ICANN87 Bali | AGM – GAC Communique Drafting (2 of 6)
Tuesday, October 20, 2026 – 16:30 to 17:30 WITA

MTS - AV

Welcome to the ICANN 87 GAC Communiqué drafting session on Tuesday, 20 October, at 16:30 local time. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. During this session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted in the proper form in the Zoom chat pod. Interpretation for this session will include all six UN languages and Portuguese. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in the Zoom room, and please remember to state your name for the record and the language you will be speaking, in case speaking a language other than English. Please speak at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. I will now leave the floor over to Ian Sheldon, GAC Vice Chair. Thank you. Over to you.

IAN SHELDON

Hi, folks. Last session of the day. Welcome back. Hope you've all had a good coffee break. And importantly, you've all had an opportunity to draft some text. So I might see if we can move to any new language that we've not covered before.

***Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file but should not be treated as an authoritative record.***

LARS HOFFMANN So we're just adding a bit more language on the new gTLD program, and that's probably where we should start.

IAN SHELDON Is it all, that's all it?

LARS HOFFMANN So we have four subsections under new gTLD program: safeguard assessments, geographic names and community applications, GAC operational readiness, and Applicant Support Program. And so we're in the process of copying that last section of text, and we should be able to start the reading of that part.

IAN SHELDON Great. I think we might kick off with the new gTLD program 2026 round language, and then we can insert more text as we go. New gTLD program 2026 round A: safeguard assessments. The GAC welcomed the presentation by ICANN staff on the safeguard assessments. GAC members noted that many applications are linked to government functions or regulated... Oh.

LARS HOFFMANN Yeah, sorry. Sorry. The chat thing is because of somebody you needed to-

IAN SHELDON Oh, I see. Okay. I'll read off the screen, and then I'll load up another version. Where was I?

LARS HOFFMANN Should I take over reading?

IAN SHELDON No, I got it. It's all good. Let me start again. A, safeguard assessments. The GAC welcomed the presentation by ICANN staff on the safeguard assessments. GAC members noted that many applications are linked to government functions or regulated sectors such as medicine, finance, education, and fundraising, and that safeguards would be required. The GAC emphasizes that the assessments should be conducted in a comprehensive, prudent, and responsible way, and noted that GAC members would carefully review the outcomes of the assessments. It was noted that the assessments should take into account globally diverse cultural and linguistic perspectives. So thank you to the group for hastily drafting this over the break. I will pause there for any comments or questions. India, please.

T. SANTHOSH Thank you, Ian. We are working on the text, so kindly provide some time on this.

IAN SHELDON: You're working on your proposed edits to this language, along with the original drafters?

T. SANTHOSH: On the safeguard, yes. We would like to highlight a few things for which, yeah, we will come back.

IAN SHELDON: Okay. Let's come back to this. Okay. Any other comments on this paragraph? I see no hands. And again, there is opportunity to work on this in the document and offline overnight as well. So perhaps we can move on to B, geographic names and community applications. Mindful that the current Applicant Guidebook may provide some limitations, the GAC expects that documentation related to non-objection or support letters of geo-name and community applications is readily made available in order to allow for timely consideration during the comment and early warning timeframe. In case there is a refusal by the applicant, then at least the names of the issuing authorities will be shared with the GAC. Any comments on this paragraph, or are we satisfied this captures the conversation we've had so far? Marco, please.

MARCO HOGEWONING: Yes. Thank you, Ian, and thank you for everybody who proposed text. I'm fine with it, but the last sentence confuses me a bit, and I think it's a logical error. In case there is a refusal by the applicant, then at least the names of the issuing authority will be shared with

GAC, and this is the GAC communiqué. So my logic here is it is refused, but the GAC says it will be shared with the GAC. Then, A, my question to the proposer is, who will share this, and how will they share this if it is refused? The sentence seems to contradict itself, if you catch my drift. Giacomo, I think it's your sentence.

GIACOMO MAZZONE: No, my proposal was to refer to the documentation. If there is a refusal to share the documentation, then at least this basic information could be provided. So I leave to the English native speakers to make it better.

IAN SHELDON: Perhaps we can try recrafting offline, but point taken. Perhaps the US has language. Please.

SUSAN CHALMERS: Thank you, Chair. I'm sorry I don't have language. But I just had a general question about this paragraph. It says, "Mindful that the current Applicant Guidebook may provide some limitations." What does that mean? Could the proposers of the text kind of please clarify what the problem is, and what the GAC would be driving for through this language? And refusal by who? So refusal by the applicant to share the documentation. It would be really helpful, I think, to have an explanation of what the intent of this paragraph is and what the limitations are in the AGB.

