

## 4) Appeals Mechanisms

### 4.1 Independent Review Process Enhancement

#### INTRODUCTION

- 01 The consultation process undertaken by ICANN produced numerous comments calling for overhaul and reform of ICANN's existing Independent Review Process (IRP). Commenters called for ICANN to be held to a *substantive standard of behavior* rather than just an evaluation of whether or not its action was taken in good faith. Commenters called for a process that was *binding* rather than merely advisory. Commenters also strongly urged that the IRP be *accessible*, both financially and from a standing perspective, transparent, *efficient*, and that it be designed to produce *consistent and coherent results* that will serve as a guide for future actions.

#### COMMENTS FROM PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Commenters expressed support for the general idea of strengthening ICANN's Independent Review process; none expressed a contrary view. The Board declined to comment, on the grounds that it could not respond to the IRP proposal without more detail. Regarding the overall structure of the IRP, two commenters urged that it "has to remain an internal mechanism within ICANN," i.e., that it not be designed as a "traditional court of international arbitration" or "international commercial arbitration panel." We have attached a detailed summary of comments as Appendix I.1 and revised the text from the Initial Draft Report (4 May 2015) based on community input and further discussions.

- 02 The process described below calls for a standing, independent panel of skilled jurists/arbitrators who are retained by ICANN and can be called upon over time and across issues to resolve disputes regarding whether ICANN is staying within its limited technical Mission, ~~whether it is abiding by policies adopted by the multistakeholder community, and whether in carrying out its Mission and applying consensus policies it is and~~ acting in accordance with ICANN's Articles of Incorporation and/or Bylaws, including commitments spelled out in the proposed *Statement of Mission, Commitments & Core Values*, or ICANN policies. ~~(See, *Statement of Mission, Commitments, and Core Values.*)~~

- 03 The proposal calls for a fully *independent* judicial/arbitral function. The purpose of a standing panel is to ensure that panelists are not beholden to ICANN or any of its constituent bodies – but a core skill of this IRP's panelists is the need to build a thorough and detailed understanding of how ICANN's Mission is implemented, and its commitments and values applied – over time and across a variety of situations.

- 04 0304 The proposal does not establish a new international court or a new body of international law: it is not a Treaty function, and is internal to ICANN. It implements the body of rules for ICANN established by the ICANN multistakeholder community. Those rules remain under the control of the ICANN multistakeholder community, so this IRP remains a mechanism the community is using to ensure that its policies and processes are

Style Definition: Heading 2: Font: Avenir Book, 14 pt

Formatted: Font: 14 pt

Formatted: Font: 14 pt, English (United States)

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25", First line: 0"

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: List Paragraph, No bullets or numbering

followed, and does not become a means to replace or subordinate the multistakeholder community to some other entity.

05. Implementation of these enhancements will necessarily require additional, detailed work. Detailed rules for the implementation of the IRP (such as rules of procedure) are to be created by the ICANN community through a CCWG (assisted by counsel, appropriate experts, and the Standing Panel when confirmed), and approved by the Board, such approval not to be unreasonably withheld. They may be updated in the light of further experience by the same process, if required. In addition, to ensure that the IRP functions as intended, we propose to subject the IRP to periodic community review.

1. **Purpose of the IRP:** The overall purpose is to ensure that ICANN does not exceed the scope of its limited technical Mission and, ~~in carrying out that Mission, acts in a manner that respects community-agreed fundamental rights, freedoms, and values~~ complies with its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws.
  - a. Empower the community and affected individuals/entities to prevent "mission creep," enforce compliance with ~~established multistakeholder policies, provide redress for due process violations, and protect the multistakeholder process~~ the Articles and Bylaws through meaningful, affordable, ~~accessible to~~ expert review of ICANN actions.
  - b. Ensure that ICANN is accountable to the community and individuals/entities for actions outside its Mission or that violate ~~community-approved standards of behavior, including violations of established ICANN policies~~ its Articles or Bylaws.
  - c. Reduce disputes going forward by creating precedent to guide and inform ICANN Board, staff, SOs/ACs, and the community in connection with policy development and implementation.

