Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) 4/30

Formatted Table

1. Community Priority Evaluation

In the 2007 GNSO Final Report on the Introduction of New Generic Top-Level Domains, Implementation Guidance F states that "[i]f there is contention for strings, applicants may: i) resolve contention between them within a pre-established timeframe[;] ii) if there is no mutual agreement, a claim to support a community by one party will be a reason to award priority to that application."[1] In the Final Report on the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process ("SubPro PDP Final Report"), the SubPro PDP Working Group affirmed "the continued prioritization of applications in contention sets that have passed Community Priority Evaluation (CPE)."[2]

CPE is an independent analysis conducted by a third-party expert panel. The panel's role is to determine whether a community-based application fulfills the CPE criteria and should receive priority in the contention set. The scoring process, which looks at a set of criteria related to community establishment, nexus between the community and applied-for string, registration policies, and community support, is designed to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both "false positives" (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a "community" construed merely to get a highly desired generic word as a gTLD string) and "false negatives" (not awarding priority to a qualified community application).

ICANN notes that the usage of the expression "community" has evolved considerably from its Latin origin ("communitas" meaning "fellowship") while still implying more of cohesion than a mere commonality of interest. Although the SubPro PDP Final Report does not define "community" for purposes of CPE, it does note, in the context of community objections, that "a community should be interpreted broadly and will include, for example, an economic sector, a cultural community, or a linguistic community."[3]

1.1. Eligibility for Community Priority Evaluation

As described in subsection [Section X.X TLD Types], all applicants will have the opportunity to designate their application as community-based[4] at their sole discretion.

---

[1] See: https://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/new-gtlds/pdp-dec05-fr-parta-08aug07.htm.

[2] See Affirmation with Modification 34.1.

[3] See Affirmation 31.1: "Subject to the recommendations/implementation guidance below, The Working Group affirms the following recommendations and implementation guidance from 2007…Recommendation 20: 'An application will be rejected if it is determined, based on public comments or otherwise, that there is substantial opposition to it from among significant established institutions of the economic sector, or cultural or language community, to which it is targeted or which it is intended to support.' [...] 'c) community – community should be interpreted broadly and will include, for example, an economic sector, a cultural community, or a linguistic community. It may be a closely related community which believes it is impacted.'"

[4] Note that an application may have more than one type, e.g., an application could be both a geographic name and community-based. See [Section X.X TLD Types] for more information.

Formatted Table

All applicants designating their applications as community-based[5] are required to respond to a set of questions in the application form to provide relevant information about their community (see Application Questions). In general, an applicant for a community-based gTLD is expected to:

- Demonstrate a relationship with an organized community, as well as show how that community engages with its members; awareness of the community between members; the established presence and external awareness of the community, and show that the community has longevity.
- Have applied for a gTLD string strongly and specifically related to the community named in the application.
- Have proposed dedicated registration policies for registrants in its proposed gTLD, commensurate with the community-based purpose it has named.
- Have its application endorsed in writing by one or more established institutions representing the community it has named.

The information provided by the applicant in response to the application questions will be used in CPE (and evaluated against the Criteria in Section 1.7).

Note that CPE will only occur if a community-based application is in contention and the applicant opts to participate.[6] Applicants will be given the opportunity to opt into CPE once the following conditions are met:

- Contention sets have been finalized
- All applications in the contention set are eligible to proceed to contention resolution
- The applicant does not have any pending Change Requests that may affect the evaluation of the applicant or application.

1.2. Conditional Fees for Community Priority Evaluation

Once the above criteria are met, any applicants with a community-based application within a contention set will be notified of the opportunity to participate in CPE and will be requested to submit the requisite fees within 30 days of transmission of the notification. If the fees are not received within 30 days, the applicant will forfeit the opportunity to participate in CPE. See [Section X.X Application Fees] for more information regarding fees.

> **Commented [1]:** clarify moves to contention set proceedings (e.g. auction)

Applications will be given priority numbers, which will be used to determine the general order of the release of evaluation results (as described in Section X.X Application Processing). However,

---

[5] Applicants for community-based gTLD strings are also required to submit written endorsements of the applied for gTLD string from the community. If an applicant for a community-based gTLD string is also seeking one or more variants, the endorsements must also apply to the requested variants.

[6] Note that CPE is one contention resolution method. However, to potentially reduce the instances of string contention, applicants are encouraged to designate a Replacement String alongside their original choice of string. See more regarding the process for Replacement Strings in Section X.X String Contention Procedures.

> **Formatted Table**

processing for CPE will largely be dictated by when an application and contention set become eligible, as noted above. Timing for CPE is also dependent upon Registry Commitment Evaluation (RCE), see Section 1.4 below for more information.

1.3.   Required Documentation

While only community-based applications that are in contention are eligible to participate in CPE, all community applicants must provide the requisite information regarding their identified community at the time of application submission, including information related to their Community Registration Policies (see Application Questions).

