

# **Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) Guidelines**

**Prepared by The Economist Intelligence Unit**

Version 2.0

## **Interconnection between Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) Guidelines and the Applicant Guidebook (AGB)**

The CPE Guidelines are an accompanying document to the AGB, and are meant to provide additional clarity around the process and scoring principles outlined in the AGB. This document does not modify the AGB framework, nor does it change the intent or standards laid out in the AGB. The Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU) is committed to evaluating each applicant under the criteria outlined in the AGB. The CPE Guidelines are intended to increase transparency, fairness and predictability around the assessment process.

## Criterion #1: Community Establishment

This section relates to the community as explicitly identified and defined according to statements in the application. (The implicit reach of the applied-for string is not considered here, but taken into account when scoring Criterion #2, “Nexus between Proposed String and Community.”)

Measured by

1-A Delineation

1-B Extension

A maximum of 4 points is possible on the Community Establishment criterion, and each sub-criterion has a maximum of 2 possible points.

### 1-A Delineation

AGB Criteria	Evaluation Guidelines
<b>Scoring</b>	
<p>2= Clearly delineated, organized, and pre-existing community.</p> <p>1= Clearly delineated and pre-existing community, but not fulfilling the requirements for a score of 2.</p> <p>0= Insufficient delineation and pre-existence for a score of 1.</p>	<p>The following questions must be scored when evaluating the application:</p> <p><i>Is the community clearly delineated?</i></p> <p><i>Is there at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community?</i></p> <p><i>Does the entity (referred to above) have documented evidence of community activities?</i></p> <p><i>Has the community been active since at least September 2007?</i></p>
<b>Definitions</b>	
<p>“Community” - 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. Notably, as “community” is used throughout the application, there should be: (a) an awareness and recognition of a community among its members; (b) some</p>	<p>The “community,” as it relates to Criterion #1, refers to the stated community in the application.</p> <p>Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Was the entity established to administer the community?</i></li> <li>• <i>Does the entity’s mission statement clearly identify the community?</i></li> </ul>

<p>understanding of the community’s existence prior to September 2007 (when the new gTLD policy recommendations were completed); and (c) extended tenure or longevity—non-transience—into the future.</p>	<p>Additional research may need to be performed to establish that there is documented evidence of community activities. Research may include reviewing the entity’s web site, including mission statements, charters, reviewing websites of community members (pertaining to groups), if applicable, etc.</p>
<p>"Delineation" relates to the membership of a community, where a clear and straight-forward membership definition scores high, while an unclear, dispersed or unbound definition scores low.</p>	<p>“Delineation” also refers to the extent to which a community has the requisite awareness and recognition from its members.</p> <p>The following non-exhaustive list denotes elements of straight-forward member definitions: fees, skill and/or accreditation requirements, privileges or benefits entitled to members, certifications aligned with community goals, etc.</p>
<p>"Pre-existing" means that a community has been active as such since before the new gTLD policy recommendations were completed in September 2007.</p>	
<p>"Organized" implies that there is at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community, with documented evidence of community activities.</p>	<p>“Mainly” could imply that the entity administering the community may have additional roles/functions beyond administering the community, but one of the key or primary purposes/functions of the entity is to administer a community or a community organization.</p> <p>Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Was the entity established to administer the community?</i></li> <li>• <i>Does the entity’s mission statement clearly identify the community?</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Criterion 1-A guidelines</b></p>	
<p>With respect to “Delineation” and “Extension,” it should be noted that a community can consist of legal entities (for example, an association of suppliers of a particular service), of individuals (for example, a language community) or of a logical alliance of communities (for example, an international federation of national communities of a similar nature). All are viable as such, provided the requisite awareness and recognition of the</p>	<p>With respect to the Community, consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Are community members aware of the existence of the community as defined by the applicant?</i></li> <li>• <i>Do community members recognize the community as defined by the applicant?</i></li> </ul>

<p>community is at hand among the members. Otherwise the application would be seen as not relating to a real community and score 0 on both “Delineation” and “Extension.”</p> <p>With respect to “Delineation,” if an application satisfactorily demonstrates all three relevant parameters (delineation, pre-existing and organized), then it scores a 2.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Is there clear evidence of such awareness and recognition?</i></li> </ul>
--	---