2. **Role of the IRP:** The role of the Independent Review Process (IRP) will be to:
  - Hear and resolve claims that ICANN through its Board of Directors or staff has acted (or has failed to act) in violation of its Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws (including any violation of the Bylaws resulting from action taken in response to advice/input from any advisory committee or supporting organization);
  - Reconcile conflicting decisions of process-specific "expert panels"; and
  - Hear and resolve claims involving rights of the Sole Member under the Articles or Bylaws (subject to voting thresholds)

- ~~2-3.~~ **A Standing Panel:** The IRP should have a standing judicial/arbitral panel tasked with reviewing and acting on complaints brought by individuals, entities, and/or the community who have been materially harmed by ICANN's action or

**Formatted:** No bullets or numbering

**Formatted:** Normal, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 01, 02, 03, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0" + Indent at: 0.25"

**Formatted:** Font: Avenir Book

**Formatted:** Font: Avenir Book

**Commented [GS1]:** I assume this is what was meant. The unrevised language did not make any sense to me.

**Formatted:** Font: Avenir Book

**Formatted:** Font: Avenir Book, Bold

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.63", Hanging: 0.38", Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 1" + Indent at: 1.42"

**Formatted:** Font: Avenir Book

**Formatted:** Font: Avenir Book, Not Bold

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 1", No bullets or numbering

**Formatted:** Font: Avenir Book

inaction in violation of ~~commitments made in ICANN's~~the Articles of

~~3-4.~~ **Initiation of an IRP:** An aggrieved party would trigger the IRP by filing a complaint alleging that a specified action or inaction is in violation of ICANN's Articles of Incorporation and/or Bylaws, including commitments spelled out in the proposed *Statement of Mission, Commitments & Core Values*, or ICANN policies. Matters specifically reserved to any "Members" of ICANN in the Articles or Bylaws would ~~be excluded from IRP~~also be subject to IRP review. ~~Likewise, the IRP could also not address matters that are so material to the Board that it would undermine its statutory obligations and fiduciary roles to allow the IRP to bind the Board.~~

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

~~4-5.~~ **Possible Outcomes of the IRP:** ~~An IRP will result in a declaration~~Decision that an action/failure to act ~~complied or did not comply with in violation of~~ICANN's Articles of Incorporation and/or Bylaws, ~~including commitments spelled out in the proposed Statement of Mission, Commitments & Core Values or ICANN policies.~~ ~~The intent is that~~To the extent permitted by law, IRP decisions should be binding on ICANN.

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book, Italic

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book, Italic

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Commented [MSAH2]: Previous language that is no longer consistent with our recommendation on Decision

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Commented [GS3]: It's incorrect at this point to say there's an "absence of appeal"

a. Decisions of ~~a three-member subpanel~~decisional panel will be ~~appealable to the full IRP Panel sitting en banc, based on a clear error of judgment or the application of an incorrect legal standard.~~ The standard may be revised or supplemented via the IRP Sub Group process. ~~are not subject to appeal (except for review of very limited issues such whether the outcome exceeded the permissible scope of the arbitration or was procured by fraud or corruption.~~ However, ~~the panel may not direct the Board or ICANN on how to amend specific decisions, it shall only be able to make decisions that confirm a decision by ICANN, or cancel a decision, totally or in parts.~~

b. This balance between ~~the absence of limited right to~~appeal and the limitation to the type of decision made is intended to mitigate the potential effect that one key decision of the panel might have on several third parties, and to avoid ~~that the panel's an outcome that would force overcomes the Board in to violate its fiduciary duties.~~

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Commented [GS4]: There was a missing word. This is my best guess what it should have been.

c. ~~The limited right to appeal is further balanced by the community powers, relevant policy development process, and advice from ACs, each as set forth in the Bylaws.~~

Formatted: Font: (Default) Avenir Book

~~b-d~~ IRP panelists will consider and may rely on prior decisions of other IRPs addressing similar ~~circumstances~~

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Commented [GS5]: One does not "complain" to a process.

~~5-6.~~ **Standing:** Any person/group/entity "materially affected" by an ICANN action or inaction in violation of ICANN's Articles of Incorporation and/or Bylaws, including commitments spelled out in the proposed *Statement of Mission, Commitments & Core Values* or ICANN policies ~~shall have the right to complain to file a complaint under the IRP and seek redress. They must do so within 30 [number of days to be determined by IRP Sub Group] days of becoming aware~~

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

of the alleged violation and how it allegedly affects them. The Sole Member has standing to bring claims involving its rights under the Articles and Bylaws. Issues relating to joinder and intervention will be determined by the IRP Sub Group, assisted by experts and the initial Standing Panel, based on consultation with the community.

- a. Interim (prospective, interlocutory, injunctive, status quo preservation) relief will be available in advance of Board/management/staff action where a complainant can demonstrate:

- ~~b.i.~~ Harm that cannot be cured once a decision has been taken or for which there is no adequate remedy once a decision has been taken;

- ~~b.ii.~~ Either (a) a likelihood of success on the merits or (b) sufficiently serious questions going to the merits; and

- ~~b.iii.~~ A balance of hardships tipping decidedly toward the party seeking the relief.

~~6-7.~~ The CCWG-Accountability recommends giving the community, as described in Section 5.1, the right to have standing with the IRP. In such ~~a case~~ cases, the burden of the legal fees would be on ICANN will bear the full cost of the proceeding. The precise process for such a case is still under development. In general, ICANN will bear the costs associated with the Standing Panel, although the IRP Sub Group may recommend filing or other fees to the extent necessary to prevent abuse of the process.

