

**Global Name Registry  
Response to ICANN Staff Report  
1 October 2002**

We thank the ICANN Staff and the evaluators for recognising Global Name Registry as one of the top three contenders to be the new .org registry operator, ranking us alongside ISOC and NeuStar on technical excellence and, along with Unity, as one of the top two contenders on substantive aspects of a strong commitment to the non-commercial community.<sup>1</sup> We appreciate the hard work done by the Staff and the evaluation teams to prepare the final report.

We respectfully submit that, despite the detailed comments we and others provided, certain problems in the report persist and call into question the Staff's recommendation. In an effort to develop a scientific process, the Staff appears to have overlooked the big picture – that Global Name Registry excelled more than any other candidate overall. While numerical rankings can assist in the evaluation process, they simply cannot substitute for discerning key differences among the top contenders. Indeed, some of the numerical differences are insignificant, and others can dramatically change the rankings. For example, the difference between the overall Global Name Registry and ISOC scores assigned by Gartner is one-hundredth of a point – 3.64 for Global Name Registry and 3.65 for ISOC. And, as discussed below, a correction of one point on a non-commercial criterion changes the overall rankings.

In this light, it is particularly important that the Board make its own decision, carefully weighing the pros and cons of each of the top contenders. The .org decision is about more than winning and losing – it is about selecting the registry operator that is best suited to accomplish, in an extremely short period of time, a critical and complex transition of the world's fifth largest top-level domain. No one wants to jeopardize the existing .org database of 2.3 million names. It is also ICANN's first transition of a database of such magnitude. As the Staff report notes, the Board is free to accept or reject the recommendation made by Staff. If the decision is sound and the transition is done well, it will be a significant achievement for ICANN.

It is therefore critical that the Board select the candidate that it believes is the strongest one across *all* of the most critical components: technical excellence; an established infrastructure that will facilitate quick conclusion of a registry agreement with ICANN and a smooth transition of .org from VeriSign; financial stability; competitive pricing; competition in the registry industry; and a strong commitment to the non-commercial community. *We believe that candidate is Global Name Registry.*

**Why Select Global Name Registry?**

Global Name Registry is the *only* candidate that performs well on *all* eleven of the criteria established in the .org RFP:

---

<sup>1</sup> The two substantive non-commercial criteria are Differentiation (Criterion 4) and Responsiveness (Criterion 5).

- **Outstanding Demonstrated Technical Capability & Compliance with Standards to Preserve a Stable .org Registry (Criteria 1, 7 & 8):** Gartner selected Global Name Registry as one of the top three contenders on technical excellence and indicated that we stand first among all applicants with respect to our ability to support, function in, and adapt to protocol changes in SRS. This is one of the most important components of transitioning the .org registry from a thin registry accessed through RRP to a thick registry accessed through EPP.

We currently operate a state-of-the-art registry system that has been built in-house and designed to serve more than 50 million domain names and thousands of registrars:

- In contrast to ISOC/Afilias, our registry infrastructure does not rely solely on an outsourced partner for operations.
- We will operate the .org registry using hardware and proprietary software, which, in contrast to ISOC/Afilias, is compliant with key IETF RFCs and has enough capacity to run the entire .com/.net/.org DNS and Whois systems.

Since launch in December 2001, we have proven our technical capabilities through virtually flawless operation of the .name registry, including on key .name SRS fulfillment services (e.g., DNS, Whois and MX).

- **Established Infrastructure & Policy Record (Criterion 2):** Given the extremely short window for the transition of .org, it is incumbent upon ICANN to select a bidder with a solid and existing infrastructure to ensure quick conclusion of a registry agreement with ICANN and that the focus of all of its attention will be on the fundamental task at hand – transition of the .org registry.

Global Name Registry has been in business since 1999, and our existing corporate infrastructure and understanding of ICANN mechanisms will allow us to move expediently through contract negotiations and a safe transition of the .org registry. Moreover, our record of full compliance with ICANN-developed policies is clear. In contrast, the candidate recommended by the Staff report does not yet exist, and, by definition, lacks any type of infrastructure and any track record of compliance with ICANN-developed policies.

