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BACKGROUND

1. DotConnectAfrica ("DCA") Trust ("Claimant"), is a non-profit organization established under the laws of the Republic of Mauritius on 15 July 2010 with its registry operation – DCA Registry Services (Kenya) Limited – as its principal place of business in Nairobi, Kenya. DCA was formed with the charitable purpose of, among other things, advancing information technology education in Africa and providing a continental Internet domain name to provide access to internet services for the people of Africa and for the public good.

2. In March 2012, DCA Trust applied to the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers ("ICANN") for the delegation of the .Africa top-level domain name in its 2012 General Top-Level Domains ("gTLD") Internet Expansion Program (the "New gTLD Program"), an internet resource available for delegation under that program.

3. ICANN ("Respondent") is a non-profit corporation established under the laws of the State of California, U.S.A., on 30 September 1998 and headquartered in Marina del Rey, California. According to its Articles of Incorporation, ICCAN was established for the benefit of the Internet community as a whole and is tasked with carrying out its activities in conformity with relevant principles of international law, international conventions, and local law.

4. On 4 June 2013, the ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee ("NGPC") posted a notice that it had decided not to accept DCA’s application.

5. On 19 June 2013, DCA Trust filed a request for reconsideration by the ICANN Board Governance Committee ("BGC"), which denied the request on 1 August 2013.

6. On 19 August 2013, DCA Trust informed ICANN of its intention to seek relief before an Independent Review Panel under ICANN’s Bylaws. Between August and October 2013, DCA Trust and ICANN participated in a Cooperative Engagement Process ("CEP") to try and resolve the issues relating to DCA Trust’s application. Despite several meetings, however, no resolution was reached.

7. On 24 October 2013, DCA Trust filed a Notice of Independent Review Process with the ICDR in accordance with Article IV, Section 3, of ICANN’s Bylaws.

INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESS

8. According to DCA Trust, the central dispute between it and ICANN in the Independent Review Process invoked by DCA Trust in October 2013 and
described in its Amended Notice of Independent Review Process submitted to ICANN on 10 January 2014 arises out of:

“(1) ICANN’s breaches of its Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, international and local law, and other applicable rules in the administration of applications for the .AFRICA top-level domain name in its 2012 General Top-Level Domains ("gTLD") Internet Expansion Program (the “New gTLD Program”); and (2) ICANN’s wrongful decision that DCA’s application for .AFRICA should not proceed [...].”

9. According to DCA Trust, “ICANN’s administration of the New gTLD Program and its decision on DCA’s application were unfair, discriminatory, and lacked appropriate due diligence and care, in breach of ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws.” DCA Trust also advanced that “ICANN’s violations materially affected DCA’s right to have its application processed in accordance with the rules and procedures laid out by ICANN for the New gTLD Program.”

10. In its Response to Claimant’s Amended Notice submitted to DCA Trust on 10 February 2014, ICANN submitted that in these proceedings, “DCA challenges the 4 June 2013 decision of the ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (“NGPC”), which has delegated authority from the ICANN Board to make decisions regarding the New gTLD. In that decision, the NGPC unanimously accepted advice from ICANN’s Governmental Advisory Committee (“GAC”) that DCA application for .AFRICA should not proceed. DCA argues that the NGPC should not have accepted the GAC’s advice. DCA also argues that ICANN’s subsequent decision to reject DCA’s Request for Reconsideration was improper.”

11. ICANN argued that the challenged decisions of ICANN’s Board “were well within the Board’s discretion” and the Board “did exactly what it was supposed to do under its Bylaws, its Articles of Incorporation, and the Applicant Guidebook (“Guidebook”) that the Board adopted for implementing the New gTLD Program.”

