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## Letter Ballot: [PTSC-LB-219 - dpATIS Standard ATIS-1000080]

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company Name: [Neustar, Inc.]** | | | | | | |
| **TO BE COMPLETED BY COMMENTER** | | | | **TO BE COMPLETED BY SUB/COMMITTEE** | | |
| **Auto#** | **Page/ Section/Line #** | **Comment** | **Rationale/Suggested Solution** | **Type[[1]](#footnote-1)** | **Res.**[[2]](#footnote-2) | **Discussion/Explanation/Note *(if comment is modified, accepted/modified via a separate ballot comment, or not accepted)*** |
|  | 80 | “Synonym for Certification Path or Certificate Chain.” | “Certification Path or” should be removed since can’t be a synonym for itself. |  |  | Fixed. |
|  | 225-228 | “The key aspect is that the identity-related information in the SIP requests is authenticated by the originating Service Provider and can be verified by the terminating Service Provider Information contained within the Personal Assertion Token (PASSporT) in the SIP messages attests to a Service Provider’s knowledge of specific telephone identities which the terminating SP can use to determine specific handling for a call.” | For sentence to make sense, consider: “The key aspect is that the identity-related information in the SIP requests is authenticated by the originating Service Provider, and can be verified by the terminating Service Provider information contained within the Personal Assertion Token (PASSporT) in the SIP messages and attests to a Service Provider’s knowledge of specific telephone identities which the terminating SP can use to determine specific handling for a call.”  Note: “Information” also changed to “information” to avoid any confusion. |  |  | There is a missing period that makes it read odd. There should be a period between “terminating Service Provider” and “Information contained within” I would prefer to keep the original wording. |
|  | 301 | “Acquisition” | “Acquisition” should be “acquisition” to avoid any confusion. |  |  | Fixed |
|  | 380 | “[draft-ietf-acme-acme-06] Section 7.3” | Probably best not to be this specific after all as 07 is now out. For document consistency, consider changing to just:  “[draft-ietf-acme-acme]” |  |  | Agreed. The reference was important when the acme draft was changing frequently and section numbers were changing but it is fairly stable now. |
|  | 471 | “Service Provide Code” | “Service Provider Code” typo |  |  | Fixed (all instances) |
|  | 472 | “…below as part of the Application for an STI Certificate” | “Application” should be “application” to avoid any confusion. |  |  | Fixed |
|  | 515 | “SHA-256” | For consistency, should be “SHA256”. |  |  | Fixed |
|  | 551 | “…previous section of this document; it can immediately…” | “;” to “,” as comma is more correct. |  |  | Fixed |
|  | 553 | “[draft-ietf-acme-acme-06] Section 7.4” | Probably best not to be this specific after all as 07 is now out. For document consistency, consider changing to just:  “[draft-ietf-acme-acme]” |  |  | Fixed |
|  | 599-600 | “…it shall use the specific identifier of type “TNAuthList” and including a key of “value” which is a Service Provider Code” | To clarify “type”, consider:  “it shall use the specific  “type” identifier of type “TNAuthList” and include a key of “value” which is a Service Provider Code” |  |  | Fixed |
|  | 648,654, 680, 705, 711 | Specification should define the “challenge” types consistently. | Specific changes? Mary.  Ensure that challenge identifiers and types are aligned with ACME specification (and vice versa).  Change “type”:”token” to “type”: “spc-token”in 654, 663 and 711. |  |  | Text has been revised to reflect the version of draft-barnes-acme-service provider at the time of letter ballot. This document is still being developed. We will make any necessary revisions once that document is complete. |
|  | 656, 681, 715 | The “token” value in the response to a challenge should include the “token” value in the original challenge, as shown on Line 656 | Specific changes? Mary.  681: change “token”: to :KeyAuthorization  715: same as 681 and in addition add  "token": "DGyRejmCefe7v4NfDGDKfA" (matching line 656). |  |  | Fixed |
|  | 686-687 | “…SHAKEN certificate framework specific challenge type of “spc-token” and the key “token” with the value of the Service Provider Code token” | To clarify “type”, consider:  “…SHAKEN certificate framework specific challenge “type” identifier of “spc-token” and the key “token” with the value of the Service Provider Code token” |  |  | The problem here is that ACME has a specific “identifier” field for challenges. And this challenges “type” is NOT that identifier. So, it’s more confusing from ACME perspective to make this change. |
|  | 690-691 | “As a part of that token validation, the STI-CA needs to make the public key of the STI-PA available, as identified in the x5u protected header value in the token” | To make accurate, consider:  “As a part of that token validation, the STI-CA needs to retrieve the public key of the STI-PA, as identified in the x5u protected header value in the token” |  |  | Fixed |
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