- **Smooth Transition by 31 December 2002 (Criterion 9):** There is no room for error, particularly on the tight schedule proposed. Our technical team's experience with VeriSign (including providing VeriSign with software developed by Global Name Registry's own technical team as the foundation for technical cooperation between the two companies) could be the single most important factor in a successful transition.
- **Sound Financial Condition (Criteria 1 & 11):** We are unique among the top three contenders identified in the report in having a strong financial track record. Our backers include the Carlyle Group, which manages more than \$14 billion in assets worldwide. Our existing investors have recently demonstrated their

continued support and have made additional capital commitments that will close in mid-October.

- **Competitive Pricing (Criterion 7):** Global Name Registry has proposed the most aggressive pricing reductions of any of the applicants, with the expectation that at least some of the savings will be passed on to the registrant. Global Name Registry has proposed the largest discount, of up to 42% (US\$3.47) based on volume and duration, while ISOC would maintain the US\$6 price and NeuStar would charge a flat rate of US\$5. Although several Board members made clear at the Ghana meeting that affordability is an important consideration, the Staff report surprisingly did not weigh proposals to reduce the registry price below US\$6.
- **Registry Competition (Criterion 3):** Selecting Global Name Registry as the .org operator would create the first European super-registry and significantly enhance competition in the registry services industry. Our headquarters and the vast majority of our infrastructure and employees are located in Europe. In addition, as the only top contender to currently operate only one top-level domain, we would be able to devote our attention exclusively to .org and .name.
- **Responsiveness to the Non-Commercial Community (Criteria 4, 5, 6 & 10):** The Non-Commercial (“NCDNHC”) evaluation team applauded Global Name Registry's vision statement, including our concept of developing .org as the "Community Capital" (which we would do while exceeding current service standards – another critical factor the ICANN Board emphasised) and ranked us ahead of the other two top contenders on Differentiation (Criterion 4) and Responsiveness (Criterion 5). The .orgcentre – a success centre available exclusively to the .org community to help non-commercial entities build their presence online – and the Causeway Community Foundation – a fund that will be established to support numerous of projects that the .org community believes would benefit the Internet community – are designed to respond specifically to the .org community's needs. These initiatives will be undertaken in close consultation and cooperation with the .org Steering Committee, composed of Global Name Registry management and the leaders selected by ICANN’s Non-Commercial constituency.

It is important to emphasise that our proposal means reinvesting revenues from .org *back into the non-commercial community*, rather than supporting a narrower set of interests (ISOC) or increasing corporate earnings (NeuStar). *If* our non-profit .orgcentre or the Causeway Community Foundation were determined to be eligible for the VeriSign endowment, the additional funds would be used to open regional .orgcentres in developing countries in Latin America, Africa and Asia. *In either case*, we will leverage our relationship with the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies to maximise our global outreach and bring the resources of the .orgcentre and the Causeway Community Foundation to local communities worldwide.

Given the complexity and subjectivity of the evaluation process, and the issues discovered in the analysis underlying the recommendation, we respectfully urge the Board to draw its own conclusions. As described in our proposal and this response, Global Name Registry is the strongest candidate overall to succeed the incumbent because of (1) our sound operation of the .name registry to date; (2) our established

infrastructure and organisation; (3) our strong financial position; (4) our aggressive pricing reductions and greater competitive benefits; and (5) our concrete commitment to serving the needs of the .org and broader Internet communities.

### **Concerns with Staff's Recommendation**

Because of the critical importance of the decision at hand, it is vital that the Board have all the information relevant to the .org decision before it. We hope that the following analysis, together with our previous public comments, will help the Board make the best decision for ICANN.

