ICANN87 Bali | AGM – GAC Communique Drafting (3 of 6)
Wednesday, October 21, 2026 – 13:15 to 14:30 WITA

GULTEN TEPE

Hello, my name is Gulten Tepe Oguksuzoglu, welcome. This is the GAC Communiqué Drafting Session on Wednesday, 21st of October at 13:15 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 bot. Interpretation for this session will include all six UN languages and Portuguese. If you'd 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'll be speaking in case speaking a language other than English. And please speak at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation.

I'll now leave the floor over to Marco Hogewoning, GAC Vice-Chair. Thank you.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, good afternoon, and welcome back. Yes, as you'll be used by now, we're taking turns as vice-chairs of the numerous departures, so I'll be guiding you through this drafting session,

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.

Communiqué time again. Before we move to, we've got some new text, some edits that we'll go over in a bit, but before we do that, can I invite Fabien to quickly remind us of the process and what's in store coming up, but still pending.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Thank you, Marco. This is Fabien Betremieux from the GAC support team. So, we will continue to focus on the substantive areas of the communiqué, but before we get back to that, we'll just go through the communiqué and kind of show where things have come in terms of text and what we'll be covering, hopefully, throughout the afternoon.

So if we start in the introduction, a paragraph was added in relation to the morning and the passing of Bertrand de La Chapelle, so we'll read that text a little bit later. In the second section, I don't think anything's changed. We're still reporting on the engagement activities of the GAC. Internal matters, section three, we're waiting, I believe, on text from the Public Safety Working Group in terms of reporting on those activities. I am not aware of other, the group working group, I don't know, no? Right, that's what I thought, so we're not going to text.

I wonder if the human rights and international law working group is planning on any text? Yes? Okay, so we'll receive that later. That's it for section three. Section, sorry. Right, so that was yesterday. So, I think we'll have to read that. Right, we'll read it, but the text was already there yesterday, so we'll get to those

pieces of text. Section four in the issues of importance, we have review of reviews, we'll review later today. New gTLD Program, Safeguard Assessment, Geographic Names and Community Application, GAC Operational Readiness, Applicant Support Program.

So, I believe all that text needs to be read and agreed upon. Universal acceptance. We have new text on DNS abuse. New text on 15 days' data validation timeline. And I believe we're expecting text in relation to registration data, SSAD supplemental recommendation and privacy proxy issues. And as far as I am aware, there are no consideration at the moment of GAC advice. And I'm sort of looking around the room to confirm. And I believe, Marco, this is where we stand from a substantive perspective.

MARCO HOGEWONING Thank you. And as a kind request I guess we said we would close the editing of the draft by lunch. I think we're good to close it at the end of this session. It is not that we want to prevent you from further suggesting edits. It's just that it allows for us to start cleaning up the text. It's still our intention to more or less have this wrapped up by the end of the day. There's two more drafting sessions after this. But I kind of hope that at least where it comes to issues of importance, all substantial edits and all substantial pieces of text have been reviewed by tonight.

So you, if need be, you can go back to your capital if you want to check anything. And then we can wrap it up tomorrow. With that,

there's a couple of text changes suggested that I've seen fly by. If we can maybe Fabiano Benedette start with section two of the issues of importance, the new gTLD.

MARTINA BARBERO We have a hand up from Janos.

MARCO HOGEWONING Okay, sorry. Janos.

JANOS DRIENYOVSZKI Thanks, Marco. Sorry, I just wanted to flag that Fabien sent you a PSWG text, but I can copy it in the chat if that's better, up to you. Okay, thank you.

MARCO HOGEWONING Thank you. I've now also been watching my Zoom channel. Okay, with that, maybe start from the section of new gTLDs. We quickly ran over them yesterday, at which point we've deferred back to some smaller groups editing. At this stage, I believe for section 2a, safeguard assessments, there was a new text submitted by the UK and India. That's the --

MARTINA BARBERO This is the original text, and this is the alternative.

