

Issues treatment suggestion - Notice
Email from David McAuley – 4 December 2017

Dear members of the IRP IOT:

One of the issues arising in public comments around the draft supplementary procedures was the issue of “Notice.”

The [comments\[forum.icann.org\]](#) from Kathy Kleiman and Robert Butler of Fletcher, Heald, and Hildreth, P.L.C. (pages 2-3 and 6-7), and the [comments\[forum.icann.org\]](#) from the Noncommercial Stakeholders Group (3rd and 4th pages) both make the point comprehensively.

Please look over these comments again. In sum, they are seeking actual notice be given to other parties involved: either from underlying proceedings (expert panels – see bylaw section 4.3(b)(iii)(A)(3)) or the SO(s) involved when a challenge is made that implicates Consensus Policy.

The notice they speak of would be given contemporaneously with the filing of the claim and would include the request for IRP and all papers that went along with it.

I would like to discuss this on our phone call this Thursday (Dec. 7th, 19:00 UTC).

In my personal opinion (as participant, not as leader), I think these suggestions make sense and should be adopted – meaning we should ask Sidley to create such language changes to the [draft supplementary procedures\[icann.org\]](#) – probably in a new section or a new subsection of section 4 (Time for Filing).

Best regards,
David