**1-B Extension**

<b>AGB Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Guidelines</b>
<b>Scoring</b>	
<p>Extension:</p> <p>2=Community of considerable size and longevity</p> <p>1=Community of either considerable size or longevity, but not fulfilling the requirements for a score of 2.</p> <p>0=Community of neither considerable size nor longevity</p>	<p>The following questions must be scored when evaluating the application:</p> <p><i>Is the community of considerable size?</i></p> <p><i>Does the community demonstrate longevity?</i></p>
<b>Definitions</b>	
<p>“Extension” relates to the dimensions of the community, regarding its number of members, geographical reach, and foreseeable activity lifetime, as further explained in the following.</p>	
<p>"Size" relates both to the number of members and the geographical reach of the community, and will be scored depending on the context rather than on absolute numbers - a geographic location community may count millions of members in a limited location, a language community may have a million members with some spread over the globe, a community of service providers may have "only" some hundred members although well spread over the globe, just to mention some examples - all these can be regarded as of "considerable size."</p>	<p>Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Is the designated community large in terms of membership and/or geographic dispersion?</i></li> </ul>

<p>"Longevity" means that the pursuits of a community are of a lasting, non-transient nature.</p>	<p>Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Is the community a relatively short-lived congregation (e.g. a group that forms to represent a one-off event)?</i></li> <li>• <i>Is the community forward-looking (i.e. will it continue to exist in the future)?</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Criterion 1-B Guidelines</b></p>	
<p>With respect to "Delineation" and "Extension," it should be noted that a community can consist of legal entities (for example, an association of suppliers of a particular service), of individuals (for example, a language community) or of a logical alliance of communities (for example, an international federation of national communities of a similar nature). All are viable as such, provided the requisite awareness and recognition of the community is at hand among the members. Otherwise the application would be seen as not relating to a real community and score 0 on both "Delineation" and "Extension."</p> <p>With respect to "Extension," if an application satisfactorily demonstrates both community size and longevity, it scores a 2.</p>	

## Criterion #2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community

This section evaluates the relevance of the string to the specific community that it claims to represent.

Measured by

2-A Nexus

2-B Uniqueness

A maximum of 4 points is possible on the Nexus criterion, and with the Nexus sub-criterion having a maximum of 3 possible points, and the Uniqueness sub-criterion having a maximum of 1 possible point.

### 2-A Nexus

AGB Criteria	Evaluation Guidelines
<b>Scoring</b>	
<p>Nexus:</p> <p>3= The string matches the name of the community or is a well-known short-form or abbreviation of the community</p> <p>2= String identifies the community, but does not qualify for a score of 3</p> <p>0= String nexus does not fulfill the requirements for a score of 2</p>	<p>The following question must be scored when evaluating the application:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Does the string match the name of the community or is it a well-known short-form or abbreviation of the community name? The name may be, but does not need to be, the name of an organization dedicated to the community.</i></p>
<b>Definitions</b>	
<p>“Name” of the community means the established name by which the community is commonly known by others. It may be, but does not need to be, the name of an organization dedicated to the community.</p>	<p>“Others” refers to individuals outside of the community itself, as well as the most knowledgeable individuals in the wider geographic and language environment of direct relevance. It also refers to recognition from other organization(s), such as quasi-official, publicly recognized institutions, or other peer groups.</p>
<p>“Identify” means that the applied for string closely describes the community or the community members, without over-reaching substantially beyond the community.</p>	<p>“Match” is of a higher standard than “identify” and means ‘corresponds to’ or ‘is equal to’.</p> <p>“Identify” does not simply mean ‘describe’, but means ‘closely describes the community’.</p> <p>“Over-reaching substantially” means that the string indicates a wider geographical or thematic remit than the community has.</p>

	<p>Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Does the string identify a wider or related community of which the applicant is a part, but is not specific to the applicant’s community?</i></li> <li>• <i>Does the string capture a wider geographical/thematic remit than the community has? The “community” refers to the community as defined by the applicant.</i></li> <li>• <i>An Internet search should be utilized to help understand whether the string identifies the community and is known by others.</i></li> <li>• <i>Consider whether the application mission statement, community responses, and websites align.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Criterion 2-A Guidelines</b></p>	
<p>With respect to “Nexus,” for a score of 3, the essential aspect is that the applied-for string is commonly known by others as the identification / name of the community.</p> <p>With respect to “Nexus,” for a score of 2, the applied-for string should closely describe the community or the community members, without over-reaching substantially beyond the community. As an example, a string could qualify for a score of 2 if it is a noun that the typical community member would naturally be called in the context. If the string appears excessively broad (such as, for example, a globally well-known but local tennis club applying for “.TENNIS”) then it would not qualify for a 2.</p>	

