Option A

Whether dispute options for registrants should be developed and implemented as part of the policy (registrants currently depend on registrars to initiate a dispute on their behalf).

Participant	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Draft rank									
1	J	H	A	O	A	A	M	M	D
2	G	Q	K	G	F	K	I	O	G
3	D	P	E	A	E	E	J	E	J
4	k	J	L	C	D	L	G	F	O
5	m	R	J	K	O	J	C	Q	P
6	L	M	Q	D	C	O	H	G	S
7	N	S	O	N	B	R	P	C	E
8	H	*	R	H	N	Q	S	B	Q
9	R	*	C	B	H	C	O	N	I
10	C	*	D	S	M	D	L	D	N
11	Q	*	G	M	Q	G	D	H	H
12	P	*	H	R	S	H	B	I	C
13	I	*	M	I	K	M	E	J	B
14	O	*	N	Q	L	N	A	A	R
15	S	*	B	J	G	B	R	K	L
16	F	*	F	P	P	F	Q	L	F
17	E	*	I	F	I	I	N	P	K
18	B	*	S	E	R	S	F	R	M
19	A	*	P	L	J	P	K	S	A

Strong "high priority"   4
Strong "low prioritiy"   2

Suggested Approach - consensus process
Discussion, ID/group concerns, resolve concerns, call for consensus, repeat once if consensus isn't reached, call for consensus, closing

Advocates   A,C,D,E,F,G,I
Facilitator
Peacekeeper
Timekeeper
Scribe

Recommendation: Select rank, send to committee, stand aside, declare block

Option B

Whether review of registry-level dispute decisions is needed (some complaints exist about inconsistency).

Participant	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Draft rank									
1	J	H	A	O	A	A	M	M	D
2	G	Q	K	G	F	K	I	O	G
3	D	P	E	A	E	E	J	E	J
4	k	J	L	C	D	L	G	F	O
5	m	R	J	K	O	J	C	Q	P
6	L	M	Q	D	C	O	H	G	S
7	N	S	O	N	B	R	P	C	E
8	H	*	R	H	N	Q	S	B	Q
9	R	*	C	B	H	C	O	N	I
10	C	*	D	S	M	D	L	D	N
11	Q	*	G	M	Q	G	D	H	H
12	P	*	H	R	S	H	B	I	C
13	I	*	M	I	K	M	E	J	B
14	O	*	N	Q	L	N	A	A	R
15	S	*	B	J	G	B	R	K	L
16	F	*	F	P	P	F	Q	L	F
17	E	*	I	F	I	I	N	P	K
18	B	*	S	E	R	S	F	R	M
19	A	*	P	L	J	P	K	S	A

Strong "high priority" 0
Strong "low prioritiy" 1

Suggested Approach - consensus process
Discussion, ID/group concerns, resolve concerns, call for consensus, repeat once if consensus isn't reached, call for consensus, closing

Advocates A
Facilitator
Peacekeeper
Timekeeper
Scribe

Recommendation: Select rank, send to committee, stand aside, declare block

Option C

Whether additional provisions on undoing inappropriate transfers are needed, especially with regard to disputes between a Registrant and Admin Contact. The policy is clear that the Registrant can overrule the AC, but how this is implemented is currently at the discretion of the registrar.

Participant	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I		
Draft rank											
1	J	H	A	O	A	A	M	M	D	**Strong "high priority"**	0
2	G	Q	K	G	F	K	I	O	G	**Strong "low prioritiy"**	0
3	D	P	E	A	E	E	J	E	J		
4	k	J	L	C	D	L	G	F	O		
5	m	R	J	K	O	J	C	Q	P		
6	L	M	Q	D	C	O	H	G	S	**Suggested Approach - broad mid-level support**	
7	N	S	O	N	B	R	P	C	E		
8	H	*	R	H	N	Q	S	B	Q	Confirm that a mid-level ranking would be satisfactory	
9	R	*	C	B	H	C	O	N	I	for all	
10	C	*	D	S	M	D	L	D	N		
11	Q	*	G	M	Q	G	D	H	H	Advocates	
12	P	*	H	R	S	H	B	I	C	Facilitator	
13	I	*	M	I	K	M	E	J	B	Peacekeeper	
14	O	*	N	Q	L	N	A	A	R	Timekeeper	
15	S	*	B	J	G	B	R	K	L	Scribe	
16	F	*	F	P	P	F	Q	L	F		
17	E	*	I	F	I	I	N	P	K		
18	B	*	S	E	R	S	F	R	M	**Recommendation:** Select rank, send to committee,	
19	A	*	P	L	J	P	K	S	A	stand aside, declare block	

Option D

Whether additional provisions should be included in the TDRP on how to handle disputes when multiple transfers have occurred.

