

---

# Public Comment Summary Report

## Proposed Language for the Draft CPE Evaluation Guide

**Open for Submissions Date:**

Tuesday, 24 March 2026

**Closed for Submissions Date:**

Monday, 04 May 2026

**Summary Report Due Date:**

Tuesday, 12 May 2026

**Category:** Policy

**Requester:** ICANN org

**ICANN org Contact(s):** [jared.erwin@icann.org](mailto:jared.erwin@icann.org)

**Open Proceeding Link:**

<https://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/proceeding/draft-evaluation-guide-for-community-priority-evaluation-cpe-draft-evaluation-guide-for-community-priority-evaluation-24-03-2026>

**Outcome:**

In total, 12 Public Comments were submitted by stakeholders from across the community on the proposed language for the draft Evaluation Guide for Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) in the 2026 Round.

Commenters were requested to focus on reviewing the Evaluation Guide itself and not on the evaluation criteria and guidelines set forth in the Applicant Guidebook. As such, in cases where commenters re-open issues previously deliberated on and discussed with the IRT or provide recommendations for changes not grounded in the SubPro Final Report or other related policies, ICANN's response notes this without further substantive consideration.

Based on the input provided, ICANN org, together with the CPE vendor, will consider whether any changes to the Evaluation Guide are required. The final Evaluation Guide will be posted on the [New gTLD Program website](#).

# Section 1: What We Received Input On

This Public Comment proceeding was seeking input from the ICANN community on proposed language for the 2026 Round draft Evaluation Guide for CPE.

Specifically, ICANN org sought input from the community on whether the CPE Vendor Evaluation Guide is consistent with policy recommendations in the [SubPro Final Report](#) and scoring criteria in the [Applicant Guidebook](#).

# Section 2: Submissions

**Organizations and Groups:**

Name	Submitted by	Initials
At-Large Advisory Committee	ALAC staff	ALAC
Not-for-Profit Organizations Constituency	Juan Manuel Rojas	NCSG
Intellectual Property Constituency	Margaret Milam	IPC
Registries Stakeholder Group	N/A	RySG
African Union of Broadcasting / World Broadcasting Unions	Giacomo Mazzone	AUB/WBU

**Individuals:**

Name	Affiliation (if provided)	Initials
Joshua Seyi Ibitoye	N/A	JSI
Nitin Walia	N/A	NW
Valerie Yan Tong Chua	N/A	VYTC
Nazma Akter	N/A	NA
Roshatey Jannat	N/A	RA
Duy Dang Cong	N/A	DDC
Prince Andrew Livingstone Zutah	International Online Safety Corp. (IOSCORP)	ALZ

---

## Section 3: Summary of Submissions

Several submissions expressed general support for the draft CPE Evaluation Guide, particularly its structured approach and emphasis on transparency and consistency. At the same time, commenters identified areas for improvement, including a request for more guidance to reduce subjectivity in key criteria, more standardized approaches to limited independent research, and ensuring the Evaluation Guide and Applicant Guidebook are aligned. Additional themes included providing more information regarding calibration and quality assurance, and ensuring transparency in evaluation reporting. Further details and specific observations are summarized in the table below.

### Summary of Additional Comments

- Seven submissions expressed general support for the structure and intent of the draft Evaluation Guide and provided input on areas where additional clarification could be considered.
- Six submissions provided input on the application of the evaluation rubric, including concepts such as “majority support,” community representation, and the handling of complex or borderline cases.
- Five submissions provided input related to objectivity in the evaluation process, including the use of limited independent research and associated parameters and documentation.
- Four submissions provided input regarding the need to ensure fairness and accessibility for diverse, informal, or resource-constrained communities.
- Four submissions provided input on evaluator calibration, training, and quality assurance, as well as transparency of evaluation determinations.
- Three submissions recommended clarifying timelines, challenge mechanisms, and the role of public comments, objections, and external expertise.
- Two submissions provided broader input related to the integrity of the CPE framework, including considerations regarding safeguards.

---

## Section 4: Analysis of Submissions

In analyzing the submissions, ICANN org will consider the items below and consult with the CPE vendor on whether any changes to the Evaluation Guide are needed.

- Consider whether additional guidance or clarification is needed to support consistent application of the evaluation criteria, including concepts such as “majority support,” community establishment, and endorsement.
- Consider whether more information or clarification is needed regarding the scope of limited independent research, including parameters, acceptable sources, or documentation requirements.
- Consider whether additional information or clarification is needed regarding evaluator calibration and quality assurance mechanisms, including evaluator training and consistency across evaluation panels.
- Consider whether additional information is needed to support transparency in evaluation outcomes, including documentation of evaluator reasoning and the availability of sample or anonymized evaluation reports.
- Consider whether additional clarification is needed regarding alignment of the Evaluation Guide with the Applicant Guidebook.
- Consider whether additional guidance is needed regarding how the Evaluation Guide is applied to diverse, informal, and multilingual communities, including how this guidance would relate to Internationalized Domain Names.
- Consider whether additional guidance is needed regarding elements such as verification of applicant-submitted information and the assessment of registration policies.

## Section 5: Next Steps

After review of the Public Comments received on the Evaluation Guide, ICANN org, together with the CPE vendor, will consider whether any changes need to be made to the Evaluation Guide.

The Evaluation Guide will be posted on the [New gTLD Program website](#).