**2-B Uniqueness**

<p><b>AGB Criteria</b></p>	<p><b>Evaluation Guidelines</b></p>
<p><b>Scoring</b></p>	
<p>Uniqueness: 1=String has no other significant meaning beyond</p>	<p>The following question must be scored when evaluating the application:</p>



<p>identifying the community described in the application. 0=String does not fulfill the requirement for a score of 1.</p>	<p><i>Does the string have any other significant meaning (to the public in general) beyond identifying the community described in the application?</i></p>
<p><b>Definitions</b></p>	
<p>“Identify” means that the applied for string closely describes the community or the community members, without over-reaching substantially beyond the community.</p>	<p>“Over-reaching substantially” means that the string indicates a wider geographical or thematic remit than the community has.</p>
<p>“Significant meaning” relates to the public in general, with consideration of the community language context added</p>	<p>Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Will the public in general immediately think of the applying community when thinking of the applied-for string?</i></li> <li>• <i>If the string is unfamiliar to the public in general, it may be an indicator of uniqueness.</i></li> <li>• <i>Is the geography or activity implied by the string?</i></li> <li>• <i>Is the size and delineation of the community inconsistent with the string?</i></li> <li>• <i>An internet search should be utilized to find out whether there are repeated and frequent references to legal entities or communities other than the community referenced in the application.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Criterion 2-B Guidelines</b></p>	
<p>"Uniqueness" will be scored both with regard to the community context and from a general point of view. For example, a string for a particular geographic location community may seem unique from a general perspective, but would not score a 1 for uniqueness if it carries another significant meaning in the common language used in the relevant community location. The phrasing "...beyond identifying the community" in the score of 1 for "uniqueness" implies a requirement that the string does identify the community, i.e. scores</p>	

2 or 3 for "Nexus," in order to be eligible for a score of 1 for "Uniqueness."

It should be noted that "Uniqueness" is only about the meaning of the string - since the evaluation takes place to resolve contention there will obviously be other applications, community-based and/or standard, with identical or confusingly similar strings in the contention set to resolve, so the string will clearly not be "unique" in the sense of "alone."

## 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.

Measured by

3-A Eligibility

3-B Name Selection

3-C Content and Use

3-D Enforcement

A maximum of 4 points is possible on the Registration Policies criterion and each sub-criterion has a maximum of 1 possible point.

### 3-A Eligibility

AGB Criteria	Evaluation Guidelines
<b>Scoring</b>	
Eligibility: 1= Eligibility restricted to community members 0= Largely unrestricted approach to eligibility	The following question must be scored when evaluating the application:  <i>Is eligibility for being allowed as a registrant restricted?</i>
<b>Definitions</b>	
“Eligibility” means the qualifications that organizations or individuals must have in order to be allowed as registrants by the registry.	
<b>Criterion 3-A Guidelines</b>	
With respect to “eligibility” the limitation to community “members” can invoke a formal membership but can also be satisfied in other ways, depending on the structure and orientation of the community at hand. For example, for a geographic location community TLD, a limitation to members of the community can be achieved by requiring that the registrant’s physical address be within the boundaries of the location.	

### 3-B Name Selection

AGB Criteria	Evaluation Guidelines
<b>Scoring</b>	
<p>Name selection:            1= Policies include name selection rules consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD            0= Policies do not fulfill the requirements for a score of 1</p>	<p>The following questions must be scored when evaluating the application:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Do the applicant’s policies include name selection rules?</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Are name selection rules consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD?</i></p>
<b>Definitions</b>	
<p>“Name selection” means the conditions that must be fulfilled for any second-level domain name to be deemed acceptable by the registry.</p>	<p>Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Are the name selection rules consistent with the entity’s mission statement?</i></li> </ul>
<b>Criterion 3-B Guidelines</b>	
<p>With respect to “Name selection,” scoring of applications against these subcriteria will be done from a holistic perspective, with due regard for the particularities of the community explicitly addressed. For example, an application proposing a TLD for a language community may feature strict rules imposing this language for name selection as well as for content and use, scoring 1 on both B and C above. It could nevertheless include forbearance in the enforcement measures for tutorial sites assisting those wishing to learn the language and still score 1 on D. More restrictions do not automatically result in a higher score. The restrictions and corresponding enforcement mechanisms proposed by the applicant should show an alignment with the community-based purpose of the TLD and demonstrate continuing accountability to the community named in the application.</p>	

