



New gTLD Subsequent Procedures

Work Track 3 | 20 JUNE 2017 | 15:00 UTC

Agenda

1

Welcome & Review/Revise Agenda

2

SOIs & Plenary Updates

3

Revised Independent Review Process (IRP)

4

Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process (PICDRP) 5

ICANN 59 F2F Discussion Topics 6

AOB
Next Meeting



New gTLD Accountability Mechanisms

CHARTER

Accountability Mechanisms: Examine whether dispute resolution and challenge processes provide adequate redress options or if additional redress options specific to the program are needed.

- 1. Independent Review Process (IRP)
 Basis is ICANN Bylaws section 4.3
- 2. Public Interest Dispute Resolution Procedure (PICDRP)
 Registry non-compliance with PICs in its Registry Agreement
- 3. Registry Restrictions Dispute Resolution Procedure (RRDRP)
 Established communities being harmed by Registry non-compliance with registration restrictions
- 4. Trademark Post Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedure (TM-PDDRP)*

 Trademark owner being harmed by Registry manner of use/operation of gTLD

 * Per agreement of GNSO & PDP Leadership, TM-PDDRP is being considered by the RPMs Review PDP



Revised ICANN IRP

David McAuley
On behalf of IRP
Implementation Oversight
Team



IRP

- New IRP:
 - Bylaw Section 4.3
 - Came into effect Oct 1st, 2016:
- Agenda:
 - Purpose
 - Main Pillars
 - Miscellaneous

IRP (Purpose)

- Purpose of IRP (Section 4.3(a)):
 - Ensure: (a) against exceeding mission; (b) compliance with Articles/Bylaws;
 - Empower community/claimants to enforce compliance with Articles/Bylaws;
 - Ensure ICANN accountability;
 - Address claims ICANN failed to enforce IANA Naming Functions contract;
 - Provide vehicle for direct IANA customers to seek resolution of PTI service complaints that are not resolved through mediation;
 - Reduce disputes by creating precedent in connection with policy development and implementation; ...

IRP (Purpose) (con't)

- Purpose of IRP (Section 4.3(a)):
 - Accessible, transparent, efficient, consistent, and just resolution of disputes;
 - Lead to binding, final resolutions consistent with international arbitration norms that are enforceable in proper courts;
 - Provide a vehicle for resolving disputes as an alternative to civil litigation.

IRP (Main Pillars)

- Three main pillars of new IRP:
 - New Standard of Review
 - Standing Panel
 - Updated 'Supplementary' Rules of Procedure

- New standard of review (Scope) of IRP (Section 4.3(b))
 - To address claims that ICANN (Board, individual directors, officers or staff) acted/failed-to-act in manner that violated Articles/Bylaws, including:
 - Exceeded scope of mission;
 - Resulted from response to advice or input from any AC or SO that are claimed to be inconsistent with Articles or Bylaws;
 - Resulted from decisions of process-specific expert panels that are claimed to be inconsistent with Articles or Bylaws;

- New standard of review ...
 - To address claims that ICANN ... violated Articles/Bylaws, by (among other things):
 - Resulted from a response to a DIDP request that is claimed to be inconsistent with Articles or Bylaws;
 - Arose from claims involving rights of the EC as set forth in Articles or Bylaws;
 - Claims of non-enforcement of ICANN's contractual rights with respect to the IANA Naming Function Contract; and
 - Claims regarding PTI service complaints by direct customers of the IANA naming functions that are not resolved through mediation.

- Excluded from Scope of IRP:
 - EC challenges to the result(s) of a PDP, unless the SO(s) that approved the PDP supports the EC challenge;
 - Claims relating to ccTLD delegations and re-delegations;
 - Claims relating to Internet numbering resources, and
 - Claims relating to protocol parameters.

Nature of Review – "objective, de novo" (Section 4.3(i))

- Standing Panel (Section 4.3(j))
 - At least seven members (ICANN to provide DNS training);
 - Secretariat/admin support to be provided (ICANN SOs/ACs IOT to coordinate selection);
 - Expression of Interest doc for panelist application (ICANN);
 - Seeking/vetting applications (ICANN SOs/ACs);
 - Panel nominations by SOs/ACs confirmation by Board (not to be unreasonably withheld);

- Standing Panel ...
 - Panelists serve five-year term (recall only for specific reasons like fraud/corruption – IOT to develop recall process);
 - Panelists must be independent of ICANN and SOs/ACs (Section 4.3(q));
 - Individual cases to be heard by three-member panel selected from standing panel (Section 4.3(k));
 - Appeals to full standing panel possible (Section 4.3(w));
 - Resolution within six months is target (Section 4.3(s));
 - Enforcement in court envisioned if needed (Section 4.3(x)).

- Rules of Procedure (Section 4.3(n)):
 - First draft of <u>updated rules</u>;
 - Review of <u>public comments</u> underway, making progress, including discussions on these rules, among others (<u>note</u> discussions not yet final):
 - Time within which a claim must be filed;
 - Retroactivity of (1) standard, and (2) rules;
 - Joinder of interested parties; and
 - Challenges to consensus policies.

Miscellaneous

- Note the Cooperative Engagement Process (CEP Process -Section 4.3(e)) an informal attempt to resolve the dispute (non-mandatory but potential consequences for failure to engage).
- Also note conciliation efforts to narrow issues under review (Section 4.3(h)) (non-mandatory).
- IRP IOT status to be addressed.
- Access consideration Section 4.3(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.

PICDRP Procedural Observations

Kiran Malancharuvil
Policy Counselor, MarkMonitor



ICANN 59 Johannesburg F2F

Work Track 3: How GAC Advice & GAC Early Warnings impact freedom of expression and the application process.



PDP F2F
Tuesday, June 27th 8:30am

Geo-Names Session 1 Monday, June 27th 5:00pm

Geo-Names Session 2 Thursday, June 29th 3:00 pm