MARCO HOGEWONING Okay, so we've left the original text in, just for clarity, but as far as I understood from the proponents, this should be replaced by the text that I will now read them. I'll go a bit slower for the translators. The GAC welcomed the presentation by ICANN staff on the safeguards assessments -- Oh, sorry. Okay, let me try again. Okay.

MARTINA BARBERO It won't move anymore.

MARCO HOGEWONING Thank you. The GAC welcomed the presentation by ICANN staff on safeguard assessments. GAC members noted that many applications are linked to government functions and public services or regulated sectors, such as medicine, finance, education, and fundraising, and that safeguards would be required. Members raised concerns about consumer protection and DNS abuse.

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. The GAC is seeking clarification from ICANN Org regarding the assessment of registry voluntary commitments, especially with regard to applications which relate to emerging technologies.

The GAC noted that safeguard assessments cannot prevent an application from proceeding, but can lead to PICs being put in

registry agreements as enforceable contractual obligations. In this regard, some members asked about the monitoring and enforcement of safeguard public interest commitments, PICs, and about the jurisdiction of the applicable laws.

So, that is the text, as I understood, currently agreed between India and the UK as the main proponents. Are there any comments, suggestions to this particular suggestion? European Commission, Martina.

MARTINA BARBERO Thank you very much, Marco. This is Martina for the records. I just wanted to ask the drafters if they could clarify which clarifications they would wish to receive from ICANN Org on the RVCs, because as far as I understand, ICANN Org explained that RVCs will not be related to content. Jorge is the subject matter expert, Marco maybe knows better as well, but I think we had long, long discussions in the GAC, and some of us were not the happiest in the world, one that was decided, but as a matter of fact, now we cannot have content-related RVCs.

So, I was wondering if the clarification relates to that, or other parts of the process of the RVCs, and if the drafters could clarify that, that would be helpful.

MARCO HOGEWONING Thank you. And if the drafters could respond to that, UK or India? UK?

PAUL BLAKER Thank you, Paul Blaker, for the record. So, this is intended to reflect a comment that was made in the discussion by our Indian colleagues. Looking at it now, I wonder if instead of saying the GAC, we should say GAC members are seeking clarification, which I think would be clearer, because it was coming based on those Indian remarks yesterday. But my colleague from India might want to add clarification to that. Thank you.

MARCO HOGEWONING Thank you, UK. I see India's hand up, but maybe, I think our more common way then is to refer to some GAC members, because the difference between the GAC and GAC members I think is not very clear to some people, but India, you want to respond?

T. SANTOSH Thank you, Marco. Yes, there is a creation of doubt here. So, during the meeting, I believe three members have raised the issue related to the RCVs. So, that is why we had mentioned it here. So, either ways, we can write GAC members, few GAC members in the test. Thank you.

MARCO HOGEWONING Okay, so suggestion for India says few GAC members are seeking a few or some. I am in your hands here. My suggestion would be to some to stick to the regular clarification, if that is okay with India, then we will just have consistency throughout the document to see

the UK noting. I see a couple of people in the front row noting, so let's just make it some GAC members. Any other comments on this particular piece?

Then my suggestion is we mark this particular piece green for now. As a reminder, we just do that to make sure that we mark that this has been discussed. Nothing is permanent until tomorrow, we agree, but then at least we've got a bit of a visual reminder of what has been looked at, what the group thinks is okay for now. So, if you can maybe do that, then we can move to the next bit. Which is geographic names and community applications.

As you remind, there was some discussion yesterday and during the meeting about the letters of support being available. I understood there has been quite a bit of consultation going on between a number of GAC members and drafters. What you see here is the original text that was shown yesterday and underneath, I believe, is an alternative text that is both the original and this text was originated from Switzerland. So, Jorge, would you be able to quickly introduce the new text and maybe also read it out while you're at it?

JORGE CANCIO Okay, thank you, Marco. And Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. So basically, as I understand the conversation, I'm trying to be as fair as possible, but obviously I'm biased here. There are two principles.

The first principle is to have access to the documents that are letters of support or non-objection related to geo-name or community applications. That those documents that in the last round were generally publicly available, that they should continue to be so. And on the other hand, there was the concern expressed by some esteemed colleagues that the AGB this time around doesn't list those documents as those that are going to be made proactively available by ICANN Org.

