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# Open Change Orders

| **Open Change Orders** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Chg Order #** | **Orig. / Date** | **Description** | **Priority** | **Category** | **Proposed Resolution** | **Level of Effort** | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | **NPAC** | **SOA LSMS** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Accepted Change Orders

| **Accepted Change Orders** | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Chg Order #** | **Orig. / Date** | **Description** | **Priority** | **Category** | **Proposed Resolution** | **Level of Effort** | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | **NPAC** | | **SOA LSMS** |
| NANC 403 | NeuStar  3/30/05 | **Allow Recovery Messages to be sent only during Recovery**  The current documentation does NOT specifically state that ALL recovery messages should only be sent to the NPAC during recovery (it is currently indicated for notifications and SWIM data). This change order will clarify the documentation to include ALL data.  This will require some operational changes for Service Providers that utilize Network Data and/or Subscription Data recovery while in normal mode. | TBD | TBD | Func Backward Compatible: Yes  The proposed solution is to update the FRS, IIS and GDMO recovery description to indicate that network data and subscription data recovery requests sent during normal mode will be rejected.  No sunset policy will be implemented with this change order. | | Low | None / None-Med |
| NANC 403  (con’t) | Proposed Resolution:  FRS, new requirements:  **Req 1 All Data Recovery Only in Recovery Mode**  NPAC SMS shall allow a SOA or LSMS to recover data ONLY in recovery mode.  **Req 2 Recovery Restriction Tunable Parameter**  NPAC SMS shall provide a Regional Recovery Restriction in Recovery Mode Only tunable parameter which is defined as an indicator on whether or not the restriction of recovery requests only is allowed while in recovery mode is supported by the NPAC SMS for a particular NPAC Region.  **Req 3 Recovery Restriction Tunable Parameter Default**  NPAC SMS shall default the Regional Recovery Restriction in Recovery Mode Only tunable parameter to TRUE.  **Req 4 Recovery Restriction Tunable Parameter Modification**  NPAC SMS shall allow NPAC Personnel, via the NPAC Administrative Interface, to modify the Regional Recovery Restriction in Recovery Mode Only tunable parameter.  IIS, section 5.2.1.9, add the following text:  All recovery requests can only be sent to the NPAC when the SOA/LSMS is in recovery mode, otherwise an error message is returned (failed).  IIS, section 5.3.4, change the following text:  ~~Service Provider and Notification~~ All recovery requests can only be sent to the NPAC when the SOA/LSMS is in recovery mode, otherwise an error message is returned (failed).  GDMO, lnpDownload notification, add the following text in the behavior section:  All recovery requests can only be sent to the NPAC when the SOA/LSMS is in recovery mode, otherwise an error message is returned (failed).  **Dec 05** – moved to Accepted per LNPAWG discussion. | | | | | | | |
| NANC 419 | AT&T  3/15/07 | **User Prioritization of Recovery-Related Notifications**  **Business Need:**  The existing NPAC Notification Priority process only allows a certain type of notification to have a different priority from another type. Using this method, however, SOAs cannot distinguish between the ***reasons*** for a certain type of notification. For example, a Status Attribute Value Change notification could indicate that all LSMSs successfully responded and a pending SV is moving to active, or it could indicate that a discrepant LSMS has just completed recovery and a partial-failure SV is moving to active.  As a result, an SP that is recovering SVs could cause the activating SOA to experience unintended delays in receiving notifications for different activities because the recovery process generates its own set of notifications. This unintended delay could happen hours after the initial activity, when the SOA is otherwise relatively lightly loaded, causing confusion to the SOA users. |  |  | Func Backward Compatible: TBD  Develop a mechanism that further defines certain notifications as initiated by regular activity versus recovery activity. With this change order the two instances would be differentiated, and an SP could indicate a different prioritization for one versus the other.  **May ’07 APT:**  The business need/scenario was explained during the APT meeting, with agreement from the group that the text captured the current business need. The group also agreed to recommend acceptance of this change order by the LNPAWG. The CMA will add additional text to this change order, then send out prior to the Jun ’07 LNPAWG con call, with a recommendation of approval from the APT.  Example of current notification:  Notification -- L-11.0 A1 SV SAVC Activates to new SP priority.  Definition -- When an INTER or INTRA SV has been created in the Local SMSs (or ‘activated‘ by the SOA) and the SV status has been set to: *Active* or *Partial-Failure*. The notification is sent to both SOAs: Old and New. If the status has been set to *Partial-Failure*, this notification contains the list of Service Providers (SP) LSMSs that have failed to receive the broadcast. | | Med | None / None |
