**NPIF – *Giddy Up Sub Team***

Monday, April 17, 2023 2:00 PM – 3:00 PM (Eastern Time Zone)

**Chairperson:**

*Cheryl Fullerton (Sinch)*

**Meeting Attendance** *– – 12 Participants*

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

**PIM 136 – LSMS Performance**

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

1. Range requests
	1. 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:
		1. 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.
		2. 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).
* **The group agreed to move forward with Option B.**
1. Relationship between SOA and LSMS transactions
	1. Option A: Update the SOA transaction aggregate requirement to address two distinct scenarios.
		1. 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
		2. The second scenario is for requests that do generate downloads (i.e., activate, modify active, disconnect) to LSMSs
		3. 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.
		* **The group agreed to move forward with Option A.**
2. Service Bureau / Primary SPID, Secondary SPIDs & Delegate SPIDS
	1. Option A: Clarify requirement wording to state that treatment of XML Primary SPIDs is identical to CMIP Primary SPIDs, as currently defined. 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.
	2. Option B: Clarify requirement wording to state that treatment of XML Primary SPIDs is identical to CMIP Primary SPIDs, as currently defined. Leave CO 559 changes in place but remove per-SOA transaction rate requirement; only aggregate SOA requirement would remain.
	3. Notifications: GUST should be certain to account for notifications in overall transaction requirement numbers, including frequency with which notification suppression is utilized.
		* During the previous meeting it was concluded that the Service Bureau (Primary SPID and its Secondary SPIDs and the Delegate SPIDs were interrelated and should be combined as one issue. Received feedback from Renee Dillon (AT&T) & John Nakamura (10xPeople). Steve (iconectiv) advised that we need to understand the accounting for primary, secondary and delegate SPIDs.
		* Feedback was requested from Service Providers at the last two GUST meetings and the industry meeting. To date no additional participation has been received.
		* Current attendees of the GUST are unable to proceed on clarifying the accounting used by Service providers for the various SPID types without that input.
		* **Discussed options to obtain better data from SPs and agreed to work with Michael Doherty to send an email from GUST requesting SP involvement so that we can resolve this last issue and move forward with submitting the final PIM for increasing the transaction rate.**

**Action Items Updates/Status Review**

* GUS to work with Steve (iconectiv) to send email requesting service provider input on the newly condensed third and final detail to be resolved.

**Next Meeting: Monday, May 1, 2023 4:00-5:00 EDT**