IAN SHELDON Thank you. Jorge, please.

JORGE CANCIO Thank you, Ian. And so Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. I'm looking for the right spot. Yeah. So to the first question from you, Susan. So when we had the explanations here from the ICANN Org team on new gTLDs, there was this question about, so what happens with the letters of non-objection or of support? And there was a sort of an answer in the direction of the AGB doesn't provide for the publication of this documentation. But if that documentation, as in the last round, is part of the correspondence between the applicants and ICANN Org, which goes to the correspondence page, it will be public. So it was sort of a bit of an explanation hinting at one side, okay, proactive publication is not foreseen in the AGB, but there might be publication through other means. And in the discussions we had in preparing this text, then there was the consideration, okay, we have to give some flexibility to ICANN Org in the sense if there's something really preventing them from publishing certain information. If there is maybe an element of a personal name of a public official whose name must not be disclosed, that they have some leeway in, for instance, anonymizing that information when publishing the letter. So really the first piece of the sentence is trying to accommodate those reservations that may exist from the ICANN Org side, but nevertheless make sure that that information, which is very

important if you want to analyze a geo-name or also a community name about whether there is support or not and from whom for that application that it is made readily available. And that if, for instance, Switzerland wants to know more about one of these applications, that we don't have to go into a chasing expedition with ICANN Org and waiting very essential time for having a response. So that's on the first part. And the last sentence, I would defer to Giacomo because he was the one proposing it.

SUSAN CHALMERS: Thank you. Oh, sorry, if I could just really quick before you intervene, Giacomo. And I'm happy to take this offline, it's just that the language gives the appearance that we're weighing in on AGB guidance. And this feels like an AGB policy question. But I'll speak with you, Jorge, offline because I might just not be understanding it. I just wouldn't want to give the impression that the GAC is arguing with the AGB. That's all.

IAN SHELDON: Thank you, Susan. I think that is an important point. The AGB has been drafted and set, and there's little scope to change that. So please talk offline and see if we can clarify this issue. Nigel Cassimire, CTU.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE: Thank you, Mr. Acting Chair. I think my comment is a general one, and I think it's applicable to the two paragraphs we've looked at so

far. The communiqué is to be read by persons outside the GAC. So they wouldn't be au courant with the details of our discussion until we put it into the communiqué to let them know. So, I'm saying the general comment is that for the paragraphs that we put, it needs to have enough context so that the reader can understand what we're talking about. Right? So, and I think in both cases, we could do better than is currently there on the safeguard assessments. One, GAC welcomed the presentation by ICANN staff on the safeguard assessments. But we could probably be a little more clear in terms of what safeguards you're talking about. Safeguards for what, right? And in the second one, well, you've heard all the comments already. So I think that general principle, that remembering that it's for persons outside of the GAC we're writing, that we need for each paragraph to explain the context clearly. And it's not necessarily a lot of words to be added. That's all.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you. A very timely reminder for all of our language in the communiqué. So perhaps you might like to engage with the original drafters to include some minor improvements for clarity. Thank you. Any other comments on paragraph B? I see none. I think these are both excellent starts, but perhaps a little bit more work offline. Let's move to C, operational readiness. C, GAC operational readiness. In light of the upcoming application review phase, the GAC stressed the importance of timely governmental readiness to review applications in the 2026 round. The GAC appreciates that it has various options to provide feedback into the evaluation

process, which includes GAC early warnings and GAC consensus advice. The GAC intends to establish an intersessional work schedule to enable members to identify potential public policy concerns and coordinate the members' responses where appropriate. Any comments? Nigel, is that an old hand?

NIGEL CASSIMIRE Yes.

IAN SHELDON Yes. Thank you. Paul, UK, please.

PAUL BLAKER Thank you. Paul Blaker, for the record. One very quick comment. In the third line, it says GAC early warnings. Perhaps we should say GAC member early warnings there. And then more generally, I think we could have a look at the last sentence, because I think for the communiqué, perhaps we should refer to the GAC establishing an operational readiness framework, rather than the sort of detailed schedule. I think it would be good to mention that, an operational readiness framework to enable members to discuss potential policy concerns. But happy to fine-tune the text offline. Thank you.

IAN SHELDON Thank you. We'll make a note and put some interim language in there. Netherlands, please.

