ICANN87 Bali | AGM – GAC Communique Drafting (4 of 6)
Wednesday, October 21, 2026 – 15:00 to 16:00 WITA

JULIA CHARVOLEN

Welcome to the ICANN87 GAC Communiqué Drafting Session on Wednesday, 21 October at 15:00 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 the session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted in the proper form in the Zoom chat pod. Interpretation for this session will include all six human languages and Portuguese. If you would like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in the Zoom room. Please remember to state your name for the record and the language you will be speaking in case speaking a language other than English. And please speak at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation.

I will now leave the floor to Jorge Cancio, GAC Vice Chair. Thank you, and over to you.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you so much, Julia. So, we are continuing our rotation of Vice Chairs and chairing the Communiqué Drafting. Ian and Marco had to excuse themselves because there's another ccNSO 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.

which is talking about the plenipotentiary of the ITU, so they are there for a while, but we can make still some progress here, I hope, in this session until 16:00, until 4:00 p.m. And let's try to finalize the texts on substance. And for this, I think, Fabien, if I understood you correctly, we would start with the Review of Reviews. I saw Manal in the room a minute ago. I don't know if Manal is around. There she comes, wonderful.

So, Review of Reviews. We have some questions on the text. Amongst other things, the second sentence, we were seeking clarification whether it really reflects what was intended because it seemed that something was missing in the second sentence of this first para. So, I don't know, Manal, if you had an opportunity to look at it.

MANAL ISMAIL I worked on the second paragraph with the European Commission. I think the first one is proposed by Portugal.

JORGE CANCIO Okay, thank you so much for the clarification, Manal. So, on the first paragraph, when we say the framework should clearly identify, et cetera, is there any clarification or addition from Portugal? No? Because otherwise, if the sentence doesn't read well, maybe we will have to take it out. Is that okay?

I'm meaning the sentence, which is saying 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. As, I don't know if there's, we can come back to this later, or I see Ana, you have a reaction to clarify what this where is.

ANA NEVES No, my point is if only Portugal sees that as an added value, please. I'm not continuing this discussion. I think that we should move on. Yeah, thank you.

JORGE CANCIO Surely there's added value. It's just to be more precise on what this where is trying to locate, but if there is no additional precision, we take it out. Is that okay for the rest? Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL Yeah, I'm okay. I'm just to reassure Portugal that I think the second paragraph as well already covers things that were previously in previous communique, but also allows for commenting on the new draft. So, we have all our options flexible still.

JORGE CANCIO I see nodding, so, we would take out that sentence and we go with the third sentence of this first paragraph. Any allocation between the structural review, et cetera? Are there any comments on this sentence? Do we feel comfortable? The European Commission.

MARTINA BARBERO Thank you very much, Jorge. I don't want to make life difficult for anybody, but now I'm wondering if the second paragraph where the GAC welcomes shouldn't be the first because we go from generically welcoming the second public comment and then we provide a very specific comment, but I don't have a very strong feeling about that. I'm just maybe for readability when we agree on the entire text, see whether it makes more sense to go from the general to the specific or vice versa.

JORGE CANCIO Okay, that's a very reasonable proposal. Any objections to moving the second paragraph to the start of this section? I don't see any objections. Martina, is this an old hand? Okay, so let's move it. We have Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL Just a minor proposal. If we're switching order, maybe we can spell out Review of Reviews cross-community in the first paragraph. Just for, thank you.

JORGE CANCIO Very sensible. It's more of an editorial proposal. Thank you very much for spotting that, Manal. So let's do that. I think Fabien is already doing it. So, we would have now the text which starts with what used to be the second para. Then we would have the first sentence of the original first para. The GAC considers that the ROR,

revised framework should explicitly preserve the full substantive scope of pilot section 4.6(b)(ii). So think there are no objections to this wording so far.

And then we would go back to the sentence that is highlighted. Any allocation between the structural review, et cetera. Is that sentence agreeable to the committee or are there any comments on it? Give you some seconds.

It appears there are no comments. So, we would mark it also as preliminarily accepted. And that ends the reading of this section, if I get that right, Fabien. That we are finishing the reading of this section. Review of Reviews for the time being, of course. We mark it in green. And we continue our journey together this afternoon.

Okay, so let's go. What's the next thing? Universal Acceptance. For instance, may I seek the advice of our good colleagues that were working on Universal Acceptance text, whether they have found an agreeable solution? Anyone wanting to report from…? I see Zeina is working with Fielo [ph]. Do you need 10 minutes, two minutes? So, we will come back in a couple of minutes.