Participant	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Draft rank									
1	J	H	A	O	A	A	M	M	D
2	G	Q	K	G	F	K	I	O	G
3	D	P	E	A	E	E	J	E	J
4	k	J	L	C	D	L	G	F	O
5	m	R	J	K	O	J	C	Q	P
6	L	M	Q	D	C	O	H	G	S
7	N	S	O	N	B	R	P	C	E
8	H	*	R	H	N	Q	S	B	Q
9	R	*	C	B	H	C	O	N	I
10	C	*	D	S	M	D	L	D	N
11	Q	*	G	M	Q	G	D	H	H
12	P	*	H	R	S	H	B	I	C
13	I	*	M	I	K	M	E	J	B
14	O	*	N	Q	L	N	A	A	R
15	S	*	B	J	G	B	R	K	L
16	F	*	F	P	P	F	Q	L	F
17	E	*	I	F	I	I	N	P	K
18	B	*	S	E	R	S	F	R	M
19	A	*	P	L	J	P	K	S	A

Strong "high priority" 2

Strong "low prioritiy" 0

Suggested Approach - consensus process

Discussion, ID/group concerns, resolve concerns, call for consensus, repeat once if consensus isn't reached, call for consensus, closing

Advocates   A,I
Facilitator
Peacekeeper
Timekeeper
Scribe

Recommendation: Select rank, send to committee, stand aside, declare block

Whether reporting requirements for registries and dispute providers should be developed, in order to make precedent and trend information available to the community and allow reference to past cases in dispute submissions.

Option E

Participant	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Draft rank									
1	J	H	A	O	A	A	M	M	D
2	G	Q	K	G	F	K	I	O	G
3	D	P	E	A	E	E	J	E	J
4	k	J	L	C	D	L	G	F	O
5	m	R	J	K	O	J	C	Q	P
6	L	M	Q	D	C	O	H	G	S
7	N	S	O	N	B	R	P	C	E
8	H	*	R	H	N	Q	S	B	Q
9	R	*	C	B	H	C	O	N	I
10	C	*	D	S	M	D	L	D	N
11	Q	*	G	M	Q	G	D	H	H
12	P	*	H	R	S	H	B	I	C
13	I	*	M	I	K	M	E	J	B
14	O	*	N	Q	L	N	A	A	R
15	S	*	B	J	G	B	R	K	L
16	F	*	F	P	P	F	Q	L	F
17	E	*	I	F	I	I	N	P	K
18	B	*	S	E	R	S	F	R	M
19	A	*	P	L	J	P	K	S	A

Strong "high priority" 4
Strong "low prioritiy" 2

Suggested Approach - consensus process
Discussion, ID/group concerns, resolve concerns, call for consensus, repeat once if consensus isn't reached, call for consensus, closing

Advocates   A,C,D,E,F,H
Facilitator
Peacekeeper
Timekeeper
Scribe

Recommendation: Select rank, send to committee, stand aside, declare block

Option F

Whether requirements or best practices should be put into place for registrars to make information on transfer dispute resolution options available to registrants.

Participant	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Draft rank									
1	J	H	A	O	A	A	M	M	D
2	G	Q	K	G	F	K	I	O	G
3	D	P	E	A	E	E	J	E	J
4	k	J	L	C	D	L	G	F	O
5	m	R	J	K	O	J	C	Q	P
6	L	M	Q	D	C	O	H	G	S
7	N	S	O	N	B	R	P	C	E
8	H	*	R	H	N	Q	S	B	Q
9	R	*	C	B	H	C	O	N	I
10	C	*	D	S	M	D	L	D	N
11	Q	*	G	M	Q	G	D	H	H
12	P	*	H	R	S	H	B	I	C
13	I	*	M	I	K	M	E	J	B
14	O	*	N	Q	L	N	A	A	R
15	S	*	B	J	G	B	R	K	L
16	F	*	F	P	P	F	Q	L	F
17	E	*	I	F	I	I	N	P	K
18	B	*	S	E	R	S	F	R	M
19	A	*	P	L	J	P	K	S	A

