
ICANN86 Seville | PF – GAC Communique Drafting (1 of 5)
Wednesday, June 10, 2026 – 14:45 to 16:00 CEST

NICOLÁS CABALLERO Okay. Welcome back, everyone. Please take your seats. We're starting the first Communiqué Drafting session. Julia, please go ahead with the recording.

JULIA CHARVOLEN Welcome to the ICANN86 GAC Communiqué Session Drafting on Wednesday, 10 June, at 14:45 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, speak clearly at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation, and please make sure to mute all other devices when you're speaking. And with that, I will leave the floor to GAC chair, Nico Caballero. Over to you. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO Thank you so much, Julia. I would kindly ask you to turn the screens on. We have no screens. There we go. Okay. Perfect. Thank you so much.

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.

So, welcome back, everyone. I hope you enjoyed your lunch and your coffee. We will need some coffee in order to have a very interactive first Communiqué Drafting session. Again, we will try to make it as interactive as possible in order to avoid any kind of boring situation for you. So, in that regard, Benedetta, let me give you the floor at this point in order to walk us through the parts of the Communiqué for which we already have text. Please go ahead.

BENEDETTA ROSSI

Thank you very much, Nico. In terms of text that we already have, if we just start scrolling slowly. Thank you, Gulsten. So, we have, as we reviewed yesterday, the Section 2 Inter-Constituency Activities, the meeting with the Board, where it includes the topics which were discussed, as well as the Cross-Community Discussions. And then we have text that hasn't been read under three internal matters.

There's GAC elections, which refers to the sessions that were discussed this morning on the GAC chair election and the special vice-chair election, and those have not been read. And then number three is the GAC working groups. We've got text from the PSWG, and then GAC operational matters on the Operating Principles, the motion that took place yesterday. New text that we hadn't seen yesterday is Section 5, the High-Level Government Meeting and Capacity Development that was submitted by topic leads.

Then it takes us to Issues of Importance, where yesterday we began the review of the section on Review of Reviews, and there's been

edits overnight. Switzerland had mentioned submitting some text. I see that Manal has also tweaked the language since this was reviewed yesterday. So, maybe that could be a good place, potentially, to begin.

We are still waiting on DNS abuse mitigation text and domain name registration data. We know that this is under discussion, so we should be receiving it. We're also expecting something on Applicant Support. I know that the topic leads are still working on that, still under Issues of Importance. And we don't know anything about GAC advice as of yet.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Perfect. So, what would be your recommendation at this point, Benedetta? You mentioned the Section 4.1. Is that what you mentioned?

BENEDETTA ROSSI

Yeah. I think it would be good to start from the Review of Reviews, if that makes sense. Maybe you can see if you can finalize it after the review yesterday.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Perfect. So, let's start right there. So, this would be Section 4.1, right? Okay. And the way we read this is going to be the traditional way, traditional for the last three years, I would say, or at least during my tenure, in which we give active participation to our distinguished vice-chairs, no matter where they are sitting. I'm

looking at some of them over there, yes, and two over here. So we're good, we're good, we're good. So I'll start reading, and then I'll pass it over to one of the vice-chairs in order to take turns, as we usually do, and in order to avoid any kind of boring situation because you might get bored of my voice at any given point. So I'll start reading Review of Reviews.

The GAC welcomed the update on the Draft Initial Report on a refreshed system of reviews from the co-chairs of the Review of Reviews Cross-Community Group (CCG). The GAC takes note of the current proposal for Cadenced and On-Demand Reviews and the CCG's proposed definition to the effect that "the purpose of reviews is to assess whether ICANN is fulfilling its Mission, Commitments, and Core Values as set out in the ICANN Articles and Bylaws in a transparent and accountable manner.

I would assume that we need to close the quotation marks here, but again that's just an editorial observation. So I'll continue.

The GAC intends to continue its participation in the CCG and reiterates its special interest in the topics highlighted or indicated—we need to decide that—in the ICANN85 Mumbai Communiqué. In that context, the GAC wishes to—and again, we need to decide what word goes there—[highlighted] it's viewed that critical reviews that are fundamental to ICANN's Core Mission, particularly the Security, Stability and Resiliency (SSR) Review must be explicitly catered for in any revised review framework with a binding commitment to regular predictable cycles.

