

Introduction to NCDNHC Analysis Model

These Methodological Spreadsheets were developed based on extensive analysis of the NCDNHC report. Four sets of spreadsheets are provided.

The first set of spreadsheets – under tab “Current Model” – explains and demonstrates the approach employed by the NCDNHC in evaluating the 11 bids. We have sought to highlight the many assumptions that underlie the various tables offered in the NCDNHC report, and the links between those tables. In a few instances, we have identified what we believe to be arithmetic errors, and have corrected such.

The second set of spreadsheets – under the tab “DotOrg Foundation Scores” – adjusts the NCDNHC tables to reflect material we believe the evaluators missed or misconstrued. Given the limited time available, we were not able to similarly analyze the other 10 bids so our adjustment of ranking is inevitably one-sided. Our goal is to demonstrate the volatility of the rankings as changes in underlying numbers play out in final scores. The changes can be startling.

The third set of spreadsheets – under the tabs “Suggested Structural Changes” – reveal the extent to which NCDNHC methodological assumptions affect the outcome of the scoring. Building on the earlier spreadsheets, we note factors that the evaluators seemingly added to the ICANN RFP – after the bids were submitted. As readers play with their own “What Ifs,” they will see how relatively small changes in underlying variables can cascade into substantial variations in final rankings.

The fourth set of spreadsheets – under the tab “Ranking Variances” – summarizes the changes made in the previous three sets and the effect on the scoring. From these results, we have provided below a re-ranking of the organizations using a similar three-tier method as the NCDNHC report.

The first set of spreadsheets – under tab “Current Model” – explains and demonstrates the approach employed by the NCDNHC in evaluating the 11 bids. We have sought to highlight the many assumptions that underlie the various tables offered in the NCDNHC report, and the links between those tables. In a few instances, we have identified what we believe to be arithmetic errors, and have corrected such.

The second set of spreadsheets – under the tab “DotOrg Foundation Scores” – adjusts the NCDNHC tables to reflect material we believe the evaluators missed or misconstrued. Given the limited time available, we were not able to similarly analyze the other 10 bids so our adjustment of ranking is inevitably one-sided. Our goal is to demonstrate the volatility of the rankings as changes in underlying numbers play out in final scores. The changes can be startling.

The third set of spreadsheets – under the tabs “Suggested Structural Changes” – reveal the extent to which NCDNHC methodological assumptions affect the outcome of the scoring. Building on the earlier spreadsheets, we note factors that the evaluators seemingly added to the ICANN RFP – after the bids were submitted. As readers play with their own “What Ifs,” they will see how relatively small changes in underlying variables can cascade into substantial variations in final rankings.

The fourth set of spreadsheets – under the tab “Ranking Variances” – summarizes the changes made in the previous three sets and the effect on the scoring. From these results, we have provided below a re-ranking of the organizations using a similar three-tier method as the NCDNHC report.

Using Average Ranking Method

Rank	NCDNHC Report	Corrected	DOF Re-Score	Structural Changes
1	Unity (1.33)	Unity (1.67)	Unity (2.00)	Unity (1.00)
2	IMS/ISC (3.33)	IMS/ISC (3.33)	DotOrg Fdn (2.67)	DotOrg Fdn (2.33)
3	ISOC (3.67)	ISOC (3.67)	IMS/ISC (3.67)	ISOC (4.00)
4	Neustar (5.00)	Neustar (5.00)	ISOC (4.33)	Neustar (5.00)
5	GNR (5.33)	GNR (5.00)	Neustar (5.67)	IMS/ISC (5.33)
6	RegisterORG (6.33)	RegisterORG (6.33)	GNR (5.67)	GNR (6.00)
7	DotOrg Fdn (6.67)	DotOrg Fdn (6.67)	RegisterORG (6.67)	RegisterORG (6.67)
8	UIA (6.67)	UIA (6.67)	UIA (7.00)	UIA (7.33)
9	.Org Fdn (8.33)	.Org Fdn (8.33)	.Org Fdn (8.33)	.Org Fdn (8.00)
10	SWITCH (9.00)	SWITCH (9.00)	SWITCH (9.33)	SWITCH (9.00)
11	Organic Names (9.67)	Organic Names (9.67)	Organic Names (10.00)	Organic Names (9.33)

Using Normalization Method

Rank	NCDNHC Report	Corrected	DOF Re-Score	Structural Changes
1	Unity (24.47)	Unity (24.47)	Unity (24.47)	Unity (20.93)
2	ISOC (20.47)	ISOC (21.00)	ISOC (21.00)	DotOrg Fdn (17.36)
3	IMS/ISC (16.73)	Neustar (17.40)	DotOrg Fdn (18.53)	ISOC (15.48)
4	GNR (15.73)	IMS/ISC (16.73)	Neustar (17.40)	Neustar (12.38)
5	UIA (12.47)	GNR (16.00)	IMS/ISC (16.73)	IMS/ISC (11.45)
6	Neustar (12.40)	UIA (12.47)	GNR (16.00)	GNR (11.16)
7	DotOrg Fdn (10.07)	DotOrg Fdn (10.07)	UIA (12.47)	UIA (9.70)
8	RegisterORG (9.53)	RegisterORG (9.53)	RegisterORG (9.53)	RegisterORG (8.14)
9	.Org Fdn (8.33)	.Org Fdn (8.33)	.Org Fdn (8.33)	.Org Fdn (8.00)
10	SWITCH (6.13)	SWITCH (6.13)	SWITCH (6.13)	SWITCH (5.45)
11	Organic Names (4.60)	Organic Names (4.60)	Organic Names (4.60)	Organic Names (3.68)

We should note that not all the changes reported in the “new” spreadsheets favor our proposal though, given our effort to correct misperceptions of our bid, many of the changes do result in a higher score for us. Whether a specific change benefits or hurts us, our purpose is to stimulate discussion of how best to evaluate the bids, hopefully focusing attention on factors that can support the stability and growth of the .org TLD.

Current NCDNHC Scoring Model

We have attempted to recreate the rankings as developed by the NCDNHC committee. In reviewing their work, we did note certain errors. These corrections are noted and corrected below.

Overall Rankings

The organizations below are presented in alphabetical order.

Applicant	Average Ranking	Normalized Ranking
.Org Foundation	9	9
DotOrg Foundation	7	7
GNR	4	5
IMS/ISC	2	4
ISOC	3	2
Neustar	4	3
Organic Names	11	11
RegisterOrg	6	8
SWITCH	10	10
UIA/Diversitas	7	6
Unity	1	1

The NCDNHC Report uses two different approaches to measure Support (Criterion 6 below in the following two tables.) For the Average Ranking, the NCDNHC uses the table found on page 22 of their report. For the Normalized Ranking the NCDNHC uses the table found on page 43 of their report. The NCDNHC does not explain this variation, although we suspect it is because the design of the table on page 43 of their report is better suited to normalization while the table on page 22 is not.

Ranking Breakdown - Average Ranking (1)

Applicant	Criterion 6: Support	Criterion 4: Differentiat ion	Criterion 5: Responsiv eness (2)	Average (3)	Rank
.Org Foundation DotOrg Foundation	4	11	10	8.33	9
GNR	7	9	4	6.67	7
IMS/ISC	8	6	1	5.00	4
ISOC	1	3	6	3.33	2
Neustar	3	5	3	3.67	3
Organic Names RegisterOrg	5	3	7	5.00	4
SWITCH	11	7	11	9.67	11
UIA/Diversitas	9	2	8	6.33	6
Unity	10	8	9	9.00	10
	5	10	5	6.67	7
	2	1	2	1.67	1

(1) Column headings are as developed in the NCDNHC report. Note that while the order presented in the NCDNHC report does not coincide with the text, we maintained their order. See page 26 of their report.