Strong "high priority" 1
Strong "low prioritiy" 2

Suggested Approach - consensus process
Discussion, ID/group concerns, resolve concerns, call for consensus, repeat once if consensus isn't reached, call for consensus, closing

Advocates D,E,G
Facilitator
Peacekeeper
Timekeeper
Scribe

Recommendation: Select rank, send to committee, stand aside, declare block

Option   G

Whether there is need for other options for electronic authentication (e.g., security token in FOA) due to security concerns on use of email addresses (potential for hacking or spoofing).

Participant	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Draft rank									
1	J	H	A	O	A	A	M	M	D
2	G	Q	K	G	F	K	I	O	G
3	D	P	E	A	E	E	J	E	J
4	k	J	L	C	D	L	G	F	O
5	m	R	J	K	O	J	C	Q	P
6	L	M	Q	D	C	O	H	G	S
7	N	S	O	N	B	R	P	C	E
8	H	*	R	H	N	Q	S	B	Q
9	R	*	C	B	H	C	O	N	I
10	C	*	D	S	M	D	L	D	N
11	Q	*	G	M	Q	G	D	H	H
12	P	*	H	R	S	H	B	I	C
13	I	*	M	I	K	M	E	J	B
14	O	*	N	Q	L	N	A	A	R
15	S	*	B	J	G	B	R	K	L
16	F	*	F	P	P	F	Q	L	F
17	E	*	I	F	I	I	N	P	K
18	B	*	S	E	R	S	F	R	M
19	A	*	P	L	J	P	K	S	A

Strong "high priority"   3
Strong "low prioritiy"   0

Suggested Approach - consensus process
Discussion, ID/group concerns, resolve concerns, call for consensus, repeat once if consensus isn't reached, call for consensus, closing

Advocates   A,D,I
Facilitator
Peacekeeper
Timekeeper
Scribe

Recommendation: Select rank, send to committee, stand aside, declare block

Option H

Whether provisions on time-limiting FOAs should be implemented to avoid fraudulent transfers out. For example, if a Gaining Registrar sends and receives an FOA back from a transfer contact, but the name is locked, the registrar may hold the FOA pending adjustment to the domain name status, during which time the registrant or other registration information may have changed.

Participant	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I		
Draft rank											
1	J	H	A	O	A	A	M	M	D	**Strong "high priority"**	1
2	G	Q	K	G	F	K	I	O	G	**Strong "low prioritiy"**	0
3	D	P	E	A	E	E	J	E	J		
4	k	J	L	C	D	L	G	F	O		
5	m	R	J	K	O	J	C	Q	P		
6	L	M	Q	D	C	O	H	G	S	**Suggested Approach - consensus process**	
7	N	S	O	N	B	R	P	C	E	Discussion, ID/group concerns, resolve concerns, call
8	H	*	R	H	N	Q	S	B	Q	for consensus, repeat once if consensus isn't reached,
9	R	*	C	B	H	C	O	N	I	call for consensus, closing
10	C	*	D	S	M	D	L	D	N		
11	Q	*	G	M	Q	G	D	H	H	Advocates	B
12	P	*	H	R	S	H	B	I	C	Facilitator	
13	I	*	M	I	K	M	E	J	B	Peacekeeper	
14	O	*	N	Q	L	N	A	A	R	Timekeeper	
15	S	*	B	J	G	B	R	K	L	Scribe	
16	F	*	F	P	P	F	Q	L	F		
17	E	*	I	F	I	I	N	P	K		
18	B	*	S	E	R	S	F	R	M	**Recommendation:** Select rank, send to committee,
19	A	*	P	L	J	P	K	S	A	stand aside, declare block

Option I

Whether requirements should be in place for Registrars of Record to send an FOA, and/or receive the FOA back from Transfer Contact before acking a transfer.