MARCO HOGEWONING Yeah. Outside of further drafting, very quick response to the comment of the UK with regard to GAC members, and I'm slightly looking to my left, but I recall that it was determined early on that the early warning process is open to GAC members and observers. But I'm looking to Benedetta because I think the general reference is GAC early warnings without further specification. Am I right?

BENEDETTA ROSSI Thanks, Marco. In the Applicant Guidebook, they are referred to as GAC member early warnings. But it specifically says, obviously, that it's GAC members and observers, but it is the title of the Applicant Guidebook section.

IAN SHELDON Okay. Thank you. Let's remain faithful to the AGB. United States, please.

SUSAN CHALMERS Thank you, Chair. And this is just, generally speaking for this meeting, which is being held after reveal day but prior to string confirmation day. We would welcome any guidance. It doesn't need to be now, but when we're discussing applications, maybe we should be mindful that some applications may not be there after string confirmation day. So just wanting to note that when we're

discussing applications in this text, we should keep that in mind in how we approach them. Thank you.

IAN SHELDON: Thank you. Well noted. Any other comments for this section? I see none. Again, perhaps we can continue working this offline and return tomorrow with some improved language.

T. SANTHOSH: India.

IAN SHELDON: Oh, India, please.

T. SANTHOSH: Yeah. Santhosh for the record. So during the discussion, we had mentioned that there would be intersessional work that is during the period 17 November till 16 March. So the intersession work should remain. Thank you.

IAN SHELDON: Thank you. So the proposal is to retain the original language as well as the operational readiness framework? Is that right? Yes.

MARCO HOGEWONING: Ian, maybe just to clarify if I just—I think indeed what India is conferring and what discussing this text with Portugal, I think the

message that we're trying to get across to, as our colleague from CTU reminded us, these are external readers. So I think the message we were indeed passing across is the GAC will probably work intersessionally within the operational framework to indeed provide, for instance, early warnings. I think that's the message we try to cross. So I tend to agree with India and to retain the operational text just as sort of based on the message we're passing.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you. Perhaps we can leave it in. Is the current drafting on screen suitable for now and we can return to this? Or are there further thoughts on this language? Maybe let's return to this again, see if we can work through that nuance overnight. Okay. Let's see if we can move on to Applicant Support Program. There is quite a volume of text here for us to get through, so we'll see what we can do for the remainder of this afternoon. D, Applicant Support Program, ASP. [Inaudible - audio feed switched to russian interpreter.]

MARTINA BARBERO

Thank you very much, Ian. Sorry, I was intervening on the paragraph before, which is in yellow, but also to offer my thoughts on the reviews of reviews. I think it's indeed something that we might want to discuss a slightly bit further. But I also wanted to offer a few considerations on the fourth paragraph, so the one that is highlighted. And why I suggested, in earlier exchanges with the drafter, to delete it, it's simply because we ask, and I think it's a

good ask and a strong ask, for ICANN Org and the Board to deliver a good evaluation of the ASP. I think we all strive in the GAC to have evidence-based policymaking, so we want to gather the data, check the data, analyze the data. And then once we have done all that, we want to decide how the data drives our policymaking into deciding something different, or the same, but at least it's data-driven. And I have a bit of the feeling that that paragraph preempts a bit the analysis that we're asking. So I was wondering whether we shouldn't focus on the ask of the analysis, and then when we've received the analysis, I would be very much comfortable determining what should be done differently if we do it again in another future round. But I think we need to look at the data first without preempting any conclusion from the analysis. Hopefully, it's going to be a well-grounded analysis and would give us a lot of food for thought on what could be done better. Thank you.

IAN SHELDON: Perhaps we can square bracket this paragraph if the EC is of the view that perhaps it's preemptive. But also welcome other views. Susan, United States, please.

SUSAN CHALMERS: Thank you. Just intervening to support the European Commission's suggestion here. The argument is very sound. Perhaps we see the analysis first, and then move on that after reviewing the analysis. Thank you.

IAN SHELDON Thank you. I also see Germany's support of the EC as well. In the absence of any other hands, perhaps we can strike it in track? Netherlands, please.

MARCO HOGEWONING Yeah, I think maybe the proposers could double check, because on the second paragraph, it says initial findings to be shared with the community, ideally, before ICANN 88. And in the final paragraph, we're referring to it being the first on-demand review. I sense here we're either looking to duplicate work, but I also wonder how these timelines would work in response to where the review of reviews work is currently going on. My sense is that we won't expect anything to happen before ICANN 88. Am I right, Manal? I'm assuming all nodding from the room, so my suggestion is to also maybe suppress the final paragraph, in that it seems to me to be a bit too preemptive on the outcomes of the review of reviews at this stage.