Additionally, as part of their application, applicants must submit written endorsements from the majority[7] of the community as identified. It should be noted, however, that during the application comment period additional organizations may express their support or opposition to the community-based applicant (see Application Comment section for more information). While applicants are encouraged to submit as much supporting documentation as possible with their application, the panel may also consider additional endorsements or comments of opposition received during the comment period.

1.4.   Community Registration Policies and Registry Commitment Evaluation

Community-based gTLD applicants must propose during application submission, and obtain ICANN's approval of, at a minimum, Community Registration Policies concerning registrant eligibility and naming selection for inclusion in the Specification 12 of the applicable Registry Agreements (RAs).[8] The evaluation outcome of a proposed Community Registration Policy for inclusion in the applicable RA will affect whether a Community-based TLD application can move forward – specifically, it will determine the application's eligibility to participate in CPE.[9] Only Community Registration Policies that are approved by ICANN will be scored in CPE, and an applicant must complete review of the proposed policies via the Registry Commitment Evaluation (RCE) process before participating in CPE. To be clear, an applicant must have approved Community Registration Policies in order to participate in CPE.

---

[7] "Majority" is defined according to the size of the identified community by the applicant. See Section 1.7.4 below for more information.

[8] If an applicant for a community-based gTLD desires for a Community Registration Policy to be scored in the CPE, it must propose such a policy for inclusion in Specification 12 of the applicable Registry Agreement when submitting an application for a community-based gTLD. Such a policy serves as a prerequisite to a community-based gTLD applicant's participation in the CPE.

[9] If an applicant for a community-based gTLD desires for a Community Registration Policy to be scored in the CPE, it must propose such a policy for inclusion in Specification 12 of the applicable Registry Agreement when submitting an application for a community-based gTLD. Such a policy serves as a prerequisite to a Community-based TLD applicant's participation in the CPE.

Formatted Table

Community-based gTLD registry operators may implement any additional Community Registration Policies outside of the RA which are desired, so long as the policies otherwise comply with the applicable ICANN agreements and policies.[10]

Commented [2]: do not conflict with

Applicants should be aware that, absent extraordinary circumstances, the estimated timeline for RCE is two to three months, which will be prior to the start of CPE. For more information on RCE, see [Section X.X PICs/RVCs].

Formatted: Highlight

The CPE Panel will evaluate the approved Community Registration Policies to determine whether the policies are consistent with the community-based objective of the application (as per the evaluation guidelines in Section 1.7.3 below). This differs from the purpose of the review of these polices as part RCE, which ensures such policies proposed by applicants for inclusion in the applicable RA are enforceable as a practicable matter and are compatible with the ICANN Bylaws.

If a Community Registration Policy proposed for inclusion in the applicable RA is not approved, it will not be considered in the CPE process and cannot be included in the RA. Additionally, if an applicant does not complete RCE or have any approved Community Registration Policies, it will not be allowed to proceed to CPE.

Applicants should be aware that, absent extraordinary circumstances, the estimated timeline for RCE is two to three months, which will be prior to the start of CPE. For more information on RCE, see [Section X.X PICs/RVCs].

1.5. Community Priority Evaluation Outcomes

CPE will be performed by a third-party expert panel appointed by ICANN. The panel's role is to determine whether a community-based application fulfills the CPE criteria and receives priority over other applications in the contention set. ICANN anticipates that the CPE process will take approximately six months from the time that an applicant elects CPE until the publication of results. The panel may conduct limited independent research[11] deemed necessary to evaluate the application according to the criteria. As part of this research, the panel may consult with relevant community-related experts to gain insight into highly specialized or localized communities.[12]

If the panel conducts independent research or consults with community experts;

---

[10] If a Community-based TLD applicant believes additional Community Registration Policies that the applicant plans to implement but does not propose to include in the applicable RA may be of interest to the public or relevant to the application, the applicant may include these as a response to [Question X] in the application for the public to review and comment. The applicant's responses to this question will be for informational purposes only, and will not be evaluated or binding on the applicant via the RA.

[11] The panel is expected to focus its "limited research" on "fact-checking" of the information provided by the applicant in response to the application questions [Section X.X Application Questions]. If the panel relies on this limited research as part of its evaluation, it will include a citation or link to the relevant research as part of its results determination.

[12] For example, the panel may consult with such experts to understand what "longevity" means in the context of different types of communities. See the Community Priority Evaluation Criteria for more information.

Formatted Table

however, the panelevaluator must disclose the results of such research to the applicant. The applicant shall be provided 30 days to respond before the evaluation decision is rendered. When conducting any such research, panelists are cautioned not to assume an advocacy role either for or against the applicant or application. Additionally, panelists may issue Clarifying Questions and/or engage in written dialogue with CPE applicants, as well as those who submit letters of opposition to community-based applications, in order to address potential issues (see Section 1.5.1 for more information).

