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| **Design Team Name** | Assessment of the Level of Consensus within the ccTLD Community in Regard to a Possible Appeal Mechanism for ccTLD Delegations and Redelegations  |
| **Draft Transition Proposal Reference** | 3.4.3.3 – Independent Appeals Panel  |
| **Summary Description** | The focus of the Design Team will be assess the level of consensus within the ccTLD Community in regard to a possible appeal mechanism on ccTLD Delegations and Redelegations.  |
| **Detailed description** | On January 30th CWG RFP3 reviewed a detailed document (available [here](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=52232278)) summarizing the status of the IAP proposal and information flowing from the survey. During the RFP3 discussion, it was noted that the IAP is in response to a request from ccTLDs. RFP3 concluded with the following ‘Request/Action:” “ccTLD members and participants in CWG to come up with a consistent proposal on IAP” (see <https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=52232278>Later that day, January 30, the CCWG of Accountability sent a [letter](https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocwgdtstwrdshp/Letter%2Bfrom%2BCCWG-Accountability%2B--%2B30%2BJanuary) to the CWG indicating that it has begun to elaborate is own work and that it will include consideration of binding redress mechanisms. It has subsequently established an ‘Appeals and Redress’ work stream. In their January 30th letter, the CCWG also said that it has no intention to give an accountability mechanism decision-making powers relating to the (re)delegation of ccTLDs. The survey that the CWG undertook in January indicated that at a high level, there appeared to be a consensus on the desirability for such a mechanism, but when issues such as who should have standing to appeal, e.g. managers, governments etc. the level of consensus was considerably reduced. In light of this, it is proposed that a Design Team assess, likely by means of a survey, whether there is any reasonable level of consensus in the ccTLD community for a ccTLD delegation and redelegation appeal mechanism and whether there might be design attributes that might lead to an acceptable level of consensus.  |
| **Proposed Membership** | It is proposed that the Design team be made up of two to three ccTLD representatives and one or two GAC representatives. The DT will investigate the potential to include an expert that may have been identified to work with the CCWG on Accountability.  |
| **Proposed by / Lead** | Allan MacGillivray, CIRA - .ca, supported by Maarten Simon SIDN - .nl |