The CCG's proposal should be consistent with a form-follows-function approach as highlighted previously by the GAC, considering whether distinct reviews on the fulfillment of the mission and goals of ICANN (the suggested Accountability and Transparency Review) and on its organization to achieve such goals (the suggested Structural Review) are really warranted or whether one single type of review for functional and organizational aspects could be a better fit, ensuring that the final proposal does not create duplications and unnecessary use of resources; and the CCG's proposal should include an estimate of the expected workload of all proposed reviews in a single timeline to enable the community to consider practical feasibility of the proposal.

Let me look at the interpreters in order to see if we're okay in terms of speed. Give me thumbs up or down. Are we okay? Show me. Thumbs up? More or less, more or less? Okay. I'll try to slow down a little bit.

Okay. As you can see, there's lots of wordsmithing needed here. I'll pause in order to see, on the one hand, if we can clean up this part of the text, and on the other hand, to see if there are comments or edits from the floor. I'll pause here.

All right. So we're just checking a couple of editorial details like the quotation marks. The important thing here is the second bullet. Does everybody agree? Does anybody have a better idea on how to phrase this? Or it's okay as it is? Whatever edits you might want to add, this is a good moment to say so. Let me pause again in order

to see. Okay. I have a hand from the European Commission. Please go ahead, Gemma.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you very much, Nico. Just there is full agreement with the proposal, just I think a very small editorial consideration. Because we are saying at the end, “Ensuring that the final proposal does not create duplications and unnecessary use of resources,” and then we stop. Oh no, we continue further down. Okay. Sorry. Because with the track changes is not entirely clear. So now reading again the text, I think it flows. Thank you. Sorry.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

No problem. Thank you so much, European Commission. As a matter of fact, Benedetta, can we please clean up the text? Okay. So that everybody can see in a clearer way. So there you have it. No need to read it again. So in case you have any kind of edits or suggestions, please raise your hand and we’ll do it until we’re all happy with the paragraph. Again, I’ll pause here in order to see if it’s okay for everyone.

Another thing we need to decide is which word to use, “highlighted” or “indicated”. I hope there will be no strong feelings in that regard. So, should we leave “highlighted” or “indicated”? I have Egypt. Please go ahead.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you, Nico. Can you hear me?

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Yes, loud and clear.

MANAL ISMAIL

Okay. Just to explain why I tried to propose “indicated”. Because yesterday European Commission noticed that there is two highlighted in one sentence, so we were just trying to find an alternative. But no strong feelings. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, Egypt. Thank you for the clarification. Yes, you’re right. Because the next sentence would read after the period. Where we would read in that context, the GAC wishes to highlight again. So yeah, maybe we should just leave indicated in the first place, and then highlight right afterwards. Would everybody agree with that? I see nodding, not a big issue. So, okay. So there we go. Indicated will be the first one, Benedetta, and highlight would be the second. Thank you.

Well, as you can see, that final part of the second bullet was proposed by Argentina. Thank you so much, Argentina, for that. I’m not going to read the whole thing. I’ll just read that last part.

After the suggested Structural Review, and then it would read: are really warranted or whether one single type of review for functional

and organizational aspects could be a better fit, ensuring that the final proposal avoids duplications. Full stop.

Are we okay? Okay. I see nodding. All right. Back to you, Benedetta. Please walk us through.

BENEDETTA ROSSI

Thank you very much, Nico. So I think this finalizes this section for the moment if there aren't any more comments. I don't see any in the in the chat, and there aren't any hands. Sorry? Jamaica?

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Jamaica, please go ahead. Wahkeen, right?

WAHKEEN MURRAY

Yes. There is a duplication in that same line where the cursor is. You have two "the," and that's just it.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Jamaica. Good catch. Moving on, Benedetta.

BENEDETTA ROSSI

Thank you, Nico. Just to clarify, we're awaiting text, therefore, on the DNS abuse mitigation and domain name registration data. Is there a timing? Not yet. Okay. Perfect. And then we're also waiting for topic leads to agree on Applicant Support text as well under Issues of Importance. That concludes the substantive sort of

elements of the Communiqué for now. So, if you would like to maybe go back up.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Let's go right at the beginning in order to take it from there, given the fact that the potentially controversial parts have been already covered, unless of course you tell me otherwise. So let's go to Section 1. For this, I will kindly ask my distinguished colleague from the Netherlands to help me with the reading. Marco, over to you.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, colleagues. So, running from Section 1, the Introduction, and I guess this is all boilerplate text so I'll move quickly.

