget development process, and shall seek public comment on the draft PTI Budget prior to approval of the PTI Budget by PTI. ICANN shall require PTI to submit the PTI Budget to ICANN as an input prior to and for the purpose of being included in the proposed Operating Plan (as defined in Section 22.5(a)) and ICANN Budget.

(ii) Prior to approval of the IANA Budget by the Board, ICANN staff shall consult with the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, as well as the Registries Stakeholder Group, the IAB and RIRs, during the IANA Budget development process, and comply with the requirements of this Section 22.4(b).

(iii) Prior to approval of the IANA Budget by the Board, a draft of the IANA Budget shall be posted on the Website and shall be subject to public comment.

(iv) After reviewing the comments submitted during the public comment period, the Board may direct ICANN staff to post a revised draft of the IANA Budget and may direct ICANN staff to conduct one or more additional public comment periods of lengths determined by the Board, in accordance with ICANN's public comment processes.

(v) Promptly after the Board approves an IANA Budget (an "IANA Budget Approval"), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the IANA Budget that is the subject of the IANA Budget Approval. ICANN shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants,
on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants. The EC Administration shall promptly commence and comply with the procedures and requirements specified in Article 2 of Annex D.

(vi) An IANA Budget shall become effective upon the earliest to occur of the following:

(A)(1) A Rejection Action Petition Notice is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D, in which case the IANA Budget that is the subject of the IANA Budget Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the 28th day following the Rejection Action Board Notification Date relating to such IANA Budget Approval and the effectiveness of such IANA Budget shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC’s rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D;

(B)(1) A Rejection Action Supported Petition is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D, in which case the IANA Budget that is the subject of the IANA Budget Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period relating to such IANA Budget Approval and the effectiveness of such IANA Budget shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC’s rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D; and

(C)(1) An EC Rejection Notice is not timely delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4(c) of Annex D, in which case the IANA Budget that is the subject of the IANA Budget Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period relating to such IANA Budget Approval and the effectiveness of such IANA Budget shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC’s rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D.
(vii) An IANA Budget that has been rejected by the EC pursuant to and in compliance with Article 2 of Annex D shall have no force and effect, and shall be void ab initio.

(viii) Following receipt of an EC Rejection Notice relating to an IANA Budget, ICANN staff and the Board shall consider the explanation provided by the EC Administration as to why the EC has chosen to reject the IANA Budget in determining the substance of such new IANA Budget, which shall be subject to the procedures of this Section 22.4(b).

(ix) If an IANA Budget has not come into full force and effect pursuant to this Section 22.4(b) on or prior to the first date of any fiscal year of ICANN, the Board shall adopt a temporary budget in accordance with Annex F hereto ("Caretaker IANA Budget"), which Caretaker IANA Budget shall be effective until such time as an IANA Budget has been effectively approved by the Board and not rejected by the EC pursuant to this Section 22.4(b).

(c) If an IANA Budget does not receive an EC Rejection Notice but an ICANN Budget receives an EC Rejection Notice, any subsequent revised ICANN Budget shall not alter the expenditures allocated for the IANA Budget.

(d) If an ICANN Budget does not receive an EC Rejection Notice but an IANA Budget receives an EC Rejection Notice, any subsequent revised IANA Budget shall, once approved, be deemed to automatically modify the ICANN Budget in a manner determined by the Board without any further right of the EC to reject the ICANN Budget.

(e) Under all circumstances, the Board will have the ability to make out-of-budget funding decisions for unforeseen expenses necessary to maintaining ICANN’s Mission or to fulfilling ICANN’s pre-existing legal obligations and protecting ICANN from harm or waste.

(f) To maintain ongoing operational excellence and financial stability of the IANA functions (so long as they are performed by ICANN or pursuant to contract with ICANN) and PTI, ICANN shall be required to plan for and allocate funds to ICANN’s performance of the IANA functions and to PTI, as applicable, that are sufficient to cover future expenses and contingencies to ensure that the performance of those IANA functions and PTI in the future are not interrupted due to lack of funding.

(g) The ICANN Budget and the IANA Budget shall be published on the Website.
Section 22.5. PLANS

(a) Operating Plan

(i) At least 45 days prior to the commencement of each fiscal year, ICANN staff shall prepare and submit to the Board a proposed operating plan of ICANN for the next five fiscal years (the "Operating Plan"), which shall be posted on the Website.

(ii) Prior to approval of the Operating Plan by the Board, ICANN staff shall consult with the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees during the Operating Plan development process, and comply with the requirements of this Section 22.5(a).

(iii) Prior to approval of the Operating Plan by the Board, a draft of the Operating Plan shall be posted on the Website and shall be subject to public comment.

(iv) After reviewing the comments submitted during the public comment period, the Board may direct ICANN staff to post a revised draft of the Operating Plan and may direct ICANN staff to conduct one or more additional public comment periods of lengths determined by the Board, in accordance with ICANN's public comment processes.

(v) Promptly after the Board approves an Operating Plan (an "Operating Plan Approval"), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the Operating Plan that is the subject of the Operating Plan Approval. ICANN shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants. The EC Administration shall promptly commence and comply with the procedures and requirements specified in Article 2 of Annex D.

(vi) An Operating Plan shall become effective upon the earliest to occur of the following:

(A)(1) A Rejection Action Petition Notice is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D, in
which case the Operating Plan that is the subject of the Operating Plan Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the 28th day following the Rejection Action Board Notification Date relating to such Operating Plan Approval and the effectiveness of such Operating Plan shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC's rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D;

(B)(1) A Rejection Action Supported Petition is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D, in which case the Operating Plan that is the subject of the Operating Plan Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period relating to such Operating Plan Approval and the effectiveness of such Operating Plan shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC's rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D; and

(C)(1) An EC Rejection Notice is not timely delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4(c) of Annex D, in which case the Operating Plan that is the subject of the Operating Plan Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period relating to such Operating Plan Approval and the effectiveness of such Operating Plan shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC's rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D.

(vii) An Operating Plan that has been rejected by the EC pursuant to and in compliance with Article 2 of Annex D shall have no force and effect, and shall be void ab initio.

(viii) Following receipt of an EC Rejection Notice relating to an Operating Plan, ICANN staff and the Board shall consider the explanation provided by the EC Administration as to why the EC has chosen to reject the Operating Plan in determining the substance of such new Operating Plan, which shall be subject to the procedures of this Section 22.5(a).

(b) Strategic Plan
(i) At least 45 days prior to the commencement of each five fiscal year period, with the first such period covering fiscal years 2021 through 2025, ICANN staff shall prepare and submit to the Board a proposed strategic plan of ICANN for the next five fiscal years (the "Strategic Plan"), which shall be posted on the Website.

(ii) Prior to approval of the Strategic Plan by the Board, ICANN staff shall consult with the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees during the Strategic Plan development process, and comply with the requirements of this Section 22.5(b).

(iii) Prior to approval of the Strategic Plan by the Board, a draft of the Strategic Plan shall be posted on the Website and shall be subject to public comment.

(iv) After reviewing the comments submitted during the public comment period, the Board may direct ICANN staff to submit a revised draft of the Strategic Plan and may direct ICANN staff to conduct one or more additional public comment periods of lengths determined by the Board, in accordance with ICANN’s public comment processes.

(v) Promptly after the Board approves a Strategic Plan (a "Strategic Plan Approval"), the Secretary shall provide a Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall enclose a copy of the Strategic Plan that is the subject of the Strategic Plan Approval. ICANN shall post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website promptly following the delivery of the Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants. The EC Administration shall promptly commence and comply with the procedures and requirements specified in Article 2 of Annex D.

(vi) A Strategic Plan shall become effective upon the earliest to occur of the following:

(A)(1) A Rejection Action Petition Notice is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D, in which case the Strategic Plan that is the subject of the Strategic Plan Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the 28th day following the
Rejection Action Board Notification Date relating to such Strategic Plan Approval and the effectiveness of such Strategic Plan shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC’s rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D;

(B)(1) A Rejection Action Supported Petition is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D, in which case the Strategic Plan that is the subject of the Strategic Plan Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period relating to such Strategic Plan Approval and the effectiveness of such Strategic Plan shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC’s rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D; and

(C)(1) An EC Rejection Notice is not timely delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D or (2) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4(c) of Annex D, in which case the Strategic Plan that is the subject of the Strategic Plan Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period relating to such Strategic Plan Approval and the effectiveness of such Strategic Plan shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC’s rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D.

(vii) A Strategic Plan that has been rejected by the EC pursuant to and in compliance with Article 2 of Annex D shall have no force and effect, and shall be void ab initio.

(viii) Following receipt of an EC Rejection Notice relating to a Strategic Plan, ICANN staff and the Board shall consider the explanation provided by the EC Administration as to why the EC has chosen to reject the Strategic Plan in determining the substance of such new Strategic Plan, which shall be subject to the procedures of this Section 22.5(b).

Section 22.6. FEES AND CHARGES

The Board may set fees and charges for the services and benefits provided by
ICANN, with the goal of fully recovering the reasonable costs of the operation of ICANN and establishing reasonable reserves for future expenses and contingencies reasonably related to the legitimate activities of ICANN. Such fees and charges shall be fair and equitable, shall be published for public comment prior to adoption, and once adopted shall be published on the Website in a sufficiently detailed manner so as to be readily accessible.

Section 22.7. INSPECTION

(a) A Decisional Participant (the "Inspecting Decisional Participant") may request to inspect the accounting books and records of ICANN, as interpreted pursuant to the provisions of Section 6333 of the CCC, and the minutes of the Board or any Board Committee for a purpose reasonably related to such Inspecting Decisional Participant's interest as a Decisional Participant in the EC. The Inspecting Decisional Participant shall make such a request by providing written notice from the chair of the Inspecting Decisional Participant to the Secretary stating the nature of the documents the Inspecting Decisional Participant seeks to inspect ("Inspection Request"). Any Inspection Request must be limited to the accounting books and records of ICANN relevant to the operation of ICANN as a whole, and shall not extend to the underlying sources of such accounting books or records or to documents only relevant to a small or isolated aspect of ICANN's operations or that relate to the minutiae of ICANN's financial records or details of its management and administration (the "Permitted Scope"). Unless ICANN declines such request (as provided below), ICANN shall make the records requested under an Inspection Request available for inspection by such Inspecting Decisional Participant within 30 days of the date the Inspection Request is received by the Secretary or as soon as reasonably practicable thereafter. All materials and information made available by ICANN for inspection pursuant to an Inspection Request may only be used by the Inspecting Decisional Participant for purposes reasonably related to such Inspecting Decisional Participant's interest as a Decisional Participant in the EC. ICANN shall post all Inspection Requests to the Website.

(b) ICANN may decline an Inspection Request on the basis that such Inspection Request (i) is motivated by a Decisional Participant’s financial, commercial or political interests, or those of one or more of its constituents, (ii) relates to documents that are not reasonably related to the purpose specified in the Inspection Request or the Inspecting Decisional Participant's interest as a Decisional Participant in the EC, (iii) requests identical records provided in a prior request of such Decisional Participant, (iv) is not within the Permitted Scope, (v) relates to personnel records, (vi) relates to documents or communications covered by attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine or other legal privilege or (vii) relates to documents or communications that ICANN may not make available.
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under applicable law because such documents or communications contain confidential information that ICANN is required to protect. If an Inspection Request is overly broad, ICANN may request a revised Inspection Request from the Inspecting Decisional Participant.

(c) Any such inspections shall be conducted at the times and locations reasonably determined by ICANN and shall not be conducted in a manner that unreasonably interferes with ICANN's operations. All such inspections shall be subject to reasonable procedures established by ICANN, including, without limitation, the number of individuals authorized to conduct any such inspection on behalf of the Inspecting Decisional Participant. ICANN may require the inspectors to sign a non-disclosure agreement. The Inspecting Decisional Participant may, at its own cost, copy or otherwise reproduce or make a record of materials inspected. ICANN may redact or determine not to provide requested materials on the same basis that such information is of a category or type described in Section 22.7(b), in which case ICANN will provide the Inspecting Decisional Participant a written rationale for such redactions or determination.

(d) The inspection rights provided to the Decisional Participants pursuant to this Section 22.7 are granted to the Decisional Participants and are not granted or available to any other person or entity. Notwithstanding the foregoing, nothing in this Section 22.7 shall be construed as limiting the accessibility of ICANN's document information disclosure policy ("DIDP").

(e) If the Inspecting Decisional Participant believes that ICANN has violated the provisions of this Section 22.7, the Inspecting Decisional Participant may seek one or more of the following remedies: (i) appeal such matter to the Ombudsman and/or the Board for a ruling on the matter, (ii) initiate the Reconsideration Request process in accordance with Section 4.2, (iii) initiate the Independent Review Process in accordance with Section 4.3, or (iv) petition the EC to initiate (A) a Community IRP pursuant to Section 4.2 of Annex D or (B) a Board Recall Process pursuant to Section 3.3 of Annex D. Any determination by the Ombudsman is not binding on ICANN staff, but may be submitted by the Inspecting Decisional Participant when appealing to the Board for a determination, if necessary.

Section 22.8. INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION

If three or more Decisional Participants deliver to the Secretary a joint written certification from the respective chairs of each such Decisional Participant that the constituents of such Decisional Participants have, pursuant to the internal procedures of such Decisional Participants, determined that there is a credible allegation that ICANN has committed fraud or that there has been a gross mismanagement of ICANN's resources, ICANN shall retain a third-party,
independent firm to investigate such alleged fraudulent activity or gross mismanagement. ICANN shall post all such certifications to the Website. The independent firm shall issue a report to the Board. The Board shall consider the recommendations and findings set forth in such report. Such report shall be posted on the Website, which may be in a redacted form as determined by the Board, in order to preserve attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine or other legal privilege or where such information is confidential, in which case ICANN will provide the Decisional Participants that submitted the certification a written rationale for such redactions.

ARTICLE 23 MEMBERS

ICANN shall not have members, as contemplated by Section 5310 of the CCC, notwithstanding the use of the term "member" in these Bylaws, in any ICANN document, or in any action of the Board or staff. For the avoidance of doubt, the EC is not a member of ICANN.

ARTICLE 24 OFFICES AND SEAL

Section 24.1. OFFICES

The principal office for the transaction of the business of ICANN shall be in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, United States of America. ICANN may also have an additional office or offices within or outside the United States of America as it may from time to time establish.

Section 24.2. SEAL

The Board may adopt a corporate seal and use the same by causing it or a facsimile thereof to be impressed or affixed or reproduced or otherwise.

ARTICLE 25 AMENDMENTS

Section 25.1. AMENDMENTS TO THE STANDARD BYLAWS

(a) Except as otherwise provided in the Articles of Incorporation or these Bylaws, these Bylaws may be altered, amended, or repealed and new Bylaws adopted only upon approval by a two-thirds vote of all Directors and in compliance with the terms of this Section 25.1 (a "Standard Bylaw Amendment").

(b) Prior to approval of a Standard Bylaw Amendment by the Board, a draft of the Standard Bylaw Amendment shall be posted on the Website and shall be subject to public comment in accordance with ICANN's public comment processes.
(c) After reviewing the comments submitted during the public comment period, the Board may direct ICANN staff to post a revised draft of the Standard Bylaw Amendment and may conduct one or more additional public comment periods in accordance with ICANN's public comment processes.

(d) Within seven days after the Board's approval of a Standard Bylaw Amendment ("Standard Bylaw Amendment Approval"), the Secretary shall (i) provide a Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall contain the form of the approved amendment and the Board's rationale for adopting such amendment, and (ii) post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website. The steps contemplated in Article 2 of Annex D shall then be followed.

(e) A Standard Bylaw Amendment shall become effective upon the earliest to occur of the following:

(i) (A) A Rejection Action Petition Notice is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D or (B) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(c) of Annex D, in which case the Standard Bylaw Amendment that is the subject of the Standard Bylaw Amendment Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the 30th day following the Rejection Action Board Notification Date relating to such Standard Bylaw Amendment Approval and the effectiveness of such Standard Bylaw Amendment shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC's rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D;

(ii) (A) A Rejection Action Supported Petition is not timely delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D or (B) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.2(d) of Annex D, in which case the Standard Bylaw Amendment that is the subject of the Standard Bylaw Amendment Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period relating to such Standard Bylaw Amendment and the effectiveness of such Standard Bylaw Amendment shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC's rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D; or
(iii) (A) An EC Rejection Notice is not timely delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D or (B) a Rejection Process Termination Notice is delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and in compliance with Section 2.4(c) of Annex D, in which case the Standard Bylaw Amendment that is the subject of the Standard Bylaw Amendment Approval shall be in full force and effect as of the date immediately following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period relating to such Standard Bylaw Amendment and the effectiveness of such Standard Bylaw Amendment shall not be subject to further challenge by the EC pursuant to the EC's rejection right as described in Article 2 of Annex D.

(f) If an EC Rejection Notice is timely delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary pursuant to and compliance with Section 2.4 of Annex D, the Standard Bylaw Amendment contained in the Board Notice shall be deemed to have been rejected by the EC. A Standard Bylaw Amendment that has been rejected by the EC shall be null and void and shall not become part of these Bylaws, notwithstanding its approval by the Board.

(g) The Secretary shall promptly inform the Board of the receipt and substance of any Rejection Action Petition, Rejection Action Supported Petition or EC Rejection Notice delivered by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant or the EC Administration, as applicable, to the Secretary hereunder.

(h) Following receipt of an EC Rejection Notice pertaining to a Standard Bylaw Amendment, ICANN staff and the Board shall consider the explanation provided by the EC Administration as to why the EC has chosen to reject the Standard Bylaw Amendment in determining whether or not to develop a new Standard Bylaw Amendment and the substance of such new Standard Bylaw Amendment, which shall be subject to the procedures of this Section 25.1.

Section 25.2. AMENDMENTS TO THE FUNDAMENTAL BYLAWS AND ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION

(a) Article 1; Sections 4.2, 4.3 and 4.7; Article 6; Sections 7.1 through 7.5, inclusive, and Sections 7.8, 7.11, 7.12, 7.17, 7.24 and 7.25; those portions of Sections 8.1, 9.2(b), 10.3(i), 11.3(f) and 12.2(d)(x)(A) relating to the provision to the EC of nominations of Directors by the nominating body, Articles 16, 17, 18 and 19, Sections 22.4, 22.5, 22.7 and 22.8, Article 26, Section 27.1; Annexes D, E and F; and this Article 25 are each a "Fundamental Bylaw" and, collectively, are the "Fundamental Bylaws".
(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of these Bylaws, a Fundamental Bylaw or the Articles of Incorporation may be altered, amended, or repealed (a "Fundamental Bylaw Amendment" or an "Articles Amendment"), only upon approval by a three-fourths vote of all Directors and the approval of the EC as set forth in this Section 25.2.

(c) Prior to approval of a Fundamental Bylaw Amendment, or an Articles Amendment by the Board, a draft of the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment, as applicable, shall be posted on the Website and shall be subject to public comment in accordance with ICANN's public comment processes.

(d) After reviewing the comments submitted during the public comment period, the Board may direct ICANN staff to submit a revised draft of the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment, as applicable, and may direct ICANN staff to conduct one or more additional public comment periods in accordance with ICANN's public comment processes.

(e) Within seven days after the Board’s approval of a Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment, as applicable, the Secretary shall (i) provide a Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall contain the form of the approved amendment and (ii) post the Board Notice, along with a copy of the notification(s) sent to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, on the Website. The steps contemplated in Article 1 of Annex D shall then be followed.

(f) If the EC Administration timely delivers an EC Approval Notice (as defined in Section 1.4(b) of Annex D), the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment, as applicable, set forth in the Board Notice shall be deemed approved by the EC, and, as applicable, (i) such Fundamental Bylaw Amendment shall be in full force and effect as part of these Bylaws as of the date immediately following the Secretary's receipt of the EC Approval Notice; or (ii) the Secretary shall cause such Articles Amendment promptly to be certified by the appropriate officers of ICANN and filed with the California Secretary of State. In the event of such approval, neither the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment nor the Articles Amendment shall be subject to any further review or approval of the EC. The Secretary shall promptly inform the Board of the receipt of an EC Approval Notice.

(g) If an EC Approval Notice is not timely delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary, the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment, as applicable, set forth in the Board Notice shall be deemed not approved by the EC, shall be null and void, and, notwithstanding its approval by the Board, the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment shall not be part of these Bylaws and the Articles Amendment shall not be filed with the Secretary of State.
(h) If a Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment, as applicable, is not approved by the EC, ICANN staff and the Board shall consider the concerns raised by the EC in determining whether or not to develop a new Fundamental Bylaws Amendment or Articles Amendment, as applicable, and the substance thereof, which shall be subject to the procedures of this Section 25.2.

Section 25.3. AMENDMENTS RESULTING FROM A POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

The Board shall not combine an amendment of these Bylaws that was the result of a policy development process of a Supporting Organization (a "PDP Amendment") with any other amendment. The Board shall indicate in the applicable Board Notice whether such amendment is a PDP Amendment.

Section 25.4. OTHER AMENDMENTS

For the avoidance of doubt, these Bylaws can only be amended as set forth in this Article 25. Neither the EC, the Decisional Participants, the Supporting Organizations, the Advisory Committees nor any other entity or person shall have the power to directly propose amendments to these Bylaws.

ARTICLE 26 SALE OR OTHER DISPOSITION OF ALL OR SUBSTANTIALLY ALL OF ICANN’S ASSETS

(a) ICANN may consummate a transaction or series of transactions that would result in the sale or disposition of all or substantially all of ICANN’s assets (an "Asset Sale") only upon approval by a three-fourths vote of all Directors and the approval of the EC as set forth in this Article 26.

(b) Prior to approval of an Asset Sale by the Board, a draft of the definitive Asset Sale agreement (an "Asset Sale Agreement"), shall be posted on the Website and shall be subject to public comment in accordance with ICANN’s public comment processes.

(c) After reviewing the comments submitted during the public comment period, the Board may direct ICANN staff to submit a revised draft of the Asset Sale Agreement, as applicable, and may direct ICANN staff to conduct one or more additional public comment periods in accordance with ICANN’s public comment processes.

(d) Within seven days after the Board’s approval of an Asset Sale the Secretary shall (i) provide a Board Notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants, which Board Notice shall contain the form of the Asset Sale
Agreement and (ii) post the Board Notice on the Website. The steps contemplated in Article 1 of Annex D shall then be followed.

(e) If the EC Administration timely delivers an EC Approval Notice for the Asset Sale pursuant to and in compliance with the procedures and requirements of Section 1.4(b) of Annex D, the Asset Sale set forth in the Board Notice shall be deemed approved by the EC, and the Asset Sale may be consummated by ICANN, but only under the terms set forth in the Asset Sale Agreement. In the event of such approval, the Asset Sale shall not be subject to any further review or approval of the EC. The Secretary shall promptly inform the Board of the receipt of an EC Approval Notice.

(f) If an EC Approval Notice is not timely delivered by the EC Administration to the Secretary, the Asset Sale set forth in the Board Notice shall be deemed not approved by the EC, shall be null and void, and, notwithstanding its approval by the Board, ICANN shall not consummate the Asset Sale.

(g) If an Asset Sale is not approved by the EC, ICANN staff and the Board shall consider the concerns raised by the EC in determining whether or not to consider a new Asset Sale, and the substance thereof, which shall be subject to the procedures of this Article 26.

ARTICLE 27 TRANSITION ARTICLE

Section 27.1. WORK STREAM 2

(a) The Cross-Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability ("CCWG-Accountability") was established pursuant to a charter dated 3 November 2014 ("CCWG-Accountability Charter"). The CCWG-Accountability Charter was subsequently adopted by the GNSO, ALAC, ccNSO, GAC, ASO and SSAC ("CCWG Chartering Organizations"). The CCWG-Accountability Charter as in effect on 3 November 2014 shall remain in effect throughout Work Stream 2 (as defined therein).

(b) The CCWG-Accountability recommended in its Supplemental Final Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations to the Board, dated 23 February 2016 ("CCWG-Accountability Final Report") that the below matters be reviewed and developed following the adoption date of these Bylaws ("Work Stream 2 Matters"), in each case, to the extent set forth in the CCWG-Accountability Final Report:

(i) Improvements to ICANN's standards for diversity at all levels;
(ii) ICANN staff accountability;

(iii) Supporting Organization and Advisory Committee accountability, including but not limited to improved processes for accountability, transparency, and participation that are helpful to prevent capture;

(iv) Improvements to ICANN's transparency, focusing on enhancements to ICANN's existing DIDP, transparency of ICANN's interactions with governments, improvements to ICANN's whistleblower policy and transparency of Board deliberations;

(v) Developing and clarifying the FOI-HR (as defined in Section 27.2);

(vi) Addressing jurisdiction-related questions, including how choice of jurisdiction and applicable laws for dispute settlement impact ICANN's accountability;

(vii) Considering enhancements to the Ombudsman's role and function;

(viii) Guidelines for standards of conduct presumed to be in good faith associated with exercising removal of individual Directors; and

(ix) Reviewing the CEP (as set forth in Section 4.3).

(c) As provided in the CCWG-Accountability Charter and the Board's 2014.10.16.16 resolution, the Board shall consider consensus-based recommendations from the CCWG-Accountability on Work Stream 2 Matters ("Work Stream 2 Recommendations") with the same process and criteria it committed to using to consider the CCWG-Accountability recommendations in the CCWG-Accountability Final Report ("Work Stream 1 Recommendations"). For the avoidance of doubt, that process and criteria includes:

(i) All Work Stream 2 Recommendations must further the following principles:

(A) Support and enhance the multistakeholder model;

(B) Maintain the security, stability and resiliency of the DNS;

(C) Meet the needs and expectations of the global customers and partners of the IANA services;
(D) Maintain the openness of the Internet; and

(E) Not result in ICANN becoming a government-led or an inter-governmental organization.

(ii) If the Board determines, by a vote of a two-thirds majority of the Board, that it is not in the global public interest to implement a Work Stream 2 Recommendation, it must initiate a dialogue with the CCWG-Accountability.

(iii) The Board shall provide detailed rationale to accompany the initiation of dialogue. The Board and the CCWG-Accountability shall mutually agree upon the method (e.g., by teleconference, email or otherwise) by which the dialogue will occur. Discussions shall be held in good faith and in a timely and efficient manner in an effort to find a mutually acceptable solution.

(iv) The CCWG-Accountability shall have an opportunity to address the Board's concerns and report back to the Board on further deliberations regarding the Board's concerns. The CCWG-Accountability shall discuss the Board's concerns within 30 days of the Board's initiation of the dialogue.

If a Work Stream 2 Recommendation is modified by the CCWG-Accountability, the CCWG-Accountability shall submit the modified Work Stream 2 Recommendation to the Board for further consideration along with detailed rationale on how the modification addresses the concerns raised by the Board.

(v) If, after the CCWG-Accountability modifies a Work Stream 2 Recommendation, the Board still believes it is not in the global public interest to implement the Work Stream 2 Recommendation, the Board may, by a vote of a two-thirds majority of the Board, send the matter back to the CCWG-Accountability for further consideration. The Board shall provide detailed rationale to accompany its action. If the Board determines not to accept a modified version of a Work Stream 2 Recommendation, unless required by its fiduciary obligations, the Board shall not establish an alternative solution on the issue addressed by the Work Stream 2 Recommendation until such time as the CCWG-Accountability and the Board reach agreement.

(d) ICANN shall provide adequate support for work on Work Stream 2 Matters, within budgeting processes and limitations reasonably acceptable to the CCWG-Accountability.

(e) The Work Stream 2 Matters specifically referenced in Section 27.1(b) shall be
the only matters subject to this Section 27.1 and any other accountability enhancements should be developed through ICANN's other procedures.

(f) The outcomes of each Work Stream 2 Matter are not limited and could include a variety of recommendations or no recommendation; provided, however, that any resulting recommendations must directly relate to the matters discussed in Section 27.1(b).

Section 27.2. HUMAN RIGHTS

(a) The Core Value set forth in Section 1.2(b)(viii) shall have no force or effect unless and until a framework of interpretation for human rights ("FOI-HR") is (i) approved for submission to the Board by the CCWG-Accountability as a consensus recommendation in Work Stream 2, with the CCWG Chartering Organizations having the role described in the CCWG-Accountability Charter, and (ii) approved by the Board, in each case, using the same process and criteria as for Work Stream 1 Recommendations.>

(b) No person or entity shall be entitled to invoke the reconsideration process provided in Section 4.2, or the independent review process provided in Section 4.3, based solely on the inclusion of the Core Value set forth in Section 1.2(b)(viii) (i) until after the FOI-HR contemplated by Section 27.2(a) is in place or (ii) for actions of ICANN or the Board that occurred prior to the effectiveness of the FOI-HR.

Section 27.3. EXISTING GROUPS AND TASK FORCES

Notwithstanding the adoption or effectiveness of these Bylaws, task forces and other groups in existence prior to the date of these Bylaws shall continue unchanged in membership, scope, and operation unless and until changes are made by ICANN in compliance with the Bylaws.

Section 27.4. CONTRACTS WITH ICANN

Notwithstanding the adoption or effectiveness of these Bylaws, all agreements, including employment and consulting agreements, entered into by ICANN shall continue in effect according to their terms.

Annex A: GNSO Policy Development Process

The following process shall govern the GNSO policy development process ("PDP") until such time as modifications are recommended to and approved by the Board. The role of the GNSO is outlined in Article 11 of these Bylaws. If the GNSO is conducting activities that are not intended to result in a Consensus Policy, the
Council may act through other processes.

Section 1. Required Elements of a Policy Development Process

The following elements are required at a minimum to form Consensus Policies as defined within ICANN contracts, and any other policies for which the GNSO Council requests application of this Annex A:

a. Final Issue Report requested by the Board, the GNSO Council ("Council") or Advisory Committee, which should include at a minimum a) the proposed issue raised for consideration, b) the identity of the party submitting the issue, and c) how that party is affected by the issue;

b. Formal initiation of the Policy Development Process by the Council;

c. Formation of a Working Group or other designated work method;

d. Initial Report produced by a Working Group or other designated work method;

e. Final Report produced by a Working Group, or other designated work method, and forwarded to the Council for deliberation;

f. Council approval of PDP Recommendations contained in the Final Report, by the required thresholds;

g. PDP Recommendations and Final Report shall be forwarded to the Board through a Recommendations Report approved by the Council; and

h. Board approval of PDP Recommendations.


The GNSO shall maintain a Policy Development Process Manual ("PDP Manual") within the operating procedures of the GNSO maintained by the GNSO Council. The PDP Manual shall contain specific additional guidance on completion of all elements of a PDP, including those elements that are not otherwise defined in these Bylaws. The PDP Manual and any amendments thereto are subject to a twenty-one (21) day public comment period at minimum, as well as Board oversight and review, as specified at Section 11.3(d).

Section 3. Requesting an Issue Report

Board Request. The Board may request an Issue Report by instructing the GNSO Council ("Council") to begin the process outlined in the PDP Manual. In the event the Board makes a request for an Issue Report, the Board should provide a
mechanism by which the GNSO Council can consult with the Board to provide information on the scope, timing, and priority of the request for an Issue Report.

**Council Request.** The GNSO Council may request an Issue Report by a vote of at least one-fourth (1/4) of the members of the Council of each House or a majority of one House.

**Advisory Committee Request.** An Advisory Committee may raise an issue for policy development by action of such committee to request an Issue Report, and transmission of that request to the Staff Manager and GNSO Council.

**Section 4. Creation of an Issue Report**

Within forty-five (45) calendar days after receipt of either (i) an instruction from the Board; (ii) a properly supported motion from the GNSO Council; or (iii) a properly supported motion from an Advisory Committee, the Staff Manager will create a report (a "Preliminary Issue Report"). In the event the Staff Manager determines that more time is necessary to create the Preliminary Issue Report, the Staff Manager may request an extension of time for completion of the Preliminary Issue Report.

The following elements should be considered in the Issue Report:

- a. The proposed issue raised for consideration;
- b. The identity of the party submitting the request for the Issue Report;
- c. How that party is affected by the issue, if known;
- d. Support for the issue to initiate the PDP, if known;
- e. The opinion of the ICANN General Counsel regarding whether the issue proposed for consideration within the Policy Development Process is properly within the scope of the Mission, policy process and more specifically the role of the GNSO as set forth in the Bylaws.
- f. The opinion of ICANN Staff as to whether the Council should initiate the PDP on the issue.

Upon completion of the Preliminary Issue Report, the Preliminary Issue Report shall be posted on the Website for a public comment period that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN.

The Staff Manager is responsible for drafting a summary and analysis of the public comments received on the Preliminary Issue Report and producing a Final Issue Report based upon the comments received. The Staff Manager should forward the
Final Issue Report, along with any summary and analysis of the public comments received, to the Chair of the GNSO Council for consideration for initiation of a PDP.

Section 5. **Initiation of the PDP**

The Council may initiate the PDP as follows:

**Board Request**: If the Board requested an Issue Report, the Council, within the timeframe set forth in the PDP Manual, shall initiate a PDP. No vote is required for such action.

**GNSO Council or Advisory Committee Requests**: The Council may only initiate the PDP by a vote of the Council. Initiation of a PDP requires a vote as set forth in Section 11.3(i)(ii) and Section 11.3(i)(iii) in favor of initiating the PDP.

Section 6. **Reports**

An Initial Report should be delivered to the GNSO Council and posted for a public comment period that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN, which time may be extended in accordance with the PDP Manual. Following the review of the comments received and, if required, additional deliberations, a Final Report shall be produced for transmission to the Council.

Section 7. **Council Deliberation**

Upon receipt of a Final Report, whether as the result of a working group or otherwise, the Council chair will (i) distribute the Final Report to all Council members; and (ii) call for Council deliberation on the matter in accordance with the PDP Manual.

The Council approval process is set forth in Section 11.3(i)(iv) through Section 11.3(vii), as supplemented by the PDP Manual.

Section 8. **Preparation of the Board Report**

If the PDP recommendations contained in the Final Report are approved by the GNSO Council, a Recommendations Report shall be approved by the GNSO Council for delivery to the Board.

Section 9. **Board Approval Processes**

The Board will meet to discuss the GNSO Council recommendation as soon as feasible, but preferably not later than the second meeting after receipt of the
Board Report from the Staff Manager. Board deliberation on the PDP Recommendations contained within the Recommendations Report shall proceed as follows:

a. Any PDP Recommendations approved by a GNSO Supermajority Vote shall be adopted by the Board unless, by a vote of more than two-thirds (2/3) of the Board, the Board determines that such policy is not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN. If the GNSO Council recommendation was approved by less than a GNSO Supermajority Vote, a majority vote of the Board will be sufficient to determine that such policy is not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN.

b. In the event that the Board determines, in accordance with paragraph a above, that the policy recommended by a GNSO Supermajority Vote or less than a GNSO Supermajority vote is not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN (the Corporation), the Board shall (i) articulate the reasons for its determination in a report to the Council (the "Board Statement"); and (ii) submit the Board Statement to the Council.

c. The Council shall review the Board Statement for discussion with the Board as soon as feasible after the Council's receipt of the Board Statement. The Board shall determine the method (e.g., by teleconference, e-mail, or otherwise) by which the Council and Board will discuss the Board Statement.

d. At the conclusion of the Council and Board discussions, the Council shall meet to affirm or modify its recommendation, and communicate that conclusion (the "Supplemental Recommendation") to the Board, including an explanation for the then-current recommendation. In the event that the Council is able to reach a GNSO Supermajority Vote on the Supplemental Recommendation, the Board shall adopt the recommendation unless more than two-thirds (2/3) of the Board determines that such policy is not in the interests of the ICANN community or ICANN. For any Supplemental Recommendation approved by less than a GNSO Supermajority Vote, a majority vote of the Board shall be sufficient to determine that the policy in the Supplemental Recommendation is not in the best interest of the ICANN community or ICANN.

Section 10. Implementation of Approved Policies

Upon a final decision of the Board adopting the policy, the Board shall, as appropriate, give authorization or direction to ICANN staff to work with the GNSO Council to create an implementation plan based upon the implementation recommendations identified in the Final Report, and to implement the policy. The GNSO Council may, but is not required to, direct the creation of an implementation...
review team to assist in implementation of the policy.

Section 11. Maintenance of Records

Throughout the PDP, from policy suggestion to a final decision by the Board, ICANN will maintain on the Website, a status web page detailing the progress of each PDP issue. Such status page will outline the completed and upcoming steps in the PDP process, and contain links to key resources (e.g. Reports, Comments Fora, WG Discussions, etc.).

Section 12. Additional Definitions

"Comment Site", "Comment Forum", "Comments For a" and "Website" refer to one or more websites designated by ICANN on which notifications and comments regarding the PDP will be posted.

"Supermajority Vote" means a vote of more than sixty-six (66) percent of the members present at a meeting of the applicable body, with the exception of the GNSO Council.

"Staff Manager" means an ICANN staff person(s) who manages the PDP.

"GNSO Supermajority Vote" shall have the meaning set forth in the Bylaws.

Section 13. Applicability

The procedures of this Annex A shall be applicable to all requests for Issue Reports and PDPs initiated after 8 December 2011. For all ongoing PDPs initiated prior to 8 December 2011, the Council shall determine the feasibility of transitioning to the procedures set forth in this Annex A for all remaining steps within the PDP. If the Council determines that any ongoing PDP cannot be feasibly transitioned to these updated procedures, the PDP shall be concluded according to the procedures set forth in Annex A in force on 7 December 2011.

Annex A-1: GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process

The following process shall govern the specific instances where the GNSO Council invokes the GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process ("EPDP"). The GNSO Council may invoke the EPDP in the following limited circumstances: (1) to address a narrowly defined policy issue that was identified and scoped after either the adoption of a GNSO policy recommendation by the Board or the implementation of such an adopted recommendation; or (2) to create new or additional recommendations for a specific policy issue that had been substantially
scoped previously such that extensive, pertinent background information already exists, e.g. (a) in an Issue Report for a possible PDP that was not initiated; (b) as part of a previous PDP that was not completed; or (c) through other projects such as a GGP. The following process shall be in place until such time as modifications are recommended to and approved by the Board. Where a conflict arises in relation to an EPDP between the PDP Manual (see Annex 2 of the GNSO Operating Procedures) and the procedures described in this Annex A-1, the provisions of this Annex A-1 shall prevail.

The role of the GNSO is outlined in Article 11 of these Bylaws. Provided the Council believes and documents via Council vote that the above-listed criteria are met, an EPDP may be initiated to recommend an amendment to an existing Consensus Policy; however, in all cases where the GNSO is conducting policy-making activities that do not meet the above criteria as documented in a Council vote, the Council should act through a Policy Development Process (see Annex A).

Section 1. Required Elements of a GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process

The following elements are required at a minimum to develop expedited GNSO policy recommendations, including recommendations that could result in amendments to an existing Consensus Policy, as part of a GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process:

a. Formal initiation of the GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process by the GNSO Council, including an EPDP scoping document;

b. Formation of an EPDP Team or other designated work method;

c. Initial Report produced by an EPDP Team or other designated work method;

d. Final EPDP Policy Recommendation(s) Report produced by an EPDP Team, or other designated work method, and forwarded to the Council for deliberation;

e. GNSO Council approval of EPDP Policy Recommendations contained in the Final EPDP Policy Recommendation(s) Report, by the required thresholds;

f. EPDP Recommendations and Final EPDP Recommendation(s) Report forwarded to the Board through a Recommendations Report approved by the Council; and

g. Board approval of EPDP Recommendation(s).
Section 2. Expedited Policy Development Process Manual

The GNSO shall include a specific section(s) on the EPDP process as part of its maintenance of the GNSO Policy Development Process Manual (PDP Manual), described in Annex 5 of the GNSO Operating Procedures. The EPDP Manual shall contain specific additional guidance on completion of all elements of an EPDP, including those elements that are not otherwise defined in these Bylaws. The EPDP Manual and any amendments thereto are subject to a twenty-one (21) day public comment period at minimum, as well as Board oversight and review, as specified at Section 11.3(d).

Section 3. Initiation of the EPDP

The Council may initiate an EPDP as follows:

The Council may only initiate the EPDP by a vote of the Council. Initiation of an EPDP requires an affirmative Supermajority vote of the Council (as defined in Section 11.3(i)(xii) of these Bylaws) in favor of initiating the EPDP.

The request to initiate an EPDP must be accompanied by an EPDP scoping document, which is expected to include at a minimum the following information:

1. Name of Council Member / SG / C;
2. Origin of issue (e.g. previously completed PDP);
3. Scope of the effort (detailed description of the issue or question that the EPDP is expected to address);
4. Description of how this issue meets the criteria for an EPDP, i.e. how the EPDP will address either: (1) a narrowly defined policy issue that was identified and scoped after either the adoption of a GNSO policy recommendation by the Board or the implementation of such an adopted recommendation, or (2) new or additional policy recommendations on a specific GNSO policy issue that had been scoped previously as part of a PDP that was not completed or other similar effort, including relevant supporting information in either case;
5. If not provided as part of item 4, the opinion of the ICANN General Counsel as to whether the issue proposed for consideration is properly within the scope of the Mission, policy process and more specifically the role of the GNSO;
6. Proposed EPDP mechanism (e.g. WG, DT, individual volunteers);
7. Method of operation, if different from GNSO Working Group Guidelines;

8. Decision-making methodology for EPDP mechanism, if different from GNSO Working Group Guidelines;

9. Target completion date.

Section 4. Council Deliberation

Upon receipt of an EPDP Final Recommendation(s) Report, whether as the result of an EPDP Team or otherwise, the Council chair will (i) distribute the Final EPDP Recommendation(s) Report to all Council members; and (ii) call for Council deliberation on the matter in accordance with the PDP Manual.

Approval of EPDP Recommendation(s) requires an affirmative vote of the Council meeting the thresholds set forth in Section 11.3(i)(xiv) and (xv), as supplemented by the PDP Manual.

Section 5. Preparation of the Board Report

If the EPDP Recommendation(s) contained in the Final EPDP Recommendation(s) Report are approved by the GNSO Council, a Recommendation(s) Report shall be approved by the GNSO Council for delivery to the Board.

Section 6. Board Approval Processes

The Board will meet to discuss the EPDP recommendation(s) as soon as feasible, but preferably not later than the second meeting after receipt of the Recommendations Report from the Staff Manager. Board deliberation on the EPDP Recommendations contained within the Recommendations Report shall proceed as follows:

a. Any EPDP Recommendations approved by a GNSO Supermajority Vote shall be adopted by the Board unless, by a vote of more than two-thirds (2/3) of the Board, the Board determines that such policy is not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN. If the GNSO Council recommendation was approved by less than a GNSO Supermajority Vote, a majority vote of the Board will be sufficient to determine that such policy is not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN.

b. In the event that the Board determines, in accordance with paragraph a above, that the proposed EPDP Recommendations are not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN (the Corporation), the Board shall (i) articulate the reasons for its determination in a report to the Council.
(the "Board Statement"); and (ii) submit the Board Statement to the Council.

c. The Council shall review the Board Statement for discussion with the Board as soon as feasible after the Council's receipt of the Board Statement. The Board shall determine the method (e.g., by teleconference, e-mail, or otherwise) by which the Council and Board will discuss the Board Statement.

At the conclusion of the Council and Board discussions, the Council shall meet to affirm or modify its recommendation, and communicate that conclusion (the "Supplemental Recommendation") to the Board, including an explanation for the then-current recommendation. In the event that the Council is able to reach a GNSO Supermajority Vote on the Supplemental Recommendation, the Board shall adopt the recommendation unless more than two-thirds (2/3) of the Board determines that such guidance is not in the interests of the ICANN community or ICANN. For any Supplemental Recommendation approved by less than a GNSO Supermajority Vote, a majority vote of the Board shall be sufficient to determine that the guidance in the Supplemental Recommendation is not in the best interest of the ICANN community or ICANN.

Section 7. Implementation of Approved Policies

Upon a final decision of the Board adopting the EPDP recommendations, the Board shall, as appropriate, give authorization or direction to ICANN staff to implement the EPDP Recommendations. If deemed necessary, the Board shall direct ICANN staff to work with the GNSO Council to create a guidance implementation plan, based upon the guidance recommendations identified in the Final EPDP Recommendation(s) Report.

Section 8. Maintenance of Records

Throughout the EPDP, from initiation to a final decision by the Board, ICANN will maintain on the Website, a status web page detailing the progress of each EPDP issue. Such status page will outline the completed and upcoming steps in the EPDP process, and contain links to key resources (e.g. Reports, Comments Fora, EPDP Discussions, etc.).

Section 9. Applicability

The procedures of this Annex A-1 shall be applicable from 28 September 2015 onwards.
Annex A-2: GNSO Guidance Process

The following process shall govern the GNSO guidance process ("GGP") until such time as modifications are recommended to and approved by the Board. The role of the GNSO is outlined in Article 11 of these Bylaws. If the GNSO is conducting activities that are intended to result in a Consensus Policy, the Council should act through a Policy Development Process (see Annex A).

Section 1. Required Elements of a GNSO Guidance Process

The following elements are required at a minimum to develop GNSO guidance:

1. Formal initiation of the GNSO Guidance Process by the Council, including a GGP scoping document;
2. Identification of the types of expertise needed on the GGP Team;
3. Recruiting and formation of a GGP Team or other designated work method;
4. Proposed GNSO Guidance Recommendation(s) Report produced by a GGP Team or other designated work method;
5. Final GNSO Guidance Recommendation(s) Report produced by a GGP Team, or other designated work method, and forwarded to the Council for deliberation;
6. Council approval of GGP Recommendations contained in the Final Recommendation(s) Report, by the required thresholds;
7. GGP Recommendations and Final Recommendation(s) Report shall be forwarded to the Board through a Recommendations Report approved by the Council; and
8. Board approval of GGP Recommendation(s).

Section 2. GNSO Guidance Process Manual

The GNSO shall maintain a GNSO Guidance Process (GGP Manual) within the operating procedures of the GNSO maintained by the GNSO Council. The GGP Manual shall contain specific additional guidance on completion of all elements of a GGP, including those elements that are not otherwise defined in these Bylaws. The GGP Manual and any amendments thereto are subject to a twenty-one (21) day public comment period at minimum, as well as Board oversight and review, as specified at Section 11.3(d).

Section 3. Initiation of the GGP
The Council may initiate a GGP as follows:

The Council may only initiate the GGP by a vote of the Council or at the formal request of the ICANN Board. Initiation of a GGP requires a vote as set forth in Section 11.3(i)(xvi) in favor of initiating the GGP. In the case of a GGP requested by the Board, a GGP will automatically be initiated unless the GNSO Council votes against the initiation of a GGP as set forth in Section 11.3(i)(xvii).

The request to initiate a GGP must be accompanied by a GGP scoping document, which is expected to include at a minimum the following information:

1. Name of Council Member / SG / C
2. Origin of issue (e.g., board request)
3. Scope of the effort (detailed description of the issue or question that the GGP is expected to address)
4. Proposed GGP mechanism (e.g. WG, DT, individual volunteers)
5. Method of operation, if different from GNSO Working Group Guidelines
6. Decision-making methodology for GGP mechanism, if different from GNSO Working Group Guidelines
7. Desired completion date and rationale

In the event the Board makes a request for a GGP, the Board should provide a mechanism by which the GNSO Council can consult with the Board to provide information on the scope, timing, and priority of the request for a GGP.

Section 4. Council Deliberation

Upon receipt of a Final Recommendation(s) Report, whether as the result of a GGP Team or otherwise, the Council chair will (i) distribute the Final Recommendation(s) Report to all Council members; and (ii) call for Council deliberation on the matter in accordance with the GGP Manual.

The Council approval process is set forth in Section 11.3(xviii) as supplemented by the GGP Manual.

Section 5. Preparation of the Board Report

If the GGP recommendations contained in the Final Recommendation(s) Report are approved by the GNSO Council, a Recommendations Report shall be approved by the GNSO Council for delivery to the Board.
Section 6. **Board Approval Processes**

The Board will meet to discuss the GNSO Guidance recommendation(s) as soon as feasible, but preferably not later than the second meeting after receipt of the Board Report from the Staff Manager. Board deliberation on the GGP Recommendations contained within the Recommendations Report shall proceed as follows:

a. Any GGP Recommendations approved by a GNSO Supermajority Vote shall be adopted by the Board unless, by a vote of more than two-thirds (2/3) of the Board, the Board determines that such guidance is not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN.

b. In the event that the Board determines, in accordance with paragraph a above, that the proposed GNSO Guidance recommendation(s) adopted by a GNSO Supermajority Vote is not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN (the Corporation), the Board shall (i) articulate the reasons for its determination in a report to the Council (the "Board Statement"); and (ii) submit the Board Statement to the Council.

c. The Council shall review the Board Statement for discussion with the Board as soon as feasible after the Council's receipt of the Board Statement. The Board shall determine the method (e.g., by teleconference, e-mail, or otherwise) by which the Council and Board will discuss the Board Statement.

d. At the conclusion of the Council and Board discussions, the Council shall meet to affirm or modify its recommendation, and communicate that conclusion (the "Supplemental Recommendation") to the Board, including an explanation for the then-current recommendation. In the event that the Council is able to reach a GNSO Supermajority Vote on the Supplemental Recommendation, the Board shall adopt the recommendation unless more than two-thirds (2/3) of the Board determines that such guidance is not in the interests of the ICANN community or ICANN.

Section 7. **Implementation of Approved GNSO Guidance**

Upon a final decision of the Board adopting the guidance, the Board shall, as appropriate, give authorization or direction to ICANN staff to implement the GNSO Guidance. If deemed necessary, the Board may direct ICANN Staff to work with the GNSO Council to create a guidance implementation plan, if deemed necessary, based upon the guidance recommendations identified in the Final Recommendation(s) Report.
Section 8. Maintenance of Records

Throughout the GGP, from initiation to a final decision by the Board, ICANN will maintain on the Website, a status web page detailing the progress of each GGP issue. Such status page will outline the completed and upcoming steps in the GGP process, and contain links to key resources (e.g. Reports, Comments Fora, GGP Discussions, etc.).

Section 9. Additional Definitions

"Comment Site", "Comment Forum", "Comments Fora" and "Website" refer to one or more websites designated by ICANN on which notifications and comments regarding the GGP will be posted.

"GGP Staff Manager" means an ICANN staff person(s) who manages the GGP.

Annex B: ccNSO Policy-Development Process (ccPDP)

The following process shall govern the ccNSO policy-development process ("PDP").

1. Request for an Issue Report

An Issue Report may be requested by any of the following:

a. Council. The ccNSO Council (in this Annex B, the "Council") may call for the creation of an Issue Report by an affirmative vote of at least seven of the members of the Council present at any meeting or voting by e-mail.

b. Board. The Board may call for the creation of an Issue Report by requesting the Council to begin the policy-development process.

c. Regional Organization. One or more of the Regional Organizations representing ccTLDs in the ICANN recognized Regions may call for creation of an Issue Report by requesting the Council to begin the policy-development process.

d. ICANN Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee. An ICANN Supporting Organization or an ICANN Advisory Committee may call for creation of an Issue Report by requesting the Council to begin the policy-development process.

e. Members of the ccNSO. The members of the ccNSO may call for the creation of an Issue Report by an affirmative vote of at least ten members of the ccNSO present at any meeting or voting by e-mail.
Any request for an Issue Report must be in writing and must set out the issue upon which an Issue Report is requested in sufficient detail to enable the Issue Report to be prepared. It shall be open to the Council to request further information or undertake further research or investigation for the purpose of determining whether or not the requested Issue Report should be created.

2. Creation of the Issue Report and Initiation Threshold

Within seven days after an affirmative vote as outlined in Item 1(a) above or the receipt of a request as outlined in Items 1(b), (c), or (d) above the Council shall appoint an Issue Manager. The Issue Manager may be a staff member of ICANN (in which case the costs of the Issue Manager shall be borne by ICANN) or such other person or persons selected by the Council (in which case the ccNSO shall be responsible for the costs of the Issue Manager).

Within fifteen (15) calendar days after appointment (or such other time as the Council shall, in consultation with the Issue Manager, deem to be appropriate), the Issue Manager shall create an Issue Report. Each Issue Report shall contain at least the following:

a. The proposed issue raised for consideration;

b. The identity of the party submitting the issue;

c. How that party is affected by the issue;

d. Support for the issue to initiate the PDP;

e. A recommendation from the Issue Manager as to whether the Council should move to initiate the PDP for this issue (the "Manager Recommendation"). Each Manager Recommendation shall include, and be supported by, an opinion of the ICANN General Counsel regarding whether the issue is properly within the scope of the ICANN policy process and within the scope of the ccNSO. In coming to his or her opinion, the General Counsel shall examine whether:
   1) The issue is within the scope of the Mission;
   2) Analysis of the relevant factors according to Section 10.6(b) and Annex Q affirmatively demonstrates that the issue is within the scope of the ccNSO;

In the event that the General Counsel reaches an opinion in the affirmative with respect to points 1 and 2 above then the General Counsel shall also consider whether the issue:
3) Implicates or affects an existing ICANN policy;

4) Is likely to have lasting value or applicability, albeit with the need for occasional updates, and to establish a guide or framework for future decision-making.

In all events, consideration of revisions to the ccPDP (this Annex B) or to the scope of the ccNSO (Annex C) shall be within the scope of ICANN and the ccNSO.

In the event that General Counsel is of the opinion the issue is not properly within the scope of the ccNSO Scope, the Issue Manager shall inform the Council of this opinion. If after an analysis of the relevant factors according to Section 10.6 and Annex C a majority of 10 or more Council members is of the opinion the issue is within scope the Chair of the ccNSO shall inform the Issue Manager accordingly. General Counsel and the ccNSO Council shall engage in a dialogue according to agreed rules and procedures to resolve the matter. In the event no agreement is reached between General Counsel and the Council as to whether the issue is within or outside Scope of the ccNSO then by a vote of 15 or more members the Council may decide the issue is within scope. The Chair of the ccNSO shall inform General Counsel and the Issue Manager accordingly. The Issue Manager shall then proceed with a recommendation whether or not the Council should move to initiate the PDP including both the opinion and analysis of General Counsel and Council in the Issues Report.

f. In the event that the Manager Recommendation is in favor of initiating the PDP, a proposed time line for conducting each of the stages of PDP outlined herein ("PDP Time Line").

g. If possible, the issue report shall indicate whether the resulting output is likely to result in a policy to be approved by the Board. In some circumstances, it will not be possible to do this until substantive discussions on the issue have taken place. In these cases, the issue report should indicate this uncertainty. Upon completion of the Issue Report, the Issue Manager shall distribute it to the full Council for a vote on whether to initiate the PDP.

3. Initiation of PDP

The Council shall decide whether to initiate the PDP as follows:

a. Within 21 days after receipt of an Issue Report from the Issue Manager, the Council shall vote on whether to initiate the PDP. Such vote should be
taken at a meeting held in any manner deemed appropriate by the Council, including in person or by conference call, but if a meeting is not feasible the vote may occur by e-mail.

b. A vote of ten or more Council members in favor of initiating the PDP shall be required to initiate the PDP provided that the Issue Report states that the issue is properly within the scope of the Mission and the ccNSO Scope.

4. Decision Whether to Appoint Task Force; Establishment of Time Line

At the meeting of the Council where the PDP has been initiated (or, where the Council employs a vote by e-mail, in that vote) pursuant to Item 3 above, the Council shall decide, by a majority vote of members present at the meeting (or voting by e-mail), whether or not to appoint a task force to address the issue. If the Council votes:

a. In favor of convening a task force, it shall do so in accordance with Item 7 below.

b. Against convening a task force, then it shall collect information on the policy issue in accordance with Item 8 below.

The Council shall also, by a majority vote of members present at the meeting or voting by e-mail, approve or amend and approve the PDP Time Line set out in the Issue Report.

5. Composition and Selection of Task Forces

a. Upon voting to appoint a task force, the Council shall invite each of the Regional Organizations (see Section 10.5) to appoint two individuals to participate in the task force (the "Representatives"). Additionally, the Council may appoint up to three advisors (the "Advisors") from outside the ccNSO and, following formal request for GAC participation in the Task Force, accept up to two Representatives from the Governmental Advisory Committee to sit on the task force. The Council may increase the number of Representatives that may sit on a task force in its discretion in circumstances that it deems necessary or appropriate.

b. Any Regional Organization wishing to appoint Representatives to the task force must provide the names of the Representatives to the Issue Manager within ten (10) calendar days after such request so that they are included on the task force. Such Representatives need not be members of the Council, but each must be an individual who has an interest, and ideally knowledge and expertise, in the subject matter, coupled with the ability to devote a substantial amount of time to the task force’s activities.
c. The Council may also pursue other actions that it deems appropriate to assist in the PDP, including appointing a particular individual or organization to gather information on the issue or scheduling meetings for deliberation or briefing. All such information shall be submitted to the Issue Manager in accordance with the PDP Time Line.

6. Public Notification of Initiation of the PDP and Comment Period

After initiation of the PDP, ICANN shall post a notification of such action to the Website and to the other ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees. A comment period (in accordance with the PDP Time Line, and ordinarily at least 21 days long) shall be commenced for the issue. Comments shall be accepted from ccTLD managers, other Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees, and from the public. The Issue Manager, or some other designated Council representative shall review the comments and incorporate them into a report (the "Comment Report") to be included in either the Preliminary Task Force Report or the Initial Report, as applicable.

7. Task Forces

a. Role of Task Force. If a task force is created, its role shall be responsible for (i) gathering information documenting the positions of the ccNSO members within the Geographic Regions and other parties and groups; and (ii) otherwise obtaining relevant information that shall enable the Task Force Report to be as complete and informative as possible to facilitate the Council’s meaningful and informed deliberation.

The task force shall not have any formal decision-making authority. Rather, the role of the task force shall be to gather information that shall document the positions of various parties or groups as specifically and comprehensively as possible, thereby enabling the Council to have a meaningful and informed deliberation on the issue.

b. Task Force Charter or Terms of Reference. The Council, with the assistance of the Issue Manager, shall develop a charter or terms of reference for the task force (the "Charter") within the time designated in the PDP Time Line. Such Charter shall include:

1. The issue to be addressed by the task force, as such issue was articulated for the vote before the Council that initiated the PDP;

2. The specific time line that the task force must adhere to, as set forth below, unless the Council determines that there is a compelling reason to extend the timeline; and
3. Any specific instructions from the Council for the task force, including whether or not the task force should solicit the advice of outside advisors on the issue.

The task force shall prepare its report and otherwise conduct its activities in accordance with the Charter. Any request to deviate from the Charter must be formally presented to the Council and may only be undertaken by the task force upon a vote of a majority of the Council members present at a meeting or voting by e-mail. The quorum requirements of Section 10.3(n) shall apply to Council actions under this Item 7(b).

c. Appointment of Task Force Chair. The Issue Manager shall convene the first meeting of the task force within the time designated in the PDP Time Line. At the initial meeting, the task force members shall, among other things, vote to appoint a task force chair. The chair shall be responsible for organizing the activities of the task force, including compiling the Task Force Report. The chair of a task force need not be a member of the Council.

d. Collection of Information.

1. Regional Organization Statements. The Representatives shall each be responsible for soliciting the position of the Regional Organization for their Geographic Region, at a minimum, and may solicit other comments, as each Representative deems appropriate, including the comments of the ccNSO members in that region that are not members of the Regional Organization, regarding the issue under consideration. The position of the Regional Organization and any other comments gathered by the Representatives should be submitted in a formal statement to the task force chair (each, a "Regional Statement") within the time designated in the PDP Time Line. Every Regional Statement shall include at least the following:

   (i) If a Supermajority Vote (as defined by the Regional Organization) was reached, a clear statement of the Regional Organization's position on the issue;

   (ii) If a Supermajority Vote was not reached, a clear statement of all positions espoused by the members of the Regional Organization;

   (iii) A clear statement of how the Regional Organization arrived at its position(s). Specifically, the statement should detail specific meetings, teleconferences, or other means of deliberating an issue, and a list of all members who participated or otherwise submitted their views;

   (iv) A statement of the position on the issue of any ccNSO members that are not
members of the Regional Organization;

(v) An analysis of how the issue would affect the Region, including any financial impact on the Region; and

(vi) An analysis of the period of time that would likely be necessary to implement the policy.

2. Outside Advisors. The task force may, in its discretion, solicit the opinions of outside advisors, experts, or other members of the public. Such opinions should be set forth in a report prepared by such outside advisors, and (i) clearly labeled as coming from outside advisors; (ii) accompanied by a detailed statement of the advisors’ (a) qualifications and relevant experience and (b) potential conflicts of interest. These reports should be submitted in a formal statement to the task force chair within the time designated in the PDP Time Line.

e. Task Force Report. The chair of the task force, working with the Issue Manager, shall compile the Regional Statements, the Comment Report, and other information or reports, as applicable, into a single document ("Preliminary Task Force Report") and distribute the Preliminary Task Force Report to the full task force within the time designated in the PDP Time Line. The task force shall have a final task force meeting to consider the issues and try and reach a Supermajority Vote. After the final task force meeting, the chair of the task force and the Issue Manager shall create the final task force report (the "Task Force Report") and post it on the Website and to the other ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees. Each Task Force Report must include:

1. A clear statement of any Supermajority Vote (being 66% of the task force) position of the task force on the issue;

2. If a Supermajority Vote was not reached, a clear statement of all positions espoused by task force members submitted within the time line for submission of constituency reports. Each statement should clearly indicate (i) the reasons underlying the position and (ii) the Regional Organizations that held the position;

3. An analysis of how the issue would affect each Region, including any financial impact on the Region;

4. An analysis of the period of time that would likely be necessary to implement the policy; and

5. The advice of any outside advisors appointed to the task force by the Council, accompanied by a detailed statement of the advisors’ (i) qualifications and relevant experience and (ii) potential conflicts of interest.
8. Procedure if No Task Force is Formed

a. If the Council decides not to convene a task force, each Regional Organization shall, within the time designated in the PDP Time Line, appoint a representative to solicit the Region’s views on the issue. Each such representative shall be asked to submit a Regional Statement to the Issue Manager within the time designated in the PDP Time Line.

b. The Council may, in its discretion, take other steps to assist in the PDP, including, for example, appointing a particular individual or organization, to gather information on the issue or scheduling meetings for deliberation or briefing. All such information shall be submitted to the Issue Manager within the time designated in the PDP Time Line.

c. The Council shall formally request the Chair of the GAC to offer opinion or advice.

d. The Issue Manager shall take all Regional Statements, the Comment Report, and other information and compile (and post on the Website) an Initial Report within the time designated in the PDP Time Line. Thereafter, the Issue Manager shall, in accordance with Item 9 below, create a Final Report.

9. Comments to the Task Force Report or Initial Report

a. A comment period (in accordance with the PDP Time Line, and ordinarily at least 21 days long) shall be opened for comments on the Task Force Report or Initial Report. Comments shall be accepted from ccTLD managers, other Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees, and from the public. All comments shall include the author’s name, relevant experience, and interest in the issue.

b. At the end of the comment period, the Issue Manager shall review the comments received and may, in the Issue Manager’s reasonable discretion, add appropriate comments to the Task Force Report or Initial Report, to prepare the "Final Report". The Issue Manager shall not be obligated to include all comments made during the comment period, nor shall the Issue Manager be obligated to include all comments submitted by any one individual or organization.

c. The Issue Manager shall prepare the Final Report and submit it to the Council chair within the time designated in the PDP Time Line.

10. Council Deliberation
a. Upon receipt of a Final Report, whether as the result of a task force or otherwise, the Council chair shall (i) distribute the Final Report to all Council members; (ii) call for a Council meeting within the time designated in the PDP Time Line wherein the Council shall work towards achieving a recommendation to present to the Board; and (iii) formally send to the GAC Chair an invitation to the GAC to offer opinion or advice. Such meeting may be held in any manner deemed appropriate by the Council, including in person or by conference call. The Issue Manager shall be present at the meeting.

b. The Council may commence its deliberation on the issue prior to the formal meeting, including via in-person meetings, conference calls, e-mail discussions, or any other means the Council may choose.

c. The Council may, if it so chooses, solicit the opinions of outside advisors at its final meeting. The opinions of these advisors, if relied upon by the Council, shall be (i) embodied in the Council's report to the Board, (ii) specifically identified as coming from an outside advisor; and (iii) accompanied by a detailed statement of the advisor's (a) qualifications and relevant experience and (b) potential conflicts of interest.

11. Recommendation of the Council

In considering whether to make a recommendation on the issue (a "Council Recommendation"), the Council shall seek to act by consensus. If a minority opposes a consensus position, that minority shall prepare and circulate to the Council a statement explaining its reasons for opposition. If the Council's discussion of the statement does not result in consensus, then a recommendation supported by 14 or more of the Council members shall be deemed to reflect the view of the Council, and shall be conveyed to the Members as the Council's Recommendation. Notwithstanding the foregoing, as outlined below, all viewpoints expressed by Council members during the PDP must be included in the Members Report.

12. Council Report to the Members

In the event that a Council Recommendation is adopted pursuant to Item 11 then the Issue Manager shall, within seven days after the Council meeting, incorporate the Council's Recommendation together with any other viewpoints of the Council members into a Members Report to be approved by the Council and then to be submitted to the Members (the "Members Report"). The Members Report must contain at least the following:

a. A clear statement of the Council's recommendation;
b. The Final Report submitted to the Council; and

c. A copy of the minutes of the Council’s deliberation on the policy issue (see Item 10), including all the opinions expressed during such deliberation, accompanied by a description of who expressed such opinions.

13. Members Vote

Following the submission of the Members Report and within the time designated by the PDP Time Line, the ccNSO members shall be given an opportunity to vote on the Council Recommendation. The vote of members shall be electronic and members' votes shall be lodged over such a period of time as designated in the PDP Time Line (at least 21 days long).

In the event that at least 50% of the ccNSO members lodge votes within the voting period, the resulting vote will be employed without further process. In the event that fewer than 50% of the ccNSO members lodge votes in the first round of voting, the first round will not be employed and the results of a final, second round of voting, conducted after at least thirty days notice to the ccNSO members, will be employed if at least 50% of the ccNSO members lodge votes. In the event that more than 66% of the votes received at the end of the voting period shall be in favor of the Council Recommendation, then the recommendation shall be conveyed to the Board in accordance with Item 14 below as the ccNSO Recommendation.

14. Board Report

The Issue Manager shall within seven days after a ccNSO Recommendation being made in accordance with Item 13 incorporate the ccNSO Recommendation into a report to be approved by the Council and then to be submitted to the Board (the "Board Report"). The Board Report must contain at least the following:

a. A clear statement of the ccNSO recommendation;

b. The Final Report submitted to the Council; and

c. the Members’ Report.

15. Board Vote

a. The Board shall meet to discuss the ccNSO Recommendation as soon as feasible after receipt of the Board Report from the Issue Manager, taking into account procedures for Board consideration.

b. The Board shall adopt the ccNSO Recommendation unless by a vote of more
than 66% the Board determines that such policy is not in the best interest of the ICANN community or of ICANN.

1. In the event that the Board determines not to act in accordance with the ccNSO Recommendation, the Board shall (i) state its reasons for its determination not to act in accordance with the ccNSO Recommendation in a report to the Council (the "Board Statement"); and (ii) submit the Board Statement to the Council.

2. The Council shall discuss the Board Statement with the Board within thirty days after the Board Statement is submitted to the Council. The Board shall determine the method (e.g., by teleconference, e-mail, or otherwise) by which the Council and Board shall discuss the Board Statement. The discussions shall be held in good faith and in a timely and efficient manner, to find a mutually acceptable solution.

3. At the conclusion of the Council and Board discussions, the Council shall meet to affirm or modify its Council Recommendation. A recommendation supported by 14 or more of the Council members shall be deemed to reflect the view of the Council (the Council's "Supplemental Recommendation"). That Supplemental Recommendation shall be conveyed to the Members in a Supplemental Members Report, including an explanation for the Supplemental Recommendation. Members shall be given an opportunity to vote on the Supplemental Recommendation under the same conditions outlined in Item 13. In the event that more than 66% of the votes cast by ccNSO Members during the voting period are in favor of the Supplemental Recommendation then that recommendation shall be conveyed to Board as the ccNSO Supplemental Recommendation and the Board shall adopt the recommendation unless by a vote of more than 66% of the Board determines that acceptance of such policy would constitute a breach of the fiduciary duties of the Board to the Company.

4. In the event that the Board does not accept the ccNSO Supplemental Recommendation, it shall state its reasons for doing so in its final decision ("Supplemental Board Statement").

5. In the event the Board determines not to accept a ccNSO Supplemental Recommendation, then the Board shall not be entitled to set policy on the issue addressed by the recommendation and the status quo shall be preserved until such time as the ccNSO shall, under the ccPDP, make a recommendation on the issue that is deemed acceptable by the Board.

16. Implementation of the Policy

Upon adoption by the Board of a ccNSO Recommendation or ccNSO
Supplemental Recommendation, the Board shall, as appropriate, direct or authorize ICANN staff to implement the policy.

17. Maintenance of Records

With respect to each ccPDP for which an Issue Report is requested (see Item 1), ICANN shall maintain on the Website a status web page detailing the progress of each ccPDP, which shall provide a list of relevant dates for the ccPDP and shall also link to the following documents, to the extent they have been prepared pursuant to the ccPDP:

a. Issue Report;

b. PDP Time Line;

c. Comment Report;

d. Regional Statement(s);

e. Preliminary Task Force Report;

f. Task Force Report;

g. Initial Report;

h. Final Report;

i. Members' Report;

j. Board Report;

k. Board Statement;

l. Supplemental Members' Report; and

m. Supplemental Board Statement.

In addition, ICANN shall post on the Website comments received in electronic written form specifically suggesting that a ccPDP be initiated.

Annex C: The Scope of the ccNSO

This annex describes the scope and the principles and method of analysis to be used in any further development of the scope of the ccNSO’s policy-development role. As provided in Section 10.6(b) of the Bylaws, that scope shall be defined according to the procedures of the ccPDP.

The scope of the ccNSO’s authority and responsibilities must recognize the
complex relation between ICANN and ccTLD managers/registries with regard to policy issues. This annex shall assist the ccNSO, the ccNSO Council, and the Board and staff in delineating relevant global policy issues.

Policy areas

The ccNSO’s policy role should be based on an analysis of the following functional model of the DNS:

1. Data is registered/maintained to generate a zone file,
2. A zone file is in turn used in TLD name servers.

Within a TLD two functions have to be performed (these are addressed in greater detail below):

1. Entering data into a database ("Data Entry Function") and
2. Maintaining and ensuring upkeep of name-servers for the TLD ("Name Server Function").

These two core functions must be performed at the ccTLD registry level as well as at a higher level (IANA function and root servers) and at lower levels of the DNS hierarchy. This mechanism, as RFC 1591 points out, is recursive:

There are no requirements on sub domains of top-level domains beyond the requirements on higher-level domains themselves. That is, the requirements in this memo are applied recursively. In particular, all sub domains shall be allowed to operate their own domain name servers, providing in them whatever information the sub domain manager sees fit (as long as it is true and correct).

The Core Functions

1. Data Entry Function (DEF):

Looking at a more detailed level, the first function (entering and maintaining data in a database) should be fully defined by a naming policy. This naming policy must specify the rules and conditions:

a. under which data will be collected and entered into a database or data changed (at the TLD level among others, data to reflect a transfer from registrant to registrant or changing registrar) in the database.

b. for making certain data generally and publicly available (be it, for example, through Whois or nameservers).
2. The Name-Server Function (NSF)

The name-server function involves essential interoperability and stability issues at the heart of the domain name system. The importance of this function extends to nameservers at the ccTLD level, but also to the root servers (and root-server system) and nameservers at lower levels.

On its own merit and because of interoperability and stability considerations, properly functioning nameservers are of utmost importance to the individual, as well as to the local and the global Internet communities.

With regard to the nameserver function, therefore, policies need to be defined and established. Most parties involved, including the majority of ccTLD registries, have accepted the need for common policies in this area by adhering to the relevant RFCs, among others RFC 1591.

Respective Roles with Regard to Policy, Responsibilities, and Accountabilities

It is in the interest of ICANN and ccTLD managers to ensure the stable and proper functioning of the domain name system. ICANN and the ccTLD registries each have a distinctive role to play in this regard that can be defined by the relevant policies. The scope of the ccNSO cannot be established without reaching a common understanding of the allocation of authority between ICANN and ccTLD registries.

Three roles can be distinguished as to which responsibility must be assigned on any given issue:

- Policy role: i.e. the ability and power to define a policy;
- Executive role: i.e. the ability and power to act upon and implement the policy; and
- Accountability role: i.e. the ability and power to hold the responsible entity accountable for exercising its power.

Firstly, responsibility presupposes a policy and this delineates the policy role. Depending on the issue that needs to be addressed those who are involved in defining and setting the policy need to be determined and defined. Secondly, this presupposes an executive role defining the power to implement and act within the boundaries of a policy. Finally, as a counter-balance to the executive role, the accountability role needs to defined and determined.

The information below offers an aid to:
1. delineate and identify specific policy areas;

2. define and determine roles with regard to these specific policy areas.

This annex defines the scope of the ccNSO with regard to developing policies. The scope is limited to the policy role of the ccNSO policy-development process for functions and levels explicitly stated below. It is anticipated that the accuracy of the assignments of policy, executive, and accountability roles shown below will be considered during a scope-definition ccPDP process.

**Name Server Function (as to ccTLDs)**

**Level 1: Root Name Servers**
Policy role: IETF, RSSAC (ICANN)
Executive role: Root Server System Operators
Accountability role: RSSAC (ICANN)

**Level 2: ccTLD Registry Name Servers in respect to interoperability**
Policy role: ccNSO Policy Development Process (ICANN), for best practices a ccNSO process can be organized
Executive role: ccTLD Manager
Accountability role: part ICANN (IANA), part Local Internet Community, including local government

**Level 3: User's Name Servers**
Policy role: ccTLD Manager, IETF (RFC)
Executive role: Registrant
Accountability role: ccTLD Manager

**Data Entry Function (as to ccTLDs)**

**Level 1: Root Level Registry**
Policy role: ccNSO Policy Development Process (ICANN)
Executive role: ICANN (IANA)
Accountability role: ICANN community, ccTLD Managers, (national authorities in some cases)

**Level 2: ccTLD Registry**
Policy role: Local Internet Community, including local government, and/or ccTLD Manager according to local structure
Executive role: ccTLD Manager
Accountability role: Local Internet Community, including national authorities in some cases
ANNEX D: EC MECHANISM

ARTICLE 1 PROCEDURE FOR EXERCISE OF EC’S RIGHTS TO APPROVE APPROVAL ACTIONS

Section 1.1. APPROVAL ACTIONS

The processes set forth in this Article shall govern the escalation procedures for the EC’s exercise of its right to approve the following (each, an "Approval Action") under the Bylaws:

a. Fundamental Bylaw Amendments, as contemplated by Section 25.2 of the Bylaws;
b. Articles Amendments, as contemplated by Section 25.2 of the Bylaws; and
c. Asset Sales, as contemplated by Article 26 of the Bylaws.

Section 1.2. APPROVAL PROCESS

Following the delivery of a Board Notice for an Approval Action ("Approval Action Board Notice") by the Secretary to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants (which delivery date shall be referred to herein as the "Approval Action Board Notification Date"), the Decisional Participants shall thereafter promptly inform their constituents of the delivery of the Approval Action Board Notice. Any Approval Action Board Notice relating to a Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment shall include a statement, if applicable, that the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment, as applicable, is based solely on the outcome of a PDP, citing the specific PDP and the provision in the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment subject to the Approval Action Board Notice that implements such PDP (as applicable, a "PDP Fundamental Bylaw Statement" or "PDP Articles Statement") and the name of the Supporting Organization that is a Decisional Participant that undertook the PDP relating to the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment, as applicable (as applicable, the "Fundamental Bylaw Amendment PDP Decisional Participant" or "Articles Amendment PDP Decisional Participant"). The process set forth in this Section 1.2 of this Annex D as it relates to a particular Approval Action is referred to herein as the "Approval Process."
Section 1.3. APPROVAL ACTION COMMUNITY FORUM

a. ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, convene a forum at which the Decisional Participants and interested parties may discuss the Approval Action (an "Approval Action Community Forum").

b. If the EC Administration requests a publicly-available conference call by providing a notice to the Secretary, ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, schedule such call prior to any Approval Action Community Forum, and inform the Decisional Participants of the date, time and participation methods of such conference call, which ICANN shall promptly post on the Website.

c. The Approval Action Community Forum shall be convened and concluded during the period beginning upon the Approval Action Board Notification Date and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 30th day after the Approval Action Board Notification Date ("Approval Action Community Forum Period"). If the EC Administration requests that the Approval Action Community Forum be held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting, the Approval Action Community Forum shall be held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting on the date and at the time determined by ICANN, taking into account any date and/or time requested by the EC Administration. If the Approval Action Community Forum is held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting and that public meeting is held after 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 30th day after the Approval Action Board Notification Date, the Approval Action Community Forum Period for the Approval Action shall expire at 11:59 p.m., local time of the city hosting such ICANN public meeting on the official last day of such ICANN public meeting.

d. The Approval Action Community Forum shall be conducted via remote participation methods such as teleconference, web-based meeting room and/or such other form of remote participation as the EC Administration selects, and/or, only if the Approval Action Community Forum is held during an ICANN public meeting, face-to-face meetings. If the Approval Action Community Forum will not be held during an ICANN public meeting, the EC Administration shall promptly inform ICANN of the date, time and participation methods of such Approval Action Community Forum, which ICANN shall promptly post on the Website.

e. The EC Administration shall manage and moderate the Approval Action Community Forum in a fair and neutral manner.

f. ICANN and any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee (including
Decisional Participants) may deliver to the EC Administration in writing its views and questions on the Approval Action prior to the convening of and during the Approval Action Community Forum. Any written materials delivered to the EC Administration shall also be delivered to the Secretary for prompt posting on the Website in a manner deemed appropriate by ICANN.

g. ICANN staff and Directors representing the Board are expected to attend the Approval Action Community Forum in order to address any questions or concerns regarding the Approval Action.

h. For the avoidance of doubt, the Approval Action Community Forum is not a decisional body.

i. During the Approval Action Community Forum Period, an additional one or two Community Forums may be held at the discretion of the Board or the EC Administration. If the Board decides to hold an additional one or two Approval Action Community Forums, it shall provide a rationale for such decision, which rationale ICANN shall promptly post on the Website.

j. ICANN will provide support services for the Approval Action Community Forum and shall promptly post on the Website a public record of the Approval Action Community Forum as well as all written submissions of ICANN and any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee (including Decisional Participants) related to the Approval Action Community Forum.

Section 1.4. DECISION WHETHER TO APPROVE AN APPROVAL ACTION

(a) Following the expiration of the Approval Action Community Forum Period, at any time or date prior to 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Approval Action Community Forum Period (such period, the "Approval Action Decision Period"), with respect to each Approval Action, each Decisional Participant shall inform the EC Administration in writing as to whether such Decisional Participant (i) supports such Approval Action, (ii) objects to such Approval Action or (iii) has determined to abstain from the matter (which shall not count as supporting or objecting to such Approval Action), and each Decisional Participant shall forward such notice to the Secretary for ICANN to promptly post on the Website. If a Decisional Participant does not inform the EC Administration of any of the foregoing prior to the expiration of the Approval Action Decision Period, the Decisional Participant shall be deemed to have abstained from the matter (even if such Decisional Participant informs the EC Administration of its support or objection following the expiration of the Approval Action Decision Period).

(b) The EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of
the Approval Action Decision Period, deliver a written notice ("EC Approval Notice") to the Secretary certifying that, pursuant to and in compliance with the procedures and requirements of this Article 1 of this Annex D, the EC has approved the Approval Action if:

(i) The Approval Action does not relate to a Fundamental Bylaw Amendment or Articles Amendment and is (A) supported by three or more Decisional Participants and (B) not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant;

(ii) The Approval Action relates to a Fundamental Bylaw Amendment and is (A) supported by three or more Decisional Participants (including the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment PDP Decisional Participant if the Board Notice included a PDP Fundamental Bylaw Statement) and (B) not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant; or

(iii) The Approval Action relates to an Articles Amendment and is (A) supported by three or more Decisional Participants (including the Articles Amendment PDP Decisional Participant if the Board Notice included a PDP Articles Statement) and (B) not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant.

(c) If the Approval Action does not obtain the support required by Section 1.4(b)(i), (ii) or (iii) of this Annex D, as applicable, the Approval Process will automatically be terminated and the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Approval Action Decision Period, deliver to the Secretary a notice certifying that the Approval Process has been terminated with respect to the Approval Action ("Approval Process Termination Notice").

(d) ICANN shall promptly post to the Website any (i) Approval Action Board Notice, (ii) EC Approval Notice, (iii) Approval Process Termination Notice, (iv) written explanation provided by the EC Administration related to any of the foregoing, and (v) other notices the Secretary receives under this Article 1.

ARTICLE 2 PROCEDURE FOR EXERCISE OF EC'S RIGHTS TO REJECT SPECIFIED ACTIONS

Section 2.1. Rejection Actions

The processes set forth in this Article 2 shall govern the escalation procedures for the EC's exercise of its right to reject the following (each, a "Rejection Action")
under the Bylaws:

a. PTI Governance Actions, as contemplated by Section 16.2(d) of the Bylaws;

b. IFR Recommendation Decisions, as contemplated by Section 18.6(d) of the Bylaws;

c. Special IFR Recommendation Decisions, as contemplated by Section 18.12(e) of the Bylaws;

d. SCWG Creation Decisions, as contemplated by Section 19.1(d) of the Bylaws;

e. SCWG Recommendation Decisions, as contemplated by Section 19.4(d) of the Bylaws;

f. ICANN Budgets, as contemplated by Section 22.4(a)(v) of the Bylaws;

g. IANA Budgets, as contemplated by Section 22.4(b)(v) of the Bylaws;

h. Operating Plans, as contemplated by Section 22.5(a)(v) of the Bylaws;

i. Strategic Plans, as contemplated by Section 22.5(b)(v) of the Bylaws; and

j. Standard Bylaw Amendments, as contemplated by Section 25.1(e) of the Bylaws.

Section 2.2. PETITION PROCESS FOR SPECIFIED ACTIONS

(a) Following the delivery of a Board Notice for a Rejection Action ("Rejection Action Board Notice") by the Secretary to the EC Administration and Decisional Participants (which delivery date shall be referred to herein as the "Rejection Action Board Notification Date"), the Decisional Participants shall thereafter promptly inform their constituents of the delivery of the Rejection Action Board Notice. The process set forth in this Section 2.2 of this Annex D as it relates to a particular Rejection Action is referred to herein as the "Rejection Process."

(b) During the period beginning on the Rejection Action Board Notification Date and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the date that is the 21st day after the Rejection Action Board Notification Date (as it relates to a particular Rejection Action, the "Rejection Action Petition Period"), subject to the procedures and requirements developed by the applicable Decisional Participant, an individual may submit a petition to a Decisional Participant, seeking to reject the Rejection Action and initiate the Rejection Process (a "Rejection Action Petition").
(c) A Decisional Participant that has received a Rejection Action Petition shall either accept or reject such Rejection Action Petition; provided that a Decisional Participant may only accept such Rejection Action Petition if it was received by such Decisional Participant during the Rejection Action Petition Period.

(i) If, in accordance with the requirements of Section 2.2(c) of this Annex D, a Decisional Participant accepts a Rejection Action Petition during the Rejection Action Petition Period, the Decisional Participant shall promptly provide to the EC Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary written notice ("Rejection Action Petition Notice") of such acceptance (such Decisional Participant, the "Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant"), and ICANN shall promptly post such Rejection Action Petition Notice on the Website. The Rejection Action Petition Notice shall also include:

(A) the rationale upon which rejection of the Rejection Action is sought. Where the Rejection Action Petition Notice relates to an ICANN Budget, an IANA Budget, an Operating Plan or a Strategic Plan, the Rejection Action Petition Notice shall not be valid and shall not be accepted by the EC Administration unless the rationale set forth in the Rejection Action Petition Notice is based on one or more significant issues that were specifically raised in the applicable public comment period(s) relating to perceived inconsistencies with the Mission, purpose and role set forth in ICANN's Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, the global public interest, the needs of ICANN's stakeholders, financial stability, or other matter of concern to the community; and

(B) where the Rejection Action Petition Notice relates to a Standard Bylaw Amendment, a statement, if applicable, that the Standard Bylaw Amendment is based solely on the outcome of a PDP, citing the specific PDP and the provision in the Standard Bylaw Amendment subject to the Board Notice that implements such PDP ("PDP Standard Bylaw Statement") and the name of the Supporting Organization that is a Decisional Participant that undertook the PDP relating to the Standard Bylaw Amendment ("Standard Bylaw Amendment PDP Decisional Participant").

The Rejection Process shall thereafter continue pursuant to Section 2.2(d) of this Annex D.

(ii) If the EC Administration has not received a Rejection Action Petition Notice pursuant to Section 2.2(c)(i) of this Annex D during the Rejection
Action Petition Period, the Rejection Process shall automatically be terminated and the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Period, deliver to the Secretary a notice certifying that the Rejection Process has been terminated with respect to the Rejection Action contained in the Approval Notice ("Rejection Process Termination Notice"). ICANN shall promptly post such Rejection Process Termination Notice on the Website.

(d) Following the delivery of a Rejection Action Petition Notice to the EC Administration pursuant to Section 2.2(c)(i) of this Annex D, the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant shall contact the EC Administration and the other Decisional Participants to determine whether any other Decisional Participants support the Rejection Action Petition. The Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant shall forward such communication to the Secretary for ICANN to promptly post on the Website.

(i) If the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant obtains the support of at least one other Decisional Participant (a "Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participant") during the period beginning upon the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Period and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 7th day after the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Period (the "Rejection Action Petition Support Period"), the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant shall provide a written notice to the EC Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary ("Rejection Action Supported Petition") within twenty-four (24) hours of receiving the support of at least one Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participant, and ICANN shall promptly post such Rejection Action Supported Petition on the Website. Each Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participant shall provide a written notice to the EC Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary within twenty-four (24) hours of providing support to the Rejection Action Petition, and ICANN shall promptly post each such notice on the Website. Such Rejection Action Supported Petition shall include:

(A) a supporting rationale in reasonable detail;

(B) contact information for at least one representative who has been designated by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant who shall act as a liaison with respect to the Rejection Action Supported Petition;
(C) a statement as to whether or not the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant and/or the Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participant requests that ICANN organize a publicly-available conference call prior to the Rejection Action Community Forum (as defined in Section 2.3 of this Annex D) for the community to discuss the Rejection Action Supported Petition;

(D) a statement as to whether the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participant have determined to hold the Rejection Action Community Forum during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting, taking into account the limitation on holding such a Rejection Action Community Forum when the Rejection Action Supported Petition relates to an ICANN Budget or IANA Budget as described in Section 2.3(c) of this Annex D; and

(E) a PDP Standard Bylaw Statement, if applicable.

The Rejection Process shall thereafter continue for such Rejection Action Supported Petition pursuant to Section 2.3 of this Annex D. The foregoing process may result in more than one Rejection Action Supported Petition relating to the same Rejection Action.

(ii) The Rejection Process shall automatically be terminated and the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period, deliver to the Secretary a Rejection Process Termination Notice, which ICANN shall promptly post on the Website, if:

(A) no Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant is able to obtain the support of at least one other Decisional Participant for its Rejection Action Petition during the Rejection Action Petition Support Period; or

(B) where the Rejection Action Supported Petition includes a PDP Standard Bylaw Statement, the Standard Bylaw Amendment PDP Decisional Participant is not (x) the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant or (y) one of the Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participants.

Section 2.3. REJECTION ACTION COMMUNITY FORUM

a. If the EC Administration receives a Rejection Action Supported Petition under Section 2.2(d) of this Annex D during the Rejection Action Petition Support Period, ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, convene a forum at which the Decisional Participants and interested parties
may discuss the Rejection Action Supported Petition ("Rejection Action Community Forum"). If the EC Administration receives more than one Rejection Action Supported Petition relating to the same Rejection Action, all such Rejection Action Supported Petitions shall be discussed at the same Rejection Action Community Forum.

b. If a publicly-available conference call has been requested in a Rejection Action Supported Petition, ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, schedule such call prior to any Rejection Action Community Forum relating to that Rejection Action Supported Petition, and inform the Decisional Participants of the date, time and participation methods of such conference call, which ICANN shall promptly post on the Website. If a conference call has been requested in relation to more than one Rejection Action Supported Petition relating to the same Rejection Action, all such Rejection Action Supported Petitions shall be discussed during the same conference call.

c. The Rejection Action Community Forum shall be convened and concluded during the period beginning upon the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period ("Rejection Action Community Forum Period") unless all Rejection Action Supported Petitions relating to the same Rejection Action requested that the Rejection Action Community Forum be held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting, in which case the Rejection Action Community Forum shall be held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting (except as otherwise provided below with respect to a Rejection Action Supported Petition relating to an ICANN Budget or IANA Budget) on the date and at the time determined by ICANN, taking into account any date and/or time requested by the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant(s) and the Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participant(s). If the Rejection Action Community Forum is held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting and that public meeting is held after 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Rejection Action Petition Support Period, the Rejection Action Community Forum Period shall expire at 11:59 p.m., local time of the city hosting such ICANN public meeting on the official last day of such ICANN public meeting. Notwithstanding the foregoing and notwithstanding any statement in the Rejection Action Supported Petition, a Rejection Action Community Forum to discuss a Rejection Action Supported Petition relating to an ICANN Budget or IANA Budget may only be held at a scheduled ICANN public meeting if such Rejection Action Community Forum occurs during the Rejection Action Community Forum Period,
without any extension of such Rejection Action Community Forum Period.

d. The Rejection Action Community Forum shall be conducted via remote participation methods such as teleconference, web-based meeting room and/or such other form of remote participation as the EC Administration selects, and/or, only if the Rejection Action Community Forum is held during an ICANN public meeting, face-to-face meetings. If the Rejection Action Community Forum will not be held during an ICANN public meeting, the EC Administration shall promptly inform ICANN of the date, time and participation methods of such Rejection Action Community Forum, which ICANN shall promptly post on the Website.

e. The EC Administration shall manage and moderate the Rejection Action Community Forum in a fair and neutral manner.

f. ICANN and any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee (including Decisional Participants) may deliver to the EC Administration in writing its views and questions on the Rejection Action Supported Petition prior to the convening of and during the Rejection Action Community Forum. Any written materials delivered to the EC Administration shall also be delivered to the Secretary for prompt posting on the Website in a manner deemed appropriate by ICANN.

g. ICANN staff (including the CFO when the Rejection Action Supported Petition relates to an ICANN Budget, IANA Budget or Operating Plan) and Directors representing the Board are expected to attend the Rejection Action Community Forum in order to address the concerns raised in the Rejection Action Supported Petition.

h. If the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant and each of the Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participants for an applicable Rejection Action Supported Petition agree before, during or after the Rejection Action Community Forum that the issue raised in such Rejection Action Supported Petition has been resolved, such Rejection Action Supported Petition shall be deemed withdrawn and the Rejection Process with respect to such Rejection Action Supported Petition will be terminated. If all Rejection Action Supported Petitions relating to a Rejection Action are withdrawn, the Rejection Process will automatically be terminated. If a Rejection Process is terminated, the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the resolution of the issue raised in the Rejection Action Supported Petition, deliver to the Secretary a Rejection Process Termination Notice. For the avoidance of doubt, the Rejection Action Community Forum is not a decisional body and the foregoing resolution process shall be handled pursuant to the internal procedures of the Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Rejection Action
Supporting Decisional Participant(s).

i. During the Rejection Action Community Forum Period, an additional one or two Rejection Action Community Forums may be held at the discretion of a Rejection Action Petitioning Decisional Participant and a related Rejection Action Supporting Decisional Participant, or the EC Administration.

j. ICANN will provide support services for the Rejection Action Community Forum and shall promptly post on the Website a public record of the Rejection Action Community Forum as well as all written submissions of ICANN and any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee (including Decisional Participants) related to the Rejection Action Community Forum.

Section 2.4. DECISION WHETHER TO REJECT A REJECTION ACTION

(a) Following the expiration of the Rejection Action Community Forum Period, at any time or date prior to 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Rejection Action Community Forum Period (such period, the "Rejection Action Decision Period"), with respect to each Rejection Action Supported Petition, each Decisional Participant shall inform the EC Administration in writing as to whether such Decisional Participant (i) supports such Rejection Action Supported Petition and has determined to reject the Rejection Action, (ii) objects to such Rejection Action Supported Petition or (iii) has determined to abstain from the matter (which shall not count as supporting or objecting to such Rejection Action Supported Petition), and each Decisional Participant shall forward such notice to the Secretary for ICANN to promptly post on the Website. If a Decisional Participant does not inform the EC Administration of any of the foregoing prior to expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period, the Decisional Participant shall be deemed to have abstained from the matter (even if such Decisional Participant informs the EC Administration of its support or objection following the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period).

(b) The EC Administration, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period, shall promptly deliver a written notice ("EC Rejection Notice") to the Secretary certifying that, pursuant to and in compliance with the procedures and requirements of this Article 2 of Annex D, the EC has resolved to reject the Rejection Action if (after accounting for any adjustments to the below as required by the GAC Carve-out pursuant to Section 3.6(e) of the Bylaws if the Rejection Action Supported Petition included a GAC Consensus Statement):

(i) A Rejection Action Supported Petition relating to a Rejection Action other
than a Standard Bylaw Amendment is (A) supported by four or more Decisional Participants and (B) not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant; or

(ii) A Rejection Action Supported Petition relating to a Standard Bylaw Amendment that is (A) supported by three or more Decisional Participants (including the Standard Bylaw Amendment PDP Decisional Participant if the Rejection Action Supported Petition included a PDP Standard Bylaw Statement) and (B) not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant.

(c) If no Rejection Action Supported Petition obtains the support required by Section 2.4(b)(i) or (ii) of this Annex D, as applicable, the Rejection Process will automatically be terminated and the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Rejection Action Decision Period, deliver to the Secretary a Rejection Process Termination Notice.

(d) ICANN shall promptly post to the Website any (i) Rejection Action Board Notice, (ii) Rejection Action Petition, (iii) Rejection Action Petition Notice, (iv) Rejection Action Supported Petition, (v) EC Rejection Notice and the written explanation provided by the EC Administration as to why the EC has chosen to reject the Rejection Action, (vi) Rejection Process Termination Notice, and (vii) other notices the Secretary receives under this Article 2.

ARTICLE 3 PROCEDURE FOR EXERCISE OF EC’S RIGHTS TO REMOVE DIRECTORS AND RECALL THE BOARD

Section 3.1. NOMINATING COMMITTEE DIRECTOR REMOVAL PROCESS

(a) Subject to the procedures and requirements developed by the applicable Decisional Participant, an individual may submit a petition to a Decisional Participant seeking to remove a Director holding Seats 1 through 8 and initiate the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process ("Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition"). Each Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition shall set forth the rationale upon which such individual seeks to remove such Director. The process set forth in this Section 3.1 of Annex D is referred to herein as the "Nominating Committee Director Removal Process."

(b) During the period beginning on the date that the Decisional Participant received the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition (such date of receipt, the "Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Date") and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN’s principal office) on the date that is the 21st day after the Nominating Committee
Director Removal Petition Date (as it relates to a particular Director, the "Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Period"), the Decisional Participant that has received a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition ("Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioned Decisional Participant") shall either accept or reject such Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition; provided that a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioned Decisional Participant shall not accept a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition if, during the same term, the Director who is the subject of such Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition had previously been subject to a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition that led to a Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum (as discussed in Section 3.1(e) of this Annex D).

(c) During the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Period, the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioned Decisional Participant shall invite the Director subject to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition and the Chair of the Board (or the Vice Chair of the Board if the Chair is the affected Director) to a dialogue with the individual(s) bringing the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition and the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioned Decisional Participant's representative on the EC Administration. The Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition may not be accepted unless this invitation has been extended upon reasonable notice and accommodation to the affected Director's availability. If the invitation is accepted by either the Director who is the subject of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition or the Chair of the Board (or the Vice Chair of the Board if the Chair is the affected Director), the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioned Decisional Participant shall not accept the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition until the dialogue has occurred or there have been reasonable efforts to have the dialogue.

(i) If, in accordance with Section 3.1(b) of this Annex D, a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioned Decisional Participant accepts a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition during the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Period (such Decisional Participant, the "Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant"), the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of its acceptance of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition, provide written notice ("Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Notice") of such acceptance to the EC Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary. The Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Notice shall include the rationale upon which removal of the affected
Director is sought. The Nominating Committee Director Removal Process shall thereafter continue pursuant to Section 3.1(d) of this Annex D.

(ii) If the EC Administration has not received a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Notice pursuant to Section 3.1(c)(i) of this Annex D during the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Period, the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process shall automatically be terminated with respect to the applicable Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition and the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Period, deliver to the Secretary a notice certifying that the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process has been terminated with respect to the applicable Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition ("Nominating Committee Director Removal Process Termination Notice").

(d) Following the delivery of a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Notice to the EC Administration by a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant pursuant to Section 3.1(c)(i) of this Annex D, the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant shall contact the EC Administration and the other Decisional Participants to determine whether any other Decisional Participants support the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition. The Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant shall forward such communication to the Secretary for ICANN to promptly post on the Website.

(i) If the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant obtains the support of at least one other Decisional Participant (a "Nominating Committee Director Removal Supporting Decisional Participant") during the period beginning upon the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Period and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 7th day after the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Period (the "Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Support Period"), the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant shall provide a written notice to the EC Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary ("Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition") within twenty-four (24) hours of receiving the support of at least one Nominating Committee Director Removal Supporting Decisional Participant. Each Nominating Committee Director Removal Supporting Decisional Participant
shall provide a written notice to the EC Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary within twenty-four (24) hours of providing support to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition. Such Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition shall include:

(A) a supporting rationale in reasonable detail;

(B) contact information for at least one representative who has been designated by the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant who shall act as a liaison with respect to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition;

(C) a statement as to whether or not the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant and/or the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supporting Decisional Participant requests that ICANN organize a publicly-available conference call prior to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum (as defined in Section 3.1(e) of this Annex D) for the community to discuss the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition; and

(D) a statement as to whether the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supporting Decisional Participant have determined to hold the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting.

The Nominating Committee Director Removal Process shall thereafter continue for such Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition pursuant to Section 3.1(e) of this Annex D.

(ii) The Nominating Committee Director Removal Process shall automatically be terminated and the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Support Period, deliver to the Secretary a Nominating Committee Director Removal Process Termination Notice if the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant is unable to obtain the support of at least one other Decisional Participant for its Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition during the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Support Period.

(e) If the EC Administration receives a Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition under Section 3.1(d) of this Annex D during the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Support Period, ICANN shall, at the
direction of the EC Administration, convene a forum at which the Decisional Participants and interested parties may discuss the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition ("Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum").

(i) If a publicly-available conference call has been requested in a Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition, ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, schedule such call prior to any Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum, and inform the Decisional Participants of the date, time and participation methods of such conference call, which ICANN shall promptly post on the Website. The date and time of any such conference call shall be determined after consultation with the Director who is the subject of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition regarding his or her availability.

(ii) The Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum shall be convened and concluded during the period beginning upon the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Support Period and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Support Period ("Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum Period") unless the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition requested that the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum be held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting, in which case the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum shall be held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting on the date and at the time determined by ICANN, taking into account any date and/or time requested by the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supporting Decisional Participant(s); provided, that, the date and time of any Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum shall be determined after consultation with the Director who is the subject of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition regarding his or her availability. If the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum is held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting and that public meeting is held after 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Support Period, the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum Period shall expire at 11:59 p.m., local time of the city hosting such ICANN public meeting on the official last day of such ICANN public meeting.
(iii) The Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum shall be conducted via remote participation methods such as teleconference, web-based meeting room and/or such other form of remote participation as the EC Administration selects, and/or, only if the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum is held during an ICANN public meeting, face-to-face meetings. If the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum will not be held during an ICANN public meeting, the EC Administration shall promptly inform ICANN of the date, time and participation methods of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum, which ICANN shall promptly post on the Website.

(iv) The EC Administration shall manage and moderate the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum in a fair and neutral manner; provided that no individual from the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant or the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supporting Decisional Participant, nor the individual who initiated the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition, shall be permitted to participate in the management or moderation of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum.

(v) The Director subject to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition, ICANN and any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee (including Decisional Participants) may deliver to the EC Administration in writing its views and questions on the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition prior to the convening of and during the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum. Any written materials delivered to the EC Administration shall also be delivered to the Secretary for prompt posting on the Website in a manner deemed appropriate by ICANN.

(vi) The Director who is the subject of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition and the Chair of the Board (or the Vice Chair of the Board if the Chair is the affected Director) are expected to attend the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum in order to address the issues raised in the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition.

(vii) If the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant and each of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supporting Decisional Participants for an applicable Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition agree before, during or after the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum that the issue
raised in such Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition has been resolved, such Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition shall be deemed withdrawn and the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process with respect to such Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition will be terminated. If a Nominating Committee Director Removal Process is terminated, the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the resolution of the issue raised in the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition, deliver to the Secretary a Nominating Committee Director Removal Process Termination Notice. For the avoidance of doubt, the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum is not a decisional body and the foregoing resolution process shall be handled pursuant to the internal procedures of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supporting Decisional Participant(s).

(viii) During the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum Period, an additional one or two Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forums may be held at the discretion of a Nominating Committee Director Removal Petitioning Decisional Participant and a related Nominating Committee Director Removal Supporting Decisional Participant, or the EC Administration.

(ix) ICANN will provide support services for the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum and shall promptly post on the Website a public record of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum as well as all written submissions of the Director who is the subject of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition, ICANN and any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee (including Decisional Participants) related to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum.

(f) Following the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum Period, at any time or date prior to 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN’s principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum Period (such period, the "Nominating Committee Director Removal Decision Period"), each Decisional Participant shall inform the EC Administration in writing as to whether such Decisional Participant (i) supports such Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition, (ii) objects to such Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition or (iii) has determined to abstain from the matter (which shall not count as supporting or objecting to the Nominating
Committee Director Removal Supported Petition), and each Decisional Participant shall forward such notice to the Secretary for ICANN to promptly post on the Website. If a Decisional Participant does not inform the EC Administration of any of the foregoing prior to the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Decision Period, the Decisional Participant shall be deemed to have abstained from the matter (even if such Decisional Participant informs the EC Administration of its support or objection following the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Decision Period).

(g) The EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Decision Period, deliver a written notice ("Nominating Committee Director Removal Notice") to the Secretary certifying that, pursuant to and in compliance with the procedures and requirements of Section 3.1 of this Annex D, the EC has approved of the removal of the Director who is subject to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process if the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition is (i) supported by three or more Decisional Participants and (ii) not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant.

(h) Upon the Secretary's receipt of a Nominating Committee Director Removal Notice, the Director subject to such Nominating Committee Director Removal Notice shall be effectively removed from office and shall no longer be a Director and such Director's vacancy shall be filled in accordance with Section 7.12 of the Bylaws.

(i) If the Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition does not obtain the support required by Section 3.1(g) of this Annex D, the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process will automatically be terminated and the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Decision Period, deliver to the Secretary a Nominating Committee Director Removal Process Termination Notice. The Director who was subject to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process shall remain on the Board and not be subject to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process for the remainder of the Director's current term.

(j) If neither a Nominating Committee Director Removal Notice nor a Nominating Committee Director Removal Process Termination Notice are received by the Secretary prior to 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Nominating Committee Director Removal Community Forum Period, the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process shall automatically terminate and the Director who was subject to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process shall remain on the Board and shall not be subject to the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process for the remainder of the Director's current term.
(k) Notwithstanding anything in this Section 3.1 to the contrary, if, for any reason, including due to resignation, death or disability, a Director who is the subject of a Nominating Committee Director Removal Process ceases to be a Director, the Nominating Committee Director Removal Process for such Director shall automatically terminate without any further action of ICANN or the EC Administration.

(l) ICANN shall promptly post to the Website any (i) Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition, (ii) Nominating Committee Director Removal Petition Notice, (iii) Nominating Committee Director Removal Supported Petition, (iv) Nominating Committee Director Removal Notice and the written explanation provided by the EC Administration as to why the EC has chosen to remove the relevant Director, (v) Nominating Committee Director Removal Process Termination Notice, and (vi) other notices the Secretary receives under this Section 3.1.

Section 3.2. SO/AC DIRECTOR REMOVAL PROCESS

(a) Subject to the procedures and requirements developed by the applicable Decisional Participant, an individual may submit a petition to the ASO, ccNSO, GNSO or At-Large Community (as applicable, the "Applicable Decisional Participant") seeking to remove a Director who was nominated by that Supporting Organization or the At-Large Community in accordance with Section 7.2(a) of the Bylaws, and initiate the SO/AC Director Removal Process ("SO/AC Director Removal Petition"). The process set forth in this Section 3.2 of this Annex D is referred to herein as the "SO/AC Director Removal Process."

(b) During the period beginning on the date that the Applicable Decisional Participant received the SO/AC Director Removal Petition (such date of receipt, the "SO/AC Director Removal Petition Date") and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the date that is the 21st day after the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Date (as it relates to a particular Director, the "SO/AC Director Removal Petition Period"), the Applicable Decisional Participant shall either accept or reject such SO/AC Director Removal Petition pursuant to the internal procedures of the Applicable Decisional Participant for the SO/AC Director Removal Petition; provided that the Applicable Decisional Participant shall not accept an SO/AC Director Removal Petition if, during the same term, the Director who is the subject of such SO/AC Director Removal Petition had previously been subject to an SO/AC Director Removal Petition that led to an SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum (as defined in Section 3.2(d) of this Annex D).

(c) During the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Period, the Applicable Decisional
Participant shall invite the Director subject to the SO/AC Director Removal Petition and the Chair of the Board (or the Vice Chair of the Board if the Chair is the affected Director) to a dialogue with the individual(s) bringing the SO/AC Director Removal Petition and the Applicable Decisional Participant's representative on the EC Administration. The SO/AC Director Removal Petition may not be accepted unless this invitation has been extended upon reasonable notice and accommodation to the affected Director's availability. If the invitation is accepted by either the Director who is the subject of the SO/AC Director Removal Petition or the Chair of the Board (or the Vice Chair of the Board if the Chair is the affected Director), the Applicable Decisional Participant shall not accept the SO/AC Director Removal Petition until the dialogue has occurred or there have been reasonable efforts to have the dialogue.

(i) If, in accordance with Section 3.2(b), the Applicable Decisional Participant accepts an SO/AC Director Removal Petition during the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Period, the Applicable Decisional Participant shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the Applicable Decisional Participant's acceptance of the SO/AC Director Removal Petition, provide written notice ("SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice") of such acceptance to the EC Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary. Such SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice shall include:

(A) a supporting rationale in reasonable detail;

(B) contact information for at least one representative who has been designated by the Applicable Decisional Participant who shall act as a liaison with respect to the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice;

(C) a statement as to whether or not the Applicable Decisional Participant requests that ICANN organize a publicly-available conference call prior to the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum (as defined in Section 3.2(d) of this Annex D) for the community to discuss the SO/AC Director Removal Petition; and

(D) a statement as to whether the Applicable Decisional Participant has determined to hold the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting.

The SO/AC Director Removal Process shall thereafter continue for such SO/AC Director Removal Petition pursuant to Section 3.2(d) of this Annex D.

(ii) If the EC Administration has not received an SO/AC Director Removal
Petition Notice pursuant to Section 3.2(c)(i) during the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Period, the SO/AC Director Removal Process shall automatically be terminated with respect to the applicable SO/AC Director Removal Petition and the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Period, deliver to the Secretary a notice certifying that the SO/AC Director Removal Process has been terminated with respect to the applicable SO/AC Director Removal Petition ("SO/AC Director Removal Process Termination Notice").

(d) If the EC Administration receives an SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice under Section 3.2(c) of this Annex D during the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Period, ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, convene a forum at which the Decisional Participants and interested parties may discuss the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice ("SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum").

(i) If a publicly-available conference call has been requested in an SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice, ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, schedule such call prior to any SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum, and inform the Decisional Participants of the date, time and participation methods of such conference call, which ICANN shall promptly post on the Website. The date and time of any such conference call shall be determined after consultation with the Director who is the subject of the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice regarding his or her availability.

(ii) The SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum shall be convened and concluded during the period beginning upon the expiration of the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Period and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Period ("SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum Period") unless the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice requested that the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum be held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting, in which case the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum shall be held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting on the date and at the time determined by ICANN, taking into account any date and/or time requested by the Applicable Decisional Participant; provided, that the date and time of any SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum shall be determined after consultation with the Director who is the subject of the
SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice regarding his or her availability. If the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum is held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting and that public meeting is held after 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Period, the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum Period shall expire at 11:59 p.m., local time of the city hosting such ICANN public meeting on the official last day of such ICANN public meeting.

(iii) The SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum shall be conducted via remote participation methods such as teleconference, web-based meeting room and/or such other form of remote participation as the EC Administration selects, and/or, only if the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum is held during an ICANN public meeting, face-to-face meetings. If the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum will not be held during an ICANN public meeting, the EC Administration shall promptly inform ICANN of the date, time and participation methods of the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum, which ICANN shall promptly post on the Website.

(iv) The EC Administration shall manage and moderate the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum in a fair and neutral manner; provided that no individual from the Applicable Decisional Participant, nor the individual who initiated the SO/AC Director Removal Petition, shall be permitted to participate in the management or moderation of the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum.

(v) The Director subject to the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice, ICANN and any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee (including Decisional Participants) may deliver to the EC Administration in writing its views and questions on the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice prior to the convening of and during the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum. Any written materials delivered to the EC Administration shall also be delivered to the Secretary for prompt posting on the Website in a manner deemed appropriate by ICANN.

(vi) The Director who is the subject of the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice and the Chair of the Board (or the Vice Chair of the Board if the Chair is the affected Director) are expected to attend the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum in order to address the issues raised in the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice.

(vii) If the Applicable Decisional Participant agrees before, during or after the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum that the issue raised in
such SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice has been resolved, such SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice shall be deemed withdrawn and the SO/AC Director Removal Process with respect to such SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice will be terminated. If an SO/AC Director Removal Process is terminated, the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the resolution of the issue raised in the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice, deliver to the Secretary an SO/AC Director Removal Process Termination Notice. For the avoidance of doubt, the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum is not a decisional body and the foregoing resolution process shall be handled pursuant to the internal procedures of the Applicable Decisional Participant.

(viii) During the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum Period, an additional one or two SO/AC Director Removal Community Forums may be held at the discretion of the Applicable Decisional Participant or the EC Administration.

(ix) ICANN will provide support services for the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum and shall promptly post on the Website a public record of the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum as well as all written submissions of the Director who is the subject of the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice, ICANN and any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee (including Decisional Participants) related to the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum.

(e) Following the expiration of the SO/AC Director Removal Community Forum Period, ICANN shall, at the request of the EC Administration, issue a request for comments and recommendations from the community, which shall be delivered to the Secretary for prompt posting on the Website along with a means for comments and recommendations to be submitted to ICANN on behalf of the EC Administration. This comment period shall remain open until 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 7th day after the request for comments and recommendations was posted on the Website (the "SO/AC Director Removal Comment Period"). ICANN shall promptly post on the Website all comments and recommendations received by ICANN during the SO/AC Director Removal Comment Period.

(f) Following the expiration of the SO/AC Director Removal Comment Period, at any time or date prior to 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the SO/AC Director Removal Comment Period (such period, the "SO/AC Director Removal Decision Period"), the Applicable Decisional Participant shall inform the EC Administration
in writing as to whether the Applicable Decisional Participant has support for the
SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice within the Applicable Decisional
Participant of a three-quarters majority as determined pursuant to the internal
procedures of the Applicable Decisional Participant ("SO/AC Director Removal
Notice"). The Applicable Decisional Participant shall, within twenty-four (24) hours
of obtaining such support, deliver the SO/AC Director Removal Notice to the EC
Administration, the other Decisional Participants and Secretary, and ICANN shall,
at the direction of the Applicable Decisional Participant, concurrently post on the
Website an explanation provided by the Applicable Decisional Participant as to
why the Applicable Decisional Participant has chosen to remove the affected
Director. Upon the Secretary's receipt of the SO/AC Director Removal Notice from
the EC Administration, the Director subject to such SO/AC Director Removal
Notice shall be effectively removed from office and shall no longer be a Director
and such Director's vacancy shall be filled in accordance with Section 7.12 of the
Bylaws.

(g) If the SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice does not obtain the support
required by Section 3.2(f) of this Annex D, the SO/AC Director Removal Process
will automatically be terminated and the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four
(24) hours of the failure to obtain such support, deliver to the Secretary an SO/AC
Director Removal Process Termination Notice. The Director who was subject to
the SO/AC Director Removal Process shall remain on the Board and shall not be
subject to the SO/AC Director Removal Process for the remainder of the Director's
current term.

(h) If neither an SO/AC Director Removal Notice nor an SO/AC Director Removal
Process Termination Notice are received by the Secretary prior to the expiration of
the SO/AC Director Removal Decision Period, the SO/AC Director Removal
Process shall automatically terminate and the Director who was subject to the
SO/AC Director Removal Process shall remain on the Board and shall not be
subject to the SO/AC Director Removal Process for the remainder of the Director's
current term.

(i) Notwithstanding anything in this Section 3.2 to the contrary, if, for any reason,
including due to resignation, death or disability, a Director who is the subject of an
SO/AC Director Removal Process ceases to be a Director, the SO/AC Director
Removal Process for such Director shall automatically terminate without any
further action of ICANN or the EC Administration.

(j) ICANN shall promptly post to the Website any (i) SO/AC Director Removal
Petition, (ii) SO/AC Director Removal Petition Notice, (iii) SO/AC Director Removal
Notice and the written explanation provided by the EC Administration as to why
the EC has chosen to remove the relevant Director, (iv) SO/AC Director Removal
Process Termination Notice, and (v) other notices the Secretary receives under
Section 3.3. BOARD RECALL PROCESS

(a) Subject to the procedures and requirements developed by the applicable Decisional Participant, an individual may submit a petition to a Decisional Participant seeking to remove all Directors (other than the President) at the same time and initiate the Board Recall Process ("Board Recall Petition"), provided that a Board Recall Petition cannot be submitted solely on the basis of a matter decided by a Community IRP if (i) such Community IRP was initiated in connection with the Board's implementation of GAC Consensus Advice and (ii) the EC did not prevail in such Community IRP. Each Board Recall Petition shall include a rationale setting forth the reasons why such individual seeks to recall the Board. The process set forth in this Section 3.3 of this Annex D is referred to herein as the "Board Recall Process."

(b) A Decisional Participant that has received a Board Recall Petition shall either accept or reject such Board Recall Petition during the period beginning on the date the Decisional Participant received the Board Recall Petition ("Board Recall Petition Date") and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN’s principal office) on the date that is the 21st day after the Board Recall Petition Date (the "Board Recall Petition Period")..

(i) If, in accordance with Section 3.3(b) of this Annex D, a Decisional Participant accepts a Board Recall Petition during the Board Recall Petition Period (such Decisional Participant, the "Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant"), the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of its acceptance of the Board Recall Petition, provide written notice ("Board Recall Petition Notice") of such acceptance to the EC Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary. The Board Recall Petition Notice shall include the rationale upon which removal of the Board is sought. The Board Recall Process shall thereafter continue pursuant to Section 3.3(c) of this Annex D.

(ii) If the EC Administration has not received a Board Recall Petition Notice pursuant to Section 3.3(b)(i) of this Annex D during the Board Recall Petition Period, the Board Recall Process shall automatically be terminated with respect to the Board Recall Petition and the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Board Recall Petition Period, deliver to the Secretary a notice certifying that the Board Recall Process has been terminated with respect to the Board Recall Petition.
("Board Recall Process Termination Notice").

(c) Following the delivery of a Board Recall Petition Notice to the EC Administration by a Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant pursuant to Section 3.3(b)(i) of this Annex D, the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant shall contact the EC Administration and the other Decisional Participants to determine whether any other Decisional Participants support the Board Recall Petition. The Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant shall forward such communication to the Secretary for ICANN to promptly post on the Website.

(i) If the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant obtains the support of at least two other Decisional Participants (each, a "Board Recall Supporting Decisional Participant") during the period beginning upon the expiration of the Board Recall Petition Period and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 7th day after the expiration of the Board Recall Petition Period (the "Board Recall Petition Support Period"), the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant shall provide a written notice to the EC Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary ("Board Recall Supported Petition") within twenty-four hours of receiving the support of at least two Board Recall Supporting Decisional Participants. Each Board Recall Supporting Decisional Participant shall provide a written notice to the EC Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary within twenty-four (24) hours of providing support to the Board Recall Petition.

Such Board Recall Supported Petition shall include:

(A) a supporting rationale in reasonable detail;

(B) contact information for at least one representative who has been designated by the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant who shall act as a liaison with respect to the Board Recall Supported Petition;

(C) a statement as to whether or not the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant and/or the Board Recall Supporting Decisional Participants requests that ICANN organize a publicly-available conference call prior to the Board Recall Community Forum (as defined in Section 3.3(d) of this Annex D) for the community to discuss the Board Recall Supported Petition; and

(D) a statement as to whether the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional
Participant and the Board Recall Supporting Decisional Participants have determined to hold the Board Recall Community Forum during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting.

The Board Recall Process shall thereafter continue for such Board Recall Supported Petition pursuant to Section 3.3(d) of this Annex D.

(ii) The Board Recall Process shall automatically be terminated and the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Board Recall Petition Support Period, deliver to the Secretary a Board Recall Process Termination Notice if the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant is unable to obtain the support of at least two other Decisional Participants for its Board Recall Petition during the Board Recall Petition Support Period.

(d) If the EC Administration receives a Board Recall Supported Petition under Section 3.3(c) of this Annex D during the Board Recall Petition Support Period, ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, convene a forum at which the Decisional Participants and interested parties may discuss the Board Recall Supported Petition ("Board Recall Community Forum").

(i) If a publicly-available conference call has been requested in a Board Recall Supported Petition, ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, schedule such call prior to any Board Recall Community Forum, and inform the Decisional Participants of the date, time and participation methods of such conference call, which ICANN shall promptly post on the Website. The date and time of any such conference call shall be determined after consultation with the Board regarding the availability of the Directors.

(ii) The Board Recall Community Forum shall be convened and concluded during the period beginning upon the expiration of the Board Recall Petition Support Period and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Board Recall Petition Support Period ("Board Recall Community Forum Period") unless the Board Recall Supported Petition requested that the Board Recall Community Forum be held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting, in which case the Board Recall Community Forum shall be held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting on the date and at the time determined by ICANN, taking into account any date and/or time requested by the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant and
the Board Recall Supporting Decisional Participants; provided, that, the date and time of any Board Recall Community Forum shall be determined after consultation with the Board regarding the availability of the Directors. If the Board Recall Community Forum is held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting and that public meeting is held after 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN’s principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Board Recall Petition Support Period, the Board Recall Community Forum Period shall expire at 11:59 p.m., local time of the city hosting such ICANN public meeting on the official last day of such ICANN public meeting.

(iii) The Board Recall Community Forum shall have at least one face-to-face meeting and may also be conducted via remote participation methods such as teleconference, web-based meeting room and/or such other form of remote participation as the EC Administration selects. If the Board Recall Community Forum will not be held during an ICANN public meeting, the EC Administration shall promptly inform ICANN of the date, time and participation methods of the Board Recall Community Forum, which ICANN shall promptly post on the Website.

(iv) The EC Administration shall manage and moderate the Board Recall Community Forum in a fair and neutral manner; provided that no individual from the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant or a Board Recall Supporting Decisional Participant, nor the individual who initiated the Board Recall Petition, shall be permitted to participate in the management or moderation of the Board Recall Community Forum.

(v) ICANN and any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee (including Decisional Participants) may deliver to the EC Administration in writing its views and questions on the Board Recall Supported Petition prior to the convening of and during the Board Recall Community Forum. Any written materials delivered to the EC Administration shall also be delivered to the Secretary for prompt posting on the Website in a manner deemed appropriate by ICANN.

(vi) ICANN staff and the full Board are expected to attend the Board Recall Community Forum in order to address the issues raised in the Board Recall Supported Petition.

(vii) If the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant and each of the Board Recall Supporting Decisional Participants for the Board Recall Supported Petition agree before, during or after the Board Recall Community Forum that the issue raised in such Board Recall Supported Petition has been resolved, such Board Recall Supported Petition shall be
deemed withdrawn and the Board Recall Process with respect to such Board Recall Supported Petition will be terminated. If a Board Recall Process is terminated, the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the resolution of the issue raised in the Board Recall Supported Petition, deliver to the Secretary a Board Recall Process Termination Notice. For the avoidance of doubt, the Board Recall Community Forum is not a decisional body and the foregoing resolution process shall be handled pursuant to the internal procedures of the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Board Recall Supporting Decisional Participants.

(viii) During the Board Recall Community Forum Period, an additional one or two Board Recall Community Forums may be held at the discretion of the Board Recall Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Board Recall Supporting Decisional Participants, or the EC Administration.

(ix) ICANN will provide support services for the Board Recall Community Forum and shall promptly post on the Website a public record of the Board Recall Community Forum as well as all written submissions of ICANN and any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee (including Decisional Participants) related to the Board Recall Community Forum.

(e) Following the expiration of the Board Recall Community Forum Period, at any time or date prior to 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Board Recall Community Forum Period (such period, the "Board Recall Decision Period"), each Decisional Participant shall inform the EC Administration in writing as to whether such Decisional Participant (i) supports such Board Recall Supported Petition, (ii) objects to such Board Recall Supported Petition or (iii) has determined to abstain from the matter (which shall not count as supporting or objecting to such Board Recall Supported Petition), and each Decisional Participant shall forward such notice to the Secretary for ICANN to promptly post on the Website. If a Decisional Participant does not inform the EC Administration of any of the foregoing prior to expiration of the Board Recall Decision Period, the Decisional Participant shall be deemed to have abstained from the matter (even if such Decisional Participant informs the EC Administration of its support or objection following the expiration of the Board Recall Decision Period).

(f) The EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Board Recall Decision Period, deliver a written notice ("EC Board Recall Notice") to the Secretary certifying that, pursuant to and in compliance with the procedures and requirements of this Section 3.3 of this Annex D, the EC has
resolved to remove all Directors (other than the President) if (after accounting for any adjustments to the below as required by the GAC Carve-out pursuant to Section 3.6(e) of the Bylaws if an IRP Panel found that, in implementing GAC Consensus Advice, the Board acted inconsistently with the Articles or Bylaws) a Board Recall Supported Petition (i) is supported by four or more Decisional Participants, and (ii) is not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant.

(g) Upon the Secretary’s receipt of an EC Board Recall Notice, all Directors (other than the President) shall be effectively removed from office and shall no longer be Directors and such vacancies shall be filled in accordance with Section 7.12 of the Bylaws.

(h) If the Board Recall Supported Petition does not obtain the support required by Section 3.3(f) of this Annex D, the Board Recall Process will automatically be terminated and the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Board Recall Decision Period, deliver to the Secretary a Board Recall Process Termination Notice. All Directors shall remain on the Board.

(i) If neither an EC Board Recall Notice nor a Board Recall Process Termination Notice are received by the Secretary prior to the expiration of the Board Recall Decision Period, the Board Recall Process shall automatically terminate and all Directors shall remain on the Board.

(j) ICANN shall promptly post to the Website any (i) Board Recall Petition, (ii) Board Recall Petition Notice, (iii) Board Recall Supported Petition, (iv) EC Board Recall Notice and the written explanation provided by the EC Administration as to why the EC has chosen to recall the Board, (v) Board Recall Process Termination Notice, and (vi) other notices the Secretary receives under this Section 3.3.

**Article 4 PROCEDURE FOR EXERCISE OF EC’S RIGHTS TO INITIATE MEDIATION, A COMMUNITY IRP OR RECONSIDERATION REQUEST**

**Section 4.1. MEDIATION INITIATION**

(a) If the Board refuses or fails to comply with a decision by the EC delivered to the Secretary pursuant to an EC Approval Notice, EC Rejection Notice, Nominating Committee Director Removal Notice, SO/AC Director Removal Notice or EC Board Recall Notice pursuant to and in compliance with Article 1, Article 2 or Article 3 of this Annex D, or rejects or otherwise does not take action that is consistent with a final IFR Recommendation, Special IFR Recommendation, SCWG Creation Recommendation or SCWG Recommendation, as applicable (each, an “EC Decision”), the EC Administration representative of any Decisional Participant who supported the exercise by the EC of its rights in the applicable EC
Decision during the applicable decision period may request that the EC initiate mediation with the Board in relation to that EC Decision as contemplated by Section 4.7 of the Bylaws, by delivering a notice to the EC Administration, the Decisional Participants and the Secretary requesting the initiation of a mediation ("Mediation Initiation Notice"). ICANN shall promptly post to the Website any Mediation Initiation Notice.

(b) As soon as practicable after receiving a Mediation Initiation Notice, the EC Administration and the Secretary shall initiate mediation, which shall proceed in accordance with Section 4.7 of the Bylaws.

Section 4.2. COMMUNITY IRP

(a) After completion of a mediation under Section 4.7 of the Bylaws, the EC Administration representative of any Decisional Participant who supported the exercise by the EC of its rights in the applicable EC Decision during the applicable decision period may request that the EC initiate a Community IRP (a "Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant"), as contemplated by Section 4.3 of the Bylaws, by delivering a notice to the EC Administration and the Decisional Participants requesting the initiation of a Community IRP ("Community IRP Petition"). The Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant shall forward such notice to the Secretary for ICANN to promptly post on the Website. The process set forth in this Section 4.2 of this Annex D as it relates to a particular Community IRP Petition is referred to herein as the "Community IRP Initiation Process."

(b) Following the delivery of a Community IRP Petition to the EC Administration by a Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant pursuant to Section 4.2(a) of this Annex D (which delivery date shall be referred to herein as the "Community IRP Notification Date"), the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant shall contact the EC Administration and the other Decisional Participants to determine whether any other Decisional Participants support the Community IRP Petition. The Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant shall forward such communication to the Secretary for ICANN to promptly post on the Website.

(i) If the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant obtains the support of at least one other Decisional Participant (a "Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participant") during the period beginning on the Community IRP Notification Date and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 21st day after the Community IRP Notification Date (the "Community IRP Petition Support Period"), the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant
shall provide a written notice to the EC Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary ("Community IRP Supported Petition") within twenty-four (24) hours of receiving the support of at least one Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participant. Each Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participant shall provide a written notice to the EC Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary within twenty-four (24) hours of providing support to the Community IRP Petition. Such Community IRP Supported Petition shall include:

(A) a supporting rationale in reasonable detail;

(B) contact information for at least one representative who has been designated by the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant who shall act as a liaison with respect to the Community IRP Supported Petition;

(C) a statement as to whether or not the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant and/or the Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participant requests that ICANN organize a publicly-available conference call prior to the Community IRP Community Forum (as defined in Section 4.2(c) of this Annex D) for the community to discuss the Community IRP Supported Petition;

(D) a statement as to whether the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participant have determined to hold the Community IRP Community Forum during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting;

(E) where the Community IRP Supported Petition relates to a Fundamental Bylaw Amendment, a PDP Fundamental Bylaw Statement if applicable and, if so, the name of the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment PDP Decisional Participant;

(F) where the Community IRP Supported Petition relates to an Articles Amendment, a PDP Articles Statement if applicable and, if so, the name of the Articles Amendment PDP Decisional Participant;

(G) where the Community IRP Supported Petition relates to a Standard Bylaw Amendment, a PDP Standard Bylaw Statement if applicable and, if so, the name of the Standard Bylaw Amendment PDP Decisional Participant; and

(H) where the Community IRP Supported Petition relates to a policy recommendation of a cross community working group chartered by more than one Supporting Organization ("CCWG Policy Recommendation"), a
The Community IRP Initiation Process shall thereafter continue for such Community IRP Supported Petition pursuant to Section 4.2(c) of this Annex D.

(ii) The Community IRP Initiation Process shall automatically be terminated and the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Community IRP Petition Support Period, deliver to the Secretary a notice certifying that the Community IRP Initiation Process has been terminated with respect to the Community IRP included in the Community IRP Petition ("Community IRP Termination Notice") if:

(A) no Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant is able to obtain the support of at least one other Decisional Participant for its Community IRP Petition during the Community IRP Petition Support Period;

(B) where the Community IRP Supported Petition includes a PDP Fundamental Bylaw Statement, the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment PDP Decisional Participant is not (x) the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant or (y) one of the Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participants;

(C) where the Community IRP Supported Petition includes a PDP Articles Statement, the Articles Amendment PDP Decisional Participant is not (x) the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant or (y) one of the Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participants;

(D) where the Community IRP Supported Petition includes a PDP Standard Bylaw Statement, the Standard Bylaw Amendment PDP Decisional Participant is not (x) the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant or (y) one of the Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participants; or

(E) where the Community IRP Supported Petition includes a CCWG Policy Recommendation Statement, the CCWG Policy Recommendation Decisional Participant is not (x) the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant or (y) one of the Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participants.
(c) If the EC Administration receives a Community IRP Supported Petition under Section 4.2(b) of this Annex D during the Community IRP Petition Support Period, ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, convene a forum at which the Decisional Participants and interested third parties may discuss the Community IRP Supported Petition ("Community IRP Community Forum").

(i) If a publicly-available conference call has been requested in a Community IRP Supported Petition, ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, schedule such call prior to any Community IRP Community Forum, and inform the Decisional Participants of the date, time and participation methods of such conference call, which ICANN shall promptly post on the Website.

(ii) The Community IRP Community Forum shall be convened and concluded during the period beginning on the expiration of the Community IRP Petition Support Period and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 30th day after the expiration of the Community IRP Petition Support Period ("Community IRP Community Forum Period") unless the Community IRP Supported Petition requested that the Community IRP Community Forum be held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting, in which case the Community IRP Community Forum shall be held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting on the date and at the time determined by ICANN, taking into account any date and/or time requested by the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participant(s). If the Community IRP Community Forum is held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting and that public meeting is held after 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 30th day after the expiration of the Community IRP Petition Support Period, the Community IRP Community Forum Period shall expire at 11:59 p.m., local time of the city hosting such ICANN public meeting on the official last day of such ICANN public meeting.

(iii) The Community IRP Community Forum shall be conducted via remote participation methods such as teleconference, web-based meeting room and/or such other form of remote participation as the EC Administration selects and/or, only if the Community IRP Community Forum is held during an ICANN public meeting, face-to-face meetings. If the Community IRP Community Forum will not be held during an ICANN public meeting, the EC Administration shall promptly inform ICANN of the date, time and participation methods of such Community IRP Community Forum, which
ICANN shall promptly post on the Website.

(iv) The EC Administration shall manage and moderate the Community IRP Community Forum in a fair and neutral manner.

(v) ICANN and any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee (including Decisional Participants) may deliver to the EC Administration in writing its views and questions on the Community IRP Supported Petition prior to the convening of and during the Community IRP Community Forum. Any written materials delivered to the EC Administration shall also be delivered to the Secretary for prompt posting on the Website in a manner deemed appropriate by ICANN.

(vi) ICANN staff and Directors representing the Board are expected to attend the Community IRP Community Forum in order to discuss the Community IRP Supported Petition.

(vii) If the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant and each of the Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participants for the Community IRP Supported Petition agree before, during or after a Community IRP Community Forum that the issue raised in such Community IRP Supported Petition has been resolved, such Community IRP Supported Petition shall be deemed withdrawn and the Community IRP Initiation Process with respect to such Community IRP Supported Petition will be terminated. If a Community IRP Initiation Process is terminated, the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the resolution of the issue raised in the Community IRP Supported Petition, deliver to the Secretary a Community IRP Termination Notice. For the avoidance of doubt, the Community IRP Community Forum is not a decisional body and the foregoing resolution process shall be handled pursuant to the internal procedures of the Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participant(s).

(viii) During the Community IRP Community Forum Period, an additional one or two Community IRP Community Forums may be held at the discretion of a Community IRP Petitioning Decisional Participant and a related Community IRP Supporting Decisional Participant, or the EC Administration.

(ix) ICANN will provide support services for the Community IRP Community Forum and shall promptly post on the Website a public record of the Community IRP Community Forum as well as all written submissions of ICANN and any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee (including Decisional Participants) related to the Community IRP Community Forum.
(d) Following the expiration of the Community IRP Community Forum Period, at any time or date prior to 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Community IRP Community Forum Period (such period, the "Community IRP Decision Period"), each Decisional Participant shall inform the EC Administration in writing as to whether such Decisional Participant (i) supports such Community IRP Supported Petition, (ii) objects to such Community IRP Supported Petition or (iii) has determined to abstain from the matter (which shall not count as supporting or objecting to the Community IRP Supported Petition), and each Decisional Participant shall forward such notice to the Secretary for ICANN to promptly post on the Website. If a Decisional Participant does not inform the EC Administration of any of the foregoing prior to the expiration of the Community IRP Decision Period, the Decisional Participant shall be deemed to have abstained from the matter (even if such Decisional Participant informs the EC Administration of its support or objection following the expiration of the Community IRP Decision Period).

(e) The EC Administration, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Community IRP Decision Period, shall promptly deliver a written notice ("EC Community IRP Initiation Notice") to the Secretary certifying that, pursuant to and in compliance with the procedures and requirements of this Section 4.2 of this Annex D, the EC has resolved to accept the Community IRP Supported Petition if:

(i) A Community IRP Supported Petition that does not include a PDP Fundamental Bylaw Statement, a PDP Articles Statement, a PDP Standard Bylaw Statement or a CCWG Policy Recommendation Statement (A) is supported by three or more Decisional Participants, and (B) is not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant;

(ii) A Community IRP Supported Petition that (A) includes a PDP Fundamental Bylaw Statement, (B) is supported by three or more Decisional Participants (including the Fundamental Bylaw Amendment PDP Decisional Participant), and (C) is not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant;

(iii) A Community IRP Supported Petition that (A) includes a PDP Articles Statement, (B) is supported by three or more Decisional Participants (including the Articles Amendment PDP Decisional Participant), and (C) is not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant;
(iv) A Community IRP Supported Petition that (A) includes a PDP Standard Bylaw Statement, (B) is supported by three or more Decisional Participants (including the Standard Bylaw Amendment PDP Decisional Participant), and (C) is not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant; or

(v) A Community IRP Supported Petition that (A) includes a CCWG Policy Recommendation Statement, (B) is supported by three or more Decisional Participants (including the CCWG Policy Recommendation Decisional Participant), and (C) is not objected to by more than one Decisional Participant.

(f) If the Community IRP Supported Petition does not obtain the support required by Section 4.2(e) of this Annex D, the Community IRP Initiation Process will automatically be terminated and the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Community IRP Decision Period, deliver to the Secretary a Community IRP Termination Notice.

(g) ICANN shall promptly post to the Website any (i) Community IRP Petition, (ii) Community IRP Supported Petition, (iii) EC Community IRP Initiation Notice, (iv) Community IRP Termination Notice, (v) written explanation provided by the EC Administration related to any of the foregoing, and (vi) other notices the Secretary receives under this Section 4.2.

Section 4.3. COMMUNITY RECONSIDERATION REQUEST

(a) Any Decisional Participant may request that the EC initiate a Reconsideration Request (a "Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant"), as contemplated by Section 4.2(b) of the Bylaws, by delivering a notice to the EC Administration and the other Decisional Participants, with a copy to the Secretary for ICANN to promptly post on the Website, requesting the review or reconsideration of an action or inaction of the ICANN Board or staff ("Community Reconsideration Petition"). A Community Reconsideration Petition must be delivered within 30 days after the occurrence of any of the conditions set forth in Section 4.2(g)(i)(A), (B) or (C) of the Bylaws. In that instance, the Community Reconsideration Petition must be delivered within 30 days from the initial posting of the rationale. The process set forth in this Section 4.3 of this Annex D as it relates to a particular Community Reconsideration Petition is referred to herein as the "Community Reconsideration Initiation Process."

(b) Following the delivery of a Community Reconsideration Petition to the EC Administration by a Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant pursuant to Section 4.3(a) of this Annex D (which delivery date shall be referred to herein as the "Community Reconsideration Notification Date"), the Community
Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant shall contact the EC Administration and the other Decisional Participants to determine whether any other Decisional Participants support the Community Reconsideration Petition. The Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant shall forward such communication to the Secretary for ICANN to promptly post on the Website.

(i) If the Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant obtains the support of at least one other Decisional Participant (a "Community Reconsideration Supporting Decisional Participant") during the period beginning on the Community Reconsideration Notification Date and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 21st day after the Community Reconsideration Notification Date (the "Community Reconsideration Petition Support Period"), the Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant shall provide a written notice to the EC Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary ("Community Reconsideration Supported Petition") within twenty-four (24) hours of receiving the support of at least one Community Reconsideration Supporting Decisional Participant. Each Community Reconsideration Supporting Decisional Participant shall provide a written notice to the EC Administration, the other Decisional Participants and the Secretary within twenty-four (24) hours of providing support to the Community Reconsideration Petition. Such Community Reconsideration Supported Petition shall include:

(A) a supporting rationale in reasonable detail;

(B) contact information for at least one representative who has been designated by the Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant who shall act as a liaison with respect to the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition;

(C) a statement as to whether or not the Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant and/or the Community Reconsideration Supporting Decisional Participant requests that ICANN organize a publicly-available conference call prior to the Community Reconsideration Community Forum (as defined in Section 4.3(c) of this Annex D) for the community to discuss the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition; and

(D) a statement as to whether the Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Community Reconsideration Supporting
Decisional Participant have determined to hold the Community Reconsideration Community Forum during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting.

The Community Reconsideration Initiation Process shall thereafter continue for such Community Reconsideration Supported Petition pursuant to Section 4.3(c) of this Annex D.

(ii) The Community Reconsideration Initiation Process shall automatically be terminated and the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Community Reconsideration Petition Support Period, deliver to the Secretary a notice certifying that the Community Reconsideration Initiation Process has been terminated with respect to the Reconsideration Request included in the Community Reconsideration Petition ("Community Reconsideration Termination Notice") if the Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant is unable to obtain the support of at least one other Decisional Participant for its Community Reconsideration Petition during the Community Reconsideration Petition Support Period.

(c) If the EC Administration receives a Community Reconsideration Supported Petition under Section 4.3(b) of this Annex D during the Community Reconsideration Petition Support Period, ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, convene a forum at which the Decisional Participants and interested third parties may discuss the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition ("Community Reconsideration Community Forum").

(i) If a publicly-available conference call has been requested in a Community Reconsideration Supported Petition, ICANN shall, at the direction of the EC Administration, schedule such call prior to any Community Reconsideration Community Forum, and inform the Decisional Participants of the date, time and participation methods of such conference call, which ICANN shall promptly post on the Website.

(ii) The Community Reconsideration Community Forum shall be convened and concluded during the period beginning on the expiration of the Community Reconsideration Petition Support Period and ending at 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 30th day after the expiration of the Community Reconsideration Petition Support Period ("Community Reconsideration Forum Period") unless the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition requested that
the Community Reconsideration Community Forum be held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting, in which case the Community Reconsideration Community Forum shall be held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting on the date and at the time determined by ICANN, taking into account any date and/or time requested by the Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Community Reconsideration Supporting Decisional Participant(s). If the Community Reconsideration Community Forum is held during the next scheduled ICANN public meeting and that public meeting is held after 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 30th day after the expiration of the Community Reconsideration Petition Support Period, the Community Reconsideration Community Forum Period shall expire at 11:59 p.m., local time of the city hosting such ICANN public meeting on the official last day of such ICANN public meeting.

(iii) The Community Reconsideration Community Forum shall be conducted via remote participation methods such as teleconference, web-based meeting room and/or such other form of remote participation as the EC Administration selects and/or, only if the Community Reconsideration Community Forum is held during an ICANN public meeting, face-to-face meetings. If the Community Reconsideration Community Forum will not be held during an ICANN public meeting, the EC Administration shall promptly inform ICANN of the date, time and participation methods of such Community Reconsideration Community Forum, which ICANN shall promptly post on the Website.

(iv) The EC Administration shall manage and moderate the Community Reconsideration Community Forum in a fair and neutral manner.

(v) ICANN and any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee (including Decisional Participants) may deliver to the EC Administration in writing its views and questions on the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition prior to the convening of and during the Community Reconsideration Community Forum. Any written materials delivered to the EC Administration shall also be delivered to the Secretary for prompt posting on the Website in a manner deemed appropriate by ICANN.

(vi) ICANN staff and Directors representing the Board are expected to attend the Community Reconsideration Community Forum in order to discuss the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition.

(vii) If the Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant and each of the Community Reconsideration Supporting Decisional Participants for a Community Reconsideration Supported Petition agree
before, during or after the Community Reconsideration Community Forum that the issue raised in such Community Reconsideration Supported Petition has been resolved, such Community Reconsideration Supported Petition shall be deemed withdrawn and the Community Reconsideration Initiation Process with respect to such Community Reconsideration Supported Petition will be terminated. If a Community Reconsideration Initiation Process is terminated, the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the resolution of the issue raised in the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition, deliver to the Secretary a Community Reconsideration Termination Notice. For the avoidance of doubt, the Community Reconsideration Community Forum is not a decisional body and the foregoing resolution process shall be handled pursuant to the internal procedures of the Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant and the Community Reconsideration Supporting Decisional Participant(s).

(viii) During the Community Reconsideration Community Forum Period, an additional one or two Community Reconsideration Community Forums may be held at the discretion of a Community Reconsideration Petitioning Decisional Participant and a related Community Reconsideration Supporting Decisional Participant, or the EC Administration.

(ix) ICANN will provide support services for the Community Reconsideration Community Forum and shall promptly post on the Website a public record of the Community Reconsideration Community Forum as well as all written submissions of ICANN and any Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee (including Decisional Participants) related to the Community Reconsideration Community Forum.

(d) Following the expiration of the Community Reconsideration Community Forum Period, at any time or date prior to 11:59 p.m. (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office) on the 21st day after the expiration of the Community Reconsideration Community Forum Period (such period, the "Community Reconsideration Decision Period"), each Decisional Participant shall inform the EC Administration in writing as to whether such Decisional Participant (i) supports such Community Reconsideration Supported Petition, (ii) objects to such Community Reconsideration Supported Petition or (iii) has determined to abstain from the matter (which shall not count as supporting or objecting to the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition), and each Decisional Participant shall forward such notice to the Secretary for ICANN to promptly post on the Website. If a Decisional Participant does not inform the EC Administration of any of the foregoing prior to the expiration of the Community
Reconsideration Decision Period, the Decisional Participant shall be deemed to have abstained from the matter (even if such Decisional Participant informs the EC Administration of its support or objection following the expiration of the Community Reconsideration Decision Period).

(e) If (i) three or more Decisional Participants support the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition and (ii) no more than one Decisional Participant objects to the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition, then the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Community Reconsideration Decision Period, deliver a notice to the Secretary certifying that, pursuant to and in compliance with the procedures and requirements of this Section 4.3 of this Annex D, the EC has resolved to accept the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition ("EC Reconsideration Initiation Notice"). The Reconsideration Request shall then proceed in accordance with Section 4.2 of the Bylaws.

(f) If the Community Reconsideration Supported Petition does not obtain the support required by Section 4.3(e) of this Annex D, the Community Reconsideration Initiation Process will automatically be terminated and the EC Administration shall, within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the Community Reconsideration Decision Period, deliver to the Secretary a Community Reconsideration Termination Notice.

(g) ICANN shall promptly post to the Website any (i) Community Reconsideration Petition, (ii) Community Reconsideration Supported Petition, (iii) EC Reconsideration Initiation Notice, (iv) Community Reconsideration Termination Notice, (v) written explanation provided by the EC Administration related to any of the foregoing, and (vi) other notices the Secretary receives under this Section 4.3.

Annex E: Caretaker ICANN Budget Principles

1. Principles

The caretaker ICANN budget (the "Caretaker ICANN Budget") is defined as an annual operating plan and budget that is established by the CFO in accordance with the following principles (the "Caretaker ICANN Budget Principles"):

a. It is based on then-current ICANN operations;

b. It allows ICANN to "take good care" and not expose itself to additional enterprise risk(s) as a result of the rejection of an ICANN Budget by the EC pursuant to the Bylaws;

c. It allows ICANN to react to emergency situations in a fashion that
preserves the continuation of its operations;

d. It allows ICANN to abide by its existing obligations (including Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and contracts, as well as those imposed under law);

e. It enables ICANN to avoid waste of its resources during the rejection period (i.e., the period between when an ICANN Budget is rejected by the EC pursuant to the Bylaws and when an ICANN Budget becomes effective in accordance with the Bylaws) or immediately thereafter, by being able to continue activities during the rejection period that would otherwise need to be restarted at a materially incremental cost; and

f. Notwithstanding any other principle listed above, it prevents ICANN from initiating activities that remains subject to community consideration (or for which that community consideration has not concluded) with respect to the applicable ICANN Budget, including without limitation, preventing implementation of any expenditure or undertaking any action that was the subject of the ICANN Budget that was rejected by the EC that triggered the need for the Caretaker ICANN Budget.

1. Examples

Below is a non-exhaustive list of examples, to assist with the interpretation of the Caretaker ICANN Budget Principles, of what a Caretaker ICANN Budget would logically include:

i. the functioning of the EC, the Decisional Participants, and any Supporting Organizations or Advisory Committees that are not Decisional Participants;

ii. the functioning of all redress mechanisms, including without limitation the office of the Ombudsman, the IRP, and mediation;

iii. employment of staff (i.e., employees and individual long term paid contractors serving in locations where ICANN does not have the mechanisms to employ such contractors) across all locations, including all related compensation, benefits, social security, pension, and other employment costs;

iv. hiring staff (i.e., employees and individual long term paid contractors serving in locations where ICANN does not have the mechanisms to employ such contractors) in the normal course of business;

v. necessary or time-sensitive travel costs for staff (i.e., employees and individual long term paid contractors serving in locations where ICANN does not have the
mechanisms to employ such contractors) or vendors as needed in the normal course of business;

vi. operating all existing ICANN offices, and continuing to assume obligations relative to rent, utilities, maintenance, and similar matters;

vii. contracting with vendors as needed in the normal course of business;

viii. conducting ICANN meetings and ICANN intercessional meetings previously contemplated; and

ix. participating in engagement activities in furtherance of the approved Strategic Plan.

b. Below is a non-limitative list of examples, to assist with the interpretation of the Caretaker ICANN Budget Principles, of what a Caretaker ICANN Budget would logically exclude:

i. hiring staff (i.e., employees and individual long term paid contractors serving in locations where ICANN does not have the mechanisms to employ such contractors) or entering into new agreements in relation to activities that are the subject of the rejection of the ICANN Budget by the EC pursuant to the Bylaws, unless excluding these actions would violate any of the Caretaker ICANN Budget Principles;

ii. in the normal course of business, travel not deemed indispensable during the rejection period, unless the lack of travel would violate any of the Caretaker ICANN Budget Principles;

iii. entering into new agreements in relation to opening or operating new ICANN locations/offices, unless the lack of commitment would violate any of the Caretaker ICANN Budget Principles;

iv. entering into new agreements with governments (or their affiliates), unless the lack of commitment would violate any of the Caretaker ICANN Budget Principles; and

v. the proposed expenditure that was the basis for the rejection by the EC that triggered the need for the Caretaker ICANN Budget.

Annex F: Caretaker IANA Budget Principles

1. Principles

The caretaker IANA Budget (the "Caretaker IANA Budget") is defined as an
annual operating plan and budget that is established by the CFO in accordance with the following principles (the "Caretaker IANA Budget Principles"):

a. It is based on then-current operations of the IANA functions;

b. It allows ICANN, in its responsibility to fund the operations of the IANA functions, to "take good care" and not expose itself to additional enterprise risk(s) as a result of the rejection of an IANA Budget by the EC pursuant to the Bylaws;

c. It allows ICANN, in its responsibility to fund the operations of the IANA functions, to react to emergency situations in a fashion that preserves the continuation of its operations;

d. It allows ICANN, in its responsibility to fund the operations of the IANA functions, to abide by its existing obligations (including Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and contracts, as well as those imposed under law);

e. It allows ICANN, in its responsibility to fund the operations of the IANA functions, to avoid waste of its resources during the rejection period (i.e., the period between when an IANA Budget is rejected by the EC pursuant to the Bylaws and when an IANA Budget becomes effective in accordance with the Bylaws) or immediately thereafter, by being able to continue activities during the rejection period that would have otherwise need to be restarted at an incremental cost; and

f. Notwithstanding any other principle listed above, it prevents ICANN, in its responsibility to fund the operations of the IANA functions, from initiating activities that remain subject to community consideration (or for which that community consultation has not concluded) with respect to the applicable IANA Budget, including without limitation, preventing implementation of any expenditure or undertaking any action that was the subject of the IANA Budget that was rejected by the EC that triggered the need for the Caretaker IANA Budget.

1. Examples

   a. Below is a non-exhaustive list of examples, to assist with the interpretation of the Caretaker IANA Budget Principles, of what a Caretaker IANA Budget would logically include:

      i. employment of staff (i.e., employees and individual long term paid contractors serving in locations where the entity or entities performing the IANA functions does not have the mechanisms to employ such contractors) across all locations,
including all related compensation, benefits, social security, pension, and other employment costs;

ii. hiring staff (i.e., employees and individual long term paid contractors serving in locations where the entity or entities performing the IANA functions does not have the mechanisms to employ such contractors) in the normal course of business;

iii. necessary or time-sensitive travel costs for staff (i.e., employees and individual long term paid contractors serving in locations where the entity or entities performing the IANA functions does not have the mechanisms to employ such contractors) or vendors as needed in the normal course of business;

iv. operating all existing offices used in the performance of the IANA functions, and continuing to assume obligations relative to rent, utilities, maintenance, and similar matters;

v. contracting with vendors as needed in the normal course of business;

vi. participating in meetings and conferences previously contemplated;

vii. participating in engagement activities with ICANN's Customer Standing Committee or the customers of the IANA functions;

viii. fulfilling obligations (including financial obligations under agreements and memoranda of understanding to which ICANN or its affiliates is a party that relate to the IANA functions; and

ix. participating in engagement activities in furtherance of the approved Strategic Plan.

b. Below is a non-limitative list of examples, to assist with the interpretation of the Caretaker IANA Budget Principles, of what a Caretaker IANA Budget would logically exclude:

i. hiring staff (i.e., employees and individual long term paid contractors serving in locations where the entity or entities performing the IANA functions does not have the mechanisms to employ such contractors) or entering into new agreements in relation to activities that are the subject of the rejection of the IANA Budget by the EC pursuant to the Bylaws, unless excluding these actions would violate any of the Caretaker IANA Budget Principles;

ii. in the normal course of business, travel not deemed indispensable during the rejection period, unless the lack of travel would violate any of the Caretaker IANA Budget Principles;
iii. entering into new agreements in relation to opening or operating new locations/offices where the IANA functions shall be performed, unless the lack of commitment would violate any of the Caretaker IANA Budget Principles;

iv. entering into new agreements with governments (or their affiliates), unless the lack of commitment would violate any of the Caretaker IANA Budget Principles; and

v. the proposed expenditure that was the basis for the rejection by the EC that triggered the need for the Caretaker IANA Budget.

ANNEX G-1

The topics, issues, policies, procedures and principles referenced in Section 1.1(a)(i) with respect to gTLD registrars are:

- issues for which uniform or coordinated resolution is reasonably necessary to facilitate interoperability, security and/or stability of the Internet, registrar services, registry services, or the DNS;
- functional and performance specifications for the provision of registrar services;
- registrar policies reasonably necessary to implement Consensus Policies relating to a gTLD registry;
- resolution of disputes regarding the registration of domain names (as opposed to the use of such domain names, but including where such policies take into account use of the domain names); or
- restrictions on cross-ownership of registry operators and registrars or resellers and regulations and restrictions with respect to registrar and registry operations and the use of registry and registrar data in the event that a registry operator and a registrar or reseller are affiliated.

