



1200 G Street, NW
Suite 500
Washington, DC 20005

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

August 1, 2022

Martin Dolly
PTSC Chair

Re: ATIS Letter Ballot PTSC-LB-276 Closing Letter

Dear Martin:

ATIS Letter Ballot PTSC-LB-276, entitled "PTSC-LB-276, *draft proposed ATIS Standard, Robocall Call Blocking Notification (ATIS-1000099)*" closed on July 31, 2022. The results are as follows:

16	Approvals Comments: Neustar, Ericsson, Peraton Labs, Google
1	Disapprovals No comments
7	Abstentions No comments
5	Ballots not returned
29	<hr/> 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:

V. 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-276 (PTSC-2022-00045R000)

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	Abstract	Missing	Editorial, add an Abstract			
2	Line 2	“mechanism” to “mechanism for”	Editorial			
3	Lines 6-7	“SIP 603” to “SIP 603 response” and “response referred” to “referred”	Editorial			
4	Line 9	“Default” to “default”	Editorial			
5	Lines 11 and 132	“Reason Header” to “Reason header”	Consistency throughout			
6	Line 36	Isn't this the definition of CVT as defined in ATIS 10K74? Or, state, for example, CVT as defined in the SHAKEN framework, to keep general?	If so, make the connection for clarity: <i>Call Validation Treatment (CVT) – This is a logical function that could be an application server function or a third-party application for applying call analytics and treatment techniques</i>			

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

			<i>once the signature is positively or negatively verified.</i>			
7	Line 53	“,” to “,”	Editorial			
8	Line 55	Delete extra double quote	Editorial			
9	Line 61	‘v’ to “v”	Consistency			
10	Lines 62 and 76	Change “Table 2” to “Table 4-2”	Editorial			
11	Line 76	Change “Reason” to Reason in title	Consistency			
12	Line 76	No reference in text to this Table 4-1?	Editorial; Add reference in preceding text			
13	Line 76	Table: “21”, “603” to “21” or “603”	Consistency			
14	Line 78	Change title to “reason-text” parameter Attribute-Value Pairs (AVPs) or just “reason-text” parameter AVPs since already defined	Editorial			
15	Line 78	“SP” not defined. Change to “service provider”	Editorial			
16	Line 78	In same table cell above, change example font to match rest of document	Format			
17	Line 84	Would it be better to illustrate location=RLN where blocking is mostly happening today or show a mix with at least one other value?	Editorial			
18	Line 121	Change “Calling Party” to “calling party” and “toward” to “towards”	Editorial			
19	Line 125	Change “MAY” to “may”	Editorial			

ATIS Letter Ballot Comment Submittal Form and Consideration Report

20	Lines 128 and 133	Change “toward” to “towards”	Editorial			
21	Lines 129-130	Change “It shall not” to “It shall not modify the 603 response” and delete this added text from end of sentence	Clarity			
22	131	Change “603+” to 603+	Editorial			

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-276]

Company Name: [Ericsson]						
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	Abstract	Text is needed in the abstract section.	Add the following text: <u>This document defines a mechanism that provides real-time notification in the backward call direction (towards the calling party), that the associated call was blocked by the indicated voice service provider due to analytics-based call processing.</u>			
2	1/ line 2	Propose slight rewording to improve readability	Change to: This document defines a mechanism <u>providing—that provides</u> real-time notification in the backward call direction ...			
3	1/ lines 6-7	Propose slight rewording to improve readability	Change to: To provide such notification, this specification defines a profile of the SIP 603 <u>response code</u> defined in RFC 3261,			