The Government Advisory Committee of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers met in Seville, Spain, in a hybrid setting from 8 to 11 June.

We, and I trust staff, will do the head count and we will mention how many members there are and observers who attended the meeting.

The GAC meeting was conducted as part of ICANN86 Policy Forum. All GAC plenary and working group sessions were conducted as open meetings.

We see a short footnote there to previous GAC advice and the previous communiqués. That's just a reference to our general GAC website. Unless I see anybody, moving on.

The Inter-Constituency Activities And Community Engagement. As a quick reminder to everybody in this section, we simply list sort of the agenda so we do not go in-depth into substantive comments. The meeting with the ICANN Board, you were all here. The GAC met with the ICANN Board and discussed the New gTLD Program, the 2026 Round and Applicant Support Program. We discussed gTLD Registration Data, the GAC Engagement on the RIR Governance Documents, Systemic Risks of Arbitrary, Non-Standardized, DNS-Layer and Geo-Blocking by Private Service Providers and the Resulting Internet Fragmentation.

The Cross-Community Discussions on a second heading. GAC members participated in relevant cross-community sessions scheduled as part of ICANN86, including current and coming impact of artificial intelligence on DNS abuse and feasibility of a platform for ASP-supported new gTLDs.

I'll pause here, Mr. Chairman, and I also have a question for you. Is this the point where I should reference that I participated this morning in a session with the At-Large community about their preparations for the Next Round, the same point where we added?

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Exactly. Thank you so much, Netherlands. I was going to mention exactly that. Would you like to go ahead with that now, or we leave it for a little bit later? Whatever you prefer is okay, we can continue reading or we can include it here.

MARCO HOGEWONING

I can continue reading. We'll edit afterwards. Probably not a good point in going wordsmithing and dictation right now. So, if you allow me to continue the section of internal matters—and I need a bit of guidance from staff which part we have already touched upon and which parts are new.

BENEDETTA ROSSI

Thank you, Marco. We've read the GAC Memberships, number one, and then we read 2a, so the GAC Chair Election, and we hadn't gone to the b, so Special Vice-Chair Election. So you want to resume there.

MARCO HOGEWONING

As requested, resuming on Section 2b, the Special Vice-Chair Election.

The GAC noted that a special election process will be conducted following ICANN86 to fill the vice-chair position that will become vacant upon the commencement of Ian Sheldon's term as GAC chair. The individual elected through this process will serve the

remainder of the vice-chair term ending at the close of the ICANN90 meeting.

I'll stop here.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Yes. I think we should include right after “Ian Sheldon’s” (in Australia) as we normally do, but I stand to be corrected because we usually include the name of the country. Is that so, Benedetta?

BENEDETTA ROSSI

I believe so, but I’m not sure just for the GAC chair since the GAC chair is not necessarily representing the country.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Good point, good point. You’re right. Okay. So it’s just a minor edit. Not the end of the world, but yeah. I just wanted to somehow refer to the fact that that position is basically or should basically—I don’t know how to say it, but would correspond to the Asia Pacific region. But I don’t know how to frame it. Because at the end of the day, it is not mandatory for the position to be filled by somebody from the APAC region. It would be ideal, of course, but depending on the situation, if somebody from, I don’t know, South America or Africa gets elected, it’s okay as well. Again, just a minor edit. Netherlands, back to you.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you. May I suggest for clarity that at the close of the ICANN90 meeting, I see online that's currently scheduled for October 2027, yes, to maybe mention that explicitly, so this term ending in October or November 2027, whether we take the start or the end of the meeting. While staff is preparing to make that addition, again, I can start reading the PSWG text.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Hold on. Just one second. Thank you again, Netherlands. That was another very good catch. Thank you for that. October 27 then it is. Do you think we should include anything as regarding the vice-chair position and the region and the potential reference to the region? Do you think that would be necessary or we leave it as it is? Portugal?

ANA NEVES

Well, not to confuse anyone, I think that it will be explicit that it will be someone from the Asia Pacific region. Otherwise, there will be an imbalance in the leadership.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Okay. Thank you, Portugal. Netherlands, and then I have Australia.