| NANC 419 (con’t) | Proposed Resolution:  Add a new scenario to the list of notification priorities (42 listed in the FRS, Appendix C). The new one will be specific to notifications generated as a result of recovery requests (not to be confused with notification recovery). This will allow notifications generated where the *reason* is recovery to have a lower priority than the same notification generated where the *reason* is a SOA GUI user working real-time with a customer request.  In the example above, notification L-11.0 A1 would have a lower priority in a recovery-related SV activate scenario where one LSMS failed the initial SV activate download, but successfully recovered that SV activate download at a later time, whereas a different instance of notification L-11.0 A1 would have a higher priority in a regular SV activate scenario where all LSMSs successfully processed the SV activate download.  **Jun ’07 LNPAWG con call:**  The change order was accepted by the LNPAWG during the call. Detailed requirements will begin to be developed.  **Jul ’07 LNPAWG meeting:**  Upon further discussion, it was agreed that instead of just one new notification that would be generated as a result of a recovery request, the type of activity (activate, modify, disconnect) should also be accounted for in the proposed solution. The group will discuss the complexity of different types of activity, and whether this is needed and/or confusing to manage. With this new ability to “change the order”, the issue of out-of-sequence notifications needs to be discussed as well.  The attached document describes the proposed new notifications in blue. These will be discussed during the Sep ’07 LNPAWG meeting.    **Sep ’07 LNPAWG meeting:**  All participants were not available to discuss this at this time. Discussion will carry forward into the Nov ’07 meeting.  **Nov ’07 LNPAWG meeting:**  After a brief discussion, it was agreed that no solid business case could be identified for keeping this at the “type of activity” level, so instead of one each for activate, modify, and disconnect, just a single recovery notification will be used for all three types. | | | | | | | |
| NANC 437 | Telcordia  1/8/09 | **Multi-Vendor NPAC SMS Solution**  **Business Need:**  Refer to separate document. |  |  | Func Backward Compatible: TBD  **Jan ’09 LNPAWG,** discussion**:**  A walk-thru of the proposed solution took place. Telcordia will be providing addition information prior to the Mar ’09 LNPAWG meeting.  **Mar ’09 LNPAWG,** discussion**:**  A walk-thru of some of the documents provided in Feb were reviewed. Further review will take place during the Apr con call, and the May face-to-face mtgs.  **May ’09 – Jul ‘10 LNPAWG,** discussion**:**  The group has continued reviews during the monthly mtgs. | TBD | | TBD |
| NANC 447 | AT&T  11/01/11 | **NPAC Support for CMIP over TCP/IPv6**  **Business Need:**  Refer to separate document. |  |  | Func Backward Compatible: Yes  **Nov ’11 LNPAWG,** discussion**:**  A walk-thru of the proposed change order took place. The group accepted the change order.  **Mar ’12 LNPAWG,** discussion**:**  The group agreed to forward the change order to the NAPM LLC, to request an SOW from Neustar.  **Jan ’13 status update:**  The NAPM LLC has withdrawn the SOW request. This change order moves back into the Accepted category. | TBD | | TBD |
| NANC 449 | Comcast  3/14/12 | **Active/Active SOA Connection to NPAC – same SPID**  **Business Need:**  Refer to separate document. |  |  | Func Backward Compatible: Yes  **Mar ’12 LNPAWG,** discussion**:**  A walk-thru of the proposed solution took place. The group accepted the change order.  **May ‘12 – Jan ‘14 LNPAWG,** discussion**:**  The group has continued reviews during the monthly mtgs.  **Mar ’15 LNPAWG,** discussion**:**  Renewed interest in this change order. The change order will be brought up-to-date, and discussed at the next meeting.  **May ’15 LNPAWG,** discussion**:**  Reviewed March updates to this change order. More updates will be discussed at the next meeting. | TBD | | TBD / N/A |
| NANC 453 | Verizon  5/08/13 | **Change Definition and Disallow use of Inactive SPID**  **Business Need:**  Refer to separate document. |  |  | Func Backward Compatible: Yes  **Jun ’13 LNPAWG,** discussion**:**  A walk-thru of the proposed short-term solution took place, and an action item was assigned to determine the viability of a SPID Delete when active SVs exist with that SPID as the Old SP value.  **Jul ‘13 LNPAWG,** discussion**:**  The group accepted the change order. Both the short-term and the long-term solution will be discussed in the Sep meeting.  **Sep ‘13 LNPAWG,** discussion**:**  The group accepted the short-term solution. It will be performed during the 9/15 maintenance window. | TBD | | N/A / N/A |
| NANC 454 | LNPA WG  5/07/13 | **Remove Unused Messages from the NPAC**  **Business Need:**  Refer to separate document. |  |  | Func Backward Compatible: Yes  **Jul ’13 LNPAWG,** discussion**:**  During the discussion of messaging in NANC 372, XML Interface, it was recommended that the capability for service providers to manage their own NPA-NXX Filters not be included in the XML interface because Neustar has been unable to identify any instances where service providers used that feature in the CMIP interface in production. This item of unused messages also applies to the Operational-Info message for scheduled downtime (never used in production).  A walk-thru of the proposed solution took place, and the group accepted the change order. Details will be added to the document and it will be discussed in the Sep meeting.  **Sep ‘13 LNPAWG,** discussion**:**  The group accepted the change order. It is now available for a release. | TBD | | TBD |
| NANC 457 | LNPA WG  7/09/13 | **SPID Migration TN Count**  **Business Need:**  Refer to separate document. |  |  | Func Backward Compatible: Yes  **Jul ’13 LNPAWG,** discussion**:**  As a follow-on to the discussion from the May ’13 meeting, the group agreed that now that we have all EDR LSMSs, it does not make sense to include pooled SVs in the count of affected SVs for a SPID Migration. In order to change the count method, a software modification will be required.  **Sep ‘13 LNPAWG,** discussion**:**  Volume limits and SCP impacts were discussed. More discussion at the Nov meeting.  **Nov ‘13 LNPAWG,** discussion**:**  No issue on SCP side. The group agreed to change the “count method” to be ported SVs plus number pool blocks.  **Jan ‘14 LNPAWG,** discussion**:**  No additional changes at this time. It is now available for a release. | TBD | | N/A / N/A |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |

# Next Documentation Release Change Orders

| **Next Documentation Release Change Orders** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Chg Order #** | **Orig. / Date** | **Description** | **Priority** | **Category** | **Proposed Resolution** | **Level of Effort** | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | **NPAC** | **SOA LSMS** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Current Development Release Change Orders

| **Current Development Release Change Orders** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Chg Order #** | **Orig. / Date** | **Description** | **Priority** | **Category** | **Proposed Resolution** | **Level of Effort** | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | **NPAC** | **SOA LSMS** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Awaiting SOW Change Orders

| **Awaiting SOW** **Change Orders** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Chg Order #** | **Orig. / Date** | **Description** | **Priority** | **Category** | **Proposed Resolution** | **Level of Effort** | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | **NPAC** | **SOA LSMS** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Approved SOW Change Orders

| **Approved SOW** **Change Orders** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Chg Order #** | **Orig. / Date** | **Description** | **Priority** | **Category** | **Proposed Resolution** | **Level of Effort** | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | **NPAC** | **SOA LSMS** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Cancel – Pending Change Orders

| **Cancel - Pending Change Orders** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Chg Order #** | **Orig. / Date** | **Description** | **Priority** | **Category** | **Proposed Resolution** | **Level of Effort** | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | **NPAC** | **SOA LSMS** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Current Release Change Orders

| **Current Release Change Orders** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Chg Order #** | **Orig. / Date** | **Description** | **Priority** | **Category** | **Proposed Resolution** | **Level of Effort** | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | **NPAC** | **SOA LSMS** |
|  |  | See Implemented List for details on Release 3.4.x. |  |  |  |  |  |

# Summary of Change Orders

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Release # / Target Date** | **Change Orders** | **Backward Compatible** |
| Open |  |  |
| Accepted | NANC 403 –Allow Recovery Messages to be sent only during Recovery  NANC 419 – User Prioritization of Recovery-Related Notifications  NANC 437 – Multi-Vendor NPAC SMS Solution  NANC 447 – NPAC Support for CMIP over TCP/IPv6  NANC 449 – Active/Active SOA Connection to NPAC – same SPID  NANC 453 – Change Definition and Disallow use of Inactive SPID  NANC 454 – Remove Unused Messages from the NPAC  NANC 457 – SPID Migration TN Count |  |
| Next Doc Release |  |  |
| Current Development Release |  |  |
| Awaiting SOW |  |  |
| Approved SOW |  |  |
| Cancel-Pending |  |  |
| Current Release | See Implemented List for details on R3.4.x |  |