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

			<i>SIP: Session Initiation Protocol, response</i> referred to herein as “603+”.			
4	1/ line 15	Propose slight rewording to improve readability	Change to: This standard is primarily developed for, and is to be adoption-adopted by, US voice service providers.			
5	4.1.1/ line 55	Remove extra quotes	Change to: The “protocol” parameter shall be either “ “Q.850”, as specified in RFC 6432 . . .			
6	4.1.1/ Lines 57-59	Propose slight rewording to improve readability	Change to: Exactly one “protocol-cause” parameter shall be included. Its value is “21” if the protocol parameter is set to “Q.850” or <u>The value of the “protocol-cause” parameter</u> shall be “603” if the protocol parameter is set to “SIP”. Exactly one “reason-text” parameter shall be included. Its-The value of the “text” parameter shall be . . .			
7	4.1.1/ Table 4-2, last row, third column	Spell out “service provider” since the acronym SP is not used elsewhere in the document. Fix font in the parenthetical expression to match the rest of the text.	Change to: Identifier used by the SP-service provider that blocked the call to facilitate redress (e.g., call identifier, blocking reason identifier, network segment identifier, etc.)			
8	4.1.3/ line 121	Propose slight rewording to improve readability	Change to: The transit network shall transparently forward toward the Calling Party a received SIP 603 response received .			
9	4.1.3/ line 124	Change “Analytic” to “Analytics”	Change to: Analytics processing in a transit . . .			
10	4.1.4/ line 128	Spell out first occurrence of “UA”	Change to:			

ATIS Letter Ballot Comment Submittal Form and Consideration Report

			The originating network shall forward the SIP 603 response message toward the SIP <u>User Agent (UA)</u> that originated the call . . .			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

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-276, Robocall Blocking Notification

Company Name: Peraton Labs						
TO BE COMPLETED BY COMMENTER				TO BE COMPLETED BY SUB/COMMITTEE		
Auto#	Page/ Section/ Line #	Comment <i>Proposed text changes are reflected in the accompanying marked-up copy.</i>	Rationale/Suggested Solution	Type ¹	Res. ²	Discussion/Explanation/Note <i>(if comment is modified, accepted/modified via a separate ballot comment, or not accepted)</i>
1	2-4	This document defines a mechanism providing that provides real-time notification in the backward call direction (towards the calling party), that the associated call was blocked by the indicated voice service provider due to analytics-based call processing.	Suggested rewording for improved readability.			
2	4-6	It ensures that voice service providers can continue to use analytics to block calls suspected to be illegal, fraudulent or for other reasons undesirable, while providing immediate-real-time notice to callers.	Clarification.			
3	7-8	To provide such notification, this specification-standard defines a profile of the SIP 603 response defined in RFC 3261, <i>SIP: Session Initiation Protocol</i> ,	Suggested rewording for improved readability; addition of reference.			

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

		response referred to [Ref 1] herein referred to as "603+".			
4	8-9	A <u>SIP 603+</u> response is differentiated from a <u>SIP 603</u> response in two ways:	Clarifications. Punctuation fix.		
5	10	... uses a unique reason phrase, "Network Blocked", rather than the <u>SIP 603</u> Default Reason Phrase "Decline" specified in RFC 3261 [Ref 1].	Clarification.		
6	12-13	2. It contains a SIP Reason Header defined in RFC 3326, <i>The Reason Header Field for the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP)</i> , [Ref 2] encoded per this specification standard.	Addition of reference; clarification.		
7	15-16	Any 603 response received without this the syntax included—defined in this standard should be treated as currently handled today.	Typo correction. Clarification.		
8	17-20	This standard is primarily developed for and adoption by US voice service providers. It is not precluded from being used internationally. Other countries may adopt these this standards and they it may be implemented through bilateral agreements with business partners in the US pursuant to their business agreements. This standard is not precluded from being used internationally.	Improved readability. Reordered sentences. Text changed to refer to the single standard.		
9	41-42	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>SIP 603 Response: the current SIP 603 response as defined in RFC 3261 [Ref 1]</u> • <u>SIP 603+ Response: a SIP 603 response that adheres to the encoding described in this standard.</u> 	Suggested additional definitions.		
10	45-46	Added acronyms HTTPS, ISUP, and URL	Completeness of acronym list.		