MARCO HOGEWONING

I would advise against it because there is also the argument being it could be made that switch your departure as the GAC chair, the leadership no longer has representation from the Americas. So,

given that the Operating Principles do not, although it encourages diversity, is that it does not require it. So, my preference, speaking as the Netherlands, would be to keep it simple, stupid, and just leave it as is.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO Thank you, Netherlands. Switzerland?

JORGE CANCIO I agree with Marco.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO Thank you. Australia, were you going to say anything? No? You're okay? Okay. So I see agreement in terms of not explicitly referring to the region. All right, no problem. That's an old hand, Switzerland, right? Okay. So moving on. Back to you, please, Netherlands. Could you please continue reading?

MARCO HOGEWONING Benedetta, quick reminder, what have we touched and what we haven't touched yet?

BENEDETTA ROSSI The GAC Public Safety Working Group text hasn't been read yet, so you could continue there.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Okay. Then I'll continue there. Thank you. Continuing then in Section 3, the text submitted, I assume, by the GAC Public Safety Working Group, otherwise known as the PSWG.

The GAC PSWG continued its work to advocate for improved measures to combat DNS abuse and promote lawful, effective access to domain name registration data. The PSWG contributed to the GAC sessions pertaining to DNS abuse and registration data issues, and the GAC bilateral meeting with the ICANN Board. The PSWG also participated in panel discussions, including regarding current and coming impact of artificial intelligence on DNS abuse. Finally, and alongside GAC Members, the PSWG engaged with community stakeholders in meetings of the GNSO Policy Development Process Working Group on Associated Domain Checks and in the Implementation Review Team for Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues. Full stop.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, Netherlands. So, let's pause here in order to see if there are reactions online or in the room. I'll give you some time to reread it.

All right, seeing no hands online or in the room, let's move on with Section 4 which is GAC Operational Matters. For that matter, speaking of, I'll give the floor to Switzerland. Jorge, please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. So we are continuing with our reading contest.

GAC Operational Matters. Pursuant to GAC Operating Principle 53, GAC members agreed on a proposal to proceed with the process to revise the GAC Operating Principles regarding a set of administrative updates intended to improve clarity, consistency, and alignment with current GAC practices and references. GAC members in attendance agreed to initiate the formal revision process for the proposed amendments previously reviewed by the GAC Operating Principles Evolution Working Group (GOPE WG) and circulated to the broader GAC membership for consideration. Consistent with the GAC Operating Principles, the proposed revisions will now be subject to a 60-day consultation period. The committee plans to make a final decision regarding the proposed amendments during the GAC meeting at ICANN87. During the consultation period, GAC Members and Observers will have an opportunity to review the proposed revisions and provide comments for consideration.

I'll pause here in case there are comments, observations, corrections.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

There's a hand from the UK. UK, please go ahead.

CRAIG STANLEY-ADAMSON

Thank you. Craig Stanley-Adamson, UK GAC, for the record. I wonder, in the first sentence after the first comma, whether we

might want to refer to the fact that this has not been updated for quite some time. Maybe we risk setting a precedent that we are going to update this on a regular basis, which is not what we're going to do, so maybe it should be comma, noting it has not been updated since X date, and then continue the sentence. Just to clarify as a suggestion. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Yes, indeed, very good idea, unless anybody has any kind of strong feelings against, which I doubt will be the case. But yes, very good idea, UK. Can you repeat what you would include there? Noting—

CRAIG STANLEY-ADAMSON

It would be actually further up, so after pursuant to GAC Operating Principle 53, noting—

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Slow down a little bit, please, in order to give Benedetta time to... Thank you, Craig. Please go ahead.

CRAIG STANLEY-ADAMSON

I'm not precious on the wording, but maybe sort of noting it has not been updated since X date. I'm not sure when that date might be. And then comma at the end, followed by GAC members agreed, etc.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Australia, please go ahead.

IAN SHELDON From memory, I believe we updated these quite recently for the term limits. We concluded those.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO How long ago was that?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE Two years.