Examples of the above include, without limitation:

- principles for allocation of registered names in a TLD (e.g., first-come/first-served, timely renewal, holding period after expiration);
- prohibitions on warehousing of or speculation in domain names by registries or registrars;
- reservation of registered names in a TLD that may not be registered initially or that may not be renewed due to reasons reasonably related to (i) avoidance of confusion among or misleading of users, (ii) intellectual
property, or (iii) the technical management of the DNS or the Internet (e.g., establishment of reservations of names from registration);

- maintenance of and access to accurate and up-to-date information concerning registered names and name servers;

- procedures to avoid disruptions of domain name registrations due to suspension or termination of operations by a registry operator or a registrar, including procedures for allocation of responsibility among continuing registrars of the registered names sponsored in a TLD by a registrar losing accreditation; and

- the transfer of registration data upon a change in registrar sponsoring one or more registered names.

ANNEX G-2

The topics, issues, policies, procedures and principles referenced in Section 1.1(a)(i) with respect to gTLD registries are:

- issues for which uniform or coordinated resolution is reasonably necessary to facilitate interoperability, security and/or stability of the Internet or DNS;

- functional and performance specifications for the provision of registry services;

- security and stability of the registry database for a TLD;

- registry policies reasonably necessary to implement Consensus Policies relating to registry operations or registrars;

- resolution of disputes regarding the registration of domain names (as opposed to the use of such domain names); or

- restrictions on cross-ownership of registry operators and registrars or registrar resellers and regulations and restrictions with respect to registry operations and the use of registry and registrar data in the event that a registry operator and a registrar or registrar reseller are affiliated.

Examples of the above include, without limitation:

- principles for allocation of registered names in a TLD (e.g., first-come/first-served, timely renewal, holding period after expiration);

- prohibitions on warehousing of or speculation in domain names by registries or registrars;
• reservation of registered names in the TLD that may not be registered initially or that may not be renewed due to reasons reasonably related to (i) avoidance of confusion among or misleading of users, (ii) intellectual property, or (iii) the technical management of the DNS or the Internet (e.g., establishment of reservations of names from registration);

• maintenance of and access to accurate and up-to-date information concerning domain name registrations; and

• procedures to avoid disruptions of domain name registrations due to suspension or termination of operations by a registry operator or a registrar, including procedures for allocation of responsibility for serving registered domain names in a TLD affected by such a suspension or termination.

[1] When "1 October 2016" is used, that signals that the date that will be used is the effective date of the Bylaws.
EXHIBIT C-3
New gTLDs have been in the forefront of ICANN’s agenda since its creation. The new gTLD program will open up the top level of the Internet’s namespace to foster diversity, encourage competition, and enhance the utility of the DNS.

Currently the namespace consists of 22 gTLDs and over 250 ccTLDs operating on various models. Each of the gTLDs has a designated “registry operator” and, in most cases, a Registry Agreement between the operator (or sponsor) and ICANN. The registry operator is responsible for the technical operation of the TLD, including all of the names registered in that TLD. The gTLDs are served by over 900 registrars, who interact with registrants to perform domain name registration and other related services. The new gTLD program will create a means for prospective registry operators to apply for new gTLDs, and create new options for consumers in the market. When the program launches its first application round, ICANN expects a diverse set of applications for new gTLDs, including IDNs, creating significant potential for new uses and benefit to Internet users across the globe.

The program has its origins in carefully deliberated policy development work by the ICANN community. In October 2007, the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO)—one of the groups that coordinate global Internet policy at ICANN—formally completed its policy development work on new gTLDs and approved a set of 19 policy recommendations. Representatives from a wide variety of stakeholder groups—governments, individuals, civil society, business and intellectual property constituencies, and the technology community—were engaged in discussions for more than 18 months on such questions as the demand, benefits and risks of new gTLDs, the selection criteria that should be applied, how gTLDs should be allocated, and the contractual conditions that should be required for new gTLD registries going forward. The culmination of this policy development process was a decision by the ICANN Board of Directors to adopt the community-developed policy in June 2008. A thorough brief to the policy process and outcomes can be found at http://gnso.icann.org/issues/new-gtlds.

ICANN’s work next focused on implementation: creating an application and evaluation process for new gTLDs that is aligned with the policy recommendations and provides a clear roadmap for applicants to reach delegation, including Board approval. This implementation work is reflected in the drafts of the applicant guidebook that were released for public comment, and in the explanatory papers giving insight into rationale behind some of the conclusions reached on specific topics. Meaningful community input has led to revisions of the draft applicant guidebook. In parallel, ICANN has established the resources needed to successfully launch and operate the program. This process concluded with the decision by the ICANN Board of Directors in June 2011 to launch the New gTLD Program.

For current information, timelines and activities related to the New gTLD Program, please go to http://www.icann.org/en/topics/new-gtld-program.htm.
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Module 1
Introduction to the gTLD Application Process

This module gives applicants an overview of the process for applying for a new generic top-level domain, and includes instructions on how to complete and submit an application, the supporting documentation an applicant must submit with an application, the fees required, and when and how to submit them.

This module also describes the conditions associated with particular types of applications, and the stages of the application life cycle.

Prospective applicants are encouraged to read and become familiar with the contents of this entire module, as well as the others, before starting the application process to make sure they understand what is required of them and what they can expect at each stage of the application evaluation process.

For the complete set of the supporting documentation and more about the origins, history and details of the policy development background to the New gTLD Program, please see http://gnso.icann.org/issues/new-gtlds/.

This Applicant Guidebook is the implementation of Board-approved consensus policy concerning the introduction of new gTLDs, and has been revised extensively via public comment and consultation over a two-year period.

1.1 Application Life Cycle and Timelines

This section provides a description of the stages that an application passes through once it is submitted. Some stages will occur for all applications submitted; others will only occur in specific circumstances. Applicants should be aware of the stages and steps involved in processing applications received.

1.1.1 Application Submission Dates

The user registration and application submission periods open at 00:01 UTC 12 January 2012.

The user registration period closes at 23:59 UTC 29 March 2012. New users to TAS will not be accepted beyond this
time. Users already registered will be able to complete the application submission process.

Applicants should be aware that, due to required processing steps (i.e., online user registration, application submission, fee submission, and fee reconciliation) and security measures built into the online application system, it might take substantial time to perform all of the necessary steps to submit a complete application. Accordingly, applicants are encouraged to submit their completed applications and fees as soon as practicable after the Application Submission Period opens. Waiting until the end of this period to begin the process may not provide sufficient time to submit a complete application before the period closes. Accordingly, new user registrations will not be accepted after the date indicated above.

The application submission period closes at **23:59 UTC 12 April 2012**.

To receive consideration, all applications must be submitted electronically through the online application system by the close of the application submission period.

An application will not be considered, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, if:

- It is received after the close of the application submission period.
- The application form is incomplete (either the questions have not been fully answered or required supporting documents are missing). Applicants will not ordinarily be permitted to supplement their applications after submission.
- The evaluation fee has not been paid by the deadline. Refer to Section 1.5 for fee information.

ICANN has gone to significant lengths to ensure that the online application system will be available for the duration of the application submission period. In the event that the system is not available, ICANN will provide alternative instructions for submitting applications on its website.

1.1.2 Application Processing Stages

This subsection provides an overview of the stages involved in processing an application submitted to ICANN. Figure 1-1 provides a simplified depiction of the process. The shortest and most straightforward path is marked with bold lines, while certain stages that may or may not be
applicable in any given case are also shown. A brief description of each stage follows.

![Diagram showing the gTLD Application Process]

Figure 1-1 – Once submitted to ICANN, applications will pass through multiple stages of processing.

1.1.2.1 Application Submission Period

At the time the application submission period opens, those wishing to submit new gTLD applications can become registered users of the TLD Application System (TAS).

After completing the user registration, applicants will supply a deposit for each requested application slot (see section 1.4), after which they will receive access to the full application form. To complete the application, users will answer a series of questions to provide general information, demonstrate financial capability, and demonstrate technical and operational capability. The supporting documents listed in subsection 1.2.2 of this module must also be submitted through the online application system as instructed in the relevant questions.

Applicants must also submit their evaluation fees during this period. Refer to Section 1.5 of this module for additional information about fees and payments.

Each application slot is for one gTLD. An applicant may submit as many applications as desired; however, there is no means to apply for more than one gTLD in a single application.
Following the close of the application submission period, ICANN will provide applicants with periodic status updates on the progress of their applications.

1.1.2.2 Administrative Completeness Check

Immediately following the close of the application submission period, ICANN will begin checking all applications for completeness. This check ensures that:

- All mandatory questions are answered;
- Required supporting documents are provided in the proper format(s); and
- The evaluation fees have been received.

ICANN will post the public portions of all applications considered complete and ready for evaluation within two weeks of the close of the application submission period. Certain questions relate to internal processes or information: applicant responses to these questions will not be posted. Each question is labeled in the application form as to whether the information will be posted. See posting designations for the full set of questions in the attachment to Module 2.

The administrative completeness check is expected to be completed for all applications in a period of approximately 8 weeks, subject to extension depending on volume. In the event that all applications cannot be processed within this period, ICANN will post updated process information and an estimated timeline.

1.1.2.3 Comment Period

Public comment mechanisms are part of ICANN’s policy development, implementation, and operational processes. As a private-public partnership, ICANN is dedicated to: preserving the operational security and stability of the Internet, promoting competition, achieving broad representation of global Internet communities, and developing policy appropriate to its mission through bottom-up, consensus-based processes. This necessarily involves the participation of many stakeholder groups in a public discussion.

ICANN will open a comment period (the Application Comment period) at the time applications are publicly posted on ICANN’s website (refer to subsection 1.1.2.2). This period will allow time for the community to review and submit comments on posted application materials.
(referred to as “application comments.”) The comment forum will require commenters to associate comments with specific applications and the relevant panel. Application comments received within a 60-day period from the posting of the application materials will be available to the evaluation panels performing the Initial Evaluation reviews. This period is subject to extension, should the volume of applications or other circumstances require. **To be considered by evaluators, comments must be received in the designated comment forum within the stated time period.**

Evaluators will perform due diligence on the application comments (i.e., determine their relevance to the evaluation, verify the accuracy of claims, analyze meaningfulness of references cited) and take the information provided in these comments into consideration. In cases where consideration of the comments has impacted the scoring of the application, the evaluators will seek clarification from the applicant. Statements concerning consideration of application comments that have impacted the evaluation decision will be reflected in the evaluators' summary reports, which will be published at the end of Extended Evaluation.

Comments received after the 60-day period will be stored and available (along with comments received during the comment period) for other considerations, such as the dispute resolution process, as described below.

In the new gTLD application process, all applicants should be aware that comment fora are a mechanism for the public to bring relevant information and issues to the attention of those charged with handling new gTLD applications. Anyone may submit a comment in a public comment forum.

**Comments and the Formal Objection Process:** A distinction should be made between application comments, which may be relevant to ICANN’s task of determining whether applications meet the established criteria, and formal objections that concern matters outside those evaluation criteria. The formal objection process was created to allow a full and fair consideration of objections based on certain limited grounds outside ICANN’s evaluation of applications on their merits (see subsection 3.2).

Public comments will not be considered as formal objections. Comments on matters associated with formal objections will not be considered by panels during Initial Evaluation. These comments will be available to and may
be subsequently considered by an expert panel during a dispute resolution proceeding (see subsection 1.1.2.9). However, in general, application comments have a very limited role in the dispute resolution process.

**String Contention:** Comments designated for the Community Priority Panel, as relevant to the criteria in Module 4, may be taken into account during a Community Priority Evaluation.

**Government Notifications:** Governments may provide a notification using the application comment forum to communicate concerns relating to national laws. However, a government’s notification of concern will not in itself be deemed to be a formal objection. A notification by a government does not constitute grounds for rejection of a gTLD application. A government may elect to use this comment mechanism to provide such a notification, in addition to or as an alternative to the GAC Early Warning procedure described in subsection 1.1.2.4 below.

Governments may also communicate directly to applicants using the contact information posted in the application, e.g., to send a notification that an applied-for gTLD string might be contrary to a national law, and to try to address any concerns with the applicant.

**General Comments:** A general public comment forum will remain open through all stages of the evaluation process, to provide a means for the public to bring forward any other relevant information or issues.

### 1.1.2.4 GAC Early Warning

Concurrent with the 60-day comment period, ICANN’s Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) may issue a GAC Early Warning notice concerning an application. This provides the applicant with an indication that the application is seen as potentially sensitive or problematic by one or more governments.

The GAC Early Warning is a notice only. It is not a formal objection, nor does it directly lead to a process that can result in rejection of the application. However, a GAC Early Warning should be taken seriously as it raises the likelihood that the application could be the subject of GAC Advice on New gTLDs (see subsection 1.1.2.7) or of a formal objection (see subsection 1.1.2.6) at a later stage in the process.
A GAC Early Warning typically results from a notice to the GAC by one or more governments that an application might be problematic, e.g., potentially violate national law or raise sensitivities. A GAC Early Warning may be issued for any reason. The GAC may then send that notice to the Board – constituting the GAC Early Warning. ICANN will notify applicants of GAC Early Warnings as soon as practicable after receipt from the GAC. The GAC Early Warning notice may include a nominated point of contact for further information.

GAC consensus is not required for a GAC Early Warning to be issued. Minimally, the GAC Early Warning must be provided in writing to the ICANN Board, and be clearly labeled as a GAC Early Warning. This may take the form of an email from the GAC Chair to the ICANN Board. For GAC Early Warnings to be most effective, they should include the reason for the warning and identify the objecting countries.

Upon receipt of a GAC Early Warning, the applicant may elect to withdraw the application for a partial refund (see subsection 1.5.1), or may elect to continue with the application (this may include meeting with representatives from the relevant government(s) to try to address the concern). To qualify for the refund described in subsection 1.5.1, the applicant must provide notification to ICANN of its election to withdraw the application within 21 calendar days of the date of GAC Early Warning delivery to the applicant.

To reduce the possibility of a GAC Early Warning, all applicants are encouraged to identify potential sensitivities in advance of application submission, and to work with the relevant parties (including governments) beforehand to mitigate concerns related to the application.

1.1.2.5 Initial Evaluation

Initial Evaluation will begin immediately after the administrative completeness check concludes. All complete applications will be reviewed during Initial Evaluation. At the beginning of this period, background screening on the applying entity and the individuals named in the application will be conducted. Applications

---

1 While definitive guidance has not been issued, the GAC has indicated that strings that could raise sensitivities include those that "purport to represent or that embody a particular group of people or interests based on historical, cultural, or social components of identity, such as nationality, race or ethnicity, religion, belief, culture or particular social origin or group, political opinion, membership of a national minority, disability, age, and/or a language or linguistic group (non-exhaustive)" and "those strings that refer to particular sectors, such as those subject to national regulation (such as .bank, .pharmacy) or those that describe or are targeted to a population or industry that is vulnerable to online fraud or abuse."
must pass this step in conjunction with the Initial Evaluation reviews.

There are two main elements of the Initial Evaluation:

1. **String reviews (concerning the applied-for gTLD string).** String reviews include a determination that the applied-for gTLD string is not likely to cause security or stability problems in the DNS, including problems caused by similarity to existing TLDs or reserved names.

2. **Applicant reviews (concerning the entity applying for the gTLD and its proposed registry services).** Applicant reviews include a determination of whether the applicant has the requisite technical, operational, and financial capabilities to operate a registry.

By the conclusion of the Initial Evaluation period, ICANN will post notice of all Initial Evaluation results. Depending on the volume of applications received, such notices may be posted in batches over the course of the Initial Evaluation period.

The Initial Evaluation is expected to be completed for all applications in a period of approximately 5 months. If the volume of applications received significantly exceeds 500, applications will be processed in batches and the 5-month timeline will not be met. The first batch will be limited to 500 applications and subsequent batches will be limited to 400 to account for capacity limitations due to managing extended evaluation, string contention, and other processes associated with each previous batch.

If batching is required, a secondary time-stamp process will be employed to establish the batches. (Batching priority will not be given to an application based on the time at which the application was submitted to ICANN, nor will batching priority be established based on a random selection method.)

The secondary time-stamp process will require applicants to obtain a time-stamp through a designated process which will occur after the close of the application submission period. The secondary time stamp process will occur, if required, according to the details to be published on ICANN’s website. (Upon the Board’s approval of a final designation of the operational details of the “secondary timestamp” batching process, the final plan will be added as a process within the Applicant Guidebook.)
If batching is required, the String Similarity review will be completed on all applications prior to the establishment of evaluation priority batches. For applications identified as part of a contention set, the entire contention set will be kept together in the same batch.

If batches are established, ICANN will post updated process information and an estimated timeline.

Note that the processing constraints will limit delegation rates to a steady state even in the event of an extremely high volume of applications. The annual delegation rate will not exceed 1,000 per year in any case, no matter how many applications are received.\(^2\)

1.1.2.6 Objection Filing

Formal objections to applications can be filed on any of four enumerated grounds, by parties with standing to object. The objection filing period will open after ICANN posts the list of complete applications as described in subsection 1.1.2.2, and will last for approximately 7 months.

Objectors must file such formal objections directly with dispute resolution service providers (DRSPs), not with ICANN. The objection filing period will close following the end of the Initial Evaluation period (refer to subsection 1.1.2.5), with a two-week window of time between the posting of the Initial Evaluation results and the close of the objection filing period. Objections that have been filed during the objection filing period will be addressed in the dispute resolution stage, which is outlined in subsection 1.1.2.9 and discussed in detail in Module 3.

All applicants should be aware that third parties have the opportunity to file objections to any application during the objection filing period. Applicants whose applications are the subject of a formal objection will have an opportunity to file a response according to the dispute resolution service provider’s rules and procedures. An applicant wishing to file a formal objection to another application that has been submitted would do so within the objection filing period, following the objection filing procedures in Module 3.

Applicants are encouraged to identify possible regional, cultural, property interests, or other sensitivities regarding TLD strings and their uses before applying and, where

possible, consult with interested parties to mitigate any concerns in advance.

1.1.2.7 Receipt of GAC Advice on New gTLDs

The GAC may provide public policy advice directly to the ICANN Board on any application. The procedure for GAC Advice on New gTLDs described in Module 3 indicates that, to be considered by the Board during the evaluation process, the GAC Advice on New gTLDs must be submitted by the close of the objection filing period. A GAC Early Warning is not a prerequisite to use of the GAC Advice process.

If the Board receives GAC Advice on New gTLDs stating that it is the consensus of the GAC that a particular application should not proceed, this will create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved. If the Board does not act in accordance with this type of advice, it must provide rationale for doing so.

See Module 3 for additional detail on the procedures concerning GAC Advice on New gTLDs.

1.1.2.8 Extended Evaluation

Extended Evaluation is available only to certain applicants that do not pass Initial Evaluation.

Applicants failing certain elements of the Initial Evaluation can request an Extended Evaluation. If the applicant does not pass Initial Evaluation and does not expressly request an Extended Evaluation, the application will proceed no further. The Extended Evaluation period allows for an additional exchange of information between the applicant and evaluators to clarify information contained in the application. The reviews performed in Extended Evaluation do not introduce additional evaluation criteria.

An application may be required to enter an Extended Evaluation if one or more proposed registry services raise technical issues that might adversely affect the security or stability of the DNS. The Extended Evaluation period provides a timeframe for these issues to be investigated. Applicants will be informed if such a review is required by the end of the Initial Evaluation period.

Evaluators and any applicable experts consulted will communicate the conclusions resulting from the additional review by the end of the Extended Evaluation period.
At the conclusion of the Extended Evaluation period, ICANN will post summary reports, by panel, from the Initial and Extended Evaluation periods.

If an application passes the Extended Evaluation, it can then proceed to the next relevant stage. If the application does not pass the Extended Evaluation, it will proceed no further.

The Extended Evaluation is expected to be completed for all applications in a period of approximately 5 months, though this timeframe could be increased based on volume. In this event, ICANN will post updated process information and an estimated timeline.

1.1.2.9 Dispute Resolution

Dispute resolution applies only to applicants whose applications are the subject of a formal objection.

Where formal objections are filed and filing fees paid during the objection filing period, independent dispute resolution service providers (DRSPs) will initiate and conclude proceedings based on the objections received. The formal objection procedure exists to provide a path for those who wish to object to an application that has been submitted to ICANN. Dispute resolution service providers serve as the fora to adjudicate the proceedings based on the subject matter and the needed expertise. Consolidation of objections filed will occur where appropriate, at the discretion of the DRSP.

As a result of a dispute resolution proceeding, either the applicant will prevail (in which case the application can proceed to the next relevant stage), or the objector will prevail (in which case either the application will proceed no further or the application will be bound to a contention resolution procedure). In the event of multiple objections, an applicant must prevail in all dispute resolution proceedings concerning the application to proceed to the next relevant stage. Applicants will be notified by the DRSP(s) of the results of dispute resolution proceedings.

Dispute resolution proceedings, where applicable, are expected to be completed for all applications within approximately a 5-month time frame. In the event that volume is such that this timeframe cannot be accommodated, ICANN will work with the dispute resolution service providers to create processing procedures and post updated timeline information.
1.1.2.10 String Contention

String contention applies only when there is more than one qualified application for the same or similar gTLD strings.

String contention refers to the scenario in which there is more than one qualified application for the identical gTLD string or for similar gTLD strings. In this Applicant Guidebook, “similar” means strings so similar that they create a probability of user confusion if more than one of the strings is delegated into the root zone.

Applicants are encouraged to resolve string contention cases among themselves prior to the string contention resolution stage. In the absence of resolution by the contending applicants, string contention cases are resolved either through a community priority evaluation (if a community-based applicant elects it) or through an auction.

In the event of contention between applied-for gTLD strings that represent geographic names, the parties may be required to follow a different process to resolve the contention. See subsection 2.2.1.4 of Module 2 for more information.

Groups of applied-for strings that are either identical or similar are called contention sets. All applicants should be aware that if an application is identified as being part of a contention set, string contention resolution procedures will not begin until all applications in the contention set have completed all aspects of evaluation, including dispute resolution, if applicable.

To illustrate, as shown in Figure 1-2, Applicants A, B, and C all apply for .EXAMPLE and are identified as a contention set. Applicants A and C pass Initial Evaluation, but Applicant B does not. Applicant B requests Extended Evaluation. A third party files an objection to Applicant C’s application, and Applicant C enters the dispute resolution process. Applicant A must wait to see whether Applicants B and C successfully complete the Extended Evaluation and dispute resolution phases, respectively, before it can proceed to the string contention resolution stage. In this example, Applicant B passes the Extended Evaluation, but Applicant C does not prevail in the dispute resolution proceeding. String contention resolution then proceeds between Applicants A and B.
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Figure 1-2 – All applications in a contention set must complete all previous evaluation and dispute resolution stages before string contention resolution can begin.

Applicants prevailing in a string contention resolution procedure will proceed toward delegation of the applied-for gTLDs.

String contention resolution for a contention set is estimated to take from 2.5 to 6 months to complete. The time required will vary per case because some contention cases may be resolved in either a community priority evaluation or an auction, while others may require both processes.

1.1.2.11 Transition to Delegation

Applicants successfully completing all the relevant stages outlined in this subsection 1.1.2 are required to carry out a series of concluding steps before delegation of the applied-for gTLD into the root zone. These steps include execution of a registry agreement with ICANN and completion of a pre-delegation technical test to validate information provided in the application.

Following execution of a registry agreement, the prospective registry operator must complete technical set-up and show satisfactory performance on a set of technical tests before delegation of the gTLD into the root zone may be initiated. If the pre-delegation testing requirements are not satisfied so that the gTLD can be delegated into the root zone within the time frame specified in the registry agreement, ICANN may in its sole and absolute discretion elect to terminate the registry agreement.
Once all of these steps have been successfully completed, the applicant is eligible for delegation of its applied-for gTLD into the DNS root zone.

It is expected that the transition to delegation steps can be completed in approximately 2 months, though this could take more time depending on the applicant’s level of preparedness for the pre-delegation testing and the volume of applications undergoing these steps concurrently.

1.1.3   Lifecycle Timelines

Based on the estimates for each stage described in this section, the lifecycle for a straightforward application could be approximately 9 months, as follows:

- **2 Months**
  - Administrative Check

- **5 Months**
  - Initial Evaluation

- **2 Months**
  - Transition to Delegation

![Figure 1-3 – A straightforward application could have an approximate 9-month lifecycle.](image)

The lifecycle for a highly complex application could be much longer, such as 20 months in the example below:
### 1.1.4 Posting Periods

The results of application reviews will be made available to the public at various stages in the process, as shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Posting Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During Administrative Completeness Check</td>
<td>Public portions of all applications (posted within 2 weeks of the start of the Administrative Completeness Check).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Administrative Completeness Check</td>
<td>Results of Administrative Completeness Check.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC Early Warning Period</td>
<td>GAC Early Warnings received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Initial Evaluation</td>
<td>Status updates for applications withdrawn or ineligible for further review. Contention sets resulting from String Similarity review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1.1.5 Sample Application Scenarios

The following scenarios briefly show a variety of ways in which an application may proceed through the evaluation process. The table that follows exemplifies various processes and outcomes. This is not intended to be an exhaustive list of possibilities. There are other possible combinations of paths an application could follow.

Estimated time frames for each scenario are also included, based on current knowledge. Actual time frames may vary depending on several factors, including the total number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Posting Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>End of Initial Evaluation</td>
<td>Application status updates with all Initial Evaluation results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC Advice on New gTLDs</td>
<td>GAC Advice received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Extended Evaluation</td>
<td>Application status updates with all Extended Evaluation results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation summary reports from the Initial and Extended Evaluation periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Objection Filing/Dispute Resolution</td>
<td>Information on filed objections and status updates available via Dispute Resolution Service Provider websites. Notice of all objections posted by ICANN after close of objection filing period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Contention Resolution (Community Priority Evaluation)</td>
<td>Results of each Community Priority Evaluation posted as completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Contention Resolution (Auction)</td>
<td>Results from each auction posted as completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition to Delegation</td>
<td>Registry Agreements posted when executed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-delegation testing status updated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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of applications received by ICANN during the application submission period. It should be emphasized that most applications are expected to pass through the process in the shortest period of time, i.e., they will not go through extended evaluation, dispute resolution, or string contention resolution processes. Although most of the scenarios below are for processes extending beyond nine months, it is expected that most applications will complete the process within the nine-month timeframe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario Number</th>
<th>Initial Evaluation</th>
<th>Extended Evaluation</th>
<th>Objection(s)Filed</th>
<th>String Contention</th>
<th>Approved for Delegation Steps</th>
<th>Estimated Elapsed Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11.5 – 15 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Applicant prevails</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>14 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Objector prevails</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Quit</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Applicant prevails</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16.5 – 20 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Applicant prevails</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>14.5 – 18 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scenario 1 - Pass Initial Evaluation, No Objection, No Contention - In the most straightforward case, the application passes Initial Evaluation and there is no need for an Extended Evaluation. No objections are filed during the objection period, so there is no dispute to resolve. As there is no contention for the applied-for gTLD string, the applicant can enter into a registry agreement and the application can proceed toward delegation of the applied-for gTLD. Most applications are expected to complete the process within this timeframe.

Scenario 2 - Extended Evaluation, No Objection, No Contention - In this case, the application fails one or more aspects of the Initial Evaluation. The applicant is eligible for and requests an Extended Evaluation for the appropriate elements. Here, the application passes the Extended Evaluation. As with Scenario 1, no objections are filed.
during the objection period, so there is no dispute to resolve. As there is no contention for the gTLD string, the applicant can enter into a registry agreement and the application can proceed toward delegation of the applied-for gTLD.

**Scenario 3 – Pass Initial Evaluation, No Objection, Contention** – In this case, the application passes the Initial Evaluation so there is no need for Extended Evaluation. No objections are filed during the objection period, so there is no dispute to resolve. However, there are other applications for the same or a similar gTLD string, so there is contention. In this case, the application prevails in the contention resolution, so the applicant can enter into a registry agreement and the application can proceed toward delegation of the applied-for gTLD.

**Scenario 4 – Pass Initial Evaluation, Win Objection, No Contention** – In this case, the application passes the Initial Evaluation so there is no need for Extended Evaluation. During the objection filing period, an objection is filed on one of the four enumerated grounds by an objector with standing (refer to Module 3, Objection Procedures). The objection is heard by a dispute resolution service provider panel that finds in favor of the applicant. The applicant can enter into a registry agreement and the application can proceed toward delegation of the applied-for gTLD.

**Scenario 5 – Pass Initial Evaluation, Lose Objection** – In this case, the application passes the Initial Evaluation so there is no need for Extended Evaluation. During the objection period, multiple objections are filed by one or more objectors with standing for one or more of the four enumerated objection grounds. Each objection is heard by a dispute resolution service provider panel. In this case, the panels find in favor of the applicant for most of the objections, but one finds in favor of the objector. As one of the objections has been upheld, the application does not proceed.

**Scenario 6 – Fail Initial Evaluation, Applicant Withdraws** – In this case, the application fails one or more aspects of the Initial Evaluation. The applicant decides to withdraw the application rather than continuing with Extended Evaluation. The application does not proceed.

**Scenario 7 – Fail Initial Evaluation, Fail Extended Evaluation** – In this case, the application fails one or more aspects of the Initial Evaluation. The applicant requests Extended Evaluation for the appropriate elements. However, the
application fails Extended Evaluation also. The application does not proceed.

**Scenario 8 - Extended Evaluation, Win Objection, Pass Contention** – In this case, the application fails one or more aspects of the Initial Evaluation. The applicant is eligible for and requests an Extended Evaluation for the appropriate elements. Here, the application passes the Extended Evaluation. During the objection filing period, an objection is filed on one of the four enumerated grounds by an objector with standing. The objection is heard by a dispute resolution service provider panel that finds in favor of the applicant. However, there are other applications for the same or a similar gTLD string, so there is contention. In this case, the applicant prevails over other applications in the contention resolution procedure, the applicant can enter into a registry agreement, and the application can proceed toward delegation of the applied-for gTLD.

**Scenario 9 - Extended Evaluation, Objection, Fail Contention** – In this case, the application fails one or more aspects of the Initial Evaluation. The applicant is eligible for and requests an Extended Evaluation for the appropriate elements. Here, the application passes the Extended Evaluation. During the objection filing period, an objection is filed on one of the four enumerated grounds by an objector with standing. The objection is heard by a dispute resolution service provider that finds in favor of the applicant. However, there are other applications for the same or a similar gTLD string, so there is contention. In this case, another applicant prevails in the contention resolution procedure, and the application does not proceed.

**Transition to Delegation** – After an application has successfully completed Initial Evaluation, and other stages as applicable, the applicant is required to complete a set of steps leading to delegation of the gTLD, including execution of a registry agreement with ICANN, and completion of pre-delegation testing. Refer to Module 5 for a description of the steps required in this stage.

**1.1.6 Subsequent Application Rounds**

ICANN’s goal is to launch subsequent gTLD application rounds as quickly as possible. The exact timing will be based on experiences gained and changes required after this round is completed. The goal is for the next application round to begin within one year of the close of the application submission period for the initial round.
ICANN has committed to reviewing the effects of the New gTLD Program on the operations of the root zone system after the first application round, and will defer the delegations in a second application round until it is determined that the delegations resulting from the first round did not jeopardize root zone system security or stability.

It is the policy of ICANN that there be subsequent application rounds, and that a systemized manner of applying for gTLDs be developed in the long term.

1.2 Information for All Applicants

1.2.1 Eligibility

Established corporations, organizations, or institutions in good standing may apply for a new gTLD. Applications from individuals or sole proprietorships will not be considered. Applications from or on behalf of yet-to-be-formed legal entities, or applications presupposing the future formation of a legal entity (for example, a pending Joint Venture) will not be considered.

ICANN has designed the New gTLD Program with multiple stakeholder protection mechanisms. Background screening, features of the gTLD Registry Agreement, data and financial escrow mechanisms are all intended to provide registrant and user protections.

The application form requires applicants to provide information on the legal establishment of the applying entity, as well as the identification of directors, officers, partners, and major shareholders of that entity. The names and positions of individuals included in the application will be published as part of the application; other information collected about the individuals will not be published.

Background screening at both the entity level and the individual level will be conducted for all applications to confirm eligibility. This inquiry is conducted on the basis of the information provided in questions 1-11 of the application form. ICANN may take into account information received from any source if it is relevant to the criteria in this section. If requested by ICANN, all applicants will be required to obtain and deliver to ICANN and ICANN’s background screening vendor any consents or agreements of the entities and/or individuals named in questions 1-11 of the application form necessary to conduct background screening activities.
ICANN will perform background screening in only two areas: (1) General business diligence and criminal history; and (2) History of cybersquatting behavior. The criteria used for criminal history are aligned with the “crimes of trust” standard sometimes used in the banking and finance industry.

In the absence of exceptional circumstances, applications from any entity with or including any individual with convictions or decisions of the types listed in (a) - (m) below will be automatically disqualified from the program.

a. within the past ten years, has been convicted of any crime related to financial or corporate governance activities, or has been judged by a court to have committed fraud or breach of fiduciary duty, or has been the subject of a judicial determination that ICANN deems as the substantive equivalent of any of these;

b. within the past ten years, has been disciplined by any government or industry regulatory body for conduct involving dishonesty or misuse of the funds of others;

c. within the past ten years has been convicted of any willful tax-related fraud or willful evasion of tax liabilities;

d. within the past ten years has been convicted of perjury, forswearing, failing to cooperate with a law enforcement investigation, or making false statements to a law enforcement agency or representative;

e. has ever been convicted of any crime involving the use of computers, telephony systems, telecommunications or the Internet to facilitate the commission of crimes;

f. has ever been convicted of any crime involving the use of a weapon, force, or the threat of force;

g. has ever been convicted of any violent or sexual offense victimizing children, the
elderly, or individuals with disabilities;

h. has ever been convicted of the illegal sale, manufacture, or distribution of pharmaceutical drugs, or been convicted or successfully extradited for any offense described in Article 3 of the United Nations Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988;

i. has ever been convicted or successfully extradited for any offense described in the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (all Protocols);

j. has been convicted, within the respective timeframes, of aiding, abetting, facilitating, enabling, conspiring to commit, or failing to report any of the listed crimes above (i.e., within the past 10 years for crimes listed in (a) - (d) above, or ever for the crimes listed in (e) - (i) above);

k. has entered a guilty plea as part of a plea agreement or has a court case in any jurisdiction with a disposition of Adjudicated Guilty or Adjudication Withheld (or regional equivalents), within the respective timeframes listed above for any of the listed crimes (i.e., within the past 10 years for crimes listed in (a) - (d) above, or ever for the crimes listed in (e) - (i) above);

l. is the subject of a disqualification imposed by ICANN and in effect at the time the application is considered;

m. has been involved in a pattern of adverse, final decisions indicating that the applicant

---


5 It is recognized that not all countries have signed on to the UN conventions referenced above. These conventions are being used solely for identification of a list of crimes for which background screening will be performed. It is not necessarily required that an applicant would have been convicted pursuant to the UN convention but merely convicted of a crime listed under these conventions, to trigger these criteria.
or individual named in the application was engaged in cybersquatting as defined in the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP), the Anti-Cybersquatting Consumer Protection Act (ACPA), or other equivalent legislation, or was engaged in reverse domain name hijacking under the UDRP or bad faith or reckless disregard under the ACPA or other equivalent legislation. Three or more such decisions with one occurring in the last four years will generally be considered to constitute a pattern.

n. fails to provide ICANN with the identifying information necessary to confirm identity at the time of application or to resolve questions of identity during the background screening process;

o. fails to provide a good faith effort to disclose all relevant information relating to items (a) – (m).

Background screening is in place to protect the public interest in the allocation of critical Internet resources, and ICANN reserves the right to deny an otherwise qualified application based on any information identified during the background screening process. For example, a final and legally binding decision obtained by a national law enforcement or consumer protection authority finding that the applicant was engaged in fraudulent and deceptive commercial practices as defined in the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Guidelines for Protecting Consumers from Fraudulent and Deceptive Commercial Practices Across Borders may cause an application to be rejected. ICANN may also contact the applicant with additional questions based on information obtained in the background screening process.

All applicants are required to provide complete and detailed explanations regarding any of the above events as part of the application. Background screening information will not be made publicly available by ICANN.

Registrar Cross-Ownership -- ICANN-accredited registrars are eligible to apply for a gTLD. However, all gTLD registries

---

6 http://www.oecd.org/document/56/0,3746,en_2649_34267_2515000_1_1_1_1,00.html
are required to abide by a Code of Conduct addressing, inter alia, non-discriminatory access for all authorized registrars. ICANN reserves the right to refer any application to the appropriate competition authority relative to any cross-ownership issues.

**Legal Compliance** -- ICANN must comply with all U.S. laws, rules, and regulations. One such set of regulations is the economic and trade sanctions program administered by the Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) of the U.S. Department of the Treasury. These sanctions have been imposed on certain countries, as well as individuals and entities that appear on OFAC’s List of Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons (the SDN List). ICANN is prohibited from providing most goods or services to residents of sanctioned countries or their governmental entities or to SDNs without an applicable U.S. government authorization or exemption. ICANN generally will not seek a license to provide goods or services to an individual or entity on the SDN List. In the past, when ICANN has been requested to provide services to individuals or entities that are not SDNs, but are residents of sanctioned countries, ICANN has sought and been granted licenses as required. In any given case, however, OFAC could decide not to issue a requested license.

### 1.2.2 Required Documents

All applicants should be prepared to submit the following documents, which are required to accompany each application:

1. **Proof of legal establishment** - Documentation of the applicant’s establishment as a specific type of entity in accordance with the applicable laws of its jurisdiction.

2. **Financial statements** - Applicants must provide audited or independently certified financial statements for the most recently completed fiscal year for the applicant. In some cases, unaudited financial statements may be provided.

As indicated in the relevant questions, supporting documentation should be submitted in the original language. English translations are not required.

All documents must be valid at the time of submission. Refer to the Evaluation Criteria, attached to Module 2, for additional details on the requirements for these documents.
Some types of supporting documentation are required only in certain cases:

1. **Community endorsement** - If an applicant has designated its application as community-based (see section 1.2.3), it will be asked to submit a written endorsement of its application by one or more established institutions representing the community it has named. An applicant may submit written endorsements from multiple institutions. If applicable, this will be submitted in the section of the application concerning the community-based designation.

   At least one such endorsement is required for a complete application. The form and content of the endorsement are at the discretion of the party providing the endorsement; however, the letter must identify the applied-for gTLD string and the applying entity, include an express statement of support for the application, and supply the contact information of the entity providing the endorsement.

   Written endorsements from individuals need not be submitted with the application, but may be submitted in the application comment forum.

2. **Government support or non-objection** - If an applicant has applied for a gTLD string that is a geographic name (as defined in this Guidebook), the applicant is required to submit documentation of support for or non-objection to its application from the relevant governments or public authorities. Refer to subsection 2.2.1.4 for more information on the requirements for geographic names. If applicable, this will be submitted in the geographic names section of the application.

3. **Documentation of third-party funding commitments** - If an applicant lists funding from third parties in its application, it must provide evidence of commitment by the party committing the funds. If applicable, this will be submitted in the financial section of the application.

### 1.2.3 Community-Based Designation

All applicants are required to designate whether their application is **community-based**.

#### 1.2.3.1 Definitions

For purposes of this Applicant Guidebook, a **community-based gTLD** is a gTLD that is operated for the benefit of a clearly delineated community. Designation or non-
designation of an application as community-based is entirely at the discretion of the applicant. Any applicant may designate its application as community-based; however, each applicant making this designation is asked to substantiate its status as representative of the community it names in the application by submission of written endorsements in support of the application. Additional information may be requested in the event of a community priority evaluation (refer to section 4.2 of Module 4). An applicant for a community-based gTLD is expected to:

1. Demonstrate an ongoing relationship with a clearly delineated community.
2. Have applied for a gTLD string strongly and specifically related to the community named in the application.
3. Have proposed dedicated registration and use policies for registrants in its proposed gTLD, including appropriate security verification procedures, commensurate with the community-based purpose it has named.
4. Have its application endorsed in writing by one or more established institutions representing the community it has named.

For purposes of differentiation, an application that has not been designated as community-based will be referred to hereinafter in this document as a standard application. A standard gTLD can be used for any purpose consistent with the requirements of the application and evaluation criteria, and with the registry agreement. A standard applicant may or may not have a formal relationship with an exclusive registrant or user population. It may or may not employ eligibility or use restrictions. Standard simply means here that the applicant has not designated the application as community-based.

### 1.2.3.2 Implications of Application Designation

Applicants should understand how their designation as community-based or standard will affect application processing at particular stages, and, if the application is successful, execution of the registry agreement and subsequent obligations as a gTLD registry operator, as described in the following paragraphs.

**Objection / Dispute Resolution** – All applicants should understand that a formal objection may be filed against any application on community grounds, even if the applicant has not designated itself as community-based or
declared the gTLD to be aimed at a particular community. Refer to Module 3, Objection Procedures.

**String Contention** – Resolution of string contention may include one or more components, depending on the composition of the contention set and the elections made by community-based applicants.

- A *settlement between the parties* can occur at any time after contention is identified. The parties will be encouraged to meet with an objective to settle the contention. Applicants in contention always have the opportunity to resolve the contention voluntarily, resulting in the withdrawal of one or more applications, before reaching the contention resolution stage.

- A *community priority evaluation* will take place only if a community-based applicant in a contention set elects this option. All community-based applicants in a contention set will be offered this option in the event that there is contention remaining after the applications have successfully completed all previous evaluation stages.

- An *auction* will result for cases of contention not resolved by community priority evaluation or agreement between the parties. Auction occurs as a contention resolution means of last resort. If a community priority evaluation occurs but does not produce a clear winner, an auction will take place to resolve the contention.

Refer to Module 4, String Contention Procedures, for detailed discussions of contention resolution procedures.

**Contract Execution and Post-Delegation** – A community-based applicant will be subject to certain post-delegation contractual obligations to operate the gTLD in a manner consistent with the restrictions associated with its community-based designation. Material changes to the contract, including changes to the community-based nature of the gTLD and any associated provisions, may only be made with ICANN’s approval. The determination of whether to approve changes requested by the applicant will be at ICANN’s discretion. Proposed criteria for approving such changes are the subject of policy discussions.

Community-based applications are intended to be a narrow category, for applications where there are
unambiguous associations among the applicant, the community served, and the applied-for gTLD string. Evaluation of an applicant's designation as community-based will occur only in the event of a contention situation that results in a community priority evaluation. However, any applicant designating its application as community-based will, if the application is approved, be bound by the registry agreement to implement the community-based restrictions it has specified in the application. This is true even if there are no contending applicants.

1.2.3.3 Changes to Application Designation
An applicant may not change its designation as standard or community-based once it has submitted a gTLD application for processing.

1.2.4 Notice concerning Technical Acceptance Issues with New gTLDs
All applicants should be aware that approval of an application and entry into a registry agreement with ICANN do not guarantee that a new gTLD will immediately function throughout the Internet. Past experience indicates that network operators may not immediately fully support new top-level domains, even when these domains have been delegated in the DNS root zone, since third-party software modification may be required and may not happen immediately.

Similarly, software applications sometimes attempt to validate domain names and may not recognize new or unknown top-level domains. ICANN has no authority or ability to require that software accept new top-level domains, although it does prominently publicize which top-level domains are valid and has developed a basic tool to assist application providers in the use of current root-zone data.

ICANN encourages applicants to familiarize themselves with these issues and account for them in their startup and launch plans. Successful applicants may find themselves expending considerable efforts working with providers to achieve acceptance of their new top-level domains.

Applicants should review [http://www.icann.org/en/topics/TLD-acceptance/](http://www.icann.org/en/topics/TLD-acceptance/) for background. IDN applicants should also review the material concerning experiences with IDN test strings in the root zone (see [http://idn.icann.org/](http://idn.icann.org/)).
1.2.5 Notice concerning TLD Delegations

ICANN is only able to create TLDs as delegations in the DNS root zone, expressed using NS records with any corresponding DS records and glue records. There is no policy enabling ICANN to place TLDs as other DNS record types (such as A, MX, or DNAME records) in the root zone.

1.2.6 Terms and Conditions

All applicants must agree to a standard set of Terms and Conditions for the application process. The Terms and Conditions are available in Module 6 of this guidebook.

1.2.7 Notice of Changes to Information

If at any time during the evaluation process information previously submitted by an applicant becomes untrue or inaccurate, the applicant must promptly notify ICANN via submission of the appropriate forms. This includes applicant-specific information such as changes in financial position and changes in ownership or control of the applicant.

ICANN reserves the right to require a re-evaluation of the application in the event of a material change. This could involve additional fees or evaluation in a subsequent application round.

Failure to notify ICANN of any change in circumstances that would render any information provided in the application false or misleading may result in denial of the application.

1.2.8 Voluntary Designation for High Security Zones


The Final Report may be used to inform further work. ICANN will support independent efforts toward developing voluntary high-security TLD designations, which may be available to gTLD applicants wishing to pursue such designations.

1.2.9 Security and Stability

Root Zone Stability: There has been significant study, analysis, and consultation in preparation for launch of the
New gTLD Program, indicating that the addition of gTLDs to the root zone will not negatively impact the security or stability of the DNS.

It is estimated that 200-300 TLDs will be delegated annually, and determined that in no case will more than 1000 new gTLDs be added to the root zone in a year. The delegation rate analysis, consultations with the technical community, and anticipated normal operational upgrade cycles all lead to the conclusion that the new gTLD delegations will have no significant impact on the stability of the root system. Modeling and reporting will continue during, and after, the first application round so that root-scaling discussions can continue and the delegation rates can be managed as the program goes forward.

All applicants should be aware that delegation of any new gTLDs is conditional on the continued absence of significant negative impact on the security or stability of the DNS and the root zone system (including the process for delegating TLDs in the root zone). In the event that there is a reported impact in this regard and processing of applications is delayed, the applicants will be notified in an orderly and timely manner.

1.2.10 Resources for Applicant Assistance

A variety of support resources are available to gTLD applicants. Financial assistance will be available to a limited number of eligible applicants. To request financial assistance, applicants must submit a separate financial assistance application in addition to the gTLD application form.

To be eligible for consideration, all financial assistance applications must be received by **23:59 UTC 12 April 2012**. Financial assistance applications will be evaluated and scored against pre-established criteria.

In addition, ICANN maintains a webpage as an informational resource for applicants seeking assistance, and organizations offering support.

See [http://newgtlds.icann.org/applicants/candidate-support](http://newgtlds.icann.org/applicants/candidate-support) for details on these resources.

1.2.11 Updates to the Applicant Guidebook

As approved by the ICANN Board of Directors, this Guidebook forms the basis of the New gTLD Program. ICANN reserves the right to make reasonable updates and
changes to the Applicant Guidebook at any time, including as the possible result of new technical standards, reference documents, or policies that might be adopted during the course of the application process. Any such updates or revisions will be posted on ICANN’s website.

1.3 Information for Internationalized Domain Name Applicants

Some applied-for gTLD strings are expected to be Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs). IDNs are domain names including characters used in the local representation of languages not written with the basic Latin alphabet (a - z), European-Arabic digits (0 - 9), and the hyphen (-). As described below, IDNs require the insertion of A-labels into the DNS root zone.

1.3.1 IDN-Specific Requirements

An applicant for an IDN string must provide information indicating compliance with the IDNA protocol and other technical requirements. The IDNA protocol and its documentation can be found at http://icann.org/en/topics/idn/rfcs.htm.

Applicants must provide applied-for gTLD strings in the form of both a U-label (the IDN TLD in local characters) and an A-label.

An A-label is the ASCII form of an IDN label. Every IDN A-label begins with the IDNA ACE prefix, “xn--”, followed by a string that is a valid output of the Punycode algorithm, making a maximum of 63 total ASCII characters in length. The prefix and string together must conform to all requirements for a label that can be stored in the DNS including conformance to the LDH (host name) rule described in RFC 1034, RFC 1123, and elsewhere.

A U-label is the Unicode form of an IDN label, which a user expects to see displayed in applications.

For example, using the current IDN test string in Cyrillic script, the U-label is <испытание> and the A-label is <xn--80akhbyknj4f>. An A-label must be capable of being produced by conversion from a U-label and a U-label must be capable of being produced by conversion from an A-label.

Applicants for IDN gTLDs will also be required to provide the following at the time of the application:
1. **Meaning or restatement of string in English.** The applicant will provide a short description of what the string would mean or represent in English.

2. **Language of label (ISO 639-1).** The applicant will specify the language of the applied-for gTLD string, both according to the ISO codes for the representation of names of languages, and in English.

3. **Script of label (ISO 15924).** The applicant will specify the script of the applied-for gTLD string, both according to the ISO codes for the representation of names of scripts, and in English.

4. **Unicode code points.** The applicant will list all the code points contained in the U-label according to its Unicode form.

5. **Applicants must further demonstrate that they have made reasonable efforts to ensure that the encoded IDN string does not cause any rendering or operational problems.** For example, problems have been identified in strings with characters of mixed right-to-left and left-to-right directionality when numerals are adjacent to the path separator (i.e., the dot).⁷

   If an applicant is applying for a string with known issues, it should document steps that will be taken to mitigate these issues in applications. While it is not possible to ensure that all rendering problems are avoided, it is important that as many as possible are identified early and that the potential registry operator is aware of these issues. Applicants can become familiar with these issues by understanding the IDNA protocol (see http://www.icann.org/en/topics/idn/rfcs.htm), and by active participation in the IDN wiki (see http://idn.icann.org/) where some rendering problems are demonstrated.

6. **[Optional] - Representation of label in phonetic alphabet.** The applicant may choose to provide its applied-for gTLD string notated according to the International Phonetic Alphabet (http://www.langsci.ucl.ac.uk/ipa/). Note that this information will not be evaluated or scored. The information, if provided, will be used as a guide to ICANN in responding to inquiries or speaking of the application in public presentations.

---

⁷ See examples at http://stupid.domain.name/node/683
1.3.2 IDN Tables

An IDN table provides the list of characters eligible for registration in domain names according to the registry’s policy. It identifies any multiple characters that are considered equivalent for domain name registration purposes (“variant characters”). Variant characters occur where two or more characters can be used interchangeably.

Examples of IDN tables can be found in the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) IDN Repository at http://www.iana.org/procedures/idn-repository.html.

In the case of an application for an IDN gTLD, IDN tables must be submitted for the language or script for the applied-for gTLD string (the “top level tables”). IDN tables must also be submitted for each language or script in which the applicant intends to offer IDN registrations at the second or lower levels.

Each applicant is responsible for developing its IDN Tables, including specification of any variant characters. Tables must comply with ICANN’s IDN Guidelines8 and any updates thereto, including:

- Complying with IDN technical standards.
- Employing an inclusion-based approach (i.e., code points not explicitly permitted by the registry are prohibited).
- Defining variant characters.
- Excluding code points not permissible under the guidelines, e.g., line-drawing symbols, pictographic dingbats, structural punctuation marks.
- Developing tables and registration policies in collaboration with relevant stakeholders to address common issues.
- Depositing IDN tables with the IANA Repository for IDN Practices (once the TLD is delegated).

An applicant’s IDN tables should help guard against user confusion in the deployment of IDN gTLDs. Applicants are strongly urged to consider specific linguistic and writing system issues that may cause problems when characters are used in domain names, as part of their work of defining variant characters.

8 See http://www.icann.org/en/topics/idn/implementation-guidelines.htm
To avoid user confusion due to differing practices across TLD registries, it is recommended that applicants cooperate with TLD operators that offer domain name registration with the same or visually similar characters.

As an example, languages or scripts are often shared across geographic boundaries. In some cases, this can cause confusion among the users of the corresponding language or script communities. Visual confusion can also exist in some instances between different scripts (for example, Greek, Cyrillic and Latin).

Applicants will be asked to describe the process used in developing the IDN tables submitted. ICANN may compare an applicant’s IDN table with IDN tables for the same languages or scripts that already exist in the IANA repository or have been otherwise submitted to ICANN. If there are inconsistencies that have not been explained in the application, ICANN may ask the applicant to detail the rationale for differences. For applicants that wish to conduct and review such comparisons prior to submitting a table to ICANN, a table comparison tool will be available.

ICANN will accept the applicant’s IDN tables based on the factors above.

Once the applied-for string has been delegated as a TLD in the root zone, the applicant is required to submit IDN tables for lodging in the IANA Repository of IDN Practices. For additional information, see existing tables at http://iana.org/domains/idn-tables/, and submission guidelines at http://iana.org/procedures/idn-repository.html.

### 1.3.3 IDN Variant TLDs

A variant TLD string results from the substitution of one or more characters in the applied-for gTLD string with variant characters based on the applicant’s top level tables.

Each application contains one applied-for gTLD string. The applicant may also declare any variant strings for the TLD in its application. However, no variant gTLD strings will be delegated through the New gTLD Program until variant management solutions are developed and implemented.\(^9\)

Declaring variant strings is informative only and will not imply any right or claim to the declared variant strings.

---

\(^9\) The ICANN Board directed that work be pursued on variant management in its resolution on 25 Sep 2010, [http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-25sep10-en.html#2.5](http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-25sep10-en.html#2.5).
When a variant delegation process is established, applicants may be required to submit additional information such as implementation details for the variant TLD management mechanism, and may need to participate in a subsequent evaluation process, which could contain additional fees and review steps.

The following scenarios are possible during the gTLD evaluation process:

a. Applicant declares variant strings to the applied-for gTLD string in its application. If the application is successful, the applied-for gTLD string will be delegated to the applicant. The declared variant strings are noted for future reference. These declared variant strings will not be delegated to the applicant along with the applied-for gTLD string, nor will the applicant have any right or claim to the declared variant strings.

Variant strings listed in successful gTLD applications will be tagged to the specific application and added to a “Declared Variants List” that will be available on ICANN’s website. A list of pending (i.e., declared) variant strings from the IDN ccTLD Fast Track is available at http://icann.org/en/topics/idn/fast-track/string-evaluation-completion-en.htm.

ICANN may perform independent analysis on the declared variant strings, and will not necessarily include all strings listed by the applicant on the Declared Variants List.

b. Multiple applicants apply for strings that are identified by ICANN as variants of one another. These applications will be placed in a contention set and will follow the contention resolution procedures in Module 4.

c. Applicant submits an application for a gTLD string and does not indicate variants to the applied-for gTLD string. ICANN will not identify variant strings unless scenario (b) above occurs.

Each variant string declared in the application must also conform to the string requirements in section 2.2.1.3.2.

Variant strings declared in the application will be reviewed for consistency with the top-level tables submitted in the application. Should any declared variant strings not be
based on use of variant characters according to the submitted top-level tables, the applicant will be notified and the declared string will no longer be considered part of the application.

Declaration of variant strings in an application does not provide the applicant any right or reservation to a particular string. Variant strings on the Declared Variants List may be subject to subsequent additional review per a process and criteria to be defined.

It should be noted that while variants for second and lower-level registrations are defined freely by the local communities without any ICANN validation, there may be specific rules and validation criteria specified for variant strings to be allowed at the top level. It is expected that the variant information provided by applicants in the first application round will contribute to a better understanding of the issues and assist in determining appropriate review steps and fee levels going forward.

1.4 Submitting an Application

Applicants may complete the application form and submit supporting documents using ICANN’s TLD Application System (TAS). To access the system, each applicant must first register as a TAS user.

As TAS users, applicants will be able to provide responses in open text boxes and submit required supporting documents as attachments. Restrictions on the size of attachments as well as the file formats are included in the instructions on the TAS site.

Except where expressly provided within the question, all application materials must be submitted in English.

ICANN will not accept application forms or supporting materials submitted through other means than TAS (that is, hard copy, fax, email), unless such submission is in accordance with specific instructions from ICANN to applicants.

1.4.1 Accessing the TLD Application System

The TAS site will be accessible from the New gTLD webpage (http://www.icann.org/en/topics/new-gtld-program.htm), and will be highlighted in communications regarding the opening of the application submission period. Users of TAS will be expected to agree to a standard set of terms of use...
including user rights, obligations, and restrictions in relation to the use of the system.

1.4.1.1 User Registration

TAS user registration (creating a TAS user profile) requires submission of preliminary information, which will be used to validate the identity of the parties involved in the application. An overview of the information collected in the user registration process is below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Full legal name of Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Principal business address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Phone number of Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fax number of Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Website or URL, if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Primary Contact: Name, Title, Address, Phone, Fax, Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Secondary Contact: Name, Title, Address, Phone, Fax, Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Proof of legal establishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Trading, subsidiary, or joint venture information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Business ID, Tax ID, VAT registration number, or equivalent of Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Applicant background: previous convictions, cybersquatting activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Deposit payment confirmation and payer information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A subset of identifying information will be collected from the entity performing the user registration, in addition to the applicant information listed above. The registered user could be, for example, an agent, representative, or
employee who would be completing the application on behalf of the applicant.

The registration process will require the user to request the desired number of application slots. For example, a user intending to submit five gTLD applications would complete five application slot requests, and the system would assign the user a unique ID number for each of the five applications.

Users will also be required to submit a deposit of USD 5,000 per application slot. This deposit amount will be credited against the evaluation fee for each application. The deposit requirement is in place to help reduce the risk of frivolous access to the online application system.

After completing the registration, TAS users will receive access enabling them to enter the rest of the application information into the system. Application slots will be populated with the registration information provided by the applicant, which may not ordinarily be changed once slots have been assigned.

No new user registrations will be accepted after 23:59 UTC 29 March 2012.

ICANN will take commercially reasonable steps to protect all applicant data submitted from unauthorized access, but cannot warrant against the malicious acts of third parties who may, through system corruption or other means, gain unauthorized access to such data.

1.4.1.2 Application Form

Having obtained the requested application slots, the applicant will complete the remaining application questions. An overview of the areas and questions contained in the form is shown here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Application and String Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Payment confirmation for remaining evaluation fee amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Applied-for gTLD string</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>IDN string information, if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>IDN tables, if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question/Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mitigation of IDN operational or rendering problems, if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Representation of string in International Phonetic Alphabet (Optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mission/purpose of the TLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Is the application for a community-based TLD?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>If community based, describe elements of community and proposed policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Is the application for a geographic name? If geographic, documents of support required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Measures for protection of geographic names at second level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Registry Services: name and full description of all registry services to be provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Technical and Operational Questions (External)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Shared registration system (SRS) performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>EPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Whois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Registration life cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Abuse prevention &amp; mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Rights protection mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30(a)</td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Technical and Operational Questions (Internal)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30(b)</td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Technical overview of proposed registry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1.4.2 Customer Service during the Application Process

Assistance will be available to applicants throughout the application process via the Applicant Service Center (ASC). The ASC will be staffed with customer service agents.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Database capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Geographic diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>DNS service compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>IPv6 reachability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Data backup policies and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Escrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Registry continuity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Registry transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Failover testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Monitoring and fault escalation processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>DNSSEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>IDNs (Optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Financial statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Projections template: costs and funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Costs: setup and operating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Funding and revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Contingency planning: barriers, funds, volumes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Continuity: continued operations instrument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4.3 *Backup Application Process*

If the online application system is not available, ICANN will provide alternative instructions for submitting applications.

1.5 *Fees and Payments*

This section describes the fees to be paid by the applicant. Payment instructions are also included here.

1.5.1 *gTLD Evaluation Fee*

The gTLD evaluation fee is required from all applicants. This fee is in the amount of USD 185,000. The evaluation fee is payable in the form of a 5,000 deposit submitted at the time the user requests an application slot within TAS, and a payment of the remaining 180,000 submitted with the full application. ICANN will not begin its evaluation of an application unless it has received the full gTLD evaluation fee by 23:59 UTC 12 April 2012.

The gTLD evaluation fee is set to recover costs associated with the new gTLD program. The fee is set to ensure that the program is fully funded and revenue neutral and is not subsidized by existing contributions from ICANN funding sources, including generic TLD registries and registrars, ccTLD contributions and RIR contributions.

The gTLD evaluation fee covers all required reviews in Initial Evaluation and, in most cases, any required reviews in Extended Evaluation. If an extended Registry Services review takes place, an additional fee will be incurred for this review (see section 1.5.2). There is no additional fee to the applicant for Extended Evaluation for geographic names, technical and operational, or financial reviews.

**Refunds** -- In certain cases, refunds of a portion of the evaluation fee may be available for applications that are withdrawn before the evaluation process is complete. An applicant may request a refund at any time until it has executed a registry agreement with ICANN. The amount of the refund will depend on the point in the process at which the withdrawal is requested, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Refund Available to Applicant</th>
<th>Percentage of Evaluation Fee</th>
<th>Amount of Refund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within 21 calendar days of a GAC Early</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>USD 148,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Refund Available to Applicant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Percentage of Evaluation Fee</th>
<th>Amount of Refund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After posting of applications until posting of Initial Evaluation results</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>USD 130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After posting Initial Evaluation results</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>USD 65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the applicant has completed Dispute Resolution, Extended Evaluation, or String Contention Resolution(s)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>USD 37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the applicant has entered into a registry agreement with ICANN</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, any applicant that has not been successful is eligible for at least a 20% refund of the evaluation fee if it withdraws its application.

An applicant that wishes to withdraw an application must initiate the process through TAS. Withdrawal of an application is final and irrevocable. Refunds will only be issued to the organization that submitted the original payment. All refunds are paid by wire transfer. Any bank transfer or transaction fees incurred by ICANN, or any unpaid evaluation fees, will be deducted from the amount paid. Any refund paid will be in full satisfaction of ICANN’s obligations to the applicant. The applicant will have no entitlement to any additional amounts, including for interest or currency exchange rate changes.

**Note on 2000 proof-of-concept round applicants** --
Participants in ICANN’s proof-of-concept application process in 2000 may be eligible for a credit toward the evaluation fee. The credit is in the amount of USD 86,000 and is subject to:
• submission of documentary proof by the applicant that it is the same entity, a successor in interest to the same entity, or an affiliate of the same entity that applied previously;

• a confirmation that the applicant was not awarded any TLD string pursuant to the 2000 proof-of-concept application round and that the applicant has no legal claims arising from the 2000 proof-of-concept process; and

• submission of an application, which may be modified from the application originally submitted in 2000, for the same TLD string that such entity applied for in the 2000 proof-of-concept application round.

Each participant in the 2000 proof-of-concept application process is eligible for at most one credit. A maximum of one credit may be claimed for any new gTLD application submitted according to the process in this guidebook. Eligibility for this credit is determined by ICANN.

1.5.2 Fees Required in Some Cases

Applicants may be required to pay additional fees in certain cases where specialized process steps are applicable. Those possible additional fees\textsuperscript{10} include:

• **Registry Services Review Fee** - If applicable, this fee is payable for additional costs incurred in referring an application to the Registry Services Technical Evaluation Panel (RSTEP) for an extended review. Applicants will be notified if such a fee is due. The fee for a three-member RSTEP review team is anticipated to be USD 50,000. In some cases, five-member panels might be required, or there might be increased scrutiny at a greater cost. The amount of the fee will cover the cost of the RSTEP review. In the event that reviews of proposed registry services can be consolidated across multiple applications or applicants, ICANN will apportion the fees in an equitable manner. In every case, the applicant will be advised of the cost before initiation of the review. Refer to subsection 2.2.3 of Module 2 on Registry Services review.

\textsuperscript{10} The estimated fee amounts provided in this section 1.5.2 will be updated upon engagement of panel service providers and establishment of fees.
• **Dispute Resolution Filing Fee** - This amount must accompany any filing of a formal objection and any response that an applicant files to an objection. This fee is payable directly to the applicable dispute resolution service provider in accordance with the provider’s payment instructions. ICANN estimates that filing fees could range from approximately USD 1,000 to USD 5,000 (or more) per party per proceeding. Refer to the appropriate provider for the relevant amount. Refer to Module 3 for dispute resolution procedures.

• **Advance Payment of Costs** - In the event of a formal objection, this amount is payable directly to the applicable dispute resolution service provider in accordance with that provider’s procedures and schedule of costs. Ordinarily, both parties in the dispute resolution proceeding will be required to submit an advance payment of costs in an estimated amount to cover the entire cost of the proceeding. This may be either an hourly fee based on the estimated number of hours the panelists will spend on the case (including review of submissions, facilitation of a hearing, if allowed, and preparation of a decision), or a fixed amount. In cases where disputes are consolidated and there are more than two parties involved, the advance payment will occur according to the dispute resolution service provider’s rules.

The prevailing party in a dispute resolution proceeding will have its advance payment refunded, while the non-prevailing party will not receive a refund and thus will bear the cost of the proceeding. In cases where disputes are consolidated and there are more than two parties involved, the refund of fees will occur according to the dispute resolution service provider’s rules.

ICANN estimates that adjudication fees for a proceeding involving a fixed amount could range from USD 2,000 to USD 8,000 (or more) per proceeding. ICANN further estimates that an hourly rate based proceeding with a one-member panel could range from USD 32,000 to USD 56,000 (or more) and with a three-member panel it could range from USD 70,000 to USD 122,000 (or more). These estimates may be lower if the panel does not call for written submissions beyond the objection and response, and does not allow a hearing. Please
refer to the appropriate provider for the relevant amounts or fee structures.

- **Community Priority Evaluation Fee** - In the event that the applicant participates in a community priority evaluation, this fee is payable as a deposit in an amount to cover the cost of the panel’s review of that application (currently estimated at USD 10,000). The deposit is payable to the provider appointed to handle community priority evaluations. Applicants will be notified if such a fee is due. Refer to Section 4.2 of Module 4 for circumstances in which a community priority evaluation may take place. An applicant who scores at or above the threshold for the community priority evaluation will have its deposit refunded.

ICANN will notify the applicants of due dates for payment in respect of additional fees (if applicable). This list does not include fees (annual registry fees) that will be payable to ICANN following execution of a registry agreement.

### 1.5.3 Payment Methods

Payments to ICANN should be submitted by **wire transfer**. Instructions for making a payment by wire transfer will be available in TAS.11

Payments to Dispute Resolution Service Providers should be submitted in accordance with the provider’s instructions.

### 1.5.4 Requesting a Remittance Form

The TAS interface allows applicants to request issuance of a remittance form for any of the fees payable to ICANN. This service is for the convenience of applicants that require an invoice to process payments.

### 1.6 Questions about this Applicant Guidebook

For assistance and questions an applicant may have in the process of completing the application form, applicants should use the customer support resources available via the ASC. Applicants who are unsure of the information being sought in a question or the parameters for acceptable documentation are encouraged to communicate these questions through the appropriate

---

11 Wire transfer is the preferred method of payment as it offers a globally accessible and dependable means for international transfer of funds. This enables ICANN to receive the fee and begin processing applications as quickly as possible.
support channels before the application is submitted. This helps avoid the need for exchanges with evaluators to clarify information, which extends the timeframe associated with processing the application.

Currently, questions may be submitted via <newgtld@icann.org>. To provide all applicants equitable access to information, ICANN will make all questions and answers publicly available.

All requests to ICANN for information about the process or issues surrounding preparation of an application must be submitted to the ASC. ICANN will not grant requests from applicants for personal or telephone consultations regarding the preparation of an application. Applicants that contact ICANN for clarification about aspects of the application will be referred to the ASC.

Answers to inquiries will only provide clarification about the application forms and procedures. ICANN will not provide consulting, financial, or legal advice.
The application can be objected to based upon any combination of the four objection grounds at the same time. Additionally, the application may face multiple objections on the same objection ground.
Module 2
Evaluation Procedures

This module describes the evaluation procedures and criteria used to determine whether applied-for gTLDs are approved for delegation. All applicants will undergo an Initial Evaluation and those that do not pass all elements may request Extended Evaluation.

The first, required evaluation is the **Initial Evaluation**, during which ICANN assesses an applied-for gTLD string, an applicant’s qualifications, and its proposed registry services.

The following assessments are performed in the **Initial Evaluation**:

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

- **Applicant Reviews**
  - Demonstration of technical and operational capability
  - Demonstration of financial capability
  - Registry services reviews for DNS stability issues

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

**Extended Evaluation** may be applicable in cases in which an applicant does not pass the Initial Evaluation. See Section 2.3 below.

### 2.1 Background Screening

Background screening will be conducted in two areas:

(a) General business diligence and criminal history; and

(b) History of cybersquatting behavior.
The application must pass both background screening areas to be eligible to proceed. Background screening results are evaluated according to the criteria described in section 1.2.1. Due to the potential sensitive nature of the material, applicant background screening reports will not be published.

The following sections describe the process ICANN will use to perform background screening.

### 2.1.1 General business diligence and criminal history

Applying entities that are publicly traded corporations listed and in good standing on any of the world’s largest 25 stock exchanges (as listed by the World Federation of Exchanges) will be deemed to have passed the general business diligence and criminal history screening. The largest 25 will be based on the domestic market capitalization reported at the end of the most recent calendar year prior to launching each round.¹

Before an entity is listed on an exchange, it must undergo significant due diligence including an investigation by the exchange, regulators, and investment banks. As a publicly listed corporation, an entity is subject to ongoing scrutiny from shareholders, analysts, regulators, and exchanges. All exchanges require monitoring and disclosure of material information about directors, officers, and other key personnel, including criminal behavior. In totality, these requirements meet or exceed the screening ICANN will perform.

For applicants not listed on one of these exchanges, ICANN will submit identifying information for the entity, officers, directors, and major shareholders to an international background screening service. The service provider(s) will use the criteria listed in section 1.2.1 and return results that match these criteria. Only publicly available information will be used in this inquiry.

ICANN is in discussions with INTERPOL to identify ways in which both organizations can collaborate in background screenings of individuals, entities and their identity documents consistent with both organizations’ rules and regulations. Note that the applicant is expected to disclose potential problems in meeting the criteria in the application, and provide any clarification or explanation at the time of application submission. Results returned from

the background screening process will be matched with the disclosures provided by the applicant and those cases will be followed up to resolve issues of discrepancies or potential false positives.

If no hits are returned, the application will generally pass this portion of the background screening.

2.1.2 History of cybersquatting

ICANN will screen applicants against UDRP cases and legal databases as financially feasible for data that may indicate a pattern of cybersquatting behavior pursuant to the criteria listed in section 1.2.1.

The applicant is required to make specific declarations regarding these activities in the application. Results returned during the screening process will be matched with the disclosures provided by the applicant and those instances will be followed up to resolve issues of discrepancies or potential false positives.

If no hits are returned, the application will generally pass this portion of the background screening.

2.2 Initial Evaluation

The Initial Evaluation consists of two types of review. Each type is composed of several elements.

String review: The first review focuses on the applied-for gTLD string to test:

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

Applicant review: The second review focuses on the applicant to test:

- Whether the applicant has the requisite technical, operational, and financial capability to operate a registry; and
- Whether the registry services offered by the applicant might adversely affect DNS security or stability.
2.2.1 String Reviews

In the Initial Evaluation, ICANN reviews every applied-for gTLD string. Those reviews are described in greater detail in the following subsections.

2.2.1.1 String Similarity Review

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

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

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

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

2.2.1.1.1 Reviews Performed

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

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

- Applied-for gTLD strings against existing TLDs and reserved names;
- Applied-for gTLD strings against other applied-for gTLD strings;
- Applied-for gTLD strings against strings requested as IDN ccTLDs; and
- Applied-for 2-character IDN gTLD strings against:
  - Every other single character.
  - Any other 2-character ASCII string (to protect possible future ccTLD delegations).
**Similarity to Existing TLDs or Reserved Names** - This review involves cross-checking between each applied-for string and the lists of existing TLD strings and Reserved Names to determine whether two strings are so similar to one another that they create a probability of user confusion.

In the simple case in which an applied-for gTLD string is identical to an existing TLD or reserved name, the online application system will not allow the application to be submitted.

Testing for identical strings also takes into consideration the code point variants listed in any relevant IDN table. For example, protocols treat equivalent labels as alternative forms of the same label, just as “foo” and “Foo” are treated as alternative forms of the same label (RFC 3490).

All TLDs currently in the root zone can be found at [http://iana.org/domains/root/db/](http://iana.org/domains/root/db/).

IDN tables that have been submitted to ICANN are available at [http://www.iana.org/domains/idn-tables/](http://www.iana.org/domains/idn-tables/).

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

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

ICANN will notify applicants who are part of a contention set as soon as the String Similarity review is completed. (This provides a longer period for contending applicants to reach their own resolution before reaching the contention resolution stage.) These contention sets will also be published on ICANN’s website.

**Similarity to TLD strings requested as IDN ccTLDs** -- Applied-for gTLD strings will also be reviewed for similarity to TLD strings requested in the IDN ccTLD Fast Track process (see [http://www.icann.org/en/topics/idn/fast-track/](http://www.icann.org/en/topics/idn/fast-track/)). Should a conflict with a prospective fast-track IDN ccTLD be identified, ICANN will take the following approach to resolving the conflict.
If one of the applications has completed its respective process before the other is lodged, that TLD will be delegated. A gTLD application that has successfully completed all relevant evaluation stages, including dispute resolution and string contention, if applicable, and is eligible for entry into a registry agreement will be considered complete, and therefore would not be disqualified by a newly-filed IDN ccTLD request. Similarly, an IDN ccTLD request that has completed evaluation (i.e., is validated) will be considered complete and therefore would not be disqualified by a newly-filed gTLD application.

In the case where neither application has completed its respective process, where the gTLD application does not have the required approval from the relevant government or public authority, a validated request for an IDN ccTLD will prevail and the gTLD application will not be approved. The term “validated” is defined in the IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process Implementation, which can be found at http://www.icann.org/en/topics/idn.

In the case where a gTLD applicant has obtained the support or non-objection of the relevant government or public authority, but is eliminated due to contention with a string requested in the IDN ccTLD Fast Track process, a full refund of the evaluation fee is available to the applicant if the gTLD application was submitted prior to the publication of the ccTLD request.

**Review of 2-character IDN strings** — In addition to the above reviews, an applied-for gTLD string that is a 2-character IDN string is reviewed by the String Similarity Panel for visual similarity to:

a) Any one-character label (in any script), and
b) Any possible two-character ASCII combination.

An applied-for gTLD string that is found to be too similar to a) or b) above will not pass this review.

**2.2.1.1.2 Review Methodology**

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

The algorithm, user guidelines, and additional background information are available to applicants for testing and informational purposes. Applicants will have the ability to test their strings and obtain algorithmic results through the application system prior to submission of an application.

The algorithm supports the common characters in Arabic, Chinese, Cyrillic, Devanagari, Greek, Japanese, Korean, and Latin scripts. It can also compare strings in different scripts to each other.

The panel will also take into account variant characters, as defined in any relevant language table, in its determinations. For example, strings that are not visually similar but are determined to be variant TLD strings based on an IDN table would be placed in a contention set. Variant TLD strings that are listed as part of the application will also be subject to the string similarity analysis.

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

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

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

### 2.2.1.1.3 Outcomes of the String Similarity Review

An application that fails the String Similarity review due to similarity to an existing TLD will not pass the Initial Evaluation.

---

2 See [http://icann.sword-group.com/algorithm](http://icann.sword-group.com/algorithm)

3 In the case where an applicant has listed Declared Variants in its application (see subsection 1.3.3), the panel will perform an analysis of the listed strings to confirm that the strings are variants according to the applicant’s IDN table. This analysis may include comparison of applicant IDN tables with other existing tables for the same language or script, and forwarding any questions to the applicant.
and no further reviews will be available. Where an application does not pass the String Similarity review, the applicant will be notified as soon as the review is completed.

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

An application that passes the String Similarity review is still subject to objection by an existing TLD operator or by another gTLD applicant in the current application round. That process requires that a string confusion objection be filed by an objector having the standing to make such an objection. Such category of 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. Refer to Module 3, Dispute Resolution Procedures, for more information about the objection process.

An applicant may file a formal objection against another gTLD application on string confusion grounds. Such an objection may, if successful, change the configuration of the preliminary contention sets in that the two applied-for gTLD strings will be considered in direct contention with one another (see Module 4, String Contention Procedures). The objection process will not result in removal of an application from a contention set.

### 2.2.1.2 Reserved Names and Other Unavailable Strings

Certain names are not available as gTLD strings, as detailed in this section.

#### 2.2.1.2.1 Reserved Names

All applied-for gTLD strings are compared with the list of top-level Reserved Names to ensure that the applied-for gTLD string does not appear on that list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top-Level Reserved Names List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFRINIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APNIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCNSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXAMPLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If an applicant enters a Reserved Name as its applied-for gTLD string, the application system will recognize the Reserved Name and will not allow the application to be submitted.

In addition, applied-for gTLD strings are reviewed during the String Similarity review to determine whether they are similar to a Reserved Name. An application for a gTLD string that is identified as too similar to a Reserved Name will not pass this review.

2.2.1.2.2 Declared Variants

Names appearing on the Declared Variants List (see section 1.3.3) will be posted on ICANN’s website and will be treated essentially the same as Reserved Names, until such time as variant management solutions are developed and variant TLDs are delegated. That is, an application for a gTLD string that is identical or similar to a string on the Declared Variants List will not pass this review.

2.2.1.2.3 Strings Ineligible for Delegation

The following names are prohibited from delegation as gTLDs in the initial application round. Future application rounds may differ according to consideration of further policy advice.

These names are not being placed on the Top-Level Reserved Names List, and thus are not part of the string similarity review conducted for names on that list. Refer to subsection 2.2.1.1: where applied-for gTLD strings are reviewed for similarity to existing TLDs and reserved names, the strings listed in this section are not reserved names and accordingly are not incorporated into this review.

Applications for names appearing on the list included in this section will not be approved.
### 2.2.1.3 DNS Stability Review

This review determines whether an applied-for gTLD string might cause instability to the DNS. In all cases, this will involve a review for conformance with technical and other requirements for gTLD strings (labels). In some exceptional cases, an extended review may be necessary to investigate possible technical stability problems with the applied-for gTLD string.
Note: All applicants should recognize issues surrounding invalid TLD queries at the root level of the DNS.

Any new TLD registry operator may experience unanticipated queries, and some TLDs may experience a non-trivial load of unanticipated queries. For more information, see the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)’s report on this topic at http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac045.pdf. Some publicly available statistics are also available at http://stats.l.root-servers.org/.

ICANN will take steps to alert applicants of the issues raised in SAC045, and encourage the applicant to prepare to minimize the possibility of operational difficulties that would pose a stability or availability problem for its registrants and users. However, this notice is merely an advisory to applicants and is not part of the evaluation, unless the string raises significant security or stability issues as described in the following section.

2.2.1.3.1 DNS Stability: String Review Procedure

New gTLD labels must not adversely affect the security or stability of the DNS. During the Initial Evaluation period, ICANN will conduct a preliminary review on the set of applied-for gTLD strings to:

- ensure that applied-for gTLD strings comply with the requirements provided in section 2.2.1.3.2, and
- determine whether any strings raise significant security or stability issues that may require further review.

There is a very low probability that extended analysis will be necessary for a string that fully complies with the string requirements in subsection 2.2.1.3.2 of this module. However, the string review process provides an additional safeguard if unanticipated security or stability issues arise concerning an applied-for gTLD string.

In such a case, the DNS Stability Panel will perform an extended review of the applied-for gTLD string during the Initial Evaluation period. The panel will determine whether the string fails to comply with relevant standards or creates a condition that adversely affects the throughput, response time, consistency, or coherence of responses to Internet servers or end systems, and will report on its findings.

If the panel determines that the string complies with relevant standards and does not create the conditions
described above, the application will pass the DNS Stability review.

If the panel determines that the string does not comply with relevant technical standards, or that it creates a condition that adversely affects the throughput, response time, consistency, or coherence of responses to Internet servers or end systems, the application will not pass the Initial Evaluation, and no further reviews are available. In the case where a string is determined likely to cause security or stability problems in the DNS, the applicant will be notified as soon as the DNS Stability review is completed.

2.2.1.3.2 String Requirements

ICANN will review each applied-for gTLD string to ensure that it complies with the requirements outlined in the following paragraphs.

If an applied-for gTLD string is found to violate any of these rules, the application will not pass the DNS Stability review. No further reviews are available.

**Part I -- Technical Requirements for all Labels (Strings)** - The technical requirements for top-level domain labels follow.

1.1 The ASCII label (i.e., the label as transmitted on the wire) must be valid as specified in technical standards Domain Names: Implementation and Specification (RFC 1035), and Clarifications to the DNS Specification (RFC 2181) and any updates thereto. This includes the following:

1.1.1 The label must have no more than 63 characters.

1.1.2 Upper and lower case characters are treated as identical.

1.2 The ASCII label must be a valid host name, as specified in the technical standards DOD Internet Host Table Specification (RFC 952), Requirements for Internet Hosts — Application and Support (RFC 1123), and Application Techniques for Checking and Transformation of Names (RFC 3696), Internationalized Domain Names in Applications (IDNA)(RFCs 5890-5894), and any updates thereto. This includes the following:

1.2.1 The ASCII label must consist entirely of letters (alphabetic characters a-z), or
1.2.2 The label must be a valid IDNA A-label (further restricted as described in Part II below).

Part II -- Requirements for Internationalized Domain Names

- These requirements apply only to prospective top-level domains that contain non-ASCII characters. Applicants for these internationalized top-level domain labels are expected to be familiar with the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) IDNA standards, Unicode standards, and the terminology associated with Internationalized Domain Names.

2.1 The label must be an A-label as defined in IDNA, converted from (and convertible to) a U-label that is consistent with the definition in IDNA, and further restricted by the following, non-exhaustive, list of limitations:

2.1.1 Must be a valid A-label according to IDNA.

2.1.2 The derived property value of all codepoints used in the U-label, as defined by IDNA, must be PVALID or CONTEXT (accompanied by unambiguous contextual rules).

2.1.3 The general category of all codepoints, as defined by IDNA, must be one of (Ll, Lo, Lm, Mn, Mc).

2.1.4 The U-label must be fully compliant with Normalization Form C, as described in Unicode Standard Annex #15: Unicode Normalization Forms. See also examples in http://unicode.org/faq/normalization.html.

2.1.5 The U-label must consist entirely of characters with the same directional property, or fulfill the requirements of the Bidi rule per RFC 5893.

2.2 The label must meet the relevant criteria of the ICANN Guidelines for the Implementation of Internationalised Domain Names. See http://www.icann.org/en/topics/idn/implementatio

---

4 It is expected that conversion tools for IDNA will be available before the Application Submission period begins, and that labels will be checked for validity under IDNA. In this case, labels valid under the previous version of the protocol (IDNA2003) but not under IDNA will not meet this element of the requirements. Labels that are valid under both versions of the protocol will meet this element of the requirements. Labels valid under IDNA but not under IDNA2003 may meet the requirements; however, applicants are strongly advised to note that the duration of the transition period between the two protocols cannot presently be estimated nor guaranteed in any specific timeframe. The development of support for IDNA in the broader software applications environment will occur gradually. During that time, TLD labels that are valid under IDNA, but not under IDNA2003, will have limited functionality.
n-guidelines.htm. This includes the following, non-exhaustive, list of limitations:

2.2.1 All code points in a single label must be taken from the same script as determined by the Unicode Standard Annex #24: Unicode Script Property (See http://www.unicode.org/reports/tr24/).

2.2.2 Exceptions to 2.2.1 are permissible for languages with established orthographies and conventions that require the commingled use of multiple scripts. However, even with this exception, visually confusable characters from different scripts will not be allowed to co-exist in a single set of permissible code points unless a corresponding policy and character table are clearly defined.

Part III - Policy Requirements for Generic Top-Level Domains – These requirements apply to all prospective top-level domain strings applied for as gTLDs.

3.1 Applied-for gTLD strings in ASCII must be composed of three or more visually distinct characters. Two-character ASCII strings are not permitted, to avoid conflicting with current and future country codes based on the ISO 3166-1 standard.

3.2 Applied-for gTLD strings in IDN scripts must be composed of two or more visually distinct characters in the script, as appropriate. Note, however, that a two-character IDN string will not be approved if:

3.2.1 It is visually similar to any one-character label (in any script); or

3.2.2 It is visually similar to any possible two-character ASCII combination.

See the String Similarity review in subsection 2.2.1.1 for additional information on this requirement.

---

Note that the Joint ccNSO-GNSO IDN Working Group (JIG) has made recommendations that this section be revised to allow for single-character IDN gTLD labels. See the JIG Final Report at http://gnso.icann.org/drafts/jig-final-report-30mar11-en.pdf. Implementation models for these recommendations are being developed for community discussion.
2.2.1.4 Geographic Names Review

Applications for gTLD strings must ensure that appropriate consideration is given to the interests of governments or public authorities in geographic names. The requirements and procedure ICANN will follow in the evaluation process are described in the following paragraphs. Applicants should review these requirements even if they do not believe their intended gTLD string is a geographic name. All applied-for gTLD strings will be reviewed according to the requirements in this section, regardless of whether the application indicates it is for a geographic name.

2.2.1.4.1 Treatment of Country or Territory Names

Applications for strings that are country or territory names will not be approved, as they are not available under the New gTLD Program in this application round. A string shall be considered to be a country or territory name if:

i. it is an alpha-3 code listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard.

ii. it is a long-form name listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard, or a translation of the long-form name in any language.

iii. it is a short-form name listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard, or a translation of the short-form name in any language.

iv. it is the short- or long-form name association with a code that has been designated as “exceptionally reserved” by the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency.

v. it is a separable component of a country name designated on the “Separable Country Names List,” or is a translation of a name appearing on the list, in any language. See the Annex at the end of this module.

vi. it is a permutation or transposition of any of the names included in items (i) through (v). Permutations include removal of spaces, insertion of punctuation, and addition or

---

Note: Country and territory names are excluded from the process based on advice from the Governmental Advisory Committee in recent communiqués providing interpretation of Principle 2.2 of the GAC Principles regarding New gTLDs to indicate that strings which are a meaningful representation or abbreviation of a country or territory name should be handled through the forthcoming ccPDP, and other geographic strings could be allowed in the gTLD space if in agreement with the relevant government or public authority.
removal of grammatical articles like “the.” A transposition is considered a change in the sequence of the long or short–form name, for example, “RepublicCzech” or “IslandsCayman.”

vii. it is a name by which a country is commonly known, as demonstrated by evidence that the country is recognized by that name by an intergovernmental or treaty organization.

2.2.1.4.2 Geographic Names Requiring Government Support

The following types of applied-for strings are considered geographic names and must be accompanied by documentation of support or non-objection from the relevant governments or public authorities:

1. An application for any string that is a representation, in any language, of the capital city name of any country or territory listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard.

2. An application for a city name, where the applicant declares that it intends to use the gTLD for purposes associated with the city name.

City names present challenges because city names may also be generic terms or brand names, and in many cases city names are not unique. Unlike other types of geographic names, there are no established lists that can be used as objective references in the evaluation process. Thus, city names are not universally protected. However, the process does provide a means for cities and applicants to work together where desired.

An application for a city name will be subject to the geographic names requirements (i.e., will require documentation of support or non-objection from the relevant governments or public authorities) if:

(a) It is clear from applicant statements within the application that the applicant will use the TLD primarily for purposes associated with the city name; and
(b) The applied-for string is a city name as listed on official city documents.\(^7\)

3. An application for any string that is an exact match of a sub-national place name, such as a county, province, or state, listed in the ISO 3166-2 standard.

4. An application for a string listed as a UNESCO region\(^8\) or appearing on the “Composition of macro geographical (continental) regions, geographical sub-regions, and selected economic and other groupings” list.\(^9\)

In the case of an application for a string appearing on either of the lists above, documentation of support will be required from at least 60% of the respective national governments in the region, and there may be no more than one written statement of objection to the application from relevant governments in the region and/or public authorities associated with the continent or the region.

Where the 60% rule is applied, and there are common regions on both lists, the regional composition contained in the “Composition of macro geographical (continental) regions, geographical sub-regions, and selected economic and other groupings” takes precedence.

An applied-for gTLD string that falls into any of 1 through 4 listed above is considered to represent a geographic name. In the event of any doubt, it is in the applicant’s interest to consult with relevant governments and public authorities and enlist their support or non-objection prior to submission of the application, in order to preclude possible objections and pre-address any ambiguities concerning the string and applicable requirements.

Strings that include but do not match a geographic name (as defined in this section) will not be considered geographic names as defined by section 2.2.1.4.2, and therefore will not require documentation of government support in the evaluation process.

---

\(^7\) City governments with concerns about strings that are duplicates, nicknames or close renderings of a city name should not rely on the evaluation process as the primary means of protecting their interests in a string. Rather, a government may elect to file a formal objection to an application that is opposed by the relevant community, or may submit its own application for the string.


For each application, the Geographic Names Panel will determine which governments are relevant based on the inputs of the applicant, governments, and its own research and analysis. In the event that there is more than one relevant government or public authority for the applied-for gTLD string, the applicant must provide documentation of support or non-objection from all the relevant governments or public authorities. It is anticipated that this may apply to the case of a sub-national place name.

It is the applicant’s responsibility to:

- identify whether its applied-for gTLD string falls into any of the above categories; and
- identify and consult with the relevant governments or public authorities; and
- identify which level of government support is required.

Note: the level of government and which administrative agency is responsible for the filing of letters of support or non-objection is a matter for each national administration to determine. Applicants should consult within the relevant jurisdiction to determine the appropriate level of support.

The requirement to include documentation of support for certain applications does not preclude or exempt applications from being the subject of objections on community grounds (refer to subsection 3.1.1 of Module 3), under which applications may be rejected based on objections showing substantial opposition from the targeted community.

2.2.1.4.3 Documentation Requirements

The documentation of support or non-objection should include a signed letter from the relevant government or public authority. Understanding that this will differ across the respective jurisdictions, the letter could be signed by the minister with the portfolio responsible for domain name administration, ICT, foreign affairs, or the Office of the Prime Minister or President of the relevant jurisdiction; or a senior representative of the agency or department responsible for domain name administration, ICT, foreign affairs, or the Office of the Prime Minister. To assist the applicant in determining who the relevant government or public authority may be for a potential geographic name, the applicant may wish to consult with the relevant...
Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) representative.\(^\text{10}\)

The letter must clearly express the government’s or public authority’s support for or non-objection to the applicant’s application and demonstrate the government’s or public authority’s understanding of the string being requested and its intended use.

The letter should also demonstrate the government’s or public authority’s understanding that the string is being sought through the gTLD application process and that the applicant is willing to accept the conditions under which the string will be available, i.e., entry into a registry agreement with ICANN requiring compliance with consensus policies and payment of fees. (See Module 5 for a discussion of the obligations of a gTLD registry operator.)

A sample letter of support is available as an attachment to this module.

Applicants and governments may conduct discussions concerning government support for an application at any time. Applicants are encouraged to begin such discussions at the earliest possible stage, and enable governments to follow the processes that may be necessary to consider, approve, and generate a letter of support or non-objection.

It is important to note that a government or public authority is under no obligation to provide documentation of support or non-objection in response to a request by an applicant.

It is also possible that a government may withdraw its support for an application at a later time, including after the new gTLD has been delegated, if the registry operator has deviated from the conditions of original support or non-objection. Applicants should be aware that ICANN has committed to governments that, in the event of a dispute between a government (or public authority) and a registry operator that submitted documentation of support from that government or public authority, ICANN will comply with a legally binding order from a court in the jurisdiction of the government or public authority that has given support to an application.

2.2.1.4.4 Review Procedure for Geographic Names

A Geographic Names Panel (GNP) will determine whether each applied-for gTLD string represents a geographic

\(^{10}\) See https://gacweb.icann.org/display/gacweb/GAC+Members
name, and verify the relevance and authenticity of the supporting documentation where necessary.

The GNP will review all applications received, not only those where the applicant has noted its applied-for gTLD string as a geographic name. For any application where the GNP determines that the applied-for gTLD string is a country or territory name (as defined in this module), the application will not pass the Geographic Names review and will be denied. No additional reviews will be available.

For any application where the GNP determines that the applied-for gTLD string is not a geographic name requiring government support (as described in this module), the application will pass the Geographic Names review with no additional steps required.

For any application where the GNP determines that the applied-for gTLD string is a geographic name requiring government support, the GNP will confirm that the applicant has provided the required documentation from the relevant governments or public authorities, and that the communication from the government or public authority is legitimate and contains the required content. ICANN may confirm the authenticity of the communication by consulting with the relevant diplomatic authorities or members of ICANN’s Governmental Advisory Committee for the government or public authority concerned on the competent authority and appropriate point of contact within their administration for communications.

The GNP may communicate with the signing entity of the letter to confirm their intent and their understanding of the terms on which the support for an application is given.

In cases where an applicant has not provided the required documentation, the applicant will be contacted and notified of the requirement, and given a limited time frame to provide the documentation. If the applicant is able to provide the documentation before the close of the Initial Evaluation period, and the documentation is found to meet the requirements, the applicant will pass the Geographic Names review. If not, the applicant will have additional time to obtain the required documentation; however, if the applicant has not produced the required documentation by the required date (at least 90 calendar days from the date of notice), the application will be considered incomplete and will be ineligible for further review. The applicant may reapply in subsequent application rounds, if desired, subject to the fees and requirements of the specific application rounds.
If there is more than one application for a string representing a certain geographic name as described in this section, and the applications have requisite government approvals, the applications will be suspended pending resolution by the applicants. If the applicants have not reached a resolution by either the date of the end of the application round (as announced by ICANN), or the date on which ICANN opens a subsequent application round, whichever comes first, the applications will be rejected and applicable refunds will be available to applicants according to the conditions described in section 1.5.

However, in the event that a contention set is composed of multiple applications with documentation of support from the same government or public authority, the applications will proceed through the contention resolution procedures described in Module 4 when requested by the government or public authority providing the documentation.

If an application for a string representing a geographic name is in a contention set with applications for similar strings that have not been identified as geographical names, the string contention will be resolved using the string contention procedures described in Module 4.

2.2.2 Applicant Reviews

Concurrent with the applied-for gTLD string reviews described in subsection 2.2.1, ICANN will review the applicant’s technical and operational capability, its financial capability, and its proposed registry services. Those reviews are described in greater detail in the following subsections.

2.2.2.1 Technical/Operational Review

In its application, the applicant will respond to a set of questions (see questions 24 – 44 in the Application Form) intended to gather information about the applicant’s technical capabilities and its plans for operation of the proposed gTLD.

Applicants are not required to have deployed an actual gTLD registry to pass the Technical/Operational review. It will be necessary, however, for an applicant to demonstrate a clear understanding and accomplishment of some groundwork toward the key technical and operational aspects of a gTLD registry operation. Subsequently, each applicant that passes the technical evaluation and all other steps will be required to complete
a pre-delegation technical test prior to delegation of the new gTLD. Refer to Module 5, Transition to Delegation, for additional information.

2.2.2.2 Financial Review

In its application, the applicant will respond to a set of questions (see questions 45-50 in the Application Form) intended to gather information about the applicant's financial capabilities for operation of a gTLD registry and its financial planning in preparation for long-term stability of the new gTLD.

Because different registry types and purposes may justify different responses to individual questions, evaluators will pay particular attention to the consistency of an application across all criteria. For example, an applicant's scaling plans identifying system hardware to ensure its capacity to operate at a particular volume level should be consistent with its financial plans to secure the necessary equipment. That is, the evaluation criteria scale with the applicant plans to provide flexibility.

2.2.2.3 Evaluation Methodology

Dedicated technical and financial evaluation panels will conduct the technical/operational and financial reviews, according to the established criteria and scoring mechanism included as an attachment to this module. These reviews are conducted on the basis of the information each applicant makes available to ICANN in its response to the questions in the Application Form.

The evaluators may request clarification or additional information during the Initial Evaluation period. For each application, clarifying questions will be consolidated and sent to the applicant from each of the panels. The applicant will thus have an opportunity to clarify or supplement the application in those areas where a request is made by the evaluators. These communications will occur via TAS. Unless otherwise noted, such communications will include a 2-week deadline for the applicant to respond. Any supplemental information provided by the applicant will become part of the application.

It is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that the questions have been fully answered and the required documentation is attached. Evaluators are entitled, but not obliged, to request further information or evidence from an applicant, and are not obliged to take into account any information or evidence that is not made
available in the application and submitted by the due date, unless explicitly requested by the evaluators.

2.2.3 Registry Services Review

Concurrent with the other reviews that occur during the Initial Evaluation period, ICANN will review the applicant’s proposed registry services for any possible adverse impact on security or stability. The applicant will be required to provide a list of proposed registry services in its application.

2.2.3.1 Definitions

Registry services are defined as:

1. operations of the registry critical to the following tasks: the receipt of data from registrars concerning registrations of domain names and name servers; provision to registrars of status information relating to the zone servers for the TLD; dissemination of TLD zone files; operation of the registry zone servers; and dissemination of contact and other information concerning domain name server registrations in the TLD as required by the registry agreement;

2. other products or services that the registry operator is required to provide because of the establishment of a consensus policy; and

3. any other products or services that only a registry operator is capable of providing, by reason of its designation as the registry operator.

Proposed registry services will be examined to determine if they might raise significant stability or security issues. Examples of services proposed by existing registries can be found at http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/. In most cases, these proposed services successfully pass this inquiry.

Registry services currently provided by gTLD registries can be found in registry agreement appendices. See http://www.icann.org/en/registries/agreements.htm.

A full definition of registry services can be found at http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/rsep.html.

For purposes of this review, security and stability are defined as follows:

Security – an effect on security by the proposed registry service means (1) the unauthorized disclosure, alteration, insertion or destruction of registry data, or (2) the unauthorized access to or disclosure of information or
resources on the Internet by systems operating in accordance with all applicable standards.

**Stability** - an effect on stability means that the proposed registry service (1) does not comply with applicable relevant standards that are authoritative and published by a well-established, recognized, and authoritative standards body, such as relevant standards-track or best current practice RFCs sponsored by the IETF, or (2) creates a condition that adversely affects the throughput, response time, consistency, or coherence of responses to Internet servers or end systems, operating in accordance with applicable relevant standards that are authoritative and published by a well-established, recognized and authoritative standards body, such as relevant standards-track or best current practice RFCs and relying on registry operator’s delegation information or provisioning services.

### 2.2.3.2 Customary Services

The following registry services are customary services offered by a registry operator:

- Receipt of data from registrars concerning registration of domain names and name servers
- Dissemination of TLD zone files
- Dissemination of contact or other information concerning domain name registrations (e.g., port-43 WHOIS, Web-based Whois, RESTful Whois)
- DNS Security Extensions

The applicant must describe whether any of these registry services are intended to be offered in a manner unique to the TLD.

Any additional registry services that are unique to the proposed gTLD registry should be described in detail. Directions for describing the registry services are provided at [http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/rrs_sample.html](http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/rrs_sample.html).

### 2.2.3.3 TLD Zone Contents

ICANN receives a number of inquiries about use of various record types in a registry zone, as entities contemplate different business and technical models. Permissible zone contents for a TLD zone are:

- Apex SOA record.
- Apex NS records and in-bailiwick glue for the TLD's DNS servers.
• NS records and in-bailiwick glue for DNS servers of registered names in the TLD.
• DS records for registered names in the TLD.
• Records associated with signing the TLD zone (i.e., RRSIG, DNSKEY, NSEC, and NSEC3).

An applicant wishing to place any other record types into its TLD zone should describe in detail its proposal in the registry services section of the application. This will be evaluated and could result in an extended evaluation to determine whether the service would create a risk of a meaningful adverse impact on security or stability of the DNS. Applicants should be aware that a service based on use of less-common DNS resource records in the TLD zone, even if approved in the registry services review, might not work as intended for all users due to lack of application support.

2.2.3.4 Methodology

Review of the applicant’s proposed registry services will include a preliminary determination of whether any of the proposed registry services could raise significant security or stability issues and require additional consideration.

If the preliminary determination reveals that there may be significant security or stability issues (as defined in subsection 2.2.3.1) surrounding a proposed service, the application will be flagged for an extended review by the Registry Services Technical Evaluation Panel (RSTEP), see http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/rstep.html). This review, if applicable, will occur during the Extended Evaluation period (refer to Section 2.3).

In the event that an application is flagged for extended review of one or more registry services, an additional fee to cover the cost of the extended review will be due from the applicant. Applicants will be advised of any additional fees due, which must be received before the additional review begins.

2.2.4 Applicant’s Withdrawal of an Application

An applicant who does not pass the Initial Evaluation may withdraw its application at this stage and request a partial refund (refer to subsection 1.5 of Module 1).
2.3 Extended Evaluation

An applicant may request an Extended Evaluation if the application has failed to pass the Initial Evaluation elements concerning:

- Geographic names (refer to subsection 2.2.1.4). There is no additional fee for an extended evaluation in this instance.

- Demonstration of technical and operational capability (refer to subsection 2.2.2.1). There is no additional fee for an extended evaluation in this instance.

- Demonstration of financial capability (refer to subsection 2.2.2.2). There is no additional fee for an extended evaluation in this instance.

- Registry services (refer to subsection 2.2.3). Note that this investigation incurs an additional fee (the Registry Services Review Fee) if the applicant wishes to proceed. See Section 1.5 of Module 1 for fee and payment information.

An Extended Evaluation does not imply any change of the evaluation criteria. The same criteria used in the Initial Evaluation will be used to review the application in light of clarifications provided by the applicant.

From the time an applicant receives notice of failure to pass the Initial Evaluation, eligible applicants will have 15 calendar days to submit to ICANN the Notice of Request for Extended Evaluation. If the applicant does not explicitly request the Extended Evaluation (and pay an additional fee in the case of a Registry Services inquiry) the application will not proceed.

2.3.1 Geographic Names Extended Evaluation

In the case of an application that has been identified as a geographic name requiring government support, but where the applicant has not provided sufficient evidence of support or non-objection from all relevant governments or public authorities by the end of the Initial Evaluation period, the applicant has additional time in the Extended Evaluation period to obtain and submit this documentation.

If the applicant submits the documentation to the Geographic Names Panel by the required date, the GNP will perform its review of the documentation as detailed in
section 2.2.1.4. If the applicant has not provided the documentation by the required date (at least 90 calendar days from the date of the notice), the application will not pass the Extended Evaluation, and no further reviews are available.

2.3.2 Technical/Operational or Financial Extended Evaluation

The following applies to an Extended Evaluation of an applicant’s technical and operational capability or financial capability, as described in subsection 2.2.2.

An applicant who has requested Extended Evaluation will again access the online application system (TAS) and clarify its answers to those questions or sections on which it received a non-passing score (or, in the case of an application where individual questions were passed but the total score was insufficient to pass Initial Evaluation, those questions or sections on which additional points are possible). The answers should be responsive to the evaluator report that indicates the reasons for failure, or provide any amplification that is not a material change to the application. Applicants may not use the Extended Evaluation period to substitute portions of new information for the information submitted in their original applications, i.e., to materially change the application.

An applicant participating in an Extended Evaluation on the Technical / Operational or Financial reviews will have the option to have its application reviewed by the same evaluation panelists who performed the review during the Initial Evaluation period, or to have a different set of panelists perform the review during Extended Evaluation.

The Extended Evaluation allows an additional exchange of information between the evaluators and the applicant to further clarify information contained in the application. This supplemental information will become part of the application record. Such communications will include a deadline for the applicant to respond.

ICANN will notify applicants at the end of the Extended Evaluation period as to whether they have passed. If an application passes Extended Evaluation, it continues to the next stage in the process. If an application does not pass Extended Evaluation, it will proceed no further. No further reviews are available.
2.3.3 Registry Services Extended Evaluation

This section applies to Extended Evaluation of registry services, as described in subsection 2.2.3.

If a proposed registry service has been referred to the Registry Services Technical Evaluation Panel (RSTEP) for an extended review, the RSTEP will form a review team of members with the appropriate qualifications.

The review team will generally consist of three members, depending on the complexity of the registry service proposed. In a 3-member panel, the review could be conducted within 30 to 45 calendar days. In cases where a 5-member panel is needed, this will be identified before the extended evaluation starts. In a 5-member panel, the review could be conducted in 45 calendar days or fewer.

The cost of an RSTEP review will be covered by the applicant through payment of the Registry Services Review Fee. Refer to payment procedures in section 1.5 of Module 1. The RSTEP review will not commence until payment has been received.

If the RSTEP finds that one or more of the applicant’s proposed registry services may be introduced without risk of a meaningful adverse effect on security or stability, these services will be included in the applicant’s registry agreement with ICANN. If the RSTEP finds that the proposed service would create a risk of a meaningful adverse effect on security or stability, the applicant may elect to proceed with its application without the proposed service, or withdraw its application for the gTLD. In this instance, an applicant has 15 calendar days to notify ICANN of its intent to proceed with the application. If an applicant does not explicitly provide such notice within this time frame, the application will proceed no further.

2.4 Parties Involved in Evaluation

A number of independent experts and groups play a part in performing the various reviews in the evaluation process. A brief description of the various panels, their evaluation roles, and the circumstances under which they work is included in this section.
2.4.1 Panels and Roles

The **String Similarity Panel** will assess whether a proposed gTLD string creates a probability of user confusion due to similarity with any reserved name, any existing TLD, any requested IDN ccTLD, or any new gTLD string applied for in the current application round. This occurs during the String Similarity review in Initial Evaluation. The panel may also review IDN tables submitted by applicants as part of its work.

The **DNS Stability Panel** will determine whether a proposed string might adversely affect the security or stability of the DNS. This occurs during the DNS Stability String review in Initial Evaluation.

The **Geographic Names Panel** will review each application to determine whether the applied-for gTLD represents a geographic name, as defined in this guidebook. In the event that the string is a geographic name requiring government support, the panel will ensure that the required documentation is provided with the application and verify that the documentation is from the relevant governments or public authorities and is authentic.

The **Technical Evaluation Panel** will review the technical components of each application against the criteria in the Applicant Guidebook, along with proposed registry operations, in order to determine whether the applicant is technically and operationally capable of operating a gTLD registry as proposed in the application. This occurs during the Technical/Operational reviews in Initial Evaluation, and may also occur in Extended Evaluation if elected by the applicant.

The **Financial Evaluation Panel** will review each application against the relevant business, financial and organizational criteria contained in the Applicant Guidebook, to determine whether the applicant is financially capable of maintaining a gTLD registry as proposed in the application. This occurs during the Financial review in Initial Evaluation, and may also occur in Extended Evaluation if elected by the applicant.

The **Registry Services Technical Evaluation Panel (RSTEP)** will review proposed registry services in the application to determine if they pose a risk of a meaningful adverse impact on security or stability. This occurs, if applicable, during the Extended Evaluation period.
Members of all panels are required to abide by the established Code of Conduct and Conflict of Interest guidelines included in this module.

2.4.2 Panel Selection Process

ICANN has selected qualified third-party providers to perform the various reviews, based on an extensive selection process. In addition to the specific subject matter expertise required for each panel, specified qualifications are required, including:

- The provider must be able to convene – or have the capacity to convene - globally diverse panels and be able to evaluate applications from all regions of the world, including applications for IDN gTLDs.

- The provider should be familiar with the IETF IDNA standards, Unicode standards, relevant RFCs and the terminology associated with IDNs.

- The provider must be able to scale quickly to meet the demands of the evaluation of an unknown number of applications. At present it is not known how many applications will be received, how complex they will be, and whether they will be predominantly for ASCII or non-ASCII gTLDs.

- The provider must be able to evaluate the applications within the required timeframes of Initial and Extended Evaluation.

2.4.3 Code of Conduct Guidelines for Panelists

The purpose of the New gTLD Program (“Program”) Code of Conduct (“Code”) is to prevent real and apparent conflicts of interest and unethical behavior by any Evaluation Panelist (“Panelist”).

Panelists shall conduct themselves as thoughtful, competent, well prepared, and impartial professionals throughout the application process. Panelists are expected to comply with equity and high ethical standards while assuring the Internet community, its constituents, and the public of objectivity, integrity, confidentiality, and credibility. Unethical actions, or even the appearance of compromise, are not acceptable. Panelists are expected

11 http://newgtlds.icann.org/about/evaluation-panels-selection-process
to be guided by the following principles in carrying out their respective responsibilities. This Code is intended to summarize the principles and nothing in this Code should be considered as limiting duties, obligations or legal requirements with which Panelists must comply.

**Bias** -- Panelists shall:

- not advance personal agendas or non-ICANN approved agendas in the evaluation of applications;
- examine facts as they exist and not be influenced by past reputation, media accounts, or unverified statements about the applications being evaluated;
- exclude themselves from participating in the evaluation of an application if, to their knowledge, there is some predisposing factor that could prejudice them with respect to such evaluation; and
- exclude themselves from evaluation activities if they are philosophically opposed to or are on record as having made generic criticism about a specific type of applicant or application.

**Compensation/Gifts** -- Panelists shall not request or accept any compensation whatsoever or any gifts of substance from the Applicant being reviewed or anyone affiliated with the Applicant. (Gifts of substance would include any gift greater than USD 25 in value).

If the giving of small tokens is important to the Applicant’s culture, Panelists may accept these tokens; however, the total of such tokens must not exceed USD 25 in value. If in doubt, the Panelist should err on the side of caution by declining gifts of any kind.

**Conflicts of Interest** -- Panelists shall act in accordance with the “New gTLD Program Conflicts of Interest Guidelines” (see subsection 2.4.3.1).

**Confidentiality** -- Confidentiality is an integral part of the evaluation process. Panelists must have access to sensitive information in order to conduct evaluations. Panelists must maintain confidentiality of information entrusted to them by ICANN and the Applicant and any other confidential information provided to them from whatever source,
except when disclosure is legally mandated or has been authorized by ICANN. “Confidential information” includes all elements of the Program and information gathered as part of the process – which includes but is not limited to: documents, interviews, discussions, interpretations, and analyses – related to the review of any new gTLD application.

**Affirmation** -- All Panelists shall read this Code prior to commencing evaluation services and shall certify in writing that they have done so and understand the Code.

### 2.4.3.1 Conflict of Interest Guidelines for Panelists

It is recognized that third-party providers may have a large number of employees in several countries serving numerous clients. In fact, it is possible that a number of Panelists may be very well known within the registry / registrar community and have provided professional services to a number of potential applicants.

To safeguard against the potential for inappropriate influence and ensure applications are evaluated in an objective and independent manner, ICANN has established detailed Conflict of Interest guidelines and procedures that will be followed by the Evaluation Panelists. To help ensure that the guidelines are appropriately followed ICANN will:

- Require each Evaluation Panelist (provider and individual) to acknowledge and document understanding of the Conflict of Interest guidelines.
- Require each Evaluation Panelist to disclose all business relationships engaged in at any time during the past six months.
- Where possible, identify and secure primary and backup providers for evaluation panels.
- In conjunction with the Evaluation Panelists, develop and implement a process to identify conflicts and re-assign applications as appropriate to secondary or contingent third party providers to perform the reviews.

**Compliance Period** -- All Evaluation Panelists must comply with the Conflict of Interest guidelines beginning with the opening date of the Application Submission period and ending with the public announcement by ICANN of the
Guidelines -- The following guidelines are the minimum standards with which all Evaluation Panelists must comply. It is recognized that it is impossible to foresee and cover all circumstances in which a potential conflict of interest might arise. In these cases the Evaluation Panelist should evaluate whether the existing facts and circumstances would lead a reasonable person to conclude that there is an actual conflict of interest.

Evaluation Panelists and Immediate Family Members:

- Must not be under contract, have or be included in a current proposal to provide Professional Services for or on behalf of the Applicant during the Compliance Period.
- Must not currently hold or be committed to acquire any interest in a privately-held Applicant.
- Must not currently hold or be committed to acquire more than 1% of any publicly listed Applicant's outstanding equity securities or other ownership interests.
- Must not be involved or have an interest in a joint venture, partnership or other business arrangement with the Applicant.
- Must not have been named in a lawsuit with or against the Applicant.
- Must not be a:
  - Director, officer, or employee, or in any capacity equivalent to that of a member of management of the Applicant;
  - Promoter, underwriter, or voting trustee of the Applicant; or
  - Trustee for any pension or profit-sharing trust of the Applicant.

Definitions--

Evaluation Panelist: An Evaluation Panelist is any individual associated with the review of an application. This includes
any primary, secondary, and contingent third party Panelists engaged by ICANN to review new gTLD applications.

Immediate Family Member: Immediate Family Member is a spouse, spousal equivalent, or dependent (whether or not related) of an Evaluation Panelist.

Professional Services: include, but are not limited to legal services, financial audit, financial planning / investment, outsourced services, consulting services such as business / management / internal audit, tax, information technology, registry / registrar services.

2.4.3.2 Code of Conduct Violations
Evaluation panelists breaches of the Code of Conduct, whether intentional or not, shall be reviewed by ICANN, which may make recommendations for corrective action, if deemed necessary. Serious breaches of the Code may be cause for dismissal of the person, persons or provider committing the infraction.

In a case where ICANN determines that a Panelist has failed to comply with the Code of Conduct, the results of that Panelist's review for all assigned applications will be discarded and the affected applications will undergo a review by new panelists.

Complaints about violations of the Code of Conduct by a Panelist may be brought to the attention of ICANN via the public comment and applicant support mechanisms, throughout the evaluation period. Concerns of applicants regarding panels should be communicated via the defined support channels (see subsection 1.4.2). Concerns of the general public (i.e., non-applicants) can be raised via the public comment forum, as described in Module 1.

2.4.4 Communication Channels
Defined channels for technical support or exchanges of information with ICANN and with evaluation panels are available to applicants during the Initial Evaluation and Extended Evaluation periods. Contacting individual ICANN staff members, Board members, or individuals engaged by ICANN to perform an evaluation role in order to lobby for a particular outcome or to obtain confidential information about applications under review is not appropriate. In the interests of fairness and equivalent treatment for all applicants, any such individual contacts will be referred to the appropriate communication channels.
gTLD application restrictions on country or territory names are tied to listing in property fields of the ISO 3166-1 standard. Notionally, the ISO 3166-1 standard has an “English short name” field which is the common name for a country and can be used for such protections; however, in some cases this does not represent the common name. This registry seeks to add additional protected elements which are derived from definitions in the ISO 3166-1 standard. An explanation of the various classes is included below.

## Separable Country Names List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>English Short Name</th>
<th>Cl.</th>
<th>Separable Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ax</td>
<td>Åland Islands</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Åland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as</td>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Tutuila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Swain’s Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ao</td>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cabinda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ag</td>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Antigua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Barbuda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Redonda Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>au</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Lord Howe Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Macquarie Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ashmore Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Carter Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Coral Sea Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bo</td>
<td>Bolivia, Plurinational State of</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bq</td>
<td>Bonaire, Sint Eustatius and Saba</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Bonaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Sint Eustatius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Saba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ba</td>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Bosnia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Herzegovina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>br</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Fernando de Noronha Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Martim Vaz Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Trinidad Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>io</td>
<td>British Indian Ocean Territory</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Chagos Archipelago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Diego Garcia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bn</td>
<td>Brunei Darussalam</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Brunei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Negara Brunei Darussalam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cv</td>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>São Tiago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>São Vicente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ky</td>
<td>Cayman Islands</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Grand Cayman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cl</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Easter Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Juan Fernández Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Sala y Gómez Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>San Ambrosio Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>San Félix Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cc</td>
<td>Cocos (Keeling) Islands</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Cocos Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Keeling Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Malpelo Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>San Andrés Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Providencia Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>km</td>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Anjouan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Grande Comore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Mohéli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ck</td>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rarotonga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cr</td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Coco Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ec</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Galápagos Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gq</td>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Annobón Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Bioko Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Country and Region</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Country and Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rio Muni</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Falkland Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Malvinas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fo</td>
<td>Faroe Islands</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Faroe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fj</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Viti Levu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rotuma Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pf</td>
<td>French Polynesia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Austral Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Gambier Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Marquesas Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Society Archipelago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Tahiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Tuamotu Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Clipperton Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tf</td>
<td>French Southern Territories</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Amsterdam Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Crozet Archipelago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Kerguelen Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Saint Paul Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Mount Athos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gd</td>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Southern Grenadine Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Carriacou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gp</td>
<td>Guadeloupe</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>la Désirade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Marie-Galante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>les Saintes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hm</td>
<td>Heard Island and McDonald Islands</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Heard Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va</td>
<td>Holy See (Vatican City State)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Holy See</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Vatican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hn</td>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Swan Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Amindivi Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Andaman Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Laccadive Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Minicoy Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Nicobar Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ir</td>
<td>Iran, Islamic Republic of</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Iran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ki</td>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Gilbert Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Tarawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Banaba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Line Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Kirimiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Phoenix Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Abariringa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Enderbury Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kp</td>
<td>Korea, Democratic People's Republic of</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>North Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kr</td>
<td>Korea, Republic of</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la</td>
<td>Lao People's Democratic Republic</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Laos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mk</td>
<td>Macedonia, the Former Yugoslav Republic of</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Sabah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Sarawak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mh</td>
<td>Marshall Islands</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Jaluit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kwajalein</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Majuro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mu</td>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Agalega Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cargados Carajos Shoals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rodrigues Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fm</td>
<td>Micronesia, Federated States of</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Micronesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Caroline Islands (see also pw)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Chuuk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Kosrae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Pohnpei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Yap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>md</td>
<td>Moldova, Republic of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Moldava</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nc</td>
<td>New Caledonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loyalty Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp</td>
<td>Northern Mariana Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mariana Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saipan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>om</td>
<td>Oman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Musandam Peninsula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pw</td>
<td>Palau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caroline Islands (see also fm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Babelthuap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ps</td>
<td>Palestinian Territory, Occupied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pg</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bismarck Archipelago</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northern Solomon Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bougainville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pn</td>
<td>Pitcairn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ducie Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henderson Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oeno Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>re</td>
<td>Réunion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bassas da India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Europa Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glorioso Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juan de Nova Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tromelin Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ru</td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaliningrad Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sh</td>
<td>Saint Helena, Ascension, and Tristan de Cunha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saint Helena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ascension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tristan de Cunha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gough Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tristan de Cunha Archipelago</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kn</td>
<td>Saint Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saint Kitts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nevis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pm</td>
<td>Saint Pierre and Miquelon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saint Pierre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miquelon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vc</td>
<td>Saint Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saint Vincent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Grenadines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northern Grenadine Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bequia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saint Vincent Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ws</td>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Savai’i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upolu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>st</td>
<td>Sao Tome and Principe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sao Tome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc</td>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mahé</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aldabra Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amirante Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cosmoledo Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farquhar Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sb</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Cruz Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Solomon Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guadalcanal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>za</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marion Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gs</td>
<td>South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Sandwich Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sj</td>
<td>Svalbard and Jan Mayen</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Svalbard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Jan Mayen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Bear Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sy</td>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Syria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Bear Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tw</td>
<td>Taiwan, Province of China</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Penghu Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Pescadores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tz</td>
<td>Tanzania, United Republic of</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tl</td>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Oecussi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Tongatapu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tt</td>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Trinidad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Tobago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tc</td>
<td>Turks and Caicos Islands</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Turks Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Caicos Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tv</td>
<td>Tuvalu</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Fanafuti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ae</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Emirates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>us</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>um</td>
<td>United States Minor Outlying Islands</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Baker Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Howland Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Jarvis Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Johnston Atoll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Kingman Reef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Midway Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Palmyra Atoll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Wake Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Navassa Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vu</td>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Efate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Santo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ve</td>
<td>Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Bird Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vg</td>
<td>Virgin Islands, British</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Anegada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Jost Van Dyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Tortola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Virgin Gorda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi</td>
<td>Virgin Islands, US</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Saint Croix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Saint John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Saint Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wf</td>
<td>Wallis and Futuna</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Wallis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Futuna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Hoorn Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Wallis Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Uvea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ye</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Socotra Island</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maintenance**

A Separable Country Names Registry will be maintained and published by ICANN Staff.
Each time the ISO 3166-1 standard is updated with a new entry, this registry will be reappraised to identify if the changes to the standard warrant changes to the entries in this registry. Appraisal will be based on the criteria listing in the “Eligibility” section of this document.

Codes reserved by the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency do not have any implication on this registry, only entries derived from normally assigned codes appearing in ISO 3166-1 are eligible.

If an ISO code is struck off the ISO 3166-1 standard, any entries in this registry deriving from that code must be struck.

Eligibility

Each record in this registry is derived from the following possible properties:

Class A: The ISO 3166-1 English Short Name is comprised of multiple, separable parts whereby the country is comprised of distinct sub-entities. Each of these separable parts is eligible in its own right for consideration as a country name. For example, “Antigua and Barbuda” is comprised of “Antigua” and “Barbuda.”

Class B: The ISO 3166-1 English Short Name (1) or the ISO 3166-1 English Full Name (2) contains additional language as to the type of country the entity is, which is often not used in common usage when referencing the country. For example, one such short name is “The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela” for a country in common usage referred to as “Venezuela.”

**Macedonia is a separable name in the context of this list; however, due to the ongoing dispute listed in UN documents between the Hellenic Republic (Greece) and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia over the name, no country will be afforded attribution or rights to the name “Macedonia” until the dispute over the name has been resolved. See [http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N93/240/37/IMG/N9324037.pdf](http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N93/240/37/IMG/N9324037.pdf).**

Class C: The ISO 3166-1 Remarks column containing synonyms of the country name, or sub-national entities, as denoted by “often referred to as,” “includes”, “comprises”, “variant” or “principal islands”.

In the first two cases, the registry listing must be directly derivative from the English Short Name by excising words and articles. These registry listings do not include vernacular or other non-official terms used to denote the country.

Eligibility is calculated in class order. For example, if a term can be derived both from Class A and Class C, it is only listed as Class A.
ICANN
Suite 330, 4676 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Attention: New gTLD Evaluation Process

Subject: Letter for support for [TLD requested]

This letter is to confirm that [government entity] fully supports the application for [TLD] submitted to ICANN by [applicant] in the New gTLD Program. As the [Minister/Secretary/position] I confirm that I have the authority of the [x government/public authority] to be writing to you on this matter. [Explanation of government entity, relevant department, division, office, or agency, and what its functions and responsibilities are]

The gTLD will be used to [explain your understanding of how the name will be used by the applicant. This could include policies developed regarding who can register a name, pricing regime and management structures.] [Government/public authority/department] has worked closely with the applicant in the development of this proposal.

The [x government/public authority] supports this application, and in doing so, understands that in the event that the application is successful, [applicant] will be required to enter into a Registry Agreement with ICANN. In doing so, they will be required to pay fees to ICANN and comply with consensus policies developed through the ICANN multi-stakeholder policy processes.

[Government / public authority] further understands that, in the event of a dispute between [government/public authority] and the applicant, ICANN will comply with a legally binding order from a court in the jurisdiction of [government/public authority].

[Optional] This application is being submitted as a community-based application, and as such it is understood that the Registry Agreement will reflect the community restrictions proposed in the application. In the event that we believe the registry is not complying with these restrictions, possible avenues of recourse include the Registry Restrictions Dispute Resolution Procedure.

[Optional] I can advise that in the event that this application is successful [government/public authority] will enter into a separate agreement with the applicant. This agreement will outline the conditions under which we support them in the operation of the TLD, and circumstances under which we would withdraw that support. ICANN will not be a party to this agreement, and enforcement of this agreement lies fully with [government/public authority].
[Government / public authority] understands that the Geographic Names Panel engaged by ICANN will, among other things, conduct due diligence on the authenticity of this documentation. I would request that if additional information is required during this process, that [name and contact details] be contacted in the first instance.

Thank you for the opportunity to support this application.

Yours sincerely

Signature from relevant government/public authority
Since ICANN was founded in 1998 as a not-for-profit, multi-stakeholder organization, one of its key mandates has been to promote competition in the domain name market. ICANN’s mission specifically calls for the corporation to maintain and build on processes that will ensure competition and consumer interests - without compromising Internet security and stability. This includes the consideration and implementation of new gTLDs. It is ICANN’s goal to make the criteria and evaluation as objective as possible.

While new gTLDs are viewed by ICANN as important to fostering choice, innovation and competition in domain registration services, the decision to launch these coming new gTLD application rounds followed a detailed and lengthy consultation process with all constituencies of the global Internet community.

Any public or private sector organization can apply to create and operate a new gTLD. However, the process is not like simply registering or buying a second-level domain name. Instead, the application process is to evaluate and select candidates capable of running a registry, a business that manages top-level domains such as, for example, .COM or .INFO. Any successful applicant will need to meet published operational and technical criteria in order to preserve Internet stability and interoperability.

1. **Principles of the Technical and Financial New gTLD Evaluation Criteria**

   - **Principles of conservatism.** This is the first round of what is to be an ongoing process for the introduction of new TLDs, including Internationalized Domain Names. Therefore, the criteria in this round require applicants to provide a thorough and thoughtful analysis of the technical requirements to operate a registry and the proposed business model.

   - The criteria and evaluation should be as objective as possible.

     - With that goal in mind, an important objective of the new TLD process is to diversify the namespace, with different registry business models and target audiences. In some cases, criteria that are objective, but that ignore the differences in business models and target audiences of new registries, will tend to make the process exclusionary. For example, the business model for a registry targeted to a small community need not possess the same robustness in funding and technical infrastructure as a registry intending to compete with large gTLDs. Therefore purely objective criteria such as a requirement for a certain amount of cash on hand will not provide the flexibility to consider different business models. The process must provide for an objective evaluation framework, but allow for adaptation according to the differing models applicants will present. Within that framework, applicant responses will be evaluated against the criteria in light of the proposed model.

     - Therefore the criteria should be flexible: able to scale with the overall business approach, providing that the planned approach is consistent and coherent, and can withstand highs and lows.
- Criteria can be **objective in areas of registrant protection**, for example:
  - Providing for funds to continue operations in the event of a registry failure.
  - Adherence to data escrow, registry failover, and continuity planning requirements.

- The evaluation must strike the correct **balance** between establishing the business and technical competence of the applicant to operate a registry (to **serve the interests of registrants**), while not asking for the detailed sort of information or making the judgment that a venture capitalist would. ICANN is not seeking to certify business success but instead seeks to encourage innovation while providing certain safeguards for registrants.

- New registries must be added in a way that maintains DNS **stability and security**. Therefore, ICANN asks several questions so that the applicant can demonstrate an understanding of the technical requirements to operate a registry. ICANN will ask the applicant to demonstrate actual operational technical compliance prior to delegation. This is in line with current prerequisites for the delegation of a TLD.

- **Registrant protection** is emphasized in both the criteria and the scoring. Examples of this include asking the applicant to:
  - Plan for the occurrence of contingencies and registry failure by putting in place financial resources to fund the ongoing resolution of names while a replacement operator is found or extended notice can be given to registrants.
  - Demonstrate a capability to understand and plan for business contingencies to afford some protections through the marketplace.
  - Adhere to DNS stability and security requirements as described in the technical section.
  - Provide access to the widest variety of services.

**II. Aspects of the Questions Asked in the Application and Evaluation Criteria**

The technical and financial questions are intended to inform and guide the applicant in aspects of registry start-up and operation. The established registry operator should find the questions straightforward while inexperienced applicants should find them a natural part of planning.

Evaluation and scoring (detailed below) will emphasize:

- How thorough are the answers? Are they well thought through and do they provide a sufficient basis for evaluation?

- Demonstration of the ability to operate and fund the registry on an ongoing basis:
  - Funding sources to support technical operations in a manner that ensures stability and security and supports planned expenses,
  - Resilience and sustainability in the face of ups and downs, anticipation of contingencies,
  - Funding to carry on operations in the event of failure.
• Demonstration that the technical plan will likely deliver on best practices for a registry and identification of aspects that might raise DNS stability and security issues.

• Ensures plan integration, consistency and compatibility (responses to questions are not evaluated individually but in comparison to others):
  ▪ Funding adequately covers technical requirements,
  ▪ Funding covers costs,
  ▪ Risks are identified and addressed, in comparison to other aspects of the plan.

III. Scoring

Evaluation

• The questions, criteria, scoring and evaluation methodology are to be conducted in accordance with the principles described earlier in section I. With that in mind, globally diverse evaluation panelists will staff evaluation panels. The diversity of evaluators and access to experts in all regions of the world will ensure application evaluations take into account cultural, technical and business norms in the regions from which applications originate.

• Evaluation teams will consist of two independent panels. One will evaluate the applications against the financial criteria. The other will evaluate the applications against the technical & operational criteria. Given the requirement that technical and financial planning be well integrated, the panels will work together and coordinate information transfer where necessary. Other relevant experts (e.g., technical, audit, legal, insurance, finance) in pertinent regions will provide advice as required.

• Precautions will be taken to ensure that no member of the Evaluation Teams will have any interest or association that may be viewed as a real or potential conflict of interest with an applicant or application. All members must adhere to the Code of Conduct and Conflict of Interest guidelines that are found in Module 2.

• Communications between the evaluation teams and the applicants will be through an online interface. During the evaluation, evaluators may pose a set of clarifying questions to an applicant, to which the applicant may respond through the interface.

Confidentiality: ICANN will post applications after the close of the application submission period. The application form notes which parts of the application will be posted.

Scoring

• Responses will be evaluated against each criterion. A score will be assigned according to the scoring schedule linked to each question or set of questions. In several questions, 1 point is the maximum score that may be awarded. In several other questions, 2 points are awarded for a response that exceeds requirements, 1 point is awarded for a response that meets requirements and 0 points are awarded for a response that fails to meet requirements. Each question must receive at least a score of “1,” making each a “pass/fail” question.

• In the Continuity question in the financial section (see Question #50), up to 3 points are awarded if an applicant provides, at the application stage, a financial instrument that will guarantee ongoing registry operations in the event of a business failure. This extra
point can serve to guarantee passing the financial criteria for applicants who score the minimum passing score for each of the individual criteria. The purpose of this weighting is to reward applicants who make early arrangements for the protection of registrants and to accept relatively riskier business plans where registrants are protected.

- There are 21 Technical & Operational questions. Each question has a criterion and scoring associated with it. The scoring for each is 0, 1, or 2 points as described above. One of the questions (IDN implementation) is optional. Other than the optional questions, all Technical & Operational criteria must be scored a 1 or more or the application will fail the evaluation.

- The total technical score must be equal to or greater than 22 for the application to pass. That means the applicant can pass by:
  - Receiving a 1 on all questions, including the optional question, and a 2 on at least one mandatory question; or
  - Receiving a 1 on all questions, excluding the optional question and a 2 on at least two mandatory questions.

  This scoring methodology requires a minimum passing score for each question and a slightly higher average score than the per question minimum to pass.

- There are six Financial questions and six sets of criteria that are scored by rating the answers to one or more of the questions. For example, the question concerning registry operation costs requires consistency between the technical plans (described in the answers to the Technical & Operational questions) and the costs (described in the answers to the costs question).

- The scoring for each of the Financial criteria is 0, 1 or 2 points as described above with the exception of the Continuity question, for which up to 3 points are possible. All questions must receive at least a 1 or the application will fail the evaluation.

- The total financial score on the six criteria must be 8 or greater for the application to pass. That means the applicant can pass by:
  - Scoring a 3 on the continuity criteria, or
  - Scoring a 2 on any two financial criteria.

- Applications that do not pass Initial Evaluation can enter into an extended evaluation process as described in Module 2. The scoring is the same.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Full legal name of the Applicant (the established entity that would enter into a Registry Agreement with ICANN)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Responses to Questions 1 - 12 are required for a complete application. Responses are not scored.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Address of the principal place of business of the Applicant. This address will be used for contractual purposes. No Post Office boxes are allowed.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Phone number for the Applicant's principal place of business.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fax number for the Applicant's principal place of business.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Website or URL, if applicable.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The primary contact is the individual designated with the primary responsibility for management of the application, including responding to tasks in the TLD Application System (TAS) during the various application phases. Both contacts listed should also be prepared to receive inquiries from the public.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date of birth</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country of birth</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone number</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fax number</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Email address</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The secondary contact is listed in the event the primary contact is unavailable to continue with the application process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date of birth</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country of birth</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone number</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fax number</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Email address</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proof of Legal Establishment</td>
<td>(a) Legal form of the Applicant. (e.g., partnership, corporation, non-profit institution).</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(b) State the specific national or other jurisdiction that defines the type of entity identified in 8(a).</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>In the event of questions regarding proof of establishment, the applicant may be asked for additional details, such as the specific national or other law applying to this type of entity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Attach evidence of the applicant's establishment as the type of entity identified in Question 8(a) above, in accordance with the applicable laws identified in Question 8(b).</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Applications without valid proof of legal establishment will not be evaluated further. Supporting documentation for proof of legal establishment should be submitted in the original language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(a) If the applying entity is publicly traded, provide the exchange and symbol.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) If the applying entity is a subsidiary, provide the parent company.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) If the applying entity is a joint venture, list all joint venture partners.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Business ID, Tax ID, VAT registration number, or equivalent of the Applicant.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Background</td>
<td>(a) Enter the full name, date and country of birth, contact information (permanent residence), and position of all directors (i.e., members of the applicant’s Board of Directors, if applicable).</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Applicants should be aware that the names and positions of the individuals listed in response to this question will be published as part of the application. The contact information listed for individuals is for identification purposes only and will not be published as part of the application. Background checks may be conducted on individuals named in the applicant’s response to question 11. Any material misstatement or misrepresentation (or omission of material information) may cause the application to be rejected. The applicant certifies that it has obtained permission for the posting of the names and positions of individuals included in this application.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Enter the full name, date and country of birth, contact information (permanent residence), and position of all officers and partners. Officers are high-level management officials of a corporation or business, for example, a CEO, vice president, secretary, chief financial officer. Partners would be listed in the context of a partnership or other such form of legal entity.</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>Enter the full name and contact information of all shareholders holding at least 15% of shares, and percentage held by each. For a shareholder entity, enter the principal place of business. For a shareholder individual, enter the date and country of birth and contact information (permanent residence).</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>For an applying entity that does not have directors, officers, partners, or shareholders, enter the full name, date and country of birth, contact information (permanent residence), and position of all individuals having overall legal or executive responsibility for the applying entity.</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>Indicate whether the applicant or any of the individuals named above: i. within the past ten years, has been convicted of any crime related to financial or corporate governance activities, or has been judged by a court to have committed fraud or breach of fiduciary duty, or has been the subject of a judicial determination that is the substantive equivalent of any of these; ii. within the past ten years, has been disciplined by any government or industry regulatory body for conduct involving dishonesty or misuse of funds of others; iii. within the past ten years has been convicted of any willful tax-related fraud or willful evasion of tax liabilities; iv. within the past ten years has been convicted of perjury, forswearing, failing to cooperate with a law enforcement investigation, or making false statements to a law enforcement agency or representative;</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>ICANN may deny an otherwise qualified application based on the background screening process. See section 1.2.1 of the guidebook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>has ever been convicted of any crime involving the use of computers, telephony systems, telecommunications or the Internet to facilitate the commission of crimes;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>has ever been convicted of any crime involving the use of a weapon, force, or the threat of force;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii.</td>
<td>has ever been convicted of any violent or sexual offense victimizing children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii.</td>
<td>has ever been convicted of the illegal sale, manufacture, or distribution of pharmaceutical drugs, or been convicted or successfully extradited for any offense described in Article 3 of the United Nations Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix.</td>
<td>has ever been convicted or successfully extradited for any offense described in the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (all Protocols);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x.</td>
<td>has been convicted, within the respective timeframes, of aiding, abetting, facilitating, enabling, conspiring to commit, or failing to report any of the listed crimes (i.e., within the past 10 years for crimes listed in (i) - (iv) above, or ever for the crimes listed in (v) – (x) above);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi.</td>
<td>has entered a guilty plea as part of a plea agreement or has a court case in any jurisdiction with a disposition of Adjudicated Guilty or Adjudication Withheld (or regional equivalents) within the respective timeframes listed above for any of the listed crimes (i.e., within the past 10 years for crimes listed in (i) – (iv) above, or ever for the crimes listed in (v) – (ix) above);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii.</td>
<td>is the subject of a disqualification imposed by ICANN and in effect at the time of this application.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If any of the above events have occurred, please provide details.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>Indicate whether the applicant or any of the individuals named above have been involved in any decisions indicating that the applicant or individual named in the application was engaged in cybersquatting, as defined in the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP), Anti-cybersquatting Consumer Protection Act (ACPA), or other equivalent legislation, or was engaged in reverse domain name hijacking under the UDRP or bad faith or reckless disregard under the ACPA or equivalent legislation.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>ICANN may deny an otherwise qualified application based on the background screening process. See section 1.2.1 of the guidebook for details.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g)</td>
<td>Disclose whether the applicant or any of the individuals named above has been involved in any administrative or other legal proceeding in which allegations of intellectual property infringement relating to registration or use of a domain name have been made. Provide an explanation related to each such instance.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>ICANN may deny an otherwise qualified application based on the background screening process. See section 1.2.1 of the guidebook for details.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h)</td>
<td>Provide an explanation for any additional background information that may be found concerning the applicant or any individual named in the application, which may affect eligibility, including any criminal convictions not identified above.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Fee</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(a) Enter the confirmation information for payment of the evaluation fee (e.g., wire transfer confirmation number).</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The evaluation fee is paid in the form of a deposit at the time of user registration, and submission of the remaining amount at the time the full application is submitted. The information in question 12 is required for each payment. The full amount in USD must be received by ICANN. Applicant is responsible for all transaction fees and exchange rate fluctuation. Fedwire is the preferred wire mechanism; SWIFT is also acceptable. ACH is not recommended as these funds will take longer to clear and could affect timing of the application processing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Payer name</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Payer address</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>Wiring bank</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>Bank address</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>Wire date</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied-for gTLD string</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Provide the applied-for gTLD string. If applying for an IDN, provide the U-label.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Responses to Questions 13-17 are not scored, but are used for database and validation purposes. The U-label is an IDNA-valid string of Unicode characters, including at least one non-ASCII character.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>(a) If applying for an IDN, provide the A-label (beginning with &quot;in-&quot;).</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) If an IDN, provide the meaning, or restatement of the string in English, that is, a description of the literal meaning of the string in the opinion of the applicant.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) If an IDN, provide the language of the label (both in English and as referenced by ISO 15924).</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) If an IDN, provide the script of the label (both in English and as referenced by ISO 15924).</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e) If an IDN, list all code points contained in the U-label according to Unicode form.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>For example, the string “HELLO” would be listed as U+0048 U+0065 U+006C U+006F U+0066.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>(a) If an IDN, upload IDN tables for the proposed registry. An IDN table must include: 1. the applied-for gTLD string relevant to the tables, 2. the script or language designator (as defined in BCP 47), 3. table version number, 4. effective date (DD Month YYYY), and 5. contact name, email address, and phone number. Submission of IDN tables in a standards-based format is encouraged.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>In the case of an application for an IDN gTLD, IDN tables must be submitted for the language or script for the applied-for gTLD string. IDN tables must also be submitted for each language or script in which the applicant intends to offer IDN registrations at the second level (see question 44). IDN tables should be submitted in a machine-readable format. The model format described in Section 5 of RFC 4290 would be ideal. The format used by RFC 3743 is an acceptable alternative. Variant generation algorithms that are more complex (such as those with contextual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Describe the process used for development of the IDN tables submitted, including consultations and sources used.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>rules) and cannot be expressed using these table formats should be specified in a manner that could be re-implemented programmatically by ICANN. Ideally, for any complex table formats, a reference code implementation should be provided in conjunction with a description of the generation rules.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Describe the applicant's efforts to ensure that there are no known operational or rendering problems concerning the applied-for gTLD string. If such issues are known, describe steps that will be taken to mitigate these issues in software and other applications.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>OPTIONAL:&lt;br&gt;Provide a representation of the label according to the International Phonetic Alphabet (<a href="http://www.langsci.ucl.ac.uk/pal">http://www.langsci.ucl.ac.uk/pal</a>).</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>If provided, this information will be used as a guide to ICANN in communications regarding the application.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mission/Purpose:&lt;br&gt;(a) Describe the mission/purpose of your proposed gTLD.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The information gathered in response to Question 18 is intended to inform the post-launch review of the New gTLD Program, from the perspective of assessing the relative costs and benefits achieved in the expanded gTLD space.&lt;br&gt;For the application to be considered complete, answers to this section must be fulsome and sufficiently quantitative and detailed to inform future study on plans vs. results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The New gTLD Program will be reviewed, as specified in section 9.3 of the Affirmation of Commitments. This will include consideration of the extent to which the introduction or expansion of gTLDs has promoted competition, consumer trust and consumer choice, as well as effectiveness of (a) the application and evaluation process, and (b) safeguards put in place to mitigate issues involved in the introduction or expansion.

The information gathered in this section will be one source of input to help inform this review. This information is not used as part of the evaluation or scoring of the application, except to the extent that the information may overlap with questions or evaluation areas that are scored.

An applicant wishing to designate this application as community-based should ensure that these responses are consistent with its responses for question 20 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) How do you expect that your proposed gTLD will benefit registrants, Internet users, and others?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Answers should address the following points:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i. What is the goal of your proposed gTLD in terms of areas of specialty, service levels, or reputation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii. What do you anticipate your proposed gTLD will add to the current space, in terms of competition, differentiation, or innovation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iii. What goals does your proposed gTLD have in terms of user experience?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iv. Provide a complete description of the applicant's intended registration policies in support of the goals listed above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. Will your proposed gTLD impose any measures for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>protecting the privacy or confidential information of registrants or users? If so, please describe any such measures. Describe whether and in what ways outreach and communications will help to achieve your projected benefits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>(c) What operating rules will you adopt to eliminate or minimize social costs (e.g., time or financial resource costs, as well as various types of consumer vulnerabilities)? What other steps will you take to minimize negative consequences/costs imposed upon consumers?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Answers should address the following points:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. How will multiple applications for a particular domain name be resolved, for example, by auction or on a first-come/first-serve basis?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Explain any cost benefits for registrants you intend to implement (e.g., advantageous pricing, introductory discounts, bulk registration discounts).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Note that the Registry Agreement requires that registrars be offered the option to obtain initial domain name registrations for periods of one to ten years at the discretion of the registrar, but no greater than ten years. Additionally, the Registry Agreement requires advance written notice of price increases. Do you intend to make contractual commitments to registrants regarding the magnitude of price escalation? If so, please describe your plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community-based Designation 19 Is the application for a community-based TLD?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>There is a presumption that the application is a standard application (as defined in the Applicant Guidebook) if this question is left unanswered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>(a) Provide the name and full description of the community that the applicant is committing to serve. In the event that this application is included in a community priority evaluation, it will be scored based on the community identified in response to this question. The name of the community does not have to be formally adopted for the application to be designated as community-based.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Descriptions should include:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Responses to Question 20 will be regarded as firm commitments to the specified community and reflected in the Registry Agreement, provided the application is successful. Responses are not scored in the Initial Evaluation. Responses may be scored in a community priority evaluation, if applicable. Criteria and scoring methodology for the community priority evaluation are described in Module 4 of the Applicant Guidebook.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Explain the applicant’s relationship to the community identified in 20(a).</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Explanations should clearly state:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Provide a description of the community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Descriptions should include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Explain the relationship between the applied-for gTLD string and the community identified in 20(a).</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Explanations should clearly state:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e) Provide a complete description of the applicant’s intended registration policies in support of the community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. Policies and enforcement mechanisms are expected to constitute a coherent set.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Descriptions should include proposed policies, if any, on the following: • Eligibility: who is eligible to register a second-level name in the gTLD, and how will eligibility be determined. • Name selection: what types of second-level names may be registered in the gTLD. • Content/Use: what restrictions, if any, the registry operator will impose on how a registrant may use its registered name. • Enforcement: what investigation practices and mechanisms exist to enforce the policies above, what resources are allocated for enforcement, and what appeal mechanisms are available to registrants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f) Attach any written endorsements for the application from established institutions representative of the community identified in 20(a). An applicant may submit written endorsements by multiple institutions, if relevant to the community.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>At least one such endorsement is required for a complete application. The form and content of the endorsement are at the discretion of the party providing the endorsement; however, the letter must identify the applied-for gTLD string and the applying entity, include an express statement support for the application, and supply the contact information of the entity providing the endorsement. Endorsements from institutions not mentioned in the response to 20(b) should be accompanied by a clear description of each such institution’s relationship to the community. Endorsements presented as supporting documentation for this question should be submitted in the original language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Names</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(a) Is the application for a geographic name?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>An applied-for gTLD string is considered a geographic name requiring government support if it is: (a) the capital city name of a country or territory listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard; (b) a city name, where it is clear from statements in the application that the applicant intends to use the gTLD for purposes associated with the city name; (c) a sub-national place name listed in the ISO 3166-2 standard; or (d) a name listed as a UNESCO region or appearing on the &quot;Composition of macro geographic (continental) or regions, geographic sub-regions, and selected economic and other groupings&quot; list. See Module 2 for complete definitions and criteria. An application for a country or territory name, as defined in the Applicant Guidebook, will not be approved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) If a geographic name, attach documentation of support or non-objection from all relevant governments or public authorities.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>See the documentation requirements in Module 2 of the Applicant Guidebook. Documentation presented in response to this question should be submitted in the original language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of Geographic Names</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Describe proposed measures for protection of geographic names at the second and other levels in the applied-for gTLD. This should include any applicable rules and procedures for reservation and/or release of such names.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Applicants should consider and describe how they will incorporate Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) advice in their management of second-level domain name registrations. See &quot;Principles regarding New gTLDs&quot; at <a href="https://gnuneifile.org/display/GACAD/ViewTLDs">https://gnuneifile.org/display/GACAD/ViewTLDs</a>. For reference, applicants may draw on existing methodology developed for the reservation and release of country names in the .INFO top-level domain. See the Dot Info Circular at <a href="https://gnuneifile.org/display/GACAD/ViewTLDs">https://gnuneifile.org/display/GACAD/ViewTLDs</a>. Proposed measures will be posted for public comment as part of the application. However, note that procedures for release of geographic names at the second level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registry Services</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Provide name and full description of all the Registry Services to be provided. Descriptions should include both technical and business components of each proposed service, and address any potential security or stability concerns. The following registry services are customary services offered by a registry operator: A. Receipt of data from registrars concerning registration of domain names and name servers. B. Dissemination of TLD zone files. C. Dissemination of contact or other information concerning domain name registrations (e.g., port-43 WHOIS, Web-based Whois, RESTful Whois service). D. Internationalized Domain Names, where offered. E. DNS Security Extensions (DNSSEC). The applicant must describe whether any of these registry services are intended to be offered in a manner unique to the TLD. Additional proposed registry services that are unique to the registry must also be described.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Registry Services are defined as the following: (1) operations of the Registry critical to the following tasks: (i) the receipt of data from registrars concerning registrations of domain names and name servers; (ii) provision to registrars of status information relating to the zone servers for the TLD; (iii) dissemination of TLD zone files; (iv) operation of the Registry zone servers; and (v) dissemination of contact and other information concerning domain name server registrations in the TLD as required by the Registry Agreement; and (2) other products or services that the Registry Operator is required to provide because of the establishment of a Consensus Policy; (3) any other products or services that only a Registry Operator is capable of providing, by reason of its designation as the Registry Operator. A full definition of Registry Services can be found at <a href="http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/rsep.html">http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/rsep.html</a>.</td>
<td>Security: For purposes of this Applicant Guidebook, an effect on security by the proposed Registry Service means (1) the unauthorized disclosure, alteration, insertion or destruction of Registry Data, or (2) the unauthorized access to or disclosure of information or resources on the Internet by systems operating in accordance with applicable standards. Stability: For purposes of this Applicant Guidebook, an effect on stability shall mean that the proposed Registry Service(s) is not compliant with applicable relevant standards that are authoritative and published by a well-established, recognized and</td>
<td>Responses are not scored. A preliminary assessment will be made to determine if there are potential security or stability issues with any of the applicant's proposed Registry Services. If any such issues are identified, the application will be referred for an extended review. See the description of the Registry Services review process in Module 2 of the Applicant Guidebook. Any information contained in the application may be considered as part of the Registry Services review. If its application is approved, applicant may engage in only those registry services defined in the application, unless a new request is submitted to ICANN in accordance with the Registry Agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td><strong>Demonstration of Technical &amp; Operational Capability (External)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Shared Registration System (SRS) Performance:</strong> describe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the plan for operation of a robust and reliable SRS. SRS is a critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>registry function for enabling multiple registrars to provide domain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>name registration services in the TLD. SRS must include the EPP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interface to the registry, as well as any other interfaces intended to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be provided, if they are critical to the functioning of the registry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please refer to the requirements in Specification 6 (section 1.2) and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specification 10 (SLA Matrix) attached to the Registry Agreement; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>resourcing plans for the initial implementation of, and ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maintenance for, this aspect of the criteria (number and description of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>personnel roles allocated to this area).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A complete answer should include, but is not limited to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A high-level SRS system description;</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The questions in this section (24-44) are intended to give applicants</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Representative network diagram(s);</td>
<td></td>
<td>an opportunity to demonstrate their technical and operational</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) a plan for operating a robust and reliable SRS, one of the five</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of servers;</td>
<td></td>
<td>capabilities to run a registry. In the event that an applicant</td>
<td></td>
<td>critical registry functions;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Description of interconnectivity with other registry systems;</td>
<td></td>
<td>should choose to outsource one or more parts of its registry</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) scalability and performance consistent with the overall business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Frequency of synchronization between servers; and</td>
<td></td>
<td>operations, the applicant should still provide the full details of</td>
<td></td>
<td>approach, and planned size of the registry; (3) a technical plan that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Synchronization scheme (e.g., hot standby, cold standby).</td>
<td></td>
<td>the technical arrangements.</td>
<td></td>
<td>is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Note that the resource plans provided in this section assist in</td>
<td></td>
<td>financial section; and (4) evidence of compliance with Specification 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>validating the technical and operational plans as well as informing</td>
<td></td>
<td>(section 1.2) to the Registry Agreement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the cost estimates in the Financial section below.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Questions 24-30(a) are designed to provide a description of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>applicant's intended technical and operational approach for those</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>registry functions that are outward-facing, i.e., interactions with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>registrars, registrants, and various DNS users. Responses to these</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>questions will be published to allow review by affected parties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>A complete answer demonstrates:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) An adequate description of SRS that substantially demonstrates the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>applicant's capabilities and knowledge required to meet this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>element; (2) Details of a well-developed plan to operate a robust and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reliable SRS; (3) SRS plans are sufficient to result in compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with Specification 6 and Specification 10 to the Registry Agreement;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) SRS is consistent with the technical, operational and financial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>approach described in the application; and (5) Demonstrates that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>adequate technical resources are already on hand, or committed or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>readily available to carry out this function.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0 - fails requirements:</strong> Does not meet all the requirements to score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scoring:**

- **Y** indicates a question that is included in the public posting.
- **0-1** indicates the scoring range for the question.
- **Y** indicates the criteria that are relevant for the question.
- **1 - meets requirements:**
  - Response includes:
    - (1) An adequate description of SRS that substantially demonstrates the applicant's capabilities and knowledge required to meet this element;
    - (2) Details of a well-developed plan to operate a robust and reliable SRS;
    - (3) SRS plans are sufficient to result in compliance with Specification 6 and Specification 10 to the Registry Agreement;
    - (4) SRS is consistent with the technical, operational and financial approach described in the application; and
    - (5) Demonstrates that adequate technical resources are already on hand, or committed or readily available to carry out this function.

