

Bidders' Comments on ICANN's .Org Process

- "It is Organic Names' position that the draft report does not achieve the level of professionalism and independence that we should expect from ICANN or any body associated with the United States Department of Commerce." [**Organic Names**].
- "A challenge of the final decision of ICANN in the .org selection process will bring undue scrutiny on ICANN. The preliminary recommendations of the Staff Report *will not withstand such scrutiny* and will bring into question the organization's reform efforts as a whole." [**Neustar**]
- "The errors are many, if not profound. Arithmetic is incorrect. Information provided by other bidders was apparently not reviewed by the committee. Text and charts clash; the committee even changed the rules of the game after the bids had been submitted." [Marshall Strauss, the **DotOrg Foundation**, on the non commercial evaluation]
- "Generally, the evaluation process can best be described as a 'beauty contest.' The proposals with the brightest and shiniest promises were highly ranked... We are missing the relationship to the 'real world.' This is probably due to the fact that the experts are not involved in daily TLD registry management. This led to the situation where the proposals looking most impressive got the best rankings and proposals based on stability, efficiency, cost effectiveness got inferior rankings." [**SWITCH Swiss Academic and Research Network**]
- "Organic Names submits that this is one of the most inconsistent, ill prepared, and badly argued reports its principals have thus far encountered." [**Organic Names**, referring to ICANN's non commercial evaluation]
- "There was no technical due diligence conducted as part of the evaluation. Past performance claims are not documented and no examination of code, logs or configurations was conducted." [**Internet Multicasting Service and Internet Software Consortium**]
- "The Preliminary Staff Report brings into question the transparency and accountability of this process as implemented. At a minimum, it is based on flawed evaluation reports...applies inconsistent weighting to the evaluation reports...[and] inappropriately and prematurely selects ISOC." [**Neustar**]
- "Our careful review of each of the reports underlying the Preliminary Report, and the Preliminary Report itself, reveals serious problems with the methodology used in certain evaluations, the consistency of the criteria applied to all 11 applications, the effort to translate scores on individual criteria into a single grade for an "Evaluation Summary", and other important aspects of the evaluation process thus far." [**Global Name Registry**]
- "Although the Administrative Procedures Act ("APA") applies only to government process, the quasi-regulatory nature of ICANN's activities suggests that the APA can

serve as a good source of guidance for sound ICANN decision making. It is unclear that, if it were a final decision of a government agency, the Preliminary Staff Report could withstand APA scrutiny.” [Neustar]

-- “One of the most important criteria for 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. Candidates' financial wherewithal and experience in managing a budget were never examined in detail by the report.” [Global Name Registry]

-- “Organic Names is concerned that none of the evaluators on the Gartner team appeared to be well-known or knowledgeable in matters of the DNS.” [Organic Names]

-- “There should have been disclosure prior to Gartner's evaluation of any bid, and acknowledgment in the Preliminary Report that Gartner had already conducted an in-depth analysis on NeuStar. This is particularly important in light of the fact that Gartner awarded NeuStar the highest score of any bidder...” [Global Name Registry, criticizing the main technical evaluator for not disclosing its recent report, “Neustar: One of the Best Kept Secrets in Telecom].

-- “No detail of the decision making process for the Academic CIO brief evaluation was provided by ICANN. Given the disparity between the Academic and Gartner evaluations, we would therefore respectfully request that the detailed report, including decision making process, be provided or the evaluation disregarded.” [Unity Registry]

-- “The Academic CIO Team evaluation is highly subjective, provides no analysis and relies on inappropriate criteria. It must therefore be disregarded...” [RegisterOrg]

-- “...it would have allowed for a more fair and transparent process had ICANN indicated up front to the bidders how the criteria would be weighted so that we could have all prepared our bids with this knowledge in mind. We believe that this was the biggest inherent flaw in ICANN’s approach to the .org bid, and probably is the root cause of the plethora of problems associated with the evaluations. It has exposed the process to criticism and gives the impression that the decision has been ‘reverse engineered.’” [UIA/Diversitas]