#### **Ensuring Realistic Plans & Smooth Transition (Criteria 9 & 11):**

Notwithstanding the extremely short window for the transition of .org, the Staff report does not acknowledge the significant problems raised by selecting an organisation that has not yet been formed. We intend no disrespect to ISOC or Afilias, but it is unrealistic to conclude that ISOC will be able to create an entirely new entity (PIR), *and* negotiate a registry agreement with ICANN *within a two-week period, and then conduct a seamless transition.* Establishing the new entity alone will require, among other things, developing an organisational structure, building a qualified Board of Directors, hiring employees, drafting organisational documents, negotiating a services agreement between ISOC and Afilias, and securing enough financing to begin operations. The new organisation, to the extent it can be established in such a brief period, will then have to immediately begin the transition of .org away from VeriSign and complete it by the end of the year. There is simply no margin for error: the transition task itself is enormous and, when coupled with establishing a completely new organisational structure, seems impossible.

**Preserving Technical Stability (Criteria 1, 7 & 8):** Global Name Registry concurs with the concerns raised by Gartner that ISOC/Afilias's use of PostgreSQL solution could compromise technical stability of the .org registry. The open source database system proposed by ISOC lacks maturity, documentation and dedicated support, and may give rise to several conflicting versions of the same software and undefined migration strategy for future software versions. Taken together, these characteristics appear to present an unacceptable risk to the 2.3 million-strong .org registry.

Although the Staff report indicates that Afilias has not yet encountered problems with its PostgreSQL database choice in its operation of .info, it should be recognised that the .info registry has been running for less than nine months. As Gartner points out, the risks are therefore still present.

**Assessing Financial Stability (Criteria 1 & 11):** One of the most important factors in running a successful registry is financial stability and viability. This is particularly relevant to an industry that has been plagued by serious financial problems during the past two years. However, candidates' financial wherewithal and experience at and infrastructure for managing a budget were never examined by the Staff report in detail, although both of these areas fall squarely within the criteria of "preserving a stable, well-functioning .org registry" (Criterion 1) and "the completeness of the proposals submitted and the extent to which they demonstrate realistic plans and sound analysis" (Criterion 11).

Despite what are surely its best efforts, ISOC is facing serious financial problems that raise questions about its stability, viability, and budget management experience. Whereas the Staff report characterises ISOC's financial condition as "not applicable" to the .org decision, its condition is relevant to both Criteria 1 and 11. The public minutes of ISOC's December 2001 Board Meeting indicate the seriousness of the situation:

"Revenues have exceeded expenses in 2000 and 2001, reducing our negative net worth to about \$500K by end of year 2001... this has severely limited our capacity to develop new initiatives in the education and policy domains. The society has been operating with a very low amount of available cash, sometimes not much more than two weeks... Membership has been stagnant for years and is now decreasing."

(See <http://www.isoc.org/isoc/general/trustees/mtg25.shtml>)

If ISOC had trouble matching revenues and expenses and maintaining its membership base during the high-tech boom years, it is not clear how it would maintain and manage sufficient funding for the transition, start-up and operation of the .org registry, notwithstanding any current commitment from Afilias. Cash reserves of two weeks or less, or even a temporary "surplus of US\$152,382" (see "Internet Society Statement in Response to Questions Regarding the Preliminary Recommendation to Award the .Org Registry to ISOC" at <http://www.isoc.org/dotorg/icann-response.shtml>) may be sufficient for a non-profit organisation, but it is inadequate for operation of the world's fifth largest top-level domain.

### **Other Concerns with Report**

**Measuring Technical Experience (Criteria 1, 7 & 8):** Gartner rated Global Name Registry as one of the top three contenders on technical competence, alongside NeuStar and ISOC. We scored the highest out of any applicant in our ability to support, adapt to and function in new protocol changes in a shared registry (Criterion 8) and second in connection with transition considerations (Criterion 9). We have concerns, however, with the way in which the Staff's report subsequently measured and analysed "extended experience in operating a TLD of a size commensurate with .org" and "extended experience in operating a TLD that includes SRS services." Both factors are relevant, but they are not determinative because there are other ways to demonstrate capability.

As Nii Quaynor stated at the Ghana Meeting:

"It's true that we have to recommend an operator that is capable of handling the scale. But we should not push it so far to the extreme that we lose out or it narrows down the potential operators to something that I think would be too restrictive.

"The priority should be stability of the net and operation and quality of the service provided.

“We should also be *reasonably open to one who is able to demonstrate in some way that he is able to scale to that level*, so that we are acting to expand the net of good operators.” (Emphasis added.)