If a single community-based application is found to meet the CPE criteria (see Section 1.7 below), that applicant will prevail and may proceed to the next step in the application process, subject to meeting all other Program requirements. Other applications in the contention set will be ineligible to proceed at that time.[13]

If more than one community-based application is found to meet the criteria, these applicants will proceed to an ICANN auction, while other applications in the contention set will be ineligible to proceed. [See Section X.X Contention Resolution for more information].

If the community-based applications (as there could be more than one) in a contention set do not meet the criteria set forth below, then all of the applications in the contention set will proceed to an ICANN auction. [See Section X.X Contention Resolution for more information.]

1.5.1. Clarifying Questions

The panel will have the opportunity to issue CPE Clarifying Questions[14] to community-based applicants that choose to participate in CPE. Clarifying Questions will be used to address issues to the extent possible provided that responses to Clarifying Questions do not constitute a material change to the application. The panel may also issue Clarifying Questions to those who submit a letter of opposition to a CPE applicant, to address any potential issues. The applicant will have 21 days from the day after receipt of a clarifying question to respond.

1.5.1.1. Challenge Mechanisms for CPE[15]

If the panel determines that the application has not met the CPE criteria and the applicant believes the evaluation panel has made a factual or procedural error, the applicant will have the opportunity to initiate an Evaluation Challenge proceeding. To initiate an Evaluation Challenge proceeding, the applicant must file a challenge within 21 days from the date of transmission of the evaluation determination. The Evaluation Challenge will be reviewed by the same CPE Provider who performed the review during the initial evaluation period. The CPE Service Provider should use a different set of panelists to evaluate an Evaluation Challenge where

> **Commented [3]:** additional instructions? who with/how file

> **Commented [4]:** maybe something to add to app journey?

---

[13] See [Section X.X. Application StatusesApplicant Journey] for more information regarding procedures for applications in different statuses.

[14] CPE Clarifying Questions should not be confused with any other clarifying questions that might be issued to applicants during applicant or application evaluations.

[15] Please note the challenge mechanism for CPE is separate from ICANN Accountability Mechanisms. ICANN Accountability Mechanisms provide additional avenues for review of ICANN actions, such as a Reconsideration Process, the Independent Review Process, and the ICANN Ombudsman. See here for more information on Accountability Mechanisms: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/mechanisms-2014-03-20-en.

> **Formatted Table**

practicable ("the Challenge Panel"). If the Challenge Panel finds a factual, procedural, or system error, the application will be reevaluated for CPE taking into account the findings from the Evaluation Challenge. If the Challenge Panel does not find a factual, procedural, or system error, the application will continue to the next stage in the process of contention resolution. Note that there are no conditional fees associated with an Evaluation Challenge proceeding.

1.6. Community Priority Evaluation Scoring

The CPE panel will review and score the application of a community-based applicant that elects to participate in CPE against the four criteria listed in Section 1.76 Community Priority Evaluation Criteria. An application must achieve a score of at least 75% (12 / 16 points) to prevail in CPE.

The scoring process is designed to identify qualified community-based applications, while preventing both "false positives" (awarding undue priority to an application that refers to a "community" construed merely to get a highly desired generic word as a gTLD string) and "false negatives" (not awarding priority to a qualified community application). This calls for a holistic approach, taking multiple criteria into account, as reflected in the process. The scoring will be performed by a panel and be based on information provided in the application plus other relevant information available (such as: public information regarding the community represented, responses to CPE Clarifying Questions, letters of support or opposition, or any limited research conducted by the panel).

Commented [5]: application comments?

Commented [6]: yes, I thought we had broad agreement on public comments when we discussed them in the last CPE meeting.

It should be noted that a qualified community application will receive priority over all directly contending applications. This means that the prevailing application will proceed to the next stage in the application process and all other contenting applications cannot proceed. This is a fundamental reason for stringent requirements for qualification of a community-based application, as embodied in the criteria below. A finding by the panel that an application does not meet the scoring threshold to prevail in a community priority evaluation is not an indication the community itself is in some way inadequate, invalid, or does not exist, but rather that the application does not qualify to receive priority over all other applications in the contention set.

1.7. Community Priority Evaluation Criteria

CPE is based upon the panel's evaluation of the application against four main criteria:

- Criterion 1: Community Establishment (6 points)
- Criterion 2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community (4 points)
- Criterion 3: Registration Policies (2 points)
- Criterion 4: Community Endorsement (4 points)

1.7.1. Criterion 1: Community Establishment

This section evaluates the community as explicitly identified in the application. Accordingly, the panel will seek to answer the following core questions in evaluating the application against this criterion:

Formatted Table

A. **Organization (2 points):** Is the applicant the organizing body for the community? If not, is the applicant able to demonstrate that the community is organized, with an organizing body(ies) relevant to the community or to each member category of the community?
B. **Engagement (1 point):** Is the applicant able to demonstrate that there is active engagement with community members?
C. **Awareness (1 point)**: Is the applicant able to demonstrate awareness among and between community members of the identified community?
D. **Established Presence (1 point)**: Is the applicant able to demonstrate a global external awareness of the community as well as an established presence of the community prior to the opening of the application submission period?
E. **Longevity (1 point):** Is the applicant able to demonstrate the longevity of the community's pursuits, showing that they are enduring and sustainable rather than temporary?