12. Specifically, ICANN also advanced that “ICANN properly investigated and rejected DCA’s assertion that two of ICANN’s Board members had conflicts of interest with regard to the .AFRICA applications, [...] numerous African

---

1 Claimant’s Amended Notice of Independent Review Process, para. 2.
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4 ICANN’s Response to Claimant’s Amended Notice contains a typographical error, it is dated “February 10, 2013” rather than 2014.
5 ICANN’s Response to Claimant’s Amended Notice, para. 4
6 Ibid, para. 5
countries issued “warnings” to ICANN regarding DCA’s application, a signal from those governments that they had serious concerns regarding DCA’s application; following the issuance of those warnings, the GAC issued “consensus advice” against DCA’s application; ICANN then accepted the GAC’s advice, which was entirely consistent with ICANN’s Bylaws and the Guidebook; [and] ICANN properly denied DCA’s Request for Reconsideration.”

13. In short, ICANN argued that in these proceedings, “the evidence establishes that the process worked exactly as it was supposed to work.”

REQUEST FOR INTERIM MEASURES OF PROTECTION

14. In an effort to safeguard its rights pending the ongoing constitution of the IRP Panel, on 22 January 2014, DCA Trust wrote to ICANN requesting that it immediately cease any further processing of all applications for the delegation of the .AFRICA gTLD, failing which DCA Trust would seek emergency relief under Article 37 of the ICDR Rules. In addition, DCA Trust indicated that it believed it had the right to seek such relief because there is no standing panel (as anticipated in the Supplementary Procedures for ICANN Independent Review Process), which would otherwise hear requests for emergency relief.

15. In response, in an email dated 5 February 2014, ICANN wrote:

“Although ICANN typically is refraining from further processing activities in conjunction with pending gTLD applications where a competing applicant has a pending reconsideration request, ICANN does not intend to refrain from further processing of applications that relate in some way to pending independent review proceedings. In this particular instance, ICANN believes that the grounds for DCA’s IRP are exceedingly weak, and that the decision to refrain from the further processing of other applications on the basis of the pending IRP would be unfair to others.”

16. In its Request for Emergency Arbitrator and Interim Measures of Protection subsequently submitted to ICANN on 28 March 2014, DCA Trust argued, inter alia, that, “in an effort to preserve its rights, in January 2014, DCA requested that ICANN suspend its processing of applications for .AFRICA during the pendency of this proceeding. ICANN, however, summarily refused to do so.”

---
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8 Ibid. para. 6
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10 Request for Emergency Arbitrator and Interim Measures of Protection, para. 3
17. DCA Trust also argued that “on 23 March 2014, DCA became aware that ICANN intended to sign an agreement with DCA’s competitor (a South African company called ZACR) on 26 March 2014 in Beijing [...] Immediately upon receiving this information, DCA contacted ICANN and asked it to refrain from signing the agreement with ZACR in light of the fact that this proceeding was still pending. Instead, according to ICANN’s website, ICANN signed its agreement with ZACR the very next day, two days ahead of plan, on 24 March instead of 26 March.”11

18. According to DCA Trust, that same day, “ICANN then responded to DCA’s request by presenting the execution of the contract as a fait accompli, arguing that DCA should have sought to stop ICANN from proceeding with ZACR’s application, as ICANN had already informed DCA of its intention [to] ignore its obligations to participate in this proceeding in good faith.”12 DCA Trust also argued that on 25 March 2014, as per ICANN’s email to the ICDR, “ICANN for the first time informed DCA that it would accept the application of Article 37 [of the ICDR International Dispute Resolution Procedures, amended and effective June 1, 2009 (“ICDR Rules”)] to this proceeding contrary to the express provisions of the Supplementary Procedures of ICANN has put in place for the IRP Process.”13

19. In its Request, DCA Trust argued that it “is entitled to an accountability proceeding with legitimacy and integrity, with the capacity to provide a meaningful remedy. [...] DCA has requested the opportunity to compete for rights to .AFRICA pursuant to the rules that ICANN put into place. Allowing ICANN to delegate .AFRICA to DCA’s only competitor – which took actions that were instrumental in the process leading to ICANN’s decision to reject DCA’s application – would eviscerate the very purpose of this proceeding and deprive DCA of it’s rights under ICANN’s own constitutive instruments and international law.”14

