



1200 G Street, NW
Suite 500
Washington, DC 20005

P: +1 202-628-6380
W: www.atis.org

April 1, 2021

Martin Dolly
PTSC Chair

Re: ATIS Letter Ballot PTSC-LB-259 Closing Letter

Dear Martin:

ATIS Letter Ballot PTSC-LB-259 entitled "*PTSC-LB-259, draft proposed ATIS Standard, Signature-based Handling of Asserted information using toKENs (SHAKEN): Calling Name and Rich Call Data Handling Procedures*" closed on March 31, 2021. The results are as follows:

13	Approvals Comments: Perspecta Labs
1	Disapprovals Comments: Neustar
11	Abstentions No comments
7	Ballots not returned
<hr/>	
32	Voting members

The comments received will be addressed by the committee at an upcoming meeting. Should the resolution(s) be substantive in nature, a default letter ballot will be issued. If there are no substantive edits to the document, it will move to publication.

Sincerely,

[Original signed by A. Karditzas]

Anna Karditzas
Coordinator, Global Standards Development

Cc:

Martin Dolly, PTSC Chair
Viqar Shaikh, PTSC Vice Chair
J. Wohlgemuth

ATIS Letter Ballot Comment Submittal Form and Consideration Report

All commenters should use this form when submitting comments on an ATIS Letter Ballot ([view the instructions](#)). This form should accompany the [letter ballot \(via ATIS Workspace\)](#) and will subsequently be used during comment consideration by the appropriate committee/subcommittee.

The commenter should use the “track changes” feature when recommending changes to existing text. Proposed changes to a table, figure, or any other item that is not purely text, should include a summary in the table below and provide the modified table, figure, etc., in the “Other Information” section. The source file for any new figures (Visio, PowerPoint, etc.) must also be included (by either zipping together with this document, or embedding as a file/object).

Letter Ballot: PTSC-LB-259 (PTSC-2021-00015R000)

Company Name: Neustar						
TO BE COMPLETED BY COMMENTER				TO BE COMPLETED BY SUB/COMMITTEE		
Auto#	Page/ Section/Line #	Comment	Rationale/Suggested Solution	Type ¹	Res. ²	Discussion/Explanation/Note (if comment is modified, accepted/modified via a separate ballot comment, or not accepted)
1	Title preceding Line 1	Consistency and accuracy	Change “CNAM” to “Calling Name”? Perhaps, better to use “Caller Name” or “Caller ID Name” per other comment. In fact, eCNAM is “Enhanced Calling Name”.			
2	Line 46	Plurality	Change “messages” to “message”.			
3	Lines 54-55	Clarifications	Change “purchases” to “leases” and delete “delegated” since latter is not needed.			
4	Line 59	Industry CNAM definition consistency	Change to “Caller Name”, Caller ID Name” and/or “Calling Name”?			
5	Line 65-66	“utilizing delegate certificates with TN granularity”	This is misleading since not required. Suggest deleting this phrase.			

¹ Type of change: Insert **S** or **NS**: Substantive (**S**) (see [ATIS OP Section A.6](#)) or Non-Substantive (**NS**)

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**).

ATIS Letter Ballot Comment Submittal Form and Consideration Report

6	Line 67	Metadata	Use consistently, “meta data” or “metadata” throughout.			
7	Line 76	Consistency	Change “Service Provider” to “service provider” or “SP” throughout.			
8	Lines 95, 151	Consistency	No need for “Conventional” or “Traditional”. Suggest deleting.			
9	Line 98	Specificity	Change to “from authoritative CNAM databases”.			
10	Line 106	Consistency	Change “Caller-ID” to “Caller ID” throughout.			
11	Line 111	Grammatical	Change to “This document extends SHAKEN by providing:”			
12	Line 122	Specificity	Change “the following clauses of this document” to “Clause 5”.			
13	Line 173	Consistency	For some reason, double quotes are being represented differently in multiple places.			
14	Lines 335-337	Not a requirement to “verify” this at RCD signing	Since a “shall”, there would never be a failure, if compliant, because of the “rcdi” claim? The sentence really does not add anything, so ideally should be struck. Could also modify to, “..., then the content contained in...”. Further, Lines 413-421 already specify the “rcdi” verification process quite clearly.			
15	Line 343	Extraneous character	Remove “i”.			
16	Line 348	Consistency	Use “VoIP Entity” not “VoIP entity” throughout.			
17	Line 377	Consistency	Change to “source currently outside” since two examples given.			