(2) The NCDNHC uses two labels for Criterion 5: "Responsiveness" and "Governance." We have elected to use the first label throughout this report.

(3) This is based on the rankings (1-11) of each bidder in each category. Lowest Average is the best.

Ranking Breakdown - Normalization Ranking (4)

Applicant	Criterion 6: Support	Criterion 4: Differentiat ion	Criterion 5: Responsiv eness	Score	Rank (5)
.Org Foundation DotOrg Foundation	5.00	5.00	5.00	8.33	9
GNR	1.00	9.00	20.50	10.07	7
IMS/ISC	3.00	14.00	27.75	16.00	5
ISOC	7.00	15.00	14.00	16.73	4
Neustar	9.00	14.50	23.25	21.00	2
Organic Names RegisterOrg	8.00	15.00	12.75	17.40	3
SWITCH	0.00	11.50	0.00	4.60	11
UIA/Diversitas					
Unity					

RegisterOrg	0.00	16.00	11.75	9.53	8
SWITCH	0.00	10.00	8.00	6.13	10
UIA/Diversitas	5.00	7.50	16.75	12.47	6
Unity	9.00	20.50	27.25	24.47	1

Question Weight	1.00	1.00	1.00		
Scale Length	2.00	5.00	6.00		
Sum of Weights	5.00	5.00	6.25	From each Criteria	
Final Weighting	1.00	0.40	0.27		

(4) Normalization was attempted, apparently, to allow comparisons across columns. The figures flow from the scores given each bidder in each criterion. The maximum score for each column has been normalized to 10; the maximum score for the table as a whole is 30.

The methodology for normalization was straightforward. By multiplying the scale length (which is the highest score value possible for each Criterion) and the sum of the weightings for each Criterion, they would get a maximum value for each Criterion. By dividing the smallest of these Criterion maximum values (in this case, 2 X 5 or 10) and dividing it by each Criterion's maximum value, they would get the Final Weighting.

Each Final Weighting is then multiplied by the Question Weight and then multiplied by the actual Criterion Score for each applicant to get the normalized score. The sum of these normalized Criterion scores for each applicant is the Score.

(5) Errors in arithmetic and possibly concept were found in the NCDNHC report. We have tried to correct these, and have flagged such whenever we have introduced what we believe to be a correction. These corrections have caused some changes in rankings as reported in the NCDNHC Report. The details of these corrections is detailed in each section.

Criterion Ratings

Criterion 4: Differentiation

Applicant	Market Research	Positioning	Defensive Reg	Unrestricted	Innovation	Registrars	Score	Rank
.Org Foundation	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	11
DotOrg	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	9.0	9

Foundation									
GNR	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	14.0	6	
IMS/ISC	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	15.0	3	
ISOC	3.0	3.0	2.0	5.0	0.0	4.0	14.5	5	
Neustar	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	2.0	15.0	3	
Organic Names	0.0	2.0	3.0	5.0	0.0	3.0	11.5	7	
RegisterOrg	4.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	4.0	16.0	2	
SWITCH	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	8	
UIA/Diversitas	0.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	7.5	10	
Unity	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	20.5	1	
Weighting	0.5	1.0	0.5	1.0	1.0	1.0			
Scale	5.0								
Total Weighting	5.0								

Criterion 5: Responsiveness to Non-Commercial User Community

Applicant	Input/Governance	Pre-Bid Survey	Post-Bid Resp	ICANN/NC DNHC	Comm Relations	Community Svcs	"Good works"	Score	Rank	Notes
.Org Foundation	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.00	10	
DotOrg Foundation	6.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	20.50	4	
GNR	4.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	27.75	1	(6)
IMS/ISC	2.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	14.00	6	
ISOC	3.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	2.0	23.25	3	(7)
Neustar	3.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	12.75	7	
Organic Names	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	11	
RegisterOrg	2.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	2.0	11.75	8	
SWITCH	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	8.00	9	
UIA/Diversitas	2.0	1.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	2.0	0.0	16.75	5	
Unity	6.0	3.0	5.0	1.0	6.0	5.0	0.0	27.25	2	(7)
Weighting	2.00	0.25	0.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.50			
Scale	6.00									
Total Weighting	6.25									

(6) The calculation in the NCDNHC report is apparently in error. With the correction of this error, GNR moves to first place.

(7) The calculation in the NCDNHC report is apparently in error. The positions of ISOC and Unity change as result of the correction. These appear to be the results of multiplication errors and not from changes in the scores.

Criterion 6: Public Support

The NCDNHC report uses two scoring methods for Public Support. One is found on page 22 and the other is found on page 43 of their report.

Page 22 Method

The results displayed on the table below were used to calculate the Average Rankings, as seen on page 26 of the NCDNHC report. The table simply counts the number of class "A" and class "B" supporters based on criteria outlined on page 22 of the report. We assume that diversity, meaning geographic diversity, was obtained by determining the location of the supporter via their address.

The score was apparently calculated by adding to the number of class "A" supporters 20 percent of the number of class "B" supporters (a 1-to-5 ratio.) On this table, diversity was only used as a tie breaker.

Applicant	Class A	Class B	Score	Diversity	Rank
.Org Foundation	14.0	17.0	17.4	L	4
DotOrg Foundation	5.0	4.0	5.8	L	7
GNR	0.0	6.0	1.2	L	8
IMS/ISC	0.0	420.0	84.0	M	1
ISOC	2.0	100.0	22.0	H	3
Neustar	1.0	25.0	6.0	M	5
Organic Names	0.0	0.0	0.0	--	11
RegisterOrg	0.0	4.0	0.8	L	9
SWITCH	0.0	3.0	0.6	L	10
UIA/Diversitas	4.0	10.0	6.0	M	5
Unity	23.0	39.0	30.8	M	2
Ratio B to A	0.2	(8)			

(8) This ratio is from page 22 and page 32 of the report

Page 43
Method

The results displayed on the table below were used to calculate the tables on page 27 and 49 of the NCDNHC report.

We could not accurately determine how they calculated the number of class “A” and “B” organizations from the complex and incomplete tables found on pages 36-42 of their report. We were, however, able to surmise that they applied the break points (at the bottom of this table) to re-categorize support in a 0-2 scale. We took the information from the Page 22 Table, above, and used the break points to calculate the “A” and “B” scores as well as the geographical diversity score.

In one case, Neustar, our calculation was different from that of the NCDNHC report. We assume this is because the NCDNHC discounted or disregarded some of the class “A” or “B” support and downgraded the geographic diversity accordingly. We are not sure, of course, and would welcome further clarification by the NCDNHC.

Applicant	Class A	Class B	Geo Diversity	Total	Rank	Rank from Page 22
.Org Foundation	2.0	1.0	0.0	5	5	4
DotOrg Foundation	1.0	0.0	0.0	1	8	7
GNR	0.0	1.0	0.0	3	7	8
IMS/ISC	0.0	2.0	1.0	7	4	1
ISOC	1.0	2.0	2.0	9	1	3
Neustar	1.0	2.0	1.0	8	3	5
Organic Names	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	9	11
RegisterOrg	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	9	9
SWITCH	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	9	10
UIA/Diversitas	1.0	1.0	1.0	5	5	5
Unity	2.0	2.0	1.0	9	1	2
Weight (9)	1	3	1			
Scale	2					
Total Weighting	5					

Break Points			
Top Score	2	2	2
When N is GT			
(>)	5	20	H (9)
Middle Score	1	1	1
When N is GT			
(>)	0	5	M
Low Score	0	0	0
When N is LTE			
(<=)	0	5	L

(9) Note that the **weighting** ratio of class "A" to "B" is 1-to-3, which substantially reverses the ratio established by the NCDNHC. In their report, on page 21, the NCDNHC states that class "A" endorsements would be considered worth 5 times class "B" endorsements.