20. Finally, DCA Trust requested, among other things, the following interim relief:

a. An order compelling ICANN to refrain from any further steps toward delegation of the .AFRICA gTLD, including but not limited to execution or assessment of pre-delegation testing, negotiations or discussions relating to delegation with the entity ZACR or any of its officers or agents; [...]15

11 Ibid.
12 Ibid.
13 Ibid., para. 4.
14 Ibid., para. 5.
15 Ibid., para. 6.
21. In its Response to DCA Trust’s Request for Emergency Arbitrator and Interim Measures of Protection submitted on 4 April 2014, ICANN urged that DCA’s request for a stay be denied. ICANN also reproached DCA for having waited five months before initiating its Request for Interim Measures of Protection pursuant to Article 37 of the ICDR Rules.

22. ICANN further argued that Claimant’s Request for Interim Relief ought to be denied because “DCA has not demonstrated a reasonable possibility that it will succeed on the merits of this IRP, which the law requires DCA to demonstrate.”\(^{16}\)

23. According to ICANN, “DCA’s decision to wait five months before seeking a stay reflects the weakness of DCA’s claims and the lack of any corresponding irreparable harm to DCA. This is compounded by the fact that DCA has done nothing to try to expedite these proceedings. To the contrary, DCA has failed to file its fees timely, it sought multiple extensions of time to file its papers, and it requested a very leisurely amount of time for the parties to select the IRP Panel. ICANN, and not the DCA, has been the party trying to expedite these proceedings, and DCA has resisted at every turn.”\(^{17}\)

24. DCA Trust’s Request for Emergency Arbitrator and Interim Measures of Protection, initially scheduled for a hearing on 14 April 2014 before an emergency arbitrator pursuant to ICDR Rules 21 and 37, was instead referred to this Panel on 13 April 2014 for review and consideration pursuant to Article 37.6 of the ICDR Rules.

25. On 22 April 2014, this Panel held an organizational telephone conference call with the Parties. During that call, it was agreed, among other things, that the telephone hearing for DCA’s Request for Interim Measures of Protection will be heard on 5 May 2014, and that ICANN would not take any further steps that would in any way prevent this Panel from granting the full relief requested by DCA Trust in its Request. These and a number of directions given by the Panel to the Parties were reflected in a Procedural Order No. 1 issued on 24 April 2014.

26. On 5 May 2014 this Panel heard the Parties’ submissions on their respective written submissions and the Panel’s questions sent to them in advance on 2 May 2014.

\(^{16}\) ICANN’s Response to Claimant’s Request for Emergency Arbitrator and Interim Measures of Protection, para. 3.

\(^{17}\) Ibid., para. 30.
DECISION AND REASONS OF THE IRP PANEL

27. After having carefully read DCA Trust's written submissions and the responses filed by ICANN, and after listening to the Parties' respective oral presentations made by telephone on 5 May 2014, for reasons set forth below, the Panel is unanimously of the view that a stay ruling in the form described below is in order in this proceeding and that ICANN must immediately refrain from any further processing of any application for .AFRICA until this Panel has heard the merits of DCA Trust's Notice of Independent Review Process and issued its final decision regarding the same.

28. The Panel finds that interim relief in this proceeding is warranted based on two independent and equally sufficient grounds.

29. First, the Panel is of the view that this Independent Review Process could have been heard and finally decided without the need for interim relief, but for ICANN's failure to follow its own Bylaws (Article IV, Section 3, paragraph 6) and Supplemental Procedures (Article 1), which require the creation of a standing panel as follows:

"There shall be an omnibus standing panel between six and nine members with a variety of expertise, including jurisprudence, judicial experience, alternative dispute resolution and knowledge of ICANN’s mission and work from which each specific IRP Panel shall be selected."

30. This requirement in ICANN's Bylaws was established on 11 April 2013. More than a year later, no standing panel has been created. Had ICANN timely constituted the standing panel, the panel could have addressed DCA Trust's request for an Independent Review Process as soon as it was filed in January 2014. It is very likely that, by now, that proceeding would have been completed, and there would be no need for any interim relief by DCA Trust.