Participant	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Draft rank									
1	J	H	A	O	A	A	M	M	D
2	G	Q	K	G	F	K	I	O	G
3	D	P	E	A	E	E	J	E	J
4	k	J	L	C	D	L	G	F	O
5	m	R	J	K	O	J	C	Q	P
6	L	M	Q	D	C	O	H	G	S
7	N	S	O	N	B	R	P	C	E
8	H	*	R	H	N	Q	S	B	Q
9	R	*	C	B	H	C	O	N	I
10	C	*	D	S	M	D	L	D	N
11	Q	*	G	M	Q	G	D	H	H
12	P	*	H	R	S	H	B	I	C
13	I	*	M	I	K	M	E	J	B
14	O	*	N	Q	L	N	A	A	R
15	S	*	B	J	G	B	R	K	L
16	F	*	F	P	P	F	Q	L	F
17	E	*	I	F	I	I	N	P	K
18	B	*	S	E	R	S	F	R	M
19	A	*	P	L	J	P	K	S	A

Strong "high priority"   1
Strong "low prioritiy"   3

Suggested Approach - consensus process
Discussion, ID/group concerns, resolve concerns, call for consensus, repeat once if consensus isn't reached, call for consensus, closing

Advocates   C,E,F,G
Facilitator
Peacekeeper
Timekeeper
Scribe

Recommendation: Select rank, send to committee, stand aside, declare block

Option J

Whether there could be a way for registrars to make Registrant Email Address data available to one another. Currently there is no way of automating approval from the Registrant, as the Registrant Email Address is not a required field in the registrar Whois. This slows down and/or complicates the process for registrants, especially since the Registrant can overrule the Admin Contact.

Participant	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Draft rank									
1	J	H	A	O	A	A	M	M	D
2	G	Q	K	G	F	K	I	O	G
3	D	P	E	A	E	E	J	E	J
4	k	J	L	C	D	L	G	F	O
5	m	R	J	K	O	J	C	Q	P
6	L	M	Q	D	C	O	H	G	S
7	N	S	O	N	B	R	P	C	E
8	H	*	R	H	N	Q	S	B	Q
9	R	*	C	B	H	C	O	N	I
10	C	*	D	S	M	D	L	D	N
11	Q	*	G	M	Q	G	D	H	H
12	P	*	H	R	S	H	B	I	C
13	I	*	M	I	K	M	E	J	B
14	O	*	N	Q	L	N	A	A	R
15	S	*	B	J	G	B	R	K	L
16	F	*	F	P	P	F	Q	L	F
17	E	*	I	F	I	I	N	P	K
18	B	*	S	E	R	S	F	R	M
19	A	*	P	L	J	P	K	S	A

Strong "high priority"   3
Strong "low prioritiy"   1

Suggested Approach - consensus process
Discussion, ID/group concerns, resolve concerns, call for consensus, repeat once if consensus isn't reached, call for consensus, closing

Advocates   A,E,G,I
Facilitator
Peacekeeper
Timekeeper
Scribe

Recommendation: Select rank, send to committee, stand aside, declare block

Option   K

Whether additional provisions relating to transfer of registrations involving various types of Whois privacy services should be developed as part of the policy.

Participant	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I		
Draft rank											
1	J	H	A	O	A	A	M	M	D	**Strong "high priority"**	2
2	G	Q	K	G	F	K	I	O	G	**Strong "low prioritiy"**	2
3	D	P	E	A	E	E	J	E	J		
4	k	J	L	C	D	L	G	F	O		
5	m	R	J	K	O	J	C	Q	P		
6	L	M	Q	D	C	O	H	G	S	**Suggested Approach - consensus process**	
7	N	S	O	N	B	R	P	C	E	Discussion, ID/group concerns, resolve concerns, call	
8	H	*	R	H	N	Q	S	B	Q	for consensus, repeat once if consensus isn't reached,	
9	R	*	C	B	H	C	O	N	I	call for consensus, closing	
10	C	*	D	S	M	D	L	D	N		
11	Q	*	G	M	Q	G	D	H	H	Advocates	C,F,G,I
12	P	*	H	R	S	H	B	I	C	Facilitator	
13	I	*	M	I	K	M	E	J	B	Peacekeeper	
14	O	*	N	Q	L	N	A	A	R	Timekeeper	
15	S	*	B	J	G	B	R	K	L	Scribe	
16	F	*	F	P	P	F	Q	L	F		
17	E	*	I	F	I	I	N	P	K		
18	B	*	S	E	R	S	F	R	M	**Recommendation:** Select rank, send to committee,	
19	A	*	P	L	J	P	K	S	A	stand aside, declare block	

Option   L

Whether additional requirements regarding Whois history should be developed, for change tracking of Whois data and use in resolving disputes.

