

SSAD Summary of key points - June 7, 2026

These bullets represent the outcome of conversations by the SSAD SRT on June 7, 2026 during an all-day in-person meeting. They are high-level guidance that the leadership team will use to update the strawperson text. The SRT confirmed at the end of its meeting that these bullets reflect their shared understanding and output.

Discussion on Recommendations 1 & 2 around the authentication and user model:

- The system should incorporate non-authenticated users, and authenticated user groups (starting with law enforcement)
 - Authenticated users could be called Designated User Groups (DUG)
 - See flowchart below that captures the vision of how this process should work.
- Use the same wording/terms throughout, and include a glossary. Be careful to review words for consistency and meaning.
- Recommendations 1 and 2 can be combined. However, the group wants to do a final check on anything important to keep from the original recommendation 2 text.
 - A likely outcome is that one or more elements of Rec 2 end up in a revised 1.4 section.
- Section 1.4 should be reviewed and elements moved to a policy recommendation.
- Make sure that this overall policy will work in the future for more groups than law enforcement. However, mention in the implementation guidance or rationale the policy's intent to start with an authentication process for law enforcement.
- Authentication:
 - Allows contracted parties to know who is submitting the request.
 - Doesn't guarantee disclosure.
 - Disclosure is a decision by contracted parties made after an evaluation. The evaluation and authorization will be informed by required information described in Recommendation 3 (information will include a statement of the legal basis for requesting the information).
 - In addition, language around the policy's view of authorization is contained in Recommendation 8 (which includes language around human rights impact.)
- Make sure mechanism(s) for making requests requires identification of the jurisdiction of the request
- Shift the language to "contracted parties" - it's not just registrars
- When registering into the system, consider a system that allows alternatives to email
 - Start by confirming the intent: what does email do for you?
 - Remember that this is the simple bar, not the authentication bar.
- Let's provide guidance to requestors about what data is where and what is appropriate to ask for
 - Clarity and consistency for all parties is the goal.

Discussion around Recommendation 10 - Service Level Agreements:

- Response times will depend on the design of the system - and that's a bigger question than what we can address today - it involves system design, questions around 2-way communication, and risks for ICANN.
- For now, let's align the policy with the existing registration data policy. 30 days.
 - However, the pilot and other experience shows much faster turnaround times than 30 days. ICANN should publish these actual outcomes (for instance, an average response time, or the average for the top 80%) alongside the SLA time, in order to give a more accurate signal to requesters about what they can expect.
 - It's hard to set the exact method now how the clock starts and stops. However, in principle, it should be a simple system for all parties, and focus on when a request is complete enough to submit, and when there is a resolution to the request.
- Whatever we settle on for timing, it needs to be visible and clear for all participants
- When to revisit the SLAs?
 - Rec 18 provides for a Standing Committee - this issue is on the list of items needing review.
 - It would be great to have data that looks at how timelines influence the rights assessment as part of the evaluation by contracted parties.

Flowchart (draft) for user experience in SSAD process