31. In the Panel's unanimous view, therefore, a stay order in this proceeding is proper to preserve DCA Trust's right to a fair hearing and a decision by this Panel before ICANN takes any further steps that could potentially moot DCA Trust's request for an independent review. This is the same opportunity DCA would have enjoyed without a stay, but for ICANN's failure to create the standing panel.

32. Whether the Panel's decision is advisory only, as ICANN contends, or binding, as DCA Trust argues, the Panel is strongly of the view that ICANN's unique, international and important public functions require it to scrupulously honor the procedural protections its Bylaws, rules and regulations purport to offer the internet community. ICANN has been entrusted with the important
responsibility of bringing order to the global internet system. As set out in Article I, Sections 1 and 2 of ICANN’s Bylaws:

"[t]he mission of ICANN is to coordinate, at the overall level, the global Internet’s systems of unique identifiers, and in particular to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet’s unique identifier systems. [...] In performing its mission, the following core values should guide the decisions and actions of ICANN:

6. Introducing and promoting competition in the registration of domain names where practicable and beneficial to public interest.

[...]

8. Making decisions by applying documented policies neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness."

33. In the Panel’s unanimous view, it would be unfair and unjust to deny DCA Trust’s request for interim relief when the need for such a relief by DCA Trust arises out of ICANN’s failure to follow its own Bylaws and procedures.

34. Second, interim relief in this case is independently warranted for reasons unrelated to ICANN’s role in creating the need for such relief as explained above.

35. DCA Trust argues that four criteria must be satisfied before interim relief is granted under international law and in international proceedings: urgency, necessity, protection of an existing right, and existence of a prima facie case on the merits, without the necessity of prejudging the matter.

36. ICANN agrees with the first three criteria identified by DCA Trust, but disagrees with the fourth. For ICANN, the Panel needs to find more than a prima facie case on the merits before ordering interim relief in this proceeding. In its Response to DCA Trust’s Request for Emergency Arbitrator and Interim Measures of Protection, ICANN submits that the standard must be the one set out in article 17(A)(1)(b) of the UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration. ICANN explains:

"In fact, it is generally accepted under both international and U.S. law that, in order to demonstrate entitlement to interim relief, the party seeking relief must also demonstrate a reasonable possibility of success on the merits. For example, Article 27 [sic.] (A)(1)(b) of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law’s ("UNCITRAL’s") Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration states that a party requesting an interim measure must demonstrate
that "there is a reasonable possibility that the requesting party will succeed on the merits of the claim." [...] Likewise, under U.S. law, a party seeking a preliminary injunction must at least demonstrate that "the likelihood of success is such that serious questions going to the merits were raised."\(^\text{18}\)

37. The Panel agrees with the Parties that the four criteria listed above in paragraph 35 form a part of the criteria most commonly used by international and national courts and arbitral tribunals\(^\text{19}\) to evaluate a party's request for interim relief. The Panel, however, does not see a distinction between the demonstration of "a prima facie case" or "a reasonable possibility that the requesting party will succeed on the merits of the claim". Like the International Law Association ("ILA"), the Panel is of the view that the demonstration of "a prima facie case" and "a reasonable possibility that the requesting party will succeed on the merits of the claim" are in reality one and the same standard.

38. Indeed, as the ILA recommended in its resolution of 1996\(^\text{20}\), the granting of an interim relief should be available "on a showing of a case on the merits on a standard of proof which is less than that required for the merits under the applicable law".

