This is a great list and a place to start, but we are not yet at a point where we can endorse stuff. I am personally unhappy with the name UTC. My latest stab at it is CONA software: Community/Collectively Owned--No Antifeatures.

And what I have in mind for the future is not an endorsement, as much as an evaluation, and may be some kind of rating on 1-5 scale. The highest rating(s) could be interpreted as an endorsement, while low ratings would indicate open issues of various severity. So we would have a forum thread per distribution, with a summary of sorts. Most non-libre distributions (like Ubuntu) would remain unrated, which is the implied lowest score: so non-free on the surface, analyzing them would be a waste of time.

Earlier on IRC I was brainstorming about ratings, I said: a point for ongoing development (a release in last n days), a point for active forum (a post/mailing list release in last n days), a point for keeping up to date with security, then one or more points for various freedom-related issues. FSF's list has reported issues like, they list distributions with a mystery development/maintenance/community support status alongside with much more viable, much better-supported distributions. With the rating system, users could easily see potential usability problems. And another thing coming to mind, collectively owned software should probably have a nontrivial and active collective behind it, or else it's hard to see how an ordinary (non-technical, non-rich) user could hope to exercise the freedom to modify.