Participant	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I		
Draft rank											
1	J	H	A	O	A	A	M	M	D	**Strong "high priority"**	0
2	G	Q	K	G	F	K	I	O	G	**Strong "low prioritiy"**	1
3	D	P	E	A	E	E	J	E	J		
4	k	J	L	C	D	L	G	F	O		
5	m	R	J	K	O	J	C	Q	P		
6	L	M	Q	D	C	O	H	G	S	**Suggested Approach - consensus process**	
7	N	S	O	N	B	R	P	C	E	Discussion, ID/group concerns, resolve concerns, call	
8	H	*	R	H	N	Q	S	B	Q	for consensus, repeat once if consensus isn't reached,	
9	R	*	C	B	H	C	O	N	I	call for consensus, closing	
10	C	*	D	S	M	D	L	D	N		
11	Q	*	G	M	Q	G	D	H	H	Advocates	D
12	P	*	H	R	S	H	B	I	C	Facilitator	
13	I	*	M	I	K	M	E	J	B	Peacekeeper	
14	O	*	N	Q	L	N	A	A	R	Timekeeper	
15	S	*	B	J	G	B	R	K	L	Scribe	
16	F	*	F	P	P	F	Q	L	F		
17	E	*	I	F	I	I	N	P	K		
18	B	*	S	E	R	S	F	R	M	**Recommendation:** Select rank, send to committee,	
19	A	*	P	L	J	P	K	S	A	stand aside, declare block	

Option M

Whether special provisions are needed for change of registrant simultaneous to transfer or within a period after transfer. The policy does not currently deal with change of registrant, which often figures in hijacking cases.

Participant	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	
Draft rank										
1	J	H	A	O	A	A	M	M	D	**Strong "high priority"** 2
2	G	Q	K	G	F	K	I	O	G	**Strong "low prioritiy"** 1
3	D	P	E	A	E	E	J	E	J	
4	k	J	L	C	D	L	G	F	O	
5	m	R	J	K	O	J	C	Q	P	
6	L	M	Q	D	C	O	H	G	S	**Suggested Approach - consensus process**
7	N	S	O	N	B	R	P	C	E	Discussion, ID/group concerns, resolve concerns, call
8	H	*	R	H	N	Q	S	B	Q	for consensus, repeat once if consensus isn't reached,
9	R	*	C	B	H	C	O	N	I	call for consensus, closing
10	C	*	D	S	M	D	L	D	N	
11	Q	*	G	M	Q	G	D	H	H	Advocates G,H,I
12	P	*	H	R	S	H	B	I	C	Facilitator
13	I	*	M	I	K	M	E	J	B	Peacekeeper
14	O	*	N	Q	L	N	A	A	R	Timekeeper
15	S	*	B	J	G	B	R	K	L	Scribe
16	F	*	F	P	P	F	Q	L	F	
17	E	*	I	F	I	I	N	P	K	
18	B	*	S	E	R	S	F	R	M	**Recommendation:** Select rank, send to committee,
19	A	*	P	L	J	P	K	S	A	stand aside, declare block

Option N

Whether existing penalties for policy violations are sufficient or if additional provisions/penalties for specific violations should be added into the policy.