\textit{Urgency}

39. Both DCA Trust and ICANN agree that urgency is one of the criteria that this Panel must consider before it decides to grant interim relief. DCA Trust in particular argues that the orders it requests are needed urgently, because:

"[w]ithout the order compelling ICANN to stay processing of ZACR's application, DCA will suffer irreparable harm before the IRP process can be concluded... A request for interim measures of protection is considered urgent, if absent the requested measure, an action that is prejudicial to the rights of either party is likely to be taken before such final decision is given. This standard is sometimes termed "imminent harm". In light of ICANN's response to DCA'S request that it refrain from signing a Registry Agreement with ZACR – namely, signing the agreement 48 hours ahead of time in order to prevent any effective intervention by DCA – the additional harm DCA seeks to prevent clearly is imminent. Moreover, ZACR claims that it will have received

\(^{18}\)\textit{Ibid. para. 21.}

\(^{19}\) By "most commonly used", the Panel means that this standard is used by international or regional courts and tribunals, but also by many domestic courts under their own laws.

all rights to .AFRICA by April 2014, and will begin operating .AFRICA by May 2014."21

40. The Panel is satisfied that the urgency test is met in the present case. Indeed, DCA Trust argues, without being contradicted by ICANN, that in March 2014 the latter officially signed the registry agreement for the .Africa gTLD with ZACR, DCA Trust’s competitor.

41. The urgency test is met as well when the Panel takes into consideration, ICANN’s noncommittal email to it and DCA Trust of 23 April 2014, in which ICANN writes:

"I am writing to follow up...with respect to the timing of the ultimate delegation by ICANN to ZA Central Registry of .AFRICA into the root zone...ICANN will not, as a practical matter, be able to conclude the delegation process prior to 15 May 2014. As a result, the schedule adopted by the Panel...would give ICANN the opportunity to consider the Panel’s recommendation in the event the Panel recommends a stay." [Emphasis added]

42. The registry agreement being signed, the countdown for the launch of the .Africa gTLD could commence. ZACR announces on its website (https://www.registry.net.za/launch.php) that the launch should take place in June 2014. This Panel, even if it works very rapidly, will not be in a position to decide on the merits of DCA’s Request for an Independent Review before June 2014. Therefore, there is absolutely no doubt in the Panel’s mind that DCA Trust’s need for interim relief in this matter is urgent.

Necessity

43. Both DCA Trust and ICANN agree that a test of necessity must be met before granting the requested interim relief. Indeed, in its Response to Claimant’s Request for Emergency Arbitrator and Interim Measures of Protection, ICANN writes:

“As DCA acknowledges in its Request, in order to show necessity under international law, it must demonstrate proportionality, i.e. that the harm it would occur in the absence of interim relief measures would “exceed [...] greatly the damage caused to the party affected” by these measures. DCA contends that it would suffer serious harm in the absence of interim relief because the “operation of .AFRICA is a unique right” and “DCA was created expressly for the purpose of campaigning for, competing for and ultimately operating .AFRICA.” But DCA fails to acknowledge that, whatever its unilateral plans might have been, its

actual probability of harm is greatly diminished by its scant probability of success on the merits. DCA also fails to note the substantial potential harm that ZACR could suffer if the processing of its application for, and the ultimate delegation of, .AFRICA is delayed."

"ICANN'S decision to proceed with the processing of ZACR's application for .AFRICA despite DCA's pending IRP is a reflection of ICANN's belief that: (i) DCA's IRP is frivolous and unlikely to succeed on the merits; and (ii) ZACR potentially could suffer substantial harm if the delegation of .AFRICA to it is further delayed." 22

44. The Panel is of the opinion that the necessity test requires the Panel to consider the proportionality of the relief requested. The Panel thus must balance the harm caused to DCA Trust if a stay is not granted and the harm that would be caused to ICANN if interim relief were to be ordered. As explained by DCA Trust:

"If [DCA Trust] is deprived of the opportunity even to compete to operate .AFRICA, DCA will be unable to accomplish its charitable aims and will be unable to perform its mandate [...] By contrast, ICANN will suffer no similar harm... Regardless of the outcome of the IRP, ICANN will be able to delegate .AFRICA. [Similarly, ZACR may receive the rights to “AFRICA even if DCA is permitted to compete with it pursuant to ICANN’s rules and procedures for the new gTLD program.] The IRP is meant to be an expedited dispute resolution process. A slight delay in delegation is hardly an undue burden compared to the issues at stake." 23

45. It is abundantly clear to the Panel from the facts as explained by both Parties in this case that if a stay is not granted and the registry agreement between ICANN and ZACR is implemented further, the chances of DCA Trust having its Request for an independent review heard and properly considered will be jeopardized.