So, there was the concern that we could be perceived as questioning the AGB or asking for a change of the AGB. So, to reconcile the two principles, which was attempted in the original draft, but apparently not to the satisfaction of some esteemed colleagues, I have proposed the second text, which is even more straightforward and then includes a form of reconciling the two principles with the first part of the sentence, without prejudice to the limitations of the AGB, and the second part of the sentence saying that ICANN Org and the applicants should or will entertain best efforts that the GAC expects that they will do so.

So, that's the approach at a principle level. And so if there are questions, I don't know, maybe we can entertain a conversation at the principle level or otherwise I can read the second, the new proposal. I'm in your hands, Marco.

MARCO HOGEWONING Yeah, I think I can read it out so everybody has a clear. So, the new text for section B would be without prejudice to any applicable

limitations on the disclosure of documentation regarding applications. The GAC expects that ICANN Org and applicants will entertain best efforts to make documentation of letters of support or non-objection related to geoname or community applications available to the extent permissible.

That would be the text for section B, and I'd like to express thanks to Switzerland, but everybody else involved in the efforts of finding compromised text. We're in your hands here, so please let me know if this is the text introduced, and indeed through small editorial to geographic names, that's the official nomenclature. So the text before you, any comments, thoughts, suggestions? Is this acceptable to the people who didn't like the original version? I'm optimistic. There we go. Aram, you have the floor.

ARAM VERDYAN Hello, I have a question here. Maybe a native speaker could correct me? It says, where is it? Just don't move it. GAC expects that ICANN Org and applicants will entertain. I think this is a verb, expect, and there is another one, will. Maybe we have to just put GAC expects that ICANN Org and applicants entertain best efforts. This is the first one. I don't know whether this will be meaningful here. And the second one is that this best effort, if you put even shall here or something else, is not compulsory. I mean, this is just inviting them to do so. I'm a lawyer, so I can just say this. Thank you.

MARCO HOGEWONING Thank you. So, suggestion to strike 'will', which is probably a question for some native speakers. And then the other suggestion is to introduce, I guess, shall entertain. Jorge, as the drafter, do you wish to comment? Or any of the English native speakers have an opinion on what is the best way forward here?

JORGE CANCIO Thank you, Marco. So, I think the will can be deleted, and it makes the sentence flow more naturally. And if we are expressing an expectation, I don't think we would need the shall, because we are, let's say, inviting them with some emphasis, but we are not expecting them to really comply as a matter of necessity. But thank you very much to the Iranian colleague for spotting this from a lawyer to a lawyer.

MARCO HOGEWONING Thank you. So it will now read then without prejudice to any applicable limitations of disclosure of documentation regarding applications. The GAC expects that ICANN Org and applicants entertain best efforts to make documentation of letters of support or non-objection related to geographic names or community applications available to the extent permissible. Any further thoughts, suggestions? I think I see a couple of nods here. Then nothing is final until everything is agreed tomorrow, but let's mark this green for now. And thank you for all your cooperation and hard efforts in finding a workable compromise.

Moving on then, I guess I'm just going to touch on C, if that's okay. This was touched upon yesterday. We have not yet received any big replacements. So, item number C on the next round is GAC operational readiness. Text originally supplied by Portugal with some tweaks. 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 member early warnings and GAC consensus advice. The GAC intends to establish an operational readiness framework, or the GAC establish an intersessional work schedule to enable members to identify potential public policy concerns and coordinate the members' responses where appropriate.

So I guess the issue at hand there is, do we want to establish an operational readiness framework, or do we want to establish an intersessional work schedule? Again, we're in your hands. I see the UK has their hand up. So, UK, Paul Blaker, what's your preference?

PAUL BLAKER Thank you, Paul Blaker for the record. My Portuguese colleague and I discussed this and suggest combining the two. Perhaps we can say to establish an operational readiness framework, including intersessional work, and delete schedule. And then we get both. Thank you.

