
ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – GAC Communiqué Drafting (2 of 6)
Tuesday, March 10, 2026 – 16:30 to 17:30 IST

JULIA CHARVOLEN

Welcome to the second session of the GAC Communiqué Drafting on Tuesday, 10 March 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.

Please remember to state your name and the language you will speak in case you will be speaking a language other than English. And speak clearly at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. Please make sure to mute all other devices when you are speaking. With that, I will leave the floor over to GAC Chair Nico Caballero. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Julia. Welcome back, everyone. This is our second GAC Communiqué Drafting Session. Hopefully we'll make progress because we already have text for our Communiqué. Without further ado, let me give the floor to Fabien who is going to be walking us through the remaining sections that need to be covered. Fabien, over to you.

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.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Let's go to issues of importance because there's been some activity there. I think the text on domain name registration data and DNS abuse mitigation is still being finalized. However, we do have text on Next Round of new gTLDs. Let's keep scrolling. We'll come back to read it.

There are three subtopics, Applicant Support Program, Community Application, TLD Application Management System. Then UDRP review, we mentioned that this is a topic that's been identified for a discussion that will occur tomorrow so we'll leave it at that for now. We've received text from India on the governance of the Regional Internet Registries. And I believe there is still consideration of potential text on the Root Server System or RSSAC. I understand there is text being finalized on the Review of Reviews. This is where we stand at the moment and I'm not aware of any proposal for GAC advice at the moment.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Perfect. Can you scroll up a little bit and get to Section 3? There you go. Next Round. No, sorry, sorry. Over there where we have text. Sure, sure. No problem. I'll be reading the text on the Next Round of new gTLDs. And then my distinguished colleague from Australia will be reading number five. I'll do three A, B, and C at this point then I'll stop in order to see if we agree or if there's anything we need to change. We'll take it from there if everybody agrees, of course. Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Just for your awareness, there's editing ongoing above this section. This is why you've seen the page going up and down as we're trying to fight the editing that's going on. Just be prepared for a little bit of movement.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

No worries, no worries. I understand that. Let's try to read Part A at least, which is the Applicant Support Program. The text reads, "The GAC welcomes the ICANN Board's proactive update regarding the Applicant Support Program (ASP) and is encouraged by the receipt of 75 applications spanning all five ICANN regions." For the interpreters, are we good in terms of speed? Okay, a little bit slower. All right, I'll do my best. Sorry about this.

"The GAC expresses its strong support for the Board's proposal to allocate up to an additional \$4.9 million from the 2012 Round auction proceeds, expanding the funding envelope to accommodate up to 75 qualified applicants well beyond the originally budgeted 45, directly aligned with the GAC's longstanding advocacy for maximizing diverse participation in the Next Round. However, the GAC emphasizes that increasing the number of supported applicants must not compromise the depth of financial assistance originally proposed. The GAC hopes that this budget expansion fully preserves the ability to apply the maximum

base fee reduction of 85% to all successfully evaluated ASP applicants.”

Let me stop here in order to see if we have reactions. Okay. Seeing none, let's move on to Part B, please, Benedetta. Community applications. There's a hand from the European Commission. Please go ahead, Gemma.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you very much, Nico. Just a couple of quick comments. Overall support for the text, something which is really editorial. I would say that we welcome the update. I'm not sure there is no update, which is not proactive. I mean, it can be reactive, but I think it's redundant. I think that we should not say that the GAC hopes, but that the GAC expects or is of the view of, because I'm not sure that the hopes are good for the Communiqué. Thank you very much.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, European Commission. But in that case, I think it should say the GAC expects this budget expansion to fully preserve or something. We need to change the wording there. Again, I'm not the English expert here but... Does it work? Okay. The GAC recommends that this budget expansion fully preserves the ability and so on and so forth. Okay. Everybody okay with that? Sorry, CTU?