MARTINA BARBERO Still not speaking.

JORGE CANCIO Owen.

MARTINA BARBERO We have U.S. in the queue as well.

JORGE CANCIO Of course. So, let's go to Owen.

OWEN FLETCHER Thank you, Owen Fletcher. Could we get the text on the screen, please?

JORGE CANCIO Yes, sorry, we're having a connectivity issue, so we're --

OWEN FLETCHER Sure, no problem. You can see it here. So, I think it will be helpful to know the results of the discussion between our colleagues from Lebanon and Peru in a few minutes. We didn't get to finish discussing this totally during the break, but I thought we were close. So, I made an edit that's displayed on the screen, choosing one of the options that had been discussed previously. Thanks.

JORGE CANCIO Thank you so much, Owen. And thank you all for making efforts to find a common ground on this section. We will come back to this section in a couple of minutes. And meanwhile, go to the next one on the discussion, because we have also new texts. So, Fabien, would we go to DNS Abuse directly? I think we have received the full text, I hope. May I seek clarification? And I see a hand, a

physical hand from Susan. Is this the full text from the DNS Abuse group? You are nodding.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Yes, thank you, Vice Chair. This is the full text as agreed by the Commission, India, Japan, and the United States. So, we look forward to receiving any comments or input from our colleagues. Thank you.

JORGE CANCIO

Wonderful. So let's read the text, because I think it's the first time we are reading it, and the first time we have the whole, the full text. So, let me try to do this para by para. DNS Abuse during the ICANN87 DNS Abuse session. The GAC welcomed presentations by the GAC representative from the host country and the Penge Lola Nama Domain Internet Indonesia, Pandi, Indonesia's ccTLD operator. The Japan Publishers Manga Anti-Piracy Conference, JPMAC, on domain name hopping and Registration Data verification, as well as ICANN Compliance and the Office of the Chief Technical Officer, OCTO.

ICANN Compliance updated the GAC on the status of enforcement action against a registrar that failed to promptly mitigate DNS Abuse as required by the Registrar Accreditation Agreement. ICANN OCTO presented a new methodology for identifying domains potentially connected to known DNS Abuse. So, I'll stop here. This is a very descriptive para, reflecting what was presented,

basically. Are there any comments? Don't see any reactions. So thank you. Thank you to the drafters. You hit the nail on the head, I guess.

So, let's put it in green. Let's move to the second para. And it reads, GAC representatives continued their participation in the policy development process on Associated Domain Checks, PDP1, during ICANN87, working alongside representatives from ICANN's various constituencies to incorporate public comments on the initial report into the draft policy. Recalling its submission to the public, I lost the screen. I'll move to my own screen. Recalling its submission to the public comment, the GAC encourages cross-registrar information sharing in the context of Associated Domain Checks, which could significantly increase the speed and effectiveness of DNS Abuse mitigation.

The GAC appreciates the swift progress made by the PDP1 working group to date and encourages the community to continue this positive trajectory. To help stem the harm to the public of phishing and other forms of DNS Abuse, PDP1 consensus policy should be implemented and in place before new gTLD strings are added to the domain name system. I'll pause here again. It's a lot of substance. And here is some recommendation from the GAC included. Appreciation as well. Any comments? I see Fabien has his hand up.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

I've just suggested, and sorry, it's not very visible. So, I've just suggested an amendment here from an editorial perspective to make clear in this sentence that refers to public comments on the initial report. So, incorporating public comments on the initial report into the draft policy, because policy is a very poly-semic word in this context. It could refer to ICANN consensus policy, which is the actual product of implementation after policy recommendations are made to the ICANN Board. So, just for clarity here, because we're at the stage of policy development in the GNSO, it would be incorporating public comments on the initial report into the draft GNSO policy recommendations. Does that make sense?

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Fabien. So, it's really adding GNSO after draft and recommendations after policy to be more specific. I see a thumb with my new glasses from Susan. So, that is positive. Any other comment on this, para? As we do in UN negotiations, I will count to three. One, two, three. And let's mark it in green. Thank you. Let's continue. Good.

So, the next paragraph reads, the GAC also discussed its one-time input to the GNSO Council on the chart being developed for PDP2 (safeguards for application programming interface API access to new customers) which inter alia encouraged the working group to examine how behavioral indicators account history and where relevant identity related measures may operate together or

separately in establishing trustworthiness. The GAC looks forward to the early launch of this work.