### 3-C Content and Use

AGB Criteria	Evaluation Guidelines
--------------	-----------------------

<b>Scoring</b>	
<p>Content and use:  1= Policies include rules for content and use consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD  0= Policies do not fulfill the requirements for a score of 1</p>	<p>The following questions must be scored when evaluating the application:</p> <p><i>Do the applicant’s policies include content and use rules?</i></p> <p><i>If yes, are content and use rules consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD?</i></p>
<b>Definitions</b>	
<p>“Content and use” means the restrictions stipulated by the registry as to the content provided in and the use of any second-level domain name in the registry.</p>	<p>Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Are the content and use rules consistent with the applicant’s mission statement?</i></li> </ul>
<b>Criterion 3-C Guidelines</b>	
<p>With respect to “Content and Use,” scoring of applications against these subcriteria will be done from a holistic perspective, with due regard for the particularities of the community explicitly addressed. For example, an application proposing a TLD for a language community may feature strict rules imposing this language for name selection as well as for content and use, scoring 1 on both B and C above. It could nevertheless include forbearance in the enforcement measures for tutorial sites assisting those wishing to learn the language and still score 1 on D. More restrictions do not automatically result in a higher score. The restrictions and corresponding enforcement mechanisms proposed by the applicant should show an alignment with the community-based purpose of the TLD and demonstrate continuing accountability to the community named in the application.</p>	

### 3-D Enforcement

<b>AGB Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Guidelines</b>
<b>Scoring</b>	
<p>Enforcement  1= Policies include specific enforcement measures</p>	<p>The following question must be scored when evaluating the application:</p>

<p>(e.g. investigation practices, penalties, takedown procedures) constituting a coherent set with appropriate appeal mechanisms 0= Policies do not fulfill the requirements for a score of 1</p>	<p><i>Do the policies include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set with appropriate appeal mechanisms?</i></p>
---	---

**Definitions**

<p>“Enforcement” means the tools and provisions set out by the registry to prevent and remedy any breaches of the conditions by registrants.</p>	<p>“Coherent set” refers to enforcement measures that ensure continued accountability to the named community, and can include investigation practices, penalties, and takedown procedures with appropriate appeal mechanisms. This includes screening procedures for registrants, and provisions to prevent and remedy any breaches of its terms by registrants.</p> <p>Consider the following: Do the enforcement measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Investigation practices</i></li> <li>• <i>Penalties</i></li> <li>• <i>Takedown procedures (e.g., removing the string)</i></li> <li>• <i>Whether such measures are aligned with the community-based purpose of the TLD</i></li> <li>• <i>Whether such measures demonstrate continuing accountability to the community named in the application</i></li> </ul>
--	---

**Criterion 3-D Guidelines**

<p>With respect to “Enforcement,” scoring of applications against these subcriteria will be done from a holistic perspective, with due regard for the particularities of the community explicitly addressed. For example, an application proposing a TLD for a language community may feature strict rules imposing this language for name selection as well as for content and use, scoring 1 on both B and C above. It could nevertheless include forbearance in the enforcement measures for tutorial sites assisting those wishing to learn the language and still score 1 on D. More restrictions do not automatically result in a higher score. The restrictions and corresponding enforcement</p>	
--	--

mechanisms proposed by the applicant should show an alignment with the community-based purpose of the TLD and demonstrate continuing accountability to the community named in the application.	
--	--

## Criterion #4: Community Endorsement

This section evaluates community support and/or opposition to the application. Support and opposition will be scored in relation to the communities explicitly addressed in the application, with due regard for communities implicitly addressed by the string.

Measured by

4-A Support

4-B Opposition

A maximum of 4 points is possible on the Community Endorsement criterion and each sub-criterion (Support and Opposition) has a maximum of 2 possible points.

### 4-A Support

AGB Criteria	Evaluation Guidelines
<b>Scoring</b>	
<p>Support:</p> <p>2= Applicant is, or has documented support from, the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), or has otherwise documented authority to represent the community</p> <p>1= Documented support from at least one group with relevance, but insufficient support for a score of 2</p> <p>0= Insufficient proof of support for a score of 1</p>	<p>The following questions must be scored when evaluating the application:</p> <p><i>Is the applicant the recognized community institution or member organization?</i></p> <p>To assess this question please consider the following:</p> <p><i>a. Consider whether the community institution or member organization is the clearly recognized representative of the community.</i></p> <p>If the applicant meets this provision, proceed to Letter(s) of support and their verification. If it does not, or if there is more than one recognized community institution or member organization (and the applicant is one of them), consider the following:</p> <p><i>Does the applicant have documented</i></p>



