

SubPro: Community Applications -- CPE Guidelines for comment

31 March 2020

From: Edmon Chung
To: Justine Chew

Sorry for the slow response, here are some of my key thoughts about the problems with the CPE, especially as it was implemented by EIU (and ICANN staff):

1 Delineation, Identify/Match/Overreach

The problem with the definition of "clearly delineated" (as well as identify/match/overreach) is from whose perspective.

In the view of competing commercial applications, the delineation is that of layman or regular users. However, for community members, the "clearly delineated" definition should be in the perspective (i.e. in the eyes of) the community members, i.e. experts in the community.

In the 2012 round, more often than not, the evaluator takes the view of the commercial applicants.

Nevertheless, if we stay true to the spirit of the original GNSO policy on the matter, community applications should be preferred and that community applications should be provided priority, then the community view should be taken. I.e. whether the community is clearly delineated should be determined by views with expertise in the community.

Fundamentally, I believe the question at a policy level is this:

Do we stick (i.e. go back) to the original intent of community priority which is to encourage the development and administration of a gTLD, seen as a scarce public resource, as a community gTLD with certain community development and support aspect to it, OR do we believe that it is purely an economic "advantage" provided to community gTLDs that is presumed to be trying to game the system unless proven otherwise (which was how it was implemented by EIU and ICANN GDD)?

2. Overlapping/Interrelated points

The scoring system is laden with points that are interrelated either directly or indirectly. The problem with directly related points is that if you lose one you lose all the others too (e.g. delineation and uniqueness), and the problem with indirectly related points is that if you win one you will likely lose the other (e.g. considerable size and uniqueness).

Finally, and in general, I go back to the few key problems with the CPE as implemented in my mind that should be considered in future rounds:

i. Expertise in the community identified should be sought in considering many of the items such as match/identify/delineation and even support and opposition

ii. Interview with applicant or at least more meaningful interaction with applicant is important to in fact provide a more objective view by the evaluators, and not make what was written the only criteria of judgement (which effectively becomes a barrier for the evaluator to really understand the applicant)... we are try to identify and select a steward of a gTLD for a long period of time.

iii. Applicants should be allowed to update and modify their application to fit the criteria in order to be established as a community applicant. The point is that we are trying to encourage good stewardship for gTLDs seen as scarce global public resources, not just as an economic advantage, but as a fundamental policy to encourage this type of TLD over open commercial ones.

Hope they may be useful

Edmon