(10) Note that the implied ratio of class "A" to class "B" endorsements is not 5-to-1 as stated in the NCD report but 4-to-1. If the 5-to-1 ratio applied, one would expect the minimum number of class "B" endorsements to earn a 2 score would be 25. In effect, the page 43 method diminishes by 20% the weighting supposedly established by the NCDNHC.

The weighting factor also has a negative impact on the importance of class "A" support as well. Because "B" supporter score is weighted at 3X that of class "A," an applicant could have 6 "A" supporters and get 2 points, but another applicant could have 6 "B" supporters and would receive 3 points.

For example:	A	B	Total Score
	5	5	1
	6	0	2
	0	6	3
	6	6	5
	25	0	2
	0	25	6
	25	25	8

Whether the NCDNHC planned this or not, this places a significantly higher value on obtaining class "B" support than class "A" support. In fact, to gain the maximum score with the least amount of work, getting a geographically dispersed group of individuals with a .org domain would be the best course of action.

Current NCDNHC Scoring Model with DotOrg Foundation Adjusted Scores

Using the model in the "Current Model" tab, the DotOrg Foundation has taken the liberty of amending its scores in accordance to a response made to ICANN and NCDNHC addressing concerns in material that we believe was missed or misconstrued in the report. This is for comparative purposes only, and we suggest that other teams use this model as part of their analysis of their rankings.

We have put in basic notes regarding our suggested changes. More information can be found in our response to the NCDNHC Report posted on the ICANN site.

Overall Rankings

Applicant	Average Ranking	Normalized Ranking
.Org Foundation	9	9
DotOrg Foundation	2	3
GNR	5	6
IMS/ISC	3	5
ISOC	4	2
Neustar	5	4
Organic Names	11	11
RegisterOrg	7	8
SWITCH	10	10
UIA/Diversitas	8	7
Unity	1	1

Ranking Breakdown - Average Ranking

Applicant	Criterion 6: Support	Criterion 4: Differentiation	Criterion 5: Responsiveness	Average	Rank
.Org Foundation	4	11	10	8.33	9
DotOrg Foundation	5	2	1	2.67	2
GNR	8	7	2	5.67	5
IMS/ISC	1	4	6	3.67	3
ISOC	3	6	4	4.33	4
Neustar	6	4	7	5.67	5
Organic Names	11	8	11	10.00	11
RegisterOrg	9	3	8	6.67	7
SWITCH	10	9	9	9.33	10
UIA/Diversitas	6	10	5	7.00	8
Unity	2	1	3	2.00	1

Ranking Breakdown - Normalization Ranking

Applicant	Criterion 6: Support	Criterion 4: Differentiation	Criterion 5: Responsiveness	Score	Rank
.Org Foundation	5.00	5.00	5.00	8.33	9
DotOrg Foundation	3.00	20.00	28.25	18.53	3
GNR	3.00	14.00	27.75	16.00	6
IMS/ISC	7.00	15.00	14.00	16.73	5
ISOC	9.00	14.50	23.25	21.00	2
Neustar	8.00	15.00	12.75	17.40	4
Organic Names	0.00	11.50	0.00	4.60	11
RegisterOrg	0.00	16.00	11.75	9.53	8
SWITCH	0.00	10.00	8.00	6.13	10
UIA/Diversitas	5.00	7.50	16.75	12.47	7
Unity	9.00	20.50	27.25	24.47	1
Question Weight	1.00	1.00	1.00		

Scale Length	2.00	5.00	6.00	
Sum of Weights	5.00	5.00	6.25	From each Criteria
Final Weighting	1.00	0.40	0.27	

Criterion Ratings

Criterion 4: Differentiation

Applicant	Market Research (1)	Positioning (2)	Defensive Reg (3)	Unrestricted (4)	Innovation (5)	Registrars (6)	Score	Rank
.Org Foundation	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	11
DotOrg								
Foundation	3.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	20.0	2
GNR	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	14.0	7
IMS/ISC	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	15.0	4
ISOC	3.0	3.0	2.0	5.0	0.0	4.0	14.5	6
Neustar	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	2.0	15.0	4
Organic Names	0.0	2.0	3.0	5.0	0.0	3.0	11.5	8
RegisterOrg	4.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	4.0	16.0	3
SWITCH	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	9
UIA/Diversitas	0.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	7.5	10
Unity	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	20.5	1
Weighting	0.5	1.0	0.5	1.0	1.0	1.0		
Scale	5.0							
Total Weighting	5.0							

(1) Market Research - Registry Advantage, our registry subcontractor, conducted detailed market research, as described in our proposal and this was used to create the basis for our suggested products and services. Registry Advantage engaged a marketing research team to analyze the current .org registrant base. The DotOrg Foundation's future products and services listed in the proposal were based on this analysis, as well as interviews with various nonprofit organizations. The market analysis was largely based on bulk Whois data information of the five largest ICANN-accredited registrars (as measured by share of .com, .net, and .org registrations under management as of March 31, 2002, by the Snapnames, State of the Domain Report, April 23, 2002. We believe that this data provided a good sampling of the general characteristics of the .org registrant base, and therefore valid market research on which to base preliminary plans. If we were to be awarded the .org bid, as we had stated in our proposal, we would want to continue market research and consult with .org stakeholders to finalize our plans.

Because of this, we feel that a score of 3 (from 2) is warranted.

(2) Positioning - the DotOrg Foundation has proposed the creation of two innovative products that provide realistic and provable benefits to noncommercial organizations - the DotOrg Directory and the validation frameworks. Both are described in our proposal and in ICANN responses and information provided to the NCDNHC. In summary, using the registry as a unique and valuable resource to collect and disseminate information about organizations that opt-in, the registry can ease the administrative issues regarding information distribution to supporters and increase their chances of receiving support from the public. Additionally, with the optional participation in the value-added validation service, noncommercial organizations that need to build trust between themselves and the public can be validated by organizations world-wide. We believe that this easily understandable value proposition is critical to the long-term success of growing the registry. By linking registration of a .org domain name to the needed validation and information distribution services, we will position .org as a "must have" for any noncommercial organization serious about their Internet strategy. Because of these reasons, we believe that our score should be increased to a 4 from a 2.

(3) Defensive Registrations - The DotOrg Foundation explicitly stated in C38 that we will not encourage defensive registrations. We believe that there may have been some confusion and subjective reaction to some proposed future services, but we also stressed through our open and transparent governance and listening structures that these services would not be introduced without thorough input and discussion within the community. Considering that noncommercial registrants will have representation on our advisory board and the opportunity to send a voting member to the board of directors, clearly the foundation would not make business decisions that would raise strong opposition from this community.

We believe that a score of 3 (from 0) is credible.

(4) Unrestricted - We have explicitly stated that we intend to maintain .org as unrestricted in the proposal, in follow-up questions posed by the NCDNHC, and at the meetings in Bucharest.

The DotOrg Foundation's proposal introduces the opportunity for the registry to play a pivotal role in building the trust between citizens and noncommercial organizations online through an optional validation service and distribution of critical noncommercial and validation data through an optional DotOrg Directory. Taken in combination, the registry has the ability to create a needed and wanted world-wide validation community that has the interests of donors, volunteers and supporters in mind. However, even though many global thought-leaders in the sector see and support the critical linkages between the power of the registry to collect and disseminate information to citizens and the validation community, the NCDNHC feared that this would lead to a closed registry. The DotOrg Foundation takes great exception to this viewpoint and believes instead that this is the type of innovation and value-added service that is critical to the success of .org becoming more prevalent in the non-commercial community.