MARCO HOGEWONING Thank you, UK and Portugal. So that particular sentence would then be, the GAC intends to establish an operational readiness framework, including intersessional work, to enable members to identify potential public policy concerns and coordinate the members' responses where appropriate. Shouldn't there be an apostrophe after the members to include possession? And I wonder, are we happy with sort of reference to the 2026 round? Or do we --

BENEDETTA ROSSI We can align the language after that.

MARCO HOGEWONING Okay, we'll take this offline, but maybe staff can review and align with that. I see no further hands. And moving on, it's marked green. Let me see. We did extensively discuss Applicant Support Program yesterday, I think, but I am not sure whether I have seen any edits yet. Or do we? I think this is where we left. But let me try from the top then. Section D on the next round, Applicant Support Program, otherwise known as the ASP.

GAC acknowledges ICANN Org's efforts in administering the Applicant Support Program, ASP, and the greater uptake compared to the 2012 Round. However, it notes the gap between ASP initiated and approved applications and remains concerned about geographic disparities in participation, particularly affecting

underserved regions. The GAC stresses the importance of a timely, lessons-learned evaluation to understand applicants' experiences, including why some prospective and approved applicants did not proceed.

The GAC requests the ICANN Board and ICANN Org to work with the GAC and the wider community to deliver this evaluation, building on existing evaluation activities and incorporating structured exit surveys and interviews as appropriate with approved and unsuccessful ASP applicants.

The analysis should examine outreach, financial and non-financial support, barriers to participation and regional equity, drawing on and capturing participants' experiences while these remain recent. It should include the impact of the ASP fee reduction being limited to 75%, particularly for applicants from developing regions. The GAC expects initial findings being shared with the community, ideally before ICANN88. And then the final paragraph.

For the 2026 Round, the GAC encourages ICANN Org to maintain targeted support, guidance and access to pro bono services for ASP supported applicants throughout the remaining application stages to help prevent applicants' withdrawal due to further financial or technical barriers, including legal costs in objection proceedings and the costs of string contention resolution.

That is the text before us as we addressed yesterday. The rest is stroken out as per discussion yesterday. Are there any comments

on these three paragraphs right now? I see none. Double check. Nope.

Then again, my suggestion would be to for now mark this green as we've touched upon this and so far have not received any objections. We're making progress here, people. Well done. Let me see. Where are we? Universal acceptance. There's still quite a bit of work, I think, pending here. Just quick scan if there were any hallway conversations on this or are there any hallway conversations ongoing on this, i.e. should we expect new text or are we cleaning up this one? Any of the proponents can enlighten me that would be helpful. Then I guess Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: My impression and seemingly recollection is that we have two alternatives for the first paragraph. So, the first and second are alternative of each other, the first one being the original, the second one being the alternative, and then we have a second sentence that's detached and for which there is no alternative. So, it sounds like it would be, my understanding would be that potentially the text is the second and third paragraph only.

MARCO HOGEWONING: Okay. Then let's take them then one at a time. So, we have first paragraph of this text. The alternative yesterday was: the GAC emphasizes that a multilingual inclusive internet requires both participation in the new gTLD program by a diverse group of

stakeholders and promoting the use of IDNs, Email Address Internationalization, EAI, and effective Universal Acceptance. Or the first paragraph would read: the GAC emphasizes that a multilingual and inclusive internet requires promoting the use of internationalized domain names and email address internationalization as well as the widespread adoption of universal acceptance.

And I see the commission, Martina has already her hand up. Please tell me which of the two you like best.

MARTINA BARBERO

I want to add another layer of complexity. No, apologies. I'm kidding. But I did a bit of digging into previous communiqué text on universal acceptance to see whether there were better lines that would capture the context, sorry, the insights of the first two alternative paragraphs. And I found one from Kuala Lumpur communiqué. I'm going to put it in the chat. Shoot at me if you think it's better to keep one of those two versions.

