Informal PIM 102 Meeting

September 27, 2017 Conference Call

Final Minutes

**Attendance**

| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Lisa Marie Maxson | 10X People | Bonnie Johnson | Minnesota Dept of Commerce |
| David Alread | AT&T | Lynette Khirallah | NetNumber |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T | Dave Garner | Neustar  |
| Kim Isaacs | Allstream | Paul LaGattuta | Neustar |
| Deborah Anstead | AlticeUSA | Nasiombe Mutonyi | Neustar |
| Kyle Belcher | ATL Communications | Meenakshi Parthasarathy | Neustar |
| Lisa Jill Freeman | Bandwidth | Amy Putnam | Neustar |
| Anna Kafka | Bandwidth | Jim Rooks | Neustar |
| Connie Stufflebeam | BKD | Lavinia Rotaru | Neustar |
| Vicki Goth | CenturyLink | Gary Sacra | Neustar |
| Joy McConnell-Couch | CenturyLink | Mubeen Saifullah | Neustar |
| Glenn Clepper  | Charter | Shannon Sevigny | Neustar Pooling |
| Kathy Troughton | Charter | Lauriann Mullen | NY DPS |
| Erik Chuss | ChaseTech | Suzanne Addington | Sprint |
| Kasha Fauscett | Comcast | Jeanne Kulesa | Synchronoss |
| Randee Ryan | Comcast | Bob Bruce | Syniverse |
| Doug Babcock | iconectiv | Amanda Molina | Townes |
| Michael Doherty | iconectiv | Kevin Batista | Transition Oversight Manager |
| Steve Koch | iconectiv | Greg Chiasson | Transition Oversight Manager |
| John Malyar | iconectiv | Bill Reilly | Transition Oversight Manager |
| George Tsacnaris | iconectiv | Jonathan Turner | Transition Oversight Manager |
| Pat White | iconectiv | Paula Campagnoli | T-Mobile |
| Bridget Alexander | JSI  | Tanya Golub | US Cellular |
| Jerry James | LNP Alliance | Kathy Rogers | Verizon Wireless |
| Dave Malfara | LNP Alliance | Deb Tucker | Verizon  |
| Namitha Sundar | MetroPCS |  |  |

The Transition Oversight Manager (TOM) facilitated the informal industry call regarding PIM 102. The TOM introduced the issue and mentioned that in an effort to drive the best path forward, the scope of the issue was limited. iconectiv cannot accommodate the change within the current schedule and new information was made available indicating the vendor could work with what iconectiv is providing. Due to the informal nature of the meeting, no Change Order was approved during the call, but Change Order approval could take place once the LNPA WG is re-formed.

The attached documents aided the discussion.

******************

iconectiv provided a summary of the situation and noted that a change order should be created that will clarify what is in the documentation.iconectiv provided the following suggested resolution for the issue.

Suggested Resolution:

Create a doc only change order to update industry documents (e.g., FRS and IIS) to provide clarifications and remove any ambiguity regarding the implementation for SWIM based recovery of modified SVs and NPBs. The change order will clarify that the SWIM recovery of modified data for SVs and NPBs will only contain the object data from the broadcast that was missed.

Neustar was asked to comment to help the group understand the overall issue. See attached NANC 504 – Neustar Comments v2 document. Clarifications were provided regarding SWIM recovery that takes place after a provider has been offline for a period of time. Edge case scenarios were discussed as part of the clarification. For example, a provider may receive a download while still online, but that download could fail. If a modify of the original message is included in the SWIM recovery, the failed message would not be considered a missed download, so the modify would not be accepted. It was suggested that the Change Order provide for these edge scenarios so information is not missed.

There were long discussions about error conditions and use cases for error conditions as well as possible misinterpretation of the requirements. Error conditions (exceptions) during recovery will create fallout that needs correction or the LSMS will not be in synch with the active NPAC. Error correction for the local system may include processing audits or obtaining BDDs. The existing systems do currently have ways to handle edge case situations.Additional discussion took place regarding differences of interpretation in the requirements and additional work that is needed for the Change Order.

Thirteen of fourteen PIMs were resolved during the 9/12 LNPA WG meeting and the proposed plan for PIM 102 accommodates the current process. Neustar agreed to move forward with the proposed plan and get certified. Future meetings will be needed to come to final agreement on how the change order will ultimately be written. If there are some potential efficiencies for operations that can be gained by taking advantage of the additional attributes, the industry may decide that a later point in time.

When asked if tests were run for the edge case scenarios to determine if vendors take advantage of additional attributes, iconectiv confirmed they ran additional tests with dummied up data to identify other LSMS systems that might be negatively impacted beyond the one known LSMS with the issue. Based on those tests, no other systems appeared to be using the additional attributes. When other Local providers were asked to report if this issue impacts them, no one responded. It was reiterated that this issue does not affect baseline porting functionality and the issue will not prevent porting from taking place.

The TOM determined that the group would move forward on the path in the suggested PIM resolution and in the future, the LNPA WG can address the issue appropriately for final resolution. Change Order 504 still requires updates to be made at a formal WG meeting.