- **0 - fails requirements:**
  - Does not meet all the requirements to score 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Extensible Provisioning Protocol (EPP); provide a detailed description of the interface with registrars, including how the applicant will comply with EPP in RFCs 3735 (if applicable), and 5730-5734. If intending to provide proprietary EPP extensions, provide documentation consistent with RFC 3735, including the EPP templates and schemas that will be used. Describe resourcing plans (number and description of personnel roles allocated to this area). A complete answer is expected to be no more than 5 pages. If there are proprietary EPP extensions, a complete answer is also expected to be no more than 5 pages per EPP extension.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates: (1) complete knowledge and understanding of this aspect of registry technical requirements; (2) a technical plan scope/scale consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry; (3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section; (4) ability to comply with relevant RFCs; (5) if applicable, a well-documented implementation of any proprietary EPP extensions; and (6) if applicable, how proprietary EPP extensions are consistent with the registration lifecycle as described in Question 27.</td>
<td>1- meets requirements: Response includes (1) Adequate description of EPP that substantially demonstrates the applicant’s capability and knowledge required to meet this element; (2) Sufficient evidence that any proprietary EPP extensions are compliant with RFCs and provide all necessary functionalities for the provision of registry services; (3) EPP interface is consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and (4) Demonstrates that technical resources are already on hand, or committed or readily available. 0- fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Whois: describe - how the applicant will comply with Whois specifications for data objects, bulk access, and lookup as defined in Specifications 4 and 10 to the Registry Agreement; - how the Applicant’s Whois service will comply with RFC 3912; and - resourcing plans for the initial implementation of, and ongoing maintenance for, this aspect of the criteria (number and description of personnel roles allocated to this area). A complete answer should include, but is not limited to:</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates: (1) complete knowledge and understanding of this aspect of registry technical requirements, (one of the five critical registry functions); (2) a technical plan scope/scale consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry; (3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the</td>
<td>2 – exceeds requirements: Response meets all the attributes for a score of 1 and includes: (1) A Searchable Whois service: Whois service includes web-based search capabilities by domain name, registrant name, postal address, contact names, registrar IDs, and Internet Protocol addresses without arbitrary limit. Boolean search capabilities may be offered. The service shall include appropriate precautions to avoid abuse of this feature (e.g., limiting access to legitimate authorized users), and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 27 | Registration Life Cycle: provide a detailed description of the proposed registration lifecycle for domain names in the proposed gTLD. The description must:  
• explain the various registration states as well as the criteria and procedures that are used to change state;  
• describe the typical registration lifecycle of create/update/delete and all intervening steps such as pending, locked, expired, and transferred that may apply;  
• clearly explain any time elements that are involved - for instance details of add-grace or redemption grace periods, or notice periods for renewals or transfers; and  
• describe resourcing plans for this aspect of the criteria (number and | Y                                      |       | 0-1           | Complete answer demonstrates:  
(1) complete knowledge and understanding of registration lifecycles and states;  
(2) consistency with any specific commitments made to registrants as adapted to the overall business approach for the proposed gTLD; and  
(3) the ability to comply with relevant RFCs.  
(4) ability to comply with relevant RFCs;  
(5) evidence of compliance with Specifications 4 and 10 to the Registry Agreement; and  
(6) if applicable, a well-documented implementation of Searchable Whois.  
planned costs detailed in the financial section;                   |

1 - meets requirements: Response includes  
(3) adequate description of Whois service that substantially demonstrates the applicant’s capability and knowledge required to meet this element;  
(2) Evidence that Whois services are compliant with RFCs, Specifications 4 and 10 to the Registry Agreement, and any other contractual requirements including all necessary functionalities for user interface;  
(3) Whois capabilities consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and  
(4) demonstrates an adequate level of resources that are already on hand or readily available to carry out this function.

0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score 1.

To be eligible for a score of 2, answers must also include:  
• Provision for Searchable Whois capabilities; and  
• A description of potential forms of abuse of this feature, how these risks will be mitigated, and the basis for these descriptions.

A complete answer is expected to be no more than 5 pages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 28 | Abuse Prevention and Mitigation: Applicants should describe the proposed policies and procedures to minimize abusive registrations and other activities that have a negative impact on Internet users. A complete answer should include, but is not limited to:  
- An implementation plan to establish and publish on its website a single abuse point of contact responsible for addressing matters requiring expedited attention and providing a timely response to abuse complaints concerning all names registered in the TLD through all registrars of record, including those involving a reseller;  
- Policies for handling complaints regarding abuse;  
- Proposed measures for removal of orphan glue records for names removed from the zone when provided with evidence in written form that the glue is present in connection with malicious conduct (see Specification 6); and  
- Resourcing plans for the initial implementation of, and ongoing maintenance for, this aspect of the criteria (number and description of personnel roles allocated to this area). To be eligible for a score of 2, answers must include measures to promote Whois accuracy as well as measures from one other area as resources that are already on hand or committed or readily available to carry out this function.  
0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score 1. | Y                           | Note that, while orphan glue often supports correct and ordinary operation of the DNS, registry operators will be required to take action to remove orphan glue records (as defined at [http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/s a0440.pdf](http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/s a0440.pdf)) when provided with evidence in written form that such records are present in connection with malicious conduct. | 0-2  | Complete answer demonstrates:  
1. Comprehensive abuse policies, which include clear definitions of what constitutes abuse in the TLD, and procedures that will effectively minimize potential for abuse in the TLD;  
2. Plans are adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section;  
3. Policies and procedures identify and address the abusive use of registered names at startup and on an ongoing basis; and  
4. When executed in accordance with the Registry Agreement, plans will result in compliance with contractual requirements. | 2 – exceeds requirements: Response meets all the criteria for a score of 1 and includes:  
1. Details of measures to promote Whois accuracy, using measures specified here or other measures commensurate in their effectiveness; and  
2. Measures from at least one additional area to be eligible for 2 points as described in the question.  
1 meets requirements: Response includes:  
1. An adequate description of abuse prevention and mitigation policies and procedures that substantially demonstrates the applicant’s capabilities and knowledge required to meet this element;  
2. Details of well-developed abuse policies and procedures;  
3. Plans are sufficient to result in compliance with contractual requirements;  
4. Plans are consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach described in the application, and any commitments made to registrants; and  
5. Demonstrates an adequate level of resources that are on hand, committed, or readily available to
A description of policies and procedures that define malicious or abusive behavior, capture metrics, and establish Service Level Requirements for resolution, including service levels for responding to law enforcement requests. This may include rapid takedown or suspension systems and sharing information regarding malicious or abusive behavior with industry partners;

Adequate controls to ensure proper access to domain functions (can be undertaken by the registry directly or by registrars via requirements in the Registry-Registrar Agreement (RRA)) may include, but are not limited to:

- Authentication of registrant information as complete and accurate at time of registration. Measures to accomplish this could include performing background checks, verifying all contact information of principals mentioned in registration data, reviewing proof of establishment documentation, and other means.
- Regular monitoring of registration data for accuracy and completeness, employing authentication methods, and establishing policies and procedures to address domain names with inaccurate or incomplete Whois data; and
- If relying on registrars to enforce measures, establishing policies and procedures to ensure compliance, which may include audits, financial incentives, penalties, or other means. Note that the requirements of the RAA will continue to apply to all ICANN-accredited registrars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>Measures to promote Whois accuracy (can be undertaken by the registry directly or by registrars via requirements in the Registry-Registrar Agreement (RRA)) may include, but are not limited to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>carry out this function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Authentication of registrant information as complete and accurate at time of registration. Measures to accomplish this could include performing background checks, verifying all contact information of principals mentioned in registration data, reviewing proof of establishment documentation, and other means.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 – fails requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Regular monitoring of registration data for accuracy and completeness, employing authentication methods, and establishing policies and procedures to address domain names with inaccurate or incomplete Whois data; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Does not meet all the requirements to score 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o If relying on registrars to enforce measures, establishing policies and procedures to ensure compliance, which may include audits, financial incentives, penalties, or other means. Note that the requirements of the RAA will continue to apply to all ICANN-accredited registrars.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>A description of policies and procedures that define malicious or abusive behavior, capture metrics, and establish Service Level Requirements for resolution, including service levels for responding to law enforcement requests. This may include rapid takedown or suspension systems and sharing information regarding malicious or abusive behavior with industry partners;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate controls to ensure proper access to domain functions (can be undertaken by the registry directly or by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A-22
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Rights Protection Mechanisms: Applicants must describe how their registry will comply with policies and practices that minimize abusive registrations and other activities that affect the legal rights of others, such as the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP), Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) system, and Trademark Claims and Sunrise services at startup.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>Complete answer describes mechanisms designed to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) prevent abusive registrations, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) identify and address the abusive use of registered names on an ongoing basis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A complete answer is expected to include:

- A description of how the registry operator will implement safeguards against allowing unqualified registrations (e.g., registrations made in violation of the registry’s eligibility restrictions or policies), and reduce opportunities for behaviors such as phishing or pharming. At a minimum, the registry operator must offer a Sunrise period and a Trademark Claims service during the required time periods, and implement decisions rendered under the URS on an ongoing basis; and
- A description of resourcing plans for the...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 30 | (a) Security Policy: provide a summary of the security policy for the proposed registry, including but not limited to:  
  • indication of any independent assessment reports demonstrating security capabilities, and provisions for periodic independent assessment reports to test security capabilities;  
  • description of any augmented security levels or capabilities commensurate with the nature of the applied for gTLD string, including the identification of any existing international or industry relevant security standards the applicant commits to following (reference site must be provided);  
  • list of commitments made to registrants concerning security levels.  
To be eligible for a score of 2, answers must also include:  
• Evidence of an independent assessment report demonstrating effective security controls (e.g., ISO 27001).  
A summary of the above should be no more than 20 pages. Note that the complete security policy for the registry is required to be submitted in accordance with 30(b). | Y | Criterion 5 calls for security levels to be appropriate for the use and level of trust associated with the TLD string, such as, for example, financial services oriented TLDs. “Financial services” are activities performed by financial institutions, including: 1) the acceptance of deposits and other repayable funds; 2) lending; 3) payment and remittance services; 4) insurance or reinsurance services; 5) brokerage services; 6) investment services and activities; 7) financial leasing; 8) issuance of guarantees and commitments; 9) provision of financial advice; 10) portfolio management and advice; or 11) acting as a financial clearinghouse. Financial services is used as an example only; other strings with exceptional potential to cause harm to consumers would also be expected to deploy appropriate levels of security. | 0-2 | Complete answer demonstrates:  
1) detailed description of processes and solutions deployed to manage logical security across infrastructure and systems, monitoring and detecting threats and security vulnerabilities and taking appropriate steps to resolve them;  
2) security capabilities are consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry;  
3) a technical plan adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section;  
4) security measures are consistent with any commitments made to registrants regarding security levels; and  
5) security measures are appropriate for the applied-for gTLD string. (For example, applications for strings with unique trust implications, such as financial services-oriented strings, would be expected to provide a commensurate level of security). | 2 - exceeds requirements: Response meets all attributes for a score of 1 and includes:  
(1) Evidence of highly developed and detailed security capabilities, with various baseline security levels, independent benchmarking of security metrics, robust periodic security monitoring, and continuous enforcement; and  
(2) an independent assessment report is provided demonstrating effective security controls are either in place or have been designed, and are commensurate with the applied-for gTLD string. (This could be ISO 27001 certification or other well-established and recognized industry certifications for the registry operation. If new independent standards for demonstration of effective security controls are established, such as the High Security Top Level Domain (HSTLD) designation, this could also be included. An illustrative example of an independent standard is the proposed set of requirements described in http://www.icann.org/en/ correspond/encoksha-frac-rootscren- crocker-20dec11-en.pdf). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 30 | (b) Security Policy: provide the complete security policy and procedures for the proposed registry, including but not limited to:  
  • system (data, server, application / services) and network access control, ensuring systems are maintained in a secure fashion, including details of how they are monitored, logged and backed up;  
  • resources to secure integrity of updates between registry systems and nameservers, and between nameservers, if any;  
  • independent assessment reports demonstrating security capabilities (submitted as attachments), if any;  
  • provisioning and other measures that mitigate risks posed by denial of service attacks;  
  • computer and network incident response | N                          |       |               |          |         |

Questions 30(b) – 44 are designed to provide a description of the applicant’s intended technical and operational approach for those registry functions that are internal to the infrastructure and operations of the registry. To allow the applicant to provide full details and safeguard proprietary information, responses to these questions will not be published.

Scoring:

1. Adequate description of security policies and procedures that substantially demonstrates the applicant’s capability and knowledge required to meet this element;
2. A description of adequate security capabilities, including enforcement of logical access control, threat analysis, incident response and auditing. Ad-hoc oversight and governance and leading practices being followed;
3. Security capabilities consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application, and any commitments made to registrants;
4. Demonstrates that an adequate level of resources are on hand, committed or readily available to carry out this function; and
5. Proposed security measures are commensurate with the nature of the applied-for gTLD string.

0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>policies, plans, and processes;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• plans to minimize the risk of unauthorized access to its systems or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tampering with registry data;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• intrusion detection mechanisms, a threat analysis for the proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>registry, the defenses that will be deployed against those threats, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>provision for periodic threat analysis updates;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• details for auditing capability on all network access;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• physical security approach;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• identification of department or group responsible for the registry's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>security organization;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• background checks conducted on security personnel;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• description of the main security threats to the registry operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that have been identified;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• resourcing plans for the initial implementation of, and ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maintenance for, this aspect of the criteria (number and description of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>personnel roles allocated to this area).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Technical Overview of Proposed Registry: provide a technical overview</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the proposed registry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) complete knowledge and understanding of technical aspects of registry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The technical plan must be adequately resourced, with appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>requirements;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>expertise and allocation of costs. The applicant will provide financial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) an adequate level of resiliency for the registry's technical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>descriptions of resources in the next section and those resources must</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>operations;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be reasonably related to these technical requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) consistency with planned or currently deployed technical/operational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The overview should include information on the estimated scale of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>solutions;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>registry’s technical operation, for example, estimates for the number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) consistency with the overall business approach and planned size of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of registration transactions and DNS queries per month should be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>registry;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>provided for the first two years of operation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) adequate resourcing for technical plan in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In addition, the overview should account for geographic dispersion of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incoming network traffic such as DNS, Whois, and registrar transactions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the registry serves a highly localized registrant base, then traffic might be expected to come mainly from one area. This high-level summary should not repeat answers to questions below. Answers should include a visual diagram(s) to highlight dataflows, to provide context for the overall technical infrastructure. Detailed diagrams for subsequent questions should be able to map back to this high-level diagram(s). The visual diagram(s) can be supplemented with documentation, or a narrative, to explain how all of the Technical &amp; Operational components conform. A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Architecture: provide documentation for the system and network architecture that will support registry operations for the proposed scale of the registry. System and network architecture documentation must clearly demonstrate the applicant's ability to operate, manage, and monitor registry systems. Documentation should include multiple diagrams or other components including but not limited to: • Detailed network diagram(s) showing the full interplay of registry elements, including but not limited to SRS, DNS, Whois, data escrow, and registry database functions; • Network and associated systems necessary to support registry operations, including: ▪ Anticipated TCP/IP addressing scheme, ▪ Hardware (i.e., servers, routers, networking components, virtual machines and key characteristics (CPU and RAM, Disk space, internal network connectivity, and make and model)), ▪ Operating system and versions, and ▪ Software and applications (with version information) necessary to support registry operations, management, and monitoring • General overview of capacity planning, including bandwidth allocation plans; • List of providers / carriers; and • Resourcing plans for the initial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates: (1) detailed and coherent network architecture; (2) architecture providing resiliency for registry systems; (3) a technical plan scope/scale that is consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry; and (4) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 - exceeds requirements: Response meets all attributes for a score of 1 and includes (1) Evidence of highly developed and detailed network architecture that is able to scale well above stated projections for high registration volumes, thereby significantly reducing the risk from unexpected volume surges and demonstrates an ability to adapt quickly to support new technologies and services that are not necessarily envisaged for initial registry startup; and (2) Evidence of a highly available, robust, and secure infrastructure. 1 - meets requirements: Response includes (1) An adequate description of the architecture that substantially demonstrates the applicant’s capabilities and knowledge required to meet this element; (2) Plans for network architecture describe all necessary elements; (3) Descriptions demonstrate adequate network architecture providing robustness and security of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 33 | Database Capabilities: provide details of database capabilities including but not limited to: database software; storage capacity (both in raw terms [e.g., MB, GB] and in number of registrations / registration transactions); maximum transaction throughput (in total and by type of transaction); scalability; procedures for object creation, editing, and deletion, and user and credential management; high availability; change management procedures; reporting capabilities; and resource planning for the initial implementation of, and ongoing maintenance for, this aspect of the criteria (number and description of personnel roles allocated to this area). A registry database data model can be included to provide additional clarity to this response. Note: Database capabilities described should be in reference to registry services and not necessarily related support functions such as Personnel or Accounting, unless such services are inherently intertwined with the delivery of registry services. To be eligible for a score of 2, answers must also include evidence of a network architecture design that greatly reduces the risk profile of the proposed registry by providing a level of scalability and adaptability (e.g., protection against DDoS attacks) that far exceeds the minimum configuration necessary for the expected volume. A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages. | N | | 0-2 | Complete answer demonstrates: (1) complete knowledge and understanding of database capabilities to meet the registry technical requirements; (2) database capabilities consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry; and (3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section. | 2 - exceeds requirements: Response meets all attributes for a score of 1 and includes (1) Highly developed and detailed description of database capabilities that are able to scale well above stated projections for high registration volumes, thereby significantly reducing the risk from unexpected volume surges and demonstrates an ability to adapt quickly to support new technologies and services that are not necessarily envisaged for registry startup; and (2) Evidence of comprehensive database capabilities, including high scalability and redundant database infrastructure, regularly reviewed operational and reporting procedures following leading practices. | 1 - meets requirements: Response includes (1) An adequate description of database capabilities that substantially demonstrates the applicant’s capabilities and knowledge required to meet this element; (2) Plans for database capabilities

(4) Bandwidth and SLA are consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and (5) Demonstrates an adequate level of resources that are on hand, or committed or readily available to carry out this function. 0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score 1. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>include evidence of database capabilities that greatly reduce the risk profile of the proposed registry by providing a level of scalability and adaptability that far exceeds the minimum configuration necessary for the expected volume. A complete answer is expected to be no more than 5 pages.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates:</td>
<td>Scoring describe all necessary elements;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) geographic diversity of nameservers and operations centers;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Descriptions demonstrate adequate database capabilities, with database throughput, scalability, and database operations with limited operational governance;</td>
<td>Scoring database capabilities are consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) proposed geo-diversity measures are consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Demonstrates that an adequate level of resources that are on hand, or committed or readily available to carry out this function.</td>
<td>Scoring does not meet all the requirements to score 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Geographic Diversity: provide a description of plans for geographic diversity of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. name servers, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. operations centers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Answers should include, but are not limited to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the intended physical locations of systems, primary and back-up operations centers (including security attributes), and other infrastructure;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• any registry plans to use Anycast or other topological and geographical diversity measures, in which case, the configuration of the relevant service must be included;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• resourcing plans for the initial implementation of, and ongoing maintenance for, this aspect of the criteria (number and description of personnel roles allocated to this area).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To be eligible for a score of 2, answers must also include evidence of a geographic diversity plan that greatly reduces the risk profile of the proposed registry by ensuring the continuance of all vital business functions (as identified in the applicant’s continuity plan in Question 39) in the event of a natural or other disaster at the principal place of business or point of presence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A complete answer is expected to be no more than 5 pages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Demonstrates adequate resources that are on hand, or committed or readily available to carry out this function.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>DNS Service: describe the configuration and operation of nameservers, including how the applicant will comply with relevant RFCs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates: (1) adequate description of configurations of nameservers and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All name servers used for the new gTLD must be operated in compliance with the DNS protocol specifications defined in the relevant RFCs,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>compliance with respective DNS protocol-related RFCs; (2) a technical plan scope/scale that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>including but not limited to: 1034, 1035, 1982, 2181, 2182, 2671, 3226, 3596, 3597, 3901, 4343, and 4472.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>is consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry; (3) a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide details of the intended DNS Service including, but not limited to: A description of the DNS services to be provided, such as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>query rates to be supported at initial operation, and reserve capacity of the system. Describe how your nameserver update methods will</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>section; (4) evidence of compliance with Specification 6 to the Registry Agreement; and (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>change at various scales. Describe how DNS performance will change at various scales.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>evidence of complete knowledge and understanding of requirements for DNS service, one of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• RFCs that will be followed – describe how services are compliant with RFCs and if these are dedicated or shared with any other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>five critical registry functions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>functions (capacity/performance) or DNS zones.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - meets requirements: Response includes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The resources used to implement the services - describe complete server hardware and software, including network bandwidth and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Adequate description of DNS service that substantially demonstrates the applicant’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>addressing plans for servers. Also include resourcing plans for the initial implementation of, and ongoing maintenance for, this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>capability and knowledge required to meet this element; (2) Plans are sufficient to result in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aspect of the criteria (number and description of personnel roles allocated to this area).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>compliance with DNS protocols (Specification 6, section 1.1) and required performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demonstrate how the system will</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>specifications Specification 10, Service Level Matrix; (3) Plans are consistent with technical,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and (4) Demonstrates an</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>adequate level of resources that are on hand, or committed or readily available to carry out this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>function.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 36 | IPv6 Reachability: provide a description of plans for providing IPv6 transport including, but not limited to:  
• How the registry will support IPv6 access to Whois, Web-based Whois and any other Registration Data Publication Service as described in Specification 6 (section 1.5) to the Registry Agreement.  
• How the registry will comply with the requirement in Specification 6 for having at least two nameservers reachable over IPv6.  
• List all services that will be provided over IPv6, and describe the IPv6 connectivity and provider diversity that will be used.  
• Resourcing plans for the initial implementation of, and ongoing maintenance for, this aspect of the criteria (number and description of personnel roles allocated to this area).  
A complete answer is expected to be no more than 5 pages. | N | IANA nameserver requirements are available at [http://www.iana.org/procedures/nameserver-requirements.html](http://www.iana.org/procedures/nameserver-requirements.html) | 0-1 | Complete answer demonstrates:  
(1) complete knowledge and understanding of this aspect of registry technical requirements;  
(2) a technical plan scope/scale that is consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry;  
(3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section; and  
(4) evidence of compliance with Specification 6 to the Registry Agreement. | 1 - meets requirements: Response includes  
(1) Adequate description of IPv6 reachability that substantially demonstrates the applicant's capability and knowledge required to meet this element;  
(2) A description of an adequate implementation plan addressing requirements for IPv6 reachability, indicating IPv6 reachability allowing IPv6 transport in the network over two independent IPv6 capable networks in compliance to IPv4 IANA specifications, and Specification 10;  
(3) IPv6 plans consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and  
(4) Demonstrates an adequate level of resources that are on hand, committed or readily available to carry out this function.  
0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score 1. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Data Backup Policies &amp; Procedures: provide</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- details of frequency and procedures for backup of data,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) detailed backup and retrieval processes deployed;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- hardware, and systems used for backup,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) backup and retrieval process and frequency are consistent with the overall business approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- data format,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and planned size of the registry;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- data backup features,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- backup testing procedures,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>planned costs detailed in the financial section.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- procedures for retrieval of data/rebuild of database,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- storage controls and procedures, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- resourcing plans for the initial implementation of, and ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- maintenance for, this aspect of the criteria (number and description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- of personnel roles allocated to this area).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A complete answer is expected to be no more than 5 pages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Data Escrow: describe</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- how the applicant will comply with the data escrow requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) complete knowledge and understanding of data escrow, one of the five</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>documented in the Registry Data Escrow Specification (Specification 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>critical registry functions;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the Registry Agreement); and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) compliance with Specification 2 of the Registry Agreement;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- resourcing plans for the initial implementation of, and ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- maintenance for, this aspect of the criteria (number and description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>planned costs detailed in the financial section;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- of personnel roles allocated to this area).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) the escrow arrangement is consistent with the overall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A complete answer is expected to be no more than 5 pages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>business approach and size/scope of the registry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Registry Continuity: describe how the applicant will comply with registry continuity obligations as described in Specification 6 (section 3) to the registry agreement. This includes conducting registry operations using diverse, redundant servers to ensure continued operation of critical functions in the case of technical failure. Describe resourcing plans for the initial implementation of, and ongoing maintenance for, this aspect of the criteria (number and description of personnel roles allocated to this area). The response should include, but is not limited to, the following elements of the business continuity plan: • Identification of risks and threats to compliance with registry continuity obligations; • Identification and definitions of vital business functions (which may include registry services beyond the five critical registry functions) versus other registry functions and supporting operations and technology; • Definitions of Recovery Point Objectives and Recovery Time Objective; and • Descriptions of testing plans to promote compliance with relevant obligations. To be eligible for a score of 2, answers must also include: • A highly detailed plan that provides for leading practice levels of availability; and • Evidence of concrete steps such as a contract with a backup provider (in addition to any currently designated service operator) or a maintained hot site. A complete answer is expected to be no more than 15 pages.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>For reference, applicants should review the ICANN gTLD Registry Continuity Plan at <a href="http://www.icann.org/en/registries/continuity/gtld-registry-continuity-plan-25apr09-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/registries/continuity/gtld-registry-continuity-plan-25apr09-en.pdf</a>. A Recovery Point Objective (RPO) refers to the point in time to which data should be recovered following a business disruption or disaster. The RPO allows an organization to define a window of time before a disruption or disaster during which data may be lost and is independent of the time it takes to get a system back on-line. If the RPO of a company is two hours, then when a system is brought back on-line after a disruption/disaster, all data must be restored to a point within two hours before the disaster. A Recovery Time Objective (RTO) is the duration of time within which a process must be restored after a business disruption or disaster to avoid what the entity may deem as unacceptable consequences. For example, pursuant to the draft Registry Agreement DNS service must not be down for longer than 4 hours. At 4 hours ICANN may invoke the use of an Emergency Back End Registry Operator to take over this function. The entity may deem this to be an unacceptable consequence and may set their RTO to be something less than 4 hours and would build continuity plans accordingly. Vital business functions are functions that are critical to the success of the operation. For example, if a registry operator provides an additional service beyond the five critical registry functions, that it deems as central to its TLD, or supports an operation that is central to the TLD, this might be identified as a vital business function.</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates: (1) detailed description showing plans for compliance with registry continuity obligations; (2) a technical plan scope/scale that is consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry; (3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section; and (4) evidence of compliance with Specification 6 to the Registry Agreement.</td>
<td>2 - exceeds requirements: Response meets all attributes for a score of 1 and includes: (1) Highly developed and detailed processes for maintaining registry continuity; and (2) Evidence of concrete steps, such as a contract with a backup service provider or a maintained hot site. 1 - meets requirements: Response includes: (1) Adequate description of a Registry Continuity plan that substantially demonstrates capability and knowledge required to meet this element; (2) Continuity plans are sufficient to result in compliance with requirements (Specification 6); (3) Continuity plans are consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and (4) Demonstrates an adequate level of resources that are on hand, committed readily available to carry out this function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Registry Transition: provide a Service Migration plan (as described in the Registry Transition Processes) that could be followed in the event</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates: (1) complete knowledge and (2) evidence of concrete steps, such as a contract with a backup service provider or a maintained hot site. A complete answer is expected to be no more than 15 pages.</td>
<td>1 - meets requirements: Response includes (1) Adequate description of a registry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Failover Testing: provide a description of the failover testing plan, including mandatory annual testing of the plan. Examples may include a description of plans to test failover of data centers or operations to alternate sites, from a hot to a cold facility, registry data escrow testing, or other mechanisms. The plan must take into account and be consistent with the vital business functions identified in Question 39; and resourcing plans for the initial implementation of, and ongoing maintenance for, this aspect of the criteria (number and description of personnel roles allocated to this area). The failover testing plan should include, but is not limited to, the following elements: Types of testing (e.g., walkthroughs, takedown of sites) and the frequency of testing; How results are captured, what is done</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates: (1) complete knowledge and understanding of this aspect of registry technical requirements; (2) a technical plan scope/scale consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry; and (3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section.</td>
<td>1 - meets requirements: Response includes (1) An adequate description of a failover testing plan that substantially demonstrates the applicant’s capability and knowledge required to meet this element; (2) A description of an adequate failover testing plan with appropriate monitoring during registry transition; and (3) Transition plan is consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application. 0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score a 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Monitoring and Fault Escalation Processes: provide</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates: (1) complete knowledge and understanding of this aspect of registry technical requirements; (2) a technical plan scope/scale that is consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry; (3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section; and (4) consistency with the commitments made to registrants and registrars regarding system maintenance.</td>
<td>2 - exceeds requirements: Response meets all attributes for a score of 1 and includes (1) Evidence showing highly developed and detailed fault tolerance/monitoring and redundant systems deployed with real-time monitoring tools / dashboard (metrics) deployed and reviewed regularly; (2) A high level of availability that allows for the ability to respond to faults through a 24x7 response team.</td>
<td>1 - meets requirements: Response includes (1) Adequate description of monitoring and fault escalation processes that substantially demonstrates the applicant’s capability and knowledge required to meet this element; (2) Evidence showing adequate fault tolerance/monitoring systems planned with an appropriate level of monitoring and limited periodic review being performed; (3) Plans are consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach described in the application; and (4) Demonstrates an adequate level of resources that are on hand,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>DNSSEC: Provide</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Complete answer demonstrates: (1) complete knowledge and understanding of this aspect of registry technical requirements, one of the five critical registry functions; (2) a technical plan scope/scale that is consistent with the overall business approach and planned size of the registry; (3) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section; and (4) an ability to comply with relevant RFCs.</td>
<td>1 - meets requirements: Response includes (1) An adequate description of DNSSEC that substantially demonstrates the applicant’s capability and knowledge required to meet this element; (2) Evidence that TLD zone files will be signed at time of launch, in compliance with all RFCs, and registry offers provisioning capabilities to accept public key material from registrants through the SRS; (3) An adequate description of key management procedures in the proposed TLD, including providing secure encryption key management (generation, exchange, and storage); (4) Technical plan is consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and (5) Demonstrates an adequate level of resources that are already on hand, committed or readily available to carry out this function. 0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>OPTIONAL: IDNs</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>IDNs are an optional service at time of launch. Absence of IDN implementation or plans will not detract from an applicant's score. Applicants who respond to this question with plans for implementation of IDNs at time of launch will be scored according to the criteria indicated here. IDN tables should be submitted in a machine-readable format. The model format described in Section 5 of RFC 4290 would be ideal. The format used by RFC 3743 is an acceptable alternative. Variant generation algorithms that are more complex (such as those with contextual scripts are settled and IDN generation rules. For newly-formed applicants, or where financial statements are not audited, provide: • the latest available unaudited financial statements; and • an explanation as to why audited or independently certified financial statements are not available.</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>IDNs are an optional service. Complete answer demonstrates: (1) complete knowledge and understanding of this aspect of registry technical requirements; (2) a technical plan that is adequately resourced in the planned costs detailed in the financial section; (3) consistency with the commitments made to registrants and the technical, operational, and financial approach described in the application; (4) issues regarding use of scripts are settled and IDN tables are complete and publicly available; and (5) ability to comply with relevant RFCs.</td>
<td>1 - meets requirements for this optional element: Response includes (1) Adequate description of IDN implementation that substantially demonstrates the applicant’s capability and knowledge required to meet this element; (2) An adequate description of the IDN procedures, including complete IDN tables, compliance with IDNA/IDN guidelines and RFCs, and periodic monitoring of IDN operations; (3) Evidence of ability to resolve rendering and known IDN issues or spoofing attacks; (4) IDN plans are consistent with the technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and (5) Demonstrates an adequate level of resources that are on hand, committed readily available to carry out this function. 0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score a 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Demonstration of Financial Capability: Financial Statements: provide • audited or independently certified financial statements for the most recently completed fiscal year for the applicant, and • audited or unaudited financial statements for the most recently ended interim financial period for the applicant for which this information may be released. For newly-formed applicants, or where financial statements are not audited, provide: • the latest available unaudited financial statements; and • an explanation as to why audited or independently certified financial statements are not available.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The questions in this section (45-50) are intended to give applicants an opportunity to demonstrate their financial capabilities to run a registry. Supporting documentation for this question should be submitted in the original language.</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Audited or independently certified financial statements are prepared in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) adopted by the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB) or nationally recognized accounting standards (e.g., GAAP). This will include a balance sheet and income statement reflecting the applicant’s financial position and results of operations, a statement of shareholders equity/partner capital, and a cash flow statement. In the event the applicant is an entity newly formed for the purpose of applying for a gTLD and with little to no operating history</td>
<td>1 - meets requirements: Complete audited or independently certified financial statements are provided, at the highest level available in the applicant's jurisdiction. Where such audited or independently certified financial statements are not available, such as for newly-formed entities, the applicant has provided an explanation and has provided, at a minimum, unaudited financial statements. 0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Financial statements are used in the analysis of projections and costs. A complete answer should include: • balance sheet; • income statement; • statement of shareholders equity/partner capital; • cash flow statement, and • letter of auditor or independent certification, if applicable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(less than one year), the applicant must submit, at a minimum, pro forma financial statements including all components listed in the question. Where audited or independently certified financial statements are not available, applicant has provided an adequate explanation as to the accounting practices in its jurisdiction and has provided, at a minimum, unaudited financial statements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Costs and capital expenditures: in conjunction with the financial projections template, describe and explain: • the expected operating costs and capital expenditures of setting up and operating the proposed registry; • any functions to be outsourced, as indicated in the cost section of the template, and the reasons for outsourcing; • any significant variances between years in any category of expected costs; and • a description of the basis / key assumptions including rationale for the costs provided in the projections template. This may include an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>costs identified are consistent with the proposed registry services, adequately fund technical requirements, and are consistent with proposed mission/purpose of the registry. Costs projected are reasonable for a registry of size and scope described in the application. Costs identified include the funding costs (interest expenses and fees) related to the continued operations instrument described in Question 50 below.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
executive summary or summary outcome of studies, reference data, or other steps taken to develop the responses and validate any assumptions made.

As described in the Applicant Guidebook, the information provided will be considered in light of the entire application and the evaluation criteria. Therefore, this answer should agree with the information provided in Template 1 to: 1) maintain registry operations, 2) provide registry services described above, and 3) satisfy the technical requirements described in the Demonstration of Technical & Operational Capability section. Costs should include both fixed and variable costs.

To be eligible for a score of two points, answers must demonstrate a conservative estimate of costs based on actual examples of previous or existing registry operations with similar approach and projections for growth and costs or equivalent. Attach reference material for such examples.

A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages.

(b) Describe anticipated ranges in projected costs. Describe factors that affect those ranges.

A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages.

48 (a) Funding and Revenue: Funding can be derived from several sources (e.g., existing capital or proceeds/revenue from operation of the proposed registry).

Describe:
1) How existing funds will provide resources for both: a) start-up of operations, and b) ongoing operations;
2) the revenue model including projections for transaction volumes and price (if the applicant does not intend to rely on registration revenue in order to cover the costs of the registry's operations).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>operation, it must clarify how the funding for the operation will be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outside sources of funding are documented and verified. Examples of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>developed and maintained in a stable and sustainable manner);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>funding sources include, but are not limited to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III) outside sources of funding (the applicant must, where applicable,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Executed funding agreements;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>provide evidence of the commitment by the party committing the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- A letter of credit;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>funds). Secured vs unsecured funding should be clearly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- A commitment letter;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>identified, including associated sources of funding (i.e.,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- A bank statement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>different types of funding, level and type of security/collateral,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding commitments may be conditional on the approval of the application.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and key items) for each type of funding;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sources of capital funding required to sustain registry operations on an on-going basis are identified. The projected revenues are consistent with the size and projected penetration of the target markets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV) Any significant variances between years in any category of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key assumptions and their rationale are clearly described and address, at a minimum:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>funding and revenue; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Key components of the funding plan and their key terms; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V) A description of the basis / key assumptions including rationale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Price and number of registrations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for the funding and revenue provided in the projections template.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This may include an executive summary or summary outcome of studies,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reference data, or other steps taken to develop the responses and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>validate any assumptions made; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VI) Assurances that funding and revenue projections cited in this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>application are consistent with other public and private claims</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>made to promote the business and generate support. To be eligible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for a score of 2 points, answers must demonstrate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) A conservative estimate of funding and revenue; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) Ongoing operations that are not dependent on projected revenue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>(a) Contingency Planning: describe your contingency planning: • Identify any projected barriers/risks to implementation of the business approach described in the application and how they affect cost, funding, revenue, or timeline in your planning; • Identify the impact of any particular regulation, law or policy that might impact the Registry Services offering; and • Describe the measures to mitigate the key risks as described in this question. A complete answer should include, for each contingency, a clear description of the impact to projected revenue, funding, and costs for the 3-year period presented in Template 1 (Most Likely Scenario). To be eligible for a score of 2 points, answers must demonstrate that action plans and operations are adequately resourced in the existing funding and revenue plan even if contingencies occur. A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>Contingencies and risks are identified, quantified, and included in the cost, revenue, and funding analyses. Action plans are identified in the event contingencies occur. The model is resilient in the event those contingencies occur. Responses address the probability and resource impact of the contingencies identified.</td>
<td>2 - exceeds requirements: Response meets all attributes for a score of 1 and: (1) Action plans and operations are adequately resourced in the existing funding and revenue plan even if contingencies occur. 1 - meets requirements: (1) Model adequately identifies the key risks (including operational, business, legal, jurisdictional, financial, and other relevant risks); (2) Response gives consideration to probability and resource impact of contingencies identified; and (3) If resources are not available to fund contingencies in the existing plan, funding sources and a plan for obtaining them are identified. 0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score a 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Describe your contingency planning where funding sources are so significantly reduced that material deviations from the implementation model are required. In particular, describe: • how on-going technical requirements will be met; and • what alternative funding can be reasonably raised at a later time. Provide an explanation if you do not believe there is any chance of reduced funding.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>(a) Provide a cost estimate for funding critical registry functions on an annual basis, and a rationale for these cost estimates commensurate with the technical, operational, and financial approach described in the application. The critical functions of a registry which must be supported even if an applicant’s business and/or funding fails are: (1) DNS resolution for registered domain names Applicants should consider ranges of volume of daily DNS queries (e.g., 0-100M, 100M-1B, 1B+), the incremental costs associated with increasing levels of such queries, and the ability to meet SLA performance metrics. (2) Operation of the Shared Registration System Applicants should consider ranges of volume of daily EPP transactions (e.g., 0-200K, 200K-2M, 2M+), the incremental costs associated with</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>Figures provided are based on an accurate estimate of costs. Documented evidence or detailed plan for ability to fund on-going critical registry functions for registrants for a period of three years in the event of registry failure, default or until a successor operator can be designated. Evidence of financial wherewithal to fund this requirement prior to delegation. This requirement must be met prior to or concurrent with the execution of the Registry Agreement.</td>
<td>3 - exceeds requirements: Response meets all the attributes for a score of 1 and: (1) Financial instrument is secured and in place to provide for on-going operations for at least three years in the event of failure. 1 - meets requirements: (1) Costs are commensurate with technical, operational, and financial approach as described in the application; and (2) Funding is identified and instrument is described to provide for on-going operations of at least three years in the event of failure. 0 - fails requirements: Does not meet all the requirements to score a 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>increasing levels of such queries, and the ability to meet SLA performance metrics.</td>
<td></td>
<td>to the applicant’s actual in-house or subcontracting costs for provision of these functions. Refer to guidelines at <a href="http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-3-23dec11-en.htm">http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-3-23dec11-en.htm</a> regarding estimation of costs. However, the applicant must provide its own estimates and explanation in response to this question.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Provision of Whois service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicants should consider ranges of volume of daily Whois queries (e.g., 0-100K, 100K-1M, 1M+), the incremental costs associated with increasing levels of such queries, and the ability to meet SLA performance metrics for both web-based and port-43 services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Registry data escrow deposits</td>
<td></td>
<td>Applicants should consider administration, retention, and transfer fees as well as daily deposit (e.g., full or incremental) handling. Costs may vary depending on the size of the files in escrow (i.e., the size of the registry database).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Maintenance of a properly signed zone in accordance with DNSSEC requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Applicants should consider ranges of volume of daily DNS queries (e.g., 0-100M, 100M-1B, 1B+), the incremental costs associated with increasing levels of such queries, and the ability to meet SLA performance metrics. List the estimated annual cost for each of these functions (specify currency used). A complete answer is expected to be no more than 10 pages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Applicants must provide evidence as to how the funds required for performing these critical registry functions will be available and guaranteed to fund registry operations (for the protection of registrants in the new gTLD) for a</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Second (Part b), methods of securing the funds required to perform those functions for at least three years are to be described by the applicant in accordance with the criteria below. Two types of instruments will fulfill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Included in public posting</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Scoring Range</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| minimum of three years following the termination of the Registry Agreement. ICANN has identified two methods to fulfill this requirement: (i) Irrevocable standby letter of credit (LOC) issued by a reputable financial institution.  
  - The amount of the LOC must be equal to or greater than the amount required to fund the registry operations specified above for at least three years. In the event of a draw upon the letter of credit, the actual payout would be tied to the cost of running those functions.  
  - The LOC must name ICANN or its designee as the beneficiary. Any funds paid out would be provided to the designee who is operating the required registry functions.  
  - The LOC must have a term of at least five years from the delegation of the TLD. The LOC may be structured with an annual expiration date if it contains an evergreen provision providing for annual extensions, without amendment, for an indefinite number of periods until the issuing bank informs the beneficiary of its final expiration or until the beneficiary releases the LOC as evidenced in writing. If the expiration date occurs prior to the fifth anniversary of the delegation of the TLD, applicant will be required to obtain a replacement instrument.  
  - The LOC must be issued by a reputable financial institution insured at the highest level in its jurisdiction. Documentation should indicate by whom the issuing institution is insured (i.e., as opposed to by whom the institution is rated).  
  - The LOC will provide that ICANN or its designee shall be unconditionally entitled to a release of funds (full or partial) thereunder upon delivery of written notice by ICANN or its designee.  
  - Applicant should attach an original copy of the executed letter of credit or a draft of the letter of credit containing the full terms and conditions. If not yet executed, the Applicant will be required to provide ICANN with an original copy of the executed LOC prior to or concurrent with the execution of the Registry Agreement.  
  - The LOC must contain at least the following required elements:  
  - Issuing bank and date of issue.  
  - Beneficiary: ICANN / 4676 Admiralty | | this requirement. The applicant must identify which of the two methods is being described. The instrument is required to be in place at the time of the execution of the Registry Agreement.  
  Financial Institution Ratings: The instrument must be issued or held by a financial institution with a rating beginning with “A” (or the equivalent) by any of the following rating agencies: A.M. Best, Dominion Bond Rating Service, Egan-Jones, Fitch Ratings, Kroll Bond Rating Agency, Moody’s, Morningstar, Standard & Poor’s, and Japan Credit Rating Agency.  
  If an applicant cannot access a financial institution with a rating beginning with “A,” but a branch or subsidiary of such an institution exists in the jurisdiction of the applying entity, then the instrument may be issued by the branch or subsidiary or by a local financial institution with an equivalent or higher rating to the branch or subsidiary.  
  If an applicant cannot access any such financial institutions, the instrument may be issued by the highest-rated financial institution in the national jurisdiction of the applying entity, if accepted by ICANN.  
  Execution by ICANN: For any financial instruments that contemplate ICANN being a party, upon the written request of the applicant, ICANN may (but is not obligated to) execute such agreement prior to submission of the applicant's application if the agreement is on terms acceptable to ICANN. ICANN encourages applicants to deliver a written copy of any such agreement (only if it requires ICANN’s signature) to ICANN as soon as possible to facilitate ICANN’s review. If the financial instrument requires ICANN’s signature, then the applicant will receive 3 points for question 50 (for the instrument being “secured and in place”) only if ICANN executes the agreement prior to submission of the application. ICANN will determine, in |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Included in public posting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|  | Way, Suite 330 / Marina del Rey, CA 90292 / US, or its designee.  
  o Applicant’s complete name and address.  
  o LOC identifying number.  
  o Exact amount in USD.  
  o Expiry date.  
  o Address, procedure, and required forms whereby presentation for payment is to be made.  
  o Conditions:  
    - Partial drawings from the letter of credit may be made provided that such payment shall reduce the amount under the standby letter of credit.  
    - All payments must be marked with the issuing bank name and the bank’s standby letter of credit number.  
    - LOC may not be modified, amended, or amplified by reference to any other document, agreement, or instrument.  
    - The LOC is subject to the International Standby Practices (ISP 98) International Chamber of Commerce (Publication No. 590), or to an alternative standard that has been demonstrated to be reasonably equivalent.  
  | | | its sole discretion, whether to execute and become a party to a financial instrument.  
  | | | The financial instrument should be submitted in the original language.  
| | (ii) A deposit into an irrevocable cash escrow account held by a reputable financial institution.  
  • The amount of the deposit must be equal to or greater than the amount required to fund registry operations for at least three years.  
  • Cash is to be held by a third party financial institution which will not allow the funds to be commingled with the Applicant’s operating funds or other funds and may only be accessed by ICANN or its designee if certain conditions are met.  
  • The account must be held by a reputable financial institution insured at the highest level in its jurisdiction. Documentation should indicate by whom the issuing institution is insured (i.e., as opposed to by whom the institution is rated).  
  • The escrow agreement relating to the escrow account will provide that ICANN or its designee shall be unconditionally entitled to a release of funds (full or partial) thereunder upon delivery of written notice by ICANN or its designee.  
  • The escrow agreement must have a term | | | | | |
of five years from the delegation of the TLD.
- The funds in the deposit escrow account are not considered to be an asset of ICANN.
- Any interest earnings less bank fees are to accrue to the deposit, and will be paid back to the applicant upon liquidation of the account to the extent not used to pay the costs and expenses of maintaining the escrow.
- The deposit plus accrued interest, less any bank fees in respect of the escrow, is to be returned to the applicant if the funds are not used to fund registry functions due to a triggering event or after five years, whichever is greater.
- The Applicant will be required to provide ICANN an explanation as to the amount of the deposit, the institution that will hold the deposit, and the escrow agreement for the account at the time of submitting an application.
- Applicant should attach evidence of deposited funds in the escrow account, or evidence of provisional arrangement for deposit of funds. Evidence of deposited funds and terms of escrow agreement must be provided to ICANN prior to or concurrent with the execution of the Registry Agreement.
**Instructions: TLD Applicant – Financial Projections**

The application process requires the applicant to submit two cash basis Financial Projections.

The first projection (Template 1) should show the Financial Projections associated with the Most Likely scenario expected. This projection should include the forecasted registration volume, registration fee, and all costs and capital expenditures expected during the start-up period and during the first three years of operations. Template 1 relates to Question 46 (Projections Template) in the application.

We also ask that applicants show as a separate projection (Template 2) the Financial Projections associated with a realistic Worst Case scenario. Template 2 relates to Question 49 (Contingency Planning) in the application.

For each Projection prepared, please include Comments and Notes on the bottom of the projection (in the area provided) to provide those reviewing these projections with information regarding:

1. Assumptions used, significant variances in Operating Cash Flows and Capital Expenditures from year-to-year;
2. How you plan to fund operations;
3. Contingency planning

As you complete Template 1 and Template 2, please reference data points and/or formulas used in your calculations (where appropriate).

**Section I – Projected Cash inflows and outflows**

**Projected Cash Inflows**

Lines A and B. Provide the number of forecasted registrations and the registration fee for years 1, 2, and 3. Leave the Start-up column blank. The start-up period is for cash costs and capital expenditures only; there should be no cash projections input to this column.

Line C. Multiply lines A and B to arrive at the Registration Cash Inflow for line C.

Line D. Provide projected cash inflows from any other revenue source for years 1, 2, and 3. For any figures provided on line D, please disclose the source in the Comments/Notes box of Section I. Note, do not include funding in Line D as that is covered in Section VI.

Line E. Add lines C and D to arrive at the total cash inflow.

**Projected Operating Cash Outflows**

Start up costs - For all line items (F thru L) Please describe the total period of time this start-up cost is expected to cover in the Comments/Notes box.
Line F. Provide the projected labor costs for marketing, customer support, and technical support for start-up, year 1, year 2, and year 3. Note, other labor costs should be put in line L (Other Costs) and specify the type of labor and associated projected costs in the Comments/Notes box of this section.

Line G. Marketing Costs represent the amount spent on advertising, promotions, and other marketing activities. This amount should not include labor costs included in Marketing Labor (line F).

Lines H through K. Provide projected costs for facilities, G&A, interests and taxes, and Outsourcing for start-up as well as for years 1, 2, and 3. Be sure to list the type of activities that are being outsourced. You may combine certain activities from the same provider as long as an appropriate description of the services being combined is listed in the Comments/Notes box.

Line L. Provide any other projected operating costs for start-up, year 1, year 2, year 3. Be sure to specify the type of cost in the Comments/Notes box.

Line M. Add lines F through L to arrive at the total costs for line M.

Line N. Subtract line E from line M to arrive at the projected net operation number for line N.

Section Ila – Breakout of Fixed and Variable Operating Cash Outflows

Line A. Provide the projected variable operating cash outflows including labor and other costs that are not fixed in nature. Variable operating cash outflows are expenditures that fluctuate in relationship with increases or decreases in production or level of operations.

Line B. Provide the projected fixed operating cash outflows. Fixed operating cash outflows are expenditures that do not generally fluctuate in relationship with increases or decreases in production or level of operations. Such costs are generally necessary to be incurred in order to operate the base line operations of the organization or are expected to be incurred based on contractual commitments.

Line C. Add lines A and B to arrive at total Fixed and Variable Operating Cash Outflows for line C. This must equal Total Operating Cash Outflows from Section I, Line M.

Section Ilib – Breakout of Critical Registry Function Operating Cash Outflows

Lines A – E. Provide the projected cash outflows for the five critical registry functions. If these functions are outsourced, the component of the outsourcing fee representing these functions must be separately identified and provided. These costs are based on the applicant’s cost to manage these functions and should be calculated separately from the Continued Operations Instrument (COI) for Question 50.

Line F. If there are other critical registry functions based on the applicant’s registry business model then the projected cash outflow for this function must be provided with a description added to the Comment/Notes box. This projected cash outflow may also be included in the 3-year reserve.

Line G. Add lines A through F to arrive at the Total Critical Registry Function Cash Outflows.
**Section III – Projected Capital Expenditures**

**Lines A through C.** Provide projected hardware, software, and furniture & equipment capital expenditures for start-up as well as for years 1, 2, and 3. Please describe the total period of time the start-up cost is expected to cover in the Comments/Notes box.

**Line D.** Provide any projected capital expenditures as a result of outsourcing. This should be included for start-up and years 1, 2, and 3. Specify the type of expenditure and describe the total period of time the start-up cost is expected to cover in the Comments/Notes box of Section III.

**Line E –** Please describe “other” capital expenditures in the Comments/Notes box.

**Line F.** Add lines A through E to arrive at the Total Capital Expenditures.

**Section IV – Projected Assets & Liabilities**

**Lines A through C.** Provide projected cash, account receivables, and other current assets for start-up as well as for years 1, 2, and 3. For Other Current Assets, specify the type of asset and describe the total period of time the start-up cost is expected to cover in the Comments/Notes box.

**Line D.** Add lines A, B, C to arrive at the Total Current Assets.

**Lines E through G.** Provide projected accounts payable, short-term debt, and other current liabilities for start-up as well as for years 1, 2, and 3. For Other Current Liabilities, specify the type of liability and describe the total period of time the start-up cost is expected to cover in the Comments/Notes box.

**Line H.** Add lines E through G to arrive at the total current liabilities.

**Lines I through K.** Provide the projected fixed assets (PP&E), the 3-year reserve, and long-term assets for start-up as well as for years 1, 2, and 3. Please describe the total period of time the start-up cost is expected to cover in the Comments/Notes box.

**Line L.** Add lines I through K to arrive at the total long-term assets.

**Line M.** Provide the projected long-term debt for start-up as well as for years 1, 2, and 3. Please describe the total period of time the start-up cost is expected to cover in the Comments/Notes box.

**Section V – Projected Cash Flow**

Cash flow is driven by Projected Net Operations (Section I), Projected Capital Expenditures (Section III), and Projected Assets & Liabilities (Section IV).

**Line A.** Provide the projected net operating cash flows for start-up as well as for years 1, 2, and 3. Please describe the total period of time the start-up cost is expected to cover in the Comments/Notes box.
**Line B.** Provide the projected capital expenditures for start-up as well as for years 1, 2, and 3. Please describe the total period of time the start-up cost is expected to cover in the Comments/Notes box of Section V.

**Lines C through F.** Provide the projected change in non-cash current assets, total current liabilities, debt adjustments, and other adjustments for start-up as well as for years 1, 2, and 3. Please describe the total period of time the start-up cost is expected to cover in the Comments/Notes box.

**Line G.** Add lines A through F to arrive at the projected net cash flow for line H.

**Section VI – Sources of Funds**

**Lines A & B.** Provide projected funds from debt and equity at start-up. Describe the sources of debt and equity funding as well as the total period of time the start-up is expected to cover in the Comments/Notes box. Please also provide evidence the funding (e.g., letter of commitment).

**Line C.** Add lines A and B to arrive at the total sources of funds for line C.

**General Comments – Regarding Assumptions Used, Significant Variances Between Years, etc.**

Provide explanations for any significant variances between years (or expected in years beyond the timeframe of the template) in any category of costing or funding.

**General Comments – Regarding how the Applicant Plans to Fund Operations**

Provide general comments explaining how you will fund operations. Funding should be explained in detail in response to question 48.

**General Comments – Regarding Contingencies**

Provide general comments to describe your contingency planning. Contingency planning should be explained in detail in response to question 49.
## TL0 Applicant – Financial Projections: Sample

### Executive Summary

- **Purpose of local currency used:**
  - Description
  - Use

### TL0 Applicant – Financial Projections: Sample

#### Income Statement

| Year | Revenue | Cost | EBITDA | 2018-2020
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Breakdown of Fixed and Variable Operating Cash Outflows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Hardware</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Software</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Maintenance of Zone in accordance with DNSSEC</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Registry Data Escrow</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Projected Net Cash Flow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cash Inflows</th>
<th>Cash Outflows</th>
<th>Net Cash Flow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### List of10

- ii) Customer Support Labor
- v) Marketing Labor
- vi) Operations Labor
- iii) Customer Support Labor
- iv) Marketing Labor
- vi) Operations Labor
- iii) Customer Support Labor
- iv) Marketing Labor
- vi) Operations Labor

### Notes

- Note: these are based on the applicant’s cost to manage the registry.
- Fixed costs are further detailed and explained in response to question 48.
- Variable Costs:
- Costs for operations and maintenance are based on changes in Current Liabilities and are commensurate with Question 43.
- Subsequent years are based on changes in Current Liabilities and are commensurate with Question 43.
- We assume that “automation and computerization” has been achieved under the current term.
### Template 1 - Financial Projections: Most Likely

#### In local currency (unless noted otherwise)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sec.</th>
<th>Reference / formula</th>
<th>Start-up Costs</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>Projected Cash inflows and outflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>Ex ante capitalization valuation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>Registration fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>Registration cash inflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>Other cash inflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td>Total cash inflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td>Projected operating Cash Outflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td>Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9)</td>
<td>Marketing labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10)</td>
<td>Customer Support labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11)</td>
<td>Technical labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12)</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13)</td>
<td>Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14)</td>
<td>General &amp; Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15)</td>
<td>Interest and Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16)</td>
<td>Outsourcing Operating Costs, if any (not the type of activities being outsourced)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17)</td>
<td>Net type of activities being outsourced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18)</td>
<td>Total operating costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19)</td>
<td>Total cash outflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20)</td>
<td>ii)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21)</td>
<td>iii)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22)</td>
<td>iv)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23)</td>
<td>Total Cash &amp; Operating Cash outflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24)</td>
<td>ii)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25)</td>
<td>iii)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26)</td>
<td>iv)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27)</td>
<td>Total Cash &amp; Operating Cash outflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Financial Projections:

- **Year 1**
- **Year 2**
- **Year 3**

**Notes:**
- General Comments (Notes Regarding Assumptions Used, Significant Variances Between Years, etc.)
- Comments regarding how the Applicant plans to fund operations:
- General Comments regarding contingencies:
## Template 2 - Financial Projections: Worst Case

### In local currency (unless noted otherwise)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sec.</th>
<th>Reference / Formula</th>
<th>Startup Costs</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I)</td>
<td>Projected Cash inflows and outflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B)</td>
<td>Registration fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C)</td>
<td>Registration cash inflows</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D)</td>
<td>Other cash inflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E)</td>
<td>Total Cash Inflows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Projected Operating Cash Outflows

- F) Labor
  - General: Marketing Labor
  - Customer Support Labor
  - Technical Labor
  - Marketing
  - Facilities
  - General & Administrative
  - Interest and Taxes

K) Outsourcing Operating Costs, if any (list the type of activities being outsourced)

- (a) Break out of Fixed and Variable Operating Cost Outflows
  - Total Fixed Operating Costs
  - Total Operating Cost Outflows
  - CHECK

### Projected Capital Expenditures

- Hardware
- Software
- Furniture & Other Equipment
- Outsourcing Capital Expenditures, if any (list the type of capital expenditures)
  - (a)
  - (b)
  - (c)
  - (d)
  - (e)
  - Other Capital Expenditures
  - Total Capital Expenditures

### Projected Assets & Liabilities

- Cash
- Accounts receivable
- Other current assets
  - Total Current Assets
- Accounts payable
- Short-term Debt
- Other Current Liabilities
  - Total Current Liabilities
- (a) Total Property, Plant & Equipment
- (b) Other Long-term Assets
  - Total Long-term Assets

### Projected Cash Flow (excl. 3-year Reserve)

- Net operating cash flows
- Capital expenditures
- Change in Non-Cash Current Assets
  - Change in Total Current Liabilities
- Debt Adjustments
- Other Adjustments
  - Projected Net Cash Flow

### Sources of funds

- Debt
  - On-hand at time of application
  - Contingent and/or committed but not yet on-hand
- Equity
  - On-hand at time of application
  - Contingent and/or committed but not yet on-hand

### General Comments (Notes Regarding Assumptions Used, Significant Variances Between Years, etc.):

Comments regarding how the Applicant plans to fund operations:

General Comments regarding contingencies:
Module 3
Objection Procedures

This module describes two types of mechanisms that may affect an application:

I. The procedure by which ICANN’s Governmental Advisory Committee may provide GAC Advice on New gTLDs to the ICANN Board of Directors concerning a specific application. This module describes the purpose of this procedure, and how GAC Advice on New gTLDs is considered by the ICANN Board once received.

II. The dispute resolution procedure triggered by a formal objection to an application by a third party. This module describes the purpose of the objection and dispute resolution mechanisms, the grounds for lodging a formal objection to a gTLD application, the general procedures for filing or responding to an objection, and the manner in which dispute resolution proceedings are conducted.

This module also discusses the guiding principles, or standards, that each dispute resolution panel will apply in reaching its expert determination.

All applicants should be aware of the possibility that a formal objection may be filed against any application, and of the procedures and options available in the event of such an objection.

3.1 GAC Advice on New gTLDs

ICANN’s Governmental Advisory Committee was formed 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.

The process for GAC Advice on New gTLDs is intended to address applications that are identified by governments to be problematic, e.g., that potentially violate national law or raise sensitivities.

GAC members can raise concerns about any application to the GAC. The GAC as a whole will consider concerns
raised by GAC members, and agree on GAC advice to forward to the ICANN Board of Directors.

The GAC can provide advice on any application. For the Board to be able to consider the GAC advice during the evaluation process, the GAC advice would have to be submitted by the close of the Objection Filing Period (see Module 1).

GAC Advice may take one of the following forms:

I. The GAC advises ICANN that it is the consensus of the GAC that a particular application should not proceed. This will create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved.

II. The GAC advises ICANN that there are concerns about a particular application “dot-example.” The ICANN Board is expected to enter into dialogue with the GAC to understand the scope of concerns. The ICANN Board is also expected to provide a rationale for its decision.

III. The GAC advises ICANN that an application should not proceed unless remediated. This will raise a strong presumption for the Board that the application should not proceed unless there is a remediation method available in the Guidebook (such as securing the approval of one or more governments), that is implemented by the applicant.

Where GAC Advice on New gTLDs is received by the Board concerning an application, ICANN will publish the Advice and endeavor to notify the relevant applicant(s) promptly. The applicant will have a period of 21 calendar days from the publication date in which to submit a response to the ICANN Board.

ICANN will consider the GAC Advice on New gTLDs as soon as practicable. The Board may consult with independent experts, such as those designated to hear objections in the New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure, in cases where the issues raised in the GAC advice are pertinent to one of the subject matter areas of the objection procedures. The receipt of GAC advice will not toll the processing of any application (i.e., an application will not be suspended but will continue through the stages of the application process).
3.2 Public Objection and Dispute Resolution Process

The independent dispute resolution process is designed to protect certain interests and rights. The process provides a path for formal objections during evaluation of the applications. It allows a party with standing to have its objection considered before a panel of qualified experts.

A formal objection can be filed only on four enumerated grounds, as described in this module. A formal objection initiates a dispute resolution proceeding. In filing an application for a gTLD, the applicant agrees to accept the applicability of this gTLD dispute resolution process. Similarly, an objector accepts the applicability of this gTLD dispute resolution process by filing its objection.

As described in section 3.1 above, ICANN’s Governmental Advisory Committee has a designated process for providing advice to the ICANN Board of Directors on matters affecting public policy issues, and these objection procedures would not be applicable in such a case. The GAC may provide advice on any topic and is not limited to the grounds for objection enumerated in the public objection and dispute resolution process.

3.2.1 Grounds for Objection

A formal objection may be filed on any one of the following four grounds:

**String Confusion Objection** – 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.

**Legal Rights Objection** – The applied-for gTLD string infringes the existing legal rights of the objector.

**Limited Public Interest Objection** – The applied-for gTLD string is contrary to generally accepted legal norms of morality and public order that are recognized under principles of international law.

**Community Objection** – There is substantial opposition to the gTLD application from a significant portion of the community to which the gTLD string may be explicitly or implicitly targeted.

The rationales for these objection grounds are discussed in the final report of the ICANN policy development process for new gTLDs. For more information on this process, see
3.2.2 Standing to Object

Objectors must satisfy standing requirements to have their objections considered. As part of the dispute proceedings, all objections will be reviewed by a panel of experts designated by the applicable Dispute Resolution Service Provider (DRSP) to determine whether the objector has standing to object. Standing requirements for the four objection grounds are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objection ground</th>
<th>Who may object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>String confusion</td>
<td>Existing TLD operator or gTLD applicant in current round. In the case where an IDN ccTLD Fast Track request has been submitted before the public posting of gTLD applications received, and the Fast Track requestor wishes to file a string confusion objection to a gTLD application, the Fast Track requestor will be granted standing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal rights</td>
<td>Rightsholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited public interest</td>
<td>No limitations on who may file – however, subject to a “quick look” designed for early conclusion of frivolous and/or abusive objections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Established institution associated with a clearly delineated community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.2.1 String Confusion Objection

Two types of entities have standing to object:

- An existing TLD operator may file a string confusion objection to assert string confusion between an applied-for gTLD and the TLD that it currently operates.

- Any gTLD applicant in this application round may file a string confusion objection to assert string confusion between an applied-for gTLD and the gTLD for which it has applied, where string confusion between the two applicants has not already been found in the Initial Evaluation. That is, an applicant does not have standing to object to another application with which it is already in a contention set as a result of the Initial Evaluation.

In the case where an existing TLD operator successfully asserts string confusion with an applicant, the application will be rejected.

In the case where a gTLD applicant successfully asserts string confusion with another applicant, the only possible
outcome is for both applicants to be placed in a contention set and to be referred to a contention resolution procedure (refer to Module 4, String Contention Procedures). If an objection by one gTLD applicant to another gTLD application is unsuccessful, the applicants may both move forward in the process without being considered in direct contention with one another.

3.2.2.2 Legal Rights Objection

A rightsholder has standing to file a legal rights objection. The source and documentation of the existing legal rights the objector is claiming (which may include either registered or unregistered trademarks) are infringed by the applied-for gTLD must be included in the filing.

An intergovernmental organization (IGO) is eligible to file a legal rights objection if it meets the criteria for registration of a .INT domain name:

a) An international treaty between or among national governments must have established the organization; and

b) The organization that is established must be widely considered to have independent international legal personality and must be the subject of and governed by international law.

The specialized agencies of the UN and the organizations having observer status at the UN General Assembly are also recognized as meeting the criteria.

3.2.2.3 Limited Public Interest Objection

Anyone may file a Limited Public Interest Objection. Due to the inclusive standing base, however, objectors are subject to a “quick look” procedure designed to identify and eliminate frivolous and/or abusive objections. An objection found to be manifestly unfounded and/or an abuse of the right to object may be dismissed at any time.

A Limited Public Interest objection would be manifestly unfounded if it did not fall within one of the categories that have been defined as the grounds for such an objection (see subsection 3.5.3).

A Limited Public Interest objection that is manifestly unfounded may also be an abuse of the right to object. An objection may be framed to fall within one of the

---

1 See also http://www.iana.org/domains/int/policy/.
accepted categories for Limited Public Interest objections, but other facts may clearly show that the objection is abusive. For example, multiple objections filed by the same or related parties against a single applicant may constitute harassment of the applicant, rather than a legitimate defense of legal norms that are recognized under general principles of international law. An objection that attacks the applicant, rather than the applied-for string, could be an abuse of the right to object.2

The quick look is the Panel’s first task, after its appointment by the DRSP and is a review on the merits of the objection. The dismissal of an objection that is manifestly unfounded and/or an abuse of the right to object would be an Expert Determination, rendered in accordance with Article 21 of the New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure.

In the case where the quick look review does lead to the dismissal of the objection, the proceedings that normally follow the initial submissions (including payment of the full advance on costs) will not take place, and it is currently contemplated that the filing fee paid by the applicant would be refunded, pursuant to Procedure Article 14(e).

3.2.2.4 Community Objection

Established institutions associated with clearly delineated communities are eligible to file a community objection. The community named by the objector must be a community strongly associated with the applied-for gTLD string in the application that is the subject of the objection. To qualify for standing for a community objection, the objector must prove both of the following:

2 The jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights offers specific examples of how the term “manifestly ill-founded” has been interpreted in disputes relating to human rights. Article 35(3) of the European Convention on Human Rights provides: “The Court shall declare inadmissible any individual application submitted under Article 34 which it considers incompatible with the provisions of the Convention or the protocols thereto, manifestly ill-founded, or an abuse of the right of application.” The ECHR renders reasoned decisions on admissibility, pursuant to Article 35 of the Convention. (Its decisions are published on the Court’s website [http://www.echr.coe.int](http://www.echr.coe.int).) In some cases, the Court briefly states the facts and the law and then announces its decision, without discussion or analysis. E.g., Decision as to the Admissibility of Application No. 34328/96 by Egbert Peree against the Netherlands (1998). In other cases, the Court reviews the facts and the relevant legal rules in detail, providing an analysis to support its conclusion on the admissibility of an application. Examples of such decisions regarding applications alleging violations of Article 10 of the Convention (freedom of expression) include: Décision sur la recevabilité de la requête no 65831/01 présentée par Roger Garaudy contre la France (2003); Décision sur la recevabilité de la requête no 65297/01 présentée par Eduardo Fernando Alves Costa contre le Portugal (2004).

The jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights also provides examples of the abuse of the right of application being sanctioned, in accordance with ECHR Article 35(3). See, for example, Décision partielle sur la recevabilité de la requête no 61164/00 présentée par Gérard Duringer et autres contre la France et de la requête no 18589/02 contre la France (2003).
It is an established institution - Factors that may be considered in making this determination include, but are not limited to:

- Level of global recognition of the institution;
- Length of time the institution has been in existence; and
- Public historical evidence of its existence, such as the presence of a formal charter or national or international registration, or validation by a government, inter-governmental organization, or treaty. The institution must not have been established solely in conjunction with the gTLD application process.

It has an ongoing relationship with a clearly delineated community - Factors that may be considered in making this determination include, but are not limited to:

- The presence of mechanisms for participation in activities, membership, and leadership;
- Institutional purpose related to the benefit of the associated community;
- Performance of regular activities that benefit the associated community; and
- The level of formal boundaries around the community.

The panel will perform a balancing of the factors listed above, as well as other relevant information, in making its determination. It is not expected that an objector must demonstrate satisfaction of each and every factor considered in order to satisfy the standing requirements.

3.2.3 Dispute Resolution Service Providers

To trigger a dispute resolution proceeding, an objection must be filed by the posted deadline date, directly with the appropriate DRSP for each objection ground.

- The International Centre for Dispute Resolution has agreed to administer disputes brought pursuant to string confusion objections.
- The Arbitration and Mediation Center of the World Intellectual Property Organization has agreed to administer disputes brought pursuant to legal rights objections.
• The International Center of Expertise of the International Chamber of Commerce has agreed to administer disputes brought pursuant to Limited Public Interest and Community Objections.

ICANN selected DRSPs on the basis of their relevant experience and expertise, as well as their willingness and ability to administer dispute proceedings in the new gTLD Program. The selection process began with a public call for expressions of interest followed by dialogue with those candidates who responded. The call for expressions of interest specified several criteria for providers, including established services, subject matter expertise, global capacity, and operational capabilities. An important aspect of the selection process was the ability to recruit panelists who will engender the respect of the parties to the dispute.

3.2.4 Options in the Event of Objection

Applicants whose applications are the subject of an objection have the following options:

The applicant can work to reach a settlement with the objector, resulting in withdrawal of the objection or the application;

The applicant can file a response to the objection and enter the dispute resolution process (refer to Section 3.2); or

The applicant can withdraw, in which case the objector will prevail by default and the application will not proceed further.

If for any reason the applicant does not file a response to an objection, the objector will prevail by default.

3.2.5 Independent Objector

A formal objection to a gTLD application may also be filed by the Independent Objector (IO). The IO does not act on behalf of any particular persons or entities, but acts solely in the best interests of the public who use the Internet.

In light of this public interest goal, the Independent Objector is limited to filing objections on the grounds of Limited Public Interest and Community.

Neither ICANN staff nor the ICANN Board of Directors has authority to direct or require the IO to file or not file any particular objection. If the IO determines that an objection should be filed, he or she will initiate and prosecute the objection in the public interest.

**Mandate and Scope** - The IO may file objections against “highly objectionable” gTLD applications to which no objection has been filed. The IO is limited to filing two types of objections: (1) Limited Public Interest objections and (2) Community objections. The IO is granted standing to file objections on these enumerated grounds, notwithstanding the regular standing requirements for such objections (see subsection 3.1.2).

The IO may file a Limited Public Interest objection against an application even if a Community objection has been filed, and vice versa.

The IO may file an objection against an application, notwithstanding the fact that a String Confusion objection or a Legal Rights objection was filed.

Absent extraordinary circumstances, the IO is not permitted to file an objection to an application where an objection has already been filed on the same ground.

The IO may consider public comment when making an independent assessment whether an objection is warranted. The IO will have access to application comments received during the comment period.

In light of the public interest goal noted above, the IO shall not object to an application unless at least one comment in opposition to the application is made in the public sphere.

**Selection** - The IO will be selected by ICANN, through an open and transparent process, and retained as an independent consultant. The Independent Objector will be an individual with considerable experience and respect in the Internet community, unaffiliated with any gTLD applicant.

Although recommendations for IO candidates from the community are welcomed, the IO must be and remain independent and unaffiliated with any of the gTLD applicants. The various rules of ethics for judges and international arbitrators provide models for the IO to declare and maintain his/her independence.
The IO’s (renewable) tenure is limited to the time necessary to carry out his/her duties in connection with a single round of gTLD applications.

**Budget and Funding** – The IO’s budget would comprise two principal elements: (a) salaries and operating expenses, and (b) dispute resolution procedure costs – both of which should be funded from the proceeds of new gTLD applications.

As an objector in dispute resolution proceedings, the IO is required to pay filing and administrative fees, as well as advance payment of costs, just as all other objectors are required to do. Those payments will be refunded by the DRSP in cases where the IO is the prevailing party.

In addition, the IO will incur various expenses in presenting objections before DRSP panels that will not be refunded, regardless of the outcome. These expenses include the fees and expenses of outside counsel (if retained) and the costs of legal research or factual investigations.

### 3.3 Filing Procedures

The information included in this section provides a summary of procedures for filing:

- Objections; and
- Responses to objections.

For a comprehensive statement of filing requirements applicable generally, refer to the New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure (“Procedure”) included as an attachment to this module. In the event of any discrepancy between the information presented in this module and the Procedure, the Procedure shall prevail.

Note that the rules and procedures of each DRSP specific to each objection ground must also be followed. See [http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/program-status/objection-dispute-resolution](http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/program-status/objection-dispute-resolution).

#### 3.3.1 Objection Filing Procedures

The procedures outlined in this subsection must be followed by any party wishing to file a formal objection to an application that has been posted by ICANN. Should an applicant wish to file a formal objection to another gTLD application, it would follow these same procedures.

- All objections must be filed electronically with the appropriate DRSP by the posted deadline date.
Objections will not be accepted by the DRSPs after this date.

- All objections must be filed in English.
- Each objection must be filed separately. An objector wishing to object to several applications must file a separate objection and pay the accompanying filing fees for each application that is the subject of an objection. If an objector wishes to object to an application on more than one ground, the objector must file separate objections and pay the accompanying filing fees for each objection ground.

Each objection filed by an objector must include:

- The name and contact information of the objector.
- A statement of the objector’s basis for standing; that is, why the objector believes it meets the standing requirements to object.
- A description of the basis for the objection, including:
  - A statement giving the specific ground upon which the objection is being filed.
  - A detailed explanation of the validity of the objection and why it should be upheld.
- Copies of any documents that the objector considers to be a basis for the objection.

Objections are limited to 5000 words or 20 pages, whichever is less, excluding attachments.

An objector must provide copies of all submissions to the DRSP associated with the objection proceedings to the applicant.

The DRSP will publish, and regularly update a list on its website identifying all objections as they are filed. ICANN will post on its website a notice of all objections filed once the objection filing period has closed.

### 3.3.2 Objection Filing Fees

At the time an objection is filed, the objector is required to pay a filing fee in the amount set and published by the relevant DRSP. If the filing fee is not paid, the DRSP will
dismiss the objection without prejudice. See Section 1.5 of Module 1 regarding fees.

Funding from ICANN for objection filing fees, as well as for advance payment of costs (see subsection 3.4.7 below) is available to the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC). Funding for ALAC objection filing and dispute resolution fees is contingent on publication by ALAC of its approved process for considering and making objections. At a minimum, the process for objecting to a gTLD application will require: bottom-up development of potential objections, discussion and approval of objections at the Regional At-Large Organization (RALO) level, and a process for consideration and approval of the objection by the At-Large Advisory Committee.

Funding from ICANN for objection filing fees, as well as for advance payment of costs, is available to individual national governments in the amount of USD 50,000 with the guarantee that a minimum of one objection per government will be fully funded by ICANN where requested. ICANN will develop a procedure for application and disbursement of funds.

Funding available from ICANN is to cover costs payable to the dispute resolution service provider and made directly to the dispute resolution service provider; it does not cover other costs such as fees for legal advice.

3.3.3 Response Filing Procedures

Upon notification that ICANN has published the list of all objections filed (refer to subsection 3.3.1), the DRSPs will notify the parties that responses must be filed within 30 calendar days of receipt of that notice. DRSPs will not accept late responses. Any applicant that fails to respond to an objection within the 30-day response period will be in default, which will result in the objector prevailing.

- All responses must be filed in English.
- Each response must be filed separately. That is, an applicant responding to several objections must file a separate response and pay the accompanying filing fee to respond to each objection.
- Responses must be filed electronically.

Each response filed by an applicant must include:

- The name and contact information of the applicant.
• A point-by-point response to the claims made by the objector.

• Any copies of documents that it considers to be a basis for the response.

Responses are limited to 5000 words or 20 pages, whichever is less, excluding attachments.

Each applicant must provide copies of all submissions to the DRSP associated with the objection proceedings to the objector.

3.3.4 Response Filing Fees

At the time an applicant files its response, it is required to pay a filing fee in the amount set and published by the relevant DRSP, which will be the same as the filing fee paid by the objector. If the filing fee is not paid, the response will be disregarded, which will result in the objector prevailing.

3.4 Objection Processing Overview

The information below provides an overview of the process by which DRSPs administer dispute proceedings that have been initiated. For comprehensive information, please refer to the New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure (included as an attachment to this module).

3.4.1 Administrative Review

Each DRSP will conduct an administrative review of each objection for compliance with all procedural rules within 14 calendar days of receiving the objection. Depending on the number of objections received, the DRSP may ask ICANN for a short extension of this deadline.

If the DRSP finds that the objection complies with procedural rules, the objection will be deemed filed, and the proceedings will continue. If the DRSP finds that the objection does not comply with procedural rules, the DRSP will dismiss the objection and close the proceedings without prejudice to the objector’s right to submit a new objection that complies with procedural rules. The DRSP’s review or rejection of the objection will not interrupt the time limit for filing an objection.

3.4.2 Consolidation of Objections

Once the DRSP receives and processes all objections, at its discretion the DRSP may elect to consolidate certain objections. The DRSP shall endeavor to decide upon
consolidation prior to issuing its notice to applicants that the response should be filed and, where appropriate, shall inform the parties of the consolidation in that notice.

An example of a circumstance in which consolidation might occur is multiple objections to the same application based on the same ground.

In assessing whether to consolidate objections, the DRSP will weigh the efficiencies in time, money, effort, and consistency that may be gained by consolidation against the prejudice or inconvenience consolidation may cause. The DRSPs will endeavor to have all objections resolved on a similar timeline. It is intended that no sequencing of objections will be established.

New gTLD applicants and objectors also will be permitted to propose consolidation of objections, but it will be at the DRSP’s discretion whether to agree to the proposal.

ICANN continues to strongly encourage all of the DRSPs to consolidate matters whenever practicable.

3.4.3 Mediation

The parties to a dispute resolution proceeding are encouraged—but not required—to participate in mediation aimed at settling the dispute. Each DRSP has experts who can be retained as mediators to facilitate this process, should the parties elect to do so, and the DRSPs will communicate with the parties concerning this option and any associated fees.

If a mediator is appointed, that person may not serve on the panel constituted to issue an expert determination in the related dispute.

There are no automatic extensions of time associated with the conduct of negotiations or mediation. The parties may submit joint requests for extensions of time to the DRSP according to its procedures, and the DRSP or the panel, if appointed, will decide whether to grant the requests, although extensions will be discouraged. Absent exceptional circumstances, the parties must limit their requests for extension to 30 calendar days.

The parties are free to negotiate without mediation at any time, or to engage a mutually acceptable mediator of their own accord.
3.4.4 Selection of Expert Panels

A panel will consist of appropriately qualified experts appointed to each proceeding by the designated DRSP. Experts must be independent of the parties to a dispute resolution proceeding. Each DRSP will follow its adopted procedures for requiring such independence, including procedures for challenging and replacing an expert for lack of independence.

There will be one expert in proceedings involving a string confusion objection.

There will be one expert, or, if all parties agree, three experts with relevant experience in intellectual property rights disputes in proceedings involving an existing legal rights objection.

There will be three experts recognized as eminent jurists of international reputation, with expertise in relevant fields as appropriate, in proceedings involving a Limited Public Interest objection.

There will be one expert in proceedings involving a community objection.

Neither the experts, the DRSP, ICANN, nor their respective employees, directors, or consultants will be liable to any party in any action for damages or injunctive relief for any act or omission in connection with any proceeding under the dispute resolution procedures.

3.4.5 Adjudication

The panel may decide whether the parties shall submit any written statements in addition to the filed objection and response, and may specify time limits for such submissions.

In order to achieve the goal of resolving disputes rapidly and at reasonable cost, procedures for the production of documents shall be limited. In exceptional cases, the panel may require a party to produce additional evidence.

Disputes will usually be resolved without an in-person hearing. The panel may decide to hold such a hearing only in extraordinary circumstances.

3.4.6 Expert Determination

The DRSPs’ final expert determinations will be in writing and will include:

- A summary of the dispute and findings;
• An identification of the prevailing party; and
• The reasoning upon which the expert determination is based.

Unless the panel decides otherwise, each DRSP will publish all decisions rendered by its panels in full on its website.

The findings of the panel will be considered an expert determination and advice that ICANN will accept within the dispute resolution process.

3.4.7 Dispute Resolution Costs

Before acceptance of objections, each DRSP will publish a schedule of costs or statement of how costs will be calculated for the proceedings that it administers under this procedure. These costs cover the fees and expenses of the members of the panel and the DRSP’s administrative costs.

ICANN expects that string confusion and legal rights objection proceedings will involve a fixed amount charged by the panelists while Limited Public Interest and community objection proceedings will involve hourly rates charged by the panelists.

Within ten (10) calendar days of constituting the panel, the DRSP will estimate the total costs and request advance payment in full of its costs from both the objector and the applicant. Each party must make its advance payment within ten (10) calendar days of receiving the DRSP’s request for payment and submit to the DRSP evidence of such payment. The respective filing fees paid by the parties will be credited against the amounts due for this advance payment of costs.

The DRSP may revise its estimate of the total costs and request additional advance payments from the parties during the resolution proceedings.

Additional fees may be required in specific circumstances; for example, if the DRSP receives supplemental submissions or elects to hold a hearing.

If an objector fails to pay these costs in advance, the DRSP will dismiss its objection and no fees paid by the objector will be refunded.

If an applicant fails to pay these costs in advance, the DRSP will sustain the objection and no fees paid by the applicant will be refunded.
After the hearing has taken place and the panel renders its expert determination, the DRSP will refund the advance payment of costs to the prevailing party.

### 3.5 Dispute Resolution Principles (Standards)

Each panel will use appropriate general principles (standards) to evaluate the merits of each objection. The principles for adjudication on each type of objection are specified in the paragraphs that follow. The panel may also refer to other relevant rules of international law in connection with the standards.

The objector bears the burden of proof in each case.

The principles outlined below are subject to evolution based on ongoing consultation with DRSPs, legal experts, and the public.

#### 3.5.1 String Confusion Objection

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 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.

#### 3.5.2 Legal Rights Objection

In interpreting and giving meaning to GNSO Recommendation 3 (“Strings must not infringe the existing legal rights of others that are recognized or enforceable under generally accepted and internationally recognized principles of law”), a DRSP panel of experts presiding over a legal rights objection will determine whether the potential use of the applied-for gTLD by the applicant 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 (as identified in the treaty establishing the organization), or unjustifiably impairs the distinctive character or the reputation of the objector’s mark or IGO name or acronym, or otherwise creates an impermissible likelihood of confusion between the applied-for gTLD and the objector’s mark or IGO name or acronym.
In the case where the objection is based on trademark rights, the panel will consider the following non-exclusive 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.
In the case where a legal rights objection has been filed by an IGO, the panel will consider the following non-exclusive 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; and

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.

3.5.3 Limited Public Interest Objection

An expert panel hearing a Limited Public Interest objection will consider whether the applied-for gTLD string is contrary to general principles of international law for morality and public order.

Examples of instruments containing such general principles include:

- The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR)
• The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)
• The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)
• The International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination
• Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women
• The International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights
• The Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment
• The International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of their Families
• Slavery Convention
• Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide
• Convention on the Rights of the Child

Note that these are included to serve as examples, rather than an exhaustive list. It should be noted that these instruments vary in their ratification status. Additionally, states may limit the scope of certain provisions through reservations and declarations indicating how they will interpret and apply certain provisions. National laws not based on principles of international law are not a valid ground for a Limited Public Interest objection.

Under these principles, everyone has the right to freedom of expression, but the exercise of this right carries with it special duties and responsibilities. Accordingly, certain limited restrictions may apply.

The grounds upon which an applied-for gTLD string may be considered contrary to generally accepted legal norms relating to morality and public order that are recognized under principles of international law are:

• Incitement to or promotion of violent lawless action;
• Incitement to or promotion of discrimination based upon race, color, gender, ethnicity, religion or national origin, or other similar types of
discrimination that violate generally accepted legal norms recognized under principles of international law;

- Incitement to or promotion of child pornography or other sexual abuse of children; or

- A determination that an applied-for gTLD string would be contrary to specific principles of international law as reflected in relevant international instruments of law.

The panel will conduct its analysis on the basis of the applied-for gTLD string itself. The panel may, if needed, use as additional context the intended purpose of the TLD as stated in the application.

3.5.4 Community Objection

The four tests described here will enable a DRSP panel to determine whether there is substantial opposition from a significant portion of the community to which the string may be targeted. For an objection to be successful, the objector must prove that:

- The community invoked by the objector is a clearly delineated community; and

- Community opposition to the application is substantial; and

- There is a strong association between the community invoked and the applied-for gTLD string; and

- The application creates a likelihood of material detriment to the rights or legitimate interests of a significant portion of the community to which the string may be explicitly or implicitly targeted. Each of these tests is described in further detail below.

Community – The objector must prove that the community expressing opposition can be regarded as a clearly delineated community. A panel could balance a number of factors to determine this, including but not limited to:

- The level of public recognition of the group as a community at a local and/or global level;

- The level of formal boundaries around the community and what persons or entities are considered to form the community;
• The length of time the community has been in existence;
• The global distribution of the community (this may not apply if the community is territorial); and
• The number of people or entities that make up the community.

If opposition by a number of people/entities is found, but the group represented by the objector is not determined to be a clearly delineated community, the objection will fail.

**Substantial Opposition** - The objector must prove substantial opposition within the community it has identified itself as representing. A panel could balance a number of factors to determine whether there is substantial opposition, including but not limited to:

- Number of expressions of opposition relative to the composition of the community;
- The representative nature of entities expressing opposition;
- Level of recognized stature or weight among sources of opposition;
- Distribution or diversity among sources of expressions of opposition, including:
  - Regional
  - Subsectors of community
  - Leadership of community
  - Membership of community
- Historical defense of the community in other contexts; and
- Costs incurred by objector in expressing opposition, including other channels the objector may have used to convey opposition.

If some opposition within the community is determined, but it does not meet the standard of substantial opposition, the objection will fail.

**Targeting** - The objector must prove a strong association between the applied-for gTLD string and the community represented by the objector. Factors that could be
balanced by a panel to determine this include but are not limited to:

- Statements contained in application;
- Other public statements by the applicant;
- Associations by the public.

If opposition by a community is determined, but there is no strong association between the community and the applied-for gTLD string, the objection will fail.

**Detriment** – The objector must prove that the application creates a likelihood of material detriment to the rights or legitimate interests of a significant portion of the community to which the string may be explicitly or implicitly targeted. An allegation of detriment that consists only of the applicant being delegated the string instead of the objector will not be sufficient for a finding of material detriment.

Factors that could be used by a panel in making this determination include but are not limited to:

- Nature and extent of damage to the reputation of the community represented by the objector that would result from the applicant’s operation of the applied-for gTLD string;
- Evidence that the applicant is not acting or does not intend to act in accordance with the interests of the community or of users more widely, including evidence that the applicant has not proposed or does not intend to institute effective security protection for user interests;
- Interference with the core activities of the community that would result from the applicant’s operation of the applied-for gTLD string;
- Dependence of the community represented by the objector on the DNS for its core activities;
- Nature and extent of concrete or economic damage to the community represented by the objector that would result from the applicant’s operation of the applied-for gTLD string; and
- Level of certainty that alleged detrimental outcomes would occur.
If opposition by a community is determined, but there is no likelihood of material detriment to the targeted community resulting from the applicant’s operation of the applied-for gTLD, the objection will fail.

The objector must meet all four tests in the standard for the objection to prevail.
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These Procedures were designed with an eye toward timely and efficient dispute resolution. As part of the New gTLD Program, these Procedures apply to all proceedings administered by each of the dispute resolution service providers (DRSP). Each of the DRSPs has a specific set of rules that will also apply to such proceedings.
NEW gTLD DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCEDURE

Article 1. ICANN’s New gTLD Program

(a) The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (“ICANN”) has implemented a program for the introduction of new generic Top-Level Domain Names (“gTLDs”) in the internet. There will be a succession of rounds, during which applicants may apply for new gTLDs, in accordance with terms and conditions set by ICANN.

(b) The new gTLD program includes a dispute resolution procedure, pursuant to which disputes between a person or entity who applies for a new gTLD and a person or entity who objects to that gTLD are resolved in accordance with this New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure (the “Procedure”).

(c) Dispute resolution proceedings shall be administered by a Dispute Resolution Service Provider (“DRSP”) in accordance with this Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules that are identified in Article 4(b).

(d) By applying for a new gTLD, an applicant accepts the applicability of this Procedure and the applicable DRSP’s Rules that are identified in Article 4(b); by filing an objection to a new gTLD, an objector accepts the applicability of this Procedure and the applicable DRSP’s Rules that are identified in Article 4(b). The parties cannot derogate from this Procedure without the express approval of ICANN and from the applicable DRSP Rules without the express approval of the relevant DRSP.

Article 2. Definitions

(a) The “Applicant” or “Respondent” is an entity that has applied to ICANN for a new gTLD and that will be the party responding to the Objection.

(b) The “Objector” is one or more persons or entities who have filed an objection against a new gTLD for which an application has been submitted.

(c) The “Panel” is the panel of Experts, comprising one or three “Experts,” that has been constituted by a DRSP in accordance with this Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules that are identified in Article 4(b).

(d) The “Expert Determination” is the decision upon the merits of the Objection that is rendered by a Panel in a proceeding conducted under this Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules that are identified in Article 4(b).

(e) The grounds upon which an objection to a new gTLD may be filed are set out in full in Module 3 of the Applicant Guidebook. Such grounds are identified in this Procedure, and are based upon the Final Report on the Introduction of New Generic Top-Level Domains, dated 7 August 2007, issued by the ICANN Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO), as follows:

(i) “String Confusion Objection” refers to the objection that the string comprising the potential gTLD is confusingly similar to an existing top-level domain or another string applied for in the same round of applications.

(ii) “Existing Legal Rights Objection” refers to the objection that the string comprising the potential new gTLD infringes the existing legal rights of others.
that are recognized or enforceable under generally accepted and internationally recognized principles of law.

(iii) “Limited Public Interest Objection” refers to the objection that the string comprising the potential new gTLD is contrary to generally accepted legal norms relating to morality and public order that are recognized under principles of international law.

(iv) “Community Objection” refers to the objection that there is substantial opposition to the application from a significant portion of the community to which the string may be explicitly or implicitly targeted.

(f) “DRSP Rules” are the rules of procedure of a particular DRSP that have been identified as being applicable to objection proceedings under this Procedure.

Article 3. Dispute Resolution Service Providers

The various categories of disputes shall be administered by the following DRSPs:

(a) String Confusion Objections shall be administered by the International Centre for Dispute Resolution.

(b) Existing Legal Rights Objections shall be administered by the Arbitration and Mediation Center of the World Intellectual Property Organization.

(c) Limited Public Interest Objections shall be administered by the International Centre for Expertise of the International Chamber of Commerce.

(d) Community Objections shall be administered by the International Centre for Expertise of the International Chamber of Commerce.

Article 4. Applicable Rules

(a) All proceedings before the Panel shall be governed by this Procedure and by the DRSP Rules that apply to a particular category of objection. The outcome of the proceedings shall be deemed an Expert Determination, and the members of the Panel shall act as experts.

(b) The applicable DRSP Rules are the following:

   (i) For a String Confusion Objection, the applicable DRSP Rules are the ICDR Supplementary Procedures for ICANN’s New gTLD Program.

   (ii) For an Existing Legal Rights Objection, the applicable DRSP Rules are the WIPO Rules for New gTLD Dispute Resolution.

   (iii) For a Limited Public Interest Objection, the applicable DRSP Rules are the Rules for Expertise of the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC), as supplemented by the ICC as needed.

   (iv) For a Community Objection, the applicable DRSP Rules are the Rules for Expertise of the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC), as supplemented by the ICC as needed.

(c) In the event of any discrepancy between this Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules, this Procedure shall prevail.
(d) The place of the proceedings, if relevant, shall be the location of the DRSP that is administering the proceedings.

(e) In all cases, the Panel shall ensure that the parties are treated with equality, and that each party is given a reasonable opportunity to present its position.

Article 5. Language

(a) The language of all submissions and proceedings under this Procedure shall be English.

(b) 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.

Article 6. Communications and Time Limits

(a) All communications by the Parties with the DRSPs and Panels must be submitted electronically. A Party that wishes to make a submission that is not available in electronic form (e.g., evidentiary models) shall request leave from the Panel to do so, and the Panel, in its sole discretion, shall determine whether to accept the non-electronic submission.

(b) The DRSP, Panel, Applicant, and Objector shall provide copies to one another of all correspondence (apart from confidential correspondence between the Panel and the DRSP and among the Panel) regarding the proceedings.

(c) For the purpose of determining the date of commencement of a time limit, a notice or other communication shall be deemed to have been received on the day that it is transmitted in accordance with paragraphs (a) and (b) of this Article.

(d) For the purpose of determining compliance with a time limit, a notice or other communication shall be deemed to have been sent, made or transmitted if it is dispatched in accordance with paragraphs (a) and (b) of this Article prior to or on the day of the expiration of the time limit.

(e) For the purpose of calculating a period of time under this Procedure, such period shall begin to run on the day following the day when a notice or other communication is received.

(f) Unless otherwise stated, all time periods provided in the Procedure are calculated on the basis of calendar days.

Article 7. Filing of the Objection

(a) A person wishing to object to a new gTLD for which an application has been submitted may file an objection (“Objection”). Any Objection to a proposed new gTLD must be filed before the published closing date for the Objection Filing period.

(b) The Objection must be filed with the appropriate DRSP, using a model form made available by that DRSP, with copies to ICANN and the Applicant.

(c) The electronic addresses for filing Objections (the specific addresses shall be made available once they are created by providers):

(i) A String Confusion Objection must be filed at: [●].
(ii) An Existing Legal Rights Objection must be filed at: [●].

(iii) A Limited Public Interest Objection must be filed at: [●].

(iv) A Community Objection must be filed at: [●].

(d) All Objections must be filed separately:

(i) An Objector who wishes to object to an application on more than one ground must file separate objections with the appropriate DRSP(s).

(ii) An Objector who wishes to object to more than one gTLD must file separate objections to each gTLD with the appropriate DRSP(s).

(e) If an Objection is filed with the wrong DRSP, that DRSP shall promptly notify the Objector of the error and that DRSP shall not process the incorrectly filed Objection. The Objector may then cure the error by filing its Objection with the correct DRSP within seven (7) days of receipt of the error notice, failing which the Objection shall be disregarded. If the Objection is filed with the correct DRSP within seven (7) days of receipt of the error notice but after the lapse of the time for submitting an Objection stipulation by Article 7(a) of this Procedure, it shall be deemed to be within this time limit.

Article 8. Content of the Objection

(a) The Objection shall contain, inter alia, the following information:

(i) The names and contact information (address, telephone number, email address, etc.) of the Objector;

(ii) A statement of the Objector's basis for standing; and

(iii) A description of the basis for the Objection, including:

(aa) A statement of the ground upon which the Objection is being filed, as stated in Article 2(e) of this Procedure;

(bb) An explanation of the validity of the Objection and why the objection should be upheld.

(b) The substantive portion of the Objection shall be limited to 5,000 words or 20 pages, whichever is less, excluding attachments. The Objector shall also describe and provide copies of any supporting or official documents upon which the Objection is based.

(c) At the same time as the Objection is filed, the Objector shall pay a filing fee in the amount set in accordance with the applicable DRSP Rules and include evidence of such payment in the Objection. In the event that the filing fee is not paid within ten (10) days of the receipt of the Objection by the DRSP, the Objection shall be dismissed without prejudice.

Article 9. Administrative Review of the Objection

(a) The DRSP shall conduct an administrative review of the Objection for the purpose of verifying compliance with Articles 5-8 of this Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules, and inform the Objector, the Applicant and ICANN of the result of its review within
fourteen (14) days of its receipt of the Objection. The DRSP may extend this time limit for reasons explained in the notification of such extension.

(b) If the DRSP finds that the Objection complies with Articles 5-8 of this Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules, the DRSP shall confirm that the Objection shall be registered for processing.

(c) If the DRSP finds that the Objection does not comply with Articles 5-8 of this Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules, the DRSP shall have the discretion to request that any administrative deficiencies in the Objection be corrected within five (5) days. If the deficiencies in the Objection are cured within the specified period but after the lapse of the time limit for submitting an Objection stipulated by Article 7(a) of this Procedure, the Objection shall be deemed to be within this time limit.

(d) If the DRSP finds that the Objection does not comply with Articles 5-8 of this Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules, and the deficiencies in the Objection are not corrected within the period specified in Article 9(c), the DRSP shall dismiss the Objection and close the proceedings, without prejudice to the Objector's submission of a new Objection that complies with this Procedure, provided that the Objection is filed within the deadline for filing such Objections. The DRSP’s review of the Objection shall not interrupt the running of the time limit for submitting an Objection stipulated by Article 7(a) of this Procedure.

(e) Immediately upon registering an Objection for processing, pursuant to Article 9(b), the DRSP shall post the following information about the Objection on its website: (i) the proposed string to which the Objection is directed; (ii) the names of the Objector and the Applicant; (ii) the grounds for the Objection; and (iv) the dates of the DRSP’s receipt of the Objection.

Article 10. ICANN’s Dispute Announcement

(a) Within thirty (30) days of the deadline for filing Objections in relation to gTLD applications in a given round, ICANN shall publish a document on its website identifying all of the admissible Objections that have been filed (the “Dispute Announcement”). ICANN shall also directly inform each DRSP of the posting of the Dispute Announcement.

(b) ICANN shall monitor the progress of all proceedings under this Procedure and shall take steps, where appropriate, to coordinate with any DRSP in relation to individual applications for which objections are pending before more than one DRSP.

Article 11. Response to the Objection

(a) Upon receipt of the Dispute Announcement, each DRSP shall promptly send a notice to: (i) each Applicant for a new gTLD to which one or more admissible Objections have been filed with that DRSP; and (ii) the respective Objector(s).

(b) The Applicant shall file a response to each Objection (the “Response”). The Response shall be filed within thirty (30) days of the transmission of the notice by the DRSP pursuant to Article 11(a).

(c) The Response must be filed with the appropriate DRSP, using a model form made available by that DRSP, with copies to ICANN and the Objector.
(d) The Response shall contain, inter alia, the following information:

(i) The names and contact information (address, telephone number, email address, etc.) of the Applicant; and

(ii) A point-by-point response to the statements made in the Objection.

(e) The substantive portion of the Response shall be limited to 5,000 words or 20 pages, whichever is less, excluding attachments. The Applicant shall also describe and provide copies of any supporting or official documents upon which the Response is based.

(f) At the same time as the Response is filed, the Applicant shall pay a filing fee in the amount set and published by the relevant DRSP (which shall be the same as the filing fee paid by the Objector) and include evidence of such payment in the Response. In the event that the filing fee is not paid within ten (10) days of the receipt of the Response by the DRSP, the Applicant shall be deemed to be in default, any Response disregarded and the Objection shall be deemed successful.

(g) If the DRSP finds that the Response does not comply with Articles 11(c) and (d)(1) of this Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules, the DRSP shall have the discretion to request that any administrative deficiencies in the Response be corrected within five (5) days. If the administrative deficiencies in the Response are cured within the specified period but after the lapse of the time limit for submitting a Response pursuant to this Procedure, the Response shall be deemed to be within this time limit.

(g) If the Applicant fails to file a Response to the Objection within the 30-day time limit, the Applicant shall be deemed to be in default and the Objection shall be deemed successful. No fees paid by the Applicant will be refunded in case of default.

Article 12. Consolidation of Objections

(a) The DRSP is encouraged, whenever possible and practicable, and as may be further stipulated in the applicable DRSP Rules, to consolidate Objections, for example, when more than one Objector has filed an Objection to the same gTLD on the same grounds. The DRSP shall endeavor to decide upon consolidation prior to issuing its notice pursuant to Article 11(a) and, where appropriate, shall inform the parties of the consolidation in that notice.

(b) If the DRSP itself has not decided to consolidate two or more Objections, any Applicant or Objector may propose the consolidation of Objections within seven (7) days of the notice given by the DRSP pursuant to Article 11(a). If, following such a proposal, the DRSP decides to consolidate certain Objections, which decision must be made within 14 days of the notice given by the DRSP pursuant to Article 11(a), the deadline for the Applicant’s Response in the consolidated proceeding shall be thirty (30) days from the Applicant’s receipt of the DRSP’s notice of consolidation.

(c) In deciding whether to consolidate Objections, the DRSP shall weigh the benefits (in terms of time, cost, consistency of decisions, etc.) that may result from the consolidation against the possible prejudice or inconvenience that the consolidation may cause. The DRSP’s determination on consolidation shall be final and not subject to appeal.

(d) Objections based upon different grounds, as summarized in Article 2(e), shall not be consolidated.
Article 13. The Panel

(a) The DRSP shall select and appoint the Panel of Expert(s) within thirty (30) days after receiving the Response.

(b) Number and specific qualifications of Expert(s):

(i) There shall be one Expert in proceedings involving a String Confusion Objection.

(ii) There shall be one Expert or, if all of the Parties so agree, three Experts with relevant experience in intellectual property rights disputes in proceedings involving an Existing Legal Rights Objection.

(iii) There shall be three Experts recognized as eminent jurists of international reputation, one of whom shall be designated as the Chair. The Chair shall be of a nationality different from the nationalities of the Applicant and of the Objector, in proceedings involving a Limited Public Interest Objection.

(iv) There shall be one Expert in proceedings involving a Community Objection.

(c) All Experts acting under this Procedure shall be impartial and independent of the parties. The applicable DRSP Rules stipulate the manner by which each Expert shall confirm and maintain their impartiality and independence.

(d) The applicable DRSP Rules stipulate the procedures for challenging an Expert and replacing an Expert.

(e) Unless required by a court of law or authorized in writing by the parties, an Expert shall not act in any capacity whatsoever, in any pending or future proceedings, whether judicial, arbitral or otherwise, relating to the matter referred to expert determination under this Procedure.

Article 14. Costs

(a) Each DRSP shall determine the costs for the proceedings that it administers under this Procedure in accordance with the applicable DRSP Rules. Such costs shall cover the fees and expenses of the members of the Panel, as well as the administrative fees of the DRSP (the “Costs”).

(b) Within ten (10) days of constituting the Panel, the DRSP shall estimate the total Costs and request the Objector and the Applicant/Respondent each to pay in advance the full amount of the Costs to the DRSP. Each party shall make its advance payment of Costs within ten (10) days of receiving the DRSP’s request for payment and submit to the DRSP evidence of such payment. The respective filing fees paid by the Parties shall be credited against the amounts due for this advance payment of Costs.

(c) The DRSP may revise its estimate of the total Costs and request additional advance payments from the parties during the proceedings.

(d) Failure to make an advance payment of Costs:

(i) If the Objector fails to make the advance payment of Costs, its Objection shall be dismissed and no fees that it has paid shall be refunded.
(ii) If the Applicant fails to make the advance payment of Costs, the Objection will be deemed to have been sustained and no fees that the Applicant has paid shall be refunded.

(e) Upon the termination of the proceedings, after the Panel has rendered its Expert Determination, the DRSP shall refund to the prevailing party, as determined by the Panel, its advance payment(s) of Costs.

Article 15. Representation and Assistance

(a) The parties may be represented or assisted by persons of their choice.

(b) Each party or party representative shall communicate the name, contact information and function of such persons to the DRSP and the other party (or parties in case of consolidation).

Article 16. Negotiation and Mediation

(a) The parties are encouraged, but not required, to participate in negotiations and/or mediation at any time throughout the dispute resolution process aimed at settling their dispute amicably.

(b) Each DRSP shall be able to propose, if requested by the parties, a person who could assist the parties as mediator.

(c) A person who acts as mediator for the parties shall not serve as an Expert in a dispute between the parties under this Procedure or any other proceeding under this Procedure involving the same gTLD.

(d) The conduct of negotiations or mediation shall not, ipso facto, be the basis for a suspension of the dispute resolution proceedings or the extension of any deadline under this Procedure. Upon the joint request of the parties, the DRSP or (after it has been constituted) the Panel may grant the extension of a deadline or the suspension of the proceedings. Absent exceptional circumstances, such extension or suspension shall not exceed thirty (30) days and shall not delay the administration of any other Objection.

(e) If, during negotiations and/or mediation, the parties agree on a settlement of the matter referred to the DRSP under this Procedure, the parties shall inform the DRSP, which shall terminate the proceedings, subject to the parties' payment obligation under this Procedure having been satisfied, and inform ICANN and the parties accordingly.

Article 17. Additional Written Submissions

(a) 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.

(b) The time limits fixed by the Panel for additional written submissions shall not exceed thirty (30) days, unless the Panel, having consulted the DRSP, determines that exceptional circumstances justify a longer time limit.
Article 18. Evidence

In order to achieve the goal of resolving disputes over new gTLDs rapidly and at reasonable cost, procedures for the production of documents shall be limited. In exceptional cases, the Panel may require a party to provide additional evidence.

Article 19. Hearings

(a) Disputes under this Procedure and the applicable DRSP Rules will usually be resolved without a hearing.

(b) The Panel may decide, on its own initiative or at the request of a party, to hold a hearing only in extraordinary circumstances.

(c) In the event that the Panel decides to hold a hearing:

   (i) The Panel shall decide how and where the hearing shall be conducted.

   (ii) In order to expedite the proceedings and minimize costs, the hearing shall be conducted by videoconference if possible.

   (iii) The hearing shall be limited to one day, unless the Panel decides, in exceptional circumstances, that more than one day is required for the hearing.

   (iv) The Panel shall decide whether the hearing will be open to the public or conducted in private.

Article 20. Standards

(a) For each category of Objection identified in Article 2(e), the Panel shall apply the standards that have been defined by ICANN.

(b) In addition, the Panel may refer to and base its findings upon the statements and documents submitted and any rules or principles that it determines to be applicable.

(c) The Objector bears the burden of proving that its Objection should be sustained in accordance with the applicable standards.

Article 21. The Expert Determination

(a) 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.

(b) 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 modifications proposed by the DRSP to the Panel, if any, shall address only the form of the Expert Determination. The signed Expert Determination shall be communicated to the DRSP, which in turn will communicate that Expert Determination to the Parties and ICANN.

(c) When the Panel comprises three Experts, the Expert Determination shall be made by a majority of the Experts.
(d) The Expert Determination shall be in writing, shall identify the prevailing party and shall state the reasons upon which it is based. The remedies available to an Applicant or an Objector pursuant to any proceeding before a Panel shall be limited to the success or dismissal of an Objection and to the refund by the DRSP to the prevailing party, as determined by the Panel in its Expert Determination, of its advance payment(s) of Costs pursuant to Article 14(e) of this Procedure and any relevant provisions of the applicable DRSP Rules.

(e) The Expert Determination shall state the date when it is made, and it shall be signed by the Expert(s). If any Expert fails to sign the Expert Determination, it shall be accompanied by a statement of the reason for the absence of such signature.

(f) In addition to providing electronic copies of its Expert Determination, the Panel shall provide a signed hard copy of the Expert Determination to the DRSP, unless the DRSP Rules provide for otherwise.

(g) Unless the Panel decides otherwise, the Expert Determination shall be published in full on the DRSP’s website.

Article 22. Exclusion of Liability

In addition to any exclusion of liability stipulated by the applicable DRSP Rules, neither the Expert(s), nor the DRSP and its employees, nor ICANN and its Board members, employees and consultants shall be liable to any person for any act or omission in connection with any proceeding conducted under this Procedure.

Article 23. Modification of the Procedure

(a) ICANN may from time to time, in accordance with its Bylaws, modify this Procedure.

(b) The version of this Procedure that is applicable to a dispute resolution proceeding is the version that was in effect on the day when the relevant application for a new gTLD is submitted.
Module 4
String Contention Procedures

This module describes situations in which contention over applied-for gTLD strings occurs, and the methods available to applicants for resolving such contention cases.

4.1 String Contention

String contention occurs when either:

1. Two or more applicants for an identical gTLD string successfully complete all previous stages of the evaluation and dispute resolution processes; or

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

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

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

4.1.1 Identification of Contention Sets

Contention sets are groups of applications containing identical or similar applied-for gTLD strings. Contention sets are identified during Initial Evaluation, following review of all applied-for gTLD strings. ICANN will publish preliminary contention sets once the String Similarity review is completed, and will update the contention sets as necessary during the evaluation and dispute resolution stages.)
Applications for identical gTLD strings will be automatically assigned to a contention set. For example, if Applicant A and Applicant B both apply for .TLDSTRING, they will be identified as being in a contention set. Such testing for identical strings also takes into consideration the code point variants listed in any relevant IDN table. That is, two or more applicants whose applied-for strings or designated variants are variant strings according to an IDN table submitted to ICANN would be considered in direct contention with one another. For example, if one applicant applies for string A and another applies for string B, and strings A and B are variant TLD strings as defined in Module 1, then the two applications are in direct contention.

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

Two strings are in **direct contention** if they are identical or similar to one another. More than two applicants might be represented in a direct contention situation: if four different applicants applied for the same gTLD string, they would all be in direct contention with one another.

Two strings are in **indirect contention** if they are both in direct contention with a third string, but not with one another. The example that follows explains direct and indirect contention in greater detail.

In Figure 4-1, Strings A and B are an example of direct contention. Strings C and G are an example of indirect contention. C and G both contend with B, but not with one another. The figure as a whole is one contention set. A contention set consists of all applications that are linked by string contention to one another, directly or indirectly.
Figure 4-1 – This diagram represents one contention set, featuring both directly and indirectly contending strings.

While preliminary contention sets are determined during Initial Evaluation, the final configuration of the contention sets can only be established once the evaluation and dispute resolution process stages have concluded. This is because any application excluded through those processes might modify a contention set identified earlier.

A contention set may be augmented, split into two sets, or eliminated altogether as a result of an Extended Evaluation or dispute resolution proceeding. The composition of a contention set may also be modified as some applications may be voluntarily withdrawn throughout the process.

Refer to Figure 4-2: In contention set 1, applications D and G are eliminated. Application A is the only remaining application, so there is no contention left to resolve.

In contention set 2, all applications successfully complete Extended Evaluation and Dispute Resolution, so the original contention set remains to be resolved.

In contention set 3, application F is eliminated. Since application F was in direct contention with E and J, but E and J are not in contention with one other, the original contention set splits into two sets: one containing E and K in direct contention, and one containing I and J.
Figure 4-2 – Resolution of string contention cannot begin until all applicants within a contention set have completed all applicable previous stages.

The remaining contention cases must then be resolved through community priority evaluation or by other means, depending on the circumstances. In the string contention resolution stage, ICANN addresses each contention set to achieve an unambiguous resolution.

As described elsewhere in this guidebook, cases of contention might be resolved by community priority evaluation or an agreement among the parties. Absent that, the last-resort contention resolution mechanism will be an auction.

4.1.2 Impact of String Confusion Dispute Resolution Proceedings on Contention Sets

If an applicant files a string confusion objection against another application (refer to Module 3), and the panel finds that user confusion is probable (that is, finds in favor of the objector), the two applications will be placed in direct contention with each other. Thus, the outcome of a dispute resolution proceeding based on a string confusion objection would be a new contention set structure for the relevant applications, augmenting the original contention set.

If an applicant files a string confusion objection against another application, and the panel finds that string...
confusion does not exist (that is, finds in favor of the responding applicant), the two applications will not be considered in direct contention with one another.

A dispute resolution outcome in the case of a string confusion objection filed by another applicant will not result in removal of an application from a previously established contention set.

4.1.3 Self-Resolution of String Contention

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

Applicants may resolve string contention in a manner whereby one or more applicants withdraw their applications. An applicant may not resolve string contention by selecting a new string or by replacing itself with a joint venture. It is understood that applicants may seek to establish joint ventures in their efforts to resolve string contention. However, material changes in applications (for example, combinations of applicants to resolve contention) will require re-evaluation. This might require additional fees or evaluation in a subsequent application round. Applicants are encouraged to resolve contention by combining in a way that does not materially affect the remaining application. Accordingly, new joint ventures must take place in a manner that does not materially change the application, to avoid being subject to re-evaluation.

4.1.4 Possible Contention Resolution Outcomes

An application that has successfully completed all previous stages and is no longer part of a contention set due to changes in the composition of the contention set (as described in subsection 4.1.1) or self-resolution by applicants in the contention set (as described in subsection 4.1.3) may proceed to the next stage.

An application that prevails in a contention resolution procedure, either community priority evaluation or auction, may proceed to the next stage.
In some cases, an applicant who is not the outright winner of a string contention resolution process can still proceed. This situation is explained in the following paragraphs.

If the strings within a given contention set are all identical, the applications are in direct contention with each other and there can only be one winner that proceeds to the next step.

However, where there are both direct and indirect contention situations within a set, more than one string may survive the resolution.

For example, consider a case where string A is in contention with B, and B is in contention with C, but C is not in contention with A. If A wins the contention resolution procedure, B is eliminated but C can proceed since C is not in direct contention with the winner and both strings can coexist in the DNS without risk for confusion.

4.2 Community Priority Evaluation

Community priority evaluation will only occur if a community-based applicant selects this option. Community priority evaluation can begin once all applications in the contention set have completed all previous stages of the process.

The community priority evaluation is an independent analysis. Scores received in the applicant reviews are not carried forward to the community priority evaluation. Each application participating in the community priority evaluation begins with a score of zero.

4.2.1 Eligibility for Community Priority Evaluation

As described in subsection 1.2.3 of Module 1, all applicants are required to identify whether their application type is:

- Community-based; or
- Standard.

Applicants designating their applications as community-based are also asked to respond to a set of questions in the application form to provide relevant information if a community priority evaluation occurs.

Only community-based applicants are eligible to participate in a community priority evaluation.
At the start of the contention resolution stage, all community-based applicants within remaining contention sets will be notified of the opportunity to opt for a community priority evaluation via submission of a deposit by a specified date. Only those applications for which a deposit has been received by the deadline will be scored in the community priority evaluation. Following the evaluation, the deposit will be refunded to applicants that score 14 or higher.

Before the community priority evaluation begins, the applicants who have elected to participate may be asked to provide additional information relevant to the community priority evaluation.

### 4.2.2 Community Priority Evaluation Procedure

Community priority evaluations for each eligible contention set will be performed by a community priority panel appointed by ICANN to review these applications. The panel’s role is to determine whether any of the community-based applications fulfills the community priority criteria. Standard applicants within the contention set, if any, will not participate in the community priority evaluation.

If a single community-based application is found to meet the community priority criteria (see subsection 4.2.3 below), that applicant will be declared to prevail in the community priority evaluation and may proceed. If more than one community-based application is found to meet the criteria, the remaining contention between them will be resolved as follows:

- In the case where the applications are in **indirect contention** with one another (see subsection 4.1.1), they will both be allowed to proceed to the next stage. In this case, applications that are in direct contention with any of these community-based applications will be eliminated.

- In the case where the applications are in **direct contention** with one another, these applicants will proceed to an auction. If all parties agree and present a joint request, ICANN may postpone the auction for a three-month period while the parties attempt to reach a settlement before proceeding to auction. This is a one-time option; ICANN will grant no more than one such request for each set of contending applications.
If none of the community-based applications are found to meet the criteria, then all of the parties in the contention set (both standard and community-based applicants) will proceed to an auction.

Results of each community priority evaluation will be posted when completed.

Applicants who are eliminated as a result of a community priority evaluation are eligible for a partial refund of the gTLD evaluation fee (see Module 1).

### 4.2.3 Community Priority Evaluation Criteria

The Community Priority Panel will review and score the one or more community-based applications having elected the community priority evaluation against four criteria as listed below.

The scoring process is conceived to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both “false positives” (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a “community” construed merely to get a sought-after generic word as a gTLD string) and “false negatives” (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). This calls for a holistic approach, taking multiple criteria into account, as reflected in the process. The scoring will be performed by a panel and be based on information provided in the application plus other relevant information available (such as public information regarding the community represented). The panel may also perform independent research, if deemed necessary to reach informed scoring decisions.

It should be noted that a qualified community application eliminates all directly contending standard applications, regardless of how well qualified the latter may be. This is a fundamental reason for very stringent requirements for qualification of a community-based application, as embodied in the criteria below. Accordingly, a finding by the panel that an application does not meet the scoring threshold to prevail in a community priority evaluation is not necessarily an indication the community itself is in some way inadequate or invalid.

The sequence of the criteria reflects the order in which they will be assessed by the panel. The utmost care has been taken to avoid any “double-counting” - any negative aspect found in assessing an application for one criterion
should only be counted there and should not affect the assessment for other criteria.

An application must score at least 14 points to prevail in a community priority evaluation. The outcome will be determined according to the procedure described in subsection 4.2.2.

**Criterion #1: Community Establishment (0-4 points)**

A maximum of 4 points is possible on the Community Establishment criterion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Establishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As measured by:

**A. Delineation (2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clearly delineated, organized, and pre-existing community.</td>
<td>Clearly delineated and pre-existing community, but not fulfilling the requirements for a score of 2.</td>
<td>Insufficient delineation and pre-existence for a score of 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Extension (2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community of considerable size and longevity.</td>
<td>Community of either considerable size or longevity, but not fulfilling the requirements for a score of 2.</td>
<td>Community of neither considerable size nor longevity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section relates to the community as explicitly identified and defined according to statements in the application. (The implicit reach of the applied-for string is not
considered here, but taken into account when scoring Criterion #2, "Nexus between Proposed String and Community.")

**Criterion 1 Definitions**

- **“Community”** - Usage of the expression “community” has evolved considerably from its Latin origin – “communitas” meaning “fellowship” – while still implying more of cohesion than a mere commonality of interest. Notably, as “community” is used throughout the application, there should be: (a) an awareness and recognition of a community among its members; (b) some understanding of the community’s existence prior to September 2007 (when the new gTLD policy recommendations were completed); and (c) extended tenure or longevity—non-transience—into the future.

- **“Delineation”** relates to the membership of a community, where a clear and straightforward membership definition scores high, while an unclear, dispersed or unbound definition scores low.

- **“Pre-existing”** means that a community has been active as such since before the new gTLD policy recommendations were completed in September 2007.

- **“Organized”** implies that there is at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community, with documented evidence of community activities.

- **“Extension”** relates to the dimensions of the community, regarding its number of members, geographical reach, and foreseeable activity lifetime, as further explained in the following.

- **“Size”** relates both to the number of members and the geographical reach of the community, and will be scored depending on the context rather than on absolute numbers - a geographic location community may count millions of members in a limited location, a language community may have a million members with some spread over the globe, a community of service providers may have “only” some hundred members although well spread over the globe, just to mention some examples - all these can be regarded as of considerable size.
"Longevity" means that the pursuits of a community are of a lasting, non-transient nature.

**Criterion 1 Guidelines**

With respect to "Delineation" and "Extension," it should be noted that a community can consist of legal entities (for example, an association of suppliers of a particular service), of individuals (for example, a language community) or of a logical alliance of communities (for example, an international federation of national communities of a similar nature). All are viable as such, provided the requisite awareness and recognition of the community is at hand among the members. Otherwise the application would be seen as not relating to a real community and score 0 on both "Delineation" and "Extension."

With respect to "Delineation," if an application satisfactorily demonstrates all three relevant parameters (delineation, pre-existing and organized), then it scores a 2.

With respect to "Extension," if an application satisfactorily demonstrates both community size and longevity, it scores a 2.

**Criterion #2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community (0-4 points)**

A maximum of 4 points is possible on the Nexus criterion:

```
4 3 2 1 0
```

Nexus between String & Community

High  Low

As measured by:

A. **Nexus (3)**

```
3 2 0
The string matches the name of the community or is a well-known short-form or abbreviation of the community
String identifies the community, but does not qualify for a score of 3.
String nexus does not fulfill the requirements for a score of 2.
```
B. **Uniqueness (1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| String has no other significant meaning beyond identifying the community described in the application | String does not fulfill the requirement for a score of 1.

This section evaluates the relevance of the string to the specific community that it claims to represent.

**Criterion 2 Definitions**

- "Name" of the community means the established name by which the community is commonly known by others. It may be, but does not need to be, the name of an organization dedicated to the community.

- “Identify” means that the applied for string closely describes the community or the community members, without over-reaching substantially beyond the community.

**Criterion 2 Guidelines**

With respect to “Nexus,” for a score of 3, the essential aspect is that the applied-for string is commonly known by others as the identification / name of the community.

With respect to “Nexus,” for a score of 2, the applied-for string should closely describe the community or the community members, without over-reaching substantially beyond the community. As an example, a string could qualify for a score of 2 if it is a noun that the typical community member would naturally be called in the context. If the string appears excessively broad (such as, for example, a globally well-known but local tennis club applying for “.TENNIS”) then it would not qualify for a 2.
With respect to "Uniqueness," significant meaning relates to the public in general, with consideration of the community language context added.

"Uniqueness" will be scored both with regard to the community context and from a general point of view. For example, a string for a particular geographic location community may seem unique from a general perspective, but would not score a 1 for uniqueness if it carries another significant meaning in the common language used in the relevant community location. The phrasing "...beyond identifying the community" in the score of 1 for "uniqueness" implies a requirement that the string does identify the community, i.e. scores 2 or 3 for "Nexus," in order to be eligible for a score of 1 for "Uniqueness."

It should be noted that "Uniqueness" is only about the meaning of the string - since the evaluation takes place to resolve contention there will obviously be other applications, community-based and/or standard, with identical or confusingly similar strings in the contention set to resolve, so the string will clearly not be "unique" in the sense of "alone."

**Criterion #3: Registration Policies (0-4 points)**

A maximum of 4 points is possible on the Registration Policies criterion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registration Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As measured by:

A. **Eligibility (1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility restricted to community members.</td>
<td>Largely unrestricted approach to eligibility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. **Name selection (1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Policies include name selection rules consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. | Policies do not fulfill the requirements for a score of 1.

C. **Content and use (1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Policies include rules for content and use consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. | Policies do not fulfill the requirements for a score of 1.

D. **Enforcement (1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Policies include specific enforcement measures (e.g. investigation practices, penalties, takedown procedures) constituting a coherent set with appropriate appeal mechanisms. | Policies do not fulfill the requirements for a score of 1.

This section evaluates the applicant’s registration policies as indicated in the application. Registration policies are the conditions that the future registry will set for prospective registrants, i.e. those desiring to register second-level domain names under the registry.
Criterion 3 Definitions

- "Eligibility" means the qualifications that entities or individuals must have in order to be allowed as registrants by the registry.

- "Name selection" means the conditions that must be fulfilled for any second-level domain name to be deemed acceptable by the registry.

- "Content and use" means the restrictions stipulated by the registry as to the content provided in and the use of any second-level domain name in the registry.

- "Enforcement" means the tools and provisions set out by the registry to prevent and remedy any breaches of the conditions by registrants.

Criterion 3 Guidelines

With respect to "Eligibility," the limitation to community "members" can invoke a formal membership but can also be satisfied in other ways, depending on the structure and orientation of the community at hand. For example, for a geographic location community TLD, a limitation to members of the community can be achieved by requiring that the registrant's physical address is within the boundaries of the location.

With respect to "Name selection," "Content and use," and "Enforcement," scoring of applications against these sub-criteria will be done from a holistic perspective, with due regard for the particularities of the community explicitly addressed. For example, an application proposing a TLD for a language community may feature strict rules imposing this language for name selection as well as for content and use, scoring 1 on both B and C above. It could nevertheless include forbearance in the enforcement measures for tutorial sites assisting those wishing to learn the language and still score 1 on D. More restrictions do not automatically result in a higher score. The restrictions and corresponding enforcement mechanisms proposed by the applicant should show an alignment with the community-based purpose of the TLD and demonstrate continuing accountability to the community named in the application.
Criterion #4: Community Endorsement (0-4 points)

As measured by:

A. **Support (2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant is, or has documented support from, the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s) or has otherwise documented authority to represent the community.</td>
<td>Documented support from at least one group with relevance, but insufficient support for a score of 2.</td>
<td>Insufficient proof of support for a score of 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. **Opposition (2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No opposition of relevance.</td>
<td>Relevant opposition from one group of non-negligible size.</td>
<td>Relevant opposition from two or more groups of non-negligible size.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section evaluates community support and/or opposition to the application. Support and opposition will be scored in relation to the communities explicitly addressed as stated in the application, with due regard for the communities implicitly addressed by the string.

**Criterion 4 Definitions**

- “Recognized” means the institution(s)/organization(s) that, through membership or otherwise, are clearly recognized by
the community members as representative of the community.

- "Relevance" and "relevant" refer to the communities explicitly and implicitly addressed. This means that opposition from communities not identified in the application but with an association to the applied-for string would be considered relevant.

**Criterion 4 Guidelines**

With respect to “Support,” it follows that documented support from, for example, the only national association relevant to a particular community on a national level would score a 2 if the string is clearly oriented to that national level, but only a 1 if the string implicitly addresses similar communities in other nations.

Also with respect to “Support,” the plurals in brackets for a score of 2, relate to cases of multiple institutions/organizations. In such cases there must be documented support from institutions/organizations representing a majority of the overall community addressed in order to score 2.

The applicant will score a 1 for “Support” if it does not have support from the majority of the recognized community institutions/member organizations, or does not provide full documentation that it has authority to represent the community with its application. A 0 will be scored on “Support” if the applicant fails to provide documentation showing support from recognized community institutions/community member organizations, or does not provide documentation showing that it has the authority to represent the community. It should be noted, however, that documented support from groups or communities that may be seen as implicitly addressed but have completely different orientations compared to the applicant community will not be required for a score of 2 regarding support.

To be taken into account as relevant support, such documentation must contain a description of the process and rationale used in arriving at the expression of support. Consideration of support is not based merely on the number of comments or expressions of support received.

When scoring “Opposition,” previous objections to the application as well as public comments during the same application round will be taken into account and assessed.
in this context. There will be no presumption that such objections or comments would prevent a score of 2 or lead to any particular score for “Opposition.” To be taken into account as relevant opposition, such objections or comments must be of a reasoned nature. Sources of opposition that are clearly spurious, unsubstantiated, made for a purpose incompatible with competition objectives, or filed for the purpose of obstruction will not be considered relevant.

4.3 Auction: Mechanism of Last Resort

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

An auction will not take place to resolve contention in the case where the contending applications are for geographic names (as defined in Module 2). In this case, the applications will be suspended pending resolution by the applicants.

An auction will take place, where contention has not already been resolved, in the case where an application for a geographic name is in a contention set with applications for similar strings that have not been identified as geographic names.

In practice, ICANN expects that most contention cases will be resolved through other means before reaching the auction stage. However, there is a possibility that significant funding will accrue to ICANN as a result of one or more auctions.¹

¹ The purpose of an auction is to resolve contention in a clear, objective manner. It is planned that costs of the new gTLD program will be offset by fees, so any funds coming from a last resort contention resolution mechanism such as auctions would result (after paying for the auction process) in additional funding. Any proceeds from auctions will be reserved and earmarked until the uses of funds are determined. Funds must be used in a manner that supports directly ICANN’s Mission and Core Values and also allows ICANN to maintain its not-for-profit status.

Possible uses of auction funds include formation of a foundation with a clear mission and a transparent way to allocate funds to projects that are of interest to the greater Internet community, such as grants to support new gTLD applications or registry operators from communities in subsequent gTLD rounds, the creation of an ICANN-administered/community-based fund for specific projects for the benefit of the Internet community, the creation of a registry continuity fund for the protection of registrants (ensuring that funds would be in place to support the operation of a gTLD registry until a successor could be found), or establishment of a security fund to expand use of secure protocols, conduct research, and support standards development organizations in accordance with ICANN’s security and stability mission.
4.3.1 Auction Procedures

An auction of two or more applications within a contention set is conducted as follows. The auctioneer successively increases the prices associated with applications within the contention set, and the respective applicants indicate their willingness to pay these prices. As the prices rise, applicants will successively choose to exit from the auction. When a sufficient number of applications have been eliminated so that no direct contentions remain (i.e., the remaining applications are no longer in contention with one another and all the relevant strings can be delegated as TLDs), the auction will be deemed to conclude. At the auction’s conclusion, the applicants with remaining applications will pay the resulting prices and proceed toward delegation. This procedure is referred to as an “ascending-clock auction.”

This section provides applicants an informal introduction to the practicalities of participation in an ascending-clock auction. It is intended only as a general introduction and is only preliminary. The detailed set of Auction Rules will be available prior to the commencement of any auction proceedings. If any conflict arises between this module and the auction rules, the auction rules will prevail.

For simplicity, this section will describe the situation where a contention set consists of two or more applications for identical strings.

All auctions will be conducted over the Internet, with participants placing their bids remotely using a web-based software system designed especially for auction. The auction software system will be compatible with current versions of most prevalent browsers, and will not require the local installation of any additional software.

Auction participants (“bidders”) will receive instructions for access to the online auction site. Access to the site will be password-protected and bids will be encrypted through SSL. If a bidder temporarily loses connection to the Internet, that bidder may be permitted to submit its bids in a given auction round by fax, according to procedures described.
in the auction rules. The auctions will generally be conducted to conclude quickly, ideally in a single day.

The auction will be carried out in a series of auction rounds, as illustrated in Figure 4-3. The sequence of events is as follows:

1. For each auction round, the auctioneer will announce in advance: (1) the start-of-round price, (2) the end-of-round price, and (3) the starting and ending times of the auction round. In the first auction round, the start-of-round price for all bidders in the auction will be USD 0. In later auction rounds, the start-of-round price will be its end-of-round price from the previous auction round.

2. During each auction round, bidders will be required to submit a bid or bids representing their willingness to pay within the range of intermediate prices between the start-of-round and end-of-round prices. In this way a bidder indicates its willingness to stay in the auction at all prices through and including the end-of-auction round price, or its wish to exit the auction at a price less than the end-of-auction round price, called the exit bid.

3. Exit is irrevocable. If a bidder exited the auction in a previous auction round, the bidder is not permitted to re-enter in the current auction round.
4. Bidders may submit their bid or bids at any time during the auction round.

5. Only bids that comply with all aspects of the auction rules will be considered valid. If more than one valid bid is submitted by a given bidder within the time limit of the auction round, the auctioneer will treat the last valid submitted bid as the actual bid.

6. At the end of each auction round, bids become the bidders’ legally-binding offers to secure the relevant gTLD strings at prices up to the respective bid amounts, subject to closure of the auction in accordance with the auction rules. In later auction rounds, bids may be used to exit from the auction at subsequent higher prices.

7. At each round, the auctioneer will disclose the aggregate number of bidders remaining in the auction at the end-of-round prices for the auction round, and will announce the prices and times for the next auction round.

- Each bid should consist of a single price associated with the application, and such price must be greater than or equal to the start-of-round price.

- If the bid amount is strictly less than the end-of-round price, then the bid is treated as an exit bid at the specified amount, and it signifies the bidder’s binding commitment to pay up to the bid amount if its application is approved.

- If the bid amount is greater than or equal to the end-of-round price, then the bid signifies that the bidder wishes to remain in the auction at all prices in the current auction round, and it signifies the bidder’s binding commitment to pay up to the end-of-round price if its application is approved. Following such bid, the application cannot be eliminated within the current auction round.

- To the extent that the bid amount exceeds the end-of-round price, then the bid is also treated as a proxy bid to be carried forward to the next auction round. The bidder will be permitted to change the proxy bid amount in the next auction round, and the amount of the proxy bid will not constrain the bidder’s ability to submit any valid bid amount in the next auction round.
• No bidder is permitted to submit a bid for any application for which an exit bid was received in a prior auction round. That is, once an application has exited the auction, it may not return.

• If no valid bid is submitted within a given auction round for an application that remains in the auction, then the bid amount is taken to be the amount of the proxy bid, if any, carried forward from the previous auction round or, if none, the bid is taken to be an exit bid at the start-of-round price for the current auction round.

8. This process continues, with the auctioneer increasing the price range for each given TLD string in each auction round, until there is one remaining bidder at the end-of-round price. After an auction round in which this condition is satisfied, the auction concludes and the auctioneer determines the clearing price. The last remaining application is deemed the successful application, and the associated bidder is obligated to pay the clearing price.

Figure 4-4 illustrates how an auction for five contending applications might progress.

![Figure 4-4 – Example of an auction for five mutually-contending applications.](image)
• Before the first auction round, the auctioneer announces the end-of-round price $P_1$.

• During Auction round 1, a bid is submitted for each application. In Figure 4-4, all five bidders submit bids of at least $P_1$. Since the aggregate demand exceeds one, the auction proceeds to Auction round 2. The auctioneer discloses that five contending applications remained at $P_1$ and announces the end-of-round price $P_2$.

• During Auction round 2, a bid is submitted for each application. In Figure 4-4, all five bidders submit bids of at least $P_2$. The auctioneer discloses that five contending applications remained at $P_2$ and announces the end-of-round price $P_3$.

• During Auction round 3, one of the bidders submits an exit bid at slightly below $P_3$, while the other four bidders submit bids of at least $P_3$. The auctioneer discloses that four contending applications remained at $P_3$ and announces the end-of-round price $P_4$.

• During Auction round 4, one of the bidders submits an exit bid midway between $P_3$ and $P_4$, while the other three remaining bidders submit bids of at least $P_4$. The auctioneer discloses that three contending applications remained at $P_4$ and announces the end-of-auction round price $P_5$.

• During Auction round 5, one of the bidders submits an exit bid at slightly above $P_4$, and one of the bidders submits an exit bid at $P_5$, midway between $P_4$ and $P_5$. The final bidder submits a bid greater than $P_5$. Since the aggregate demand at $P_5$ does not exceed one, the auction concludes in Auction round 5. The application associated with the highest bid in Auction round 5 is deemed the successful application. The clearing price is $P_c$, as this is the lowest price at which aggregate demand can be met.

To the extent possible, auctions to resolve multiple string contention situations will be conducted simultaneously.

4.3.1.1 Currency

For bids to be comparable, all bids in the auction will be submitted in any integer (whole) number of US dollars.
4.3.1.2 Fees

A bidding deposit will be required of applicants participating in the auction, in an amount to be determined. The bidding deposit must be transmitted by wire transfer to a specified bank account specified by ICANN or its auction provider at a major international bank, to be received in advance of the auction date. The amount of the deposit will determine a bidding limit for each bidder: the bidding deposit will equal 10% of the bidding limit; and the bidder will not be permitted to submit any bid in excess of its bidding limit.

In order to avoid the need for bidders to pre-commit to a particular bidding limit, bidders may be given the option of making a specified deposit that will provide them with unlimited bidding authority for a given application. The amount of the deposit required for unlimited bidding authority will depend on the particular contention set and will be based on an assessment of the possible final prices within the auction.

All deposits from non-defaulting losing bidders will be returned following the close of the auction.

4.3.2 Winning Bid Payments

Any applicant that participates in an auction will be required to sign a bidder agreement that acknowledges its rights and responsibilities in the auction, including that its bids are legally binding commitments to pay the amount bid if it wins (i.e., if its application is approved), and to enter into the prescribed registry agreement with ICANN— together with a specified penalty for defaulting on payment of its winning bid or failing to enter into the required registry agreement.

The winning bidder in any auction will be required to pay the full amount of the final price within 20 business days of the end of the auction. Payment is to be made by wire transfer to the same international bank account as the bidding deposit, and the applicant’s bidding deposit will be credited toward the final price.

In the event that a bidder anticipates that it would require a longer payment period than 20 business days due to verifiable government-imposed currency restrictions, the bidder may advise ICANN well in advance of the auction and ICANN will consider applying a longer payment period to all bidders within the same contention set.
Any winning bidder for whom the full amount of the final price is not received within 20 business days of the end of an auction is subject to being declared in default. At their sole discretion, ICANN and its auction provider may delay the declaration of default for a brief period, but only if they are convinced that receipt of full payment is imminent.

Any winning bidder for whom the full amount of the final price is received within 20 business days of the end of an auction retains the obligation to execute the required registry agreement within 90 days of the end of auction. Such winning bidder who does not execute the agreement within 90 days of the end of the auction is subject to being declared in default. At their sole discretion, ICANN and its auction provider may delay the declaration of default for a brief period, but only if they are convinced that execution of the registry agreement is imminent.

4.3.3 Post-Default Procedures

Once declared in default, any winning bidder is subject to immediate forfeiture of its position in the auction and assessment of default penalties. After a winning bidder is declared in default, the remaining bidders will receive an offer to have their applications accepted, one at a time, in descending order of their exit bids. In this way, the next bidder would be declared the winner subject to payment of its last bid price. The same default procedures and penalties are in place for any runner-up bidder receiving such an offer.

Each bidder that is offered the relevant gTLD will be given a specified period—typically, four business days—to respond as to whether it wants the gTLD. A bidder who responds in the affirmative will have 20 business days to submit its full payment. A bidder who declines such an offer cannot revert on that statement, has no further obligations in this context and will not be considered in default.

The penalty for defaulting on a winning bid will equal 10% of the defaulting bid. Default penalties will be charged against any defaulting applicant’s bidding deposit before the associated bidding deposit is returned.

---

2 If bidders were given the option of making a specified deposit that provided them with unlimited bidding authority for a given application and if the winning bidder utilized this option, then the penalty for defaulting on a winning bid will be the lesser of the following: (1) 10% of the defaulting bid, or (2) the specified deposit amount that provided the bidder with unlimited bidding authority.
4.4 Contention Resolution and Contract Execution

An applicant that has been declared the winner of a contention resolution process will proceed by entering into the contract execution step. (Refer to section 5.1 of Module 5.)

If a winner of the contention resolution procedure has not executed a contract within 90 calendar days of the decision, ICANN has the right to deny that application and extend an offer to the runner-up applicant, if any, to proceed with its application. For example, in an auction, another applicant who would be considered the runner-up applicant might proceed toward delegation. This offer is at ICANN’s option only. The runner-up applicant in a contention resolution process has no automatic right to an applied-for gTLD string if the first place winner does not execute a contract within a specified time. If the winning applicant can demonstrate that it is working diligently and in good faith toward successful completion of the steps necessary for entry into the registry agreement, ICANN may extend the 90-day period at its discretion. Runner-up applicants have no claim of priority over the winning application, even after what might be an extended period of negotiation.
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Module 5
Transition to Delegation

This module describes the final steps required of an applicant for completion of the process, including execution of a registry agreement with ICANN and preparing for delegation of the new gTLD into the root zone.

5.1 Registry Agreement

All applicants that have successfully completed the evaluation process—including, if necessary, the dispute resolution and string contention processes—are required to enter into a registry agreement with ICANN before proceeding to delegation.

After the close of each stage in the process, ICANN will send a notification to those successful applicants that are eligible for execution of a registry agreement at that time.

To proceed, applicants will be asked to provide specified information for purposes of executing the registry agreement:

1. Documentation of the applicant’s continued operations instrument (see Specification 8 to the agreement).

2. Confirmation of contact information and signatory to the agreement.

3. Notice of any material changes requested to the terms of the agreement.

4. The applicant must report: (i) any ownership interest it holds in any registrar or reseller of registered names, (ii) if known, any ownership interest that a registrar or reseller of registered names holds in the applicant, and (iii) if the applicant controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with any registrar or reseller of registered names. ICANN retains the right to refer an application to a competition authority prior to entry into the registry agreement if it is determined that the registry-registrar cross-ownership
arrangements might raise competition issues. For this purpose “control” (including the terms “controlled by” and “under common control with”) means the possession, directly or indirectly, of the power to direct or cause the direction of the management or policies of a person or entity, whether through the ownership of securities, as trustee or executor, by serving as a member of a board of directors or equivalent governing body, by contract, by credit arrangement or otherwise.

To ensure that an applicant continues to be a going concern in good legal standing, ICANN reserves the right to ask the applicant to submit additional updated documentation and information before entering into the registry agreement.

ICANN will begin processing registry agreements one month after the date of the notification to successful applicants. Requests will be handled in the order the complete information is received.

Generally, the process will include formal approval of the agreement without requiring additional Board review, so long as: the application passed all evaluation criteria; there are no material changes in circumstances; and there are no material changes to the base agreement. There may be other cases where the Board requests review of an application.

Eligible applicants are expected to have executed the registry agreement within nine (9) months of the notification date. Failure to do so may result in loss of eligibility, at ICANN’s discretion. An applicant may request an extension of this time period for up to an additional nine (9) months if it can demonstrate, to ICANN’s reasonable satisfaction, that it is working diligently and in good faith toward successfully completing the steps necessary for entry into the registry agreement.

The registry agreement can be reviewed in the attachment to this module. Certain provisions in the agreement are labeled as applicable to governmental and intergovernmental entities only. Private entities, even if supported by a government or IGO, would not ordinarily be eligible for these special provisions.

All successful applicants are expected to enter into the agreement substantially as written. Applicants may request and negotiate terms by exception; however, this extends
the time involved in executing the agreement. In the event
that material changes to the agreement are requested,
these must first be approved by the ICANN Board of
Directors before execution of the agreement.

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

5.2 Pre-Delegation Testing

Each applicant will be required to complete pre-
delegation technical testing as a prerequisite to
delegation into the root zone. This pre-delegation test must
be completed within the time period specified in the
registry agreement.

The purpose of the pre-delegation technical test is to verify
that the applicant has met its commitment to establish
registry operations in accordance with the technical and
operational criteria described in Module 2.

The test is also intended to indicate that the applicant can
operate the gTLD in a stable and secure manner. All
applicants will be tested on a pass/fail basis according to
the requirements that follow.

The test elements cover both the DNS server operational
infrastructure and registry system operations. In many cases
the applicant will perform the test elements as instructed
and provide documentation of the results to ICANN to
demonstrate satisfactory performance. At ICANN’s
discretion, aspects of the applicant’s self-certification
documentation can be audited either on-site at the
service delivery point of the registry or elsewhere as
determined by ICANN.

5.2.1 Testing Procedures

The applicant may initiate the pre-delegation test by
submitting to ICANN the Pre-Delegation form and
accompanying documents containing all of the following
information:
• All name server names and IPv4/IPv6 addresses to be used in serving the new TLD data;

• If using anycast, the list of names and IPv4/IPv6 unicast addresses allowing the identification of each individual server in the anycast sets;

• If IDN is supported, the complete IDN tables used in the registry system;

• A test zone for the new TLD must be signed at test time and the valid key-set to be used at the time of testing must be provided to ICANN in the documentation, as well as the TLD DNSSEC Policy Statement (DPS);

• The executed agreement between the selected escrow agent and the applicant; and

• Self-certification documentation as described below for each test item.

ICANN will review the material submitted and in some cases perform tests in addition to those conducted by the applicant. After testing, ICANN will assemble a report with the outcome of the tests and provide that report to the applicant.

Any clarification request, additional information request, or other request generated in the process will be highlighted and listed in the report sent to the applicant.

ICANN may request the applicant to complete load tests considering an aggregated load where a single entity is performing registry services for multiple TLDs.

Once an applicant has met all of the pre-delegation testing requirements, it is eligible to request delegation of its applied-for gTLD.

If an applicant does not complete the pre-delegation steps within the time period specified in the registry agreement, ICANN reserves the right to terminate the registry agreement.
5.2.2 Test Elements: DNS Infrastructure

The first set of test elements concerns the DNS infrastructure of the new gTLD. In all tests of the DNS infrastructure, all requirements are independent of whether IPv4 or IPv6 is used. All tests shall be done both over IPv4 and IPv6, with reports providing results according to both protocols.

**UDP Support** -- The DNS infrastructure to which these tests apply comprises the complete set of servers and network infrastructure to be used by the chosen providers to deliver DNS service for the new gTLD to the Internet. The documentation provided by the applicant must include the results from a system performance test indicating available network and server capacity and an estimate of expected capacity during normal operation to ensure stable service as well as to adequately address Distributed Denial of Service (DDoS) attacks.

Self-certification documentation shall include data on load capacity, latency and network reachability.

Load capacity shall be reported using a table, and a corresponding graph, showing percentage of queries responded against an increasing number of queries per second generated from local (to the servers) traffic generators. The table shall include at least 20 data points and loads of UDP-based queries that will cause up to 10% query loss against a randomly selected subset of servers within the applicant’s DNS infrastructure. Responses must either contain zone data or be NXDOMAIN or NODATA responses to be considered valid.

Query latency shall be reported in milliseconds as measured by DNS probes located just outside the border routers of the physical network hosting the name servers, from a network topology point of view.

Reachability will be documented by providing information on the transit and peering arrangements for the DNS server locations, listing the AS numbers of the transit providers or peers at each point of presence and available bandwidth at those points of presence.

**TCP Support** -- TCP transport service for DNS queries and responses must be enabled and provisioned for expected load. ICANN will review the capacity self-certification documentation provided by the applicant and will perform TCP reachability and transaction capability tests across a
randomly selected subset of the name servers within the applicant’s DNS infrastructure. In case of use of anycast, each individual server in each anycast set will be tested.

Self-certification documentation shall include data on load capacity, latency and external network reachability.

Load capacity shall be reported using a table, and a corresponding graph, showing percentage of queries that generated a valid (zone data, NO_DATA, or NXDOMAIN) response against an increasing number of queries per second generated from local (to the name servers) traffic generators. The table shall include at least 20 data points and loads that will cause up to 10% query loss (either due to connection timeout or connection reset) against a randomly selected subset of servers within the applicant’s DNS infrastructure.

Query latency will be reported in milliseconds as measured by DNS probes located just outside the border routers of the physical network hosting the name servers, from a network topology point of view.

Reachability will be documented by providing records of TCP-based DNS queries from nodes external to the network hosting the servers. These locations may be the same as those used for measuring latency above.

**DNSSEC support** -- Applicant must demonstrate support for EDNS(0) in its server infrastructure, the ability to return correct DNSSEC-related resource records such as DNSKEY, RRSIG, and NSEC/NSEC3 for the signed zone, and the ability to accept and publish DS resource records from second-level domain administrators. In particular, the applicant must demonstrate its ability to support the full life cycle of KSK and ZSK keys. ICANN will review the self-certification materials as well as test the reachability, response sizes, and DNS transaction capacity for DNS queries using the EDNS(0) protocol extension with the “DNSSEC OK” bit set for a randomly selected subset of all name servers within the applicant’s DNS infrastructure. In case of use of anycast, each individual server in each anycast set will be tested.

Load capacity, query latency, and reachability shall be documented as for UDP and TCP above.
5.2.3 Test Elements: Registry Systems

As documented in the registry agreement, registries must provide support for EPP within their Shared Registration System, and provide Whois service both via port 43 and a web interface, in addition to support for the DNS. This section details the requirements for testing these registry systems.

System performance -- The registry system must scale to meet the performance requirements described in Specification 10 of the registry agreement and ICANN will require self-certification of compliance. ICANN will review the self-certification documentation provided by the applicant to verify adherence to these minimum requirements.

Whois support -- Applicant must provision Whois services for the anticipated load. ICANN will verify that Whois data is accessible over IPv4 and IPv6 via both TCP port 43 and via a web interface and review self-certification documentation regarding Whois transaction capacity. Response format according to Specification 4 of the registry agreement and access to Whois (both port 43 and via web) will be tested by ICANN remotely from various points on the Internet over both IPv4 and IPv6.

Self-certification documents shall describe the maximum number of queries per second successfully handled by both the port 43 servers as well as the web interface, together with an applicant-provided load expectation.

Additionally, a description of deployed control functions to detect and mitigate data mining of the Whois database shall be documented.

EPP Support -- As part of a shared registration service, applicant must provision EPP services for the anticipated load. ICANN will verify conformance to appropriate RFCs (including EPP extensions for DNSSEC). ICANN will also review self-certification documentation regarding EPP transaction capacity.

Documentation shall provide a maximum Transaction per Second rate for the EPP interface with 10 data points corresponding to registry database sizes from 0 (empty) to the expected size after one year of operation, as determined by applicant.
Documentation shall also describe measures taken to handle load during initial registry operations, such as a land-rush period.

**IPv6 support** -- The ability of the registry to support registrars adding, changing, and removing IPv6 DNS records supplied by registrants will be tested by ICANN. If the registry supports EPP access via IPv6, this will be tested by ICANN remotely from various points on the Internet.

**DNSSEC support** -- ICANN will review the ability of the registry to support registrars adding, changing, and removing DNSSEC-related resource records as well as the registry's overall key management procedures. In particular, the applicant must demonstrate its ability to support the full life cycle of key changes for child domains. Inter-operation of the applicant's secure communication channels with the IANA for trust anchor material exchange will be verified.

The practice and policy document (also known as the DNSSEC Policy Statement or DPS), describing key material storage, access and usage for its own keys is also reviewed as part of this step.

**IDN support** -- ICANN will verify the complete IDN table(s) used in the registry system. The table(s) must comply with the guidelines in [http://iana.org/procedures/idn-repository.html](http://iana.org/procedures/idn-repository.html).

Requirements related to IDN for Whois are being developed. After these requirements are developed, prospective registries will be expected to comply with published IDN-related Whois requirements as part of pre-delegation testing.

**Escrow deposit** -- The applicant-provided samples of data deposit that include both a full and an incremental deposit showing correct type and formatting of content will be reviewed. Special attention will be given to the agreement with the escrow provider to ensure that escrowed data can be released within 24 hours should it be necessary. ICANN may, at its option, ask an independent third party to demonstrate the reconstitutability of the registry from escrowed data. ICANN may elect to test the data release process with the escrow agent.
5.3 Delegation Process

Upon notice of successful completion of the ICANN pre-delegation testing, applicants may initiate the process for delegation of the new gTLD into the root zone database.

This will include provision of additional information and completion of additional technical steps required for delegation. Information about the delegation process is available at http://iana.org/domains/root/.

5.4 Ongoing Operations

An applicant that is successfully delegated a gTLD will become a “Registry Operator.” In being delegated the role of operating part of the Internet’s domain name system, the applicant will be assuming a number of significant responsibilities. ICANN will hold all new gTLD operators accountable for the performance of their obligations under the registry agreement, and it is important that all applicants understand these responsibilities.

5.4.1 What is Expected of a Registry Operator

The registry agreement defines the obligations of gTLD registry operators. A breach of the registry operator’s obligations may result in ICANN compliance actions up to and including termination of the registry agreement. Prospective applicants are encouraged to review the following brief description of some of these responsibilities.

Note that this is a non-exhaustive list provided to potential applicants as an introduction to the responsibilities of a registry operator. For the complete and authoritative text, please refer to the registry agreement.

A registry operator is obligated to:

Operate the TLD in a stable and secure manner. The registry operator is responsible for the entire technical operation of the TLD. As noted in RFC 1591:

“The designated manager must do a satisfactory job of operating the DNS service for the domain. That is, the actual management of the assigning of domain names, delegating subdomains and operating nameservers must be done with technical competence. This includes keeping

1 See http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc1591.txt
the central IR\(^2\) (in the case of top-level domains) or other higher-level domain manager advised of the status of the domain, responding to requests in a timely manner, and operating the database with accuracy, robustness, and resilience.\(^3\)

The registry operator is required to comply with relevant technical standards in the form of RFCs and other guidelines. Additionally, the registry operator must meet performance specifications in areas such as system downtime and system response times (see Specifications 6 and 10 of the registry agreement).

**Comply with consensus policies and temporary policies.**

gTLD registry operators are required to comply with consensus policies. Consensus policies may relate to a range of topics such as issues affecting interoperability of the DNS, registry functional and performance specifications, database security and stability, or resolution of disputes over registration of domain names.

To be adopted as a consensus policy, a policy must be developed by the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO)\(^3\) following the process in Annex A of the ICANN Bylaws.\(^4\) The policy development process involves deliberation and collaboration by the various stakeholder groups participating in the process, with multiple opportunities for input and comment by the public, and can take significant time.

Examples of existing consensus policies are the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (governing transfers of domain names between registrars), and the Registry Services Evaluation Policy (establishing a review of proposed new registry services for security and stability or competition concerns), although there are several more, as found at [http://www.icann.org/en/general/consensus-policies.htm](http://www.icann.org/en/general/consensus-policies.htm).

gTLD registry operators are obligated to comply with both existing consensus policies and those that are developed in the future. Once a consensus policy has been formally adopted, ICANN will provide gTLD registry operators with notice of the requirement to implement the new policy and the effective date.

---

\(^2\) IR is a historical reference to “Internet Registry,” a function now performed by ICANN.

\(^3\) [http://gnso.icann.org](http://gnso.icann.org)

In addition, the ICANN Board may, when required by circumstances, establish a temporary policy necessary to maintain the stability or security of registry services or the DNS. In such a case, all gTLD registry operators will be required to comply with the temporary policy for the designated period of time.

For more information, see Specification 1 of the registry agreement.

**Implement start-up rights protection measures.** The registry operator must implement, at a minimum, a Sunrise period and a Trademark Claims service during the start-up phases for registration in the TLD, as provided in the registry agreement. These mechanisms will be supported by the established Trademark Clearinghouse as indicated by ICANN.

The Sunrise period allows eligible rightsholders an early opportunity to register names in the TLD.

The Trademark Claims service provides notice to potential registrants of existing trademark rights, as well as notice to rightsholders of relevant names registered. Registry operators may continue offering the Trademark Claims service after the relevant start-up phases have concluded.

For more information, see Specification 7 of the registry agreement and the Trademark Clearinghouse model accompanying this module.

**Implement post-launch rights protection measures.** The registry operator is required to implement decisions made under the Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) procedure, including suspension of specific domain names within the registry. The registry operator is also required to comply with and implement decisions made according to the Trademark Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Policy (PDDRP).