But otherwise, there is already agreed upon language that emphasized the importance of this topic. And since we like to stay consistent, we maybe want to reuse that language. Just a suggestion, but no strong feelings.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, European Commission. While I then wait for your alternative, and maybe staff can put that in. I see comments from

Columbia saying the second paragraph reads much better. Noted. So, from earlier communiqué text, as introduced by the commission: the GAC welcomes and encourages the further adoption of Universal Acceptance for the better use of Internationalized Domain Names, IDN, email addresses, internationalizations, and new generic Top-Level Domains for accelerating the progress of online diversity.

If I'm nitpicky, I think it's email address internationalizations, but I'm happy to stand corrected. With that, I now have three versions. We have plenty of experiences with Zoom, Pulse, and Mentimeter, but I have none set up. I might be biased. I think I'm leaning towards the third version, partially because if that's already used text, then for consistency. But I'm in your hands, and I see Egypt has their hand up. Christine.

CHRISTINE ARIDA Thank you, Marco. Christine Arida for the record. Thank you, European Commission, for bringing up that text. I think it's probably good to have a language that you've already agreed upon. It makes life easier. I just want to maybe ask, I think that the original text proposed in this section was put forward by Portugal, if I correctly recall, and there was a mention of the New gTLD Program. So, if there is some logic into that, that we should be adding something to acknowledge something related to you in relation to the new round, it would be good to hear it. If not, then I

would tend to stick to the text proposed by the European Commission. Thank you.

MARCO HOGEWONING: Thank you, Egypt. Just also, I did this visual here, but just to clarify, this is a new section of the Issues of Importance, so section two is dealing with the New gTLD Round. This is section three, specifically dealing with universal acceptance, but Portugal, do you wish to comment on Egypt's question, whether New gTLDs should be referenced here?

ANA NEVES: It's okay. I can live with the proposal from the European Commission. Thank you.

MARCO HOGEWONING: Thank you for that. So, and I trust reading your comments, you're okay with leaving that out as well. Then my suggestion forward would be for the third paragraph as the final one. Is there anybody disagreeing with that way forward? I see nothing. Okay, so let me then read that one more time. Okay, thank you for clearing that up, because then we have the second paragraph. Okay, thank you, Fabien, for cleaning up.

So, section three of the Issues of Importance, universal acceptance. The GAC welcomes and encourages the further adoption of universal acceptance, UA, for the better use of internationalized domain names, IDN, email addresses, internationalization, and

new generic top-level domains for accelerating the progress of online diversity. The GAC notes that interested GAC members could promote UA readiness in public digital services and relevant procurement specifications supported by practical technical guidance.

That is what is now being proposed for this. Are there any comments, suggestions? Is there anybody who has second thoughts by this text? I think I spotted a dot missing on the first paragraph, Fabien. If we can make an editorial note to see what Email Addresses Internationalization or Email Address Internationalization. I'm not sure what it's usually called. To me, it sounds weird to say Email Addresses Internationalization, but I'm happy to ask Google or LLM to see what the common thing is. I see no -- Sorry? Okay, Lebanon, Zeina.

ZEINA BOU HARB Can we add linguistic or something? Because I don't understand online diversity.

MARCO HOGEWONING So, the suggestion is for accelerating the progress of online linguistic diversity. I'm happy to give that to Sarai. Martina, I see your hand up.

MARTINA BARBERO Totally fine, but that's an exact quote from Kuala Lumpur. So it depends if we want to quote the Kuala Lumpur communiqué or if

we want to modify it. Just letting it, no problem with linguistic, but just in case.

MARCO HOGEWONING I guess I'm open to modifications. Of course it's good to stick to existing language, but then again minor differences appear. So, with the addition of Lebanon online linguistic diversity -- Scanning the room again. I think we're --

MARTINA BARBERO We have a comment in the chat from Coral de Cielo Cano Gallardo.

MARCO HOGEWONING Comments, okay. Could be in support of a more inclusive and multilingual internet. To check Peru, that's then sort of in the end of the first paragraph. So, for accelerating, so that would then be and new generic Top-Level Domains in support of a more inclusive and multilingual internet. Is that what you're suggesting? I see you nodding.

