



September 26, 2022

Alliance For Telecommunications Industry Solutions  
PTSC  
1200 G Street NW, Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20005

To Whom It May Concern:

We sincerely appreciate the work of ATIS and the SIP Forum and the opportunity to comment on the draft **Robocall Call Blocking Notification** standard, and we agree that such an amendment to the SIP protocol is appropriate for call blocking. Below is commentary and recommendations to refine the draft.

#### **603+ Response [Page 7, Section 4.1]**

We believe that a 6xx code is appropriate for Robocall Call Blocking, however, we suggest that a **new 6xx code be designated for this purpose** so that Robocall Blocking statistics can be differentiated from “standard” 603 Decline messages. Altering the Status Line is insufficient for this purpose since many systems use the status code as a primary key for such reporting and analytics.

We do not support altering the Status Line. We believe that response codes should be deterministic and not require extra processing, computer or human, to interpret.

While we strongly prefer a newly defined 6xx code, we understand that creating a new status code has practical implications that may require system updates for it to be supported, which could significantly and unreasonably delay the adoption of this standard. If ATIS and SIP Forum has chosen to enhance the existing 603 response code to simplify and expedite adoption, then we suggest leaving the default Status Line as “Declined” because we believe that is the true status and the remaining parameters explain *why* it is declined.

#### **Reason Header Syntax [Pages 7-8, Section 4.1.1]**

We believe there is great benefit to the Reason Header Parameters as they are defined, except for the “v” attribute, as outlined below. We find particularly useful the “location” and the “url/tel/email” contact attributes.



**“v” Attribute [Page 8, Table 4-2]**

We interpret the “v” attribute value “*analytics1*” in the document as a static value and believe this attribute would have greater meaning if it were variable that could be defined on a per-system basis by each operator, though analytics1 may be used as a default value if no overwritten value is given.

If the value is to always be the same, then it holds no benefit, and we suggest removing the attribute altogether.

Thank you again for ~~allowing~~ us to provide feedback on the proposed standard. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Shannon Detwiler  
Director of Engineering  
+16102300807  
[sdetwiler@evolveip.net](mailto:sdetwiler@evolveip.net)

Peter Eisengrein  
SVP, Network Engineering  
+16102300192  
[peisengrein@evolveip.net](mailto:peisengrein@evolveip.net)

Remko Kloosterman  
Senior Voice Engineer  
+31651603487  
[remko.kloosterman@evolveip.eu](mailto:remko.kloosterman@evolveip.eu)

Jason Morrison  
Senior Voice Engineer  
+16102321483  
[jmorrison@evolveip.net](mailto:jmorrison@evolveip.net)