To which Vint Cerf replied:

“I think that’s not an unreasonable sentiment to express, as long as we take into account that *demonstration* of capability is paramount.” (Emphasis added.)

(See Real-Time Captioning of ICANN Board Meeting in Accra, Ghana, Afternoon Session, 14 March 2002, <http://www.icann.org/accra/captioning-afternoon-14mar02.htm>)

As this discussion shows, there are different ways to demonstrate capacity and capability, other than size, or operation of the SRS function. In addition, the idea that the experience of ISOC or NeuStar is significantly more applicable than that of Global Name Registry is unfounded – the difference between our experience and either of the other two top contenders is a matter of months. Moreover, it is important to note that none of the candidates operates a database of “a size commensurate with .org.” We recognise that Afilias operates the largest new top-level domain (.info), but that registry maintains less than half of the number of names in the .org registry.

We believe that the more important criteria are scalability and proven excellence, against both of which Global Name Registry performs well. The registry operated by Global Name Registry has been built by our team to scale to more than 50 million objects. It is a fact that whether a registry system includes 1,000 objects, 150,000 objects, or 2 million objects, the experience of the operator is a function of how the scalability strategy has been implemented, and not a function of how many objects have been inserted. Additionally, as the Staff report recognised, although all of the new generic top-level domains launched in the last year were started from scratch, Global Name Registry stands alone in its virtually flawless record, free of any significant technical and legal issues.

Experience in running a live SRS is important, but it can be measured in different ways. Indeed, the most critical aspects of the system are a well-functioning database and database abstraction. Global Name Registry has run both elements independently for more than six months – a difference of less than three months between us and either NeuStar or Afilias. With the exception of the EPP front-end, we operate a full registry system, including DNS, Whois and MX services, as well as consistency validation, backup, reporting, billing and zone file access, among other components. We clearly have the in-house expertise and experience to operate .org with the same level of excellence and confidence that we operate .name.

**Corrected Noncommercial Scoring (Criterion 4, 5 & 6):** It may sound inconsequential to raise concerns about how the NCDNHC team measured expressions of public support (Criterion 6) and input/governance (Criterion 5). However, these seemingly minor errors were enough to affect the overall rankings (see Tab A below for corrected versions of relevant Tables). Corrected, Global Name Registry moves into 2<sup>nd</sup> place on the Averaged Ranking – behind Unity, ahead of

ISOC and into the “A” Tier in the Staff Report. On the normalized ranking, Unity becomes the only “A” Tier candidate, with Global Name Registry, ISOC and NeuStar clustered together in the “B” Tier. This situation casts serious doubt on the efficacy of relying on any combined rankings, as the NCDNHC team and the ICANN Staff cautioned against but then proceeded to do.

Errors in Measurement of Public Support (Criterion 6): We do not question whether the NCDNHC team’s assessment of public support is desirable for we recognise that public support was clearly delineated in the RFP as a factor in the evaluation. But we do question the use of a scoring system that the NCDNHC team admits is an “inexact process.” The NCDNHC team simply counted the number of letters received by each applicant, whether they were form letters or letters incapable of authentication. This had the effect, perhaps unintended, of minimising the weight of the two far more substantive criteria (4 & 5) and skewing the overall rankings. More alarmingly, because it could not devise a better way to determine the authorship of certain letters (and therefore whether the authors of those letters stood to benefit from a winning .org application), the NCDNHC team made arbitrary calculations: ISOC received 20 additional points because the evaluation team estimated that 100 of the letters came from non-ISOC members,<sup>2</sup> and NeuStar received points for letters which did not specifically support NeuStar’s efforts. It would have been more objective and accurate to instead describe for the Board the varying types of letters that came in.