~~7-8.~~ In their letter dated 15 April 2015, the CWG-Stewardship-Stewardship indicated ~~“As such”~~ any appeal mechanism developed by the CCWG-Accountability should not cover ccTLD delegation/re-delegation issues as these are expected to be developed by the ccTLD community through the appropriate processes”. As requested by the CWG-Stewardship, decisions regarding ccTLD delegations or revocations would be excluded from standing, until relevant appeal mechanisms have been developed by the ccTLD community, in coordination with other parties.

~~8-9.~~ In case of including the global number resources policy in its scope, further considerations should be made of its implications. The bottom up policy development process and its forum for the number resources is outside the ICANN, even though the ICANN Board approves its global policies, and the same mechanisms as the names related policies may not be applicable. The related to Internet number resources should be out of scope for the IRP. As requested by the ASO, decisions regarding numbering resources would be excluded from standing, unless and until relevant appeal mechanisms have been developed by the ASP, in coordination with other parties.

Formatted

**Commented [GS6]:** The “As such” does not refer to anything in this context and should be deleted to avoid confusion.

**Formatted:** Font: Avenir Book

9-10. **Standard of Review:** ~~The IRP Panel, with respect to a particular IRP, shall decide the issue(s) presented based on their own independent interpretation of the ICANN Articles and Bylaws in the context of applicable governing law. A party challenging an action or inaction would have the burden to demonstrate that~~ The standard of review shall be an a de novo and objective examination as to whether the complained-of action exceeds the scope of ICANN's Mission and/or violates either (a) substantive limitations on the permissible scope of ICANN's actions, or (b) decision-making procedures, in each case as set forth in ICANN's Bylaws, Articles of Incorporation, or Statement of Mission, Commitments, and Core Values or ICANN policies Articles and Bylaws.

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Commented [MSAH7]: WP2 said that this should be de novo and objective, which is the same standard applied in the .africa IRP case

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

10-11. **Composition of Panel; Expertise:** Significant legal expertise, particularly international ~~arbitration expertise~~ law, corporate governance, and judicial systems/dispute resolution/arbitration. ~~Panelists should also possess and~~ expertise, developed over time, about the DNS and ICANN's policies, practices, and procedures. At a minimum, ~~Panelists~~ panelists should receive training on the workings and management of the domain name system. Panelists must have access to skilled technical experts upon request. In addition to legal expertise and a strong understanding of the DNS, panelists may confront issues where highly technical, civil society, business, diplomatic, and regulatory skills are needed. To the extent that individual panelists have one or more of these areas of expertise, the process must ensure that this expertise is available upon request.

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

~~While most of the working group was comfortable with this formulation, some participants prefer to require that the panelists themselves possess the requisite skill sets—of course, individual panelists need not possess every kind of expertise, rather, they suggest that taken together the panel should possess the requisite skills.~~

11-12. **Diversity: Geographic diversity.** English as primary working language with provision of translation services for claimants as needed. Reasonable efforts will be taken to achieve cultural, linguistic, gender, and legal tradition diversity, with an aspirational cap on number of panelists from any single region (based on the number of members of the Standing Panel as a whole). ~~The Standing Panel members should have diversity in geographic and cultural representation. Diversity of experience will be considered in completing the composition of the Panel. Reasonable efforts should be undertaken to achieve~~

12-13. **Size of Panel**

- a. Standing Panel – a minimum of 7 Panelists
- b. Decisional Panel – ~~1 or~~ 3 Panelists

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

~~13.~~14. **Independence:** Members must be independent of ICANN, including SOs and ACs. Members should be compensated at a rate that cannot decline during their fixed term; no removal except for specified cause (corruption, misuse of position for personal use, etc.) To ensure independence, term limits should apply (5 years, no renewal), and post-term appointment to Board, NomCom, or other positions within ICANN would be prohibited for a specified time period. Panelists will have an ongoing obligation to disclose any material relationship with ICANN, SOs/ACs, or any other party in an IRP.

14. **Selection and Appointment:** The selection of panelists would follow a ~~43~~-step process:

b. ICANN will then issue a call for expressions of interest from potential panelists; work with the community and Board to identify and solicit applications from well-qualified candidates with the goal of securing diversity; conduct an initial review and vetting of applications; and working with ICANN and community to develop operational rules for IRP

c. The community would nominate a slate of proposed panel members

d. Final selection is subject to ICANN Board confirmation  
— Third party international arbitral bodies would nominate candidates

15. **Recall or other Accountability:** Appointments made for a fixed term of five (5) years with no removal except for specified cause (corruption, misuse of position for personal use, etc.). The recall process will be developed via the IRP Sub Group.