So, I'll stop here again. This is rather descriptive of the discussion. And looking forward, is there any comment on this, para? No comment. So, we can also mark it in green, making good progress. Thank you all for your good work.

Next paragraph: The GAC understands that the GNSO Council is undertaking a prioritization exercise for future work, including on DNS Abuse. The GAC reiterates its interest in receiving further information on this process and emphasizes the importance of ensuring that the exercise takes into account issues previously highlighted by the GAC, including preventative measures and mandatory DNS Abuse reporting.

I'll pause here, seek your feedback. Any comment? I see our esteemed colleague from India, Sushil, please.

SUSHIL PAL Just, no, I think nothing, we agree with the para, only maybe over to Fabian, I think we also agreed for having a footnote for the earlier committee, will that be okay from the drafting guidelines? Referring it to the Seville and the earlier committee regarding mandatory DNS Abuse reporting.

JORGE CANCIO Thank you, Sushil. Has this been included, Fabien? We will be taking a note and making sure that that is being done, if this is okay

for everyone, of course. But on the text, there are no other comments on the text itself. I don't see anyone, any comment, so let's mark it also in green. And we come to finally.

Finally, to promote accountability, the GAC expresses the need for industry-wide visibility over contracted parties' compliance with their DNS Abuse obligations. Whether provided by ICANN or other entities, reliable and reproducible measurement of registry and registrar, DNS Abuse mitigation is fundamental to the development of evidence-based policy.

So, I'll stop here, seek again. Comments, feedback from the room, is this acceptable? No objections, no comments, no additions. Congratulations, we have another green paragraph, wonderful. Is this the end of the DNS Abuse section? Checking myself. Indeed, it is.

Okay, so we have the green section. Congratulations to the hard work of all those colleagues involved. Thank you very much. And we will solve the footnote issue in due course. May I inquire with Fabien where we do go next?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX So, we would move down to the next section, which is identified as 15 days Registration Data validation timeline, for which I believe we have final, complete and final purpose text. And maybe as a question from an editorial perspective, I wonder if it is intended to have this topic as a new section. Usually we've had this under

Registration Data. And so I just want to make sure we understand the intent clearly here.

JORGE CANCIO Thank you so much, Fabien, for raising also that question. Are there any views from the topic leads on whether including this under any of the other general sections or whether we keep it as a separate section? I see Martina, please.

MARTINA BARBERO Thank you very much, Jorge. We don't have very strong feeling, but it was a suggestion since this is becoming in between DNS Abuse and Registration Data. So, we find ourselves having again, for consistency, it has always been under Registration Data, but it's now it's true that we're linking it more to DNS Abuse. We are traveling from when it's a journey. So, I guess we're in the middle of the journey. I don't know.

JORGE CANCIO Thank you so much, Martina. Any other views? Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX I can confirm the struggle from a support staff perspective as to where this discussion falls in the DNS Abuse small group or the Registration Data small group. And so we've struggled over the last few months. And so it is well placed here, I think. We will probably suggest an alternative title just to avoid having number of section

and 15. So I'm just working on that too, but we don't need to discuss it now.

JORGE CANCIO Thank you so much, Fabien. Maybe we can write out 15 in letters. That could be a solution to avoid too many numbers. So, let's start the reading of this section. We start with a rather longish paragraph. The GAC reiterates that, quote, maintaining accurate domain name Registration Data is an important element in the prevention and mitigation of DNS Abuse. Close quote. As stated in the ICANN72 communique, recent evidence such as the informal report states that validating registrant information during the account creation or before the domain delegation correlates to lower levels of abuse.

Further research, including a recent 2026 study, suggests that in some types of abuse campaigns, malicious domains are often active only for a very short time. Experiences shared by ccTLDs during ICANN87 also demonstrate that preventative verification measures can lead to lower levels of DNS Abuse without necessarily affecting registrations and renewals. Establishing meaningful friction in order to deter malicious domain name registrations therefore remains a GAC priority ahead of the delegation of new gTLDs. I stop here and I've seen that my esteemed colleague from India, Santhosh, has asked for the floor.

T. SANTOSH Thank you, Jorge. Now the topic of the issue of importance is 15-day Registration Data verification timeline, not validation timeline.