We believe that the score of 0 should be 5 in line with similar proposals.

(5) Innovation - We believe that our approach of linking together registry services with validation and information distribution is a very innovative approach. Information provided in these notes detail this innovation and how it is an important step forward in showing the noncommercial community a tangible value to having a .org. We believe that our score should be increased to 4 from 3.

(6) Registrars - The NCDNHC report believed that our response to registrar support was vague. We would like to point out that in both the response to questions posed by the NCDNHC in Bucharest and on the ICANN website and in our proposal (sections C31, C35 and C38) we provided detailed plans on how we would support existing and new registrars with programs to help them encourage more noncommercial organizations to register for a .org domain. Not only did we propose potentially funding stakeholder (including noncommercial registrants and registrars) participation in .org meetings, which would be adjacent to ICANN meetings, but we offered registrars and registrants an opportunity to directly participate on the Foundation's board of directors. Particularly at this time of flux in ICANN governance, this feature of the DOF offers a unique opportunity for noncommercial registrants and registrars to participate directly in domain name policies, as well as in one of the key stakeholders in ICANN. Because of our detailed responses, we believe that our score for this section should be a 4 (from a 3.)

Criterion 5: Responsiveness to Non-Commercial User Community

Applicant	Input/Governance	Pre-Bid Survey (7)	Post-Bid Resp	ICANN/NCDNHC (8)	Comm Relations	Community Svcs	"Good works" (9)	Score	Rank	Notes
.Org Foundation	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.00	10	
DotOrg Foundation	6.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	28.25	1	

GNR	4.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	27.75	2
IMS/ISC	2.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	14.00	6
ISOC	3.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	2.0	23.25	4
Neustar	3.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	12.75	7
Organic Names	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	11
RegisterOrg	2.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	2.0	11.75	8
SWITCH	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	8.00	9
UIA/Diversitas	2.0	1.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	2.0	0.0	16.75	5
Unity	6.0	3.0	5.0	1.0	6.0	5.0	0.0	27.25	3
Weighting	2.00	0.25	0.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.50		
Scale	6.00								
Total Weighting	6.25								

(7) Pre-bid Survey - As stated in note (1) above, the DotOrg Foundation's registry contractor, Registry Advantage, conducted a detailed pre-bid survey. While it was not as extensive as other bidders, we believe that a score of 3, from 0, is warranted for the effort put into this comprehensive analysis.

(8) ICANN/NCDNHC - The DotOrg Foundation proposed a comprehensive plan to encourage participation both in ICANN and in the NCDNHC in section C38 of the proposal. In summary, we plan to first educate the noncommercial marketplace of the importance of the registry and about their representatives in the NCDNHC through outreach at conferences and other public forums. Second, we are holding "town-hall" meetings in conjunction with ICANN meetings to solicit participation and input from the local non-commercial community. By holding these meetings concurrently with ICANN meetings, we hope to encourage participation by local noncommercial organizations that do not have the budget to travel to these meetings, but nonetheless provide a critical connection into the community. As indicated in C35, we also have a sizable budget to do outreach to the local community to get healthy participation. In addition to the ICANN meetings, we will also hold these town-hall meetings in other parts of the world, hosting a total of 6 meetings per year.

Our detailed and effective response, we believe, earns us a 5 in this category, up from 0.

(9) "Good Works" - Our proposal's budget offers us the ability to build valuable services such as validation and the DotOrg Directory. We have also set aside funds for other projects that may be suggested by the community, the Advisory Council or the Board of Directors in the future. We do not, however, believe that it would be responsible stewardship of registry funds to give it away to organizations that are not adding value to the registry. Many of the efforts proposed add value to the community, such as creation of portals to disseminate information to noncommercial organizations or providing grants to noncommercial entities, but these are duplicative of other efforts already in place in the community and add only marginal value to the community and none to the registry. We believe that our approach on validation and the DotOrg database meets the criteria of providing a needed resource to the noncommercial community, increases the usefulness and therefore value of the .org domain, and creates a stable and growing registry. Our score should be reflective of this and increased from a 0 to a 4.

Criterion 6: Public Support

Page 22 Method

Applicant	Class A (10)	Class B (11)	Score	Diversity (12)	Rank
.Org Foundation	14.0	17.0	17.4	L	4
DotOrg Foundation	7.0	2.0	7.4	M	5
GNR	0.0	6.0	1.2	L	8
IMS/ISC	0.0	420.0	84.0	M	1
ISOC	2.0	100.0	22.0	H	3
Neustar	1.0	25.0	6.0	M	6
Organic Names	0.0	0.0	0.0	--	11
RegisterOrg	0.0	4.0	0.8	L	9
SWITCH	0.0	3.0	0.6	L	10
UIA/Diversitas	4.0	10.0	6.0	M	6
Unity	23.0	39.0	30.8	M	2
Ratio B to A	0.2				

(10) Class A - based on the narrative on page 25 of the NCDNHC report regarding our class "A" supporters, we feel that the committee inadvertently mislabeled two of our supporters as "B" - WorldReach and Habitat for Humanity Canada. We understand that although it was not noted, eGrants supported multiple bids and would therefore be a "B" supporter. This will increase our class "A" supporters to 7. Please note that our table of supporters was not listed with the other in Anex 4 (pages 36-42.)

(11) Class "B" - As noted in (10), two "B" supporters should be labeled as "A" so this drops "B" supporters by 2.

(12) Geographic Diversity - Although it was not stated how this was scored, we have made the logical assumption that it is not the place where the organization is located, but rather what geographic locations they represent and support. For instance, one can easily argue that although Doctors Without Borders is based in France, it is truly worldwide in its reach. Based on that reasoning, we suggest that many of our supporters reach across borders or are not located in the United States: Association of Fundraising Professionals is an International association with members in the US, Canada and Mexico; WorldReach provides validation and grants to NGOs in over 15 countries; Charity Aid Foundation provides services to NGOs in Western and Eastern Europe, India and Africa; Habitat for Humanity Canada and CanadaHelps are both located in Canada. We believe that we should be ranked as at least Medium, not Low.

Page 43 Method (13)

Applicant	Class A	Class B	Geo Diversity	Total	Rank	Rank from Page 22
.Org Foundation	2.0	1.0	0.0	5	5	4
DotOrg						
Foundation	2.0	0.0	1.0	3	7	5
GNR	0.0	1.0	0.0	3	7	8
IMS/ISC	0.0	2.0	1.0	7	4	1
ISOC	1.0	2.0	2.0	9	1	3
Neustar	1.0	2.0	1.0	8	3	6
Organic Names	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	9	11
RegisterOrg	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	9	9
SWITCH	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	9	10
UIA/Diversitas	1.0	1.0	1.0	5	5	6
Unity	2.0	2.0	1.0	9	1	2
Weight	1	3	1			
Scale	2					
Total Weighting	5					
Break Points						
Top Score	2	2	2			
When N is GT (>)	5	20	H			
Middle Score	1	1	1			
When N is GT (>)	0	5	M			
Low Score	0	0	0			
When N is LTE (<=)	0	5	L			

(13) Because of the changes made to the previous table from notes (10)-(12), the scores here automatically changed.

Current NCDNHC Scoring Model with DotOrg Foundation Adjusted Scores: Criterion 4

Using the model in the "Current Model" tab, and with the updates to the DotOrg score from the "DotOrg Fdn Scores" tab, we have put forth our recommendations for review of structural changes to the review process. This is not to take away credit from the hard work of the NCDNHC, but rather to provide a different perspective on the evaluations.