IAN SHELDON I'm not sure. I mean, I can appreciate the UK's point, but I think it has been quite recently that we had updated them. We were going through this process, and then we kind of stepped aside and did the chair and the vice-chair limits, and then we're moving back to the broader administrative changes that we were doing.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO You're right. Yes. Thank you. Good catch, Australia. But thank you anyways, UK, for the suggestion. You're right, it was June last year, right? So, a year ago. Not sure we should. All right, but thank you again, UK. Egypt, please go ahead.

MANAL ISMAIL Thank you, Nico. No, it's okay. I was going to say the same as Ian. Because we have done three very specific changes but we have never reviewed the Operating Principles overall. So we have added

five vice-chairs, we have allowed online voting, and we have modified the terms of the chairs and vice-chairs. So things that were very specific, but we have never reviewed the Operating Principles overall. So it would be hard really to specify when we last reviewed the Operating Principles. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you so very much, Egypt. Greatly appreciated. Okay, moving on for topic number five which is High-Level Government Meeting. I will kindly ask our distinguished colleague from Lebanon to help us with the reading. Zeina, please.

ZEINA BOU HARB

5. High-Level Government Meeting. Following ICANN's decision to relocate the ICANN87 Annual General Meeting, High-Level Government Meeting (HLGM) discussions will continue with planning activities resuming as soon as a host country for the next HLGM is identified. The GAC expresses its sincere appreciation to the Sultanate of Oman and its Telecommunications Regulatory Authority for their interest, commitment, and efforts to organize an HLGM during the initially scheduled Muscat meeting.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Lebanon. We'll pause here again in order to see reactions. All right, seeing no hands online or in the room, let me give the floor back to Switzerland in order to walk us through the Capacity Development section. Over to you, Jorge.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. Capacity Development. The GAC held Comprehensive Capacity Development sessions during ICANN86, focusing on the 2026 Round of the New gTLD Program. The session commenced with a status update on the application process, detailing key upcoming milestones, including Reveal Day and String Confirmation Day. Participants deepened their understanding of evaluation stages and community input mechanisms, including the Application Comment Forum, objections, GAC Early Warnings and GAC Advice. Do I continue?

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Yes, please.

JORGE CANCIO

Participants then engaged in small breakout groups on these topics, exploring key 2026 deadlines for GAC Early Warnings, pathways from Early Warnings to GAC Advice, Communiqué drafting considerations, while also exchanging national government approaches to preparing for the Next Round. This was followed by a wrap-up plenary, where speakers reported their findings back to the GAC. The outcomes of the sessions will be used to guide future actions by the GAC in regard to the New gTLD Program.

The GAC extends its sincere gratitude to all participants and organizers, and particularly recognizes the significant

contributions of the GAC Underserved Regions Working Group, GAC leadership, topic leads, and GAC support staff in developing and organizing the sessions.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, Switzerland. Let's pause here again. This is a little bit longer. So maybe—and just maybe—some wordsmithing might be needed. I'm just saying. I'm not pushing you. But if everybody's okay with it, let's pause here so that you can read it. Switzerland?

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. This is under Internal Matters, right? I'm not sure whether thanking ourselves is—I don't know if that is fitting with the current practice. But maybe we can take a rain check on that and look into whether we do this normally. Because I know we thank other parts of the community, but thanking ourselves is a bit of self-serving in a way.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you. I didn't think about it that way. You're right. I thought we were thanking other community members. But yes, you have a very good point there. Thank you. Another good catch, Switzerland. So, let's just erase that part, unless again anybody says otherwise. I see no hands. Okay. So let's just erase that part. Thank you, Benedetta. We have Colombia. Go ahead.

THIAGO DAL-TOE

Thank you, Nico. Just a question. When we mention the methods of participation, applicant comments, objections, GAC Early Warning, should we say GAC Consensus Advice? Isn't that the way we generally refer to? Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Colombia. Another good catch. Greatly appreciated. Yes, we normally refer to Consensus Advice. Okay. So there it is. Any other edit or comment? Netherlands?

MARCO HOGEWONING

Small editorial, but should we capitalize the O of objections, giving all the other ones are capitalized?

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you very much. I have the UK, and then Spain.