1.7.1.1. Scoring for Criterion 1: Community Establishment

An application can receive up to five (65) points, with a maximum of two (2) points awarded for the organization sub-criterion, and a maximum of one (1) point for the engagement, awareness, established presence, and longevity sub-criteria. See scoring guides below:

A. Organization (2)

Table X: Criterion 1 - Organization

2 - Applicant is the organizing body for the identified community	1 - Community has evidence of organizing bodies	0 - Community has no evidence of organizing bodies
The applicant serves as the sole organizing body for the identified community and all its member categories, with exclusive responsibility for representing or administering the community.	The applicant is not the sole organizing body for the identified community, but is able to demonstrate that the community has an organizing body or bodies relevant to the identified community as a whole or relevant to each identified member category of the community. These organizing bodies may either represent or administer the community.	The applicant is not able to demonstrate that there is an organizing body or bodies relevant to the identified community or to each member category of the identified community.

● The following are the guidelines for **Organization**:
   a. Is the applicant able to demonstrate that it is the sole organizing body for the community, whether to represent or administer it? If not, is the applicant able to

demonstrate that there are organizing bodies relevant to the identified community?

b. Is there one association dedicated to the community as a whole, or are there multiple individual organizations that represent, administer or are relevant to different segments or groups within the community?

    i. Multiple entities may administer or represent a community. An organization *representing* a community should be regarded with the same level of importance and legitimacy as one that *administers* the community.

c. In support of providing evidence related to organization, the applicant should provide:

    i. An overview of the community structure, as applicable, and whether it is formal or informal:

        1. Formal communities typically have well-defined organizational structures and membership lists, such as economic communities or coalitions of nonprofit organizations.

        2. Non-formal communities may consist of self-identified members, or individuals, such as those in linguistic or cultural groups.

    ii. The names of relevant organizations

    iii. Relevant leaders within the community, as applicable

    iv. Information regarding how an individual would join the community, such as through paying membership fees, skill and/or accreditation requirements, or certifications aligned with community goals; or, any privileges or benefits entitled to members upon joining a community.

    v. Information regarding whether organizing bodies were established to administer or represent the community. Relevant information may include the mission statements of the identified organizing bodies.

d. Does an internet search corroborate the evidence provided by the applicant of organization within the community, e.g., the existence of bodies or groups that are relevant to the community, or, if applicable, evidence of the applicant acting on behalf of the community?

B. Engagement (1)

Table X: Criterion 1 - Engagement

1 - Demonstration of engagement activities	0 - Limited or no demonstration of engagement activities
Applicant is able to sufficiently demonstrate[16] its active[17] efforts to engage and connect with community members.	The applicant is not able to sufficiently demonstrate its active efforts to engage and connect with community members.

---

[16] Either as the organizing body itself or through the organizing bodies which it has identified as relevant to the community. In the latter case, the applicant, in submitting their application,may be acting as an "aggregator" for the community, obtaining the relevant information on and support from the community.

[17] "Active" suggests that the community is engaging with community members at a defined frequency. The frequency of the activities listed in "b." may vary by community, but regardless of frequency, the applicant should show evidence of ongoing activities or efforts within the last two years. The inability to demonstrate recent and ongoing "active" Engagement may be an indicator of an inactive community. However, the panel should take into account different types of communities in evaluating this sub-criterion and the relevance and frequency of recent activity.

Formatted Table

- The following are the guidelines for **Engagement**:
  a. As noted in the Organization sub-criterion, a community may have one or multiple organizations representing or administering it. In the same way, there may be one or multiple organizations or entities conducting engagement activities on behalf of the identified community.
  b. In support of demonstrating "active" Engagement, the applicant should provide documentation of the following practices, which should have occurred within the two years leading up to application submission:
      - Offering support;
      - Sharing information;
      - Responding to specific community needs;
      - Fostering and strengthening relationships within the community.
      - Note that the inability to demonstrate recent Engagement-related activities may be an indicator of a community that lacks engagement. However, the panel should take into account different types of communities in evaluating this sub-criterion and the relevance of recent activity.
  c. An internet search should corroborate the evidence provided by the applicant regarding activities held by the community's organizing body(ies) (or the applicant itself).

C. Awareness (1)

Table X: Criterion 1 - Awareness

1 - Demonstration of awareness among community members	0 - No demonstration of awareness among community members
Applicant is able to demonstrate[18] an awareness among and between the community members of the identified community and its various sub-groups or member categories.	Applicant is not able to demonstrate an awareness among and between the identified community and its various sub-groups or member categories.

