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## Letter Ballot: [PTSC-LB-251]

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company Name: [Inteliquent]** | | | | | | |
| **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)*** |
|  | Pg 6/Ln 199+/5.5.1 | When providing authentication services for an originating INVITE request where the canonicalized values of the To header and Request-URI TNs do not match because the INVITE was retargeted by the originating network, and the originating network has established an association between an identified and authenticated retargeting entity and its retargeting TN, the STI-AS of the originating SP shall first perform SHAKEN authentication as specified in ATIS-1000074 [Ref 1], and then perform “div” authentication as described in this document. The resulting INVITE request shall contain two Identity headers, one containing the "shaken" PASSporT and one containing a “div” PASSporT. The “div” PASSporT shall provide an intact chain of valid TN claims from the Request-URI TN to the “shaken” PASSporT “dest” claim. If the STI-AS has not established an association between an identified and authenticated retargeting entity and its retargeting TN, | There is no concept in SHAKEN of a network being “authoritative” for a TN. The assertion of the SP is that the retargeting entity is known and legitimately using the diversion number (e.g. original called TN). | NS | A |  |
|  | Pg 8/5.6.2/ln 295 | If the information contained in an INVITE request received from an end-user device indicates that the request has been retargeted, but the request does not contain a SHAKEN Identity header, then the STI-AS may sign the request normally, performing base SHAKEN authentication as defined in ATIS-1000074 [Ref 1. If the TN in the To header field value does not match the Request-URI TN (which would normally be the case when the INVITE is retargeted), and the STI-AS is able to assert that the end-user has a verified association with the TN in the To header field value, then the STI-AS shall additionally perform “div” authentication to create an unbroken chain of valid TN claims from the “shaken” PASSporT “dest” claim to the Request-URI TN. If the STI-AS is not able to assert that the end-user has a verified association with the TN in the To header field value, then it will be unable to generate a “div” PASSporT, which might result in a broken chain of valid TN claims from the To header field value to the Request-URI. If allowed by local policy, the STI-AS may resolve this by updating the To header TN to match the Request-URI TN before performing SHAKEN authentication, or take other measures to enable adding a “div” PASSporT that are left to future work. | There is no defined procedure called “SHAKEN authorization,” and attestation does not rely on a specific claim of “authority” for TNs. Since the intent seems to be to mirror the SHAKEN attestation criteria, updated the language to reflect that. | NS | A |  |
|  | Pg 8/5.6.3/ln 319 | Since the "div" PASSporT does not contain an "attest" claim, verifiers must assume that the signing entity is asserting the equivalent of the SHAKEN “full attestation” level for the "div" TN, and is in addition asserting that the retargeting customer entity was authorized to retarget the INVITE request. When applied to "div” authentication, the full attestation criteria defined in ATIS-1000074 [Ref 1] are modified as follows:   1. The signing provider must be responsible for the origination of the retargeted call leg onto the IP based service provider voice network. 2. The signing provider must have a direct authenticated relationship with the retargeting customer and can identify the customer. 3. The signing provider must have established a verified association with the retargeting telephone number   The mechanisms used to satisfy criteria 2 and 3 when the OSP does not have a direct relationship with the retargeting entity, and/or when the OSP has no association with the retargeting TN, are outside the scope of this document. | Clarified the relationship of this procedure to SHAKEN attestation. If the (retargeting) OSP does not have a relationship with the retargeting entity then that entity is not its “customer.” | NS | A |  |
|  | Pg 11/A.1/ln 396 | Note: Figure A.1 shows the case where the To header field in the retargeted INVITE request (e.g., in [2] INVITE) contains the TN of the Request-URI before retargeting. There are also cases where the To header field in a retargeted INVITE does not contain the pre-retargeting Request-URI TN; e.g., when the retargeting CSCF or end-user device updates the To header field to match the post-retargeting Request-URI, or when retargeting occurs for a previously retargeted INVITE request. The “div” procedures described in this document can support all of these cases. | AS creates PASSporTs and does not modify SIP headers | NS | AM | abbreviation expanded from “AS” to “Application Server” |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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