	<p><i>support from the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s) to represent the community?</i></p> <p>If the applicant meets this provision, proceed to Letter(s) of support and their verification. If not, consider the following:</p> <p><i>Does the applicant have documented authority to represent the community?</i></p> <p>If the applicant meets this provision, proceed to Letter(s) of support and their verification. If not, consider the following:</p> <p><i>Does the applicant have support from at least one group with relevance?</i></p> <p>If the applicant meets this provision, proceed to Letter(s) of support and their verification.</p> <p>➤ Instructions on letter(s) of support requirements are located below, in <b>Letter(s) of support and their verification</b></p>
<b>Definitions</b>	
<p>“Recognized” means the institution(s)/organization(s) that, through membership or otherwise, are clearly recognized by the community members as representative of that community.</p>	
<p>“Relevance” and “relevant” refer to the communities explicitly and implicitly addressed. This means that opposition from communities not identified in the application but with an association to the applied for string would be considered relevant.</p>	<p>The institution(s)/organization(s) could be deemed relevant when not identified in the application but has an association to the applied-for string.</p>
<b>Criterion 4-A Guidelines</b>	
<p>With respect to “Support,” it follows that documented support from, for example, the only national association relevant to a particular community on a national level would score a 2 if the string is clearly oriented to that national level, but only a 1 if the string implicitly addresses similar communities in other nations.</p>	<p><b>Letter(s) of support and their verification:</b> Letter(s) of support must be evaluated to determine both the relevance of the organization and the validity of the documentation and must meet the criteria spelled out below. The letter(s) of support is an input used to determine the relevance of the organization and the validity of</p>

<p>Also with respect to “Support,” the plurals in brackets for a score of 2, relate to cases of multiple institutions/organizations. In such cases there must be documented support from institutions/organizations representing a majority of the overall community addressed in order to score 2.</p> <p>The applicant will score a 1 for “Support” if it does not have support from the majority of the recognized community institutions/member organizations, or does not provide full documentation that it has authority to represent the community with its application. A 0 will be scored on “Support” if the applicant fails to provide documentation showing support from recognized community institutions/community member organizations, or does not provide documentation showing that it has the authority to represent the community. It should be noted, however, that documented support from groups or communities that may be seen as implicitly addressed but have completely different orientations compared to the applicant community will not be required for a score of 2 regarding support.</p> <p>To be taken into account as relevant support, such documentation must contain a description of the process and rationale used in arriving at the expression of support. Consideration of support is not based merely on the number of comments or expressions of support received.</p>	<p>the documentation.</p> <p>Consider the following:</p> <p>Are there multiple institutions/organizations supporting the application, with documented support from institutions/organizations representing a majority of the overall community addressed?</p> <p>Does the applicant have support from the majority of the recognized community institution/member organizations?</p> <p>Has the applicant provided full documentation that it has authority to represent the community with its application?</p> <p>A majority of the overall community may be determined by, but not restricted to, considerations such as headcount, the geographic reach of the organizations, or other features such as the degree of power of the organizations.</p> <p><u>Determining relevance and recognition</u></p> <p><i>Is the organization relevant and/or recognized as per the definitions above?</i></p> <p><u>Letter requirements &amp; validity</u></p> <p><i>Does the letter clearly express the organization’s support for the community-based application?</i></p> <p><i>Does the letter demonstrate the organization’s understanding of the string being requested?</i></p> <p><i>Is the documentation submitted by the applicant valid (i.e. the organization exists and the letter is authentic)?</i></p> <p>To be taken into account as relevant support, such documentation must contain a description of the process and rationale used in arriving at the expression of support. Consideration of support is not based merely on the number of comments or</p>
--	--