- The following are the guidelines for **Awareness**:
  a. Are community members aware of the existence of the identified community? Do community members recognize the identified community? The panel should take into account the nature of the identified community. For example, for some communities, awareness or recognition of a community and public acknowledgment of membership in such a community may be limited by national law. The panel should consider that awareness would be assessed differently for such a community. ~~The views of the relevant community-related experts, especially in cases where recognition of awareness of the community is not measurable (for example, where such recognition is prevented by national law), may provide additional insight.~~

Commented [8]: I'm afraid we are counting, double counting and triple counting what the (self-)identified communities are allowed to do. In this change, we deleted the "check" that was here: "The views of the relevant community-related experts, especially in cases where recognition of awareness of the community is not measurable" -- and we should add, where they are very measurable (and may not be reflected by the self-identified groups). *THESE CHECKS WERE NOT QUESTIONED BY OUR COMMENTERS.* We know that Community Establishment, Organization and Engagement are internally facing, and Awareness & Community Endorsement are Externally Facing. If the "identified community" applies only to how the Applicant defines it, and not how the rest of the world would see the term or identify the Community, then we have no CPE -- all of the balance and external recognition and awareness is thrown out. What was intended to protect a small group of not-identified-communities will be gamed to hurt well-known communities with factions and haters.

Formatted Table

---

[18] *Ibid.*

b. In support of demonstrating Awareness, the applicant should provide documentation of the following practices, which should have occurred within the two years leading up to application submission:
  ■ Surveys conducted;
  ■ Records of activities involving a diversity of community groups, segments, or members;
  ■ Note that the inability to demonstrate recent Awareness-related activities may be an indicator of a community that lacks awareness. However, the panel should take into account different types of communities in evaluating this sub-criterion and the relevance of recent activity.
b. An internet search should corroborate the evidence provided by the applicant regarding awareness among community members, including across different segments, e.g., interaction in community activities or on online forums.

D. Established Presence (1)

Table X: Criterion 1 - Established Presence

1 - Demonstration of established presence of the community	0 - No demonstration of established presence of the community
Applicant is able to demonstrate[19] an external~~a global external~~[20] awareness of the identified community, including that there was an established presence of the community prior to the opening of the application submission period.	Applicant is not able to demonstrate an external awareness of the identified community. There is no evidence of an established presence of the community prior to the opening of the application submission period.

- The following are the guidelines for **Established Presence**:
  a. Are individuals and groups outside of the identified community aware of the existence of the identified community? The panel should keep in mind that awareness may differ based on the size, scope, or nature of the identified community. For example, a large sports-related community may be recognized globally, and an applicant for a string related to that sports community should show evidence of a global awareness of that community. In contrast, a small linguistic community may only be recognized within specific regions, and the applicant should only be required to provide evidence consistent with more localized awareness.
    a.i. ~~As with the Awareness sub-criterion, the views of the relevant community-related experts, especially in cases where recognition of the community is not measurable (for example, where such recognition is prevented by national law), may provide additional insight.~~

Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt

Formatted Table

b. In support of demonstrating an established presence, the applicant should provide documentation of the following practices, which should have occurred within the two years leading up to application submission:
   - Media or other public information regarding the community and its activities or members;
   - Discussion of the community in various fora, whether online or in person;
   - Evidence of partnerships or collaborations with groups outside of the identified community;
   - Evidence of the chartering or organization of the community prior to the opening of the application submission window;
   - Evidence of contributions (e.g., cultural or scientific) to a larger society or population;
   - Note that the inability to demonstrate an "established presence" may be an indicator of a community that lacks such presence. However, the panel should take into account different types of communities in evaluating this sub-criterion and the relevance of recent activity and how different communities might show presence.
c. An internet search should corroborate the evidence provided by the applicant regarding awareness of the identified community by those outside of it.

E. Longevity (1)

Table X: Criterion 1 - Longevity

1 - Demonstration of longevity of community's pursuits	0 - No demonstration of longevity of community's pursuits
Applicant is able to demonstrate[21] that the community's pursuits are enduring and sustainable.	Applicant is not able to demonstrate that the community's pursuits are enduring or sustainable.

- The following are the guidelines for **Longevity**:
  a. Is the community a relatively short-lived congregation (e.g., a group that is formed to represent a one-off event)? Is the community forward-looking (i.e., will it continue to exist in the future)? The panel should keep in mind that longevity may differ based on the nature of the identified community. For example, in some countries or regions, the continued existence of certain communities may be threatened by national or international policies, and the panel should consider that longevity would be measured differently for such a community.
  b. In support of demonstrating evidence related to longevity, the applicant should provide documentation of the following practices which should have occurred within the two years leading up to application submission:
     i. Evidence of recurring or scheduled activities that demonstrate continuity over time;

---

[21] *Ibid.*

Formatted Table

ii. Documented records of past activities that demonstrate a long-standing tradition or practice;
iii. Records of discussions emphasizing the community's enduring presence or its cultural significance.
iv. Note that the inability to demonstrate recent Longevity-related activities may be an indicator of a community that does not demonstrate longevity. However, the Panel should take into account different types of communities in evaluating this sub-criterion and the relevance of recent activity.
c. An internet search should corroborate the evidence provided by the applicant regarding the community's activities, whether past or planned, and its enduring presence, e.g., availability of information on community events or articles on community presence within a community.

