



one member. one vote. one domain.

Proof of Concept Report for .coop TLD

Covering: Phase 2—July 9, 2001-January 30, 2002

Phase 3—30 days pre-launch to 60 days post-launch

Attachment 21 sets out the following requirement:

“1.2 Phase 2 Effectiveness - within 120 days after the end of Phase 2, Sponsor shall provide the following information and reports to ICANN.

1.2.1 Total application volume by week during Phase 2.

1.2.2 Total initial Phase 2 application volume with holder addresses in the regions described below:

1.2.2.1 Africa;

1.2.2.2 Asia Pacific;

1.2.2.3 Europe;

1.2.2.4 Latin America/Caribbean; and

1.2.2.5 North America.

1.2.3 A list of all Founders admitted during the period of this report.

1.2.4 Total number of domain name applications submitted during Phase 2 by each Founder.

1.2.5 A summary of the complaints received from applicants regarding the processing of Phase 2 applications.

1.2.6 A description of significant technical difficulties encountered during Phase 2.

1.2.7 A report detailing the effectiveness of Sponsor's domain name dispute policy adapted for Founder registrations during Phase 2.

Phase 3 Effectiveness - within 120 days after the end of Phase 3, Sponsor, Sponsor shall provide the following information and reports to ICANN.

1.3.1 Total application (for Registered Names) volume by week during Phase 3.

1.3.2 Total initial Phase 3 application volume with holder addresses in the regions described below:

1.3.2.1 Africa;

1.3.2.2 Asia Pacific;

1.3.2.3 Europe;

1.3.2.4 Latin America/Caribbean; and

1.3.2.5 North America.

1.3.3 A list of all Innovators admitted during the period of this report.

1.3.4 Total number of domain name applications submitted during Phase 3 by each Innovator.

1.3.5 A summary of the complaints received from applicants regarding the processing of Phase 3 applications.

1.3.6 A description of significant technical difficulties encountered during Phase 3.

1.3.7 A report detailing the effectiveness of Sponsor's domain name dispute policy adapted during Phase 3."

1.2.1 Total application volume by week during Phase 2.

Week ending

2-Jul-01	7
9-Jul-01	56
16-Jul-01	231
23-Jul-01	80
30-Jul-01	26
6-Aug-01	42
13-Aug-01	45
20-Aug-01	192
27-Aug-01	246
3-Sep-01	492
10-Sep-01	89
17-Sep-01	69
24-Sep-01	70
1-Oct-01	31
8-Oct-01	45
15-Oct-01	58
22-Oct-01	24
29-Oct-01	30
5-Nov-01	137
12-Nov-01	190
19-Nov-01	84
26-Nov-01	38
3-Dec-01	212
10-Dec-01	128
17-Dec-01	240
24-Dec-01	121

31-Dec-01	26
7-Jan-02	172
15-Jan-02	145
22-Jan-02	220
29-Jan-02	320
30-Jan-02	316
Total	4182

1.2.2 Total initial Phase 2 application volume with holder addresses in the regions described below:

1.2.2.1 Africa;

1.2.2.2 Asia Pacific;

1.2.2.3 Europe;

1.2.2.4 Latin America/Caribbean; and

1.2.2.5 North America.

Total initial Phase 2 application volume by holder addresses country

Argentina	1
Belgium	3
Brazil	1
Canada	26
Cyprus	3
Czech Republic	5
Denmark	9
Finland	2
France	5
France, Metropolitan	11
Germany	1
India	3
Italy	50
Japan	4
Netherlands	17
Norway	6
Paraguay	1
Philippines	1
Puerto Rico	9
Russia	1
Singapore	1
Slovakia	1
South Korea	2

Spain	4
Sweden	21
Switzerland	7
United Kingdom	924
United States	3060
Uruguay	1
US Minor Outlying Islands	2
Total	4182

1.2.3 A list of all Founders admitted during the period of this report.

The first group of Founders included the National Cooperative Business Association (NCBA) and its direct members, and the International Cooperative Alliance (ICA) and its direct members. The NCBA and the ICA were proponents of the .coop application made to ICANN and are respectively the senior, national cooperative organization in the United States, and the senior international cooperative organization, based in Geneva.

The second Founders group of cooperatives was comprised of senior cooperative organizations representing constituencies of direct member cooperatives. The following organizations were added to the first Founders between June 2001 and October 2001:

- The United Kingdom Co-operative Union (UK Union). The UK Union is the senior national association of cooperatives in England and Scotland. The UK Union has 291 direct member cooperatives.
- National Rural Telecommunications Cooperative (NRTC). The NRTC is a cooperative association in the United States having 1253 direct member cooperatives.
- National Cooperative Bank (NCB). The NCB provides financial services to cooperatives in the U.S. NCB serves 1,841 member/owners.
- Liga de Cooperativas de Puerto Rico (Cooperative League of Puerto Rico). Liga Cooperative has 200 affiliates, representing a total of 243 cooperatives in Puerto Rico, 79 percent of Puerto Rico's cooperatives.
- National Dairy Development Board (NDDB). The NDDB leads India's 96,000 dairy cooperatives.

Finally, a third group of Founders was initiated but not admitted in this period. A group of European cooperatives expressed interest in establishing a European Group Founder. The European Group is being established, but did not participate in the submission of applications during Phase 2.