To the extent the Board differs with this assessment, we urge it to honor the express language of the RFP in reviewing letters of support. Criterion 6 refers specifically to “demonstrated support *among registrants in the .org TLD*, particularly those that actually use .org names for noncommercial purposes.” The NCDNHC team, however, counted letters of support from registrants that were not .org registrants, in contravention of the RFP. It is not enough to discount these “Class B” letters as worth 1/5<sup>th</sup> of a “Class A” letter: they do not count at all under the RFP. (If the NCDNHC had thought it would be beneficial to count *any* letters of support, even from those people or groups are *not* .org registrants, it should have raised that point during the drafting of the RFP but did not do so.<sup>3</sup>

If the rankings are to be used, they should be corrected, consistent with the RFP, to count only “Class A” letters and “Class B” letters from .org registrants. They must also reflect correctly the exact number of “qualified Class A” letters that Global Name Registry received. Because the team decided to count ISOC supporters as one letter

---

<sup>2</sup> The NCDNHC team admitted that it could not distinguish whether a letter of support for ISOC was from an ISOC member (in which case it would not be given additional weight) or from a non-member. (Milton Mueller to Thomas Roessler: "What we can't tell from the evidence is whether the people who added their name to the Class B list were ISOC members or not" (See <http://www.icann-ncc.org/pipermail/discuss/2002-August/002730.html>.) Nonetheless, the team arbitrarily decided that "100" of the support letters would be deemed to be from non-ISOC members, thereby giving ISOC an extra 20 points that were critical to its overall ranking.

<sup>3</sup> This suggestion is not intended to be critical, but rather reflect the position taken by the NCDNHC and Staff reports that proposals to change the RFP should have been raised during that comment period.

for ISOC and UIA members as one letter for Diversitas, notwithstanding that in each case these members stood to benefit from a successful bid, it should apply the same rule to Global Name Registry and count the letter we received from the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies.<sup>4</sup> It should also include as “Class A” the three letters that Global Name Registry received just as the draft report was being published, from the March of Dimes, First Night, and the National Parenting Association.

Error in Input/Governance Score: The team missed an important part of our proposal for the governance structure, although we pointed it out in our previous comment. The NCDNHC report states that Global Name Registry was graded a 4 instead of a 5 for governance because it perceived that we would be able to handpick the non-commercial representatives to our proposed .org Steering Committee. This is incorrect: our proposal states that it is the *elected leadership* of the NCDNHC (i.e., the people chosen by the NCDNHC) who serve on the Committee along with representatives from Global Name Registry. With the correction of *one point*, based on the NCDNHC team’s own analysis of our proposal, Global Name Registry moves into 1<sup>st</sup> place on Responsiveness and Governance Rankings (Criterion 5) with a score of 28.75, ahead of Unity with a score of 27.25. This change in ranking also changes the final ranking of the Averaged table, with Unity still in 1<sup>st</sup> place but Global Name Registry just behind it and ahead of ISOC.<sup>5</sup>

**Competitive Pricing (Criterion 7)**: Based on statements by members of the Board at its meeting in Ghana, it is clear that pricing was intended to be a key criterion in the evaluation process. Vint Cerf summed up Board discussion at the Ghana meeting by stating:

"My recommendation to the Board is to convey a sense to the President that the organization be focused on making the operation safe, secure, efficient and *as inexpensive as possible* [emphasis added]" (see Real-Time Captioning of ICANN Board Meeting in Accra, Ghana, Afternoon Session, 14 March 2002, <http://www.icann.org/accra/captioning-afternoon-14mar02.htm>).

The Staff did include pricing as a “significant consideration” in Criterion 7 of the RFP, but then failed to attribute much weight to it in its final analysis. In its report, the Staff simply states that any price at or below the current US\$6 level is affordable, although, in accordance with the intent of the Board, the Staff should have considered the differences between all of the proposed pricing structures.

Global Name Registry proposed the most aggressive pricing policy of any applicant, and we did so precisely because we concurred with the Board’s assessment that it should be “*as inexpensive as possible*.” We have proposed a discount of up to 42%

---

<sup>4</sup> The NCDNHC team admits that it was “generous” about counting the letters for ISOC when it could not verify whom they were from, and that it has considered disqualifying all of them. It made the same observations about counting the UIA letter in Class A.

<sup>5</sup> It should be noted that failure to correct the problem of counting letters from non-.org registrants as Public Support in contravention of the RFP would result in a tie between Global Name Registry and ISOC for second place.