NIGEL CASSIMIRE	Thank you. Just to correct the English. If we're saying recommends, I think it should be fully preserved rather than preserves.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Good catch. Thank you very much, CTU. Any other? UPU?
TRACY HACKSHAW	Thank you. I'm just pointing out that there's some bracketed text from Lebanon that—
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Sorry, Tracy, you said you want me to read that?
TRACY HACKSHAW	No, I'm just saying that I'm not sure if we want to review it before you move on to B.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	You mean the text in brackets?
TRACY HACKSHAW	Yes, because Lebanon produced—
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Okay, sure. I can read that. The GAC also encourages continued transparency regarding the evaluation, the implementation, and outcomes of the Applicant Support Program. Everybody okay with

that? Any strong feelings? I don't see any hand in the room so... Oh, I have the Netherlands and India. Please, Marco, go ahead.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, Chair. I originally raised my hand on the EU edits on the previous application, but now you've asked the full support of the addition that Lebanon is proposing. To the edits proposed by the Commission regarding the GAC recommends, I'm also not a native speaker, but I think "The GAC recommends that this budget expansion should fully preserve," I think that's the correct English. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. Nigel, are we okay with that? Okay, perfect. Thank you so much. There we go. Any other detail you would like to review at this point before we move to Part B? Sorry, I have India next.

[SUSHIL PAL]

Thank you, Nico. Under Applicant Support Program, the second para which mentioned that up to 75 qualified applicants, and it has written 75 qualified applicants. Now coming to the para three, it is mentioned as "To all..." para three last line "To all successfully evaluated ASP applicants." Can we keep it as "To all qualified applicants" so that there is a consistency in para two and three? Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay. Let me read that sentence. It would be, “The GAC recommends that this budget expansion should fully preserve the ability to apply the maximum base fee reduction of 85% to all qualified ASP applicants.” Would that be good for everyone? CTU.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE

Thank you, Chair. The difference with the successfully evaluated is a recognition that we currently have 75 completed applications, but they haven’t gone through the evaluation to see whether they will actually get the support as yet. It’s quite conceivable that you end up with fewer than 75 actually getting through the evaluation to get things. That’s why it was saying “to all successfully evaluated” because that process is still ongoing.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, CTU. India, could you live with that? No problem? Thank you so much. Thank you, CTU again. Moving on. Before we move to Part B, any other detail we need to pay attention to in Part A? I see a hand from—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE

Actually, it’s from me.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE

Just a point of clarification because I had, I think, the same question that Nigel had, but ICANN staff has confirmed that the intention is to be able to fund all 75 applications if indeed they are “qualified” at the end of the process. The consistency of qualified here is actually the more accurate one. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay. We’re entering Shakespearean territory here, because to me, successfully evaluated or qualified almost sound like the same. But again, I’m not a native speaker. Again, I just happen to speak a very popular language in Spain and Latin America, which is called Spanish. But I totally trust your suggestions. We stick with qualified then. CTU, are you okay with that? India? Australia? Good. USA? Good. All right.

Moving on then to Part B. Thank you so much. Thank you so much. Please scroll up a little bit.

Part B is Community Applications. The GAC notes that ICANN will decide which vendor will conduct Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) for the Next Round of new gTLDs. We underlined that this decision is very relevant for the correct involvement of communities into the future domain name ecosystem. The GAC requests ICANN ensure—shouldn’t that be to ensure? But anyways. ICANN ensure that the vendor prepares and tests their evaluation processes to ensure a smooth process for community applicants.

Sounds a little bit weird to me, but again, I'm not the expert. I see maybe redundancies. I really think it should say "The GAC requests ICANN to ensure that the vendor prepares and blah, blah, blah." And then maybe we need to do some wordsmithing because I see processes and then process, and it's a little bit confusing. But maybe it's just me. So I'll leave it there. I see a hand from the Netherlands. Marco?

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you. I think on the second sentence, it's very relevant for the correct involvement of communities. I find this sufficiently vague and ambiguous that I have no idea what we're saying here.

The other comment to the same sentence is I prefer to stick to domain name system instead of introducing a whole new concept of domain name ecosystem. But that in turn then also makes me question future. After all, we have a domain name system, so I'm not sure whether there is a future domain name system other than the domain name system we have [inaudible]. Happy to—from the proposers here, more clarification on what the actual second sentence is saying. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Marco. And the floor is open. Let me read it again, just in case. It would say, "The GAC notes that ICANN will decide which vendor will conduct CPE for the Next Round of new gTLDs. We underline that this decision is very relevant for the correct

involvement of communities into the domain name system. The GAC requests ICANN to ensure that the vendor prepares and tests their evaluation processes to ensure a smooth process for community applicants.”

