

	Applicant	Criterion 4: Differentiation	Criterion 5: Responsiveness/Governance	Criterion 6: Public Support	Normalized Rank
1	Unity Registry	20.50	27.25	5.00	23.80
2	ISOC/Afilias	14.50	21.25	5.00	19.80
3	GNR	16.00	26.75	1.00	15.20
4	IMS/ISC	15.00	14.00	3.00	14.73
5	Neustar	14.50	12.75	3.00	14.20
6	UIA	8.50	16.75	3.00	12.87
7	DotOrg	12.00	20.50	1.00	11.93
8	RegisterOrg	16.00	14.75	0.00	10.33
9	.Org Foundation	5.00	12.50	3.00	10.33
10	SWITCH	10.00	8.00	0.00	6.13
11	Organic Names	11.50	0.00	0.00	4.60
	weight	1.00	1.00	1.00	
	Structural weight	25.00	37.50	6.00	

There are 11 bids to evaluate regarding 3 distinct criteria (# 4, 5 and 6). Each criteria is made of a set of parameters, according to the rfp or understanding of the topic by the non-commercial committee. The normalizing methodology has for unique input, the worded evaluation made by the committee. It does not introduce more evaluation than the input, except the weighting factors, which can be different of one, according to a consensus-based decision of the committee.

Suppose that one criteria is evaluated according to 6 parameters (like Differentiation). For all these parameters, we took the same uniform scale (0-5 for instance), which is used to transform words (like "very high") into figures ("5")

We agree that not all parameters may be of equal importance. Therefore, there is a weighting factor for each parameter. Default value of weighting is 1, but can be decreased (like 0.5) or increased (like 2.0) if appropriate (the choice of the weighting factor values was established by the evaluation committee).

The maximum grade possible for this criteria is therefore the product of the scale amplitude (5 in this case) by the sum of the weighting factors ($0.5+1+0.5+1+1+1 = 5$). This is the normalisation factor (25 in this example). This prevents a criterion made of 7 parameters more important than a criterion made of 2 parameters in a ratio 7/2. (called structural weighting in the spreadsheet).

The grade of this criterion (sum of the parameter's grades) must be divided by the normalisation factor. The normalized grade is therefore

ranging between 0 and 1. Thus, the normalized results is not depending on the scale size, which acts only as a sensitivity parameter (more possible intermediate values in a scale of 6 than in a scale of 3).

Similarly, if the criteria are not felt of equal importance, it is possible to have a criterion weighting factor different of 1 (again, the choice of the weighting factor values was established by the evaluation committee).

(This paragraph may seem too technical but it helps to understand the background:) Because of the cumulative effect of the properly normalized ingredients, this approach may be seen as more stable than the the average ranking, since it carries information with real numbers rather than with integer rankings (in mathematical sense). A small change in the input figures, is not going to make drastic change in the output.

Last, the observation that the final grade is not ranging between 0 and 3, is just because all criteria grades were multiplied by 10, to have more visible figures instead of decimal cases. Therefore the final grades for the three criteria are ranging between 0 and 30 (instead of 0 and 3).

Rank	Applicant	Input/Governance	Pre-bid survey	Post-bid Responsiveness	ICANN/NCDNHC	Relationship with Community	Services targeted at community	"Good works"	Score
1	Unity	6	3	5	1	6	5	0	27.25
2	GNR	4	3	5	5	4	4	5	26.75
3	ISOC	2	3	5	5	3	5	2	21.25
4	DotOrg	6	0	5	0	3	3	0	20.50
5	UIA	2	1	5	5	3	2	0	16.75
6	RegisterOrg	2	5	5	0	3	2	4	14.75
7	IMS/ISC	2	0	6	0	3	3	2	14.00
8	Neustar	3	5	5	0	0	3	0	12.75
9	.Org Foundation	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	12.50
10	SWITCH	2	0	2	0	3	0	0	8.00
11	Organic Names	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
	Weight	2.00	0.25	0.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.50	6.25