1.7.2. Criterion 2: Nexus

This section evaluates the relevance of the applied-for string to the identified community. The panel will seek to answer the following core question in evaluating the applied-for string against this criterion:

Nexus (4 points): Does the string match the name of the community or is it a well-known alternative of the community name?

1.7.2.1. Scoring for Criterion 2: Nexus

An application can receive up to 4 points. See scoring guide below:

Table X: Criterion 2 - Nexus

4 - Full Match	2 - Strong match	1 - Partial match	0 - Weak or No match
String matches the name of the community or is a well-known alternative name of the community. The general public would associate the string with the identified community.	String matches the name of the community or is a well-known alternative name of the ~~short-form or abbreviation of the~~ community, but there may be other meanings of the string–while not in common usage– that the general public may associate with the string.	String partially matches the community or the community members but may have a meaning or connotation beyond the identified community–which is commonly used–that the general public may associate with the string.	String does not match or identify community or has a weak assoc with the community. The genera public would likely not associate string with the identified commu

- The following are the guidelines for Nexus:
  a. What is the "name" of the community? A reference to the "name" of the community is a reference to the established name by which the community is commonly known by others.[22]

22

Formatted Table

- ■ "Others" refers to individuals outside of the community itself. It also refers to recognition from other organization(s), such as quasi-official, publicly recognized institutions, or other peer groups.
  - ■ The name may be, but does not need to be, the name of an organization dedicated to any member category within the community.
  b. Will the general public instinctively think of the applying community when thinking of the applied-for string? Additional limited research can be conducted to help understand whether the string identifies the community and is known by others. The limited research should also reveal whether there are repeated and frequent references to legal entities or communities other than the community referenced in the application.
  c. Does the string identify a wider geographic or thematic remit than is related to the identified community? Does the string indicate a community of which the applicant is a part, but is not specific to the applicant's community?
  d. Is the size or definition of the identified community consistent with the string?
  e. An internet search should corroborate the evidence provided by the applicant regarding the string as it relates to the identified community. This may include verifying whether the applicant's responses to the application questions align with the mission statements of the relevant organizing bodies.

1.7.3.   Criterion 3: Registration Policies

This section evaluates the applicant's registration policies as indicated in the application. Registration policies are the conditions that the future registry will set for prospective registrants, i.e., those desiring to register second-level domain names under the registry.

Accordingly, the panel will seek to answer the following core questions when evaluating the application against this criterion:

A. **Eligibility (1 point)**: Is eligibility for registrants restricted? Who is qualified to register a domain in the TLD? Are there specific qualifications provided that entities or individuals must meet to be eligible as registrants by the registry?

B. **Name selection (1 point)**: Do the applicant's policies include name selection rules? Are name selection rules consistent with the mission statement and articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD? What domain names are acceptable in the TLD? Are there specific conditions provided that must be fulfilled for a second-level domain name to be considered acceptable by the registry?

1.7.3.1.   Scoring for Criterion 3: Registration Policies

An application can receive up to 2 points. See scoring guides below:

A. Eligibility (1)

Table X: Criterion 3 - Eligibility

1 - Restricted	0 - Unrestricted

Formatted Table

Eligibility is restricted to members within the identified community.	The identified community has an unrestricted approach to eligibility.

- The following are the guidelines for **Eligibility**:
    a. What limitations are imposed on potential registrants?
    b. With respect to "Eligibility," the limitation to community "members" may involve formal membership or be fulfilled in other ways, depending on the structure and focus of the community at hand. Some informal communities may have different methods for determining membership in a particular community.
        i. For example, for a geographic location community TLD, a limitation to members of the community can be achieved by requiring documentation, such as a business license or proof of a local address to verify physical presence in the associated geographic location.

B. Name Selection (1)

Table X: Criterion 3 - Name Selection

1 - Consistent with community-based purpose	0 - Not consistent with community-based purpose
Policies include name selection rules[23] that are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD[24].	Policies do not include name selection rules consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD.

- The following are the guidelines for **Name Selection**:
    a. Do the applicant's policies include name selection rules?
    b. Are name selection rules consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD?

1.7.4.   Criterion 4: Community Endorsement

This section evaluates community support and/or opposition to the application. The panel will seek to answer the following core question when evaluating the application against this criterion:

Support and Opposition (4 points): Is the applicant the organizing body for the identified community? Or does the applicant have support from a majority of the identified community? Does the applicant have any opposition?[25]

---

[23] "Name Selection" means the conditions that must be fulfilled for any second-level domain name to be deemed acceptable by the registry.