CRAIG STANLEY-ADAMSON

Thank you. I'll just glance at this, but maybe we also, before the final sentence or after the final sentence, endeavor to continue to do this capacity building going forward. But the GAC endeavors to continue these sessions at the next meeting, potentially.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Before I give the floor to Spain, I do have a little issue with that because we will be repeating GAC three times like in the last part of

the paragraph. Because it would read, “This was followed by a wrap-up plenary where speakers reported their findings back to the GAC. The outcomes of the sessions will be used to guide future actions by the GAC”—again—“in regard to the New gTLD Program. The GAC endeavors to continue...” It’s a little bit repetitive. But maybe it’s just me. I’m not the Shakespearean native speaker here, but I would revert back to you, Craig.

CRAIG STANLEY-ADAMSON

Essentially, the final sentence that’s in the black print, we could start with “the GAC endeavors to continue the sessions in the next meeting, and the outcomes of the sessions will be used, etc.”

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, Craig. In the purest Nigel Hickson spirit, by all means. Okay. There we have it. So I’m not going to read the whole thing. So, Benedetta, let’s just erase that part and we’ll go ahead with... There we go. Okay. Yeah, it looks way better now. Thank you so much for that. Spain, please.

IÑAKI GIL OSÉS

It’s just a small minor.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Iñaki, could you please speak closer to the microphone?

IÑAKI GIL OSÉS

Yes, sure. A small minor editorial in the second paragraph at the beginning of the fourth line. Next Round, if the round has already started, shouldn't be the current round or the 2026 Round? Are we talking of still another round in the future or to the current round? That's it.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you for that, Spain. Yes, the current round, so 2026. Okay. I have Trinidad and Tobago.

KAREL DOUGLAS

Thank you, Nico. Karel Douglas for Trinidad and Tobago. A very slight or minor change on the second paragraph where it reads, the third line, "while also exchanging national government approaches to preparing," I would say in preparation of or for. That's it. Thanks.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Okay. Thank you very much, Trinidad and Tobago. I have Egypt next.

MANAL ISMAIL

Just to say that when we moved the last sentence to avoid the repetition, we kept GAC twice, so I thought the move was to move one or both, right?

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

You're right, Egypt. We have three, as a matter of fact. Now we have only two. How do we work it out? I'm looking at my distinguished colleague from the UK, not to put you on the spot, but anybody? Should we leave it as it is, or anybody has a better idea? We have Manal. Egypt, go ahead, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL

I thought the proposal was to move the sentence, and then it will read, "and the outcomes of the sessions will be used to guide future actions in regard to the next gTLD Program." So just dropping "by the GAC" as we already have "the GAC" at the beginning.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Egypt. Netherlands?

MARCO HOGEWONING

In similar fashion, I was going to suggest this was followed by a plenary where speakers reported their findings back. I think we can stop there. It doesn't necessarily need to say to the GAC.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

So full stop after "findings," right?

MARCO HOGEWONING

Full stop after "reported their findings back".

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Okay. Thank you so much for your contributions. Switzerland, would you be so kind as to read the second paragraph only in order to see if we are in agreement?

JORGE CANCIO

Sure. So it reads now, “Participants then engaged in small breakout groups on these topics, exploring key 2026 deadlines for GAC Early Warnings, pathways from Early Warnings to GAC Consensus Advice, Communiqué drafting considerations while also exchanging national government approaches in preparation for the 2026 Round. This was followed by a wrap-up plenary where speakers reported their findings back. The GAC endeavors to continue these sessions at the next meeting and the outcomes of the sessions will be used to guide future actions in regard to the New gTLD Program.”

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Perfect. So, there it is. Thank you very much, Switzerland. Seeing no hand. Oh, there are two hands, as a matter of fact. Trinidad and Tobago and Jamaica. Karel, please.

KAREL DOUGLAS

Yes, Nico. Thank you. Just to say you don’t have to say back at the end of the second sentence. I think it would be understood, unless you say back to something, back to the committee. So either remove it or add back to the committee. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Trinidad and Tobago. Jamaica?

WAHKEEN MURRAY

With respect to the very last line, “where we reference the outcomes of the sessions will be used to guide future actions,” which sessions are we speaking to? The session we had or the sessions we are going to have?

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Jamaica. I would assume that if it says the outcomes is referred to something that has already happened, but again I’m not the native speaker here. I just happen to speak a very popular language in this country that is called Spanish, so not much I can do.

