Registry Services Evaluation Policy (RSEP) Request

March 8, 2021

Registry Operator
DotCooperation LLC

Request Details
Case Number: 00952863

This Registry Services Evaluation Policy (RSEP) request form should be submitted for review by ICANN org when a registry operator is adding, modifying, or removing a Registry Service for a TLD or group of TLDs.

The RSEP Process webpage provides additional information about the process and lists RSEP requests that have been reviewed and/or approved by ICANN org. If you are proposing a service that was previously approved, we encourage you to respond similarly to the most recently approved request(s) to facilitate ICANN org's review.

Certain known Registry Services are identified in the Naming Services portal (NSp) case type list under "RSEP Fast Track" (example: "RSEP Fast Track – BTAPPA"). If you would like to submit a request for one of these services, please exit this case and select the specific Fast Track case type. Unless the service is identified under RSEP Fast Track, all other RSEP requests should be submitted through this form.

Helpful Tips

- Click the "Save" button to save your work. This will allow you to return to the request at a later time and will not submit the request.
- You may print or save your request as a PDF by clicking the printer icon in the upper right corner. You must click "Save" at least once in order to print the request.
- Click the "Submit" button to submit your completed request to ICANN org.
- Complete the information requested below. All fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required. If not applicable, respond with "N/A."

1. PROPOSED SERVICE DESCRIPTION

1.1. Name of proposed service.

New IDN Support for .COOP

1.2. Provide a general description of the proposed service including the impact to external users and how it will be offered.

DotCooperation LLC, the Registry Operator or the .coop TLD, intend to allow internationalised domain name (IDN) registrations for .coop, as follows:
- Arabic (language)
- Chinese (language)
- Cyrillic (script)
- French (language)
- Greek (script)
- Hebrew (language)
- Japanese (language)
- Korean (language)
- Lao (language)
- Latin (script)
- Myanmar (script)
- Polish (language)
- Russian (language)
- Spanish (language)
- Swedish (language)
- Thai (language)

1.3. Provide a technical description of the proposed service.

DotCooperation LLC, the Registry Operator for the .COOP TLD, propose an amendment to its Registry Agreement with ICANN, allowing the registrant to register and use Second Level labels

in their own language and script. Currently .COOP does not offer any IDNs. The proposed service would allow for:
- Arabic (language)
- Chinese (Excludes Chinese IDN Variants which will not be fully supported – language)
- Cyrillic (script)
- French (language)
- Greek (script)
- Hebrew (language)
- Japanese (language)
- Korean (language)
- Lao (language)
- Latin (script)
- Myanmar (script)
- Polish (language)
- Russian (language)
- Spanish (language)
- Swedish (language)
- Thai (language)

Registry Operator will offer Registrars support for handling IDN registrations in EPP. Registry Operator will handle variant IDNs as follows: By default variant IDNs (as defined in the Registry Operator's IDN tables and IDN Registration Rules) will be blocked from registration. Variant IDNs may be activated when requested by the sponsoring Registrar of the canonical name as described in the IDN Tables and IDN Registration Rules. Active variant IDNs will be provisioned in the TLD's DNS zone file as zone cuts using the same NS resource records as the canonical name.

1.4. If this proposed service has already been approved by ICANN org, identify and provide a link to the RSEP request for the same service that was most recently approved.

https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rsep-2019109-dealer-request-03oct19-en.pdf

1.5. Describe the benefits of the proposed service and who would benefit from the proposed service.

Will allow domain name registrants to register domain names in a preferred language set, both for their benefit and the benefit of the users who interact with their domain name-based services.

1.6. Describe the timeline for implementation of the proposed service.

As soon as ICANN has approved this service. All registrations will continue to be supported at the time of this amendment and in future.

1.7. If additional information should be considered with the description of the proposed service, attach one or more file(s) below.

ar-1.2.txt

1.7. If additional information should be considered with the description of the proposed service, attach one or more file(s) below.

zh-1.0.txt

1.7. If additional information should be considered with the description of the proposed service, attach one or more file(s) below.

th-2.2.txt

1.7. If additional information should be considered with the description of the proposed service, attach one or more file(s) below.

sv-1.1.txt

1.7. If additional information should be considered with the description of the proposed service, attach one or more file(s) below.

ru-1.0.txt

1.7. If additional information should be considered with the description of the proposed service, attach one or more file(s) below.

pl-1.0.txt

1.7. If additional information should be considered with the description of the proposed service, attach one or more file(s) below.

mymr-2.0.txt

1.7. If additional information should be considered with the description of the proposed service, attach one or more file(s) below.