(US\$3.47) based on volume and duration, while ISOC would charge a flat rate of US\$6, and NeuStar would charge a flat rate of US\$5.

It is also important to consider another factor related to pricing – where do revenues go? With respect to ISOC, it is not clear, and regarding NeuStar, revenues are simply reinvested in NeuStar. In contrast, Global Name Registry has committed to reinvest up to 15% of .org revenues to the non-commercial community, in addition to price reductions. We believe, and have received feedback from various members of the non-commercial community within ICANN, that our concepts for the .orgcentre and the Causeway Community Foundation are uniquely innovative. As noted above, (1) the .orgcentre will provide .org registrants with various tools, training and support to help develop their presence online, and (2) the Causeway Community Foundation will be available to financially support numerous projects every year to grow the .org community and benefit the broader Internet community.

**Analysing Eligibility for VeriSign Endowment:** The General Counsel appears to have misunderstood our intentions with respect to the VeriSign endowment. We believe we were very clear in our original application and in subsequent statements: *we do not need it*. Our commitment to allocate up to 15% of .org revenues to the .orgcentre and the Causeway Community Foundation provides plentiful support for these initiatives. As we have described in our application, both the .orgcentre and the Causeway Community Foundation would function robustly without the VeriSign endowment.

We indicated that only *if* one of these non-profit entities, in partnership with Global Name Registry as the registry operator, were to qualify for the endowment, we would use it to build an .orgcentre presence on-the-ground in developing countries in Africa, Latin American and Asia. We made it very clear that failure to receive any endowment funds would *not* diminish the resources already available to fully fund the .orgcentre and the Causeway Community Foundation. Therefore, the statement by General Counsel that there would be a “potential 50% reduction in funding for proposed ‘worthy projects’” is simply wrong.

Finally, it is not entirely clear that ISOC will be eligible for the VeriSign endowment. While it would be desirable to have the successful bidder be eligible for at least part of the endowment, VeriSign could argue that because: (1) ISOC will not be the registry operator; (2) Afilias is a for-profit corporation; and (3) PIR has yet to be formed, there is no applicant of record that qualifies for it.

## **Conclusion**

As we have demonstrated in our proposal and in this response to the Staff report, Global Name Registry offers the strongest combination of elements critical for the new .org registry operator.

Our technical excellence has been proven and recognized. We have an established and reliable operating infrastructure. Our financial position is the strongest of the top contenders. We offer the most affordable pricing model. We would substantially enhance competition in the registry industry by becoming the first European operator of a major gTLD. Our understanding of VeriSign systems increases the likelihood of

a smooth transition. And we have made the strongest and most concrete commitment to the success of the non-commercial .org and broader Internet communities.

The combination of these strengths puts us in the best position to succeed the current registry operator, in a manner that preserves technical stability while serving the needs of the .org community.

We thank the Board for its consideration and would be glad to answer any questions.

**Tab A: Corrected Tables**

NCDNHC

Table 1: Criteria 4: Ranking of Applicants by Differentiation Criteria (unchanged):

Rank	Applicant	Market research	Positioning	Defensive	Unrestricted	Innovation	Registrars	Score	Normalized score
1	UNITY	3	4	4	5	3	5	20.50	0.82
2	GNR	5	4	5	5	0	2	16.00	0.64
2	RegisterOrg	4	5	0	5	0	4	16.00	0.64
4	IMS/ISC	0	5	0	5	5	0	15.00	0.60
5	Neustar	5	3	4	5	0	2	14.50	0.58
5	ISOC	3	3	2	5	0	4	14.50	0.58
7	DotOrg Foundation	2	2	0	2	3	4	12.00	0.48
8	Organic Names	0	2	3	5	0	3	11.50	0.46
9	SWITCH	0	0	0	5	5	0	10.00	0.40
10	UIA	2	2	1	2	2	1	8.50	0.34
11	Org Foundation	0	0	0	5	0	0	5.00	0.20
	<b>Weighting</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>		

Table 2: Criterion 5: Responsiveness & Governance Ranking

Corrected in red, GNR score on Input/Governance to be consistent with NCDNHC textual analysis, i.e., its statement that it would have given GNR a 5 if it did not handpick the non-commercial members of the proposed .org Steering Committee; as our proposal made clear, we do not select them.