The required measures are described fully in the URS and PDDRP procedures accompanying this module. Registry operators may introduce additional rights protection measures relevant to the particular gTLD.

**Implement measures for protection of country and territory names in the new gTLD.** All new gTLD registry operators are required to provide certain minimum protections for country and territory names, including an initial reservation requirement and establishment of applicable rules and
procedures for release of these names. The rules for release can be developed or agreed to by governments, the GAC, and/or approved by ICANN after a community discussion. Registry operators are encouraged to implement measures for protection of geographical names in addition to those required by the agreement, according to the needs and interests of each gTLD’s particular circumstances. (See Specification 5 of the registry agreement).

Pay recurring fees to ICANN. In addition to supporting expenditures made to accomplish the objectives set out in ICANN’s mission statement, these funds enable the support required for new gTLDs, including: contractual compliance, registry liaison, increased registrar accreditations, and other registry support activities. The fees include both a fixed component (USD 25,000 annually) and, where the TLD exceeds a transaction volume, a variable fee based on transaction volume. See Article 6 of the registry agreement.

Regularly deposit data into escrow. This serves an important role in registrant protection and continuity for certain instances where the registry or one aspect of the registry operations experiences a system failure or loss of data. (See Specification 2 of the registry agreement.)

Deliver monthly reports in a timely manner. A registry operator must submit a report to ICANN on a monthly basis. The report includes registrar transactions for the month and is used by ICANN for calculation of registrar fees. (See Specification 3 of the registry agreement.)

Provide Whois service. A registry operator must provide a publicly available Whois service for registered domain names in the TLD. (See Specification 4 of the registry agreement.)

Maintain partnerships with ICANN-accredited registrars. A registry operator creates a Registry-Registrar Agreement (RRA) to define requirements for its registrars. This must include certain terms that are specified in the Registry Agreement, and may include additional terms specific to the TLD. A registry operator must provide non-discriminatory access to its registry services to all ICANN-accredited registrars with whom it has entered into an RRA, and who are in compliance with the requirements. This includes providing advance notice of pricing changes to all
registrars, in compliance with the time frames specified in the agreement. (See Article 2 of the registry agreement.)

**Maintain an abuse point of contact.** A registry operator must maintain and publish on its website a single point of contact responsible for addressing matters requiring expedited attention and providing a timely response to abuse complaints concerning all names registered in the TLD through all registrars of record, including those involving a reseller. A registry operator must also take reasonable steps to investigate and respond to any reports from law enforcement, governmental and quasi-governmental agencies of illegal conduct in connection with the use of the TLD. (See Article 2 and Specification 6 of the registry agreement.)

**Cooperate with contractual compliance audits.** To maintain a level playing field and a consistent operating environment, ICANN staff performs periodic audits to assess contractual compliance and address any resulting problems. A registry operator must provide documents and information requested by ICANN that are necessary to perform such audits. (See Article 2 of the registry agreement.)

**Maintain a Continued Operations Instrument.** A registry operator must, at the time of the agreement, have in place a continued operations instrument sufficient to fund basic registry operations for a period of three (3) years. This requirement remains in place for five (5) years after delegation of the TLD, after which time the registry operator is no longer required to maintain the continued operations instrument. (See Specification 8 to the registry agreement.)

**Maintain community-based policies and procedures.** If the registry operator designated its application as community-based at the time of the application, the registry operator has requirements in its registry agreement to maintain the community-based policies and procedures it specified in its application. The registry operator is bound by the Registry Restrictions Dispute Resolution Procedure with respect to disputes regarding execution of its community-based policies and procedures. (See Article 2 to the registry agreement.)

**Have continuity and transition plans in place.** This includes performing failover testing on a regular basis. In the event that a transition to a new registry operator becomes necessary, the registry operator is expected to cooperate
by consulting with ICANN on the appropriate successor, providing the data required to enable a smooth transition, and complying with the applicable registry transition procedures. (See Articles 2 and 4 of the registry agreement.)

**Make TLD zone files available via a standardized process.** This includes provision of access to the registry’s zone file to credentialed users, according to established access, file, and format standards. The registry operator will enter into a standardized form of agreement with zone file users and will accept credential information for users via a clearinghouse. (See Specification 4 of the registry agreement.)

**Implement DNSSEC.** The registry operator is required to sign the TLD zone files implementing Domain Name System Security Extensions (DNSSEC) in accordance with the relevant technical standards. The registry must accept public key material from registrars for domain names registered in the TLD, and publish a DNSSEC Policy Statement describing key material storage, access, and usage for the registry’s keys. (See Specification 6 of the registry agreement.)

5.4.2 **What is Expected of ICANN**

ICANN will continue to provide support for gTLD registry operators as they launch and maintain registry operations. ICANN’s gTLD registry liaison function provides a point of contact for gTLD registry operators for assistance on a continuing basis.

ICANN’s contractual compliance function will perform audits on a regular basis to ensure that gTLD registry operators remain in compliance with agreement obligations, as well as investigate any complaints from the community regarding the registry operator’s adherence to its contractual obligations. See [http://www.icann.org/en/compliance/](http://www.icann.org/en/compliance/) for more information on current contractual compliance activities.

ICANN’s Bylaws require ICANN to act in an open and transparent manner, and to provide equitable treatment among registry operators. ICANN is responsible for maintaining the security and stability of the global Internet, and looks forward to a constructive and cooperative relationship with future gTLD registry operators in furtherance of this goal.
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New gTLD Agreement

This document contains the registry agreement associated with the Applicant Guidebook for New gTLDs.

Successful gTLD applicants would enter into this form of registry agreement with ICANN prior to delegation of the new gTLD. (Note: ICANN reserves the right to make reasonable updates and changes to this proposed agreement during the course of the application process, including as the possible result of new policies that might be adopted during the course of the application process).
REGISTRY AGREEMENT

This REGISTRY AGREEMENT (this “Agreement”) is entered into as of ___________ (the “Effective Date”) between Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers, a California nonprofit public benefit corporation (“ICANN”), and __________, a _____________ (“Registry Operator”).

ARTICLE 1.

DELEGATION AND OPERATION

OF TOP–LEVEL DOMAIN; REPRESENTATIONS AND WARRANTIES

1.1 Domain and Designation. The Top-Level Domain to which this Agreement applies is _____ (the “TLD”). Upon the Effective Date and until the end of the Term (as defined in Section 4.1), ICANN designates Registry Operator as the registry operator for the TLD, subject to the requirements and necessary approvals for delegation of the TLD and entry into the root-zone.

1.2 Technical Feasibility of String. While ICANN has encouraged and will continue to encourage universal acceptance of all top-level domain strings across the Internet, certain top-level domain strings may encounter difficulty in acceptance by ISPs and webhosters and/or validation by web applications. Registry Operator shall be responsible for ensuring to its satisfaction the technical feasibility of the TLD string prior to entering into this Agreement.

1.3 Representations and Warranties.

(a) Registry Operator represents and warrants to ICANN as follows:

(i) all material information provided and statements made in the registry TLD application, and statements made in writing during the negotiation of this Agreement, were true and correct in all material respects at the time made, and such information or statements continue to be true and correct in all material respects as of the Effective Date except as otherwise previously disclosed in writing by Registry Operator to ICANN;

(ii) Registry Operator is duly organized, validly existing and in good standing under the laws of the jurisdiction set forth in the preamble hereto, and Registry Operator has all requisite power and authority and obtained all necessary approvals to enter into and duly execute and deliver this Agreement; and

(iii) Registry Operator has delivered to ICANN a duly executed instrument that secures the funds required to perform registry functions for the TLD in the event of the termination or expiration of this Agreement (the “Continued Operations Instrument”), and such instrument is a binding obligation of the parties thereto, enforceable against the parties thereto in accordance with its terms.

(b) ICANN represents and warrants to Registry Operator that ICANN is a nonprofit public benefit corporation duly organized, validly existing and in good standing under the laws of the State of California, United States of America. ICANN has all requisite power and authority and obtained all necessary corporate approvals to enter into and duly execute and deliver this Agreement.
ARTICLE 2.

COVENANTS OF REGISTRY OPERATOR

Registry Operator covenants and agrees with ICANN as follows:

2.1 **Approved Services; Additional Services.** Registry Operator shall be entitled to provide the Registry Services described in clauses (a) and (b) of the first paragraph of Section 2.1 in the specification at [see specification 6] (“Specification 6”) and such other Registry Services set forth on Exhibit A (collectively, the “Approved Services”). If Registry Operator desires to provide any Registry Service that is not an Approved Service or is a modification to an Approved Service (each, an “Additional Service”), Registry Operator shall submit a request for approval of such Additional Service pursuant to the Registry Services Evaluation Policy at [http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/rsep.html](http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/rsep.html), as such policy may be amended from time to time in accordance with the bylaws of ICANN (as amended from time to time, the “ICANN Bylaws”) applicable to Consensus Policies (the “RSEP”). Registry Operator may offer Additional Services only with the written approval of ICANN, and, upon any such approval, such Additional Services shall be deemed Registry Services under this Agreement. In its reasonable discretion, ICANN may require an amendment to this Agreement reflecting the provision of any Additional Service which is approved pursuant to the RSEP, which amendment shall be in a form reasonably acceptable to the parties.

2.2 **Compliance with Consensus Policies and Temporary Policies.** Registry Operator shall comply with and implement all Consensus Policies and Temporary Policies found at [http://www.icann.org/general/consensus-policies.htm](http://www.icann.org/general/consensus-policies.htm), as of the Effective Date and as may in the future be developed and adopted in accordance with the ICANN Bylaws, provided such future Consensus Policies and Temporary Policies are adopted in accordance with the procedure and relate to those topics and subject to those limitations set forth at [see specification 1] (“Specification 1”).

2.3 **Data Escrow.** Registry Operator shall comply with the registry data escrow procedures posted at [see specification 2].

2.4 **Monthly Reporting.** Within twenty (20) calendar days following the end of each calendar month, Registry Operator shall deliver to ICANN reports in the format posted in the specification at [see specification 3].

2.5 **Publication of Registration Data.** Registry Operator shall provide public access to registration data in accordance with the specification posted at [see specification 4] (“Specification 4”).

2.6 **Reserved Names.** Except to the extent that ICANN otherwise expressly authorizes in writing, Registry Operator shall comply with the restrictions on registration of character strings set forth at [see specification 5] (“Specification 5”). Registry Operator may establish policies concerning the reservation or blocking of additional character strings within the TLD at its discretion. If Registry Operator is the registrant for any domain names in the Registry TLD (other than the Second-Level Reservations for Registry Operations from Specification 5), such registrations must be through an ICANN accredited registrar. Any such registrations will be considered Transactions (as defined in Section 6.1) for purposes of calculating the Registry-Level Transaction Fee to be paid to ICANN by Registry Operator pursuant to Section 6.1.

2.7 **Registry Interoperability and Continuity.** Registry Operator shall comply with the Registry Interoperability and Continuity Specifications as set forth in Specification 6.
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2.8 Protection of Legal Rights of Third Parties. Registry Operator must specify, and comply with, a process and procedures for launch of the TLD and initial registration-related and ongoing protection of the legal rights of third parties as set forth in the specification at "Specification 7". Registry Operator may, at its election, implement additional protections of the legal rights of third parties. Any changes or modifications to the process and procedures required by Specification 7 following the Effective Date must be approved in advance by ICANN in writing. Registry Operator must comply with all remedies imposed by ICANN pursuant to Section 2 of Specification 7, subject to Registry Operator’s right to challenge such remedies as set forth in the applicable procedure described therein. Registry Operator shall take reasonable steps to investigate and respond to any reports from law enforcement and governmental and quasi-governmental agencies of illegal conduct in connection with the use of the TLD. In responding to such reports, Registry Operator will not be required to take any action in contravention of applicable law.

2.9 Registrars.

(a) Registry Operator must use only ICANN accredited registrars in registering domain names. Registry Operator must provide non-discriminatory access to Registry Services to all ICANN accredited registrars that enter into and are in compliance with the registry-registrar agreement for the TLD; provided, that Registry Operator may establish non-discriminatory criteria for qualification to register names in the TLD that are reasonably related to the proper functioning of the TLD. Registry Operator must use a uniform non-discriminatory agreement with all registrars authorized to register names in the TLD. Such agreement may be revised by Registry Operator from time to time; provided, however, that any such revisions must be approved in advance by ICANN.

(b) If Registry Operator (i) becomes an Affiliate or reseller of an ICANN accredited registrar, or (ii) subcontracts the provision of any Registry Services to an ICANN accredited registrar, registrar reseller or any of their respective Affiliates, then, in either such case of (i) or (ii) above, Registry Operator will give ICANN prompt notice of the contract, transaction or other arrangement that resulted in such affiliation, reseller relationship or subcontract, as applicable, including, if requested by ICANN, copies of any contract relating thereto; provided, that ICANN will not disclose such contracts to any third party other than relevant competition authorities. ICANN reserves the right, but not the obligation, to refer any such contract, transaction or other arrangement to relevant competition authorities in the event that ICANN determines that such contract, transaction or other arrangement might raise competition issues.

(c) For the purposes of this Agreement: (i) “Affiliate” means a person or entity that, directly or indirectly, through one or more intermediaries, controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with, the person or entity specified, and (ii) “control” (including the terms “controlled by” and “under common control with”) means the possession, directly or indirectly, of the power to direct or cause the direction of the management or policies of a person or entity, whether through the ownership of securities, as trustee or executor, by serving as an employee or a member of a board of directors or equivalent governing body, by contract, by credit arrangement or otherwise.

2.10 Pricing for Registry Services.

(a) With respect to initial domain name registrations, Registry Operator shall provide ICANN and each ICANN accredited registrar that has executed the registry-registrar agreement for the TLD advance written notice of any price increase (including as a result of the elimination of any refunds, rebates, discounts, product tying or other programs which had the effect of reducing the price charged to registrars, unless such refunds, rebates, discounts, product tying or other programs are of a limited
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duration that is clearly and conspicuously disclosed to the registrar when offered) of no less than thirty (30) calendar days. Registry Operator shall offer registrars the option to obtain initial domain name registrations for periods of one to ten years at the discretion of the registrar, but no greater than ten years.

(b) With respect to renewal of domain name registrations, Registry Operator shall provide ICANN and each ICANN accredited registrar that has executed the registry-registrar agreement for the TLD advance written notice of any price increase (including as a result of the elimination of any refunds, rebates, discounts, product tying, Qualified Marketing Programs or other programs which had the effect of reducing the price charged to registrars) of no less than one hundred eighty (180) calendar days. Notwithstanding the foregoing sentence, with respect to renewal of domain name registrations: (i) Registry Operator need only provide thirty (30) calendar days notice of any price increase if the resulting price is less than or equal to (A) for the period beginning on the Effective Date and ending twelve (12) months following the Effective Date, the initial price charged for registrations in the TLD, or (B) for subsequent periods, a price for which Registry Operator provided a notice pursuant to the first sentence of this Section 2.10(b) within the twelve (12) month period preceding the effective date of the proposed price increase; and (ii) Registry Operator need not provide notice of any price increase for the imposition of the Variable Registry-Level Fee set forth in Section 6.3. Registry Operator shall offer registrars the option to obtain domain name registration renewals at the current price (i.e. the price in place prior to any noticed increase) for periods of one to ten years at the discretion of the registrar, but no greater than ten years.

(c) In addition, Registry Operator must have uniform pricing for renewals of domain name registrations (“Renewal Pricing”). For the purposes of determining Renewal Pricing, the price for each domain registration renewal must be identical to the price of all other domain name registration renewals in place at the time of such renewal, and such price must take into account universal application of any refunds, rebates, discounts, product tying or other programs in place at the time of renewal. The foregoing requirements of this Section 2.10(c) shall not apply for (i) purposes of determining Renewal Pricing if the registrar has provided Registry Operator with documentation that demonstrates that the applicable registrant expressly agreed in its registration agreement with registrar to higher Renewal Pricing at the time of the initial registration of the domain name following clear and conspicuous disclosure of such Renewal Pricing to such registrant, and (ii) discounted Renewal Pricing pursuant to a Qualified Marketing Program (as defined below). The parties acknowledge that the purpose of this Section 2.10(c) is to prohibit abusive and/or discriminatory Renewal Pricing practices imposed by Registry Operator without the written consent of the applicable registrant at the time of the initial registration of the domain and this Section 2.10(c) will be interpreted broadly to prohibit such practices. For purposes of this Section 2.10(c), a “Qualified Marketing Program” is a marketing program pursuant to which Registry Operator offers discounted Renewal Pricing, provided that each of the following criteria is satisfied: (i) the program and related discounts are offered for a period of time not to exceed one hundred eighty (180) calendar days (with consecutive substantially similar programs aggregated for purposes of determining the number of calendar days of the program), (ii) all ICANN accredited registrars are provided the same opportunity to qualify for such discounted Renewal Pricing; and (iii) the intent or effect of the program is not to exclude any particular class(es) of registrations (e.g., registrations held by large corporations) or increase the renewal price of any particular class(es) of registrations. Nothing in this Section 2.10(c) shall limit Registry Operator’s obligations pursuant to Section 2.10(b).

(d) Registry Operator shall provide public query-based DNS lookup service for the TLD (that is, operate the Registry TLD zone servers) at its sole expense.

2.11 Contractual and Operational Compliance Audits.
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(a) ICANN may from time to time (not to exceed twice per calendar year) conduct, or engage a third party to conduct, contractual compliance audits to assess compliance by Registry Operator with its representations and warranties contained in Article 1 of this Agreement and its covenants contained in Article 2 of this Agreement. Such audits shall be tailored to achieve the purpose of assessing compliance, and ICANN will (a) give reasonable advance notice of any such audit, which notice shall specify in reasonable detail the categories of documents, data and other information requested by ICANN, and (b) use commercially reasonable efforts to conduct such audit in such a manner as to not unreasonably disrupt the operations of Registry Operator. As part of such audit and upon request by ICANN, Registry Operator shall timely provide all responsive documents, data and any other information necessary to demonstrate Registry Operator’s compliance with this Agreement. Upon no less than five (5) business days notice (unless otherwise agreed to by Registry Operator), ICANN may, as part of any contractual compliance audit, conduct site visits during regular business hours to assess compliance by Registry Operator with its representations and warranties contained in Article 1 of this Agreement and its covenants contained in Article 2 of this Agreement.

(b) Any audit conducted pursuant to Section 2.11(a) will be at ICANN’s expense, unless (i) Registry Operator (A) controls, is controlled by, is under common control or is otherwise Affiliated with, any ICANN accredited registrar or registrar reseller or any of their respective Affiliates, or (B) has subcontracted the provision of Registry Services to an ICANN accredited registrar or registrar reseller or any of their respective Affiliates, and, in either case of (A) or (B) above, the audit relates to Registry Operator’s compliance with Section 2.14, in which case Registry Operator shall reimburse ICANN for all reasonable costs and expenses associated with the portion of the audit related to Registry Operator’s compliance with Section 2.14, or (ii) the audit is related to a discrepancy in the fees paid by Registry Operator hereunder in excess of 5% to ICANN’s detriment, in which case Registry Operator shall reimburse ICANN for all reasonable costs and expenses associated with the entirety of such audit. In either such case of (i) or (ii) above, such reimbursement will be paid together with the next Registry-Level Fee payment due following the date of transmittal of the cost statement for such audit.

(c) Notwithstanding Section 2.11(a), if Registry Operator is found not to be in compliance with its representations and warranties contained in Article 1 of this Agreement or its covenants contained in Article 2 of this Agreement in two consecutive audits conducted pursuant to this Section 2.11, ICANN may increase the number of such audits to one per calendar quarter.

(d) Registry Operator will give ICANN immediate notice of the commencement of any of the proceedings referenced in Section 4.3(d) or the occurrence of any of the matters specified in Section 4.3(f).

2.12 Continued Operations Instrument. Registry Operator shall comply with the terms and conditions relating to the Continued Operations Instrument set forth in the specification at [see specification 8].

2.13 Emergency Transition. Registry Operator agrees that in the event that any of the registry functions set forth in Section 6 of Specification 10 fails for a period longer than the emergency threshold for such function set forth in Section 6 of Specification 10, ICANN may designate an emergency interim registry operator of the registry for the TLD (an “Emergency Operator”) in accordance with ICANN's registry transition process (available at ____________) (as the same may be amended from time to time, the “Registry Transition Process”) until such time as Registry Operator has demonstrated to ICANN’s reasonable satisfaction that it can resume operation of the registry for the TLD without the reoccurrence of such failure. Following such demonstration, Registry Operator may transition back into operation of the registry for the TLD pursuant to the procedures set out in the Registry Transition Process,
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provided that Registry Operator pays all reasonable costs incurred (i) by ICANN as a result of the designation of the Emergency Operator and (ii) by the Emergency Operator in connection with the operation of the registry for the TLD, which costs shall be documented in reasonable detail in records that shall be made available to Registry Operator. In the event ICANN designates an Emergency Operator pursuant to this Section 2.13 and the Registry Transition Process, Registry Operator shall provide ICANN or any such Emergency Operator with all data (including the data escrowed in accordance with Section 2.3) regarding operations of the registry for the TLD necessary to maintain operations and registry functions that may be reasonably requested by ICANN or such Emergency Operator. Registry Operator agrees that ICANN may make any changes it deems necessary to the IANA database for DNS and WHOIS records with respect to the TLD in the event that an Emergency Operator is designated pursuant to this Section 2.13. In addition, in the event of such failure, ICANN shall retain and may enforce its rights under the Continued Operations Instrument and Alternative Instrument, as applicable.

2.14 Registry Code of Conduct. In connection with the operation of the registry for the TLD, Registry Operator shall comply with the Registry Code of Conduct as set forth in the specification at [see specification 9].

2.15 Cooperation with Economic Studies. If ICANN initiates or commissions an economic study on the impact or functioning of new generic top-level domains on the Internet, the DNS or related matters, Registry Operator shall reasonably cooperate with such study, including by delivering to ICANN or its designee conducting such study all data reasonably necessary for the purposes of such study requested by ICANN or its designee, provided, that Registry Operator may withhold any internal analyses or evaluations prepared by Registry Operator with respect to such data. Any data delivered to ICANN or its designee pursuant to this Section 2.15 shall be fully aggregated and anonymized by ICANN or its designee prior to any disclosure of such data to any third party.

2.16 Registry Performance Specifications. Registry Performance Specifications for operation of the TLD will be as set forth in the specification at [see specification 10]*. Registry Operator shall comply with such Performance Specifications and, for a period of at least one year, shall keep technical and operational records sufficient to evidence compliance with such specifications for each calendar year during the Term.

2.17 Personal Data. Registry Operator shall (i) notify each ICANN-accredited registrar that is a party to the registry-registrar agreement for the TLD of the purposes for which data about any identified or identifiable natural person (“Personal Data”) submitted to Registry Operator by such registrar is collected and used under this Agreement or otherwise and the intended recipients (or categories of recipients) of such Personal Data, and (ii) require such registrar to obtain the consent of each registrant in the TLD for such collection and use of Personal Data. Registry Operator shall take reasonable steps to protect Personal Data collected from such registrar from loss, misuse, unauthorized disclosure, alteration or destruction. Registry Operator shall not use or authorize the use of Personal Data in a way that is incompatible with the notice provided to registrars.

2.18 [Note: For Community-Based TLDs Only] Obligations of Registry Operator to TLD Community. Registry Operator shall establish registration policies in conformity with the application submitted with respect to the TLD for: (i) naming conventions within the TLD, (ii) requirements for registration by members of the TLD community, and (iii) use of registered domain names in conformity with the stated purpose of the community-based TLD. Registry Operator shall operate the TLD in a manner that allows the TLD community to discuss and participate in the development and modification of policies and practices for the TLD. Registry Operator shall establish procedures for the enforcement of registration policies for the TLD, and resolution of disputes concerning compliance with TLD registration
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policies, and shall enforce such registration policies. Registry Operator agrees to implement and be bound by the Registry Restrictions Dispute Resolution Procedure as set forth at [insert applicable URL] with respect to disputes arising pursuant to this Section 2.18.]

ARTICLE 3.

COVENANTS OF ICANN

ICANN covenants and agrees with Registry Operator as follows:

3.1 Open and Transparent. Consistent with ICANN’s expressed mission and core values, ICANN shall operate in an open and transparent manner.

3.2 Equitable Treatment. ICANN shall not apply standards, policies, procedures or practices arbitrarily, unjustifiably, or inequitably and shall not single out Registry Operator for disparate treatment unless justified by substantial and reasonable cause.

3.3 TLD Nameservers. ICANN will use commercially reasonable efforts to ensure that any changes to the TLD nameserver designations submitted to ICANN by Registry Operator (in a format and with required technical elements specified by ICANN at http://www.iana.org/domains/root/ will be implemented by ICANN within seven (7) calendar days or as promptly as feasible following technical verifications.

3.4 Root-zone Information Publication. ICANN’s publication of root-zone contact information for the TLD will include Registry Operator and its administrative and technical contacts. Any request to modify the contact information for the Registry Operator must be made in the format specified from time to time by ICANN at http://www.iana.org/domains/root/.

3.5 Authoritative Root Database. To the extent that ICANN is authorized to set policy with regard to an authoritative root server system, ICANN shall use commercially reasonable efforts to (a) ensure that the authoritative root will point to the top-level domain nameservers designated by Registry Operator for the TLD, (b) maintain a stable, secure, and authoritative publicly available database of relevant information about the TLD, in accordance with ICANN publicly available policies and procedures, and (c) coordinate the Authoritative Root Server System so that it is operated and maintained in a stable and secure manner; provided, that ICANN shall not be in breach of this Agreement and ICANN shall have no liability in the event that any third party (including any governmental entity or internet service provider) blocks or restricts access to the TLD in any jurisdiction.

ARTICLE 4.

TERM AND TERMINATION

4.1 Term. The term of this Agreement will be ten years from the Effective Date (as such term may be extended pursuant to Section 4.2, the “Term”).

4.2 Renewal.

(a) This Agreement will be renewed for successive periods of ten years upon the expiration of the initial Term set forth in Section 4.1 and each successive Term, unless:
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(i) Following notice by ICANN to Registry Operator of a fundamental and material breach of Registry Operator’s covenants set forth in Article 2 or breach of its payment obligations under Article 6 of this Agreement, which notice shall include with specificity the details of the alleged breach, and such breach has not been cured within thirty (30) calendar days of such notice, (A) an arbitrator or court has finally determined that Registry Operator has been in fundamental and material breach of such covenant(s) or in breach of its payment obligations, and (B) Registry Operator has failed to comply with such determination and cure such breach within ten (10) calendar days or such other time period as may be determined by the arbitrator or court; or

(ii) During the then current Term, Registry Operator shall have been found by an arbitrator (pursuant to Section 5.2 of this Agreement) on at least three (3) separate occasions to have been in fundamental and material breach (whether or not cured) of Registry Operator’s covenants set forth in Article 2 or breach of its payment obligations under Article 6 of this Agreement.

(b) Upon the occurrence of the events set forth in Section 4.2(a) (i) or (ii), the Agreement shall terminate at the expiration of the then current Term.

4.3 Termination by ICANN.

(a) ICANN may, upon notice to Registry Operator, terminate this Agreement if: (i) Registry Operator fails to cure (A) any fundamental and material breach of Registry Operator’s representations and warranties set forth in Article 1 or covenants set forth in Article 2, or (B) any breach of Registry Operator’s payment obligations set forth in Article 6 of this Agreement, each within thirty (30) calendar days after ICANN gives Registry Operator notice of such breach, which notice will include with specificity the details of the alleged breach, (ii) an arbitrator or court has finally determined that Registry Operator is in fundamental and material breach of such covenant(s) or in breach of its payment obligations, and (iii) Registry Operator fails to comply with such determination and cure such breach within ten (10) calendar days or such other time period as may be determined by the arbitrator or court.

(b) ICANN may, upon notice to Registry Operator, terminate this Agreement if Registry Operator fails to complete all testing and procedures (identified by ICANN in writing to Registry Operator prior to the date hereof) for delegation of the TLD into the root zone within twelve (12) months of the Effective Date. Registry Operator may request an extension for up to additional twelve (12) months for delegation if it can demonstrate, to ICANN’s reasonable satisfaction, that Registry Operator is working diligently and in good faith toward successfully completing the steps necessary for delegation of the TLD. Any fees paid by Registry Operator to ICANN prior to such termination date shall be retained by ICANN in full.

(c) ICANN may, upon notice to Registry Operator, terminate this Agreement if (i) Registry Operator fails to cure a material breach of Registry Operator’s obligations set forth in Section 2.12 of this Agreement within thirty (30) calendar days of delivery of notice of such breach by ICANN, or if the Continued Operations Instrument is not in effect for greater than sixty (60) consecutive calendar days at any time following the Effective Date, (ii) an arbitrator or court has finally determined that Registry Operator is in material breach of such covenant, and (iii) Registry Operator fails to cure such breach within ten (10) calendar days or such other time period as may be determined by the arbitrator or court.
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(d) ICANN may, upon notice to Registry Operator, terminate this Agreement if (i) Registry Operator makes an assignment for the benefit of creditors or similar act, (ii) attachment, garnishment or similar proceedings are commenced against Registry Operator, which proceedings are a material threat to Registry Operator’s ability to operate the registry for the TLD, and are not dismissed within sixty (60) days of their commencement, (iii) a trustee, receiver, liquidator or equivalent is appointed in place of Registry Operator or maintains control over any of Registry Operator’s property, (iv) execution is levied upon any property of Registry Operator, (v) proceedings are instituted by or against Registry Operator under any bankruptcy, insolvency, reorganization or other laws relating to the relief of debtors and such proceedings are not dismissed within thirty (30) days of their commencement, or (vi) Registry Operator files for protection under the United States Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. Section 101 et seq., or a foreign equivalent or liquidates, dissolves or otherwise discontinues its operations or the operation of the TLD.

(e) ICANN may, upon thirty (30) calendar days’ notice to Registry Operator, terminate this Agreement pursuant to Section 2 of Specification 7, subject to Registry Operator’s right to challenge such termination as set forth in the applicable procedure described therein.

(f) ICANN may, upon notice to Registry Operator, terminate this Agreement if (i) Registry Operator knowingly employs any officer that is convicted of a misdemeanor related to financial activities or of any felony, or is judged by a court of competent jurisdiction to have committed fraud or breach of fiduciary duty, or is the subject of a judicial determination that ICANN reasonably deems as the substantive equivalent of any of the foregoing and such officer is not terminated within thirty (30) calendar days of Registry Operator’s knowledge of the foregoing, or (ii) any member of Registry Operator’s board of directors or similar governing body is convicted of a misdemeanor related to financial activities or of any felony, or is judged by a court of competent jurisdiction to have committed fraud or breach of fiduciary duty, or is the subject of a judicial determination that ICANN reasonably deems as the substantive equivalent of any of the foregoing and such member is not removed from Registry Operator’s board of directors or similar governing body within thirty (30) calendar days of Registry Operator’s knowledge of the foregoing.

(g) [Applicable to intergovernmental organizations or governmental entities only.] ICANN may terminate this Agreement pursuant to Section 7.14.

4.4 Termination by Registry Operator.

(a) Registry Operator may terminate this Agreement upon notice to ICANN if, (i) ICANN fails to cure any fundamental and material breach of ICANN’s covenants set forth in Article 3, within thirty (30) calendar days after Registry Operator gives ICANN notice of such breach, which notice will include with specificity the details of the alleged breach, (ii) an arbitrator or court has finally determined that ICANN is in fundamental and material breach of such covenants, and (iii) ICANN fails to comply with such determination and cure such breach within ten (10) calendar days or such other time period as may be determined by the arbitrator or court.

(b) Registry Operator may terminate this Agreement for any reason upon one hundred eighty (180) calendar day advance notice to ICANN.

4.5 Transition of Registry upon Termination of Agreement. Upon expiration of the Term pursuant to Section 4.1 or Section 4.2 or any termination of this Agreement pursuant to Section 4.3 or Section 4.4, Registry Operator shall provide ICANN or any successor registry operator that may be designated by ICANN for the TLD in accordance with this Section 4.5 with all data (including the data
escrowed in accordance with Section 2.3) regarding operations of the registry for the TLD necessary to maintain operations and registry functions that may be reasonably requested by ICANN or such successor registry operator. After consultation with Registry Operator, ICANN shall determine whether or not to transition operation of the TLD to a successor registry operator in its sole discretion and in conformance with the Registry Transition Process; provided, however, that if Registry Operator demonstrates to ICANN’s reasonable satisfaction that (i) all domain name registrations in the TLD are registered to, and maintained by, Registry Operator for its own exclusive use, (ii) Registry Operator does not sell, distribute or transfer control or use of any registrations in the TLD to any third party that is not an Affiliate of Registry Operator, and (iii) transitioning operation of the TLD is not necessary to protect the public interest, then ICANN may not transition operation of the TLD to a successor registry operator upon the expiration or termination of this Agreement without the consent of Registry Operator (which shall not be unreasonably withheld, conditioned or delayed). For the avoidance of doubt, the foregoing sentence shall not prohibit ICANN from delegating the TLD pursuant to a future application process for the delegation of top-level domains, subject to any processes and objection procedures instituted by ICANN in connection with such application process intended to protect the rights of third parties. Registry Operator agrees that ICANN may make any changes it deems necessary to the IANA database for DNS and WHOIS records with respect to the TLD in the event of a transition of the TLD pursuant to this Section 4.5. In addition, ICANN or its designee shall retain and may enforce its rights under the Continued Operations Instrument and Alternative Instrument, as applicable, regardless of the reason for termination or expiration of this Agreement.

[Alternative Section 4.5 Transition of Registry upon Termination of Agreement text for intergovernmental organizations or governmental entities or other special circumstances:

“Transition of Registry upon Termination of Agreement. Upon expiration of the Term pursuant to Section 4.1 or Section 4.2 or any termination of this Agreement pursuant to Section 4.3 or Section 4.4, in connection with ICANN’s designation of a successor registry operator for the TLD, Registry Operator and ICANN agree to consult each other and work cooperatively to facilitate and implement the transition of the TLD in accordance with this Section 4.5. After consultation with Registry Operator, ICANN shall determine whether or not to transition operation of the TLD to a successor registry operator in its sole discretion and in conformance with the Registry Transition Process. In the event ICANN determines to transition operation of the TLD to a successor registry operator, upon Registry Operator’s consent (which shall not be unreasonably withheld, conditioned or delayed), Registry Operator shall provide ICANN or such successor registry operator for the TLD with any data regarding operations of the TLD necessary to maintain operations and registry functions that may be reasonably requested by ICANN or such successor registry operator in addition to data escrowed in accordance with Section 2.3 hereof. In the event that Registry Operator does not consent to provide such data, any registry data related to the TLD shall be returned to Registry Operator, unless otherwise agreed upon by the parties. Registry Operator agrees that ICANN may make any changes it deems necessary to the IANA database for DNS and WHOIS records with respect to the TLD in the event of a transition of the TLD pursuant to this Section 4.5. In addition, ICANN or its designee shall retain and may enforce its rights under the Continued Operations Instrument and Alternative Instrument, as applicable, regardless of the reason for termination or expiration of this Agreement.”]

**4.6 Effect of Termination.** Upon any expiration of the Term or termination of this Agreement, the obligations and rights of the parties hereto shall cease, provided that such expiration or termination of this Agreement shall not relieve the parties of any obligation or breach of this Agreement accruing prior to such expiration or termination, including, without limitation, all accrued payment obligations arising under Article 6. In addition, Article 5, Article 7, Section 2.12, Section 4.5, and this
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Section 4.6 shall survive the expiration or termination of this Agreement. For the avoidance of doubt, the rights of Registry Operator to operate the registry for the TLD shall immediately cease upon any expiration of the Term or termination of this Agreement.

**ARTICLE 5.**

**DISPUTE RESOLUTION**

5.1 **Cooperative Engagement.** Before either party may initiate arbitration pursuant to Section 5.2 below, ICANN and Registry Operator, following initiation of communications by either party, must attempt to resolve the dispute by engaging in good faith discussion over a period of at least fifteen (15) calendar days.

5.2 **Arbitration.** Disputes arising under or in connection with this Agreement, including requests for specific performance, will be resolved through binding arbitration conducted pursuant to the rules of the International Court of Arbitration of the International Chamber of Commerce. The arbitration will be conducted in the English language and will occur in Los Angeles County, California. Any arbitration will be in front of a single arbitrator, unless (i) ICANN is seeking punitive or exemplary damages, or operational sanctions, or (ii) the parties agree in writing to a greater number of arbitrators. In either case of clauses (i) or (ii) in the preceding sentence, the arbitration will be in front of three arbitrators with each party selecting one arbitrator and the two selected arbitrators selecting the third arbitrator. In order to expedite the arbitration and limit its cost, the arbitrator(s) shall establish page limits for the parties’ filings in conjunction with the arbitration, and should the arbitrator(s) determine that a hearing is necessary, the hearing shall be limited to one (1) calendar day, provided that in any arbitration in which ICANN is seeking punitive or exemplary damages, or operational sanctions, the hearing may be extended for one (1) additional calendar day if agreed upon by the parties or ordered by the arbitrator(s) based on the arbitrator(s) independent determination or the reasonable request of one of the parties thereto. The prevailing party in the arbitration will have the right to recover its costs and reasonable attorneys’ fees, which the arbitrator(s) shall include in the awards. In the event the arbitrators determine that Registry Operator has been repeatedly and willfully in fundamental and material breach of its obligations set forth in Article 2, Article 6 or Section 5.4 of this Agreement, ICANN may request the arbitrators award punitive or exemplary damages, or operational sanctions (including without limitation an order temporarily restricting Registry Operator’s right to sell new registrations). In any litigation involving ICANN concerning this Agreement, jurisdiction and exclusive venue for such litigation will be in a court located in Los Angeles County, California; however, the parties will also have the right to enforce a judgment of such a court in any court of competent jurisdiction.

[Alternative Section 5.2 Arbitration text for intergovernmental organizations or governmental entities or other special circumstances:

“**Arbitration.** Disputes arising under or in connection with this Agreement, including requests for specific performance, will be resolved through binding arbitration conducted pursuant to the rules of the International Court of Arbitration of the International Chamber of Commerce. The arbitration will be conducted in the English language and will occur in Geneva, Switzerland, unless another location is mutually agreed upon by Registry Operator and ICANN. Any arbitration will be in front of a single arbitrator, unless (i) ICANN is seeking punitive or exemplary damages, or operational sanctions, or (ii) the parties agree in writing to a greater number of arbitrators. In either case of clauses (i) or (ii) in the preceding sentence, the arbitration will be in front of three arbitrators with each party selecting one arbitrator and the two selected arbitrators selecting the third arbitrator. In order to expedite the arbitration and limit its cost, the arbitrator(s) shall establish page limits for the parties’ filings in conjunction with the arbitration.”]
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arbitration, and should the arbitrator(s) determine that a hearing is necessary, the hearing shall be limited to one (1) calendar day, provided that in any arbitration in which ICANN is seeking punitive or exemplary damages, or operational sanctions, the hearing may be extended for one (1) additional calendar day if agreed upon by the parties or ordered by the arbitrator(s) based on the arbitrator(s) independent determination or the reasonable request of one of the parties thereto. The prevailing party in the arbitration will have the right to recover its costs and reasonable attorneys’ fees, which the arbitrator(s) shall include in the awards. In the event the arbitrators determine that Registry Operator has been repeatedly and willfully in fundamental and material breach of its obligations set forth in Article 2, Article 6 or Section 5.4 of this Agreement, ICANN may request the arbitrators award punitive or exemplary damages, or operational sanctions (including without limitation an order temporarily restricting Registry Operator’s right to sell new registrations). In any litigation involving ICANN concerning this Agreement, jurisdiction and exclusive venue for such litigation will be in a court located in Geneva, Switzerland, unless an another location is mutually agreed upon by Registry Operator and ICANN; however, the parties will also have the right to enforce a judgment of such a court in any court of competent jurisdiction.”]

5.3 Limitation of Liability. ICANN’s aggregate monetary liability for violations of this Agreement will not exceed an amount equal to the Registry-Level Fees paid by Registry Operator to ICANN within the preceding twelve-month period pursuant to this Agreement (excluding the Variable Registry-Level Fee set forth in Section 6.3, if any). Registry Operator’s aggregate monetary liability to ICANN for breaches of this Agreement will be limited to an amount equal to the fees paid to ICANN during the preceding twelve-month period (excluding the Variable Registry-Level Fee set forth in Section 6.3, if any), and punitive and exemplary damages, if any, awarded in accordance with Section 5.2. In no event shall either party be liable for special, punitive, exemplary or consequential damages arising out of or in connection with this Agreement or the performance or nonperformance of obligations undertaken in this Agreement, except as provided in Section 5.2. Except as otherwise provided in this Agreement, neither party makes any warranty, express or implied, with respect to the services rendered by itself, its servants or agents, or the results obtained from their work, including, without limitation, any implied warranty of merchantability, non-infringement or fitness for a particular purpose.

5.4 Specific Performance. Registry Operator and ICANN agree that irreparable damage could occur if any of the provisions of this Agreement was not performed in accordance with its specific terms. Accordingly, the parties agree that they each shall be entitled to seek from the arbitrator specific performance of the terms of this Agreement (in addition to any other remedy to which each party is entitled).

ARTICLE 6.

FEES

6.1 Registry-Level Fees. Registry Operator shall pay ICANN a Registry-Level Fee equal to (i) the Registry Fixed Fee of US$6,250 per calendar quarter and (ii) the Registry-Level Transaction Fee. The Registry-Level Transaction Fee will be equal to the number of annual increments of an initial or renewal domain name registration (at one or more levels, and including renewals associated with transfers from one ICANN-accredited registrar to another, each a “Transaction”), during the applicable calendar quarter multiplied by US$0.25; provided, however that the Registry-Level Transaction Fee shall not apply until and unless more than 50,000 Transactions have occurred in the TLD during any calendar quarter or any four calendar quarter period (the “Transaction Threshold”) and shall apply to each Transaction that occurred during each quarter in which the Transaction Threshold has been met, but shall not apply to each quarter in which the Transaction Threshold has not been met. Registry Operator shall pay the Registry-
Level Fees on a quarterly basis by the 20th day following the end of each calendar quarter (i.e., on April 20, July 20, October 20 and January 20 for the calendar quarters ending March 31, June 30, September 30 and December 31) of the year to an account designated by ICANN.

6.2 Cost Recovery for RSTEP. Requests by Registry Operator for the approval of Additional Services pursuant to Section 2.1 may be referred by ICANN to the Registry Services Technical Evaluation Panel ("RSTEP") pursuant to that process at http://www.icann.org/en/registries/rsep/. In the event that such requests are referred to RSTEP, Registry Operator shall remit to ICANN the invoiced cost of the RSTEP review within ten (10) business days of receipt of a copy of the RSTEP invoice from ICANN, unless ICANN determines, in its sole and absolute discretion, to pay all or any portion of the invoiced cost of such RSTEP review.

6.3 Variable Registry-Level Fee.

(a) If the ICANN accredited registrars (as a group) do not approve pursuant to the terms of their registrar accreditation agreements with ICANN the variable accreditation fees established by the ICANN Board of Directors for any ICANN fiscal year, upon delivery of notice from ICANN, Registry Operator shall pay to ICANN a Variable Registry-Level Fee, which shall be paid on a fiscal quarter basis, and shall accrue as of the beginning of the first fiscal quarter of such ICANN fiscal year. The fee will be calculated and invoiced by ICANN on a quarterly basis, and shall be paid by Registry Operator within sixty (60) calendar days with respect to the first quarter of such ICANN fiscal year and within twenty (20) calendar days with respect to each remaining quarter of such ICANN fiscal year, of receipt of the invoiced amount by ICANN. The Registry Operator may invoice and collect the Variable Registry-Level Fees from the registrars who are party to a registry-registrar agreement with Registry Operator (which agreement may specifically provide for the reimbursement of Variable Registry-Level Fees paid by Registry Operator pursuant to this Section 6.3); provided, that the fees shall be invoiced to all ICANN accredited registrars if invoiced to any. The Variable Registry-Level Fee, if collectible by ICANN, shall be an obligation of Registry Operator and shall be due and payable as provided in this Section 6.3 irrespective of Registry Operator’s ability to seek and obtain reimbursement of such fee from registrars. In the event ICANN later collects variable accreditation fees for which Registry Operator has paid ICANN a Variable Registry-Level Fee, ICANN shall reimburse the Registry Operator an appropriate amount of the Variable Registry-Level Fee, as reasonably determined by ICANN. If the ICANN accredited registrars (as a group) do approve pursuant to the terms of their registrar accreditation agreements with ICANN the variable accreditation fees established by the ICANN Board of Directors for a fiscal year, ICANN shall not be entitled to a Variable-Level Fee hereunder for such fiscal year, irrespective of whether the ICANN accredited registrars comply with their payment obligations to ICANN during such fiscal year.

(b) The amount of the Variable Registry-Level Fee will be specified for each registrar, and may include both a per-registrar component and a transactional component. The per-registrar component of the Variable Registry-Level Fee shall be specified by ICANN in accordance with the budget adopted by the ICANN Board of Directors for each ICANN fiscal year. The transactional component of the Variable Registry-Level Fee shall be specified by ICANN in accordance with the budget adopted by the ICANN Board of Directors for each ICANN fiscal year but shall not exceed US$0.25 per domain name registration (including renewals associated with transfers from one ICANN-accredited registrar to another) per year.

6.4 Adjustments to Fees. Notwithstanding any of the fee limitations set forth in this Article 6, commencing upon the expiration of the first year of this Agreement, and upon the expiration of each year thereafter during the Term, the then current fees set forth in Section 6.1 and Section 6.3 may be
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adjusted, at ICANN’s discretion, by a percentage equal to the percentage change, if any, in (i) the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers, U.S. City Average (1982-1984 = 100) published by the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, or any successor index (the “CPI”) for the month which is one (1) month prior to the commencement of the applicable year, over (ii) the CPI published for the month which is one (1) month prior to the commencement of the immediately prior year. In the event of any such increase, ICANN shall provide notice to Registry Operator specifying the amount of such adjustment. Any fee adjustment under this Section 6.4 shall be effective as of the first day of the year in which the above calculation is made.

6.5 Additional Fee on Late Payments. For any payments thirty (30) calendar days or more overdue under this Agreement, Registry Operator shall pay an additional fee on late payments at the rate of 1.5% per month or, if less, the maximum rate permitted by applicable law.

ARTICLE 7.
MISCELLANEOUS

7.1 Indemnification of ICANN.

(a) Registry Operator shall indemnify and defend ICANN and its directors, officers, employees, and agents (collectively, “Indemnitees”) from and against any and all third-party claims, damages, liabilities, costs, and expenses, including reasonable legal fees and expenses, arising out of or relating to intellectual property ownership rights with respect to the TLD, the delegation of the TLD to Registry Operator, Registry Operator’s operation of the registry for the TLD or Registry Operator’s provision of Registry Services, provided that Registry Operator shall not be obligated to indemnify or defend any Indemnitee to the extent the claim, damage, liability, cost or expense arose: (i) due to the actions or omissions of ICANN, its subcontractors, panelists or evaluators specifically related to and occurring during the registry TLD application process (other than actions or omissions requested by or for the benefit of Registry Operator), or (ii) due to a breach by ICANN of any obligation contained in this Agreement or any willful misconduct by ICANN. This Section shall not be deemed to require Registry Operator to reimburse or otherwise indemnify ICANN for costs associated with the negotiation or execution of this Agreement, or with monitoring or management of the parties’ respective obligations hereunder. Further, this Section shall not apply to any request for attorney’s fees in connection with any litigation or arbitration between or among the parties, which shall be governed by Article 5 or otherwise awarded by a court or arbitrator.

[Alternative Section 7.1(a) text for intergovernmental organizations or governmental entities:

“Registry Operator shall use its best efforts to cooperate with ICANN in order to ensure that ICANN does not incur any costs associated with claims, damages, liabilities, costs and expenses, including reasonable legal fees and expenses, arising out of or relating to intellectual property ownership rights with respect to the TLD, the delegation of the TLD to Registry Operator, Registry Operator’s operation of the registry for the TLD or Registry Operator’s provision of Registry Services, provided that Registry Operator shall not be obligated to provide such cooperation to the extent the claim, damage, liability, cost or expense arose due to a breach by ICANN of any of its obligations contained in this Agreement or any willful misconduct by ICANN. This Section shall not be deemed to require Registry Operator to reimburse or otherwise indemnify ICANN for costs associated with the negotiation or execution of this Agreement, or with monitoring or management of the parties’ respective obligations hereunder. Further, this Section shall not apply to any request for attorney’s fees in connection with any
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litigation or arbitration between or among the parties, which shall be governed by Article 5 or otherwise awarded by a court or arbitrator.”

(b) For any claims by ICANN for indemnification whereby multiple registry operators (including Registry Operator) have engaged in the same actions or omissions that gave rise to the claim, Registry Operator’s aggregate liability to indemnify ICANN with respect to such claim shall be limited to a percentage of ICANN’s total claim, calculated by dividing the number of total domain names under registration with Registry Operator within the TLD (which names under registration shall be calculated consistently with Article 6 hereof for any applicable quarter) by the total number of domain names under registration within all top level domains for which the registry operators thereof are engaging in the same acts or omissions giving rise to such claim. For the purposes of reducing Registry Operator’s liability under Section 7.1(a) pursuant to this Section 7.1(b), Registry Operator shall have the burden of identifying the other registry operators that are engaged in the same actions or omissions that gave rise to the claim, and demonstrating, to ICANN’s reasonable satisfaction, such other registry operators’ culpability for such actions or omissions. For the avoidance of doubt, in the event that a registry operator is engaged in the same acts or omissions giving rise to the claims, but such registry operator(s) do not have the same or similar indemnification obligations to ICANN as set forth in Section 7.1(a) above, the number of domains under management by such registry operator(s) shall nonetheless be included in the calculation in the preceding sentence. [Note: This Section 7.1(b) is inapplicable to intergovernmental organizations or governmental entities.]

7.2 Indemnification Procedures. If any third-party claim is commenced that is indemnified under Section 7.1 above, ICANN shall provide notice thereof to Registry Operator as promptly as practicable. Registry Operator shall be entitled, if it so elects, in a notice promptly delivered to ICANN, to immediately take control of the defense and investigation of such claim and to employ and engage attorneys reasonably acceptable to ICANN to handle and defend the same, at Registry Operator’s sole cost and expense, provided that in all events ICANN will be entitled to control at its sole cost and expense the litigation of issues concerning the validity or interpretation of ICANN’s policies, Bylaws or conduct. ICANN shall cooperate, at Registry Operator’s cost and expense, in all reasonable respects with Registry Operator and its attorneys in the investigation, trial, and defense of such claim and any appeal arising therefrom, and may, at its own cost and expense, participate, through its attorneys or otherwise, in such investigation, trial and defense of such claim and any appeal arising therefrom. No settlement of a claim that involves a remedy affecting ICANN other than the payment of money in an amount that is fully indemnified by Registry Operator will be entered into without the consent of ICANN. If Registry Operator does not assume full control over the defense of a claim subject to such defense in accordance with this Section 7.2, ICANN will have the right to defend the claim in such manner as it may deem appropriate, at the cost and expense of Registry Operator and Registry Operator shall cooperate in such defense. [Note: This Section 7.2 is inapplicable to intergovernmental organizations or governmental entities.]

7.3 Defined Terms. For purposes of this Agreement, unless such definitions are amended pursuant to a Consensus Policy at a future date, in which case the following definitions shall be deemed amended and restated in their entirety as set forth in such Consensus Policy, Security and Stability shall be defined as follows:

(a) For the purposes of this Agreement, an effect on “Security” shall mean (1) the unauthorized disclosure, alteration, insertion or destruction of registry data, or (2) the unauthorized access to or disclosure of information or resources on the Internet by systems operating in accordance with all applicable standards.
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For purposes of this Agreement, an effect on “Stability” shall refer to (1) lack of compliance with applicable relevant standards that are authoritative and published by a well-established and recognized Internet standards body, such as the relevant Standards-Track or Best Current Practice Requests for Comments (“RFCs”) sponsored by the Internet Engineering Task Force; or (2) the creation of a condition that adversely affects the throughput, response time, consistency or coherence of responses to Internet servers or end systems operating in accordance with applicable relevant standards that are authoritative and published by a well-established and recognized Internet standards body, such as the relevant Standards-Track or Best Current Practice RFCs, and relying on Registry Operator's delegated information or provisioning of services.

7.4 No Offset. All payments due under this Agreement will be made in a timely manner throughout the Term and notwithstanding the pendency of any dispute (monetary or otherwise) between Registry Operator and ICANN.

7.5 Change in Control; Assignment and Subcontracting. Neither party may assign this Agreement without the prior written approval of the other party, which approval will not be unreasonably withheld. Notwithstanding the foregoing, ICANN may assign this Agreement in conjunction with a reorganization or re-incorporation of ICANN to another nonprofit corporation or similar entity organized in the same legal jurisdiction in which ICANN is currently organized for the same or substantially the same purposes. For purposes of this Section 7.5, a direct or indirect change of control of Registry Operator or any material subcontracting arrangement with respect to the operation of the registry for the TLD shall be deemed an assignment. ICANN shall be deemed to have reasonably withheld its consent to any such direct or indirect change of control or subcontracting arrangement in the event that ICANN reasonably determines that the person or entity acquiring control of Registry Operator or entering into such subcontracting arrangement (or the ultimate parent entity of such acquiring or subcontracting entity) does not meet the ICANN-adopted registry operator criteria or qualifications then in effect. In addition, without limiting the foregoing, Registry Operator must provide no less than thirty (30) calendar days advance notice to ICANN of any material subcontracting arrangements, and any agreement to subcontract portions of the operations of the TLD must mandate compliance with all covenants, obligations and agreements by Registry Operator hereunder, and Registry Operator shall continue to be bound by such covenants, obligations and agreements. Without limiting the foregoing, Registry Operator must also provide no less than thirty (30) calendar days advance notice to ICANN prior to the consummation of any transaction anticipated to result in a direct or indirect change of control of Registry Operator. Such change of control notification shall include a statement that affirms that the ultimate parent entity of the party acquiring such control meets the ICANN-adopted specification or policy on registry operator criteria then in effect, and affirms that Registry Operator is in compliance with its obligations under this Agreement. Within thirty (30) calendar days of such notification, ICANN may request additional information from Registry Operator establishing compliance with this Agreement, in which case Registry Operator must supply the requested information within fifteen (15) calendar days. If ICANN fails to expressly provide or withhold its consent to any direct or indirect change of control of Registry Operator or any material subcontracting arrangement within thirty (30) (or, if ICANN has requested additional information from Registry Operator as set forth above, sixty (60)) calendar days of the receipt of written notice of such transaction from Registry Operator, ICANN shall be deemed to have consented to such transaction. In connection with any such transaction, Registry Operator shall comply with the Registry Transition Process.

7.6 Amendments and Waivers.

(a) If ICANN determines that an amendment to this Agreement (including to the Specifications referred to herein) and all other registry agreements between ICANN and the Applicable
Registry Operators (the “Applicable Registry Agreements”) is desirable (each, a “Special Amendment”), ICANN may submit a Special Amendment for approval by the Applicable Registry Operators pursuant to the process set forth in this Section 7.6, provided that a Special Amendment is not a Restricted Amendment (as defined below). Prior to submitting a Special Amendment for such approval, ICANN shall first consult in good faith with the Working Group (as defined below) regarding the form and substance of a Special Amendment. The duration of such consultation shall be reasonably determined by ICANN based on the substance of the Special Amendment. Following such consultation, ICANN may propose the adoption of a Special Amendment by publicly posting such amendment on its website for no less than thirty (30) calendar days (the “Posting Period”) and providing notice of such amendment by ICANN to the Applicable Registry Operators in accordance with Section 7.8. ICANN will consider the public comments submitted on a Special Amendment during the Posting Period (including comments submitted by the Applicable Registry Operators).

(b) If, within two (2) calendar years of the expiration of the Posting Period (the “Approval Period”), (i) the ICANN Board of Directors approves a Special Amendment (which may be in a form different than submitted for public comment) and (ii) such Special Amendment receives Registry Operator Approval (as defined below), such Special Amendment shall be deemed approved (an “Approved Amendment”) by the Applicable Registry Operators (the last date on which such approvals are obtained is herein referred to as the “Amendment Approval Date”) and shall be effective and deemed an amendment to this Agreement upon sixty (60) calendar days notice from ICANN to Registry Operator (the “Amendment Effective Date”). In the event that a Special Amendment is not approved by the ICANN Board of Directors or does not receive Registry Operator Approval within the Approval Period, the Special Amendment will have no effect. The procedure used by ICANN to obtain Registry Operator Approval shall be designed to document the written approval of the Applicable Registry Operators, which may be in electronic form.

(c) During the thirty (30) calendar day period following the Amendment Approval Date, Registry Operator (so long as it did not vote in favor of the Approved Amendment) may apply in writing to ICANN for an exemption from the Approved Amendment (each such request submitted by Registry Operator hereunder, an “Exemption Request”). Each Exemption Request will set forth the basis for such request and provide detailed support for an exemption from the Approved Amendment. An Exemption Request may also include a detailed description and support for any alternatives to, or a variation of, the Approved Amendment proposed by such Registry Operator. An Exemption Request may only be granted upon a clear and convincing showing by Registry Operator that compliance with the Approved Amendment conflicts with applicable laws or would have a material adverse effect on the long-term financial condition or results of operations of Registry Operator. No Exemption Request will be granted if ICANN determines, in its reasonable discretion, that granting such Exemption Request would be materially harmful to registrants or result in the denial of a direct benefit to registrants. Within ninety (90) calendar days of ICANN’s receipt of an Exemption Request, ICANN shall either approve (which approval may be conditioned or consist of alternatives to or a variation of the Approved Amendment) or deny the Exemption Request in writing, during which time the Approved Amendment will not amend this Agreement; provided, that any such conditions, alternatives or variations shall be effective and, to the extent applicable, will amend this Agreement as of the Amendment Effective Date. If the Exemption Request is approved by ICANN, the Approved Amendment will not amend this Agreement. If such Exemption Request is denied by ICANN, the Approved Amendment will amend this Agreement as of the Amendment Effective Date (or, if such date has passed, such Approved Amendment shall be deemed effective immediately on the date of such denial), provided that Registry Operator may, within thirty (30) calendar days following receipt of ICANN’s determination, appeal ICANN’s decision to deny the Exemption Request pursuant to the dispute resolution procedures set forth in Article 5. The Approved
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Amendment will be deemed not to have amended this Agreement during the pendency of the dispute resolution process. For avoidance of doubt, only Exemption Requests submitted by Registry Operator that are approved by ICANN pursuant to this Section 7.6(c) or through an arbitration decision pursuant to Article 5 shall exempt Registry Operator from any Approved Amendment, and no exemption request granted to any other Applicable Registry Operator (whether by ICANN or through arbitration) shall have any effect under this Agreement or exempt Registry Operator from any Approved Amendment.

(d) Except as set forth in this Section 7.6, no amendment, supplement or modification of this Agreement or any provision hereof shall be binding unless executed in writing by both parties, and nothing in this Section 7.6 shall restrict ICANN and Registry Operator from entering into bilateral amendments and modifications to this Agreement negotiated solely between the two parties. No waiver of any provision of this Agreement shall be binding unless evidenced by a writing signed by the party waiving compliance with such provision. No waiver of any of the provisions of this Agreement or failure to enforce any of the provisions hereof shall be deemed or shall constitute a waiver of any other provision hereof, nor shall any such waiver constitute a continuing waiver unless otherwise expressly provided. For the avoidance of doubt, nothing in this Section 7.6 shall be deemed to limit Registry Operator’s obligation to comply with Section 2.2.

(e) For purposes of this Section 7.6, the following terms shall have the following meanings:

(i) “Applicable Registry Operators” means, collectively, the registry operators of the top-level domains party to a registry agreement that contains a provision similar to this Section 7.6, including Registry Operator.

(ii) “Registry Operator Approval” means the receipt of each of the following: (A) the affirmative approval of the Applicable Registry Operators whose payments to ICANN accounted for two-thirds of the total amount of fees (converted to U.S. dollars, if applicable) paid to ICANN by all the Applicable Registry Operators during the immediately previous calendar year pursuant to the Applicable Registry Agreements, and (B) the affirmative approval of a majority of the Applicable Registry Operators at the time such approval is obtained. For avoidance of doubt, with respect to clause (B), each Applicable Registry Operator shall have one vote for each top-level domain operated by such Registry Operator pursuant to an Applicable Registry Agreement.

(iii) “Restricted Amendment” means the following: (i) an amendment of Specification 1, (ii) except to the extent addressed in Section 2.10 hereof, an amendment that specifies the price charged by Registry Operator to registrars for domain name registrations, (iii) an amendment to the definition of Registry Services as set forth in the first paragraph of Section 2.1 of Specification 6, or (iv) an amendment to the length of the Term.

(iv) “Working Group” means representatives of the Applicable Registry Operators and other members of the community that ICANN appoints, from time to time, to serve as a working group to consult on amendments to the Applicable Registry Agreements (excluding bilateral amendments pursuant to Section 7.6(d)).
7.7 **No Third-Party Beneficiaries.** This Agreement will not be construed to create any obligation by either ICANN or Registry Operator to any non-party to this Agreement, including any registrar or registered name holder.

7.8 **General Notices.** Except for notices pursuant to Section 7.6, all notices to be given under or in relation to this Agreement will be given either (i) in writing at the address of the appropriate party as set forth below or (ii) via facsimile or electronic mail as provided below, unless that party has given a notice of change of postal or email address, or facsimile number, as provided in this agreement. All notices under Section 7.6 shall be given by both posting of the applicable information on ICANN’s web site and transmission of such information to Registry Operator by electronic mail. Any change in the contact information for notice below will be given by the party within thirty (30) calendar days of such change. Notices, designations, determinations, and specifications made under this Agreement will be in the English language. Other than notices under Section 7.6, any notice required by this Agreement will be deemed to have been properly given (i) if in paper form, when delivered in person or via courier service with confirmation of receipt or (ii) if via facsimile or by electronic mail, upon confirmation of receipt by the recipient’s facsimile machine or email server, provided that such notice via facsimile or electronic mail shall be followed by a copy sent by regular postal mail service within two (2) business days. Any notice required by Section 7.6 will be deemed to have been given when electronically posted on ICANN’s website and upon confirmation of receipt by the email server. In the event other means of notice become practically achievable, such as notice via a secure website, the parties will work together to implement such notice means under this Agreement.

If to ICANN, addressed to:
Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers
4676 Admiralty Way, Suite 330
Marina Del Rey, California 90292
Telephone: 1-310-823-9358
Facsimile: 1-310-823-8649
Attention: President and CEO

With a Required Copy to: General Counsel
Email: (As specified from time to time.)

If to Registry Operator, addressed to:
[________________]
[________________]
[________________]
Telephone: 
Facsimile: 
Attention:

With a Required Copy to: 
Email: (As specified from time to time.)

7.9 **Entire Agreement.** This Agreement (including those specifications and documents incorporated by reference to URL locations which form a part of it) constitutes the entire agreement of the parties hereto pertaining to the operation of the TLD and supersedes all prior agreements, understandings, negotiations and discussions, whether oral or written, between the parties on that subject.

* Final text will be posted on ICANN website; agreement reference to be replaced by hyperlink.
7.10 **English Language Controls.** Notwithstanding any translated version of this Agreement and/or specifications that may be provided to Registry Operator, the English language version of this Agreement and all referenced specifications are the official versions that bind the parties hereto. In the event of any conflict or discrepancy between any translated version of this Agreement and the English language version, the English language version controls. Notices, designations, determinations, and specifications made under this Agreement shall be in the English language.

7.11 **Ownership Rights.** Nothing contained in this Agreement shall be construed as establishing or granting to Registry Operator any property ownership rights or interests in the TLD or the letters, words, symbols or other characters making up the TLD string.

7.12 **Severability.** This Agreement shall be deemed severable; the invalidity or unenforceability of any term or provision of this Agreement shall not affect the validity or enforceability of the balance of this Agreement or of any other term hereof, which shall remain in full force and effect. If any of the provisions hereof are determined to be invalid or unenforceable, the parties shall negotiate in good faith to modify this Agreement so as to effect the original intent of the parties as closely as possible.

7.13 **Court Orders.** ICANN will respect any order from a court of competent jurisdiction, including any orders from any jurisdiction where the consent or non-objection of the government was a requirement for the delegation of the TLD. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, ICANN's implementation of any such order will not be a breach of this Agreement.

[Note: The following section is applicable to intergovernmental organizations or governmental entities only.]

7.14 **Special Provision Relating to Intergovernmental Organizations or Governmental Entities.**

(a) ICANN acknowledges that Registry Operator is an entity subject to public international law, including international treaties applicable to Registry Operator (such public international law and treaties, collectively hereinafter the “Applicable Laws”). Nothing in this Agreement and its related specifications shall be construed or interpreted to require Registry Operator to violate Applicable Laws or prevent compliance therewith. The Parties agree that Registry Operator’s compliance with Applicable Laws shall not constitute a breach of this Agreement.

(b) In the event Registry Operator reasonably determines that any provision of this Agreement and its related specifications, or any decisions or policies of ICANN referred to in this Agreement, including but not limited to Temporary Policies and Consensus Policies (such provisions, specifications and policies, collectively hereinafter, “ICANN Requirements”), may conflict with or violate Applicable Law (hereinafter, a “Potential Conflict”), Registry Operator shall provide detailed notice (a “Notice”) of such Potential Conflict to ICANN as early as possible and, in the case of a Potential Conflict with a proposed Consensus Policy, no later than the end of any public comment period on such proposed Consensus Policy. In the event Registry Operator determines that there is Potential Conflict between a proposed Applicable Law and any ICANN Requirement, Registry Operator shall provide detailed Notice of such Potential Conflict to ICANN as early as possible and, in the case of a Potential Conflict with a proposed Consensus Policy, no later than the end of any public comment period on such proposed Consensus Policy.

(c) As soon as practicable following such review, the parties shall attempt to resolve the Potential Conflict by cooperative engagement pursuant to the procedures set forth in Section 5.1.

* Final text will be posted on ICANN website; agreement reference to be replaced by hyperlink.
addition, Registry Operator shall use its best efforts to eliminate or minimize any impact arising from such Potential Conflict between Applicable Laws and any ICANN Requirement. If, following such cooperative engagement, Registry Operator determines that the Potential Conflict constitutes an actual conflict between any ICANN Requirement, on the one hand, and Applicable Laws, on the other hand, then ICANN shall waive compliance with such ICANN Requirement (provided that the parties shall negotiate in good faith on a continuous basis thereafter to mitigate or eliminate the effects of such non-compliance on ICANN), unless ICANN reasonably and objectively determines that the failure of Registry Operator to comply with such ICANN Requirement would constitute a threat to the Security and Stability of Registry Services, the Internet or the DNS (hereinafter, an “ICANN Determination”). Following receipt of notice by Registry Operator of such ICANN Determination, Registry Operator shall be afforded a period of ninety (90) calendar days to resolve such conflict with an Applicable Law. If the conflict with an Applicable Law is not resolved to ICANN’s complete satisfaction during such period, Registry Operator shall have the option to submit, within ten (10) calendar days thereafter, the matter to binding arbitration as defined in subsection (d) below. If during such period, Registry Operator does not submit the matter to arbitration pursuant to subsection (d) below, ICANN may, upon notice to Registry Operator, terminate this Agreement with immediate effect.

(d) If Registry Operator disagrees with an ICANN Determination, Registry Operator may submit the matter to binding arbitration pursuant to the provisions of Section 5.2, except that the sole issue presented to the arbitrator for determination will be whether or not ICANN reasonably and objectively reached the ICANN Determination. For the purposes of such arbitration, ICANN shall present evidence to the arbitrator supporting the ICANN Determination. If the arbitrator determines that ICANN did not reasonably and objectively reach the ICANN Determination, then ICANN shall waive Registry Operator’s compliance with the subject ICANN Requirement. If the arbitrators or pre-arbitral referee, as applicable, determine that ICANN did reasonably and objectively reach the ICANN Determination, then, upon notice to Registry Operator, ICANN may terminate this Agreement with immediate effect.

(e) Registry Operator hereby represents and warrants that, to the best of its knowledge as of the date of execution of this Agreement, no existing ICANN Requirement conflicts with or violates any Applicable Law.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Section 7.14, following an ICANN Determination and prior to a finding by an arbitrator pursuant to Section 7.14(d) above, ICANN may, subject to prior consultations with Registry Operator, take such reasonable technical measures as it deems necessary to ensure the Security and Stability of Registry Services, the Internet and the DNS. These reasonable technical measures shall be taken by ICANN on an interim basis, until the earlier of the date of conclusion of the arbitration procedure referred to in Section 7.14(d) above or the date of complete resolution of the conflict with an Applicable Law. In case Registry Operator disagrees with such technical measures taken by ICANN, Registry Operator may submit the matter to binding arbitration pursuant to the provisions of Section 5.2 above, during which process ICANN may continue to take such technical measures. In the event that ICANN takes such measures, Registry Operator shall pay all costs incurred by ICANN as a result of taking such measures. In addition, in the event that ICANN takes such measures, ICANN shall retain and may enforce its rights under the Continued Operations Instrument and Alternative Instrument, as applicable.

* * * * *

* Final text will be posted on ICANN website; agreement reference to be replaced by hyperlink.
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IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this Agreement to be executed by their duly authorized representatives.

INTERNET CORPORATION FOR ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS

By: _____________________________
   [_____________
President and CEO
Date:

[Registry Operator]

By: _____________________________
   [_____________
   [_____________
Date:
EXHIBIT A

Approved Services
SPECIFICATION 1

CONSENSUS POLICIES AND TEMPORARY POLICIES SPECIFICATION


1.1. “Consensus Policies” are those policies established (1) pursuant to the procedure set forth in ICANN's Bylaws and due process, and (2) covering those topics listed in Section 1.2 of this document. The Consensus Policy development process and procedure set forth in ICANN's Bylaws may be revised from time to time in accordance with the process set forth therein.

1.2. Consensus Policies and the procedures by which they are developed shall be designed to produce, to the extent possible, a consensus of Internet stakeholders, including the operators of gTLDs. Consensus Policies shall relate to one or more of the following:

   1.2.1. issues for which uniform or coordinated resolution is reasonably necessary to facilitate interoperability, security and/or stability of the Internet or Domain Name System (“DNS”);
   1.2.2. functional and performance specifications for the provision of Registry Services;
   1.2.3. Security and Stability of the registry database for the TLD;
   1.2.4. registry policies reasonably necessary to implement Consensus Policies relating to registry operations or registrars;
   1.2.5. resolution of disputes regarding the registration of domain names (as opposed to the use of such domain names); or
   1.2.6. restrictions on cross-ownership of registry operators and registrars or registrar resellers and regulations and restrictions with respect to registry operations and the use of registry and registrar data in the event that a registry operator and a registrar or registrar reseller are affiliated.

1.3. Such categories of issues referred to in Section 1.2 shall include, without limitation:

   1.3.1. principles for allocation of registered names in the TLD (e.g., first-come/first-served, timely renewal, holding period after expiration);
   1.3.2. prohibitions on warehousing of or speculation in domain names by registries or registrars;
   1.3.3. reservation of registered names in the TLD that may not be registered initially or that may not be renewed due to reasons reasonably related to (i) avoidance of confusion among or misleading of users, (ii) intellectual property, or (iii) the technical management of the DNS or the Internet (e.g., establishment of reservations of names from registration); and
   1.3.4. maintenance of and access to accurate and up-to-date information concerning domain name registrations; and procedures to avoid disruptions of domain name registrations due to suspension or termination of operations by a registry operator or a registrar, including procedures for allocation of responsibility for serving registered domain names in a TLD affected by such a suspension or termination.

1.4. In addition to the other limitations on Consensus Policies, they shall not:
1.4.1. prescribe or limit the price of Registry Services;
1.4.2. modify the terms or conditions for the renewal or termination of the Registry Agreement;
1.4.3. modify the limitations on Temporary Policies (defined below) or Consensus Policies;
1.4.4. modify the provisions in the registry agreement regarding fees paid by Registry Operator to ICANN; or
1.4.5. modify ICANN’s obligations to ensure equitable treatment of registry operators and act in an open and transparent manner.

2. **Temporary Policies.** Registry Operator shall comply with and implement all specifications or policies established by the Board on a temporary basis, if adopted by the Board by a vote of at least two-thirds of its members, so long as the Board reasonably determines that such modifications or amendments are justified and that immediate temporary establishment of a specification or policy on the subject is necessary to maintain the stability or security of Registry Services or the DNS ("Temporary Policies").

2.1. Such proposed specification or policy shall be as narrowly tailored as feasible to achieve those objectives. In establishing any Temporary Policy, the Board shall state the period of time for which the Temporary Policy is adopted and shall immediately implement the Consensus Policy development process set forth in ICANN's Bylaws.

2.1.1. ICANN shall also issue an advisory statement containing a detailed explanation of its reasons for adopting the Temporary Policy and why the Board believes such Temporary Policy should receive the consensus support of Internet stakeholders.

2.1.2. If the period of time for which the Temporary Policy is adopted exceeds 90 days, the Board shall reaffirm its temporary adoption every 90 days for a total period not to exceed one year, in order to maintain such Temporary Policy in effect until such time as it becomes a Consensus Policy. If the one year period expires or, if during such one year period, the Temporary Policy does not become a Consensus Policy and is not reaffirmed by the Board, Registry Operator shall no longer be required to comply with or implement such Temporary Policy.

3. **Notice and Conflicts.** Registry Operator shall be afforded a reasonable period of time following notice of the establishment of a Consensus Policy or Temporary Policy in which to comply with such policy or specification, taking into account any urgency involved. In the event of a conflict between Registry Services and Consensus Policies or any Temporary Policy, the Consensus Policies or Temporary Policy shall control, but only with respect to subject matter in conflict.
SPECIFICATION 2
DATA ESCROW REQUIREMENTS

Registry Operator will engage an independent entity to act as data escrow agent (“Escrow Agent”) for the provision of data escrow services related to the Registry Agreement. The following Technical Specifications set forth in Part A, and Legal Requirements set forth in Part B, will be included in any data escrow agreement between Registry Operator and the Escrow Agent, under which ICANN must be named a third-party beneficiary. In addition to the following requirements, the data escrow agreement may contain other provisions that are not contradictory or intended to subvert the required terms provided below.

PART A – TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS

1. **Deposits.** There will be two types of Deposits: Full and Differential. For both types, the universe of Registry objects to be considered for data escrow are those objects necessary in order to offer all of the approved Registry Services.

   1.1 “Full Deposit” will consist of data that reflects the state of the registry as of 00:00:00 UTC on each Sunday.

   1.2 “Differential Deposit” means data that reflects all transactions that were not reflected in the last previous Full or Differential Deposit, as the case may be. Each Differential Deposit will contain all database transactions since the previous Deposit was completed as of 00:00:00 UTC of each day, but Sunday. Differential Deposits must include complete Escrow Records as specified below that were not included or changed since the most recent full or Differential Deposit (i.e., newly added or modified domain names).

2. **Schedule for Deposits.** Registry Operator will submit a set of escrow files on a daily basis as follows:

   2.1 Each Sunday, a Full Deposit must be submitted to the Escrow Agent by 23:59 UTC.

   2.2 The other six days of the week, the corresponding Differential Deposit must be submitted to Escrow Agent by 23:59 UTC.

3. **Escrow Format Specification.**

   3.1 Deposit’s Format. Registry objects, such as domains, contacts, name servers, registrars, etc. will be compiled into a file constructed as described in draft-arias-noguchi-registry-data-escrow, see [1]. The aforementioned document describes some elements as optional; Registry Operator will include those elements in the Deposits if they are available. Registry Operator will use the draft version available at the time of signing the Agreement, if not already an RFC. Once the specification is published as an RFC, Registry Operator will implement that specification, no later than 180 days after. UTF-8 character encoding will be used.

   3.2 Extensions. If a Registry Operator offers additional Registry Services that require submission of additional data, not included above, additional “extension schemas” shall be defined in a case by case base to represent that data. These “extension schemas” will be specified as described in [1]. Data related to the “extensions schemas” will be included in the deposit file described in section 3.1. ICANN and the respective Registry shall work together to agree on such new objects’ data escrow specifications.
4. **Processing of Deposit files.** The use of compression is recommended in order to reduce electronic data transfer times, and storage capacity requirements. Data encryption will be used to ensure the privacy of registry escrow data. Files processed for compression and encryption will be in the binary OpenPGP format as per OpenPGP Message Format - RFC 4880, see [2]. Acceptable algorithms for Public-key cryptography, Symmetric-key cryptography, Hash and Compression are those enumerated in RFC 4880, not marked as deprecated in OpenPGP IANA Registry, see [3], that are also royalty-free. The process to follow for a data file in original text format is:

(1) The file should be compressed. The suggested algorithm for compression is ZIP as per RFC 4880.

(2) The compressed data will be encrypted using the escrow agent's public key. The suggested algorithms for Public-key encryption are Elgamal and RSA as per RFC 4880. The suggested algorithms for Symmetric-key encryption are TripleDES, AES128 and CAST5 as per RFC 4880.

(3) The file may be split as necessary if, once compressed and encrypted is larger than the file size limit agreed with the escrow agent. Every part of a split file, or the whole file if split is not used, will be called a processed file in this section.

(4) A digital signature file will be generated for every processed file using the Registry's private key. The digital signature file will be in binary OpenPGP format as per RFC 4880 [2], and will not be compressed or encrypted. The suggested algorithms for Digital signatures are DSA and RSA as per RFC 4880. The suggested algorithm for Hashes in Digital signatures is SHA256.

(5) The processed files and digital signature files will then be transferred to the Escrow Agent through secure electronic mechanisms, such as, SFTP, SCP, HTTPS file upload, etc. as agreed between the Escrow Agent and the Registry Operator. Non-electronic delivery through a physical medium such as CD-ROMs, DVD-ROMs, or USB storage devices may be used if authorized by ICANN.

(6) The Escrow Agent will then validate every (processed) transferred data file using the procedure described in section 8.

5. **File Naming Conventions.** Files will be named according to the following convention:

{gTLD}__{YYYY-MM-DD}__{type}_S{#}_R{rev}__{ext} where:

5.1 {gTLD} is replaced with the gTLD name; in case of an IDN-TLD, the ASCII-compatible form (A-Label) must be used;

5.2 {YYYY-MM-DD} is replaced by the date corresponding to the time used as a timeline watermark for the transactions; i.e. for the Full Deposit corresponding to 2009-08-02T00:00Z, the string to be used would be “2009-08-02”;

5.3 {type} is replaced by:
(1) “full”, if the data represents a Full Deposit;
(2) “diff”, if the data represents a Differential Deposit;
(3) “thin”, if the data represents a Bulk Registration Data Access file, as specified in section 3 of Specification 4;

5.4 {#} is replaced by the position of the file in a series of files, beginning with “1”; in case of a lone file, this must be replaced by “1”.

5.5 {rev} is replaced by the number of revision (or resend) of the file beginning with “0”;

5.6 {ext} is replaced by “sig” if it is a digital signature file of the quasi-homonymous file. Otherwise it is replaced by “ryde”.
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6. **Distribution of Public Keys.** Each of Registry Operator and Escrow Agent will distribute its public key to the other party (Registry Operator or Escrow Agent, as the case may be) via email to an email address to be specified. Each party will confirm receipt of the other party's public key with a reply email, and the distributing party will subsequently reconfirm the authenticity of the key transmitted via offline methods, like in person meeting, telephone, etc. In this way, public key transmission is authenticated to a user able to send and receive mail via a mail server operated by the distributing party. Escrow Agent, Registry and ICANN will exchange keys by the same procedure.

7. **Notification of Deposits.** Along with the delivery of each Deposit, Registry Operator will deliver to Escrow Agent and to ICANN a written statement (which may be by authenticated e-mail) that includes a copy of the report generated upon creation of the Deposit and states that the Deposit has been inspected by Registry Operator and is complete and accurate. Registry Operator will include the Deposit’s "id" and "resend" attributes in its statement. The attributes are explained in [1].

8. **Verification Procedure.**  
   (1) The signature file of each processed file is validated.  
   (2) If processed files are pieces of a bigger file, the latter is put together.  
   (3) Each file obtained in the previous step is then decrypted and uncompressed.  
   (4) Each data file contained in the previous step is then validated against the format defined in [1].  
   (5) If [1] includes a verification process, that will be applied at this step.  
   If any discrepancy is found in any of the steps, the Deposit will be considered incomplete.

9. **References.**  
PART B – LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

1. **Escrow Agent.** Prior to entering into an escrow agreement, the Registry Operator must provide notice to ICANN as to the identity of the Escrow Agent, and provide ICANN with contact information and a copy of the relevant escrow agreement, and all amendment thereto. In addition, prior to entering into an escrow agreement, Registry Operator must obtain the consent of ICANN to (a) use the specified Escrow Agent, and (b) enter into the form of escrow agreement provided. ICANN must be expressly designated a third-party beneficiary of the escrow agreement. ICANN reserves the right to withhold its consent to any Escrow Agent, escrow agreement, or any amendment thereto, all in its sole discretion.

2. **Fees.** Registry Operator must pay, or have paid on its behalf, fees to the Escrow Agent directly. If Registry Operator fails to pay any fee by the due date(s), the Escrow Agent will give ICANN written notice of such non-payment and ICANN may pay the past-due fee(s) within ten business days after receipt of the written notice from Escrow Agent. Upon payment of the past-due fees by ICANN, ICANN shall have a claim for such amount against Registry Operator, which Registry Operator shall be required to submit to ICANN together with the next fee payment due under the Registry Agreement.

3. **Ownership.** Ownership of the Deposits during the effective term of the Registry Agreement shall remain with Registry Operator at all times. Thereafter, Registry Operator shall assign any such ownership rights (including intellectual property rights, as the case may be) in such Deposits to ICANN. In the event that during the term of the Registry Agreement any Deposit is released from escrow to ICANN, any intellectual property rights held by Registry Operator in the Deposits will automatically be licensed on a non-exclusive, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free, paid-up basis to ICANN or to a party designated in writing by ICANN.

4. **Integrity and Confidentiality.** Escrow Agent will be required to (i) hold and maintain the Deposits in a secure, locked, and environmentally safe facility, which is accessible only to authorized representatives of Escrow Agent, (ii) protect the integrity and confidentiality of the Deposits using commercially reasonable measures and (iii) keep and safeguard each Deposit for one year. ICANN and Registry Operator will be provided the right to inspect Escrow Agent's applicable records upon reasonable prior notice and during normal business hours. Registry Operator and ICANN will be provided with the right to designate a third-party auditor to audit Escrow Agent’s compliance with the technical specifications and maintenance requirements of this Specification 2 from time to time.

If Escrow Agent receives a subpoena or any other order from a court or other judicial tribunal pertaining to the disclosure or release of the Deposits, Escrow Agent will promptly notify the Registry Operator and ICANN unless prohibited by law. After notifying the Registry Operator and ICANN, Escrow Agent shall allow sufficient time for Registry Operator or ICANN to challenge any such order, which shall be the responsibility of Registry Operator or ICANN; provided, however, that Escrow Agent does not waive its rights to present its position with respect to any such order. Escrow Agent will cooperate with the Registry Operator or ICANN to support efforts to quash or limit any subpoena, at such party’s expense. Any party requesting additional assistance shall pay Escrow Agent’s standard charges or as quoted upon submission of a detailed request.
5. **Copies.** Escrow Agent may be permitted to duplicate any Deposit, in order to comply with the terms and provisions of the escrow agreement.

6. **Release of Deposits.** Escrow Agent will make available for electronic download (unless otherwise requested) to ICANN or its designee, within twenty-four hours, at the Registry Operator’s expense, all Deposits in Escrow Agent's possession in the event that the Escrow Agent receives a request from Registry Operator to effect such delivery to ICANN, or receives one of the following written notices by ICANN stating that:

6.1 the Registry Agreement has expired without renewal, or been terminated; or

6.2 ICANN failed, with respect to (a) any Full Deposit or (b) five Differential Deposits within any calendar month, to receive, within five calendar days after the Deposit's scheduled delivery date, notification of receipt from Escrow Agent; (x) ICANN gave notice to Escrow Agent and Registry Operator of that failure; and (y) ICANN has not, within seven calendar days after such notice, received notice from Escrow Agent that the Deposit has been received; or

6.3 ICANN has received notification from Escrow Agent of failed verification of a Full Deposit or of failed verification of five Differential Deposits within any calendar month and (a) ICANN gave notice to Registry Operator of that receipt; and (b) ICANN has not, within seven calendar days after such notice, received notice from Escrow Agent of verification of a remediated version of such Full Deposit or Differential Deposit; or

6.4 Registry Operator has: (i) ceased to conduct its business in the ordinary course; or (ii) filed for bankruptcy, become insolvent or anything analogous to any of the foregoing under the laws of any jurisdiction anywhere in the world; or

6.5 Registry Operator has experienced a failure of critical registry functions and ICANN has asserted its rights pursuant to Section 2.13 of the Registry Agreement; or

6.6 a competent court, arbitral, legislative, or government agency mandates the release of the Deposits to ICANN.

Unless Escrow Agent has previously released the Registry Operator’s Deposits to ICANN or its designee, Escrow Agent will deliver all Deposits to ICANN upon termination of the Registry Agreement or the Escrow Agreement.

7. **Verification of Deposits.**

7.1 Within twenty-four hours after receiving each Deposit or corrected Deposit, Escrow Agent must verify the format and completeness of each Deposit and deliver to ICANN a copy of the verification report generated for each Deposit. Reports will be delivered electronically, as specified from time to time by ICANN.

7.2 If Escrow Agent discovers that any Deposit fails the verification procedures, Escrow Agent must notify, either by email, fax or phone, Registry Operator and ICANN of such nonconformity within twenty-four hours after receiving the non-conformant Deposit. Upon notification of such verification failure, Registry Operator must begin developing modifications, updates, corrections, and other fixes of the Deposit necessary for the Deposit to pass the verification procedures and deliver such fixes to Escrow Agent as promptly as possible.

8. **Amendments.** Escrow Agent and Registry Operator shall amend the terms of the Escrow Agreement to conform to this Specification 2 within ten (10) calendar days of any amendment or modification to this Specification 2. In the event of a conflict between this Specification 2 and the Escrow Agreement, this Specification 2 shall control.

9. **Indemnity.** Registry Operator shall indemnify and hold harmless Escrow Agent and each of its directors, officers, agents, employees, members, and stockholders ("Escrow Agent Indemnitees")
absolutely and forever from and against any and all claims, actions, damages, suits, liabilities, obligations, costs, fees, charges, and any other expenses whatsoever, including reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, that may be asserted by a third party against any Escrow Agent Indemnitees in connection with the Escrow Agreement or the performance of Escrow Agent or any Escrow Agent Indemnitees thereunder (with the exception of any claims based on the misrepresentation, negligence, or misconduct of Escrow Agent, its directors, officers, agents, employees, contractors, members, and stockholders). Escrow Agent shall indemnify and hold harmless Registry Operator and ICANN, and each of their respective directors, officers, agents, employees, members, and stockholders ("Indemnitees") absolutely and forever from and against any and all claims, actions, damages, suits, liabilities, obligations, costs, fees, charges, and any other expenses whatsoever, including reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, that may be asserted by a third party against any Indemnitee in connection with the misrepresentation, negligence or misconduct of Escrow Agent, its directors, officers, agents, employees and contractors.
SPECIFICATION 3

FORMAT AND CONTENT FOR REGISTRY OPERATOR MONTHLY REPORTING

Registry Operator shall provide one set of monthly reports per gTLD to __________ with the following content. ICANN may request in the future that the reports be delivered by other means and using other formats. ICANN will use reasonable commercial efforts to preserve the confidentiality of the information reported until three months after the end of the month to which the reports relate.

1. Per-Registrar Transactions Report. This report shall be compiled in a comma separated-value formatted file as specified in RFC 4180. The file shall be named “gTLD-transactions-yyyymm.csv”, where “gTLD” is the gTLD name; in case of an IDN-TLD, the A-label shall be used; “yyyymm” is the year and month being reported. The file shall contain the following fields per registrar:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field #</th>
<th>Field Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>registrar-name</td>
<td>registrar's full corporate name as registered with IANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>iana-id</td>
<td><a href="http://www.iana.org/assignments/registrar-ids">http://www.iana.org/assignments/registrar-ids</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>total-domains</td>
<td>total domains under sponsorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>total-nameservers</td>
<td>total name servers registered for TLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>net-adds-1-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered with an initial term of one year (and not deleted within the add grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>net-adds-2-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered with an initial term of two years (and not deleted within the add grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>net-adds-3-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered with an initial term of three years (and not deleted within the add grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>net-adds-4-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered with an initial term of four years (and not deleted within the add grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>net-adds-5-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered with an initial term of five years (and not deleted within the add grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>net-adds-6-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered with an initial term of six years (and not deleted within the add grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>net-adds-7-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered with an initial term of seven years (and not deleted within the add grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Number of Domains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>net-adds-8-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered with an initial term of eight years (and not deleted within the add grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>net-adds-9-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered with an initial term of nine years (and not deleted within the add grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>net-adds-10-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully registered with an initial term of ten years (and not deleted within the add grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>net-renews-1-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of one year (and not deleted within the renew grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>net-renews-2-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of two years (and not deleted within the renew grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>net-renews-3-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of three years (and not deleted within the renew grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>net-renews-4-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of four years (and not deleted within the renew grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>net-renews-5-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of five years (and not deleted within the renew grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>net-renews-6-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of six years (and not deleted within the renew grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>net-renews-7-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of seven years (and not deleted within the renew grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>net-renews-8-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of eight years (and not deleted within the renew grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>net-renews-9-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of nine years (and not deleted within the renew grace period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 net-renews-10-yr</td>
<td>number of domains successfully renewed either automatically or by command with a new renewal period of ten years (and not deleted within the renew grace period)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 transfer-gaining-successful</td>
<td>transfers initiated by this registrar that were ack'd by the other registrar – either by command or automatically</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 transfer-gaining-nacked</td>
<td>transfers initiated by this registrar that were n'acked by the other registrar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 transfer-losing-successful</td>
<td>transfers initiated by another registrar that this registrar ack'd – either by command or automatically</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 transfer-losing-nacked</td>
<td>transfers initiated by another registrar that this registrar n'acked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 transfer-disputed-won</td>
<td>number of transfer disputes in which this registrar prevailed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 transfer-disputed-lost</td>
<td>number of transfer disputes this registrar lost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 transfer-disputed-nodecision</td>
<td>number of transfer disputes involving this registrar with a split or no decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 deleted-domains-grace</td>
<td>domains deleted within the add grace period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 deleted-domains-nograce</td>
<td>domains deleted outside the add grace period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 restored-domains</td>
<td>domain names restored from redemption period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 restored-noreport</td>
<td>total number of restored names for which the registrar failed to submit a restore report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 agp-exemption-requests</td>
<td>total number of AGP (add grace period) exemption requests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 agp-exemptions-granted</td>
<td>total number of AGP (add grace period) exemption requests granted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 agp-exempted-domains</td>
<td>total number of names affected by granted AGP (add grace period) exemption requests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 attempted-adds</td>
<td>number of attempted (successful and failed) domain name create commands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first line shall include the field names exactly as described in the table above as a “header line” as described in section 2 of RFC 4180. The last line of each report shall include totals for each column across all registrars; the first field of this line shall read “Totals” while the second field shall be left empty in that line. No other lines besides the ones described above shall be included. Line breaks shall be `<U+000D, U+000A>` as described in RFC 4180.
2. **Registry Functions Activity Report.** This report shall be compiled in a comma separated-value formatted file as specified in RFC 4180. The file shall be named “gTLD-activity-yyyymm.csv”, where “gTLD” is the gTLD name; in case of an IDN-TLD, the A-label shall be used; “yyyymm” is the year and month being reported. The file shall contain the following fields:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field #</th>
<th>Field Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>operational-registrars</td>
<td>number of operational registrars at the end of the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>ramp-up-registrars</td>
<td>number of registrars that have received a password for access to OT&amp;E at the end of the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>pre-ramp-up-registrars</td>
<td>number of registrars that have requested access, but have not yet entered the ramp-up period at the end of the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>zfa-passwords</td>
<td>number of active zone file access passwords at the end of the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>whois-43-queries</td>
<td>number of WHOIS (port-43) queries responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>web-whois-queries</td>
<td>number of Web-based Whois queries responded during the reporting period, not including searchable Whois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>searchable-whois-queries</td>
<td>number of searchable Whois queries responded during the reporting period, if offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>dns-udp-queries-received</td>
<td>number of DNS queries received over UDP transport during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>dns-udp-queries-responded</td>
<td>number of DNS queries received over UDP transport that were responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>dns-tcp-queries-received</td>
<td>number of DNS queries received over TCP transport during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>dns-tcp-queries-responded</td>
<td>number of DNS queries received over TCP transport that were responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>srs-dom-check</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “check” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>srs-dom-create</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “create” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>srs-dom-delete</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “delete” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>srs-dom-info</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “info” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>srs-dom-renew</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>srs-dom-rgp-restore-report</td>
<td>“renew” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>srs-dom-rgp-restore-request</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name RGP “restore” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>srs-dom-transfer-approve</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “transfer” requests to approve transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>srs-dom-transfer-cancel</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “transfer” requests to cancel transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>srs-dom-transfer-query</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “transfer” requests to query about a transfer responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>srs-dom-transfer-reject</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “transfer” requests to reject transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>srs-dom-transfer-request</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “transfer” requests to request transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>srs-dom-update</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) domain name “update” requests (not including RGP restore requests) responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>srs-host-check</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) host “check” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>srs-host-create</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) host “create” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>srs-host-delete</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) host “delete” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>srs-host-info</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) host “info” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>srs-host-update</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) host “update” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>srs-cont-check</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “check” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>srs-cont-create</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “create” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>srs-cont-delete</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “delete” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>srs-cont-info</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “info” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>srs-cont-transfer-approve</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “transfer” requests to approve transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>srs-cont-transfer-cancel</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “transfer” requests to cancel transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>srs-cont-transfer-query</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “transfer” requests to query about a transfer responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>srs-cont-transfer-reject</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “transfer” requests to reject transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>srs-cont-transfer-request</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “transfer” requests to request transfers responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>srs-cont-update</td>
<td>number of SRS (EPP and any other interface) contact “update” requests responded during the reporting period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first line shall include the field names exactly as described in the table above as a “header line” as described in section 2 of RFC 4180. No other lines besides the ones described above shall be included. Line breaks shall be `<U+000D, U+000A>` as described in RFC 4180.
SPECIFICATION 4

SPECIFICATION FOR REGISTRATION DATA PUBLICATION SERVICES

1. Registration Data Directory Services. Until ICANN requires a different protocol, Registry Operator will operate a WHOIS service available via port 43 in accordance with RFC 3912, and a web-based Directory Service at <whois.nic.TLD> providing free public query-based access to at least the following elements in the following format. ICANN reserves the right to specify alternative formats and protocols, and upon such specification, the Registry Operator will implement such alternative specification as soon as reasonably practicable.

1.1. The format of responses shall follow a semi-free text format outline below, followed by a blank line and a legal disclaimer specifying the rights of Registry Operator, and of the user querying the database.

1.2. Each data object shall be represented as a set of key/value pairs, with lines beginning with keys, followed by a colon and a space as delimiters, followed by the value.

1.3. For fields where more than one value exists, multiple key/value pairs with the same key shall be allowed (for example to list multiple name servers). The first key/value pair after a blank line should be considered the start of a new record, and should be considered as identifying that record, and is used to group data, such as hostnames and IP addresses, or a domain name and registrant information, together.

1.4. Domain Name Data:

1.4.1. Query format: whois EXAMPLE.TLD

1.4.2. Response format:

Domain Name: EXAMPLE.TLD
Domain ID: D1234567-TLD
WHOIS Server: whois.example.tld
Referral URL: http://www.example.tld
Updated Date: 2009-05-29T20:13:00Z
Creation Date: 2000-10-08T00:45:00Z
Registry Expiry Date: 2010-10-08T00:44:59Z
Sponsoring Registrar: EXAMPLE REGISTRAR LLC
Sponsoring Registrar IANA ID: 5555555
Domain Status: clientDeleteProhibited
Domain Status: clientRenewProhibited
Domain Status: clientTransferProhibited
Domain Status: serverUpdateProhibited
Registrant ID: 5372808-ERL
Registrant Name: EXAMPLE REGISTRANT
Registrant Organization: EXAMPLE ORGANIZATION
Registrant Street: 123 EXAMPLE STREET
Registrant City: ANYTOWN
Registrant State/Province: AP
Registrant Postal Code: A1A1A1
Registrant Country: EX
Registrant Phone: +1.5555551212
Registrant Phone Ext: 1234
Registrant Fax: +1.5555551213
Registrant Fax Ext: 4321
Registrant Email: EMAIL@EXAMPLE.TLD
Admin ID: 5372809-ERL
Admin Name: EXAMPLE REGISTRANT ADMINISTRATIVE
Admin Organization: EXAMPLE REGISTRANT ORGANIZATION
Admin Street: 123 EXAMPLE STREET
Admin City: ANYTOWN
Admin State/Province: AP
Admin Postal Code: A1A1A1
Admin Country: EX
Admin Phone: +1.5555551212
Admin Phone Ext: 1234
Admin Fax: +1.5555551213
Admin Fax Ext:
Admin Email: EMAIL@EXAMPLE.TLD
Tech ID: 5372811-ERL
Tech Name: EXAMPLE REGISTRAR TECHNICAL
Tech Organization: EXAMPLE REGISTRAR LLC
Tech Street: 123 EXAMPLE STREET
Tech City: ANYTOWN
Tech State/Province: AP
Tech Postal Code: A1A1A1
Tech Country: EX
Tech Phone: +1.1235551234
Tech Phone Ext: 1234
Tech Fax: +1.5555551213
Tech Fax Ext: 93
Tech Email: EMAIL@EXAMPLE.TLD
Name Server: NS01.EXAMPLEREGISTRAR.TLD
Name Server: NS02.EXAMPLEREGISTRAR.TLD
DNSSEC: signedDelegation
DNSSEC: unsigned

>>> Last update of WHOIS database: 2009-05-29T20:15:00Z <<<

1.5. Registrar Data:

1.5.1. Query format: whois "registrar Example Registrar, Inc."

1.5.2. Response format:

Registrar Name: Example Registrar, Inc.
Street: 1234 Admiralty Way
City: Marina del Rey
State/Province: CA
Postal Code: 90292
Country: US
Phone Number: +1.3105551212
Fax Number: +1.3105551213
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Email: registrar@example.tld
WHOIS Server: whois.example-registrar.tld
Referral URL: http://www.example-registrar.tld
Admin Contact: Joe Registrar
Phone Number: +1.3105551213
Fax Number: +1.3105551213
Email: joeregistrar@example-registrar.tld
Admin Contact: Jane Registrar
Phone Number: +1.3105551214
Fax Number: +1.3105551213
Email: janeregistrar@example-registrar.tld
Technical Contact: John Geek
Phone Number: +1.3105551215
Fax Number: +1.3105551216
Email: johngreek@example-registrar.tld

>>> Last update of WHOIS database: 2009-05-29T20:15:00Z <<<

1.6. Nameserver Data:

1.6.1. **Query format:** whois "NS1.EXAMPLE.TLD" or whois "nameserver (IP Address)"

1.6.2. **Response format:**

Server Name: NS1.EXAMPLE.TLD
IP Address: 192.0.2.123
IP Address: 2001:0DB8::1
Registrar: Example Registrar, Inc.
WHOIS Server: whois.example-registrar.tld
Referral URL: http://www.example-registrar.tld

>>> Last update of WHOIS database: 2009-05-29T20:15:00Z <<<

1.7. The format of the following data fields: domain status, individual and organizational names, address, street, city, state/province, postal code, country, telephone and fax numbers, email addresses, date and times should conform to the mappings specified in EPP RFCs 5730-5734 so that the display of this information (or values return in WHOIS responses) can be uniformly processed and understood.

1.8. **Searchability.** Offering searchability capabilities on the Directory Services is optional but if offered by the Registry Operator it shall comply with the specification described in this section.

1.8.1. Registry Operator will offer searchability on the web-based Directory Service.

1.8.2. Registry Operator will offer partial match capabilities, at least, on the following fields: domain name, contacts and registrant’s name, and contact and registrant’s postal address, including all the sub-fields described in EPP (e.g., street, city, state or province, etc.).

1.8.3. Registry Operator will offer exact-match capabilities, at least, on the following fields: registrar id, name server name, and name server’s IP address (only applies to IP addresses stored by the registry, i.e., glue records).
1.8.4. Registry Operator will offer Boolean search capabilities supporting, at least, the following logical operators to join a set of search criteria: AND, OR, NOT.

1.8.5. Search results will include domain names matching the search criteria.

1.8.6. Registry Operator will: 1) implement appropriate measures to avoid abuse of this feature (e.g., permitting access only to legitimate authorized users); and 2) ensure the feature is in compliance with any applicable privacy laws or policies.

2. Zone File Access

2.1. Third-Party Access

2.1.1. Zone File Access Agreement. Registry Operator will enter into an agreement with any Internet user that will allow such user to access an Internet host server or servers designated by Registry Operator and download zone file data. The agreement will be standardized, facilitated and administered by a Centralized Zone Data Access Provider (the “CZDA Provider”). Registry Operator will provide access to zone file data per Section 2.1.3 and do so using the file format described in Section 2.1.4. Notwithstanding the foregoing, (a) the CZDA Provider may reject the request for access of any user that does not satisfy the credentialing requirements in Section 2.1.2 below; (b) Registry Operator may reject the request for access of any user that does not provide correct or legitimate credentials under Section 2.1.2 or where Registry Operator reasonably believes will violate the terms of Section 2.1.5. below; and, (c) Registry Operator may revoke access of any user if Registry Operator has evidence to support that the user has violated the terms of Section 2.1.5.

2.1.2. Credentialing Requirements. Registry Operator, through the facilitation of the CZDA Provider, will request each user to provide it with information sufficient to correctly identify and locate the user. Such user information will include, without limitation, company name, contact name, address, telephone number, facsimile number, email address, and the Internet host machine name and IP address.

2.1.3. Grant of Access. Each Registry Operator will provide the Zone File FTP (or other Registry supported) service for an ICANN-specified and managed URL (specifically, <TLD>.zda.icann.org where <TLD> is the TLD for which the registry is responsible) for the user to access the Registry’s zone data archives. Registry Operator will grant the user a non-exclusive, non-transferable, limited right to access Registry Operator’s Zone File FTP server, and to transfer a copy of the top-level domain zone files, and any associated cryptographic checksum files no more than once per 24 hour period using FTP, or other data transport and access protocols that may be prescribed by ICANN. For every zone file access server, the zone files are in the top-level directory called <zone>.zone.gz, with <zone>.zone.gz.md5 and <zone>.zone.gz.sig to verify downloads. If the Registry Operator also provides historical data, it will use the naming pattern <zone>-yyyymmdd.zone.gz, etc.

2.1.4. File Format Standard. Registry Operator will provide zone files using a sub-format of the standard Master File format as originally defined in RFC 1035, Section 5, including all the records present in the actual zone used in the public DNS. Sub-format is as follows:

1. Each record must include all fields in one line as: <domain-name> <TTL> <class> <type> <RDATA>.
2. Class and Type must use the standard mnemonics and must be in lower case.
3. TTL must be present as a decimal integer.
4. Use of /X and /DDD inside domain names is allowed.
5. All domain names must be in lower case.
6. Must use exactly one tab as separator of fields inside a record.
7. All domain names must be fully qualified.
8. No SORIGIN directives.
9. No use of "@" to denote current origin.
10. No use of "blank domain names" at the beginning of a record to continue the use of the domain name in the previous record.
11. No INCLUDE directives.
12. No $TTL directives.
13. No use of parentheses, e.g., to continue the list of fields in a record across a line boundary.
14. No use of comments.
15. No blank lines.
16. The SOA record should be present at the top and (duplicated at) the end of the zone file.
17. With the exception of the SOA record, all the records in a file must be in alphabetical order.
18. One zone per file. If a TLD divides its DNS data into multiple zones, each goes into a separate file named as above, with all the files combined using tar into a file called <tld>.zone.tar.

2.1.5. Use of Data by User. Registry Operator will permit user to use the zone file for lawful purposes; provided that, (a) user takes all reasonable steps to protect against unauthorized access to and use and disclosure of the data, and (b) under no circumstances will Registry Operator be required or permitted to allow user to use the data to, (i) allow, enable, or otherwise support the transmission by e-mail, telephone, or facsimile of mass unsolicited, commercial advertising or solicitations to entities other than user’s own existing customers, or (ii) enable high volume, automated, electronic processes that send queries or data to the systems of Registry Operator or any ICANN-accredited registrar.

2.1.6. Term of Use. Registry Operator, through CZDA Provider, will provide each user with access to the zone file for a period of not less than three (3) months. Registry Operator will allow users to renew their Grant of Access.

2.1.7. No Fee for Access. Registry Operator will provide, and CZDA Provider will facilitate, access to the zone file to user at no cost.

2.2 Co-operation

2.2.1. Assistance. Registry Operator will co-operate and provide reasonable assistance to ICANN and the CZDA Provider to facilitate and maintain the efficient access of zone file data by permitted users as contemplated under this Schedule.

2.3 ICANN Access. Registry Operator shall provide bulk access to the zone files for the TLD to ICANN or its designee on a continuous basis in the manner ICANN may reasonably specify from time to time.

2.4 Emergency Operator Access. Registry Operator shall provide bulk access to the zone files for the TLD to the Emergency Operators designated by ICANN on a continuous basis in the manner ICANN may reasonably specify from time to time.
3. Bulk Registration Data Access to ICANN

3.1. Periodic Access to Thin Registration Data. In order to verify and ensure the operational stability of Registry Services as well as to facilitate compliance checks on accredited registrars, Registry Operator will provide ICANN on a weekly basis (the day to be designated by ICANN) with up-to-date Registration Data as specified below. Data will include data committed as of 00:00:00 UTC on the day previous to the one designated for retrieval by ICANN.

3.1.1. Contents. Registry Operator will provide, at least, the following data for all registered domain names: domain name, domain name repository object id (roid), registrar id (IANA ID), statuses, last updated date, creation date, expiration date, and name server names. For sponsoring registrars, at least, it will provide: registrar name, registrar repository object id (roid), hostname of registrar Whois server, and URL of registrar.

3.1.2. Format. The data will be provided in the format specified in Specification 2 for Data Escrow (including encryption, signing, etc.) but including only the fields mentioned in the previous section, i.e., the file will only contain Domain and Registrar objects with the fields mentioned above. Registry Operator has the option to provide a full deposit file instead as specified in Specification 2.

3.1.3. Access. Registry Operator will have the file(s) ready for download as of 00:00:00 UTC on the day designated for retrieval by ICANN. The file(s) will be made available for download by SFTP, though ICANN may request other means in the future.

3.2. Exceptional Access to Thick Registration Data. In case of a registrar failure, de-accreditation, court order, etc. that prompts the temporary or definitive transfer of its domain names to another registrar, at the request of ICANN, Registry Operator will provide ICANN with up-to-date data for the domain names of the losing registrar. The data will be provided in the format specified in Specification 2 for Data Escrow. The file will only contain data related to the domain names of the losing registrar. Registry Operator will provide the data within 2 business days. Unless otherwise agreed by Registry Operator and ICANN, the file will be made available for download by ICANN in the same manner as the data specified in Section 3.1. of this Specification.
SPECIFICATION 5

SCHEDULE OF RESERVED NAMES AT THE SECOND LEVEL IN GTLD REGISTRIES

Except to the extent that ICANN otherwise expressly authorizes in writing, Registry Operator shall reserve (i.e., Registry Operator shall not register, delegate, use or otherwise make available such labels to any third party, but may register such labels in its own name in order to withhold them from delegation or use) names formed with the following labels from initial (i.e. other than renewal) registration within the TLD:

1. **Example. The label “EXAMPLE”** shall be reserved at the second level and at all other levels within the TLD at which Registry Operator makes registrations.

2. **Two-character labels.** All two-character labels shall be initially reserved. The reservation of a two-character label string may be released to the extent that Registry Operator reaches agreement with the government and country-code manager. The Registry Operator may also propose release of these reservations based on its implementation of measures to avoid confusion with the corresponding country codes.

3. **Tagged Domain Names.** Labels may only include hyphens in the third and fourth position if they represent valid internationalized domain names in their ASCII encoding (for example "xn--ndk061n").

4. **Second-Level Reservations for Registry Operations.** The following names are reserved for use in connection with the operation of the registry for the TLD. Registry Operator may use them, but upon conclusion of Registry Operator's designation as operator of the registry for the TLD they shall be transferred as specified by ICANN: NIC, WWW, IRIS and WHOIS.

5. **Country and Territory Names.** The country and territory names contained in the following internationally recognized lists shall be initially reserved at the second level and at all other levels within the TLD at which the Registry Operator provides for registrations:

   5.1. the short form (in English) of all country and territory names contained on the ISO 3166-1 list, as updated from time to time, including the European Union, which is exceptionally reserved on the ISO 3166-1 list, and its scope extended in August 1999 to any application needing to represent the name European Union <http://www.iso.org/iso/support/country_codes/iso_3166_code_lists/iso-3166-1_decoding_table.htm#EU>;

   5.2. the United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names, Technical Reference Manual for the Standardization of Geographical Names, Part III Names of Countries of the World; and


provided, that the reservation of specific country and territory names may be released to the extent that Registry Operator reaches agreement with the applicable government(s), provided, further, that
Registry Operator may also propose release of these reservations, subject to review by ICANN’s Governmental Advisory Committee and approval by ICANN.
SPECIFICATION 6

REGISTRY INTEROPERABILITY AND CONTINUITY SPECIFICATIONS

1. Standards Compliance

1.1. DNS. Registry Operator shall comply with relevant existing RFCs and those published in the future by the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) including all successor standards, modifications or additions thereto relating to the DNS and name server operations including without limitation RFCs 1034, 1035, 1982, 2181, 2182, 2671, 3226, 3596, 3597, 4343, and 5966.

1.2. EPP. Registry Operator shall comply with relevant existing RFCs and those published in the future by the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) including all successor standards, modifications or additions thereto relating to the provisioning and management of domain names using the Extensible Provisioning Protocol (EPP) in conformance with RFCs 5910, 5730, 5731, 5732, 5733 and 5734. If Registry Operator implements Registry Grace Period (RGP), it will comply with RFC 3915 and its successors. If Registry Operator requires the use of functionality outside the base EPP RFCs, Registry Operator must document EPP extensions in Internet-Draft format following the guidelines described in RFC 3735. Registry Operator will provide and update the relevant documentation of all the EPP Objects and Extensions supported to ICANN prior to deployment.

1.3. DNSSEC. Registry Operator shall sign its TLD zone files implementing Domain Name System Security Extensions (“DNSSEC”). During the Term, Registry Operator shall comply with RFCs 4033, 4034, 4035, 4509 and their successors, and follow the best practices described in RFC 4641 and its successors. If Registry Operator implements Hashed Authenticated Denial of Existence for DNS Security Extensions, it shall comply with RFC 5155 and its successors. Registry Operator shall accept public-key material from child domain names in a secure manner according to industry best practices. Registry shall also publish in its website the DNSSEC Practice Statements (DPS) describing critical security controls and procedures for key material storage, access and usage for its own keys and secure acceptance of registrants’ public-key material. Registry Operator shall publish its DPS following the format described in “DPS-framework” (currently in draft format, see http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-dnsop-dnssec-dps-framework) within 180 days after the “DPS-framework” becomes an RFC.

1.4. IDN. If the Registry Operator offers Internationalized Domain Names (“IDNs”), it shall comply with RFCs 5890, 5891, 5892, 5893 and their successors. Registry Operator shall comply with the ICANN IDN Guidelines at <http://www.icann.org/en/topics/idn/implementation-guidelines.htm>, as they may be amended, modified, or superseded from time to time. Registry Operator shall publish and keep updated its IDN Tables and IDN Registration Rules in the IANA Repository of IDN Practices as specified in the ICANN IDN Guidelines.

1.5. IPv6. Registry Operator shall be able to accept IPv6 addresses as glue records in its Registry System and publish them in the DNS. Registry Operator shall offer public IPv6 transport for, at least, two of the Registry’s name servers listed in the root zone with the corresponding IPv6 addresses registered with IANA. Registry Operator should follow “DNS IPv6 Transport Operational Guidelines” as described in BCP 91 and the recommendations and considerations described in RFC 4472. Registry Operator shall offer public IPv6 transport for its Registration Data Publication Services as defined in Specification 4 of this Agreement; e.g. Whois (RFC 3912), Web based Whois. Registry Operator shall offer public IPv6 transport for its Shared Registration System (SRS) to any Registrar, no later than six months after receiving the first request in writing from a gTLD accredited Registrar willing to operate with the SRS over IPv6.
2. **Registry Services**

   2.1. **Registry Services**. “Registry Services” are, for purposes of the Registry Agreement, defined as the following: (a) those services that are operations of the registry critical to the following tasks: the receipt of data from registrars concerning registrations of domain names and name servers; provision to registrars of status information relating to the zone servers for the TLD; dissemination of TLD zone files; operation of the registry DNS servers; and dissemination of contact and other information concerning domain name server registrations in the TLD as required by this Agreement; (b) other products or services that the Registry Operator is required to provide because of the establishment of a Consensus Policy as defined in Specification 1; (c) any other products or services that only a registry operator is capable of providing, by reason of its designation as the registry operator; and (d) material changes to any Registry Service within the scope of (a), (b) or (c) above.

   2.2. **Wildcard Prohibition.** For domain names which are either not registered, or the registrant has not supplied valid records such as NS records for listing in the DNS zone file, or their status does not allow them to be published in the DNS, the use of DNS wildcard Resource Records as described in RFCs 1034 and 4592 or any other method or technology for synthesizing DNS Resources Records or using redirection within the DNS by the Registry is prohibited. When queried for such domain names the authoritative name servers must return a “Name Error” response (also known as NXDOMAIN), RCODE 3 as described in RFC 1035 and related RFCs. This provision applies for all DNS zone files at all levels in the DNS tree for which the Registry Operator (or an affiliate engaged in providing Registration Services) maintains data, arranges for such maintenance, or derives revenue from such maintenance.

3. **Registry Continuity**

   3.1. **High Availability.** Registry Operator will conduct its operations using network and geographically diverse, redundant servers (including network-level redundancy, end-node level redundancy and the implementation of a load balancing scheme where applicable) to ensure continued operation in the case of technical failure (widespread or local), or an extraordinary occurrence or circumstance beyond the control of the Registry Operator.

   3.2. **Extraordinary Event.** Registry Operator will use commercially reasonable efforts to restore the critical functions of the registry within 24 hours after the termination of an extraordinary event beyond the control of the Registry Operator and restore full system functionality within a maximum of 48 hours following such event, depending on the type of critical function involved. Outages due to such an event will not be considered a lack of service availability.

   3.3. **Business Continuity.** Registry Operator shall maintain a business continuity plan, which will provide for the maintenance of Registry Services in the event of an extraordinary event beyond the control of the Registry Operator or business failure of Registry Operator, and may include the designation of a Registry Services continuity provider. If such plan includes the designation of a Registry Services continuity provider, Registry Operator shall provide the name and contact information for such Registry Services continuity provider to ICANN. In the case of an extraordinary event beyond the control of the Registry Operator where the Registry Operator cannot be contacted, Registry Operator consents that ICANN may contact the designated Registry Services continuity provider, if one exists. Registry Operator shall conduct Registry Services Continuity testing at least once per year.

4. **Abuse Mitigation**
4.1. **Abuse Contact.** Registry Operator shall provide to ICANN and publish on its website its accurate contact details including a valid email and mailing address as well as a primary contact for handling inquiries related to malicious conduct in the TLD, and will provide ICANN with prompt notice of any changes to such contact details.

4.2. **Malicious Use of Orphan Glue Records.** Registry Operators shall take action to remove orphan glue records (as defined at http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac048.pdf) when provided with evidence in written form that such records are present in connection with malicious conduct.

5. **Supported Initial and Renewal Registration Periods**

5.1. **Initial Registration Periods.** Initial registrations of registered names may be made in the registry in one (1) year increments for up to a maximum of ten (10) years. For the avoidance of doubt, initial registrations of registered names may not exceed ten (10) years.

5.2. **Renewal Periods.** Renewal of registered names may be made in one (1) year increments for up to a maximum of ten (10) years. For the avoidance of doubt, renewal of registered names may not extend their registration period beyond ten (10) years from the time of the renewal.
MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR RIGHTS PROTECTION MECHANISMS

1. Rights Protection Mechanisms. Registry Operator shall implement and adhere to any rights protection mechanisms (“RPMs”) that may be mandated from time to time by ICANN. In addition to such RPMs, Registry Operator may develop and implement additional RPMs that discourage or prevent registration of domain names that violate or abuse another party’s legal rights. Registry Operator will include all ICANN mandated and independently developed RPMs in the registry-registrar agreement entered into by ICANN-accredited registrars authorized to register names in the TLD. Registry Operator shall implement in accordance with requirements established by ICANN each of the mandatory RPMs set forth in the Trademark Clearinghouse (posted at [url to be inserted when final Trademark Clearinghouse is adopted]), which may be revised by ICANN from time to time. Registry Operator shall not mandate that any owner of applicable intellectual property rights use any other trademark information aggregation, notification, or validation service in addition to or instead of the ICANN-designated Trademark Clearinghouse.

2. Dispute Resolution Mechanisms. Registry Operator will comply with the following dispute resolution mechanisms as they may be revised from time to time:

   a. the Trademark Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedure (PDDRP) and the Registration Restriction Dispute Resolution Procedure (RRDRP) adopted by ICANN (posted at [urls to be inserted when final procedure is adopted]). Registry Operator agrees to implement and adhere to any remedies ICANN imposes (which may include any reasonable remedy, including for the avoidance of doubt, the termination of the Registry Agreement pursuant to Section 4.3(e) of the Registry Agreement) following a determination by any PDDRP or RRDRP panel and to be bound by any such determination; and

   b. the Uniform Rapid Suspension system (“URS”) adopted by ICANN (posted at [url to be inserted]), including the implementation of determinations issued by URS examiners.
SPECIFICATION 8

CONTINUED OPERATIONS INSTRUMENT

1. The Continued Operations Instrument shall (a) provide for sufficient financial resources to ensure the continued operation of the critical registry functions related to the TLD set forth in Section [__] of the Applicant Guidebook posted at [url to be inserted upon finalization of Applicant Guidebook] (which is hereby incorporated by reference into this Specification 8) for a period of three (3) years following any termination of this Agreement on or prior to the fifth anniversary of the Effective Date or for a period of one (1) year following any termination of this Agreement after the fifth anniversary of the Effective Date but prior to or on the sixth (6th) anniversary of the Effective Date, and (b) be in the form of either (i) an irrevocable standby letter of credit, or (ii) an irrevocable cash escrow deposit, each meeting the requirements set forth in Section [__] of the Applicant Guidebook posted at [url to be inserted upon finalization of Applicant Guidebook] (which is hereby incorporated by reference into this Specification 8).

Registry Operator shall use its best efforts to take all actions necessary or advisable to maintain in effect the Continued Operations Instrument for a period of six (6) years from the Effective Date, and to maintain ICANN as a third party beneficiary thereof. Registry Operator shall provide to ICANN copies of all final documents relating to the Continued Operations Instrument and shall keep ICANN reasonably informed of material developments relating to the Continued Operations Instrument. Registry Operator shall not agree to, or permit, any amendment of, or waiver under, the Continued Operations Instrument or other documentation relating thereto without the prior written consent of ICANN (such consent not to be unreasonably withheld). The Continued Operations Instrument shall expressly state that ICANN may access the financial resources of the Continued Operations Instrument pursuant to Section 2.13 or Section 4.5 [insert for government entity: or Section 7.14] of the Registry Agreement.

2. If, notwithstanding the use of best efforts by Registry Operator to satisfy its obligations under the preceding paragraph, the Continued Operations Instrument expires or is terminated by another party thereto, in whole or in part, for any reason, prior to the sixth anniversary of the Effective Date, Registry Operator shall promptly (i) notify ICANN of such expiration or termination and the reasons therefor and (ii) arrange for an alternative instrument that provides for sufficient financial resources to ensure the continued operation of the Registry Services related to the TLD for a period of three (3) years following any termination of this Agreement on or prior to the fifth anniversary of the Effective Date or for a period of one (1) year following any termination of this Agreement after the fifth anniversary of the Effective Date but prior to or on the sixth (6) anniversary of the Effective Date (an “Alternative Instrument”). Any such Alternative Instrument shall be on terms no less favorable to ICANN than the Continued Operations Instrument and shall otherwise be in form and substance reasonably acceptable to ICANN.

3. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in this Specification 8, at any time, Registry Operator may replace the Continued Operations Instrument with an alternative
instrument that (i) provides for sufficient financial resources to ensure the continued operation of the Registry Services related to the TLD for a period of three (3) years following any termination of this Agreement on or prior to the fifth anniversary of the Effective Date or for a period one (1) year following any termination of this Agreement after the fifth anniversary of the Effective Date but prior to or on the sixth (6) anniversary of the Effective Date, and (ii) contains terms no less favorable to ICANN than the Continued Operations Instrument and is otherwise in form and substance reasonably acceptable to ICANN. In the event Registry Operation replaces the Continued Operations Instrument either pursuant to paragraph 2 or this paragraph 3, the terms of this Specification 8 shall no longer apply with respect to the original Continuing Operations Instrument, but shall thereafter apply with respect to such replacement instrument(s).
SPECIFICATION 9

Registry Operator Code of Conduct

1. In connection with the operation of the registry for the TLD, Registry Operator will not, and will not allow any parent, subsidiary, Affiliate, subcontractor or other related entity, to the extent such party is engaged in the provision of Registry Services with respect to the TLD (each, a “Registry Related Party”), to:

   a. directly or indirectly show any preference or provide any special consideration to any registrar with respect to operational access to registry systems and related registry services, unless comparable opportunities to qualify for such preferences or considerations are made available to all registrars on substantially similar terms and subject to substantially similar conditions;

   b. register domain names in its own right, except for names registered through an ICANN accredited registrar that are reasonably necessary for the management, operations and purpose of the TLD, provided, that Registry Operator may reserve names from registration pursuant to Section 2.6 of the Registry Agreement;

   c. register names in the TLD or sub-domains of the TLD based upon proprietary access to information about searches or resolution requests by consumers for domain names not yet registered (commonly known as, "front-running");

   d. allow any Affiliated registrar to disclose user data to Registry Operator or any Registry Related Party, except as necessary for the management and operations of the TLD, unless all unrelated third parties (including other registry operators) are given equivalent access to such user data on substantially similar terms and subject to substantially similar conditions; or

   e. disclose confidential registry data or confidential information about its Registry Services or operations to any employee of any DNS services provider, except as necessary for the management and operations of the TLD, unless all unrelated third parties (including other registry operators) are given equivalent access to such confidential registry data or confidential information on substantially similar terms and subject to substantially similar conditions.

2. If Registry Operator or a Registry Related Party also operates as a provider of registrar or registrar-reseller services, Registry Operator will, or will cause such Registry Related Party to, ensure that such services are offered through a legal entity separate from Registry Operator, and maintain separate books of accounts with respect to its registrar or registrar-reseller operations.

3. Registry Operator will conduct internal reviews at least once per calendar year to
ensure compliance with this Code of Conduct. Within twenty (20) calendar days following the end of each calendar year, Registry Operator will provide the results of the internal review, along with a certification executed by an executive officer of Registry Operator certifying as to Registry Operator’s compliance with this Code of Conduct, via email to an address to be provided by ICANN. (ICANN may specify in the future the form and contents of such reports or that the reports be delivered by other reasonable means.) Registry Operator agrees that ICANN may publicly post such results and certification.

4. Nothing set forth herein shall: (i) limit ICANN from conducting investigations of claims of Registry Operator’s non-compliance with this Code of Conduct; or (ii) provide grounds for Registry Operator to refuse to cooperate with ICANN investigations of claims of Registry Operator’s non-compliance with this Code of Conduct.

5. Nothing set forth herein shall limit the ability of Registry Operator or any Registry Related Party, to enter into arms-length transactions in the ordinary course of business with a registrar or reseller with respect to products and services unrelated in all respects to the TLD.

6. Registry Operator may request an exemption to this Code of Conduct, and such exemption may be granted by ICANN in ICANN’s reasonable discretion, if Registry Operator demonstrates to ICANN’s reasonable satisfaction that (i) all domain name registrations in the TLD are registered to, and maintained by, Registry Operator for its own exclusive use, (ii) Registry Operator does not sell, distribute or transfer control or use of any registrations in the TLD to any third party that is not an Affiliate of Registry Operator, and (iii) application of this Code of Conduct to the TLD is not necessary to protect the public interest.
SPECIFICATION 10

REGISTRY PERFORMANCE SPECIFICATIONS

1. Definitions

1.1. DNS. Refers to the Domain Name System as specified in RFCs 1034, 1035, and related RFCs.

1.2. DNSSEC proper resolution. There is a valid DNSSEC chain of trust from the root trust anchor to a particular domain name, e.g., a TLD, a domain name registered under a TLD, etc.

1.3. EPP. Refers to the Extensible Provisioning Protocol as specified in RFC 5730 and related RFCs.

1.4. IP address. Refers to IPv4 or IPv6 addresses without making any distinction between the two. When there is need to make a distinction, IPv4 or IPv6 is used.

1.5. Probes. Network hosts used to perform (DNS, EPP, etc.) tests (see below) that are located at various global locations.

1.6. RDDS. Registration Data Directory Services refers to the collective of WHOIS and Web-based WHOIS services as defined in Specification 4 of this Agreement.

1.7. RTT. Round-Trip Time or RTT refers to the time measured from the sending of the first bit of the first packet of the sequence of packets needed to make a request until the reception of the last bit of the last packet of the sequence needed to receive the response. If the client does not receive the whole sequence of packets needed to consider the response as received, the request will be considered unanswered.

1.8. SLR. Service Level Requirement is the level of service expected for a certain parameter being measured in a Service Level Agreement (SLA).

2. Service Level Agreement Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>SLR (monthly basis)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DNS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNS service availability</td>
<td>0 min downtime = 100% availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNS name server availability</td>
<td>≤ 432 min of downtime (≈ 99%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP DNS resolution RTT</td>
<td>≤ 1500 ms, for at least 95% of the queries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDP DNS resolution RTT</td>
<td>≤ 500 ms, for at least 95% of the queries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNS update time</td>
<td>≤ 60 min, for at least 95% of the probes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RDDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDDS availability</td>
<td>≤ 864 min of downtime (≈ 98%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDDS query RTT</td>
<td>≤ 2000 ms, for at least 95% of the queries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDDS update time</td>
<td>≤ 60 min, for at least 95% of the probes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EPP</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP service availability</td>
<td>≤ 864 min of downtime (≈ 98%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP session-command RTT</td>
<td>≤ 4000 ms, for at least 90% of the commands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP query-command RTT</td>
<td>≤ 2000 ms, for at least 90% of the commands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP transform-command RTT</td>
<td>≤ 4000 ms, for at least 90% of the commands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Registry Operator is encouraged to do maintenance for the different services at the times and dates of statistically lower traffic for each service. However, note that there is no provision for planned outages or similar; any downtime, be it for maintenance or due to system failures, will be noted simply as downtime and counted for SLA purposes.

3. DNS

3.1. DNS service availability. Refers to the ability of the group of listed-as-authoritative name servers of a particular domain name (e.g., a TLD), to answer DNS queries from DNS probes. For the service to be considered available at a particular moment, at least, two of the delegated name servers registered in the DNS must have successful results from “DNS tests” to each of their public-DNS registered “IP addresses” to which the name server resolves. If 51% or more of the DNS testing probes see the service as unavailable during a given time, the DNS service will be considered unavailable.

3.2. DNS name server availability. Refers to the ability of a public-DNS registered “IP address” of a particular name server listed as authoritative for a domain name, to answer DNS queries from an Internet user. All the public DNS-registered “IP address” of all name servers of the domain name being monitored shall be tested individually. If 51% or more of the DNS testing probes get undefined/unanswered results from “DNS tests” to a name server “IP address” during a given time, the name server “IP address” will be considered unavailable.

3.3. UDP DNS resolution RTT. Refers to the RTT of the sequence of two packets, the UDP DNS query and the corresponding UDP DNS response. If the RTT is 5 times greater than the time specified in the relevant SLR, the RTT will be considered undefined.

3.4. TCP DNS resolution RTT. Refers to the RTT of the sequence of packets from the start of the TCP connection to its end, including the reception of the DNS response for only one DNS query. If the RTT is 5 times greater than the time specified in the relevant SLR, the RTT will be considered undefined.

3.5. DNS resolution RTT. Refers to either “UDP DNS resolution RTT” or “TCP DNS resolution RTT”.

3.6. DNS update time. Refers to the time measured from the reception of an EPP confirmation to a transform command on a domain name, until the name servers of the parent domain name answer “DNS queries” with data consistent with the change made. This only applies for changes to DNS information.

3.7. DNS test. Means one non-recursive DNS query sent to a particular “IP address” (via UDP or TCP). If DNSSEC is offered in the queried DNS zone, for a query to be considered answered, the signatures must be positively verified against a corresponding DS record published in the parent zone or, if the parent is not signed, against a statically configured Trust Anchor. The answer to the query must contain the corresponding information from the Registry System, otherwise the query will be considered unanswered. A query with a “DNS resolution RTT” 5 times higher than the corresponding SLR, will be considered unanswered. The possible results to a DNS test are: a number in milliseconds corresponding to the “DNS resolution RTT” or, undefined/unanswered.

3.8. Measuring DNS parameters. Every minute, every DNS probe will make an UDP or TCP “DNS test” to each of the public-DNS registered “IP addresses” of the name servers of the domain
name being monitored. If a “DNS test” result is undefined/unanswered, the tested IP will be considered unavailable from that probe until it is time to make a new test.

3.9. Collating the results from DNS probes. The minimum number of active testing probes to consider a measurement valid is 20 at any given measurement period, otherwise the measurements will be discarded and will be considered inconclusive; during this situation no fault will be flagged against the SLRs.

3.10. Distribution of UDP and TCP queries. DNS probes will send UDP or TCP “DNS test” approximating the distribution of these queries.

3.11. Placement of DNS probes. Probes for measuring DNS parameters shall be placed as near as possible to the DNS resolvers on the networks with the most users across the different geographic regions; care shall be taken not to deploy probes behind high propagation-delay links, such as satellite links.

4. RDDS

4.1. RDDS availability. Refers to the ability of all the RDDS services for the TLD, to respond to queries from an Internet user with appropriate data from the relevant Registry System. If 51% or more of the RDDS testing probes see any of the RDDS services as unavailable during a given time, the RDDS will be considered unavailable.

4.2. WHOIS query RTT. Refers to the RTT of the sequence of packets from the start of the TCP connection to its end, including the reception of the WHOIS response. If the RTT is 5-times or more the corresponding SLR, the RTT will be considered undefined.

4.3. Web-based-WHOIS query RTT. Refers to the RTT of the sequence of packets from the start of the TCP connection to its end, including the reception of the HTTP response for only one HTTP request. If Registry Operator implements a multiple-step process to get to the information, only the last step shall be measured. If the RTT is 5-times or more the corresponding SLR, the RTT will be considered undefined.

4.4. RDDS query RTT. Refers to the collective of “WHOIS query RTT” and “Web-based-WHOIS query RTT”.

4.5. RDDS update time. Refers to the time measured from the reception of an EPP confirmation to a transform command on a domain name, host or contact, up until the servers of the RDDS services reflect the changes made.

4.6. RDDS test. Means one query sent to a particular “IP address” of one of the servers of one of the RDDS services. Queries shall be about existing objects in the Registry System and the responses must contain the corresponding information otherwise the query will be considered unanswered. Queries with an RTT 5 times higher than the corresponding SLR will be considered as unanswered. The possible results to an RDDS test are: a number in milliseconds corresponding to the RTT or undefined/unanswered.

4.7. Measuring RDDS parameters. Every 5 minutes, RDDS probes will select one IP address from all the public-DNS registered “IP addresses” of the servers for each RDDS service of the TLD being monitored and make an “RDDS test” to each one. If an “RDDS test” result is
4.8. **Collating the results from RDDS probes.** The minimum number of active testing probes to consider a measurement valid is 10 at any given measurement period, otherwise the measurements will be discarded and will be considered inconclusive; during this situation no fault will be flagged against the SLRs.

4.9. **Placement of RDDS probes.** Probes for measuring RDDS parameters shall be placed inside the networks with the most users across the different geographic regions; care shall be taken not to deploy probes behind high propagation-delay links, such as satellite links.

5. **EPP**

5.1. **EPP service availability.** Refers to the ability of the TLD EPP servers as a group, to respond to commands from the Registry accredited Registrars, who already have credentials to the servers. The response shall include appropriate data from the Registry System. An EPP command with “**EPP command RTT**” 5 times higher than the corresponding SLR will be considered unanswered. If 51% or more of the EPP testing probes see the EPP service as unavailable during a given time, the EPP service will be considered unavailable.

5.2. **EPP session-command RTT.** Refers to the **RTT** of the sequence of packets that includes the sending of a session command plus the reception of the EPP response for only one EPP session command. For the login command it will include packets needed for starting the TCP session. For the logout command it will include packets needed for closing the TCP session. EPP session commands are those described in section 2.9.1 of EPP RFC 5730. If the **RTT** is 5-times or more the corresponding SLR, the **RTT** will be considered undefined.

5.3. **EPP query-command RTT.** Refers to the **RTT** of the sequence of packets that includes the sending of a query command plus the reception of the EPP response for only one EPP query command. It does not include packets needed for the start or close of either the EPP or the TCP session. EPP query commands are those described in section 2.9.2 of EPP RFC 5730. If the **RTT** is 5-times or more the corresponding SLR, the **RTT** will be considered undefined.

5.4. **EPP transform-command RTT.** Refers to the **RTT** of the sequence of packets that includes the sending of a transform command plus the reception of the EPP response for only one EPP transform command. It does not include packets needed for the start or close of either the EPP or the TCP session. EPP transform commands are those described in section 2.9.3 of EPP RFC 5730. If the **RTT** is 5-times or more the corresponding SLR, the **RTT** will be considered undefined.

5.5. **EPP command RTT.** Refers to “**EPP session-command RTT**”, “**EPP query-command RTT**” or “**EPP transform-command RTT**”.

5.6. **EPP test.** Means one EPP command sent to a particular “**IP address**” for one of the EPP servers. Query and transform commands, with the exception of “create”, shall be about existing objects in the Registry System. The response shall include appropriate data from the Registry System. The possible results to an EPP test are: a number in milliseconds corresponding to the “**EPP command RTT**” or undefined/unanswered.
5.7. **Measuring EPP parameters.** Every 5 minutes, EPP probes will select one “IP address” of the EPP servers of the TLD being monitored and make an “EPP test”; every time they should alternate between the 3 different types of commands and between the commands inside each category. If an “EPP test” result is undefined/unanswered, the EPP service will be considered as unavailable from that probe until it is time to make a new test.

5.8. **Collating the results from EPP probes.** The minimum number of active testing probes to consider a measurement valid is 5 at any given measurement period, otherwise the measurements will be discarded and will be considered inconclusive; during this situation no fault will be flagged against the SLRs.

5.9. **Placement of EPP probes.** Probes for measuring EPP parameters shall be placed inside or close to Registrars points of access to the Internet across the different geographic regions; care shall be taken not to deploy probes behind high propagation-delay links, such as satellite links.

6. **Emergency Thresholds**

The following matrix presents the Emergency Thresholds that, if reached by any of the services mentioned above for a TLD, would cause the Emergency Transition of the Critical Functions as specified in Section 2.13. of this Agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Function</th>
<th>Emergency Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DNS service (all servers)</td>
<td>4-hour downtime / week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNSSEC proper resolution</td>
<td>4-hour downtime / week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP</td>
<td>24-hour downtime / week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDDS (WHOIS/Web-based WHOIS)</td>
<td>24-hour downtime / week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Escrow</td>
<td>Breach of the Registry Agreement caused by missing escrow deposits as described in Specification 2, Part B, Section 6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **Emergency Escalation**

Escalation is strictly for purposes of notifying and investigating possible or potential issues in relation to monitored services. The initiation of any escalation and the subsequent cooperative investigations do not in themselves imply that a monitored service has failed its performance requirements.

Escalations shall be carried out between ICANN and Registry Operators, Registrars and Registry Operator, and Registrars and ICANN. Registry Operators and ICANN must provide said emergency operations departments. Current contacts must be maintained between ICANN and Registry Operators and published to Registrars, where relevant to their role in escalations, prior to any processing of an Emergency Escalation by all related parties, and kept current at all times.

7.1. **Emergency Escalation initiated by ICANN**

Upon reaching 10% of the Emergency thresholds as described in Section 6, ICANN’s emergency operations will initiate an Emergency Escalation with the relevant Registry Operator. An Emergency Escalation consists of the following minimum elements: electronic (i.e., email or SMS) and/or voice contact notification to the Registry Operator’s emergency operations department with detailed information concerning the issue being escalated, including evidence of monitoring failures, cooperative trouble-shooting of the monitoring failure between ICANN staff and the Registry Operator, and the
commitment to begin the process of rectifying issues with either the monitoring service or the service being monitoring.

7.2. Emergency Escalation initiated by Registrars

Registry Operator will maintain an emergency operations departments prepared to handle emergency requests from registrars. In the event that a registrar is unable to conduct EPP transactions with the Registry because of a fault with the Registry Service and is unable to either contact (through ICANN mandated methods of communication) the Registry Operator, or the Registry Operator is unable or unwilling to address the fault, the registrar may initiate an Emergency Escalation to the emergency operations department of ICANN. ICANN then may initiate an Emergency Escalation with the Registry Operator as explained above.

7.3. Notifications of Outages and Maintenance

In the event that a Registry Operator plans maintenance, they will provide related notice to the ICANN emergency operations department, at least, 24 hours ahead of that maintenance. ICANN’s emergency operations department will note planned maintenance times, and suspend Emergency Escalation services for the monitored services during the expected maintenance outage period.

If Registry Operator declares an outage, as per their contractual obligations with ICANN, on services under SLA and performance requirements, it will notify the ICANN emergency operations department. During that declared outage, ICANN’s emergency operations department will note and suspend Emergency Escalation services for the monitored services involved.

8. Covenants of Performance Measurement

8.1. No interference. Registry Operator shall not interfere with measurement Probes, including any form of preferential treatment of the requests for the monitored services. Registry Operator shall respond to the measurement tests described in this Specification as it would do with any other request from Internet users (for DNS and RDDS) or registrars (for EPP).

8.2. ICANN testing registrar. Registry Operator agrees that ICANN will have a testing registrar used for purposes of measuring the SLRs described above. Registry Operator agrees to not provide any differentiated treatment for the testing registrar other than no billing of the transactions. ICANN shall not use the registrar for registering domain names (or other registry objects) for itself or others, except for the purposes of verifying contractual compliance with the conditions described in this Agreement.
1. PURPOSE OF CLEARINGHOUSE

1.1 The Trademark Clearinghouse is a central repository for information to be authenticated, stored, and disseminated, pertaining to the rights of trademark holders. ICANN will enter into an arms-length contract with service provider or providers, awarding the right to serve as a Trademark Clearinghouse Service Provider, i.e., to accept, authenticate, validate and facilitate the transmission of information related to certain trademarks.

1.2 The Clearinghouse will be required to separate its two primary functions: (i) authentication and validation of the trademarks in the Clearinghouse; and (ii) serving as a database to provide information to the new gTLD registries to support pre-launch Sunrise or Trademark Claims Services. Whether the same provider could serve both functions or whether two providers will be determined in the tender process.

1.3 The Registry shall only need to connect with one centralized database to obtain the information it needs to conduct its Sunrise or Trademark Claims Services regardless of the details of the Trademark Clearinghouse Service Provider’s contract(s) with ICANN.

1.4 Trademark Clearinghouse Service Provider may provide ancillary services, as long as those services and any data used for those services are kept separate from the Clearinghouse database.

1.5 The Clearinghouse database will be a repository of authenticated information and disseminator of the information to a limited number of recipients. Its functions will be performed in accordance with a limited charter, and will not have any discretionary powers other than what will be set out in the charter with respect to authentication and validation. The Clearinghouse administrator(s) cannot create policy. Before material changes are made to the Clearinghouse functions, they will be reviewed through the ICANN public participation model.

1.6 Inclusion in the Clearinghouse is not proof of any right, nor does it create any legal rights. Failure to submit trademarks into the Clearinghouse should not be perceived to be lack of vigilance by trademark holders or a waiver of any rights, nor can any negative influence be drawn from such failure.

2. SERVICE PROVIDERS

2.1 The selection of Trademark Clearinghouse Service Provider(s) will be subject to predetermined criteria, but the foremost considerations will be the ability to store, authenticate, validate and disseminate the data at the highest level of technical stability
and security without interference with the integrity or timeliness of the registration process or registry operations.

2.2 Functions – Authentication/Validation; Database Administration. Public commentary has suggested that the best way to protect the integrity of the data and to avoid concerns that arise through sole-source providers would be to separate the functions of database administration and data authentication/validation.

2.2.1 One entity will authenticate registrations ensuring the word marks qualify as registered or are court-validated word marks or word marks that are protected by statute or treaty. This entity would also be asked to ensure that proof of use of marks is provided, which can be demonstrated by furnishing a signed declaration and one specimen of current use.

2.2.2 The second entity will maintain the database and provide Sunrise and Trademark Claims Services (described below).

2.3 Discretion will be used, balancing effectiveness, security and other important factors, to determine whether ICANN will contract with one or two entities - one to authenticate and validate, and the other to, administer in order to preserve integrity of the data.

2.4 Contractual Relationship.

2.4.1 The Clearinghouse shall be separate and independent from ICANN. It will operate based on market needs and collect fees from those who use its services. ICANN may coordinate or specify interfaces used by registries and registrars, and provide some oversight or quality assurance function to ensure rights protection goals are appropriately met.

2.4.2 The Trademark Clearinghouse Service Provider(s) (authenticator/validator and administrator) will be selected through an open and transparent process to ensure low costs and reliable, consistent service for all those utilizing the Clearinghouse services.

2.4.3 The Service Provider(s) providing the authentication of the trademarks submitted into the Clearinghouse shall adhere to rigorous standards and requirements that would be specified in an ICANN contractual agreement.

2.4.4 The contract shall include service level requirements, customer service availability (with the goal of seven days per week, 24 hours per day, 365 days per year), data escrow requirements, and equal access requirements for all persons and entities required to access the Trademark Clearinghouse database.
2.4.5 To the extent practicable, the contract should also include indemnification by Service Provider for errors such as false positives for participants such as Registries, ICANN, Registrants and Registrars.

2.5. Service Provider Requirements. The Clearinghouse Service Provider(s) should utilize regional marks authentication service providers (whether directly or through subcontractors) to take advantage of local experts who understand the nuances of the trademark in question. Examples of specific performance criteria details in the contract award criteria and service-level-agreements are:

2.5.1 provide 24 hour accessibility seven days a week (database administrator);
2.5.2 employ systems that are technically reliable and secure (database administrator);
2.5.3 use globally accessible and scalable systems so that multiple marks from multiple sources in multiple languages can be accommodated and sufficiently cataloged (database administrator and validator);
2.5.4 accept submissions from all over the world - the entry point for trademark holders to submit their data into the Clearinghouse database could be regional entities or one entity;
2.5.5 allow for multiple languages, with exact implementation details to be determined;
2.5.6 provide access to the Registrants to verify and research Trademark Claims Notices;
2.5.7 have the relevant experience in database administration, validation or authentication, as well as accessibility to and knowledge of the various relevant trademark laws (database administrator and authenticator); and
2.5.8 ensure through performance requirements, including those involving interface with registries and registrars, that neither domain name registration timeliness, nor registry or registrar operations will be hindered (database administrator).

3. CRITERIA FOR TRADEMARK INCLUSION IN CLEARINGHOUSE

3.1 The trademark holder will submit to one entity – a single entity for entry will facilitate access to the entire Clearinghouse database. If regional entry points are used, ICANN will publish an information page describing how to locate regional submission points. Regardless of the entry point into the Clearinghouse, the authentication procedures established will be uniform.

3.2 The standards for inclusion in the Clearinghouse are:

3.2.1 Nationally or regionally registered word marks from all jurisdictions.
3.2.2 Any word mark that has been validated through a court of law or other judicial proceeding.
3.2.3 Any word mark protected by a statute or treaty in effect at the time the mark is submitted to the Clearinghouse for inclusion.

3.2.4 Other marks that constitute intellectual property.

3.2.5 Protections afforded to trademark registrations do not extend to applications for registrations, marks within any opposition period or registered marks that were the subject of successful invalidation, cancellation or rectification proceedings.

3.3 The type of data supporting entry of a registered word mark into the Clearinghouse must include a copy of the registration or the relevant ownership information, including the requisite registration number(s), the jurisdictions where the registrations have issued, and the name of the owner of record.

3.4 Data supporting entry of a judicially validated word mark into the Clearinghouse must include the court documents, properly entered by the court, evidencing the validation of a given word mark.

3.5 Data supporting entry into the Clearinghouse of word marks protected by a statute or treaty in effect at the time the mark is submitted to the Clearinghouse for inclusion, must include a copy of the relevant portion of the statute or treaty and evidence of its effective date.

3.6 Data supporting entry into the Clearinghouse of marks that constitute intellectual property of types other than those set forth in sections 3.2.1-3.2.3 above shall be determined by the registry operator and the Clearinghouse based on the services any given registry operator chooses to provide.

3.7 Registrations that include top level extensions such as “icann.org” or “.icann” as the word mark will not be permitted in the Clearinghouse regardless of whether that mark has been registered or it has been otherwise validated or protected (e.g., if a mark existed for icann.org or .icann, neither will not be permitted in the Clearinghouse).

3.8 All mark holders seeking to have their marks included in the Clearinghouse will be required to submit a declaration, affidavit, or other sworn statement that the information provided is true and current and has not been supplied for an improper purpose. The mark holder will also be required to attest that it will keep the information supplied to the Clearinghouse current so that if, during the time the mark is included in the Clearinghouse, a registration gets cancelled or is transferred to another entity, or in the case of a court- or Clearinghouse-validated mark the holder abandons use of the mark, the mark holder has an affirmative obligation to notify the Clearinghouse. There will be penalties for failing to keep information current. Moreover, it is anticipated that there will be a process whereby registrations can be
removed from the Clearinghouse if it is discovered that the marks are procured by fraud or if the data is inaccurate.

3.9 As an additional safeguard, the data will have to be renewed periodically by any mark holder wishing to remain in the Clearinghouse. Electronic submission should facilitate this process and minimize the cost associated with it. The reason for periodic authentication is to streamline the efficiencies of the Clearinghouse and the information the registry operators will need to process and limit the marks at issue to the ones that are in use.

4. USE OF CLEARINGHOUSE DATA

4.1 All mark holders seeking to have their marks included in the Clearinghouse will have to consent to the use of their information by the Clearinghouse. However, such consent would extend only to use in connection with the stated purpose of the Trademark Clearinghouse Database for Sunrise or Trademark Claims services. The reason for such a provision would be to presently prevent the Clearinghouse from using the data in other ways without permission. There shall be no bar on the Trademark Clearinghouse Service Provider or other third party service providers providing ancillary services on a non-exclusive basis.

4.2 In order not to create a competitive advantage, the data in the Trademark Clearinghouse should be licensed to competitors interested in providing ancillary services on equal and non-discriminatory terms and on commercially reasonable terms if the mark holders agree. Accordingly, two licensing options will be offered to the mark holder: (a) a license to use its data for all required features of the Trademark Clearinghouse, with no permitted use of such data for ancillary services either by the Trademark Clearinghouse Service Provider or any other entity; or (b) license to use its data for the mandatory features of the Trademark Clearinghouse and for any ancillary uses reasonably related to the protection of marks in new gTLDs, which would include a license to allow the Clearinghouse to license the use and data in the Trademark Clearinghouse to competitors that also provide those ancillary services. The specific implementation details will be determined, and all terms and conditions related to the provision of such services shall be included in the Trademark Clearinghouse Service Provider’s contract with ICANN and subject to ICANN review.

4.3 Access by a prospective registrant to verify and research Trademark Claims Notices shall not be considered an ancillary service, and shall be provided at no cost to the Registrant. Misuse of the data by the service providers would be grounds for immediate termination.
5. DATA AUTHENTICATION AND VALIDATION GUIDELINES

5.1 One core function for inclusion in the Clearinghouse would be to authenticate that the data meets certain minimum criteria. As such, the following minimum criteria are suggested:

5.1.1 An acceptable list of data authentication sources, i.e. the web sites of patent and trademark offices throughout the world, third party providers who can obtain information from various trademark offices;

5.1.2 Name, address and contact information of the applicant is accurate, current and matches that of the registered owner of the trademarks listed;

5.1.3 Electronic contact information is provided and accurate;

5.1.4 The registration numbers and countries match the information in the respective trademark office database for that registration number.

5.2 For validation of marks by the Clearinghouse that were not protected via a court, statute or treaty, the mark holder shall be required to provide evidence of use of the mark in connection with the bona fide offering for sale of goods or services prior to application for inclusion in the Clearinghouse. Acceptable evidence of use will be a signed declaration and a single specimen of current use, which might consist of labels, tags, containers, advertising, brochures, screen shots, or something else that evidences current use.

6. MANDATORY RIGHTS PROTECTION MECHANISMS

All new gTLD registries will be required to use the Trademark Clearinghouse to support its pre-launch or initial launch period rights protection mechanisms (RPMs). These RPMs, at a minimum, must consist of a Trademark Claims service and a Sunrise process.

6.1 Trademark Claims service

6.1.1 New gTLD Registry Operators must provide Trademark Claims services during an initial launch period for marks in the Trademark Clearinghouse. This launch period must occur for at least the first 60 days that registration is open for general registration.

6.1.2 A Trademark Claims service is intended to provide clear notice to the prospective registrant of the scope of the mark holder’s rights in order to minimize the chilling effect on registrants (Trademark Claims Notice). A form that describes the required elements is attached. The specific statement by
prospective registrant warrants that: (i) the prospective registrant has received notification that the mark(s) is included in the Clearinghouse; (ii) the prospective registrant has received and understood the notice; and (iii) to the best of the prospective registrant’s knowledge, the registration and use of the requested domain name will not infringe on the rights that are the subject of the notice.

6.1.3 The Trademark Claims Notice should provide the prospective registrant access to the Trademark Clearinghouse Database information referenced in the Trademark Claims Notice to enhance understanding of the Trademark rights being claimed by the trademark holder. These links (or other sources) shall be provided in real time without cost to the prospective registrant. Preferably, the Trademark Claims Notice should be provided in the language used for the rest of the interaction with the registrar or registry, but it is anticipated that at the very least the most appropriate UN-sponsored language (as specified by the prospective registrant or registrar/registry).

6.1.4 If the domain name is registered in the Clearinghouse, the registrar (again through an interface with the Clearinghouse) will promptly notify the mark holders(s) of the registration after it is effectuated.

6.1.5 The Trademark Clearinghouse Database will be structured to report to registries when registrants are attempting to register a domain name that is considered an “Identical Match” with the mark in the Clearinghouse. “Identical Match” means that the domain name consists of the complete and identical textual elements of the mark. In this regard: (a) spaces contained within a mark that are either replaced by hyphens (and vice versa) or omitted; (b) only certain special characters contained within a trademark are spelled out with appropriate words describing it (@ and &); (c) punctuation or special characters contained within a mark that are unable to be used in a second-level domain name may either be (i) omitted or (ii) replaced by spaces, hyphens or underscores and still be considered identical matches; and (d) no plural and no “marks contained” would qualify for inclusion.