CORAL DE CIELO CANO GALLARDO Yes, I was suggesting that we can correct the last part because as I now recognize, we have difficult to understand this linguistic diversity, but if we really want to support the multilingual internet, we should mention it explicitly.

MARCO HOGEWONING I understand, so maybe then, Fabien, I think then the alternative is between for accelerating the progress of online linguistic diversity or the alternative would be in support of a more inclusive and multilingual internet. I think basically so the brackets would start after domains. So, Top-Level Domains. And then we have either for accelerating or in support of.

Any strong preferences in the room as to retain the original language or do we accept Peru's suggestion? Given the rationale, I'm happy to take Peru's suggestion unless somebody has strong feelings about that. No, Lebanon okay? Okay, I see a thumbs up. So, then it would be and new generic Top-Level Domains in support of a more inclusive and multilingual internet. I'm happy if you are happy. Sorry, I did miss that then. Argentina, you still wish to speak?

MARINA FLEGO EIRAS Thank you very much. I don't have any strong feelings with the proposal, but I feel that it could be better to stick to what it is agreed or to the language that we have already used in the past unless there is an innovation, of course. An innovation noted during the discussions.

MARCO HOGEWONING Thank you, noted. Portugal has her hand up. Ana.

ANA NEVES: Thank you, Marco. So, I think that we might lose some meaning in this para if we delete for accelerating the progress of online diversity or of online linguistic diversity. I like the online diversity because it entails more than only linguistic, but I can live with online linguistic diversity. Otherwise, in support of a more inclusive and multilingual internet, I think that we are losing the sense of diversity. And this verb for accelerating the progress. I like these words. Thank you.

MARCO HOGEWONING: Okay, so Portugal rather retains the accelerating linguistic diversity. Peru, you want to…?

CORAL DE CIELO CANO GALLARDO: Yes, thank you. As I recognize, there is not a factual agreement until now, so we are in negotiation. That was for beginning. We can also elaborate with accelerating if it is something that you want to keep on. But I would support and have a strong feeling with the more inclusive and multilingual internet that has really strong meaning that I don't find in progress of online. I don't find meaning on those words, actually. So, if you could consider the options, we can work on that. Thank you.

MARCO HOGEWONING: Thank you, Peru. I might be thinking of a solution myself, but maybe our Swiss colleague already has found one. Jorge, can you help us out?

JORGE CANCIO

Maybe, let me try. It's just a friendly proposal, and you can kick me out if you don't like it. So, it's a bit of a merger of both ideas, and we could take one part of the one and the other, so I feel Anna's comment is about diversity as a general concept, and then combining with more the specific inclusive and multilingual internet, so maybe it could read in support of a more diverse, inclusive, and multilingual internet. So, you have diversity as a general concept without linking it exclusively to multilingual. That would be my proposal.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you. So, we now have three options. I understood that Portugal was attached to accelerating, but I'm happy to see if she supports your addition, and of course also to the rest of the room. Do we take the Swiss proposal as a compromise? Ana?

ANA NEVES

My second try, but I'm not going to make any issue with this. So I think that it's a very good proposal, but I think that for accelerating the progress, it's a very good wording, and if we could perhaps engineer top-level domains for accelerating the progress of online diversity in support of a more inclusive and multilingual internet. Thank you.

MARCO HOGEWONING That was where my mind was going. That might be a final try indeed. So, then it would be for accelerating the progress of online linguistic diversity in support of a more inclusive and multilingual internet. Would that be --

ANA NEVES Sorry to come back. The progress of online diversity in support of a more inclusive and multilingual internet.

MARCO HOGEWONING I'm just waiting for the edits. Let me just sort of read. So, then it would be an end to new generic top-level domains for accelerating the progress of online diversity in support of a more inclusive and multilingual internet. That was then the current compromise on the table. I'm looking at the room. Anybody? Peru, would you be willing to take this?

CORAL DE CIELO CANO GALLARDO Yes, I would like to agree, but also I really like the addition that was made by Jorge. So, with the word diverse. So, it could be added, if not opposition, because it's a really great goal. So, in support of a more diverse and inclusive and multilingual internet could be possible. Thank you.

