

LNPA WORKING GROUP
January 10-11, 2012 Meeting
Final Minutes

Scottsdale, Arizona	Host: Telcordia
----------------------------	------------------------

LNPA WORKING GROUP ARCHITECTURE PLANNING
TEAM (APT) DISCUSSION:

TUESDAY 01/10/12

Tuesday, 01/10/12, Attendance:

Name	Company	Name	Company
Tracey Guidotti	AT&T (phone)	Mubeen Saifullah	Neustar Clearinghouse
Ron Steen	AT&T	Shannon Sevigny	Neustar Pooling (phone)
Teresa Patton	AT&T	Sue Tiffany	Sprint Nextel (phone)
Mark Lancaster	AT&T (phone)	Ken Havens	Sprint Nextel
Lonnie Keck	AT&T Mobility	Rosemary Emmer	Sprint Nextel
Barb Hjelmaa	Brighthouse (phone)	Suzanne Addington	Sprint Nextel
Marian Hearn	Canadian LNP Consortium	Rosalee Pinnock	Syniverse
Jan Doell	CenturyLink	Joel Zamlong	Telcordia
Tim Kagele	Comcast (phone)	Pat White	Telcordia
Brenda Blomke	Comcast (phone)	Lisa Marie Maxson	Telcordia
Linda Peterman	EarthLink Business	John Malyar	Telcordia
Crystal Hanus	GVNW (phone)	George Tsacnaris	Telcordia
Bridget Alexander	John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone)	Kayla Sharbaugh	Telcordia (phone)
Angie Mackey	John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone)	Steven Koch	Telcordia
Eric Monkeliën	Level 3 (phone)	Paula Jordan	T-Mobile
Bridget Ketiku	Metro PCS	Luke Sessions	T-Mobile
Jim Rooks	Neustar	Glenn Andrews	TNS
Paul LaGattuta	Neustar	David Lund	US Cellular
Stephen Addicks	Neustar	Gary Sacra	Verizon
John Nakamura	Neustar	Jason Lee	Verizon (phone)
Lavinia Rotaru	Neustar	Deb Tucker	Verizon Wireless
Ed Barker	Neustar (phone)	Imanu Hill	Vonage
Kristen Hamilton	Neustar	Traci Brunner	Windstream

Name	Company	Name	Company
Marcel Champagne	Neustar	Dawn Lawrence	XO Comm.
Dave Garner	Neustar		

NOTE: ALL APT ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “JANUARY_10_2012 LNPA WG APT ACTION ITEMS” FILE ISSUED IN A SEPARATE E-MAIL FROM THESE MINUTES AND ATTACHED BELOW.



JANUARY_10_2012
LNPA WG APT ACTIO

MEETING MINUTES:

2012 LNPA WG Meeting/Call Schedule:

Following is the current schedule for the 2012 LNPA WG meetings and calls.

MONTH (2012)	NANC MEETING DATES	LNPA WG MEETING/CALL DATES	HOST COMPANY	MEETING LOCATION
January		10 th -11 th	Telcordia	Scottsdale, Arizona
February		No meeting or call.		
March		13 th -14 th	Comcast	Denver, Colorado
April		No meeting. 4/10/2012 call if necessary.		
May		8 th -9 th	Neustar	Key West, Florida
June		No meeting. 6/12/2012 call if necessary.		
July		10 th -11 th	Canadian LNP Consortium	Mont Tremblant Quebec, Canada
August		No meeting. 8/7/2012 call if necessary.		
September		11 th -12 th	CenturyLink &	Denver, Colorado

MONTH (2012)	NANC MEETING DATES	LNPA WG MEETING/CALL DATES	HOST COMPANY	MEETING LOCATION
			Tekelec	
October		No meeting. 10/9/2012 call if necessary		
November		6 th -7 th	Sprint Nextel	Overland Park, Kansas
December		No meeting. 12/11/2012 call if necessary		

- Continuing evaluation during 2012 will determine if interim conference calls are needed or if the decision to meet face-to-face every other month should be revisited.

November 9, 2011 APT Meeting Minutes Review:

- No changes were made to the DRAFT November 9, 2011 APT meeting minutes, and they were approved as FINAL.