6.2 Sunrise service

6.2.1 Sunrise registration services must be offered for a minimum of 30 days during the pre-launch phase and notice must be provided to all trademark holders in the Clearinghouse if someone is seeking a sunrise registration. This notice will be provided to holders of marks in the Clearinghouse that are an Identical Match to the name to be registered during Sunrise.

6.2.2 Sunrise Registration Process. For a Sunrise service, sunrise eligibility requirements (SERs) will be met as a minimum requirement, verified by Clearinghouse data, and
incorporate a Sunrise Dispute Resolution Policy (SDRP).

6.2.3 The proposed SERs include: (i) ownership of a mark (that satisfies the criteria in section 7.2 below), (ii) optional registry elected requirements re: international class of goods or services covered by registration; (iii) representation that all provided information is true and correct; and (iv) provision of data sufficient to document rights in the trademark.

6.2.4 The proposed SDRP must allow challenges based on at least the following four grounds: (i) at time the challenged domain name was registered, the registrant did not hold a trademark registration of national effect (or regional effect) or the trademark had not been court-validated or protected by statute or treaty; (ii) the domain name is not identical to the mark on which the registrant based its Sunrise registration; (iii) the trademark registration on which the registrant based its Sunrise registration is not of national effect (or regional effect) or the trademark had not been court-validated or protected by statute or treaty; or (iv) the trademark registration on which the domain name registrant based its Sunrise registration did not issue on or before the effective date of the Registry Agreement and was not applied for on or before ICANN announced the applications received.

6.2.5 The Clearinghouse will maintain the SERs, validate and authenticate marks, as applicable, and hear challenges.

7. PROTECTION FOR MARKS IN CLEARINGHOUSE

The scope of registered marks that must be honored by registries in providing Trademarks Claims services is broader than those that must be honored by registries in Sunrise services.

7.1 For Trademark Claims services - Registries must recognize and honor all word marks that have been or are: (i) nationally or regionally registered; (ii) court-validated; or (iii) specifically protected by a statute or treaty in effect at the time the mark is submitted to the Clearinghouse for inclusion. No demonstration of use is required.

7.2 For Sunrise services - Registries must recognize and honor all word marks: (i) nationally or regionally registered and for which proof of use – which can be a declaration and a single specimen of current use – was submitted to, and validated by, the Trademark Clearinghouse; or (ii) that have been court-validated; or (iii) that are specifically protected by a statute or treaty currently in effect and that was in effect on or before 26 June 2008.

8. COSTS OF CLEARINGHOUSE

Costs should be completely borne by the parties utilizing the services. Trademark holders will pay to register the Clearinghouse, and registries will pay for Trademark Claims and Sunrise services. Registrars and others who avail themselves of Clearinghouse services will pay the Clearinghouse directly.
TRADEMARK NOTICE

[In English and the language of the registration agreement]

You have received this Trademark Notice because you have applied for a domain name which matches at least one trademark record submitted to the Trademark Clearinghouse.

You may or may not be entitled to register the domain name depending on your intended use and whether it is the same or significantly overlaps with the trademarks listed below.

Your rights to register this domain name may or may not be protected as noncommercial use or “fair use” by the laws of your country. [in bold italics or all caps]

Please read the trademark information below carefully, including the trademarks, jurisdictions, and goods and service for which the trademarks are registered. Please be aware that not all jurisdictions review trademark applications closely, so some of the trademark information below may exist in a national or regional registry which does not conduct a thorough or substantive review of trademark rights prior to registration.

If you have questions, you may want to consult an attorney or legal expert on trademarks and intellectual property for guidance.

If you continue with this registration, you represent that, you have received and you understand this notice and to the best of your knowledge, your registration and use of the requested domain name will not infringe on the trademark rights listed below. The following [number] Trademarks are listed in the Trademark Clearinghouse:

1. Mark: Jurisdiction: Goods: [click here for more if maximum character count is exceeded] International Class of Goods and Services or Equivalent if applicable: Trademark Registrant: Trademark Registrant Contact:

[with links to the TM registrations as listed in the TM Clearinghouse]

2. Mark: Jurisdiction: Goods: [click here for more if maximum character count is exceeded] International Class of Goods and Services or Equivalent if applicable: Trademark Registrant:

Trademark Registrant Contact:
***** [with links to the TM registrations as listed in the TM Clearinghouse]

X. 1. Mark: Jurisdiction: Goods: [click here for more if maximum character count is exceeded] International Class of Goods and Services or Equivalent if applicable: Trademark Registrant: Trademark Registrant Contact:
UNIFORM RAPID SUSPENSION SYSTEM (“URS”)  
4 JUNE 2012  

DRAFT PROCEDURE  

1. Complaint  

1.1 Filing the Complaint  

a) Proceedings are initiated by electronically filing with a URS Provider a Complaint outlining the trademark rights and the actions complained of entitling the trademark holder to relief.  

b) Each Complaint must be accompanied by the appropriate fee, which is under consideration. The fees will be non-refundable.  

c) One Complaint is acceptable for multiple related companies against one Registrant, but only if the companies complaining are related. Multiple Registrants can be named in one Complaint only if it can be shown that they are in some way related. There will not be a minimum number of domain names imposed as a prerequisite to filing.  

1.2 Contents of the Complaint  

The form of the Complaint will be simple and as formulaic as possible. There will be a Form Complaint. The Form Complaint shall include space for the following:  

1.2.1 Name, email address and other contact information for the Complaining Party (Parties).  

1.2.2 Name, email address and contact information for any person authorized to act on behalf of Complaining Parties.  

1.2.3 Name of Registrant (i.e. relevant information available from Whois) and Whois listed available contact information for the relevant domain name(s).  

1.2.4 The specific domain name(s) that are the subject of the Complaint. For each domain name, the Complainant shall include a copy of the currently available Whois information and a description and copy, if available, of the offending portion of the website content associated with each domain name that is the subject of the Complaint.  

1.2.5 The specific trademark/service marks upon which the Complaint is based and pursuant to which the Complaining Parties are asserting their rights to them, for which goods and in connection with what services.  

1.2.6 A statement of the grounds upon which the Complaint is based setting forth facts showing that the Complaining Party is entitled to relief, namely:
1.2.6.1. that the registered domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a word mark: (i) for which the Complainant holds a valid national or regional registration and that is in current use; or (ii) that has been validated through court proceedings; or (iii) that is specifically protected by a statute or treaty in effect at the time the URS complaint is filed.

a. Use can be shown by demonstrating that evidence of use – which can be a declaration and one specimen of current use in commerce - was submitted to, and validated by, the Trademark Clearinghouse) 

b. Proof of use may also be submitted directly with the URS Complaint.

and

1.2.6.2. that the Registrant has no legitimate right or interest to the domain name; and

1.2.6.3. that the domain was registered and is being used in bad faith.

A non-exclusive list of circumstances that demonstrate bad faith registration and use by the Registrant include:

a. Registrant has registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

b. Registrant has registered the domain name in order to prevent the trademark holder or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that Registrant has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

c. Registrant registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

d. By using the domain name Registrant has intentionally attempted to attract for commercial gain, Internet users to Registrant’s web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Registrant’s web site or location or of a product or service on that web site or location.
1.2.7 A box in which the Complainant may submit up to 500 words of explanatory free form text.

1.2.8. An attestation that the Complaint is not being filed for any improper basis and that there is a sufficient good faith basis for filing the Complaint.

2. Fees

2.1 URS Provider will charge fees to the Complainant. Fees are thought to be in the range of USD 300 per proceeding, but will ultimately be set by the Provider.

2.2 Complaints listing fifteen (15) or more disputed domain names registered by the same registrant will be subject to a Response Fee which will be refundable to the prevailing party. Under no circumstances shall the Response Fee exceed the fee charged to the Complainant.

3. Administrative Review

3.1 Complaints will be subjected to an initial administrative review by the URS Provider for compliance with the filing requirements. This is a review to determine that the Complaint contains all of the necessary information, and is not a determination as to whether a prima facie case has been established.

3.2 The Administrative Review shall be conducted within two (2) business days of submission of the Complaint to the URS Provider.

3.3 Given the rapid nature of this Procedure, and the intended low level of required fees, there will be no opportunity to correct inadequacies in the filing requirements.

3.4 If a Complaint is deemed non-compliant with filing requirements, the Complaint will be dismissed without prejudice to the Complainant filing a new complaint. The initial filing fee shall not be refunded in these circumstances.

4. Notice and Locking of Domain

4.1 Upon completion of the Administrative Review, the URS Provider must immediately notify the registry operator (via email) ("Notice of Complaint") after the Complaint has been deemed compliant with the filing requirements. Within 24 hours of receipt of the Notice of Complaint from the URS Provider, the registry operator shall lock the domain, meaning the registry shall restrict all changes to the registration data, including transfer and deletion of the domain names, but the name will continue to resolve. The registry operator will notify the URS Provider immediately upon locking the domain name ("Notice of Lock").

4.2 Within 24 hours after receiving Notice of Lock from the registry operator, the URS Provider shall notify the Registrant of the Complaint, sending a hard copy of the Notice of Complaint to the addresses listed in the Whois contact information, and providing an electronic copy of the Complaint, advising of the locked status, as well as the potential
effects if the Registrant fails to respond and defend against the Complaint. Notices must be clear and understandable to Registrants located globally. The Notice of Complaint shall be in English and translated by the Provider into the predominant language used in the registrant’s country or territory.

4.3 All Notices to the Registrant shall be sent through email, fax (where available) and postal mail. The Complaint and accompanying exhibits, if any, shall be served electronically.

4.4 The URS Provider shall also electronically notify the registrar of record for the domain name at issue via the addresses the registrar has on file with ICANN.

5. The Response

5.1 A Registrant will have 14 calendar days from the date the URS Provider sent its Notice of Complaint to the Registrant to electronically file a Response with the URS Provider. Upon receipt, the Provider will electronically send a copy of the Response, and accompanying exhibits, if any, to the Complainant.

5.2 No filing fee will be charged if the Registrant files its Response prior to being declared in default or not more than thirty (30) days following a Determination. For Responses filed more than thirty (30) days after a Determination, the Registrant should pay a reasonable non-refundable fee for re-examination, plus a Response Fee as set forth in section 2.2 above if the Complaint lists twenty-six (26) or more disputed domain names against the same registrant. The Response Fee will be refundable to the prevailing party.

5.3 Upon request by the Registrant, a limited extension of time to respond may be granted by the URS Provider if there is a good faith basis for doing so. In no event shall the extension be for more than seven (7) calendar days.

5.4 The Response shall be no longer than 2,500 words, excluding attachments, and the content of the Response should include the following:

5.4.1 Confirmation of Registrant data.

5.4.2 Specific admission or denial of each of the grounds upon which the Complaint is based.

5.4.3 Any defense which contradicts the Complainant’s claims.

5.4.4 A statement that the contents are true and accurate.

5.5 In keeping with the intended expedited nature of the URS and the remedy afforded to a successful Complainant, affirmative claims for relief by the Registrant will not be permitted except for an allegation that the Complainant has filed an abusive Complaint.

5.6 Once the Response is filed, and the URS Provider determines that the Response is compliant with the filing requirements of a Response (which shall be on the same day),
the Complaint, Response and supporting materials will immediately be sent to a qualified Examiner, selected by the URS Provider, for review and Determination. All materials submitted are considered by the Examiner.

5.7 The Response can contain any facts refuting the claim of bad faith registration by setting out any of the following circumstances:

5.7.1 Before any notice to Registrant of the dispute, Registrant’s use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

5.7.2 Registrant (as an individual, business or other organization) has been commonly known by the domain name, even if Registrant has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

5.7.3 Registrant is making a legitimate or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

Such claims, if found by the Examiner to be proved based on its evaluation of all evidence, shall result in a finding in favor of the Registrant.

5.8 The Registrant may also assert Defenses to the Complaint to demonstrate that the Registrant’s use of the domain name is not in bad faith by showing, for example, one of the following:

5.8.1 The domain name is generic or descriptive and the Registrant is making fair use of it.

5.8.2 The domain name sites are operated solely in tribute to or in criticism of a person or business that is found by the Examiner to be fair use.

5.8.3 Registrant’s holding of the domain name is consistent with an express term of a written agreement entered into by the disputing Parties and that is still in effect.

5.8.4 The domain name is not part of a wider pattern or series of abusive registrations because the Domain Name is of a significantly different type or character to other domain names registered by the Registrant.

5.9 Other factors for the Examiner to consider:

5.9.1 Trading in domain names for profit, and holding a large portfolio of domain names, are of themselves not indicia of bad faith under the URS. Such conduct, however, may be abusive in a given case depending on the circumstances of the dispute. The Examiner must review each case on its merits.

5.9.2 Sale of traffic (i.e. connecting domain names to parking pages and earning click-per-view revenue) does not in and of itself constitute bad faith under the URS.
Such conduct, however, may be abusive in a given case depending on the circumstances of the dispute. The Examiner will take into account:

5.9.2.1. the nature of the domain name;

5.9.2.2. the nature of the advertising links on any parking page associated with the domain name; and

5.9.2.3. that the use of the domain name is ultimately the Registrant’s responsibility.

6. Default

6.1 If at the expiration of the 14-day answer period (or extended period if granted), the Registrant does not submit an answer, the Complaint proceeds to Default.

6.2 In either case, the Provider shall provide Notice of Default via email to the Complainant and Registrant, and via mail and fax to Registrant. During the Default period, the Registrant will be prohibited from changing content found on the site to argue that it is now a legitimate use and will also be prohibited from changing the Whois information.

6.3 All Default cases proceed to Examination for review on the merits of the claim.

6.4 If after Examination in Default cases, the Examiner rules in favor of Complainant, Registrant shall have the right to seek relief from Default via de novo review by filing a Response at any time up to six months after the date of the Notice of Default. The Registrant will also be entitled to request an extension of an additional six months if the extension is requested before the expiration of the initial six-month period.

6.5 If a Response is filed after: (i) the Respondent was in Default (so long as the Response is filed in accordance with 6.4 above); and (ii) proper notice is provided in accordance with the notice requirements set forth above, the domain name shall again resolve to the original IP address as soon as practical, but shall remain locked as if the Response had been filed in a timely manner before Default. The filing of a Response after Default is not an appeal; the case is considered as if responded to in a timely manner.

6.5 If after Examination in Default case, the Examiner rules in favor of Registrant, the Provider shall notify the Registry Operator to unlock the name and return full control of the domain name registration to the Registrant.

7. Examiners

7.1 One Examiner selected by the Provider will preside over a URS proceeding.

7.2 Examiners should have demonstrable relevant legal background, such as in trademark law, and shall be trained and certified in URS proceedings. Specifically, Examiners shall be provided with instructions on the URS elements and defenses and how to conduct the examination of a URS proceeding.
7.3 Examiners used by any given URS Provider shall be rotated to the extent feasible to avoid “forum or examiner shopping.” URS Providers are strongly encouraged to work equally with all certified Examiners, with reasonable exceptions (such as language needs, non-performance, or malfeasance) to be determined on a case by case analysis.

8. Examination Standards and Burden of Proof

8.1 The standards that the qualified Examiner shall apply when rendering its Determination are whether:

8.1.2 The registered domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a word mark: (i) for which the Complainant holds a valid national or regional registration and that is in current use; or (ii) that has been validated through court proceedings; or (iii) that is specifically protected by a statute or treaty currently in effect and that was in effect at the time the URS Complaint is filed; and

8.1.2.1 Use can be shown by demonstrating that evidence of use – which can be a declaration and one specimen of current use – was submitted to, and validated by, the Trademark Clearinghouse.

8.1.2.2 Proof of use may also be submitted directly with the URS Complaint.

8.1.2 The Registrant has no legitimate right or interest to the domain name; and

8.1.3 The domain was registered and is being used in a bad faith.

8.2 The burden of proof shall be clear and convincing evidence.

8.3 For a URS matter to conclude in favor of the Complainant, the Examiner shall render a Determination that there is no genuine issue of material fact. Such Determination may include that: (i) the Complainant has rights to the name; and (ii) the Registrant has no rights or legitimate interest in the name. This means that the Complainant must present adequate evidence to substantiate its trademark rights in the domain name (e.g., evidence of a trademark registration and evidence that the domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith in violation of the URS).

8.4 If the Examiner finds that the Complainant has not met its burden, or that genuine issues of material fact remain in regards to any of the elements, the Examiner will reject the Complaint under the relief available under the URS. That is, the Complaint shall be dismissed if the Examiner finds that evidence was presented or is available to the Examiner to indicate that the use of the domain name in question is a non-infringing use or fair use of the trademark.

8.5 Where there is any genuine contestable issue as to whether a domain name registration and use of a trademark are in bad faith, the Complaint will be denied, the URS proceeding will be terminated without prejudice, e.g., a UDRP, court proceeding or
another URS may be filed. The URS is not intended for use in any proceedings with open questions of fact, but only clear cases of trademark abuse.

8.6 To restate in another way, if the Examiner finds that all three standards are satisfied by clear and convincing evidence and that there is no genuine contestable issue, then the Examiner shall issue a Determination in favor of the Complainant. If the Examiner finds that any of the standards have not been satisfied, then the Examiner shall deny the relief requested, thereby terminating the URS proceeding without prejudice to the Complainant to proceed with an action in court of competent jurisdiction or under the UDRP.

9. Determination

9.1 There will be no discovery or hearing; the evidence will be the materials submitted with the Complaint and the Response, and those materials will serve as the entire record used by the Examiner to make a Determination.

9.2 If the Complainant satisfies the burden of proof, the Examiner will issue a Determination in favor of the Complainant. The Determination will be published on the URS Provider’s website. However, there should be no other preclusive effect of the Determination other than the URS proceeding to which it is rendered.

9.3 If the Complainant does not satisfy the burden of proof, the URS proceeding is terminated and full control of the domain name registration shall be returned to the Registrant.

9.4 Determinations resulting from URS proceedings will be published by the service provider in a format specified by ICANN.

9.5 Determinations shall also be emailed by the URS Provider to the Registrant, the Complainant, the Registrar, and the Registry Operator, and shall specify the remedy and required actions of the registry operator to comply with the Determination.

9.6 To conduct URS proceedings on an expedited basis, examination should begin immediately upon the earlier of the expiration of a fourteen (14) day Response period (or extended period if granted), or upon the submission of the Response. A Determination shall be rendered on an expedited basis, with the stated goal that it be rendered within three (3) business days from when Examination began. Absent extraordinary circumstances, however, Determinations must be issued no later than five (5) days after the Response is filed. Implementation details will be developed to accommodate the needs of service providers once they are selected. (The tender offer for potential service providers will indicate that timeliness will be a factor in the award decision.)

10. Remedy

10.1 If the Determination is in favor of the Complainant, the decision shall be immediately transmitted to the registry operator.
10.2 Immediately upon receipt of the Determination, the registry operator shall suspend the domain name, which shall remain suspended for the balance of the registration period and would not resolve to the original web site. The nameservers shall be redirected to an informational web page provided by the URS Provider about the URS. The URS Provider shall not be allowed to offer any other services on such page, nor shall it directly or indirectly use the web page for advertising purposes (either for itself or any other third party). The Whois for the domain name shall continue to display all of the information of the original Registrant except for the redirection of the nameservers. In addition, the Whois shall reflect that the domain name will not be able to be transferred, deleted or modified for the life of the registration.

10.3 There shall be an option for a successful Complainant to extend the registration period for one additional year at commercial rates.

10.4 No other remedies should be available in the event of a Determination in favor of the Complainant.

11. **Abusive Complaints**

11.1 The URS shall incorporate penalties for abuse of the process by trademark holders.

11.2 In the event a party is deemed to have filed two (2) abusive Complaints, or one (1) “deliberate material falsehood,” that party shall be barred from utilizing the URS for one-year following the date of issuance of a Determination finding a complainant to have: (i) filed its second abusive complaint; or (ii) filed a deliberate material falsehood.

11.3 A Complaint may be deemed abusive if the Examiner determines:

   11.3.1 it was presented solely for improper purpose such as to harass, cause unnecessary delay, or needlessly increase the cost of doing business; and

   11.3.2 (i) the claims or other assertions were not warranted by any existing law or the URS standards; or (ii) the factual contentions lacked any evidentiary support

11.4 An Examiner may find that Complaint contained a deliberate material falsehood if it contained an assertion of fact, which at the time it was made, was made with the knowledge that it was false and which, if true, would have an impact on the outcome on the URS proceeding.

11.5 Two findings of “deliberate material falsehood” shall permanently bar the party from utilizing the URS.

11.6 URS Providers shall be required to develop a process for identifying and tracking barred parties, and parties whom Examiners have determined submitted abusive complaints or deliberate material falsehoods.
11.7 The dismissal of a complaint for administrative reasons or a ruling on the merits, in itself, shall not be evidence of filing an abusive complaint.

11.8 A finding that filing of a complaint was abusive or contained a deliberate materially falsehood can be appealed solely on the grounds that an Examiner abused his/her discretion, or acted in an arbitrary or capricious manner.

12. Appeal

12.1 Either party shall have a right to seek a de novo appeal of the Determination based on the existing record within the URS proceeding for a reasonable fee to cover the costs of the appeal. An appellant must identify the specific grounds on which the party is appealing, including why the appellant claims the Examiner’s Determination was incorrect.

12.2 The fees for an appeal shall be borne by the appellant. A limited right to introduce new admissible evidence that is material to the Determination will be allowed upon payment of an additional fee, provided the evidence clearly pre-dates the filing of the Complaint. The Appeal Panel, to be selected by the Provider, may request, in its sole discretion, further statements or documents from either of the Parties.

12.3 Filing an appeal shall not change the domain name’s resolution. For example, if the domain name no longer resolves to the original nameservers because of a Determination in favor or the Complainant, the domain name shall continue to point to the informational page provided by the URS Provider. If the domain name resolves to the original nameservers because of a Determination in favor of the registrant, it shall continue to resolve during the appeal process.

12.4 An appeal must be filed within 14 days after a Determination is issued and any Response must be filed 14 days after an appeal is filed.

12.5 If a respondent has sought relief from Default by filing a Response within six months (or the extended period if applicable) of issuance of initial Determination, an appeal must be filed within 14 days from date the second Determination is issued and any Response must be filed 14 days after the appeal is filed.

12.6 Notice of appeal and findings by the appeal panel shall be sent by the URS Provider via e-mail to the Registrant, the Complainant, the Registrar, and the Registry Operator.

12.7 The Providers’ rules and procedures for appeals, other than those stated above, shall apply.

13. Other Available Remedies

The URS Determination shall not preclude any other remedies available to the appellant, such as UDRP (if appellant is the Complainant), or other remedies as may be available in a court of competition jurisdiction. A URS Determination for or against a party shall not prejudice the
party in UDRP or any other proceedings.

14. Review of URS

A review of the URS procedure will be initiated one year after the first Examiner Determination is issued. Upon completion of the review, a report shall be published regarding the usage of the procedure, including statistical information, and posted for public comment on the usefulness and effectiveness of the procedure.
1. **Parties to the Dispute**

The parties to the dispute will be the trademark holder and the gTLD registry operator. ICANN shall not be a party.

2. **Applicable Rules**

2.1 This procedure is intended to cover Trademark post-delegation dispute resolution proceedings generally. To the extent more than one Trademark PDDRP provider (“Provider”) is selected to implement the Trademark PDDRP, each Provider may have additional rules that must be followed when filing a Complaint. The following are general procedures to be followed by all Providers.

2.2 In the Registry Agreement, the registry operator agrees to participate in all post-delegation procedures and be bound by the resulting Determinations.

3. **Language**

3.1 The language of all submissions and proceedings under the procedure will be English.

3.2 Parties may submit supporting evidence in their original language, provided and subject to the authority of the Expert Panel to determine otherwise, that such evidence is accompanied by an English translation of all relevant text.

4. **Communications and Time Limits**

4.1 All communications with the Provider must be submitted electronically.

4.2 For the purpose of determining the date of commencement of a time limit, a notice or other communication will be deemed to have been received on the day that it is transmitted to the appropriate contact person designated by the parties.

4.3 For the purpose of determining compliance with a time limit, a notice or other communication will be deemed to have been sent, made or transmitted on the day that it is dispatched.

4.4 For the purpose of calculating a period of time under this procedure, such period will begin to run on the day following the date of receipt of a notice or other communication.

4.5 All references to day limits shall be considered as calendar days unless otherwise specified.
5. Standing

5.1 The mandatory administrative proceeding will commence when a third-party complainant (“Complainant”) has filed a Complaint with a Provider asserting that the Complainant is a trademark holder (which may include either registered or unregistered marks as defined below) claiming that one or more of its marks have been infringed, and thereby the Complainant has been harmed, by the registry operator’s manner of operation or use of the gTLD.

5.2 Before proceeding to the merits of a dispute, and before the Respondent is required to submit a substantive Response, or pay any fees, the Provider shall appoint a special one-person Panel to perform an initial “threshold” review (“Threshold Review Panel”).

6. Standards

For purposes of these standards, “registry operator” shall include entities directly or indirectly controlling, controlled by or under common control with a registry operator, whether by ownership or control of voting securities, by contract or otherwise where ‘control’ means the possession, directly or indirectly, of the power to direct or cause the direction of the management and policies of an entity, whether by ownership or control of voting securities, by contract or otherwise.

6.1 Top Level:

A complainant must assert and prove, by clear and convincing evidence, that the registry operator’s affirmative conduct in its operation or use of its gTLD string that is identical or confusingly similar to the complainant’s mark, causes or materially contributes to the gTLD doing one of the following:

(a) taking unfair advantage of the distinctive character or the reputation of the complainant’s mark; or

(b) impairing the distinctive character or the reputation of the complainant’s mark; or

(c) creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark.

An example of infringement at the top-level is where a TLD string is identical to a trademark and then the registry operator holds itself out as the beneficiary of the mark.

6.2 Second Level

Complainants are required to prove, by clear and convincing evidence that, through the registry operator’s affirmative conduct:

(a) there is a substantial pattern or practice of specific bad faith intent by the registry operator to profit from the sale of trademark infringing domain names; and
(b) the registry operator’s bad faith intent to profit from the systematic registration of domain names within the gTLD that are identical or confusingly similar to the complainant’s mark, which:

(i) takes unfair advantage of the distinctive character or the reputation of the complainant’s mark; or

(ii) impairs the distinctive character or the reputation of the complainant’s mark, or

(iii) creates a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark.

In other words, it is not sufficient to show that the registry operator is on notice of possible trademark infringement through registrations in the gTLD. The registry operator is not liable under the PDDRP solely because: (i) infringing names are in its registry; or (ii) the registry operator knows that infringing names are in its registry; or (iii) the registry operator did not monitor the registrations within its registry.

A registry operator is not liable under the PDDRP for any domain name registration that: (i) is registered by a person or entity that is unaffiliated with the registry operator; (ii) is registered without the direct or indirect encouragement, inducement, initiation or direction of any person or entity affiliated with the registry operator; and (iii) provides no direct or indirect benefit to the registry operator other than the typical registration fee (which may include other fees collected incidental to the registration process for value added services such enhanced registration security).

An example of infringement at the second level is where a registry operator has a pattern or practice of actively and systematically encouraging registrants to register second level domain names and to take unfair advantage of the trademark to the extent and degree that bad faith is apparent. Another example of infringement at the second level is where a registry operator has a pattern or practice of acting as the registrant or beneficial user of infringing registrations, to monetize and profit in bad faith.

7. Complaint

7.1 Filing:

The Complaint will be filed electronically. Once the Administrative Review has been completed and the Provider deems the Complaint be in compliance, the Provider will electronically serve the Complaint and serve a paper notice on the registry operator that is the subject of the Complaint (“Notice of Complaint”) consistent with the contact information listed in the Registry Agreement.

7.2 Content:

7.2.1 The name and contact information, including address, phone, and email address, of the Complainant, and, to the best of Complainant’s knowledge, the name and address of the current owner of the registration.
7.2.2 The name and contact information, including address, phone, and email address of any person authorized to act on behalf of Complainant.

7.2.3 A statement of the nature of the dispute, and any relevant evidence, which shall include:

(a) The particular legal rights claim being asserted, the marks that form the basis for the dispute and a short and plain statement of the basis upon which the Complaint is being filed.

(b) A detailed explanation of how the Complainant’s claim meets the requirements for filing a claim pursuant to that particular ground or standard.

(c) A detailed explanation of the validity of the Complaint and why the Complainant is entitled to relief.

(d) A statement that the Complainant has at least 30 days prior to filing the Complaint notified the registry operator in writing of: (i) its specific concerns and specific conduct it believes is resulting in infringement of Complainant’s trademarks and (ii) its willingness to meet to resolve the issue.

(e) An explanation of how the mark is used by the Complainant (including the type of goods/services, period and territory of use – including all online usage) or otherwise protected by statute, treaty or has been validated by a court or the Clearinghouse.

(f) Copies of any documents that the Complainant considers to evidence its basis for relief, including evidence of current use of the Trademark at issue in the Complaint and domain name registrations.

(g) A statement that the proceedings are not being brought for any improper purpose.

(h) A statement describing how the registration at issue has harmed the trademark owner.

7.3 Complaints will be limited 5,000 words and 20 pages, excluding attachments, unless the Provider determines that additional material is necessary.

7.4 At the same time the Complaint is filed, the Complainant will pay a non-refundable filing fee in the amount set in accordance with the applicable Provider rules. In the event that the filing fee is not paid within 10 days of the receipt of the Complaint by the Provider, the Complaint will be dismissed without prejudice.
8. Administrative Review of the Complaint

8.1 All Complaints will be reviewed by the Provider within five (5) business days of submission to the Provider to determine whether the Complaint contains all necessary information and complies with the procedural rules.

8.2 If the Provider finds that the Complaint complies with procedural rules, the Complaint will be deemed filed, and the proceedings will continue to the Threshold Review. If the Provider finds that the Complaint does not comply with procedural rules, it will electronically notify the Complainant of such non-compliant and provide the Complainant five (5) business days to submit an amended Complaint. If the Provider does not receive an amended Complaint within the five (5) business days provided, it will dismiss the Complaint and close the proceedings without prejudice to the Complainant’s submission of a new Complaint that complies with procedural rules. Filing fees will not be refunded.

8.3 If deemed compliant, the Provider will electronically serve the Complaint on the registry operator and serve the Notice of Complaint consistent with the contact information listed in the Registry Agreement.

9. Threshold Review

9.1 Provider shall establish a Threshold Review Panel, consisting of one panelist selected by the Provider, for each proceeding within five (5) business days after completion of Administrative Review and the Complaint has been deemed compliant with procedural rules.

9.2 The Threshold Review Panel shall be tasked with determining whether the Complainant satisfies the following criteria:

9.2.1 The Complainant is a holder of a word mark that: (i) is nationally or regionally registered and that is in current use; or (ii) has been validated through court proceedings; or (iii) that is specifically protected by a statute or treaty at the time the PDDRP complaint is filed;

9.2.1.1 Use can be shown by demonstrating that evidence of use – which can be a declaration and one specimen of current use – was submitted to, and validated by, the Trademark Clearinghouse

9.2.1.2 Proof of use may also be submitted directly with the Complaint.

9.2.2 The Complainant has asserted that it has been materially harmed as a result of trademark infringement;

9.2.3 The Complainant has asserted facts with sufficient specificity that, if everything the Complainant asserted is true, states a claim under the Top Level Standards herein

OR
The Complainant has asserted facts with sufficient specificity that, if everything the Complainant asserted is true, states a claim under the Second Level Standards herein;

9.2.4 The Complainant has asserted that: (i) at least 30 days prior to filing the Complaint the Complainant notified the registry operator in writing of its specific concerns and specific conduct it believes is resulting in infringement of Complainant’s trademarks, and its willingness to meet to resolve the issue; (ii) whether the registry operator responded to the Complainant’s notice of specific concerns; and (iii) if the registry operator did respond, that the Complainant attempted to engage in good faith discussions to resolve the issue prior to initiating the PDDRP.

9.3 Within ten (10) business days of date Provider served Notice of Complaint, the registry operator shall have the opportunity, but is not required, to submit papers to support its position as to the Complainant’s standing at the Threshold Review stage. If the registry operator chooses to file such papers, it must pay a filing fee.

9.4 If the registry operator submits papers, the Complainant shall have ten (10) business days to submit an opposition.

9.5 The Threshold Review Panel shall have ten (10) business days from due date of Complainant’s opposition or the due date of the registry operator’s papers if none were filed, to issue Threshold Determination.

9.6 Provider shall electronically serve the Threshold Determination on all parties.

9.7 If the Complainant has not satisfied the Threshold Review criteria, the Provider will dismiss the proceedings on the grounds that the Complainant lacks standing and declare that the registry operator is the prevailing party.

9.8 If the Threshold Review Panel determines that the Complainant has standing and satisfied the criteria then the Provider will commence the proceedings on the merits.

10. Response to the Complaint

10.1 The registry operator must file a Response to each Complaint within forty-five (45) days after the date of the Threshold Review Panel Declaration.

10.2 The Response will comply with the rules for filing of a Complaint and will contain the name and contact information for the registry operator, as well as a point-by-point response to the statements made in the Complaint.

10.3 The Response must be filed with the Provider and the Provider must serve it upon the Complainant in electronic form with a hard-copy notice that it has been served.
10.4 Service of the Response will be deemed effective, and the time will start to run for a Reply, upon confirmation that the electronic Response and hard-copy notice of the Response was sent by the Provider to the addresses provided by the Complainant.

10.5 If the registry operator believes the Complaint is without merit, it will affirmatively plead in its Response the specific grounds for the claim.

11. Reply

11.1 The Complainant is permitted ten (10) days from Service of the Response to submit a Reply addressing the statements made in the Response showing why the Complaint is not “without merit.” A Reply may not introduce new facts or evidence into the record, but shall only be used to address statements made in the Response. Any new facts or evidence introduced in a Response shall be disregarded by the Expert Panel.

11.2 Once the Complaint, Response and Reply (as necessary) are filed and served, a Panel will be appointed and provided with all submissions.

12. Default

12.1 If the registry operator fails to respond to the Complaint, it will be deemed to be in default.

12.2 Limited rights to set aside the finding of default will be established by the Provider, but in no event will they be permitted absent a showing of good cause to set aside the finding of default.

12.3 The Provider shall provide notice of Default via email to the Complainant and registry operator.

12.4 All Default cases shall proceed to Expert Determination on the merits.

13. Expert Panel

13.1 The Provider shall establish an Expert Panel within 21 days after receiving the Reply, or if no Reply is filed, within 21 days after the Reply was due to be filed.

13.2 The Provider shall appoint a one-person Expert Panel, unless any party requests a three-member Expert Panel. No Threshold Panel member shall serve as an Expert Panel member in the same Trademark PDDRP proceeding.

13.3 In the case where either party requests a three-member Expert Panel, each party (or each side of the dispute if a matter has been consolidated) shall select an Expert and the two selected Experts shall select the third Expert Panel member. Such selection shall be made pursuant to the Providers rules or procedures. Trademark PDDRP panelists within a Provider shall be rotated to the extent feasible.
13.4 Expert Panel member must be independent of the parties to the post-delegation challenge. Each Provider will follow its adopted procedures for requiring such independence, including procedures for challenging and replacing a panelist for lack of independence.

14. Costs

14.1 The Provider will estimate the costs for the proceedings that it administers under this procedure in accordance with the applicable Provider rules. Such costs will be estimated to cover the administrative fees of the Provider, the Threshold Review Panel and the Expert Panel, and are intended to be reasonable.

14.2 The Complainant shall be required to pay the filing fee as set forth above in the “Complaint” section, and shall be required to submit the full amount of the Provider estimated administrative fees, the Threshold Review Panel fees and the Expert Panel fees at the outset of the proceedings. Fifty percent of that full amount shall be in cash (or cash equivalent) to cover the Complainant’s share of the proceedings and the other 50% shall be in either cash (or cash equivalent), or in bond, to cover the registry operator’s share if the registry operator prevails.

14.3 If the Panel declares the Complainant to be the prevailing party, the registry operator is required to reimburse Complainant for all Panel and Provider fees incurred. Failure to do so shall be deemed a violation of the Trademark PDDRP and a breach of the Registry Agreement, subject to remedies available under the Agreement up to and including termination.

15. Discovery

15.1 Whether and to what extent discovery is allowed is at the discretion of the Panel, whether made on the Panel’s own accord, or upon request from the Parties.

15.2 If permitted, discovery will be limited to that for which each Party has a substantial need.

15.3 In extraordinary circumstances, the Provider may appoint experts to be paid for by the Parties, request live or written witness testimony, or request limited exchange of documents.

15.4 At the close of discovery, if permitted by the Expert Panel, the Parties will make a final evidentiary submission, the timing and sequence to be determined by the Provider in consultation with the Expert Panel.

16. Hearings

16.1 Disputes under this Procedure will be resolved without a hearing unless either party requests a hearing or the Expert Panel determines on its own initiative that one is necessary.
16.2 If a hearing is held, videoconferences or teleconferences should be used if at all possible. If not possible, then the Expert Panel will select a place for hearing if the Parties cannot agree.

16.3 Hearings should last no more than one day, except in the most extraordinary circumstances.

16.4 All dispute resolution proceedings will be conducted in English.

17. Burden of Proof

The Complainant bears the burden of proving the allegations in the Complaint; the burden must be by clear and convincing evidence.

18. Remedies

18.1 Since registrants are not a party to the action, a recommended remedy cannot take the form of deleting, transferring or suspending registrations (except to the extent registrants have been shown to be officers, directors, agents, employees, or entities under common control with a registry operator).

18.2 Recommended remedies will not include monetary damages or sanctions to be paid to any party other than fees awarded pursuant to section 14.

18.3 The Expert Panel may recommend a variety of graduated enforcement tools against the registry operator if it the Expert Panel determines that the registry operator is liable under this Trademark PDDRP, including:

18.3.1 Remedial measures for the registry to employ to ensure against allowing future infringing registrations, which may be in addition to what is required under the registry agreement, except that the remedial measures shall not:

(a) Require the Registry Operator to monitor registrations not related to the names at issue in the PDDRP proceeding; or

(b) Direct actions by the registry operator that are contrary to those required under the Registry Agreement;

18.3.2 Suspension of accepting new domain name registrations in the gTLD until such time as the violation(s) identified in the Determination is(are) cured or a set period of time;

18.3.3 In extraordinary circumstances where the registry operator acted with malice, providing for the termination of a Registry Agreement.
18.4 In making its recommendation of the appropriate remedy, the Expert Panel will consider the ongoing harm to the Complainant, as well as the harm the remedies will create for other, unrelated, good faith domain name registrants operating within the gTLD.

18.5 The Expert Panel may also determine whether the Complaint was filed “without merit,” and, if so, award the appropriate sanctions on a graduated scale, including:

18.5.1 Temporary bans from filing Complaints;

18.5.2 Imposition of costs of registry operator, including reasonable attorney fees; and

18.5.3 Permanent bans from filing Complaints after being banned temporarily.

18.6 Imposition of remedies shall be at the discretion of ICANN, but absent extraordinary circumstances, those remedies will be in line with the remedies recommended by the Expert Panel.

19. The Expert Panel Determination

19.1 The Provider and the Expert Panel will make reasonable efforts to ensure that the Expert Determination is issued within 45 days of the appointment of the Expert Panel and absent good cause, in no event later than 60 days after the appointment of the Expert Panel.

19.2 The Expert Panel will render a written Determination. The Expert Determination will state whether or not the Complaint is factually founded and provide the reasons for that Determination. The Expert Determination should be publicly available and searchable on the Provider’s web site.

19.3 The Expert Determination may further include a recommendation of specific remedies. Costs and fees to the Provider, to the extent not already paid, will be paid within thirty (30) days of the Expert Panel’s Determination.

19.4 The Expert Determination shall state which party is the prevailing party.

19.5 While the Expert Determination that a registry operator is liable under the standards of the Trademark PDDRP shall be taken into consideration, ICANN will have the authority to impose the remedies, if any, that ICANN deems appropriate given the circumstances of each matter.

20. Appeal of Expert Determination

20.1 Either party shall have a right to seek a de novo appeal of the Expert Determination of liability or recommended remedy based on the existing record within the Trademark PDDRP proceeding for a reasonable fee to cover the costs of the appeal.

20.2 An appeal must be filed with the Provider and served on all parties within 20 days after an Expert Determination is issued and a response to the appeal must be filed within 20
days after the appeal. Manner and calculation of service deadlines shall in consistent with those set forth in Section 4 above, “Communication and Time Limits.”

20.3 A three-member Appeal Panel is to be selected by the Provider, but no member of the Appeal Panel shall also have been an Expert Panel member.

20.4 The fees for an appeal in the first instance shall be borne by the appellant.

20.5 A limited right to introduce new admissible evidence that is material to the Determination will be allowed upon payment of an additional fee, provided the evidence clearly pre-dates the filing of the Complaint.

20.6 The Appeal Panel may request at its sole discretion, further statements or evidence from any party regardless of whether the evidence pre-dates the filing of the Complaint if the Appeal Panel determines such evidence is relevant.

20.7 The prevailing party shall be entitled to an award of costs of appeal.

20.8 The Provider’s rules and procedures for appeals, other than those stated above, shall apply.

21. Challenge of a Remedy

21.1 ICANN shall not implement a remedy for violation of the Trademark PDDRP for at least 20 days after the issuance of an Expert Determination, providing time for an appeal to be filed.

21.2 If an appeal is filed, ICANN shall stay its implementation of a remedy pending resolution of the appeal.

21.3 If ICANN decides to implement a remedy for violation of the Trademark PDDRP, ICANN will wait ten (10) business days (as observed in the location of its principal office) after notifying the registry operator of its decision. ICANN will then implement the decision unless it has received from the registry operator during that ten (10) business-day period official documentation that the registry operator has either: (a) commenced a lawsuit against the Complainant in a court of competent jurisdiction challenging the Expert Determination of liability against the registry operator, or (b) challenged the intended remedy by initiating dispute resolution under the provisions of its Registry Agreement. If ICANN receives such documentation within the ten (10) business day period, it will not seek to implement the remedy in furtherance of the Trademark PDDRP until it receives: (i) evidence of a resolution between the Complainant and the registry operator; (ii) evidence that registry operator’s lawsuit against Complainant has been dismissed or withdrawn; or (iii) a copy of an order from the dispute resolution provider selected pursuant to the Registry Agreement dismissing the dispute against ICANN whether by reason of agreement of the parties or upon determination of the merits.
21.4 The registry operator may challenge ICANN’s imposition of a remedy imposed in furtherance of an Expert Determination that the registry operator is liable under the PDDRP, to the extent a challenge is warranted, by initiating dispute resolution under the provisions of its Registry Agreement. Any arbitration shall be determined in accordance with the parties’ respective rights and duties under the Registry Agreement. Neither the Expert Determination nor the decision of ICANN to implement a remedy is intended to prejudice the registry operator in any way in the determination of the arbitration dispute. Any remedy involving a termination of the Registry Agreement must be according to the terms and conditions of the termination provision of the Registry Agreement.

21.5 Nothing herein shall be deemed to prohibit ICANN from imposing remedies at any time and of any nature it is otherwise entitled to impose for a registry operator’s non-compliance with its Registry Agreement.

22. **Availability of Court or Other Administrative Proceedings**

22.1 The Trademark PDDRP is not intended as an exclusive procedure and does not preclude individuals from seeking remedies in courts of law, including, as applicable, review of an Expert Determination as to liability.

22.2 In those cases where a Party submits documented proof to the Provider that a Court action involving the same Parties, facts and circumstances as the Trademark PDDRP was instituted prior to the filing date of the Complaint in the Trademark PDDRP, the Provider shall suspend or terminate the Trademark PDDRP.
1. **Parties to the Dispute**

   The parties to the dispute will be the harmed established institution and the gTLD registry operator. ICANN shall not be a party.

2. **Applicable Rules**

   2.1 This procedure is intended to cover these dispute resolution proceedings generally. To the extent more than one RRDRP provider ("Provider") is selected to implement the RRDRP, each Provider may have additional rules and procedures that must be followed when filing a Complaint. The following are the general procedure to be followed by all Providers.

   2.2 In any new community-based gTLD registry agreement, the registry operator shall be required to agree to participate in the RRDRP and be bound by the resulting Determinations.

3. **Language**

   3.1 The language of all submissions and proceedings under the procedure will be English.

   3.2 Parties may submit supporting evidence in their original language, provided and subject to the authority of the RRDRP Expert Panel to determine otherwise, that such evidence is accompanied by an English translation of all relevant text.

4. **Communications and Time Limits**

   4.1 All communications with the Provider must be filed electronically.

   4.2 For the purpose of determining the date of commencement of a time limit, a notice or other communication will be deemed to have been received on the day that it is transmitted to the appropriate contact person designated by the parties.

   4.3 For the purpose of determining compliance with a time limit, a notice or other communication will be deemed to have been sent, made or transmitted on the day that it is dispatched.

---

1 Initial complaints that a Registry has failed to comply with registration restrictions shall be processed through a Registry Restriction Problem Report System (RRPRS) using an online form similar to the Whois Data Problem Report System (WDPRS) at InterNIC.net. A nominal processing fee could serve to decrease frivolous complaints. The registry operator shall receive a copy of the complaint and will be required to take reasonable steps to investigate (and remedy if warranted) the reported non-compliance. The Complainant will have the option to escalate the complaint in accordance with this RRDRP, if the alleged non-compliance continues. Failure by the Registry to address the complaint to complainant’s satisfaction does not itself give the complainant standing to file an RRDRP complaint.
4.4 For the purpose of calculating a period of time under this procedure, such period will begin to run on the day following the date of receipt of a notice or other communication.

4.5 All references to day limits shall be considered as calendar days unless otherwise specified.

5. Standing

5.1 The mandatory administrative proceeding will commence when a third-party complainant (“Complainant”) has filed a Complaint with a Provider asserting that the Complainant is a harmed established institution as a result of the community-based gTLD registry operator not complying with the registration restrictions set out in the Registry Agreement.

5.2 Established institutions associated with defined communities are eligible to file a community objection. The “defined community” must be a community related to the gTLD string in the application that is the subject of the dispute. To qualify for standing for a community claim, the Complainant must prove both: it is an established institution, and has an ongoing relationship with a defined community that consists of a restricted population that the gTLD supports.

5.3 Complainants must have filed a claim through the Registry Restriction Problem Report System (RRPRS) to have standing to file an RRDRP.

5.4 The Panel will determine standing and the Expert Determination will include a statement of the Complainant’s standing.

6. Standards

6.1 For a claim to be successful, the claims must prove that:

6.1.1 The community invoked by the objector is a defined community;

6.1.2 There is a strong association between the community invoked and the gTLD label or string;

6.1.3 The TLD operator violated the terms of the community-based restrictions in its agreement;

6.1.4 There is a measurable harm to the Complainant and the community named by the objector.

7. Complaint

7.1 Filing:
The Complaint will be filed electronically. Once the Administrative Review has been completed and the Provider deems the Complaint to be in compliance, the Provider will electronically serve the Complaint and serve a hard copy and fax notice on the registry operator consistent with the contact information listed in the Registry Agreement.

7.2 Content:

7.2.1 The name and contact information, including address, phone, and email address, of the Complainant, the registry operator and, to the best of Complainant’s knowledge, the name and address of the current owner of the registration.

7.2.2 The name and contact information, including address, phone, and email address of any person authorized to act on behalf of Complainant.

7.2.3 A statement of the nature of the dispute, which must include:

7.2.3.1 The particular registration restrictions in the Registry Agreement with which the registry operator is failing to comply; and

7.2.3.2 A detailed explanation of how the registry operator’s failure to comply with the identified registration restrictions has caused harm to the complainant.

7.2.4 A statement that the proceedings are not being brought for any improper purpose.

7.2.5 A statement that the Complainant has filed a claim through the RRPRS and that the RRPRS process has concluded.

7.2.6 A statement that Complainant has not filed a Trademark Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedure (PDDRP) complaint relating to the same or similar facts or circumstances.

7.3 Complaints will be limited to 5,000 words and 20 pages, excluding attachments, unless the Provider determines that additional material is necessary.

7.4 Any supporting documents should be filed with the Complaint.

7.5 At the same time the Complaint is filed, the Complainant will pay a filing fee in the amount set in accordance with the applicable Provider rules. In the event that the filing fee is not paid within 10 days of the receipt of the Complaint by the Provider, the Complaint will be dismissed without prejudice to the Complainant to file another complaint.

8. **Administrative Review of the Complaint**

8.1 All Complaints will be reviewed within five (5) business days of submission by panelists designated by the applicable Provider to determine whether the Complainant has complied with the procedural rules.
8.2 If the Provider finds that the Complaint complies with procedural rules, the Complaint will be deemed filed, and the proceedings will continue. If the Provider finds that the Complaint does not comply with procedural rules, it will electronically notify the Complainant of such non-compliance and provide the Complainant five (5) business days to submit an amended Complaint. If the Provider does not receive an amended Complaint within the five (5) business days provided, it will dismiss the Complaint and close the proceedings without prejudice to the Complainant’s submission of a new Complaint that complies with procedural rules. Filing fees will not be refunded if the Complaint is deemed not in compliance.

8.3 If deemed compliant, the Provider will electronically serve the Complaint on the registry operator and serve a paper notice on the registry operator that is the subject of the Complaint consistent with the contact information listed in the Registry Agreement.

9. **Response to the Complaint**

9.1 The registry operator must file a response to each Complaint within thirty (30) days of service the Complaint.

9.2 The Response will comply with the rules for filing of a Complaint and will contain the names and contact information for the registry operator, as well as a point by point response to the statements made in the Complaint.

9.3 The Response must be electronically filed with the Provider and the Provider must serve it upon the Complainant in electronic form with a hard-copy notice that it has been served.

9.4 Service of the Response will be deemed effective, and the time will start to run for a Reply, upon electronic transmission of the Response.

9.5 If the registry operator believes the Complaint is without merit, it will affirmatively plead in it Response the specific grounds for the claim.

9.6 At the same time the Response is filed, the registry operator will pay a filing fee in the amount set in accordance with the applicable Provider rules. In the event that the filing fee is not paid within ten (10) days of the receipt of the Response by the Provider, the Response will be deemed improper and not considered in the proceedings, but the matter will proceed to Determination.

10 **Reply**

10.1 The Complainant is permitted ten (10) days from Service of the Response to submit a Reply addressing the statements made in the Response showing why the Complaint is not “without merit.” A Reply may not introduce new facts or evidence into the record, but shall only be used to address statements made in the Response. Any new facts or evidence introduced in a Response shall be disregarded by the Expert Panel.

10.2 Once the Complaint, Response and Reply (as necessary) are filed and served, a Panel will be appointed and provided with all submissions.
11. **Default**

11.1 If the registry operator fails to respond to the Complaint, it will be deemed to be in default.

11.2 Limited rights to set aside the finding of default will be established by the Provider, but in no event will it be permitted absent a showing of good cause to set aside the finding of Default.

11.3 The Provider shall provide Notice of Default via email to the Complainant and registry operator.

11.4 All Default cases shall proceed to Expert Determination on the merits.

12. **Expert Panel**

12.1 The Provider shall select and appoint a single-member Expert Panel within (21) days after receiving the Reply, or if no Reply is filed, within 21 days after the Reply was due to be filed.

12.2 The Provider will appoint a one-person Expert Panel unless any party requests a three-member Expert Panel.

12.3 In the case where either party requests a three-member Expert Panel, each party (or each side of the dispute if a matter has been consolidated) shall select an Expert and the two selected Experts shall select the third Expert Panel member. Such selection shall be made pursuant to the Provider’s rules or procedures. RRDRP panelists within a Provider shall be rotated to the extent feasible.

12.4 Expert Panel members must be independent of the parties to the post-delegation challenge. Each Provider will follow its adopted procedures for requiring such independence, including procedures for challenging and replacing an Expert for lack of independence.

13. **Costs**

13.1 The Provider will estimate the costs for the proceedings that it administers under this procedure in accordance with the applicable Provider Rules. Such costs will cover the administrative fees, including the Filing and Response Fee, of the Provider, and the Expert Panel fees, and are intended to be reasonable.

13.2 The Complainant shall be required to pay the Filing fee as set forth above in the “Complaint” section, and shall be required to submit the full amount of the other Provider-estimated administrative fees, including the Response Fee, and the Expert Panel fees at the outset of the proceedings. Fifty percent of that full amount shall be in cash (or cash equivalent) to cover the Complainant’s share of the proceedings and the other 50% shall be in either cash (or cash equivalent), or in bond, to cover the registry operator’s share if the registry operator prevails.
13.3 If the Panel declares the Complainant to be the prevailing party, the registry operator is required to reimburse Complainant for all Panel and Provider fees incurred, including the Filing Fee. Failure to do shall be deemed a violation of the RRDRP and a breach of the Registry Agreement, subject to remedies available under the Agreement up to and including termination.

13.4 If the Panel declares the registry operator to be the prevailing party, the Provider shall reimburse the registry operator for its Response Fee.

14. Discovery/Evidence

14.1 In order to achieve the goal of resolving disputes rapidly and at a reasonable cost, discovery will generally not be permitted. In exceptional cases, the Expert Panel may require a party to provide additional evidence.

14.2 If permitted, discovery will be limited to that for which each Party has a substantial need.

14.3 Without a specific request from the Parties, but only in extraordinary circumstances, the Expert Panel may request that the Provider appoint experts to be paid for by the Parties, request live or written witness testimony, or request limited exchange of documents.

15. Hearings

15.1 Disputes under this RRDRP will usually be resolved without a hearing.

15.2 The Expert Panel may decide on its own initiative, or at the request of a party, to hold a hearing. However, the presumption is that the Expert Panel will render Determinations based on written submissions and without a hearing.

15.3 If a request for a hearing is granted, videoconferences or teleconferences should be used if at all possible. If not possible, then the Expert Panel will select a place for hearing if the parties cannot agree.

15.4 Hearings should last no more than one day, except in the most exceptional circumstances.

15.5 If the Expert Panel grants one party's request for a hearing, notwithstanding the other party's opposition, the Expert Panel is encouraged to apportion the hearing costs to the requesting party as the Expert Panel deems appropriate.

15.6 All dispute resolution proceedings will be conducted in English.

16. Burden of Proof

The Complainant bears the burden of proving its claim; the burden should be by a preponderance of the evidence.
17. **Recommended Remedies**

17.1 Since registrants of domain names registered in violation of the agreement restriction are not a party to the action, a recommended remedy cannot take the form of deleting, transferring or suspending registrations that were made in violation of the agreement restrictions (except to the extent registrants have been shown to be officers, directors, agents, employees, or entities under common control with a registry operator).

17.2 Recommended remedies will not include monetary damages or sanctions to be paid to any party other than fees awarded pursuant to section 13.

17.3 The Expert Panel may recommend a variety of graduated enforcement tools against the registry operator if the Expert Panel determines that the registry operator allowed registrations outside the scope of its promised limitations, including:

17.3.1 Remedial measures, which may be in addition to requirements under the registry agreement, for the registry to employ to ensure against allowing future registrations that do not comply with community-based limitations; except that the remedial measures shall not:

(a) Require the registry operator to monitor registrations not related to the names at issue in the RRDRP proceeding, or

(b) Direct actions by the registry operator that are contrary to those required under the registry agreement

17.3.2 Suspension of accepting new domain name registrations in the gTLD until such time as the violation(s) identified in the Determination is(are) cured or a set period of time;

OR,

17.3.3 In extraordinary circumstances where the registry operator acted with malice providing for the termination of a registry agreement.

17.3 In making its recommendation of the appropriate remedy, the Expert Panel will consider the ongoing harm to the Complainant, as well as the harm the remedies will create for other, unrelated, good faith domain name registrants operating within the gTLD.

18. **The Expert Determination**

18.1 The Provider and the Expert Panel will make reasonable efforts to ensure that the Expert Determination is rendered within 45 days of the appointment of the Expert Panel and absent good cause, in no event later than 60 days after the appointment of the Expert Panel.

18.2 The Expert Panel will render a written Determination. The Expert Determination will state whether or not the Complaint is factually founded and provide the reasons for its
Determination. The Expert Determination should be publicly available and searchable on the Provider’s web site.

18.3 The Expert Determination may further include a recommendation of specific remedies. Costs and fees to the Provider, to the extent not already paid, will be paid within thirty (30) days of the Expert Determination.

18.4 The Expert Determination shall state which party is the prevailing party.

18.5 While the Expert Determination that a community-based restricted gTLD registry operator was not meeting its obligations to police the registration and use of domains within the applicable restrictions shall be considered, ICANN shall have the authority to impose the remedies ICANN deems appropriate, given the circumstances of each matter.

19. Appeal of Expert Determination

19.1 Either party shall have a right to seek a de novo appeal of the Expert Determination based on the existing record within the RRDRP proceeding for a reasonable fee to cover the costs of the appeal.

19.2 An appeal must be filed with the Provider and served on all parties within 20 days after an Expert Determination is issued and a response to the appeal must be filed within 20 days after the appeal. Manner and calculation of service deadlines shall in consistent with those set forth in Section 4 above, “Communication and Time Limits.”

19.3 A three-member Appeal Panel is to be selected by the Provider, but no member of the Appeal Panel shall also have been an Expert Panel member.

19.4 The fees for an appeal in the first instance shall be borne by the appellant.

19.5 A limited right to introduce new admissible evidence that is material to the Determination will be allowed upon payment of an additional fee, provided the evidence clearly pre-dates the filing of the Complaint.

19.6 The Appeal Panel may request at its sole discretion, further statements or evidence from any party regardless of whether the evidence pre-dates the filing of the Complaint if the Appeal Panel determines such evidence is relevant.

19.7 The prevailing party shall be entitled to an award of costs of appeal.

19.8 The Providers rules and procedures for appeals, other than those stated above, shall apply.

20. Breach

20.1 If the Expert determines that the registry operator is in breach, ICANN will then proceed to notify the registry operator that it is in breach. The registry operator will be given the opportunity to cure the breach as called for in the Registry Agreement.
20.2 If registry operator fails to cure the breach then both parties are entitled to utilize the options available to them under the registry agreement, and ICANN may consider the recommended remedies set forth in the Expert Determination when taking action.

20.3 Nothing herein shall be deemed to prohibit ICANN from imposing remedies at any time and of any nature it is otherwise entitled to impose for a registry operator’s non-compliance with its Registry Agreement.

21. **Availability of Court or Other Administrative Proceedings**

21.1 The RRDRP is not intended as an exclusive procedure and does not preclude individuals from seeking remedies in courts of law, including, as applicable, review of an Expert Determination as to liability.

21.2 The parties are encouraged, but not required to participate in informal negotiations and/or mediation at any time throughout the dispute resolution process but the conduct of any such settlement negotiation is not, standing alone, a reason to suspend any deadline under the proceedings.
Module 6

Top-Level Domain Application – Terms and Conditions

By submitting this application through ICANN’s online interface for a generic Top Level Domain (gTLD) (this application), applicant (including all parent companies, subsidiaries, affiliates, agents, contractors, employees and any and all others acting on its behalf) agrees to the following terms and conditions (these terms and conditions) without modification. Applicant understands and agrees that these terms and conditions are binding on applicant and are a material part of this application.

1. Applicant warrants that the statements and representations contained in the application (including any documents submitted and oral statements made and confirmed in writing in connection with the application) are true and accurate and complete in all material respects, and that ICANN may rely on those statements and representations fully in evaluating this application. Applicant acknowledges that any material misstatement or misrepresentation (or omission of material information) may cause ICANN and the evaluators to reject the application without a refund of any fees paid by Applicant. Applicant agrees to notify ICANN in writing of any change in circumstances that would render any information provided in the application false or misleading.

2. Applicant warrants that it has the requisite organizational power and authority to make this application on behalf of applicant, and is able to make all agreements, representations, waivers, and understandings stated in these terms and conditions and to enter into the form of registry agreement as posted with these terms and conditions.

3. Applicant acknowledges and agrees that ICANN has the right to determine not to proceed with any and all applications for new gTLDs, and that there is no assurance that any additional gTLDs will be created. The decision to review, consider and approve an application to establish one or more
gTLDs and to delegate new gTLDs after such approval is entirely at ICANN's discretion. ICANN reserves the right to reject any application that ICANN is prohibited from considering under applicable law or policy, in which case any fees submitted in connection with such application will be returned to the applicant.

4. Applicant agrees to pay all fees that are associated with this application. These fees include the evaluation fee (which is to be paid in conjunction with the submission of this application), and any fees associated with the progress of the application to the extended evaluation stages of the review and consideration process with respect to the application, including any and all fees as may be required in conjunction with the dispute resolution process as set forth in the application. Applicant acknowledges that the initial fee due upon submission of the application is only to obtain consideration of an application. ICANN makes no assurances that an application will be approved or will result in the delegation of a gTLD proposed in an application. Applicant acknowledges that if it fails to pay fees within the designated time period at any stage of the application review and consideration process, applicant will forfeit any fees paid up to that point and the application will be cancelled. Except as expressly provided in this Application Guidebook, ICANN is not obligated to reimburse an applicant for or to return any fees paid to ICANN in connection with the application process.

5. Applicant shall indemnify, defend, and hold harmless ICANN (including its affiliates, subsidiaries, directors, officers, employees, consultants, evaluators, and agents, collectively the ICANN Affiliated Parties) from and against any and all third-party claims, damages, liabilities, costs, and expenses, including legal fees and expenses, arising out of or relating to: (a) ICANN's or an ICANN Affiliated Party's consideration of the application, and any approval rejection or withdrawal of the application; and/or (b) ICANN's or an ICANN Affiliated Party's reliance on information provided by applicant in the application.
6. Applicant hereby releases ICANN and the ICANN Affiliated Parties from any and all claims by applicant that arise out of, are based upon, or are in any way related to, any action, or failure to act, by ICANN or any ICANN Affiliated Party in connection with ICANN’s or an ICANN Affiliated Party’s review of this application, investigation or verification, any characterization or description of applicant or the information in this application, any withdrawal of this application or the decision by ICANN to recommend, or not to recommend, the approval of applicant’s gTLD application. APPLICANT AGREES NOT TO CHALLENGE, IN COURT OR IN ANY OTHER JUDICIAL FORA, ANY FINAL DECISION MADE BY ICANN WITH RESPECT TO THE APPLICATION, AND IRREVOCABLY WAIVES ANY RIGHT TO SUE OR PROCEED IN COURT OR ANY OTHER JUDICIAL FORA ON THE BASIS OF ANY OTHER LEGAL CLAIM AGAINST ICANN AND ICANN AFFILIATED PARTIES WITH RESPECT TO THE APPLICATION. APPLICANT ACKNOWLEDGES AND ACCEPTS THAT APPLICANT’S NONENTITLEMENT TO PURSUE ANY RIGHTS, REMEDIES, OR LEGAL CLAIMS AGAINST ICANN OR THE ICANN AFFILIATED PARTIES IN COURT OR ANY OTHER JUDICIAL FORA WITH RESPECT TO THE APPLICATION SHALL MEAN THAT APPLICANT WILL FOREGO ANY RECOVERY OF ANY APPLICATION FEES, MONIES INVESTED IN BUSINESS INFRASTRUCTURE OR OTHER STARTUP COSTS AND ANY AND ALL PROFITS THAT APPLICANT MAY EXPECT TO REALIZE FROM THE OPERATION OF A REGISTRY FOR THE TLD; PROVIDED, THAT APPLICANT MAY UTILIZE ANY ACCOUNTABILITY MECHANISM SET FORTH IN ICANN’S BYLAWS FOR PURPOSES OF CHALLENGING ANY FINAL DECISION MADE BY ICANN WITH RESPECT TO THE APPLICATION. APPLICANT ACKNOWLEDGES THAT ANY ICANN AFFILIATED PARTY IS AN EXPRESS THIRD PARTY BENEFICIARY OF THIS SECTION 6 AND MAY ENFORCE EACH PROVISION OF THIS SECTION 6 AGAINST APPLICANT.

7. Applicant hereby authorizes ICANN to publish on ICANN’s website, and to disclose or publicize in any other manner, any materials submitted to, or obtained or generated by, ICANN and the ICANN Affiliated Parties in connection with the application, including evaluations, analyses and any other
materials prepared in connection with the evaluation of the application; provided, however, that information will not be disclosed or published to the extent that this Applicant Guidebook expressly states that such information will be kept confidential, except as required by law or judicial process. Except for information afforded confidential treatment, applicant understands and acknowledges that ICANN does not and will not keep the remaining portion of the application or materials submitted with the application confidential.

8. Applicant certifies that it has obtained permission for the posting of any personally identifying information included in this application or materials submitted with this application. Applicant acknowledges that the information that ICANN posts may remain in the public domain in perpetuity, at ICANN’s discretion. Applicant acknowledges that ICANN will handle personal information collected in accordance with its gTLD Program privacy statement http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/program-privacy, which is incorporated herein by this reference. If requested by ICANN, Applicant will be required to obtain and deliver to ICANN and ICANN's background screening vendor any consents or agreements of the entities and/or individuals named in questions 1-11 of the application form necessary to conduct these background screening activities. In addition, Applicant acknowledges that to allow ICANN to conduct thorough background screening investigations:

a. Applicant may be required to provide documented consent for release of records to ICANN by organizations or government agencies;

b. Applicant may be required to obtain specific government records directly and supply those records to ICANN for review;

c. Additional identifying information may be required to resolve questions of identity of individuals within the applicant organization;
d. Applicant may be requested to supply certain information in the original language as well as in English.

9. Applicant gives ICANN permission to use applicant’s name in ICANN’s public announcements (including informational web pages) relating to Applicant’s application and any action taken by ICANN related thereto.

10. Applicant understands and agrees that it will acquire rights in connection with a gTLD only in the event that it enters into a registry agreement with ICANN, and that applicant’s rights in connection with such gTLD will be limited to those expressly stated in the registry agreement. In the event ICANN agrees to recommend the approval of the application for applicant’s proposed gTLD, applicant agrees to enter into the registry agreement with ICANN in the form published in connection with the application materials. (Note: ICANN reserves the right to make reasonable updates and changes to this proposed draft agreement during the course of the application process, including as the possible result of new policies that might be adopted during the course of the application process). Applicant may not resell, assign, or transfer any of applicant’s rights or obligations in connection with the application.

11. Applicant authorizes ICANN to:

   a. Contact any person, group, or entity to request, obtain, and discuss any documentation or other information that, in ICANN’s sole judgment, may be pertinent to the application;

   b. Consult with persons of ICANN’s choosing regarding the information in the application or otherwise coming into ICANN’s possession, provided, however, that ICANN will use reasonable efforts to ensure that such persons maintain the confidentiality of information in the application that this Applicant Guidebook expressly states will be kept confidential.
12. For the convenience of applicants around the world, the application materials published by ICANN in the English language have been translated into certain other languages frequently used around the world. Applicant recognizes that the English language version of the application materials (of which these terms and conditions is a part) is the version that binds the parties, that such translations are non-official interpretations and may not be relied upon as accurate in all respects, and that in the event of any conflict between the translated versions of the application materials and the English language version, the English language version controls.

13. Applicant understands that ICANN has a long-standing relationship with Jones Day, an international law firm, and that ICANN intends to continue to be represented by Jones Day throughout the application process and the resulting delegation of TLDs. ICANN does not know whether any particular applicant is or is not a client of Jones Day. To the extent that Applicant is a Jones Day client, by submitting this application, Applicant agrees to execute a waiver permitting Jones Day to represent ICANN adverse to Applicant in the matter. Applicant further agrees that by submitting its Application, Applicant is agreeing to execute waivers or take similar reasonable actions to permit other law and consulting firms retained by ICANN in connection with the review and evaluation of its application to represent ICANN adverse to Applicant in the matter.

14. ICANN reserves the right to make reasonable updates and changes to this applicant guidebook and to the application process, including the process for withdrawal of applications, at any time by posting notice of such updates and changes to the ICANN website, including as the possible result of new policies that might be adopted or advice to ICANN from ICANN advisory committees during the course of the application process. Applicant acknowledges that ICANN may make such updates and changes and agrees that its application will be subject to any such updates and changes. In the event that Applicant has completed and submitted its application prior to
Such updates or changes and Applicant can demonstrate to ICANN that compliance with such updates or changes would present a material hardship to Applicant, then ICANN will work with Applicant in good faith to attempt to make reasonable accommodations in order to mitigate any negative consequences for Applicant to the extent possible consistent with ICANN's mission to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems.
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ABSTRACT

This is the Generic Names Supporting Organization's Final Report on the Introduction of New Top-Level Domains. The Report is in two parts. Part A contains the substantive discussion of the Principles, Policy Recommendations and Implementation Guidelines and Part B contains a range of supplementary materials that have been used by the Committee during the course of the Policy Development Process.

The GNSO Committee on New Top-Level Domains consisted of all GNSO Council members. All meetings were open to a wide range of interested stakeholders and observers. A set of participation data is found in Part B.

Many of the terms found here have specific meaning within the context of ICANN and new top-level domains discussion. A full glossary of terms is available in the Reference Material section at the end of Part A.

BACKGROUND

1. The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) is responsible for the overall coordination of "the global Internet's system of unique identifiers" and ensuring the "stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems. In particular, ICANN coordinates the "allocation and assignment of the three sets of unique identifiers for the Internet". These are "domain names" (forming a system called the DNS); Internet protocol (IP) addresses and autonomous system (AS) numbers and Protocol port and parameter numbers". ICANN is also responsible for the "operation and evolution of the DNS root name server system and policy development reasonably and appropriately related to these technical functions". These elements are all contained in ICANN's Mission and Core Values[1] in addition to provisions which enable policy development work that, once approved by the ICANN Board, become binding on the organization. The results of the policy development process found here relate to the introduction of new generic top-level domains.

2. This document is the Final Report of the Generic Names Supporting Organisation's (GNSO) Policy Development Process (PDP) that has been conducted using ICANN's Bylaws and policy development guidelines that relate to the work of the GNSO. This Report reflects a comprehensive examination of four Terms of Reference designed to establish a stable and ongoing process that facilitates the introduction of new top-level domains. The policy development process (PDP) is part of the Generic Names Supporting Organisation's (GNSO) mandate within the ICANN structure. However, close consultation with other ICANN Supporting Organisations and Advisory Committees has been an integral part of the process. The consultations and negotiations have also included a wide range of interested stakeholders from within and outside the ICANN community[2].

3. The Final Report is in two parts. This document is Part A and contains the full explanation of each of the Principles, Recommendations and Implementation Guidelines that the Committee has developed since December 2005[3]. Part B of the Report contains a wide range of supplementary materials which have been used in the policy development process including Constituency Impact Statements (CIS), a series of Working Group Reports on important sub-elements of the Committee's deliberations, a collection of external reference materials, and the procedural documentation of the policy development process[4].

4. The finalisation of the policy for the introduction of new top-level domains is part of a long series of events that have dramatically changed the nature of the Internet. The 1969 ARPANET diagram shows the
initial design of a network that is now global in its reach and an integral part of many lives and businesses.

The policy recommendations found here illustrate the complexity of the Internet of 2007 and, as a package, propose a system to add new top-level domains in an orderly and transparent way. The ICANN Staff Implementation Team, consisting of policy, operational and legal staff members, has worked closely with the Committee on all aspects of the policy development process[5]. The ICANN Board has received regular information and updates about the process and the substantive results of the Committee’s work.

5. The majority of the early work on the introduction of new top-level domains is found in the IETF’s Request for Comment series. RFC 1034[6] is a fundamental resource that explains key concepts of the naming system. Read in conjunction with RFC920[7], an historical picture emerges of how and why the domain name system hierarchy has been organised. Postel & Reynolds set out in their RFC920 introduction about the "General Purpose Domains" that ..."While the initial domain name "ARPA" arises from the history of the development of this system and environment, in the future most of the top level names will be very general categories like "government", "education", or "commercial". The motivation is to provide an organization name that is free of undesirable semantics."

6. In 2007, the Internet is multi-dimensional and its development is driven by widespread access to inexpensive communications technologies in many parts of the world. In addition, global travel is now relatively inexpensive, efficient and readily available to a diverse range of travellers. As a consequence, citizens no longer automatically associate themselves with countries but with international communities of linguistic, cultural or professional interests independent of physical location. Many people now exercise multiple citizenship rights, speak many different languages and quite often live far from where they were born or educated. The 2007 OECD Factbook[8] provides comprehensive statistics about the impact of migration on OECD member countries. In essence, many populations are fluid and changing due in part to easing labour movement restrictions but also because technology enables workers to live in one place and work in another relatively easily. As a result, companies and organizations are now global and operate across many geographic borders and jurisdictions. The following illustration[9] shows how rapidly the number of domain names under registration has increased and one could expect that trend to continue with the introduction of new top-level domains.
7. A key driver of change has been the introduction of competition in the registration of domain names through ICANN Accredited Registrars[10]. In June 2007, there were more than 800 accredited registrars who register names for end users with ongoing downward pressure on the prices end-users pay for domain name registration.

8. ICANN’s work on the introduction of new top-level domains has been underway since 1999. By mid-1999, Working Group C[11] had quickly reached consensus on two issues, namely that “...ICANN should add new gTLDs to the root. The second is that ICANN should begin the deployment of new gTLDs with an initial rollout of six to ten new gTLDs, followed by an evaluation period”. This work was undertaken throughout 2000 and saw the introduction of, for example, .coop, .aero and .biz.

9. After an evaluation period, a further round of sponsored TLDs was introduced during 2003 and 2004 which included, amongst others, .mobi and .travel[12].

10. The July 2007 zone file survey statistics from www.registrarstats.com[13] shows that there are slightly more than 96,000,000 top level domains registered across a selection of seven top-level domains including .com, .net and .info. Evidence from potential new applicants provides more impetus to implement a system that enables the ongoing introduction of new top level domains[14]. In addition, interest from Internet users who could use Internationalised Domain Names (IDNs) in a wide variety of scripts beyond ASCII is growing rapidly.

11. To arrive at the full set of policy recommendations which are found here, the Committee considered the responses to a Call for Expert Papers issued at the beginning of the policy development process[15], and which was augmented by a full set of GNSO Constituency Statements[16]. These are all found in Part B of the Final Report and should be read in conjunction with this document. In addition, the Committee received detailed responses from the Implementation Team about proposed policy recommendations and
the implementation of the recommendations package as an on-line application process that could be used by a wide array of potential applicants.

12. The Committee reviewed and analysed a wide variety of materials including Working Group C’s findings, the evaluation reports from the 2003 & 2004 round of sponsored top-level domains and a full range of other historic materials[17].

13. In the past, a number of different approaches to new top level domains have been considered including the formulation of a structured taxonomy[18] of names, for example, .auto, .books, .travel and .music. The Committee has opted to enable potential applicants to self-select strings that are either the most appropriate for their customers or potentially the most marketable. It is expected that applicants will apply for targeted community strings such as .travel for the travel industry and .cat for the Catalan community as well as some generic strings. The Committee identified five key drivers for the introduction of new top-level domains.

(i) It is consistent with the reasons articulated in 1999 when the first proof-of-concept round was initiated

(ii) There are no technical impediments to the introduction of new top-level domains as evidenced by the two previous rounds

(iii) Expanding the domain name space to accommodate the introduction of both new ASCII and internationalised domain name (IDN) top-level domains will give end users more choice about the nature of their presence on the Internet. In addition, users will be able to use domain names in their language of choice.

(iv) There is demand for additional top-level domains as a business opportunity. The GNSO Committee expects that this business opportunity will stimulate competition at the registry service level which is consistent with ICANN’s Core Value 6.

(v) No compelling reason has been articulated to not proceed with accepting applications for new top-level domains.

14. The remainder of this Report is structured around the four Terms of Reference. This includes an explanation of the Principles that have guided the work taking into account the Governmental Advisory Committee’s March 2007 Public Policy Principles for New gTLDs[19]; a comprehensive set of Recommendations which has majority Committee support and a set of Implementation Guidelines which has been discussed in great detail with the ICANN Staff Implementation Team. The Implementation Team has released two ICANN Staff Discussion Points documents (in November 2006 and June 2007). Version 2 provides detailed analysis of the proposed recommendations from an implementation standpoint and provides suggestions about the way in which the implementation plan may come together. The ICANN Board will make the final decision about the actual structure of the application and evaluation process.

15. In each of the sections below the Committee’s recommendations are discussed in more detail with an explanation of the rationale for the decisions. The recommendations have been the subject of numerous public comment periods and intensive discussion across a range of stakeholders including ICANN’s GNSO Constituencies, ICANN Supporting Organisations and Advisory Committees and members of the broader Internet-using public that is interested in ICANN’s work[20]. In particular, detailed work has been conducted through the Internationalised Domain Names Working Group (IDN-WG)[21], the Reserved Names Working Group (RN-WG)[22] and the Protecting the Rights of Others Working Group (PRO-WG)[23]. The Working Group Reports are found in full in Part B of the Final Report along with the March 2007 GAC Public Policy Principles for New Top-Level Domains, Constituency Impact Statements. A minority statement from the NCUC about Recommendations 6 & 20 are found Annexes for this document along with individual comments from Nominating Committee appointee Ms Avri Doria.

SUMMARY -- PRINCIPLES, RECOMMENDATIONS & IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINES

1. This section sets out, in table form, the set of Principles, proposed Policy Recommendations and Guidelines that the Committee has derived through its work. The addition of new gTLDs will be done
2. The Principles are a combination of GNSO Committee priorities, ICANN staff implementation principles developed in tandem with the Committee and the March 2007 GAC Public Policy Principles on New Top-Level Domains. The Principles are supported by all GNSO Constituencies. [25]

3. ICANN's Mission and Core Values were key reference points for the development of the Committee’s Principles, Recommendations and Implementation Guidelines. These are referenced in the right-hand column of the tables below.

4. The Principles have support from all GNSO Constituencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINCIPLES</th>
<th>MISSION &amp; CORE VALUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> New generic top-level domains (gTLDs) must be introduced in an orderly, timely and predictable way.</td>
<td>M1 &amp; CV1 &amp; 2, 4-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong> Some new generic top-level domains should be internationalised domain names (IDNs) subject to the approval of IDNs being available in the root.</td>
<td>M1-3 &amp; CV 1, 4 &amp; 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> The reasons for introducing new top-level domains include that there is demand from potential applicants for new top-level domains in both ASCII and IDN formats. In addition the introduction of new top-level domain application process has the potential to promote competition in the provision of registry services, to add to consumer choice, market differentiation and geographical and service-provider diversity.</td>
<td>M3 &amp; CV 4-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong> A set of technical criteria must be used for assessing a new gTLD registry applicant to minimise the risk of harming the operational stability, security and global interoperability of the Internet.</td>
<td>M1-3 &amp; CV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong> A set of capability criteria for a new gTLD registry applicant must be used to provide an assurance that an applicant has the capability to meets its obligations under the terms of ICANN's registry agreement.</td>
<td>M1-3 &amp; CV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong> A set of operational criteria must be set out in contractual conditions in the registry agreement to ensure compliance with ICANN policies.</td>
<td>M1-3 &amp; CV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong> The string evaluation process must not infringe the applicant's freedom of expression rights that are protected under internationally recognized principles of law.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS[26]</th>
<th>MISSION &amp; CORE VALUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  ICANN must implement a process that allows the introduction of new top-level domains.</td>
<td>M1-3 &amp; CV1-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The evaluation and selection procedure for new gTLD registries should respect the principles of fairness, transparency and non-discrimination.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All applicants for a new gTLD registry should therefore be evaluated against transparent and predictable criteria, fully</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Strings must not be confusingly similar to an existing top-level domain or a Reserved Name.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Strings must not infringe the existing legal rights of others that are recognized or enforceable under generally accepted and internationally recognized principles of law.</strong> Examples of these legal rights that are internationally recognized include, but are not limited to, rights defined in the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industry Property (in particular trademark rights), the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) (in particular freedom of expression rights).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Strings must not cause any technical instability.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Strings must not be a Reserved Word[27].</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6*</td>
<td><strong>Strings must not be contrary to generally accepted legal norms relating to morality and public order that are recognized under international principles of law.</strong> Examples of such principles of law include, but are not limited to, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, intellectual property treaties administered by the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO) and the WTO Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property (TRIPS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Applicants must be able to demonstrate their technical capability to run a registry operation for the purpose that the applicant sets out.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>Applicants must be able to demonstrate their financial and organisational operational capability.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>There must be a clear and pre-published application process using objective and measurable criteria.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>There must be a base contract provided to applicants at the beginning of the application process.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><strong>[Replaced with Recommendation 20 and Implementation Guideline P and inserted into Term of Reference 3 Allocation Methods section]</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><strong>Dispute resolution and challenge processes must be established prior to the start of the process.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><strong>Applications must initially be assessed in rounds until the scale of demand is clear.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td><strong>The initial registry agreement term must be of a commercially</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There must be renewal expectancy.  

Registries must apply existing Consensus Policies and adopt new Consensus Policies as they are approved.  

A clear compliance and sanctions process must be set out in the base contract which could lead to contract termination.  

If an applicant offers an IDN service, then ICANN’s IDN guidelines[28] must be followed.  

Registries must use only ICANN accredited registrars in registering domain names and may not discriminate among such accredited registrars.

An application will be rejected if an expert panel determines that there is substantial opposition to it from a significant portion of the community to which the string may be explicitly or implicitly targeted.

* The NCUC submitted Minority Statements on Recommendations 6 and 20. The remainder of the Recommendations have support from all GNSO Constituencies.

**IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IG A</th>
<th>The application process will provide a pre-defined roadmap for applicants that encourages the submission of applications for new top-level domains.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IG B</td>
<td>Application fees will be designed to ensure that adequate resources exist to cover the total cost to administer the new gTLD process. Application fees may differ for applicants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG C</td>
<td>ICANN will provide frequent communications with applicants and the public including comment forums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG D</td>
<td>A first come first served processing schedule within the application round will be implemented and will continue for an ongoing process, if necessary. Applications will be time and date stamped on receipt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG E</td>
<td>The application submission date will be at least four months after the issue of the Request for Proposal and ICANN will promote the opening of the application round.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| IG F* | If there is contention for strings, applicants may[29]:  
  i) resolve contention between them within a pre-established timeframe |

---

*MISSION & CORE VALUES*

| CV 2, 5, 6, 8 & 9 |
| CV 5, 6, 8 & 9 |
| CV 9 & 10 |
| CV 8-10 |
| CV 9 & 10 |
| CV 7-10 |
ii) if there is no mutual agreement, a claim to support a community by one party will be a reason to award priority to that application. If there is no such claim, and no mutual agreement a process will be put in place to enable efficient resolution of contention and;

iii) the ICANN Board may be used to make a final decision, using advice from staff and expert panels.

| IG H* | Where an applicant lays any claim that the TLD is intended to support a particular community such as a sponsored TLD, or any other TLD intended for a specified community, that claim will be taken on trust with the following exceptions:

   (i) the claim relates to a string that is also subject to another application and the claim to support a community is being used to gain priority for the application; and

   (ii) a formal objection process is initiated.

   Under these exceptions, Staff Evaluators will devise criteria and procedures to investigate the claim.

   Under exception (ii), an expert panel will apply the process, guidelines, and definitions set forth in IG P. |
| CV 7 - 10 |

| IG H | External dispute providers will give decisions on objections. |
| CV 10 |

| IG I | An applicant granted a TLD string must use it within a fixed timeframe which will be specified in the application process. |
| CV 10 |

| IG J | The base contract should balance market certainty and flexibility for ICANN to accommodate a rapidly changing market place. |
| CV 4-10 |

| IG K | ICANN should take a consistent approach to the establishment of registry fees. |
| CV 5 |

| IG L | The use of personal data must be limited to the purpose for which it is collected. |
| CV 8 |

| IG M | ICANN may establish a capacity building and support mechanism aiming at facilitating effective communication on important and technical Internet governance functions in a way that no longer requires all participants in the conversation to be able to read and write English[30]. |
| CV 3 - 7 |

| IG N | ICANN may put in place a fee reduction scheme for gTLD applicants from economies classified by the UN as least developed. |
| CV 3 - 7 |

| IG O | ICANN may put in place systems that could provide information about the gTLD process in major languages other than English, for example, in the six working languages of the United Nations. |
| CV 8 -10 |
The following process, definitions and guidelines refer to Recommendation 20.

Process

Opposition must be objection based.

Determination will be made by a dispute resolution panel constituted for the purpose.

The objector must provide verifiable evidence that it is an established institution of the community (perhaps like the RSTEP pool of panelists from which a small panel would be constituted for each objection).

Guidelines

The task of the panel is the determination of substantial opposition.

a) substantial – in determining substantial the panel will assess the following: signification portion, community, explicitly targeting, implicitly targeting, established institution, formal existence, detriment

b) significant portion – in determining significant portion the panel will assess the balance between the level of objection submitted by one or more established institutions and the level of support provided in the application from one or more established institutions. The panel will assess significance proportionate to the explicit or implicit targeting.

c) community – community should be interpreted broadly and will include, for example, an economic sector, a cultural community, or a linguistic community. It may be a closely related community which believes it is impacted.

d) explicitly targeting – explicitly targeting means there is a description of the intended use of the TLD in the application.

e) implicitly targeting – implicitly targeting means that the objector makes an assumption of targeting or that the objector believes there may be confusion by users over its intended use.

f) established institution – an institution that has been in formal existence for at least 5 years. In exceptional cases, standing may be granted to an institution that has been in existence for fewer than 5 years.

Exceptional circumstances include but are not limited to a re-organization, merger or an inherently younger community.

The following ICANN organizations are defined as established institutions: GAC, ALAC, GNSO, ccNSO, ASO.
g) **formal existence** – formal existence may be demonstrated by appropriate public registration, public historical evidence, validation by a government, intergovernmental organization, international treaty organization or similar.

h) **detriment** – the objector must provide sufficient evidence to allow the panel to determine that there would be a likelihood of detriment to the rights or legitimate interests of the community or to users more widely.

| IG Q | ICANN staff will provide an automatic reply to all those who submit public comments that will explain the objection procedure. |
| IG R | Once formal objections or disputes are accepted for review there will be a cooling off period to allow parties to resolve the dispute or objection before review by the panel is initiated. |

*The NCUC submitted Minority Statements on Implementation Guidelines F, H & P. The remainder of the Implementation Guidelines have support from all GNSO Constituencies.

1. This set of implementation guidelines is the result of detailed discussion, particularly with respect to the two ICANN Staff Discussion Points[31] documents that were prepared to facilitate consultation with the GNSO Committee about the implementation impacts of the proposed policy Recommendations. The Implementation Guidelines will be used to inform the final Implementation Plan which is approved by the ICANN Board.

2. The Discussion Points documents contain draft flowcharts which have been developed by the Implementation Team and which will be updated, based on the final vote of the GNSO Council and the direction of the ICANN Board. The Discussion Points documents have been used in the ongoing internal implementation discussions that have focused on ensuring that draft recommendations proposed by the Committee are implementable in an efficient and transparent manner[32]. The flowchart setting out the proposed Contention Evaluation Process is a more detailed component within the Application Evaluation Process and will be amended to take into account the inputs from Recommendation 20 and its related Implementation Guidelines.

3. This policy development process has been designed to produce a systemised and ongoing mechanism for applicants to propose new top-level domains. The Request for Proposals (RFP) for the first round will include scheduling information for the subsequent rounds to occur within one year. After the first round of new applications, the application system will be evaluated by ICANN's TLDs Project Office to assess the effectiveness of the application system. Success metrics will be developed and any necessary adjustments made to the process for subsequent rounds.

4. The following sections set out in detail the explanation for the Committee's recommendations for each Term of Reference.

**TERM OF REFERENCE ONE -- WHETHER TO INTRODUCE NEW TOP-LEVEL DOMAINS**

1. Recommendation 1 Discussion – All GNSO Constituencies supported the introduction of new top-level domains.

2. The GNSO Committee was asked to address the question of whether to introduce new top-level domains. The Committee recommends that ICANN should implement a process that allows the introduction of new top-level domains and that work should proceed to develop policies that will enable the introduction of new generic top-level domains, taking into account the recommendations
found in the latter sections of the Report concerning Selection Criteria (Term of Reference 2), Allocation Methods (Term of Reference 3) and Policies for Contractual Conditions (Term of Reference 4).

3. ICANN's work on the introduction of new top-level domains has been ongoing since 1999. The early work included the 2000 Working Group C Report[33] that also asked the question of "whether there should be new TLDs". By mid-1999, the Working Group had quickly reached consensus on two issues, namely that "...ICANN should add new gTLDs to the root. The second is that ICANN should begin the deployment of new gTLDs with an initial rollout of six to ten new gTLDs, followed by an evaluation period". This work was undertaken throughout 2000 and saw the introduction of, for example, .coop, .aero and .biz.

4. After an evaluation period, a further round of sponsored TLDs was introduced during 2003 and 2004 which included, amongst others, .mobi and .travel.

5. In addressing Term of Reference One, the Committee arrived at its recommendation by reviewing and analysing a wide variety of materials including Working Group C’s findings; the evaluation reports from the 2003-2004 round of sponsored top-level domains and full range of other historic materials which are posted at http://gnso.icann.org/issues/new-gtlds/

6. In addition, the Committee considered the responses to a Call for Expert Papers issued at the beginning of the policy development process[34]. These papers augmented a full set of GNSO Constituency Statements[35] and a set of Constituency Impact Statements[36] that addressed specific elements of the Principles, Recommendations and Implementation Guidelines.

7. The Committee was asked, at its February 2007 Los Angeles meeting, to confirm its rationale for recommending that ICANN introduce new top-level domains. In summary, there are five threads which have emerged:

(i) It is consistent with the reasons articulated in 1999 when the first proof-of-concept round was initiated

(ii) There are no technical impediments to the introduction of new top-level domains as evidenced by the two previous rounds

(iii) It is hoped that expanding the domain name space to accommodate the introduction of both new ASCII and internationalised domain name (IDN) top-level domains will give end users more choice about the nature of their presence on the Internet. In addition, users will be able to use domain names in their language of choice.

(iv) In addition, the introduction of a new top-level domain application process has the potential to promote competition in the provision of registry services, and to add to consumer choice, market differentiation and geographic and service-provider diversity which is consistent with ICANN's Core Value 6.

(v) No compelling reason has been articulated to not proceed with accepting applications for new top-level domains.

8. Article X, Part 7, Section E of the GNSO's Policy Development Process requires the submission of "constituency impact statements" which reflect the potential implementation impact of policy recommendations. By 4 July 2007 all GNSO Constituencies had submitted Constituency Impact Statements (CIS) to the gtdc-council mailing list[37]. Each of those statements is referred to throughout the next sections[38] and are found in full in Part B of the Report. The NCUC submitted Minority Statements on Recommendations 6 & 20 and on Implementation Guidelines F, H & P. These statements are found in full here in Annex A & C, respectively, as they relate specifically to the finalised text of those two recommendations. GNSO Committee Chair and Nominating Committee appointee Ms Avri Doria also submitted individual comments on the recommendation package. Her comments are found in Annex B here.
9. All Constituencies support the introduction of new TLDs particularly if the application process is transparent and objective. For example, the ISPCP said that, "...the ISPCP is highly supportive of the principles defined in this section, especially with regards to the statement in [principle A] (A): New generic top-level domains must be introduced in an orderly, timely and predictable way. Network operators and ISPs must ensure their customers do not encounter problems in addressing their emails, and in their web searching and access activities, since this can cause customer dissatisfaction and overload help-desk complaints. Hence this principle is a vital component of any addition sequence to the gTLD namespace. The various criteria as defined in D, E and F, are also of great importance in contributing to minimise the risk of moving forward with any new gTLDs, and our constituency urges ICANN to ensure they are scrupulously observed during the applications evaluation process". The Business Constituency's (BC) CIS said that "...If the outcome is the best possible there will be a beneficial impact on business users from: a reduction in the competitive concentration in the Registry sector; increased choice of domain names; lower fees for registration and ownership; increased opportunities for innovative on-line business models." The Registrar Constituency (RC) agreed with this view stating that "...new gTLDs present an opportunity to Registrars in the form of additional products and associated services to offer to its customers. However, that opportunity comes with the costs if implementing the new gTLDs as well as the efforts required to do the appropriate business analysis to determine which of the new gTLDs are appropriate for its particular business model."

10. The Registry Constituency (RyC) said that "...Regarding increased competition, the RyC has consistently supported the introduction of new gTLDs because we believe that: there is a clear demand for new TLDs; competition creates more choices for potential registrants; introducing new TLDs with different purposes increases the public benefit; new gTLDs will result in creativity and differentiation in the domain name industry; the total market for all TLDs, new and old, will be expanded." In summary, the Committee recommended, "ICANN must implement a process that allows the introduction of new top-level domains. 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". Given that this recommendation has support from all Constituencies, the following sections set out the other Terms of Reference recommendations.

TERM OF REFERENCE -- SELECTION CRITERIA

1. Recommendation 2 Discussion -- Strings must not be confusingly similar to an existing top-level domain.

   i) This recommendation has support from all the GNSO Constituencies. Ms Dorla accepted the recommendation with the concern expressed below[39].

   ii) The list of existing top-level domains is maintained by IANA and is listed in full on ICANN's website[40]. Naturally, as the application process enables the operation of new top-level domains this list will get much longer and the test more complex. The RyC, in its Impact Statement, said that "...This recommendation is especially important to the RyC. ... It is of prime concern for the RyC that the introduction of new gTLDs results in a ubiquitous experience for Internet users that minimizes user confusion. gTLD registries will be impacted operationally and financially if new gTLDs are introduced that create confusion with currently existing gTLD strings or with strings that are introduced in the future. There is a strong possibility of significant impact on gTLD registries if IDN versions of existing ASCII gTLDs are introduced by registries different than the ASCII gTLD registries. Not only could there be user confusion in both email and web applications, but dispute resolution processes could be greatly complicated." The ISPCP also stated that this recommendation was "especially important in the avoidance of any negative impact on network activities." The RC stated that "...Registrars would likely be hesitant to offer confusingly similar gTLDs due to customer
demand and support concerns. On the other hand, applying the concept too broadly would inhibit gTLD applicants and ultimately limit choice to Registrars and their customers.

iii) There are two other key concepts within this recommendation. The first is the issue of “confusingly similar” [41] and the second “likelihood of confusion”. There is extensive experience within the Committee with respect to trademark law and the issues found below have been discussed at length, both within the Committee and amongst the Implementation Team.

iv) The Committee used a wide variety of existing law[42], international treaty agreements and covenants to arrive at a common understanding that strings should not be confusingly similar either to existing top-level domains like .com and .net or to existing trademarks[43]. For example, the Committee considered the World Trade Organisation’s TRIPS agreement, in particular Article 16 which discusses the rights which are conferred to a trademark owner [44]. In particular, the Committee agreed upon an expectation that strings must avoid increasing opportunities for entities or individuals, who operate in bad faith and who wish to defraud consumers. The Committee also considered the Universal Declaration of Human Rights[45] and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights which address the “freedom of expression” element of the Committee’s deliberations.

v) The Committee also benefited from the work of the Protecting the Rights of Others Working Group (PRO-WG). The PRO-WG presented its Final Report[46] to the Committee at the June 2007 San Juan meeting. The Committee agreed that the Working Group could develop some reference implementation guidelines on rights protection mechanisms that may inform potential new TLD applicants during the application process. A small ad-hoc group of interested volunteers are preparing those materials for consideration by the Council by mid-October 2007.

vi) The Committee had access to a wide range of differing approaches to rights holder protection mechanisms including the United Kingdom, the USA, Jordan, Egypt and Australia[47].

vii) In addition, the Committee referred to the 1883 Paris Convention on the Protection of Industrial Property[48]. It describes the notion of confusion and describes creating confusion as “to create confusion by any means whatever” {Article 10bis (3) (1)} and, further, being “liable to mislead the public” {Article 10bis (3) (3)}. The treatment of confusingly similar is also contained in European Union law (currently covering twenty-seven countries) and is structured as follows. “...because of its identity with or similarity to...there exists a likelihood of confusion on the part of the public...; the likelihood of confusion includes the likelihood of association...” {Article 4 (1) (b) of the 1988 EU Trade Mark directive 89/104/EEC}. Article 8 (1) (b) of the 1993 European Union Trade Mark regulation 40/94 is also relevant.

viii) In the United States, existing trade mark law requires applicants for trademark registration to state under penalty of perjury that “...to the best of the verifier’s knowledge and belief, no other person has the right to use such mark in commerce either in the identical form thereof or in such near resemblance thereto as to be likely, when used on or in connection with the goods of such other person, to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive...” which is contained in Section 1051 (3) (d) of the US Trademark Act 2005 (found at http://www.ultlaw.com/source/15usc/1051.html) [49]

ix) In Australia, the Australian Trade Marks Act 1995 Section 10 says that “...For the purposes of this Act, a trade mark is taken to be deceptively similar to another trade mark if it so nearly resembles that other trade mark that it is likely to deceive or cause confusion” (found at http://www.ipaustralia.gov.au/resources/legislation_index.shtml)

x) A number of different trademark offices provide guidance on how to interpret confusion. For example, the European Union Trade Mark Office provides guidance on how to interpret confusion. “…confusion may be visual, phonetic or conceptual. A mere aural similarity may create a likelihood of confusion. A mere visual similarity may create a likelihood of confusion. Confusion is based on the fact that the relevant public does not tend to analyse a word in
detail but pays more attention to the distinctive and dominant components. Similarities are more significant than dissimilarities. The visual comparison is based on an analysis of the number and sequence of the letters, the number of words and the structure of the signs. Further particularities may be of relevance, such as the existence of special letters or accents that may be perceived as an indication of a specific language. For words, the visual comparison coincides with the phonetic comparison unless in the relevant language the word is not pronounced as it is written. It should be assumed that the relevant public is either unfamiliar with that foreign language, or even if it understands the meaning in that foreign language, will still tend to pronounce it in accordance with the phonetic rules of their native language. The length of a name may influence the effect of differences. The shorter a name, the more easily the public is able to perceive all its single elements. Thus, small differences may frequently lead in short words to a different overall impression. In contrast, the public is less aware of differences between long names. The overall phonetic impression is particularly influenced by the number and sequence of syllables." (found at http://oami.europa.eu/en/mark/marque/direc.htm).

xi) An extract from the United Kingdom’s Trade Mark Office’s Examiners’s Guidance Manual is useful in explaining further the Committee’s approach to developing its Recommendation. "For likelihood of confusion to exist, it must be probable, not merely possible that confusion will arise in the mind of the average consumer. Likelihood of association is not an alternative to likelihood of confusion, "but serves to define its scope". Mere association, in the sense that the later mark brings the earlier mark to mind is insufficient to find a likelihood of confusion, unless the average consumer, in bringing the earlier mark to mind, is led to expect the goods or services of both marks to be under the control of one single trade source. "The risk that the public might believe that the goods/services in question come from the same undertaking or, as the case may be, from economically-linked undertakings, constitutes a likelihood of confusion...". (found at http://www.patent.gov.uk/tm/t-decisionmaking/t-law/t-law-manual.htm)

xii) The Committee also looked in detail at the existing provisions of ICANN’s Registrar Accreditation Agreement, particularly Section 3.7.7.9[50] which says that "...The Registered Name Holder shall represent that, to the best of the Registered Name Holder’s knowledge and belief, neither the registration of the Registered Name nor the manner in which it is directly or indirectly used infringes the legal rights of any third party."

xiii) The implications of the introduction of Internationalised Domain Names (IDNs) are, in the main, the same as for ASCII top-level domains. On 22 March 2007 the IDN-WG released its Outcomes Report[51] that the Working Group presented to the GNSO Committee. The Working Group’s exploration of IDN-specific issues confirmed that the new TLD recommendations are valid for IDN TLDs. The full IDN WG Report is found in Part B of the Report.

xiv) The technical testing for IDNs at the top-level is not yet completed although strong progress is being made. Given this and the other work that is taking place around the introduction of IDNs at the top-level, there are some critical factors that may impede the immediate acceptance of new IDN TLD applications. The conditions under which those applications would be assessed would remain the same as for ASCII TLDs.

xv) Detailed work continues on the preparation of an Implementation Plan that reflects both the Principles and the Recommendations. The proposed Implementation Plan deals with a comprehensive range of potentially controversial (for whatever reason) string applications which balances the need for reasonable protection of existing legal rights and the capacity to innovate with new uses for top level domains that may be attractive to a wide range of users[52].

xvi) The draft Implementation Plan (included in the Discussion Points document), illustrates the
flow of the application and evaluation process and includes a detailed dispute resolution and extended evaluation tracks designed to resolve objections to applicants or applications.

xvii) There is tension between those on the Committee who are concerned about the protection of existing TLD strings and those concerned with the protection of trademark and other rights as compared to those who wish, as far as possible, to preserve freedom of expression and creativity. The Implementation Plan sets out a series of tests to apply the recommendation during the application evaluation process.

2. Recommendation 3 Discussion -- Strings must not infringe the existing legal rights of others that are recognized or enforceable under generally accepted and internationally recognized principles of law. Examples of these legal rights that are internationally recognized include, but are not limited to, rights defined in the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property (in particular trademark rights), the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) (in particular freedom of expression rights).

i. This recommendation has support from all GNSO Constituencies. Ms Doria supported the recommendation with concern expressed below[53].

ii. This recommendation was discussed in detail in the lead up to the Committee’s 7 June 2007 conference call and it was agreed that further work would be beneficial. That work was conducted through a series of teleconferences and email exchanges. The Committee decided to leave the recommendation text as it had been drafted and insert a new Principle G that reads "...The string evaluation process must not infringe the applicant's freedom of expression rights that are protected under internationally recognized principles of law."

iii. Prior to this, the Committee engaged in comprehensive discussion about this recommendation and took advice from a number of experts within the group[54]. The original text of the recommendation has been modified to recognise that an applicant would be bound by the laws of the country where they are located and an applicant may be bound by another country that has jurisdiction over them. In addition, the original formulation that included "freedom of speech" was modified to read the more generally applicable "freedom of expression".

iv. Before reaching agreement on the final text, the IPC and the NCUC, in their respective Constituency Impact Statements (CIS), had differing views. The NCUC argued that "...there is no recognition that trade marks (and other legal rights have legal limits and defensos." The IPC says "agreed [to the recommendation], and, as stated before, appropriate mechanisms must be in place to address conflicts that may arise between any proposed new string and the IP rights of others."

3. Recommendation 4 Discussion -- Strings must not cause any technical instability.

i. This recommendation is supported by all GNSO Constituencies and Ms Doria.

ii. It was agreed by the Committee that the string should not cause any technical issues that threatened the stability and security of the Internet.

iii. In its CIS, the ISPCP stated that "...this is especially important in the avoidance of any negative impact on network activities...The ISPCP considers recommendations 7 and 8 to be fundamental. The technical, financial, organizational and operational capability of the applicant are the evaluators' instruments for preventing potential negative impact on a new string on the activities of our sector (and indeed of many other sectors)." The IPC also agreed that "technical and operational stability are imperative to any new gTLD introduction." The RC said "...This is important to Registrars in that unstable registry and/or zone operations would have a serious and costly impact on its operations and customer service and support."

iv. The Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) has been involved in general discussions about
new top level domains and will be consulted formally to confirm that the implementation of 
the recommendations will not cause any technical instability.

v. A reserved word list, which includes strings which are reserved for technical reasons, has been 
recommended by the RN-WG. This table is found in the section below.

4. Recommendation 5 Discussion -- Strings must not be a Reserved Word.[55]

i. This recommendation is supported by all GNSO Constituencies. Ms Doria supported the 
recommendation but expressed some concerns outlined in the footnote below.[56]

ii. The RN WG developed a definition of "reserved word" in the context of new TLDs which said 
"...depending on the specific reserved name category as well as the type (ASCII or IDN), the 
reserved name requirements recommended may apply in any one or more of the following 
levels as indicated:

1. At the top level regarding gTLD string restrictions

2. At the second-level as contractual conditions

3. At the third-level as contractual conditions for any new gTLDs that offer domain name 
registrations at the third-level.

iii. The notion of "reserved words" has a specific meaning within the ICANN context. Each of the existing 
ICANN registry contracts has provisions within it that govern the use of reserved words. 
Some of these recommendations will become part of the contractual conditions for new 
registry operators.

iv. The Reserved Names Working Group (RN-WG) developed a series of recommendations across a 
broad spectrum of reserved words. The Working Group's Final Report[57] was reviewed and 
the recommendations updated by the Committee at ICANN's Puerto Rico meeting and, with 
respect to the recommendations relating to IDNs, with IDN experts. The final 
recommendations are included in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reserved Name Category</th>
<th>Domain Name Level(s)</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ICANN &amp; IANA</td>
<td>All ASCII</td>
<td>The names listed as ICANN and IANA names will be reserved at all levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ICANN &amp; IANA</td>
<td>Top level, IDN</td>
<td>Any names that appear in the IDN evaluation facility[58] which consist exclusively of translations of 'example' or 'test' that appear in the document at <a href="http://www.icann.org/topics/idn/idn-evaluation-plan-v2%209.pdf">http://www.icann.org/topics/idn/idn-evaluation-plan-v2%209.pdf</a> shall be reserved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ICANN &amp; IANA</td>
<td>2nd &amp; 3rd levels, IDN</td>
<td>Any names that appear in the IDN evaluation facility which consist exclusively of translations of 'example' or 'test' that appear in the document at <a href="http://www.icann.org/topics/idn/idn-evaluation-plan-v2%209.pdf">http://www.icann.org/topics/idn/idn-evaluation-plan-v2%209.pdf</a> shall be reserved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Symbols</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>We recommend that the current practice be maintained, so that no symbols other than the '-' [hyphen] be considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single and Two Character IDNs</td>
<td>IDNA-valid strings at all levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single Letters</td>
<td>Top Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single Letters and Digits</td>
<td>2nd Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single and Two Digits</td>
<td>Top Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single Letter, Single Digit Combinations</td>
<td>Top Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two Letters</td>
<td>Top Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any combination of Two Letters, Digits</td>
<td>2nd Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tagged Names</td>
<td>Top Level ASCII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | N/A | Top Level IDN | For each IDN gTLD proposed, applicant must provide both the "ASCII compatible encoding" ("A-label") and the "Unicode display form" ("U-label")[62] For example:
- If the Chinese word for 'Beijing' is proposed as a new gTLD, the applicant would be required to provide the A-label (xn--1lq90i) and the U-label (北京).
- If the Japanese word for 'Tokyo' is proposed as a new gTLD, the applicant would be required to provide the A-label (xn--1lqs71d) and the U-label (東京).
|   | Tagged Names | 2^nd Level ASCII | The current reservation requirement be reworded to say, "In the absence of standardization activity and appropriate IANA registration, all labels with hyphens in both the third and fourth character positions (e.g., "bq--1k2n4h4b" or "xn--ndk061n") must be reserved in ASCII at the second (2^nd) level.[63] – added words in *italics*. (Note that names starting with "xn--" may only be used if the current ICANN IDN Guidelines are followed by a gTLD registry.)
|   | Tagged Names | 3^rd Level ASCII | All labels with hyphens in both the third and fourth character positions (e.g., "bq--1k2n4h4b" or "xn--ndk061n") must be reserved in ASCII at the third (3^rd) level for gTLD registries that register names at the third level.[64] – added words in *italics*. (Note that names starting with "xn--" may only be used if the current ICANN IDN Guidelines are followed by a gTLD registry.)
| 16 | NIC, WHOIS, WWW | Top ASCII | The following names must be reserved: nic, whois, www.
| 17 | NIC, WHOIS, WWW | Top IDN | Do not try to translate nic, whois and www into Unicode versions for various scripts or to reserve any ACE versions of such translations or transiterations if they exist.
| 18 | NIC, WHOIS, WWW | Second and Third* ASCII | The following names must be reserved for use in connection with the operation of the registry for the Registry TLD: nic, whois, www Registry Operator may use them, but upon conclusion of Registry Operator's designation as operator of the registry for the Registry TLD, they shall be transferred as specified by ICANN. (*Third level only applies in cases where a registry offers registrations at the third level.)
| 19 | NIC, WHOIS, WWW | Second and Third* IDN | Do not try to translate nic, whois and www into Unicode versions for various scripts or to reserve any ACE versions of such translations or transiterations if they exist, except on a case by case basis as proposed by given registries. (*Third level only applies in cases where a registry offers registrations at the third level.)
| 20 | Geographic and geopolitical | Top Level ASCII and IDN | There should be no geographical reserved names (i.e., no exclusionary list, no presumptive right of registration, no separate administrative procedure, etc.). The proposed challenge mechanisms currently being proposed in the draft
new gTLD process would allow national or local governments to initiate a challenge, therefore no additional protection mechanisms are needed. Potential applicants for a new TLD need to represent that the use of the proposed string is not in violation of the national laws in which the applicant is incorporated.

However, new TLD applicants interested in applying for a TLD that incorporates a country, territory, or place name should be advised of the GAC Principles, and the advisory role vested to it under the ICANN Bylaws. Additionally, a summary overview of the obstacles encountered by previous applicants involving similar TLDs should be provided to allow an applicant to make an informed decision. Potential applicants should also be advised that the failure of the GAC, or an individual GAC member, to file a challenge during the TLD application process, does not constitute a waiver of the authority vested to the GAC under the ICANN Bylaws.

*Note New gTLD Recommendation 20*

| 21 | Geographic and geopolitical | All Levels ASCII and IDN | The term 'geopolitical names' should be avoided until such time that a useful definition can be adopted. The basis for this recommendation is founded on the potential ambiguity regarding the definition of the term, and the lack of any specific definition of it in the WIPO Second Report on Domain Names or GAC recommendations. | *Note New gTLD Recommendation 20* |

<p>| 22 | Geographic and geopolitical | Second Level &amp; Third Level if applicable, ASCII &amp; IDN | The consensus view of the working group is given the lack of any established international law on the subject, conflicting legal opinions, and conflicting recommendations emerging from various governmental fora, the current geographical reservation provision contained in the sTLD contracts during the 2004 Round should be removed, and harmonized with the more recently executed .COM, .NET, .ORG, .BIZ and .INFO registry contracts. The only exception to this consensus recommendation is those registries incorporated/organized under countries that require additional protection for geographical identifiers. In this instance, the registry would have to incorporate appropriate mechanisms to comply with their national/local laws. | For those registries incorporated/organized under the laws of those countries that have expressly supported the guidelines of the WIPO Standing Committee on the Law of Trademarks, Industrial Designs and Geographical Indications as adopted by the WIPO General Assembly, it is |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>strongly recommended (but not mandated) that these registries take appropriate action to promptly implement protections that are in line with these WIPO guidelines and are in accordance with the relevant national laws of the applicable Member State.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>gTLD Reserved Names</td>
<td>Second &amp; Third Level ASCII and IDN (when applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Controversial Names</td>
<td>All Levels, ASCII &amp; IDN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Controversial Names</td>
<td>Top Level, ASCII &amp; IDN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Controversial Names</td>
<td>Top Level, ASCII &amp; IDN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Controversial Names</td>
<td>Top Level, ASCII &amp; IDN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Controversial Names</td>
<td>Top Level, ASCII &amp; IDN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
organizations do not currently have formal processes for receiving, and deciding on such activities, these processes would need to be defined:

- The Advisory Groups and the Supporting Organizations, using their own processes and consistent with their organizational structure, will need to define procedures for deciding on any requests for dispute initiation.

- Any consensus or other formally supported position from an ICANN Advisory Committee or ICANN Supporting Organization must document the position of each member within that committee or organization (i.e., support, opposition, abstention) in compliance with both the spirit and letter of the ICANN bylaws regarding openness and transparency.

*Note New gTLD Recommendation 6*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>29</th>
<th>Controversial Names</th>
<th>Top Level, ASCII &amp; IDN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Further work is needed to develop predictable and transparent criteria that can be used by the Controversial Resolution Panel. These criteria must take into account the need to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Further details provided in the table.*

*Note New gTLD Recommendation 6*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30</th>
<th>Controversial Names</th>
<th>Top Level, ASCII &amp; IDN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In any dispute resolution process, or sequence of issue resolution processes, the Controversial name category should be the last category considered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note New gTLD Recommendation 6*

v. With respect to geographic terms, the NCUC's CIS stated that "...We oppose any attempts to create lists of reserved names. Even examples are to be avoided as they can only become prescriptive. We are concerned that geographic names should not be fenced off from the commons of language and rather should be free for the use of all...Moreover, the proposed recommendation does not make allowance for the duplication of geographic names outside the ccTLDs – where the real issues arise and the means of resolving competing use and fair
vi. The GAC’s Public Policy Principle 2.2 states that "ICANN should avoid country, territory or place names, and country, territory or regional language or people descriptions, unless in agreement with the relevant government or public authorities."

vii. The Implementation Team has developed some suggestions about how this recommendation may be implemented. Those suggestions and the process flow were incorporated into the Version 2 of the ICANN Staff Discussion Points document for consideration by the Committee.

5. Recommendation 6 Discussion -- Strings must not be contrary to generally accepted legal norms relating to morality and public order that are recognized under international principles of law.

Examples of such principles of law include, but are not limited to, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and the International Convention of the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, intellectual property treaties administered by the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO) and the WTO Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property (TRIPS).

i. This Recommendation is supported by all GNSO Constituencies except the NCUC. The NCUC has submitted a Minority Statement which is found in full in Annex A. The NCUC’s earlier Constituency Impact Statement is found, along with all the GNSO Constituency Impact Statements, in Part B of this report. Ms Doria has submitted individual comments[87]. The Committee has discussed this recommendation in great detail and has attempted to address the experiences of the 2003-2004 sTLD round and the complex issues surrounding the .xxx application. The Committee has also recognised the GAC’s Public Policy Principles, most notably Principle 2.1 a) and b) which refer to both freedom of expression and terms with significance in a variety of contexts. In addition, the Committee recognises the tension respecting freedom of expression and being sensitive to the legitimate concerns others have about offensive terms. The NCUC’s earlier CIS says "...we oppose any string criteria based on morality and public order".

ii. Other Constituencies did not address this recommendation in their CISs. The Implementation Team has tried to balance these views by establishing an Implementation Plan that recognises the practical effect of opening a new top-level domain application system that will attract applications that some members of the community do not agree with. Whilst ICANN does have a technical co-ordination remit, it must also put in place a system of handling objections to strings or to applicants, using pre-published criteria, that is fair and predictable for applicants. It is also necessary to develop guidance for independent evaluators tasked with making decisions about objections.

iii. In its consideration of public policy aspects of new top-level domains the Committee examined the approach taken in a wide variety of jurisdictions to issues of morality and public order. This was done not to make decisions about acceptable strings but to provide a series of potential tests for independent evaluators to use should an objection be raised to an application. The use of the phrase "morality and public order" within the recommendation was done to set some guidelines for potential applicants about areas that may raise objections. The phrasing was also intended to set parameters for potential objectors so that any objection to an application could be analysed within the framework of broadly accepted legal norms that independent evaluators could use across a broad spectrum of possible objections. The Committee also sought to ensure that the objections process would have parameters set for who could object. Those suggested parameters are found within the Implementation Guidelines.

iv. In reaching its decision about the recommendation, the Committee sought to be consistent with, for
example, Article 3(1)(f) of the 1988 European Union Trade Mark Directive 89/104/EEC and within Article 7(1)(f) of the 1993 European Union Trade Mark Regulation 40/94. In addition, the phrasing "contrary to morality or public order and in particular of such a nature as to deceive the public" comes from Article 6quinquies (B)(3) of the 1883 Paris Convention. The reference to the Paris Convention remains relevant to domain names even though, when it was drafted, domain names were completely unheard of.

v. The concept of "morality" is captured in Article 19 United Nations Convention on Human Rights (http://www.unhchr.ch/udhr/lang/eng.htm) says "...Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers." Article 29 continues by saying that "...In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society".

vi. The EU Trade Mark Office's Examiner's guidelines provides assistance on how to interpret morality and deceit. "...Contrary to morality or public order. Words or images which are offensive, such as swear words or racially derogatory images, or which are blasphemous are not acceptable. There is a dividing line between this and words which might be considered in poor taste. The latter do not offend against this provision." The further element is deception of the public which is treated in the following way. "...Deceive the public. To deceive the public, is for instance as to the nature, quality or geographical origin. For example, a word may give rise to a real expectation of a particular locality which is untrue." For more information, see Sections 8.7 and 8.8 at http://oami.europa.eu/en/mark/marque/direc.htm

vii. The UK Trade Mark office provides similar guidance in its Examiner's Guidance Manual. "Marks which offend fall broadly into three types: those with criminal connotations, those with religious connotations and explicit/taboo signs. Marks offending public policy are likely to offend accepted principles of morality, e.g. illegal drug terminology, although the question of public policy may not arise against marks offending accepted principles of morality, for example, taboo swear words. If a mark is merely distasteful, an objection is unlikely to be justified, whereas if it would cause outrage or would be likely significantly to undermine religious, family or social values, then an objection will be appropriate. Offence may be caused on matters of race, sex, religious belief or general matters of taste and decency. Care should be taken when words have a religious significance and which may provoke greater offence than mere distaste, or even outrage, if used to parody a religion or its values. Where a sign has a very sacred status to members of a religion, mere use may be enough to cause outrage." For more information, see http://www.patent.gov.uk/tm/t-decisionmaking/t-law/t-law-manual.htm

viii. This recommendation has been the subject of detailed Committee and small group work in an attempt to reach consensus about both the text of the recommendation and the examples included as guidance about generally accepted legal norms. The work has been informed by detailed discussion within the GAC and through interactions between the GNSO Committee and the GAC.

6. Recommendation 7 Discussion -- Applicants must be able to demonstrate their technical capability to run a registry operation for the purpose that the applicant sets out.

i. This recommendation is supported by all GNSO Constituencies and Ms Doria.

ii. The Committee agreed that the technical requirements for applicants would include compliance with a minimum set of technical standards and that this requirement would be part of the new registry operator's contractual conditions included in the proposed base contract. The more
detailed discussion about technical requirements has been moved to the contractual conditions section.

iii. Reference was made to numerous Requests for Comment (RFCs) and other technical standards which apply to existing registry operators. For example, Appendix 7 of the June 2005 .net agreement[68] provides a comprehensive listing of technical requirements in addition to other technical specifications in other parts of the agreement. These requirements are consistent with that which is expected of all current registry operators. These standards would form the basis of any new top-level domain operator requirements.

iv. This recommendation is referred to in two CISs. "The ISPCP considers recommendations 7 and 8 to be fundamental. The technical, financial, organisational and operational capabilities of the applicant are the evaluators’ instruments for preventing potential negative impact on a new string on the activities of our sector (and indeed of many other sectors)." The NCUC submitted "...we record that this must be limited to transparent, predictable and minimum technical requirements only. These must be published. They must then be adhered to neutrally, fairly and without discrimination."

v. The GAC supported this direction in its Public Policy Principles 2.6, 2.10 and 2.11.

7. Recommendation 8 Discussion -- Applicants must be able to demonstrate their financial and organisational operational capability.

i. This recommendation is supported by all GNSO Constituencies and accepted with concern by Ms Doria[69].

   ii. The Committee discussed this requirement in detail and determined that it was reasonable to request this information from potential applicants. It was also consistent with past practices including the prior new TLD rounds in 2000 and 2003-2004; the .net and .org rebids and the conditions associated with ICANN registrar accreditation.

   iii. This is also consistent with best practice procurement guidelines recommended by the World Bank (www.worldbank.org), the OECD (www.oecd.org) and the Asian Development Bank (www.adb.org) as well as a range of federal procurement agencies such as the UK telecommunications regulator, Ofcom; the US Federal Communications Commission and major public companies.

   iv. The challenging aspect of this recommendation is to develop robust and objective criteria against which applicants can be measured, recognising a vast array of business conditions and models. This will be an important element of the ongoing development of the Implementation Plan.

   v. The ISPCP discussed the importance of this recommendation in its CIS, as found in Recommendation 7 above.

   vi. The NCUC's CIS addressed this recommendation by saying "...we support this recommendation to the extent that the criteria is truly limited to minimum financial and organizational operationally capability...All criteria must be transparent, predictable and minimum. They must be published. They must then be adhered to neutrally, fairly and without discrimination."

   vii. The GAC echoed these views in its Public Policy Principle 2.5 that said "...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."
8. Recommendation 9 Discussion -- There must be a clear and pre-published process using objective and measurable criteria.

i. This recommendation is supported by all GNSO Constituencies and by Ms Doria. It is consistent with ICANN's previous TLD rounds in 2000 and 2003-2004 and with its re-bid of both the .net and .org registry contracts.

ii. It is also consistent with ICANN's Mission and Core Values especially 7, 8 and 9 which address openness in decision-making processes and the timeliness of those processes.

iii. The Committee decided that the "process" criteria for introducing new top-level domains would follow a pre-published application system including the levying of an application fee to recover the costs of the application process. This is consistent with ICANN's approach to the introduction of new TLDs in the previous 2000 and 2004 round for new top-level domains.

iv. The RyC reiterated its support for this recommendation in its CIS. It said that "...this Recommendation is of major importance to the RyC because the majority of constituency members incurred unnecessarily high costs in previous rounds of new gTLD introductions as a result of excessively long time periods from application submittal until they were able to start their business. We believe that a significant part of the delays were related to selection criteria and processes that were too subjective and not very measurable. It is critical in our opinion that the process for the introduction of new gTLDs be predictable in terms of evaluation requirements and timeframes so that new applicants can properly scope their costs and develop reliable implementation plans." The NCUC said that "...we strongly support this recommendation and again stress the need for all criteria to be limited to minimum operational, financial, and technical considerations. We all stress the need that all evaluation criteria be objective and measurable."

9. Recommendation 10 Discussion -- There must be a base contract provided to applicants at the beginning of the process.

i. This recommendation is supported by all GNSO Constituencies and by Ms Doria.

ii. The General Counsel's office has been involved in discussions about the provision of a base contract which would assist applicants both during the application process and in any subsequent contract negotiations.

iii. A framework for the base contract was developed for discussion at the June 2007 ICANN meeting in Puerto Rico. The base contract will not be completed until the policy recommendations are in place. Completion of the policy recommendations will enable the completion of a draft base contract that would be available to applicants prior to the start of the new gTLD process, that is, prior to the beginning of the four-month window preceding the application submittal period.

iv. The RyC, in its CIS, said, "...like the comments for Recommendation 9, we believe that this recommendation will facilitate a more cost-effective and timely application process and thereby minimize the negative impacts of a process that is less well-defined and objective. Having a clear understanding of base contractual requirements is essential for a new gTLD applicant in developing a complete business plan."

10. Recommendation 11 Discussion -- (This recommendation has been removed and is left intentionally blank. Note Recommendation 20 and its Implementation Guidelines).

11. Recommendation 12 Discussion -- Dispute resolution and challenge processes must be established prior to the start of the process.

i. This recommendation is supported by all GNSO Constituencies and Ms Doria.

ii. The Committee has provided clear direction on its expectations that all the dispute
resolution and challenge processes would be established prior to the opening of the application round. The full system will be published prior to an application round starting. However, the finalisation of this process is contingent upon a completed set of recommendations being agreed: a public comment period and the final agreement of the ICANN Board.

iii. The draft Implementation Plan in the Implementation Team Discussion Points document sets out the way in which the ICANN Staff proposes that disputes between applicants and challenge processes may be handled. Expert legal and other professional advice from, for example, auctions experts is being sought to augment the Implementation Plan.

TERM OF REFERENCE THREE -- ALLOCATION METHODS

12. Recommendation 13 Discussion -- Applications must initially be assessed in rounds until the scale of demand is clear.

i. This recommendation is supported by all GNSO Constituencies and Ms Doria.

ii. This recommendation sets out the principal allocation methods for TLD applications. The narrative here should be read in conjunction with the draft flowcharts and the draft Request for Proposals.

iii. An application round would be opened on Day 1 and closed on an agreed date in the future with an unspecified number of applications to be processed within that round.

iv. This recommendation may be amended, after an evaluation period and report that may suggest modifications to this system. The development of objective "success metrics" is a necessary part of the evaluation process that could take place within the new TLDs Project Office.

v. The ISPCP expressed its support for this recommendation. Its CIS said that "...this is an essential element in the deployment of new gTLDs, as it enables any technical difficulties to be quickly identified and sorted out, working with reduced numbers of new strings at a time, rather than many all at once. Recommendation 18 on the use of IDNs is also important in preventing any negative impact on network operators and ISPs."

13. Recommendation 20 Discussion -- An application will be rejected if an expert panel determines that there is substantial opposition to it from a significant portion of the community to which the string may be explicitly or implicitly targeted.

i. This recommendation is supported by the majority of GNSO Constituencies. Ms Doria supports the recommendation but has concerns about its implementation[70]. The NCUC has submitted a Minority Statement which is found in full in Annex C about the recommendation and its associated Implementation Guidelines F, H and P.

ii. This recommendation was developed during the preparations for the Committee's 7 June 2007 conference call and during subsequent Committee deliberations. The intention was to factor into the process the very likely possibility of objections to applications from a wide variety of stakeholders.

iii. The language used here is relatively broad and the implementation impact of the proposed recommendation is discussed in detail in the Implementation Team's Discussion Points document.

iv. The NCUC's response to this recommendation in its earlier CIS says, in part, "...recommendation 20 swallows up any attempt to narrow the string criteria to technical, operational and financial evaluations. It asks for objections based on entirely subjective and unknowable criteria and for unlimited reasons and by unlimited parties." This view has, in part, been addressed in the Implementation Team's proposed plan but this requires further
discussion and agreement by the Committee.

TERM OF REFERENCE FOUR -- CONTRACTUAL CONDITIONS

14. Recommendation 14 Discussion – The initial registry agreement term must be of a commercially reasonable length.

   i. The remainder of the recommendations address Term of Reference Four on policies for contractual conditions and should be read in conjunction with Recommendation 10 on the provision of a base contract prior to the opening of an application round. The recommendation is supported by all GNSO Constituencies and Ms Doria.

   ii. This recommendation is consistent with the existing registry contract provisions found in, for example, the .com and .biz agreements.

   iii. These conditions would form the baseline conditions of term length for new TLD operators. It was determined that a term of ten years would reasonably balance the start up costs of registry operations with reasonable commercial terms.

   iv. The RyC commented on this recommendation in its CIS saying that "...the members of the RyC have learned first hand that operating a registry in a secure and stable manner is a capital intensive venture. Extensive infrastructure is needed both for redundant registration systems and global domain name constellations. Even the most successful registries have taken many years to recoup their initial investment costs. The RyC is convinced that these two recommendations [14 & 15] will make it easier for new applicants to raise the initial capital necessary and to continue to make investments needed to ensure the level of service expected by registrants and users of their TLDs. These two recommendations will have a very positive impact on new gTLD registries and in turn on the quality of the service they will be able to provide to the Internet community."

15. Recommendation 15 -- There must be renewal expectancy.

   i. This recommendation is consistent with the existing registry contract provisions found in, for example, the .com and .biz agreements and is supported by all Constituencies. Ms Doria supported the recommendation and provided the comments found in the footnote below.[71]

   ii. These conditions would form the baseline conditions of term length for new TLD operators. It was determined that a term of ten years would reasonably balance the start up costs of registry operations with reasonable commercial terms.

   iii. See the CIS comments from the RyC in the previous section.

16. Recommendation 16 -- Registries must apply existing Consensus Policies[72] and adopt new Consensus Policies as they are approved.

   i. This recommendation is supported by all GNSO Constituencies and Ms Doria.

   ii. The full set of existing ICANN registry contracts can be found here http://www.icann.org/registries/agreements.htm and ICANN’s seven current Consensus Policies are found at http://www.icann.org/general/consensus-policies.htm.

   iii. ICANN develops binding Consensus Policies through its policy development processes, in this case, through the GNSO[73].

17. Recommendation 17 -- A clear compliance and sanctions process must be set out in the base contract which could lead to contract termination.

   i. This recommendation is supported by all GNSO Constituencies and Ms Doria.
ii. Referring to the recommendations on contractual conditions above, this section sets out the discussion of the policies for contractual conditions for new top-level domain registry operators. The recommendations are consistent with the existing provisions for registry operators which were the subject of detailed community input throughout 2006[74].

iii. The Committee developed its recommendations during the Brussels and Amsterdam face-to-face consultations, with assistance from the ICANN General Counsel’s office. The General Counsel’s office has also provided a draft base contract which will be completed once the policy recommendations are agreed. Reference should also be made to Recommendation 5 on reserved words as some of the findings could be part of the base contract.

iv. The Committee has focused on the key principles of consistency, openness and transparency. It was also determined that a scalable and predictable process is consistent with industry best practice standards for services procurement. The Committee referred in particular to standards within the broadcasting, telecommunications and Internet services industries to examine how regulatory agencies in those environments conducted, for example, spectrum auctions, broadcasting licence distribution and media ownership frameworks.

v. Since then ICANN has developed and published a new approach to its compliance activities. These are found on ICANN’s website at http://www.icann.org/compliance/ and will be part of the development of base contract materials.

vi. The Committee found a number of expert reports[75] beneficial. In particular, the World Bank report on mobile licensing conditions provides some guidance on best practice principles for considering broader market investment conditions. "...A major challenge facing regulators in developed and developing countries alike is the need to strike the right balance between ensuring certainty for market players and preserving flexibility of the regulatory process to accommodate the rapidly changing market, technological and policy conditions. As much as possible, policy makers and regulators should strive to promote investors’ confidence and give incentives for long-term investment. They can do this by favouring the principle of ‘renewal expectancy’, but also by promoting regulatory certainty and predictability through a fair, transparent and participatory renewal process. For example, by providing details for license renewal or reissuance, clearly establishing what is the discretion offered to the licensing body, or ensuring sufficient lead-times and transitional arrangements in the event of non-renewal or changes in licensing conditions. Public consultation procedures and guaranteeing the right to appeal regulatory decisions maximizes the prospects for a successful renewal process. As technological changes and convergence and technologically neutral approaches gain importance, regulators and policy makers need to be ready to adapt and evolve licensing procedures and practices to the new environment."

vii. The Recommendations which the Committee has developed with respect to the introduction of new TLDs are consistent with the World Bank principles.

18. Recommendation 18 Discussion – If an applicant offers an IDN service, then ICANN’s IDN guidelines must be followed.

i. This recommendation is supported by all GNSO Constituencies and Ms Doria. The introduction of internationalised domain names at the root presents ICANN with a series of implementation challenges. This recommendation would apply to any new gTLD (IDN or ASCII TLD) offering IDN services. The initial technical testing[76] has been completed and a series of live root tests will take place during the remainder of 2007.

ii. The Committee recognises that there is ongoing work in other parts of the ICANN organisation that needs to be factored into the application process that will apply to IDN applications. The work includes the President’s Committee on IDNs and the GAC and ccNSO joint working group on IDNs.
19. **Recommendation 19 Discussion --** Registries must use only ICANN accredited registrars in registering domain names and may not discriminate among such accredited registrars.

i. This recommendation is supported by all GNSO Constituencies and Ms Doria.

ii. There is a long history associated with the separation of registry and registrar operations for top-level domains. The structural separation of VeriSign's registry operations from Network Solutions registrar operations explains much of the ongoing policy to require the use of ICANN accredited registrars.

iii. In order to facilitate the stable and secure operation of the DNS, the Committee agreed that it was prudent to continue the current requirement that registry operators be obliged to use ICANN accredited registrars.

iv. ICANN's Registrar Accreditation Agreement has been in place since 2001[77]. Detailed information about the accreditation of registrars can be found on the ICANN website[78]. The accreditation process is under active discussion but the critical element of requiring the use of ICANN accredited registrars remains constant.

v. In its CIS, the RyC noted that "...the RyC has no problem with this recommendation for larger gTLDs; the requirement to use accredited registrars has worked well for them. But it has not always worked as well for very small, specialized gTLDs. The possible impact on the latter is that they can be at the mercy of registrars for whom there is no good business reason to devote resources. In the New gTLD PDP, it was noted that this requirement would be less of a problem if the impacted registry would become a registrar for its own TLD, with appropriate controls in place. The RyC agrees with this line of reasoning but current registry agreements forbid registries from doing this. Dialog with the Registrars Constituency on this topic was initiated and is ongoing, the goal being to mutually agree on terms that could be presented for consideration and might provide a workable solution."

**NEXT STEPS**

1. Under the GNSO's Policy Development Process, the production of this Final Report completes Stage 9. The next steps are to conduct a twenty-day public comment period running from 10 August to 30 August 2007. The GNSO Council is due to meet on 6 September 2007 to vote on the package of principles, policy recommendations and implementation guidelines.

2. After the GNSO Council have voted the Council Report to the Board is prepared. The GNSO's PDP guidelines stipulate that "the Staff Manager will be present at the final meeting of the Council, and will have five (5) calendar days after the meeting to incorporate the views of the Council into a report to be submitted to the Board (the "Board Report"). The Board Report must contain at least the following:

   a. A clear statement of any Supermajority Vote recommendation of the Council;

   b. If a Supermajority Vote was not reached, a clear statement of all positions held by Council members. Each statement should clearly indicate (i) the reasons underlying each position and (ii) the constituency(ies) that held the position;

   c. An analysis of how the issue would affect each constituency, including any financial impact on the constituency;

   d. An analysis of the period of time that would likely be necessary to implement the policy;
e. The advice of any outside advisors relied upon, which should be accompanied by a detailed statement of the advisor's (i) qualifications and relevant experience; and (ii) potential conflicts of interest;

f. The Final Report submitted to the Council; and

g. A copy of the minutes of the Council deliberation on the policy issue, including the all opinions expressed during such deliberation, accompanied by a description of who expressed such opinions.

3. It is expected that, according to the Bylaws, "...The Board will meet to discuss the GNSO Council recommendation as soon as feasible after receipt of the Board Report from the Staff Manager. In the event that the Council reached a Supermajority Vote, the Board shall adopt the policy according to the Council Supermajority Vote recommendation unless by a vote of more than sixty-six (66%) percent of the Board determines that such policy is not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN. In the event that the Board determines not to act in accordance with the Council Supermajority Vote recommendation, the Board shall (i) articulate the reasons for its determination in a report to the Council (the "Board Statement"); and (ii) submit the Board Statement to the Council. The Council shall review the Board Statement for discussion with the Board within twenty (20) calendar days after the Council's receipt of the Board Statement. The Board shall determine the method (e.g., by teleconference, e-mail, or otherwise) by which the Council and Board will discuss the Board Statement. At the conclusion of the Council and Board discussions, the Council shall meet to affirm or modify its recommendation, and communicate such conclusion (the "Supplemental Recommendation") to the Board, including an explanation for its current recommendation. In the event that the Board is able to reach a Supermajority Vote on the Supplemental Recommendation, the Board shall adopt the recommendation unless more than sixty-six (66%) percent of the Board determines that such policy is not in the interests of the ICANN community or ICANN. In any case in which the Board is not able to reach Supermajority, a majority vote of the Board will be sufficient to act. When a final decision on a GNSO Council Recommendation or Supplemental Recommendation is timely, the Board shall take a preliminary vote and, where practicable, will publish a tentative decision that allows for a ten (10) day period of public comment prior to a final decision by the Board."

4. The final stage in the PDP is the implementation of the policy which is also governed by the Bylaws as follows. "...Upon a final decision of the Board, the Board shall, as appropriate, give authorization or direction to the ICANN staff to take all necessary steps to implement the policy."

Annex A – NCUC Minority Statement: Recommendation 6

**STATEMENT OF DISSENT ON RECOMMENDATION #6 OF GNSO’S NEW GTLD REPORT FROM the Non-Commercial Users Constituency (NCUC)**

20 July 2007

NCUC supports most of the recommendations in the GNSO’s Final Report, but Recommendation #6 is one we cannot support.\[79\]

We oppose Recommendation #6 for the following reasons:

1) It will completely undermine ICANN’s efforts to make the gTLD application process predictable, and instead make the evaluation process arbitrary, subjective and political;

2) It will have the effect of suppressing free and diverse expression;
3) It exposes ICANN to litigation risks;

4) It takes ICANN too far away from its technical coordination mission and into areas of legislating morality and public order.

We also believe that the objective of Recommendation #3 is unclear, in that much of its desirable substance is already covered by Recommendation #3. At a minimum, we believe that the words "relating to morality and public order" must be struck from the recommendation.

1) Predictability, Transparency and Objectivity

Recommendation #6 poses severe implementation problems. It makes it impossible to achieve the GNSO's goals of predictable and transparent evaluation criteria for new gTLDs.

Principle 1 of the New gTLD Report states that the evaluation process must be "predictable," and Recommendation #1 states that the evaluation criteria must be transparent, predictable, and fully available to applicants prior to their application.

NCUC strongly supports those guidelines. But no gTLD applicant can possibly know in advance what people or governments in a far away land will object to as "immoral" or contrary to "public order." When applications are challenged on these grounds, applicants cannot possibly know what decision an expert panel – which will be assembled on an ad hoc basis with no precedent to draw on – will make about it.

Decisions by expert panels on "morality and public order" must be subjective and arbitrary, because there is no settled and well-established international law regarding the relationship between TLD strings and morality and public order. There is no single "community standard" of morality that ICANN can apply to all applicants in every corner of the globe. What is considered "immoral" in Teheran may be easily accepted in Los Angeles or Stockholm; what is considered a threat to "public order" in China and Russia may not be in Brazil and Qatar.

2) Suppression of expression of controversial views

gTLD applicants will respond to the uncertainty inherent in a vague "morality and public order" standard and lack of clear standards by suppressing and avoiding any ideas that might generate controversy. Applicants will have to invest sizable sums of money to develop a gTLD application and see it through the ICANN process. Most of them will avoid risking a challenge under Recommendation #6. In other words, the presence of Recommendation #6 will result in self-censorship by most applicants.

That policy would strip citizens everywhere of their rights to express controversial ideas because someone else finds them offensive. This policy recommendation ignores international and national laws, in particular freedom of expression guarantees that permit the expression of "immoral" or otherwise controversial speech on the Internet.

3) Risk of litigation

Some people in the ICANN community are under the mistaken impression that suppressing controversial gTLDs will protect it from litigation. Nothing could be further from the truth. By introducing subjective and culturally divisive standards into the evaluation process Recommendation #6 will increase the likelihood of litigation.

ICANN operates under authority from the US Commerce Department. It is undisputed that the US Commerce Department is prohibited from censoring the expression of US citizens in the manner proposed by Recommendation #6. The US Government cannot "contract away" the constitutional protections of its citizens to ICANN any more than it can engage in the censorship itself.

Adoption of Recommendation #6 invites litigation against ICANN to determine whether its censorship policy is compatible with the US First Amendment. An ICANN decision to suppress a gTLD string that would be permitted under US law could and probably would lead to legal challenges to the decision as a form of US Government action.
If ICANN left the adjudication of legal rights up to courts, it could avoid the legal risk and legal liability that this policy of censorship brings upon it.

4) ICANN's mission and core values

Recommendation #6 exceeds the scope of ICANN's technical mission. It asks ICANN to create rules and adjudicate disputes about what is permissible expression. It enables it to censor expression in domain names that would be lawful in some countries. It would require ICANN and "expert panels" to make decisions about permitting top-level domain names based on arbitrary "morality" judgments and other subjective criteria. Under Recommendation #6, ICANN will evaluate domain names based on ideas about "morality and public order"—concepts for which there are varying interpretations, in both law and culture, in various parts of the world. Recommendation #6 risks turning ICANN into the arbiter of "morality" and "appropriate" public policy through global rules.

This new role for ICANN conflicts with its intended narrow technical mission, as embodied in its mission and core values. ICANN holds no legitimate authority to regulate in this entirely non-technical area and adjudicate the legal rights of others. This recommendation takes the adjudication of people’s rights to use domain names out of the hands of democratically elected representatives and into the hands of "expert panels" or ICANN staff and board with no public accountability.

Besides exceeding the scope of ICANN's authority, Recommendation #6 seems unsure of its objective. It mandates "morality and public order" in domain names, but then lists, as examples of the type of rights to protect, the WTO TRIPS Agreement and all 24 World Intellectual Property (WIPO) Treaties, which deal with economic and trade rights, and have little to do with "morality and public order". Protection for intellectual property rights was fully covered in Recommendation #3, and no explanation has been provided as to why intellectual property rights would be listed again in a recommendation on "morality and public order", an entirely separate concept.

In conclusion Recommendation #6 exceeds ICANN’s authority, ignores Internet users’ free expression rights, and its adoption would impose an enormous burden on and liability for ICANN. It should not be adopted by the Board of Directors in the final policy decision for new gTLDs.

Annex B – Nominating Committee Appointee Avri Doria: Individual Comments

Comments from Avri Doria

The "Personal level of support" indications fall into 3 categories:

- I Support: these are principles, recommendations or guidelines that are compatible with my personal opinions

- I Support with concerns: While these principles, recommendations and guidelines are not incompatible with my personal opinions, I have some concerns about them.

- I Accept with concern: these recommendations and guidelines do not necessarily correspond to my personal opinions, but I am able to accept them in that they have the broad support of the committee. I do, however, have concerns with these recommendations and guideline.

I believe these comments are consistent with comments I have made throughout the process and do not constitute new input.

Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Personal level of</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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### Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>While I strongly support the introduction of IDN TLDs, I am concerned that the unresolved issues with IDN ccTLD equivalents may interfere with the introduction of IDN TLDs. I am also concerned that some of these issues could impede the introduction of some new ASCII TLDs dealing with geographically related identifiers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>Support with concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>While I favor the establishment of a minimum set of necessary technical criteria, I am concerned that this set actually be the basic minimum set necessary to protect the stability, security and global interoperability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th>Support with concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Level of support</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>My concern involves using definitions that rely on legal terminology established for trademarks for what I believe should be a policy based on technical criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I in the first instance I believe that this is essentially a technical issue that should have been resolved with reference to typography, homologues, orthographic neighbourhood, transliteration and other technically defined attributes of a name that would make it unacceptable. There is a large body of scientific and technical knowledge and description in this field that we could have drawn on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I By using terms that rely on the legal language of trademark law, I believe we have created an implicit redundancy between recommendations 2 and 3. I.e., I believe both 2 and 3 can be used to protect trademarks and other intellectual property rights, and while 3 has specific limitations, 2 remains open to full and varied interpretation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I As we begin to consider IDNs, I am concerned that the interpretations of confusingly similar may be used to eliminate many potential TLDs based on translation. That is, when a translation may have the same or similar meaning to an existing TLD, that the new name may be eliminated because it is considered confusing to users who know both languages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accept with concern</td>
<td>My first concern relates to the protection of what can be called the linguistic commons. While it is true that much of trademark law and practice does protect general vocabulary and common usage from trademark protection, I am not sure that this is always the case in practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I also am not convinced that trademark law and policy that applies to specific product type within a specific locale is entirely compatible with a general and global naming system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Support with concerns</strong></td>
<td>Until such time as the technical work on IDNabis is completed, I am concerned about establishing reserved name rules connected to IDNs. My primary concern involves policy decisions made in ICANN for reserved names becoming hard coded in the IDNabis technical solution and thus becoming technical constraints that are no longer open to future policy reconsideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Accept with concern</strong></td>
<td>My primary concern focuses on the term 'morality'. While public order is frequently codified in national laws and occasionally in international law and conventions, the definition of what constitutes morality is not generally codified, and when it is, I believe it could be referenced as public order. This concern is related to the broad set of definitions used in the world to define morality. By including morality in the list of allowable exclusions we have made the possible exclusion list indefinitely large and have subjected the process to the consideration of all possible religious and ethical systems. ICANN or the panel of reviewers will also have to decide between different sets of moral principles, e.g., a morality that holds that people should be free to express themselves in all forms of media and those who believe that people should be free from exposure to any expression that is prohibited by their faith or moral principles. This recommendation will also subject the process to the fashion and occasional demagoguery of political correctness. I do not understand how ICANN or any expert panel will be able to judge that something should be excluded based on reasons of morality without defining, at least de-facto, an ICANN definition of morality? And while I am not a strict constructionist and sometimes allow for the broader interpretation of ICANN’s mission, I do not believe it includes the definition of a system of morality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>While I accept that a prospective registry must show adequate operational capability, creating a financial criteria is of concern. There may be many different ways of satisfying the requirement for operational capability and stability that may not be demonstrable in a financial statement or traditional business plan. E.g., in the case of an less developed community, the registry may rely on volunteer effort from knowledgeable technical experts. Another concern I have with financial requirements and high application fees is that they may act to discourage applications from developing nations or indigenous and minority peoples that have a different set of financial opportunities or capabilities then those recognized as acceptable within an expensive and highly developed region such as Los Angeles or Brussels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>Accept with concern</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,10, 12-14</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>In general I support the idea that a registry that is doing a good job should have the expectancy of renewal. I do, however, believe that a registry, especially a registry with general market dominance, or specific or local market dominance, should be subject to comment from the relevant user public and to evaluation of that public comment before renewal. When performance is satisfactory, there should an expectation of renewal. When performance is not satisfactory, there should be some procedure for correcting the situation before renewal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Level of support</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-E</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>In designing a New gTLD process, one of the original design goals had been to design a predictable and timely process that did not include the involvement of the Board of Directors except for very rare and exceptional cases and perhaps in the due diligence check of a final approval. My concern is that the use of Board in step (iii) may make them a regular part of many of the application procedure and may overload both the Board and the process. If every dispute can fall through to Board consideration in the process sieve, then the incentive to resolve the dispute earlier will be lessened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-M</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>I strongly support the idea of financial assistance programs and fee reduction for less developed communities. I am concerned that not providing pricing that enables applications from less developed countries and communities may serve to increase the divide between the haves and the have-nots in the Internet and may lead to a foreign ‘land grab’ of choice TLD names, especially IDN TLD names in a new form of resource colonialism because only those with well developed funding capability will be able to participate in the process as currently planned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>While I essentially agree with the policy recommendation and its implementation guideline, its social justice and fairness depends heavily on the implementation issues. While the implementation details are not yet settled, I have serious concerns about the published draft plans of the ICANN staff in this regard. The current proposal involves using fees to prevent vexatious or unreasonable objections. In my personal opinion this would be a cause of social injustice in the application of the policy as it would prejudice the objection policy in favor of the rich. I also believe that an objection policy based on financial means would allow for well endowed entities to object to any term they found objectionable, hence enabling them to be as vexatious as they wish to be. In order for an objection system to work properly, it must be fair and it must allow for any applicant to understand the basis on which they might have to answer an objection. If the policy and implementation are clear about objections only being considered when they can be shown to cause irreparable harm to a community then it may be possible to build a just process. In addition to the necessity for there to be strict filters on which potential objections are actually processed for further review by an objections review process, it is essential that an external and impartial professional review panel have a clear basis for judging any objections.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I do not believe that the ability to pay for a review will provide a reasonable criteria, nor do I believe that financial barriers are an adequate filter for stopping vexatious or unreasonable objections though they are a sufficient barrier for the poor.

I believe that ICANN should investigate other methods for balancing the need to allow even the poorest to raise an issue of irreparable harm while filtering out unreasonable disputes. I believe, as recommend in the Reserved Names Working group report, that the ALAC and GAC may be an important part of the solution. IG (P) currently includes support for treating ALAC and GAC as established institutions in regard to raising objections to TLD concerns. I believe this is an important part of the policy recommendation and should be retained in the implementation. I believe that it should be possible for the ALAC or GAC, through some internal procedure that they define, to take up the cause of the individual complainant and to request a review by the external expert review panel. Some have argued that this is unacceptable because it operationalizes these Advisory Committees. I believe we do have precedence for such an operational role for volunteers within ICANN and that it is in keeping with their respective roles and responsibilities as representatives of the user community and of the international community of nations. I strongly recommend that such a solution be included in the implementation of the New gTLD process.
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Text of Recommendation #20:

"An application will be rejected if an expert panel determines that there is substantial opposition to it from a significant portion of the community to which the string may be explicitly or implicitly targeted."

Text of Implementation Guideline F:

If there is contention for strings, applicants may:

i) resolve contention between them within a pre-established timeframe
ii) If there is no mutual agreement, a claim to support a community by one party will be a reason to award priority to that application. If there is no such claim, and no mutual agreement a process will be put in place to enable efficient resolution of contention and;

iii) the ICANN Board may be used to make a final decision, using advice from staff and expert panels.

**Text of Implementation Guideline H:**

External dispute providers will give decisions on complaints.

**Text of Implementation Guideline P:**

The following process, definitions, and guidelines refer to Recommendation 20.

**Process**

**Opposition** must be objection based.

**Determination** will be made by a dispute resolution panel constituted for the purpose.

The objector must provide verifiable evidence that it is an established institution of the community (perhaps like the RSTEP pool of panelists from which a small panel would be constituted for each objection).

**Guidelines**

The task of the panel is the determination of substantial opposition.

a) **substantial**

In determining substantial the panel will assess the following: significant portion, community, explicitly targeting, implicitly targeting, established institution, formal existence, detriment.

b) **significant portion:**

In determining significant portion the panel will assess the balance between the level of objection submitted by one or more established institutions and the level of support provided in the application from one or more established institutions. The panel will assess significance proportionate to the explicit or implicit targeting.

c) **community**

Community should be interpreted broadly and will include for example an economic sector, a cultural community, or a linguistic community. It may also be a closely related community which believes it is
d) explicitly targeting

Explicitly targeting means there is a description of the intended use of the TLD in the application.

e) implicitly targeting

Implicitly targeting means that the objector makes an assumption of targeting or that the objector believes there may be confusion by users over its intended use.

f) established institution

An institution that has been in formal existence for at least 5 years. In exceptional cases, standing may be granted to an institution that has been in existence for fewer than 5 years. Exceptional circumstance include but are not limited to reorganisation, merger, or an inherently younger community. The following ICANN organizations are defined as established institutions: GAC, ALAC, GNSO, ccNSO, ASO.

g) formal existence

Formal existence may be demonstrated by: appropriate public registration, public historical evidence, validation by a government, Intergovernmental organization, international treaty organisation or similar.

h) detriment

<< A >> Evidence of detriment to the community or to users more widely must be provided.
<< B >> [A likelihood of detriment to the community or to users more widely must be provided.]

Recommendation #20

The Non-Commercial Users Constituency (NCUC) Dissenting Statement on Recommendation #20 of the New GTLD Committee’s Final Report[81] should be read in combination with Implementation Guidelines F, H & P, which detail the implementation of Recommendation #20. This statement should also be read in conjunction with its statement[82] of 13 June 2007 on the committee’s draft report.

NCUC cannot support the committee’s proposal for ICANN to establish a broad objection and rejection process for domain names that empowers ICANN and its “experts” to adjudicate the legal rights of domain name applicants (and objectors). The proposal would also empower ICANN and its “experts” to invent entirely new rights to domain names that do not exist in law and that will compete with existing legal rights to domains.

However “good-intentioned”, the proposal would inevitably set up a system that decides legal rights based on subjective beliefs of “expert panels” and the amount of insider lobbying. The proposal would give “established institutions” veto power over applications for domain names to the detriment of innovators and start-ups. The proposal is further flawed because it makes no allowances for generic words to which no community claims exclusive “ownership” of. Instead, it wants to assign rights to use language based on
subjective standards and will over-regulate to the detriment of competition, innovation, and free expression.

There is no limitation on the type of objections that can be raised to kill a domain name, no requirement that actual harm be shown to deny an application, and no recourse for the wrongful denial of legal rights by ICANN and its experts under this proposal. An applicant must be able to appeal decisions of ICANN and its experts to courts, who have more competence and authority to decide the applicant's legal rights. Legal due process requires maintaining a right to appeal these decisions to real courts.

The proposal is hopelessly flawed and will result in the improper rejection of many legitimate domain names. The reasons permitted to object to a domain are infinite in number. Anyone may make an objection; and an application will automatically be rejected upon a very low threshold of "detriment" or an even lower standard of "a likelihood of detriment" to anyone. Not a difficult bar to meet.

If ICANN attempted to put this policy proposal into practice it would intertwine itself in general policy debates, cultural clashes, business feuds, religious wars, and national politics, among a few of the disputes ICANN would have to rule on through this domain name policy.

The proposal operates under false assumptions of "communities" that can be defined, and that parties can be rightfully appointed representatives of "the community" by ICANN. The proposal gives preference to "established institutions" for domain names, and leaves applicants' without the backing of "established institutions" with little right to a top-level domain. The proposal operates to the detriment of small-scale start-ups and innovators who are clever enough to come up with an idea for a domain first, but lack the insider-connections and financial resources necessary to convince an ICANN panel of their worthiness.