To make this more illustrative, we will make the changes on each criteria separately and then on all three last. This section deals with Criterion 4 - the other Criteria are left as originally presented.

Also note that some of these changes are not to the benefit of the DotOrg Foundation and are being made simply to encourage deeper analysis of this evaluation process.

Overall Rankings

The rankings below reflect the structural changes that have been made to the report as described in the affected criterion. These changes are merely "what-if" suggestions and are designed to promote discussion and consideration, not as criticisms to the NCDNHC or other members of the community. We have also provided rankings from the "DotOrg Fdn Scores" as a reference.

We encourage all members of the community to use this section to examine the impact of the structure on the rankings and to use this to further discussion in the community.

Applicant	Average Ranking	Previous Scores		
		Normalized Ranking	Average Ranking	Normalized Ranking
.Org Foundation	9	9	9	9
DotOrg Foundation	2	3	2	3
GNR	5	6	5	6
IMS/ISC	3	5	3	5
ISOC	4	2	4	2
Neustar	5	4	5	4
Organic Names	11	11	11	11
RegisterOrg	7	8	7	8

SWITCH	10	10	10	10
UIA/Diversitas	8	7	8	7
Unity	1	1	1	1

Ranking Breakdown - Average Ranking

Applicant	Criterion 6: Support	Criterion 4: Differentiation	Criterion 5: Responsiveness	Average	Rank	Previous Scores
.Org Foundation	4	11	10	8.33	9	9
DotOrg						
Foundation	5	2	1	2.67	2	2
GNR	8	7	2	5.67	5	5
IMS/ISC	1	4	6	3.67	3	3
ISOC	3	6	4	4.33	4	4
Neustar	6	4	7	5.67	5	5
Organic Names	11	8	11	10.00	11	11
RegisterOrg	9	3	8	6.67	7	7
SWITCH	10	9	9	9.33	10	10
UIA/Diversitas	6	10	5	7.00	8	8
Unity	2	1	3	2.00	1	1

Ranking Breakdown - Normalization Ranking

Applicant	Criterion 6: Support	Criterion 4: Differentiation	Criterion 5: Responsiveness	Score	Rank	Previous Scores
.Org Foundation	5.00	5.00	5.00	8.33	9	9
DotOrg						
Foundation	3.00	20.00	28.25	18.53	3	3
GNR	3.00	14.00	27.75	16.00	6	6
IMS/ISC	7.00	15.00	14.00	16.73	5	5
ISOC	9.00	14.50	23.25	21.00	2	2
Neustar	8.00	15.00	12.75	17.40	4	4
Organic Names	0.00	11.50	0.00	4.60	11	11
RegisterOrg	0.00	16.00	11.75	9.53	8	8
SWITCH	0.00	10.00	8.00	6.13	10	10

UIA/Diversitas	5.00	7.50	16.75	12.47	7	7
Unity	9.00	20.50	27.25	24.47	1	1
Question Weight	1.00	1.00	1.00			
Scale Length	2.00	5.00	6.00			
Sum of Weights	5.00	5.00	6.25	From each Criteria		
Final Weighting	1.00	0.40	0.27			

Criterion Ratings

Criterion 4: Differentiation

We do not feel that any change needs to be made to Criterion 4. We have provided this tab for others to use to make changes they feel important.

Applicant	Market Research	Positioning	Defensive Reg	Unrestricted	Innovation	Registrars	Score	Rank	Prev Rank
.Org Foundation	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	11	11
DotOrg									
Foundation	3.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	20.0	2	2
GNR	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	14.0	7	7
IMS/ISC	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	15.0	4	4
ISOC	3.0	3.0	2.0	5.0	0.0	4.0	14.5	6	6
Neustar	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	2.0	15.0	4	4
Organic Names	0.0	2.0	3.0	5.0	0.0	3.0	11.5	8	8
RegisterOrg	4.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	4.0	16.0	3	3
SWITCH	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	9	9
UIA/Diversitas	0.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	7.5	10	10
Unity	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	20.5	1	1
Weighting	0.5	1.0	0.5	1.0	1.0	1.0			
Scale	5.0								
Total Weighting	5.0								

Criterion 5: Responsiveness to Non-Commercial User Community

Applicant	Input/Governance	Pre-Bid Survey	Post-Bid Resp	ICANN/NCDNHC	Comm Relations	Community Svcs	"Good works"	Score	Rank
.Org Foundation	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.00	10
DotOrg Foundation	6.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	28.25	1
GNR	4.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	27.75	2
IMS/ISC	2.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	14.00	6
ISOC	3.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	2.0	23.25	4
Neustar	3.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	12.75	7
Organic Names	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	11
RegisterOrg	2.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	2.0	11.75	8
SWITCH	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	8.00	9
UIA/Diversitas	2.0	1.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	2.0	0.0	16.75	5
Unity	6.0	3.0	5.0	1.0	6.0	5.0	0.0	27.25	3
Weighting Scale	2.00	0.25	0.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.50		
Total Weighting	6.00								
	6.25								

Criterion 6: Public Support

Page 22 Method

Applicant	Class A	Class B	Score	Diversity	Rank
.Org Foundation	14.0	17.0	17.4	L	4
DotOrg Foundation	7.0	2.0	7.4	M	5
GNR	0.0	6.0	1.2	L	8
IMS/ISC	0.0	420.0	84.0	M	1
ISOC	2.0	100.0	22.0	H	3
Neustar	1.0	25.0	6.0	M	6
Organic Names	0.0	0.0	0.0	--	11
RegisterOrg	0.0	4.0	0.8	L	9
SWITCH	0.0	3.0	0.6	L	10

UIA/Diversitas	4.0	10.0	6.0	M	6
Unity	23.0	39.0	30.8	M	2
Ratio B to A	0.2				

Page 43 Method

Applicant	Class A	Class B	Geo Diversity	Total	Rank	Rank from Page
.Org Foundation	2.0	1.0	0.0	5	5	4
DotOrg Foundation	2.0	0.0	1.0	3	7	5
GNR	0.0	1.0	0.0	3	7	8
IMS/ISC	0.0	2.0	1.0	7	4	1
ISOC	1.0	2.0	2.0	9	1	3
Neustar	1.0	2.0	1.0	8	3	6
Organic Names	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	9	11
RegisterOrg	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	9	9
SWITCH	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	9	10
UIA/Diversitas	1.0	1.0	1.0	5	5	6
Unity	2.0	2.0	1.0	9	1	2
Weight	1	3	1			
Scale	2					
Total Weighting	5					
Break Points						
Top Score	2	2	2			
When N is GT (>)	5	20	H			
Middle Score	1	1	1			
When N is GT (>)	0	5	M			
Low Score	0	0	0			
When N is LTE (<=)	0	5	L			

Current NCDNHC Scoring Model with DotOrg Foundation Adjusted Scores: Criterion 5

Using the model in the "Current Model" tab, and with the updates to the DotOrg score from the "DotOrg Fdn Scores" tab, we have put forth our recommendations for review of structural changes to the review process. This is not to take away credit from the hard work of the NCDNHC, but rather to provide a different perspective on the evaluations.

To make this more illustrative, we will make the changes on each criteria separately and then on all three last. This section deals with Criterion 5 - the other Criteria are left as originally presented.

Also note that some of these changes are not to the benefit of the DotOrg Foundation and are being made simply to encourage deeper analysis of this evaluation process.