It is still a little bit confusing for me, but I’ll just leave it there. Comments? Australia, please go ahead. Sorry, UK? No, it is Australia indeed. Go ahead.

INGRAM NIBLOCK

Ingram Niblock from Australia. I think we should come back to this. This was some early draft text that still needs some working on, so I think we can skip it for now and come back to it.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay. Thank you. Yes, because it is a little bit confusing, right? Thank you. And the UK. Please, Craig.

CRAIG STANLEY-ADAMSON

Craig Stanley-Adamson, UK GAC. I did just have a suggestion. Obviously, you can take it offline. But to say potentially to make that second sentence make a little more sense that this decision is impactful towards meaningful involvement of communities into something like that. Impactful for meaningful involvement of communities in the domain name system rather than into. But obviously, I wasn’t part of the conversation in building this, but that might bring clarity. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, UK. Moving on. We'll park it here, Australia, in order to move on. Let's read Part C, TLD Application Management System. And it reads, "The GAC appreciates ICANN expedient development of the TLD Application Management System (TAMS) and emphasizes the importance of seamless access to application materials for review by the general public. The GAC calls on ICANN to socialize the TAMS among applicants and GAC members in advance of April 30th to ensure predictability and maximize transparency. The GAC discussed holding a call before ICANN86 during which GAC members have the opportunity to exchange information on their respective approaches to conducting gTLD application reviews. Lastly, the GAC would welcome intersessional opportunities during the GAC early warning period to support for their capacity building and exchanges of views."

I'll stop there in order to see reactions. Netherlands, please, go ahead.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you. Apologies, colleagues, for taking the floor again. While I agree to the GAC calling on ICANN to socialize the TAMS among applicants, I wonder if the second part "and GAC members" is actually necessary in that. In my view, they just did that by presenting it during the session on, I believe, Sunday morning. I'm kind of feeling that we are asking to do it again, which I'm wondering if we want to leave that signal to ICANN Org inciting,

“Let’s try to do this again,” also because if any GAC member is applying, I think we can address them as applicants and not as GAC members. That’s why I would suggest striking “and GAC members” from the part. In your hands, as they say.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Marco. There we go. What do you think? Who was the original drafter of this part of the paragraph? Canada, would you be okay with this?

DAVID BEDARD

Yes, that’s totally fine. Marco, that’s a good editorial suggestion. If others are okay with it, I am as well.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Canada. Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

And either your comment from the GAC supports perspective, the end of the paragraph, “the GAC discussed holding a call before ICANN86 during which,” this sounds like this is wider than the TLD Application Management System. Should this have its own section? I’m just asking the question, it feels to me that’s not just related to the heading of that section, which is TLD Application Management System.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Canada?

DAVID BEDARD

Thanks, Fabien. I certainly see your point. It does seem like it's wider than the—or it's a little bit more broad than the subheading suggests. That portion could possibly be moved to... We could break it out or it could be moved to Readiness since it does touch on readiness. But I also would welcome recommendations or suggestions from colleagues as well.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Canada. That totally makes sense to me. Again, the floor is open. Australia?

IAN SHELDON

I think it would make sense to move it under the Readiness dot point under 6. GAC Readiness for the Next Round of new gTLDs.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

I've moved that paragraph. I mean, those few sentences into the section which is part of internal matters just to clarify and make sure. And I don't know if it affects the text above. We might need to read through it to make sure.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Let's get done with the paragraph we were dealing with before, and then we go back to the other one in order to see if it makes sense.

We were in Part C, if I recall. There we are. “C. TLD Application Management System. The GAC appreciates ICANN’s expedient development of the TLD Application Management System (TAMS) and emphasizes the importance of seamless access to application materials for review by the general public. The GAC calls on ICANN to socialize the TAMS among applicants in advance of 30 April 2026 to ensure predictability and maximize transparency.” Full stop.

Everybody okay with that? And I see nodding. Benedetta?

BENEDETTA ROSSI

Thank you, Nico. I just wanted to ask if this text goes beyond what was already socialized here at ICANN85 since the Next Round Team did do a demo here already for GAC members. I know that GAC members has now been removed from this sentence, but there were also sessions that were directly open for applicants. Is the GAC here asking for something more that wasn’t done already by ICANN Org? Just noting this for further discussions with the Board since there are discussions on the issues of importance to make sure that it’s clear if the ask goes beyond what was already done. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Benedetta. Canada?