WAHKEEN MURRAY

Right. If we’re talking about the session we had here, then it becomes ambiguous. We would have to reference the sessions earlier or say that the GAC endeavors to continue these sessions at the next meeting. And the outcomes of these sessions, if we’re intending it to be futurist, to be something in the future, will be used to guide future actions. Otherwise, we’ll have to probably flip the sentence so that we’re saying that the outcomes of the sessions we had during this meeting will guide future actions. I hope I’m clear.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO I'm a little bit confused. But anyways, I have the UK, and then Trinidad and Tobago. Craig?

CRAIG STANLEY-ADAMSON Thank you. Just to pick up on this last comment, I very much see the point. This could work or we could say all sessions. All sessions, basically, related to this. The outcomes of all sessions will be used to guide actions. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO Thank you very much again, UK. Trinidad and Tobago?

KAREL DOUGLAS I was going to say as well, I would recommend you remove the second sessions since it's understood. So that would, to me, solve the problem. So, GAC endeavors to continue these sessions at the next meeting and the outcomes—where we just put these—will be used to guide future actions.

So we don't have to repeat sessions. Just say the outcomes. And we understood and know it refers to the sessions coming out. So you don't need to repeat sessions again. So I hope that would solve.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO That sounds good to me. Are we okay with that? I see nodding from Jamaica and more nodding in the room. Okay. So there it is. This is

where we are. Can you clean up? Okay. Thank you so much, Benedetta. Okay. So I'll just read that last sentence for the sake of clarity.

The GAC endeavors to continue these sessions at the next meeting and the outcomes will be used to guide future actions in regard to the New gTLD Program. Full stop.

Are we okay with that? Show me some nodding, some thumbs up, or something. Okay. Thank you so much. Moving on, Benedetta. Back to you.

BENEDETTA ROSSI

That brings us to the end of the text that we've received so far. If we go back up really quickly, we just have under the Cross-Community Discussions, I see that Marco has added the language on the leadership joining an At-Large session. But so far that's the only additional text that we've received. We're still waiting on topic leads for DNS abuse and registration data and Applicant Support.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Again, in Section 2, right at the end, under Cross-Community Discussions, I assume we didn't read that part. So, Netherlands, would you please go ahead with that?

MARCO HOGEWONING

Yes. As I just mentioned, and I had to look up the actual title of that session, but this morning, representing the GAC leadership, I was

there. So the GAC leadership was invited to participate in a session of the At-Large community. And I think we can remove the word session there. Thank you. Some of my typo.

The GAC leadership was invited to participate in a session of the At-Large community on Preparation for the Next Round, Comments, Objections and Community Engagement.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Okay. Thank you, Netherlands. Should we leave Next Round or should we write Next Round of gTLDs? Again, not a big thing. Netherlands?

MARCO HOGEWONING

Please keep it because this was taken from the agenda of the ALAC, I think. Let's not change the title of the ALAC session.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Okay. Thank you so much. All right, so there it is. Comments, edits, anything we need to modify here? All right. I see no hands in the room. I see no hands online. Perfect. Thank you so much. Benedetta, back to you.

BENEDETTA ROSSI

There's still the item—

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Okay. So we are still missing text on DNS abuse mitigation. What else, Benedetta? I forgot. Go ahead, go ahead.

BENEDETTA ROSSI

Domain name registration data and the Applicant Support under Issues of Importance. I know that you're working on it but we're just reminding what is currently pending.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

All right. So my suggestion is we take a 20-minute pause, wait for that text to be produced so that we can fine tune it, and then go straight into the coffee break in order to allow extra time for those teams still drafting that part of the Communiqué. Again, in order to make sure that we might—and I'm just saying and I'm crossing my fingers—we might be able to finish earlier with the Communiqué Drafting sessions. So, if you all agree, I'm very happy to give you 20 minutes of your time for that part of the drafting. I have a hand from India.

SUSHIL PAL

Thank you. I think this is with regard to the earlier block wherein we had the agenda with ICANN Board, because there were other issues which were discussed, and as a matter of AOB, I think that should also be brought out. We'll be proposing a text for that.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Okay. Thank you so much. Understood, India. Any other? Basically, do we agree on pausing here in order to give more time to the drafting teams? I see nodding. All right, so let's go grab some good coffee and please be back in the room at, let's say, 4:25 in order to make sure that we might—and I just say might—be able to finish earlier. Thank you so much. So let's pause here.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]