16. **Settlement Efforts:**

- a. Reasonable efforts, as specified in a public-published policy, must be made to resolve disputes informally prior to/in connection with filing an IRP case.
- b. Parties to cooperatively engage informally, but either party may inject independent dispute resolution facilitator (mediator) after initial CEP meeting. Either party can terminate informal dispute resolution efforts (CEP or mediation) if, after specified period, that party's concludes in good faith that further efforts are unlikely to produce agreement.
- c. The process must be governed by clearly understood and **pre-published rules applicable to both parties** and be subject to strict time limits. In particular, the CCWG-ACCT will review the CEP process as part of Work Stream 2.

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: Font: (Default) Avenir Book

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

17. Decision Making:

- a. In each case, a ~~single or~~ 3 member panel will be drawn from ~~the Standing Panels~~. ~~In single member panel, ICANN and complaining party agree on panelist. In 3 member panel cases, each party will select one panelist, and those panelists will select the third.~~ We anticipate that the Standing Panel would draft, issue for comment, and revise procedural rules. Focus on streamlined, simplified processes with rules that are easy to understand and follow.
- b. Panel decisions will be based on each IRP panelist's assessment of the merits of the claimant's case. The panel may undertake a de novo review of the case, make findings of fact, and issue decisions based on those facts. All decisions will be documented and made public and will reflect a well-reasoned application of the standard to be applied (i.e., Bylaws, the *Statement of Mission, Commitments, and Core Values*, and ICANN policies).

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

18. Decision:

- a. Panel decisions (~~where there is more than one panelist~~) would be determined by a simple majority. Alternatively, this could be included in the category of procedures that the IRP ~~Standing Panel~~ itself should be empowered to set.
- b. The CCWG-Accountability recommends that IRP decisions be "precedential" – meaning, that ~~deference should be given to~~ ~~panel panelists should consider and may rely on~~ prior decisions. By conferring precedential weight on panel the IRP can provide guidance for future actions and inaction by ICANN decision-makers, which is valuable. It also reduces the chances of inconsistent treatment of one claimant or another, based on the specific individuals making up the decisional panel in particular cases. ~~But~~ ~~However~~, this makes it more likely that "bad" decision in one case ~~will~~ affects other cases going
- b.c. ~~CCWG-Accountability confirms that the IRP decisional Panel has the power to stay a Board decision or action in the Panel's decision. The CCWG-Accountability further recommends that the decisional Panel also have the power to require ICANN to take a decision or action consistent with the Panel's decision on an interim basis, until the Board has had a chance to consider and decide how to implement an IRP Panel decision.~~
- c.d. It is ~~expected~~ ~~intended~~ that judgments of ~~the IRP a decisional Panel or the Standing Panel~~ would be enforceable in the

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: Indent: Left: 2", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

Formatted: Font: Avenir Book

applicable courts of the US and other countries that accept international arbitration results.

**Commented [GS8]:** Clarifying that both initial decisions and decisions on appeal to the full Standing Panel are both enforceable by courts.

**Formatted:** Font: Avenir Book

19. **Accessibility and Cost:**

- a. The CCWG-Accountability recommends that ICANN would bear all the administrative ~~the~~ costs of maintaining the system (including Panelist salaries), ~~except that while~~ each party should bear the costs of their own legal advice. The Panel may provide for loser pays/fee shifting in the event it identifies a challenge or defense as frivolous or abusive. ICANN should seek to establish access, for example by access to pro bono representation for community, non-profit complainants and other complainants that would otherwise be excluded from utilizing the process.
- b. The Panel should complete work expeditiously; issuing a scheduling order early in the process, and in the ordinary course should issue decisions within a standard time frame (six months). The Panel will issue an update and estimated completion schedule in the event it is unable to complete its work within that period.

**Formatted:** Font: Avenir Book

**Formatted:** Font: Avenir Book

**Formatted:** Font: Avenir Book

**Formatted:** Font: Avenir Book

20. Implementation: The CCWG-Accountability proposes that the revised IRP provisions be adopted as Fundamental Bylaws. Implementation of these enhancements will necessarily require additional, detailed work. Detailed rules for the implementation of the IRP (such as rules of procedure) are to be created by the ICANN community through a CCWG (assisted by counsel, appropriate experts, and the Standing Panel when confirmed), and approved by the Board, such approval not to be unreasonably withheld. They may be updated in the light of further experience by the same process, if required. In addition, to ensure that the IRP functions as intended, we propose to subject the IRP to periodic community review.

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.63", Hanging: 0.38", Space Before: 2 pt, After: 8 pt, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 1" + Indent at: 1.42"

**Formatted:** Font: Avenir Book

20-21. Transparency: The community has expressed concerns regarding the ICANN document/information access policy and implementation. Free access to relevant information is an essential element of a robust independent review process. We recommend reviewing and enhancing the Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP) as part of the accountability enhancements in Work Stream 2.