APT Test Plan Review Team Update – John Nakamura, Neustar:

Action Item 051011-16: Neustar and Telcordia will create a list of Vendor (ITP) and Service Provider regression test cases, identify which are Vendor (ITP) and which are regression or which are both, determine which are conditional, and which apply to the following four categories:

- New Service Provider and New Vendor,
- New Service Provider and Experienced Vendor,
- Experienced Service Provider and New Vendor,
- Experienced Service Provider and Experienced Vendor.

The status of this work effort will be provided on the June 14, 2011 APT conference call and at the APT portion of the July 2011 LNPA WG meeting.

Action Item 091311-APT-02: As a part of the effort to review and update the Vendor ITP and Service Provider Turn-up Test Plans, the APT Test Plan Sub-team will identify to the full LNPA WG any functionality that is recommended for consideration to be sunsetted.

- An interim conference call was held to discuss the SV portion of the vendor interoperability and turn-up test plans.

- On the call the team discussed how we could make the front-end vendor testing more efficient so that providers did not have to do as much testing on the back end.
- Vendor testing is with the CMIP portion and not the full NPAC solution like in SP testing.
- The question we need to answer is do we want the vendors to test with the full NPAC solution.
- It was questioned if we are moving to having vendor testing with the NPAC solution rather than the simulator, why would SPs need to run the same tests.
- A provider asked if we need to decide if vendors need to test with the same full NPAC test bed as the SPs. Neustar responded that that might preclude the industry from doing interop and turn-up testing at the same time. Neustar also said that as long as the software is the same on both test systems, then that should be sufficient.
- A provider asked if we have considered splitting the test cases down the middle and have vendors do half and SPs do half. The answer is we have not progressed that far in the discussion yet. A vendor said that they would be reluctant to rely on SP testing for certain tests.
- Neustar said that the decision to be made is not whether we are going to use the same software version for both, but if we are going to throw away the ITP test plan and rebuild one that utilizes a business flow approach for testing.
- The current ITP test plan cannot be run on the NPAC test bed.
- There was general agreement that we will develop one test plan with a matrix indicating who (vendor or SP) will perform each test. Optionally, each could do any of the tests.
- Today, vendors do surrogate testing on behalf of SPs that do not have test beds.
- A provider asked if the team could consider doing some test cases, like creates, in batch without having an NPAC tester on the line checking each individual create, and then have the NPAC tester go in after they are completed and check to see if they are passed.
- Action Items 051011-16 and 091311-APT-02 will remain open.

Review of Change Order to Sunset Non-EDR Support – All:

Action Item 110911-APT-01: At the November 9, 2011 LNPA WG APT meeting, the group agreed that support for non-EDR would be grandfathered for existing Service Providers until such time that support will be sunsetted at the end of 2Q2012. Neustar will develop a Change Order for the sunsetting of non-EDR support for review at the January 2012 LNPA WG APT meeting.



NANC TBD - Sunset
of non-EDR Support -

- Neustar presented the attached proposed Change Order in response to Action Item 110911-APT-01 and explained that when the last LSMS begins to support EDR, the SPID profile will be switched to “yes.”
- This Change Order is for optimizing the NPAC code down the road as opportunities to do so are identified.
- It was agreed that when the time is appropriate, the last LSMS profile flag will be flipped to support EDR, and no LSMS in the future will be allowed to not support EDR.
- Neustar asked if we want to continue to allow non-EDR BDDs for SOA-only providers. It was stated that we already decided to sunset all support of non-EDR by end of 2Q2012.
- Neustar will send a message out over the Cross-Regional distribution list indicating that support of non-EDR will sunset at the end of 2Q2012. In that notification, Neustar will describe the implications, e.g., no pooled SVs in BDDs. Neustar will provide a status at the March 2012 LNPA WG meeting.
- NANC Change Order 448 was accepted. Once we hear any responses to the X-Regional message and if any entity has a problem, we will discuss in the LNPA WG.
- Setting all profiles to indicate EDR support will prevent pooled SVs from being created in BDD files.
- Neustar followed up during the meeting and said that some users are requesting BDDs with pooled SVs.
- Action Item 110911-APT-01 is closed.

Discussion of Alternative Interface (NANC Change Order 372) – All:

Action Item 110911-APT-02: Neustar will develop a list of key questions to assist Service Providers in their internal discussions of NANC 372 – Alternative Interface – in

order to drive future discussions and requirements development. See related Action Item 110911-APT-03.

