**NPIF – *Giddy Up Sub Team***

Monday, March 20, 2023 2:00 PM – 3:00 PM (Eastern Time Zone)

**Chairpersons:**

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

**Meeting Attendance** *– – 6 Participants*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Name** | **Company** |  | **Name** | **Company** |
|  | Lisa Marie Maxson | 10xPeople |  | Krishnan Shanmugavel | iconectiv |
| X | John Nakamura | 10xPeople |  | Doug Babcock | iconectiv |
| X | Sara Cleland | ATL |  | Ken Bade | Lumen |
|  | Shawyna Hanes | AT&T |  | Joy McConnell-Couch | Lumen |
|  | Renee Dillon | AT&T |  | Brad Smeal | Lumen |
|  | Teresa Patton | AT&T |  | Jim Kientz | Neustar |
|  | Larry Turner | AT&T |  | Sreetal Brahmadevaiah | Neustar |
|  | Sheri Pressler | Frontier |  | Steve Brock | Oracle |
| X | Cheryl Fullerton | Sinch Voice |  | Vincent Hamrick | Oracle |
|  | Donna LaFontaine | Sinch Voice |  | Holly Nagel | Powernet |
|  | 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 |
|  | Matt Timmerman | iconectiv |  | 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.**
* 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.

Group Discussion

* Regarding A: Per iconectiv, there are around 100+ primary and secondary SPIDs per region. There are some where we have 148 SPIDs that have at least one delegate SPID. John Nakamura from 10X stated that we are not going to be able to simplify this. There are just too many.

Regarding B: Right now, SOAs are looking at this independently. It is hard to keep this as we would need to agree on what it means and is saying. This is about *NPAC not local system requirements*. Ideally this is valuable as it put the individual in the position of looking at their own use, not attempting to extrapolate overall NPAC usage. However, since this is an NPAC requirement, local systems may feel like they could work normally and estimate NPAC usage and boost their rate if they think overall NPAC usage is low. Per iconectiv, this has happened several times over the last few years. The recommendation is that if we do this, it should this be backed up by a best practice to deter abuse. . NPAC requirements are the baseline, but do not tell you how far beyond that baseline and what the problems associated are. So, if we choose B, we need to modify FRS Rates and do a best practice to stop abuse. Sara Cleland from ATL raised concerns about abuse and concurred with John Nakamura that option B is better than A, but potential abuse is a concern that a best practice can address but does not have the teeth to enforce. Due to the small attendance group this week it was agreed to review the data, assess pros and cons, and return next week to discuss with the larger group.

**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 provided data regarding the number of primary and secondary SPIDs, there were a lot more than anyone expected making that calculation more complex. Not all who had previously expressed concerns with these requirements were present in the call. Further discussion is planned for the next meeting. Please review the attached Cheat Sheet**

**Next Meeting: Monday, March 27, 2023 4:00-5:00 EDT**