	expressions of support received.
--	----------------------------------

#### 4-B Opposition

AGB Criteria	Evaluation Guidelines
<b>Scoring</b>	
<p>Opposition:</p> <p>2= No opposition of relevance</p> <p>1= Relevant opposition from one group of non-negligible size</p> <p>0= Relevant opposition from two or more groups of non-negligible size</p>	<p>The following question must be scored when evaluating the application:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Does the application have any opposition that is deemed relevant?</i></p>
<b>Definitions</b>	
<p>“Relevance” and “relevant” refer to the communities explicitly and implicitly addressed. This means that opposition from communities not identified in the application but with an association to the applied for string would be considered relevant.</p>	<p>Consider the following:</p> <p>For “non-negligible” size, “relevant” and “relevance” consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>If the application has opposition from communities that are deemed to be relevant.</i></li> <li>• <i>If a web search may help determine relevance and size of the objecting organization(s).</i></li> <li>• <i>If there is opposition by some other reputable organization(s), such as a quasi-official, publicly recognized organization(s) or a peer organization(s)?</i></li> <li>• <i>If there is opposition from a part of the community explicitly or implicitly addressed?</i></li> </ul>
<b>Criterion 4-B Guidelines</b>	
<p>When scoring “Opposition,” previous objections to the application as well as public comments during the same application round will be taken into account and assessed in this context. There will be no presumption that such objections or comments would prevent a score of 2 or lead to any particular score for “Opposition.” To be taken into account as relevant opposition, such objections or</p>	<p><b>Letter(s) of opposition and their verification:</b> Letter(s) of opposition should be evaluated to determine both the relevance of the organization and the validity of the documentation and should meet the criteria spelled out below.</p> <p><u>Determining relevance and recognition</u> <i>Is the organization relevant and/or</i></p>

<p>comments must be of a reasoned nature. Sources of opposition that are clearly spurious, unsubstantiated, made for a purpose incompatible with competition objectives, or filed for the purpose of obstruction will not be considered relevant.</p>	<p><i>recognized as per the definitions above?</i></p> <p><u>Letter requirements &amp; validity</u></p> <p><i>Does the letter clearly express the organization's opposition to the applicant's application?</i></p> <p><i>Does the letter demonstrate the organization's understanding of the string being requested?</i></p> <p><i>Is the documentation submitted by the organization valid (i.e. the organization exists and the letter is authentic)?</i></p> <p>To be considered relevant opposition, such documentation should contain a description of the process and rationale used in arriving at the expression of opposition. Consideration of opposition is not based merely on the number of comments or expressions of opposition received.</p>
---	---

## Verification of letter(s) of support and opposition

Additional information on the verification of letter(s) of support and opposition:

- Changes in governments may result in new leadership at government agencies. As such, the signatory need only have held the position as of the date the letter was signed or sealed.
- A contact name should be provided in the letter(s) of support or opposition.
- The contact must send an email acknowledging that the letter is authentic, as a verbal acknowledgement is not sufficient.
- In cases where the letter was signed or sealed by an individual who is not currently holding that office or a position of authority, the letter is valid only if the individual was the appropriate authority at the time that the letter was signed or sealed.

## About the Community Priority Evaluation Panel and its Processes

The Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU) is the business information arm of The Economist Group, publisher of The Economist. Through a global network of more than 900 analysts and contributors, the EIU continuously assesses political, economic, and business conditions in more than 200 countries. As the world's leading provider of country intelligence, the EIU helps executives, governments, and institutions by providing timely, reliable, and impartial analysis.

The EIU was selected as a Panel Firm for the gTLD evaluation process based on a number of criteria, including:

- The panel will be an internationally recognized firm or organization with significant demonstrated expertise in the evaluation and assessment of proposals in which the relationship of the proposal to a defined public or private community plays an important role.
- The provider must be able to convene a linguistically and culturally diverse panel capable, in the aggregate, of evaluating Applications from a wide variety of different communities.
- The panel must be able to exercise consistent and somewhat subjective judgment in making its evaluations in order to reach conclusions that are compelling and defensible, and
- The panel must be able to document the way in which it has done so in each case.

The evaluation process will respect the principles of fairness, transparency, avoiding potential conflicts of interest, and non-discrimination. Consistency of approach in scoring Applications will be of particular importance.

The following principles characterize the EIU evaluation process for gTLD applications:

- All EIU evaluators must ensure that no conflicts of interest exist.
- All EIU evaluators must undergo training and be fully cognizant of all CPE requirements as listed in the Applicant Guidebook. This process will include a pilot testing process.
- EIU evaluators are selected based on their knowledge of specific countries, regions and/or industries, as they pertain to Applications.
- Language skills will also be considered in the selection of evaluators and the assignment of specific Applications.
- All applications will be evaluated and scored, in the first instance by two evaluators, working independently.
- All Applications will subsequently be reviewed by members of the core project team to verify accuracy and compliance with the AGB, and to ensure consistency of approach across all applications.

- The EIU will work closely with ICANN when questions arise and when additional information may be required to evaluate an application.
- The EIU will fully cooperate with ICANN's quality control process.