Action Item 110911-APT-03: Service Providers are to come to the January 2012 LNPA WG APT meeting prepared to discuss NANC 372 – Alternative Interface – and provide any available internal feedback on the attached key questions provided by Neustar. See related Action Item 110911-APT-02



NANC 372 Discussion
Questions.docx

- Current working assumptions:
 1. SOA and LSMS functionality will be implemented.
 2. The interface protocol will be HTTPS and the data encoding will be XML
 3. The interface will be non-session based (authentication on each request).
 4. The interface will be connection-less.
 5. The interface will push messages in real time.
 6. Security will be HTTPS where NPAC generated key are distributed to providers.
 7. Recovery will be enhanced to deliver messages until successful.

- The group discussed the following questions posed in the attached NANC 372 discussion document pertaining to areas where decisions need to be made by the LNPA WG in the development of technical requirements for an alternative interface. These were considered preliminary responses subject to modification as requirements development further progresses.
 1. Should the interface protocol be SOAP or HTTPS?
 - Neustar stated that in their experience, HTTPS is much more efficient without SOAP. HTTPS is lower level and can operate with or without SOAP.
 - Neustar stated that they would prefer discussing security as a separate agenda item for the alternate interface.
 - T-Mobile prefers HTTPS. Sprint Nextel, CenturyLink, and Verizon agreed.
 - It was agreed that Assumption No. 2 above will apply for HTTPS.
 2. Should the interface data encoding be XML or JSON?
 - Verizon stated that the typical SOAP-based interface is XML-based. JSON is lighter weight and perhaps quicker. XML has more overhead. Verizon stated that if we had to choose at this point, JSON would be their preference. AT&T agreed.
 - CenturyLink stated a preference for XML because of the industry's experience level with that protocol. They are also concerned with the interaction with back office systems that are currently using SOAP/XML. It was stated that vendors would have to support that translation.

- T-Mobile stated that they prefer XML because it is more flexible and efficient. Sprint Nextel agreed. Sprint Nextel asked about security risks of JSON.
 - Telcordia stated that the specialized type of messaging that we do with porting is better suited for JSON. Telcordia said that the JSON spec is stable.
 - Question remains open.
 - Neustar stated that it is more important to make a decision rather than the choice being XML or JSON.
 - Vendors in attendance agreed that they would have to keep the interfaces between back office systems and SOAs/LSMSs the same if their customers require that.
3. Should the interface be connection oriented or connection-less?
- Connection-less means a connection is established and closed with each message. It is typically HTTPS. The association would be on and off, one message per connection.
 - CenturyLink asked for a pro/con analysis. Verizon agreed.
 - Connection-less means you could have a pool of resources in a round-robin fashion to respond to requests. Connection means that you have to have a dedicated resource for the entire duration.
 - Connection-less does have some higher overhead to establish connections but would not need to constantly ping (heartbeat).
 - It was agreed that for now, we will assume connection-less for the purpose of moving forward with requirements development. During the discussion of requirements, a natural byproduct of that will be discussion of pros/cons and if we need to revisit the assumptions we will.
4. Should the interface be session based (like the CMIP interface) or single request (like most web traffic)?
- An example of accessing your bank account as being session-based was discussed. Requests can be made back and forth for a period of time without re-authenticating. For single requests, you would have to provide login and password for every message in the bank example.
 - T-Mobile prefers non-session single requests. These are asynchronous requests (data is only going in one direction).
 - Neustar said that the interface would be somewhat more complicated for session-based in order to understand that a session is open.
 - It was agreed that we will assume single request for now.
5. Should this be a push interface (like the CMIP interface) or should it be a pull/poll interface where providers ask the NPAC if there are any new transactions/messages for them?
- Verizon stated that a pull interface has some firewall advantages, but expressed concerns about DBs being out of synch. When would we declare Partial Failures?
 - It was agreed that we need to draw out how things are done today vs. a push/pull in the new paradigm.