ATIS Letter Ballot Comment Submittal Form and Consideration Report

11	47	4. Blocking Call Processing Notification of Analytics-based Network Blocking	Suggested rewording for improved readability.			
12	49	4.1 Data -Analytics Blocking	Alignment with definition in Section 3.1			
13	50-51	If-When a service provider blocks a call due to analytics, the service provider shall reply with a SIP 603+ response encoded per <u>the profile defined in this specification standard</u> .	Clarification.			
14	52-53	This capability defines a The profile of the SIP 603 <u>response</u> [Ref 1] <u>defined in this standard is</u> referred to as 603+.	Suggested rewording for improved readability.			
15	54-58	<u>A SIP 603+ response</u> is differentiated from a <u>SIP 603 response</u> in that it contains a format where it has with a status line <u>value</u> of "603 - Network Blocked", with a Reason header containing an indication of the reason for the blocking and, the version of this specification, "analytics1", and the contact information of the entity responsible for <u>blocking</u> the call, having been blocked . The contact information allows-provides the calling party <u>with information on where to go</u> to learn-find out why the call was blocked, and <u>to</u> potentially to -seek redress	Clarifications. Suggested rewording for improved readability.			
16	59	Any <u>SIP 603 response</u> received without this-the <u>syntax defined in this standard</u> should be treated as currently handled today.	Clarifications.			
17	61	4.1.1 Formal Specification of Reason Header Syntax for 603+ <u>Response</u>	Clarification.			
18	62-63	Reason headers used in 603+ responses shall comply with the syntax specified in RFC 3326 [Ref 2], with the following	Suggested rewording for improved readability; punctuation fix.			

ATIS Letter Ballot Comment Submittal Form and Consideration Report

		restrictions per the profile of their usage defined in this specification <u>standard</u> :-			
19	64-65	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The “protocol” parameter shall be either “Q.850”, as specified in RFC 6432, <i>Carrying Q.850 Codes in Reason Header Fields in SIP (Session Initiation Protocol) Responses</i>, or “SIP” [Ref 3] 	Addition of reference. Deletion of extraneous quotation mark.		
20	71-72	The ‘v’ attribute shall be included, and shall be the first AVP in the “reason-text” parameter. Supported AVPs are specified in Table 4-2 .	Corrected table reference.		
21	86	Third row of Table 4-1: See Table 4-2	Corrected table reference.		
22	91	4.1.2 Examples of Reason Header Syntax for 603+ Response	Clarification.		
23	92-93	Example “Reason” headers with different parameters (“protocol-cause”, “reason-text” and “location”) and value parameters attribute-value pairs (AVPs) are illustrated below:	Clarification.		
24	132-137	The A transit network shall transparently forward a received SIP 603+ response toward the Calling Party. a SIP 603 response received . It shall not change the response code from 603 to a different value, nor modify any part of the 603+ response other than headers used to forward it (e.g., Via headers) except as required by its interconnect agreements or other contractual arrangements with the downstream network. It shall not retry the associated request. Analytic processing in a transit network MAY generate result in the generation of a 603+ response .	Suggested rewording for improved readability.		
25	140-143	The An originating network receiving a SIP 603+ response shall forward the SIP 603+ response message toward the SIP UA that	Suggested rewording for improved readability.		

ATIS Letter Ballot Comment Submittal Form and Consideration Report

		<p>originated the call sessionrequest. It shall not, except as required by contractual agreements with the entity responsible for the originating SIP UA or the network (e.g., Enterprise) that must be traversed to reach the originating SIP UA, modify the 603+ response.</p>			
26	144-147	<p>If an originating network receives a SIP 603 response where the status line of the SIP 603 response identifies it as a “603+” response as defined by this specificationstandard, but its Reason Header header does not adhere to the syntax in Clause 4.1.1, the Reason header shall be removed prior to forwarding the 603 response onward—toward the originating SIP UA.</p>	<p>Suggested rewording for improved readability. Terminology correction.</p>		

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-276]**

Company Name: [Google]						
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		The reason phrase in the SIP response status line is intended for human consumption and insisting that it have a specific machine interpretable format is unusual and arguably an anti-pattern. It seems like it's unnecessary in this case so the better option would be to rely solely on the Reason header for determining whether this standard applies, e.g. look for the cause=603 and the "v" param.	This spec could still suggest a specific status line reason phrase.			
2		Encoding name-value parameters inside the "text" Reason param seems very unfortunate. Could these params not appear directly as Reason params in their own right (as RFC 3326				

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

		reason-extension)? Among other things it would work better with existing SIP stacks.			
3		The spec probably should define a grammar for the list of name-value params of the "text" Reason param.			
4		The examples are not valid Reason headers. The param names are "cause" and "text", not "protocol-cause" and "reason-text".			
5		It seems odd that the spec doesn't even mention 608 and RFC 8688. Should it say that in SHAKEN, 603+ is used instead of 608 or provide *some* kind of guidance?			

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