Participant	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I		
Draft rank											
1	J	H	A	O	A	A	M	M	D	**Strong "high priority"**	0
2	G	Q	K	G	F	K	I	O	G	**Strong "low prioritiy"**	1
3	D	P	E	A	E	E	J	E	J		
4	k	J	L	C	D	L	G	F	O		
5	m	R	J	K	O	J	C	Q	P		
6	L	M	Q	D	C	O	H	G	S	**Suggested Approach - consensus process**	
7	N	S	O	N	B	R	P	C	E	Discussion, ID/group concerns, resolve concerns, call	
8	H	*	R	H	N	Q	S	B	Q	for consensus, repeat once if consensus isn't reached,	
9	R	*	C	B	H	C	O	N	I	call for consensus, closing	
10	C	*	D	S	M	D	L	D	N		
11	Q	*	G	M	Q	G	D	H	H	Advocates	G
12	P	*	H	R	S	H	B	I	C	Facilitator	
13	I	*	M	I	K	M	E	J	B	Peacekeeper	
14	O	*	N	Q	L	N	A	A	R	Timekeeper	
15	S	*	B	J	G	B	R	K	L	Scribe	
16	F	*	F	P	P	F	Q	L	F		
17	E	*	I	F	I	I	N	P	K		
18	B	*	S	E	R	S	F	R	M	**Recommendation:** Select rank, send to committee,	
19	A	*	P	L	J	P	K	S	A	stand aside, declare block	

Option O

Participant	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Draft rank									
1	J	H	A	O	A	A	M	M	D
2	G	Q	K	G	F	K	I	O	G
3	D	P	E	A	E	E	J	E	J
4	k	J	L	C	D	L	G	F	O
5	m	R	J	K	O	J	C	Q	P
6	L	M	Q	D	C	O	H	G	S
7	N	S	O	N	B	R	P	C	E
8	H	*	R	H	N	Q	S	B	Q
9	R	*	C	B	H	C	O	N	I
10	C	*	D	S	M	D	L	D	N
11	Q	*	G	M	Q	G	D	H	H
12	P	*	H	R	S	H	B	I	C
13	I	*	M	I	K	M	E	J	B
14	O	*	N	Q	L	N	A	A	R
15	S	*	B	J	G	B	R	K	L
16	F	*	F	P	P	F	Q	L	F
17	E	*	I	F	I	I	N	P	K
18	B	*	S	E	R	S	F	R	M
19	A	*	P	L	J	P	K	S	A

Strong "high priority" 2

Strong "low prioritiy" 0

Suggested Approach - consensus process
Discussion, ID/group concerns, resolve concerns, call for consensus, repeat once if consensus isn't reached, call for consensus, closing

Advocates   D,H
Facilitator
Peacekeeper
Timekeeper
Scribe

Recommendation: Select rank, send to committee, stand aside, declare block

Option   P   Whether the process could be streamlined by a requirement that registries use IANA IDs for registrars rather than proprietary IDs.

Participant	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Draft rank									
1	J	H	A	O	A	A	M	M	D
2	G	Q	K	G	F	K	I	O	G
3	D	P	E	A	E	E	J	E	J
4	k	J	L	C	D	L	G	F	O
5	m	R	J	K	O	J	C	Q	P
6	L	M	Q	D	C	O	H	G	S
7	N	S	O	N	B	R	P	C	E
8	H	*	R	H	N	Q	S	B	Q
9	R	*	C	B	H	C	O	N	I
10	C	*	D	S	M	D	L	D	N
11	Q	*	G	M	Q	G	D	H	H
12	P	*	H	R	S	H	B	I	C
13	I	*	M	I	K	M	E	J	B
14	O	*	N	Q	L	N	A	A	R
15	S	*	B	J	G	B	R	K	L
16	F	*	F	P	P	F	Q	L	F
17	E	*	I	F	I	I	N	P	K
18	B	*	S	E	R	S	F	R	M
19	A	*	P	L	J	P	K	S	A

Strong "high priority"   1
Strong "low prioritiy"   3

Suggested Approach - consensus process
Discussion, ID/group concerns, resolve concerns, call
for consensus, repeat once if consensus isn't reached,
call for consensus, closing

Advocates   B,C,F,H
Facilitator
Peacekeeper
Timekeeper
Scribe

Recommendation: Select rank, send to committee,
stand aside, declare block

Option Q — Whether standards or best practices should be implemented regarding use of Registrar Lock status (e.g., when it may/may not, should/should not be applied).