- Comcast asked if any of these decisions will have an impact on throughput. Neustar said that we still have SLRs that will need to be met.
 - Partial Failures would still be declared after a certain established interval.
 - In a pull environment, users could pull at varying intervals to accommodate those users that don't need updates in near-real time.
 - Comcast asked if the pull method introduces an additional point of failure, i.e., a server on the far end. Neustar responded that it doesn't introduce additional risk, it is just a different way of doing things.
 - T-Mobile stated that they believe pull is more resource intensive. They are also concerned about data integrity. Neustar responded that with messaging today, you should get a response either way. Neustar doesn't think in today's environment, we would get many empty responses with a pull.
 - With pull, you don't need to have a server on your side, or open up your firewall.
 - It was agreed we will wait to discuss further before we decide.
6. Should the interface security be a digital signature (like CMIP) or HTTPS where the entire message is encrypted including client authentication?
 - Verizon stated they felt it should be HTTPS. HTTPS is 128-bit.
 - We will discuss further at the March 2012 LNPA WG meeting.
 7. Should recovery of missed data be SWIM based (like CMIP) or should the NPAC constantly attempt to send until successful delivery?
 - This is impacted by our decision on push or pull.
 - To be discussed further at the March 2012 LNPA WG meeting.
 8. How can create/modify/delete notifications be enhanced to make them more efficient?
 - To be discussed further at the March 2012 LNPA WG meeting.
- Action Item 110911-APT-02 is closed. Action Item 110911-APT-03 remains open.
 - **Neustar** will expand the text in NANC 372 – Alternative Interface – based on current working assumptions agreed to at the January 2012 LNPA WG meeting for review and discussion at the March 2012 LNPA WG meeting.
 - It was agreed that we need to eventually answer what timeframe this will be implemented and when CMIP might be sunsetted.

Discussion of NPAC Support of IPv6 (NANC 447) – All:



NANC TBD - NPAC
support of IPv6.docx

- No timeline is currently associated with Change Order 447.

- No changes have been made to NANC 447 since it was last reviewed by the LNPA WG.
- NANC 447 will be on the agenda for the March 2012 LNPA WG meeting.

APT Action Items Not Previously Discussed in Agenda – All:



NOVEMBER_9_2011
LNPA WG APT ACTIO

Review of November 9, 2011 LNPA WG APT Action Items:

November 9, 2011 LNPA WG APT Action Items:

- Item 110911-APT-01: This item has been completed and is Closed.
- Item 110911-APT-02: This item has been completed and is Closed.
- Item 110911-APT-03: This item remains Open.

LNPA WG APT Action Items Remaining Open from Previous Meetings:

- Item 051011-16: This item remains Open.
- Item 091311-APT-02: This item remains Open.

Discussion of Need for Interim APT Call(s) – All:

- Test plan calls will be scheduled separately.
- No full APT calls will be scheduled prior to the March 2012 face-to-face meeting.

Next APT Meeting ...Part of the March 13-14, 2012 LNPA WG Meeting:

Location...Denver, Colorado...

Hosted by Comcast

FULL LNPA WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION:

WEDNESDAY 01/11/12

Wednesday, 01/11/12, Attendance:

Name	Company	Name	Company
Tracey Guidotti	AT&T (phone)	Mubeen Saifullah	Neustar Clearinghouse
Ron Steen	AT&T	Shannon Sevigny	Neustar Pooling (phone)
Teresa Patton	AT&T	Sue Tiffany	Sprint Nextel (phone)
Mark Lancaster	AT&T (phone)	Ken Havens	Sprint Nextel

Name	Company	Name	Company
Lonnie Keck	AT&T Mobility	Rosemary Emmer	Sprint Nextel
Barb Hjelmaa	Brighthouse (phone)	Suzanne Addington	Sprint Nextel
Tony Filippone	Cablevision Lightpath (phone)	Nancy Conant	Synchronoss (phone)
Marian Hearn	Canadian LNP Consortium	Rosalee Pinnock	Syniverse
Jan Doell	CenturyLink	Joel Zamlong	Telcordia
Tim Kagele	Comcast (phone)	Pat White	Telcordia
Brenda Blomke	Comcast (phone)	Lisa Marie Maxson	Telcordia
Linda Peterman	EarthLink Business	John Malyar	Telcordia
Crystal Hanus	GVNW (phone)	George Tsacnaris	Telcordia
Bridget Alexander	John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone)	Kayla Sharbaugh	Telcordia (phone)
Angie Mackey	John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone)	Steven Koch	Telcordia
Eric Monkelien	Level 3 (phone)	Paula Jordan	T-Mobile
Bridget Ketiku	Metro PCS	Luke Sessions	T-Mobile
Jim Rooks	Neustar	Glenn Andrews	TNS
Paul LaGattuta	Neustar	David Lund	US Cellular
Stephen Addicks	Neustar	Gary Sacra	Verizon
John Nakamura	Neustar	Jason Lee	Verizon (phone)
Lavinia Rotaru	Neustar	Deb Tucker	Verizon Wireless
Ed Barker	Neustar (phone)	Imanu Hill	Vonage
Kristen Hamilton	Neustar	Traci Brunner	Windstream
Marcel Champagne	Neustar	Dawn Lawrence	XO Comm.
Dave Garner	Neustar		

