**NPIF – *Giddy Up Sub Team***

Monday, March 6, 2023 2:00 PM – 3:00 PM (Eastern Time Zone)

**Chairpersons:**

*Cheryl Fullerton (Sinch), Joy McConnell-Couch (CenturyLink/Lumen)*

**Meeting Attendance** *– – 14 Participants*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Name** | **Company** |  | **Name** | **Company** |
| X | Lisa Marie Maxson | 10xPeople |  | Krishnan Shanmugavel | iconectiv |
| X | John Nakamura | 10xPeople |  X | Doug Babcock | iconectiv |
|  | Sara Cleland | ATL |  | Ken Bade | Lumen |
| X | Shawyna Hanes | AT&T |  X | Joy McConnell-Couch | Lumen |
| X | Renee Dillon | AT&T |  | Brad Smeal | Lumen |
|  | Teresa Patton | AT&T | X | Jim Kientz | Neustar |
|  | Sheri Pressler | Frontier | X | Sreetal Brahmadevaiah | Neustar |
| X | Cheryl Fullerton | Sinch Voice | X | Steve Brock | Oracle |
|  | Donna LaFontaine | Sinch Voice |  | Vincent Hamrick | Oracle |
| X | Renee Berkowitz | iconectiv |  | Holly Nagel | Powernet |
| X | Michael Doherty | iconectiv |  | Bob Bruce | Syniverse |
|  | Darold Hemphill | iconectiv |  | Tessa Whiteside | Telnyx |
| X | Steve Koch | iconectiv |  | Sarah Halko | Telnyx |
| X | Matt Timmerman | iconectiv |  | Bale Pathman | Verizon |
|  |  |  |  | Deb Tucker | Verizon |

**PIM 136 – LSMS Performance**

**Requirements that need to be updated or addressed**

* Range requests
* Option A: Each TN in a SOA request or notification constitutes a transaction. For example, a SOA range request with 10 TNs is 10 transactions.
* Option B: For notifications, the number of SOA transactions is determined by the ceiling of (the total number of TNs in the notification divided by *X*). For requests, the number of SOA transactions represented by a single range request is determined to be the greater of
	+ the ceiling of (the total number of TNs in the request divided by *X*). For example, if *X* is 5, then a range request with 10 TNs is 2 SOA transaction and a range request with 106 TNs is 22 SOA transactions
	+ the number of download messages sent to all LSMSs divided by the number of LSMSs (i.e., the average number of download messages per LSMS).
* Option C: Range requests count as 1 transaction unless they involve multiple message to LSMS, in which case the average download message per LSMS is the effective transaction count.

Group Discussion:

* Option C leaves the door wide open. Option A is constrictive on ranges. Option B is the most accurate but would require the industry to come up with a number.
* **The group agreed to move forward with Option B. iconectiv will provide updated data for the calculations and LSMS impact status.**
* Relationship between SOA and LSMS transactions
	+ Option A: Update the SOA transaction aggregate requirement to address two distinct scenarios.
		- The first scenario is for requests that do not generate downloads (e.g., SV create request, cancel request, modify pending request, query request, etc.) to LSMSs and for notifications to SOAs
		- The second scenario is for requests that do generate downloads (i.e., activate, modify active, disconnect) to LSMSs
		- Modify the aggregate transaction requirement (currently 70/sec) to be the sum of both scenarios with a condition that the transaction rate for the second scenario does not exceed the LSMS required rate (currently 7/sec). Using the current numbers, this update would state that NPAC is required to support 70 SOA transactions per second of which 7 are requests that result in LSMS downloads.
	+ Option B: Update the SOA transaction requirements to indicate the NPAC is not held to them when the LSMS transaction rate exceeds the defined rate (in aggregate or per LSMS).

Group Discussion

* **The group agreed to move forward with Option A.**

**Topics for next meeting:**

* Service Bureau / Primary SPID and its Secondary SPIDs
	+ Option A: Clarify requirement wording to state that treatment of XML Primary SPIDs is identical to CMIP Primary SPIDs, as currently defined.
	+ Option B: Remove per-SOA transaction rate requirement; only aggregate SOA requirement would remain.
* Delegate SPIDs
	+ Option A: Leave CO 559 changes in place to limit quantity of delegates that can be used by a single Service Provider SPID but make no further changes.
	+ Option B: Leave CO 559 changes in place but remove per-SOA transaction rate requirement; only aggregate SOA requirement would remain.
	+ Notifications: GUST should be certain to account for notifications in overall transaction requirement numbers, including frequency with which notification suppression is utilized

**Next Meeting: Monday, March 13, 2023 4:00-5:00 EDT**