Proposed Service

Name of Proposed Service:

.coop Third Level Domain DNS Support

Technical description of Proposed Service:

The .coop Registrant Agreement will be updated to allow second level .coop registrants to enter into an agreement with dotCoop that will allow them to manage third-level domains through standard DNS entries for eligible cooperatives that are associated with the second level registrant. To preserve verification requirements for these 3rd level users, the second level registrant will provide information about all 3rd level users to allow normal verification of eligibility by dotCoop.

Consultation

Please describe with specificity your consultations with the community, experts and or others. What were the quantity, nature and content of the consultations?:

This process was developed upon a request from several large cooperative organizations that want to be able to support the desire of their members who currently do not have websites to be able to have an initial Internet presence.

In order to support the desire of these organizations to support their members’ desire for Internet access within the .coop domain, dotCoop proposed this modification to the current Registrant Agreement which only allowed third level domains supporting the second level registrant.

This approach was approved by the dotCoop Board of Managers in February 2011.

a. If the registry is a sponsored TLD, what were the nature and content of these consultations with the sponsored TLD community?:

See above.
b. Were consultations with gTLD registrars or the registrar constituency appropriate? Which registrars were consulted? What were the nature and content of the consultation?:

The primary .coop registrar who is the registrar of the proposing second level domain was consulted to ensure that they had no issues with the proposed service.

Subsequently the complete set of changes to the .coop RAA and the related policy were submitted to the Registrar StakeHolder Group for a 21-day comment period. There were no comments.

c. Were consultations with other constituency groups appropriate? Which groups were consulted? What were the nature and content of these consultations?:

No other consultations were considered appropriate since there were no technical changes needed to implement this process.

d. Were consultations with end users appropriate? Which groups were consulted? What were the nature and content of these consultations?:

No end users are impacted by this process. This is a totally internal effort.

e. Who would endorse the introduction of this service? What were the nature and content of these consultations?:

Cooperative members who are seeking the support of a primary organization that is willing to take on the support of their members in this manner would support this approach of providing access to these co-ops to having the value of a .coop domain available to them with organizational support.

f. Who would object the introduction of this service? What were(or would be) the nature and content of these consultations?:


DotCoop is unaware of anyone that would object to the introduction of this service which would not create any impact on existing or potential registrars, on users or on the participating cooperatives.

The proposed process also provides dotCoop the means to continue its verification processes.

Timeline

Please describe the timeline for implementation of the proposed new registry service:

This process can be immediately implemented once the .coop RAA is updated and signed by the registrar of the second level domain that would "sponsor" the third level domains.

Business Description

Describe how the Proposed Service will be offered:

The service is supported through an update to the .coop RAA that is executed with our existing .coop registrars. Registrars will be notified of the ability to sign the updated .coop RAA so that their registrants can consider this service.

This service will also be offered to cooperative organizations that enter into an agreement with dotCoop that meets the Third-Level Domain Policy requirements and enters into an agreement with dotCoop to ensure that all verification requirements can be met by dotCoop.

Describe quality assurance plan or testing of Proposed Service:

DotCoop will monitor any participants in this program to ensure that active third level domains supported match the information provided by the second level registrant on an ongoing basis in a manner similar to that used for spot-check verification of existing registrations.
Please list any relevant RFCs or White Papers on the proposed service and explain how those papers are relevant:

None

Contractual Provisions

List the relevant contractual provisions impacted by the Proposed Service:

As previously noted, this will require an update to the .coop Registrar Accreditation Agreement (.coop RAA (also known as the .coop Registry-Registrar Agreement (RRA))) as well as the embedded Registrant Agreement which previously prohibited any type of third level registration by unrelated cooperatives.

What effect, if any, will the Proposed Service have on the reporting of data to ICANN:

This should not have an impact on ICANN data as these domains are not registered but are internally maintained through DNS records.

What effect, if any, will the Proposed Service have on the Whois?:

None. dotCoop supports complete WHOIS information. The supporting organization that controls the third level information is reachable through the WHOIS information that will be supplied.

DotCoop will also have information about each of the third level users as part of the verification requirements.

Contract Amendments
Please describe or provide the necessary contractual amendments for the proposed service:

There are no contract amendments that are needed.

Benefits of Service

Describe the benefits of the Proposed Service:

This process will allow dotCoop to provide domains in areas and sectors where the current cost of the .coop domain has prevented any significant uptake of the .coop domain among interested cooperatives and cooperative organizations.

Although dotCoop has tried to promote special pricing to such areas, there has been no cost-effective way for registrars to reach these potential registrants.

Co-op organizations often provide services such as this as part of their membership benefits and the organizations that have approached us are interested in getting more of their members using domain names that reflect their support and involvement in the global cooperative community envisioned when .coop was launched in 2002.

By encouraging the use and support of .coop by country and sector apex organizations and their members, we hope to expand the market for second-level domains as well. This could lead to an increased market for .coop domains for our accredited registrars without any additional marketing effort on their part.

Competition

Do you believe your proposed new Registry Service would have any positive or negative effects on competition? If so, please explain.: 

The service should provide an avenue for cooperatives to move to a .coop domain with the support of their apex organization. There is the potential for some of these users to move to a .coop second-level domain providing more business for .coop registrars and also for other co-ops in the sector or location of the participating third level users to also start using .coop domains to promote their own cooperative identity.

How would you define the markets in which your proposed Registry Service would compete?: 
Agreements would not be advantageous to dotCoop unless the existing .coop market penetration in the co-op community is extremely low.

What companies/entities provide services or products that are similar in substance or effect to your proposed Registry Service?:

Although direct third level registrations are offered by others, the market .coop third level domains would be very small and would therefore not be cost-effective to offer by registrars.

In view of your status as a registry operator, would the introduction of your proposed Registry Service potentially impair the ability of other companies/entities that provide similar products or services to compete?:

Not applicable.

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

No; this is all supported by existing services provided by all .coop registrars.

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

We have discussed with the registrar that brought the initial request to our attention. We have developed a process that could be supported by any registrar without any additional effort on their part.

Do you have any documents that address the possible effects on competition of your proposed Registry Service? If so, please submit them with your application. (ICANN will keep the documents confidential).:
No

Security and Stability

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

There is no change to the Registry Data.

Please explain how the proposed service will affect the throughput, response time, consistency or coherence of responses to Internet servers or end systems:

There should be no impact.

Have technical concerns been raised about the proposed service, and if so, how do you intend to address those concerns?:

No.

Other Issues

Are there any Intellectual Property considerations raised by the Proposed Service:

No

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

No

List Disclaimers provided to potential customers regarding the Proposed Service:
Any other relevant information to include with this request:

There is a new .coop Third Level Domain Policy which describes the requirements for the handling of the third level domains by the second level registrant and dotCoop to ensure verification and support requirements are met. The Policy is attached.