lo-2.0.txt

1.7. If additional information should be considered with the description of the proposed service, attach one or more file(s) below.

latn-1.1.txt

1.7. If additional information should be considered with the description of the proposed service, attach one or more file(s) below.

ko-1.0.txt

1.7. If additional information should be considered with the description of the proposed service, attach one or more file(s) below.

ja-1.2.txt

1.7. If additional information should be considered with the description of the proposed service, attach one or more file(s) below.

he-1.0.txt

1.7. If additional information should be considered with the description of the proposed service, attach one or more file(s) below.

grek-1.1.txt

1.7. If additional information should be considered with the description of the proposed service, attach one or more file(s) below.

fr-1.0.txt

1.7. If additional information should be considered with the description of the proposed service, attach one or more file(s) below.

es-1.0.txt

1.7. If additional information should be considered with the description of the proposed service, attach one or more file(s) below.

cyrl-1.1.txt

1.8. If the proposed service adds or modifies Internationalized Domain Name (IDN) languages or scripts that have already been approved in another RSEP request or are considered pre-

approved by ICANN org, provide (a) a reference to the RSEP request, TLD(s), and IDN table(s) that were already approved or (b) a link to the pre-approved Reference Label Generation Rules (LGR). Otherwise, indicate "not applicable."

All proposed IDNs have been previously approved by ICANN. The latest RSEPs approving them are as follows:

- .dealer on Oct 2019 for Chinese, Cyrillic script, French language and Japanese language;
- .bond on May 2019 for Greek script, Hebrew, Korean, Lao, Latin script, Russian, Spanish;
- .mls on Oct 2018 for Arabic, Myanmar script, Polish and Thai; and
- .cam on Oct 2018 for Swedish.

The most current IDN requirements will be used to evaluate a submitted table.

2. SECURITY AND STABILITY

2.1. What effect, if any, will the proposed service have on the life cycle of domain names?

None.

2.2. Does the proposed service alter the storage and input of Registry Data?

No.

2.3. Explain how the proposed service will affect the throughput, response time, consistency or coherence of responses to Internet servers or end systems.

None.

2.4. Have technical concerns been raised about the proposed service? If so, identify the concerns and describe how you intend to address those concerns.

None.

2.5. Describe the quality assurance plan and/or testing of the proposed service prior to deployment.

The IDN language tables covered by this request are offered already in other registries, including many of the TLDs on CentralNic's backend . CentralNic's technical team will conduct registration testing on its OT&E platform prior to moving the IDN tables to its production platform, to ensure that the registration experience for registrars and registrants is reliable and responsive.

2.6. Identify and list any relevant RFCs or White Papers on the proposed service and explain how those papers are relevant.

Not applicable.

3. COMPETITION

3.1. Do you believe the proposed service would have any positive or negative effects on competition? If so, please explain.

We do not see any impact on competition from the proposed change.

3.2. How would you define the markets in which the proposed service would compete?

The service would be worldwide.

3.3. What companies/entities provide services or products that are similar in substance or effect to the proposed service?

Many registry operators permit multiple language script registration in their TLDs. See http://www.iana.org/domains/idn-tables for a current list.

3.4. In view of your status as a Registry Operator, would the introduction of the proposed service potentially affect the ability of other companies/entities that provide similar products or services to compete?

No.

3.5. Do you propose to work with a vendor or contractor to provide the proposed service? If so, what is the name of the vendor/contractor and describe the nature of the services the vendor/contractor would provide.

CentralNic is our back end registry services provider, and they would be implementing these services from a technical standpoint, just as they do for all of our technical services.

3.6. Have you communicated with any of the entities whose products or services might be affected by the introduction of your proposed service? If so, please describe the communications.

Other than the registrars that sell .COOP domains, no other entities would be affected.

3.7. If you have any documents that address the possible effects on competition of the proposed service, attach them below. ICANN will keep the documents confidential.

4. CONTRACTUAL PROVISIONS

4.1. List the relevant contractual provisions impacted by the proposed service. This includes, but is not limited to, Consensus Policies, previously approved amendments or services, Reserved Names, and Rights Protection Mechanisms.

ICANN will need to amend Sections 4 of Exhibit A of the .coop registry agreement to add the additional language sets.

4.2. What effect, if any, will the proposed service have on the reporting of data to ICANN?

None.

4.3. What effect, if any, will the proposed service have on Registration Data Directory Service (RDDS)?*

None.