Participant	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I		
Draft rank											
1	J	H	A	O	A	A	M	M	D	**Strong "high priority"**	1
2	G	Q	K	G	F	K	I	O	G	**Strong "low prioritiy"**	0
3	D	P	E	A	E	E	J	E	J		
4	k	J	L	C	D	L	G	F	O		
5	m	R	J	K	O	J	C	Q	P		
6	L	M	Q	D	C	O	H	G	S	**Suggested Approach - consensus process**	
7	N	S	O	N	B	R	P	C	E	Discussion, ID/group concerns, resolve concerns, call	
8	H	*	R	H	N	Q	S	B	Q	for consensus, repeat once if consensus isn't reached,	
9	R	*	C	B	H	C	O	N	I	call for consensus, closing	
10	C	*	D	S	M	D	L	D	N		
11	Q	*	G	M	Q	G	D	H	H	Advocates	B
12	P	*	H	R	S	H	B	I	C	Facilitator	
13	I	*	M	I	K	M	E	J	B	Peacekeeper	
14	O	*	N	Q	L	N	A	A	R	Timekeeper	
15	S	*	B	J	G	B	R	K	L	Scribe	
16	F	*	F	P	P	F	Q	L	F		
17	E	*	I	F	I	I	N	P	K		
18	B	*	S	E	R	S	F	R	M	**Recommendation:** Select rank, send to committee,	
19	A	*	P	L	J	P	K	S	A	stand aside, declare block	

Option R — Whether registrants should be able to retrieve authInfo codes from third parties other than the registrar.

Participant	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Draft rank									
1	J	H	A	O	A	A	M	M	D
2	G	Q	K	G	F	K	I	O	G
3	D	P	E	A	E	E	J	E	J
4	k	J	L	C	D	L	G	F	O
5	m	R	J	K	O	J	C	Q	P
6	L	M	Q	D	C	O	H	G	S
7	N	S	O	N	B	R	P	C	E
8	H	*	R	H	N	Q	S	B	Q
9	R	*	C	B	H	C	O	N	I
10	C	*	D	S	M	D	L	D	N
11	Q	*	G	M	Q	G	D	H	H
12	P	*	H	R	S	H	B	I	C
13	I	*	M	I	K	M	E	J	B
14	O	*	N	Q	L	N	A	A	R
15	S	*	B	J	G	B	R	K	L
16	F	*	F	P	P	F	Q	L	F
17	E	*	I	F	I	I	N	P	K
18	B	*	S	E	R	S	F	R	M
19	A	*	P	L	J	P	K	S	A

Strong "high priority" 0
Strong "low prioritiy" 2

Suggested Approach - consensus process
Discussion, ID/group concerns, resolve concerns, call for consensus, repeat once if consensus isn't reached, call for consensus, closing

Advocates   E,H
Facilitator
Peacekeeper
Timekeeper
Scribe

Recommendation: Select rank, send to committee, stand aside, declare block

Option S

Whether the policy should incorporate provisions for handling "partial bulk transfers" between registrars – that is, transfers involving a number of names but not the entire group of names held by the losing registrar.

Participant	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Draft rank									
1	J	H	A	O	A	A	M	M	D
2	G	Q	K	G	F	K	I	O	G
3	D	P	E	A	E	E	J	E	J
4	k	J	L	C	D	L	G	F	O
5	m	R	J	K	O	J	C	Q	P
6	L	M	Q	D	C	O	H	G	S
7	N	S	O	N	B	R	P	C	E
8	H	*	R	H	N	Q	S	B	Q
9	R	*	C	B	H	C	O	N	I
10	C	*	D	S	M	D	L	D	N
11	Q	*	G	M	Q	G	D	H	H
12	P	*	H	R	S	H	B	I	C
13	I	*	M	I	K	M	E	J	B
14	O	*	N	Q	L	N	A	A	R
15	S	*	B	J	G	B	R	K	L
16	F	*	F	P	P	F	Q	L	F
17	E	*	I	F	I	I	N	P	K
18	B	*	S	E	R	S	F	R	M
19	A	*	P	L	J	P	K	S	A

Strong "high priority" 0
Strong "low prioritiy" 3

Suggested Approach - consensus process
Discussion, ID/group concerns, resolve concerns, call for consensus, repeat once if consensus isn't reached, call for consensus, closing

Advocates C,F,H
Facilitator
Peacekeeper
Timekeeper
Scribe

Recommendation: Select rank, send to committee, stand aside, declare block