It will be excessively expensive to apply for either a controversial or a popular domain name, so only well-financed "established institutions" will have both the standing and financial wherewithal to be awarded a top-level domain. The proposal privileges who is awarded a top-level domain, and thus discourages diversity of thought and the free flow of information by making it more difficult to obtain information on controversial ideas or from innovative new-comers.

Implementation Guideline F

NCUC does not agree with the part of Implementation Guideline F that empowers ICANN identified "communities" to support or oppose applications. Why should all "communities" agree before a domain name can be issued? How to decide who speaks for a "community"?

NCUC also notes that ICANN's Board of Directors would make the final decisions on applications and thus the legal rights of applicants under proposed IG-F. ICANN Board Members are not democratically elected, accountable to the public in any meaningful way, or trained in the adjudication of legal rights. Final decisions regarding legal rights should come from legitimate law-making processes, such as courts.

"Expert panels" or corporate officers are not obligated to respect an applicant's free expression rights and there is no recourse for a decision by the panel or ICANN for rights wrongly denied. None of the "expert" panelists are democratically elected, nor accountable to the public for their decisions. Yet they will take decisions on the boundaries between free expression and trademark rights in domain names; and "experts" will decide what ideas are too controversial to be permitted in a domain name under this process.

Implementation Guideline H

Implementation Guideline H recommends a system to adjudicate legal rights that exists entirely outside of legitimate democratic law-making processes. The process sets up a system of unaccountable "private law" where "experts" are free to pick and choose favored laws, such as trademark rights, and ignore disfavored laws, such as free expression guarantees.

IG-H operates under the false premise that external dispute providers are authorized to adjudicate the legal rights of domain name applicants and objectors. It further presumes that such expert panels will be
qualified to adjudicate the legal rights of applicants and others. But undertaking the creation of an entirely new international dispute resolution process for the adjudication of legal rights and the creation of new rights is not something that can be delegated to a team of experts. Existing international law that takes into account conflict of laws, choice of laws, jurisdiction, standing, and due process must be part of any legitimate process; and the applicant's legal rights including freedom of expression rights must be respected in the process.

Implementation Guideline P

"The devil is in the details" of Implementation Guideline P as it describes in greater detail the proposed adversarial dispute process to adjudicate legal rights to top-level domain names in Recommendation #20. IG-P mandates the rejection of an application if there is "substantial opposition" to it according to ICANN's expert panel. But "substantial" is defined in such a way so as to actually mean "insubstantial" and as a result many legitimate domain names would be rejected by such an extremely low standard for killing an application.

Under IG-P, opposition against and support for an application must be made by an "established institution" for it to count as "significant", again favoring major industry players and mainstream cultural institutions over cultural diversity, innovative individuals, small niche, and medium-sized Internet businesses.

IG-P states that "community" should be interpreted broadly, which will allow for the maximum number of objections to a domain name to count against an application. It includes examples of "the economic sector, cultural community or linguistic community" as those who have a right to complain about an application. It also includes any "related community which believes it is impacted." So anyone who claims to represent a community and believes it is impacted by a domain name can file a complaint and have standing to object to another's application.

There is no requirement that the objection be based on legal rights or the operational capacity of the applicant. There is no requirement that the objection be reasonable or the belief about impact to be reasonable. There is no requirement that the harm be actual or verifiable. The standard for "community" is entirely subjective and based on the personal beliefs of the objector.

The definition of "implicitly targeting" further confirms this subjective standard by inviting objections where "the objector makes the assumption of targeting" and also where "the objector believes there may be confusion by users". Such a subjective process will inevitably result in the rejection of many legitimate domain names.

Picking such a subjective standard conflicts with Principle A in the Final Report that states domain names must be introduced in a "predictable way", and also with Recommendation 1 that states "All applicants for a new gTLD registry should be evaluated against transparent and predictable criteria, fully available to the applicants prior to the initiation of the process." The subjectivity and unpredictability invited into the process by Recommendation #20 turn Principle A and Recommendation 1 from the same report upside down.

Besides the Inherent subjectivity, the standard for killing applications is remarkably low. An application need not be intended to serve a particular community for "community-based" objections to kill the application under the proposal. Anyone who believed that he or she was part of the targeted community or who believes others face "detriment" have standing to object to a domain name, and the objection weighs in favor of "significant opposition". This standard is even lower than the "reasonable person" standard, which would at least require that the belief be "reasonable" for it to count against an applicant. The proposed standard for rejecting domains is so low it even permits unreasonable beliefs about a domain name to weigh against an applicant.

If a domain name does cause confusion, existing trademark law and unfair competition law have dealt with it for years and already balanced intellectual property rights against free expression rights in domain names. There is neither reason nor authority for ICANN processes to overtake the adjudication of legal
rights and invite unreasonable and illegitimate objections to domain names.

IG-P falsely assumes that the number of years in operation is indicative of one's right to use language. It privileges entities over 5 years old with objection rights that will effectively veto innovative start-ups who cannot afford the dispute resolution process and will be forced to abandon their application to the incumbents.

IG-P sets the threshold for harm that must be shown to kill an application for a domain name remarkably low. Indeed harm need not be actual or verified for an application to be killed based on "substantial opposition" from a single objector.

Whether the committee selects the unbounded definition for "detriment" that includes a "likelihood of detriment" or the narrower definition of "evidence of detriment" as the standard for killing an application for a domain name is largely irrelevant. The difference is akin to re-arranging the deck chairs on the Titanic.

ICANN will become bogged down with the approval of domain names either way, although it is worth noting that "likelihood of detriment" is a very long way from "substantial harm" and an easy standard to meet, so will result in many more domain names being rejected.

The definitions and guidelines detailed in IG-P invite a lobby-fest between competing businesses, instill the "heckler's veto" into domain name policy, privilege incumbents, price out of the market non-commercial applicants, and give third-parties who have no legal rights to domain names the power to block applications for those domains. A better standard for killing an application for non-technical reasons would be for a domain name to be shown to be illegal in the applicant's jurisdiction before it can rejected.

In conclusion, the committee's recommendation for domain name objection and rejection processes are far too broad and unwieldy to be put into practice. They would stifle freedom of expression, innovation, cultural diversity, and market competition. Rather than follow existing law, the proposal would set up an illegitimate process that usurps jurisdiction to adjudicate peoples' legal rights (and create new rights) in a process designed to favor incumbents. The adoption of this "free-for-all" objection and rejection process will further call into question ICANN's legitimacy to govern and its ability to serve the global public interest that respects the rights of all citizens.

NCUC respectfully submits that ICANN will best serve the global public interest by resisting the temptation to stray from its technical mandate and meddle in international lawmakerng as proposed by Rec. #20 and IG-F, IG-H, and IG-P of the New GTLD Committee Final Report.

REFERENCE MATERIAL -- GLOSSARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>ACRONYM &amp; EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-label</td>
<td>The A-label is what is transmitted in the DNS protocol and this is the ASCII-compatible (ACE) form of an IDNA string; for example &quot;xm-11b5bs1dl&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCII Compatible Encoding</td>
<td>ACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACE is a system for encoding Unicode so each character can be transmitted using only the letters a-z, 0-9 and hyphens. Refer also to <a href="http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc3467.txt?number=3467">http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc3467.txt?number=3467</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Standard Code for Information Exchange</td>
<td>ASCII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASCII is a common numerical code for computers and other devices that work with text. Computers can only understand numbers, so an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Research Projects Agency</td>
<td>ARPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial &amp; Business Users Constituency</td>
<td>CBUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.bizconst.org/">http://www.bizconst.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus Policy</td>
<td>A defined term in all ICANN registry contracts usually found in Article 3 (Covenants). See, for example, <a href="http://www.icann.org/tlds/agreements/biz/registry-agmt-08dec06.htm">http://www.icann.org/tlds/agreements/biz/registry-agmt-08dec06.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Code Names Supporting Organization</td>
<td>ccNSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://ccnso.icann.org/">http://ccnso.icann.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Code Top Level Domain</td>
<td>ccTLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two letter domains, such as .uk (United Kingdom), .de (Germany) and .jp (Japan) (for example), are called country code top level domains (ccTLDs) and correspond to a country, territory, or other geographic location. The rules and policies for registering domain names in the ccTLDs vary significantly and ccTLD registries limit use of the ccTLD to citizens of the corresponding country. Some ICANN-accredited registrars provide registration services in the ccTLDs in addition to registering names in .biz, .com, .info, .name, .net and .org, however, ICANN does not specifically accredit registrars to provide ccTLD registration services. For more information regarding registering names in ccTLDs, including a complete database of designated ccTLDs and managers, please refer to <a href="http://www.iana.org/cctld/cctld.htm">http://www.iana.org/cctld/cctld.htm</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain Names</td>
<td>The term domain name has multiple related meanings: A name that identifies a computer or computers on the internet. These names appear as a component of a website's URL, e.g. <a href="http://www.wikipedia.org">www.wikipedia.org</a>. This type of domain name is also called a hostname. The product that Domain name registrars provide to their customers. These names are often called registered domain names. Names used for other purposes in the Domain Name System (DNS), for example the special name which follows the @ sign in an email address, or the Top-level domains like .com, or the names used by the Session Initiation Protocol (VoIP), or DomainKeys. <a href="http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Domain_names">http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Domain_names</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain Name System</td>
<td>The Domain Name System (DNS) helps users to find their way around the Internet. Every computer on the Internet has a unique address - just like a telephone number - which is a rather complicated string of numbers. It is called its &quot;IP address&quot; (IP stands for &quot;Internet Protocol&quot;). IP Addresses are hard to remember. The DNS makes using the Internet easier by allowing a familiar string of letters (the &quot;domain name&quot;) to be used instead of the arcane IP address. So instead of typing 207.151.159.3, you can type <a href="http://www.internic.net">www.internic.net</a>. It is a &quot;mnemonic&quot; device that makes addresses easier to remember.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Generic Top Level Domain | gTLD  
Most TLDs with three or more characters are referred to as "generic" TLDs, or "gTLDs". They can be subdivided into two types, "sponsored" TLDs (sTLDs) and "unsponsored" TLDs (uTLDs), as described in more detail below.  
In the 1980s, seven gTLDs (.com, .edu, .gov, .int, .mil, .net, and .org) were created. Domain names may be registered in three of these (.com, .net, and .org) without restriction; the other four have limited purposes.  
In 2001 & 2002 four new unsponsored TLDs (.biz, .info, .name, and .pro) were introduced. The other three new TLDs (.aero, .coop, and .museum) were sponsored.  
Generally speaking, an unsponsored TLD operates under policies established by the global Internet community directly through the ICANN process, 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 thus carries out delegated policy-formulation responsibilities over many matters concerning the TLD. |
| Governmental Advisory Committee | GAC  
http://gac.icann.org/web/index.shtml |
| Intellectual Property Constituency | IPC  
http://www.ipconstituency.org/ |
| Internet Service & Connection Providers Constituency | ISPCP |
| Internationalized Domain Names | IDNs  
IDNs are domain names represented by local language characters. These domain names may contain characters with diacritical marks (required by many European languages) or characters from non-Latin scripts like Arabic or Chinese. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internationalized Domain Names In Application</th>
<th>IDNA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDNA is a protocol that makes it possible for applications to handle domain names with non-ASCII characters. IDNA converts domain names with non-ASCII characters to ASCII labels that the DNS can accurately understand. These standards are developed within the IETF (<a href="http://www.ietf.org">http://www.ietf.org</a>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internationalized Domain Names – Labels</th>
<th>IDN A Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The A-label is what is transmitted in the DNS protocol and this is the ASCII-compatible ACE form of an IDN A string. For example &quot;xn-1lq90l&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internationalized Domain Names – Labels</th>
<th>IDN U Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The U-label is what should be displayed to the user and is the representation of the IDN in Unicode. For example &quot;北电&quot; (&quot;Beijing&quot; in Chinese).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internationalized Domain Names – Labels</th>
<th>LDH Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The LDH-label strictly refers to an all-ASCII label that obeys the &quot;hostname&quot; (LDH) conventions and that is not an IDN; for example &quot;icann&quot; in the domain name &quot;icann.org&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internationalized Domain Names Working Group</th>
<th>IDN-WG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter Digit Hyphen</th>
<th>LDH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The hostname convention used by domain names before internationalization. This meant that domain names could only practically contain the letters a-z, digits 0-9 and the hyphen &quot;.-&quot;. The term &quot;LDH code points&quot; refers to this subset. With the introduction of IDNs this rule is no longer relevant for all domain names.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter Digit Hyphen</th>
<th>LDH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The LDH-label strictly refers to an all-ASCII label that obeys the &quot;hostname&quot; (LDH) conventions and that is not an IDN; for example &quot;icann&quot; in the domain name &quot;icann.org&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominating Committee</th>
<th>NomCom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://nomcom.icann.org/">http://nomcom.icann.org/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Commercial Users Constituency</th>
<th>NCUC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Development Process</th>
<th>PDP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See <a href="http://www.icann.org/general/archive-bylaws/bylaws-28feb06.htm#AnnexA">http://www.icann.org/general/archive-bylaws/bylaws-28feb06.htm#AnnexA</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting the Rights of Others Working Group</td>
<td>PRO-WG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See the mailing list archive at <a href="http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnso-pro-wg/">http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnso-pro-wg/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punycode</td>
<td>Punycode is the ASCII-compatible encoding algorithm described in Internet standard [RFC3492]. This is the method that will encode IDNs into sequences of ASCII characters in order for the Domain Name System (DNS) to understand and manage the names. The intention is that domain name registrants and users will never see this encoded form of a domain name. The sole purpose is for the DNS to be able to resolve for example a web-address containing local characters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>Domain names ending with .aero, .biz, .com, .coop, .info, .museum, .name, .net, .org, and .pro can be registered through many different companies (known as &quot;registrars&quot;) that compete with one another. A listing of these companies appears in the Accredited Registrar Directory. The registrar asks registrants to provide various contact and technical information that makes up the domain name registration. The registrar keeps records of the contact information and submits the technical information to a central directory known as the &quot;registry.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar Constituency</td>
<td>RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registry</td>
<td>A registry is the authoritative, master database of all domain names registered in each Top Level Domain. The registry operator keeps the master database and also generates the &quot;zone file&quot; which allows computers to route Internet traffic to and from top-level domains anywhere in the world. Internet users don't interact directly with the registry operator. Users can register names in TLDs including .biz, .com, .info, .net, .name, .org by using an ICANN-Accredited Registrar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registry Constituency</td>
<td>RyC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for Comment</td>
<td>RFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved Names Working Group</td>
<td>RN-WG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See the mailing list archive at <a href="http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnso-rn-wg/">http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnso-rn-wg/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root server</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A root nameserver is a <strong>DNS</strong> server that answers requests for the root namespace domain, and redirects requests for a particular <strong>top-level domain</strong> to that TLD's nameservers. Although any local implementation of DNS can implement its own private root nameservers, the term &quot;root nameserver&quot; is generally used to describe the thirteen well-known root nameservers that implement the root namespace domain for the Internet's official global implementation of the Domain Name System.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| All domain names on the Internet can be regarded as ending in a full stop character e.g. "en.wikipedia.org.". This final dot is generally implied rather than explicit, as modern DNS software does not actually require that the final dot be included when attempting to translate a domain name to an IP address. The empty string after the final dot is called the **root domain**, and all other domains (i.e. .com, .org, .net, etc.) are contained within the root domain. |


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsored Top Level Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>sTLD</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| A Sponsor is an organization to which some policy making is delegated from ICANN. The sponsored TLD has a Charter, which defines the purpose for which the sponsored TLD has been created and will be operated. The Sponsor is responsible for developing policies on the delegated topics so that the TLD is operated for the benefit of a defined group of stakeholders, known as the Sponsored TLD Community, that are most directly interested in the operation of the TLD. The Sponsor also is responsible for selecting the registry operator and to varying degrees for establishing the roles played by registrars and their relationship with the registry operator. The Sponsor must exercise its delegated authority according to fairness standards and in a manner that is representative of the Sponsored TLD Community. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U-label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The U-label is what should be displayed to the user and is the representation of the Internationalized Domain Name (IDN) in Unicode.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unicode Consortium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A not-for-profit organization found to develop, extend and promote use of the Unicode standard. See <a href="http://www.unicode.org">http://www.unicode.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unicode is a commonly used single encoding scheme that provides a unique number for each character across a wide variety of languages and scripts. The Unicode standard contains tables that list the code points for each local character identified. These tables continue to expand as more characters are digitalized.

[2] The ICANN "community" is a complex matrix of intersecting organizations and which are represented graphically here. http://www.icann.org/structure/
[3] The Final Report is Step 9 in the GNSO's policy development process which is set out in full at http://www.icann.org/general/archive-bylaws/bylaws-28feb06.htm#AnnexA
[10] The full list is available here http://www.icann.org/registars/accredited-list.html
[14] Verisign produce a regular report on the domain name industry. http://www.verisign.com/Resources/Naming_Services_Resources/Domain_Name...
[20] A list of the working materials of the new TLDs Committee can be found at http://gnso.icann.org/issues/new-gtlds/
[21] The Outcomes Report for the IDN-WG is found http://gnso.icann.org/drafts/idn-wg-fr-22mar07.htm. A full set of resources which the WG is using is found at http://gnso.icann.org/issues/idn-tlds/
[25] Ms Doria supports all of the Principles but expressed concern about Principle B by saying "...While I strongly support the introduction of IDN TLDs, I am concerned that the unresolved issues with IDN ccTLD equivalents may interfere with the introduction of IDN TLDs. I am also concerned that some of these issues could impede the introduction of some new ASCII TLDs dealing with geographically related identifiers" and Principle D "...While I favor the establishment of a minimum set of necessary technical criteria, I am concerned that this set actually be the basic minimum set necessary to protect the stability,
security and global interoperability."

[26] Note the updated recommendation text sent to the gtdl-council list after the 7 June meeting.
http://forum.icann.org/lists/gtdl-council/msg00520.html

[27] Reserved word limitations will be included in the base contract that will be available to applicants prior to
the start of the application round.


[29] The Implementation Team sought advice from a number of auction specialists and examined other
industries in which auctions were used to make clear and binding decisions. Further expert advice will be
used in developing the implementation of the application process to ensure the fairest and most
appropriate method of resolving contention for strings.

[30] Detailed work is being undertaken, lead by the Corporate Affairs Department, on establishing a
translation framework for ICANN documentation. This element of the Implementation Guidelines may be
addressed separately.

[31] http://gnso.icann.org/drafts/GNSO-PDP-Dec05-StaffMemo-14Nov06.pdf

[32] Consistent with ICANN's commitments to accountability and transparency found at
http://www.icann.org/announcements/announcement-26jan07b.htm


[34] The announcement is here http://www.icann.org/announcements/announcement-03jan06.htm and the
results are here http://gnso.icann.org/issues/new-gtld/new-gtld-pdp-input.htm


Constituency http://forum.icann.org/lists/gtdl-council/msg00514.html, Internet Service Providers
http://forum.icann.org/lists/gtdl-council/msg00500.html, NCUC http://forum.icann.org/lists/gtdl-
council/msg00530.html, Registry Constituency http://forum.icann.org/lists/gtdl-council/msg00494.html

[39] "My concern involves using definitions that rely on legal terminology established for trademarks for
what I believe should be a policy based on technical criteria.

In the first instance I believe that this is essentially a technical issue that should have been resolved with
reference to typography, homologues, orthographic neighbourhood, transliteration and other technically
defined attributes of a name that would make it unacceptable. There is a large body of scientific and
technical knowledge and description in this field that we could have drawn on.

By using terms that rely on the legal language of trademark law, I believe we have created an implicit
redundancy between recommendations 2 and 3. I.e., I believe both 2 and 3 can be used to protect
trademarks and other intellectual property rights, and while 3 has specific limitations, 2 remains open to
full and varied interpretation.

As we begin to consider IDNs, I am concerned that the interpretations of confusingly similar may be used to
eliminate many potential TLDs based on translation. That is, when a translation may have the same or
similar meaning to an existing TLD, that the new name may be eliminated because it is considered
confusing to users who know both languages."


[42] In addition to the expertise within the Committee, the NCUC provided, as part of its Constituency
Impact Statement expert outside advice from Professor Christine Haight Farley which said, in part, "...A
determination about whether use of a mark by another is "confusingly similar" is simply first step in the
analysis of infringement. As the committee correctly notes, account will be taken of visual, phonetic and
conceptual similarity. But this determination does not end the analysis. Delta Dental and Delta Airlines are
confusingly similar, but are like to cause confusion, and therefore do not infringe. ... In trademark law,
where there is confusing similarity and the mark is used on similar goods or services, a likelihood of
confusion will usually be found. European trademark law recognizes this point perhaps more readily than
U.S. trademark law. As a result, sometimes "confusingly similar" is used as shorthand for "likelihood of
confusion". However, these concepts must remain distinct in domain name policy where there is no opportunity to consider how the mark is being used."

[43] In addition, advice was sought from experts within WIPO who continue to provide guidance on this and other elements of dispute resolution procedures.

[44] Kristina Rosette provided the reference to the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights which is found online at http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/trips_e/it_agm1_e.htm

"...Article 16 Rights Conferred  1. The owner of a registered trademark shall have the exclusive right to prevent all third parties not having the owner’s consent from using in the course of trade identical or similar signs for goods or services which are identical or similar to those in respect of which the trademark is registered where such use would result in a likelihood of confusion. In case of the use of an identical sign for identical goods or services, a likelihood of confusion shall be presumed. The rights described above shall not prejudice any existing prior rights, nor shall they affect the possibility of Members making rights available on the basis of use...."


[47] Charles Sha’ban provided a range of examples from Arabic speaking countries. For example, in Jordan, Article 7 Trademarks eligible for registration are 1- A trademark shall be registered if it is distinctive, as to words, letters, numbers, figures, colors, or other signs or any combination thereof and visually perceptible. 2- For the purposes of this Article, "distinctive" shall mean applied in a manner which secures distinguishing the goods of the proprietor of the trademark from those of other persons.

Article 8 Marks which may not be registered as trademarks. The following may not be registered as trademarks: 10- A mark identical with one belonging to a different proprietor which is already entered in the register in respect of the same goods or class of goods for which the mark is intended to be registered, or so closely resembling such trademark to the extent that it may lead to deceiving third parties.

12- The trademark which is identical or similar to, or constitutes a translation of, a well-known trademark for use on similar or identical goods to those for which that one is well-known for and whose use would cause confusion with the well-known mark, or for use of different goods in such a way as to prejudice the interests of the owner of the well-known mark and leads to believing that there is a connection between its owner and those goods as well as the marks which are similar or identical to the honorary badges, flags, and other insignia as well as the names and abbreviations relating to international or regional organizations or those that offend our Arab and Islamic age-old values.

In Oman for example, Article 2 of the Sultan Decree No. 38/2000 states:

"The following shall not be considered as trademarks and shall not be registered as such: If the mark is identical, similar to a degree which causes confusion, or a translation of a trademark or a commercial name known in the Sultanate of Oman with respect to identical or similar goods or services belonging to another business, or if it is known and registered in the Sultanate of Oman on goods and service which are neither identical nor similar to those for which the mark is sought to be registered provided that the usage of the mark on those goods or services in this last case will suggest a connection between those goods or services and the owner of the known trademark and such use will cause damage to the interests of the owner of the known trademark."

Although the laws in Egypt do not have specific provisions regarding confusion they stress in great detail the importance of distinctiveness of a trade mark.

Article 63 in the IP Law of Egypt No.82 for the year 2002 states:

"A trademark is any sign distinguishing goods, whether products or services, and include is particular names represented in a distinctive manner, signatures, words, letters, numerals, design, symbols, signposts, stamps, seal, drawings, engravings, a combination of distinctly formed colors and any other combination of these elements if used, or meant to be used, to distinguish the precedents of a particular industry, agriculture, forest or mining venture or any goods, or to indicate the origin of products or goods
or their quality, category, guarantee, preparation process, or to indicate the provision of any service. In all cases, a trademark shall be a sign that is recognizable by sight.”


[49] Further information can be found at the US Patent and Trademark Office's website http://www.uspto.gov/

[50] Found at http://www.icann.org/registars/ra-agreement-17may01.htm#3


[52] The 2003 correspondence between ICANN's then General Counsel and the then GAC Chairman is also useful http://www.icann.org/correspondence/touton-letter-to-tarmizi-10feb03.htm.

[53] "My first concern relates to the protection of what can be called the linguistic commons. While it is true that much of trademark law and practice does protect general vocabulary and common usage from trademark protection, I am not sure that this is always the case in practice. I am also not convinced that trademark law and policy that applies to specific product type within a specific locale is entirely compatible with a general and global naming system.”

[54] For example, David Maher, Jon Bing, Steve Metalitz, Philip Sheppard and Michael Palage.

[55] Reserved Word has a specific meaning in the ICANN context and includes, for example, the reserved word provisions in ICANN's existing registry contracts. See http://www.icann.org/registries/agreements.htm.

[56] "Until such time as the technical work on IDNabis is completed, I am concerned about establishing reserved name rules connected to IDNs. My primary concern involves policy decisions made in ICANN for reserved names becoming hard coded in the IDNabis technical solution and thus becoming technical constraints that are no longer open to future policy reconsideration."


[58] The Committee are aware that the terminology used here for the purposes of policy recommendations requires further refinement and may be at odds with similar terminology developed in other context. The terminology may be imprecise in other contexts than the general discussion about reserved words found here.

[59] The subgroup was encouraged by the ccNSO not to consider removing the restriction on two-letter names at the top level. IANA has based its allocation of two-letter names at the top level on the ISO 3166 list. There is a risk of collisions between any interim allocations, and ISO 3166 assignments which may be desired in the future.

[60] The existing gTLD registry agreements provide for a method of potential release of two-character LDH names at the second level. In addition, two character LDH strings at the second level may be released through the process for new registry services, which process involves analysis of any technical or security concerns and provides opportunity for public input. Technical issues related to the release of two-letter and/or number strings have been addressed by the RSTEP Report on GNR's proposed registry service. The GAC has previously noted the WIPO II Report statement that "If ISO 3166 alpha-2 country code elements are to be registered as domain names in the gTLDs, it is recommended that this be done in a manner that minimises the potential for confusion with the ccTLDs."

[61] Considering that the current requirement in all 16 registry agreement reserves "All labels with hyphens in the third and fourth character positions (e.g., "bq–1k2n4h4b" or "xn–ndk061n"), this requirement reserves any names having any of a combination of 1296 different prefixes (36x36).

[62] Internet Draft IDNAbis Issues: http://www.ietf.org/Internet-drafts/draft-kiensin-iodnabis-issues-01.txt (J. Kiersin), Section 3.1.1.1

[63] Considering that the current requirement in all 16 registry agreement reserves "All labels with hyphens in the third and fourth character positions (e.g., "bq–1k2n4h4b" or "xn–ndk061n"), this requirement reserves any names having any of a combination of 1296 different prefixes (36x36).

[64] Considering that the current requirement in all 16 registry agreement reserves "All labels with hyphens in the third and fourth character positions (e.g., "bq–1k2n4h4b" or "xn–ndk061n"), this requirement reserves any names having any of a combination of 1296 different prefixes (36x36).

[65] With its recommendation, the sub-group takes into consideration that justification for potential user confusion (i.e., the minority view) as a result of removing the contractual condition to reserve gTLD strings
for new TLDs may surface during one or more public comment periods.

[66] Note that this recommendation is a continuation of the recommendation in the original RN-WG report, modified to synchronize with the additional work done in the 30-day extension period.

[67] Ms Doria said "...My primary concern focuses on the term 'morality'. While public order is frequently codified in national laws and occasionally in international law and conventions, the definition of what constitutes morality is not generally codified, and when it is, I believe it could be referenced as public order. This concern is related to the broad set of definitions used in the world to define morality. By including morality in the list of allowable exclusions we have made the possible exclusion list indefinitely large and have subjected the process to the consideration of all possible religious and ethical systems. ICANN or the panel of reviewers will also have to decide between different sets of moral principles, e.g., a morality that holds that people should be free to express themselves in all forms of media and those who believe that people should be free from exposure to any expression that is prohibited by their faith or moral principles. This recommendation will also subject the process to the fashion and occasional demagoguery of political correctness. I do not understand how ICANN or any expert panel will be able to judge that something should be excluded based on reasons of morality without defining, at least de-facto, an ICANN definition of morality? And while I am not a strict constructionist and sometimes allow for the broader interpretation of ICANN's mission, I do not believe it includes the definition of a system of morality."


[69] "While I accept that a prospective registry must show adequate operational capability, creating a financial criteria is of concern. There may be many different ways of satisfying the requirement for operational capability and stability that may not be demonstrable in a financial statement or traditional business plan. E.g., in the case of an less developed community, the registry may rely on volunteer effort from knowledgeable technical experts.

Another concern I have with financial requirements and high application fees is that they may act to discourage applications from developing nations or indigenous and minority peoples that have a different set of financial opportunities or capabilities then those recognized as acceptable within an expensive and highly developed region such as Los Angeles or Brussels."

[70] "In general I support the policy though I do have concerns about the implementation which I discuss below in relation to IG (P)".

[71] "In general I support the idea that a registry that is doing a good job should have the expectancy of renewal. I do, however, believe that a registry, especially a registry with general market dominance, or specific or local market dominance, should be subject to comment from the relevant user public and to evaluation of that public comment before renewal. When performance is satisfactory, there should an expectation of renewal. When performance is not satisfactory, there should be some procedure for correcting the situation before renewal."

[72] Consensus Policies has a particular meaning within the ICANN environment. Refer to http://www.icann.org/general/consensus-policies.htm for the full list of ICANN's Consensus Policies.

[73] http://www.icann.org/general/bylaws.htm#AnnexA


[75] The full list of reports is found in the Reference section at the end of the document.

[76] http://www.icann.org/announcements/announcement-4-07marO7.htm

[77] Found at http://www.icann.org/registrars/ra-agreement-17may01.htm


[79] Text of Recommendation #6: "Strings must not be contrary to generally accepted legal norms relating to morality and public order that are enforceable under generally accepted and internationally recognized principles of law. Examples of such principles of law include, but are not limited to, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, intellectual property treaties administered by the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO) and the WTO Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS)."
Ms Doria took over from former GNSO Council Chairman (and GNSO new TLDs Committee Chairman) Dr Bruce Tonkin on 7 June 2007. Ms Doria's term runs until 31 January 2008.

Available at: http://forum.icann.org/lists/gtld-council/pdfOQqgaRNrXf.pdf


This glossary has been developed over the course of the policy development process. Refer here to ICANN's glossary of terms http://www.icann.org/general/glossary.htm for further information.
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Approval of Minutes

Resolved (2008.06.26.01), the minutes of the Board Meeting of 29 May 2008 are approved. <http://www.icann.org/minutes/prelim-report-29may08.htm>

GNSO Recommendations on New gTLDs

Whereas, the GNSO initiated a policy development process on the introduction of New gTLDs in December 2005. <http://gnso.icann.org/issues/new-gtlds/>

Whereas, the GNSO Committee on the Introduction of New gTLDs addressed a range of difficult technical, operational, legal, economic, and policy questions, and facilitated widespread participation and public comment throughout the process.

Whereas, the GNSO successfully completed its policy development process on the Introduction of New gTLDs and on 7 September 2007, and achieved a Supermajority vote on its 19 policy recommendations. <http://gnso.icann.org/meetings/minutes-gnso-06sep07.shtml>

Whereas, the Board instructed staff to review the GNSO recommendations and determine whether they were capable of implementation.

Whereas, staff has engaged international technical, operational and legal expertise to provide counsel on details to support the implementation of the Policy recommendations and as a result, ICANN cross-functional teams have developed implementation details in support of the GNSO's policy recommendations, and have concluded that the recommendations are capable of implementation.

Whereas, staff has provided regular updates to the community and the Board on the implementation plan. <http://icann.org/topics/new-gtld-program.htm>

Whereas, consultation with the DNS technical community has led to the
conclusion that there is not currently any evidence to support establishing a limit to how many TLDs can be inserted in the root based on technical stability concerns. <http://www.icann.org/topics/dns-stability-draft-paper-06feb08.pdf>

Whereas, the Board recognizes that the process will need to be resilient to unforeseen circumstances.

Whereas, the Board has listened to the concerns about the recommendations that have been raised by the community, and will continue to take into account the advice of ICANN's supporting organizations and advisory committees in the implementation plan.

Resolved (2008.06.26.02), based on both the support of the community for New gTLDs and the advice of staff that the introduction of new gTLDs is capable of implementation, the Board adopts the GNSO policy recommendations for the introduction of new gTLDs <http://gnso.icann.org/issues/new-gtlds/pdp-dec05-fr-parta-08aug07.htm>.

Resolved (2008.06.26.03), the Board directs staff to continue to further develop and complete its detailed implementation plan, continue communication with the community on such work, and provide the Board with a final version of the implementation proposals for the board and community to approve before the new gTLD introduction process is launched.

IDNC / IDN Fast-track

Whereas, the ICANN Board recognizes that the "IDNC Working Group" developed, after extensive community comment, a final report on feasible methods for timely (fast-track) introduction of a limited number of IDN ccTLDs associated with ISO 3166-1 two-letter codes while an overall, long-term IDN ccTLD policy is under development by the ccNSO.

Whereas, the IDNC Working Group has concluded its work and has submitted recommendations for the selection and delegation of "fast-track" IDN ccTLDs and, pursuant to its charter, has taken into account and was guided by consideration of the requirements to:

- Preserve the security and stability of the DNS;
- Comply with the IDNA protocols;
- Take input and advice from the technical community with respect to the implementation of IDNs; and
• Build on and maintain the current practices for the delegation of ccTLDs, which include the current IANA practices.

Whereas, the IDNC Working Group’s high-level recommendations require implementation planning.

Whereas, ICANN is looking closely at interaction with the final IDN ccTLD PDP process and potential risks, and intends to implement IDN ccTLDs using a procedure that will be resilient to unforeseen circumstances.

Whereas, staff will consider the full range of implementation issues related to the introduction of IDN ccTLDs associated with the ISO 3166-1 list, including means of promoting adherence to technical standards and mechanisms to cover the costs associated with IDN ccTLDs.

Whereas, the Board intends that the timing of the process for the introduction of IDN ccTLDs should be aligned with the process for the introduction of New gTLDs.

Resolved (2008.06.26.04), the Board thanks the members of the IDNC WG for completing their chartered tasks in a timely manner.

Resolved (2008.06.26.05), the Board directs staff to: (1) post the IDNC WG final report for public comments; (2) commence work on implementation issues in consultation with relevant stakeholders; and (3) submit a detailed implementation report including a list of any outstanding issues to the Board in advance of the ICANN Cairo meeting in November 2008.

GNSO Recommendation on Domain Tasting

Whereas, ICANN community stakeholders are increasingly concerned about domain tasting, which is the practice of using the add grace period (AGP) to register domain names in bulk in order to test their profitability.

Whereas, on 17 April 2008, the GNSO Council approved, by a Supermajority vote, a motion to prohibit any gTLD operator that has implemented an AGP from offering a refund for any domain name deleted during the AGP that exceeds 10% of its net new registrations in that month, or fifty domain names, whichever is greater. <http://gnso.icann.org/meetings/minutes-gnso-17apr08.shtml>

Whereas, on 25 April 2008, the GNSO Council forwarded its formal "Report to the ICANN Board - Recommendation for Domain Tasting"
Whereas, the Board is also considering the Proposed FY 09 Operating Plan and Budget <http://www.icann.org/financials/fiscal-30jun09.htm>, which includes (at the encouragement of the GNSO Council) a proposal similar to the GNSO policy recommendation to expand the applicability of the ICANN transaction fee in order to limit domain tasting.

Resolved (2008.06.26.06), the Board adopts the GNSO policy recommendation on domain tasting, and directs staff to implement the policy following appropriate comment and notice periods on the implementation documents.

Approval of Operating Plan and Budget for Fiscal Year 2008-2009


Whereas, the Initial Operating Plan and Budget Framework for fiscal year 2009 was presented at the New Delhi ICANN meeting and was posted in February 2008 for community consultation. <http://www.icann.org/announcements/announcement-2-04feb08.htm>

Whereas, community consultations were held to discuss and obtain feedback on the Initial Framework.

Whereas, the draft FY09 Operating Plan and Budget was posted for public comment in accordance with the Bylaws on 17 May 2008 based upon the Initial Framework, community consultation, and consultations with the Board Finance Committee. A slightly revised version was posted on 23 May 2008. <http://www.icann.org/financials/fiscal-30jun09.htm>

Whereas, ICANN has actively solicited community feedback and consultation with ICANN's constituencies. <http://forum.icann.org/lists/op-budget-fy2009/>

Whereas, the ICANN Board Finance Committee has discussed, and guided staff on, the FY09 Operating Plan and Budget at each of its regularly scheduled monthly meetings.

Whereas, the final FY09 Operating Plan and Budget was posted on 26 June 2008.
Whereas, the ICANN Board Finance Committee met in Paris on 22 June 2008 to discuss the FY09 Operating Plan and Budget, and recommended that the Board adopt the FY09 Operating Plan and Budget.

Whereas, the President has advised that the FY09 Operating Plan and Budget reflects the work of staff and community to identify the plan of activities, the expected revenue, and resources necessary to be spent in fiscal year ending 30 June 2009.

Whereas, continuing consultation on the budget has been conducted at ICANN’s meeting in Paris, at constituency meetings, and during the public forum.


Update on Draft Amendments to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement
(For discussion only.)

Approval of PIR Request to Implement DNSSEC in .ORG

Whereas, Public Interest Registry has submitted a proposal to implement DNS Security Extensions (DNSSEC) in .ORG. <http://icann.org/registries/rsep/pir-request-03apr08.pdf>

Whereas, staff has evaluated the .ORG DNSSEC proposal as a new registry service via the Registry Services Evaluation Policy <http://icann.org/registries/rsep/>, and the proposal included a requested amendment to Section 3.1(c)(i) of the .ORG Registry Agreement <http://icann.org/tlds/agreements/org/proposed-org-amendment-23apr08.pdf> which was posted for public comment along with the PIR proposal.

Whereas, the evaluation under the threshold test of the Registry Services Evaluation Policy <http://icann.org/registries/rsep/rsep.html> found a likelihood of security and stability issues associated with the proposed implementation. The
RSTEP Review Team considered the proposal and found that there was a risk of a meaningful adverse effect on security and stability, which could be effectively mitigated by policies, decisions and actions to which PIR has expressly committed in its proposal or could be reasonably required to commit.

Whereas, the Chair of the SSAC has advised that RSTEP's thorough investigation of every issue that has been raised concerning the security and stability effects of DNSSEC deployment concludes that effective measures to deal with all of them can be taken by PIR, and that this conclusion after exhaustive review greatly increases the confidence with which DNSSEC deployment in .ORG can be undertaken.

Whereas, PIR intends to implement DNSSEC only after extended testing and consultation.

Resolved (2008.06.26.08), that PIR's proposal to implement DNSSEC in .ORG is approved, with the understanding that PIR will continue to cooperate and consult with ICANN on details of the implementation. The President and the General Counsel are authorized to enter the associated amendment to the .ORG Registry Agreement, and to take other actions as appropriate to enable the deployment of DNSSEC in .ORG.

ICANN Board of Directors' Code of Conduct

Whereas, the members of ICANN's Board of Directors are committed to maintaining a high standard of ethical conduct.

Whereas, the Board Governance Committee has developed a Code of Conduct to provide the Board with guiding principles for conducting themselves in an ethical manner.

Resolved (2008.06.26.09), the Board directs staff to post the newly proposed ICANN Board of Directors' Code of Conduct for public comment, for consideration by the Board as soon as feasible. [Reference to PDF will be inserted when posted.]

Ratification of Selection of Consultant to Conduct Independent Review of the Board
Whereas, the Board Governance Committee has recommended that Boston Consulting Group be selected as the consultant to perform the independent review of the ICANN Board.

Whereas, the BGC’s recommendation to retain BCG was approved by the Executive Committee during its meeting on 12 June 2008.

Resolved (2008.06.26.10), the Board ratifies the Executive Committee’s approval of the Board Governance Committee’s recommendation to select Boston Consulting Group as the consultant to perform the independent review of the ICANN Board.

Appointment of Independent Review Working Groups

Whereas, the Board Governance Committee has recommended that several working groups should be formed to coordinate pending independent reviews of ICANN structures.

Resolved (2008.06.26.11), the Board establishes the following independent review working groups:

- **ICANN Board Independent Review Working Group**: Amadeu Abril i Abril, Roberto Gaetano (Chair), Steve Goldstein, Thomas Narten, Rajasekhar Ramaraj, Rita Rodin, and Jean Jacques Subrenat.

- **DNS Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) Independent Review Working Group**: Harald Alvestrand (Chair), Steve Crocker and Bruce Tonkin.

- **Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) Independent Review Working Group**: Robert Blokzijl, Dennis Jennings (Chair), Reinhard Scholl and Suzanne Woolf.

Update on Independent Reviews of ICANN Structures

(For discussion only.)

Board Committee Assignment Revisions
Whereas, the Board Governance Committee has recommended that the membership of several Board should be revised, and that all other committees should remain unchanged until the 2008 Annual Meeting.

Resolved (2008.06.26.12), the membership of the Audit, Finance, and Reconsideration committees are revised as follows:

- Audit Committee: Raimundo Beca, Demi Getschko, Dennis Jennings, Njeri Rionge and Rita Rodin (Chair).
- Finance Committee: Raimundo Beca, Peter Dengate Thrush, Steve Goldstein, Dennis Jennings, Rajasekhar Ramaraj (Chair), and Bruce Tonkin (as observer).
- Reconsideration Committee: Susan Crawford (Chair), Demi Getschko, Dennis Jennings, Rita Rodin, and Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

Approval of BGC Recommendations on GNSO Improvements

Whereas, Article IV, Section 4 of ICANN's Bylaws calls for periodic reviews of the performance and operation of ICANN's structures by an entity or entities independent of the organization under review.

Whereas, the Board created the "Board Governance Committee GNSO Review Working Group" (Working Group) to consider the independent review of the GNSO and other relevant input, and recommend to the Board Governance Committee a comprehensive proposal to improve the effectiveness of the GNSO, including its policy activities, structure, operations and communications.

Whereas, the Working Group engaged in extensive public consultation and discussions, considered all input, and developed a final report <http://www.icann.org/topics/gnso-improvements/gnso-improvements-report-03feb08.pdf> containing a comprehensive and exhaustive list of proposed recommendations on GNSO improvements.

Whereas, the Board Governance Committee determined that the GNSO Improvements working group had fulfilled its charter and forwarded the final report to the Board for consideration.

Whereas, a public comment forum was held open for 60 days to receive, consider and summarize <http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnso-improvements-report-2008/msg000033.html> public comments on the final report.
Whereas, the GNSO Council and Staff have worked diligently over the past few months to develop a top-level plan for approaching the implementation of the improvement recommendations, as requested by the Board at its New Delhi meeting.

Whereas, ICANN has a continuing need for a strong structure for developing policies that reflect to the extent possible a consensus of all stakeholders in the community including ICANN’s contracted parties.

Resolved (2008.06.26.13), the Board endorses the recommendations of the Board Governance Committee’s GNSO Review Working Group, other than on GNSO Council restructuring, and requests that the GNSO convene a small working group on Council restructuring including one representative from the current NomCom appointees, one member from each constituency and one member from each liaison-appointing advisory committee (if that advisory committee so desires), and that this group should reach consensus and submit a consensus recommendation on Council restructuring by no later than 25 July 2008 for consideration by the ICANN Board as soon as possible, but no later than the Board’s meeting in August 2008.

Receipt of Report of President's Strategy Committee Consultation

Whereas, the Chairman of the Board requested that the President's Strategy Committee undertake a process on how to strengthen and complete the ICANN multi-stakeholder model.

Whereas, the PSC has developed three papers that outline key areas and possible responses to address them: "Transition Action Plan," "Improving Institutional Confidence in ICANN," and "FAQ."

Resolved (2008.06.26.14), the Board thanks the President's Strategy Committee for its work to date, and instructs ICANN staff to undertake the public consultation recommended in the action plan, and strongly encourages the entire ICANN community to participate in the continuing consultations on the future of ICANN by...
reviewing and submitting comments to the PSC by 31 July 2008.

Selection of Mexico City for March 2009 ICANN Meeting

Whereas, ICANN intends to hold its first meeting for calendar year 2009 in the Latin America region;

Whereas, the Mexican Internet Association (AMIPCI) has agreed to host the meeting;

Resolved (2008.06.26.15), the Board accepts the AMIPCI proposal to host ICANN's 34th global meeting in Mexico City, in March 2009.

Review of Paris Meeting Structure
(For discussion only.)

| back to top |

Board Response to Discussions Arising from Paris Meeting
(For discussion only.)

| back to top |

ICANN At-Large Summit Proposal

Whereas, at the ICANN meeting in New Delhi in February 2008, the Board resolved to direct staff to work with the ALAC to finalise a proposal to fund an ICANN At-Large Summit, for consideration as part of the 2008-2009 operating plan and budget process. <http://www.icann.org/minutes/resolutions-15feb08.htm>

Whereas, potential funding for such a summit has been identified in the FY09 budget. <http://www.icann.org/financials/fiscal-30jun09.htm>

Whereas, a proposal for the Summit was completed and submitted shortly before the ICANN Meeting in Paris.

Resolved (2008.06.26.16), the Board approves the proposal to hold an ICANN At-Large Summit as a one-time special event, and requests that the ALAC work with ICANN Staff to implement the Summit in a manner that achieves efficiency, including considering the Mexico meeting as the venue.
Resolved (2008.06.26.17), with the maturation of At-Large and the proposal for the At-Large Summit’s objectives set out, the Board expects the ALAC to look to more self-funding for At-Large travel in the fiscal year 2010 plan, consistent with the travel policies of other constituencies.

Other Business
(TBD)

Thanks to Steve Conte
Whereas, Steve Conte has served as an employee of ICANN for over five years.

Whereas, Steve has served ICANN in a number of roles, currently as ICANN's Chief Security Officer, but also as a vital support to the Board and its work at meetings.

Whereas, Steve has given notice to ICANN that he has accepted a new position with the Internet Society (ISOC), and that his employment with ICANN will conclude at the end of this meeting.

Whereas, Steve is of gentle nature, possessed of endless patience and fierce integrity, a love of music, and great dedication to the Internet and those who nurture it.

Whereas, the ICANN Board wishes to recognize Steve for his service to ICANN and the global Internet community. In particular, Steve has tirelessly and with good nature supported the past 19 ICANN meetings and his extraordinary efforts have been most appreciated.

Resolved (2008.06.26.18), the ICANN Board formally thanks Steve Conte for his service to ICANN, and expresses its good wishes to Steve for his work with ISOC and all his future endeavors.

Thanks to Sponsors
The Board extends its thanks to all sponsors of this meeting:
Thanks to Local Hosts, Staff, Scribes, Interpreters, Event Teams, and Others

The Board wishes to extend its thanks to the local host organizers, AGIFEM, its President Daniel Dardailler, Vice-President Pierre Bonis and CEO Sebastien Bachollet, as well as Board Members from Afnic, Amen, Domaine.fr, Eurodns, Indom, Internet Society France, Internet fr, Namebay, Renater, and W3C.

The Board would also like to thank Eric Besson, the Minister for Forward Planning, Assessment of Public Policies and Development of the Digital Economy for his participation in the Welcome Ceremony and the Welcome Cocktail.

The Board thanks the Au Toit de la Grande Arche, its president, Francis Bouvier, and Directeur, Philippe Nieuwbourg, and Bertrand Delanoë, Maire de Paris, and Jean-Louis Missika, adjoint au Maire de Paris for their hospitality at the social events at the ICANN Paris meeting.

The Board expresses its appreciation to the scribes Laura Brewer, Teri Darrenougue, Jennifer Schuck, and Charles Motter and to the entire ICANN staff for their efforts in facilitating the smooth operation of the meeting. ICANN would particularly like to acknowledge the many efforts of Michael Evans for his assistance in organizing the past eighteen public board meetings and many other smaller events for the ICANN community.

The Board also wishes to express its appreciation to VeriLan Events Services, Inc.
for technical support, Auvitec and Prosn for audio/visual support, Calliope Interpreters France for interpretation, and France Telecom for bandwidth. Additional thanks are given to the Le Meridien Montparnasse for this fine facility, and to the event facilities and support.

The Board also wishes to thank all those who worked to introduce a Business Access Agenda for the first time at this meeting, Ayesha Hassan of the International Chamber of Commerce, Marilyn Cade, and ICANN Staff.

The members of the Board wish to especially thank their fellow Board Member Jean-Jacques Subrenat for his assistance in making the arrangements for this meeting in Paris, France.
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ARTICLE I: MISSION AND CORE VALUES

Section 1. MISSION

The mission of The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers ("ICANN") is to coordinate, at the overall level, the global Internet's systems of unique identifiers, and in particular to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems. In particular, ICANN:

1. Coordinates the allocation and assignment of the three sets of unique identifiers for the Internet, which are
   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.

2. Coordinates the operation and evolution of the DNS root name server system.

3. Coordinates policy development reasonably and appropriately related to these technical functions.

Section 2. CORE VALUES

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

1. Preserving and enhancing the operational stability, reliability, security, and global interoperability of the Internet.

2. Respecting the creativity, innovation, and flow of information made possible by the Internet by limiting ICANN's activities to those matters within ICANN's mission requiring or significantly benefiting from global coordination.

3. To the extent feasible and appropriate, delegating coordination functions to or recognizing the policy role of other responsible entities that reflect the...
interests of affected parties.

4. Seeking and supporting broad, informed participation reflecting the functional, geographic, and cultural diversity of the Internet at all levels of policy development and decision-making.

5. Where feasible and appropriate, depending on market mechanisms to promote and sustain a competitive environment.

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

7. Employing open and transparent policy development mechanisms that (i) promote well-informed decisions based on expert advice, and (ii) ensure that those entities most affected can assist in the policy development process.

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

9. Acting with a speed that is responsive to the needs of the Internet while, as part of the decision-making process, obtaining informed input from those entities most affected.

10. Remaining accountable to the Internet community through mechanisms that enhance ICANN's effectiveness.

11. While remaining rooted in the private sector, recognizing that governments and public authorities are responsible for public policy and duly taking into account governments' or public authorities' recommendations.

These core values are deliberately expressed in very general terms, so that they may provide useful and relevant guidance in the broadest possible range of circumstances. Because they are not narrowly prescriptive, the specific way in which they apply, individually and collectively, to each new situation will necessarily depend on many factors that cannot be fully anticipated or enumerated; and because they are statements of principle rather than practice, situations will inevitably arise in which perfect fidelity to all eleven core values simultaneously is not possible. Any ICANN body making a recommendation or decision shall exercise its judgment to determine which core values are most relevant and how they apply to the specific circumstances of the case at hand, and to determine, if necessary, an appropriate and defensible balance among competing values.

ARTICLE II: POWERS
Section 1. GENERAL POWERS

Except as otherwise provided in the Articles of Incorporation or these Bylaws, the powers of ICANN shall be exercised by, and its property controlled and its business and affairs conducted by or under the direction of, the Board. With respect to any matters that would fall within the provisions of Article III, Section 6, the Board may act only by a majority vote of all members of the Board. In all other matters, except as otherwise provided in these Bylaws or by law, the Board may act by majority vote of those present at any annual, regular, or special meeting of the Board. Any references in these Bylaws to a vote of the Board shall mean the vote of only those members present at the meeting where a quorum is present unless otherwise specifically provided in these Bylaws by reference to "all of the members of the Board."

Section 2. RESTRICTIONS

ICANN shall not act as a Domain Name System Registry or Registrar or Internet Protocol Address Registry in competition with entities affected by the policies of ICANN. Nothing in this Section is intended to prevent ICANN from taking whatever steps are necessary to protect the operational stability of the Internet in the event of financial failure of a Registry or Registrar or other emergency.

Section 3. NON-DISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT

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.

ARTICLE III: TRANSPARENCY

Section 1. PURPOSE

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

Section 2. WEBSITE

ICANN shall maintain a publicly-accessible Internet World Wide Web site (the "Website"), which may include, among other things, (i) a calendar of scheduled meetings of the Board, Supporting Organizations, and Advisory Committees; (ii) a docket of all pending policy development matters, including their schedule and current status; (iii) specific meeting notices and agendas as described below; (iv) information on ICANN’s budget, annual audit, financial contributors and the
amount of their contributions, and related matters; (v) information about the availability of accountability mechanisms, including reconsideration, independent review, and Ombudsman activities, as well as information about the outcome of specific requests and complaints invoking these mechanisms; (vi) announcements about ICANN activities of interest to significant segments of the ICANN community; (vii) comments received from the community on policies being developed and other matters; (viii) information about ICANN’s physical meetings and public forums; and (ix) other information of interest to the ICANN community.

Section 3. MANAGER OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There shall be a staff position designated as Manager of Public Participation, or such other title as shall be determined by the President, that shall be responsible, under the direction of the President, for coordinating the various aspects of public participation in ICANN, including the Website and various other means of communicating with and receiving input from the general community of Internet users.

Section 4. MEETING NOTICES AND AGENDAS

At least seven days in advance of each Board meeting (or if not practicable, as far in advance as is practicable), a notice of such meeting and, to the extent known, an agenda for the meeting shall be posted.

Section 5. MINUTES AND PRELIMINARY REPORTS

1. All minutes of meetings of the Board and Supporting Organizations (and any councils thereof) shall be approved promptly by the originating body and provided to the ICANN Secretary for posting on the Website.

2. No later than 11:59 p.m. on the second business days after the conclusion of each meeting (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN’s principal office), any resolutions passed by the Board of Directors at that meeting shall be made publicly available on the Website; provided, however, that any actions relating to personnel or employment matters, legal matters (to the extent the Board determines it is necessary or appropriate to protect the interests of ICANN), matters that ICANN is prohibited by law or contract from disclosing publicly, and other matters that the Board determines, by a three-quarters (3/4) vote of Directors present at the meeting and voting, are not appropriate for public distribution, shall not be included in the preliminary report made publicly available. The Secretary shall send notice to the Board of Directors and the Chairs of the Supporting Organizations (as set forth in Articles VIII - X of these Bylaws) and Advisory Committees (as set forth in Article XI of these Bylaws).
Bylaws) informing them that the resolutions have been posted.

3. No later than 11:59 p.m. on the seventh business days after the conclusion of each meeting (as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office), any actions taken by the Board shall be made publicly available in a preliminary report on the Website, subject to the limitations on disclosure set forth in Section 5.2 above. For any matters that the Board determines not to disclose, the Board shall describe in general terms in the relevant preliminary report the reason for such nondisclosure.

4. No later than the day after the date on which they are formally approved by the Board (or, if such day is not a business day, as calculated by local time at the location of ICANN's principal office, then the next immediately following business day), the minutes shall be made publicly available on the Website; provided, however, that any minutes relating to personnel or employment matters, legal matters (to the extent the Board determines it is necessary or appropriate to protect the interests of ICANN), matters that ICANN is prohibited by law or contract from disclosing publicly, and other matters that the Board determines, by a three-quarters (3/4) vote of Directors present at the meeting and voting, are not appropriate for public distribution, shall not be included in the minutes made publicly available. For any matters that the Board determines not to disclose, the Board shall describe in general terms in the relevant minutes the reason for such nondisclosure.

Section 6. NOTICE AND COMMENT ON POLICY ACTIONS

1. With respect to any policies that are being considered by the Board for adoption that substantially affect the operation of the Internet or third parties, including the imposition of any fees or charges, ICANN shall:
   a. provide public notice on the Website explaining what policies are being considered for adoption and why, at least twenty-one days (and if practical, earlier) prior to any action by the Board;

   b. provide a reasonable opportunity for parties to comment on the adoption of the proposed policies, to see the comments of others, and to reply to those comments, prior to any action by the Board; and

   c. in those cases where the policy action affects public policy concerns, to 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.
2. Where both practically feasible and consistent with the relevant policy development process, an in-person public forum shall also be held for discussion of any proposed policies as described in Section 6(1)(b) of this Article, prior to any final Board action.

3. After taking action on any policy subject to this Section, the Board shall publish in the meeting minutes the reasons for any action taken, the vote of each Director voting on the action, and the separate statement of any Director desiring publication of such a statement.

Section 7. TRANSLATION OF DOCUMENTS

As appropriate and to the extent provided in the ICANN budget, ICANN shall facilitate the translation of final published documents into various appropriate languages.

ARTICLE IV: ACCOUNTABILITY AND REVIEW

Section 1. PURPOSE

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

Section 2. RECONSIDERATION

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

2. Any person or entity may submit a request for reconsideration or review of an ICANN action or inaction ("Reconsideration Request") to the extent that he, she, or it have been adversely affected by:
   a. one or more staff actions or inactions that contradict established ICANN policy(ies); or
   b. one or more actions or inactions of the ICANN Board that have been taken or refused to be taken without consideration of material information, except where the party submitting the request could
have submitted, but did not submit, the information for the Board's consideration at the time of action or refusal to act; or

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

3. The Board has designated the Board Governance Committee to review and consider any such Reconsideration Requests. The Board Governance Committee shall have the authority to:
   a. evaluate requests for review or reconsideration;
   b. summarily dismiss insufficient requests;
   c. evaluate requests for urgent consideration;
   d. conduct whatever factual investigation is deemed appropriate;
   e. request additional written submissions from the affected party, or from other parties;
   f. make a final determination on Reconsideration Requests regarding staff action or inaction, without reference to the Board of Directors; and
   g. make a recommendation to the Board of Directors on the merits of the request, as necessary.

4. ICANN shall absorb the normal administrative costs of the reconsideration process. It reserves the right to recover from a party requesting review or reconsideration any costs that are deemed to be extraordinary in nature. When such extraordinary costs can be foreseen, that fact and the reasons why such costs are necessary and appropriate to evaluating the Reconsideration Request shall be communicated to the party seeking reconsideration, who shall then have the option of withdrawing the request or agreeing to bear such costs.

5. All Reconsideration Requests must be submitted to an e-mail address designated by the Board Governance Committee within fifteen days after:
   a. for requests challenging Board actions, the date on which information about the challenged Board action is first published in a resolution, unless the posting of the resolution is not accompanied by a rationale. In that instance, the request must be submitted within 15 days from the initial posting of the rationale; or
   b. for requests challenging staff actions, the date on which the party
submitting the request became aware of, or reasonably should have become aware of, the challenged staff action; or

c. for requests challenging either Board or staff inaction, the date on which the affected person reasonably concluded, or reasonably should have concluded, that action would not be taken in a timely manner.

6. To properly initiate a Reconsideration process, all requestors must review and follow the Reconsideration Request form posted on the ICANN website at http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/governance/reconsideration. Requestors must also acknowledge and agree to the terms and conditions set forth in the form when filing.

7. Requestors shall not provide more than 25 pages (double-spaced, 12-point font) of argument in support of a Reconsideration Request. Requestors may submit all documentary evidence necessary to demonstrate why the action or inaction should be reconsidered, without limitation.

8. The Board Governance Committee shall have authority to consider Reconsideration Requests from different parties in the same proceeding so long as: (i) the requests involve the same general action or inaction; and (ii) the parties submitting Reconsideration Requests are similarly affected by such action or inaction. In addition, consolidated filings may be appropriate if the alleged causal connection and the resulting harm is the same for all of the requestors. Every requestor must be able to demonstrate that it has been materially harmed and adversely impacted by the action or inaction giving rise to the request.

9. The Board Governance Committee shall review each Reconsideration Request upon its receipt to determine if it is sufficiently stated. The Board Governance Committee may summarily dismiss a Reconsideration Request if: (i) the requestor fails to meet the requirements for bringing a Reconsideration Request; (ii) it is frivolous, querulous or vexatious; or (iii) the requestor had notice and opportunity to, but did not, participate in the public comment period relating to the contested action, if applicable. The Board Governance Committee's summary dismissal of a Reconsideration Request shall be posted on the Website.

10. For all Reconsideration Requests that are not summarily dismissed, the Board Governance Committee shall promptly proceed to review and consideration.

11. The Board Governance Committee may ask the ICANN staff for its views
on the matter, which comments shall be made publicly available on the Website.

12. The Board Governance Committee may request additional information or clarifications from the requestor, and may elect to conduct a meeting with the requestor by telephone, email or, if acceptable to the party requesting reconsideration, in person. A requestor may ask for an opportunity to be heard; the Board Governance Committee's decision on any such request is final. To the extent any information gathered in such a meeting is relevant to any recommendation by the Board Governance Committee, it shall so state in its recommendation.

13. The Board Governance Committee may also request information relevant to the request from third parties. To the extent any information gathered is relevant to any recommendation by the Board Governance Committee, it shall so state in its recommendation. Any information collected from third parties shall be provided to the requestor.

14. The Board Governance Committee shall act on a Reconsideration Request on the basis of the public written record, including information submitted by the party seeking reconsideration or review, by the ICANN staff, and by any third party.

15. For all Reconsideration Requests brought regarding staff action or inaction, the Board Governance Committee shall be delegated the authority by the Board of Directors to make a final determination and recommendation on the matter. Board consideration of the recommendation is not required. As the Board Governance Committee deems necessary, it may make recommendation to the Board for consideration and action. The Board Governance Committee's determination on staff action or inaction shall be posted on the Website. The Board Governance Committee's determination is final and establishes precedential value.

16. The Board Governance Committee shall make a final determination or a recommendation to the Board with respect to a Reconsideration Request within thirty days following its receipt of the request, unless impractical, in which case it shall report to the Board the circumstances that prevented it from making a final recommendation and its best estimate of the time required to produce such a final determination or recommendation. The final recommendation shall be posted on ICANN's website.

17. The Board shall not be bound to follow the recommendations of the Board Governance Committee. The final decision of the Board shall be made public as part of the preliminary report and minutes of the Board meeting at which action is taken. The Board shall issue its decision on the
recommendation of the Board Governance Committee within 60 days of receipt of the Reconsideration Request or as soon thereafter as feasible. Any circumstances that delay the Board from acting within this timeframe must be identified and posted on ICANN's website. The Board's decision on the recommendation is final.

18. If the requestor believes that the Board action or inaction posed for Reconsideration is so urgent that the timing requirements of the Reconsideration process are too long, the requestor may apply to the Board Governance Committee for urgent consideration. Any request for urgent consideration must be made within two business days (calculated at ICANN's headquarters in Los Angeles, California) of the posting of the resolution at issue. A request for urgent consideration must include a discussion of why the matter is urgent for reconsideration and must demonstrate a likelihood of success with the Reconsideration Request.

19. The Board Governance Committee shall respond to the request for urgent consideration within two business days after receipt of such request. If the Board Governance Committee agrees to consider the matter with urgency, it will cause notice to be provided to the requestor, who will have two business days after notification to complete the Reconsideration Request. The Board Governance Committee shall issue a recommendation on the urgent Reconsideration Request within seven days of the completion of the filing of the Request, or as soon thereafter as feasible. If the Board Governance Committee does not agree to consider the matter with urgency, the requestor may still file a Reconsideration Request within the regular time frame set forth within these Bylaws.

20. The Board Governance Committee shall submit a report to the Board on an annual basis containing at least the following information for the preceding calendar year:

   a. the number and general nature of Reconsideration Requests received, including an identification if the requests were acted upon, summarily dismissed, or remain pending;

   b. for any Reconsideration Requests that remained pending at the end of the calendar year, the average length of time for which such Reconsideration Requests have been pending, and a description of the reasons for any request pending for more than ninety (90) days;

   c. an explanation of any other mechanisms available to ensure that ICANN is accountable to persons materially affected by its decisions; and

   d. whether or not, in the Board Governance Committee's view, the
criteria for which reconsideration may be requested should be revised, or another process should be adopted or modified, to ensure that all persons materially affected by ICANN decisions have meaningful access to a review process that ensures fairness while limiting frivolous claims.

Section 3. INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF BOARD ACTIONS

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

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

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

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

   a. did the Board act without conflict of interest in taking its decision?

   b. did the Board exercise due diligence and care in having a reasonable amount of facts in front of them?; and

   c. did the Board members exercise independent judgment in taking the decision, believed to be in the best interests of the company?

5. Requests for independent review shall not exceed 25 pages (double-
6. There shall be an omnibus standing panel of between six and nine members with a variety of expertise, including jurisprudence, judicial experience, alternative dispute resolution and knowledge of ICANN's mission and work from which each specific IRP Panel shall be selected. The panelists shall serve for terms that are staggered to allow for continued review of the size of the panel and the range of expertise. A Chair of the standing panel shall be appointed for a term not to exceed three years. Individuals holding an official position or office within the ICANN structure are not eligible to serve on 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 IRP Provider; or (ii) is in place but does not have the requisite diversity of skill and experience needed for a particular proceeding, the IRP Provider shall identify one or more panelists, as required, from outside the omnibus standing panel to augment the panel members for that proceeding.

7. All IRP proceedings shall be administered by an international dispute resolution provider appointed from time to time by ICANN ("the IRP Provider"). The membership of the standing panel shall be coordinated by the IRP Provider subject to approval by ICANN.

8. 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.

9. Either party may request that the IRP be considered by a one- or three-member panel; the Chair of the standing panel shall make the final determination of the size of each IRP panel, taking into account the wishes of the parties and the complexity of the issues presented.

10. The IRP Provider shall determine a procedure for assigning members from the standing panel to individual IRP panels.

11. The IRP Panel shall have the authority to:
   a. summarily dismiss requests brought without standing, lacking in substance, or that are frivolous or vexatious;
   b. request additional written submissions from the party seeking review, the Board, the Supporting Organizations, or from other
parties;

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

d. recommend that the Board stay any action or decision, or that the Board take any interim action, until such time as the Board reviews and acts upon the opinion of the IRP;

e. consolidate requests for independent review if the facts and circumstances are sufficiently similar; and

f. determine the timing for each proceeding.

12. In order to keep the costs and burdens of independent review as low as possible, the IRP Panel should conduct its proceedings by email and otherwise via the Internet to the maximum extent feasible. Where necessary, the IRP Panel may hold meetings by telephone. In the unlikely event that a telephonic or in-person hearing is convened, the hearing shall be limited to argument only; all evidence, including witness statements, must be submitted in writing in advance.

13. All panel members shall adhere to conflicts-of-interest policy stated in the IRP Provider’s operating rules and procedures, as approved by the Board.

14. Prior to initiating a request for independent review, the complainant is urged to enter into a period of cooperative engagement with ICANN for the purpose of resolving or narrowing the issues that are contemplated to be brought to the IRP. The cooperative engagement process is published on ICANN.org and is incorporated into this Section 3 of the Bylaws.

15. Upon the filing of a request for an independent review, the parties are urged to participate in a conciliation period for the purpose of narrowing the issues that are stated within the request for independent review. A conciliator will be appointed from the members of the omnibus standing panel by the Chair of that panel. The conciliator shall not be eligible to serve as one of the panelists presiding over that particular IRP. The Chair of the standing panel may deem conciliation unnecessary if cooperative engagement sufficiently narrowed the issues remaining in the independent review.

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

17. All matters discussed during the cooperative engagement and conciliation phases are to remain confidential and not subject to discovery or as evidence for any purpose within the IRP, and are without prejudice to either party.

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

19. The IRP operating procedures, and all petitions, claims, and declarations, shall be posted on ICANN's website when they become available.

20. The IRP Panel may, in its discretion, grant a party's request to keep certain information confidential, such as trade secrets.

21. Where feasible, the Board shall consider the IRP Panel declaration at the Board's next meeting. The declarations of the IRP Panel, and the Board's subsequent action on those declarations, are final and have precedential value.

Section 4. PERIODIC REVIEW OF ICANN STRUCTURE AND OPERATIONS

1. The Board shall cause a periodic review of the performance and operation of each Supporting Organization, each Supporting Organization Council, each Advisory Committee (other than the Governmental Advisory Committee), and the Nominating Committee by an entity or entities independent of the organization under review. The goal of the review, to be undertaken pursuant to such criteria and standards as the Board shall direct, shall be to determine (i) whether that organization has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure, and (ii) if so, whether any change in structure or operations is desirable to improve its effectiveness.

These periodic reviews shall be conducted no less frequently than every five years, based on feasibility as determined by the Board. Each five-year cycle will be computed from the moment of the reception by the Board of
the final report of the relevant review Working Group.

The results of such reviews shall be posted on the Website for public review and comment, and shall be considered by the Board no later than the second scheduled meeting of the Board after such results have been posted for 30 days. The consideration by the Board includes the ability to revise the structure or operation of the parts of ICANN being reviewed by a two-thirds vote of all members of the Board.

2. The Governmental Advisory Committee shall provide its own review mechanisms.

ARTICLE V: OMBUDSMAN

Section 1. OFFICE OF OMBUDSMAN

1. There shall be an Office of Ombudsman, to be managed by an Ombudsman and to include such staff support as the Board determines is appropriate and feasible. The Ombudsman shall be a full-time position, with salary and benefits appropriate to the function, as determined by the Board.

2. The Ombudsman shall be appointed by the Board for an initial term of two years, subject to renewal by the Board.

3. The Ombudsman shall be subject to dismissal by the Board only upon a three-fourths (3/4) vote of the entire Board.

4. The annual budget for the Office of Ombudsman shall be established by the Board as part of the annual ICANN budget process. The Ombudsman shall submit a proposed budget to the President, and the President shall include that budget submission in its entirety and without change in the general ICANN budget recommended by the ICANN President to the Board. Nothing in this Article shall prevent the President from offering separate views on the substance, size, or other features of the Ombudsman's proposed budget to the Board.

Section 2. CHARTER

The charter of the Ombudsman shall be to act as a neutral dispute resolution practitioner for those matters for which the provisions of the Reconsideration Policy set forth in Section 2 of Article IV or the Independent Review Policy set forth in Section 3 of Article IV have not been invoked. The principal function of the Ombudsman shall be to provide an independent internal evaluation of complaints by members of the ICANN community who believe that the ICANN staff, Board or
an ICANN constituent body has treated them unfairly. The Ombudsman shall serve as an objective advocate for fairness, and shall seek to evaluate and where possible resolve complaints about unfair or inappropriate treatment by ICANN staff, the Board, or ICANN constituent bodies, clarifying the issues and using conflict resolution tools such as negotiation, facilitation, and "shuttle diplomacy" to achieve these results.

Section 3. OPERATIONS

The Office of Ombudsman shall:

1. facilitate the fair, impartial, and timely resolution of problems and complaints that affected members of the ICANN community (excluding employees and vendors/suppliers of ICANN) may have with specific actions or failures to act by the Board or ICANN staff which have not otherwise become the subject of either the Reconsideration or Independent Review Policies;

2. exercise discretion to accept or decline to act on a complaint or question, including by the development of procedures to dispose of complaints that are insufficiently concrete, substantive, or related to ICANN's interactions with the community so as to be inappropriate subject matters for the Ombudsman to act on. In addition, and without limiting the foregoing, the Ombudsman shall have no authority to act in any way with respect to internal administrative matters, personnel matters, issues relating to membership on the Board, or issues related to vendor/supplier relations;

3. have the right to have access to (but not to publish if otherwise confidential) all necessary information and records from ICANN staff and constituent bodies to enable an informed evaluation of the complaint and to assist in dispute resolution where feasible (subject only to such confidentiality obligations as are imposed by the complainant or any generally applicable confidentiality policies adopted by ICANN);

4. heighten awareness of the Ombudsman program and functions through routine interaction with the ICANN community and online availability;

5. maintain neutrality and independence, and have no bias or personal stake in an outcome; and

6. comply with all ICANN conflicts-of-interest and confidentiality policies.

Section 4. INTERACTION WITH ICANN AND OUTSIDE ENTITIES

1. No ICANN employee, Board member, or other participant in Supporting
Organizations or Advisory Committees shall prevent or impede the Ombudsman's contact with the ICANN community (including employees of ICANN). ICANN employees and Board members shall direct members of the ICANN community who voice problems, concerns, or complaints about ICANN to the Ombudsman, who shall advise complainants about the various options available for review of such problems, concerns, or complaints.

2. ICANN staff and other ICANN participants shall observe and respect determinations made by the Office of Ombudsman concerning confidentiality of any complaints received by that Office.

3. Contact with the Ombudsman shall not constitute notice to ICANN of any particular action or cause of action.

4. The Ombudsman shall be specifically authorized to make such reports to the Board as he or she deems appropriate with respect to any particular matter and its resolution or the inability to resolve it. Absent a determination by the Ombudsman, in his or her sole discretion, that it would be inappropriate, such reports shall be posted on the Website.

5. The Ombudsman shall not take any actions not authorized in these Bylaws, and in particular shall not institute, join, or support in any way any legal actions challenging ICANN structure, procedures, processes, or any conduct by the ICANN Board, staff, or constituent bodies.

Section 5. ANNUAL REPORT

The Office of Ombudsman shall publish on an annual basis a consolidated analysis of the year's complaints and resolutions, appropriately dealing with confidentiality obligations and concerns. Such annual report should include a description of any trends or common elements of complaints received during the period in question, as well as recommendations for steps that could be taken to minimize future complaints. The annual report shall be posted on the Website.

ARTICLE VI: BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Section 1. COMPOSITION OF THE BOARD

The ICANN Board of Directors ("Board") shall consist of sixteen voting members ("Directors"). In addition, four non-voting liaisons ("Liaisons") shall be designated for the purposes set forth in Section 9 of this Article. Only Directors shall be included in determining the existence of quorums, and in establishing the validity of votes taken by the ICANN Board.
Section 2. DIRECTORS AND THEIR SELECTION; ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN

1. The Directors shall consist of:

   a. Eight voting members selected by the Nominating Committee established by Article VII of these Bylaws. These seats on the Board of Directors are referred to in these Bylaws as Seats 1 through 8.

   b. Two voting members selected by the Address Supporting Organization according to the provisions of Article VIII of these Bylaws. These seats on the Board of Directors are referred to in these Bylaws as Seat 9 and Seat 10.

   c. Two voting members selected by the Country-Code Names Supporting Organization according to the provisions of Article IX of these Bylaws. These seats on the Board of Directors are referred to in these Bylaws as Seat 11 and Seat 12.

   d. Two voting members selected by the Generic Names Supporting Organization according to the provisions of Article X of these Bylaws. These seats on the Board of Directors are referred to in these Bylaws as Seat 13 and Seat 14.

   e. One voting member selected by the At-Large Community according to the provisions of Article XI of these Bylaws. This seat on the Board of Directors is referred to in these Bylaws as Seat 15.

   f. The President ex officio, who shall be a voting member.

2. In carrying out its responsibilities to fill Seats 1 through 8, the Nominating Committee shall seek to ensure that the ICANN Board is composed of members who in the aggregate display diversity in geography, culture, skills, experience, and perspective, by applying the criteria set forth in Section 3 of this Article. At no time when it makes its selection shall the Nominating Committee select a Director to fill any vacancy or expired term whose selection would cause the total number of Directors (not including the President) from countries in any one Geographic Region (as defined in Section 5 of this Article) to exceed five; and the Nominating Committee shall ensure when it makes its selections that the Board includes at least one Director who is from a country in each ICANN Geographic Region ("Diversity Calculation").

For purposes of this sub-section 2 of Article VI, Section 2 of the ICANN Bylaws, if any candidate for director maintains citizenship of more than one
country, or has been domiciled for more than five years in a country of which the candidate does not maintain citizenship ("Domicile"), that candidate may be deemed to be from either country and must select in his/her Statement of Interest the country of citizenship or Domicile that he/she wants the Nominating Committee to use for Diversity Calculation purposes. For purposes of this sub-section 2 of Article VI, Section 2 of the ICANN Bylaws, a person can only have one "Domicile," which shall be determined by where the candidate has a permanent residence and place of habitation.

3. In carrying out their responsibilities to fill Seats 9 through 15, the Supporting Organizations and the At-Large Community shall seek to ensure that the ICANN Board is composed of members that in the aggregate display diversity in geography, culture, skills, experience, and perspective, by applying the criteria set forth in Section 3 of this Article. At any given time, no two Directors selected by a Supporting Organization shall be citizens from the same country or of countries located in the same Geographic Region.

For purposes of this sub-section 3 of Article VI, Section 2 of the ICANN Bylaws, if any candidate for director maintains citizenship of more than one country, or has been domiciled for more than five years in a country of which the candidate does not maintain citizenship ("Domicile"), that candidate may be deemed to be from either country and must select in his/her Statement of Interest the country of citizenship or Domicile that he/she wants the Supporting Organization or the At-Large Community to use for selection purposes. For purposes of this sub-section 3 of Article VI, Section 2 of the ICANN Bylaws, a person can only have one "Domicile," which shall be determined by where the candidate has a permanent residence and place of habitation.

4. The Board shall annually elect a Chairman and a Vice-Chairman from among the Directors, not including the President.

Section 3. CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF DIRECTORS

ICANN Directors shall be:

1. Accomplished persons of integrity, objectivity, and intelligence, with reputations for sound judgment and open minds, and a demonstrated capacity for thoughtful group decision-making;

2. Persons with an understanding of ICANN's mission and the potential impact of ICANN decisions on the global Internet community, and
committed to the success of ICANN;

3. Persons who will produce the broadest cultural and geographic diversity on the Board consistent with meeting the other criteria set forth in this Section;

4. Persons who, in the aggregate, have personal familiarity with the operation of gTLD registries and registrars; with ccTLD registries; with IP address registries; with Internet technical standards and protocols; with policy-development procedures, legal traditions, and the public interest; and with the broad range of business, individual, academic, and non-commercial users of the Internet; and

5. Persons who are able to work and communicate in written and spoken English.

Section 4. ADDITIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

1. Notwithstanding anything herein to the contrary, no official of a national government or a multinational entity established by treaty or other agreement between national governments may serve as a Director. As used herein, the term "official" means a person (i) who holds an elective governmental office or (ii) who is employed by such government or multinational entity and whose primary function with such government or entity is to develop or influence governmental or public policies.

2. No person who serves in any capacity (including as a liaison) on any Supporting Organization Council shall simultaneously serve as a Director or liaison to the Board. If such a person accepts a nomination to be considered for selection by the Supporting Organization Council or the At-Large Community to be a Director, the person shall not, following such nomination, participate in any discussion of, or vote by, the Supporting Organization Council or the committee designated by the At-Large Community relating to the selection of Directors by the Council or Community, until the Council or committee(s) designated by the At-Large Community has selected the full complement of Directors it is responsible for selecting. In the event that a person serving in any capacity on a Supporting Organization Council accepts a nomination to be considered for selection as a Director, the constituency group or other group or entity that selected the person may select a replacement for purposes of the Council’s selection process. In the event that a person serving in any capacity on the At-Large Advisory Committee accepts a nomination to be considered for selection by the At-Large Community as a Director, the Regional At-Large Organization or other group or entity that selected the person may select a replacement for purposes of the Community’s selection process.
3. Persons serving in any capacity on the Nominating Committee shall be ineligible for selection to positions on the Board as provided by Article VII, Section 8.

Section 5. INTERNATIONAL REPRESENTATION

In order to ensure broad international representation on the Board, the selection of Directors by the Nominating Committee, each Supporting Organization and the At-Large Community shall comply with all applicable diversity provisions of these Bylaws or of any Memorandum of Understanding referred to in these Bylaws concerning the Supporting Organization. One intent of these diversity provisions is to ensure that at all times each Geographic Region shall have at least one Director, and at all times no region shall have more than five Directors on the Board (not including the President). As used in these Bylaws, each of the following is considered to be a "Geographic Region": Europe; Asia/Australia/Pacific; Latin America/Caribbean islands; Africa; and North America. The specific countries included in each Geographic Region shall be determined by the Board, and this Section shall be reviewed by the Board from time to time (but at least every three years) to determine whether any change is appropriate, taking account of the evolution of the Internet.

Section 6. DIRECTORS’ CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The Board, through the Board Governance Committee, shall require a statement from each Director not less frequently than once a year setting forth all business and other affiliations that relate in any way to the business and other affiliations of ICANN. Each Director shall be responsible for disclosing to ICANN any matter that could reasonably be considered to make such Director an "interested director" within the meaning of Section 5233 of the California Nonprofit Public Benefit Corporation Law ("CNPBCL"). In addition, each Director shall disclose to ICANN any relationship or other factor that could reasonably be considered to cause the Director to be considered to be an "interested person" within the meaning of Section 5227 of the CNPBCL. The Board shall adopt policies specifically addressing Director, Officer, and Supporting Organization conflicts of interest. No Director shall vote on any matter in which he or she has a material and direct financial interest that would be affected by the outcome of the vote.

Section 7. DUTIES OF DIRECTORS

Directors shall serve as individuals who have the duty to act in what they reasonably believe are the best interests of ICANN and not as representatives of the entity that selected them, their employers, or any other organizations or constituencies.
Section 8. TERMS OF DIRECTORS

1. The regular term of office of Director Seats 1 through 15 shall begin as follows:
   a. The regular terms of Seats 1 through 3 shall begin at the conclusion of ICANN's annual meeting in 2003 and each ICANN annual meeting every third year after 2003;
   b. The regular terms of Seats 4 through 6 shall begin at the conclusion of ICANN's annual meeting in 2004 and each ICANN annual meeting every third year after 2004;
   c. The regular terms of Seats 7 and 8 shall begin at the conclusion of ICANN's annual meeting in 2005 and each ICANN annual meeting every third year after 2005;
   d. The terms of Seats 9 and 12 shall continue until the conclusion of ICANN's annual meeting in 2015. The next terms of Seats 9 and 12 shall begin at the conclusion of ICANN's annual meeting in 2015 and each ICANN annual meeting every third year after 2015;
   e. The terms of Seats 10 and 13 shall continue until the conclusion of ICANN's annual meeting in 2013. The next terms of Seats 10 and 13 shall begin at the conclusion of ICANN's annual meeting in 2013 and each ICANN annual meeting every third year after 2013; and
   f. The terms of Seats 11, 14 and 15 shall continue until the conclusion of ICANN's annual meeting in 2014. The next terms of Seats 11, 14 and 15 shall begin at the conclusion of ICANN's annual meeting in 2014 and each ICANN annual meeting every third year after 2014.

2. Each Director holding any of Seats 1 through 15, including a Director selected to fill a vacancy, shall hold office for a term that lasts until the next term for that Seat commences and until a successor has been selected and qualified or until that Director resigns or is removed in accordance with these Bylaws.

3. At least two months before the commencement of each annual meeting, the Nominating Committee shall give the Secretary of ICANN written notice of its selection of Directors for seats with terms beginning at the conclusion of the annual meeting.

4. At least six months before the date specified for the commencement of the term as specified in paragraphs 1.d-f above, any Supporting Organization or the At-Large community entitled to select a Director for a Seat with a term beginning that year shall give the Secretary of ICANN written notice of
its selection.

5. Subject to the provisions of the Transition Article of these Bylaws, no Director may serve more than three consecutive terms. For these purposes, a person selected to fill a vacancy in a term shall not be deemed to have served that term. (Note: In the period prior to the beginning of the first regular term of Seat 15 in 2010, Seat 15 was deemed vacant for the purposes of calculation of terms of service.)

6. The term as Director of the person holding the office of President shall be for as long as, and only for as long as, such person holds the office of President.

Section 9. NON-VOTING LIAISONS

1. The non-voting liaisons shall include:
   a. One appointed by the Governmental Advisory Committee;
   b. One appointed by the Root Server System Advisory Committee established by Article XI of these Bylaws;
   c. One appointed by the Security and Stability Advisory Committee established by Article XI of these Bylaws;
   d. One appointed by the Internet Engineering Task Force.

2. The non-voting liaisons shall serve terms that begin at the conclusion of each annual meeting. At least one month before the commencement of each annual meeting, each body entitled to appoint a non-voting liaison shall give the Secretary of ICANN written notice of its appointment.

3. Each non-voting liaison may be reappointed, and shall remain in that position until a successor has been appointed or until the liaison resigns or is removed in accordance with these Bylaws.

4. The non-voting liaisons shall be entitled to attend Board meetings, participate in Board discussions and deliberations, and have access (under conditions established by the Board) to materials provided to Directors for use in Board discussions, deliberations and meetings, but shall otherwise not have any of the rights and privileges of Directors. Non-voting liaisons shall be entitled (under conditions established by the Board) to use any materials provided to them pursuant to this Section for the purpose of consulting with their respective committee or organization.

Section 10. RESIGNATION OF A DIRECTOR OR NON-VOTING LIAISON
Subject to Section 5226 of the CNPBCL, any Director or non-voting liaison may resign at any time, either by oral tender of resignation at any meeting of the Board (followed by prompt written notice to the Secretary of ICANN) or by giving written notice thereof to the President or the Secretary of ICANN. Such resignation shall take effect at the time specified, and, unless otherwise specified, the acceptance of such resignation shall not be necessary to make it effective. The successor shall be selected pursuant to Section 12 of this Article.

Section 11. REMOVAL OF A DIRECTOR OR NON-VOTING LIAISON

1. Any Director may be removed, following notice to that Director, by a three-fourths (3/4) majority vote of all Directors; provided, however, that the Director who is the subject of the removal action shall not be entitled to vote on such an action or be counted as a voting member of the Board when calculating the required three-fourths (3/4) vote; and provided further, that each vote to remove a Director shall be a separate vote on the sole question of the removal of that particular Director. If the Director was selected by a Supporting Organization, notice must be provided to that Supporting Organization at the same time notice is provided to the Director. If the Director was selected by the At-Large Community, notice must be provided to the At-Large Advisory Committee at the same time notice is provided to the Director.

2. With the exception of the non-voting liaison appointed by the Governmental Advisory Committee, any non-voting liaison may be removed, following notice to that liaison and to the organization by which that liaison was selected, by a three-fourths (3/4) majority vote of all Directors if the selecting organization fails to promptly remove that liaison following such notice. The Board may request the Governmental Advisory Committee to consider the replacement of the non-voting liaison appointed by that Committee if the Board, by a three-fourths (3/4) majority vote of all Directors, determines that such an action is appropriate.

Section 12. VACANCIES

1. A vacancy or vacancies in the Board of Directors shall be deemed to exist in the case of the death, resignation, or removal of any Director; if the authorized number of Directors is increased; or if a Director has been declared of unsound mind by a final order of court or convicted of a felony or incarcerated for more than 90 days as a result of a criminal conviction or has been found by final order or judgment of any court to have breached a duty under Sections 5230 et seq. of the CNPBCL. Any vacancy occurring on the Board of Directors shall be filled by the Nominating Committee, unless (a) that Director was selected by a Supporting Organization,
which case that vacancy shall be filled by that Supporting Organization, or (b) that Director was the President, in which case the vacancy shall be filled in accordance with the provisions of Article XIII of these Bylaws. The selecting body shall give written notice to the Secretary of ICANN of their appointments to fill vacancies. A Director selected to fill a vacancy on the Board shall serve for the unexpired term of his or her predecessor in office and until a successor has been selected and qualified. No reduction of the authorized number of Directors shall have the effect of removing a Director prior to the expiration of the Director's term of office.

2. The organizations selecting the non-voting liaisons identified in Section 9 of this Article are responsible for determining the existence of, and filling, any vacancies in those positions. They shall give the Secretary of ICANN written notice of their appointments to fill vacancies.

Section 13. ANNUAL MEETINGS

Annual meetings of ICANN shall be held for the purpose of electing Officers and for the transaction of such other business as may come before the meeting. Each annual meeting for ICANN shall be held at the principal office of ICANN, or any other appropriate place of the Board's time and choosing, provided such annual meeting is held within 14 months of the immediately preceding annual meeting. If the Board determines that it is practical, the annual meeting should be distributed in real-time and archived video and audio formats on the Internet.

Section 14. REGULAR MEETINGS

Regular meetings of the Board shall be held on dates to be determined by the Board. In the absence of other designation, regular meetings shall be held at the principal office of ICANN.

Section 15. SPECIAL MEETINGS

Special meetings of the Board may be called by or at the request of one-quarter (1/4) of the members of the Board or by the Chairman of the Board or the President. A call for a special meeting shall be made by the Secretary of ICANN. In the absence of designation, special meetings shall be held at the principal office of ICANN.

Section 16. NOTICE OF MEETINGS

Notice of time and place of all meetings shall be delivered personally or by telephone or by electronic mail to each Director and non-voting liaison, or sent by first-class mail (air mail for addresses outside the United States) or facsimile,
charges prepaid, addressed to each Director and non-voting liaison at the Director’s or non-voting liaison’s address as it is shown on the records of ICANN. In case the notice is mailed, it shall be deposited in the United States mail at least fourteen (14) days before the time of the holding of the meeting. In case the notice is delivered personally or by telephone or facsimile or electronic mail it shall be delivered personally or by telephone or facsimile or electronic mail at least forty-eight (48) hours before the time of the holding of the meeting. Notwithstanding anything in this Section to the contrary, notice of a meeting need not be given to any Director who signed a waiver of notice or a written consent to holding the meeting or an approval of the minutes thereof, whether before or after the meeting, or who attends the meeting without protesting, prior thereto or at its commencement, the lack of notice to such Director. All such waivers, consents and approvals shall be filed with the corporate records or made a part of the minutes of the meetings.

Section 17. QUORUM

At all annual, regular, and special meetings of the Board, a majority of the total number of Directors then in office shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, and the act of a majority of the Directors present at any meeting at which there is a quorum shall be the act of the Board, unless otherwise provided herein or by law. If a quorum shall not be present at any meeting of the Board, the Directors present thereat may adjourn the meeting from time to time to another place, time, or date. If the meeting is adjourned for more than twenty-four (24) hours, notice shall be given to those Directors not at the meeting at the time of the adjournment.

Section 18. ACTION BY TELEPHONE MEETING OR BY OTHER COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT

Members of the Board or any Committee of the Board may participate in a meeting of the Board or Committee of the Board through use of (i) conference telephone or similar communications equipment, provided that all Directors participating in such a meeting can speak to and hear one another or (ii) electronic video screen communication or other communication equipment; provided that (a) all Directors participating in such a meeting can speak to and hear one another, (b) all Directors are provided the means of fully participating in all matters before the Board or Committee of the Board, and (c) ICANN adopts and implements means of verifying that (x) a person participating in such a meeting is a Director or other person entitled to participate in the meeting and (y) all actions of, or votes by, the Board or Committee of the Board are taken or cast only by the members of the Board or Committee and not persons who are not members. Participation in a meeting pursuant to this Section constitutes presence in person at such meeting. ICANN shall make available at the place of any meeting of the Board
telecommunications equipment necessary to permit members of the Board to participate by telephone.

Section 19. ACTION WITHOUT MEETING

Any action required or permitted to be taken by the Board or a Committee of the Board may be taken without a meeting if all of the Directors entitled to vote thereat shall individually or collectively consent in writing to such action. Such written consent shall have the same force and effect as the unanimous vote of such Directors. Such written consent or consents shall be filed with the minutes of the proceedings of the Board.

Section 20. ELECTRONIC MAIL

If permitted under applicable law, communication by electronic mail shall be considered equivalent to any communication otherwise required to be in writing. ICANN shall take such steps as it deems appropriate under the circumstances to assure itself that communications by electronic mail are authentic.

Section 21. RIGHTS OF INSPECTION

Every Director shall have the right at any reasonable time to inspect and copy all books, records and documents of every kind, and to inspect the physical properties of ICANN. ICANN shall establish reasonable procedures to protect against the inappropriate disclosure of confidential information.

Section 22. COMPENSATION

1. Except for the President of ICANN, who serves ex officio as a voting member of the Board, each of the Directors shall be entitled to receive compensation for his/her services as a Director. The President shall receive only his/her compensation for service as President and shall not receive additional compensation for service as a Director.

2. If the Board determines to offer a compensation arrangement to one or more Directors other than the President of ICANN for services to ICANN as Directors, the Board shall follow a process that is calculated to pay an amount for service as a Director that is in its entirety Reasonable Compensation for such service under the standards set forth in §53.4958-4(b) of the Treasury Regulations.

3. As part of the process, the Board shall retain an Independent Valuation Expert to consult with and to advise the Board regarding Director compensation arrangements and to issue to the Board a Reasoned Written Opinion from such expert regarding the ranges of Reasonable
Compensation for any such services by a Director. The expert's opinion shall address all relevant factors affecting the level of compensation to be paid a Director, including offices held on the Board, attendance at Board and Committee meetings, the nature of service on the Board and on Board Committees, and appropriate data as to comparability regarding director compensation arrangements for U.S.-based, nonprofit, tax-exempt organizations possessing a global employee base.

4. After having reviewed the expert's written opinion, the Board shall meet with the expert to discuss the expert's opinion and to ask questions of the expert regarding the expert's opinion, the comparability data obtained and relied upon, and the conclusions reached by the expert.

5. The Board shall adequately document the basis for any determination the Board makes regarding a Director compensation arrangement concurrently with making that determination.

6. In addition to authorizing payment of compensation for services as Directors as set forth in this Section 22, the Board may also authorize the reimbursement of actual and necessary reasonable expenses incurred by any Director and by non-voting liaisons performing their duties as Directors or non-voting liaisons.

7. As used in this Section 22, the following terms shall have the following meanings:

a. An "Independent Valuation Expert" means a person retained by ICANN to value compensation arrangements that: (i) holds itself out to the public as a compensation consultant; (ii) performs valuations regarding compensation arrangements on a regular basis, with a majority of its compensation consulting services performed for persons other than ICANN; (iii) is qualified to make valuations of the type of services involved in any engagement by and for ICANN; (iv) issues to ICANN a Reasoned Written Opinion regarding a particular compensation arrangement; and (v) includes in its Reasoned Written Opinion a certification that it meets the requirements set forth in (i) through (iv) of this definition.

b. A "Reasoned Written Opinion" means a written opinion of a valuation expert who meets the requirements of subparagraph 7(a) (i) through (iv) of this Section. To be reasoned, the opinion must be based upon a full disclosure by ICANN to the valuation expert of the factual situation regarding the compensation arrangement that is the subject of the opinion, the opinion must articulate the applicable valuation standards relevant in valuing such compensation arrangement, and the opinion must apply those standards to such
compensation arrangement, and the opinion must arrive at a conclusion regarding whether the compensation arrangement is within the range of Reasonable Compensation for the services covered by the arrangement. A written opinion is reasoned even though it reaches a conclusion that is subsequently determined to be incorrect so long as the opinion addresses itself to the facts and the applicable standards. However, a written opinion is not reasoned if it does nothing more than recite the facts and express a conclusion.

c. "Reasonable Compensation" shall have the meaning set forth in §53.4958-4(b)(1)(ii) of the Regulations issued under §4958 of the Code.

8. Each of the non-voting liaisons to the Board, with the exception of the Governmental Advisory Committee liaison, shall be entitled to receive compensation for his/her services as a non-voting liaison. If the Board determines to offer a compensation arrangement to one or more non-voting liaisons, the Board shall approve that arrangement by a required three-fourths (3/4) vote.

Section 23. PRESUMPTION OF ASSENT

A Director present at a Board meeting at which action on any corporate matter is taken shall be presumed to have assented to the action taken unless his or her dissent or abstention is entered in the minutes of the meeting, or unless such Director files a written dissent or abstention to such action with the person acting as the secretary of the meeting before the adjournment thereof, or forwards such dissent or abstention by registered mail to the Secretary of ICANN immediately after the adjournment of the meeting. Such right to dissent or abstain shall not apply to a Director who voted in favor of such action.

ARTICLE VII: NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Section 1. DESCRIPTION

There shall be a Nominating Committee of ICANN, responsible for the selection of all ICANN Directors except the President and those Directors selected by ICANN's Supporting Organizations, and for such other selections as are set forth in these Bylaws.

Section 2. COMPOSITION

The Nominating Committee shall be composed of the following persons:
1. A non-voting Chair, appointed by the ICANN Board;

2. A non-voting Chair-Elect, appointed by the ICANN Board as a non-voting advisor;

3. A non-voting liaison appointed by the ICANN Root Server System Advisory Committee established by Article XI of these Bylaws;

4. A non-voting liaison appointed by the ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee established by Article XI of these Bylaws;

5. A non-voting liaison appointed by the Governmental Advisory Committee;

6. Subject to the provisions of the Transition Article of these Bylaws, five voting delegates selected by the At-Large Advisory Committee established by Article XI of these Bylaws;

7. Voting delegates to the Nominating Committee shall be selected from the Generic Names Supporting Organization, established by Article X of these Bylaws, as follows:
   a. One delegate from the Registries Stakeholder Group;
   b. One delegate from the Registrars Stakeholder Group;
   c. Two delegates from the Business Constituency, one representing small business users and one representing large business users;
   d. One delegate from the Internet Service Providers Constituency;
   e. One delegate from the Intellectual Property Constituency; and
   f. One delegate from consumer and civil society groups, selected by the Non-Commercial Users Constituency.

8. One voting delegate each selected by the following entities:
   a. The Council of the Country Code Names Supporting Organization established by Article IX of these Bylaws;
   b. The Council of the Address Supporting Organization established by Article VIII of these Bylaws; and
   c. The Internet Engineering Task Force.

9. A non-voting Associate Chair, who may be appointed by the Chair, at his or her sole discretion, to serve during all or part of the term of the Chair. The Associate Chair may not be a person who is otherwise a member of the same Nominating Committee. The Associate Chair shall assist the Chair in
carrying out the duties of the Chair, but shall not serve, temporarily or otherwise, in the place of the Chair.

Section 3. TERMS

Subject to the provisions of the Transition Article of these Bylaws:

1. Each voting delegate shall serve a one-year term. A delegate may serve at most two successive one-year terms, after which at least two years must elapse before the individual is eligible to serve another term.

2. The regular term of each voting delegate shall begin at the conclusion of an ICANN annual meeting and shall end at the conclusion of the immediately following ICANN annual meeting.

3. Non-voting liaisons shall serve during the term designated by the entity that appoints them. The Chair, the Chair-Elect, and any Associate Chair shall serve as such until the conclusion of the next ICANN annual meeting.

4. It is anticipated that upon the conclusion of the term of the Chair-Elect, the Chair-Elect will be appointed by the Board to the position of Chair. However, the Board retains the discretion to appoint any other person to the position of Chair. At the time of appointing a Chair-Elect, if the Board determines that the person identified to serve as Chair shall be appointed as Chair for a successive term, the Chair-Elect position shall remain vacant for the term designated by the Board.

5. Vacancies in the positions of delegate, non-voting liaison, Chair or Chair-Elect shall be filled by the entity entitled to select the delegate, non-voting liaison, Chair or Chair-Elect involved. For any term that the Chair-Elect position is vacant pursuant to paragraph 4 of this Article, or until any other vacancy in the position of Chair-Elect can be filled, a non-voting advisor to the Chair may be appointed by the Board from among persons with prior service on the Board or a Nominating Committee, including the immediately previous Chair of the Nominating Committee. A vacancy in the position of Associate Chair may be filled by the Chair in accordance with the criteria established by Section 2(9) of this Article.

6. The existence of any vacancies shall not affect the obligation of the Nominating Committee to carry out the responsibilities assigned to it in these Bylaws.

Section 4. CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF NOMINATING COMMITTEE DELEGATES
Delegates to the ICANN Nominating Committee shall be:

1. Accomplished persons of integrity, objectivity, and intelligence, with reputations for sound judgment and open minds, and with experience and competence with collegial large group decision-making;

2. Persons with wide contacts, broad experience in the Internet community, and a commitment to the success of ICANN;

3. Persons whom the selecting body is confident will consult widely and accept input in carrying out their responsibilities;

4. Persons who are neutral and objective, without any fixed personal commitments to particular individuals, organizations, or commercial objectives in carrying out their Nominating Committee responsibilities;

5. Persons with an understanding of ICANN's mission and the potential impact of ICANN's activities on the broader Internet community who are willing to serve as volunteers, without compensation other than the reimbursement of certain expenses; and

6. Persons who are able to work and communicate in written and spoken English.

Section 5. DIVERSITY

In carrying out its responsibilities to select members of the ICANN Board (and selections to any other ICANN bodies as the Nominating Committee is responsible for under these Bylaws), the Nominating Committee shall take into account the continuing membership of the ICANN Board (and such other bodies), and seek to ensure that the persons selected to fill vacancies on the ICANN Board (and each such other body) shall, to the extent feasible and consistent with the other criteria required to be applied by Section 4 of this Article, make selections guided by Core Value 4 in Article I, Section 2.

Section 6. ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL SUPPORT

ICANN shall provide administrative and operational support necessary for the Nominating Committee to carry out its responsibilities.

Section 7. PROCEDURES

The Nominating Committee shall adopt such operating procedures as it deems necessary, which shall be published on the Website.

Section 8. INELIGIBILITY FOR SELECTION BY NOMINATING COMMITTEE
No person who serves on the Nominating Committee in any capacity shall be eligible for selection by any means to any position on the Board or any other ICANN body having one or more membership positions that the Nominating Committee is responsible for filling, until the conclusion of an ICANN annual meeting that coincides with, or is after, the conclusion of that person’s service on the Nominating Committee.

Section 9. INELIGIBILITY FOR SERVICE ON NOMINATING COMMITTEE

No person who is an employee of or paid consultant to ICANN (including the Ombudsman) shall simultaneously serve in any of the Nominating Committee positions described in Section 2 of this Article.

ARTICLE VIII: ADDRESS SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

Section 1. DESCRIPTION

1. The Address Supporting Organization (ASO) shall advise the Board with respect to policy issues relating to the operation, assignment, and management of Internet addresses.

2. The ASO shall be the entity established by the Memorandum of Understanding entered on 21 October 2004 between ICANN and the Number Resource Organization (NRO), an organization of the existing regional Internet registries (RIRs).

Section 2. ADDRESS COUNCIL

1. The ASO shall have an Address Council, consisting of the members of the NRO Number Council.

2. The Address Council shall select Directors to those seats on the Board designated to be filled by the ASO.

ARTICLE IX: COUNTRY-CODE NAMES SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

Section 1. DESCRIPTION

There shall be a policy-development body known as the Country-Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO), which shall be responsible for:

1. developing and recommending to the Board global policies relating to country-code top-level domains;
2. Nurturing consensus across the ccNSO’s community, including the name-related activities of ccTLDs; and

3. Coordinating with other ICANN Supporting Organizations, committees, and constituencies under ICANN.

Policies that apply to ccNSO members by virtue of their membership are only those policies developed according to section 4.10 and 4.11 of this Article. However, the ccNSO may also engage in other activities authorized by its members. Adherence to the results of these activities will be voluntary and such activities may include: seeking to develop voluntary best practices for ccTLD managers, assisting in skills building within the global community of ccTLD managers, and enhancing operational and technical cooperation among ccTLD managers.

Section 2. ORGANIZATION

The ccNSO shall consist of (i) ccTLD managers that have agreed in writing to be members of the ccNSO (see Section 4(2) of this Article) and (ii) a ccNSO Council responsible for managing the policy-development process of the ccNSO.

Section 3. ccNSO COUNCIL

1. The ccNSO Council shall consist of (a) three ccNSO Council members selected by the ccNSO members within each of ICANN’s Geographic Regions in the manner described in Section 4(7) through (9) of this Article; (b) three ccNSO Council members selected by the ICANN Nominating Committee; (c) liaisons as described in paragraph 2 of this Section; and (iv) observers as described in paragraph 3 of this Section.

2. There shall also be one liaison to the ccNSO Council from each of the following organizations, to the extent they choose to appoint such a liaison: (a) the Governmental Advisory Committee; (b) the At-Large Advisory Committee; and (c) each of the Regional Organizations described in Section 5 of this Article. These liaisons shall not be members of or entitled to vote on the ccNSO Council, but otherwise shall be entitled to participate on equal footing with members of the ccNSO Council. Appointments of liaisons shall be made by providing written notice to the ICANN Secretary, with a notification copy to the ccNSO Council Chair, and shall be for the term designated by the appointing organization as stated in the written notice. The appointing organization may recall from office or replace its liaison at any time by providing written notice of the recall or replacement to the ICANN Secretary, with a notification copy to the ccNSO Council Chair.
3. The ccNSO Council may agree with the Council of any other ICANN Supporting Organization to exchange observers. Such observers shall not be members of or entitled to vote on the ccNSO Council, but otherwise shall be entitled to participate on equal footing with members of the ccNSO Council. The appointing Council may designate its observer (or revoke or change the designation of its observer) on the ccNSO Council at any time by providing written notice to the ICANN Secretary, with a notification copy to the ccNSO Council Chair.

4. Subject to the provisions of the Transition Article of these Bylaws: (a) the regular term of each ccNSO Council member shall begin at the conclusion of an ICANN annual meeting and shall end at the conclusion of the third ICANN annual meeting thereafter; (b) the regular terms of the three ccNSO Council members selected by the ccNSO members within each ICANN Geographic Region shall be staggered so that one member's term begins in a year divisible by three, a second member's term begins in the first year following a year divisible by three, and the third member's term begins in the second year following a year divisible by three; and (c) the regular terms of the three ccNSO Council members selected by the Nominating Committee shall be staggered in the same manner. Each ccNSO Council member shall hold office during his or her regular term and until a successor has been selected and qualified or until that member resigns or is removed in accordance with these Bylaws.

5. A ccNSO Council member may resign at any time by giving written notice to the ICANN Secretary, with a notification copy to the ccNSO Council Chair.

6. ccNSO Council members may be removed for not attending three consecutive meetings of the ccNSO Council without sufficient cause or for grossly inappropriate behavior, both as determined by at least a 66% vote of all of the members of the ccNSO Council.

7. A vacancy on the ccNSO Council shall be deemed to exist in the case of the death, resignation, or removal of any ccNSO Council member. Vacancies in the positions of the three members selected by the Nominating Committee shall be filled for the unexpired term involved by the Nominating Committee giving the ICANN Secretary written notice of its selection, with a notification copy to the ccNSO Council Chair. Vacancies in the positions of the ccNSO Council members selected by ccNSO members shall be filled for the unexpired term by the procedure described in Section 4(7) through (9) of this Article.

8. The role of the ccNSO Council is to administer and coordinate the affairs of the ccNSO (including coordinating meetings, including an annual meeting,
of ccNSO members as described in Section 4(6) of this Article) and to manage the development of policy recommendations in accordance with Section 6 of this Article. The ccNSO Council shall also undertake such other roles as the members of the ccNSO shall decide from time to time.

9. The ccNSO Council shall make selections to fill Seats 11 and 12 on the Board by written ballot or by action at a meeting; any such selection must have affirmative votes of a majority of all the members of the ccNSO Council then in office. Notification of the ccNSO Council's selections shall be given by the ccNSO Council Chair in writing to the ICANN Secretary, consistent with Article VI, Sections 8(4) and 12(1).

10. The ccNSO Council shall select from among its members the ccNSO Council Chair and such Vice Chair(s) as it deems appropriate. Selections of the ccNSO Council Chair and Vice Chair(s) shall be by written ballot or by action at a meeting; any such selection must have affirmative votes of a majority of all the members of the ccNSO Council then in office. The term of office of the ccNSO Council Chair and any Vice Chair(s) shall be as specified by the ccNSO Council at or before the time the selection is made. The ccNSO Council Chair or any Vice Chair(s) may be recalled from office by the same procedure as used for selection.

11. The ccNSO Council, subject to direction by the ccNSO members, shall adopt such rules and procedures for the ccNSO as it deems necessary, provided they are consistent with these Bylaws. Rules for ccNSO membership and operating procedures adopted by the ccNSO Council shall be published on the Website.

12. Except as provided by paragraphs 9 and 10 of this Section, the ccNSO Council shall act at meetings. The ccNSO Council shall meet regularly on a schedule it determines, but not fewer than four times each calendar year. At the discretion of the ccNSO Council, meetings may be held in person or by other means, provided that all ccNSO Council members are permitted to participate by at least one means described in paragraph 14 of this Section. Except where determined by a majority vote of the members of the ccNSO Council present that a closed session is appropriate, physical meetings shall be open to attendance by all interested persons. To the extent practicable, ccNSO Council meetings should be held in conjunction with meetings of the Board, or of one or more of ICANN's other Supporting Organizations.

13. Notice of time and place (and information about means of participation other than personal attendance) of all meetings of the ccNSO Council shall be provided to each ccNSO Council member, liaison, and observer by e-mail, telephone, facsimile, or a paper notice delivered personally or by
postal mail. In case the notice is sent by postal mail, it shall be sent at least 21 days before the day of the meeting. In case the notice is delivered personally or by telephone, facsimile, or e-mail it shall be provided at least seven days before the day of the meeting. At least seven days in advance of each ccNSO Council meeting (or if not practicable, as far in advance as is practicable), a notice of such meeting and, to the extent known, an agenda for the meeting shall be posted.

14. Members of the ccNSO Council may participate in a meeting of the ccNSO Council through personal attendance or use of electronic communication (such as telephone or video conference), provided that (a) all ccNSO Council members participating in the meeting can speak to and hear one another, (b) all ccNSO Council members participating in the meeting are provided the means of fully participating in all matters before the ccNSO Council, and (c) there is a reasonable means of verifying the identity of ccNSO Council members participating in the meeting and their votes. A majority of the ccNSO Council members (i.e. those entitled to vote) then in office shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, and actions by a majority vote of the ccNSO Council members present at any meeting at which there is a quorum shall be actions of the ccNSO Council, unless otherwise provided in these Bylaws. The ccNSO Council shall transmit minutes of its meetings to the ICANN Secretary, who shall cause those minutes to be posted to the Website as soon as practicable following the meeting, and no later than 21 days following the meeting.

Section 4. MEMBERSHIP

1. The ccNSO shall have a membership consisting of ccTLD managers. Any ccTLD manager that meets the membership qualifications stated in paragraph 2 of this Section shall be entitled to be members of the ccNSO. For purposes of this Article, a ccTLD manager is the organization or entity responsible for managing an ISO 3166 country-code top-level domain and referred to in the IANA database under the current heading of "Sponsoring Organization", or under any later variant, for that country-code top-level domain.

2. Any ccTLD manager may become a ccNSO member by submitting an application to a person designated by the ccNSO Council to receive applications. Subject to the provisions of the Transition Article of these Bylaws, the application shall be in writing in a form designated by the ccNSO Council. The application shall include the ccTLD manager's recognition of the role of the ccNSO within the ICANN structure as well as the ccTLD manager's agreement, for the duration of its membership in the ccNSO, (a) to adhere to rules of the ccNSO, including membership rules,
(b) to abide by policies developed and recommended by the ccNSO and adopted by the Board in the manner described by paragraphs 10 and 11 of this Section, and (c) to pay ccNSO membership fees established by the ccNSO Council under Section 7(3) of this Article. A ccNSO member may resign from membership at any time by giving written notice to a person designated by the ccNSO Council to receive notices of resignation. Upon resignation the ccTLD manager ceases to agree to (a) adhere to rules of the ccNSO, including membership rules, (b) to abide by policies developed and recommended by the ccNSO and adopted by the Board in the manner described by paragraphs 10 and 11 of this Section, and (c) to pay ccNSO membership fees established by the ccNSO Council under Section 7(3) of this Article. In the absence of designation by the ccNSO Council of a person to receive applications and notices of resignation, they shall be sent to the ICANN Secretary, who shall notify the ccNSO Council of receipt of any such applications and notices.

3. Neither membership in the ccNSO nor membership in any Regional Organization described in Section 5 of this Article shall be a condition for access to or registration in the IANA database. Any individual relationship a ccTLD manager has with ICANN or the ccTLD manager's receipt of IANA services is not in any way contingent upon membership in the ccNSO.

4. The Geographic Regions of ccTLDs shall be as described in Article VI, Section 5 of these Bylaws. For purposes of this Article, managers of ccTLDs within a Geographic Region that are members of the ccNSO are referred to as ccNSO members "within" the Geographic Region, regardless of the physical location of the ccTLD manager. In cases where the Geographic Region of a ccNSO member is unclear, the ccTLD member should self-select according to procedures adopted by the ccNSO Council.

5. Each ccTLD manager may designate in writing a person, organization, or entity to represent the ccTLD manager. In the absence of such a designation, the ccTLD manager shall be represented by the person, organization, or entity listed as the administrative contact in the IANA database.

6. There shall be an annual meeting of ccNSO members, which shall be coordinated by the ccNSO Council. Annual meetings should be open for all to attend, and a reasonable opportunity shall be provided for ccTLD managers that are not members of the ccNSO as well as other non-members of the ccNSO to address the meeting. To the extent practicable, annual meetings of the ccNSO members shall be held in person and should be held in conjunction with meetings of the Board, or of one or more of ICANN's other Supporting Organizations.
7. The ccNSO Council members selected by the ccNSO members from each Geographic Region (see Section 3(1)(a) of this Article) shall be selected through nomination, and if necessary election, by the ccNSO members within that Geographic Region. At least 90 days before the end of the regular term of any ccNSO-member-selected member of the ccNSO Council, or upon the occurrence of a vacancy in the seat of such a ccNSO Council member, the ccNSO Council shall establish a nomination and election schedule, which shall be sent to all ccNSO members within the Geographic Region and posted on the Website.

8. Any ccNSO member may nominate an individual to serve as a ccNSO Council member representing the ccNSO member’s Geographic Region. Nominations must be seconded by another ccNSO member from the same Geographic Region. By accepting their nomination, individuals nominated to the ccNSO Council agree to support the policies committed to by ccNSO members.

9. If at the close of nominations there are no more candidates nominated (with seconds and acceptances) in a particular Geographic Region than there are seats on the ccNSO Council available for that Geographic Region, then the nominated candidates shall be selected to serve on the ccNSO Council. Otherwise, an election by written ballot (which may be by e-mail) shall be held to select the ccNSO Council members from among those nominated (with seconds and acceptances), with ccNSO members from the Geographic Region being entitled to vote in the election through their designated representatives. In such an election, a majority of all ccNSO members in the Geographic Region entitled to vote shall constitute a quorum, and the selected candidate must receive the votes of a majority of those cast by ccNSO members within the Geographic Region. The ccNSO Council Chair shall provide the ICANN Secretary prompt written notice of the selection of ccNSO Council members under this paragraph.

10. Subject to clause 4(11), ICANN policies shall apply to ccNSO members by virtue of their membership to the extent, and only to the extent, that the policies (a) only address issues that are within scope of the ccNSO according to Article IX, Section 6 and Annex C; (b) have been developed through the ccPDP as described in Section 6 of this Article, and (c) have been recommended as such by the ccNSO to the Board, and (d) are adopted by the Board as policies, provided that such policies do not conflict with the law applicable to the ccTLD manager which shall, at all times, remain paramount. In addition, such policies shall apply to ICANN in its activities concerning ccTLDs.

11. A ccNSO member shall not be bound if it provides a declaration to the ccNSO Council stating that (a) implementation of the policy would require
the member to breach custom, religion, or public policy (not embodied in the applicable law described in paragraph 10 of this Section), and (b) failure to implement the policy would not impair DNS operations or interoperability, giving detailed reasons supporting its statements. After investigation, the ccNSO Council will provide a response to the ccNSO member's declaration. If there is a ccNSO Council consensus disagreeing with the declaration, which may be demonstrated by a vote of 14 or more members of the ccNSO Council, the response shall state the ccNSO Council's disagreement with the declaration and the reasons for disagreement. Otherwise, the response shall state the ccNSO Council's agreement with the declaration. If the ccNSO Council disagrees, the ccNSO Council shall review the situation after a six-month period. At the end of that period, the ccNSO Council shall make findings as to (a) whether the ccNSO members' implementation of the policy would require the member to breach custom, religion, or public policy (not embodied in the applicable law described in paragraph 10 of this Section) and (b) whether failure to implement the policy would impair DNS operations or interoperability. In making any findings disagreeing with the declaration, the ccNSO Council shall proceed by consensus, which may be demonstrated by a vote of 14 or more members of the ccNSO Council.

Section 5. REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

The ccNSO Council may designate a Regional Organization for each ICANN Geographic Region, provided that the Regional Organization is open to full membership by all ccNSO members within the Geographic Region. Decisions to designate or de-designate a Regional Organization shall require a 66% vote of all of the members of the ccNSO Council and shall be subject to review according to procedures established by the Board.

Section 6. ccNSO POLICY-DEVELOPMENT PROCESS AND SCOPE

1. The scope of the ccNSO's policy-development role shall be as stated in Annex C to these Bylaws; any modifications to the scope shall be recommended to the Board by the ccNSO by use of the procedures of the ccPDP, and shall be subject to approval by the Board.

2. In developing global policies within the scope of the ccNSO and recommending them to the Board, the ccNSO shall follow the ccNSO Policy-Development Process (ccPDP). The ccPDP shall be as stated in Annex B to these Bylaws; modifications shall be recommended to the Board by the ccNSO by use of the procedures of the ccPDP, and shall be subject to approval by the Board.
Section 7. STAFF SUPPORT AND FUNDING

1. Upon request of the ccNSO Council, a member of the ICANN staff may be assigned to support the ccNSO and shall be designated as the ccNSO Staff Manager. Alternatively, the ccNSO Council may designate, at ccNSO expense, another person to serve as ccNSO Staff Manager. The work of the ccNSO Staff Manager on substantive matters shall be assigned by the Chair of the ccNSO Council, and may include the duties of ccPDP Issue Manager.

2. Upon request of the ccNSO Council, ICANN shall provide administrative and operational support necessary for the ccNSO to carry out its responsibilities. Such support shall not include an obligation for ICANN to fund travel expenses incurred by ccNSO participants for travel to any meeting of the ccNSO or for any other purpose. The ccNSO Council may make provision, at ccNSO expense, for administrative and operational support in addition or as an alternative to support provided by ICANN.

3. The ccNSO Council shall establish fees to be paid by ccNSO members to defray ccNSO expenses as described in paragraphs 1 and 2 of this Section, as approved by the ccNSO members.

4. Written notices given to the ICANN Secretary under this Article shall be permanently retained, and shall be made available for review by the ccNSO Council on request. The ICANN Secretary shall also maintain the roll of members of the ccNSO, which shall include the name of each ccTLD manager’s designated representative, and which shall be posted on the Website.

ARTICLE X: GENERIC NAMES SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

Section 1. DESCRIPTION

There shall be a policy-development body known as the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO), which shall be responsible for developing and recommending to the ICANN Board substantive policies relating to generic top-level domains.

Section 2. ORGANIZATION

The GNSO shall consist of:

i. A number of Constituencies, where applicable, organized within the Stakeholder Groups as described in Section 5 of this Article;
ii. Four Stakeholder Groups organized within Houses as described in Section 5 of this Article;

iii. Two Houses within the GNSO Council as described in Section 3(8) of this Article; and

iv. a GNSO Council responsible for managing the policy development process of the GNSO, as described in Section 3 of this Article.

Except as otherwise defined in these Bylaws, the four Stakeholder Groups and the Constituencies will be responsible for defining their own charters with the approval of their members and of the ICANN Board of Directors.

Section 3. GNSO COUNCIL

1. Subject to the provisions of Transition Article XX, Section 5 of these Bylaws and as described in Section 5 of Article X, the GNSO Council shall consist of:

   a. three representatives selected from the Registries Stakeholder Group;

   b. three representatives selected from the Registrars Stakeholder Group;

   c. six representatives selected from the Commercial Stakeholder Group;

   d. six representatives selected from the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group; and

   e. three representatives selected by the ICANN Nominating Committee, one of which shall be non-voting, but otherwise entitled to participate on equal footing with other members of the GNSO Council including, e.g. the making and seconding of motions and of serving as Chair if elected. One Nominating Committee Appointee voting representative shall be assigned to each House (as described in Section 3(8) of this Article) by the Nominating Committee.

No individual representative may hold more than one seat on the GNSO Council at the same time.

Stakeholder Groups should, in their charters, ensure their representation on the GNSO Council is as diverse as possible and practicable, including
considerations of geography, GNSO Constituency, sector, ability and gender.

There may also be liaisons to the GNSO Council from other ICANN Supporting Organizations and/or Advisory Committees, from time to time. The appointing organization shall designate, revoke, or change its liaison on the GNSO Council by providing written notice to the Chair of the GNSO Council and to the ICANN Secretary. Liaisons shall not be members of or entitled to vote, to make or second motions, or to serve as an officer on the GNSO Council, but otherwise liaisons shall be entitled to participate on equal footing with members of the GNSO Council.

2. Subject to the provisions of the Transition Article XX, and Section 5 of these Bylaws, the regular term of each GNSO Council member shall begin at the conclusion of an ICANN annual meeting and shall end at the conclusion of the second ICANN annual meeting thereafter. The regular term of two representatives selected from Stakeholder Groups with three Council seats shall begin in even-numbered years and the regular term of the other representative selected from that Stakeholder Group shall begin in odd-numbered years. The regular term of three representatives selected from Stakeholder Groups with six Council seats shall begin in even-numbered years and the regular term of the other three representatives selected from that Stakeholder Group shall begin in odd-numbered years. The regular term of one of the three members selected by the Nominating Committee shall begin in even-numbered years and the regular term of the other two of the three members selected by the Nominating Committee shall begin in odd-numbered years. Each GNSO Council member shall hold office during his or her regular term and until a successor has been selected and qualified or until that member resigns or is removed in accordance with these Bylaws.

Except in a "special circumstance," such as, but not limited to, meeting geographic or other diversity requirements defined in the Stakeholder Group charters, where no alternative representative is available to serve, no Council member may be selected to serve more than two consecutive terms, in such a special circumstance a Council member may serve one additional term. For these purposes, a person selected to fill a vacancy in a term shall not be deemed to have served that term. A former Council member who has served two consecutive terms must remain out of office for one full term prior to serving any subsequent term as Council member. A "special circumstance" is defined in the GNSO Operating Procedures.

3. A vacancy on the GNSO Council shall be deemed to exist in the case of the death, resignation, or removal of any member. Vacancies shall be filled
for the unexpired term by the appropriate Nominating Committee or Stakeholder Group that selected the member holding the position before the vacancy occurred by giving the GNSO Secretariat written notice of its selection. Procedures for handling Stakeholder Group-appointed GNSO Council member vacancies, resignations, and removals are prescribed in the applicable Stakeholder Group Charter.

A GNSO Council member selected by the Nominating Committee may be removed for cause: i) stated by a three-fourths (3/4) vote of all members of the applicable House to which the Nominating Committee appointee is assigned; or ii) stated by a three-fourths (3/4) vote of all members of each House in the case of the non-voting Nominating Committee appointee (see Section 3(8) of this Article). Such removal shall be subject to reversal by the ICANN Board on appeal by the affected GNSO Council member.

4. The GNSO Council is responsible for managing the policy development process of the GNSO. It shall adopt such procedures (the "GNSO Operating Procedures") as it sees fit to carry out that responsibility, provided that such procedures are approved by a majority vote of each House. The GNSO Operating Procedures shall be effective upon the expiration of a twenty-one (21) day public comment period, and shall be subject to Board oversight and review. Until any modifications are recommended by the GNSO Council, the applicable procedures shall be as set forth in Section 6 of this Article.

5. No more than one officer, director or employee of any particular corporation or other organization (including its subsidiaries and affiliates) shall serve on the GNSO Council at any given time.

6. The GNSO shall make selections to fill Seats 13 and 14 on the ICANN Board by written ballot or by action at a meeting. Each of the two voting Houses of the GNSO, as described in Section 3(8) of this Article, shall make a selection to fill one of two ICANN Board seats, as outlined below; any such selection must have affirmative votes compromising sixty percent (60%) of all the respective voting House members:

   a. the Contracted Party House shall select a representative to fill Seat 13; and

   b. the Non-Contracted Party House shall select a representative to fill Seat 14

Election procedures are defined in the GNSO Operating Procedures.
Notification of the Board seat selections shall be given by the GNSO Chair in writing to the ICANN Secretary, consistent with Article VI, Sections 8(4) and 12(1).

7. The GNSO Council shall select the GNSO Chair for a term the GNSO Council specifies, but not longer than one year. Each House (as described in Section 3.8 of this Article) shall select a Vice-Chair, who will be a Vice-Chair of the whole of the GNSO Council, for a term the GNSO Council specifies, but not longer than one year. The procedures for selecting the Chair and any other officers are contained in the GNSO Operating Procedures. In the event that the GNSO Council has not elected a GNSO Chair by the end of the previous Chair's term, the Vice-Chairs will serve as Interim GNSO Co-Chairs until a successful election can be held.

8. Except as otherwise required in these Bylaws, for voting purposes, the GNSO Council (see Section 3(1) of this Article) shall be organized into a bicameral House structure as described below:

   a. the Contracted Parties House includes the Registries Stakeholder Group (three members), the Registrars Stakeholder Group (three members), and one voting member appointed by the ICANN Nominating Committee for a total of seven voting members; and

   b. the Non Contracted Parties House includes the Commercial Stakeholder Group (six members), the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (six members), and one voting member appointed by the ICANN Nominating Committee to that House for a total of thirteen voting members.

   Except as otherwise specified in these Bylaws, each member of a voting House is entitled to cast one vote in each separate matter before the GNSO Council.

9. Except as otherwise specified in these Bylaws, Annex A, Annex A-1 and Annex A-2 hereto, or the GNSO Operating Procedures, the default threshold to pass a GNSO Council motion or other voting action requires a simple majority vote of each House. The voting thresholds described below shall apply to the following GNSO actions:

   a. Create an Issues Report: requires an affirmative vote of more than one-fourth (1/4) vote of each House or majority of one House.

   b. Initiate a Policy Development Process ("PDP") Within Scope (as described in Annex A): requires an affirmative vote of more than one-third (1/3) of each House or more than two-thirds (2/3) of one
c. Initiate a PDP Not Within Scope: requires an affirmative vote of GNSO Supermajority.

d. Approve a PDP Team Charter for a PDP Within Scope: requires an affirmative vote of more than one-third (1/3) of each House or more than two-thirds (2/3) of one House.

e. Approve a PDP Team Charter for a PDP Not Within Scope: requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO Supermajority.

f. Changes to an Approved PDP Team Charter: For any PDP Team Charter approved under d. or e. above, the GNSO Council may approve an amendment to the Charter through a simple majority vote of each House.

g. Terminate a PDP: Once initiated, and prior to the publication of a Final Report, the GNSO Council may terminate a PDP only for significant cause, upon a motion that passes with a GNSO Supermajority Vote in favor of termination.

h. Approve a PDP Recommendation Without a GNSO Supermajority: requires an affirmative vote of a majority of each House and further requires that one GNSO Council member representative of at least 3 of the 4 Stakeholder Groups supports the Recommendation.

i. Approve a PDP Recommendation With a GNSO Supermajority: requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO Supermajority,

j. Approve a PDP Recommendation Imposing New Obligations on Certain Contracting Parties: where an ICANN contract provision specifies that "a two-thirds vote of the council" demonstrates the presence of a consensus, the GNSO Supermajority vote threshold will have to be met or exceeded.

k. Modification of Approved PDP Recommendation: Prior to Final Approval by the ICANN Board, an Approved PDP Recommendation may be modified or amended by the GNSO Council with a GNSO Supermajority vote.


m. Approve an EPDP Team Charter: requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO Supermajority.
n. Approval of EPDP recommendations: requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO Supermajority.

o. Approve an EPDP Recommendation Imposing New Obligations on Certain Contracting Parties: where an ICANN contract provision specifies that "a two-thirds vote of the council" demonstrates the presence of a consensus, the GNSO Supermajority vote threshold will have to be met or exceeded.

p. Initiation of a GNSO Guidance Process (GGP): requires an affirmative vote of more than one-third (1/3) of each House or more than two-thirds (2/3) of one House.

q. Rejection of initiation of a GGP requested by the ICANN Board: requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO Supermajority.

r. Approval of GGP recommendations: requires an affirmative vote of a GNSO Supermajority.

s. A "GNSO Supermajority" shall mean: (a) two-thirds (2/3) of the Council members of each House, or (b) three-fourths (3/4) of one House and a majority of the other House."

Section 4. STAFF SUPPORT AND FUNDING

1. A member of the ICANN staff shall be assigned to support the GNSO, whose work on substantive matters shall be assigned by the Chair of the GNSO Council, and shall be designated as the GNSO Staff Manager (Staff Manager).

2. ICANN shall provide administrative and operational support necessary for the GNSO to carry out its responsibilities. Such support shall not include an obligation for ICANN to fund travel expenses incurred by GNSO participants for travel to any meeting of the GNSO or for any other purpose. ICANN may, at its discretion, fund travel expenses for GNSO participants under any travel support procedures or guidelines that it may adopt from time to time.

Section 5. STAKEHOLDER GROUPS

1. The following Stakeholder Groups are hereby recognized as representative of a specific group of one or more Constituencies or interest groups and subject to the provisions of the Transition Article XX, Section 5 of these Bylaws:

   a. Registries Stakeholder Group representing all gTLD registries under
contract to ICANN;

b. Registrars Stakeholder Group representing all registrars accredited by and under contract to ICANN;

c. Commercial Stakeholder Group representing the full range of large and small commercial entities of the Internet; and

d. Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group representing the full range of non-commercial entities of the Internet.

2. Each Stakeholder Group is assigned a specific number of Council seats in accordance with Section 3(1) of this Article.

3. Each Stakeholder Group identified in paragraph 1 of this Section and each of its associated Constituencies, where applicable, shall maintain recognition with the ICANN Board. Recognition is granted by the Board based upon the extent to which, in fact, the entity represents the global interests of the stakeholder communities it purports to represent and operates to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness. Stakeholder Group and Constituency Charters may be reviewed periodically as prescribed by the Board.

4. Any group of individuals or entities may petition the Board for recognition as a new or separate Constituency in the Non-Contracted Parties House. Any such petition shall contain:

   a. A detailed explanation of why the addition of such a Constituency will improve the ability of the GNSO to carry out its policy-development responsibilities;

   b. A detailed explanation of why the proposed new Constituency adequately represents, on a global basis, the stakeholders it seeks to represent;

   c. A recommendation for organizational placement within a particular Stakeholder Group; and

   d. A proposed charter that adheres to the principles and procedures contained in these Bylaws.

Any petition for the recognition of a new Constituency and the associated charter shall be posted for public comment.

5. The Board may create new Constituencies as described in Section 5(3) in
response to such a petition, or on its own motion, if the Board determines that such action would serve the purposes of ICANN. In the event the Board is considering acting on its own motion it shall post a detailed explanation of why such action is necessary or desirable, set a reasonable time for public comment, and not make a final decision on whether to create such new Constituency until after reviewing all comments received. Whenever the Board posts a petition or recommendation for a new Constituency for public comment, the Board shall notify the GNSO Council and the appropriate Stakeholder Group affected and shall consider any response to that notification prior to taking action.

Section 6. POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

The policy-development procedures to be followed by the GNSO shall be as stated in Annex A to these Bylaws. These procedures may be supplemented or revised in the manner stated in Section 3(4) of this Article.

ARTICLE XI: ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Section 1. GENERAL

The Board may create one or more Advisory Committees in addition to those set forth in this Article. Advisory Committee membership may consist of Directors only, Directors and non-directors, or non-directors only, and may also include non-voting or alternate members. Advisory Committees shall have no legal authority to act for ICANN, but shall report their findings and recommendations to the Board.

Section 2. SPECIFIC ADVISORY COMMITTEES

There shall be at least the following Advisory Committees:

1. Governmental Advisory Committee
   a. The Governmental Advisory Committee should 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.
   b. Membership in the Governmental Advisory Committee shall be open to all national governments. Membership shall also be open to Distinct Economies as recognized in international fora, and multinational governmental organizations and treaty organizations,
on the invitation of the Governmental Advisory Committee through its Chair.

c. The Governmental Advisory Committee may adopt its own charter and internal operating principles or procedures to guide its operations, to be published on the Website.

d. The chair of the Governmental Advisory Committee shall be elected by the members of the Governmental Advisory Committee pursuant to procedures adopted by such members.

e. Each member of the Governmental Advisory Committee shall appoint one accredited representative to the Committee. The accredited representative of a member must hold a formal official position with the member's public administration. The term "official" includes a holder of an elected governmental office, or a person who is employed by such government, public authority, or multinational governmental or treaty organization and whose primary function with such government, public authority, or organization is to develop or influence governmental or public policies.

f. The Governmental Advisory Committee shall annually appoint one non-voting liaison to the ICANN Board of Directors, without limitation on reappointment, and shall annually appoint one non-voting liaison to the ICANN Nominating Committee.

g. The Governmental Advisory Committee may designate a non-voting liaison to each of the Supporting Organization Councils and Advisory Committees, to the extent the Governmental Advisory Committee deems it appropriate and useful to do so.

h. The Board shall notify the Chair of the Governmental Advisory Committee in a timely manner of any proposal raising public policy issues on which it or any of ICANN's supporting organizations or advisory committees seeks public comment, and shall take duly into account any timely response to that notification prior to taking action.

i. The Governmental Advisory Committee may put issues to the Board directly, either by way of comment or prior advice, or by way of specifically recommending action or new policy development or revision to existing policies.

j. 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.

k. If no such solution can be found, the ICANN Board will state in its final decision the reasons why the Governmental Advisory Committee 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.

2. Security and Stability Advisory Committee

a. The role of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee ("SSAC") is to advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the security and integrity of the Internet's naming and address allocation systems. It shall have the following responsibilities:

1. To communicate on security matters with the Internet technical community and the operators and managers of critical DNS infrastructure services, to include the root name server operator community, the top-level domain registries and registrars, the operators of the reverse delegation trees such as in-addr.arpa and ip6.arpa, and others as events and developments dictate. The Committee shall gather and articulate requirements to offer to those engaged in technical revision of the protocols related to DNS and address allocation and those engaged in operations planning.

2. To engage in ongoing threat assessment and risk analysis of the Internet naming and address allocation services to assess where the principal threats to stability and security lie, and to advise the ICANN community accordingly. The Committee shall recommend any necessary audit activity to assess the current status of DNS and address allocation security in relation to identified risks and threats.

3. To communicate with those who have direct responsibility for Internet naming and address allocation security matters (IETF, RSSAC, RIRs, name registries, etc.), to ensure that its advice on security risks, issues, and priorities is properly
synchronized with existing standardization, deployment, operational, and coordination activities. The Committee shall monitor these activities and inform the ICANN community and Board on their progress, as appropriate.

4. To report periodically to the Board on its activities.

5. To make policy recommendations to the ICANN community and Board.

b. The SSAC’s chair and members shall be appointed by the Board. SSAC membership appointment shall be for a three-year term, commencing on 1 January and ending the second year thereafter on 31 December. The chair and members may be re-appointed, and there are no limits to the number of terms the chair or members may serve. The SSAC chair may provide recommendations to the Board regarding appointments to the SSAC. The SSAC chair shall stagger appointment recommendations so that approximately one-third (1/3) of the membership of the SSAC is considered for appointment or re-appointment each year. The Board shall also have the power to remove SSAC appointees as recommended by or in consultation with the SSAC. (Note: The first full term under this paragraph shall commence on 1 January 2011 and end on 31 December 2013. Prior to 1 January 2011, the SSAC shall be comprised as stated in the Bylaws as amended 25 June 2010, and the SSAC chair shall recommend the re-appointment of all current SSAC members to full or partial terms as appropriate to implement the provisions of this paragraph.)

c. The SSAC shall annually appoint a non-voting liaison to the ICANN Board according to Section 9 of Article VI.

3. Root Server System Advisory Committee

a. The role of the Root Server System Advisory Committee ("RSSAC") is to advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the operation, administration, security, and integrity of the Internet's Root Server System. It shall have the following responsibilities:

1. Communicate on matters relating to the operation of the Root Servers and their multiple instances with the Internet technical community and the ICANN community. The Committee shall gather and articulate requirements to offer to those engaged in technical revision of the protocols and best common practices related to the operation of DNS servers.
2. Communicate on matters relating to the administration of the Root Zone with those who have direct responsibility for that administration. These matters include the processes and procedures for the production of the Root Zone File.


4. Respond to requests for information or opinions from the ICANN Board of Directors.

5. Report periodically to the Board on its activities.

6. Make policy recommendations to the ICANN community and Board.

b. The RSSAC shall be led by two co-chairs. The RSSAC’s chairs and members shall be appointed by the Board.

1. RSSAC membership appointment shall be for a three-year term, commencing on 1 January and ending the second year thereafter on 31 December. Members may be re-appointed, and there are no limits to the number of terms the members may serve. The RSSAC chairs shall provide recommendations to the Board regarding appointments to the RSSAC. If the board declines to appoint a person nominated by the RSSAC then it will provide the rationale for its decision. The RSSAC chairs shall stagger appointment recommendations so that approximately one-third (1/3) of the membership of the RSSAC is considered for appointment or re-appointment each year. The Board shall also have the power to remove RSSAC appointees as recommended by or in consultation with the RSSAC. (Note: The first term under this paragraph shall commence on 1 July 2013 and end on 31 December 2015, and shall be considered a full term for all purposes. All other full terms under this paragraph shall begin on 1 January of the corresponding year. Prior to 1 July 2013, the RSSAC shall be comprised as stated in the Bylaws as amended 16 March 2012, and the RSSAC chairs shall recommend the re-appointment of all current RSSAC members to full or partial terms as appropriate to implement the provisions of this paragraph.)
2. The RSSAC shall recommend the appointment of the chairs to the board following a nomination process that it devises and documents.

c. The RSSAC shall annually appoint a non-voting liaison to the ICANN Board according to Section 9 of Article VI.

4. At-Large Advisory Committee

a. The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) is the primary organizational home within ICANN for individual Internet users. The role of the ALAC shall be to consider and provide advice on the activities of ICANN, insofar as they relate to the interests of individual Internet users. This includes policies created through ICANN's Supporting Organizations, as well as the many other issues for which community input and advice is appropriate. The ALAC, which plays an important role in ICANN's accountability mechanisms, also coordinates some of ICANN's outreach to individual Internet users.

b. The ALAC shall consist of (i) two members selected by each of the Regional At-Large Organizations ("RALOs") established according to paragraph 4(g) of this Section, and (ii) five members selected by the Nominating Committee. The five members selected by the Nominating Committee shall include one citizen of a country within each of the five Geographic Regions established according to Section 5 of Article VI.

c. Subject to the provisions of the Transition Article of these Bylaws, the regular terms of members of the ALAC shall be as follows:

1. The term of one member selected by each RALO shall begin at the conclusion of an ICANN annual meeting in an even-numbered year.

2. The term of the other member selected by each RALO shall begin at the conclusion of an ICANN annual meeting in an odd-numbered year.

3. The terms of three of the members selected by the Nominating Committee shall begin at the conclusion of an annual meeting in an odd-numbered year and the terms of the other two members selected by the Nominating Committee shall begin at the conclusion of an annual meeting in an even-numbered year.
4. The regular term of each member shall end at the conclusion of the second ICANN annual meeting after the term began.

d. The Chair of the ALAC shall be elected by the members of the ALAC pursuant to procedures adopted by the Committee.

e. The ALAC shall, after consultation with each RALO, annually appoint five voting delegates (no two of whom shall be citizens of countries in the same Geographic Region, as defined according to Section 5 of Article VI) to the Nominating Committee.

f. Subject to the provisions of the Transition Article of these Bylaws, the At-Large Advisory Committee may designate non-voting liaisons to each of the ccNSO Council and the GNSO Council.

g. There shall be one RALO for each Geographic Region established according to Section 5 of Article VI. Each RALO shall serve as the main forum and coordination point for public input to ICANN in its Geographic Region and shall be a non-profit organization certified by ICANN according to criteria and standards established by the Board based on recommendations of the At-Large Advisory Committee. An organization shall become the recognized RALO for its Geographic Region upon entering a Memorandum of Understanding with ICANN addressing the respective roles and responsibilities of ICANN and the RALO regarding the process for selecting ALAC members and requirements of openness, participatory opportunities, transparency, accountability, and diversity in the RALO’s structure and procedures, as well as criteria and standards for the RALO’s constituent At-Large Structures.

h. Each RALO shall be comprised of self-supporting At-Large Structures within its Geographic Region that have been certified to meet the requirements of the RALO’s Memorandum of Understanding with ICANN according to Paragraph 4(i) of this Section. If so provided by its Memorandum of Understanding with ICANN, a RALO may also include individual Internet users who are citizens or residents of countries within the RALO’s Geographic Region.

i. Membership in the At-Large Community

1. The criteria and standards for the certification of At-Large Structures within each Geographic Region shall be established by the Board based on recommendations from the ALAC and shall be stated in the Memorandum of Understanding between ICANN and the RALO for each
2. The criteria and standards for the certification of At-Large Structures shall be established in such a way that participation by individual Internet users who are citizens or residents of countries within the Geographic Region (as defined in Section 5 of Article VI) of the RALO will predominate in the operation of each At-Large Structure within the RALO, while not necessarily excluding additional participation, compatible with the interests of the individual Internet users within the region, by others.

3. Each RALO’s Memorandum of Understanding shall also include provisions designed to allow, to the greatest extent possible, every individual Internet user who is a citizen of a country within the RALO’s Geographic Region to participate in at least one of the RALO’s At-Large Structures.

4. To the extent compatible with these objectives, the criteria and standards should also afford to each RALO the type of structure that best fits the customs and character of its Geographic Region.

5. Once the criteria and standards have been established as provided in this Clause i, the ALAC, with the advice and participation of the RALO where the applicant is based, shall be responsible for certifying organizations as meeting the criteria and standards for At-Large Structure accreditation.

6. Decisions to certify or decertify an At-Large Structure shall be made as decided by the ALAC in its Rules of Procedure, save always that any changes made to the Rules of Procedure in respect of ALS applications shall be subject to review by the RALOs and by the ICANN Board.

7. Decisions as to whether to accredit, not to accredit, or disaccredit an At-Large Structure shall be subject to review according to procedures established by the Board.

8. On an ongoing basis, the ALAC may also give advice as to whether a prospective At-Large Structure meets the applicable criteria and standards.

j. The ALAC is also responsible, working in conjunction with the RALOs, for coordinating the following activities:

1. Making a selection by the At-Large Community to fill Seat 15...
on the Board. Notification of the At-Large Community's selection shall be given by the ALAC Chair in writing to the ICANN Secretary, consistent with Article VI, Sections 8(4) and 12(1).

2. Keeping the community of individual Internet users informed about the significant news from ICANN;

3. Distributing (through posting or otherwise) an updated agenda, news about ICANN, and information about items in the ICANN policy-development process;

4. Promoting outreach activities in the community of individual Internet users;

5. Developing and maintaining on-going information and education programs, regarding ICANN and its work;

6. Establishing an outreach strategy about ICANN issues in each RALO's Region;

7. Participating in the ICANN policy development processes and providing input and advice that accurately reflects the views of individual Internet users;

8. Making public, and analyzing, ICANN's proposed policies and its decisions and their (potential) regional impact and (potential) effect on individuals in the region;

9. Offering Internet-based mechanisms that enable discussions among members of At-Large structures; and

10. Establishing mechanisms and processes that enable two-way communication between members of At-Large Structures and those involved in ICANN decision-making, so interested individuals can share their views on pending ICANN issues.

Section 3. PROCEDURES

Each Advisory Committee shall determine its own rules of procedure and quorum requirements.

Section 4. TERM OF OFFICE

The chair and each member of a committee shall serve until his or her successor is appointed, or until such committee is sooner terminated, or until he or she is
removed, resigns, or otherwise ceases to qualify as a member of the committee.

Section 5. VACANCIES

Vacancies on any committee shall be filled in the same manner as provided in the case of original appointments.

Section 6. COMPENSATION

Committee members shall receive no compensation for their services as a member of a committee. The Board may, however, authorize the reimbursement of actual and necessary expenses incurred by committee members, including Directors, performing their duties as committee members.

ARTICLE XI-A: OTHER ADVISORY MECHANISMS

Section 1. EXTERNAL EXPERT ADVICE

1. Purpose. The purpose of seeking external expert advice is to allow the policy-development process within ICANN to take advantage of existing expertise that resides in the public or private sector but outside of ICANN. In those cases where there are relevant public bodies with expertise, or where access to private expertise could be helpful, the Board and constituent bodies should be encouraged to seek advice from such expert bodies or individuals.

2. Types of Expert Advisory Panels.
   a. On its own initiative or at the suggestion of any ICANN body, the Board may appoint, or authorize the President to appoint, Expert Advisory Panels consisting of public or private sector individuals or entities. If the advice sought from such Panels concerns issues of public policy, the provisions of Section 1(3)(b) of this Article shall apply.

   b. In addition, in accordance with Section 1(3) of this Article, the Board may refer issues of public policy pertinent to matters within ICANN’s mission to a multinational governmental or treaty organization.

   a. The Governmental Advisory Committee may at any time recommend that the Board seek advice concerning one or more issues of public policy from an external source, as set out above.

   b. In the event that the Board determines, upon such a recommendation or otherwise, that external advice should be
sought concerning one or more issues of public policy, the Board shall, as appropriate, consult with the Governmental Advisory Committee regarding the appropriate source from which to seek the advice and the arrangements, including definition of scope and process, for requesting and obtaining that advice.

c. The Board shall, as appropriate, transmit any request for advice from a multinational governmental or treaty organization, including specific terms of reference, to the Governmental Advisory Committee, with the suggestion that the request be transmitted by the Governmental Advisory Committee to the multinational governmental or treaty organization.

4. Process for Seeking and Advice-Other Matters. Any reference of issues not concerning public policy to an Expert Advisory Panel by the Board or President in accordance with Section 1(2)(a) of this Article shall be made pursuant to terms of reference describing the issues on which input and advice is sought and the procedures and schedule to be followed.

5. Receipt of Expert Advice and its Effect. External advice pursuant to this Section shall be provided in written form. Such advice is advisory and not binding, and is intended to augment the information available to the Board or other ICANN body in carrying out its responsibilities.

6. Opportunity to Comment. The Governmental Advisory Committee, in addition to the Supporting Organizations and other Advisory Committees, shall have an opportunity to comment upon any external advice received prior to any decision by the Board.

Section 2. TECHNICAL LIAISON GROUP

1. Purpose. The quality of ICANN's work depends on access to complete and authoritative information concerning the technical standards that underlie ICANN's activities. ICANN's relationship to the organizations that produce these standards is therefore particularly important. The Technical Liaison Group (TLG) shall connect the Board with appropriate sources of technical advice on specific matters pertinent to ICANN's activities.

2. TLG Organizations. The TLG shall consist of four organizations: the European Telecommunications Standards Institute (ETSI), the International Telecommunications Union's Telecommunication Standardization Sector (ITU-T), the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C), and the Internet Architecture Board (IAB).

3. Role. The role of the TLG organizations shall be to channel technical
information and guidance to the Board and to other ICANN entities. This role has both a responsive component and an active "watchdog" component, which involve the following responsibilities:

a. In response to a request for information, to connect the Board or other ICANN body with appropriate sources of technical expertise. This component of the TLG role covers circumstances in which ICANN seeks an authoritative answer to a specific technical question. Where information is requested regarding a particular technical standard for which a TLG organization is responsible, that request shall be directed to that TLG organization.

b. As an ongoing "watchdog" activity, to advise the Board of the relevance and progress of technical developments in the areas covered by each organization’s scope that could affect Board decisions or other ICANN actions, and to draw attention to global technical standards issues that affect policy development within the scope of ICANN's mission. This component of the TLG role covers circumstances in which ICANN is unaware of a new development, and would therefore otherwise not realize that a question should be asked.

4. TLG Procedures. The TLG shall not have officers or hold meetings, nor shall it provide policy advice to the Board as a committee (although TLG organizations may individually be asked by the Board to do so as the need arises in areas relevant to their individual charters). Neither shall the TLG debate or otherwise coordinate technical issues across the TLG organizations; establish or attempt to establish unified positions; or create or attempt to create additional layers or structures within the TLG for the development of technical standards or for any other purpose.

5. Technical Work with the IETF. The TLG shall have no involvement with the ICANN's work for the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), Internet Research Task Force, or the Internet Architecture Board (IAB), as described in the IETF-ICANN Memorandum of Understanding Concerning the Technical Work of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority ratified by the Board on 10 March 2000.

6. Individual Technical Experts. Each TLG organization shall designate two individual technical experts who are familiar with the technical standards issues that are relevant to ICANN's activities. These 8 experts shall be available as necessary to determine, through an exchange of e-mail messages, where to direct a technical question from ICANN when ICANN does not ask a specific TLG organization directly.
ARTICLE XII: BOARD AND TEMPORARY COMMITTEES

Section 1. BOARD COMMITTEES

The Board may establish one or more committees of the Board, which shall continue to exist until otherwise determined by the Board. Only Directors may be appointed to a Committee of the Board. If a person appointed to a Committee of the Board ceases to be a Director, such person shall also cease to be a member of any Committee of the Board. Each Committee of the Board shall consist of two or more Directors. The Board may designate one or more Directors as alternate members of any such committee, who may replace any absent member at any meeting of the committee. Committee members may be removed from a committee at any time by a two-thirds (2/3) majority vote of all members of the Board; provided, however, that any Director or Directors which are the subject of the removal action shall not be entitled to vote on such an action or be counted as a member of the Board when calculating the required two-thirds (2/3) vote; and, provided further, however, that in no event shall a Director be removed from a committee unless such removal is approved by not less than a majority of all members of the Board.

Section 2. POWERS OF BOARD COMMITTEES

1. The Board may delegate to Committees of the Board all legal authority of the Board except with respect to:
   a. The filling of vacancies on the Board or on any committee;
   b. The amendment or repeal of Bylaws or the Articles of Incorporation or the adoption of new Bylaws or Articles of Incorporation;
   c. The amendment or repeal of any resolution of the Board which by its express terms is not so amendable or repealable;
   d. The appointment of committees of the Board or the members thereof;
   e. The approval of any self-dealing transaction, as such transactions are defined in Section 5233(a) of the CNPBCL;
   f. The approval of the annual budget required by Article XVI; or
   g. The compensation of any officer described in Article XIII.

2. The Board shall have the power to prescribe the manner in which proceedings of any Committee of the Board shall be conducted. In the absence of any such prescription, such committee shall have the power to prescribe the manner in which its proceedings shall be conducted. Unless
these Bylaws, the Board or such committee shall otherwise provide, the regular and special meetings shall be governed by the provisions of Article VI applicable to meetings and actions of the Board. Each committee shall keep regular minutes of its proceedings and shall report the same to the Board from time to time, as the Board may require.

Section 3. TEMPORARY COMMITTEES

The Board may establish such temporary committees as it sees fit, with membership, duties, and responsibilities as set forth in the resolutions or charters adopted by the Board in establishing such committees.

ARTICLE XIII: OFFICERS

Section 1. OFFICERS

The officers of ICANN shall be a President (who shall serve as Chief Executive Officer), a Secretary, and a Chief Financial Officer. ICANN may also have, at the discretion of the Board, any additional officers that it deems appropriate. Any person, other than the President, may hold more than one office, except that no member of the Board (other than the President) shall simultaneously serve as an officer of ICANN.

Section 2. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

The officers of ICANN shall be elected annually by the Board, pursuant to the recommendation of the President or, in the case of the President, of the Chairman of the ICANN Board. Each such officer shall hold his or her office until he or she resigns, is removed, is otherwise disqualified to serve, or his or her successor is elected.

Section 3. REMOVAL OF OFFICERS

Any Officer may be removed, either with or without cause, by a two-thirds (2/3) majority vote of all the members of the Board. Should any vacancy occur in any office as a result of death, resignation, removal, disqualification, or any other cause, the Board may delegate the powers and duties of such office to any Officer or to any Director until such time as a successor for the office has been elected.

Section 4. PRESIDENT

The President shall be the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of ICANN in charge of all of its activities and business. All other officers and staff shall report to the President or his or her delegate, unless stated otherwise in these Bylaws.
President shall serve as an ex officio member of the Board, and shall have all the same rights and privileges of any Board member. The President shall be empowered to call special meetings of the Board as set forth herein, and shall discharge all other duties as may be required by these Bylaws and from time to time may be assigned by the Board.

Section 5. SECRETARY

The Secretary shall keep or cause to be kept the minutes of the Board in one or more books provided for that purpose, shall see that all notices are duly given in accordance with the provisions of these Bylaws or as required by law, and in general shall perform all duties as from time to time may be prescribed by the President or the Board.