1.2.4 Total number of domain name applications submitted during Phase 2 by each Founder.

Total initial Phase 2 application volume by Founder

Poptel	18
International Co-operative Alliance	178
National Cooperative Business Association (NCBA) directly	1839
National Rural Telecommunications Cooperative	1033
National Cooperative Bank	209
Co-operative Union	893
Liga de Cooperativas de Puerto Rico	9
National Dairy Development Board (NDDB)	3
Total	4182

1.2.5 A summary of the complaints received from applicants regarding the processing of Phase 2 applications.

Feedback was clustered into four types: a. Policy-level feedback b. Name selection feedback c. Payment feedback, and d. Ease-of-Use feedback.

a. Policy-level feedback

Working with Founders between July 9 ,2001 and January 30, 2002 .coop staff continued to test and review eligibility and dispute policies. Eligibility criteria were a high priority and a great deal of time was spent with Founders discussing eligibility. Founders were very interested in understanding the eligibility criteria and in assisting in applying those criteria to their membership. Feedback on policy during this period continued to reflect the initial weeks of the Founders period. Feedback was:

- The Criteria—The eligibility criteria need explanation to and support from the associations of cooperatives to whose members it will apply. Once the associations understand and support the criteria they can work with their members to convey the purpose and application of the criteria. Founders all pointed to the need for understanding national and sectoral application of the criteria. Founders all wanted to assist in future verification of eligibility. .coop initiated a program of Verification Partners to provide a framework for that support in the future. At the time of launch dotCoop had contracted with 10 Verification Partners.
- Dispute—There was continuing concern about potential name conflicts outside the formal UDRP scope, particularly potential conflicts over names that are highly desirable for cooperatives in all parts of the world. An early Founder suggested that widely-used names be set aside for “stewardship” by

representatives of that business sector so as to enable use by any cooperative active in the sector.

- Pre-qualification of names—There were a number of questions about the ability to pre-qualify names and the ability of only Founder members to participate in this program. Information on the Founders and their role in the .coop start-up were provided and contacts in the various Founder organizations were provided upon request and through the www.cooperative.org website until launch

b. Name selection feedback

The cooperatives that .coop worked with in Phase 1 suggested that .coop should work with national and sectoral organizations to explain how name selection in .coop would affect or relate to names already used in other TLDs. Information documents were developed to deal with this suggestion.

c. Payment feedback

The payment system in place during Phase 2 was a fully-automated credit card system. This system brought a number of problems and suggestions:

Credit Card availability— Request for payment process other than credit card was requested. There is concern by certain individuals about credit card use on the Internet and in certain areas of the world, credit cards are not readily available. A process was developed to support pre-qualification in India using Bank Drafts and Wire Transfer. This was later formalized after launch for general registrations.

We added AMEX, based on registrant feedback, after initially only being able to support MC and VISA.

d. Ease-of-Use feedback

We continued to evolve the registration process based on user feedback including ongoing refinement to FAQs, screen help and diagnostics and screen organization. In addition, the .coop home page continued to add content and graphics to provide information from Founders and others about the progress toward launch.

All users found the system easy to use except where they were unfamiliar with domain name nomenclature. Information support was modified to provide better guidance to new users.

1.2.6 A description of significant technical difficulties encountered during Phase 2.

Phase 2, from July 2001 to January 13, 2001 was a technical test of the complete system, apart from DNS and Whois, given that no name registration and provisioning was to occur. In all other respects the system was a full name selection, payment and confirmation system. There were no technical problems in this period.

On January 13, 2001 provisioning testing began for the names applied for by Founders members. There were no technical problems in this period. Names were entered in the DNS and were successfully utilized.

On the launch date dotCoop sold and provisioned 201 domains, our peak daily volume, with no problems.

1.2.7 A report detailing the effectiveness of Sponsor's domain name dispute policy adapted for Founder registrations during Phase 2.

During Phase 2 period there were two approaches taken to dispute management, the first permitted conflicts and the second was based on the more usual "first-come" system.

The first mechanism was based on the fact that, since names were only applied for and were not allocated, and since a registration contract with UDRP was not in place, an alternative dispute mechanism should be implemented. The dispute mechanism was called a "name conflict system" and it was based on a policy decision that all Founder applicants should be treated equally in their access to names and that conflicts should be permitted and managed through negotiation.

Given that the Founders and their members did not enter the program at the same time, but over more than five months, dotCoop decided to permit open applications for any name without confirmation of that name to any applicant until provisioning could occur. The implication of this decision was that names might be applied for by more than one applicant and that conflicts over names might arise.

The online application procedure notified each applicant of a potential conflict at the time of an attempt to apply for a name that had already been applied for. In that situation, if the second applicant continued in their application, the system permitted the name application to go forward. The applicant was notified during the application process that application was accepted but that the status of the name was that it was in "conflict".

The conflict mechanism continued until September 4, 2001 at which time it was replaced with a “first-come” system. The change was made after consultation with Founders. The change was initiated because, while it was anticipated that conflicts would be managed by negotiation, it became clear that it would be more desirable to eliminate conflicts.

By the time of launch, January 30, 2002, eleven (11) conflicts had been lodged. dotCoop worked with Founders and the cooperatives that had applied for the eleven names and negotiated satisfactory resolutions to all conflicts. No conflicts continue and no UDRP claims have been initiated.

Phase 3 Effectiveness

The Phase 3 program, designated as the Innovators Program, was initiated and expressions of interest sought. However, dotCoop determined that those cooperatives that were interested in a pre-launch incentive program were more interested in the Founders Program than in the Innovators Program. After several months of promotion and discussions, the Innovators Program was discontinued with no participants.

Submitted by

DotCooperation LLC, Sponsor of the .coop TLD