IAN SHELDON Thank you, Marco. Any other comments? Calls for the floor? I see none, and obviously there continues to be the opportunity to engage offline on this language with the proponents as well. Any other calls before we move on to a slightly reworked universal acceptance paragraph? I see none. Scroll down, please. Three, universal acceptance. The GAC emphasizes that a multilingual

Internet requires both participation of the new gTLD program by a diverse group of stakeholders, and promoting the use of IDNs, EAI, and universal acceptance. It encourages interested GAC members to promote UA readiness in public digital services and relevant procurement specifications supported by practical technical guidance. Any comments here? Netherlands, please.

MARCO HOGEWONING: Might be the originator or the proponent of this text could provide a bit more context why we are explicitly referring to the new gTLD program. I understand IDNs are part of the set that has been requested. We'll likely see a few IDNs, but I struggle a bit with making the link here from universal acceptance and making the jump to participation in the new gTLD program, which is currently ongoing. So I also struggle a bit with what are we actually asking people to participate in.

IAN SHELDON: That's a fair point, I think. Applications have closed for this current round. Would the proponents like the mic to provide additional context to the inclusion of this next round in this paragraph? It reads to me, this first sentence is primarily about the next round. Argentina, then the United States, please.

ARGENTINA: Thank you very much. I have just some doubts as regards the second sentence. It's not clear to me what it is, what encourages

interested GAC members to promote UA readiness. And I think that it was mentioned, like, UA readiness in another paragraph of the communiqué, which was specifically related to the work of the Universal Acceptance Group.

IAN SHELDON Did you have suggested text amendment, or is it a question perhaps the proponents might like to answer?

ARGENTINA It's a question.

IAN SHELDON Okay. Perhaps I can give the floor to Abdalmonem. I assume you are the proponent of this language. Please, if the US and the EC might be patient. Thank you.

ABDALMONEM GALILA Thank you very much. Actually, I want to say the GAC emphasizes that a multilingual and inclusive Internet requires the use of IDNs, EAIs, and the new generic top-level domain names with universal acceptance. I mean, I want to say that universal acceptance is not only for IDNs or EAIs, but also for your generic top-level domain names, as well as universal acceptance will handle the full environment to be consistent, and the use of IDNs, EAIs, domain names.

IAN SHELDON: Perhaps we could take the language offline to better clarify that point. Unless the United States would like to help with drafting? Okay, just give me a second. Zeina, did you want to help clarify this point? Lebanon?

ZEINA BOUHARB: Maybe just to respond to Argentina, why we have two paragraphs about the UA, because one, this one, is related to topics of importance, I guess, and the other is only related to the activities of the working groups. That's why we have two places in the document where you can see universal acceptance.

ARGENTINA: Okay, I see. Thank you very much. But maybe it lacks a subject, because what is it, what encourages?

IAN SHELDON: Okay, I think we can address that through drafting. Thank you for your patience, Owen. United States, please.

OWEN FLETCHER: Thank you. In the second sentence, I wanted to suggest the following edit. It, or the GAC, notes that interested GAC members could promote, then allow the sentence to finish from there. Thank you.

IAN SHELDON Thank you. Martina, European Commission.

MARTINA BARBERO Since we are speaking about universal acceptance, I'm going to switch to French for the first time. Je trouve que ce paragraphe décale sur les objectifs de ce communiqué, justement au public va lire le communiqué. Et je pense qu'on peut peut-être souligner un peu plus l'importance de ce sujet, une clarification vraiment quels sont les messages clés qu'on va faire passer à travers ce paragraphe. Le deuxième paragraphe, c'est peut-être un peu plus clair, parce qu'on demande aux GAC members de promouvoir universal acceptance. Mais le premier paragraphe, en fait, c'est juste une constatation, mais ça ne reflète pas particulièrement l'importance des discussions qu'on a eues les premiers jours. Donc je pense qu'on peut effectivement proposer peut-être d'autres variantes sur ce texte pendant les breaks et revenir dans un deuxième moment.

IAN SHELDON I do apologize, Martina. It seems we might have had some challenges with translation.

MARTINA BARBERO Can I repeat it in English? I wanted to do it once in my life. I thought it was a little reasonably slow French for a French standard, but okay, slower in English. I think it's a very important topic, universal

acceptance, and we had some good discussion during the universal acceptance session on day one. I think the paragraphs do not make justice to those discussions. Maybe the second paragraph a bit, because we encourage GAC members to promote universal acceptance, which is a message that came through during that session. But the initial paragraph is just a statement about effect. I think it doesn't reflect the highlights from the discussion we had, and I think we can try to shape it in a way that really highlights the value of universal acceptance in today's world.