NOTE: ALL ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “JANUARY 10-11 2012 FULL LNPA WG ACTION ITEMS” FILE ISSUED IN A SEPARATE E-MAIL FROM THESE MINUTES AND ATTACHED BELOW.



JANUARY 10-11
2012 FULL LNPA WG

MEETING MINUTES:

2012 LNPA WG Meeting/Call Schedule:

Following is the current schedule for the 2012 LNPA WG meetings and calls.

MONTH (2012)	NANC MEETING DATES	LNPA WG MEETING/CALL DATES	HOST COMPANY	MEETING LOCATION
January		10 th -11 th	Telcordia	Scottsdale, Arizona
February		No meeting or call.		
March		13 th -14 th	Comcast	Denver, Colorado
April		No meeting. 4/10/2012 call if necessary.		
May		8 th -9 th	Neustar	Key West, Florida
June		No meeting. 6/12/2012 call if necessary.		
July		10 th -11 th	Canadian LNP Consortium	Mont Tremblant Quebec, Canada
August		No meeting. 8/7/2012 call if necessary.		
September		11 th -12 th	CenturyLink & Tekelec	Denver, Colorado
October		No meeting. 10/9/2012 call if necessary		
November		6 th -7 th	Sprint Nextel	Overland Park, Kansas
December		No meeting. 12/11/2012 call if necessary		

- Continuing evaluation during 2012 will determine if interim conference calls are needed or if the decision to meet face-to-face every other month should be revisited.

November 9-10, 2011 Full LNPA WG Meeting Minutes Review:

- On page 18, the status of PIM 80 was revised as follows:
 “The LNPA WG’s recommendation to the NAPM LLC to request a Statement of Work (SOW) from Neustar for PIM 80 was sent to the NAPM LLC. It was

decided to perform the work without an SOW. PIM 80 will remain in a tracking state.”

- No further changes were made to the DRAFT November 9-10, 2011 Full LNPA WG meeting minutes, and with the change above they were approved as FINAL.

OBF Wireless Service Ordering (WSO) Subcommittee Update (Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless):

- The Wireless Ordering Task Force (WOTF) met December 7, 2011 to discuss open Issue 3429, WICIS Review for Alignment with Business Practices. Several items for review were mentioned during the brainstorming session that took place. Some of the items mentioned will be discussed in more detail during the virtual meeting scheduled for February 14th, 2-3 Eastern. Issue 3429 remains open.
- The Wireless Ordering Task Force (WOTF) became the Wireless Service Ordering (WSO) Subcommittee effective January 1, 2012 with Syed Mubeen Saifullah of Neustar and Teresa Patton of AT&T being elected as the co-chairs.

OBF Local Service Ordering (LSO) Subcommittee Update (Linda Peterman, EarthLink Business):

- The Local Ordering Task Force (LOTF) has not met since the November LNPA WG meeting. However, the Local Ordering Task Force (LOTF) became the Local Service Ordering (LSO) Subcommittee effective January 1, 2012, with Monet Topps of AT&T and Nancy Conant of Synchronoss as the co-chairs.
- A virtual meeting is scheduled for January 18th to continue work on issue 3381 (directory listings) and to establish an agenda for the Annual Meeting of Committees (AMOC) in April.