Very High	6
High	5
Moderately high	4
Moderate	3
Low	2
Very low	1
None	0

Rank	Bidder	Class A	Grade A	Class B	Grade B	Score	Geo. Diversity	Grade GeoDiv	GRADE
1	IMS/ISC	0	0	420	2	84.0	Medium	1	3
2	Unity Registry	23	2	39	2	30.8	Medium	1	5
3	Internet Society	2	1	100	2	22.0	High	2	5
4	.Org Foundation	14	2	17	1	17.4	Low	0	3
5	UIA	5	1	12	1	7.4	Medium	1	3
6	Neustar	2	1	24	1	6.8	Medium	1	3
7	DotOrg Foundation	5	1	5	0	6.0	Low	0	1
8	GNR	0	0	6	1	1.2	Low	0	1
9	RegisterOrg	0	0	4	0	0.8	Low	0	0
10	Switch	0	0	3	0	0.6	Low	0	0
11	Organic Names	0	0	0	0	0.0	--	0	0
Weight		1	1	0.2	1			1	3

N > 5 ==> 2	N > 25 ==> 2
0 < N = 5 ==> 1	5 < N = 25 ==> 1
N = 0 ==> 0	0 < N = 5 ==> 0

High = 2
Medium = 1
Low = 0

	Applicant	Criterion 4: Differentiation	Criterion 5: Responsiveness /Governance	Criterion 6: Public Support	Average Rank
1	Unity Registry	1	1	2	1.3
2	ISOC/Afilias	5	3	3	3.7
3	IMS/ISC	4	7	1	4.0
3	GNR	2	2	8	4.0
5	RegisterOrg	2	6	9	5.7
6	DotOrg	7	4	7	6.0
7	Neustar	5	8	6	6.3
8	UIA	10	5	5	6.7
9	.Org Foundation	11	9	4	8.0
10	SWITCH	9	10	10	9.7
11	Organic Names	8	11	11	10.0

	Applicant	Criterion 4: Differentiation	Criterion 5: Responsiveness/Governance	Criterion 6: Public Support	Normalized Rank
1	Unity Registry	20.50	27.25	5.00	23.80
2	ISOC/Afilias	14.50	21.25	5.00	19.80
3	GNR	16.00	26.75	1.00	15.20
4	IMS/ISC	15.00	14.00	3.00	14.73
5	Neustar	14.50	12.75	3.00	14.20
6	UIA	8.50	16.75	3.00	12.87
7	DotOrg	12.00	20.50	1.00	11.93
8	RegisterOrg	16.00	14.75	0.00	10.33
9	.Org Foundation	5.00	12.50	3.00	10.33
10	SWITCH	10.00	8.00	0.00	6.13
11	Organic Names	11.50	0.00	0.00	4.60
	weight	1.00	1.00	1.00	
	Structural weight	25.00	37.50	6.00	

There are 11 bids to evaluate regarding 3 distinct criteria (# 4, 5 and 6). Each criteria is made of a set of parameters, according to the rfp or understanding of the topic by the non-commercial committee. The normalizing methodology has for unique input, the worded evaluation made by the committee. It does not introduce more evaluation than the input, except the weighting factors, which can be different of one, according to a consensus-based decision of the committee.

Suppose that one criteria is evaluated according to 6 parameters (like Differentiation). For all these parameters, we took the same uniform scale (0-5 for instance), which is used to transform words (like "very high") into figures ("5")

We agree that not all parameters may be of equal importance. Therefore, there is a weighting factor for each parameter. Default value of weighting is 1, but can be decreased (like 0.5) or increased (like 2.0) if appropriate (the choice of the weighting factor values was established by the evaluation committee).

The maximum grade possible for this criteria is therefore the product of the scale amplitude (5 in this case) by the sum of the weighting factors ($0.5+1+0.5+1+1+1 = 5$). This is the normalisation factor (25 in this example). This prevents a criterion made of 7 parameters more important than a criterion made of 2 parameters in a ratio 7/2. (called structural weighting in the spreadsheet).

The grade of this criterion (sum of the parameter's grades) must be divided by the normalisation factor. The normalized grade is therefore

ranging between 0 and 1. Thus, the normalized results is not depending on the scale size, which acts only as a sensitivity parameter (more possible intermediate values in a scale of 6 than in a scale of 3).

Similarly, if the criteria are not felt of equal importance, it is possible to have a criterion weighting factor different of 1 (again, the choice of the weighting factor values was established by the evaluation committee).

(This paragraph may seem too technical but it helps to understand the background:) Because of the cumulative effect of the properly normalized ingredients, this approach may be seen as more stable than the the average ranking, since it carries information with real numbers rather than with integer rankings (in mathematical sense). A small change in the input figures, is not going to make drastic change in the output.

Last, the observation that the final grade is not ranging between 0 and 3, is just because all criteria grades were multiplied by 10, to have more visible figures instead of decimal cases. Therefore the final grades for the three criteria are ranging between 0 and 30 (instead of 0 and 3).