**1. All Scenarios and end-to-end calls.**

**b. I3v3 AUS**

* + 1. **Concern** - AUS needs clarification. Explicitly how an AUS is detected as a response for items like SIP UA(s) from an ECRF LoST response.
		2. **Proposed Solution** - It should be better explained how to use strings not containing a schema for each protocol.

**b. I3v3 AUS-NAPTR**

* + 1. **Concern** - While the standard may expect everyone to use the same transport protocol, that is currently not the case. Adoption and interworking may require, at times, alternate transports to be supported.
		2. **Proposed Solution** - Provide a way to accurately determine the transport to use, and using AUS and NAPTR for SIP can do this. The standard needs to clarify how AUS should be used with NAPTR to help determine transport.

**3. Miscellaneous**

**b. STIR/SHAKEN**

* + 1. **Possible Implementation -** Headers were not preserved through the entire call path. For the purposes of ICE 10 this analysis was done at the ESRP.
		2. **Proposed Solution** - Further definition is needed to explain how and what to do with STIR/SHAKEN, RPH signing, and Attestation results to verify identity. It is recommended to add detail to the appropriate standard documents explaining related headers must be preserved throughout the entire call path. No intermediary element can change or remove the headers. Additionally, explain where attestation should be performed and what elements are to do when it fails.

**d. Location dereferences**

* + 1. **Observation** - PIF, NIF, and LIF are not currently defined by i3v3. Nuances between implementations prevented a seamless result. **Proposed Solution** - Recommendation that NENA provides at least an information document based on the pattern used by disparate vendors at ICE 10. One example of a pattern that could be recommended, is the use of the“device identifier” extension for dereferencing from an LDB. It was only slight nuances between the interpretations of these vendors and the LNG that prevented immediate interworking. A simple recommendation would allow these vendors to better operate this necessary legacy interworking function.

**5. Additional Feedback**

* 1. **Observation** - The forward verification of the identity of a caller is understood. The prerequisites for STIR/SHAKEN Callbacks are the needed mechanisms that support callbacks in general. In future ICE work, it is recommended that we address PSAP Callbacks prior to focusing on STIR/SHAKEN Callbacks. OCIF implementation guidance is missing in regard to invoking PSAP Callbacks. OSPs are prepared for providing the required headers for this callback, however, it is not clear how the path is built back and associated with the original call.