DAVID BEDARD

I don’t know if I have a response. I think that it simply recalls what was discussed and what was suggested to the GAC, and it reiterates the importance of socializing the TAMS system with applicants. I’d

be interested to what colleagues have to say, but I don't think it necessarily goes beyond what was articulated within the session, but happy for the discussions.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Canada. Any reaction? Should it stay as it is? Should we change it? Anybody has any different idea at this point? If not, then let's move to the other paragraph, the one we need to read in order to see if it makes sense with the last added paragraph. There's a hand from CTU. Nigel?

NIGEL CASSIMIRE

Yes, it was the previous one. I'm not sure in the last sentence, "30 April, to ensure predictability and maximize transparency." I'm not sure, predictability of what? I didn't quite follow. So I don't know if any clarification might be required there. Or explanation. I can't see.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Nigel. Any idea how we should change it? Any suggestion?

NIGEL CASSIMIRE

Not from me, that's what I'm saying, I'm not sure what the intent was. That's what I'm saying. It's not clear to me, I'm not sure what the intent was, so I'm asking if anyone could clarify.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you. I have the USA next.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Chair. Susan Chalmers, the United States. I believe, if I recall correctly, that the presentation, it was a presentation for informational purposes, I think that the sole purpose of the subsection, what would seem to be 3C is really just to appreciate and recognize the work that ICANN has done. We would be perfectly happy just to recommend deleting that second sentence.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Canada, would you be okay with that?

DAVID BEDARD

Thank you, Chair. And thanks for the suggestion by my colleagues in the U.S. That looks good to me.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Perfect. Thank you so much. Then we end up with one sentence there, which would read, "The GAC appreciates ICANN's expedient development of the TLD Application Management System (TAMS) and emphasizes the importance of seamless access to application materials for review by the general public."

We all agree, right? Anybody against? No problem. Thank you so much. Now back to you, Fabien. And we have Netherlands. Marco, go ahead.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Sorry, Mr. Chairman. To remain on the topic, but feeling where—and I much appreciate that one sentence that was proposed by Canada, but still feeling that we're somehow conflating the actual Application Management System, which is a software application to be used by the respective applicants. And the fact there are application materials, to my point and to emphasize, I do not really see the use of the use or purpose of the TAMS system for the general public. This is a very specific software application that is aimed to let people apply for a TLD. At minimum, I suggest to put a full stop somewhere in between the sentence as to make sure these are two different things. But happy to hear the original proposer's view on this. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. We would read—sorry, Canada?

DAVID BEDARD

Thank you, Chair. I do seem to remember when we were in the session that there was a point made that the general public would be able to review the applications within the system itself, but maybe that's not correct. And if it's not, I'm happy to go with the change that you're suggesting there. I'm also happy to, if folks are

still not happy with this language, we can certainly move on and take this offline.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Canada. I wish I could help you, but unfortunately, I was participating. I was with the Board at the time, so I wasn't there, of course, so there's no way... If anybody can chime in and help here. I have Netherlands. Marco?

MARCO HOGEWONING

To respond to Canada's comment—and I might be to take this offline because I feel that we're entering the "Let's look at the transcript territory"—but I recall asking explicitly what the role was of the TAMS system in reviewing applications. I'm pretty sure I recall ICANN Org explicitly mentioning that the reviews are done via a secondary system, and the TAMS system is strictly for the applicants and processing the applications.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

USA?

SUSAN CHALMERS

Maybe we should proceed as our colleague from the Netherlands suggests and review the transcript. I think, again, one of the more important points here is that we want to make sure that on reveal day, everybody can access the transcripts and review them. If I recall, there was some discussion during that session that there

could be maybe a separate system, as Marco suggested, for the GAC reps or for folks to be able to download. There was a discussion from Martina, if I recall, on being able to download the applications in a machine-readable format. In any event, I think it's just an important point and we should probably take this offline at this point. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, USA. I totally agree. Finally, Fabien, back to you. Let's park this and try to finish the other paragraph.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

On the theme of the Next Round of new gTLD issue, we go to internal matters Subsection 6 on the Readiness for the Next Round, just to stay on the theme and then we'll come back to the other topics.