Issues in Final Closure:

3428 LSOG – COMMON LANGUAGE Reference cleanup for CCNA and OCCNA fields in the 071, 099, 102, 111, 119, 120 and 122 practices

Issues Withdrawn:

None

Issues in Initial Closure or Initial Pending:

None

Open Issues:

- 3373 LSOG: Standardization of RT of “Z” in the 099 practice for REQTYP “C” to be utilized by all providers.
- 3381 LSOG: Standardization of directory listings in the 102 Practice
- 3382 LSOG: Standardization and consolidation of Directory Listings Inquiry/Response and Listing Reconciliation (from LSOG 6) all into the 111 Practice

New Issues:

- 3436 LSOG – Correction to the ACNA and RACNA fields in the Local Service Request (LSR-071) and Resale Frame Relay (RFR-079) forms

The LOTF has scheduled the following virtual and face-to-face meetings:

01/18/12	Virtual	2-4 Eastern
Week of 4/16/12	AMOC (F-to-F)	Bellevue, WA

Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Update (Dave Garner, Neustar):

INC Issue 719: Available “Red” Blocks where PSTN Activation has not been confirmed

Issue Statement: Most of the pools are being replenished by the opening of new codes for pool replenishment or for LRN purposes. When a new code is opened the blocks not assigned to the code holder are placed in the available pool with a future effective date and show up on the block available report in “red” until the code holder confirms activation in the PSTN and all other code holder responsibilities have been met. Currently the guidelines allow an SP that is not the code holder to request the assignment of these “red” blocks as long as they acknowledge that they are willing to accept a block in “red” and that they explicitly understand that the underlying CO code may not yet be activated in the PSTN and loaded in the NPAC on the block effective date.

SPs that have been assigned these “red” blocks are encountering delays with the activation of the blocks in these codes. This has caused an increased volume of requests by the SP receiving the block, for the PA to follow up with code holders who have not confirmed PSTN activation by the code effective date. The PA is asked to act as the mediator between the two companies which is causing a lot of extra work.

In addition, the assignment of “red” blocks is causing additional work for the NPAC pooling team since they are often not able to create the block records in the NPAC database at the time of the block assignment because the code holder has not yet established the code in the NPAC database. This is causing the NPAC pooling team to keep separate lists of blocks where the code has not yet been established and then follow up until they are able to create the block record.

INC discussed this issue and contributions at the October INC meeting. The contribution RAM 034 suggested that a timeframe be established for Service Providers to load a new NPA-NXX into the NPAC for pooled codes.

The suggested language to be added to the “Code Holders Responsibility” section in the TBPAG reads:

1. b) Load the NPA-NXX into the NPAC database within 7 calendar days of the code being assigned.

During the INC discussion, a question was raised regarding the feasibility of NPAC operations loading the code in the NPAC when NANPA assigns the code to a Service Provider, thus minimizing the delay in getting the code loaded in the NPAC. Neustar (Dave Garner) was given an action item to investigate the feasibility of NPAC Operations performing the function in the NPAC and to report the findings at the next INC meeting.

At the December INC meeting, Neustar (Dave Garner) responded to the October action item on the feasibility of NPAC Operations loading the code in the NPAC when NANPA assigns the code. He reported that it would be feasible if the process were automated and NANPA could obtain and provide the additional information of NPAC SPID and if the code were portable. Several of the Service Providers reported that their operations team did not think the problems occurred frequently enough to justify making the process and system changes needed to have the NPAC open the codes. The Service Providers also indicated they wanted to retain the responsibility and timing flexibility in loading their own codes. INC decided not to pursue the idea of NPAC opening the codes. INC continues to discuss adding language in the TBPAG indicating the Code Holder shall load the NPA-NXX into the NPAC data base within 7 calendar days of the code being assigned.

INC Issue 722: Review and Reconcile TN Administration Guidelines with Updated NANC LNP Flows

Issue Statement: During discussion of Issue 713, it was noted that some of the language in the Guidelines for the Administration of Telephone Numbers (“TN Administration Guidelines”) comes from NANC NRO WG reports that pre-dated the FCC’s NRO Orders. Although INC reviewed these guidelines when the NRO Orders were issued, the INC has not reviewed the TN Administration Guidelines in some time. The INC should review these guidelines to determine if the guidelines are consistent with the NANC’s LNP flows and current FCC rules

At the October INC meeting, a Contribution Development Team (CDT) was formed and given an action item to review the TN Administration Guidelines and submit a contribution with suggested changes to the guidelines to correct any inconsistencies between them and the current NANC LNP flows and FCC rules.