IAN SHELDON Thank you. So where should we go with this paragraph? Are we comfortable with what's on the screen, or should we take it offline and perhaps work this slightly? Okay, perhaps? Argentina, is this an old hand?

ARGENTINA Yes, it is. Sorry.

IAN SHELDON Thank you. Egypt, please.

CHRISTINE ARIDA I was just going to note that there is some language in the chat proposed.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you, Christine. And your language is noted, Susan. Any other comments on this? We'll insert it. Perhaps we can work it offline, and we'll move through other parts of the document and come back to this. We have about 13 minutes, and there is a little bit more new text, I think, back up in the document, which we'll try and get through this evening. Yes. Four, GAC working groups. GAC Capacity Development Working Group, CDWG. The newly established GAC CDWG outlined its role in coordinating GAC capacity development and activities and noted that its draft work plan would be shared with GAC members for review and consideration following ICANN 87. The working group will continue collaborating with GAC members and observers, GAC working groups and topic leads, ICANN Org, and relevant ICANN constituencies to identify priority learning needs and deliver targeted capacity development activities and resources that support informed and timely participation in GAC and ICANN policy processes. I will pause here for comments. I see none. Perhaps we can move on. GAC Universal Acceptance and IDN Working Group, UA IDN WG. The GAC Universal Acceptance and Internationalized Domain Names Working Group, GAC UA IDN WG, held a session at ICANN 87 in Bali to explore how governments can accelerate universal acceptance, UA, adoption, and advance a more linguistically diverse, accessible, and multilingual Internet. The discussion highlighted the importance of integrating UA into national digital strategies, where six governments expressed their interest in the GAC UA Champion initiative and shared their experiences and challenges in implementing UA at a national level, aiming to encourage UA

adoption within digital public sector policies and services, particularly among governments facing resource constraints. It was noted that the window for other governments to express their interest remains open. Updates provided during the session included the UNESCO ICANN policy brief, preparations for UA Day 2027, and the ICANN UA Expert Working Group. Christine, Egypt, please.

CHRISTINE ARIDA Thank you. I was just wondering if the language used here, which is particularly among governments facing resource constraints, is something that we use. I know we use underserved regions, we use developing countries. I'm not sure this is something we use. Because then what are the constraints? And that brings in questions that are not really... So, thank you.

IAN SHELDON Would it be preferable to revert to underserved regions or more standard nomenclature?

CHRISTINE ARIDA I think the text is proposed by Peru, so if that's okay with them, I think that would be good.

IAN SHELDON Okay. But I can also see a queue forming. Portugal, please.

PORTUGAL Thank you very much. I'm wondering if to state six governments, it's the best wording here. Thank you.

IAN SHELDON I think you had a good point. I'm not sure we've brought that level of specificity in previous communiqués.

PORTUGAL A number?

IAN SHELDON A number. Would that be more acceptable? Some? Nigel, CTU, please.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE Thank you. This is just editorial. In the first paragraph, where it says, "Advance a more linguistic diverse, " I think it's "linguistically diverse." C-A-L-L-Y. Linguistically. Double L.

IAN SHELDON Thank you, Nigel. Christine, please.

CHRISTINE ARIDA On the "a number" and "some, " I would tend to use "a number" instead of "some." I think "some" has some negative connotation, and we're talking about something that those countries have

championed and have showed off in our session. So I would use "a number."

IAN SHELDON: Okay. Thank you. Portugal, is that an old hand? I assume it is. Thank you. Netherlands, please.

MARCO HOGEWONING: Yeah. And in the end, I think this is for the people in the Universal Acceptance Working Group. My mind, and I fully understand what you're saying when you say governments from underserved regions, but in my observation, lack of universal acceptance is widespread also in more developed economies and other countries. And I would almost be inclined to ask the proponents whether they agree to simply say, "In all countries, " also to adhere to the spirit of universal acceptance being universal.

IAN SHELDON: Thank you. Any other comments? I see none. And I should again reemphasize that this text remains open overnight, so please discuss. And let's see if we can squeeze in-

NIGEL CASSIMIRE: Right on the cooperation matters and then-

IAN SHELDON: Yeah. Two more paragraphs. And then United States, please.

