

## Proof of Concept Report for .coop TLD

### Phase 1—June 25-July 9, 2001

Attachment 21 sets out the following requirement:

“Phase 1 Effectiveness - within 180 days after the end of Phase 1<sup>1</sup> Sponsor shall provide the following information and reports to ICANN.

A list of the representative group of cooperatives chosen to test the on-line application system.

A summary of the feedback provided by the representative group of cooperatives during Phase 1.

A description of significant technical difficulties encountered during Phase 1.”

1. List of representative group of cooperatives chosen to test the on-line applications system

During the Phase 1 period there were two broad types of cooperatives chosen to test the system. Collectively these groups have been named the “Founders” to designate their importance in establishing the .coop TLD. 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 constitute 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 member cooperatives. In the period up to July 9, 2001 these cooperatives included the following:

- 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.

Member lists for the NCBA, ICA, UK Union and the NRTC were entered into the .coop database and unique member names and passwords were automatically generated for all member cooperatives of the four cooperative associations. Although the data was provided in the

---

<sup>1</sup> Phases 1 through 5 are described in Attachment 8.

specified electronic format it required substantial manual manipulation in order to be actually processed.

Prior to July 9 a select number of cooperatives were led through the system to allow staff to develop a sense of support requirements and to allow a limited testing of the technical system. This process enabled staff to finalize instruction and support FAQs. Emails were then sent to all Founder members, along with their unique IDs and passwords. By July 9, when the system was opened for Founder member use, each Founder was setup with a unique name selection page in the .coop system allowing them to customize a message to their own members. The Founder name selection page then permitted member cooperatives to select, pay for and confirm their names. At July 9 the .coop system was opened to all direct members of the Founders.

By July 9, 11 cooperatives had been tested in the system and 95 names had been qualified for eventual registration and use.

a. Summary of the feedback provided by the representative cooperatives.

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

a. Policy-level feedback

Working with the initial Founders between June 25 and July 9 .coop staff reviewed 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. Early feedback on policy 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 the national and sectoral application of the criteria. Founders all wanted to assist in future verification of eligibility. dotCoop initiated a program of Verification Partners to provide that support in the future.
- Dispute – There was continuing concern about putting in place name selection processes for the case of potential name conflicts outside the formal UDRP scope, particularly potential conflicts over names that were 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 for use by any cooperative active in the sector.

b. Name selection feedback

The cooperatives that dotCoop worked with in the Phase 1 period suggested that dotCoop 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 at this time was a fully-automated credit card system. This system brought a number of problems and suggestions:

- Credit Card denial – It was found that there were problems with credit card denial due to the combination of Internet purchases, often for multiple names, small purchase amounts, international transactions involving at least two banks. The support system worked through these problems directly.
- Credit Card availability – Not all credit cards were supported by the system. Applicants often used different credit cards than those supported. Many organizations do not use credit cards for purchases and wanted alternative methods. It was suggested that this would be a particular problem for cooperatives in developing nations.
- Bulk arrangements – Several cooperatives wanted to use wire transfer methods. Wire transfers were also desirable where an association wanted to handle name selection for its membership in “bulk” with a single bulk payment.

## d. Usability feedback

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

## 2. A description of significant technical difficulties encountered during Phase 1.

Phase 1 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. Loading of the system was not high given that prior to July 9 the system was open only to a limited selection of cooperatives.

Prior to July 9, only 11 cooperatives were tested.

The number of system defects found during acceptance testing prior to July 9 was well below industry norms.

We had no reported bugs by any external customer on the live system, the system behaved as expected.

Once again, DNS and Whois were not live during the Phase 1 period so no testing occurred.

Submitted by

DotCooperation LLC (dotCoop), Sponsor of the .coop TLD