

# At-Large's Subsequent Procedures Scorecard: Conflict of Interest

## CPWG SubPro Small Team

Post At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group (CPWG) Call  
On Wednesday, 2 September 2020, 20:00 UTC



## FOUNDATIONAL ISSUES

Topic/Area:	<b>[8] CONFLICTS OF INTEREST</b>		Priority:	<b>HIGH</b>	Settled On:	3.09.2020
Related:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All reviews, evaluations and objections.</li> </ul>					
Key Issues:	Anyone charged with making an evaluation and determination must be free of conflicts of interest. Independent Objectors and ICANN Board included.					
Policy Goals:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To have policy and process in place to ensure that all dispute resolution service provider panelists, Independent Objectors, and application evaluators etc are free from conflicts of interest.</li> </ul>					
Assigned CCT-RT Rec's:	None.					
References:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">06. Limited Challenge/Appeal Mechanism – CPWG Consensus building, 25 August 2020</a></li> <li>Sub_Pro Draft Final Report, 20 August 2020</li> </ul>					
What has SubPro PDP WG concluded?	<b><u>What is SubPro PDP WG recommending?</u></b>			Is this acceptable? If not, why so? What else needs to be done and by/with whom?		
1. Process is required	<u>Recommendation 8.1:</u> ICANN must develop a transparent process to ensure that dispute resolution service provider panelists, Independent Objectors, and application evaluators are free from conflicts of interest. This process must serve as a supplement to existing Code of Conduct Guidelines for Panelists, Conflict of Interest Guidelines for Panelists, and ICANN Board Conflicts of Interest Policy.			Yes, acceptable.		
	<u>Under Annex F:</u> Arbiter of an appeal re: Conflict of Interest of Panelists is to be determined by the IRT.			No comment.		
Main Positions of Concern:	None.					