MARCO HOGEWONING So, for accelerating the progress of online diversity in support of a more diverse, inclusive and multilingual internet. I'm in your

hands, but now we're sort of saying diversity in support of a more diverse. I think we're doubling here.

CORAL DE CIELO CANO GALLARDO: Yeah, we need to delay this for diversity.

MARCO HOGEWONING: So, then it would be for accelerating the progress in support. That doesn't think, and I believe -- I don't know. Any good? I don't think we're getting closer to a solution here. I'm either inclined to revert back to, as the European Commission suggested, the Kuala Lumpur cut and paste with, as was requested, the insertion of linguistic in front of diversity.

We can refer back to what was mentioned in the chat, I guess. Generic top-level domains for accelerating the progress of online linguistic diversity. And that would be a full stop. But again, I'm in your hands. If we simply stop after online linguistic diversity, that was the original suggested by the Commission, and that's the one that is pretty much in the Kuala Lumpur, which also is supported by Argentina, to start to agree text, if possible. Would people be willing to take that? And I see the US, indeed. Thank you for reminding me. Susan Chalmers, I don't see you immediately, but you have the floor.

SUSAN CHALMERS: Thank you, Chair. Susan Chalmers, for the United States. We were wondering if we might be able to have a discussion on this text. I know we've been going around for a bit, but to take this offline and revisit the text in a subsequent communiqué drafting session. Thank you.

MARCO HOGEWONING: Thank you, indeed. That would have been my next suggestion, but I was trying one more. Indeed, let's defer it for now. We have several options on the table. If people can find each other in the next break and try to come up with text, and if so, please Communiqué to our helpful support staff. Then we'll try it in the next session. Is that okay with you, Portugal? I still see your hand up.

Okay, then we leave this open for now, which gives me 18 minutes to the coffee break. I am an optimist. I am going to open on DNS abuse, if that's okay with the proponents. Sorry, Martina, European Commission?

MARTINA BARBERO: Just noting, as Susan kindly noted in the text, this is just the first paragraph. There's more coming, so I don't know if you want to see the first paragraph now, and then when there's more coming, we'll read the rest, or if we go to something that is complete, just for transparency.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Okay, then we'll wait for something else. Then I have the 15-day registration data validation timeline, which I think is a bit too long to cover in 17 minutes, so I'm inclined not to take that if there is -- I'm looking for -- Maybe should we try the Review of reviews, section one? Okay, if we can scroll back to issues of importance. No, it's the first part of the section one of the issues of importance. There we go.

There's some text here on the Review of Reviews, as it's currently headed. Let me just read it to you as what is currently there: The GAC considers that the Review of Reviews, ROR Cross-Community Group, CCG, revised framework, should explicitly preserve the full substantive scope of bylaws section 4.6(b)(ii)(B). The framework should clearly identify where the GAC's interaction with the board and the broader community and ICANN's effective consideration of GAC public policy input will be assessed. Any allocation between the structural review and the accountability and transparency review should ensure complete coverage, avoid duplication, and preserve the GAC's own review arrangements under section 4.4(b).

In the second paragraph, the GAC welcomes the opportunity to have a second public comment period on the CCG's report to allow feedback on modifications reflected in the second draft report and looks forward to reviewing it in light of the previous GAC input provided in Seville and Mumbai and Dublin Communiqués.

I guess that last sentence needs further edits and clarifications. As towards what is there, back to the room. Comments, thoughts?

Anybody already checked whether the Dublin Communiqué is relevant? Switzerland.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Marco. I have more of a question on the second sentence in the first paragraph. Maybe it's the lack of coffee, but I don't really get the sense or the full meaning of this sentence. So, we are saying that the framework should clearly identify and then where the GAC's interaction, blah, blah, blah, blah, will be assessed. I don't know exactly what that means. So, I don't know if the proponents could elaborate or clarify a little bit what we are aiming at.