Section 6. CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

The Chief Financial Officer ("CFO") shall be the chief financial officer of ICANN. If required by the Board, the CFO shall give a bond for the faithful discharge of his or her duties in such form and with such surety or sureties as the Board shall determine. The CFO shall have charge and custody of all the funds of ICANN and shall keep or cause to be kept, in books belonging to ICANN, full and accurate amounts of all receipts and disbursements, and shall deposit all money and other valuable effects in the name of ICANN in such depositories as may be designated for that purpose by the Board. The CFO shall disburse the funds of ICANN as may be ordered by the Board or the President and, whenever requested by them, shall deliver to the Board and the President an account of all his or her transactions as CFO and of the financial condition of ICANN. The CFO shall be responsible for ICANN's financial planning and forecasting and shall assist the President in the preparation of ICANN's annual budget. The CFO shall coordinate and oversee ICANN's funding, including any audits or other reviews of ICANN or its Supporting Organizations. The CFO shall be responsible for all other matters relating to the financial operation of ICANN.

Section 7. ADDITIONAL OFFICERS

In addition to the officers described above, any additional or assistant officers who are elected or appointed by the Board shall perform such duties as may be assigned to them by the President or the Board.

Section 8. COMPENSATION AND EXPENSES

The compensation of any Officer of ICANN shall be approved by the Board. Expenses incurred in connection with performance of their officer duties may be reimbursed to Officers upon approval of the President (in the case of Officers...
other than the President), by another Officer designated by the Board (in the case of the President), or the Board.

Section 9. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The Board, through the Board Governance Committee, shall establish a policy requiring a statement from each Officer not less frequently than once a year setting forth all business and other affiliations that relate in any way to the business and other affiliations of ICANN.

ARTICLE XIV: INDEMNIFICATION OF DIRECTORS, OFFICERS, EMPLOYEES, AND OTHER AGENTS

ICANN shall, to maximum extent permitted by the CNPBCL, indemnify each of its agents against expenses, judgments, fines, settlements, and other amounts actually and reasonably incurred in connection with any proceeding arising by reason of the fact that any such person is or was an agent of ICANN, provided that the indemnified person’s acts were done in good faith and in a manner that the indemnified person reasonably believed to be in ICANN’s best interests and not criminal. For purposes of this Article, an “agent” of ICANN includes any person who is or was a Director, Officer, employee, or any other agent of ICANN (including a member of any Supporting Organization, any Advisory Committee, the Nominating Committee, any other ICANN committee, or the Technical Liaison Group) acting within the scope of his or her responsibility; or is or was serving at the request of ICANN as a Director, Officer, employee, or agent of another corporation, partnership, joint venture, trust, or other enterprise. The Board may adopt a resolution authorizing the purchase and maintenance of insurance on behalf of any agent of ICANN against any liability asserted against or incurred by the agent in such capacity or arising out of the agent's status as such, whether or not ICANN would have the power to indemnify the agent against that liability under the provisions of this Article.

ARTICLE XV: GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 1. CONTRACTS

The Board may authorize any Officer or Officers, agent or agents, to enter into any contract or execute or deliver any instrument in the name of and on behalf of ICANN, and such authority may be general or confined to specific instances. In the absence of a contrary Board authorization, contracts and instruments may only be executed by the following Officers: President, any Vice President, or the CFO. Unless authorized or ratified by the Board, no other Officer, agent, or employee shall have any power or authority to bind ICANN or to render it liable for any debts or obligations.
Section 2. DEPOSITS

All funds of ICANN not otherwise employed shall be deposited from time to time to the credit of ICANN in such banks, trust companies, or other depositories as the Board, or the President under its delegation, may select.

Section 3. CHECKS

All checks, drafts, or other orders for the payment of money, notes, or other evidences of indebtedness issued in the name of ICANN shall be signed by such Officer or Officers, agent or agents, of ICANN and in such a manner as shall from time to time be determined by resolution of the Board.

Section 4. LOANS

No loans shall be made by or to ICANN and no evidences of indebtedness shall be issued in its name unless authorized by a resolution of the Board. Such authority may be general or confined to specific instances; provided, however, that no loans shall be made by ICANN to its Directors or Officers.

ARTICLE XVI: FISCAL MATTERS

Section 1. ACCOUNTING

The fiscal year end of ICANN shall be determined by the Board.

Section 2. AUDIT

At the end of the fiscal year, the books of ICANN shall be closed and audited by certified public accountants. The appointment of the fiscal auditors shall be the responsibility of the Board.

Section 3. ANNUAL REPORT AND ANNUAL STATEMENT

The Board shall publish, at least annually, a report describing its activities, including an audited financial statement and a description of any payments made by ICANN to Directors (including reimbursements of expenses). ICANN shall cause the annual report and the annual statement of certain transactions as required by the CNPBCL to be prepared and sent to each member of the Board and to such other persons as the Board may designate, no later than one hundred twenty (120) days after the close of ICANN's fiscal year.

Section 4. ANNUAL BUDGET
At least forty-five (45) days prior to the commencement of each fiscal year, the President shall prepare and submit to the Board, a proposed annual budget of ICANN for the next fiscal year, which shall be posted on the Website. The proposed budget shall identify anticipated revenue sources and levels and shall, to the extent practical, identify anticipated material expense items by line item. The Board shall adopt an annual budget and shall publish the adopted Budget on the Website.

**Section 5. FEES AND CHARGES**

The Board may set fees and charges for the services and benefits provided by ICANN, with the goal of fully recovering the reasonable costs of the operation of ICANN and establishing reasonable reserves for future expenses and contingencies reasonably related to the legitimate activities of ICANN. Such fees and charges shall be fair and equitable, shall be published for public comment prior to adoption, and once adopted shall be published on the Website in a sufficiently detailed manner so as to be readily accessible.

**ARTICLE XVII: MEMBERS**

ICANN shall not have members, as defined in the California Nonprofit Public Benefit Corporation Law ("CNPBCL"), notwithstanding the use of the term "Member" in these Bylaws, in any ICANN document, or in any action of the ICANN Board or staff.

**ARTICLE XVIII: OFFICES AND SEAL**

**Section 1. OFFICES**

The principal office for the transaction of the business of ICANN shall be in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, United States of America. ICANN may also have an additional office or offices within or outside the United States of America as it may from time to time establish.

**Section 2. SEAL**

The Board may adopt a corporate seal and use the same by causing it or a facsimile thereof to be impressed or affixed or reproduced or otherwise.

**ARTICLE XIX: AMENDMENTS**

Except as otherwise provided in the Articles of Incorporation or these Bylaws, the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws of ICANN may be altered, amended, or repealed and new Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws adopted only upon action by
a two-thirds (2/3) vote of all members of the Board.

ARTICLE XX: TRANSITION ARTICLE

Section 1. PURPOSE

This Transition Article sets forth the provisions for the transition from the processes and structures defined by the ICANN Bylaws, as amended and restated on 29 October 1999 and amended through 12 February 2002 (the "Old Bylaws"), to the processes and structures defined by the Bylaws of which this Article is a part (the "New Bylaws"). [Explanatory Note (dated 10 December 2009): For Section 5(3) of this Article, reference to the Old Bylaws refers to the Bylaws as amended and restated through to 20 March 2009.]

Section 2. BOARD OF DIRECTORS

1. For the period beginning on the adoption of this Transition Article and ending on the Effective Date and Time of the New Board, as defined in paragraph 5 of this Section 2, the Board of Directors of the Corporation ("Transition Board") shall consist of the members of the Board who would have been Directors under the Old Bylaws immediately after the conclusion of the annual meeting in 2002, except that those At-Large members of the Board under the Old Bylaws who elect to do so by notifying the Secretary of the Board on 15 December 2002 or in writing or by e-mail no later than 23 December 2002 shall also serve as members of the Transition Board. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article VI, Section 12 of the New Bylaws, vacancies on the Transition Board shall not be filled. The Transition Board shall not have liaisons as provided by Article VI, Section 9 of the New Bylaws. The Board Committees existing on the date of adoption of this Transition Article shall continue in existence, subject to any change in Board Committees or their membership that the Transition Board may adopt by resolution.

2. The Transition Board shall elect a Chair and Vice-Chair to serve until the Effective Date and Time of the New Board.

3. The "New Board" is that Board described in Article VI, Section 2(1) of the New Bylaws.

4. Promptly after the adoption of this Transition Article, a Nominating Committee shall be formed including, to the extent feasible, the delegates and liaisons described in Article VII, Section 2 of the New Bylaws, with terms to end at the conclusion of the ICANN annual meeting in 2003. The Nominating Committee shall proceed without delay to select Directors to fill Seats 1 through 8 on the New Board, with terms to conclude upon the
commencement of the first regular terms specified for those Seats in Article VI, Section 8(1)(a)-(c) of the New Bylaws, and shall give the ICANN Secretary written notice of that selection.

5. The Effective Date and Time of the New Board shall be a time, as designated by the Transition Board, during the first regular meeting of ICANN in 2003 that begins not less than seven calendar days after the ICANN Secretary has received written notice of the selection of Directors to fill at least ten of Seats 1 through 14 on the New Board. As of the Effective Date and Time of the New Board, it shall assume from the Transition Board all the rights, duties, and obligations of the ICANN Board of Directors. Subject to Section 4 of this Article, the Directors (Article VI, Section 2(1)(a)-(d)) and non-voting liaisons (Article VI, Section 9) as to which the ICANN Secretary has received notice of selection shall, along with the President (Article VI, Section 2(1)(e)), be seated upon the Effective Date and Time of the New Board, and thereafter any additional Directors and non-voting liaisons shall be seated upon the ICANN Secretary's receipt of notice of their selection.

6. The New Board shall elect a Chairman and Vice-Chairman as its first order of business. The terms of those Board offices shall expire at the end of the annual meeting in 2003.

7. Committees of the Board in existence as of the Effective Date and Time of the New Board shall continue in existence according to their existing charters, but the terms of all members of those committees shall conclude at the Effective Date and Time of the New Board. Temporary committees in existence as of the Effective Date and Time of the New Board shall continue in existence with their existing charters and membership, subject to any change the New Board may adopt by resolution.

8. In applying the term-limitation provision of Section 8(5) of Article VI, a Director's service on the Board before the Effective Date and Time of the New Board shall count as one term.

Section 3. ADDRESS SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

The Address Supporting Organization shall continue in operation according to the provisions of the Memorandum of Understanding originally entered on 18 October 1999 between ICANN and a group of regional Internet registries (RIRs), and amended in October 2000, until a replacement Memorandum of Understanding becomes effective. Promptly after the adoption of this Transition Article, the Address Supporting Organization shall make selections, and give the ICANN Secretary written notice of those selections, of:
1. Directors to fill Seats 9 and 10 on the New Board, with terms to conclude upon the commencement of the first regular terms specified for each of those Seats in Article VI, Section 8(1)(d) and (e) of the New Bylaws; and

2. the delegate to the Nominating Committee selected by the Council of the Address Supporting Organization, as called for in Article VII, Section 2(8)(f) of the New Bylaws.

With respect to the ICANN Directors that it is entitled to select, and taking into account the need for rapid selection to ensure that the New Board becomes effective as soon as possible, the Address Supporting Organization may select those Directors from among the persons it previously selected as ICANN Directors pursuant to the Old Bylaws. To the extent the Address Supporting Organization does not provide the ICANN Secretary written notice, on or before 31 March 2003, of its selections for Seat 9 and Seat 10, the Address Supporting Organization shall be deemed to have selected for Seat 9 the person it selected as an ICANN Director pursuant to the Old Bylaws for a term beginning in 2001 and for Seat 10 the person it selected as an ICANN Director pursuant to the Old Bylaws for a term beginning in 2002.

Section 4. COUNTRY-CODE NAMES SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

1. Upon the enrollment of thirty ccTLD managers (with at least four within each Geographic Region) as members of the ccNSO, written notice shall be posted on the Website. As soon as feasible after that notice, the members of the initial ccNSO Council to be selected by the ccNSO members shall be selected according to the procedures stated in Article IX, Section 4(8) and (9). Upon the completion of that selection process, a written notice that the ccNSO Council has been constituted shall be posted on the Website. Three ccNSO Council members shall be selected by the ccNSO members within each Geographic Region, with one member to serve a term that ends upon the conclusion of the first ICANN annual meeting after the ccNSO Council is constituted, a second member to serve a term that ends upon the conclusion of the second ICANN annual meeting after the ccNSO Council is constituted, and the third member to serve a term that ends upon the conclusion of the third ICANN annual meeting after the ccNSO Council is constituted. (The definition of "ccTLD manager" stated in Article IX, Section 4(1) and the definitions stated in Article IX, Section 4(4) shall apply within this Section 4 of Article XX.)

2. After the adoption of Article IX of these Bylaws, the Nominating Committee shall select the three members of the ccNSO Council described in Article IX, Section 3(1)(b). In selecting three individuals to serve on the ccNSO Council, the Nominating Committee shall designate one to serve a term
that ends upon the conclusion of the first ICANN annual meeting after the ccNSO Council is constituted, a second member to serve a term that ends upon the conclusion of the second ICANN annual meeting after the ccNSO Council is constituted, and the third member to serve a term that ends upon the conclusion of the third ICANN annual meeting after the ccNSO Council is constituted. The three members of the ccNSO Council selected by the Nominating Committee shall not take their seats before the ccNSO Council is constituted.

3. Upon the ccNSO Council being constituted, the At-Large Advisory Committee and the Governmental Advisory Committee may designate one liaison each to the ccNSO Council, as provided by Article IX, Section 3(2) (a) and (b).

4. Upon the ccNSO Council being constituted, the Council may designate Regional Organizations as provided in Article IX, Section 5. Upon its designation, a Regional Organization may appoint a liaison to the ccNSO Council.

5. Until the ccNSO Council is constituted, Seats 11 and 12 on the New Board shall remain vacant. Promptly after the ccNSO Council is constituted, the ccNSO shall, through the ccNSO Council, make selections of Directors to fill Seats 11 and 12 on the New Board, with terms to conclude upon the commencement of the next regular term specified for each of those Seats in Article VI, Section 8(1)(d) and (f) of the New Bylaws, and shall give the ICANN Secretary written notice of its selections.

6. Until the ccNSO Council is constituted, the delegate to the Nominating Committee established by the New Bylaws designated to be selected by the ccNSO shall be appointed by the Transition Board or New Board, depending on which is in existence at the time any particular appointment is required, after due consultation with members of the ccTLD community. Upon the ccNSO Council being constituted, the delegate to the Nominating Committee appointed by the Transition Board or New Board according to this Section 4(9) then serving shall remain in office, except that the ccNSO Council may replace that delegate with one of its choosing within three months after the conclusion of ICANN’s annual meeting, or in the event of a vacancy. Subsequent appointments of the Nominating Committee delegate described in Article VII, Section 2(8)(c) shall be made by the ccNSO Council.

Section 5. GENERIC NAMES SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

1. The Generic Names Supporting Organization ("GNSO"), upon the adoption of this Transition Article, shall continue its operations; however, it shall be
restructured into four new Stakeholder Groups which shall represent, organizationally, the former Constituencies of the GNSO, subject to ICANN Board approval of each individual Stakeholder Group Charter:

a. The gTLD Registries Constituency shall be assigned to the Registries Stakeholder Group;

b. The Registrars Constituency shall be assigned to the Registrars Stakeholder Group;

c. The Business Constituency shall be assigned to the Commercial Stakeholder Group;

d. The Intellectual Property Constituency shall be assigned to the Commercial Stakeholder Group;

e. The Internet Services Providers Constituency shall be assigned to the Commercial Stakeholder Group; and

f. The Non-Commercial Users Constituency shall be assigned to the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group.

2. Each GNSO Constituency described in paragraph 1 of this subsection shall continue operating substantially as before and no Constituency official, working group, or other activity shall be changed until further action of the Constituency, provided that each GNSO Constituency described in paragraph 1 (c-f) shall submit to the ICANN Secretary a new or revised Charter inclusive of its operating procedures, adopted according to the Constituency's processes and consistent with these Bylaws Amendments, no later than the ICANN meeting in October 2009, or another date as the Board may designate by resolution.

3. Prior to the commencement of the ICANN meeting in October 2009, or another date the Board may designate by resolution, the GNSO Council shall consist of its current Constituency structure and officers as described in Article X, Section 3(1) of the Bylaws (as amended and restated on 29 October 1999 and amended through 20 March 2009 (the "Old Bylaws")). Thereafter, the composition of the GNSO Council shall be as provided in these Bylaws, as they may be amended from time to time. All committees, task forces, working groups, drafting committees, and similar groups established by the GNSO Council and in existence immediately before the adoption of this Transition Article shall continue in existence with the same charters, membership, and activities, subject to any change by action of the GNSO Council or ICANN Board.

4. Beginning with the commencement of the ICANN Meeting in October 2009, or another date the Board may designate by resolution (the "Effective Date
of the Transition"), the GNSO Council seats shall be assigned as follows:

a. The three seats currently assigned to the Registry Constituency shall be reassigned as three seats of the Registries Stakeholder Group;

b. The three seats currently assigned to the Registrar Constituency shall be reassigned as three seats of the Registrars Stakeholder Group;

c. The three seats currently assigned to each of the Business Constituency, the Intellectual Property Constituency, and the Internet Services Provider Constituency (nine total) shall be decreased to be six seats of the Commercial Stakeholder Group;

d. The three seats currently assigned to the Non-Commercial Users Constituency shall be increased to be six seats of the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group;

e. The three seats currently selected by the Nominating Committee shall be assigned by the Nominating Committee as follows: one voting member to the Contracted Party House, one voting member to the Non-Contracted Party House, and one non-voting member assigned to the GNSO Council at large.

Representatives on the GNSO Council shall be appointed or elected consistent with the provisions in each applicable Stakeholder Group Charter, approved by the Board, and sufficiently in advance of the October 2009 ICANN Meeting that will permit those representatives to act in their official capacities at the start of said meeting.

5. The GNSO Council, as part of its Restructure Implementation Plan, will document: (a) how vacancies, if any, will be handled during the transition period; (b) for each Stakeholder Group, how each assigned Council seat to take effect at the 2009 ICANN annual meeting will be filled, whether through a continuation of an existing term or a new election or appointment; (c) how it plans to address staggered terms such that the new GNSO Council preserves as much continuity as reasonably possible; and (d) the effect of Bylaws term limits on each Council member.

6. As soon as practical after the commencement of the ICANN meeting in October 2009, or another date the Board may designate by resolution, the GNSO Council shall, in accordance with Article X, Section 3(7) and its GNSO Operating Procedures, elect officers and give the ICANN Secretary written notice of its selections.
Section 6. PROTOCOL SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

The Protocol Supporting Organization referred to in the Old Bylaws is discontinued.

Section 7. ADVISORY COMMITTEES AND TECHNICAL LIAISON GROUP

1. Upon the adoption of the New Bylaws, the Governmental Advisory Committee shall continue in operation according to its existing operating principles and practices, until further action of the committee. The Governmental Advisory Committee may designate liaisons to serve with other ICANN bodies as contemplated by the New Bylaws by providing written notice to the ICANN Secretary. Promptly upon the adoption of this Transition Article, the Governmental Advisory Committee shall notify the ICANN Secretary of the person selected as its delegate to the Nominating Committee, as set forth in Article VII, Section 2 of the New Bylaws.

2. The organizations designated as members of the Technical Liaison Group under Article XI-A, Section 2(2) of the New Bylaws shall each designate the two individual technical experts described in Article XI-A, Section 2(6) of the New Bylaws, by providing written notice to the ICANN Secretary. As soon as feasible, the delegate from the Technical Liaison Group to the Nominating Committee shall be selected according to Article XI-A, Section 2(7) of the New Bylaws.

3. Upon the adoption of the New Bylaws, the Security and Stability Advisory Committee shall continue in operation according to its existing operating principles and practices, until further action of the committee. Promptly upon the adoption of this Transition Article, the Security and Stability Advisory Committee shall notify the ICANN Secretary of the person selected as its delegate to the Nominating Committee, as set forth in Article VII, Section 2(4) of the New Bylaws.

4. Upon the adoption of the New Bylaws, the Root Server System Advisory Committee shall continue in operation according to its existing operating principles and practices, until further action of the committee. Promptly upon the adoption of this Transition Article, the Root Server Advisory Committee shall notify the ICANN Secretary of the person selected as its delegate to the Nominating Committee, as set forth in Article VII, Section 2(3) of the New Bylaws.

5. At-Large Advisory Committee
   a. There shall exist an Interim At-Large Advisory Committee until such time as ICANN recognizes, through the entry of a Memorandum of Understanding, all of the Regional At-Large Organizations (RALOs)
identified in Article XI, Section 2(4) of the New Bylaws. The Interim At-Large Advisory Committee shall be composed of (i) ten individuals (two from each ICANN region) selected by the ICANN Board following nominations by the At-Large Organizing Committee and (ii) five additional individuals (one from each ICANN region) selected by the initial Nominating Committee as soon as feasible in accordance with the principles established in Article VII, Section 5 of the New Bylaws. The initial Nominating Committee shall designate two of these individuals to serve terms until the conclusion of the ICANN annual meeting in 2004 and three of these individuals to serve terms until the conclusion of the ICANN annual meeting in 2005.

b. Upon the entry of each RALO into such a Memorandum of Understanding, that entity shall be entitled to select two persons who are citizens and residents of that Region to be members of the At-Large Advisory Committee established by Article XI, Section 2(4) of the New Bylaws. Upon the entity’s written notification to the ICANN Secretary of such selections, those persons shall immediately assume the seats held until that notification by the Interim At-Large Advisory Committee members previously selected by the Board from the RALO’s region.

c. Upon the seating of persons selected by all five RALOs, the Interim At-Large Advisory Committee shall become the At-Large Advisory Committee, as established by Article XI, Section 2(4) of the New Bylaws. The five individuals selected to the Interim At-Large Advisory Committee by the Nominating Committee shall become members of the At-Large Advisory Committee for the remainder of the terms for which they were selected.

d. Promptly upon its creation, the Interim At-Large Advisory Committee shall notify the ICANN Secretary of the persons selected as its delegates to the Nominating Committee, as set forth in Article VII, Section 2(6) of the New Bylaws.

Section 8. OFFICERS

ICANN officers (as defined in Article XIII of the New Bylaws) shall be elected by the then-existing Board of ICANN at the annual meeting in 2002 to serve until the annual meeting in 2003.

Section 9. GROUPS APPOINTED BY THE PRESIDENT

Notwithstanding the adoption or effectiveness of the New Bylaws, task forces and
other groups appointed by the ICANN President shall continue unchanged in membership, scope, and operation until changes are made by the President.

Section 10. CONTRACTS WITH ICANN

Notwithstanding the adoption or effectiveness of the New Bylaws, all agreements, including employment and consulting agreements, entered by ICANN shall continue in effect according to their terms.

Annex A: GNSO Policy Development Process

The following process shall govern the GNSO policy development process ("PDP") until such time as modifications are recommended to and approved by the ICANN Board of Directors ("Board"). The role of the GNSO is outlined in Article X of these Bylaws. If the GNSO is conducting activities that are not intended to result in a Consensus Policy, the Council may act through other processes.

Section 1. Required Elements of a Policy Development Process

The following elements are required at a minimum to form Consensus Policies as defined within ICANN contracts, and any other policies for which the GNSO Council requests application of this Annex A:

a. Final Issue Report requested by the Board, the GNSO Council ("Council") or Advisory Committee, which should include at a minimum a) the proposed issue raised for consideration, b) the identity of the party submitting the issue, and c) how that party is affected by the issue;

b. Formal initiation of the Policy Development Process by the Council;

c. Formation of a Working Group or other designated work method;

d. Initial Report produced by a Working Group or other designated work method;

e. Final Report produced by a Working Group, or other designated work method, and forwarded to the Council for deliberation;

f. Council approval of PDP Recommendations contained in the Final Report, by the required thresholds;

g. PDP Recommendations and Final Report shall be forwarded to the Board through a Recommendations Report approved by the Council; and

h. Board approval of PDP Recommendations.

The GNSO shall maintain a Policy Development Process Manual (PDP Manual) within the operating procedures of the GNSO maintained by the GNSO Council. The PDP Manual shall contain specific additional guidance on completion of all elements of a PDP, including those elements that are not otherwise defined in these Bylaws. The PDP Manual and any amendments thereto are subject to a twenty-one (21) day public comment period at minimum, as well as Board oversight and review, as specified at Article X, Section 3.6.

Section 3. Requesting an Issue Report

Board Request. The Board may request an Issue Report by instructing the GNSO Council ("Council") to begin the process outlined the PDP Manual. In the event the Board makes a request for an Issue Report, the Board should provide a mechanism by which the GNSO Council can consult with the Board to provide information on the scope, timing, and priority of the request for an Issue Report.

Council Request. The GNSO Council may request an Issue Report by a vote of at least one-fourth (1/4) of the members of the Council of each House or a majority of one House.

Advisory Committee Request. An Advisory Committee may raise an issue for policy development by action of such committee to request an Issue Report, and transmission of that request to the Staff Manager and GNSO Council.

Section 4. Creation of an Issue Report

Within forty-five (45) calendar days after receipt of either (i) an instruction from the Board; (ii) a properly supported motion from the GNSO Council; or (iii) a properly supported motion from an Advisory Committee, the Staff Manager will create a report (a "Preliminary Issue Report"). In the event the Staff Manager determines that more time is necessary to create the Preliminary Issue Report, the Staff Manager may request an extension of time for completion of the Preliminary Issue Report.

The following elements should be considered in the Issue Report:

a. The proposed issue raised for consideration;

b. The identity of the party submitting the request for the Issue Report;

c. How that party is affected by the issue, if known;

d. Support for the issue to initiate the PDP, if known;
e. The opinion of the ICANN General Counsel regarding whether the issue proposed for consideration within the Policy Development Process is properly within the scope of the ICANN's mission, policy process and more specifically the role of the GNSO as set forth in the Bylaws.

f. The opinion of ICANN Staff as to whether the Council should initiate the PDP on the issue

Upon completion of the Preliminary Issue Report, the Preliminary Issue Report shall be posted on the ICANN website for a public comment period that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN.

The Staff Manager is responsible for drafting a summary and analysis of the public comments received on the Preliminary Issue Report and producing a Final Issue Report based upon the comments received. The Staff Manager should forward the Final Issue Report, along with any summary and analysis of the public comments received, to the Chair of the GNSO Council for consideration for initiation of a PDP.

Section 5. Initiation of the PDP

The Council may initiate the PDP as follows:

**Board Request:** If the Board requested an Issue Report, the Council, within the timeframe set forth in the PDP Manual, shall initiate a PDP. No vote is required for such action.

**GNSO Council or Advisory Committee Requests:** The Council may only initiate the PDP by a vote of the Council. Initiation of a PDP requires a vote as set forth in Article X, Section 3, paragraph 9(b) and (c) in favor of initiating the PDP.

Section 6. Reports

An Initial Report should be delivered to the GNSO Council and posted for a public comment period that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN, which time may be extended in accordance with the PDP Manual. Following the review of the comments received and, if required, additional deliberations, a Final Report shall be produced for transmission to the Council.

Section 7. Council Deliberation

Upon receipt of a Final Report, whether as the result of a working group or otherwise, the Council chair will (i) distribute the Final Report to all Council members; and (ii) call for Council deliberation on the matter in accordance with the
PDP Manual.

The Council approval process is set forth in Article X, Section 3, paragraph 9(d) through (g), as supplemented by the PDP Manual.

Section 8. Preparation of the Board Report

If the PDP recommendations contained in the Final Report are approved by the GNSO Council, a Recommendations Report shall be approved by the GNSO Council for delivery to the ICANN Board.

Section 9. Board Approval Processes

The Board will meet to discuss the GNSO Council recommendation as soon as feasible, but preferably not later than the second meeting after receipt of the Board Report from the Staff Manager. Board deliberation on the PDP Recommendations contained within the Recommendations Report shall proceed as follows:

a. Any PDP Recommendations approved by a GNSO Supermajority Vote shall be adopted by the Board unless, by a vote of more than two-thirds (2/3) of the Board, the Board determines that such policy is not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN. If the GNSO Council recommendation was approved by less than a GNSO Supermajority Vote, a majority vote of the Board will be sufficient to determine that such policy is not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN.

b. In the event that the Board determines, in accordance with paragraph a above, that the policy recommended by a GNSO Supermajority Vote or less than a GNSO Supermajority vote is not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN (the Corporation), the Board shall (i) articulate the reasons for its determination in a report to the Council (the "Board Statement"); and (ii) submit the Board Statement to the Council.

c. The Council shall review the Board Statement for discussion with the Board as soon as feasible after the Council's receipt of the Board Statement. The Board shall determine the method (e.g., by teleconference, e-mail, or otherwise) by which the Council and Board will discuss the Board Statement.

d. At the conclusion of the Council and Board discussions, the Council shall meet to affirm or modify its recommendation, and communicate that conclusion (the "Supplemental Recommendation") to the Board, including an explanation for the then-current recommendation. In the event that the Council is able to reach a GNSO Supermajority Vote on the Supplemental
Recommendation, the Board shall adopt the recommendation unless more than two-thirds (2/3) of the Board determines that such policy is not in the interests of the ICANN community or ICANN. For any Supplemental Recommendation approved by less than a GNSO Supermajority Vote, a majority vote of the Board shall be sufficient to determine that the policy in the Supplemental Recommendation is not in the best interest of the ICANN community or ICANN.

Section 10. Implementation of Approved Policies

Upon a final decision of the Board adopting the policy, the Board shall, as appropriate, give authorization or direction to ICANN staff to work with the GNSO Council to create an implementation plan based upon the implementation recommendations identified in the Final Report, and to implement the policy. The GNSO Council may, but is not required to, direct the creation of an implementation review team to assist in implementation of the policy.

Section 11. Maintenance of Records

Throughout the PDP, from policy suggestion to a final decision by the Board, ICANN will maintain on the Website, a status web page detailing the progress of each PDP issue. Such status page will outline the completed and upcoming steps in the PDP process, and contain links to key resources (e.g. Reports, Comments Fora, WG Discussions, etc.).

Section 12. Additional Definitions

"Comment Site", "Comment Forum", "Comments For a" and "Website" refer to one or more websites designated by ICANN on which notifications and comments regarding the PDP will be posted.

"Supermajority Vote" means a vote of more than sixty-six (66) percent of the members present at a meeting of the applicable body, with the exception of the GNSO Council.

"Staff Manager" means an ICANN staff person(s) who manages the PDP.

"GNSO Supermajority Vote" shall have the meaning set forth in the Bylaws.

Section 13. Applicability

The procedures of this Annex A shall be applicable to all requests for Issue Reports and PDPs initiated after 8 December 2011. For all ongoing PDPs initiated prior to 8 December 2011, the Council shall determine the feasibility of
transitioning to the procedures set forth in this Annex A for all remaining steps within the PDP. If the Council determines that any ongoing PDP cannot be feasibly transitioned to these updated procedures, the PDP shall be concluded according to the procedures set forth in Annex A in force on 7 December 2011.

Annex A-1: GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process

The following process shall govern the specific instances where the GNSO Council invokes the GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process ("EPDP"). The GNSO Council may invoke the EPDP in the following limited circumstances: (1) to address a narrowly defined policy issue that was identified and scoped after either the adoption of a GNSO policy recommendation by the ICANN Board or the implementation of such an adopted recommendation; or (2) to create new or additional recommendations for a specific policy issue that had been substantially scoped previously such that extensive, pertinent background information already exists, e.g. (a) in an Issue Report for a possible PDP that was not initiated; (b) as part of a previous PDP that was not completed; or (c) through other projects such as a GGP. The following process shall be in place until such time as modifications are recommended to and approved by the ICANN Board of Directors. Where a conflict arises in relation to an EPDP between the PDP Manual (see Annex 2 of the GNSO Operating Procedures) and the procedures described in this Annex A-1, the provisions of this Annex A-1 shall prevail.

The role of the GNSO is outlined in Article X of these Bylaws. Provided the Council believes and documents via Council vote that the above-listed criteria are met, an EPDP may be initiated to recommend an amendment to an existing Consensus Policy; however, in all cases where the GNSO is conducting policy-making activities that do not meet the above criteria as documented in a Council vote, the Council should act through a Policy Development Process (see Annex A).

Section 1. Required Elements of a GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process

The following elements are required at a minimum to develop expedited GNSO policy recommendations, including recommendations that could result in amendments to an existing Consensus Policy, as part of a GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process:

a. Formal initiation of the GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process by the GNSO Council, including an EPDP scoping document;

b. Formation of an EPDP Team or other designated work method;
c. Initial Report produced by an EPDP Team or other designated work method;

d. Final EPDP Policy Recommendation(s) Report produced by an EPDP Team, or other designated work method, and forwarded to the Council for deliberation;

e. GNSO Council approval of EPDP Policy Recommendations contained in the Final EPDP Policy Recommendation(s) Report, by the required thresholds;

f. EPDP Recommendations and Final EPDP Recommendation(s) Report forwarded to the Board through a Recommendations Report approved by the Council; and

g. Board approval of EPDP Recommendation(s).

Section 2. Expedited Policy Development Process Manual

The GNSO shall include a specific section(s) on the EPDP process as part of its maintenance of the GNSO Policy Development Process Manual (PDP Manual), described in Annex 5 of the GNSO Operating Procedures. The EPDP Manual shall contain specific additional guidance on completion of all elements of an EPDP, including those elements that are not otherwise defined in these Bylaws. The EPDP Manual and any amendments thereto are subject to a twenty-one (21) day public comment period at minimum, as well as Board oversight and review, as specified at Article X, Section 3.4.

Section 3. Initiation of the EPDP

The Council may initiate an EPDP as follows:

The Council may only initiate the EPDP by a vote of the Council. Initiation of an EPDP requires an affirmative Supermajority vote of the Council (as defined in these Bylaws) in favor of initiating the EPDP.

The request to initiate an EPDP must be accompanied by an EPDP scoping document, which is expected to include at a minimum the following information:

1. Name of Council Member / SG / C;

2. Origin of issue (e.g. previously completed PDP);

3. Scope of the effort (detailed description of the issue or question that the EPDP is expected to address);
4. Description of how this issue meets the criteria for an EPDP, i.e. how the EPDP will address either: (1) a narrowly defined policy issue that was identified and scoped after either the adoption of a GNSO policy recommendation by the ICANN Board or the implementation of such an adopted recommendation, or (2) new or additional policy recommendations on a specific GNSO policy issue that had been scoped previously as part of a PDP that was not completed or other similar effort, including relevant supporting information in either case;

5. If not provided as part of item 4, the opinion of the ICANN General Counsel as to whether the issue proposed for consideration is properly within the scope of the ICANN’s mission, policy process and more specifically the role of the GNSO;

6. Proposed EPDP mechanism (e.g. WG, DT, individual volunteers);

7. Method of operation, if different from GNSO Working Group Guidelines;

8. Decision-making methodology for EPDP mechanism, if different from GNSO Working Group Guidelines;

9. Target completion date.

Section 4. Council Deliberation

Upon receipt of an EPDP Final Recommendation(s) Report, whether as the result of an EPDP Team or otherwise, the Council chair will (i) distribute the Final EPDP Recommendation(s) Report to all Council members; and (ii) call for Council deliberation on the matter in accordance with the PDP Manual.

Approval of EPDP Recommendation(s) requires an affirmative vote of the Council meeting the thresholds set forth in in Article X, Section 3, paragraphs 9 n-o, as supplemented by the PDP Manual.

Section 5. Preparation of the Board Report

If the EPDP Recommendation(s) contained in the Final EPDP Recommendation(s) Report are approved by the GNSO Council, a Recommendation(s) Report shall be approved by the GNSO Council for delivery to the ICANN Board.

Section 6. Board Approval Processes

The Board will meet to discuss the EPDP recommendation(s) as soon as feasible, but preferably not later than the second meeting after receipt of the Recommendations Report from the Staff Manager. Board deliberation on the
EPDP Recommendations contained within the Recommendations Report shall proceed as follows:

a. Any EPDP Recommendations approved by a GNSO Supermajority Vote shall be adopted by the Board unless, by a vote of more than two-thirds (2/3) of the Board, the Board determines that such policy is not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN. If the GNSO Council recommendation was approved by less than a GNSO Supermajority Vote, a majority vote of the Board will be sufficient to determine that such policy is not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN.

b. In the event that the Board determines, in accordance with paragraph a above, that the proposed EPDP Recommendations are not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN (the Corporation), the Board shall (i) articulate the reasons for its determination in a report to the Council (the "Board Statement"); and (ii) submit the Board Statement to the Council.

c. The Council shall review the Board Statement for discussion with the Board as soon as feasible after the Council's receipt of the Board Statement. The Board shall determine the method (e.g., by teleconference, e-mail, or otherwise) by which the Council and Board will discuss the Board Statement.

d. At the conclusion of the Council and Board discussions, the Council shall meet to affirm or modify its recommendation, and communicate that conclusion (the "Supplemental Recommendation") to the Board, including an explanation for the then-current recommendation. In the event that the Council is able to reach a GNSO Supermajority Vote on the Supplemental Recommendation, the Board shall adopt the recommendation unless more than two-thirds (2/3) of the Board determines that such guidance is not in the interests of the ICANN community or ICANN. For any Supplemental Recommendation approved by less than a GNSO Supermajority Vote, a majority vote of the Board shall be sufficient to determine that the guidance in the Supplemental Recommendation is not in the best interest of the ICANN community or ICANN.

Section 7. Implementation of Approved Policies

Upon a final decision of the Board adopting the EPDP recommendations, the Board shall, as appropriate, give authorization or direction to ICANN staff to implement the EPDP Recommendations. If deemed necessary, the Board shall direct ICANN staff to work with the GNSO Council to create a guidance implementation plan, based upon the guidance recommendations identified in the
Final EPDP Recommendation(s) Report.

Section 8. Maintenance of Records

Throughout the EPDP, from initiation to a final decision by the Board, ICANN will maintain on the Website, a status web page detailing the progress of each EPDP issue. Such status page will outline the completed and upcoming steps in the EPDP process, and contain links to key resources (e.g. Reports, Comments Fora, EPDP Discussions, etc.).

Section 9. Applicability

The procedures of this Annex A-1 shall be applicable from 28 September 2015 onwards.

Annex A-2: GNSO Guidance Process

The following process shall govern the GNSO guidance process ("GGP") until such time as modifications are recommended to and approved by the ICANN Board of Directors ("Board"). The role of the GNSO is outlined in Article X of these Bylaws. If the GNSO is conducting activities that are intended to result in a Consensus Policy, the Council should act through a Policy Development Process (see Annex A).

Section 1. Required Elements of a GNSO Guidance Process

The following elements are required at a minimum to develop GNSO guidance:

1. Formal initiation of the GNSO Guidance Process by the Council, including a GGP scoping document;
2. Identification of the types of expertise needed on the GGP Team;
3. Recruiting and formation of a GGP Team or other designated work method;
4. Proposed GNSO Guidance Recommendation(s) Report produced by a GGP Team or other designated work method;
5. Final GNSO Guidance Recommendation(s) Report produced by a GGP Team, or other designated work method, and forwarded to the Council for deliberation;
6. Council approval of GGP Recommendations contained in the Final Recommendation(s) Report, by the required thresholds;
7. GGP Recommendations and Final Recommendation(s) Report shall be forwarded to the Board through a Recommendations Report approved by the Council; and

8. Board approval of GGP Recommendation(s).

Section 2. **GNSO Guidance Process Manual**

The GNSO shall maintain a GNSO Guidance Process (GGP Manual) within the operating procedures of the GNSO maintained by the GNSO Council. The GGP Manual shall contain specific additional guidance on completion of all elements of a GGP, including those elements that are not otherwise defined in these Bylaws. The GGP Manual and any amendments thereto are subject to a twenty-one (21) day public comment period at minimum, as well as Board oversight and review, as specified at Article X, Section 3.4.

Section 3. **Initiation of the GGP**

The Council may initiate a GGP as follows:

The Council may only initiate the GGP by a vote of the Council or at the formal request of the ICANN Board. Initiation of a GGP requires a vote as set forth in Article X, Section 3, paragraph 9.p in favor of initiating the GGP. In the case of a GGP requested by the ICANN Board, a GGP will automatically be initiated unless the GNSO Council votes against the initiation of a GGP as set forth in Article X, Section 3, paragraph 9.q.

The request to initiate a GGP must be accompanied by a GGP scoping document, which is expected to include at a minimum the following information:

1. Name of Council Member / SG / C

2. Origin of issue (e.g., board request)

3. Scope of the effort (detailed description of the issue or question that the GGP is expected to address)

4. Proposed GGP mechanism (e.g. WG, DT, individual volunteers)

5. Method of operation, if different from GNSO Working Group Guidelines

6. Decision-making methodology for GGP mechanism, if different from GNSO Working Group Guidelines

7. Desired completion date and rationale
In the event the Board makes a request for a GGP, the Board should provide a mechanism by which the GNSO Council can consult with the Board to provide information on the scope, timing, and priority of the request for a GGP.

Section 4. Council Deliberation

Upon receipt of a Final Recommendation(s) Report, whether as the result of a GGP Team or otherwise, the Council chair will (i) distribute the Final Recommendation(s) Report to all Council members; and (ii) call for Council deliberation on the matter in accordance with the GGP Manual.

The Council approval process is set forth in Article X, Section 3, paragraph 9. as supplemented by the GGP Manual.

Section 5. Preparation of the Board Report

If the GGP recommendations contained in the Final Recommendation(s) Report are approved by the GNSO Council, a Recommendations Report shall be approved by the GNSO Council for delivery to the ICANN Board.

Section 6. Board Approval Processes

The Board will meet to discuss the GNSO Guidance recommendation(s) as soon as feasible, but preferably not later than the second meeting after receipt of the Board Report from the Staff Manager. Board deliberation on the GGP Recommendations contained within the Recommendations Report shall proceed as follows:

a. Any GGP Recommendations approved by a GNSO Supermajority Vote shall be adopted by the Board unless, by a vote of more than two-thirds (2/3) of the Board, the Board determines that such guidance is not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN.

b. In the event that the Board determines, in accordance with paragraph a above, that the proposed GNSO Guidance recommendation(s) adopted by a GNSO Supermajority Vote is not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN (the Corporation), the Board shall (i) articulate the reasons for its determination in a report to the Council (the "Board Statement"); and (ii) submit the Board Statement to the Council.

c. The Council shall review the Board Statement for discussion with the Board as soon as feasible after the Council's receipt of the Board Statement. The Board shall determine the method (e.g., by teleconference, e-mail, or otherwise) by which the Council and Board will discuss the Board Statement.
d. At the conclusion of the Council and Board discussions, the Council shall meet to affirm or modify its recommendation, and communicate that conclusion (the "Supplemental Recommendation") to the Board, including an explanation for the then-current recommendation. In the event that the Council is able to reach a GNSO Supermajority Vote on the Supplemental Recommendation, the Board shall adopt the recommendation unless more than two-thirds (2/3) of the Board determines that such guidance is not in the interests of the ICANN community or ICANN.

Section 7. Implementation of Approved GNSO Guidance

Upon a final decision of the Board adopting the guidance, the Board shall, as appropriate, give authorization or direction to ICANN staff to implement the GNSO Guidance. If deemed necessary, the Board may direct ICANN Staff to work with the GNSO Council to create a guidance implementation plan, if deemed necessary, based upon the guidance recommendations identified in the Final Recommendation(s) Report.

Section 8. Maintenance of Records

Throughout the GGP, from initiation to a final decision by the Board, ICANN will maintain on the Website, a status web page detailing the progress of each GGP issue. Such status page will outline the completed and upcoming steps in the GGP process, and contain links to key resources (e.g. Reports, Comments Fora, GGP Discussions, etc.).

Section 9. Additional Definitions

"Comment Site", "Comment Forum", "Comments Fora" and "Website" refer to one or more websites designated by ICANN on which notifications and comments regarding the GGP will be posted.

"GGP Staff Manager" means an ICANN staff person(s) who manages the GGP.

Annex B: ccNSO Policy-Development Process (ccPDP)

The following process shall govern the ccNSO policy-development process ("PDP").

1. Request for an Issue Report

An Issue Report may be requested by any of the following:
a. Council. The ccNSO Council (in this Annex B, the "Council") may call for the creation of an Issue Report by an affirmative vote of at least seven of the members of the Council present at any meeting or voting by e-mail.

b. Board. The ICANN Board may call for the creation of an Issue Report by requesting the Council to begin the policy-development process.

c. Regional Organization. One or more of the Regional Organizations representing ccTLDs in the ICANN recognized Regions may call for creation of an Issue Report by requesting the Council to begin the policy-development process.

d. ICANN Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee. An ICANN Supporting Organization or an ICANN Advisory Committee may call for creation of an Issue Report by requesting the Council to begin the policy-development process.

e. Members of the ccNSO. The members of the ccNSO may call for the creation of an Issue Report by an affirmative vote of at least ten members of the ccNSO present at any meeting or voting by e-mail.

Any request for an Issue Report must be in writing and must set out the issue upon which an Issue Report is requested in sufficient detail to enable the Issue Report to be prepared. It shall be open to the Council to request further information or undertake further research or investigation for the purpose of determining whether or not the requested Issue Report should be created.

2. Creation of the Issue Report and Initiation Threshold

Within seven days after an affirmative vote as outlined in Item 1(a) above or the receipt of a request as outlined in Items 1(b), (c), or (d) above the Council shall appoint an Issue Manager. The Issue Manager may be a staff member of ICANN (in which case the costs of the Issue Manager shall be borne by ICANN) or such other person or persons selected by the Council (in which case the ccNSO shall be responsible for the costs of the Issue Manager).

Within fifteen (15) calendar days after appointment (or such other time as the Council shall, in consultation with the Issue Manager, deem to be appropriate), the Issue Manager shall create an Issue Report. Each Issue Report shall contain at least the following:
a. The proposed issue raised for consideration;

b. The identity of the party submitting the issue;

c. How that party is affected by the issue;

d. Support for the issue to initiate the PDP;

e. A recommendation from the Issue Manager as to whether the Council should move to initiate the PDP for this issue (the "Manager Recommendation"). Each Manager Recommendation shall include, and be supported by, an opinion of the ICANN General Counsel regarding whether the issue is properly within the scope of the ICANN policy process and within the scope of the ccNSO. In coming to his or her opinion, the General Counsel shall examine whether:

1. The issue is within the scope of ICANN's mission statement;

2. Analysis of the relevant factors according to Article IX, Section 6(2) and Annex C affirmatively demonstrates that the issue is within the scope of the ccNSO;

In the event that the General Counsel reaches an opinion in the affirmative with respect to points 1 and 2 above then the General Counsel shall also consider whether the issue:

3. Implicates or affects an existing ICANN policy;

4. Is likely to have lasting value or applicability, albeit with the need for occasional updates, and to establish a guide or framework for future decision-making.

In all events, consideration of revisions to the ccPDP (this Annex B) or to the scope of the ccNSO (Annex C) shall be within the scope of ICANN and the ccNSO.

In the event that General Counsel is of the opinion the issue is not properly within the scope of the ccNSO Scope, the Issue Manager shall inform the Council of this opinion. If after an analysis of the relevant factors according to Article IX, Section 6 and Annex C a majority of 10 or more Council members is of the opinion the issue is within scope the Chair of the ccNSO shall inform the Issue Manager accordingly. General Counsel and the ccNSO Council shall engage in a dialogue according to agreed rules and procedures to resolve the matter. In the event no agreement is reached between General Counsel and the Council as to whether the issue is within or outside Scope of the ccNSO then by a vote of 15 or more members the
Council may decide the issue is within scope. The Chair of the ccNSO shall inform General Counsel and the Issue Manager accordingly. The Issue Manager shall then proceed with a recommendation whether or not the Council should move to initiate the PDP including both the opinion and analysis of General Counsel and Council in the Issues Report.

f. In the event that the Manager Recommendation is in favor of initiating the PDP, a proposed time line for conducting each of the stages of PDP outlined herein (PDP Time Line).

g. If possible, the issue report shall indicate whether the resulting output is likely to result in a policy to be approved by the ICANN Board. In some circumstances, it will not be possible to do this until substantive discussions on the issue have taken place. In these cases, the issue report should indicate this uncertainty. Upon completion of the Issue Report, the Issue Manager shall distribute it to the full Council for a vote on whether to initiate the PDP.

3. Initiation of PDP

The Council shall decide whether to initiate the PDP as follows:

a. Within 21 days after receipt of an Issue Report from the Issue Manager, the Council shall vote on whether to initiate the PDP. Such vote should be taken at a meeting held in any manner deemed appropriate by the Council, including in person or by conference call, but if a meeting is not feasible the vote may occur by e-mail.

b. A vote of ten or more Council members in favor of initiating the PDP shall be required to initiate the PDP provided that the Issue Report states that the issue is properly within the scope of the ICANN mission statement and the ccNSO Scope.

4. Decision Whether to Appoint Task Force; Establishment of Time Line

At the meeting of the Council where the PDP has been initiated (or, where the Council employs a vote by e-mail, in that vote) pursuant to Item 3 above, the Council shall decide, by a majority vote of members present at the meeting (or voting by e-mail), whether or not to appoint a task force to address the issue. If the Council votes:

a. In favor of convening a task force, it shall do so in accordance with Item 7 below.
b. Against convening a task force, then it shall collect information on the policy issue in accordance with Item 8 below.

The Council shall also, by a majority vote of members present at the meeting or voting by e-mail, approve or amend and approve the PDP Time Lineset out in the Issue Report.

5. Composition and Selection of Task Forces

a. Upon voting to appoint a task force, the Council shall invite each of the Regional Organizations (see Article IX, Section 6) to appoint two individuals to participate in the task force (the "Representatives"). Additionally, the Council may appoint up to three advisors (the "Advisors") from outside the ccNSO and, following formal request for GAC participation in the Task Force, accept up to two Representatives from the Governmental Advisory Committee to sit on the task force. The Council may increase the number of Representatives that may sit on a task force in its discretion in circumstances that it deems necessary or appropriate.

b. Any Regional Organization wishing to appoint Representatives to the task force must provide the names of the Representatives to the Issue Manager within ten (10) calendar days after such request so that they are included on the task force. Such Representatives need not be members of the Council, but each must be an individual who has an interest, and ideally knowledge and expertise, in the subject matter, coupled with the ability to devote a substantial amount of time to the task force's activities.

c. The Council may also pursue other actions that it deems appropriate to assist in the PDP, including appointing a particular individual or organization to gather information on the issue or scheduling meetings for deliberation or briefing. All such information shall be submitted to the Issue Manager in accordance with the PDP Time Line.

6. Public Notification of Initiation of the PDP and Comment Period

After initiation of the PDP, ICANN shall post a notification of such action to the Website and to the other ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees. A comment period (in accordance with the PDP Time Line, and ordinarily at least 21 days long) shall be commenced for the issue. Comments shall be accepted from ccTLD managers, other Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees, and from the public. The
Issue Manager, or some other designated Council representative shall review the comments and incorporate them into a report (the "Comment Report") to be included in either the Preliminary Task Force Report or the Initial Report, as applicable.

7. Task Forces

a. Role of Task Force. If a task force is created, its role shall be responsible for (i) gathering information documenting the positions of the ccNSO members within the Geographic Regions and other parties and groups; and (ii) otherwise obtaining relevant information that shall enable the Task Force Report to be as complete and informative as possible to facilitate the Council's meaningful and informed deliberation.

The task force shall not have any formal decision-making authority. Rather, the role of the task force shall be to gather information that shall document the positions of various parties or groups as specifically and comprehensively as possible, thereby enabling the Council to have a meaningful and informed deliberation on the issue.

b. Task Force Charter or Terms of Reference. The Council, with the assistance of the Issue Manager, shall develop a charter or terms of reference for the task force (the "Charter") within the time designated in the PDP Time Line. Such Charter shall include:

1. The issue to be addressed by the task force, as such issue was articulated for the vote before the Council that initiated the PDP;

2. The specific time line that the task force must adhere to, as set forth below, unless the Council determines that there is a compelling reason to extend the timeline; and

3. Any specific instructions from the Council for the task force, including whether or not the task force should solicit the advice of outside advisors on the issue.

The task force shall prepare its report and otherwise conduct its activities in accordance with the Charter. Any request to deviate from the Charter must be formally presented to the Council and may only be undertaken by the task force upon a vote of a majority of the Council members present at a meeting or voting by e-mail. The quorum requirements of Article IX, Section 3(14) shall apply to
c. **Appointment of Task Force Chair.** The Issue Manager shall convene the first meeting of the task force within the time designated in the PDP Time Line. At the initial meeting, the task force members shall, among other things, vote to appoint a task force chair. The chair shall be responsible for organizing the activities of the task force, including compiling the Task Force Report. The chair of a task force need not be a member of the Council.

d. **Collection of Information.**

1. **Regional Organization Statements.** The Representatives shall each be responsible for soliciting the position of the Regional Organization for their Geographic Region, at a minimum, and may solicit other comments, as each Representative deems appropriate, including the comments of the ccNSO members in that region that are not members of the Regional Organization, regarding the issue under consideration. The position of the Regional Organization and any other comments gathered by the Representatives should be submitted in a formal statement to the task force chair (each, a "Regional Statement") within the time designated in the PDP Time Line. Every Regional Statement shall include at least the following:

   i. If a Supermajority Vote (as defined by the Regional Organization) was reached, a clear statement of the Regional Organization's position on the issue;

   ii. If a Supermajority Vote was not reached, a clear statement of all positions espoused by the members of the Regional Organization;

   iii. A clear statement of how the Regional Organization arrived at its position(s). Specifically, the statement should detail specific meetings, teleconferences, or other means of deliberating an issue, and a list of all members who participated or otherwise submitted their views;

   iv. A statement of the position on the issue of any ccNSO members that are not members of the Regional Organization;
v. An analysis of how the issue would affect the Region, including any financial impact on the Region; and

vi. An analysis of the period of time that would likely be necessary to implement the policy.

2. Outside Advisors. The task force may, in its discretion, solicit the opinions of outside advisors, experts, or other members of the public. Such opinions should be set forth in a report prepared by such outside advisors, and (i) clearly labeled as coming from outside advisors; (ii) accompanied by a detailed statement of the advisors' (a) qualifications and relevant experience and (b) potential conflicts of interest. These reports should be submitted in a formal statement to the task force chair within the time designated in the PDP Time Line.

e. Task Force Report. The chair of the task force, working with the Issue Manager, shall compile the Regional Statements, the Comment Report, and other information or reports, as applicable, into a single document ("Preliminary Task Force Report") and distribute the Preliminary Task Force Report to the full task force within the time designated in the PDP Time Line. The task force shall have a final task force meeting to consider the issues and try and reach a Supermajority Vote. After the final task force meeting, the chair of the task force and the Issue Manager shall create the final task force report (the "Task Force Report") and post it on the Website and to the other ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees. Each Task Force Report must include:

1. A clear statement of any Supermajority Vote (being 66% of the task force) position of the task force on the issue;

2. If a Supermajority Vote was not reached, a clear statement of all positions espoused by task force members submitted within the time line for submission of constituency reports. Each statement should clearly indicate (i) the reasons underlying the position and (ii) the Regional Organizations that held the position;

3. An analysis of how the issue would affect each Region, including any financial impact on the Region;

4. An analysis of the period of time that would likely be necessary to implement the policy; and
5. The advice of any outside advisors appointed to the task force by the Council, accompanied by a detailed statement of the advisors’ (i) qualifications and relevant experience and (ii) potential conflicts of interest.

8. Procedure if No Task Force is Formed

a. If the Council decides not to convene a task force, each Regional Organization shall, within the time designated in the PDP Time Line, appoint a representative to solicit the Region’s views on the issue. Each such representative shall be asked to submit a Regional Statement to the Issue Manager within the time designated in the PDP Time Line.

b. The Council may, in its discretion, take other steps to assist in the PDP, including, for example, appointing a particular individual or organization, to gather information on the issue or scheduling meetings for deliberation or briefing. All such information shall be submitted to the Issue Manager within the time designated in the PDP Time Line.

c. The Council shall formally request the Chair of the GAC to offer opinion or advice.

d. The Issue Manager shall take all Regional Statements, the Comment Report, and other information and compile (and post on the Website) an Initial Report within the time designated in the PDP Time Line. Thereafter, the Issue Manager shall, in accordance with Item 9 below, create a Final Report.

9. Comments to the Task Force Report or Initial Report

a. A comment period (in accordance with the PDP Time Line, and ordinarily at least 21 days long) shall be opened for comments on the Task Force Report or Initial Report. Comments shall be accepted from ccTLD managers, other Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees, and from the public. All comments shall include the author's name, relevant experience, and interest in the issue.

b. At the end of the comment period, the Issue Manager shall review the comments received and may, in the Issue Manager’s reasonable discretion, add appropriate comments to the Task Force Report or Initial Report, to prepare the "Final Report". The Issue Manager shall not be obligated to include all comments made during
the comment period, nor shall the Issue Manager be obligated to include all comments submitted by any one individual or organization.

c. The Issue Manager shall prepare the Final Report and submit it to the Council chair within the time designated in the PDP Time Line.

10. Council Deliberation

a. Upon receipt of a Final Report, whether as the result of a task force or otherwise, the Council chair shall (i) distribute the Final Report to all Council members; (ii) call for a Council meeting within the time designated in the PDP Time Line wherein the Council shall work towards achieving a recommendation to present to the Board; and (iii) formally send to the GAC Chair an invitation to the GAC to offer opinion or advice. Such meeting may be held in any manner deemed appropriate by the Council, including in person or by conference call. The Issue Manager shall be present at the meeting.

b. The Council may commence its deliberation on the issue prior to the formal meeting, including via in-person meetings, conference calls, e-mail discussions, or any other means the Council may choose.

c. The Council may, if it so chooses, solicit the opinions of outside advisors at its final meeting. The opinions of these advisors, if relied upon by the Council, shall be (i) embodied in the Council's report to the Board, (ii) specifically identified as coming from an outside advisor; and (iii) accompanied by a detailed statement of the advisor's (a) qualifications and relevant experience and (b) potential conflicts of interest.

11. Recommendation of the Council

In considering whether to make a recommendation on the issue (a "Council Recommendation"), the Council shall seek to act by consensus. If a minority opposes a consensus position, that minority shall prepare and circulate to the Council a statement explaining its reasons for opposition. If the Council's discussion of the statement does not result in consensus, then a recommendation supported by 14 or more of the Council members shall be deemed to reflect the view of the Council, and shall be conveyed to the Members as the Council's Recommendation. Notwithstanding the foregoing, as outlined below, all viewpoints expressed by Council members during the PDP must be included in the Members Report.

12. Council Report to the Members
In the event that a Council Recommendation is adopted pursuant to Item 11 then the Issue Manager shall, within seven days after the Council meeting, incorporate the Council's Recommendation together with any other viewpoints of the Council members into a Members Report to be approved by the Council and then to be submitted to the Members (the "Members Report"). The Members Report must contain at least the following:

a. A clear statement of the Council's recommendation;

b. The Final Report submitted to the Council; and

c. A copy of the minutes of the Council's deliberation on the policy issue (see Item 10), including all the opinions expressed during such deliberation, accompanied by a description of who expressed such opinions.

13. **Members Vote**

Following the submission of the Members Report and within the time designated by the PDP Time Line, the ccNSO members shall be given an opportunity to vote on the Council Recommendation. The vote of members shall be electronic and members' votes shall be lodged over such a period of time as designated in the PDP Time Line (at least 21 days long).

In the event that at least 50% of the ccNSO members lodge votes within the voting period, the resulting vote will be employed without further process. In the event that fewer than 50% of the ccNSO members lodge votes in the first round of voting, the first round will not be employed and the results of a final, second round of voting, conducted after at least thirty days notice to the ccNSO members, will be employed if at least 50% of the ccNSO members lodge votes. In the event that more than 66% of the votes received at the end of the voting period shall be in favor of the Council Recommendation, then the recommendation shall be conveyed to the Board in accordance with Item 14 below as the ccNSO Recommendation.

14. **Board Report**

The Issue Manager shall within seven days after a ccNSO Recommendation being made in accordance with Item 13 incorporate the ccNSO Recommendation into a report to be approved by the Council and then to be submitted to the Board (the "Board Report"). The Board Report must contain at least the following:
a. A clear statement of the ccNSO recommendation;

b. The Final Report submitted to the Council; and

c. the Members' Report.

15. **Board Vote**

a. The Board shall meet to discuss the ccNSO Recommendation as soon as feasible after receipt of the Board Report from the Issue Manager, taking into account procedures for Board consideration.

b. The Board shall adopt the ccNSO Recommendation unless by a vote of more than 66% the Board determines that such policy is not in the best interest of the ICANN community or of ICANN.

1. In the event that the Board determines not to act in accordance with the ccNSO Recommendation, the Board shall (i) state its reasons for its determination not to act in accordance with the ccNSO Recommendation in a report to the Council (the "Board Statement"); and (ii) submit the Board Statement to the Council.

2. The Council shall discuss the Board Statement with the Board within thirty days after the Board Statement is submitted to the Council. The Board shall determine the method (e.g., by teleconference, e-mail, or otherwise) by which the Council and Board shall discuss the Board Statement. The discussions shall be held in good faith and in a timely and efficient manner, to find a mutually acceptable solution.

3. At the conclusion of the Council and Board discussions, the Council shall meet to affirm or modify its Council Recommendation. A recommendation supported by 14 or more of the Council members shall be deemed to reflect the view of the Council (the Council's "Supplemental Recommendation"). That Supplemental Recommendation shall be conveyed to the Members in a Supplemental Members Report, including an explanation for the Supplemental Recommendation. Members shall be given an opportunity to vote on the Supplemental Recommendation under the same conditions outlined in Item 13. In the event that more than 66% of the votes cast by ccNSO Members during the voting period are in favor of the Supplemental Recommendation then that recommendation shall be
conveyed to Board as the ccNSO Supplemental Recommendation and the Board shall adopt the recommendation unless by a vote of more than 66% of the Board determines that acceptance of such policy would constitute a breach of the fiduciary duties of the Board to the Company.

4. In the event that the Board does not accept the ccNSO Supplemental Recommendation, it shall state its reasons for doing so in its final decision ("Supplemental Board Statement").

5. In the event the Board determines not to accept a ccNSO Supplemental Recommendation, then the Board shall not be entitled to set policy on the issue addressed by the recommendation and the status quo shall be preserved until such time as the ccNSO shall, under the ccPDP, make a recommendation on the issue that is deemed acceptable by the Board.

16. Implementation of the Policy

Upon adoption by the Board of a ccNSO Recommendation or ccNSO Supplemental Recommendation, the Board shall, as appropriate, direct or authorize ICANN staff to implement the policy.

17. Maintenance of Records

With respect to each ccPDP for which an Issue Report is requested (see Item 1), ICANN shall maintain on the Website a status web page detailing the progress of each ccPDP, which shall provide a list of relevant dates for the ccPDP and shall also link to the following documents, to the extent they have been prepared pursuant to the ccPDP:

a. Issue Report;

b. PDP Time Line;

c. Comment Report;

d. Regional Statement(s);

e. Preliminary Task Force Report;

f. Task Force Report;
g. Initial Report;

h. Final Report;

i. Members' Report;

j. Board Report;

k. Board Statement;

l. Supplemental Members' Report; and

m. Supplemental Board Statement.

In addition, ICANN shall post on the Website comments received in electronic written form specifically suggesting that a ccPDP be initiated.

Annex C: The Scope of the ccNSO

This annex describes the scope and the principles and method of analysis to be used in any further development of the scope of the ccNSO's policy-development role. As provided in Article IX, Section 6(2) of the Bylaws, that scope shall be defined according to the procedures of the ccPDP.

The scope of the ccNSO's authority and responsibilities must recognize the complex relation between ICANN and ccTLD managers/registries with regard to policy issues. This annex shall assist the ccNSO, the ccNSO Council, and the ICANN Board and staff in delineating relevant global policy issues.

Policy areas

The ccNSO's policy role should be based on an analysis of the following functional model of the DNS:

1. Data is registered/maintained to generate a zone file,

2. A zone file is in turn used in TLD name servers.

Within a TLD two functions have to be performed (these are addressed in greater detail below):

1. Entering data into a database (Data Entry Function) and

2. Maintaining and ensuring upkeep of name-servers for the TLD (Name Server Function).
These two core functions must be performed at the ccTLD registry level as well as at a higher level (IANA function and root servers) and at lower levels of the DNS hierarchy. This mechanism, as RFC 1591 points out, is recursive:

There are no requirements on sub domains of top-level domains beyond the requirements on higher-level domains themselves. That is, the requirements in this memo are applied recursively. In particular, all sub domains shall be allowed to operate their own domain name servers, providing in them whatever information the sub domain manager sees fit (as long as it is true and correct).

The Core Functions

1. Data Entry Function (DEF):

   Looking at a more detailed level, the first function (entering and maintaining data in a database) should be fully defined by a naming policy. This naming policy must specify the rules and conditions:

   a. under which data will be collected and entered into a database or data changed (at the TLD level among others, data to reflect a transfer from registrant to registrant or changing registrar) in the database.

   b. for making certain data generally and publicly available (be it, for example, through Whois or nameservers).

2. The Name-Server Function (NSF)

   The name-server function involves essential interoperability and stability issues at the heart of the domain name system. The importance of this function extends to nameservers at the ccTLD level, but also to the root servers (and root-server system) and nameservers at lower levels.

   On its own merit and because of interoperability and stability considerations, properly functioning nameservers are of utmost importance to the individual, as well as to the local and the global Internet communities.

   With regard to the nameserver function, therefore, policies need to be defined and established. Most parties involved, including the majority of ccTLD registries, have accepted the need for common policies in this area by adhering to the relevant RFCs, among others RFC 1591.
It is in the interest of ICANN and ccTLD managers to ensure the stable and proper functioning of the domain name system. ICANN and the ccTLD registries each have a distinctive role to play in this regard that can be defined by the relevant policies. The scope of the ccNSO cannot be established without reaching a common understanding of the allocation of authority between ICANN and ccTLD registries.

Three roles can be distinguished as to which responsibility must be assigned on any given issue:

- **Policy role:** i.e. the ability and power to define a policy;
- **Executive role:** i.e. the ability and power to act upon and implement the policy; and
- **Accountability role:** i.e. the ability and power to hold the responsible entity accountable for exercising its power.

Firstly, responsibility presupposes a policy and this delineates the policy role. Depending on the issue that needs to be addressed those who are involved in defining and setting the policy need to be determined and defined. Secondly, this presupposes an executive role defining the power to implement and act within the boundaries of a policy. Finally, as a counter-balance to the executive role, the accountability role needs to defined and determined.

The information below offers an aid to:

1. delineate and identify specific policy areas;
2. define and determine roles with regard to these specific policy areas.

This annex defines the scope of the ccNSO with regard to developing policies. The scope is limited to the policy role of the ccNSO policy-development process for functions and levels explicitly stated below. It is anticipated that the accuracy of the assignments of policy, executive, and accountability roles shown below will be considered during a scope-definition ccPDP process.

*Name Server Function (as to ccTLDs)*

**Level 1: Root Name Servers**
Policy role: IETF, RSSAC (ICANN)
Executive role: Root Server System Operators
Accountability role: RSSAC (ICANN), (US DoC-ICANN MoU)

**Level 2: ccTLD Registry Name Servers in respect to interoperability**
Policy role: ccNSO Policy Development Process (ICANN), for best practices a ccNSO process can be organized
Executive role: ccTLD Manager
Accountability role: part ICANN (IANA), part Local Internet Community, including local government

Level 3: User's Name Servers
Policy role: ccTLD Manager, IETF (RFC)
Executive role: Registrant
Accountability role: ccTLD Manager

*Data Entry Function (as to ccTLDs)*
Level 1: Root Level Registry
Policy role: ccNSO Policy Development Process (ICANN)
Executive role: ICANN (IANA)
Accountability role: ICANN community, ccTLD Managers, US DoC, (national authorities in some cases)

Level 2: ccTLD Registry
Policy role: Local Internet Community, including local government, and/or ccTLD Manager according to local structure
Executive role: ccTLD Manager
Accountability role: Local Internet Community, including national authorities in some cases

Level 3: Second and Lower Levels
Policy role: Registrant
Executive role: Registrant
Accountability role: Registrant, users of lower-level domain names

---

1 A GNSO Supermajority Vote will be required to not initiate a GGP following a formal request from the ICANN Board.

2 Approval of GGP recommendations requires a GNSO Supermajority Vote.
EXHIBIT C-44
13 July 2016

Mr. Jose Ignacio Rasco, NU DOT CO LLC
Ms. Sarah Falvey, Charleston Road Registry Inc.
Mr. Robert Wiegand, Web.com Group, Inc
Mr. Brijesh Joshi, DotWeb Inc.
Mr. Daniel Schindler, Ruby Glen, LLC
Mr. John Kane, Afilias Domains No. 3 Limited
Mr. David Barron, Vistaprint Ltd
Mr. Thomas Moerz, Schlund Technologies GmbH
Mr. Jonathon Nevett, Ruby Glen, LLC

Re: .WEB/.WEBS Auction on 27 July 2016

Dear Members of the .WEB/.WEBS Contention Set,

We are writing in regards to inquiries we have received concerning potential changes of control of NU DOT CO LLC, an applicant in the .WEB/.WEBS contention set, and requests to postpone the auction to investigate the matter. We would like to provide some clarification regarding this issue and how it may or may not impact the .WEB/.WEBS auction scheduled for 27 July 2016.

Firstly, as a reminder, in regards to a request for postponement, Rule 10 of the Auction Rules for Indirect Contention states:

"...Postponement requests must be submitted by all members of the Contention Set by the due date specified within the ICANN Customer Portal, generally twenty eight (28) days after receipt of Intent to Auction notice from ICANN. If a postponement request is not submitted by the due date specified within the ICANN Customer Portal or is not accommodated by ICANN, an applicant may request an advancement/postponement request via submission of the Auction Date Advancement/Postponement Request Form. The form must be submitted at least 45 days prior to the scheduled Auction Date and ICANN must receive a request from each member of the contention set..." (https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/auctions/rules-indirect-contention-24feb15-en.pdf)

The date to submit the postponement form passed on 12 June 2016, and we did not receive consensus from the contention set. As such, no postponement was granted.

Secondly, in regards to potential changes of control of NU DOT CO LLC, we have investigated the matter, and to date we have found no basis to initiate the application change request process or postpone the auction.
Finally, as you are aware, ICANN provided confirmation to all members of the .WEB/.WEBS contention set on 6 July 2016 that the auction will be proceeding as scheduled on 27 July 2016. Please follow all instructions provided to you by Power Auctions, the Auction Manager, regarding next steps, including mini and mock auctions as well as the deposit deadline.

Regarding the deposit deadline, Rule 28 of the Auction Rules for Indirect Contention states:

“All wires and all instructions associated with Deposits, including instructions regarding the allocation of funds among Contention Sets from wires and funds rolled over from previous Auctions, must be received no later than 16:00 UTC on the day that is seven (7) calendar days prior to the Commencement Date of the relevant Auction (the “Deposit Deadline”), unless this deadline is waived, at the Auction Manager’s sole discretion.”

As per Rule 28, the Deposit Deadline for the upcoming auction is 16:00 UTC on 20 July 2016.

While the auction is currently set to proceed as scheduled, applicants may continue to work toward self-resolution of the contention set. Applicants may withdraw their application up until the Deposit Deadline noted above. Once the Deposit Deadline is reached, there is a quiet period in which applicants are no longer allowed to withdraw their application until after conclusion of the auction.

I hope this information has been helpful to you. Please do not hesitate to respond with any additional questions or concerns. Should you have specific questions regarding next steps for the auction, you may submit a case to globalsupport@icann.org, and someone from my team will contact you promptly.

Sincerely,

Christine A. Willett
Vice President, GDD Operations
ICANN
EXHIBIT C-46
August 1, 2016

Verisign Statement Regarding .Web Auction Results

RESTON, Va.--(BUSINESS WIRE)-- VeriSign, Inc. (NASDAQ:VRSN), a global leader in domain names and internet security, today announced the following information pertaining to the .web top-level domain (TLD):

The Company entered into an agreement with Nu Dot Co LLC wherein the Company provided funds for Nu Dot Co's bid for the .web TLD. We are pleased that the Nu Dot Co bid was successful.

We anticipate that Nu Dot Co will execute the .web Registry Agreement with the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) and will then seek to assign the Registry Agreement to Verisign upon consent from ICANN.

As the most experienced and reliable registry operator, Verisign is well-positioned to widely distribute .web. Our expertise, infrastructure, and partner relationships will enable us to quickly grow .web and establish it as an additional option for registrants worldwide in the growing TLD marketplace. Our track record of over 19 years of uninterrupted availability means that businesses and individuals using .web as their online identity can be confident of being reliably found online. And these users, along with our global distribution partners, will benefit from the many new domain name choices that .web will offer.

About Verisign

Verisign, a global leader in domain names and internet security, enables internet navigation for many of the world's most recognized domain names and provides protection for websites and enterprises around the world. Verisign ensures the security, stability and resiliency of key internet infrastructure and services, including the .com and .net domains and two of the internet's root servers, as well as performs the root zone maintainer functions for the core of the internet's Domain Name System (DNS). Verisign's Security Services include intelligence-driven Distributed Denial of Service Protection, iDefense Security Intelligence and Managed DNS. To learn more about what it means to be Powered by Verisign, please visit Verisign.com.

VRSNF

© 2016 VeriSign, Inc. All rights reserved. VERISIGN, the VERISIGN logo, and other trademarks, service marks, and designs are registered or unregistered trademarks of VeriSign, Inc. and its subsidiaries in the United States and in foreign countries. All other trademarks are property of their respective owners.
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EXHIBIT C-49
8 August 2016

Mr. Akram Atallah
President, Global Domains Division
Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers
12025 Waterfront Drive, Suite 300
Los Angeles, CA 90094

Re: .WEB Auction

Dear Akram:

Afilias Domains Nu. 3 Limited, a wholly-owned subsidiary of Afilias plc, is an applicant for the .WEB top-level domain under the ICANN new gTLD program. On 27-28 August 2016, ICANN conducted an auction (the “Auction”) for the .WEB string per the rules and procedures set forth in the New gTLD Applicant Guidebook (the “Guidebook”). As announced by ICANN on 28 August 2016 (https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2-2016-07-28-en), the successful bidder in the Auction was Nu Dot Co LLC (“NDC”).

Subsequent to the conclusion of the auction, it has been publically disclosed that VeriSign, Inc. acquired rights in the NDC application for .WEB. VeriSign’s press release, dated 3 August 2016, states “The Company [i.e., VeriSign] entered into an agreement with Nu Dot Co LLC wherein the Company provided funds for Nu Dot Co’s bid for the .web TLD. We are pleased that the Nu Dot Co bid was successful. We anticipate that Nu Dot Co will execute the .web Registry Agreement with the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) and will then seek to assign the Registry Agreement to VeriSign upon consent from ICANN.” (https://investor.verisign.com/releasedetail.cfm?ReleaseID=981994)

Further, in its 10-Q for the quarter ended 30 June 2016, filed with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission on 28 July 2016, VeriSign states “Subsequent to June 30, 2016, the Company incurred a commitment to pay approximately $130.0 million for the future assignment of contractual rights, which are subject to third-party consent. The payment is expected to occur during the third quarter of 2016.

Paragraph 10 of the Terms and Conditions set forth in the Guidebook includes in part the following language: “Applicant may not resell, assign or transfer any of applicant’s rights or obligations in connection with the application.” We have not been able to review a copy of the agreement(s) between NDC and VeriSign with respect to this arrangement, but it appears likely, given the public statements of VeriSign, that DNC and VeriSign entered into an agreement in the form of an option or similar arrangement with respect to the rights and obligations of NDC regarding its .WEB application. An option to acquire a string won at auction, together with a promise to fund the auction, is exactly the type of transfer of rights and obligations in connection with an application that ICANN was attempting to stop by including this language in the Terms and Conditions. Otherwise, such language would have no real purpose. The language of paragraph 10 precludes not only a transfer of all rights or obligations in an application, but of any rights or obligations. There is no materiality threshold, and
no procedure to seek consent or waiver of these terms. It is an absolute prohibition of this type of arrangement in clear and unambiguous terms.

The purposes of a prohibition on transferring rights and obligations in an application are obvious. ICANN and the community spent years engaged in a stakeholder driven process to develop the important processes and procedures by which one could submit an application for a new gTLD. These procedures were developed to ensure a level playing field for gTLD applicants and to protect the integrity of the process. The application requirements and associated filing deadlines were clear and strictly enforced from the beginning. To allow third parties to circumvent the entire Guidebook process simply by buying rights in an application once filed renders the entire Guidebook and ICANN process mere folly and negatively impacts to a material degree the rights and expectations of applicants that have played by the rules.

There is no cure provided in the Guidebook for violations of paragraph 10 of the Terms and Conditions. The only reasonable and fair solution is to disqualify the NDC application and proceed to the next highest bidder in the auction to contract for the string, at the price at which the third highest bidder exited the auction.

Further, section 1.2.7 of the Guidebook provides:

If at any time during the evaluation process information previously submitted by an applicant becomes untrue or inaccurate, the applicant must promptly notify ICANN via submission of the appropriate forms. This includes applicant-specific information such as changes in financial position and changes in ownership or control of the applicant.

ICANN reserves the right to require a re-evaluation of the application in the event of a material change. This could involve additional fees or evaluation in a subsequent application round.

Failure to notify ICANN of any change in circumstances that would render any information provided in the application false or misleading may result in denial of the application.

Clearly, an agreement to provide at least $135 Million to an applicant constitutes a material change in that applicant’s financial condition. Further, the type of option agreement that apparently exists between NDC and VeriSign likely constitutes a change in control of the applicant. A change in control can be effected by contract as well as by changes in equity ownership. It is our understanding that NDC never notified ICANN of these changes per the terms of the Guidebook. In the interest of fairness to the other WEB auction participants, ICANN should exercise its right under paragraph 1.2.7 and deny NDC’s application.

We request that ICANN promptly undertake an investigation of the matters set forth in this letter and take appropriate action against NDC and its WEB application for violations of the Guidebook as we have requested.

In addition to this letter, we are filing a complaint with the ICANN Ombudsman with regard to this matter. We strongly urge ICANN to stay any further action in this matter with respect to NDC, including entering into a registry agreement for .WEB with NDC, or acting on any request of NDC or VeriSign to
assign such agreement to VeriSign, until the Ombudsman has had an opportunity to investigate and report on this matter.

Regards,

[Signature]

M. Scott Hemphill
Vice President & General Counsel

cc: Steve Crocker, Chairman of the Board
    Göran Marby, President and CEO
EXHIBIT C-50
16 September 2016

Mr. John Kane  
Vice President, Corporate Services  
Afilias Domains No. 3 Limited  
2 La Touche House  
IFSC Dublin 1  
Ireland

Dear Mr. John Kane:

In various fora, Ruby Glen LLC (Ruby Glen) and Afilias Domains No. 3 Limited (Afilias) have raised questions regarding, among other things, whether NU DOT CO LLC (NDC) should have participated in the 27-28 July 2016 auction for the .WEB contention set and whether NDC’s application for the .WEB gTLD should be rejected. To help facilitate informed resolution of these questions, ICANN would find it useful to have additional information.

Accordingly, ICANN invites Ruby Glen, NDC, Afilias, and Verisign, Inc. (Verisign) to provide information and comment on the topics listed in the attached. Please endeavor to respond to all of the topics/questions for which you have information to do so. To allow ICANN to promptly evaluate these matters, please provide responses to globalsupport@icann.org no later than 7 October 2016.

Thank you for your cooperation and attention to this matter. Please do not hesitate to let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Christine A. Willett  
Vice President, gTLD Operations
TOPICS ON WHICH RUBY GLEN, NU DOT CO LLC, AFILIAS, AND VERISIGN ARE INVITED TO COMMENT

Please note that all responses to these questions will be taken into consideration in ICANN’s evaluation of the issues raised, but that does not mean that ICANN will adopt any particular response as definitive and authoritative.

Topics for Comment

1. Afilias and Ruby Glen have alleged that NDC failed promptly to notify ICANN of “changes in ownership and control of the applicant” [i.e., NDC], as contemplated by Section 1.2.7 of the gTLD Applicant Guidebook (Version 2012-06-04) (AGB). Please provide or describe any evidence of which you are aware regarding whether ownership or control of NDC changed after NDC applied for the .WEB gTLD.

2. In the Ruby Glen, LLC v. ICANN lawsuit, two NDC officers, Jose Ignacio Rasco III and Nicolai Bezsonoff, provided declarations dated 25 July 2016 under penalty of perjury regarding ownership and control of NDC. What evidence, if any, is there that statements made in those declarations are false?

3. AGB Section 1.2.7 speaks of changes in ownership and control specifically “of the applicant.” Please describe other NDC activities besides its having applied for the .WEB gTLD, and the activities relating to that application. Do you think that a change regarding only one of many activities of an applicant constitutes a change in ownership and control within the meaning of AGB Section 1.2.7? Please explain why or why not.

4. In his 8 August 2016, letter, Scott Hemphill stated: “A change in control can be effected by contract as well as by changes in equity ownership.” Do you think that an applicant’s making a contractual promise to conduct particular activities in which it is engaged in a particular manner constitutes a “change in control” of the applicant? Do you think that compliance with such a contractual promise constitutes such a change in control? Please give reasons.

5. Do you think that AGB Section 1.2.7 requires an applicant to disclose to ICANN all contractual commitments it makes to conduct its affairs in particular ways? If not, in what circumstances (if any) would disclosure be required?

6. In his 8 August 2016, letter, Scott Hemphill stated that “an agreement to provide at least $135 Million to an applicant constitutes a material change in that applicant’s financial condition.” In your view, does AGB Section 1.2.7 require applicants to notify ICANN of all
changes in their financial condition? If the requirement is limited by an (unstated) materiality test, how should materiality be determined?

7. Do you think that changes to an applicant’s financial condition that do not negatively reflect on an applicant’s qualifications to operate the gTLD should be deemed material? If so, why? Do you think that an applicant’s obtaining a funding commitment from a third party to fund bidding at auction negatively affects that applicant’s qualifications to operate the gTLD? Please explain why, describing your view of the relevance of (a) the funding commitment the applicant received and (b) the consideration the applicant gave to obtain that commitment (e.g., a promise to repay; a promise to use a particular backend provider; an option to receive some ownership interest in the applicant in the future; some promise about how the gTLD will be operated).

8. Do you have any knowledge or information that applicants in other circumstances have obtained post-application funding commitments (whether received through loans, contributions from affiliated companies, or otherwise) for their auction bidding or other operations? If so, please elaborate. Do you know if applicants have commonly notified ICANN of those funding commitments? If so, please explain. Should applicants be required to notify ICANN of those funding commitments? If so, in what circumstances?

9. Do you think that requiring applicants to disclose funding commitments (whether through loans, contributions from affiliated companies, or otherwise) they obtain for auction bids would help or harm the auction process? Would a requirement that applicants disclose their funding arrangements create problems for applicants (for example, making funding commitments harder to obtain)? To what extent, if any, do you think scrutinizing such arrangements (beyond determining whether they negatively reflect on an applicant’s qualifications) would be within ICANN’s proper mission? Would required disclosure of applicants’ funding sources pose any threat to robust competition?

10. The final sentence of AGB Section 1.2.7 states that failures to notify ICANN of changes “may result in denial of the application.” What standards do you think ICANN should follow in determining whether a particular failure to make a required notification should lead to denial of an application? If an applicant or related entities have multiple applications and it is discovered that the applicant or related entities have external funding commitments not disclosed to ICANN, should all of that applicant’s or its related entities’ applications be denied?

11. Afilias and Ruby Glen have also raised questions as to whether NDC violated the last sentence of AGB, Module 6, Paragraph 10, which states: “Applicant may not resell, assign, or
transfer any of the applicant’s rights or obligations in connection with the application.” Do you think the “rights or obligations” mentioned in that sentence are limited to those that flow from approval of the application (e.g., the right to enter a registry agreement), or do you think that they also include rights and obligations concerning the prosecution of the application (e.g., obligations to respond to additional inquiries from ICANN; rights to assist in pursuing the application by raising or addressing concerns)? In responding on this topic, please address the context established by the first two sentences of AGB Module 6, Paragraph 10.

12. Do you have knowledge or information that gTLD applicants in other circumstances have assigned others to handle aspects of the process by which applications are evaluated? If so, please describe with specifics what you know about this practice. For example, do applicants empower persons or companies with which they are working to take charge of handling various stages of the evaluation process? If so, do you think this violates AGB Module 6, Paragraph 10?

13. Specifically with regard to the auction process, what knowledge or information do you have regarding the extent to which applicants within contention sets have taken suggestions or direction from others regarding how to conduct bidding? How common is this practice? (It is noted that Clause 68 of the “Auction Rules for New gTLDs (Version 2014-11-03)” (Auction Rules) and Section 2.6 of the “New gTLD Auctions Bidder Agreement (Version 2014-04-03)” (Bidder Agreement) prohibit certain collusive activities between applicants; the immediately preceding two questions are directed to suggestions or directions not violating those prohibitions.) Clause 12 of the Auction Rules states in part “Before an Auction to resolve a given Contention Set, each Qualified Applicant may designate a party to bid on its behalf (‘Designated Bidder’).” Designated Bidders must execute Bidder Agreements with the Auction Manager reflecting their rights and obligations concerning the conduct of the auction. Do you think that designation of a Designated Bidder violates the last sentence of AGB Module 6, Paragraph 10?

14. Clause 12 of the Auction Rules states that a purpose for an applicant’s selection of a Designated Bidder is to allow the Designated Bidder to bid on the applicant’s behalf. Do you think that clause merely states a purpose for designation, or does it obligate the Designated Bidder to bid on behalf of only the applicant? What do you think the phrase “its behalf” means in the Auction Rules and Bidder Agreement? Do you think it indicates that the Designated Bidder acts in the stead of the applicant, or does it additionally indicate that the Designated Bidder must act in only the interest of the applicant? (In this regard, please discuss the wording of the seventh recital in the Bidder Agreement.) Where no Designated Bidder is designated, do you think the Auction Rules or the Bidder Agreement requires that
an applicant acting for itself as the Bidder act only in its own interest? If so, please explain why. As relevant to this topic 14, do you think there are any inconsistencies between the Auction Rules and the Bidder Agreement? If so, please explain those inconsistencies in detail.

15. Clause 13 of the Auction Rules states: “Before each Auction, each Bidder shall nominate up to two people (‘Authorized Individuals’) to bid on its behalf in the Auction.” Authorized Individuals have certain rights and obligations in connection with the auction. Do you think that an applicant’s nomination of an Authorized Individual violates the last sentence of AGB Module 6, Paragraph 10?

16. Do you think that an applicant’s entry into a contract promising in exchange for a payment of money to make bids and otherwise participate in the auction in the manner directed by the other party to the contract constitutes “resell[ing], assign[ing], or transfer[ing] any of applicant’s rights or obligations in connection with the application,” as prohibited by AGB Module 6, Paragraph 10? Please explain why or why not.

17. Do you think that AGB Module 6, Paragraph 10 would be violated by a contractual promise by an applicant to request ICANN’s consent to transfer to another party any registry agreement it receives as the result of its application? If so, under what circumstances? To the best of your knowledge and information, in the context of any other gTLD has an applicant agreed, before entry into a registry agreement, to seek ICANN’s consent to transfer the agreement after it is entered?

18. Do you think that AGB Module 6, Paragraph 10 would be violated by a contractual promise by an applicant to seek to transfer to another party, but only upon consent of ICANN, any registry agreement it receives as the result of its application? If so, under what circumstances? To the best of your knowledge and information, in the context of any other gTLD has an applicant made such an agreement?

19. Do you think that AGB Module 6, Paragraph 10 means that a resale, assignment, or transfer contrary to its last sentence constitutes a violation that can result in forfeiture or denial of the application, or is it its effect simply that any such attempted resale, assignment, or transfer of the application is ineffective? In your response, please address Restatement (Second) of Contracts §§ 317 and 322 (including comment b) and any other applicable legal principles.

20. In his 9 September 2016 letter, Scott Hemphill stated that NDC and Verisign’s efforts to give Verisign control over the .WEB gTLD “must be sanctioned by ICANN by disqualifying NDC’s bid and rejecting its application.” Assuming that a resale, assignment, or transfer
contrary to the last sentence of AGB Module 6, Paragraph 10 can result in forfeiture or denial of the application (see topic 19 above), do you think that the application must be forfeited or denied in all cases? If ICANN has discretion to determine an appropriate remedy, what factors do you think should guide ICANN’s discretion?
EXHIBIT C-51
October 7, 2016

Christine A. Willett
Vice President, gTLD Operations
Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers
12025 Waterfront Drive, Suite 300
Los Angeles, CA 90094

Re: Response of Afilias Domains No. 3 Ltd. ("Afilias") to 16 September 2016 Request for Comments from the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers ("ICANN")

Dear Ms. Willett:

We appreciate the opportunity to provide comments on behalf of Afilias to the questions posed by ICANN in its 16 September 2016 letter. Further, we acknowledge receipt of the letter from Mr. Atallah, dated 30 September 2016, providing a response to previous letters submitted by Afilias regarding this matter. However, we note that Mr. Atallah’s letter fails to respond to the serious issues concerning the auction for the rights to administer the .WEB generic top-level domain ("gTLD") raised in Scott Hemphill’s letters of 8 August 2016 and 9 September 2016. Further, Mr. Atallah states that, while the .WEB/WEBS contention set was placed on hold by ICANN on 19 August 2016, such action was taken because of the initiation of an ICANN Accountability Mechanism by another applicant. We are concerned that this statement appears to imply that ICANN is not placing the contention set on hold in order to address the issues raised by Afilias.

As reflected in the accompanying answers to ICANN’s questions, Afilias reaffirms its position that the actions taken by NU DOT CO LLC ("NDC") and Verisign, Inc. ("Verisign") in connection with the auction and NDC’s failure to disclose material information relating to its bid for the .WEB rights should result in the disqualification of NDC as a member of the contention set for .WEB and the invalidation of NDC’s bid.

As part of its review, ICANN must recognize and investigate the significant harm to competition arising from Verisign’s agreement with NDC to acquire the rights to .WEB. Verisign’s actions are clearly designed to preserve Verisign’s existing monopoly in gTLD services that results from its control of .COM and .NET. If awarded to Afilias, the .WEB gTLD will be uniquely situated to challenge Verisign’s gTLD services dominance by providing registrants a compelling alternative to .COM and .NET. If Verisign is permitted by ICANN to succeed in its efforts to secure the rights to .WEB, on the other hand, this potential for important new competition will be destroyed. Verisign (through NDC) cannot be allowed to obtain the rights to .WEB through subterfuge, when all of the remaining applicants agreed to and played by the rules.

Accordingly, we urge ICANN to disqualify NDC’s bid and prevent Verisign from obtaining control over the .WEB gTLD in order to ensure competition in the gTLD marketplace and prevent an unlawful act of monopolization based on anti-competitive behavior.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
John Kane
Vice President, Corporate Services

Directors: Henry Lubean (American), Huw Spliers (British), Jonathan Robinson (English), Scott Hemphill (American), Thomas Moerz (German), Dennis Jennings (Irish), Kenyon Stubbs (American), Michael Heller (German), Philipp Grabensee (German).
Registered in Ireland | Number: 936901 | Registered Office: 3rd Floor, 2 Grand Canal Square, Dublin 2, D02 A342, Ireland | VAT Number: IE0388901P
Afilias' Comments on ICANN's September 16, 2016 Topics

**Topic 01.** Afilias and Ruby Glen have alleged that NDC failed promptly to notify ICANN of "changes in ownership and control of the applicant" (i.e., NDC), as contemplated by Section 1.2.7 of the .gTLD Applicant Guidebook (Version 2012-06-04) (AGB). Please provide or describe any evidence of which you are aware regarding whether ownership or control of NDC changed after NDC applied for the .WEB gTLD.

**Response.** According to Afilias' review of publicly available documents, "ownership or control of NDC changed after NDC applied for the .WEB gTLD." Specifically,

- Verisign's 1 August 2016 press release states that it "entered into an agreement with Nu Dot Co LLC wherein the Company provided funds for Nu Dot Co's bid for the .web TLD. ... We anticipate that Nu Dot Co ... will then seek to assign the Registry Agreement to Verisign upon consent from ICANN."

- Verisign's 10-Q for the quarter ended 30 June 2016, filed with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission on 28 July 2016, states that "[s]ubsequent to June 30, 2016, the Company incurred a commitment to pay approximately $130.0 million for the future assignment of contractual rights, which are subject to third-party consent. The payment is expected to occur during third quarter of 2016."

- Ruby Glen alleges that "NDC also made statements indicating a potential change in the ownership of NDC, including an admission that the board of NDC had changed to add 'several others'" in its Amended Complaint for Ruby Glen, LLC v. ICANN.

In the unique circumstances of the present case, the arrangement between Verisign and NDC constitutes the effective control of NDC by Verisign. If NDC is granted the rights to administer the .WEB gTLD from ICANN, those rights would constitute the principal business asset of NDC. NDC appears to have given Verisign de facto control over NDC's business by entering into an agreement by which Verisign will fund NDC's bid for .WEB and which gives Verisign the power to direct and control NDC's participation in the auction for .WEB in exchange for an assignment of all rights in .WEB from NDC to Verisign. Thus, Afilias has a good faith basis to believe that "ownership or control of NDC changed after NDC applied for the .WEB gTLD" and NDC did not disclose this change in violation of ICANN's rules.

Accordingly, ICANN must carefully investigate NDC's conduct by obtaining further information from NDC and Verisign, including: (1) agreements between NDC and Verisign; (2) changes to NDC's board of directors; and (3) inter-company transactions between NDC and Verisign, including the sale of assets to Verisign. Such information must also be disclosed to Afilias, the party materially affected and injured by Verisign's and NDC's actions.

**Topic 02.** In the Ruby Glen, LLC v. ICANN lawsuit, two NDC officers, Jose Ignacio Rasco III and Nicolai Bezsonoff, provided declarations dated 25 July 2016 under penalty of perjury regarding ownership and control of NDC. What evidence, if any, is there that statements made in those declarations are false?

**Response.** Please see our response to Topic 01. In the event that Messrs. Rasco and Bezsonoff are deposed or questioned by ICANN, Afilias requests that it be informed of the
same. If necessary, in due course, we will seek the deposition of Messrs. Rasco and Bezsonoff among others.

**Topic 03.** AGB Section 1.2.7 speaks of changes in ownership and control specifically “of the applicant.” Please describe other NDC activities besides its having applied for the .WEB gTLD, and the activities relating to that application. Do you think that a change regarding only one of many activities of an applicant constitutes a change in ownership and control within the meaning of AGB Section 1.2.7? Please explain why or why not.

**Response.** Please see our response to Topic 01.

**Topic 04.** In his 8 August 2016, letter, Scott Hemphill stated: “A change in control can be effected by contract as well as by changes in equity ownership.” Do you think that an applicant’s making a contractual promise to conduct particular activities in which it is engaged in a particular manner constitutes a “change in control” of the applicant? Do you think that compliance with such a contractual promise constitutes such a change in control? Please give reasons.

**Response.** Please see our response to Topic 01.

**Topic 05.** Do you think that AGB Section 1.2.7 requires an applicant to disclose to ICANN all contractual commitments it makes to conduct its affairs in particular ways? If not, in what circumstances (if any) would disclosure be required?

**Response.** The plain language of AGB § 1.2.7 states that disclosure “via submission of the appropriate forms” is required when “information previously submitted by an applicant becomes untrue or inaccurate” or gives rise to a material “change in circumstances” during the evaluation process. The plain language of the AGB thus clearly identifies circumstances that require a disclosure to ICANN. Afilias believes that the AGB requires applicants to disclose extraordinary commitments and changes in circumstances that materially affect the implications of the award of registry rights in terms of ICANN’s authorities. Here, as the commitment between NDC and Verisign uniquely raises antitrust issues, Afilias believes that NDC was required to disclose its contractual arrangement with Verisign because such arrangement will potentially destroy any new competition given Verisign’s existing monopoly in gTLD services. ICANN’s exercise of its authorities includes a duty to ensure that there will be an effective potential for development of competition among providers of gTLD registry services. One of ICANN’s core values is to “promot[e] competition in the registration of domain names where practicable and beneficial in the public interest.” Bylaws, Art. 1 § 2(6). A third party (such as Verisign) secretly funding bids to gain or preserve a monopoly directly contravenes this core value.

**Topic 06.** In his 8 August 2016, letter, Scott Hemphill stated that “an agreement to provide at least $135 Million to an applicant constitutes a material change in that applicant’s financial condition.” In your view, does AGB Section 1.2.7 require applicants to notify ICANN of all changes in their financial condition? If the requirement is limited by an (unstated) materiality test, how should materiality be determined?

**Response.** Please see our response to Topic 05.
**Topic 07.** Do you think that changes to an applicant’s financial condition that do not negatively reflect on an applicant’s qualifications to operate the gTLD should be deemed material? If so, why? Do you think that an applicant’s obtaining a funding commitment from a third party to fund bidding at auction negatively affects that applicant’s qualifications to operate the gTLD? Please explain why, describing your view of the relevance of (a) the funding commitment the applicant received and (b) the consideration the applicant gave to obtain that commitment (e.g., a promise to repay; a promise to use a particular backend provider; an option to receive some ownership interest in the applicant in the future; some promise about how the gTLD will be operated).

**Response.** The plain language of AGB § 1.2.7 requires the applicant to “promptly notify ICANN” if “at any time during the evaluation process information [including changes in financial position] previously submitted by an applicant becomes untrue or inaccurate”. And failure to notify ICANN of “any change in circumstances that would render any information provided in the application false or misleading may result in denial of the application.”

An applicant that obtains a funding commitment from a third party to fund bidding at an auction negatively affects that applicant’s qualifications when the third party is attempting to gain or preserve a monopoly. One of ICANN’s core values is to “promot[e] competition in the registration of domain names where practicable and beneficial in the public interest.” Bylaws, Art. I § 2(6). A third party secretly funding bids to obtain a monopoly directly contravenes this core value.

Verisign’s significant financial strength was built upon its ICANN-granted position as a monopoly provider of registry services. When those monopolist profits are then employed to finance a bid to maintain that dominant market position, it is anticompetitive and material to the affected bid and to ICANN new gTLD process as a whole.

Here, NDC’s agreement with Verisign is essentially an agreement not-to-compete, which stifles competition. Neither NDC nor Verisign has offered any procompetitive justification for the deal or otherwise indicated that they are engaged in a procompetitive joint venture to operate the .WEB gTLD. Verisign’s monopoly position gives it significant market power in the gTLD registration market. Through its secret agreement with NDC, Verisign intends to foreclose the possibility of any competition from .WEB.

Verisign’s acquisition of .WEB likely means (1) fewer resources being invested in maximizing .WEB’s competitive potential, (2) a dramatically reduced chance that .WEB will act as a competitive check on .COM and .NET, and (3) that .WEB will not be marketed to compete and siphon away customers from .COM and .NET. This will deprive Internet users, businesses, and Web site developers of commercially promising and viable new domains for their Web sites. This competitive harm will likely never be undone.

**Topic 08.** Do you have any knowledge or information that applicants in other circumstances have obtained post-application funding commitments (whether received through loans, contributions from affiliated companies, or otherwise) for their auction bidding or other operations? If so, please elaborate. Do you know if applicants have commonly notified ICANN of those funding commitments? If so, please explain. Should applicants be required to notify ICANN of those funding commitments? If so, in what circumstances?

**Response.** We are not aware of similar arrangements that would have the effect of creating or preserving a monopoly in gTLD registry services like Verisign’s monopoly. Afilias is aware
of applications in other circumstances that have obtained post-application funding commitments. These situations are not analogous to the commitment between NDC and Verisign, however, because Verisign’s acquisition of .WEB raises serious antitrust issues by stifling competition in favor of Verisign’s dominance in gTLD services. Prior applicants’ circumstances have no relevance to this unique situation.

**Topic 09.** Do you think that requiring applicants to disclose funding commitments (whether through loans, contributions from affiliated companies, or otherwise) they obtain for auction bids would help or harm the auction process? Would a requirement that applicants disclose their funding arrangements create problems for applicants (for example, making funding commitments harder to obtain)? To what extent, if any, do you think scrutinizing such arrangements (beyond determining whether they negatively reflect on an applicant’s qualifications) would be within ICANN’s proper mission? Would required disclosure of applicants’ funding sources pose any threat to robust competition?

**Response.** Please see our response to Topic 08.

Disclosure is required when there is a change in circumstances that affects competition. AGB § 1.2.7 clearly states that a disclosure “via submission of the appropriate forms” is required when “information previously submitted by an applicant becomes untrue or inaccurate” during the application process. NDC deliberately chose not to disclose its relationship with Verisign in order to avoid questions about their anti-competitive relationship, deliberately violating AGB § 1.2.7 and thus harming the auction process.

ICANN should act in accordance with its core values, which dictate that it should not only “promote and sustain a competitive environment” but also “introduce[e] and promot[e] competition in the registration of domain names where practicable and beneficial to the public interest.” Bylaws, Art. I §§ 2(5), (6). In accordance with its mission, then, ICANN must therefore scrutinize arrangements that contravene these values and stifle competition – such as the one between NDC and Verisign.

The importance of a competitive environment is particularly stressed in ICANN’s Bylaws. Despite ICANN’s core value of “applying documented policies neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness”, Bylaws, Art. I § 2(8), ICANN’s own Bylaws permit the disparate treatment of parties for the “promotion of effective competition.” Bylaws, Art. II § 3.

**Topic 10.** The final sentence of AGB Section 1.2.7 states that failures to notify ICANN of changes “may result in denial of the application.” What standards do you think ICANN should follow in determining whether a particular failure to make a required notification should lead to denial of an application? If an applicant or related entities have multiple applications and it is discovered that the applicant or related entities have external funding commitments not disclosed to ICANN, should all of that applicant’s or its related entities’ applications be denied?

**Response.** Consistent with ICANN’s obligations to promote competition, ICANN must deny an application improperly and surreptitiously funded by a third party in order to obtain control over a gTLD and to stifle competition and harm consumers. Here, ICANN must disqualify NDC’s bid and prevent Verisign from acquiring the rights in .WEB. Verisign, which already exercises exclusive control over .COM and .NET, chose not to apply for .WEB, as it could have done. Rather, Verisign secretly funded NDC’s application to game the system and to obtain control over .WEB for Verisign in order to stifle competition for .COM and .NET’s
existing monopoly. Indeed, Verisign has few incentives to market .WEB aggressively because its growth would inevitably come at the expense of Verisign’s dominant position with .COM and .NET. The damage will likely be irreparable as ICANN contracts are generally automatically renewed.

Indeed, there are several standards from ICANN’s own Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws that support NDC’s disqualification. They are as follows:

- ICANN is required to “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.” Articles of Incorporation, Art. 4.

- ICANN is required to “[m]ak[e] decisions by applying documented policies neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness.” Bylaws, Art. I § 2(8).

- ICANN is required to “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.” Bylaws, Art. II § 3.

- ICANN is required to “[a]ct[ ] with a speed that is responsive to the needs of the Internet while, as part of the decision-making process, obtaining informed input from those entities most affected.” Bylaws, Art. I § 2(9).

- ICANN is directed to “operate to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner and consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness.” Bylaws, Art. III § 1.

- ICANN is required to “promot[e] competition in the registration of domain names where practicable and beneficial in the public interest.” Bylaws, Art. I § 2(6).

- ICANN is required to “[r]emain[ ] accountable to the Internet community through mechanisms that enhance ICANN’s effectiveness.” Bylaws, Art. I § 2(10).

**Topic 11.** Afilias and Ruby Glen have also raised questions as to whether NDC violated the last sentence of AGB, Module 6, Paragraph 10, which states: “Applicant may not resell, assign, or transfer any of the applicant’s rights or obligations in connection with the application.” Do you think the “rights or obligations” mentioned in that sentence are limited to those that flow from approval of the application (e.g., the right to enter a registry agreement), or do you think that they also include rights and obligations concerning the prosecution of the application (e.g., obligations to respond to additional inquiries from ICANN; rights to assist in pursuing the application by raising or addressing concerns)? In responding on this topic, please address the context established by the first two sentences of AGB Module 6, Paragraph 10.

**Response.** Under the plain language of AGB Module 6, Paragraph 10, an “[a]pplicant may not resell, assign, or transfer any of applicant’s rights or obligations in connection with the application.” Thus, it is clear that “any” rights or obligations in “connection” with the application cannot be resold, assigned, or transferred to a third party.
Topic 12. Do you have knowledge or information that gTLD applicants in other circumstances have assigned others to handle aspects of the process by which applications are evaluated? If so, please describe with specifics what you know about this practice. For example, do applicants empower persons or companies with which they are working to take charge of handling various stages of the evaluation process? If so, do you think this violates AGB Module 6, Paragraph 10?

Response. Afilias is not aware of other circumstances where an applicant (such as NDC) empowers a person or a company to improperly gain or preserve a monopoly in violation of ICANN’s Bylaws. The commitment between NDC and Verisign uniquely raises antitrust issues for the reasons discussed above. Prior applicants’ circumstances thus have no relevance to this unique situation.

Topic 13. Specifically with regard to the auction process, what knowledge or information do you have regarding the extent to which applicants within contention sets have taken suggestions or direction from others regarding how to conduct bidding? How common is this practice? (It is noted that Clause 68 of the “Auction Rules for New gTLDs (Version 2014-11-03)" (Auction Rules) and Section 2.6 of the “New gTLD Auctions Bidder Agreement (Version 2014-04-03)” (Bidder Agreement) prohibit certain collusive activities between applicants; the immediately preceding two questions are directed to suggestions or directions not violating those prohibitions.) Clause 12 of the Auction Rules states in part “Before an Auction to resolve a given Contention Set, each Qualified Applicant may designate a party to bid on its behalf (‘Designated Bidder’).” Designated Bidders must execute Bidder Agreements with the Auction Manager reflecting their rights and obligations concerning the conduct of the auction. Do you think that designation of a Designated Bidder violates the last sentence of AGB Module 6, Paragraph 10?

Response. The actions of other gTLD applicants are not relevant to NDC’s actions. NDC deliberately chose not to disclose its relationship with Verisign in order to avoid questions about their anti-competitive relationship and deliberately violated AGB § 1.2.7’s requirement to “promptly notify ICANN” of “any change in circumstance” that would have a material effect on the potential to create effective new competition for Verisign’s existing monopoly in gTLD services.

NDC is helping Verisign solidify its monopoly over gTLDs. Verisign has enjoyed uninterrupted gTLD dominance for over a decade thanks to its control over .COM and .NET. As a result of this control, Verisign has a dominant share of all gTLD registrations. The next closest competitors have much smaller shares.

As stated above, Verisign’s acquisition of .WEB likely means (1) fewer resources being invested in maximizing .WEB’s competitive potential, (2) a dramatically reduced change that .WEB will act as a competitive check on .COM and .NET, and (3) that .WEB will not be marketed to compete and siphon away customers from .COM and .NET. If NDC and Verisign are permitted to consummate their arrangement, the result will deprive Internet users, businesses, and Web site developers of commercially promising and viable new domains for their Web sites. This competitive harm will likely never be undone.

Topic 14. Clause 12 of the Auction Rules states that a purpose for an applicant’s selection of a Designated Bidder is to allow the Designated Bidder to bid on the applicant’s behalf. Do you think that clause merely states a purpose for designation, or does it obligate the Designated Bidder to bid on
behalf of only the applicant? What do you think the phrase “its behalf” means in the Auction Rules and Bidder Agreement? Do you think it indicates that the Designated Bidder acts in the stead of the applicant, or does it additionally indicate that the Designated Bidder must act in only the interest of the applicant? (In this regard, please discuss the wording of the seventh recital in the Bidder Agreement.) Where no Designated Bidder is designated, do you think the Auction Rules or the Bidder Agreement requires that an applicant acting for itself as the Bidder act only in its own interest? If so, please explain why. As relevant to this topic 14, do you think there are any inconsistencies between the Auction Rules and the Bidder Agreement? If so, please explain those inconsistencies in detail.

Response. Afilias believes that in applying its rules in the present circumstances, ICANN should focus on the uniquely harmful competition implications of an undisclosed arrangement between NDC and Verisign, the current dominant monopolist in gTLD services. Other applications or potential applications of the rules in other circumstances are not necessarily relevant to the present unique situation.

Topic 15. Clause 13 of the Auction Rules states: “Before each Auction, each Bidder shall nominate up to two people (‘Authorized Individuals’) to bid on its behalf in the Auction.” Authorized Individuals have certain rights and obligations in connection with the auction. Do you think that an applicant’s nomination of an Authorized Individual violates the last sentence of AGB Module 6, Paragraph 10?

Response. Please see our response to Topic 14.

Topic 16. Do you think that an applicant’s entry into a contract promising in exchange for a payment of money to make bids and otherwise participate in the auction in the manner directed by the other party to the contract constitutes “resell[ing], assign[ing], or transfer[ing] any of applicant’s rights or obligations in connection with the application,” as prohibited by AGB Module 6, Paragraph 10? Please explain why or why not.

Response. Please see our responses to Topics 05, 07, 08, and 14.

Topic 17. Do you think that AGB Module 6, Paragraph 10 would be violated by a contractual promise by an applicant to request ICANN’s consent to transfer to another party any registry agreement it receives as the result of its application? If so, under what circumstances? To the best of your knowledge and information, in the context of any other gTLD has an applicant agreed, before entry into a registry agreement, to seek ICANN’s consent to transfer the agreement after it is entered?

Response. Please see our responses to Topics 05, 07, 08, and 14.

Topic 18. Do you think that AGB Module 6, Paragraph 10 would be violated by a contractual promise by an applicant to seek to transfer to another party, but only upon consent of ICANN, any registry agreement it receives as the result of its application? If so, under what circumstances? To the best of your knowledge and information, in the context of any other gTLD has an applicant made such an agreement?

Response. Please see our responses to Topics 05, 07, 08, and 14.
Topic 19. Do you think that AGB Module 6, Paragraph 10 means that a resale, assignment, or transfer contrary to its last sentence constitutes a violation that can result in forfeiture or denial of the application, or is its effect simply that any such attempted resale, assignment, or transfer of the application is ineffective? In your response, please address Restatement (Second) of Contracts §§ 317 and 322 (including comment b) and any other applicable legal principles.

Response. Please see our responses to Topics 05, 07, 08, and 14.

Topic 20. In his 9 September 2016 letter, Scott Hemphill stated that NDC and Verisign’s efforts to give Verisign control over the .WEB gTLD “must be sanctioned by ICANN by disqualifying NDC’s bid and rejecting its application.” Assuming that a resale, assignment, or transfer contrary to the last sentence of AGB Module 6, Paragraph 10 can result in forfeiture or denial of the application (see topic 19 above), do you think that the application must be forfeited or denied in all cases? If ICANN has discretion to determine an appropriate remedy, what factors do you think should guide ICANN’s discretion?

Response. Afilias contests the specific circumstances surrounding NDC’s actions, which violate the AGB, and declines to make generalizations regarding resales, assignments, or transfers contrary to the AGB. For the reasons provided in our responses above, ICANN should disqualify NDC’s bid based on the principles found in ICANN’s Bylaws and Articles of Incorporation, and on NDC’s violations of the AGB. ICANN cannot permit Verisign to acquire rights in .WEB and thereby stifle competition and preserve its existing monopoly of gTLD services in direct contravention of ICANN’s core values, all to the likely detriment of consumer choice and trust in ICANN.
These interim procedures (Interim Supplementary Procedures) supplement the International Centre for Dispute Resolution’s international arbitration rules in accordance with the independent review process set forth in Article 4, Section 4.3 of ICANN’s Bylaws. These procedures apply to all independent review process proceedings filed after 1 May 2018.

In drafting these Interim Supplementary Procedures, the IRP Implementation Oversight Team (IOT) applied the following principles: (1) remain as close as possible to the current Supplementary Procedures or the Updated Supplementary Procedures (USP) posted for public comment on 28 November 2016; (2) to the extent public comments received in response to the USP reflected clear movement away from either the current Supplementary Procedures or the

---

1 CONTEXTUAL NOTE: These Interim Supplementary Procedures are intended to supplement the ICDR RULES. Therefore, when the ICDR RULES appropriately address an item, there is no need to re-state that Rule within the Supplemental Procedures. The IOT, through its work, may identify additional places where variance from the ICDR RULES is recommended, and that would result in addition or modification to the Supplemental Procedures.

USP, to reflect that movement unless doing so would require significant drafting that should be properly deferred for broader consideration; (3) take no action that would materially expand any part of the Supplementary Procedures that the IOT has not clearly agreed upon, or that represent a significant change from what was posted for comment and would therefore require further public consultation prior to changing the supplemental rules to reflect those expansions or changes.

1. Definitions

In these Interim Supplementary Procedures:

A CLAIMANT is any legal or natural person, group, or entity including, but not limited to the Empowered Community, a Supporting Organization, or an Advisory Committee, that has been materially affected by a Dispute. To be materially affected by a Dispute, the Claimant must suffer an injury or harm that is directly and causally connected to the alleged violation.

COVERED ACTIONS are any actions or failures to act by or within ICANN committed by the Board, individual Directors, Officers, or Staff members that give rise to a DISPUTE.

DISPUTES are defined as:

(A) Claims that COVERED ACTIONS violated ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws, including, but not limited to, any action or inaction that:

1) exceeded the scope of the Mission;

2) resulted from action taken in response to advice or input from any Advisory Committee or Supporting Organization that are claimed to be inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws;

3) resulted from decisions of process-specific expert panels that are claimed to be inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws;

4) resulted from a response to a DIDP (as defined in Section 22.7(d)) request that is claimed to be inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws; or

5) arose from claims involving rights of the EC as set forth in the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws;
(B) Claims that ICANN, the Board, individual Directors, Officers or Staff members have not enforced ICANN’s contractual rights with respect to the IANA Naming Function Contract; and

(C) Claims regarding the Post-Transition IANA entity service complaints by direct customers of the IANA naming functions that are not resolved through mediation.

EMERGENCY PANELIST refers to a single member of the STANDING PANEL designated to adjudicate requests for interim relief or, if a STANDING PANEL is not in place at the time the relevant IRP is initiated, it shall refer to the panelist appointed by the ICDR pursuant to ICDR RULES relating to appointment of panelists for emergency relief (ICDR RULES Article 6).

IANA refers to the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority.

ICDR refers to the International Centre for Dispute Resolution, which has been designated and approved by ICANN’s Board of Directors as the IRP Provider (IRPP) under Article 4, Section 4.3 of ICANN’s Bylaws.

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

INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESS or IRP refers to the procedure that takes place upon the Claimant’s filing of a written statement of a DISPUTE with the ICDR.

IRP PANEL refers to the panel of three neutral members appointed to decide the relevant DISPUTE.

IRP PANEL DECISION refers to the final written decision of the IRP PANEL that reflects the reasoned analysis of how the DISPUTE was resolved in compliance with ICANN’s Articles and Bylaws.

ICDR RULES refers to the ICDR’s International Arbitration rules in effect at the time the relevant request for independent review is submitted.

PROCEDURES OFFICER refers to a single member of the STANDING PANEL designated to adjudicate requests for consolidation, intervention, and/or participation as an amicus, or, if a STANDING PANEL is not in place at the time the relevant IRP is initiated, it shall refer to the panelist appointed by the ICDR pursuant to its International Arbitration Rules relating to appointment of panelists for consolidation (ICDR Rules Article 8).

PURPOSES OF THE IRP are to hear and resolve Disputes for the reasons specified in the ICANN Bylaws, Article 4, Section 4.3(a).
STANDING PANEL refers to an omnibus standing panel of at least seven members from which three-member IRP PANELS are selected to hear and resolve DISPUTES consistent with the purposes of the IRP.

2. Scope

The ICDR will apply these Interim Supplementary Procedures, in addition to the ICDR RULES, in all cases submitted to the ICDR in connection with Article 4, Section 4.3 of the ICANN Bylaws after the date these Interim Supplementary Procedures go into effect. In the event there is any inconsistency between these Interim Supplementary Procedures and the ICDR RULES, these Interim Supplementary Procedures will govern. These Interim Supplementary Procedures and any amendment of them shall apply in the form in effect at the time the request for an INDEPENDENT REVIEW is commenced. IRPs commenced prior to the adoption of these Interim Supplementary Procedures shall be governed by the Supplementary Procedures in effect at the time such IRPs were commenced.

In the event that any of these Interim Supplementary Procedures are subsequently amended, the rules surrounding the application of those amendments will be defined therein.

3. Composition of Independent Review Panel

The IRP PANEL will comprise three panelists selected from the STANDING PANEL, unless a STANDING PANEL is not in place when the IRP is initiated. The CLAIMANT and ICANN shall each select one panelist from the STANDING PANEL, and the two panelists selected by the parties will select the third panelist from the STANDING PANEL. A STANDING PANEL member’s appointment will not take effect unless and until the STANDING PANEL member signs a Notice of STANDING PANEL Appointment affirming that the member is available to serve and is Independent and Impartial pursuant to the ICDR RULES. In addition to disclosing relationships with parties to the DISPUTE, IRP PANEL members must also disclose the existence of any material relationships with ICANN, and/or an ICANN Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee. In the event that a STANDING PANEL is not in place when the relevant IRP is initiated or is in place but does not have capacity due to other IRP commitments, the CLAIMANT and ICANN shall each select a qualified panelist from outside the STANDING PANEL, and the two panelists selected by the parties shall select the third panelist. In the event that the two party-selected panelists cannot agree on the third panelist, the ICDR RULES shall apply to selection of the third panelist. In the event that a panelist resigns, is incapable of performing the duties of a panelist, or is removed and the position becomes vacant, a substitute arbitrator shall be appointed pursuant to the provisions of this Section [3] of these Interim Supplementary Procedures.
4. Time for Filing

An INDEPENDENT REVIEW is commenced when CLAIMANT files a written statement of a DISPUTE. A CLAIMANT shall file a written statement of a DISPUTE with the ICDR no more than 120 days after a CLAIMANT becomes aware of the material effect of the action or inaction giving rise to the DISPUTE; provided, however, that a statement of a DISPUTE may not be filed more than twelve (12) months from the date of such action or inaction.

In order for an IRP to be deemed to have been timely filed, all fees must be paid to the ICDR within three business days (as measured by the ICDR) of the filing of the request with the ICDR.

5. Conduct of the Independent Review

It is in the best interests of ICANN and of the ICANN community for IRP matters to be resolved expeditiously and at a reasonably low cost while ensuring fundamental fairness and due process consistent with the PURPOSES OF THE IRP. The IRP PANEL shall consider accessibility, fairness, and efficiency (both as to time and cost) in its conduct of the IRP.

In the event that an EMERGENCY PANELIST has been designated to adjudicate a request for interim relief pursuant to the Bylaws, Article 4, Section 4.3(p), the EMERGENCY PANELIST shall comply with the rules applicable to an IRP PANEL, with such modifications as appropriate.

5A. Nature of IRP Proceedings

The IRP PANEL should conduct its proceedings by electronic means to the extent feasible. Hearings shall be permitted as set forth in these Interim Supplementary Procedures. Where necessary, the IRP PANEL may conduct hearings via telephone, video conference or similar technologies. The IRP PANEL should conduct its proceedings with the presumption that in-person hearings shall not be permitted. For purposes of these Interim Supplementary Procedures, an “in-person hearing” refers to any IRP proceeding held face-to-face, with participants physically present in the same location. The presumption against in-person hearings may be rebutted only under extraordinary circumstances, where, upon motion by a Party, the IRP PANEL determines that the party seeking an in-person hearing has demonstrated that: (1) an in-

---

3 The IOT recently sought additional public comment to consider the Time for Filing rule that will be recommended for inclusion in the final set of Supplementary Procedures. In the event that the final Time for Filing procedure allows additional time to file than this interim Supplementary Procedure allows, ICANN committed to the IOT that the final Supplementary Procedures will include transition language that provides potential claimants the benefit of that additional time, so as not to prejudice those potential claimants.
person hearing is necessary for a fair resolution of the claim; (2) an in-person hearing is necessary to further the PURPOSES OF THE IRP; and (3) considerations of fairness and furtherance of the PURPOSES OF THE IRP outweigh the time and financial expense of an in-person hearing. In no circumstances shall in-person hearings be permitted for the purpose of introducing new arguments or evidence that could have been previously presented, but were not previously presented, to the IRP PANEL.

All hearings shall be limited to argument only unless the IRP Panel determines that a the party seeking to present witness testimony has demonstrated that such testimony is: (1) necessary for a fair resolution of the claim; (2) necessary to further the PURPOSES OF THE IRP; and (3) considerations of fairness and furtherance of the PURPOSES OF THE IRP outweigh the time and financial expense of witness testimony and cross examination.

All evidence, including witness statements, must be submitted in writing 15 days in advance of any hearing.

With due regard to ICANN Bylaws, Article 4, Section 4.3(s), 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 Interim Supplementary Procedures.

5B. Translation

As required by ICANN Bylaws, Article 4, Section 4.3(l), “All IRP proceedings shall be administered in English as the primary working language, with provision of translation services for CLAIMANTS if needed.” Translation may include both translation of written documents/transcripts as well as interpretation of oral proceedings.

The IRP PANEL shall have discretion to determine (i) whether the CLAIMANT has a need for translation services, (ii) what documents and/or hearing that need relates to, and (iii) what language the document, hearing or other matter or event shall be translated into. A CLAIMANT not determined to have a need for translation services must submit all materials in English (with the exception of the request for translation services if the request includes CLAIMANT’s certification to the IRP PANEL that submitting the request in English would be unduly burdensome).

In determining whether a CLAIMANT needs translation, the IRP PANEL shall consider the CLAIMANT’s proficiency in spoken and written English and, to the extent that the CLAIMANT is represented in the proceedings by an attorney or other agent, that representative’s proficiency
in spoken and written English. The IRP PANEL shall only consider requests for translations from/to English and the other five official languages of the United Nations (i.e., Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian, or Spanish).

In determining whether translation of a document, hearing or other matter or event shall be ordered, the IRP PANEL shall consider the CLAIMANT’s proficiency in English as well as in the requested other language (from among Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian or Spanish). The IRP PANEL shall confirm that all material portions of the record of the proceeding are available in English.

In considering requests for translation, the IRP PANEL shall consider the materiality of the particular document, hearing or other matter or event requested to be translated, as well as the cost and delay incurred by translation, pursuant to ICDR Article 18 on Translation, and the need to ensure fundamental fairness and due process under ICANN Bylaws, Article 4, Section 4.3(n)(iv).

Unless otherwise ordered by the IRP PANEL, costs of need-based translation (as determined by the IRP PANEL) shall be covered by ICANN as administrative costs and shall be coordinated through ICANN’s language services providers. Even with a determination of need-based translation, if ICANN or the CLAIMANT coordinates the translation of any document through its legal representative, such translation shall be considered part of the legal costs and not an administrative cost to be born by ICANN. Additionally, in the event that either the CLAIMANT or ICANN retains a translator for the purpose of translating any document, hearing or other matter or event, and such retention is not pursuant to a determination of need-based translation by the IRP PANEL, the costs of such translation shall not be charged as administrative costs to be covered by ICANN.

6. Written Statements

A CLAIMANT’S written statement of a DISPUTE shall include all claims that give rise to a particular DISPUTE, but such claims may be asserted as independent or alternative claims.

The initial written submissions of the parties shall not exceed 25 pages each in argument, double-spaced and in 12-point font. All necessary and available evidence in support of the CLAIMANT’S claim(s) should be part of the initial written 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.
In addition, the IRP PANEL may grant a request for additional written submissions from any person or entity who is intervening as a CLAIMANT or who is participating as an amicus upon the showing of a compelling basis for such request. In the event the IRP PANEL grants a request for additional written submissions, any such additional written submission shall not exceed 15 pages, double-spaced and in 12-point font.

For any DISPUTE resulting from a decision of a process-specific expert panel that is claimed to be inconsistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws, as specified at Bylaw Section 4.3(b)(iii)(A)(3), any person, group or entity that was previously identified as within a contention set with the CLAIMANT regarding the issue under consideration within such expert panel proceeding shall reasonably receive notice from ICANN that the INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESS has commenced. ICANN shall undertake reasonable efforts to provide notice by electronic message within two business days (calculated at ICANN’s principal place of business) of receiving notification from the ICDR that the IRP has commenced.

7. Consolidation, Intervention and Participation as an Amicus

A PROCEDURES OFFICER shall be appointed from the STANDING PANEL to consider any request for consolidation, intervention, and/or participation as an amicus. Except as otherwise expressly stated herein, requests for consolidation, intervention, and/or participation as an amicus are committed to the reasonable discretion of the PROCEDURES OFFICER. In the event that no STANDING PANEL is in place when a PROCEDURES OFFICER must be selected, a panelist may be appointed by the ICDR pursuant to its INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION RULES relating to appointment of panelists for consolidation.

In the event that requests for consolidation or intervention are granted, the restrictions on Written Statements set forth in Section 6 shall apply to all CLAIMANTS collectively (for a total of 25 pages exclusive of evidence) and not individually unless otherwise modified by the IRP PANEL in its discretion consistent with the PURPOSES OF THE IRP.

Consolidation

Consolidation of DISPUTES may be appropriate when the PROCEDURES OFFICER concludes that there is a sufficient common nucleus of operative fact among multiple IRPs such that the joint resolution of the DISPUTES would foster a more just and efficient resolution of the DISPUTES than addressing each DISPUTE individually. If DISPUTES are consolidated, each existing DISPUTE shall no longer be subject to further separate consideration. The PROCEDURES OFFICER may in its discretion order briefing to consider the propriety of consolidation of DISPUTES.
**Intervention**

Any person or entity qualified to be a CLAIMANT pursuant to the standing requirement set forth in the Bylaws may intervene in an IRP with the permission of the PROCEDURES OFFICER, as provided below. This applies whether or not the person, group or entity participated in an underlying proceeding (a process-specific expert panel per ICANN Bylaws, Article 4, Section 4.3(b)(iii)(A)(3)).

Intervention is appropriate to be sought when the prospective participant does not already have a pending related DISPUTE, and the potential claims of the prospective participant stem from a common nucleus of operative facts based on such briefing as the PROCEDURES OFFICER may order in its discretion.

In addition, the Supporting Organization(s) which developed a Consensus Policy involved when a DISPUTE challenges a material provision(s) of an existing Consensus Policy in whole or in part shall have a right to intervene as a CLAIMANT to the extent of such challenge. Supporting Organization rights in this respect shall be exercisable through the chair of the Supporting Organization.

Any person, group or entity who intervenes as a CLAIMANT pursuant to this section will become a CLAIMANT in the existing INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESS and have all of the rights and responsibilities of other CLAIMANTS in that matter and be bound by the outcome to the same extent as any other CLAIMANT. All motions to intervene or for consolidation shall be directed to the IRP PANEL within 15 days of the initiation of the INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESS. All requests to intervene or for consolidation must contain the same information as a written statement of a DISPUTE and must be accompanied by the appropriate filing fee. The IRP PANEL may accept for review by the PROCEDURES OFFICER any motion to intervene or for consolidation after 15 days in cases where it deems that the PURPOSES OF THE IRP are furthered by accepting such a motion.

Excluding materials exempted from production under Rule 8 (Exchange of Information) below, the IRP PANEL shall direct that all materials related to the DISPUTE be made available to entities that have intervened or had their claim consolidated unless a CLAIMANT or ICANN objects that such disclosure will harm commercial confidentiality, personal data, or trade secrets; in which case the IRP PANEL shall rule on objection and provide such information as is consistent with the PURPOSES OF THE IRP and the appropriate preservation of confidentiality as recognized in Article 4 of the Bylaws.
Participation as an *Amicus Curiae*

Any person, group, or entity that has a material interest relevant to the DISPUTE but does not satisfy the standing requirements for a CLAIMANT set forth in the Bylaws may participate as an *amicus curiae* before an IRP PANEL, subject to the limitations set forth below. Without limitation to the persons, groups, or entities that may have such a material interest, the following persons, groups, or entities shall be deemed to have a material interest relevant to the DISPUTE and, upon request of person, group, or entity seeking to so participate, shall be permitted to participate as an *amicus* before the IRP PANEL:

i. A person, group or entity that participated in an underlying proceeding (a process-specific expert panel per ICANN Bylaws, Article 4, Section 4.3(b)(iii)(A)(3));

ii. If the IRP relates to an application arising out of ICANN’s New gTLD Program, a person, group or entity that was part of a contention set for the string at issue in the IRP; and

iii. If the briefings before the IRP PANEL significantly refer to actions taken by a person, group or entity that is external to the DISPUTE, such external person, group or entity.

All requests to participate as an *amicus* must contain the same information as the Written Statement (set out at Section 6), specify the interest of the *amicus curiae*, and must be accompanied by the appropriate filing fee.

If the PROCEDURES OFFICER determines, in his or her discretion, subject to the conditions set forth above, that the proposed *amicus curiae* has a material interest relevant to the DISPUTE, he or she shall allow participation by the *amicus curiae*. Any person participating as an *amicus curiae* may submit to the IRP Panel written briefing(s) on the DISPUTE or on such discrete questions as the IRP PANEL may request briefing, in the discretion of the IRP PANEL and subject to such deadlines, page limits, and other procedural rules as the IRP PANEL may specify in its discretion.4 The IRP PANEL shall determine in its discretion what materials related to the DISPUTE to make available to a person participating as an *amicus curiae*.

---

4 During the pendency of these Interim Supplementary Rules, in exercising its discretion in allowing the participation of *amicus curiae* and in then considering the scope of participation from *amicus curiae*, the IRP PANEL shall lean in favor of allowing broad participation of an *amicus curiae* as needed to further the purposes of the IRP set forth at Section 4.3 of the ICANN Bylaws.
8. Exchange of Information

The IRP PANEL shall be guided by considerations of accessibility, fairness, and efficiency (both as to time and cost) in its consideration of requests for exchange of information.

On the motion of either Party and upon finding by the IRP PANEL that such exchange of information is necessary to further the PURPOSES OF THE IRP, the IRP PANEL may order a Party to produce to the other Party, and to the IRP PANEL if the moving Party requests, documents or electronically stored information in the other Party’s possession, custody, or control that the Panel determines are reasonably likely to be relevant and material to the resolution of the CLAIMS and/or defenses in the DISPUTE and are not subject to the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine or otherwise protected from disclosure by applicable law (including, without limitation, disclosures to competitors of the dislosing person, group or entity, of any competition-sensitive information of any kind). Where such method(s) for exchange of information are allowed, all Parties shall be granted the equivalent rights for exchange of information.

A motion for exchange of documents shall contain a description of the specific documents, classes of documents or other information sought that relate to the subject matter of the Dispute along with an explanation of why such documents or other information are likely to be relevant and material to resolution of the Dispute.

Depositions, interrogatories, and requests for admission will not be permitted.

In the event that a Party submits what the IRP PANEL deems to be an expert opinion, such opinion must be provided in writing and the other Party must have a right of reply to such an opinion with an expert opinion of its own.

9. Summary Dismissal

An IRP PANEL may summarily dismiss any request for INDEPENDENT REVIEW where the Claimant has not demonstrated that it has been materially affected by a DISPUTE. To be materially affected by a DISPUTE, a Claimant must suffer an injury or harm that is directly and causally connected to the alleged violation.

An IRP PANEL may also summarily dismiss a request for INDEPENDENT REVIEW that lacks substance or is frivolous or vexatious.
10. Interim Measures of Protection

A Claimant may request interim relief from the IRP PANEL, or if an IRP PANEL is not yet in place, from the STANDING PANEL. Interim relief may include prospective relief, interlocutory relief, or declaratory or injunctive relief, and specifically may include a stay of the challenged ICANN action or decision in order to maintain the status quo until such time as the opinion of the IRP PANEL is considered by ICANN as described in ICANN Bylaws, Article 4, Section 4.3(o)(iv).

An EMERGENCY PANELIST shall be selected from the STANDING PANEL to adjudicate requests for interim relief. In the event that no STANDING PANEL is in place when an EMERGENCY PANELIST must be selected, a panelist may be appointed by the ICDR pursuant to ICDR RULES relating to appointment of panelists for emergency relief. Interim relief may only be provided if the EMERGENCY PANELIST determines that the Claimant has established all of the following factors:

(i) A harm for which there will be no adequate remedy in the absence of such relief;

(ii) Either: (A) likelihood of success on the merits; or (B) sufficiently serious questions related to the merits; and

(iii) A balance of hardships tipping decidedly toward the party seeking relief.

Interim relief may be granted on an ex parte basis in circumstances that the EMERGENCY PANELIST deems exigent, but any Party whose arguments were not considered prior to the granting of such interim relief may submit any opposition to such interim relief, and the EMERGENCY PANELIST must consider such arguments, as soon as reasonably possible. The EMERGENCY PANELIST may modify or terminate the interim relief if the EMERGENCY PANELIST deems it appropriate to do so in light of such further arguments.

11. Standard of Review

Each IRP PANEL shall conduct an objective, de novo examination of the DISPUTE.

a. With respect to COVERED ACTIONS, the IRP PANEL shall make findings of fact to determine whether the COVERED ACTION constituted an action or inaction that violated ICANN’S Articles or Bylaws.
b. All DISPUTES shall be decided in compliance with ICANN’s Articles and Bylaws, as understood in the context of the norms of applicable law and prior relevant IRP decisions.

c. For Claims arising out of the Board’s exercise of its fiduciary duties, the IRP PANEL shall not replace the Board’s reasonable judgment with its own so long as the Board’s action or inaction is within the realm of reasonable business judgment.

d. With respect to claims that ICANN has not enforced its contractual rights with respect to the IANA Naming Function Contract, the standard of review shall be whether there was a material breach of ICANN’s obligations under the IANA Naming Function Contract, where the alleged breach has resulted in material harm to the Claimant.

e. IRPs initiated through the mechanism contemplated at Article 4, Section 4.3(a)(iv) of ICANN’s Bylaws shall be subject to a separate standard of review as defined in the IANA Naming Function Contract.

12. IRP PANEL Decisions

IRP PANEL DECISIONS shall be made by a simple majority of the IRP PANEL. If any IRP PANEL member fails to sign the IRP PANEL DECISION, the IRP PANEL member shall endeavor to provide a written statement of the reason for the absence of such signature.

13. Form and Effect of an IRP PANEL DECISION

a. IRP PANEL DECISIONS shall be made in writing, promptly by the IRP PANEL, based on the documentation, supporting materials and arguments submitted by the parties. IRP PANEL DECISIONS shall be issued in English, and the English version will be authoritative over any translations.

b. The IRP PANEL DECISION shall specifically designate the prevailing party as to each Claim.

c. Subject to Article 4, Section 4.3 of ICANN’s Bylaws, all IRP PANEL DECISIONS shall be made public, and shall reflect a well-reasoned application of how the DISPUTE was resolved in compliance with ICANN’s Articles and Bylaws, as understood in light of prior IRP PANEL DECISIONS decided under
the same (or an equivalent prior) version of the provision of the Articles and Bylaws at issue, and norms of applicable law.

14. Appeal of IRP PANEL Decisions

An IRP PANEL DECISION may be appealed to the full STANDING PANEL sitting en banc within 60 days of the issuance of such decision. The en banc STANDING PANEL will review such appealed IRP PANEL DECISION based on a clear error of judgment or the application of an incorrect legal standard. The en banc STANDING PANEL may also resolve any disputes between panelists on an IRP PANEL or the PROCEDURES OFFICER with respect to consolidation of CLAIMS or intervention.

15. Costs

The IRP PANEL shall fix costs in its IRP PANEL DECISION. Except as otherwise provided in Article 4, Section 4.3(e)(ii) of ICANN’s Bylaws, each party to an IRP proceeding shall bear its own legal expenses, except that ICANN shall bear all costs associated with a Community IRP, as defined in Article 4, Section 4.3(d) of ICANN’s Bylaws, including the costs of all legal counsel and technical experts.

Except with respect to a Community IRP, the IRP PANEL may shift and provide for the losing party to pay administrative costs and/or fees of the prevailing party in the event it identifies the losing party’s Claim or defense as frivolous or abusive.
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Synopsis
Background: Payphone service providers brought action claiming that incumbent local exchange carrier (ILEC) owed reimbursements for periods in which it failed to file tariffs implementing new standards or filed tariffs not compliant with Federal Telecommunications Act and its implementing regulations. The United States District Court for the Western District of Washington, Marsha J. Pechman, J., granted judgment for ILEC. Providers appealed.

Holdings: The Court of Appeals, Berzon, Circuit Judge, held that:

primary jurisdiction doctrine contention could be addressed on its merits in due course;

filed-rate doctrine did not preclude lawsuit;

primary jurisdiction doctrine required referral of threshold issue to Federal Communications Commission (FCC);

remand to district court was warranted;

providers' cause of action based on fraud protection rates of ILEC accrued as soon as ILEC missed federal filing deadline and providers paid for fraud protection services based on non-compliant rates on file with state utility commissions; and

providers were injured anew by ILEC's failure to file required federal tariff each time that providers paid state-filed tariff that did not comply with FCC's new services test (NST).

Reversed in part, vacated in part, and remanded.

Opinion, 451 F.3d 1037, superseded.

Procedural Posture(s): On Appeal.
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*1078 Brooks E. Harlow and David Rice, Miller Nash LLP, Seattle, WA, for the plaintiffs-appellants.

Douglas P. Lobel and David A. Vogel, Arnold & Porter LLP, McLean, VA, for the defendant-appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington; Marsha J. Pechman, District Judge, Presiding. D.C. No. CV 03 03680 MJP.


* The Honorable William W Schwarzer, Senior United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, sitting by designation.

ORDER AND AMENDED OPINION

BERZON, Circuit Judge.

ORDER

The opinion filed June 26, 2006, and published at 451 F.3d 1037, is withdrawn and superseded by the opinion filed concurrently herewith. The opinion is amended as follows:

1. At slip op. 7048, first full paragraph, line 15, 451 F.3d at 1045 46, delete from the sentence beginning “That is to say ...” through to the end of the paragraph.

2. At slip op. 7049, 451 F.3d at 1046, delete from the paragraph beginning “Here, the FCC ...” through to the end of Part II of the opinion, and insert the following:

“In Reiter, the Supreme Court held that the claim that a carrier's rates were not ‘reasonable,’ as required by Interstate Commerce Act, was not barred by the filed-rate doctrine.” 507 U.S. at 266, 113 S.Ct. 1213. Davel's complaint arises under §§ 201 and 276 of the 1996 Act. Section 201 is nearly identical to the provision of the Interstate Commerce Act at issue in Reiter, requiring telecommunications rates to be just and reasonable. Section 276 adds the further command that a carrier may not set its payphone rates so as to discriminate in favor of or subsidize its own payphone services, and instructs the agency to implement regulations requiring rates to meet the new services test. As in Reiter, these requirements, as well as the provision conferring on Davel a right of action for their enforcement, are accorded by the regulating statute which imposed the tariff filing requirement and are therefore not precluded by the filed rate doctrine.

“There is a related reason that the filed rate doctrine is inapplicable to the claims in this case. In Transcon Lines, the Supreme Court, following Reiter, held that a regulating agency may require a ‘departure from a filed rate when necessary to enforce other specific and valid regulations adopted under the Act, regulations that are consistent with
the filed rate system and compatible with its effective operation.’ ” 513 U.S. at 147, 115 S.Ct. 689. Here, the FCC, in adopting the Waiver Order, expressly required a “departure from a filed rate” as to some non-compliant intrastate public access line tariffs. The Waiver Order extended the time for filing NST-compliant rates and provided that any existing non-compliant rates would remain on file in the interim. The Order further provided that once the NST-compliant rates became effective, carriers were to reimburse their customers for the difference between any newly compliant rates and any noncompliant rates on file after April 15, 1997. As the Order thus expressly provided that Qwest's customers might ultimately pay rates different from those on file during the waiver period for certain services obtained during that time, it is not consistent with a strict application of the filed-rate doctrine to a challenge under the Waiver Order to assertedly non-compliant rates on file after April 15, 1997. Consequently, the filed-rate doctrine does not stand as a bar to construing the reach of and then enforcing the Waiver Order's reimbursement requirement in a case such as this one. This is so even though the lawsuit, in effect, challenges the tariffs on file between 1997 and 2002 and, if successful, would result in Davel paying an amount for public access line services different from that provided in those tariffs.

Challenged in this case or to any particular time period. As discussed below, the primary jurisdiction doctrine precludes us from determining the scope of the Waiver Order.

*1080 “Accordingly, we hold that Davel's claims in this case are not barred by the filed-rate doctrine. 6”

6 The parties' arguments with regard to the fraud protection rates concern only the district court's statute of limitations decision. We therefore do not decide on this appeal whether the filed rate doctrine is applicable to that claim.

3. At slip op. 7055, first full paragraph, line 12, 451 F.3d at 1049, change “consideration” to “argument”.

4. At slip op. 7055, first full paragraph, lines 15 16, 451 F.3d at 1049, change “was not one contemplated” to “may not have been contemplated”.

5. At slip op. 7055, last paragraph, line 2, 451 F.3d at 1049, change “the initial expectation” to “any initial expectation”.

With these amendments, Qwest Corporation's petition for panel rehearing and motion for judicial notice are denied. No further petitions for rehearing or rehearing en banc will be entertained. See 9th Cir. G.O. 5.3(a).

OPINION

The Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 (“1996 Act”) largely deregulated the telecommunications industry. At the same time, the 1996 Act continued to regulate certain segments of the industry
so as to increase competition overall. For example, to promote more competitive market conditions, the 1996 Act required incumbent local exchange carriers, including appellee Qwest Corp., to provide access to their telephone lines and services essentially at their cost of providing the service.

In 1996 and 1997, the Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”) issued a series of orders setting standards for rates and services offered by local carriers to payphone service providers. This case concerns claims by Davel Communications, Inc. and other payphone service providers (“Davel”) that, under the FCC's 1996 and 1997 orders, Qwest owes reimbursements for periods in which it failed to file tariffs implementing the new standards or filed tariffs not compliant with the 1996 Act and its implementing regulations. The district court held the reimbursement claims barred by the filed-tariff doctrine and dismissed them without prejudice. In addition, the court dismissed on statute of limitations grounds Davel's claims that Qwest overcharged it for fraud protection services during the time Qwest failed to file required fraud protection tariffs with the FCC.

As a threshold matter, Qwest contends that the district court lacked jurisdiction under the primary jurisdiction doctrine over Davel's claims and that we therefore lack jurisdiction to hear this appeal. That is not so. The primary jurisdiction doctrine is “a doctrine specifically applicable to claims properly cognizable in court that contain some issue within the special competence of an administrative agency.” Reiter v. Cooper, 507 U.S. 258, 268, 113 S.Ct. 1213, 122 L.Ed.2d 604 (1993) (emphasis added). In other words, “[p]rimary jurisdiction is not a doctrine that implicates the subject matter jurisdiction of the federal courts.” Syntek Semiconductor Co. v. Microchip Tech. Inc., 307 F.3d 775, 780 (9th Cir.2002). Consequently, even where the doctrine requires an issue to be referred to an administrative agency, it “does not deprive the court of jurisdiction.” Reiter, 507 U.S. at 268, 113 S.Ct. 1213.

We therefore have jurisdiction of this appeal from the final judgment of the district *1081 court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and address Qwest's primary jurisdiction doctrine contention on its merits in due course rather than as a threshold jurisdictional issue. Cf. Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Env't, 523 U.S. 83, 93 94, 118 S.Ct. 1003, 140 L.Ed.2d 210 (jurisdictional objections must be addressed before proceeding to merits issues). After considering the parties' contentions, we vacate the district court's order of dismissal and remand for further proceedings.

I. Background

Davel and the other appellants are payphone service providers that purchase telecommunications services from Qwest in eleven of the fourteen states in which Qwest operates. Because Qwest operates its own payphones, Davel is both a competitor and a customer of Qwest. The services Qwest provides its payphone service provider
customers include public access lines, local usage to enable Davel to connect its payphones to the telephone network for placing calls, and fraud protection.

Chapter 5 of the Federal Communications Act of 1934 as amended by the 1996 Act regulates the telecommunications industry. 47 U.S.C. § 151 et seq. As a general matter, the Federal Communications Act requires common carriers subject to its provisions to charge only just and reasonable rates, id. § 201, and to file their rates for their services with the FCC or, in some cases, with state agencies. Id. § 203. As part of the 1996 Act's general focus on improving the competitiveness of markets for telecommunications services, § 276 substantially modified the regulatory regime governing the payphone industry by providing, in general terms, that dominant carriers may not subsidize their payphone services from their other telecommunications operations and may not “prefer or discriminate in favor of [their] payphone service[s]” in the rates they charge to competitors. Id. § 276(a). The 1996 Act directs the FCC to issue regulations implementing these provisions, specifying in some detail the mandatory contents of the regulations. Id. § 276(b).

Pursuant to this directive, the FCC adopted regulations requiring local exchange carriers such as Qwest to set payphone service rates and “unbundled features” rates, including rates for fraud protection, according to the FCC's “new services test” (sometimes “NST”). The new services test requires that rates for those telecommunications services to which it applies be based on the actual cost of providing the service, plus a reasonable amount of the service provider's overhead costs. The FCC's regulations required local exchange carriers to develop rates for the use of public access lines by intrastate payphone service providers that were compliant with the new services test. The rates were to be submitted to the utility commissions in the states in the local exchange carriers' territory, which would review and “file” (i.e., approve) the rates. See In re Implementation of the Pay Telephone Reclassification and Compensation Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Report and Order, FCC 96 388, 11 F.C.C.R. 20,541 (Sept. 20, 1996); In re Implementation of the Pay Telephone Reclassification and Compensation Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Order on Reconsideration, FCC 96 439, 11 F.C.C.R. 21,233 (Nov. 8, 1996) ¶ 163 (“Order on Recons.”) (collectively “Payphone Orders”). Also pursuant to the regulations, *1082 local exchange carriers were required to file their “unbundled features” rates with both the state commissions and the FCC for approval. Order on Recons. ¶ 163. The FCC required the local exchange carriers to file the new tariffs for both kinds of rates by January 15, 1997, with an effective date no later than April 15, 1997. Id.

In addition, the Payphone Orders required interexchange carriers, mainly long distance telephone service providers, to pay “dial-around compensation” to payphone service
providers, including Qwest, for calls carried on the carrier's lines which originated from one of the provider's pay telephones. If, however, the payphone service provider was also an incumbent local exchange carrier, as was Qwest, the Payphone Orders required full compliance with the new tariff filing requirements, including the filing of cost-based public access line rates and fraud protection rates, before the local exchange carrier could begin collecting dial-around compensation.

Prior to the passage of the 1996 Act, callers could use an access number to bypass the payphone provider and place a call directly with the interexchange carrier. The interexchange carrier then collected the full tariff, leaving the payphone provider with no compensation for the call. Payphone providers were prohibited from blocking these calls. The new rules requiring dial around compensation changed this regime so as to assure some compensation to the company that provided the payphone. See 47 U.S.C. § 276(b)(1)(A); see generally Global Crossing Telecomm., Inc. v. FCC, 259 F.3d 740, 742, 747 (D.C.Cir.2001) (tracing background of the dial around compensation regulations).

On April 10, 1997, a coalition of regional Bell operating companies (“the Coalition”), which included Qwest, sent a letter to the FCC requesting a limited waiver of certain provisions of the Payphone Orders. The Coalition wanted this waiver so that the constituent companies could begin collecting dial-around compensation before they were in full compliance with the new regulations. Specifically, they requested an extension of time to file intrastate payphone service rates compliant with the new services test. These rates were due to become effective on April 15, 1997, but the Coalition wanted that deadline extended forty-five days from April 4, 1997. (The FCC had earlier granted a similar extension with respect to interstate rates.) The Coalition proposed that, if the FCC granted the waiver and allowed the Coalition companies to file rates that complied with the new services test by the extended deadline, those companies would reimburse or provide a credit back to April 15, 1997, to customers purchasing the services if the new rates were lower than the previous non-compliant rates.

On April 15, 1997, the FCC issued an order granting a limited waiver of the new services test rate-filing requirement. In re Implementation of the Pay Telephone Reclassification and Compensation Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Order, DA 97 805, 12 F.C.C.R. 21,370 (Apr. 15, 1997) (“Waiver Order”). Specifically, the Waiver Order granted an extension until May 19, 1997, for filing intrastate payphone service rates compliant with the new services test, while at the same time permitting incumbent local exchange carriers to begin collecting dial-around compensation as of April 15, 1997. Id. ¶ 2. The Waiver Order stated that the existing rates would continue in effect from April 15, 1997, until the new, compliant rates became effective (“the waiver period”). The NST-compliant rates were to be filed with state utility commissions, which were required to act on the filed rates “within a reasonable time.” Id. ¶ 19 n. 60; see also id. ¶¶ 2, 18 19, 25. If a local exchange carrier relied on the waiver, it was required to reimburse its customers *1083 “from April 15, 1997 in situations where the newly [filed] rates, when effective, are lower than the existing [filed] rates.” Id. ¶¶ 2, 20, 25. The order emphasized
that the waiver was “limited” and “of brief duration.” *Id.* ¶¶ 21, 23.

In 2002, in a decision subsequently affirmed by the D.C. Circuit, the FCC clarified the requirements of the new services test as it applies to the payphone industry, making it clear that, as in other areas in which it has been applied, the new services test requires forward looking, cost-based rates. *In re Wis. Pub. Serv. Comm’n, Mem. Op. & Order, 17 F.C.C.R.2051 (2002) (“Wisconsin Order”), aff’d New Eng. Pub. Comm’n’s Council, Inc. v. FCC, 334 F.3d 69 (D.C.Cir.2003).* That is, the rates must take into account only the ongoing costs of providing the service, and may not recover previously incurred costs, such as those incurred in building the telephone system infrastructure. In so holding, the FCC rejected the Coalition’s challenge to its authority to regulate intrastate rates and to require forward-looking cost estimates in determining rates, as well as the Coalition’s challenges to the agency’s determination of how overhead costs may be allocated. *Id.* ¶¶ 31–58. In 2002, after the FCC’s decision in the Wisconsin Order, Qwest dramatically reduced its public access line and fraud protection tariffs.

Davel further contends that: (1) from 1997 to 2002, rather than filing NST-compliant public access line rates in any of eleven states in which the plaintiff payphone service providers operate, Qwest was pursuing legal challenges to the FCC’s authority to regulate intrastate public access line rates; (2) the first time Qwest filed NST-compliant rates in the states at issue was in 2002; (3) the rates filed in 2002, which were substantially lower than the 1997 2002 rates, show that Qwest's 1997 2002 rates were not compliant with the new services test. On these premises, Davel argues that the Waiver Order requires Qwest to reimburse it for the difference between the compliant rate filed in 2002 and the non-compliant rates actually charged for the entire preceding period, beginning on April 15, 1997.

In addition, according to Davel, Qwest was required pursuant to the Order on Recons. to file with the FCC rates compliant with the new services test for fraud protection services and other “unbundled features.” Davel alleges that Qwest failed to file compliant fraud protection rates from 1997 until 2002 or 2003, and that this lapse violated the Act. Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §§ 206 207, Davel asserts, it is entitled to recover damages for this violation measured by the difference between the amount it was charged and the compliant rates.

Qwest moved to dismiss Davel's complaint under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), arguing (1) that Davel's claims
arising out of the payphone service rates are barred by the filed-rate doctrine; and (2) that Davel's claim arising from the fraud protection rates is time-barred under the applicable statute of limitations. In the alternative, Qwest, invoking the primary jurisdiction doctrine, requested a stay and referral of the threshold legal issues to the appropriate state and federal agencies. The district court granted Qwest's motion to dismiss, holding Davel's refund claims under the Waiver Order *1084 barred by the filed-rate doctrine and its fraud protection claims barred by the two year statute of limitations set out in 47 U.S.C. § 415. The court dismissed Davel's complaint without prejudice to Davel's asserting the claims before the appropriate administrative tribunals. We review de novo the district court's dismissal for failure to state a claim under Fed.R.Civ.P. 12(b)(6). Madison v. Graham, 316 F.3d 867, 869 (9th Cir.2002).