ATIS Letter Ballot Comment Submittal Form and Consideration Report

18	Line 390	Consistency	Change “Authentication” to “authentication” throughout.			
19	Line 417	Grammatical	Change “does” to “do”. Also, “rcd” should be in double quotes for consistency.			
20	Lines 418-421	Grammatical	This does not seem like a complete sentence? Consider “... but the associated claims are only an indication ...”.			
21	Lines 435-436	Grammatical	Change to, “... the TSP shall ensure that any rich call data item (e.g., company logo) in the Call-Info header field and the “shaken” or “rcd” PASSporT match.”			
22	Line 470	Consistency	Use “rcd” and “rcdl” with quotes throughout.			
23	Line 473	Consistency	Use “shaken” in quotes throughout.			
24	Line 459, 478	Redundancy	Delete “entirely”.			
25	Line 486	Grammatical	Change to “then:”			
26	Line 491	Clarification	Change to “... functions by the TSP.”			

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

ATIS Letter Ballot Comment Submittal Form and Consideration Report

All commenters should use this form when submitting comments on an ATIS Letter Ballot ([view the instructions](#)). This form should accompany the [letter ballot \(via ATIS Workspace\)](#) and will subsequently be used during comment consideration by the appropriate committee/subcommittee.

The commenter should use the “track changes” feature when recommending changes to existing text. Proposed changes to a table, figure, or any other item that is not purely text, should include a summary in the table below and provide the modified table, figure, etc., in the “Other Information” section. The source file for any new figures (Visio, PowerPoint, etc.) must also be included (by either zipping together with this document, or embedding as a file/object).

Letter Ballot: [PTSC-LB-259]

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	Res. ²	Discussion/Explanation/Note (if comment is modified, accepted/modified via a separate ballot comment, or not accepted)
1	7	calling name, enhanced → calling name and enhanced	Typo fix			
2	8	called user vs. called party?	Use one term consistently? See related comment 25.			
3	36	Misplaced reference	Move to Clause 2.1			
4	36	Duplicate Scope clause	Delete			
5	43	[Ref 101]?	Should it be [16]?			
6	49	sign and verify → sign or verify	Any particular service provider would either sign or verify with a particular STI certificate, not do both with the same certificate.			
7	59+	Conventional Caller Name →	Incorrect acronym definition			

¹ Type of change: Insert **S** or **NS**: Substantive (**S**) (see [ATIS OP Section A.6](#)) or Non-Substantive (**NS**)

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**).

ATIS Letter Ballot Comment Submittal Form and Consideration Report

		Conventional Calling Name			
8	59+	Enhanced Caller Name → Enhanced Calling Name	Incorrect acronym definition		
9	59+	Public Branch Exchange → Private Branch Exchange	Incorrect acronym definition		
10	68	Enhanced Caller Name → Enhanced Calling Name	Incorrect term		
11	68-69	Does this document really provide the interface specification of RCD, or just the signing and verifying of RCD using SHAKEN? Relate to [Ref 6]	Clarification		
12	79	the name of the calling party → the calling party name and other caller identify information	clarification		
13	82	extended → provided	Re-wording suggestion		
14	87-88	will discuss → discusses	Re-wording suggestion		
15	89	will be discussed → are discussed	Re-wording suggestion		
16	95	(CNAM) → (CNAM),	Comma added for improved readability		
17	95	telephone network → public telephone network	Clarification		
18	96	telephones → telephones,	Comma added for improved readability		
19	97	is used to display a caller or company name	Mention that it may also display city, state, "Wireless Caller", etc.?		
20	115	Both RCD and eCNAM can support current and future needs... →	Re-wording suggestion		

ATIS Letter Ballot Comment Submittal Form and Consideration Report

		Both RCD and eCNAM are intended to support current and future needs...	Cannot assure that future needs can be met			
21	117-121	Also mention "jcl" key value here?	To be consistent with Clause 5.1.			
22	119	values. → values:	Typo fix			
23	122-123	will detail → detail	Re-wording suggestion			
24	178,195, 233, 248, 253, 276, 291, 295, 318, 319	Missing comma at end	Typo fix			
25	256	a new logo URL → a new URL	Simplified wording			
26	299-300	a new jCard URL → a new URL	Simplified wording			
27	335	Move sentence "The RCD authentication service may include a "crn" claim." to after the following sentence	For better continuity			
28	338 (339), 452 (453)	calling user → calling party	Use one term consistently?			
29	343 (344)	(i such as → (e.g. such as	Typo fix			
30	355 (356)	The authentication service → The RCD authentication service	Clarification			
31	358 (359)	Remove highlighting	Typo fix			
32	365 (366)	permitted rcdi values → permitted "rcdi" values	Typo fix			

ATIS Letter Ballot Comment Submittal Form and Consideration Report

33	408 (409)	the verification service → the RCD verification service	Clarification			
34	417 (418)	for cases where the rcd claims does not → for cases where the “rcd” claims do not	Typo/grammar fix			
35	452 (453)	called UE → called endpoint	Use one term consistently?			
36	457 (458)	two things → two purposes	Suggested re-wording			

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