During the December INC meeting, the CDT suggested changes/updates to the TN

Administration Guidelines were discussed and accepted with minor changes. During the CDT review of the guidelines and the NANC LNP flows, the CDT noted that Step 7 of Figure 14 (Disconnect Process for Ported Telephone Numbers) in the NANC “Inter-Service Provider LNP Operations Flows – Narratives”, indicates a maximum interval between the disconnect date and effective release date is 18 months. Given the FCC in 47 CFR 52.15 provided aging intervals, the INC agreed to suggest that the LNPA WG consider updating the last sentence of Step 7, Figure 14 to read something like: “Per FCC 47 CFR § 52.15 (f) (1) (ii), the Service Provider maximum aging interval between the disconnect date and effective release date is 90 days for residential numbers and 365 days for business numbers”.

- **NOTE: INC Issue 722 will be placed on the agenda for discussion at the March 2012 LNPA WG meeting.**

NANC Future of Numbering Working Group Update (Adam Newman, Telcordia and FoN Tri-Chair):

- Adam Newman, Telcordia and FoN Tri-Chair, reported that the FoN held conference calls on 11/2/2011 and 12/7/2011. Adam presented the attached FoN status report to the LNPA WG, which provides the status and next steps of open active issues and planned future activities for the FoN.



FoN_Report_Dec2011.pptx

Review & Update of LNPA WG Best Practices Document – All:



LNPA_NP_Best_Practices_12-20-2011.doc

- The group continued its review of the LNPA WG Best Practices document.

Action Item 110911-LNPAWG-03: Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will accept all currently proposed revisions to the Best Practices document in order to facilitate the continuing review of the document at the January 2012 LNPA WG meeting.

- Action Item 110911-LNPAWG-03 was completed and is closed.
- A question was asked about verification of the links contained in the BP document. Those individuals that are working on specific BPs that contain links to websites or other documents should be checking and verifying the validity of any links. In addition, **Gary Sacra**, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will verify all links in the Best Practices document and update them as necessary.

Action Item 091311-LNPAWG-05: All **Service Providers** are to review the attached PIM 53 (Inadvertent Port) Contact List and provide any missing or updated contact information to the LNPA WG Co-Chairs by October 31, 2011. The Co-Chairs e-mail addresses are: gary.m.sacra@verizon.com (Gary Sacra), paula.jordan@t-mobile.com (Paula Jordan), and lpeterman@corp.earthlink.com (Linda Peterman).



PIM 53 Service
Provider Contact v5.c

- Action Item 091311-LNPAWG-05 will remain open.

Action Item 110911-LNPAWG-05: **Deb Tucker**, Verizon Wireless, will revise the proposed Best Practice 33 based on feedback received at the November 2011 LNPA WG meeting for review at the January 2012 LNPA WG meeting. See related Action Items 110911-LNPAWG-02 and 110911-LNPAWG-07.

Action Item 110911-LNPAWG-07: **Service Providers** are to come to the January 2012 LNPA WG meeting prepared to discuss v7 of the proposed Best Practice 33 in an attempt to reach consensus on a final Best Practice. See related Action Items 110911-LNPAWG-02 and 110911-LNPAWG-05.



BP 33 draft 050311
v7.docx

- Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, reviewed the latest attached version of the proposed BP 33.
- It was stated that some automated systems require exact matches for address that is based on the 911 record. If you are not using a pre-order process (i.e., CSR pulls), any non-match will be rejected.
- A provider stated that for orders with loops, exact matches are more important for them because of potential 911 issues.
- Some providers have chosen to relax certain edits so that they do not reject for these examples in BP 33.
- A provider stated that what is more troubling is personnel that have been directed to reject based on these examples manually, and that provider feels that this is evidence of intentionally delaying the port.
- Another provider stated that they have relaxed the edits for addresses similar to what they have done for simple ports.

- A provider stated that they do not support the recommendation as written. They want “must” changed to “should” in the recommendation. They agreed that the examples are valid. Another provider stated that they prefer the use of “must.”
- One provider objected to the listing of the examples. Consensus was reached to leave in the examples.
- A provider suggested that we specify Req Type C (no loop involved) for this BP. Action for SPs to determine if they have different validations for Req. B (with loop) vs. Req. Type C. Regarding the attached proposed Best Practice 33, **Service Providers** are to determine if they have different validations for LSR Req. Type B (port with loop) vs. LSR Req. Type C (port only – no loop). This will be discussed at the March 2012 LNPA WG meeting.