SUSAN CHALMERS: Thank you, Chair. Just a suggestion, but we have no strong feelings: to advance a more linguistically diverse and therefore more accessible Internet. That could be one suggestion, just explaining how linguistic diversity contributes to accessibility. But again, we have no strong feelings on this point, so happy to leave it if others would prefer to retain the language as is. Thanks.

IAN SHELDON: Thank you. Egypt, please.

CHRISTINE ARIDA: Thank you for the suggestion by the US, but I would retain the other language because accessibility, especially if I'm, and the technical people can correct me here, is not only about linguistic diversity, it's also about other technical factors. So I would tend to keep it as is. I think that would be more correct. Stand to be corrected.

IAN SHELDON: Okay. Thank you. In the absence of, Marco, Netherlands, please.

MARCO HOGEWONING: Sure. I understand, right? But maybe to take this offline because it explicitly says universal acceptance and IDNs, where IDNs go to linguistic diversity. Universal acceptance, for instance, also pertains to making sure that people accept the new gTLDs when they are introduced and not just mark them as invalid. And I think

| | |
|---|---|
| | that's an important distinction to maintain in the work of this working group. |
| IAN SHELDON | Thank you. Is that Peru in the queue? |
| PERU | Yeah. |
| IAN SHELDON | Please. |
| PERU | Thank you. Peru will suggest keeping "facing underserved regions" or "facing resource constraints" that follow the criterion of the 2023 Applicant Guidebook, which refers to those facing financial and resource constraints and covers every government that lacks the means of implementing UA, irrespective of its classification. A reference to a specific region or categories of countries could leave out those governments in comparable circumstances. Thank you. |
| IAN SHELDON | Sorry. To clarify, your preference was to retain original language? |
| PERU | Yeah. Or the one that you suggest, but not keeping with "in all countries." |

IAN SHELDON Okay. Noted. Any other comments on this? And again, perhaps we can work this through this evening. Any other comments on this? Please, Abdalmonem.

ABDALMONEM GALILA Yeah, Abdalmonem for the record. Actually, I want to highlight that the word universal, it means all countries, all languages, all the scripts. It is a fully general word, stick to our role of universal acceptance here at the moment. Whatever the country is developed, whatever is other country, whatever it is, ASCII country, Latin script, non-Latin script, it works. That is why it is here. It is not user acceptance, it is universal acceptance.

IAN SHELDON Okay. Thank you. Egypt. Manal, please.

MANAL ISMAIL Thank you, Ian. I'm wondering whether we can... It's not on this topic. Shall I? Not on the same topic. Is it okay?

IAN SHELDON Yes. We are at time, though, so-

MANAL ISMAIL Okay. So I was proposing if we can put a couple of sentences regarding Bertrand's passing away. He used to be a GAC

representative and a GAC vice chair and member of the Board. And I consulted with Fabien and Giacomo, Jorge, and we've done it also before to other colleagues, so...

IAN SHELDON Yes, completely fine. Yes. Well, the leadership had discussed this, and we had already planned to insert some language on Bertrand, so yes. Thank you for raising it.

MANAL ISMAIL Okay. We tried to put something that we will share for a suggested draft, and please feel free to edit.

IAN SHELDON Thank you. Completely agree.

MANAL ISMAIL Thanks.

IAN SHELDON I'm very supportive of this. Okay. Look, with that, I think that concludes our second communiqué session. I think we are moving through this quite well. Still a little bit of work to do tomorrow. Just having a look at the agenda. Where are we? We start our day tomorrow with a meeting with the CPH, meeting with the ccNSO, and then back to communiqué drafting. I should also mention that, please remember that we have the GAC reception generously

hosted by our Indonesian colleagues. Could I ask somebody who's across the logistics to provide a brief reminder of what the plan is? Gülten, Julia, you want to quickly remind us of the logistics for tonight?

GULTEN TEPE Thank you, Marco. Shuttles will start to leave, so please refer back to the email I just shared in the GAC mailing list. Thank you.

IAN SHELDON Thank you, Gülten. And one last reminder on the timelines for the communiqué. So you have until lunchtime tomorrow for insertion of new language into the communiqué, at which time we will close the document and begin working through and refining language. So please take another look at the Google Doc tonight, review your thoughts, and make sure by lunchtime tomorrow you have included all language. And then we look to finalize, and then you'll have a final opportunity overnight on Wednesday night to confirm with capital before we wrap it up all on Thursday morning. So with that, I think we might close the day today. Thank you very much. Looking forward to seeing you all at the reception later tonight. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**