4.4. What effect, if any, will the proposed service have on the price of a domain name registration?

None

4.5. Will the proposed service result in a change to a Material Subcontracting Arrangement (MSA) as defined by the Registry Agreement? If so, identify and describe the change. Please note that a change to an MSA requires consent from ICANN org through the MSA change request process. The RSEP request must be approved prior to submitting the MSA change request.

No.

5. AUTHORIZATION LANGUAGE

5.1. A Registry Agreement (RA) amendment is required when the proposed service: (i) contradicts existing provisions in the RA or (ii) is not contemplated in the RA and, therefore, needs to be added to Exhibit A of the RA and/or as an appropriate addendum/appendix. If applicable, provide draft language (or a link to previously approved RA amendment language) describing the service to be used in an RA amendment if the proposed service is approved. If an RA amendment is not applicable, respond with "N/A" and provide a complete response to question 5.2.*

For examples or for IDN services, you may refer to the webpage for standard RA template amendments for commonly requested Registry Services.

The following Section 4 in relation to languages/scripts should be added to Exhibit A:
4. Registry Operator may offer registration of IDNs at the second and lower levels provided that Registry Operator complies with the following requirements:
4.1. Registry Operator must offer Registrars support for handling IDN registrations in EPP.
4.2. Registry Operator must handle variant IDNs as follows:
4.2.1. By default variant IDNs (as defined in the Registry Operator's IDN tables and IDN Registration Rules) must be blocked from registration.
4.2.2. Variant IDNs may be activated when requested by the sponsoring Registrar of the canonical name as described in the IDN Tables and IDN Registration Rules.
4.2.3. Active variant IDNs must be provisioned in the TLD's DNS zone file as zone cuts using the same NS resource records as the canonical name.4.3. Registry Operator may offer registration of IDNs in the following languages/scripts (IDN Tables and IDN Registration Rules will be published by the Registry Operator as specified in the ICANN IDN Implementation Guidelines):
4.3.1. Arabic
4.3.2. Chinese (Excludes Chinese IDN Variants)

4.3.3. Cyrillic (script)
4.3.4. French
4.3.5. Greek (script)
4.3.6. Hebrew
4.3.7. Japanese
4.3.8. Korean
4.3.9. Lao
4.3.10. Latin (script)
4.3.11. Myanmar (script)
4.3.12. Polish
4.3.13. Russian
4.3.14. Spanish
4.3.15. Swedish
4.3.16. Thai

5.2. If the proposed service is permissible under an existing provision in the Registry Agreement, identify the provision and provide rationale. If not applicable, respond with "N/A" and provide a complete response to question 5.1.

Not applicable.

6. CONSULTATION

6.1. ICANN org encourages you to set up a consultation call through your Engagement Manager prior to submitting this RSEP request. This is to help ensure that necessary information is assembled ahead of time.

Identify if and when you had a consultation call with ICANN org. If you did not request a consultation call, provide rationale.

The new IDN tables may be added in accordance to Section 3.1 of the .coop RA

6.2. Describe your consultations with the community, experts, and/or others. This can include, but is not limited to, the relevant community for a sponsored or community TLD, registrars or the registrar constituency, end users and/or registrants, or other constituency groups. What were the quantity, nature, and results of the consultations? How will the proposed service impact these groups? Which groups support or oppose this proposed service?

DotCoop is owned by the International Cooperative Alliance, comprising national apex organisations of cooperatives across the globe. Therefore, DotCoop has access to a network of national cooperative federations -from over 100 countries- (https://www.ica.coop/en/about-us/our-members/global-cooperative-network). DotCoop regularly engages with the Cooperative organisations it serves, and with its wider cooperative network, in annual international and regional conferences across the world (https://www.ica.coop/en/events).

From consultations with our global network we have concluded that cooperatives outside of the USA and Europe can better be served with IDNs. In countries like Japan, Korea, China, Malaysia, Indonesia, with a great number of cooperatives, IDNs will be instrumental in promoting the use of the .coop TLD by cooperatives.

7. OTHER

7.1. Would there be any intellectual property impact or considerations raised by the proposed service?

No new Intellectual Property considerations are raised by the proposed service. We will comply with all relevant ICANN rules and regulations concerning intellectual property, such as the Rights Protections Mechanisms.

7.2. Does the proposed service contain intellectual property exclusive to your gTLD registry?

No.

7.3. Provide any other relevant information to include with the request. If none, respond with "N/A."

N/A

7.4. If additional information should be considered, attach one or more file(s) below.

Affected TLDs

Current Registry Operator	Top Level Domain	Registry Agreement Date
DotCooperation LLC	coop	