JORGE CANCIO Thank you for that comment. I'll defer to topic leads, whether this is the terminology I see as thumbed up from the U.S. delegation, maybe Gabe. I don't see your face. And any other opinion? Otherwise we would take the change. I see Finn raising his physical hand.

FINN PETERSEN Thank you. Finn Petersen, for the record. Only one thing, when we mention experience shared by ccTLDs during the meeting, I also shared some experience from Denmark and I'm not a ccTLD. Perhaps we also should add NGAC members.

JORGE CANCIO That's a valid point. I remember that presentation myself. Can we add NGAC members? Any other comment, precision, feedback? I see Paul. Yes, Paul, please.

PAUL BLAKER Thank you. Paul Blaker, for the record. Could I make a small suggestion? Experiences shared by some ccTLDs and NGAC members. Just add the word some, just for clarity. And one other just question, really. Where it mentions a recent 2026 study, is it

possible to put a footnote with a link to the study just so that people can find that? That might be helpful. Thank you.

JORGE CANCIO Wonderful suggestions, at least. I was thinking also about; I guess this is the Oxford study that we've heard about many times. So, I guess we have the reference and we can include the footnote to ease also the attentive readers work in looking up the study, which I'm also looking forward to reading in more detail. So, let's do that.

Fabien, you will be able to look up the reference. Any other comments? And thank you so much, Paul, for spotting those. Good. Then I think we can green this text as well with the first para. Let's start with the first para. Let's not be overambitious. And let's continue our journey step-by-step, steadily but surely.

Let's go with the second paragraph: The GAC welcomed conversations with the GNSO Council, the contracted parties house, CPH, the ICANN Board. I think there's a comma lacking after CPH. And the commercial stakeholder group, CSG, on this matter during ICANN87 Bali, particularly regarding the 15-day timeline for validating and verifying Registration Data under existing contractual arrangements. The GAC continues to recommend that registrars be required to complete these validation and verification steps before a newly registered domain name can become accessible through the DNS.

Let's stop here. Again, see whether there are any comments. No comments, no feedback. Kudos to the drafters again for the good work. Let's green this, connectivity issues preventing us from greening it yet. But let's take it as green and go to the third para and final para on this question.

And it reads: the GAC appreciates the registrar's willingness to continue engaging on the possible evolution of this timeline and proposes further intersessional discussion on this topic prior to ICANN88. Recalling the ICANN86 Seville communique and the discussions with the ICANN Board during ICANN87, the GAC looks forward to the board's continued engagement and support in aligning relevant parties and for advancing timely consideration of the two available pathways, namely policy development process and contractual amendments. The GAC will also seek to provide further evidence and insights, including from ccTLD experience to inform these exchanges.

So, I stop here again, seek your comments and feedback to this text. I see the UK, Paul, the floor is yours.

PAUL BLAKER Thank you, just a spelling question. Should intersessional be with three S's?

JORGE CANCIO I don't want to interfere in British, American or other kinds of English conflict or discussion. I myself, I always am in doubt

whether it's with a C or an S, but I'll take, of course, your advice. So, if it's okay, we'll leave it with an S, which reassures me that I've written it correctly all the times. Thank you so much. Any other comments?

Okay, then we can bring also this and we have a completed section. Good, we can also accept the changes in the title. And Fabien has a point.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: And so that's on the title. You see in the comments, I've suggested for consideration, a potential eternity, which would be timeline for verification and validation of registrar on contact information. We could remove a validation, but I think the obligation, that timeline pertains to both verification, validation, and then parentheses 15 day timelines for a shorter hand and an easier reference to how it's usually referred to. But you had also proposed another alternative for the title, which would be to replace 15 to actually spell out the number 15. So, those are suggestion for the title. And I'm not sure if there are particular preferences.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you, Fabien. Any opinion from the committee on the title, either writing out 15 in letters or the alternative proposed by Fabien? And I see Susan with her physical hand up.

SUSAN CHALMERS: Thank you. We would suggest just adding the word the, and then removing the S after days. So the 15-day Registration Data verification timeline. Thanks.

JORGE CANCIO: Looks like an elegant and simple solution to me. Any reactions? Thumbs up, nodding. Let's go with that. Thank you anyway for the good proposal, Fabien. Let's go with the committee. Good, so we have another section. And we have 21 minutes. Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Before we leave this section, I just wanted to confirm that I've linked the study that's to be referenced in the footnote. So, if anybody wants to have a look at the study, the link is in the comment here for that section.