MARCO HOGEWONING

As you noticed me struggling while reading, I tend to concur. Is the original drafter able to explain or provide minor improvements to make this a bit easier flowing? I don't know who originated this text. Was that Egypt, Manal, or was this Tracy? While we do that, feel free to take the floor. Christine, sorry.

CHRISTINE ARIDA

No worries. Thank you. So, I'm not sure if the whole text has originated from Manal. But I just took the microphone to say that Manal is currently with the CCWG working group meeting the board. So, maybe it's not the best time to discuss this or to read it because she cannot provide her input. But I defer to Martina. I think there was some discussion. Thank you.

MARCO HOGEWONING Thank you. Before I go to the Commission, was that an old hand or are you still? Okay. Then Martina, European commissioned.

MARTINA BARBERO I just wanted to clarify that the new paragraph is just the last one that was authored by Manal. I think the previous paragraph comes from Anna and was submitted by email a few days ago. So, I'm happy to speak to the second paragraph because I supported Manal in the drafting. But for the first one, maybe Anna can take it.

MARCO HOGEWONING Let's then take the second paragraph first, if you have any suggestions to improve. Can we safely remove Dublin from this list?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX I just pulled in a comment, as you might see in the document, the actual text in the Dublin Communiqué that relates to review of reviews. So, depending on what's the purpose of making a reference to the previous communiques, if it's about whether the GAC had provided input, the GAC did provide input in Dublin Communiqué. If it's a reference to a particular aspect of the input, I wonder if we want to make a reference.

MARTINA BARBERO From where I stand, I can remove.

MARCO HOGEWONING Okay. As you originated the text, then we'll not reference Dublin. I guess then it's an editorial to put the numbers etc. in, but we can take that offline, pending that we'll have to come back to this when Manal and or Tracy are in the room. Would we be willing to at least take the second paragraph green?

CHRISTINE ARIDA Christine. No, I'm just seeking clarification. I missed why are we taking out Dublin. We do not have a reference in Dublin?

MARCO HOGEWONING Martina?

MARTINA BARBERO Before we started discussing the content, we commented on the content of the framework in Mumbai and Seville. In Dublin we said it was before the first draft of the framework as far as I understand was out, so our comments were more generic on what we would like the review of the overview to focus on.

So if we include Dublin in there, as Fabien has highlighted, we need to split the sentence and say that the comments to the framework as expressed in Mumbai and Seville, and the general comments to

the RR process as per the Dublin communication. I was trying to keep it simple, but nothing prevents us from splitting the sentence.

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Can I come back? I'm sorry, I can't see the text that you've put, Fabien, because if there is some additional reference that stresses on the GAC's special status, I think we should split and keep the Dublin. If it's already mentioned in our civil and Mumbai communique, then fine. If there is an addition, let's just keep it and split the sentence in my view.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Okay, well, maybe as we are going to revisit the first paragraph, maybe this is one for the coffee break and invite you to talk with each other and see if there is text to be added or not. I am looking at the clock, so we now have two Review of Reviews, B revisited. What was the other one that we had? Universal Acceptance is still pending. We're still waiting for some text on DNS abuse. Meanwhile, our chair elect, Ian. I'm kind of inclined to wrap it up here and send people to work further on text, if you agree with that move.

IAN SHELDON

I think so. I'm comfortable with that. Sorry if we covered this. Do we have an ETA on a certain privacy proxy? Owen, please.

OWEN FLETCHER	Thanks. I've emailed the privacy proxy text to Fabian and I think David might have his hand up about that. Thank you. Canada.
IAN SHELDON	Thank you. Canada?
JORGE CANCIO	Thanks. Yes, Owen is correct. We're just workshopping some text and you should have something soon. Thanks.
IAN SHELDON	Great. We should be able to work through both of these portions in the next session. Okay. With that, perhaps, we can give everybody seven minutes back. Enjoy your coffee break and we'll be back here at 3:00p.m. Thank you.
MARCO HOGEWONING	Thank you. As a reminder, the staff will now sort of close the text down. Any further edits, please Communiqué them to GAC staff so they can start cleaning up the comments and we'll hopefully have a good text. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]