**Introduction**

This tracking document is associated with activities related to the application of the SHAKEN framework to Public Safety architectures/services.

| **Open Items** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Contribution #/Description** | **Assigned To** | **Comment** |
| ATIS-1000074, Section 5.2.1 | Origination Claims – Update ATIS-1000074 to reflect origination TNs can be SIP URIs. |  |  |
| ATIS-1000074, Section 5.2.1 | Destination Claims – Make changes in ATIS-1000074 to reflect header content for emergency services as discussed in Notes. Changes to other ATIS standards? | Terry Reese | ATIS-1000074 currently states that the To can be 911. Also ATIS-1000074 expects the Request URI and To (or PAI) to be the same. ATIS-0700015 (and 3GPP) requires the Request URI to be urn:service:sos. ATIS-0700015 allows the To to be either 911 or urn:service:sos. Need to define how we can authenticate based upon the options allowed by ATIS-0700015.  Addressed in contribution IPNNI-2019-00108R000 |
| ATIS-1000074, Section 5.2.1 | Destination Claims - Need to allow the “dest” claim to be of a “type” that is appropriate for a service URN | Terry Reese | RFC 8224 defines a “type” with a value of “uri”, however process for “normalizing” the uri and transforming SIP and SIPS URIs into a canonical form do not apply to service URNs  Addressed in contribution IPNNI-2019-00108R000 |
| ATIS-1000074, Section 5.3.1 | Need to define validation procedures performed on a “dest” claim that contains a service URN |  | Contribution IPNNI-2019-00108R000 references normalization procedures in RFC 8224. Should additional definition of validation procedures for dest claims that contain service URNs be pursued in IETF? |
| ATIS-1000074, Section 5.3.1 | Add text that states that normal SHAKEN verification should be performed if the To header contains a TN that is an emergency service number and the Request URI contains an emergency service URN | Terry Reese | Addressed in contribution IPNNI-2019-00108R000 |
| ATIS-1000074, Section 5.3.4 | 3GPP TS 24.229 allows the P-CSCF to add a Resource-Priority header in the esnet namespace. In ATIS-1000074 we should allude to the fact that the P-CSCF may add a RPH. |  |  |
| ATIS-1000074, Section 5.3.4 | Reflect that an emergency service network can invoke CVT, based on the presence of an RPH in the ‘esnet’ namespace and local policy. | Terry Reese | ATIS-1000074 states that the CVT function will not be invoked if there is a RPH header. Emergency calls will ALL have an RPH Value in the “esnet” namespace within the ESInet. In the May 1 meeting it was suggested that an emergency service network could invoke CVT based on the value of the RPH (i.e., the fact that the RPH value is from the emergency services (“esnet”) namespace).  Addressed in contribution IPNNI-2019-00108R000 |
| ATIS-1000074, Section 5.3.4 | Address relationship of RPH signing capabilities to emergency calls, and interactions between RPH and caller ID authentication/verification |  |  |
|  | ATIS-1000074 may need to clarify WPS/GETS callers can make 9-1-1 calls and there would be an RPH header noting the priority service., as well as add the discussion of RHP in general. |  |  |
|  | New “Verstat” values for emergency services. | Martin Dolly | Further exploration may determine if there is a need for new values.  Proposal made in contribution IPNNI-2019-00105R000; further discussion needed |
|  | A position is needed as to whether NSI handsets fall under the SHAKEN/STIR framework.  Does RPH signing play a role in the handling of emergency calls originated from NSI handsets? |  | There was discussion on the 6/14 call that there is text in ATIS-1000074 that may be extended to include emergency services. |
|  | Roamers making 9-1-1 calls.  Does RPH signing play a role in the handling of emergency calls originated by roamers? |  | When mobile callers roam to another network (called a “visited” network) and make a 9-1-1 call, those calls are handled by the visited network and not the home network. While this is a broader issue than emergency services, if 80% or the 9-1-1 calls are wireless and “X” percent of those callers are roamers, this topic needs to be addressed.  Further discussion needed regarding conveyance of caller ID information in emergency calls originated by roamers |
|  | A SIP INVITE associated with an emergency callback will contain a RPH set to esnet.0. Evaluate if changes are needed for terminating processing for emergency callbacks.  Is there a benefit to signing the RPH associated with **callback** calls? |  | If the RPH is maintained between the networks then, according to ATIS-1000074, CVT would not be invoked in the terminating network. Or if the procedures are changed in ATIS-1000074 to allow the CVT to be invoked on calls with RPHs in the esnet namespace, then the same mechanism could be applied in the terminating network for emergency originations or callback calls.  The ability to apply CVT to callback calls based on RPH namespace and local policy addressed in IPNNI-2019-00108R000. Further work is needed to address signing of RPH. |
|  | Emergency callbacks will have a Priority header set to “psap-callback”. Evaluate if this is a valuable attribute to influence termination processing. |  |  |

| **Closed Items** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
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