[24] As detailed in the responses to the application questions.

[25] Please note that CPE, and the Community Endorsement criterion, is separate from the Community Objection process, which allows for a party with standing to object to a gTLD application on the basis that there that there is well-substantiated opposition to an applied-for gTLD string and/or one or more applied-for allocatable variant string(s) from a significant portion of the community which the gTLD string may be explicitly or implicitly targeting. Please see [Section X.X Objections] for more information.

Formatted Table

1.7.4.1. Scoring for Criterion 4: Community Endorsement

An application can receive up to 4 points. See scoring guide below:

Table X: Criterion 4 - Community Endorsement

4 - Applicant has majority support and does not have relevant opposition~~Applicant is the organizing body and does not have relevant opposition~~	3 - Applicant has majority support and has relevant minority opposition ~~Applicant is the organizing body and does have relevant minority opposition~~ ~~Or~~ ~~Applicant has majority support and does not have relevant opposition~~	2 - Applicant has majority support but also has relevant majority opposition ~~Applicant has majority support and has relevant minority opposition~~	0 - Applicant does not have majority support
The applicant has demonstrated support with clear rationale from the organizing body(ies) from the identified community. The applicant does not have any relevant opposition. ~~The applicant serves as the sole organizing body for the identified community and all its member categories, with exclusive responsibility for representing or administering the identified community and does not have any relevant opposition.~~	The applicant has demonstrated majority support with clear rationale from the identified community. However, the applicant has relevant minority opposition with clear rationale. ~~The applicant serves as the sole organizing body for the identified community and all its member categories, with exclusive responsibility for representing or administering the identified community but the applicant has relevant minority opposition.~~ ~~Or~~	The applicant has demonstrated majority support with clear rationale from the identified community. However, the applicant also has relevant majority opposition with clear rationale. ~~The applicant has demonstrated majority support with clear rationale from the identified community.~~ ~~However, the applicant has relevant minority opposition with clear rationale.~~	The applicant has not demonstrated majority support with clear rationale from the identified community.

Commented [9]: significant? too much of a burden to be majority

Commented [10]: Based on Jeff's comment in our last meeting, you may want to say "relevant substantial opposition" in the 2 point category.

Formatted Table

	The applicant (which is not the sole organizing body for the identified community) has demonstrated support with clear rationale from the organizing body(ies) from the identified community. The applicant does not have any relevant opposition.		

1. These are the guidelines for the scoring of **support or opposition**:
   a. For full points, the applicant must be able to demonstrate that a majority of the identified community supports the applicant and that the applicant does not have any relevant opposition. the sole organizing body for the community and, as such, have the documented support of the community.
      The panel should consider whether the applicant is the sole organizing body for the community but does not have full support of the community. In such cases, the applicant cannot achieve full points.
   b. If the applicant is not the sole organizing body, the panel should consider whether the applicant is able to demonstrate that a majority of the community as identified supports the applicant.
   c. The panel should consider whether the applicant is able to demonstrate that there is relevant support or no relevant opposition from outside the community as identified. This may apply in cases where the applied-for string carries more than one meaning or when an applicant has identified a community that is narrower than the scope suggested by the applied-for string.
   d. The panel should consider whether there are objections to the application or comments from the same application round noting opposition to the application.
      i. Although these will be taken into account and assessed in this context, there will be no presumption that such objections or comments would lead to any particular score for "Opposition."
   e. The panel should consider whether the sources of opposition are clearly spurious, unsubstantiated, or filed for the purpose of obstruction.
   f. The panel should consider whether there is opposition by some other reputable organization(s), such as a quasi-official, publicly recognized organization(s) or a peer organization(s) and if the opposition amounts to a minority or majority of the community (see guidelines above regarding relevant organizations).

2. The following are guidelines for determining "**majority**" and "**minority**" support or opposition:
   a. "Majority" and "Minority" are defined according to the size of the identified community as detailed by the applicant in response to the application questions.

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Font: Bold, Underline

Commented [11]: Add more re: expectations for panel, doesn't just have to accept what applicant says. not only applicant asserting.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted Table

b. The applicant should define its community with clear estimates of size of the entire community and any sub-categories/groups within the community.

c. A majority of the overall community may be determined by, but not restricted to, considerations such as headcount or the geographic reach of the organizations.

d. Applicants without support from a majority of the community as identified will not receive points. Note that in some cases the panel may consider support from outside the community as identified as relevant. This may apply in cases where an applied-for string carries more than one meaning or when an applicant has identified a community that is narrower than the scope suggested by the applied-for string.

c.e. In some cases, an applicant may have majority support and majority opposition. This may occur when an identified community is divided on whether to support a particular applicant. Note that the panel may consider opposition from outside the community as identified as relevant, such as when an applied-for string carries more than one meaning. In such cases, an applicant may have a large amount of opposition from outside the community while still maintaining a large amount of support from within the community.