II. The Filed Rate Doctrine

The filed-rate doctrine, also known as the filed-tariff doctrine, applies in regulated industries in which federal law requires common carriers publicly to file schedules of services and the rates or tariffs to be charged for those services. The doctrine requires that common carriers and their customers adhere to tariffs filed and approved by appropriate regulatory agencies. Evanns v. AT & T Corp., 229 F.3d 837, 840 (9th Cir.2000). “Under the doctrine, once a carrier's tariff is approved by the FCC [or an appropriate state agency], the terms of the federal tariff are considered to be ‘the law’ and to therefore ‘conclusively and exclusively enumerate the rights and liabilities as between the carrier and the customer.” Id. (quoting Marcus v. AT & T Corp., 138 F.3d 46, 56 (2d Cir.1998)).

Not only is a carrier forbidden from charging rates other than as set out in its filed tariff, but customers are also charged with notice of the terms and rates set out in that filed tariff and may not bring an action against a carrier that would invalidate, alter or add to the terms of the filed tariff.

Id. (citations omitted). That is, the doctrine bars suits challenging rates which “if successful, would have the effect of changing the filed tariff.” Brown v. MCI WorldCom Network Servs., Inc., 277 F.3d 1166, 1170 (9th Cir.2002).

The regulatory scheme of the Federal Communications Act, the source since 1934 of the filed-rate doctrine in the telecommunications industry, see Evanns, 229 F.3d at 840, was fundamentally altered with the passage of the 1996 Act. Although the Federal Communications Act prohibited the FCC from eliminating for any covered carriers the requirement that they obtain advance approval of schedules of rates from the agency and adhere to the approved tariffs, see Ting v. AT & T, 319 F.3d 1126, 1131 32 (9th
Nevertheless, the filed-tariff doctrine does not bar a suit to enforce a command of the very regulatory statute giving rise to the tariff-filing requirement, even where the effect of enforcement would be to change the filed tariff. **Reiter, 507 U.S. at 266, 113 S.Ct. 1213** (holding, in a motor carrier case, that the filed-rate doctrine applies to common-law claims but “assuredly does not preclude avoidance of the tariff rate ... through claims and defenses that are specifically accorded by the[Interstate Commerce Act] itself”). This principle applies to regulations implementing the statutory command as well as to the statute itself. **See ICC v. Transcon Lines, 513 U.S. 138, 147, 115 S.Ct. 689, 130 L.Ed.2d 562 (1995)** (“Carriers must comply with the comprehensive scheme provided by the statute and regulations promulgated under it, and their failure to do so may justify departure from the filed rate.”).

3 We note that the question whether the 1996 Act provides a private right of action to enforce payphone regulations such as the Waiver Order is pending before the United States Supreme Court. **See Metrophones Telecommuns., Inc. v. Global Crossing Telecommuns., Inc., 423 F.3d 1056, 1065 70 (9th Cir.2005), cert. granted U.S., 126 S.Ct. 1329, 164 L.Ed.2d 46 (Feb. 21, 2006).** However, as Qwest emphatically stated in its October 3, 2005, Fed. R.App. P. 28(j) letter, it has never disputed in this case that Davel has such a right of action. We therefore decline to address the issue, assuming for purposes of this case only that Davel does have a right of action. **See Burks v. Lasker, 441 U.S. 471, 475 76 & n. 5, 99 S.Ct. 1831, 60 L.Ed.2d 404 (1979)** (the existence of a private right of action is not a jurisdictional question, and, where not raised, may be assumed without being decided).
Commerce Act, was not barred by the filed-rate doctrine. 507 U.S. at 266, 113 S.Ct. 1213. Davel's complaint arises under §§ 201 and 276 of the 1996 Act. Section 201 is nearly identical to the provision of the Interstate Commerce Act at issue in Reiter, requiring telecommunications rates to be just and reasonable. Section 276 adds the further command that a carrier may not set its payphone rates so as to discriminate in favor of or subsidize its own payphone services, and instructs the agency to implement regulations requiring rates to meet the new services test. As in Reiter, these requirements, as well as the provision conferring on Davel a right of action for their enforcement, are accorded by the regulating statute which imposed the tariff filing requirement and are therefore not precluded by the filed rate doctrine.

There is a related reason that the filed rate doctrine is inapplicable to the claims in this case. In Transcon Lines, the Supreme Court, following Reiter, held that a regulating agency may require a “departure from a filed rate when necessary to enforce other specific and valid regulations adopted under the Act, regulations that are consistent with the filed rate system and compatible with its effective operation.” 513 U.S. at 147, 115 S.Ct. 689. Here, the FCC, in adopting the Waiver Order, expressly required a “departure from a filed rate” as to some non-compliant intrastate public access line tariffs. The Waiver Order extended the time for filing NST-compliant rates and provided that any existing non-compliant rates would remain on file in the interim. The Order further provided that once the NST-compliant rates became effective, carriers were to reimburse their customers for the difference between any newly compliant rates and any noncompliant rates on file after April 15, 1997. As the Order thus expressly provided that Qwest's customers might ultimately pay rates different from those on file during the waiver period for certain services obtained during that time, 4 it is not consistent with a strict application of the filed-rate doctrine to a challenge under the Waiver Order to assertedly noncompliant rates on file after April 15, 1997. Consequently, the filed-rate doctrine does not stand as a bar to construing the reach of and then enforcing the Waiver Order's reimbursement requirement in a case such as this one. This is so even though the lawsuit, in effect, challenges the tariffs on file between 1997 and 2002 and, if successful, would result in Davel paying an amount for public access line services different from that provided in those tariffs. 5

4 Qwest does not raise any challenge to the FCC's authority to promulgate such an order, and indeed, was part of the Coalition that requested it.

5 By so holding, we do not decide whether the Waiver Order applies with respect to the particular rates challenged in this case or to any particular time period. As discussed below, the primary jurisdiction doctrine precludes us from determining the scope of the Waiver Order.

Accordingly, we hold that Davel's claims in this case are not barred by the filed-rate doctrine. 6

6 The parties' arguments with regard to the fraud protection rates concern only the district court's statute of limitations decision. We therefore do not
III. The Primary Jurisdiction Doctrine

The conclusion that the filed-rate doctrine does not preclude Davel's lawsuit does not mean that the case can go forward. Davel's refund claim presents several issues that arguably implicate technical and policy considerations. Qwest contends that under the primary jurisdiction doctrine, these issues must be addressed in the first instance by the agencies with regulatory authority over the payphone industry.

The doctrine of primary jurisdiction “is a prudential doctrine under which courts may, under appropriate circumstances, determine that the initial decisionmaking responsibility should be performed by the relevant agency rather than the courts.” Syntek, 307 F.3d at 780. “The doctrine is applicable whenever the enforcement of a claim subject to a specific regulatory scheme requires resolution of issues that are ‘within the special competence of an administrative body.’ ” Farley Transp. Co. v. Santa Fe Trail Transp. Co., 778 F.2d 1365, 1370 (9th Cir.1985) (quoting United States v. W. Pac. R.R. Co., 352 U.S. 59, 63, 77 S.Ct. 161, 1 L.Ed.2d 126 (1956)). The doctrine does not, however, “require that all claims within an agency's purview be decided by the agency.” Brown, 277 F.3d at 1172; accord United States v. Gen. Dynamics Corp., 828 F.2d 1356, 1363 (9th Cir.1987) (“While it is certainly true that the competence of an agency to pass on an issue is a necessary condition to the application of the doctrine, competence alone is not sufficient.”). “Nor is [the primary jurisdiction doctrine] intended to ‘secure expert advice’ for the courts from regulatory agencies every time a court is presented with an issue conceivably within the agency's ambit.” Brown, 277 F.3d at 1172.

Although “[n]o fixed formula exists for applying the doctrine of primary jurisdiction,” W. Pac., 352 U.S. at 64, 77 S.Ct. 161, courts in this circuit traditionally look for four factors identified in General Dynamics. Under this test, the doctrine applies where there is “(1) the need to resolve an issue that (2) has been placed by Congress within the jurisdiction of an administrative body having regulatory authority (3) pursuant to a statute that subjects an industry or activity to a comprehensive regulatory scheme that (4) requires expertise or uniformity in administration.” Gen. Dynamics, 828 F.2d at 1362.

Where an issue falls within an agency's primary jurisdiction, the district court enables “referral” of the issue to the agency. Reiter, 507 U.S. at 268, 113 S.Ct. 1213. As we have explained,

“Referral” is the term of art employed in primary jurisdiction cases. In practice, it means that a court either stays proceedings, or dismisses the case without prejudice, so that the parties may
pursue their administrative remedies. There is no formal transfer mechanism between the courts and the agency; rather, upon invocation of the primary jurisdiction doctrine, the parties are responsible for initiating the appropriate proceedings before the agency.

_Cost Management Services, Inc. v. Washington Natural Gas Co., 99 F.3d 937, 948 49 (9th Cir.1996)_

Relying on _Cost Management Services, Inc. v. Washington Natural Gas Co., 99 F.3d 937, 948 49 (9th Cir.1996)_ Davel asserts as an initial matter that the primary jurisdiction doctrine does not apply at this juncture that is, when a case is at the motion to dismiss stage. Davel maintains that it has adequately alleged that the public access line rates Qwest filed prior to 2002 were not cost-based, so the threshold issue of whether the rates were consistent with the new services test must be resolved in Davel's favor, and it is therefore entitled to go forward with its case. Qwest, in contrast, maintains that the proper interpretation of an agency order, here the Waiver Order, is an issue which must be decided by the agency, regardless of the plaintiffs' factual allegations. 7

7 Qwest additionally contends that the issue of its rates' compliance with the new services test may be referred on a motion to dismiss. Because we conclude that referral of the proper construction of the Waiver Order is required, we do not address this contention.

In _Cost Management_, the plaintiff claimed that the owner of the natural gas delivery facilities violated its own filed tariff in an effort to monopolize the local natural gas market, in violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act. _Id. at 940 41_. The defendant sought dismissal on the ground, among others, that the issue whether it had violated the tariff was within the primary jurisdiction of the state utility commission. _Id. at 941, 948 49_. We held the primary jurisdiction doctrine inapplicable on the grounds that
the facts alleged in the complaint established a violation of the tariff, and thus, on a 12(b)(6) motion, the issue to be referred “must necessarily be resolved in favor of [the plaintiff].” Id. at 949. Implicit in this conclusion was the recognition that resolving the question whether there was a violation of an applicable tariff did not necessarily involve complex issues requiring agency expertise. Cf. W. Pac., 352 U.S. at 69, 77 S.Ct. 161; Brown, 277 F.3d at 1173.

Reading Cost Management against the background of established Rule 12(b)(6) jurisprudence, it becomes clear that Cost Management’s primary jurisdiction holding was but a straightforward application in the context of the primary jurisdiction doctrine of standard principles of pleading applicable to any motion to dismiss. Under these principles, “the federal courts may not dismiss a complaint unless ‘it is clear that no relief could be granted under any set of facts that could be proved consistent with the allegations.’” Kwai Fun Wong v. United States, 373 F.3d 952, 956 57 (9th Cir.2004) (quoting Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N.A., 534 U.S. 506, 514, 122 S.Ct. 992, 152 L.Ed.2d 1 (2002)).

In the context of the primary jurisdiction doctrine, the analogous question is whether any set of facts could be proved which would avoid application of the doctrine. The superordinate question governing the primary jurisdiction doctrine is “whether the reasons for the existence of the doctrine are present and whether the purposes it serves will be aided by its application in the particular litigation.” W. Pac., 352 U.S. at 64, 77 S.Ct. 161. Whether this question can be answered on a motion to dismiss depends on the nature of the case.

Where the issues raised by a complaint necessarily implicate policy concerns requiring application of the primary jurisdiction doctrine, a federal court may suspend its resolution of those issues in favor of their referral to the governing agency. Cost Management by contrast did not necessarily involve policy concerns committed to an agency, and our decision there simply conforms the primary jurisdiction doctrine with the usual principles that apply on motions to dismiss. In other words, where, as in Cost Management, the allegations of the complaint do not necessarily require the doctrine's applicability, then the primary jurisdiction doctrine may not be applied on a motion to dismiss; if, on the other hand, the primary jurisdiction doctrine applies on any set of facts that could be developed by the parties, there is no reason to await discovery, summary judgment, or trial, and the application of the doctrine properly may be determined on the pleadings. The Waiver Order construction issue in this case, as will appear, is of the latter variety.

B.

The threshold dispute regarding the refund claim centers on whether the Waiver Order entitles Davel to the refund, assuming the facts Davel has alleged. Specifically, the parties dispute whether the Waiver Order's reimbursement requirement is limited to the
forty-five-day period of the Order's waiver of the rate filing deadline, or whether the reimbursement obligation instead extends indefinitely that is, until Qwest's NST-compliant rates are on file and effective. Davel contends that the plain language of the Waiver Order provides for an open-ended obligation. Qwest maintains, in contrast, that the waiver provided by the order was expressly limited to a forty-five-day period, and that it would be absurd to construe the reimbursement obligation as extending beyond that period. Qwest further contends that if, as Davel alleges, it failed to file NST-compliant rates at all during the forty-five-day extension provided by the Waiver Order, then the Order's refund obligation never arose, and Davel's only remedy was a reparations claim filed with the FCC at the time of the missed deadline.

*1089 Finally, Qwest argues, this threshold dispute over the scope and construction of the Waiver Order must be referred to the FCC under the primary jurisdiction doctrine.

We agree that the primary jurisdiction doctrine requires referral of the threshold issue of the scope of the Waiver Order. Both this court and the Supreme Court have held that the interpretation of an agency order issued pursuant to the agency's congressionally granted regulatory authority falls within the agency's primary jurisdiction where the order reflects policy concerns or issues requiring uniform resolution. See, e.g., Rilling v. Burlington N. R. R. Co., 909 F.2d 399, 401 (9th Cir.1990) (holding that the resolution of plaintiff's claim required a proper interpretation of an ICC merger order, an issue within ICC's primary jurisdiction); see also Serv. Storage & Transfer Co. v. Virginia, 359 U.S. 171, 177, 79 S.Ct. 714, 3 L.Ed.2d 717 (1959) (holding that the interpretation of a certificate of convenience and necessity issued by ICC to an interstate motor carrier was an issue within the primary jurisdiction of the ICC). These decisions are grounded in the central focus of the primary jurisdiction doctrine, the desirability of uniform determination and administration of federal policy embodied in the agency's orders. Serv. Storage, 359 U.S. at 177, 79 S.Ct. 714; Rilling, 909 F.2d at 401.

Given this emphasis on achieving uniformity in policy determination and administration, the application of the primary jurisdiction doctrine to the issue of the scope of the FCC's Waiver Order is particularly compelling. The Waiver Order was issued pursuant to the congressional mandate that the FCC regulate the payphone industry and, specifically, that it provide for payphone service providers to receive compensation from interexchange carriers and for incumbent local exchange carriers to eliminate cost subsidies for their payphone systems. Davel observes that the Waiver Order's plain language may be read as open-ended. Opposed to that observation is the argument that, in adopting the Order, the FCC initially contemplated that all local exchange carriers would file NST-compliant tariffs within the forty-five-day waiver period. As the current dilemma may not have been contemplated at the outset by the agency, interpreting the Waiver Order requires consideration of
policy considerations similar to those that gave rise to the FCC's 1996 and 1997 orders applying the new services test to intrastate payphone rates, as well as to the Waiver Order itself.

More specifically, with the issuance of the Wisconsin Order in 2002, it became apparent that any initial expectation of prompt filing of NST-compliant tariffs may not have been fulfilled. Thus, beyond issues of initial FCC intent, any application of the Order to the several-year period beyond the original forty-five-day waiver term a several-year period in which the existence of NST-compliant tariffs was uncertain would raise policy questions not resolved by the Waiver Order itself. Those policy questions include whether applying the refund obligation should depend on whether or not there were good-faith efforts to file compliant rates; whether future enforcement of tariffs will be impeded by allowing ratepayers to complain about noncompliant rates years after the fact; and, conversely, whether a narrow construction of the Waiver Order would reward intentional non-compliance with FCC orders under the 1996 Act.

We cannot say without addressing such policy considerations how the Waiver Order should be applied in the circumstances of this case. How the Waiver Order applies here thus involves questions of policy best left to the FCC, the agency that adopted the Waiver Order in the first place pursuant to its regulatory authority in this arena.

In addition, the Waiver Order is national in scope, affecting local exchange carriers and payphone service providers throughout the country, including many industry participants not involved in this litigation. For the Order's reimbursement requirement to be applied uniformly, it is the FCC that must construe its scope. We note that there are currently five requests for such a construction pending before the FCC. The agency has provided some indication that it will determine this issue in due course. See In re Implementation of the Pay Telephone Reclassification and Compensation Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Public Notice, New England Public Communications Council, Inc. Filing of Letter from Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts Regarding Implementation of the Pay Telephone Compensation Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, DA 06 780, 2006 WL 850948 (Apr. 3, 2006), ¶ 1 & n. 3; see also In re Implementation of the Pay Telephone Reclassification and Compensation Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Public Notice, Pleading Cycle Established for Michigan Pay Telephone Association Petition for Declaratory Ruling, DA 06 1190, 2006 WL 1519441 (June 2, 2006). It is precisely the purpose of the primary jurisdiction doctrine to avoid the possibility of conflicting rulings by courts and agencies concerning issues within the agency's special competence. At least unless and until the FCC declines to determine the scope of the Waiver Order, questions regarding that scope, including those at the core of this case, are within the agency's primary jurisdiction.
Whether, as Davel maintains, the FCC could decline to address the scope of its Waiver Order, either expressly or by failing to respond to the outstanding requests, and, if it does, whether the district court could then proceed to do so, are questions we do not decide.

We conclude that the issue of the scope of the Waiver Order should be referred to the FCC.

C.

If the Waiver Order does entitle Davel to some relief as a result of Qwest's alleged failure to file public access line rates compliant with the new services test by the specified deadline, the pivotal question would become whether Qwest's rates between 1997 and 2002 were NST-compliant. Until we know whether and, if so, to what degree the Waiver Order gives rise to refund relief for all or part of the several year period in which Qwest's rates were assertedly non-NST-compliant, however, we cannot evaluate this refund claim on its merits. Nor, applying our understanding of Cost Management, can we determine whether the refund claim is sufficiently fact-dependent that any primary jurisdiction determination must await factual development. Consequently, because we have held that the scope of the Waiver Order is within the primary jurisdiction of the FCC, we cannot now address whether the issue of Qwest's pre-2002 rates' compliance with the new services test is also within the agency's primary jurisdiction, and we do not do so.

Qwest also contends that the determination of whether its pre-2002 intrastate public access line rates complied with the new services test is within the primary jurisdiction of the state utility commissions, with which, pursuant to the FCC's Order on Recons., those rates are filed. For the same reasons we cannot address whether the issue is within the FCC's primary jurisdiction, we cannot address this contention. We thus do not decide the open question whether primary jurisdiction referral to a state agency would be proper in any event. See Cost Mgmt., 99 F.3d at 949 n. 12.

*1091 D.

The district court dismissed the case pursuant to the filed rate doctrine. Davel contends that, under the primary jurisdiction doctrine, the appropriate disposition of this case is a stay, not a dismissal. Whether to stay or dismiss without prejudice a case within an administrative agency's primary jurisdiction is a decision within the discretion of the district court. Reiter, 507 U.S. at 268 69, 113 S.Ct. 1213. The court may stay the case and retain jurisdiction or, “if the parties would not be unfairly disadvantaged, ... dismiss the case without prejudice.” Id. The factor most often considered in determining whether a party will be disadvantaged by dismissal without prejudice is whether there is a risk that the statute of limitations may run on the claims pending agency resolution of threshold issues. Syntek, 307 F.3d at 782; Brown, 277 F.3d at 1173. Also, where the court suspends proceedings to give preliminary deference to an administrative agency but further judicial proceedings are contemplated, then jurisdiction should ordinarily be retained via a stay of proceedings, not relinquished via a dismissal. N. Cal. Dist. Council of Hod Carriers, Bldg. & Constr. Laborers, AFL
**CIO v. Opinski, 673 F.2d 1074, 1076 (9th Cir.1982).**

Here, because it dismissed the case on the basis of the filed-rate doctrine, the district court did not address whether Davel would be disadvantaged by dismissal. In particular, the district court had no occasion to consider that Davel's claims are subject to a two-year statute of limitations that began to run, at the latest, when Qwest first filed its NST-compliant tariffs, so Davel may well lose its claims before the FCC resolves the threshold issues.

We therefore remand to the district court to determine whether to stay the case or dismiss it without prejudice, applying the pertinent factors.

**IV. STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS**

The district court dismissed Davel's claims based on Qwest's fraud protection rates as barred by the two-year statute of limitations of 47 U.S.C. § 415(b). Davel contends this dismissal was error because its fraud rate claims did not accrue until Qwest filed NST-compliant fraud protection rates with the FCC in 2003.

The Order on Recons. required the filing of fraud protection tariffs with the FCC by January 15, 1997. *See Order on Recons. ¶ 163. Davel contends, and Qwest does not dispute, that Qwest filed no fraud protection tariffs with the FCC until 2003. During the period between 1997 and 2003, Davel paid Qwest for fraud protection under the rates specified in tariffs Qwest filed with the states. The district court correctly found that, accepting the allegations of the complaint as true, Davel had a cause of action against Qwest as soon as Qwest missed the federal filing deadline and Davel paid for fraud protection services based on the non-compliant rates on file with the state utility commissions. At that time, Davel could have brought any claim it had under 47 U.S.C. §§ 206-207 in district court or with the FCC.

We reject Davel's contention that its cause of action did not accrue until Qwest filed NST-compliant rates in 2003, because it had no knowledge until then that Qwest's rates were too high. The D.C. Circuit, affirming the FCC, rejected such a contention in similar circumstances in *Sprint Communications Co. v. FCC, 76 F.3d 1221, 1227 31 (D.C.Cir.1996)* (rejecting application of a “discovery” rule of accrual where cause of action was predicated on “AT & T's failure to file and to charge cost-justified rates”). In that case, the plaintiff, Sprint, argued that it had no knowledge of its claim based on the payment of tariffed rates for telecommunications services until the defendant, AT & T, several years later, filed cost data indicating that the rates charged exceeded lawful levels. *Id. at 1224 25. Affirming the FCC, the D.C. Circuit held that Sprint was on inquiry notice of the claim as soon as it had knowledge suggesting the rates might be improper. Id. at 1229 30.*

We find the D.C. Circuit's reasoning on this issue particularly apposite in the circumstances of this case. As soon as Qwest...
failed to file fraud protection rates with the FCC, it was in technical non-compliance with the Payphone Orders, and Davel was on inquiry notice that it might be paying excessive rates for fraud protection. Its cause of action therefore accrued at that time. The fact that, until Qwest filed its new fraud protection rates in 2003, Davel was not in a position to determine the precise amount of the overcharges, or even whether the charges were excessive at all, does not change this result. “Accrual does not wait until the injured party has access to or constructive knowledge of all the facts required to support its claim. Nor is accrual deferred until the injured party has enough information to calculate its damages.” *Sprint*, 76 F.3d at 1229 (citation omitted). Rather, “once a plaintiff has [inquiry] notice of its claim, it bears the responsibility of making diligent inquiries to uncover the remaining facts needed to support the claim.” *Id.* at 1230. Once Davel was aware that Qwest had missed the federal filing deadline, it was obliged to make reasonable inquiries to determine any possible injury it may have suffered as a result.

Indeed, as Davel recognizes, the Colorado Public Utilities Commission determined in 1999, based upon a complaint filed in March of 1998, that Qwest's fraud protection rates filed in that state were excessive. *See Colo. Payphone Ass'n v. U.S. West Commcns, Inc.*, 1999 WL 632854 (Colo. Pub. Util. Comm'n May 18, 1999). Thus, as in *Sprint*, publicly available information allowed parties similarly situated to Davel to discover their cause of action within a year of the new regulations coming into effect.

We also find it of no moment that this case is before us on a motion to dismiss. Davel's own allegations charge that Qwest missed the federal filing deadline, and there is no reasonable possibility that it can prove that it was not aware of this omission until after 2002. This analysis reflects a key difference between the damages claims concerning the fraud protection services and the claims based on the Waiver Order. On Davel's construction of the Waiver Order, the right to reimbursement under the Order came into existence only upon the filing of NST-compliant rates. On that interpretation, Davel had no right to reimbursement against Qwest until Qwest filed compliant rates, allegedly in 2002, and its cause of action for Qwest's alleged violation of the Waiver Order thus accrued thereafter, when Qwest failed to pay the reimbursements. In contrast, there was no reimbursement order applicable to the fraud protection services, so any cause of action necessarily accrued when Qwest failed to comply with the Payphone Orders and Davel was injured as a result.

Davel's fraud protection services claims are not, however, wholly barred. Qwest's tariff filing obligations were ongoing. Each time Davel paid the non-NST-compliant state filed tariff, it was injured anew by Qwest's failure to file the required federal tariff. *See MCI Telecomms. Corp. v. Teleconcepts, Inc.*, 71 F.3d 1086, 1101 (3d Cir.1995) (analogizing to installment contracts and coming to a similar conclusion with respect to 47 U.S.C. § 415(a), the statute of limitations applicable to actions by carriers). Thus, while the district court was correct that the claim for any amounts paid as of May 15, *1093* 1997, expired on May 15, 1999, amounts paid under non-compliant tariffs within two years prior to the filing of the complaint are timely.
Accordingly, we hold that the fraud protection claims based on non-NST-compliant fraud protection rates paid within two years of the filing of Davel's complaint are timely. 12

12 Because the parties have raised on appeal no other issues regarding the fraud protection claims, our decision on these claims is limited to the statute of limitations question. Qwest is free to raise other available defenses to these claims on remand.

V. CONCLUSION

We REVERSE the dismissal of Davel's fraud protection claims with respect to fraud protection payments made pursuant to non-NST-compliant rates within the two-year period prior to the filing of the complaint and REMAND for further proceedings consistent with this opinion. We VACATE the dismissal without prejudice of Davel's Waiver Order claims and REMAND the case to the district court for a consideration whether a stay or dismissal without prejudice is the appropriate disposition pursuant to the primary jurisdiction doctrine.
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improper, and accrual was not delayed by reason of “technical complexity” of the case.

Reversed.

Mr. Justice Stevens dissented and filed opinion in which Mr. Justice Brennan and Mr. Justice Marshall joined.

**353**  *111 Syllabus*

* The syllabus constitutes no part of the opinion of the Court but has been prepared by the Reporter of Decisions for the convenience of the reader. See United States v. Detroit Lumber Co., 200 U.S. 321, 337, 26 S.Ct. 282, 287, 50 L.Ed. 499.

A provision of the Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA), 28 U.S.C. § 2401(b), bars any tort claim against the United States unless it is presented in writing to the appropriate federal agency “within two years after such claim accrues.” In 1968, several weeks after having an infected leg treated with neomycin (an antibiotic) at a Veterans' Administration (VA) hospital, respondent suffered a hearing loss, and in January 1969 was informed by a private physician that it was highly possible that the hearing loss was the result of the neomycin treatment. Subsequently, in the course of respondent's unsuccessful administrative appeal from the VA's denial of his claim for certain veterans' benefits based on the allegation that the neomycin treatment had caused his deafness, another private physician in June **354** 1971 told respondent that the neomycin had caused his injury and should not have been administered. In 1972, respondent filed suit under the FTCA, alleging that he
had been injured by negligent treatment at the VA hospital. The District Court rendered judgment for respondent, rejecting the Government's defense that respondent's claim was barred by the 2-year statute of limitations because it had accrued in January 1969, when respondent first learned that his hearing loss had probably resulted from the neomycin, and holding that respondent had no reason to suspect negligence until his conversation with the second physician in June 1971, less than two years before the action was commenced. The Court of Appeals affirmed, holding that if a medical malpractice claim does not accrue until a plaintiff is aware of his injury and its cause, neither should it accrue until he knows or should suspect that the doctor who caused the injury was legally blameworthy, and that here the limitations period was not triggered until the second physician indicated in June 1971 that the neomycin treatment had been improper.

_Held:_ A claim accrues within the meaning of § 2401(b) when the plaintiff knows both the existence and the cause of his injury, and not at a later time when he also knows that the acts inflicting the injury may constitute medical malpractice. Hence, respondent's claim accrued in *112 January 1969 when he was aware of his injury and its probable cause, and thus was barred by the 2-year statute of limitations. Pp. 357–361.

(a) Section 2401(b) is the balance struck by Congress in the context of tort claims against the Government, and should not be construed so as to defeat its purpose of encouraging the prompt presentation of claims. Moreover, § 2401(b), being a condition of the FTCA's waiver of the United States' immunity from suit, should not be construed to extend such waiver beyond that which Congress intended. P. 357.

(b) There is nothing in the FTCA's language or legislative history that provides a substantial basis for the Court of Appeals' construction of § 2401(b). Nor did the prevailing case law at the time the FTCA was passed lend support to the notion that tort claims in general or malpractice claims in particular do not accrue until a plaintiff learns that his injury was negligently inflicted. P. 358.

(c) For statute of limitations purposes, a plaintiff's ignorance of his legal rights and his ignorance of the fact of his injury or its cause should not receive equal treatment. P. 359.

(d) A plaintiff such as respondent, armed with the facts about the harm done to him, can protect himself by seeking advice in the medical and legal community, and to excuse him from promptly doing so by postponing the accrual of his claim would undermine the purpose of the limitations statute. Whether or not he is competently advised, or even whether he is advised, the putative malpractice plaintiff must determine within the period of limitations whether to sue or not, which is precisely the judgment that other tort plaintiffs must make. P. 360.

581 F.2d 1092, reversed.
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Opinion

*113 Mr. Justice WHITE delivered the opinion of the Court.

Under the Federal Tort Claims Act (Act), 28 U.S.C. § 2401(b), a tort claim against the United States is barred unless it is presented in writing to the appropriate federal agency “within two years after such claim accrues.” The issue in this case is whether the claim “accrues” within the meaning of the Act when the plaintiff knows both the existence and the cause of his injury or at a later time when he also knows that the acts inflicting the injury may constitute medical malpractice.

1 Title 28 U.S.C. § 2674 provides in part:

“The United States shall be liable, respecting the provisions of this title relating to tort claims, in the same manner and to the same extent as a private individual under like circumstances, but shall not be liable for interest prior to judgment or for punitive damages.

Title 28 U.S.C. § 1346(b) provides that the district courts “shall have exclusive jurisdiction of civil actions on claims against the United States, for money damages, accruing on and after January 1, 1945, for injury or loss of property, or personal injury or death caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any employee of the Government while acting within the scope of his office or employment, under circumstances where the United States, if a private person, would be liable to the claimant in accordance with the law of the place where the act or omission occurred. Title 28 U.S.C. § 2401(b), the limitations provision applicable to tort claims against the United States, provides:

“A tort claim against the United States shall be forever barred unless it is presented in writing to the appropriate Federal agency within two years after such claim accrues or unless action is begun within six months after the date of mailing, by certified or registered mail, of notice of final denial of the claim by the agency to which it was presented.

I

Respondent Kubrick, a veteran, was admitted to the Veterans' Administration (VA) hospital in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., in April 1968, for treatment of an infection of the right femur. Following surgery, the infected area was irrigated with neomycin, an antibiotic, until the infection cleared. Approximately six weeks after discharge, Kubrick noticed a ringing sensation in his ears and some loss of hearing. An ear specialist in Scranton, Pa., Dr. Soma, diagnosed the condition as bilateral nerve deafness. His diagnosis was confirmed by other specialists. One of them, Dr. Sataloff, secured Kubrick's VA hospital records and in January 1969, informed Kubrick that it was highly possible that the hearing loss
was the result of the neomycin treatment administered at the hospital. Kubrick, who was already receiving disability benefits for a service-connected back injury, filed an application for an increase in benefits pursuant to 38 U.S.C. § 351, alleging that the neomycin treatment had caused his deafness. The VA denied the claim in September 1969, and on resubmission again denied the claim, on the grounds that no causal relationship existed between the neomycin treatment and the hearing loss and that there was no evidence of "carelessness, accident, negligence, lack of proper skill, error in judgment or other fault on the part of the Government."

Title 38 U.S.C. § 351 provides that a veteran who suffers "an injury, or an aggravation of an injury, as the result of hospitalization, medical or surgical treatment administered by the VA shall be awarded disability benefits "in the same manner as if such disability . . . were service connected." The regulations require the applicant for benefits to show that "the disability proximately resulted through carelessness, accident, negligence, lack of proper skill, error in judgment, or similar instances of indicated fault on the part of the Veterans Administration. 38 CFR § 3.358(a)(3) (1978).

In the course of pursuing his administrative appeal, Kubrick was informed by the VA that Dr. Soma had suggested a connection between Kubrick's loss of hearing and his prior occupation as a machinist. When questioned by Kubrick on June 2, 1971, Dr. Soma not only denied making the statement attributed to him but also told respondent that the neomycin had caused his injury and should not have been administered. On Dr. Sataloff's advice, respondent then consulted an attorney and employed him to help with his appeal. In rendering its decision in August 1972, the VA Board of Appeals recognized that Kubrick's hearing loss "may have been caused by the neomycin irrigation" but rejected the appeal on the ground that the treatment was in accordance with acceptable medical practices and procedures and that the Government was therefore faultless.

In 1975, upon reconsideration of its decision, the VA Board of Appeals not only found, as it had before, that Kubrick's hearing loss may have been caused by neomycin irrigation but also concluded that there was fault on the part of the VA in administering that drug by irrigation. In the present litigation, the Government contested the allegation of malpractice despite the administrative finding of fault.

Kubrick then filed suit under the Act, alleging that he had been injured by negligent treatment in the VA hospital. After trial, the District Court rendered judgment for Kubrick, rejecting, among other defenses, the assertion by the United States that Kubrick's claim was barred by the 2-year statute of limitations because the claim had accrued in January 1969, when he learned from Dr. Sataloff that his hearing loss had probably resulted from the neomycin. The District Court conceded that the lower federal courts had held with considerable uniformity that a claim accrues within the meaning of the Act when "the claimant has discovered, or in the exercise of reasonable diligence should have discovered, the acts constituting the alleged malpractice," 435 F.Supp. 166, 180 (ED Pa.1977), and that notice of the injury and its cause normally were sufficient to trigger the limitations period. *116 Id., at 184. As the District Court read the authorities, however, a plaintiff could avoid the usual rule by
showing that he had exercised reasonable diligence and had no “reasonable suspicion” that there was negligence in his treatment. Id., at 185. “[W]e do not believe it reasonable to start the statute running until the plaintiff had reason at least to suspect that a legal duty to him had been breached.” Ibid. Here, the District Court found, Kubrick had no reason to suspect negligence until his conversation with Dr. Soma in June 1971, less than two years prior to presentation of his tort claim.

Title 28 U.S.C. § 2675(a) in pertinent part provides:

“An action shall not be instituted upon a claim against the United States for money damages for injury or loss of property or personal injury or death caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any employee of the Government while acting within the scope of his office or employment, unless the claimant shall have first presented the claim to the appropriate Federal Agency and his claim shall have been finally denied by the agency in writing and sent by certified or registered mail.

Kubrick did not file an administrative claim until after he filed his action in the District Court. This possible objection to his suit the District Court found moot when the VA denied the administrative claim on April 13, 1973. The United States did not pursue the issue on appeal.

The District Court went on to hold, based on the expert testimony before it, that a reasonably competent orthopedic surgeon in the Wilkes-Barre community, which the VA doctor held himself out to be, should have known that irrigating Kubrick’s wound with neomycin would cause deafness. It was therefore negligent to use that drug in that manner. Damages were determined and awarded.

Except for remanding to resolve a setoff claimed by the United States, the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit affirmed. 581 F.2d 1092 (1978). It ruled that even though a plaintiff is aware of his injury and of the defendant’s responsibility for it, the statute of limitations does not run where the plaintiff shows that “in the exercise of due diligence he did not know, nor should he have known, facts which would have alerted a reasonable person to the possibility that the treatment was improper.” Id., at 1097. We granted certiorari to resolve this important question of the administration of the statute, 440 U.S. 906, 99 S.Ct. 1211, 59 L.Ed.2d 453 (1979), and we now reverse.

The VA Board of Appeals’ reconsideration of Kubrick’s case in 1975 entitled him to an increase in his disability rating as a result of the use of neomycin. By the time of the Court of Appeals’ decision, respondent had received over $50,000 in augmented disability benefits. Under 38 U.S.C. § 351, the benefits payments must be set off against the damages awarded in tort; and the increment in future monthly benefits is not paid until the aggregate amount of the benefits withheld equals the damages awarded.

II

Statutes of limitations, which “are found and approved in all systems of enlightened jurisprudence,” Wood v. Carpenter, 101 U.S. 135, 139, 25 L.Ed. 807 (1879), represent
a pervasive legislative judgment that it is unjust to fail to put the adversary **357 on notice to defend within a specified period of time and that “the right to be free of stale claims in time comes to prevail over the right to prosecute them.” Railroad Telegraphers v. Railway Express Agency, 321 U.S. 342, 349, 64 S.Ct. 582, 586, 88 L.Ed. 788 (1944). These enactments are statutes of repose; and although affording plaintiffs what the legislature deems a reasonable time to present their claims, they protect defendants and the courts from having to deal with cases in which the search for truth may be seriously impaired by the loss of evidence, whether by death or disappearance of witnesses, fading memories, disappearance of documents, or otherwise. United States v. Marion, 404 U.S. 307, 322, n. 14, 92 S.Ct. 455, 464, n. 14, 30 L.Ed.2d 468 (1971); Burnett v. New York Central R. Co., 380 U.S. 424, 428, 85 S.Ct. 1050, 1054, 13 L.Ed.2d 941 (1965); Chase Securities Corp. v. Donaldson, 325 U.S. 304, 314, 65 S.Ct. 1137, 1142, 89 L.Ed. 1628 (1945); Missouri K. & T. R. Co. v. Harriman, 227 U.S. 657, 672, 33 S.Ct. 397, 401, 57 L.Ed. 690 (1913); Bell v. Morrison, 1 Pet. 351, 360, 7 L.Ed. 174 (1828).

Section 2401(b), the limitations provision involved here, is the balance struck by Congress in the context of tort claims against the Government; and we are not free to construe it so as to defeat its obvious purpose, which is to encourage the prompt presentation of claims. Campbell v. Haverhill, 155 U.S. 610, 617, 39 L.Ed. 280 (1895); Bell v. Morrison, supra, at 360. We should regard the plea of limitations as a “meritorious defense, in itself serving a public interest.” Guaranty Trust Co. v. United States, 304 U.S. 126, 136, 58 S.Ct. 785, 790, 82 L.Ed. 1224 (1938).

We should also have in mind that the Act waives the immunity of the United States and that in construing the statute of limitations, which is a condition of that waiver, we *118 should not take it upon ourselves to extend the waiver beyond that which Congress intended. See Soriano v. United States, 352 U.S. 270, 276, 77 S.Ct. 269, 273, 1 L.Ed.2d 306 (1957); cf. Indian Towing Co. v. United States, 350 U.S. 61, 68 69, 76 S.Ct. 122, 126, 100 L.Ed. 48 (1955). Neither, however, should we assume the authority to narrow the waiver that Congress intended. Indian Towing Co. v. United States, supra.

It is in the light of these considerations that we review the judgment of the Court of Appeals.

III

It is undisputed in this case that in January 1969 Kubrick was aware of his injury and its probable cause. Despite this factual predicate for a claim against the VA at that time, the Court of Appeals held that Kubrick's claim had not yet accrued and did not accrue until he knew or could reasonably be expected to know that in the eyes of the law, the neomycin treatment constituted medical malpractice. The Court of Appeals thought that in “most” cases knowledge of the causal connection between treatment and injury, without more, will or should alert
a reasonable person that there has been an actionable wrong. 581 F.2d, at 1096. But it is apparent, particularly in light of the facts in this record, that the Court of Appeals' rule would reach any case where an untutored plaintiff, without benefit of medical or legal advice and because of the "technical complexity" of the case, id., at 1097, would not himself suspect that his doctors had negligently treated him. As we understand the Court of Appeals, the plaintiff in such cases need not initiate a prompt inquiry and would be free to sue at any time within two years from the time he receives or perhaps forms for himself a reasonable opinion that he has been wronged. In this case, for example, Kubrick would have been free to sue if Dr. Soma had not told him until 1975, or even 1980, instead of 1971, that the neomycin irrigation treatment had been a negligent act.

*119 There is nothing in the language or the legislative history of the Act that provides a substantial basis for the Court of Appeals' construction of the accrual language of **358 § 2401(b).” Nor did the prevailing case law at the time the Act was passed lend support for the notion that tort claims in general or malpractice claims in particular do not accrue until a plaintiff learns that his injury was negligently inflicted. Indeed, the Court of Appeals recognized that the general rule under the Act has been that a tort claim accrues at the time of the plaintiff's injury, although it thought that in medical malpractice cases the rule had come to be that the 2-year period did not begin to run until the plaintiff has discovered both his injury and its cause.7 But even so and the **359 United States was prepared *121 to concede as much for present purposes the latter rule would not save Kubrick's action since he was aware of these essential facts in January 1969. Reasoning, however, that if a claim does not accrue until a plaintiff is aware of his injury and its cause, neither should it accrue until he knows or should suspect that the doctor who caused his injury was legally blameworthy, the Court of Appeals went on to hold that the limitations period was not triggered until Dr. Soma indicated in June 1971 that the neomycin irrigation treatment had been improper.8

Respondent concedes as much with respect to the legislative history. The Act was enacted as part of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, 60 Stat. 842. The Senate Report on the bill, S.Rep.No.1400, 79th Cong., 2d Sess., 33 (1946), merely states that the limitations period is one year but does not mention when a claim accrues. In 1949, the limitations period was extended to two years, Ch. 92, 63 Stat. 62, but the issue of accrual was not further addressed. H.R.Rep.No.276, 81st Cong., 1st Sess., 1 (1949), U.S.Code Cong. Service 1949, p. 1226, notes that the limitations period would enlarge the period for filing to two years from “the date of accrual” but does not explain how to determine the date of accrual. Indeed, to the extent that the Report touches the issue at all, the Report seems almost to indicate that the time of accrual is the time of injury. Thus, the Report states as the reason for the amendment, in addition to bringing the Act more in line with limitations periods for state tort actions and other federal statutes:

“The 1 year existing period is unfair to some claimants who suffered injuries which did not fully develop until after the expiration of the period for making claim. Moreover, the wide area of operations of the Federal agencies, particularly the armed service agencies, would increase the possibility that notice of the wrongful death of a deceased to his next of kin would be so long delayed in going through channels of communication that the notice would arrive at a time when the running
of the statute had already barred the institution of a claim or suit. *Id.*, at 3 4.

The Act was further amended in 1966, 80 Stat. 307, to require that every claim under the Act be presented in writing to the appropriate agency as a prerequisite to suit. The Act originally required presentation to the agency only if the claim was for $1,000 or less, 60 Stat. 845. An amendment in 1959 raised the amount to $2,500, Pub.L.86 238, 73 Stat. 472. Prior to 1966, the limitations period was keyed to the filing of suit; the 1966 amendment made the time of filing the administrative claim the critical date for limitations purposes. But although the Reports indicate these changes with precision, they do not further explicate when a tort claim “accrues” within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 2401(b). S.Rep.No.1327, 89th Cong., 2d Sess., 1, 5 (1966); H.R.Rep.No.1532, 89th Cong., 2d Sess., 3, 8 (1966), U.S.Code Cong. & Admin.News 1966, p. 2515.

In *Urie v. Thompson*, 337 U.S. 163, 69 S.Ct. 1018, 93 L.Ed. 1282 (1949), the Court held that a claim under the Federal Employers’ Liability Act did not accrue until the plaintiff’s injury manifested itself. In that case, plaintiff Urie contracted silicosis from his work as a fireman on a steam locomotive. His condition was diagnosed only in the weeks after he became too ill to work. The Court was reluctant to charge Urie with the “unknown and inherently unknowable and held that because of his “blameless ignorance” of the fact of his injury, his claim did not accrue under the Federal Employers’ Liability Act until his disease manifested itself. 337 U.S., at 169 170, 69 S.Ct., at 1024 1025. *Quinton v. United States*, 304 F.2d 234 (CA5 1962), applied the *Urie* approach to medical malpractice claims under the Federal Tort Claims Act. Other Circuits have followed suit. *Hungerford v. United States*, 307 F.2d 99 (CA9 1962); *Toal v. United States*, 438 F.2d 222 (CA2 1971); *Tyminski v. United States*, 481 F.2d 257 (CA3 1973); *Portis v. United States*, 483 F.2d 670 (CA4 1973); *Reilly v. United States*, 513 F.2d 147 (CA8 1975); *Casias v. United States*, 532 F.2d 1339 (CA10 1976).

Restatement (Second) of Torts § 899, Comment, e, pp. 444 445 (1979), reflects these developments: “One group of cases in which there has been extensive departure from the earlier rule that the statute of limitations runs although the plaintiff has no knowledge of the injury has involved actions for medical malpractice. Two reasons can be suggested as to why there has been a change in the rule in many jurisdictions in this area. One is the fact that in most instances the statutory period within which the action must be initiated is short one year, or at most two, being the common time limit. This is for the purpose of protecting physicians against unjustified claims; but since many of the consequences of medical malpractice often do not become known or apparent for a period longer than that of the statute, the injured plaintiff is left without a remedy. The second reason is that the nature of the tort itself and the character of the injury will frequently prevent knowledge of what is wrong, so that the plaintiff is forced to rely upon what he is told by the physician or surgeon.

“*There are still courts that proceed to apply the rule that the action is barred by the statute even though there has been no knowledge that it could be brought.*

“In a wave of recent decisions these various devices have been replaced by decisions meeting the issue directly and holding that the statute must be construed as not intended to start to run until the plaintiff has in fact discovered the fact that he has suffered injury or by the exercise of reasonable diligence should have discovered it. There have also been a number of instances in which a similar rule has been applied to other professional malpractice, such as that of attorneys or accountants and the rule may thus become a general one.

The Court of Appeals relied on three federal cases, all decided within the past five years, that held or indicated in dictum that a malpractice plaintiff under the federal Act must know the legal implications of the facts, as well as the facts themselves, before the limitations period will begin to run. *Exonvicious v. United States*, 563 F.2d 418, 420, 424 (CA10 1977); *Bridgford v. United States*, 550 F.2d 978, 981 982 (CA4 1977); *Jordan v. United States*, 503 F.2d 620 (CA6 1974). Since the holding below, another Circuit has endorsed these views. *De Witt v. United States*, 593 F.2d 276 (CA7 1979).

The dissent, like the respondent, relies on *Urie* and *Quinton*, but neither case controls this one. Both dealt with the discovery of the factual predicate for a malpractice claim, but neither addressed the question of plaintiff’s awareness of negligence on defendant’s part. Contrary to the implications of the dissent, the prevailing rule under the Act has not been to postpone the running of the limitations period in malpractice cases until the plaintiff is aware that he has been legally wronged. Holdings such as the one before us now are departures from
the general rule and, as indicated above, are of quite recent vintage.

*122 We disagree. We are unconvinced that for statute of limitations purposes a plaintiff’s ignorance of his legal rights and his ignorance of the fact of his injury or its cause should receive identical treatment. That he has been injured in fact may be unknown or unknowable until the injury manifests itself; and the facts about causation may be in the control of the putative defendant, unavailable to the plaintiff or at least very difficult to obtain. The prospect is not so bleak for a plaintiff in possession of the critical facts that he has been hurt and who has inflicted the injury. He is no longer at the mercy of the latter. There are others who can tell him if he has been wronged, and he need only ask. If he does ask and if the defendant has failed to live up to minimum standards of medical proficiency, the odds are that a competent doctor will so inform the plaintiff. In this case, the trial court found, and the United States did not appeal its finding, that the treating physician at the VA hospital had failed to observe the standard of care governing doctors of his specialty in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., and that reasonably competent doctors in this branch of medicine would have known that Kubrick should not have been treated with neomycin.9 Crediting **360 this finding, as we must, Kubrick *123 need only have made inquiry among doctors with average training and experience in such matters to have discovered that he probably had a good cause of action. The difficulty is that it does not appear that Kubrick ever made any inquiry, although meanwhile he had consulted several specialists about his loss of hearing and had been in possession of all the facts about the cause of his injury since January 1969. Furthermore, there is no reason to doubt that Dr. Soma, who in 1971 volunteered his opinion that Kubrick's treatment had been improper, would have had the same opinion had the plaintiff sought his judgment in 1969.

9 The trial court found:

“We credit the testimony of plaintiff's experts that the medical literature as of April 1968 contained sufficient and sufficiently widespread information as to the ototoxicity and absorption properties of neomycin to have warned the treating physician of the dangerousness and hence the impropriety of his treatment. 435 F.Supp. 166, 177 (E.D.Pa.1977) (footnote omitted). It further concluded:

“Those findings tell us that the physician's] lack of knowledge, and his concomitant treatment, violated the national standard for specialists because of the generalized knowledge in the national community of orthopedic specialists of the hazards of neomycin and of its potentiality for absorption in circumstances such as those created by the physician's] use of neomycin in 1% irrigating solution through a closed hemovac system (at least in such high and lengthy dosage). However, even if a similar locality standard were to be applied, our findings of fact support the conclusion that the information in question was available to or known by the average specialist in Wilkes Barre to the same or similar extent as the average specialist in Philadelphia...

“Finally, we conclude that what was involved was not mere error in judgment but a lack of skill or knowledge as measured, of course, by the level of medical knowledge in April, 1968. Id., at 188 189.

We thus cannot hold that Congress intended that “accrual” of a claim must await awareness by the plaintiff that his injury was negligently inflicted. A plaintiff such as Kubrick, armed with the facts about the harm done to him, can protect himself by seeking advice in the medical and legal
community. To excuse him from promptly doing so by postponing the accrual of his claim would undermine the purpose of the limitations statute, which is to require the reasonably diligent presentation of tort claims against the Government. If there exists in the community a generally applicable standard of care with respect to the treatment of his ailment, we see no reason to suppose that competent advice would not be available to the plaintiff as to whether his treatment conformed to that standard. If advised that he has been wronged, he may promptly bring suit. If competently advised to the contrary, he may be dissuaded, as he should be, from pressing a baseless claim. Of course, he may be incompetently advised or the medical community may be divided on the crucial issue of negligence, as the experts proved to be on the trial of this case. But however or even whether he is advised, the putative malpractice plaintiff must determine within the period of limitations whether to sue or not, which is precisely the judgment that other tort claimants must make. If he fails to bring suit because he is incompetently or mistakenly told that he does not have a case, we discern no sound reason for visiting the consequences of such error on the defendant by delaying the accrual of the claim until the plaintiff is otherwise informed or himself determines to bring suit, even though more than two years have passed from the plaintiff's discovery of the relevant facts about injury.

10 As the dissent suggests, post at 362, we are thus in partial disagreement with the conclusion of the lower courts that Kubrick exercised all reasonable diligence. Although he diligently ascertained the cause of his injury, he sought no advice within two years thereafter as to whether he had been legally wronged. The dissent would excuse the omission. For statute of limitations purposes, we would not.

The District Court, 435 F.Supp., at 185, and apparently the Court of Appeals, thought its ruling justified because of the “technical complexity,” 581 F.2d, at 1097, of the negligence question in this case. But determining negligence or not is often complicated and hotly disputed, so much so that judge or jury must decide the issue after listening to a barrage of conflicting expert testimony. And if in this complicated malpractice case, the statute is not to run until the plaintiff is led to suspect negligence, it would be difficult indeed not to apply the same accrual rule to medical and health claims arising under other statutes and to a whole range of other negligence cases arising under the Act and other federal statutes, where the legal implications or complicated facts make it unreasonable to expect the injured plaintiff, who does not seek legal or other appropriate advice, to realize that his legal rights may have been invaded.

125 We also have difficulty ascertaining the precise standard proposed by the District Court and the Court of Appeals. On the one hand, the Court of Appeals seemed to hold that a Tort Claims Act malpractice claim would not accrue until the plaintiff knew or could reasonably be expected to know of the Government's breach of duty. Ibid. On the other hand, it seemed to hold that the claim would accrue only when the plaintiff had reason to suspect or was aware of facts that would have alerted a reasonable person to the possibility that a
legal duty to him had been breached. *Ibid.* In any event, either of these standards would go far to eliminate the statute of limitations as a defense separate from the denial of breach of duty.

IV

It goes without saying that statutes of limitations often make it impossible to enforce what were otherwise perfectly valid claims. But that is their very purpose, and they remain as ubiquitous as the statutory rights or other rights to which they are attached or are applicable. We should give them effect in accordance with what we can ascertain the legislative intent to have been. We doubt that here we have misconceived the intent of Congress when § 2401(b) was first adopted or when it was amended to extend the limitations period to two years. But if we have, or even if we have not but Congress desires a different result, it may exercise its prerogative to amend the statute so as to effect its legislative will.

The judgment of the Court of Appeals is

Reversed.

Mr. Justice STEVENS, with whom Mr. Justice BRENNAN and Mr. Justice MARSHALL join, dissenting.

Normally a tort claim accrues at the time of the plaintiff's injury. In most cases that event provides adequate notice to the plaintiff of the possibility that his legal rights have been invaded. It is well settled, however, that the normal rule does not apply to medical malpractice claims under the Federal Tort Claims Act. The reason for this exception is essentially the same as the reason for the general rule itself. The victim of medical malpractice frequently has no reason to believe that his legal rights have been invaded simply because some misfortune has followed medical treatment. Sometimes he may not even be aware of the actual injury until years have passed; at other times, he may recognize the harm but not know its cause; or, as in this case, he may have knowledge of the injury and its cause, but have no reason to suspect that a physician has been guilty of any malpractice. In such cases until today the rule that has been applied in the federal courts is that the statute of limitations does not begin to run until after fair notice of the invasion of the plaintiff's legal rights.

Essentially, there are two possible approaches to construction of the word "accrues" in statutes of limitations: (1) a claim might be deemed to "accrue" at the moment of injury without regard to the potentially harsh consequence of barring a meritorious claim before the plaintiff has a reasonable chance to assert his legal rights, or (2) it might "accrue" when a diligent plaintiff has knowledge of facts sufficient to put him on notice of an invasion of his legal rights. The benefits that flow from certainty in the administration of our affairs favor the former approach in most commercial situations. But in medical malpractice cases the harsh consequences of that approach have generally been considered unacceptable. In all events, this
Court adopted the latter approach over 30 years ago when it endorsed the principle that “blameless ignorance” should not cause the loss of a valid claim for *127 medical injuries. Writing for the Court, Mr. Justice Rutledge expressed the point simply:

1. See Gates Rubber Co. v. USM Corp., 508 F.2d 603, 611 (CA7 1975).

2. One should note not only the cases cited by the Court in its footnote 7, ante, at 358 359, but also the reference to “a wave of recent decisions in the quotation from the Restatement (Second) of Torts in that footnote.

“We do not think the humane legislative plan [Federal Employers' Liability Act] intended such consequences to attach to blameless ignorance. Nor do we **362 think those consequences can be reconciled with the traditional purposes of statutes of limitations, which conventionally require the assertion of claims within a specified period of time after notice of the invasion of legal rights.” Urie v. Thompson, 337 U.S. 163, 170, 69 S.Ct. 1018, 1025.

This rule has been consistently applied by the Courts of Appeals in the intervening decades without any suggestion of complaint from Congress.

In my judgment, a fair application of this rule forecloses the Court's attempt to distinguish between a plaintiff's knowledge of the cause of his injury on the one hand and his knowledge of the doctor's failure to meet acceptable medical standards on the other. For in both situations the typical plaintiff will, and normally should, rely on his doctor's explanation of the situation. 3

3 In its discussion of the reasons why most jurisdictions have adopted a special rule for medical malpractice cases, the Restatement (Second) of Torts notes “that the nature of the tort itself and the character of the injury will frequently prevent knowledge of what is wrong, so that the plaintiff is forced to rely upon what he is told by the physician or surgeon. Restatement (Second) of Torts § 899, Comment e. p. 444 (1979).

The Urie rule would not, of course, prevent the statute from commencing to run if the plaintiff's knowledge of an injury, or its cause, would place a reasonably diligent person on notice that a doctor had been guilty of misconduct. But if he neither suspects, nor has any reason to suspect, malpractice, I see no reason to treat his claim differently than if he were not aware of the cause of the harm or, indeed, of the harm itself. In this case the District Court expressly found that “plaintiff's belief that there was no malpractice was reasonable in view of the technical complexity of the question *128 whether his neomycin treatment involved excessive risks, the failure of any of his doctors to suggest prior to June 1971 the possibility of negligence, and the repeated unequivocal assertions by the Veterans Administration that there was no negligence on the part of the government.” 435 F.Supp. 166, 174.

The Court is certainly correct in stating that one purpose of the statute of limitations is to require the “reasonably diligent presentation of tort claims against the Government.” Ante, at 360. A plaintiff who remains ignorant through lack of diligence cannot be characterized as “blameless.” But unless the Court is prepared to reverse the Court of Appeals' judgment that the District Court's findings were adequately supported by the evidence, the principle of requiring
diligence does not justify the result the Court reaches today. The District Court found that “plaintiff exercised all kinds of reasonable diligence in attempting to establish a medical basis for increased disability benefits.” 435 F.Supp., at 185. That diligence produced not only the Government's denials, but, worse, what may have been a fabrication. It was only after the Government told plaintiff that Dr. Soma had suggested that plaintiff’s occupation as a machinist had caused his deafness that plaintiff, by confronting Dr. Soma, first became aware that neomycin irrigation may not have been an acceptable medical practice. Plaintiff was unquestionably diligent; moreover, his diligence ultimately bore fruit. There is no basis for assuming, as this Court holds, that plaintiff could have been more diligent and discovered his cause of action sooner.

The issue of diligence in a negligence case should be resolved by the factfinder not by the Supreme Court of the United States and its resolution should depend on the evidence in the record, rather than on speculation about what might constitute diligence in various other circumstances. 4

129 **363 Since a large number of circuit judges have reached the same conclusion, and since I find nothing in the Court's opinion that lessens my respect for their collective wisdom, I would simply affirm the unanimous holding of the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit affirming the judgment of the District Court which merely applied well-settled law to the somewhat unusual facts of this case. 5

4 The factual predicate for the Court's speculation is its assumption that if a patient who has been mistreated by one doctor should ask another if the first “failed to live up to minimum standards of medical proficiency, the odds are that a competent doctor will so inform the plaintiff. Ante, at 359. I am not at all sure about those odds. See W. Prosser, Law of Torts 164 (4th ed. 1971); Markus, Conspiracy of Silence, 14 Cleve. Mar.L.Rev. 520 (1965); Seidelson, Medical Malpractice Cases and the Reluctant Expert, 16 Cath. U.L.Rev. 158 (1966). But whatever the odds are generally, I would prefer to have the issue of the diligence in exploring the reason for the unfortunate condition of this deaf plaintiff decided on the basis of evidence relevant to his particular injury.

5 Not only do I dissent from the Court's result, but I also believe the decision to grant certiorari was ill advised. The Court notes, ante, at 361, that Congress may change the rule announced today. I would add that Congress possesses certain options we do not have, such as creating a bifurcated statute, to temper the interest in repose when it threatens to cause an unfair result. See Gates Rubber Co. v. USM Corp., 508 F.2d, at 611 612. But Congress possessed the same options before this decision as well as after it. There was nothing to prevent the Executive from notifying Congress that the omission of any statutory definition of the word “accrues has created problems that need legislative attention. Reversal of a just judgment is an unnecessarily high price to pay in order to provide Congress with that notice.
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<td></td>
<td>discovery rule did not apply to toll limitations on FCRA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disclosure claim.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td><a href="13">Frame v. City of Arlington</a></td>
<td>July 07, 2009</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>575 F.3d 432, 5th Cir.(Tex.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>Headnote(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined to Extend by</td>
<td>CIVIL RIGHTS - Disabilities. City's provision of curbs, sidewalks, and parking lots fell under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act.</td>
<td>Apr. 23, 2012</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined to Extend by</td>
<td>Nunnelee v. U.S.</td>
<td>Sep. 26, 2013</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined to Extend by</td>
<td>Anderson v. BNSF Rly.</td>
<td>Aug. 12, 2015</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Anderson v. BNSF Rly.</td>
<td>354 P.3d 1248, Mont. LABOR AND EMPLOYMENT - Transportation Workers. Railroad worker may pursue recovery for injury caused by railroad's negligence within three years prior to filing FELA claim.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S.Ct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined to Extend by</td>
<td>Evergreen Marine, Ltd. v. United States</td>
<td>Jan. 03, 2019</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Evergreen Marine, Ltd. v. United States</td>
<td>2019 WL 1116186, S.D.Fla. THIS CAUSE is before the Court on Defendant's Motion to Dismiss [DE 7], and Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Amend Complaint [DE 19], which were referred to the undersigned...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S.Ct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished by</td>
<td>Camire v. U.S.</td>
<td>May 23, 1980</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Camire v. U.S.</td>
<td>489 F.Supp. 998, N.D.N.Y. Action was brought under the Federal Tort Claims Act for alleged malpractice of an air force physician. Following initial dismissal and remand, 535 F.2d 749, the District Court,...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished by</td>
<td>Cain v. U.S.</td>
<td>July 25, 1986</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Cain v. U.S.</td>
<td>643 F.Supp. 175, S.D.N.Y. Former prisoner at state facility, who was allegedly subjected to syphilis experimentation without consent, brought suit against Government under Federal Tort Claims Act. ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S.Ct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished by</td>
<td>Wehrman v. U.S.</td>
<td>Nov. 20, 1986</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>Headnote(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42 F.3d 1472, 4th Cir.(Md.) Prisoner appealed from order of the United States District Court for the District of Maryland. Walter E. Black, Jr., J., dismissing his complaint against prison officials as...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>978 F.Supp. 41, D.Mass. Plant supervisor who suffered burns from scalding water when hopper doors on boiler swung open brought products liability action against asserted manufacturer of hopper doors. ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>132 F.Supp.2d 864, D.Or. CIVIL RIGHTS - Arrest and Detention. Claim that firefighters were obstructed sustained arrest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>244 F.3d 1088, 9th Cir.(Ariz.) HEALTH - Malpractice. Limitations period on medical malpractice claim under Federal Tort Claims Act was tolled.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished by</td>
<td>30. Sarris v. Smith</td>
<td>Apr. 05, 2001</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 S.Ct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>782 So.2d 721, Miss. HEALTH - Malpractice. Medical malpractice action accrued on date that widow first had access to husband's medical records.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>263 F.3d 272, 3rd Cir.(Pa.) GOVERNMENT - Tort Claims. Limitations period for VA hospital patient's FTCA suit ran from time of discovery of alleged negligence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>281 F.3d 997, 9th Cir.(Wash.) TORTS - Wrongful Death. Wrongful death action accrued upon receipt of expert opinion that pre-existing condition caused death.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>843 So.2d 157, Ala. LABOR AND EMPLOYMENT - Employer's Liability. Three-year statute of limitations under FELA began to run at time of decedents' death.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment by</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>Headnote(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Distinguished by | **34. Carwell v. Childrens Nat. Medical Center**  
217 F.Supp.2d 101, D.D.C. GOVERNMENT - United States. Malpractice claim under FTCA accrued when plaintiff learned that cause of death hospital gave was wrong. | Sep. 17, 2002 | Case | 2  
6  
7 | S.Ct. |
| Distinguished by | **35. Lewis v. U.S.**  
6  
7 | S.Ct. |
| Distinguished by | **36. Waggoner v. U.S.**  
95 Fed.Appx. 69, 5th Cir.(La.) GOVERNMENT - Tort Claims. Wrongful death claim under FTCA did not accrue until widow received death certificate. | Apr. 20, 2004 | Case | 6  
7 | S.Ct. |
| Distinguished by | **37. Green v. U.S.**  
180 Fed.Appx. 310, 3rd Cir.(N.J.) GOVERNMENT - Tort Claims. Patient's FTCA claim accrued when he became aware that his orthopedist at the VA had misplaced the hip prosthesis. | Mar. 31, 2006 | Case | 2  
6  
7 | S.Ct. |
| Distinguished by | **38. Christiansen v. Union Pacific R.R. Co.**  
136 P.3d 1266, Utah App. LABOR AND EMPLOYMENT - Transportation Workers. Fact issues precluded summary judgment on FELA claim by former railroad company employee who was exposed to asbestos. | May 04, 2006 | Case | 6  
7 | S.Ct. |
| Distinguished by | **39. Davis v. U.S.**  
2006 WL 3544701, W.D.Pa. This civil rights action was received by the Clerk of Court on February 7, 2006, and was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Susan Paradise Baxter for report and... | Dec. 08, 2006 | Case | 2  
6  
7 | S.Ct. |
| Distinguished by | **40. Arnold v. Johnson**  
2008 WL 1141209 | Feb. 11, 2008 | Other | —  | — |
| Distinguished by | **41. Amarillo v. United States**  
2008 WL 11413515, D.N.M. THIS MATTER comes before the Court upon Defendant's Motion to Dismiss or, in the Alternative, for Summary Judgment, filed October 3, 2007 (Doc. 21). This is a medical negligence... | Feb. 19, 2008 | Case | 6 | S.Ct. |
| Distinguished by | **42. T.R. v. Boy Scouts of America**  
181 P.3d 758, Or. CIVIL RIGHTS - Limitations. Accrual of § 1983 claim against city was issue for jury. | Mar. 13, 2008 | Case | 2  
6  
7 | S.Ct. |
| Distinguished by | **43. Chasten v. U.S.**  
334 Fed.Appx. 271, 11th Cir.(Fla.) | June 22, 2009 | Case | 2  
6  
7 | S.Ct. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Headnote(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished by</td>
<td>HEALTH - Malpractice. Wrongful death claim accrued on date of patient's death, rather than on date of her autopsy.</td>
<td>Sep. 02, 2009</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Aloe Vera of America, Inc. v. U.S.</td>
<td>580 F.3d 867, 9th Cir.(Ariz.). TAXATION - Limitations. Two-year limitations period on taxpayer's wrongful disclosure claim accrued on date that taxpayer discovered the disclosure.</td>
<td>Oct. 28, 2010</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>S.Ct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished by</td>
<td>HEALTH - Limitations. Fact issue as to whether patient was of unsound mind when medical malpractice action accrued preceded summary judgment.</td>
<td>325 S.W.3d 584, Tenn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Sherrill v. Souder</td>
<td>2012 WL 12884409, C.D.Cal. Plaintiff Kissandra Tysman alleges her former employer Edward Masry hired private investigator Anthony Pellicano to wiretap her phone conversations. Pellicano is further alleged to...</td>
<td>Feb. 27, 2012</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished by</td>
<td>46. Tysman v. Pellicano</td>
<td>Sep. 25, 2012</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished by</td>
<td>47. Jones v. Kakani</td>
<td>June 12, 2013</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished by</td>
<td>48. Mosos v. Westchester County Dept. of Corrections</td>
<td></td>
<td>Case</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished by</td>
<td>49. Singleton v. Clash</td>
<td>July 01, 2013</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>951 F.Supp.2d 578, S.D.N.Y. LITIGATION - Limitations. Accrual of claims by victims of alleged sexual abuse against an alleged abuser were not delayed under the discovery rule.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>749 F.3d 1235, 10th Cir.(Utah) GOVERNMENT - Tort Claims. Claimant knew or had reason to know that her illness was caused by exposure to nerve gas when she received a positive medical test result.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished by</td>
<td>51. Dawson v. BNSF Railway Company</td>
<td>Mar. 15, 2019</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437 P.3d 929, Kan. LABOR AND EMPLOYMENT — Transportation Workers. Whether injured railroad worker timely asserted his FELA claim was properly submitted jury.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
whether portions of holders' works traceable to third-party sources pervaded entire works was material fact issue precluding summary judgment;

under discovery rule, copyright infringement action accrued, and three-year limitations period began to run, when copyright holders suspected that alleged infringers were in fact using copyrighted materials;

alleged infringers' conduct in denying copyright infringement was not fraudulent concealment, and thus, equitable tolling of statute of limitations was not warranted;

fact that attorney did not apprise holders of need timely to litigate copyright infringement action upon actual or constructive notice of infringement was not grounds for tolling statute of limitations;

presence of allegedly infringing document on website did not give rise under separate accrual rule to discrete claim accruing within three-year limitations window;

under California law, copyright holders' tort claims accrued, and relevant limitations periods began to run, when holders suspected or had express notice regarding wrongdoing and resulting harm giving rise to various tort claims; and

fact that holders' investigation did not produce evidence of wrongdoing did not justify tolling of relevant statutes of limitation for tort claims.

Motion granted in part and denied in part.
Procedural Posture(s): Motion for Summary Judgment.

Attorneys and Law Firms


John Sung Cha, Steven Thomas Gebelin, Raines Feldman LLP, Beverly Hills, CA, for Defendants.

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT (Dkt. 142, filed December 11, 2015)

CHRISTINA A. SNYDER, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

I. INTRODUCTION


On September 29, 2014, upon stipulation by the parties, Wolf filed a second amended complaint, adding state law claims (collectively, the “state law claims”) for (1) misappropriation of trade secrets; (2) conversion; (3) interference with economic relationships; (4) breach of fiduciary duty; and (5) violation of California Business and Professions Code section 17200, et seq. (California's unfair competition law, or the “UCL”). Dkt. 39. Also on September 29, 2014, defendants filed an Amended Answer to the First Amended Complaint and Counterclaims. Dkt. 40. On November 24, 2014, the Court dismissed defendants' counterclaims and Wolf's claims for misappropriation and conversion, all without prejudice and with leave to amend. Dkt. 79.

On December 18, 2014, plaintiff filed a third amended complaint that did not add any parties or claims for relief. Dkt. 84. On March 8, 2015, plaintiff filed a motion for leave to file a fourth amended complaint, which sought to add over thirty new parties and over twenty new claims for relief. Dkts. 93, 94. On April 1, 2015, the Court denied plaintiff's motion for leave to amend, thereby striking plaintiff's proposed fourth amended complaint. Dkt. 1.

On August 5, 2015, upon stipulation by the parties, Wolf filed the operative fourth amended complaint, adding co-plaintiff
Actors for Autism (“AFA”) and asserting, for the first time, an additional claim for infringement of Wolf’s copyright in a written work dated September 5, 2006, and entitled, “Actors for Autism Practical Film Program Proposal” (the “second work” or “the September 2006 Work”). Dkt. 132 (“FAC”). The operative complaint thus asserts two claims for copyright infringement (with one claim first asserted on February 6, 2014, and the other first asserted on August 5, 2015), and five state law claims (all first asserted on September 29, 2014).


Both parties also filed objections to the evidence presented in support of and in opposition to the instant motion. See Dkts. 144 2 (Plaintiffs' Objections), 148 (Defendants' Objections). To the extent the parties object to any evidence not discussed in this order, these objections are OVERRULED AS MOOT because the Court does not rely on the objected to evidence in ruling on the instant motion. The parties may renew any and all such evidentiary objections at a later date in this proceeding.

On February 4, 2016, the Court provided the parties with a revised tentative order, advising plaintiffs that the Court was inclined, on its own motion, to grant summary judgment in favor of defendants as to the entirety of plaintiffs' two copyright claims. Dkt. 183. The Court accordingly requested supplemental briefing on whether there were genuine disputes of material fact regarding alleged copyright infringement in the three years preceding Wolf's filing of this action. Id. On February 12, 2016, plaintiffs filed a supplemental brief meant to address this narrow issue. Dkt. 184 (“P's Supp. Brief.”). On February 22, 2016, defendant filed a supplemental response. Dkt. 185. (“D's Supp. Brief”)

2 “After giving notice and a reasonable time to respond, the court may ... consider summary judgment on its own after identifying for the parties material facts that may not be genuinely in dispute. Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(f)(3); see also Nunley v. City of Los Angeles, 121 F.3d 716 (9th Cir.1997) (“The district court clearly possesses the authority to grant summary judgment on its own motion, if the parties receive adequate notice to bring forward their evidence. ) (citation omitted).

On February 25, 2016 the Court provided the parties with an additional revised tentative order, dkt. 187, and on February 29, 2016, the Court held a final oral argument on the motion. Having carefully considered the parties' arguments, the Court finds and concludes as follows.

II. BACKGROUND

A. The Relevant Factual Background

Plaintiff Alisa Wolf met defendant Joseph “Joey” Travolta after she read an August 2003 newspaper article describing Travolta's film classes, his prior work with disabled children, and his vision for a “practical film school.” Dkt. 142-1 (Defendants' Statement
of Undisputed Facts ("DS")) at ¶ 1; Dkt. 175 (Plaintiffs' Amended Statement of Undisputed Facts ("PS")) at ¶ 1. After meeting, Wolf and Travolta worked together to incorporate autistic children, like Wolf’s son, into Travolta's acting programs. DS at ¶ 2; PS at ¶ 2. In December 2004, Wolf established Actors for Autism ("AFA"), a non-profit organization that provides performing arts and film-making programs for individuals with disabilities, including persons on the autistic spectrum. Dkt. 142-3 (February 9, 2015 Declaration of Alisa Wolf ("Wolf Decl. II")) at ¶¶ 17, 45. Wolf served as AFA's Executive Director, while Travolta served as its President. Id. at ¶ 45; see also DS at ¶ 3; PS at ¶ 3.

In late 2005, Wolf and Travolta met with representatives of the Lanterman Regional Center (the "Center"), including Director of Community Services Karen Ingram ("Ingram"), regarding whether the Center would “vendorize” (i.e., authorize payments towards) AFA's own acting classes for autistic children. DS at ¶ 4; PS at ¶ 4. The parties dispute what occurred during this meeting. According to defendants, when representatives from the Center asked about potential vocational skill programs, Travolta responded by “proposing the use of his long gestating idea for a practical film school for the center's clients.” DS at ¶ 5. In a declaration, Travolta avers that after the meeting, he “instructed [plaintiff] Wolf [to put] together documentation for *1084 [his] vocational film program idea for submission to the Center,” which he then “reviewed and edited.” Dkt. 142-2 (December 11, 2015 Declaration of Joseph “Joey” Travolta ("Travolta Decl.")) at ¶ 3; DS at ¶ 6. Travolta subsequently made efforts to obtain a slate of films for production that would serve as “the backbone” for the program. DS at ¶ 8; PS at ¶ 8. Wolf denies that Travolta ever made any proposal during the meeting with the Center, insisting instead that it was Wolf who, during the meeting, mentioned “[her] original concept for the Practical Film Vocational Program for adults with disabilities”:

Th[e] program would be for adults on the autistic spectrum to learn skills in the technical side of film-making in order to obtain employment in the film industry. Defendant Travolta and Ms. Ingram had absolutely no input regarding my Practical Film Vocational Program for adults with disabilities, as it was solely my original concept which I was disclosing to them at the meeting for the very first time.

Wolf Decl. II at ¶ 57.

Months after the meeting, in a letter dated April 13, 2006 and addressed to “Joey Travolta, Actors for Autism, 831 S. Main Street, Burbank, CA 91506,” Karen Ingram stated that the Center had approved “the film-making program” at “the rate of
$10,000 for the 6 month program.” Travolta Decl., Ex. O (“April 13, 2006 letter”); see also Wolf Decl. II at ¶ 64-65; DS at ¶ 7, PS at ¶ 7. The letter also indicated that in order to “complete the service design,” additional information regarding the program was needed, including, inter alia, the entrance criteria, referral process, exit criteria, and outcomes. Travolta Decl., Ex. O.

Travolta and Wolf ended their professional collaboration in the summer of 2006. DS at ¶ 9; PS at ¶ 9. Specifically, Travolta resigned his position as President of AFA, effective July 11, 2006, and AFA moved out of the offices and performance space that Travolta had previously permitted the organization to use without payment of rent. DS at ¶¶ 9-10; PS at ¶¶ 9-10. Wolf avers that around this time, Travolta formed a separate business entity of his own. Wolf Decl. II at ¶ 94. Shortly thereafter, on August 11, 2006, Wolf registered the first of her two copyrighted works, “Practical Film Vocational Program For People with Developmental Disabilities,” with the United States Copyright Office. DS at ¶ 11; PS at ¶ 11; Dkt. 142-3 (“Gebelin Decl.”), Ex. E (Practical Film Vocational Program, dated May 10, 2006).

In a letter dated September 19, 2006, Wolf sent a “completed proposal for [a] practical film program” on behalf of Actors for Autism to the Center's Karen Ingram. Gebelin, Ex. G; DS at ¶ 13; PS at ¶ 13. Wolf avers that she sent this letter “based on [the] agreement reflected in [Ingram's] letter dated April 13, 2006.” Wolf Decl. II at ¶ 97. While awaiting a response from the Center, the AFA Board of Directors held a board meeting on December 4, 2006. See id. at ¶ 111; see also Gebelin Decl., Ex. I (December 4, 2006 meeting minutes). Wolf avers that at this meeting, she informed the Board of Directors of Actors for Autism of her concerns that Travolta was “using [her] program without permission.” Id. at ¶ 108. Wolf also states that she shared with the Board the advice of an attorney, Shannon Nash (“Nash”), whom Wolf had contacted “to get her opinion” regarding whether “there was any action [Wolf] could take against Defendant Travolta at the time.” Id. at ¶ 107. According to Wolf, Nash advised her that “although I [Wolf] thought it seemed clear that Defendant Travolta was using the program, more evidence was needed before any legal action” could be taken. Id. at ¶ 108. More specifically, Nash advised Wolf that she “should not file a frivolous lawsuit,” but “if [she] could find evidence and proof, [she] could file a lawsuit against Defendant Travolta for taking [her] program.” Id. at ¶ 107.

These board minutes read, in relevant part, as follows:

Wolf stated that she contacted the attorney, Shannon Nash [ ], to get her opinion regarding the vocational academy. It was clear that Joey Travolta could be sued for taking the program. In addition, he would be responsible for any money due for attorneys fees and any money received for the program should we win the case. However, Wolf stated that she was also advised about the other issues that would arise and the press given to Actors for Autism and Joey Travolta. It was decided by the board not to pursue a lawsuit [ sic ] at this time, rather to write a different program to submit to the regional center. Board members Adam Shawn and Robyn Eastman agreed that was the best approach to take in this situation.

Gebelin Decl., Ex. I. Although Wolf initially offered these board minutes as an exhibit to a prior
declaration, she now objects to their admission, citing (without argument) to Federal Rules of Evidence (“FRE”) 601 (competency to testify), 602 (need for personal knowledge), 701 (opinion testimony by lay witnesses), 801 (hearsay), and 901 (failure to authenticate). See Dkt. 144 2 (Plaintiffs' Objections). First, with respect to authentication under FRE 901, the Court finds plaintiff's own sworn statement regarding the authenticity of the document to be “sufficient to support a finding that the item is what the defendant] claims it is. Fed. R. Evid. 901. Again, Wolf herself produced this document to defendants and also attached it to her July 23, 2014 declaration, submitted in support of her motion for a preliminary injunction. See Dkt. 19 1 (Wolf Decl. I), ¶ 26 (“Attached hereto as Exhibit B is a true and correct copy of the Minutes of meetings of the Board of Directors of Actors for Autism. ). However, in order for the Court to rely upon the statements contained within the minutes, both the document itself and the statements contained therein must (1) fall under an exception to the rule against hearsay, pursuant to FRE 803, or (2) not constitute hearsay at all, pursuant to FRE 801.

Here, the statements i.e., that “[t]here was clear that the hearing could be sued for taking the program, but the board “decided ... not to pursue a law suit sic] at that time and instead to “write a different program to submit to the regional center” are not hearsay, as they are offered only to demonstrate what was discussed at the meeting, not for the truth of the matters asserted. In other words, these statements are offered only to demonstrate that AFA Board members, including Wolf, attended a 2006 Board meeting wherein Travolta's alleged infringement was expressly discussed.

Nonetheless, it is unclear whether the document itself (as opposed to the statements contained therein) is admissible pursuant to an exception to the rule against hearsay. See Fed. R. Evid. 803. On the one hand, neither party has submitted “testimony of a custodian or another qualified witness regarding the preconditions to the document's admission as a record of a regularly conducted activity pursuant to FRE 803(6). See Fed. R. Evid. 803(6)(a)(e). On the other hand, defendants argue that the document itself constitutes an admission of a party opponent and therefore does not constitute hearsay at all, pursuant to FRE 801(d). Under FRE 801(d), an opposing party's statement being offered against the party is not hearsay if it: “(A) was made by the party in an individual or representative capacity; (B) is one the party manifested that it adopted or believed to be true; (C) was made by a person whom the party authorized to make a statement on the subject; (D) was made by the party's agent or employee on a matter within the scope of that relationship and while it existed; or (E) was made by the party's coconspirator during and in furtherance of the conspiracy. Fed. R. Evid. 801(d)(2)(A) (E). Here, the board minutes arguably constitute a statement by party opponent Actors for Autism, as they appear to have been “made by a person whom the party authorized to make a statement on the subject, see FRE 801(d)(2)(C), or were otherwise “made by the party's agent or employee on a matter within the scope of that relationship and while it existed, FRE 801(d)(2)(D). Nonetheless, because the Court concludes that it need not rely upon the board minutes for purposes of the instant motion, the Court does not consider them.

Roughly three weeks after the December 2006 AFA Board meeting, the Center *1086 informed plaintiffs, in a letter dated December 28, 2006, that it was “unable to consider [AFA's] request for vendorization” because the Center “[had] been working with Joey Travolta to develop a work program that would introduce regional center clients to the various aspects of film production a program identical to your proposed program.” Gebelin Decl., Ex. H (December 28, 2006 letter) (emphasis added); see also Wolf Decl. II at ¶ 98 (“Ms. Ingram's letter stated that Lanterman Regional Center had been working with Defendant Travolta to develop a work that was ‘identical’ to my proposed program.”) (emphasis added). Wolf states that “[f]or this reason,” she “suspected Defendant Travolta had merely changed the cover sheet to [her] program design” and submitted it to the Center. Wolf Decl. II at ¶ 99 (emphasis added). Because the Board did not want “bad press,” however, the Board “agreed that [Wolf] should write a different program design.” Id. at ¶ 108.
In the meantime, Wolf wrote a letter to the Center in response to the rejection of her practical film program design proposal. In this letter, dated January 23, 2007, Wolf asserted on behalf of AFA that (1) “[a]ll documents that [she] submitted to [the Center] regarding the film program are copy written [sic] by [her] and registered with the U.S. State Department [sic],” that (2) “Travolta broke his fiduciary duty when he continued to have conversations with [the] Lanterman Regional Center about [AFA’s] program for his own personal gain,” and that (3) after Travolta left AFA “any further conversations regarding this program should have ceased.” Wolf Decl. II at ¶ 109; see also DS at ¶ 16; PS at ¶ 16. The letter also asserted that by law “any and all concepts, programs and services which are developed under a public charity belong to the charity” such that “board member[s] [like defendant Travolta] may not take an idea, concept, program, or service for personal gain.” Wolf Decl. II at ¶ 109. Eventually, Wolf met in person with representatives from the Center and decided to submit a different 2-year vocational program that would include film, television, and animation vocational training. DS at ¶ 17; PS at ¶ 17. Wolf has stated that despite having received assurances at the time from Travolta and Ingram that the program service design was not copied, she still believed that Travolta was harming plaintiffs by taking their opportunities and ideas and breaching fiduciary duties to them. DS at ¶ 18, PS at ¶ 18; see also Wolf Decl. II at ¶¶ 101-102, 106, 111.

Plaintiffs offer the following additional facts, all of which are disputed by defendants, in whole or in part:

Wolf avers that she spoke with Travolta in early 2007 and asked him whether he was using either of her works in developing a program for vendorization. PS at ¶ 45. Travolta purportedly denied that he was doing so, insisting that he was working with the Center to develop a “different program.” Id. Wolf also states that in early 2007 she spoke with Richard Bluth, one of Travolta’s business associates, who denied that either he or Travolta were using Wolf’s works in any way. See id. at ¶¶ 46-48. Wolf accordingly avers that “despite her efforts to learn [of the alleged infringement], all of [her] suspicions disappeared regarding [Travolta’s] copying [of] her practical filmmaking program ....” Id. at ¶ 48. From early 2007 until November 25, 2012, Wolf asserts that she did not have “any verifiable information that Mr. Travolta had actually acquired a copy of the May 2006 Work [or the] September 2006 Work, that he provided either of them to any third party in exchange for or in order to receive money, or that Mr. Travolta was contracting with [anyone] to perform or license the program designs in the May 2006 Work or [the] September 2006 *1087 Work.” Id. at ¶ 49. Plaintiff further states that on November 25, 2012, Dale O’Prandy, an individual purporting to be a business associate of Travolta, informed her that Travolta was using her works in order to gain substantial financial benefits through his business, Inclusion Films. Id. at ¶ 50. Wolf avers that after this conversation,
she took steps to confirm that defendants Travolta and Inclusion Films had in fact accessed her works and had “vendored” a practical filmmaking program for autistic persons based upon unauthorized copies of her works. Id. at ¶ 51.

B. Plaintiffs' Copyrighted Works and Defendants' Allegedly Infringing Work

1. Plaintiffs' May 2006 Work

Wolf registered the work underlying her first claim for copyright infringement on August 11, 2006. DS at ¶ 10; PS at ¶ 10; Wolf Decl. II at ¶ 4. The work, entitled “Practical Film Vocational Program For People with Developmental Disabilities,” is dated May 10, 2006. Gebelin Decl., Ex. E. The work itself is comprised of a title page and three pages of text detailing the program under the following six headings: (1) Mission Statement; (2) Entrance Criteria; (3) Referral Process; (4) Exit Criteria; (5) Participation Limits; and (6) Outcomes. See id.

Defendants contend, and plaintiffs dispute, that all of these topics besides the mission statement were prepared in direct response to a list of elements and a brief description of the required information “needed to complete the service design” detailed in a letter written by the Center to Travolta and AFA in April 2006. DS at ¶ 32. Defendants also contend that substantial portions of the language in this work are copied verbatim from other documents that defendants have uncovered during the course of this litigation. Specifically, defendants contend that the first paragraph and list of five elements from the May 2006 Work's “Referral Process” section copies 87.5% of its 247 words verbatim from a July 18, 2005 PDF document regarding Americans with Disabilities Act compliance, created by the Texas Tech University Health Science Center's Student Services Program. DS at ¶ 33. Defendants further assert that the remaining paragraph of the “Referral Process” section copies 36 of its 81 words from the screening section of an employment opportunity flyer published on March 8, 2006 by the College of the Siskiyous. DS at ¶ 34. In addition, defendants assert that the September 2006 Work's “Outcomes” section shares large blocks of language verbatim with a course description published on the Internet by the London Film Academy, including identical language from that section's opening paragraph. DS at ¶ 35.

2. Plaintiffs' September 2006 Work

Wolf registered the work which forms the basis of her second claim for copyright infringement on June 18, 2015, shortly before the filing of her fourth amended complaint in this litigation. DS at ¶ 35; PS at ¶ 35. Wolf asserts that this work, whose title page is dated September 5, 2006, was actually created in late 2006. According to defendants, portions of this document “used material” from various third-party sources, including the Vancouver Film School's website, Columbia College Hollywood's “production course,” and the
3. Defendants' Allegedly Infringing Work and the Allegations in the Operative Complaint

The specific infringing work plaintiff identifies in the fourth amended complaint is a “Program Service Guide” dated April 22, 2010, and entitled “Practical Film Workshop: A 20 Week Vocational Based Program For Adults with Developmental *1088 Disabilities.” FAC, Ex. F; see also Travolta Decl., Ex. S. The allegedly infringing document contains a title page and 11 pages of text detailing defendants' vocational program under various subheadings. See Travolta Decl., Ex. S (document). In the operative complaint, plaintiffs allege that defendants infringed Wolf's two copyrights “by copying large portions of [both her May 2006 and September 2006 Works], including lengthy verbatim passages, into [defendants'] Inclusion Films program guide, which [defendants] then published in the course of advertising and promoting their vocational film-making programs.” FAC at ¶¶ 91 (first copyright claim); 100 (second copyright claim). It is undisputed that defendants first published a version of this particular work in or about 2010 by offering a version of the document for download on the inclusionfilms.com webpage. DS at ¶ 29; PS at ¶ 29.

III. LEGAL STANDARD

Summary judgment is appropriate where “there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a). The moving party bears the initial burden of identifying relevant portions of the record that demonstrate the absence of a fact or facts necessary for one or more essential elements of each claim upon which the moving party seeks judgment. See Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 323, 106 S.Ct. 2548, 91 L.Ed.2d 265 (1986).

If the moving party meets its initial burden, the opposing party must then set out specific facts showing a genuine issue for trial in order to defeat the motion. Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 250, 106 S.Ct. 2505, 91 L.Ed.2d 202 (1986); see also Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c), (e). The nonmoving party must not simply rely on the pleadings and must do more than make “conclusory allegations [in] an affidavit.” Lujan v. Nat'l Wildlife Fed'n, 497 U.S. 871, 888, 110 S.Ct. 3177, 111 L.Ed.2d 695 (1990); see also Celotex, 477 U.S. at 324, 106 S.Ct. 2548. Summary judgment must be granted for the moving party if the nonmoving party “fails to make a showing sufficient to establish the existence of an element essential to that party's case, and on which that party will bear the burden of proof at trial.” Id. at 322, 106 S.Ct. 2548; see also Abromson v. Am. Pac. Corp., 114 F.3d 898, 902 (9th Cir.1997).

In light of the facts presented by the nonmoving party, along with any
undisputed facts, the Court must decide whether the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. See T.W. Elec. Serv., Inc. v. Pac. Elec. Contractors Ass’n, 809 F.2d 626, 631 & n. 3 (9th Cir.1987). When deciding a motion for summary judgment, “the inferences to be drawn from the underlying facts ... must be viewed in the light most favorable to the party opposing the motion.” Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp., 475 U.S. 574, 587, 106 S.Ct. 1348, 89 L.Ed.2d 538 (1986) (citation omitted); Valley Nat’l Bank of Ariz. v. A.E. Rouse & Co., 121 F.3d 1332, 1335 (9th Cir.1997). Summary judgment for the moving party is proper when a rational trier of fact would not be able to find for the nonmoving party on the claims at issue. See Matsushita, 475 U.S. at 587, 106 S.Ct. 1348.

IV. DISCUSSION

In the instant motion, defendants move for summary judgment as to all of plaintiffs' claims on two grounds. First, defendants argue (a) that portions of plaintiffs' two copyrighted works were copied verbatim from third-party sources, (b) that such “unauthorized derivation” pervades the entire works, and (c) that plaintiffs accordingly do not hold valid copyrights in the works. Second, defendants argue that aside from any alleged copyright infringement *1089 that occurred within three years of the filing of this action, all of plaintiffs' claims are barred by the relevant statutes of limitation, as each claim arises from conduct of which plaintiffs were aware or were sufficiently placed on notice in 2006 and 2007. The Court addresses the merits of defendants' arguments in the discussion that follows.

A. Plaintiffs' Underlying Copyright Infringement Claims

A copyright infringement claim has two elements: “(1) [plaintiff’s] ownership of a valid copyright, and (2) [defendant’s] copying of constituent elements of the work that are original.” Feist Publ’ns v. Rural Tel. Serv. Co., Inc., 499 U.S. 340, 361, 111 S.Ct. 1282, 113 L.Ed.2d 358 (1991).

Throughout the course of this litigation, plaintiff Alisa Wolf has maintained that her two copyrighted works are original and that she did not lift portions of text from third-party sources when generating her written works. See, e.g., Dkt. 156 (Dec. 3, 2015 Deposition of Alisa Wolf), at 262:3 17, 263:14 24, 264:2 265:4; 266:17 19; see also Wolf Decl. II at ¶ 73 (“I created all [ ] draft of the program design for the practical film program dated May 10, 2006 ... on my own without the contribution of others.”); id. at ¶ 84 (“At all times, I authored my Work and all derivative work without the contribution from anyone else.”). In the instant motion, defendants submit evidence of third-party sources that purportedly pre-date the creation of plaintiffs' works and appear to contain language substantially similar or identical to that of plaintiffs' works. See Dkt. 142-4 (Palmer Decl.), Ex. T (Texas Tech University Health Science Center's Student Services Program regarding ADA Compliance for Students with Disabilities), Ex. U (March 8, 2006 College of the Siskiyou employment opportunity flyer), Ex. V (London Film
in the instant motion, plaintiffs' objections are **OVERRULED AS MOOT**. The Court also notes that these documents are the subject of a motion *in limine* that is currently pending before the Court. See Dkt.157.

The Court notes that defendants do not argue that even absent any alleged unauthorized copying, plaintiffs' works would nonetheless not be subject to copyright protection. For example, defendants do not contend that plaintiff is improperly attempting to extend copyright protection of her written works to an idea, concept, process, system, or other unprotectable subject matter. See 17 U.S.C. § 102(b) ("In no case does copyright protection for an original work of authorship extend to any idea, procedure, process, system, method of operation, concept, principle, or discovery, regardless of the form in which it is described, explained, illustrated, or embodied in such work. ") (emphasis added). Instead, defendants' argument appears limited to whether the degree of Wolf's allegedly unauthorized copying of third party written works so pervades her works that they should not be afforded copyright protection.

### 1. Originality and Ownership of a Valid Copyright

Copyright protection extends only to “original works of authorship.” 17 U.S.C. § 102. “Although the amount of creative input by the author required to meet the originality standard is low, it is not negligible.” *Satava v. Lowry*, 323 F.3d 805, 810 (9th Cir.2003). A “certificate of registration from the U.S. Copyright Office entitle[s] [plaintiff] to a ‘rebuttable presumption of originality.’ ” *Ets Hokin v. Sky Spirits, Inc.*, 225 F.3d 1068, 1075 (9th Cir.2000). However, “the statutory presumption of validity can be rebutted if the alleged infringer demonstrates that the plaintiff's work ‘is not original but copied from another's work.’ ” *Entmt Research Grp., Inc. v. Genesis Creative Grp., Inc.*, 122 F.3d 1211, 1218 (9th Cir.1997) (quoting *N. Coast Indus. v. Jason*)

---

4 Specifically, plaintiffs object to these documents under *Federal Rules of Evidence 601* (competency to testify), 602 (need for personal knowledge), 701 (opinion testimony by lay witnesses), 801 (hearsay), and 901 (failure to authenticate), as well as *Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(e)(1)(A)* (untimely service of exhibits). See Dkt. 144 2 (Plaintiffs' Objections). In light the Court's finding that consideration of this evidence does not inform a different result...
Maxwell, Inc., 972 F.2d 1031, 1033 (9th Cir.1992); see also Masquerade Novelty, Inc. v. Unique Indus., Inc., 912 F.2d 663, 668 69 (3rd Cir.1990) (“Where, for example, the issue is whether the copyrighted article is ‘original,’ the presumption will not be overcome unless the defendant offers proof that the plaintiff's product was copied from other works or similarly probative evidence as to originality.”).

At bottom, defendants' argument is that (1) the degree of similarity between portions of plaintiffs' works and the purportedly preexisting third-party works is so substantial as to compel the conclusion that plaintiff copied these works; (2) plaintiffs' copying was necessarily unauthorized, in light of her repeated denials that any copying occurred; and (3) plaintiffs' copyrighted works are accordingly “unauthorized derivative works” and therefore not subject to copyright protection.

In their motion, defendants primarily rely upon Sobhani v. @Radical.Media Inc., where the court granted defendant's motion for summary judgment as to a copyright infringement claim. See 257 F.Supp.2d 1234, 1241 (C.D.Cal.2003) (Wilson, J.). The plaintiff in Sobhani, an aspiring video commercial director, brought a copyright infringement action against a producer who had produced a commercial substantially similar to a “spec” commercial that the plaintiff had previously shared with the defendant. In a motion for summary judgment, defendant argued, like defendants in the instant motion, that plaintiff's own work lifted elements of copyrighted third-party materials without permission, such that plaintiff's work was an “unauthorized derivative work,” and accordingly could not support an infringement claim. See id. at 1239. In response, plaintiff argued that at minimum, his “original contributions” to his productions were entitled to copyright protection, even if the work as a whole is an unauthorized derivative work. Id. Ultimately, the Court concluded that “[b]ecause [the] copyrighted [third-party] work pervades [Plaintiff's] derivative work, and because Plaintiff used the previous work without [the third party's] authorization, no copyright protection is afforded” to plaintiff's work. Id. at 1240.

While it is true, as defendants contend, that courts may “deny copyright *1091 to derivative works in which [a] pre-existing work tends to pervade the entire derivative work,” courts need not deny protection “to collective works in which the infringement arises from the copying of the selection and arrangement of a number of pre-existing works,” nor must courts necessarily deny protection “per se [due to] the reproduction of any particular prior work.” 1 M. Nimmer & D. Nimmer, Nimmer on Copyright § 3.06 (2015) (citing, inter alia, Sobhani). As the Ninth Circuit has explained, the Copyright Act “provides that a derivative author may own the copyright in material the author contributed to a preexisting work, but not in infringing material or material the author did not create.” U.S. Auto Parts Network, Inc. v. Parts Geek, LLC, 692 F.3d 1009, 1016 (9th Cir.2012); see also id. (“[C]opyright protection for a derivative work ‘does not extend to any part of the work in which
such [preexisting] material has been used unlawfully.’ ”) (citing 17 U.S.C. § 103(a)).

Thus, even if the Court concluded, based upon defendants' evidence submitted in support of this motion, that Wolf did in fact copy portions of her copyrighted works from (copyrighted) third-party sources without authorization, the Court would also need to conclude, as a matter of law, that the purportedly cribbed portions so “pervade” the works that they render them completely unprotected under the Copyright Act. The Court finds that on the current record, it cannot make this finding as a matter of law. A reasonable jury could find that despite any substantial similarities between plaintiffs' works and those of third-party sources, those additional portions of plaintiffs' works not traceable to any third-party source demonstrate that the derivative portions do not pervade the entire works. See Shaw v. Lindheim, 919 F.2d 1353, 1355 (9th Cir.1990) (noting “summary judgment is not highly favored on questions of substantial similarity in copyright cases”).

Accordingly, defendants' motion for summary judgment as to the invalidity of plaintiffs' underlying copyrights is denied.

B. Statutes of Limitation and the Discovery Rule
Defendants contend that plaintiffs' copyright and state law claims all accrued in 2006 or 2007, at which time Wolf was either aware or sufficiently placed on notice of defendants' alleged conduct underlying these claims. Accordingly, defendants first argue that plaintiffs are barred from seeking any damages for alleged copyright infringement that occurred outside the relevant three-year statute of limitations. Defendants then argue that absent application of an equitable exception, all of plaintiffs' state law claims are time barred.

1. The Relative Burdens of Proof at Summary Judgment

Because the statute of limitations is an affirmative defense, defendants bear the initial burden on a motion for summary judgment of demonstrating that plaintiffs' claims are time barred. See Celotex, 477 U.S. at 323, 106 S.Ct. 2548; see also Cal. Sansome Co. v. U.S. Gypsum, 55 F.3d 1402, 1406 (9th Cir.1995) (“A defendant raising the statute of limitations as an affirmative defense has the burden of proving the action is time barred.”). Defendants primarily attempt to meet this burden in the instant motion by relying upon plaintiff Wolf’s own testimony regarding her strong suspicions (and arguably her knowledge), dating from as 2006 and 2007, regarding defendants alleged wrongdoing. If defendants meet their burden, the burden then shifts to plaintiffs as the non-moving party to establish that there is sufficient evidence in the record from which a reasonable trier of fact could conclude *1092 that plaintiffs' claims are not time barred. See Nissan Fire & Marine Ins. Co. v. Fritz Companies, Inc., 210 F.3d 1099, 1103 (9th Cir.2000) (“If ... a moving party carries its burden of production, the nonmoving party must produce evidence to support its claim or defense.”).
As is relevant here, if defendants establish that plaintiffs' claims are time barred absent application of an equitable exception, plaintiffs bear the burden of demonstrating the applicability of any such exception, including the delayed discovery rule. See O'Connor v. Boeing N. Am., 311 F.3d 1139, 1150 (9th Cir.2002) (“Because Plaintiffs have the burden of proof at trial to establish that they are entitled to the benefit of the discovery rule, to defeat summary judgment they [are] required to come forward with evidence establishing a triable issue of fact with regard to whether the discovery rule applies.”) (emphasis added) (citing Celotex, 477 U.S. at 323, 106 S.Ct. 2548); Gabriel Techs. Corp. v. Qualcomm, Inc., 857 F.Supp.2d 997, 1003 (S.D.Cal.2012) (noting that plaintiff bears the burden on summary judgment of establishing entitlement to delayed accrual under the discovery rule). Plaintiffs argue in opposition to the instant motion that “[d]ue to the sparse evidence on record, and construing it in the light most favorable to [p]laintiffs, AFA has demonstrated that at the very least a triable issue exists concerning its discovery of [d]efendants' wrongdoing,” such that the Court cannot conclude that plaintiffs' claims are time barred as a matter of law. Opp’n at 17 (emphasis added). Essentially, plaintiffs contend that they were not sufficiently aware of defendants' conduct until November 25, 2012 and that therefore, under the discovery rule, none of their claims accrued until November 2012 well within two years of this suit's initiation.

2. Plaintiffs' Copyright Infringement Claims

Plaintiffs' first claim for copyright infringement relates to her May 2006 Work and was first asserted on February 6, 2014, the day on which this suit was filed. Plaintiffs' second claim for copyright infringement relates to her September 2006 Work and was first asserted on August 5, 2015, the day on which the operative fourth amended complaint was filed. Based upon the Copyright Act's three-year statute of limitations, see 17 U.S.C. § 507(b) (discussed infra) defendants argue that plaintiffs should be barred from seeking damages for any alleged copyright infringement that occurred before February 6, 2011 as to the first claim, or before August 5, 2012 as to the second claim. As explained in the discussion below, the Court agrees, and finds that plaintiffs are barred from seeking damages attributable to infringement occurring beyond the three years preceding plaintiffs' assertion of the two copyright claims.

i. Accrual of Plaintiff's Claims under 17 U.S.C. § 507(b)

and Dry Cleaning Pension Trust Fund v. Ferbar Corp. of Cal., 522 U.S. 192, 201, 118 S.Ct. 542, 139 L.Ed.2d 553 (1997) (internal quotation marks omitted). However, in *Polar Bear Prods., Inc. v. Timex Corp.*, 384 F.3d 700, 706 (9th Cir.2004) (emphasis added) (quoting *Roley*, 19 F.3d 479, 481 (9th Cir.1994)). In further construing the language of *Roley*, the Ninth Circuit has explained that “§ 507(b) permits damages occurring outside of the three-year window, so long as the copyright owner did not discover *and reasonably could not have discovered* the infringement before the commencement of the three-year limitation period.” *Polar Bear Prods., Inc. v. Timex Corp.*, 384 F.3d 700, 706 (9th Cir.2004) (holding that “[b]ecause [plaintiff] did not discover [defendant’s] infringement until within three years of filing suit, [plaintiff] may recover damages for infringement that occurred outside of the three-year window”).

As explained in the discussion that follows, even viewing all facts in the light most favorable to plaintiffs and resolving all factual ambiguities in their favor, the Court cannot conclude both that plaintiffs (1) were unaware of defendants' infringement and (2) “reasonably could not have discovered” such infringement as far back as 2006 or 2007. *Polar Bear Prods.*, 384 F.3d at 706 (noting section 507(b)'s “statute of limitations does not prohibit recovery of damages incurred more than three years prior to the filing of suit if [1] the copyright plaintiff was unaware of the infringement, and [2] that lack of knowledge was reasonable under the circumstances.”) (emphasis added); see also *William A. Graham Co. v. Haughey*, 568 F.3d 425, 438 (3d Cir.2009) (In applying discovery rule to a copyright claim, “we ask whether [plaintiff] ‘should have known of the basis for [her] claims [, which] depends on whether [plaintiff] had sufficient information of possible wrongdoing to place [her] on inquiry notice or to excite storm warnings of culpable activity.’”) (citation omitted).

In the more recent of her two declarations, Wolf states that it was not until November 25, 2012 that she “became aware that defendant[s] Travolta and Inclusion Films ... were using [her] Work without [her] permission and that Defendant Travolta was, in fact, still acting against [her] interests.” Id. at ¶
115 (emphasis added). Wolf avers that on that date, an acquaintance informed her that Travolta was using her curriculum to gain “substantial financial benefits” through co-defendant Inclusion Films. Id. This revelation was, in Wolf’s view, “the first time that [she] learned that Defendant Travolta was, in fact, wrongfully using [her] Work.” Id.

However, Wolf’s own testimony establishes that in mid-to-late 2006, she “suspected Defendant Travolta had merely changed the cover sheet to [her] program design” and submitted it to the Center. Id. at ¶ 99 (emphasis added). Indeed, Wolf states that on December 4, 2006, she “informed the [AFA] Board ... of [her] concerns about Defendant Travolta using *1094 [her] program without permission, and the advice [that attorney Shannon Nash] gave [her] indicating that, although I [Wolf] thought it seemed clear that Defendant Travolta was using the program, more evidence was needed before any legal action” could be commenced. Id. at ¶ 108 (emphasis added). The December 2006 letter that Wolf received shortly thereafter from the Center further stated, in fairly unequivocal terms, that the Center “[had] been working with Joey Travolta to develop ... a program identical to your proposed program.” Gebelin Decl., Ex. H (emphasis added). 7

Wolf nonetheless contends that even though she had strong suspicions of defendants’ infringement in late 2006, she exercised due diligence at the time by initiating “[her] own independent investigation” and thereby taking “reasonable steps to find out if, in fact, Defendant Travolta was using [her] program without [her] permission.” Wolf Decl. II at ¶¶ 110-11. Thus, “having found no direct or circumstantial evidence proving [Travolta] was [infringing], [Wolf] thought there was no ‘grounds’ to pursue legal action at that time.” Id. (emphasis added). Plaintiff’s “reasonable” investigation of her suspicions essentially involved confronting Travolta, his associate Richard Bluth, and Karen Ingram of the Center and asking them whether they had infringed upon her copyright by using her underlying works. See Wolf Decl. II at ¶ 110. According to Wolf, all three denied that they had used Wolf’s works, insisting instead that they were working to “develop a different film program.” Wolf Decl. II at ¶ 110; see also PS at ¶ 48 (stating that “despite [Wolf’s] efforts to learn [of the alleged infringement at the time], all of [her] suspicions disappeared regarding [Travolta’s] copying [of her practical filmmaking program ...”]). Wolf contends that in making such denials, these individuals “concealed facts from [her] that would have informed her of acts and injury triggering the running of all statute[s] of limitations.” Opp’n at 14. Plaintiff accordingly contends that such conduct constituted “fraudulent concealment” warranting equitable tolling of the statute of limitations. Id. The Court disagrees.

7 Plaintiffs contend that “there is a significant difference between ‘developing an unspecified ‘program and Defendants actually copying Dr. Wolf’s works and submitting them in the vendorization process. Opp’n at 13. Even if the Court were to recognize such a distinction, this would not warrant a different result here, as Wolf repeatedly states that she suspected Travolta was in fact using her specific program design materials. See Wolf Decl. II at ¶ 99
Generally speaking, the doctrine of fraudulent concealment “is invoked only if the plaintiff both pleads and proves that the defendant actively misled her, and that she had neither actual nor constructive knowledge of the facts constituting his cause of action despite her due diligence.” *Grimmett v. Brown*, 75 F.3d 506, 514 (9th Cir.1996) (emphasis in original) (citing *Volk v. D.A. Davidson & Co.*, 816 F.2d 1406, 1415 (9th Cir.1987)) (“The doctrine [of fraudulent concealment] is properly invoked only if a plaintiff establishes ‘affirmative conduct upon the part of the defendant which would, under the circumstances of the case, lead a reasonable person to believe that he did not have a claim for relief.’”) (citation omitted); see also *Gypsum*, 55 F.3d at 1409 n. 12 (noting that evidence of defendant's misrepresentations was irrelevant because plaintiff was on notice of a potential claim). Crucially for purposes of the Court's analysis here, a defendant's “failure to ‘own up’ [to the alleged wrongdoing] does not constitute active concealment.” *Grimmett*, 75 F.3d at 515 (emphasis in original).

*1095* The Ninth Circuit's decision in *Grimmett v. Brown*, a case outside the context of copyright law, is instructive. The plaintiff in *Grimmett* argued that her RICO cause of action should have been tolled until December 1990, when she first learned that her injuries were part of a pattern of racketeering activity. *Id.* at 511. Specifically, plaintiff argued that until that point in time, the defendant had fraudulently concealed her activity by “perjuring[ing] herself in depositions and other correspondence to insure that [plaintiff] never learned of the [offending conduct].” *Id.* The Ninth Circuit rejected plaintiff's argument that such conduct constituted fraudulent concealment, as plaintiff “set[ ] forth no proof of [defendant's] active concealment of the reorganization scheme.” *Id.* “At most,” the court explained, defendant “failed to ‘own up’ to her illegal conduct.” *Id.* In many respects, this failure to “own up” mirrors purported denials by Ingram, Bluth, and defendant Travolta as to any wrongdoing. 8 See *Wolf Decl. II* at ¶ 110 (detailing these alleged denials). Thus, as in *Grimmett*, plaintiff Alisa Wolf “had available all the facts necessary to discover her cause of action with due diligence. The limitations period does not toll simply because a party is ignorant of her cause of action.” 9 *Id.*; see also *Volk*, 816 F.2d at 1416 (“Once appellants had clear knowledge of their claims, it was not reasonable for them to rely on reassuring comments from a broker [employed by defendant].”).

The Court notes that Travolta denies that Wolf ever approached him in 2007 to ask whether he was using any of her works. See Dkt. 146 1 (December 25, 2015 Declaration of Joseph “Joey” Travolta (“Travolta Decl. II”)) at ¶¶ 5, 6. Travolta further denies that he ever made any representations or gave Wolf any assurances that he was not using program materials that she created (i.e., the copyrighted works that are the subject of this litigation). *Id.* In granting the instant motion, the Court resolves such factual disputes and ambiguities in favor of plaintiffs (as the non moving parties).

To the extent Wolf argues that the statute of limitations should be tolled due to the legal advice she received from AFA's attorney, Shannon Nash, the Court rejects this argument. According to Wolf, Nash advised her that she “should not file a frivolous lawsuit, but “if she] could find evidence and proof, she] could file a lawsuit against Defendant Travolta
for taking [her] program. Wolf Decl. II at ¶ 107. Wolf further avers that at the time she “thought
it seemed clear that Defendant Travolta was using the program, but Nash nonetheless advised her
seemingly without reference to the risks associated with delay that “more evidence was needed before
any legal action could be taken.” Id. at ¶ 108. The fact that Nash, in her capacity as counsel to AFA, did not
apprise AFA or Wolf of the need timely to litigate such an action upon actual or constructive notice
of infringement does not constitute grounds for tolling the statute of limitations. See Booth v. Carnival
Corp., 522 F.3d 1148 (11th Cir. 2008) (attorney’s simple neglect could not justify equitably tolling
the applicable limitation period.) (citing Irwin v. Dept. of Veterans Affairs, 498 U.S. 89, 96, 111
S.Ct. 453, 112 L.Ed.2d 435 (1990)) (declining to toll statute of limitations on plaintiff’s Title VII
claim due to “what is at best a garden variety claim of excusable neglect on the part of plaintiff’s
attorney); cf. Fahmy v. Jay Z, 835 F.Supp.2d 783, 791 (C.D.Cal. 2011) (“Plaintiff ... may not rely on
alleged misrepresentations from his own agents ... to toll the statute of limitations”).

Plaintiffs’ opposition cites only one case, Prather v. Neva Paperbacks, Inc., 446 F.2d 338, (5th Cir.1971), in which a court
specifically considered whether fraudulent concealment tolled the statute of limitations
imposed by section 507(b). See *1096

Opp’n at 14. However, Prather also militates in favor of finding that defendants’ alleged
concealment does not toll the statute of limitations in the instant case. In Prather,
the plaintiff’s “only alleged excuse” for failing timely to file a suit was that he was
“ignorant” of his copyright infringement claim because the defendants “concealed
from him the existence of [an allegedly infringing book] and prevented him from
obtaining a copy of that book.” Prather, 446 F.2d at 340 (noting that the facts of such
concealment were undisputed). Essentially, the plaintiff “suspected that he had a cause of
action, but could not prove the infringement without the book.” Id. at 341. “Such a

showing,” the Fifth Circuit explained, “is insufficient to toll the statute of limitations.”

Id. As the court further explained:

[W]e conclude that the mere fact that plaintiff was unable to procure a copy of the book
is insufficient to show the successful concealment necessary to toll the statute of limitations. This
was merely ignorance of evidence, not ignorance of a potential claim. The appellant knew of
the alleged infringement, but did not have in his possession the precise minutiae of the plagiarism.
The bells do not toll the limitations statute while one ferrets the facts. Consequently, the plaintiff
did not allege facts which if true would justify tolling the statute of limitations. The district
court was therefore correct in granting summary judgment.

Prather, 446 F.2d at 341.

10 Plaintiffs’ supplemental brief cites additional cases involving alleged fraudulent concealment, including the
opinion of Judge Posner in Taylor v. Metrick, 712 F.2d 1112 (7th Cir.1983). In Taylor, Judge Posner
explained that “although many cases state that mere ignorance of a cause of action does not toll the
statute of limitations, in context these statements invariably mean only that the plaintiff has a duty of diligence: it is not enough that he did not discover he had a cause of action, if a reasonable man in his shoes would have. Id. at 1118 (emphasis in original). The Taylor court further concluded that “fraudulent concealment occurred where the defendant placed a copyright notice bearing his own name on copies of plaintiff’s work. Id. “This finding, however, is probably limited to the circumstances where, as in Taylor, only a close inspection would have revealed the infringement because the features in plaintiff’s work that were copyrightable were subtle and would easily escape notice with another’s name affixed as copyright holder. 1 M. Nimmer & D. Nimmer, Nimmer on Copyright § 12.05 (2015) (quoting Taylor, 712 F.2d at 1118). This is not the case here, where defendants placed no such copyright notice on their program design and their alleged infringement, as described by plaintiffs, was not “subtle.”

In the instant case, much as in Prather, Wolf states that she “thought there was no ‘grounds’ to pursue legal action” because she “found no evidence that [Travolta] was using [her] program without [her] permission” and was expressly told by Travolta himself that he did not use her works. Wolf Decl. at ¶ 111. Again, this “mere[ ] ignorance of evidence” is “not ignorance of a potential claim.” Prather, 446 F.2d at 341 (emphasis added). Nor is the alleged infringer's denial of wrongdoing sufficient to constitute fraudulent concealment or otherwise sufficient to render Wolf's purported inability to discover the infringement reasonable under the circumstances. 11 See Grimmert, 75 F.3d at 515. *1097 This is particularly so where, as here, Wolf was expressly advised in December 2006 by the Center that Travolta had been working to develop a program that was “identical to her program.” Wolf Decl. II at ¶ 98.

As the Ninth Circuit has explained, fraudulent concealment “requires a showing both that the defendant used fraudulent means to keep the plaintiff unaware of his cause of action, and also that the plaintiff was, in fact, ignorant of the existence of his cause of action. [Here, plaintiff] has made no showing to prove the first prong of this test and has [arguably] disproven the second [prong]” through her own testimony regarding her decision not to file suit in 2006 or 2007. 12 Wood v. Santa Barbara Chamber of Commerce, Inc., 705 F.2d 1515, 1521 (9th Cir.1983) (emphasis added). Again, plaintiff herself has stated that it “seemed clear [to her in 2006] that Defendant Travolta was using the program” i.e, that Travolta...
“had merely changed the cover sheet to [her] program design” and submitted it to the Center. Wolf Decl. II at ¶ 99, 108. Rather than sue at the time, the AFA Board “agreed that [Wolf] should write a different program design,” in part because they did not want the “bad press” that might have accompanied such a suit. Id. at ¶ 108.

12 The Ninth Circuit’s decision in Wood v. Santa Barbara Chamber of Commerce, Inc., 705 F.2d 1515 (9th Cir. 1983) is instructive. The plaintiff in Wood had, through his initiation of an earlier suit, “indicated his suspicion that at least one of his photographs had been infringed by defendants. Id. at 1521. ‘That suspicion placed upon the plaintiff] a duty to investigate further into possible infringements of his copyrights which the plaintiff failed to do in that case. Id. But regardless of whether or not the plaintiff conducted any such investigation, the Ninth Circuit explained that “equity will impute to a litigant knowledge of facts that would have been revealed by reasonably required further investigation. Id. In Wood, the court “held as a matter of law that the plaintiff should reasonably have discovered the allegedly infringing use of those photographs at issue in the case, and that “no rational jury would, on the narrow facts of the case], fail to find that a reasonable litigant should have investigated and would have discovered the potential causes of action underlying this lawsuit. Id. (emphasis added). In the instant case, the Court similarly finds to the extent plaintiff argues she did not have actual knowledge of a potential claim that no rational trier of fact would find that plaintiff reasonably could not have discovered Travolta’s alleged infringement well before 2012.

Ultimately, therefore, the Court cannot conclude that plaintiffs both (1) did not discover and (2) reasonably could not have discovered defendants’ alleged infringement before November 2012. Polar Bear Prods., 384 F.3d at 706; see also William A. Graham Co. v. Haughey, 568 F.3d 425, 438 (3d Cir.2009) (noting that if defendants demonstrate plaintiff “had sufficient information of possible wrongdoing to place [her] on inquiry notice or to excite storm warnings of culpable activity,” then “the burden shifts to [plaintiff] to show that [she] exercised reasonable due diligence and yet [was] unable to discover [her] injuries”). Accordingly, any damages to be awarded for plaintiffs’ two copyright infringement claims must arise from acts of infringement that accrued in the three years preceding her assertion of these claims i.e., damages must be limited to those stemming from infringement of the first work that post-dates February 6, 2011, and infringement of the second work that post-dates August 5, 2012.

*1098 ii. Evidence of Infringement Accruing within the Three-year Statute of Limitations

As the Supreme Court explained in Petrella, “when a defendant has engaged (or is alleged to have engaged) in a series of discrete infringing acts, the copyright holder's suit ordinarily will be timely under § 507(b) with respect to more recent acts of infringement (i.e., acts within the three-year window), but untimely with respect to prior acts of the same or similar kind.” Petrella, 134 S.Ct. at 1970. In a revised tentative order provided to the parties, the Court noted that neither party had referenced testimony or other evidence in the record regarding alleged copyright infringement occurring within the three-year statute of limitations i.e., between February 6, 2011 and February 6, 2014 for plaintiff’s May 2006 Work, or between August 5, 2012 and August 5, 2015 for plaintiff’s September
2006 Work. Accordingly, because “[d]istrict courts unquestionably possess the power to enter summary judgment sua sponte, even on the eve of trial,” the Court notified the parties that it was inclined, on its own motion, to grant summary judgment in favor of defendants as to the entirety of plaintiffs' two copyright claims. Norse v. City of Santa Cruz, 629 F.3d 966, 971 (9th Cir.2010) (en banc); see also Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(f)(3) (“After giving notice and a reasonable time to respond, the court may ... consider summary judgment on its own after identifying for the parties material facts that may not be genuinely in dispute.”). The Court requested supplemental evidence and briefing to assess whether a genuine dispute of material fact existed regarding alleged acts of infringement post-dating February 6, 2011. Dkt. 183.

In response, plaintiffs filed a supplemental brief that largely rehashes arguments made in opposition to the instant motion. See P's Supp. Brief at 2-15. Plaintiffs also provided three additional documents that were produced by various non-party regional centers in response to a subpoena: (1) a revised version of defendants' program design, dated April 19, 2011, that was produced by the Westside Regional Center (which apparently is not related to Travolta); (2) what appears to be a significantly modified version of defendants' allegedly infringing program design, dated July 28, 2014, that was produced by the Alta Regional Center (which apparently is not related to Travolta); and (3) a copy of defendants' program design, dated February 4, 2008, that appears to have been faxed to an unknown entity by the Lanterman Regional Center on November 16, 2011, based on a time stamp on the document. See Dkt. 184-1. Plaintiffs argue these documents demonstrate that “[d]efendants, either through themselves or through the [Lanterman Regional Center], were distributing copies of their infringing program design to the other regional centers between 2011 and 2014.” P's Supp. Brief at 2. In support of this contention, plaintiffs do not cite any testimony from defendants or the regional centers themselves. Rather, plaintiffs cite only to a supplemental declaration of their attorney in which he makes conclusory statements regarding defendants' purported distribution of these three documents. See Dkt. 184-1 (Chisvin Supp. Decl.) at ¶¶ 2 (stating document “was copied and distributed in 2011 as it states ‘DRAFT UPDATED: April 19, 2011’”), 3 (stating document “was copied and distributed in 2014, as it is dated ‘July 28, 2014’”), 5 (stating document “was copied and distributed in 2011, as it was faxed by [the Lanterman Regional Center] on November 16, 2011.”).

In response, defendants contend that they did not instruct any third-party regional centers to distribute copies of the allegedly infringing program design *1099 and generally had no control over regional centers' decisions to send copies of the program service designs. See D's Supp. Brief. Defendants also object to the declaration of plaintiffs' attorney, arguing that he provides no basis for his personal knowledge regarding who created or distributed the supplemental documents. Dkt. 186 (citing
Fed. R. Evid. 602, 800, et seq.). In a supplemental declaration, Travolta avers that neither he, defendant Inclusion Wear, LLC, nor defendant Little Documentary Films had any control over the decisions of any regional centers to send copies of program service designs to other regional centers. Dkt. 185-1, Travolta Suppl. Decl. at ¶ 4. Rather, Travolta avers that the main version of the allegedly infringing program service guide was published on the Inclusion Films website in or about April 2010, “where it remained without substantial revisions until it was removed in response to this litigation.” 13 Id. at ¶ 6.

13 The fact that the allegedly infringing document published in 2010, outside the relevant three year window remained on defendant's website through 2014 does not give rise to a discrete claim accruing within the three year window. The Court in Petrella "specifically distinguish[ed] the separate accrual rule established in § 507(b) from the 'continuing violation doctrine. Chicago Bldg. Design, P.C. v. Mongolian House, Inc., 770 F.3d 610, 615 (7th Cir.2014) (citing Petrella, 134 S.Ct. at 1969). Under the separate accrual rule, "when a defendant commits successive violations, the statute of limitations runs separately from each violation. Each time an infringing work is reproduced or distributed, the infringer commits a new wrong. Each wrong gives rise to a discrete 'claim that 'accrues' at the time the wrong occurs. Petrella, 134 S.Ct. at 1969 (citation omitted). However, the Court in Petrella cautioned that such "separately accruing harm should not be confused with harm from past violations that are continuing. Id. at 1969 n. 6 (emphasis added); Compare Klehr v. A.O. Smith Corp., 521 U.S. 179, 190, 117 S.Ct. 1984, 138 L.Ed.2d 373 (1997) (for separately accruing harm, each new act must cause "harm to the plaintiff over and above the harm that the earlier acts caused )., with Havens Realty Corp. v. Coleman, 455 U.S. 363, 380 81, 102 S.Ct. 1114, 71 L.Ed.2d 214 (1982) ("Where a plaintiff ... challenges ... an unlawful practice that continues into the limitations period, the complaint is timely when it is filed within the limitations period, measured from] the last asserted occurrence of that practice. ) (footnote omitted). Thus, in the instant case, the allegedly infringing document's continued presence on defendants' website through 2014 at best constitutes "harm from a] past violation ] that was] continuing through 2014, and not a "new wrong that gave rise to " separately accruing harm within the limitations period. Petrella, 134 S.Ct. at 1969, 1969 n. 6. Plaintiffs have failed to produce admissible evidence creating a genuine dispute of material fact regarding whether "the alleged] infringer commit ted] a new wrong by reproducing or distributing the infringing work within three years of the initiation of this suit. Id. at 1969.

Crucially, a defendant is only liable for "his acts of infringement committed within three years prior to [a plaintiff's] lawsuit." Makedwe Publ'g Co. v. Johnson, 37 F.3d 180, 181 (5th Cir.1994) ("We are persuaded by the Ninth, Sixth, and Second Circuits' interpretation of section 507(b)")); see also Kling v. Hallmark Cards, Inc., 225 F.3d 1030, 1038 (9th Cir.2000) ("[T]he [copyright] statute of limitations is triggered only by violations i.e., actual infringements."). At the summary judgment stage, "judgment shall be entered against the nonmoving party unless affidavits or other evidence "set forth specific facts showing that there is a genuine issue for trial." Lujan, 497 U.S. at 888, 110 S.Ct. 3177 (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 56). The object of this standard "is not to replace conclusory allegations of [a] complaint or answer with conclusory allegations of an affidavit ... Rather, the purpose of Rule 56 is to enable a party who believes there is no genuine dispute as to a specific fact essential to the other side's case to demand at *1100 least one sworn averment of that fact before the lengthy process of litigation continues." Id. at 888 89, 110 S.Ct. 3177. The conclusory and unsubstantiated assertions
in the declaration of plaintiffs' attorney coupled with unauthenticated and largely unexplained documentation produced by third-parties does not suffice to defeat summary judgment here. Although two of plaintiffs' proffered documents are dated April 19, 2011 and July 28, 2014, respectively, dates within the relevant three-year statute of limitations the documents were produced by third-party regional centers without any indication as to whether defendants themselves created, edited, or distributed the documents. See Dkt. 184-1. The third of these documents is dated February 4, 2008 and contains a time stamp indicating that it was faxed by the Lanterman Regional Center on November 16, 2011. Id. Again, even if the Center, which is not party to this suit, may have faxed an older version of defendants' allegedly infringing program, this does not generate a genuine dispute regarding whether defendants themselves engaged in acts of infringement after February 6, 2011.

Accordingly, because the Court finds that plaintiffs have failed to cite admissible evidence in the record that creates a genuine dispute as to material facts regarding alleged infringement by defendants within the relevant three-year window, the Court concludes that summary judgment in favor of defendants as to plaintiffs' copyright claims is warranted. See Roley, 19 F.3d at 481 82 (explaining that in “case[s] of continuing copyright infringement[, ] an action may be brought for all acts that accrued within the three years preceding the filing of the suit,” but concluding that plaintiff “fail[ed] to produce any evidence that appellees engaged in actionable conduct [in the three-year window],” producing instead only “naked allegations and speculation” and consequently “fail[ing] to demonstrate that either a genuine issue of material fact exists, or that the district court incorrectly applied the relevant law”).

3. Plaintiffs' State Law Claims

It is undisputed that plaintiffs' five state law claims stem from conduct that began in 2006, in the wake of defendant Travolta's resignation from Actors for Autism specifically, Travolta's allegedly unlawful appropriation in 2006 of plaintiffs' copyrighted works and defendants' interference with plaintiffs' existing and future economic relationships in the years following the alleged misappropriation. Indeed, based upon the operative complaint's allegations and the relevant statutes of limitation all of which, as discussed infra, are four years or less plaintiffs' state law claims all appear to be time barred, as each is premised upon conduct and resulting harm that first occurred seven or eight years before the filing of the instant action. Therefore, defendants argue that all of plaintiffs' state law claims, which were first asserted on September 29, 2014, see dkt. 39, are barred by the applicable statutes of limitation.

See DS at ¶¶ 23 24; PS at ¶¶ 23 24 (undisputed that plaintiffs' UCL claim is “based on the alleged infringement and exploitation of the works set forth in the first and second causes of action and also of unspecified trade secrets ; and further undisputed that plaintiffs' fourth claim for interference with
economic relationships is “based on the same alleged infringement and exploitation of the works and unspecified trade secrets”); DS at ¶ 25; PS at ¶ 25 (undisputed that plaintiffs' fifth claim “is based on allegations of Travolta's] Breach of Fiduciary Duty ... for his alleged taking of business opportunities that allegedly belonged to AFA, information that belonged to Wolf, and his use of knowledge gained while on the board of directors of AFA in competition with Plaintiffs”); DS at ¶ 26; PS at ¶ 26 (undisputed that plaintiffs' sixth claim “is based on allegations of Misappropriation of Trade Secrets comprised of the registered works, client lists, and business strategies held by Plaintiffs at the time that Travolta left his association with AFA”); DS at ¶ 27; PS at ¶ 27 (undisputed that plaintiffs' seventh claim “is based on allegations of Conversion of physical property, intangible (intellectual) property and/or ideas allegedly belonging to Plaintiffs at the time that Travolta left his association with AFA”).

Although plaintiffs concede that the state law claims stem from Travolta's conduct in the wake of his 2006 resignation from AFA, plaintiffs nonetheless contend these claims are not time barred because Wolf did not know that Travolta “unlawfully took property belonging to AFA” until November 2012, in part due to defendants' purported fraudulent concealment. Opp'n at 15. Applying the delayed discovery rule, plaintiffs contend that although the conduct underlying their claims began in 2006, the statutes of limitation were not triggered until 2012, such that plaintiffs' assertion of these claims in 2014 permits recovery for damages as far back as 2006. In the alternative, plaintiffs appear to suggest albeit without any supporting authority that either the continuing violation doctrine or the related theory of continuous accrual apply and therefore preclude summary judgment. See Opp'n at 16. The Court addresses the merits of these arguments in the discussion that follows.

i. Allegations of State Law Claims in the Fourth Amended Complaint

Plaintiffs assert state law claims for misappropriation of trade secrets, conversion, interference with economic relationships, breach of fiduciary duty, and violation of the UCL. See generally FAC. Plaintiffs' misappropriation and conversion claims are closely related: plaintiffs' conversion claim alleges that “[u]pon his resignation from AFA [in 2006],” Travolta “intentionally and substantially interfered with Plaintiffs' property by taking possession of their assets and converting such assets to Defendants' own use and benefit.” FAC at ¶ 179. More specifically, defendants purportedly converted plaintiffs' “computer equipment, computer files[,] and the intellectual property contained [therein], confidential information, client lists, business strategies, and trade secrets, all of which constitute plaintiffs' assets.” Id. at ¶ 176. Similarly, plaintiffs' claim for misappropriation of trade secrets alleges that “upon his resignation [in 2006],” Travolta “took [plaintiffs' trade secrets] without permission,” including “copyrighted work[s], business strategies, and client lists.” Id. at ¶¶ 159, 162.

Plaintiffs' claim for interference with economic relationships alleges that Travolta interfered with Woll's existing and prospective economic relationships with regional centers. Id. at ¶ 126. In purportedly disrupting plaintiffs' economic relationships, Travolta is alleged to have “[w]rongfully used Dr. Wolf's confidential information
that [he] was provided in confidence” in or around 2006, including “program vendorization information, potential clients, California regional centers information, and editable draft of Dr. Wolf’s copyrighted work.” Id. Plaintiffs' breach of fiduciary duty claim alleges that “[a]s President and board member of AFA, Defendant Travolta had fiduciary duties to Dr. Wolf and AFA,” including, inter alia, duties of undivided loyalty, good faith, confidentiality, reasonable care, and a duty to refrain from using his position for his own benefit and to the detriment of AFA. Id. at ¶ 139. Plaintiffs thus allege that Travolta's use of plaintiffs' “copyrighted work, business strategies, and client lists” constitutes a breach of his fiduciary duties. Id. at ¶ 144. Finally, plaintiffs' UCL claim is premised upon defendants' “unfair, deceptive, and fraudulent” (1) misappropriation and misuse of plaintiffs' copyrighted works, (2) improper diversion of and interference with plaintiffs' business relationships, and *1102 (3) false and misleading representations about Wolf and her work. See, e.g., id. at ¶¶ 109, 110, 113.

ii. Applicability of the Discovery Rule

As with the foregoing analysis regarding accrual of copyright claims, an important exception under California law to the “general rule for defining the accrual of a cause of action indeed, the ‘most important’ [exception] is the discovery rule,” which “postpones accrual of a cause of action until the plaintiff discovers, or has reason to discover, the cause of action.” Norgart v. Upjohn Co., 21 Cal.4th 383, 397, 87 Cal.Rptr.2d 453, 981 P.2d 79 (1999) (citation omitted). The discovery rule does not require “absolute certainty” for a cause of action to accrue. See Fox v. Ethicon Endo Surgery, Inc., 35 Cal.4th 797, 807, 27 Cal.Rptr.3d 661, 110 P.3d 914 (2005). Rather, “suspicion of one or more of the elements of a cause of action, coupled with knowledge of any remaining elements, will generally trigger the statute of limitations period.” Id. In this context, “elements” refers not to the specific legal elements of the particular cause of action at bar, but rather to the “‘generic’ elements of [1] wrongdoing, [2] causation, and [3] harm.” Id. (quoting Norgart, 21 Cal.4th at 397, 87 Cal.Rptr.2d 453, 981 P.2d 79). Thus, the Court “do[es] not take a hypertechnical approach to the application of the discovery rule,” but rather “look[s] to whether the plaintiffs ha[d] reason to at least suspect that a type of wrongdoing ha[d] injured them.” Id. (emphasis added). Stated differently, “[o]nce the plaintiff has a suspicion of wrongdoing, and therefore an incentive to sue, she must decide whether to file suit or sit on her rights.” Jolly v. Eli Lilly & Co., 44 Cal.3d 1103, 1111, 245 Cal.Rptr. 658, 751 P.2d 923 (1988).
658, 751 P.2d 923 (emphasis added). Wolf's declaration specifically details her early suspicions or express notice regarding the wrongdoing and resulting harm giving rise to the operative complaint's various tort claims. Specifically, Wolf asserts that “in 2006, [she] first suspected that Defendant Travolta was interfering with ... contracts that were being sought after by Actors for Autism.” Wolf Decl. II ¶ 101 (emphasis added). “For example,” Wolf continues, Travolta “breached his fiduciary duties” before he resigned from Actors for Autism when he convinced a San Mateo-based center for autism spectrum disorders “to change the name on a two week film-making summer camp.” Id. at ¶ 102. Travolta also “interfered with [Wolf's] business relations again when Actors for Autism sought another ... contract with Oakland University.” Id. at ¶ 103. Before he left AFA's Board, Travolta had also charged and requested reimbursement from AFA for “unauthorized expenses, such as purchases from Sport Chalet, Costco, Party Corner, Lowe's, Jo-Ann Fabrics and Crafts, Michaels, and Gelson's.” Wolf Decl. II at ¶ 91. Accordingly, on or about July 11, 2006, Travolta was asked to resign as President of Actors for Autism “due to his indiscretions,” as the AFA Board “felt [at the time] that they could not discuss any prospective business contacts or programs, in fear that Defendant Travolta would steal them.” Wolf Decl. II at ¶ 90.

Furthermore, Wolf avers that during a December 4, 2006 Board meeting, she “thought it seemed clear that Defendant Travolta was using the program,” and accordingly “informed the [AFA] Board ... *1103 of [her] concerns about Defendant Travolta using [her] program without permission.” Wolf Decl. II ¶ 108. To the extent Wolf is now arguing that she did not suspect at the time that Travolta had actually retained any copies of her underlying works, any such assertion is belied by Wolf's own testimony. Specifically, Wolf asserts that when she learned that the Center was working with Travolta to develop a program “identical to [her own] proposed program,” she “suspected Defendant Travolta had merely changed the cover sheet to [her] program design” i.e., that he had retained a copy of her work and misrepresented it as his own. Wolf Decl. II at ¶ 99.

Wolf's letter of appeal to the Center, dated January 23, 2007, further reveals her suspicions regarding the conduct underlying her five state law claims:

When the [Actors For Autism] film program was submitted to you [i.e., the Center] and approved, Joey Travolta was the President of our organization and the liaison between Lanterman Regional Center and Actors for Autism. Mr. Travolta resigned as a board member in July 11th of 2006. As a result of his resignation he no longer represented the organization and any further conversations regarding this program should have ceased.

All documents that I submitted to you regarding the film program are copy written [sic] by me and registered with the U.S. State Department [sic].
California Non-Profit law is very specific stating that any and all concepts, programs and services which are developed under a public charity belong to the charity. Further, a board member may not take an idea, concept, program or service for personal gain.

Mr. Travolta broke his fiduciary duty when he continued to have conversations with Lanterman Regional Center about our program for his own personal gain.

Wolf Decl. II at ¶ 109.

As with plaintiff's copyright claims, discussed supra, the fact that Wolf's "independent investigation" purportedly produced no "direct or circumstantial evidence proving" Travolta's wrongdoing does not justify tolling of the relevant statutes of limitation. Wolf Decl. II at ¶ 111 (noting that plaintiff "thought there was no 'grounds' to pursue legal action at that time"). "A plaintiff need not be aware of the specific 'facts' necessary to establish the claim [in order for the claim to accrue]; that is a process contemplated by pretrial discovery. Once the plaintiff has a suspicion of wrongdoing, and therefore an incentive to sue, she must decide whether to file suit or sit on her rights." Jolly, 44 Cal.3d at 1110, 245 Cal.Rptr. 658, 751 P.2d 923. In the instant case, despite her suspicions and her own independent investigation, plaintiff chose to "sit on her rights" rather than act upon her "incentive to sue" in 2006 or 2007. See id.; c.f. Miller v. Bechtel Corp., 33 Cal.3d 868, 875, 191 Cal.Rptr. 619, 663 P.2d 177 (1983) ("Since plaintiff's representatives chose not to pursue their inquiry further despite their suspicions, [plaintiff] is charged with knowledge of facts which would have been revealed if she had pursued the investigation. ... [W]e cannot assume that such an inquiry would have been unavailing.").

Accordingly, the Court concludes that even under the discovery rule, all of plaintiffs' state law claims accrued no later than early 2007. Therefore, all of these claims would be time barred, unless plaintiffs can demonstrate the applicability of an alternative equitable ground for denying defendants' motion.

*1104 iii. Applicability of the Continuing Violation Doctrine and Continuous Accrual Theory

In addition to arguing applicability of the discovery rule, plaintiffs' opposition makes cursory reference to additional grounds for finding an equitable exception to the running of the statute of limitations. See Opp'n at 14-15 (noting the fact that "California courts have developed a handful of equitable exceptions to and modifications of the usual rules governing limitations periods"). The Court construes plaintiffs' reference to unspecified "equitable exceptions" as seeking to invoke either the continuing violation doctrine or the theory of continuous accrual. See FAC at ¶¶ 107 (UCL claim), 124 (interference with economic relationships claim), 138 (breach of fiduciary duty claim) (alleging that defendants' "continuous acts and omissions
constitute a ‘continuous course of conduct’ and, under the ‘accrual theory,’ each of Defendant[s’] acts and omissions constitutes a separate, recurring invasion of Plaintiffs' rights which, thereby, triggers a separate and distinct statute of limitations period”).

The continuing violation doctrine “aggregates a series of wrongs or injuries for purposes of the statute of limitations, treating the limitations period as accruing for all of them upon commission or sufferance of the last of them.” Arvey v. Canon Bus. Solutions, Inc., 55 Cal.4th 1185, 1192, 151 Cal.Rptr.3d 827, 292 P.3d 871 (2013) (citation omitted). As the California Supreme Court recently explained,

Some injuries are the product of a series of small harms, any one of which may not be actionable on its own. Those injured in such a fashion should not be handicapped by the inability to identify with certainty when harm has occurred or has risen to a level sufficient to warrant action ... Allegations of a pattern of reasonably frequent and similar acts may, in a given case, justify treating the acts as an indivisible course of conduct actionable in its entirety, notwithstanding that the conduct occurred partially outside and partially inside the limitations period.

Id. at 1198, 151 Cal.Rptr.3d 827, 292 P.3d 871. However, the continuing violation doctrine has little applicability where, as here, plaintiffs allege “a series of discrete, independently actionable alleged wrongs,” such that it is not necessary for a series of harms to accumulate before the alleged wrongdoing becomes apparent and actionable. Id.

Under the related but distinct theory of continuous accrual, “a series of wrongs or injuries may be viewed as each triggering its own limitations period, such that a suit for relief may be partially time-barred as to older events” like those occurring in 2006 or 2007 “but timely as to those within the applicable limitations period.” Id. at 1192, 151 Cal.Rptr.3d 827, 292 P.3d 871. Thus, “unlike the continuing violation doctrine, which renders an entire course of conduct actionable, the theory of continuous accrual supports recovery only for damages arising from those breaches falling within the limitations period.” Id. at 1199, 151 Cal.Rptr.3d 827, 292 P.3d 871. Generally speaking, “continuous accrual applies whenever there is a continuing or recurring obligation: ‘When an obligation or liability arises on a recurring basis, a cause of action accrues each time a wrongful act occurs, triggering a new limitations period.’ ” Id. (citation omitted) (emphasis added). Because each new breach of such an obligation “provides all the elements of a claim wrongdoing, harm,
and causation each may be treated as an independently actionable wrong with its own time limit for recovery.” Id. (citation omitted). Accordingly, “California courts have held that disputes regarding monthly billing *1105 and payments qualify for continuous accrual, with each month triggering a new limitations period.” Ryan v. Microsoft Corp., 147 F.Supp.3d 868, 895, 2015 WL 7429495, at *21 (N.D.Cal. Nov. 23, 2015) (Koh, J.) (citing Arveh, 55 Cal.4th at 1200, 151 Cal.Rptr.3d 827, 292 P.3d 871 (defendant's “duty not to impose unfair charges in monthly bills” was “a continuing one”); Tsemisin v. Coast Fed'l Sav. & Loan Ass'n, 57 Cal.App.4th 1334, 1344, 67 Cal.Rptr.2d 726 (1997) (periodic monthly rent payments owed were a recurring obligation); Armstrong Petroleum Corp. v. Tri-Valley Oil & Gas Co., 116 Cal.App.4th 1375, 1388 89, 11 Cal.Rptr.3d 412 (2004) (monthly payments on a gas and oil lease created a recurring obligation)).

Thus, for continuous accrual to apply to a particular claim here, defendants' wrongful conduct within the relevant limitation period must have violated a particular “continuing or recurring obligation” to plaintiffs, such that a more recent breach of that obligation “may be treated as an independently actionable wrong with its own time limit for recovery.” Arveh, 55 Cal.4th at 1199, 151 Cal.Rptr.3d 827, 292 P.3d 871 (citations omitted). With these principles in mind, the Court turns to the potential applicability of the continuous accrual theory to each of plaintiffs' state law claims for relief.

a. Continuous Accrual and Misappropriation of Trade Secrets

The theory of continuous accrual in inapplicable to plaintiffs' claims for misappropriation of trade secrets. Under section 3426.6 of the California Civil Code, an action for misappropriation “must be brought within three years after the misappropriation is discovered or by the exercise of reasonable diligence should have been discovered” more importantly, “a continuing misappropriation constitutes a single claim.” Cal. Civ. Code § 3426.6. Interpreting this provision, the California Supreme Court has held that “the continued improper use or disclosure of a trade secret after defendant's initial misappropriation is viewed ... as part of a single claim of ‘continuing misappropriation' accruing at the time of the initial misappropriation.” Cadence Design Sys., Inc. v. AvantA Corp., 29 Cal.4th 215, 218, 127 Cal.Rptr.2d 169, 57 P.3d 647 (2002) (emphasis added). Therefore, because the Court has concluded that plaintiff's claim for misappropriation of trade secrets accrued in 2007 at the latest, the theory of continuous accrual does not aid plaintiffs' effort to assert this claim as to conduct in the three years preceding September 29, 2014.

b. Continuous Accrual and Conversion

With respect to plaintiffs' claim for conversion, the operative complaint alleges that “[u]pon his resignation from AFA [in 2006],” Travolta “intentionally and
substantially interfered with Plaintiffs' property by taking possession of their assets and converting such assets to Defendants' own use and benefit.” FAC at ¶ 179. Under California Code of Civil procedure 338(c), “which applies to the conversion of personal property, there is a three-year limitations period for ‘action[s] for taking, detaining, or injuring any goods or chattels.’” AmerUS Life Ins. Co. v. Bank of Am., N.A., 143 Cal.App.4th 631, 639, 49 Cal.Rptr.3d 493 (2006). Furthermore, as with plaintiffs' misappropriation claim, the “‘statute of limitations for conversion is triggered by the act of wrongfully taking property.’” Id. (quoting Bono v. Clark, 103 Cal.App.4th 1409, 1433, 128 Cal.Rptr.2d 31 (2002)). Accordingly, the rationale underlying the continuing violation doctrine is inapplicable to a claim that is “triggered by the act of wrongfully taking property.”

*1106 c. Continuous Accrual and Interference with Economic Relationships

Plaintiffs' claim for interference with economic relationships is subject to a two-year statute of limitations. Augusta v. United Serv. Auto. Assn., 13 Cal.App.4th 4, 10, 16 Cal.Rptr.2d 400 (1993) (citing Cal. Code Civ. P. § 339). To the extent plaintiffs allege in their complaint that the continuous accrual theory applies to this claim, the Court is unaware of any authority applying this equitable doctrine (under California law) to tortious interference claims; indeed, some courts in this circuit have noted the dearth of any such authority. See DC Comics v. Pac. Pictures Corp., 938 F.Supp.2d 941, 949 (C.D.Cal.2013), appeal docketed, No. 14 56926 (9th Cir. Dec. 10, 2014) (noting that the court was unaware of any cases “directly applying either of California's continuing-wrong principles to tortious-interference claims”); Nano Second Tech. Co. v. Dynaflex Int'l, No. CV 10 9176 RSWL MANX, 2013 WL 1855828, at *3 (C.D.Cal. May 1, 2013) (finding that “the theory of continuous accrual does not toll the statute of limitations for tortious interference claims, and should not be invoked in this Action”); Boon Rawd Trading Int'l v. Paleewong Trading Co., Inc., 688 F.Supp.2d 940, 952 (N.D.Cal.2010) (noting that “based upon an examination of California decisions that have applied the ‘continuing tort’ doctrine, none have extended the doctrine to the tort of intentional interference with prospective economic advantage”).

Furthermore, plaintiffs' operative complaint contains only vague allegations of “continuous” interference with economic relationships, failing to specifically allege that defendants have interfered with any particular economic relationships in the two years preceding plaintiffs' assertion of this claim. See, e.g., FAC at ¶¶ 127 (“Defendants continue to interfere with Dr. Wolf's economic relationships by continuing to exploit her intellectual property ... without her permission.”), 131 (“Travolta, through his instruction, manipulation, and/or undue influence of others, has engaged in a continuous court of conduct of interfering with Dr. Wolf's existing and prospective business relations.”). Plaintiffs have also failed in their separate statement to point
to any genuine dispute of material fact regarding any alleged interference with economic relationships in recent years. See generally PS. Accordingly, on the record before the Court, the theory of continuous accrual does not appear to apply to this claim.

**d. Continuous Accrual and Breach of Fiduciary Duty**

Plaintiffs' breach of fiduciary duty claim alleges that “[a]s President and board member of AFA, Defendant Travolta had fiduciary duties to Dr. Wolf and AFA,” including, *inter alia*, duties of undivided loyalty, good faith, confidentiality, reasonable care, and a duty to refrain from using his position for his own benefit and to the detriment of AFA. FAC at ¶ 139. Plaintiffs thus allege that Travolta's use of plaintiffs' “copyrighted work, business strategies, and client lists” constitutes a breach of the aforementioned fiduciary duties. FAC at ¶ 144. “The statute of limitations for breach of fiduciary duty is three years or four years, depending on whether the breach is fraudulent or non-fraudulent.” *American Master Lease LLC v. Idanta Partners, Ltd.*, 225 Cal.App.4th 1451, 1479, 171 Cal.Rptr.3d 548 (2014). In certain contexts, courts have applied California's continuous accrual theory to breach of fiduciary duty claims. See, e.g., *Yamauchi v. Cotterman*, 84 F.Supp.3d 993, 1015 (N.D.Cal.2015) (Chen, J.) (granting motion to dismiss breach of fiduciary claim because “on the face of the Amended Complaint, [plaintiff] has not alleged any timely breaches of fiduciary duty against the [defendants], *even applying a theory of continuous accrual*”); *POGA MGMT PTNRS LLC v. Medfiler LLC*, No. C 12 06087 SBA, 2014 WL 3963854, at *10 *11 (N.D.Cal. Aug. 12, 2014) (denying motion to dismiss plaintiffs' breach of fiduciary claim because theory of continuous accrual applied).

Here, however, as with their interference with economic relationships claim, plaintiffs' operative complaint provides only conclusory allegations of a continuous breach of fiduciary duties without reference to any specific breaches that fall within three or four years of the assertion of this claim. See, e.g., FAC at ¶ 149 (“Travolta's fiduciary duties owed to Dr. Wolf continue regarding the information he held in confidence [while he was President of AFA], specifically the curricula to which he had access by virtue of his former position with Actors for Autism ... [and] each act of using Dr. Wolf's work without her permission is a new and independent injury”); see also id. at ¶ 150. Nor have plaintiffs pointed the Court to any evidence in an affidavit, deposition, or elsewhere that would create a triable issue of fact as to whether any such breaches of fiduciary duty occurred in recent years. See *Lujan*, 497 U.S. at 888 89, 110 S.Ct. 3177 (“The purpose of Rule 56 is to enable a party who believes there is no genuine dispute as to a specific fact essential to the other side's case to demand at least one sworn averment of that fact before the lengthy process of litigation continues.”); cf. *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 249, 106 S.Ct. 2505, 91 L.Ed.2d 202 (1986) (“[T]he plaintiff could not rest
on his allegations of a conspiracy to get to a jury without ‘any significant probative evidence tending to support the complaint’”) (citation omitted).

**e. Continuous Accrual and the UCL**

Plaintiffs' UCL claim is governed by the four-year statute of limitations set forth in section 17208. Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17208 (“Any action to enforce any cause of action pursuant to this chapter shall be commenced within four years after the cause of action accrued.”). In Arvey, the California Supreme Court clarified that the UCL “is governed by common law accrual rules to the same extent as any other statute,” such that “‘the nature of the right sued upon’ and the circumstances attending its invocation control the point of accrual.” Arvey, 55 Cal.4th at 1196, 151 Cal.Rptr.3d 827, 292 P.3d 871 (citation omitted). Accordingly, the court in Arvey applied the continuous accrual doctrine to plaintiffs' UCL claim. Id. at 1201, 151 Cal.Rptr.3d 827, 292 P.3d 871 (explaining that if certain conduct is “actionable as an unfair business practice under the UCL,” then each monthly recurrence of such conduct “would constitute a new unfair act with its own attendant limitations period”). Thus, application of the continuous accrual theory in the instant action would “permit [Wolf] to sue [under the UCL], but only for those discrete acts occurring within the [four] years immediately preceding the filing of [their] [UCL claim on September 29, 2014].” Id. at 1199-1200, 151 Cal.Rptr.3d 827, 292 P.3d 871.

As explained supra, the UCL claim in the instant action is premised upon defendants' “unfair, deceptive, and fraudulent” (1) misappropriation and misuse of plaintiffs' copyrighted works, (2) improper diversion of and interference with plaintiffs' business relationships, and (3) false and misleading representations about Wolf and her work. See, e.g., FAC at ¶¶ 109, 110, 113. Plaintiffs have failed sufficiently to allege that any such acts occurred in the four years preceding plaintiffs' September 29, 2014 assertion of the UCL claim. Accordingly, reliance upon the continuous accrual theory is, based upon the current record and briefing, unavailing.

**1108 iv. Conclusion**

Thus, in accordance with the foregoing, all of plaintiffs' state law claims are time barred, as plaintiffs were on sufficient notice of these claims in early 2007, and plaintiffs cannot, based upon the current record, avail themselves of either the discovery rule or the theory of continuous accrual.

**V. CONCLUSION**

In accordance with the foregoing, defendants' motion for summary judgment is hereby DENIED in part and GRANTED in part.

Specifically, defendants' motion is DENIED insofar as it seeks to invalidate plaintiffs' two underlying copyrights. The motion is
GRANTED insofar as (1) it argues that all of plaintiffs' state law claims are time-barred, and (2) it seeks to bar damages from copyright infringement beyond the three years preceding plaintiffs' assertion of the two copyright claims in this suit. In addition, having given the parties notice and a reasonable time to respond pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56(f)(3), the Court hereby GRANTS summary judgment in favor of defendants as to the entirety of plaintiffs' two copyright claims.

As a reminder, plaintiffs' claims were first asserted in this action on the following dates: February 6, 2014 (first claim for copyright infringement of the May 2006 Work); September 29, 2014 (five state law claims); and August 5, 2015 (second claim for copyright infringement of the September 2006 Work).

IT IS SO ORDERED.
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