Overall Rankings

The rankings below reflect the structural changes that have been made to the report as described in the affected criterion. These changes are merely "what-if" suggestions and are designed to promote discussion and consideration, not as criticisms to the NCDNHC or other members of the community. We have also provided rankings from the "DotOrg Fdn Scores" as a reference.

We encourage all members of the community to use this section to examine the impact of the structure on the rankings and to use this to further discussion in the community.

Applicant	Average Ranking	Normalized Ranking	Previous Scores	
			Average Ranking	Normalized Ranking
.Org Foundation	9	9	9	9
DotOrg Foundation	2	4	2	3
GNR	6	6	5	6
IMS/ISC	3	5	3	5
ISOC	4	2	4	2
Neustar Organic Names	5	3	5	4
	11	11	11	11

RegisterOrg	7	8	7	8
SWITCH	10	10	10	10
UIA/Diversitas	8	7	8	7
Unity	1	1	1	1

Ranking Breakdown - Average Ranking

Applicant	Criterion 6: Support	Criterion 4: Differentiati on	Criterion 5: Responsiv eness	Average	Rank	Previous Scores
.Org Foundation	4	11	10	8.33	9	9
DotOrg Foundation	5	2	2	3.00	2	2
GNR	8	7	3	6.00	6	5
IMS/ISC	1	4	5	3.33	3	3
ISOC	3	6	4	4.33	4	4
Neustar Organic	6	4	6	5.33	5	5
Names	11	8	11	10.00	11	11
RegisterOrg	9	3	8	6.67	7	7
SWITCH	10	9	9	9.33	10	10
UIA/Diversitas	6	10	7	7.67	8	8
Unity	2	1	1	1.33	1	1

Ranking Breakdown - Normalization Ranking

Applicant	Criterion 6: Support	Criterion 4: Differentiati on	Criterion 5: Responsiv eness	Score	Rank	Previous Scores
.Org Foundation	5.00	5.00	5.00	8.75	9	9
DotOrg Foundation	3.00	20.00	21.25	18.46	4	3
GNR	3.00	14.00	20.25	15.71	6	6
IMS/ISC	7.00	15.00	13.00	17.56	5	5
ISOC	9.00	14.50	17.25	20.85	2	2

Neustar	8.00	15.00	12.75	18.47	3	4
Organic						
Names	0.00	11.50	0.00	4.60	11	11
RegisterOrg	0.00	16.00	10.75	10.17	8	8
SWITCH	0.00	10.00	8.00	6.81	10	10
UIA/Diversitas	5.00	7.50	11.75	12.12	7	7
Unity	9.00	20.50	26.25	26.41	1	1

Question						
Weight	1.00	1.00	1.00			
Scale Length	2.00	5.00	6.00			
Sum of						
Weights	5.00	5.00	4.75	From each Criteria		
Final						
Weighting	1.00	0.40	0.35			

Criterion Ratings

Criterion 4: Differentiation

Applicant	Market Research	Positioning	Defensive Reg	Unrestricted	Innovation	Registrars	Score	Rank
.Org Foundation	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	11
DotOrg Foundation	3.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	20.0	2
GNR	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	14.0	7
IMS/ISC	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	15.0	4
ISOC	3.0	3.0	2.0	5.0	0.0	4.0	14.5	6
Neustar	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	2.0	15.0	4
Organic								
Names	0.0	2.0	3.0	5.0	0.0	3.0	11.5	8
RegisterOrg	4.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	4.0	16.0	3
SWITCH	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	9
UIA/Diversitas	0.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	7.5	10
Unity	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	20.5	1

Weighting	0.5	1.0	0.5	1.0	1.0	1.0
Scale	5.0					
Total						
Weighting	5.0					

Criterion 5: Responsiveness to Non-Commercial User Community

We believe that there are several structural changes that need to be made here to comply with the RFP distributed by ICANN and with comments made explicitly by ICANN regarding the proposal content:

1. ICANN did not ask bidders to indicate how they would encourage more participation in ICANN and NCDNHC meetings or forums. We feel that these types of programs, while very valuable to both the noncommercial community and the public at large, put both ICANN and NCDNHC in a position where they cannot be impartial as they may benefit from such programs. We believe that inclusion of the community through programs and outreach should be judged under Input/Governance and Community Services and have consequently removed the ICANN/NCDNHC factor.
2. "Good Works" was specifically mentioned both at the Acra and Bucharest meetings by the ICANN Board as something that was not appropriate. We agree that funds received by the registry should be used for registry enhancements, growth and stabilization of the registry, and, if there are surpluses, returned to the community through price reductions. We believe that Criterion 4 covers these sufficiently and therefore, "Good Works" should also be eliminated.

Applicant	Input/Governance	Pre-Bid Survey	Post-Bid Resp	ICANN/NCDNHC	Comm Relations	Community Svcs	"Good works"	Score	Rank	Prev Rank
.Org Foundation	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.00	10	10
DotOrg Foundation	6.0	3.0	5.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	21.25	2	1
GNR	4.0	3.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	4.0	0.0	20.25	3	2
IMS/ISC	2.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	13.00	5	6
ISOC	3.0	3.0	5.0	0.0	3.0	5.0	0.0	17.25	4	4
Neustar Organic Names	3.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	12.75	6	7
RegisterOrg	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	11	11
SWITCH	2.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	10.75	8	8
UIA/Diversitas	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	8.00	9	9
Unity	2.0	1.0	5.0	0.0	3.0	2.0	0.0	11.75	7	5
	6.0	3.0	5.0	0.0	6.0	5.0	0.0	26.25	1	3

Weighting	2.00	0.25	0.50	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Scale	6.00						
Total							
Weighting	4.75						

Criterion 6: Public Support

**Page 22
Method**

Applicant	Class A	Class B	Score	Diversity	Rank
DotOrg					
Foundation	7.0	2.0	7.4	M	5
GNR	0.0	6.0	1.2	L	8
IMS/ISC	0.0	420.0	84.0	M	1
ISOC	2.0	100.0	22.0	H	3
Neustar	1.0	25.0	6.0	M	6
Organic					
Names	0.0	0.0	0.0	--	11
.Org					
Foundation	14.0	17.0	17.4	L	4
RegisterOrg	0.0	4.0	0.8	L	9
SWITCH	0.0	3.0	0.6	L	10
UIA/Diversitas	4.0	10.0	6.0	M	6
Unity	23.0	39.0	30.8	M	2

Ratio B to A 0.2

**Page 43
Method**

Applicant	Class A	Class B	Geo Diversity	Total	Rank	Rank from Page 22
DotOrg						
Foundation	2.0	0.0	1.0	3	7	5

GNR	0.0	1.0	0.0	3	7	8
IMS/ISC	0.0	2.0	1.0	7	4	1
ISOC	1.0	2.0	2.0	9	1	3
Neustar	1.0	2.0	1.0	8	3	6
Organic Names	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	9	11
.Org Foundation	2.0	1.0	0.0	5	5	4
RegisterOrg	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	9	9
SWITCH	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	9	10
UIA/Diversitas	1.0	1.0	1.0	5	5	6
Unity	2.0	2.0	1.0	9	1	2
Weight	1	3	1			
Scale	2					
Total						
Weighting	5					
Break Points						
Top Score	2	2	2			
When N is GT						
(>)	5	20	H			
Middle Score	1	1	1			
When N is GT						
(>)	0	5	M			
Low Score	0	0	0			
When N is						
LTE (<=)	0	5	L			

Current NCDNHC Scoring Model with DotOrg Foundation Adjusted Scores: Criterion 6

Using the model in the "Current Model" tab, and with the updates to the DotOrg score from the "DotOrg Fdn Scores" tab, we have put forth our recommendations for review of structural changes to the review process. This is not to take away credit from the hard work of the NCDNHC, but rather to provide a different perspective on the evaluations.