"GAC Readiness for the Next Round of new gTLDs. The GAC continues its readiness activities in preparation for the Next Round of new gTLDs opening in April 2026. The GAC held two targeted capacity development sessions to prepare GAC members and observers for their review and evaluation of the new gTLD applications. This included the review of a workbook developed by ICANN or to provide foundational understanding of community input, timelines, and actions relevant to GAC members and observers. The GAC continued discussions and drafting of its process for the submission of GAC early warnings, a deliverable

that will be finalized prior to the launch of the Next Round. The GAC discussed holding a call before ICANN86 during which GAC members have the opportunity to exchange information on their respective approaches to conducting gTLD application reviews. Lastly, the GAC would welcome intersessional opportunities during the GAC early warning period to support further capacity building and exchanges of views.”

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you. Australia, shouldn't it be “GAC members had the opportunity?” The last paragraph, I mean, where it says the GAC discussed in the past tense, right? Discussed holding a call before ICANN86 during which GAC members have the opportunity?

IAN SHELTON

Would have.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Would have, right? Or will have. Okay. I have a hand from Switzerland. Jorge?

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. There's an echo. Now the echo is gone. No, it's still there. Shall I try again?

IAN SHELTON

Jorge, we can hear you.

JORGE CANCIO

Okay. On this section, I have a comment. I don't have a wording. But if people are okay with my comment, I can try to insert a wording proposal, which is the following. I think I repeatedly mentioned that the workbook or the materials should include a section with digestible information about the possibilities of using the objections by GAC members. Because now it's only focusing on early warnings and on consensus advice, and objections are another means that can be used by GAC members. But if you just refer to the Applicant Guidebook, it's super overly complicated. I would suggest that we include some wording on that. And if nobody objects, I would try to include a short sentence.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Switzerland. Everybody okay with that? And I see nodding in the room. Please go ahead, Switzerland, and provide some draft text for that part. Is everybody okay with Part 6 with GAC Readiness for the Next Round on new gTLDs? Of course, we're expecting some additional text from Switzerland, but so far so good. Unless anybody tells me otherwise, maybe we can move on and wait for Jorge's text. Is that okay? India, please go ahead.

[SUSHIL PAL]

Just for a clarification, the workbook has been developed or is being developed? Because it is written, "workbook developed."

-
- IAN SHELTON I think it has been developed. Benedetta informs me it should be on the GAC website.
- NICOLAS CABALLERO India, if I understand correctly, you want to change that from the past tense to “have been developed” or something like that? It’s fine as it is, right? Okay. One last read, Ian, before we move on, just to make sure we’re on the same page.
- IAN SHELTON Maybe we can come back and give Jorge time so he’s not under pressure drafting with everybody watching him. Do you want to come back to this section?
- NICOLAS CABALLERO Fabien, over to you.
- FABIEN BETREMIEUX We certainly have text to review in the issue of importance and we could go to Subsection 2, for instance, on DNS Abuse. For the last— noting that we have 20 minutes left in this session.
- NICOLAS CABALLERO Okay. Let’s try to invest the remaining 20 minutes on this text on DNS abuse mitigation, which would read, “The GAC reiterates its commitment to cooperate with the ICANN community through policy development and capacity building to make progress on

addressing DNS abuse. During the ICANN85 DNS Abuse session, the GAC welcomed a presentation by the host country, ccTLD.in, on its policies to prevent DNS abuse, as well as a trusted notifier network, not for profit organization focused on facilitating and operationalizing trusted notifier programs.”

“GAC members participated in the inaugural meetings of the GNSO policy development process on associated domain checks contributing to initial discussions on its timeline and methodology. The GAC considers that this PDP starts with a positive outlook. The GAC favors shortening the overall timeline of the work and encourages the GNSO Council and ICANN Org to regularly assess whether project milestones are being achieved. The GAC expects that the PDP’s narrow scope will yield rapid results so that the PDP can be treated as a blueprint for effective policy development at ICANN going forward.”

“Concerning future work on DNS abuse beyond PDP 2, safeguards for Application Programming Interface or API, access to new customers, and a coordination mechanism for combating domain generation algorithm, botnet attacks. The GAC recalls the importance of also addressing the other critical gaps identified in the issue report and notably concerning transparency of reporting under use of predictive algorithms for early detection and subdomain abuse. The GAC further highlights the importance of preventive measures identified under Priority 2 and Priority 3 (P2

and P3), particularly reducing the time for registrant contact verification.”

