**NPIF – *Giddy Up Sub Team***

Monday, March 13, 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** |
|  | Lisa Marie Maxson | 10xPeople |  | Krishnan Shanmugavel | iconectiv |
| X | John Nakamura | 10xPeople |  | 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 |  | Jim Kientz | Neustar |
| X | Larry Turner | AT&T | X | Sreetal Brahmadevaiah | Neustar |
| X | Sheri Pressler | Frontier |  | Steve Brock | Oracle |
| X | Cheryl Fullerton | Sinch Voice |  | Vincent Hamrick | Oracle |
|  | Donna LaFontaine | Sinch Voice |  | Holly Nagel | Powernet |
| X | Renee Berkowitz | iconectiv |  | Bob Bruce | Syniverse |
| X | Michael Doherty | iconectiv |  | Tessa Whiteside | Telnyx |
| X | Darold Hemphill | iconectiv |  | Sarah Halko | Telnyx |
| X | Steve Koch | iconectiv |  | Bale Pathman | Verizon |
| X | Matt Timmerman | iconectiv | X | 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 reviewed data from December 2022, January 2023 & February 2023 regarding the volume of range requests during these months.**



* 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
* **iconectiv reviewed the impacted requirements and the group discussed both of these topics as they are interdependent. Not all who had previously expressed concerns with these requirements were present in the call. Further discussion is planned for the next meeting.**

**Next Meeting: Monday, March 20, 2023 4:00-5:00 EDT**