To make this more illustrative, we will make the changes on each criteria separately and then on all three last. This section deals with Criterion 6 - the other Criteria are left as originally presented.

Also note that some of these changes are not to the benefit of the DotOrg Foundation and are being made simply to encourage deeper analysis of this evaluation process.

Overall Rankings

The rankings below reflect the structural changes that have been made to the report as described in the affected criterion. These changes are merely "what-if" suggestions and are designed to promote discussion and consideration, not as criticisms to the NCDNHC or other members of the community. We have also provided rankings from the "DotOrg Fdn Scores" as a reference.

We encourage all members of the community to use this section to examine the impact of the structure on the rankings and to use this to further discussion in the community.

Applicant	Average Ranking	Normalized Ranking	Previous Scores	
			Average Ranking	Normalized Ranking
.Org Foundation	9	8	9	9
DotOrg Foundation	2	2	2	3
GNR	5	5	5	6
IMS/ISC	5	6	3	5
ISOC	3	3	4	2
Neustar Organic	4	4	5	4
Names	11	11	11	11
RegisterOrg	7	9	7	8

SWITCH	10	10	10	10
UIA/Diversitas	7	7	8	7
Unity	1	1	1	1

Ranking Breakdown - Average Ranking

Applicant	Criterion 6: Support	Criterion 4: Differentiation	Criterion 5: Responsiveness	Average	Rank	Previous Scores
.Org Foundation	3	11	10	8.00	9	9
DotOrg Foundation	3	2	1	2.00	2	2
GNR	8	7	2	5.67	5	5
IMS/ISC	7	4	6	5.67	5	3
ISOC	2	6	4	4.00	3	4
Neustar Organic Names	5	4	7	5.33	4	5
RegisterOrg	9	8	11	9.33	11	11
SWITCH	9	3	8	6.67	7	7
UIA/Diversitas	9	9	9	9.00	10	10
Unity	5	10	5	6.67	7	8
	1	1	3	1.67	1	1

Ranking Breakdown - Normalization Ranking

Applicant	Criterion 6: Support	Criterion 4: Differentiation	Criterion 5: Responsiveness	Score	Rank	Previous Scores
.Org Foundation	5.00	5.00	5.00	7.67	8	9
DotOrg Foundation	5.00	20.00	28.25	17.43	2	3
GNR	1.00	14.00	27.75	11.40	5	6

IMS/ISC	3.00	15.00	14.00	10.79	6	5
ISOC	6.00	14.50	23.25	15.60	3	2
Neustar	4.00	15.00	12.75	11.52	4	4
Organic						
Names	0.00	11.50	0.00	3.68	11	11
RegisterOrg	0.00	16.00	11.75	7.63	9	8
SWITCH	0.00	10.00	8.00	4.91	10	10
UIA/Diversitas	4.00	7.50	16.75	9.97	7	7
Unity	7.00	20.50	27.25	19.37	1	1

Question						
Weight	1.00	1.00	1.00			
Scale Length	2.00	5.00	6.00			
Sum of						
Weights	4.00	5.00	6.25	From each Criteria		
Final						
Weighting	1.00	0.32	0.21			

Criterion Ratings
Criterion 4: Differentiation

Applicant	Market Research	Positioning	Defensive Reg	Unrestricted	Innovation	Registrars	Score	Rank
.Org Foundation	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	11
DotOrg Foundation	3.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	20.0	2
GNR	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	14.0	7
IMS/ISC	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	15.0	4
ISOC	3.0	3.0	2.0	5.0	0.0	4.0	14.5	6
Neustar	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	2.0	15.0	4
Organic								
Names	0.0	2.0	3.0	5.0	0.0	3.0	11.5	8
RegisterOrg	4.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	4.0	16.0	3
SWITCH	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	9

UIA/Diversitas	0.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	7.5	10
Unity	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	20.5	1
Weighting Scale	0.5	1.0	0.5	1.0	1.0	1.0		
Total Weighting	5.0							

Criterion 5: Responsiveness to Non-Commercial User Community

Applicant	Input/Governance	Pre-Bid Survey	Post-Bid Resp	ICANN/NCD NHC	Comm Relations	Community Svcs	"Good works"	Score	Rank
.Org Foundation	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.00	10
DotOrg Foundation	6.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	28.25	1
GNR	4.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	27.75	2
IMS/ISC	2.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	14.00	6
ISOC	3.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	2.0	23.25	4
Neustar Organic Names	3.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	12.75	7
RegisterOrg	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	11
SWITCH	2.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	2.0	11.75	8
UIA/Diversitas	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	8.00	9
Unity	2.0	1.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	2.0	0.0	16.75	5
	6.0	3.0	5.0	1.0	6.0	5.0	0.0	27.25	3
Weighting Scale	2.00	0.25	0.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.50		
Total Weighting	6.00								
	6.25								

Criterion 6: Public Support

Note: We strongly believe that having two different scorings of the same process causes undue confusion. To alleviate this and to address some weighting issues, we propose the following:

1. Rank for the Average Ranking is taken from the results of the table created on Page 43. The results from the table on page 22 cannot be normalized for the Normalized Table because there is no scale factor that can be applied. The Average Rankings will be affected by this change.
2. Because of 1, we suggest that the values in Class "A" and "B" from the table on page 22 be used to create the scoring for the table on page 43. The tables that were created specifying who was and was not contacted should be dropped because they are too subjective (there are many legitimate reasons why an organization would not respond.)
3. The weighting for "B" versus "A" in the table on page 43 adds too much value to "B" support. If gaining widespread support is to be seen as critical to the success of the registry, then gaining the support of the organizations that are credible and that lead the sector are significantly more important than getting support from the individuals who have .org domains. We suggest changing the weighting to 2 for "A," 1 for "B" and 1 for Geo Diversity.
4. We suggest that the break points for support should be modified to be in line with the 5-to-1 ratio as indicated on page 22. This means making the break point for "B" to 25 from 20 for the top score.

Page 22
Method

Applicant	Class A	Class B	Score	Diversity	Rank	Prev Rank
.Org Foundation	14.0	17.0	17.4	L	4	4
DotOrg Foundation	7.0	2.0	7.4	M	5	5
GNR	0.0	6.0	1.2	L	8	8
IMS/ISC	0.0	420.0	84.0	M	1	1
ISOC	2.0	100.0	22.0	H	3	3
Neustar Organic Names	1.0	25.0	6.0	M	6	6
RegisterOrg	0.0	0.0	0.0	--	11	11
SWITCH	0.0	4.0	0.8	L	9	9
UIA/Diversitas	0.0	3.0	0.6	L	10	10
Unity	4.0	10.0	6.0	M	6	6
	23.0	39.0	30.8	M	2	2
Ratio B to A	0.2					

Page 43
Method

Applicant	Class A	Class B	Geo Diversity	Total	Rank	Prev Rank	Rank from Page 22
.Org Foundation	2.0	1.0	0.0	5	3	5	4
DotOrg Foundation	2.0	0.0	1.0	5	3	7	5
GNR	0.0	1.0	0.0	1	8	7	8
IMS/ISC	0.0	2.0	1.0	3	7	4	1
ISOC	1.0	2.0	2.0	6	2	1	3
Neustar Organic Names	1.0	1.0	1.0	4	5	3	6
RegisterOrg	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	9	9	11
SWITCH	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	9	9	9
UIA/Diversitas	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	9	9	10
Unity	1.0	1.0	1.0	4	5	5	6
	2.0	2.0	1.0	7	1	1	2
Weight Scale	2	1	1				
Total Weighting	2						
	4						
Break Points							
Top Score When N is GT (>)	2	2	2				
Middle Score When N is GT (>)	5	25	H				
Low Score When N is LTE (<=)	1	1	1				
	0	5	M				
	0	0	0				
	0	5	L				