Rank	Bidder	Input/Governance	Pre-bid survey	Post-Bid responsiveness	ICANN/NCDNHC	Relationship w. community	Services targeted at community	"Good Works"	Score	Normalized score
1	<b>GNR</b>	5	3	5	5	4	4	5	28.75	0.77
2	Unity	6	3	5	1	6	5	0	27.25	0.73
3	<b>ISOC</b>	2	3	5	5	3	5	2	21.25	0.57
4	DotOrg Foundation	6	0	5	0	3	3	0	20.50	0.55
5	UIA	2	1	5	5	3	2	0	16.75	0.45
6	IMS/ISC	2	0	6	0	3	3	2	14.00	0.37
7	<b>Neustar</b>	3	5	5	0	0	3	0	12.75	0.34
7	RegisterOrg	2	5	5	0	3	0	4	12.75	0.34
9	.Org Foundation	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	12.50	0.33
10	Switch	2	0	2	0	3	0	0	8.00	0.21
11	Organic Names	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	
<b>Weight</b>		<b>2.00</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.50</b>		

Table 3: Criterion 6: Ranking by Public Support

Corrected, consistent with RFP, to eliminate counting of Class B letters from non-.org registrants; geographical diversity had to be rescored accordingly.

Rank	Bidder	Class A	Grade a	Class B	Grade b	Geographical diversity	grade geo	score	Normalized score
1	Unity	23	1	3	1	Medium	1	23.60	3.00
2	.Org Foundation	14	1	1	1	Low	0	14.20	2.00
3	<b>Neustar</b>	2	0	18	2	Medium	1	5.60	3.00
4	DotOrg Foundation	5	0	1	1	Low	0	5.20	1.00
5	UIA	5	0	0	0	Medium	1	5.00	1.00
6	<b>GNR</b>	4	0	0	0	Low	0	4.00	-
7	IMS/ISC	0	0	16	2	Low	0	3.20	2.00
8	<b>ISOC</b>	2	0	0	0	Low	0	2.00	-
9	RegisterOrg	0	0	2	1	Low	0	0.40	1.00
10	Switch	0	0	0	0	Low	0	-	-
11	Organic Names	0	0	0	0	Low	0	-	-

Weight	1	N>25 =>2	0.2	N > 5 =>2	High=2
		5 < N = 25 =>1		0 < N = 5 => 1	Medium=1
		etc		etc	Low=0

Corrected Average ranking:

		Criteria 4	Criteria 5	Criteria 6	
Rank	Bidder	Differentiation	Responsiveness	Support	Average
1	Unity	1	2	1	1.33
2	GNR	2	1	6	3.00
3	Neustar	5	7	3	5.00
3	DotOrg Foundation	7	4	4	5.00
5	ISOC	5	3	8	5.33
6	IMS/ISC	4	6	7	5.67
7	RegisterOrg	2	7	9	6.00
8	UIA	10	5	5	6.67
9	.Org Foundation	11	9	2	7.33
10	Switch	9	10	10	9.67
11	Organic Names	8	11	11	10.00

Corrected Normalization ranking:

Rank	Applicant	scores			Normalized score
		Criterion 4	Criterion 5	Criterion 6	
1	Unity	20.50	27.25	3.00	20.47
2	Neustar	14.50	12.75	3.00	14.20
3	GNR	16.00	28.75	-	14.07
4	IMS/ISC	15.00	14.00	2.00	13.07
5	DotOrg Foundation	12.00	20.50	1.00	11.93
6	RegisterOrg	16.00	12.75	1.00	11.47
7	ISOC	14.50	21.25	-	11.47
8	UIA	8.50	16.75	1.00	9.53
9	.Org Foundation	5.00	12.50	2.00	8.67
10	Switch	10.00	8.00	-	6.13
11	Organic Names	11.50	-	-	4.60
	<i>weight</i>	1.00	1.00	1.00	
	<i>Structural weight</i>	25.00	37.50	6.00	