Section 4.12.3.5 Incident IDs

The IncidentIdArray table specifies a member name of incidentIDs but the JSON schema definition in Section E.8.1 for the IncidentIdArray schema on page 639 specifies a member name of logEventIds.

Section E.7.1 Additional Data Repository OpenAPI Interface Description

The schema for AdditionalDataValue is a string and the schema for the AdditionalDataReference is a string.

If the Content-Type header in the response is application/xml then an AdditionDataValue object is returned. If the Content-Type header of the response is application/json then an AdditionalDataValue object is returned.

How is this supposed to work? What are the data types for these strings?

Section E.10.1 Service/Agency Locator Service OpenAPI Interface Description

The required section for the LocatorRecordUri lists a property of locatorRecordUri but there is no property of that name in the schema for LocatorRecordUri.

Section 4.15.3 Service/Agency Locator Search by Name, page 295

The description column for the serviceAgencyName property says “May occur more than once”, but the schema description in Section E.10.1 does not define serviceAgencyName as an array of strings.

Section 4.5.1 GeocodeRequest

The table for the GeodeticData type on page 197 specifies two properties: pidfLoGeo and gcsReferralUri. The schema definition for the GeodeticData type in Section E.5.1 on page 624 only specifies the pidfLoGeo property. Also, the table on page 197 specifies that the pidfLoGeo property is conditional and the schema definition on page 624 specifies that the pidfLoGeo property is required.

Section E.5.1 Geocode Conversion Service OpenAPI Interface Description

The schema definition for the POST request for the GeocodeRequest on page 622 specifies that the content type is application/json. This appears to be incorrect because Section 4.5.1 Geocode Request on page 196 specifies that the body of the POST request must contain a PIDF-LO document, which is an XML document. The content type should therefore be applicaton/pidf+xml.

The schema definition for the POST request for ReverseGeocodeRequest on page 623 specifies that the content type is application/json. This appears to be incorrect because Section 4.5.2 ReverseGeocodeRequest on page 196 specifies that the body of the POST request must contain a PIDF-LO document, which is an XML document. The content type should therefore be application/pidf+xml.

Section 4.5.1 GeocodeRequest

The table for the CivicAddress type on page 197 specifies two properties: pidfLoAddress and gcsReferralUri. The schema definition for the CivicAddress type in Section E.5.1 on page 624 only specifies the pidfLoAddress property. Also, the table on page 197 specifies that the pidfLoAddress is conditional and the schema definition on page 624 specifies the pidfLoAddress property is required.

Section E.4.1 MSAG Conversion Service OpenAPI Interface Description

The content type for the PidfloToMsag POST request is specified as application/json on page 619. This appears to be incorrect because Section 4.4.1 (PIDF-LO to MSAG Conversion) on page 194 states: “The body of the request MUST contain a PIDF-LO as a string”. The content type should therefore be application/pidf+xml, which is registered MIME type for a PIDF-LO.

Section E.4.1 MSAG Conversion Service OpenAPI Interface Description

The content type for the MsagToPidfLo POST request is specified as application/json on page 620. This appears to be incorrect because Section 4.4.2 (MSAG to PIDF-LO Conversion) on page 195 seems to indicate that the body of the POST request must contain an ALI XML 4.0 formatted string (NENA 02-010 Version 4, XML Format for Data Exchange). The content type should probably be application/xml.

Also, need clarification for which schema and version of the MSAP data is to be used.

Section E.2.1 Discrepancy Report OpenAPI Description

On page 607, the enumeration for the resolution property contains “OtherResponse” twice.

On page 606, the schema definition for the DiscrepancyResolution type contains reportingAgentId property but the description of the DiscrepancyResolution type in Section 3.7.2 on page 125 does not include this property.

Section 3.7.5 LoST Discrepancy Report

The schema defined in Section E.2.1 for the LostDiscrepancyReport defines a property called “discrepancyDetail” but Section 3.7.5 does provide a description of this property.

Section 3.7.8 PSAP Call Taker Discrepancy Report

The text mentions the “problemService” parameter, the “CallTaker” parameter, and the “Comment” parameter, but these parameters are not shown in the table nor are described in the schema for the CallTakerDiscrepancyReport in Section E.2.1.

Section 3.7.11 GIS Discrepancy Report

The description for the “location” property states: “One or more locations where the gap or overlap can be found or for which an incorrect LoST referral is made”.

What is the format of the location data? Is it a PIDF-LO XML document? If so, how are multiple locations to be represented as a string?

Section 3.7.13 Policy Discrepancy Report

What is the format for the “location” property? Is it PIDF-LO XML?

Section 3.7.14 Originating Service Provider Discrepancy Report

What is the format for the “location” property? Is it PIDF-LO XML?

Section 3.7.18 ADR/IS-ADR Discrepancy Report

What is the format of the “block” property. Is it “EmergencyCallData.ServiceInfo” or just “ServiceInfo”?

What is the format for the “location” property? Is it PIDF-LO XML?

Section 3.7.19 Network Discrepancy Report and Section E.2.1

The text in Section 3.7.19 specifies an enumeration value for the “problem” property as “OtherNetwork” but the YAML in Section E.2.1 on page 615 specifies an enumeration value of “OtherAdr”.

Section 3.7.21 Test Call Generator Discrepancy Report

The schema definition in Section E.2.1, pages 615 and 616 specifies properties called “time”, “contact”, “sdp” and “mediaOk”, but Section 3.7.21 does not provide a description of these properties.

Section 12 References. On page 484, Reference 228 lists RFC 8032 but it should be RFC 8037.

Section 5.7 Integrity Protection states:

“See [213] for details related to SRTP support for SHA-256.”

Reference 213 refers to RFC 6188 The Use of AES-192 and AES-256 in Secure RTP. RFC 6188 specifies the use of HMAC-SHA1 for authentication and does not reference or use SHA-256. RFC 6188 describes the use of AES-256. Therefore, the wording in Section 5.7 should be changed to:

“See [213] for details related to SRTP support for AES-256 with HMAC-SHA1.”