Proof of Concept Report for .coop TLD

Covering: Phase 4—January 30, 2002 to July 31, 2002

Attachment 21 sets out the following requirement:

"1.4 Phase 4 Effectiveness - within 180 days after the start of Phase 4, Sponsor shall provide the following information and reports to ICANN.

1.4.1 Total initial registration volume by week.

1.4.2 Total initial Phase 4 registration volume for holder addresses in the regions described below:

1.4.2.1 Africa;

1.4.2.2 Asia Pacific;

1.4.2.3 Europe;

1.4.2.4 Latin America/Caribbean; and

1.4.2.5 North America.

1.4.3 A list of all VP partners admitted during the period of this report.

1.4.4 Total number of domain names registered during Phase 4 submitted by each VP Partner.

1.4.5 A summary of the complaints received from registrants regarding the processing of Phase 4 registrations.

1.4.6 A description of significant technical difficulties encountered during Phase 4.

1.4.7 A summary of difficulties encountered, if any, in the commencement of ENS Services."

1.4.1 Total initial registration volume by week.

Note: These weekly totals include the pre-qualification period when applications were received but registrations not entered. All applications were processed as registrations on the launch date of January 30, 2002. The following break-downs are provided for reference as to pre-launch volumes even though they do not fall within the period of the phase reported on in this report.

Week ending

2001	26	7
2001	27	56
2001	28	231
2001	29	80
2001	30	26
2001	31	42
2001	32	45
2001	33	192
2001	34	246
2001	35	492
2001	36	89
2001	37	69
2001	38	70
2001	39	31
2001	40	45
2001	41	58
2001	42	24
2001	43	30
2001	44	137
2001	45	190
2001	46	84
2001	47	38
2001	48	212
2001	49	128
2001	50	240
2001	51	121
2001	52	26
2001	53	7
2002	1	165
2002	2	145
2002	3	220
2002	4	320

2002	5	734
2002	6	290
2002	7	201
2002	8	137
2002	9	76
2002	10	91
2002	11	49
2002	12	66
2002	13	41
2002	14	56
2002	15	60
2002	16	36
2002	17	54
2002	18	30
2002	19	25
2002	20	34
2002	21	38
2002	22	69
2002	23	28
2002	24	35
2002	25	24
2002	26	55
2002	27	47
2002	28	21
2002	29	12
2002	30	29
2002	31	35
2002	32	34
2002	33	10
2002	34	12
2002	35	31
2002	36	17
2002	37	22
2002	38	63
2002	39	154
2002	40	12
Total		**6594**

1.4.2 Total initial Phase 4 registration volume for holder addresses in the regions described below:

1.4.2.1 Africa;

1.4.2.2 Asia Pacific;

1.4.2.3 Europe;

1.4.2.4 Latin America/Caribbean; and

1.4.2.5 North America.

Total initial Phase 4 registration volume by holder addresses country

Country	Volume	Region
AUSTRALIA	1	Asia Pacific
INDIA	87	Asia Pacific
JAPAN	64	Asia Pacific
KOREA, REPUBLIC OF	2	Asia Pacific
MALAYSIA	3	Asia Pacific
PHILIPPINES	3	Asia Pacific
SINGAPORE	2	Asia Pacific
AUSTRIA	12	Europe
BELGIUM	4	Europe
CYPRUS	3	Europe
CZECH REPUBLIC	5	Europe
DENMARK	20	Europe
FINLAND	6	Europe
FRANCE	133	Europe
FRANCE, METROPOLITAN	33	Europe
GERMANY	25	Europe
IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)	1	Europe
IRELAND	2	Europe
ITALY	209	Europe
LUXEMBOURG	1	Europe
NETHERLANDS	25	Europe
NORWAY	8	Europe
PORTUGAL	4	Europe
RUSSIAN FEDERATION	1	Europe
SAUDI ARABIA	1	Europe
SLOVAKIA (Slovak Republic)	1	Europe
SPAIN	85	Europe
SWEDEN	57	Europe
SWITZERLAND	42	Europe
UNITED ARAB EMIRATES	1	Europe
UNITED KINGDOM	1023	Europe
ARGENTINA	18	Latin America/Caribbean
BOLIVIA	1	Latin America/Caribbean
BRAZIL	1	Latin America/Caribbean
CHILE	1	Latin America/Caribbean
COSTA RICA	1	Latin