If you can scroll up a little bit please. “The GAC expresses it’s strong interest in engaging further with the Board and the contracted parties on how to address in a swift and effective manner the need to preferably complete validation and verification steps of registrant contact information before a newly registered domain name can become accessible through the DNS or at least significantly shorten or eliminate the 15 days verification window for registrant contact information. This could be achieved, for example, through contract amendments.”

“The GAC also encourages ICANN to explore the establishment of a centralized reporting mechanism managed by ICANN for the periodic reporting of DNS abuse complaints received by registrars and registries, including the number of complaints and actions taken. Such reporting would help provide a clearer understanding of abuse trends, improve transparency, and support more effective policy responses.”

“Finally, the GAC recognizes the importance of voluntary collaborative initiatives on DNS abuse mitigation practices beyond ICANN’s remit, given their flexibility in addressing real-world issues and encourages the community on a voluntary basis to continue exploring paths for such collaboration in the context of trusted notifier schemes.”

Apparently, I skipped a paragraph. Scroll up a little bit. Sorry, I skipped a paragraph over there. Right after contact verification, “The GAC welcomes the indication from the GNSO Council that a methodology is under development for further assessment and prioritization of these gaps. The GAC would appreciate further details from the GNSO Council on this methodology and the next steps for this work.”

I’ll stop there. I don’t need to read the rest because I’ve already read it. Let’s scroll down a little bit in order to see if we have reactions so far. I have the USA and then Portugal. USA, please.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to say that this text is—while we’re always drafting by committee here, but this text was informed by four different governments, that’s why it is a bit robust. And I’d be happy, given the attention that’s been paid by so many governments during this meeting to the topic of DNS abuse, to kind of walk through and give the cliff’s notes of this text. I’m happy to do that if there is a desire for that. But for present purposes, I might just suggest two commas.

If we could scroll down a wee bit. I think it was in the paragraph that had an “and notably”. There we go. If we could just scooch up a little bit. Thank you. Maybe a comma after “in the issue report” or we could just... There we go. And delete “and”. Though I’m sure

that is not perfect, but just for the... I would suggest deleting “and” but I think it could use some more tweaking.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, USA. I have the same impression for the—I mean, two paragraphs below, I have the same impression. The one that reads, “The GAC expresses its strong interest and blah, blah, blah,” way too long as well. Maybe we need a couple of commas there. Let me try to read that.

“The GAC expresses its strong interest in engaging further with the Board and the contracted parties on how to address in a swift and effective manner the need to preferably complete validation and verification steps of registrant contact information before newly...” Jesus Christ, way too long. But again, I’m in your hands. I’m not the expert here, but I feel that we need somehow some sort of way of stopping there just to be able to breathe at least. Well, I have the USA, then Portugal, and then the UK. US, the floor is yours.

SUSAN CHALMERS

That’s an old hand.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Sorry. Portugal?

ANA NEVES

Well, my first comment and my main comment goes, for the time being, for the first paragraph. Well, waiting this point among the

others of our Communiqué, I think this is really robust, as Susan mentioned. But I think that perhaps part of it could go to the minutes and the other part that we really want to emphasize to be here in the Communiqué. Well, nevertheless, my main point for the time being is maybe to make it more clear that in the GAC, we are discussing the DNS abuse mainly for the gTLDs, and not exactly for the ccTLD. Because this will be made public, I think that it was a very good presentation, and of course we need that, and it's important for the GAC to have these kind of national presentations. But I wonder if we could make a distinction that it was for informative purpose and not really for GAC advice. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Portugal. Where exactly would you like to include that? In the first paragraph as well?

ANA NEVES

Not strong feelings. I'm just raising this point that it seems like GAC is supposed to give advice on ccTLDs, DNS abuse. And what we are discussing here is the DNS abuse for the gTLDs. To make it clear, otherwise, as this is for public purposes, and it will be made available everywhere—well, it will be posted. I think it will be important to this thing that GAC is not discussing and not giving advice for the ccTLDs DNS abuse. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Portugal. I have the UK next.

CRAIG STANLEY-ADAMSON

Thank you. Going back down to that very long sentence paragraph that you're referring to, Nico. Line four, just as a proposal, after DNS, try to full stop. And then "as a minimum, there is a need to" and then strike out, "or at least." Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, UK. I have the European Commission next.