2.3. The following are the guidelines for determining **relevant organizations**:

a. The terms "relevance" and "relevant" refer to the organizations, groups, or communities with an association to the string. This means that support or opposition from communities not identified in the application but with an association to the applied-for string would be considered relevant.

b. Limited research should help determine relevance and size of the objecting or supporting organization(s).

c. As noted in Criterion 1, there may be one organizing body mainly dedicated to a community or multiple entities dedicated to a community.
   i. Are multiple institutions/organizations supporting the application, with documented support from institutions/organizations representing a majority of the overall community addressed? or,
   ii. Does the applicant have support from the majority of the recognized community institution/member organizations? or,
   iii. Has the applicant provided full documentation that it has authority to represent the community with its application?

d. In considering "relevant" support or opposition, the panel should consider both the size of the group or groups expressing support or opposition as well as the relevancy to the identified community or the string.
   i. For example, a letter of opposition from an organization that claims to represent several million individuals but has a weak association to the community or string may not be considered as relevant, in which case such a letter may count less towards opposition. Whereas a letter of opposition from a small group with a close association to the identified community or string may be considered more relevant, in which case such a letter may count more towards opposition. The same would be true of such letters of support.

3.4. The following are the guidelines for reviewing the **content of the documentation of support[26] or opposition**:

   a. The documentation clearly expresses the organization's support or opposition for the community-based application.[27]
   b. The documentation demonstrates the organization's understanding of the string being requested.
   c. The documentation submitted by the applicant is valid (i.e., the organization exists and the letter is authentic).
   d. The documentation should contain a description of the process and rationale used in arriving at the expression of support or opposition. Consideration of support or opposition is not based merely on the number of comments or expressions of support or opposition received. Support or opposition will not be considered if the documentation lacks a clear rationale or explanation for the support or opposition.

~~4. These are the guidelines for the level of **support or opposition**:~~
   ~~a. For full points, the applicant must be the sole organizing body for the community and, as such, have the documented support of the community.~~
   ~~b. The panel should consider whether the applicant is the sole organizing body for the community but does not have full support of the community. In such cases, the applicant cannot achieve full points.~~
   ~~c. If the applicant is not the sole organizing body, the panel should consider whether the applicant is able to demonstrate that a majority of the community as identified supports the applicant.~~
   ~~d. The panel should consider whether the applicant is able to demonstrate that there is relevant support or no relevant opposition from outside the community as identified. This may apply in cases where the applied-for string carries more than one meaning or when an applicant has identified a community that is narrower than the scope suggested by the applied-for string..~~
   ~~e. The panel should consider whether there are objections to the application or comments from the same application round noting opposition to the application.~~
      ~~i. Although these will be taken into account and assessed in this context, there will be no presumption that such objections or comments would lead to any particular score for "Opposition."~~
   ~~f. The panel should consider whether the sources of opposition are clearly spurious, unsubstantiated, or filed for the purpose of obstruction.~~
~~g.~~5. ~~The panel should consider whether there is opposition by some other reputable organization(s), such as a quasi-official, publicly recognized organization(s) or a peer organization(s) and if the opposition amounts to a minority or majority of the community (see guidelines above regarding relevant organizations).~~

See table X below for a more detailed explanation of how a panel would evaluate different levels of support and opposition.

---

[26]An applicant for a Community-based TLD string and its allocatable variant label(s) is required to submit a written endorsement of its applied-for primary gTLD.

[27] It should be noted that the information provided by the applicant in response to Criterion 1: Community Establishment will play an important role in the panel's scoring of Criterion 4: Endorsement.

Table X: Explanation of Panel Evaluation with different levels of support and opposition

Support	Opposition	Scenario	Points
~~Applicant is the sole organizing body~~	~~No Opposition~~	~~Applicant is the sole organizing body with exclusive responsibility for representing or administering the identified community~~	~~4~~
~~Applicant is the sole organizing body~~	~~Minority opposition~~	~~Applicant is the sole organizing body with relevant minority opposition~~	~~3~~
Majority support	No opposition	Majority support with no relevant opposition	4~~3~~
Majority support	Minority opposition	Majority support with relevant minority opposition	3~~2~~
Majority support	Majority opposition	Majority support with relevant majority opposition	2
Minority support[28] or No Support	Any opposition or No opposition	Applicant does not have majority support~~Minority support with no relevant opposition~~	0
~~Minority support~~	~~Minority opposition~~	~~Minority support with minority relevant opposition~~	~~0~~
~~Minority support~~	~~Majority opposition[29]~~	~~Minority support with majority relevant opposition~~	~~0~~
~~No support~~	~~No opposition~~	~~No support and no relevant opposition~~	~~0~~
~~No support~~	~~Minority opposition~~	~~No support with minority relevant opposition~~	~~0~~
~~No support~~	~~Majority opposition~~	~~No support with majority relevant opposition~~	~~0~~