		America/Caribbean
		Latin
NICARAGUA	1	America/Caribbean
		Latin
PARAGUAY	2	America/Caribbean
		Latin
PUERTO RICO	27	America/Caribbean
		Latin
URUGUAY	1	America/Caribbean
		Latin
VENEZUELA	1	America/Caribbean
CANADA	194	North America
UNITED STATES	4010	North America
UNITED STATES MINOR OUTLYING ISLANDS	2	North America

1.4.3 A list of all VP partners admitted during the period of this report.

Verification Partners are co-operative organizations that assist the Sponsor in verifying the eligibility of applicants for .coop names. Verification Partners assist the Sponsor by providing general information on laws, practices and models of co-operative organization in their nation or region. The Sponsor refers applications to a Verification Partner where there is a question of eligibility that requires local knowledge. The Verification Partner will make a recommendation or provide further information to the Sponsor in those cases. At all times the Sponsor remains the sole determiner of eligibility.

Verification Partners at the date of this report are:

1. National Cooperative Business Association (NCBA)
   Country served: United States

2. International Co-operative Alliance (ICA)
   Countries served: Membership

3. Conseil Canadian de la Cooperation (CCC)
   Country served: Canada

4. Canadian Co-operative Association (CCA)
   Country served: Canada

5. Japanese Consumers' Co-operative Union (JCCU)
   Country served: Japan

6. Confederacion Uruguaya de Entidades Cooperativas (CUDECOOP)
    Country served: Uruguay

7. Lithuanian Consumer Cooperative Union
    Country served: Lithuania

8. Co-operative Association of the Czech Republic
    Country served: Czech Republic

9. Foreningen Kooperativ Utveckling Sverige (Co-operative Development in
    Sweden)
    Country served: Sweden

10. Pellervo Confederation of Finnish Cooperatives
    Country served: Finland

11. Orah Cooperative
    Countries served: Switzerland, Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia, Macedonia

12. Central Union of Consumer Societies of Ukraine (UKOOPSPILKA)
    Country served: Ukraine

13. National Co-operative Organisation of Malaysia (ANGKASA)
    Country served: Malaysia

14. Consejo Nacional de Cooperativas (CONACOOP)
    Country served: Costa Rica

15. Institute of Cooperation of Greece
    Country served: Greece

16. Instituto Antonio Sergio de Sector Cooperativo (INSCOOP)
    Country served: Portugal

17. AL-Butain Agricultural Cooperative Association (BACA)
    Country served: Saudi Arabia

18. National Dairy Development Board
    Country served: India

19. National Confederation of Cooperatives (NATCCO)
    Country served: Philippines

1.4.4 Total number of domain names registered during Phase 4 by each Verification Partner.

Verification Partners do not register domain names but assist in verification of eligibility. Verification requests were made to the following Partners in the volumes noted in the period covered by this report.

Total initial Phase 4 registration verification volume by Verification Partner

JCCU	5
CCA	4
CCC	1
ICA	5
Orah Cooperative	1
Pellervo	1
Total	**17**

1.4.5 A summary of the complaints received from registrants regarding the processing of Phase 4 registrations.

Many of the issues and concerns raised were not with the processing of the registration itself, but with the use of the domain name subsequent to purchase. For many co-operatives, they have a tenuous understanding of the Internet – combined with the lack of knowledge in the ISP arena about the new TLDs, this created a lack of communication on what was needed to activate and use their new .coop domains.

Registration Issues:

1. User Id and Password Concerns – the user ids and passwords had been provided to many potential registrants as part of the pre-qualification phase. Use of this login information facilitated the verification process for these registrants but many of them had difficulty retaining this information and locating it after registration. The system sends an automatic message upon registration with this information but often it was not retained. Also, the registrants would forget that they had updated the password and request that information to be resent.

2. DNS information – Users were often not familiar with what to request from their ISP to provide to the registry. The explanation of the DNS information was revised several times on the FAQs to clarify the information but many of the people involved in registering .coop domain names were not familiar with the terms needed to describe this information. The Operations Center would often talk directly to the ISP provider to clarify what was needed.