46. The Panel considers that a stay in the implementation of the registry agreement between ICANN and ZACR is therefore proportionate and adequate to the particular circumstances of this case. Indeed, neither ICANN, nor ZACR will suffer from a few more months of delay if a stay of processing of ZACR's .AFRICA application is ordered. Indeed, neither ICANN nor ZACR has pointed to any specific prejudice or harm that it will suffer if DCA Trust’s request for interim relief is granted. The same cannot be said about the

---

23 Request for Emergency Arbitrator and Interim Measures of Protection, paras. 27 and 29.
absence of such a relief for DCA Trust, which clearly would suffer irreparable harm if interim relief is not granted.

Protection of an existing right

47. DCA Trust has demonstrated, to the satisfaction of this Panel that, beyond the procedural rights it must enjoy to have its case heard, DCA Trust also enjoys, according to ICANN's own Bylaws, the right to have ICANN's Board decision reviewed by an independent panel, a right which will be lost if interim relief is not granted in this case. Indeed, Article IV, Section 3, paragraph 1 of ICANN's Bylaws unequivocally indicates that:

"In addition to the reconsideration process described in Section 2 of this Article, ICANN shall have in place a separate process for independent third-party review of Board actions alleged by an affected party to be inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws." [Emphasis added]

Consequently, the Panel has determined that this criterion for the granting of interim relief in this case has also been met.

A reasonable possibility that the requesting party will succeed on the merits

48. This criterion was most heavily debated between the Parties. ICANN argues that DCA Trust does not have a case on the merits. In fact, ICANN goes as far as saying that Claimant's Request for an Independent Review Process is frivolous. Therefore, ICANN argues that DCA Trust has not demonstrated that there is a reasonable possibility it would succeed on the merits. In the Panel's view, by doing so, ICANN is asking for more than is required of DCA Trust at this stage of the independent review process.

49. Contrary to ICANN'S submissions, the Panel is of the view that it need not, at this stage, make a full appraisal of the merits of DCA Trust's case, given that the standard of proof for interim relief is lower than the standard of proof required for the evaluation of the merits of the case.²⁴

50. Having carefully examined the written submissions of the Parties, heard their oral submissions by telephone and deliberated on the various issues raised by them to date, the Panel is of the view that DCA Trust's case must proceed to the next stage.

²⁴ See the report accompanying the ILA resolution of 1996 mentioned in footnote 2. On page 195, the report says that the "standard of proof propounded (...) was one which found wide acceptance" among all the countries studied, except one.
DECISION OF THE IRP PANEL

51. The Panel therefore concludes that ICANN must immediately refrain from any further processing of any application for .AFRICA until this Panel has heard the merits of DCA Trust’s Notice of Independent Review Process and issued its conclusions regarding the same.

52. The Panel reserves its views with respect to the other requests for relief made by DCA Trust in its Request for Emergency Arbitrator and Interim Measures of Protection. The Panel will consider the Parties’ respective arguments in that regard if and when required by the Parties and if appropriate.

53. The Panel reserves its decision on the issue of costs relating to this stage of the proceeding until the hearing of the merits.

This Decision on Interim Measures of Protection has thirteen (13) pages. The members of the Panel have all reviewed this decision and agreed that the Chair may sign it alone on their behalf.

Signed in Montreal, Quebec for delivery to the Parties in Los Angeles, California.

Dated 12 May 2014.

[Signature]

Babak Barim, President of the Panel, on behalf of himself, Prof. Catherine Kessedjian and the Hon. Richard C. Neal (Ret.) as consented to by the Parties in their respective emails to the Panel of 7 May 2014