Current NCDNHC Scoring Model with DotOrg Foundation Adjusted Scores: Criterion 6

Using the model in the "Current Model" tab, and with the updates to the DotOrg score from the "DotOrg Fdn Scores" tab, we have put forth our recommendations for review of structural changes to the review process. This is not to take away credit from the hard work of the NCDNHC, but rather to provide a different perspective on the evaluations.									
This tab combines all the suggested structural changes from Criterion 4, 5 and 6.									
Also note that some of these changes are not to the benefit of the DotOrg Foundation and are being made simply to encourage deeper analysis of this evaluation process.									
Overall Rankings									
The rankings below reflect all the structural changes that have been made to the report as described previously. These changes are merely "what-if" suggestions and are designed to promote discussion and consideration, not as criticisms to the NCDNHC or other members of the community. We have also provided rankings from the "DotOrg Fdn Scores" as a reference.									
We encourage all members of the community to use this section to examine the impact of the structure on the rankings and to use this to further discussion in the community.									
			Previous Scores						
Applicant	Average Ranking	Normalized Ranking	Average Ranking	Normalized Ranking					
.Org Foundation	9	9	9	9					
DotOrg Foundation	2	2	2	3					
GNR	6	6	5	6					
IMS/ISC	5	5	3	5					
ISOC	3	3	4	2					
Neustar	4	4	5	4					
Organic Names	11	11	11	11					
RegisterOrg	7	8	7	8					
SWITCH	10	10	10	10					
UIA/Diversitas	8	7	8	7					

Unity	1	1	1	1				
Ranking Breakdown - Average Ranking								
Applicant	Criterion 6: Support	Criterion 4: Differentiation	Criterion 5: Responsiveness	Average	Rank	Previous Scores		
.Org Foundation	3	11	10	8.00	9	9		
DotOrg Foundation	3	2	2	2.33	2	2		
GNR	8	7	3	6.00	6	5		
IMS/ISC	7	4	5	5.33	5	3		
ISOC	2	6	4	4.00	3	4		
Neustar	5	4	6	5.00	4	5		
Organic Names	9	8	11	9.33	11	11		
RegisterOrg	9	3	8	6.67	7	7		
SWITCH	9	9	9	9.00	10	10		
UIA/Diversitas	5	10	7	7.33	8	8		
Unity	1	1	1	1.00	1	1		
Ranking Breakdown - Normalization Ranking								
Applicant	Criterion 6: Support	Criterion 4: Differentiation	Criterion 5: Responsiveness	Score	Rank	Previous Scores		
.Org Foundation	5.00	5.00	5.00	8.00	9	9		
DotOrg Foundation	5.00	20.00	21.25	17.36	2	3		
GNR	1.00	14.00	20.25	11.16	6	6		
IMS/ISC	3.00	15.00	13.00	11.45	5	5		
ISOC	6.00	14.50	17.25	15.48	3	2		
Neustar	4.00	15.00	12.75	12.38	4	4		
Organic Names	0.00	11.50	0.00	3.68	11	11		
RegisterOrg	0.00	16.00	10.75	8.14	8	8		
SWITCH	0.00	10.00	8.00	5.45	10	10		
UIA/Diversitas	4.00	7.50	11.75	9.70	7	7		

Unity	7.00	20.50	26.25	20.93	1	1			
Question Weight	1.00	1.00	1.00						
Scale Length	2.00	5.00	6.00						
Sum of Weights	4.00	5.00	4.75	From each Criteria					
Final Weighting	1.00	0.32	0.28						
Criterion Ratings									
Criterion 4: Differentiation									
Applicant	Market Research	Positioning	Defensive Reg	Unrestricted	Innovation	Registrars	Score	Rank	Prev Rank
.Org Foundation	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	11	11
DotOrg Foundation	3.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	20.0	2	2
GNR	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	14.0	7	7
IMS/ISC	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	15.0	4	4
ISOC	3.0	3.0	2.0	5.0	0.0	4.0	14.5	6	6
Neustar	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	2.0	15.0	4	4
Organic Names	0.0	2.0	3.0	5.0	0.0	3.0	11.5	8	8
RegisterOrg	4.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	4.0	16.0	3	3
SWITCH	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	9	9
UIA/Diversitas	0.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	7.5	10	10
Unity	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	20.5	1	1
Weighting	0.5	1.0	0.5	1.0	1.0	1.0			
Scale	5.0								
Total Weighting	5.0								
Criterion 5: Responsiveness to Non-Commercial User Community									
Applicant	Input/Governance	Pre-Bid Survey	Post-Bid Resp	Comm Relations	Community Svcs	Score	Rank	Prev Rank	
.Org Foundation	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	5.00	10	4	

DotOrg Foundation	6.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	21.25	2	5
GNR	4.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	20.25	3	8
IMS/ISC	2.0	0.0	6.0	3.0	3.0	13.00	5	1
ISOC	3.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	17.25	4	3
Neustar	3.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	3.0	12.75	6	6
Organic Names	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	11	11
RegisterOrg	2.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	0.0	10.75	8	9
SWITCH	2.0	0.0	2.0	3.0	0.0	8.00	9	10
UIA/Diversitas	2.0	1.0	5.0	3.0	2.0	11.75	7	6
Unity	6.0	3.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	26.25	1	2
Weighting	2.00	0.25	0.50	1.00	1.00			
Scale	6.00							
Total Weighting	4.75							
Criterion 6: Public Support								
Page 22 Method								
Applicant	Class A	Class B	Score	Diversity	Rank	Prev Rank		
.Org Foundation	14.0	17.0	17.4	L	4	4		
DotOrg Foundation	7.0	2.0	7.4	M	5	5		
GNR	0.0	6.0	1.2	L	8	8		
IMS/ISC	0.0	420.0	84.0	M	1	1		
ISOC	2.0	100.0	22.0	H	3	3		
Neustar	1.0	25.0	6.0	M	6	6		
Organic Names	0.0	0.0	0.0	--	11	11		
RegisterOrg	0.0	4.0	0.8	L	9	9		
SWITCH	0.0	3.0	0.6	L	10	10		
UIA/Diversitas	4.0	10.0	6.0	M	6	6		
Unity	23.0	39.0	30.8	M	2	2		
Ratio B to A	0.2							

Page 43 Method							
Applicant	Class A	Class B	Geo Diversity	Total	Rank	Prev Rank	Rank from Page 22
.Org Foundation	2.0	1.0	0.0	5	3	5	4
DotOrg Foundation	2.0	0.0	1.0	5	3	7	5
GNR	0.0	1.0	0.0	1	8	7	8
IMS/ISC	0.0	2.0	1.0	3	7	4	1
ISOC	1.0	2.0	2.0	6	2	1	3
Neustar	1.0	1.0	1.0	4	5	3	6
Organic Names	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	9	9	11
RegisterOrg	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	9	9	9
SWITCH	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	9	9	10
UIA/Diversitas	1.0	1.0	1.0	4	5	5	6
Unity	2.0	2.0	1.0	7	1	1	2
Weight	2	1	1				
Scale	2						
Total Weighting	4						
Break Points							
Top Score	2	2	2				
When N is GT (>)	5	25	H				
Middle Score	1	1	1				
When N is GT (>)	0	5	M				
Low Score	0	0	0				
When N is LTE (<=)	0	5	L				