MARTINA BARBERO

Thank you very much, Nico. Also expressing my apologies for the length of the text. We always strive for conciseness and we never get exactly where we want to be. Maybe just to explain a bit for the first paragraph because the convention in the Communiqué is to acknowledge we always invite the ccTLD or in any event, the host country to suggest a speaker on DNS abuse, and we normally have the ccTLDs coming. We just basically, as a convention, acknowledge this presentation. We try to keep it as short as possible not to add too many words to what this presentation was really covering because that's what we've been doing in the last few Communiqués.

The idea is not really to say that we are going to cover ccTLD's matter but rather to acknowledge that we received this interesting presentation. It's basically a convention. I mean, if needs to go to the minutes that's changing the Communiqué convention, which is fine, I just wanted to let everybody know that this was an act of

respect towards the host country that we've been doing since I've been around, at least the last three years that I recall.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, European Commission. Portugal, would you like to say anything in that regard?

ANA NEVES

Yes. My point is that we start the paragraph with "The GAC reiterates its commitment to cooperate with ICANN community through policy development and capacity building to make progress on addressing DNS abuse." And then "GAC welcomed the presentation..."

I think that the connection that is made in that paragraph is not perfect or it's not ideal. It's not ideal, that's what I want to say. Because it seems like GAC is discussing the DNS abuse policy for the ccTLD so it's my only concern otherwise to state that we have this presentation. Of course, it's very good. But what I want is not to have any misunderstanding. Well, I'm saying that because I had some discussions a few months ago about what is the discussions in the GAC about the DNS abuse. That's why I'm raising these concerns, to make it clear that we are not giving advice to DNS abuse, to the ccTLDs.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Portugal.

ANA NEVES

But I will not make a case from this.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

You don't have any hard feelings in this. Thank you, Portugal. I have India next.

[SUSHIL PAL]

Just to inform the Portugal that I think in the 84th session as well, you have a similar text from the Dublin Communiqué. In more ways, only a welcoming thing. Not even saying that GAC would take learning from this and implement that. It doesn't... Otherwise, just for the sake of transparency, I would read that in a session gap will come a presentation by the host country ccTLD .ie, which was, I understand, Ireland, on designing effective policy as well as TWNIC and .asia on their innovative trusted notifier network. I think it's a standard practice. I mean, part of the capacity building as I've—

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, India. I have the USA next.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Chair. How do my colleagues feel if we move the first sentence to be the first sentence of the presently third paragraph? Just trying to respond to, Ana, your point.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, USA. Portugal?

ANA NEVES

Well, I think that's because we are using standard language that I had that discussion about [inaudible]. Maybe it's the time to improve the language, not to have any misunderstandings. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Portugal. Indeed, that's what we're here for. No problem. We'll continue doing lots of wordsmithing. I have the Netherlands next.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am commenting on another part. Sorry to walk you back. The last sentence of the first paragraph, it talks about trusted notifier network and then says a not-for-profit organization. In my understanding, a trusted notifier network is not an organization as such, but could be a network of several organizations and then be there not-for-profit, I sense to understand there might also be for-profit organizations that can act as a trusted notifier. My suggestion is we revise that at some point to get clarity on what we're saying here.

IAN SHELDON

Marco, that's the name of their organization.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

I have USA next.

SUSAN CHALMERS

I was just going to say, Marco, we understand your point but that is the name of the organization. It's kind of like how "Hand me a band-aid," the brand name is Band-Aid.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Sorry. Maybe to clarify say the Indian trusted notifier network to avoid any confusion with other trusted notifier networks.

IAN SHELDON

Let's take this offline. But I think the text as it is is reasonably clear that TNN is an organization. I think they're incorporated in Hong Kong if I had to pick but they're separate to the presentation from our host country.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay. That's all we have time for. Let's park it here. Let's take this offline. Let's come back tomorrow with a fresh mind, some extra good Indian coffee, and we'll take it from there if everybody agrees. Because we're already out of time.

Thank you so very much. Just let me give you some housekeeping comments for tomorrow. Basically, we need to be here at 9:00 for the meeting with the IETF. Let's wrap up here. Anything you would

like to add at this point? No? Okay. Thank you so much. I'll see you tomorrow.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]