3. Payment Issues – some small number of registrants either could not or would not use credit cards for payment. DotCoop, knowing that this would be an issue for registrants in developing nations as well, developed a process to handle both wire transfers and bank draft payments for that group – which included most of the registrants from India, for example. In general, there were very few questions concerning the registration process itself. With a step by step process, registrants were able to self-direct in most instances.

4. Verification – there were a number of questions about what contacts could be used as the sponsor co-op for a registration. For those that were members of a Verification Partner organization, this was simplified. Others were provided the same examples that were stated in the FAQs and were able to supply the needed information easily once it was explained.

5. Disputes – there were not any disputes presented or suggested during this period. It appears that the eligibility information provides the needed definition to help prevent these issues.

6. Non-English Support – some items were submitted in languages other than English. The registry provides registration facilities in Spanish and French as well as English. Non-English support was provided as needed by use of translation software and support staff to provide call-backs on telephone contacts. DotCoop had one (1) known query where those facilities were not able to provide the needed level of support to an interested party from Eastern Europe

7. www.nic.coop Availability – Registrants initially reported a handful of instances when the registry site was not available to them. At those times, dotCoop Operations staff were able to access the site. In some instances, it was related to browser issues and in some it appeared that their ISP did not support access to our site.

8. Multiple Contact Information – During this phase, the registry only supported the maintenance of one set of contact information. This created

problems in that many registrants would prefer that we contact a specific person with system notifications and someone else with service information. We were not able to add this feature during this phase.

Support of .coop Domains

1. ISP Issues – There were a number of contacts where the ISP of the registrant would not support a .coop domain name. In some instances, the ISP was simply unfamiliar with the new TLDs and was able to support the name after discussions or emails sent by DotCoop Operations staff. In other instances, the ISP refused to support the TLD and told the registrant they would have to go elsewhere for support. Obviously, this is a burden for the registrant and dotCoop began to accumulate a list of ISPs that would support .coop domains to provide as needed. In some instances, the ISP agreed to support the new domain name, but at a greatly inflated price.

    ISPs who were unfamiliar with the new TLDs often were using incorrect whois sites for verification of registration. For example, some were looking in Verisign's site. Some ISP's have "wizards" set up to handle these lookups and zone file creation and these could not handle the new TLD. Once the information was added to www.internic.net, these issues declined.

    Some ISPs did not set up the zone files or set them up improperly. DotCoop could usually give detailed instructions on what was needed or would discuss this with the ISP as needed.

2. Registrar-based registration – 3-4 registrants had been mislead by "pre-registration" advertisements in various registrar sites. At least 2 registrants lost money to these sites as they were not valid pre-registrations since that could only be done through the dotCoop pre-qualification program. DotCoop consistently sent notifications to any of these sites that were identified to us to cease these activities. Only one registrant had potentially lost a name because they thought they had pre-registered a name that was subsequently taken by someone else before they realized the issue.

In general, we had many positive comments on the personalized service from registrants who contacted the dotCoop Operations Center via e-mail or phone. Even though the answers were not always what they wanted to hear, at least it was someone who would talk to them and take the time needed to address their concerns. One comment was – "Well, at least it is a person telling me this rather than a machine."

1.4.6 A description of significant technical difficulties encountered during Phase 4.

There were no significant technical difficulties encountered during Phase 4.

1.4.7 A summary of difficulties encountered, if any, in the commencement of ENS Services.

Eligibility and Name Selection has been essentially problem free. There have been few attempted applications by ineligible persons. After six months of operation there have been no complaints by members of the co-operative community that ineligible organizations have received registrations. Most national co-operative organizations encounter some early difficulty in matching the .coop eligibility criteria to their national situation, but these have been resolved after discussion and co-ordination through Verification Partners.

Co-operative organizations have indicated that they desire a mechanism whereby national or sectoral names might be held by registrants on behalf of their nation and sector and the Sponsor has instituted a mechanism of name review and application that ensures that such names are held for the benefit of the co-operative community.

Submitted by

DotCooperation LLC, Sponsor of the .coop TLD