JORGE CANCIO: Okay, let's look into that detail. Is there any quick comment? So, there's already the footnote as a comment. And it would be reading, examining newly registered phishing domains at scale by Sharad Argawal, Mary Vasek in Journal of Cybersecurity, volume 12, issue one, 2026 with a link. I understand this is the correct citation. Any objections?

Don't think so. So, let's do that as a footnote. Good, let's close this section then. What's next? Do we have, how do you say that, a

white smoke on the Universal Acceptance? Let's go back to universal acceptance. Okay, so have you, I see Zeina, her hand up.

ZEINA BOU HARB: There is a proposed text in the chat. Please consider.

JORGE CANCIO: Is this proposed text something you have agreed amongst the different interested colleagues? Hopefully. So, let's give it a try. Have you found the text, Fabien? So, it would be the second paragraph as an alternative to the first one. If that's the intention, yes.

So, let's read again the first version: The GAC welcomes and encourages the further adoption of Universal Acceptance, UA, for the better use of internationalized domain names, IDN, Email Address Internationalization, and New Generic Top-Level Domains to accelerate the progress of online linguistic diversity. That's the first paragraph, alternative one.

And the new alternative reads, the GAC welcomes and encourages further adoption of Universal Acceptance, UA, for the better use of Internationalized Domain Names, IDN, Email Address Internationalization, and new generic top-level domains to accelerate the progress of, and here comes the change, more diverse, inclusive, and multilingual internet.

So, really the part that is different from both versions is starting with the words after progress. As this second version is the

compromise proposal, I will seek reactions to this second version. And we have the U.S. requesting the floor.

SUSAN CHALMERS: Thank you, Chair. The second proposal goes a bit beyond what was discussed during break. The United States would support the first paragraph, actually.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you, Susan. I have Egypt.

ABDALMONEN GALILA: This is Abdalmonen for the record. Actually for the use of Internationalized Domain Names, IDNs, first sentence, second sentence, Email Address Internationalization could add brackets and the E-R, so we could refer to these terms for the second paragraph, instead of writing the full term again.

JORGE CANCIO: Okay, could you speed down a little bit and specify what changes and to what wording are you proposing?

ABDALMONEN GALILA: Sure. IDN, the abbreviation of Internationalized Domain Names, it should be IDNs. Yeah, just add S.

JORGE CANCIO Okay, in any of the two paragraphs?

ABDALMONEN GALILA Yeah. Second one, email address internationalization, the abbreviation is E-A-I. So we need to add brackets, E-A-I. So, we could use both terms, IDNs and AIs, for the second paragraph, instead of writing the full term again.

JORGE CANCIO Well, the first and the second paragraphs are alternatives right now, so. Okay. Thank you. Thank you for spotting those. On substance, we have the preference expressed by the U.S. to the first para. I'm in the hands of the committee, so it really depends on you, colleagues, whether you can agree on one of the two alternatives, either the first one, which is supported by the U.S., or the second one, which was proposed by different members in the chat. But apparently, that's not a preference of not, cannot be agreed by everyone. So, we are at a hard spot, and we don't have that much time. Is there objection to settle with the first alternative? Peru? Is that an objection? Yes?

MARTINA BARBERO Yes, I object. I prefer the second version. Thank you.

JORGE CANCIO Okay, so then we have homework. If there's objection, there is homework. And homework means the interested countries get

together in the next coffee break and come back with an agreed solution. But I have the physical hand of Ana.

ANA NEVES

Thank you. I'm trying now to propose, so the new generic top-level domains to accelerate and progress of online diversity for, no, online diversity, and, no, that will not work. Okay, so the progress of online linguistic diversity and inclusive internet. Only that. For the progress of online linguistic diversity and inclusive internet. Thank you.

JORGE CANCIO

I'll give this a try of maximum four minutes. So, reactions to Ana's tweaking of the first version. So, it would read, to accelerate the progress of online linguistic diversity and inclusive internet. That's the new version. I see one, two fingers from Susan.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you to Portugal for the proposal. Perhaps we could try the progress of linguistic diversity and inclusivity online.

JORGE CANCIO

Did you capture that, Fabien? Thank you so much. Any reactions to the retweaking by Susan? Come on, we are close. I will start counting backwards and settle on this. So this is the art of the communiqué, the art of compromise. Three, two, one, it's green. Thank you. Cool, so we have the first para. Settled.

