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

|  |
| --- |
| **Company Name: Perspecta Labs** |
| **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)*** |
|  | 31 | “add support draft” 🡪 “add support for draft” | Typo fix | NS | A | Already addressed in Charter comments |
|  | 73 | Should PAID acronym be PAI? | Have not seen PAID acronym previously. | NS | N |  |
|  | 244-245 | “…then the host SP shall consume the 302 response,…”. | Add a reference to the standard that defines what the host SP does with a 302? | NS | A | Reference to be provided before default letter ballot |
|  | 258 | “If allowed by local policy, the terminating SP shall not remove the Identity headers”. | Unclear wording: Does this mean that if allowed, it shall not remove, but if not allowed, it shall remove?Re-word to something like: “If identity header removal is prohibited by local policy, the terminating SP shall not remove the Identify headers.” | NS | AM | Modified to: “If allowed by local policy, the terminating SP shall deliver the Identity headers in the INVITE request sent to the end-user device.” [lines 266-267] |
|  | 313 | If the end user is not authorized to retarget using a certain TN, then why would the STI AS not just reject the attempt rather than perform SHAKEN authentication? |  | NS | I |  |

**Other Information (e.g., Tables, Figures):**

1. Type of change: Insert **S** or **NS**: Substantive (**S**) (*see* [*ATIS OP*](http://www.atis.org/01_legal/operatingpro.asp) *Section A.6*) or Non-Substantive (**NS**) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Resolution (how was comment considered): Insert **A**, **AM**, **N**, **I**, or **W**: Accepted (**A**), Accepted as Modified (**AM**), Not Accepted (**N**), For Information/No Action/Noted (**I**), or Withdrawn (**W**). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)