And we have this second para, which reads, the GAC notes that interested GAC members could promote UA readiness in public digital services and relevant procurement specifications supported by practical technical guidance. Is there any comment on this second sentence? I see some nodding. It's obviously a code, something that we could do. I see Christine seeking the floor.

CHRISTINE ARIDA Yeah, just a minor thing. I think a public digital service and relevant recruitment specifications; I think there was a term that we used in the section of the working group. I just, if we can use the same language here, because I think this is too specific.

JORGE CANCIO Could you specify what word you are meaning? We are almost there.

CHRISTINE ARIDA I think it reads, within digital public services, public sector policies and services. I'm just seeking that we be consistent with the term that we're using, that we don't introduce new things. We've already agreed on the text in the section of the working group. Section four, yes. Aiming to encourage UA adoption within digital public sector policies and services. I'm suggesting that we use this exact language again in the other section.

JORGE CANCIO — So, let's see how that flows. With a caveat that, as far as I understand, we haven't greened the working groups yet. So maybe it has been agreed in the working group, but not here in the committee. So, let's see how it reads. So, it would read: the GAC notes that interested GAC members could promote UA readiness within digital public sector policies and services and relevant procurement specifications supported by practical technical guidance. Is this what you proposed?

CHRISTINE ARIDA — I suggest also removing 'and relevant procurement specifications'.

JORGE CANCIO — So, just leave it with digital public sector policies and services, which is like everything we do in the public sector. Great. Any reactions to this proposal, to this para? Don't see any. It's general enough to cover all points of view. Thank you so much. Let's close this as well and green it. Thank you. So, the question now is what is next? And I know you're struggling with the Google Doc, Fabien. Don't want to put you under pressure.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX — We have text on Registration Data, but I think we have five minutes left in the session. So, that might be a lot to chew for five minutes. If we want to use those five minutes, we could go back up in section three of the communique and maybe start reading the GAC working group text. We have texts from the Public Safety Working

Group and texts for the UA IDN working group. And I believe we also have texts for waiting texts. Not anything. We have texts for the human rights and international law working group.

JORGE CANCIO Okay, let's go with the first working group. So, that is greened. The capacity development working group is okay. I understand.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX But we have one more above. We have Public Safety Working Group above.

JORGE CANCIO We have the Public Safety Working Group. Is it that one, Fabien? Okay, so let's go with the reporting out of the GAC Public Safety Working Group. Try and do this in four minutes. And it reads: The GAC CPWG continued its work to advocate for improved measures to combat DNS Abuse and promote lawful effective access to domain name Registration Data. The CPWG contributed to the GAC sessions pertaining to DNS Abuse and Registration Data issues and to cross community plenary meetings on the GAC in registrant recourse and on DNS Abuse mitigation.

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 of the Law Enforcement Agency Authentication Mechanism

Input Group and of the Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Policy Implementation Review Team.

Wow, so that's a collection of acronyms. It's a very descriptive paragraph of the very good work being done throughout the meeting by our colleagues in the CPWG. Any reactions to this account of their work? Any positions, feedback? Doesn't appear to be the case. So, let's green it, let's green the text.

Let's go to the next working group. And 'we, the human rights working group' is too long a text to cover in three minutes. And the UA text, I think it's also too much for two minutes. Do we have something to cover in two minutes? Operational matters let's do that. Let's extract every second of value.

So, five, GAC operational matters. Pursuant to GAC operating principle 53 and following the completion of the required 60-day consultation period initiated at act 96, GAC members in attendance voted to adopt proposed administrative revisions to the GAC operating principles. Developed by the GAC Operating Principles Evolution Working Group, (GOPE WG), these revisions are intended to improve clarity and consistency, update references and terminology and align the operating principles with current GAC practices.

So, I'll stop there. This is what we did. Any misspelling problems, something lacking? Looking into the committee. Also online, there appears not to be any request for the floor. Yes, the UK, Paul.

PAUL BLAKER: Thank you, Paul Blaker for the record. I just wanted to ask what we mean by administrative revisions. Is there a difference between an administrative revision and a different kind of revision? I would suggest maybe just deleting administrative or changing it to editorial. If there's not a category of revision, that might be better.

JORGE CANCIO: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Paul. What about clerical? No. So, let's keep it at, what did you propose? Editorial. Is editorial okay? Is editorial okay? Yes.

So, we are at the top of the hour. We need some coffee. Thank you very much. It was a very effective session. And we will come back in 30 minutes with the last Communiqué Session of today. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]