Action Item 110911-LNPAWG-02: **Linda Peterman**, Earthlink and LNPA WG Co-Chair, will tee up a discussion in the OBF of revisiting the previously proposed 22 standard fields for non-simple LSRs. See related Action Items 110911-LNPAWG-05 and 110911-LNPAWG-07.

- Linda Peterman, Earthlink and LNPA WG Co-Chair, reported that she has had preliminary discussions with the LOTF Chair and will continue to engage the OBF in discussion.
- Action Item 110911-LNPAWG-02 remains open.

Action Item 031511-04: **Paula Jordan**, T-Mobile and LNPA WG Co-Chair, and **Jason Lee**, Verizon, and **Teresa Patton**, AT&T, and **Tracey Guidotti**, AT&T, will document in LNPA WG Best Practice 30 requirements for ICP during the permissive dialing period for NPA splits. This will be reviewed and discussed at the May 2011 LNPA WG meeting.

- Action Item 031511-04 remains open.

Action Item 071211-LNPAWG-09: **Gary Sacra**, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will update the NP Best Practices document as follows, to reflect changes agreed to at the July 2011 LNPA WG meeting:

1. Remove PIM documents from the Best Practices and insert links to PIMs when the updated NPAC website is up and running. **(REMAINS OPEN AWAITING NEW WEBSITE)**

- Action Item 071211-LNPAWG-09 remains open.

Next Steps for Best Practices Review and Update – All:

- Review and update of the BP document will continue at the March 2012 LNPA WG meeting.

FULL LNPA WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION:

WEDNESDAY 01/11/12

Wednesday, 01/11/12, Attendance:

Name	Company	Name	Company
Tracey Guidotti	AT&T (phone)	Shannon Sevigny	Neustar Pooling (phone)
Ron Steen	AT&T	Sue Tiffany	Sprint Nextel (phone)
Teresa Patton	AT&T	Ken Havens	Sprint Nextel
Barb Hjelmaa	BrightHouse (phone)	Rosemary Emmer	Sprint Nextel
Tony Filippone	Cablevision Lightpath (phone)	Suzanne Addington	Sprint Nextel
Marian Hearn	Canadian LNP Consortium	Nancy Conant	Synchronoss (phone)
Jan Doell	CenturyLink	Rosalee Pinnock	Syniverse
Tim Kagele	Comcast (phone)	Joel Zamlong	Telcordia
Brenda Blomke	Comcast (phone)	Pat White	Telcordia
Linda Peterman	EarthLink Business	Lisa Marie Maxson	Telcordia
Crystal Hanus	GVNW (phone)	John Malyar	Telcordia
Bridget Alexander	John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone)	George Tsacnaris	Telcordia
Angie Mackey	John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone)	Adam Newman	Telcordia
Stephanie Hudson	John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone)	Steven Koch	Telcordia
Bridget Ketiku	Metro PCS	Paula Jordan	T-Mobile
Lynette Khirallah	Netnumber (phone)	Luke Sessions	T-Mobile
Jim Rooks	Neustar	Glenn Andrews	TNS
Paul LaGattuta	Neustar	David Lund	US Cellular
Stephen Addicks	Neustar	Gary Sacra	Verizon
John Nakamura	Neustar	Jason Lee	Verizon (phone)
Lavinia Rotaru	Neustar	Deb Tucker	Verizon Wireless
Marcel Champagne	Neustar	Imanu Hill	Vonage
Dave Garner	Neustar	Traci Brunner	Windstream
Mubeen Saifullah	Neustar Clearinghouse	Dawn Lawrence	XO Comm.

MEETING MINUTES:

PIM Discussion:

- PIM 80 – This PIM submitted by Verizon, seeks to address instances where ported/pooled NPAC database records currently contain LRNs that are in a different LATA than their associated ported/pooled telephone numbers (TNs).



PIM 80.doc

The LNPA WG's recommendation to the NAPM LLC to request a Statement of Work (SOW) from Neustar for PIM 80 was sent to the NAPM LLC. It was decided to perform the work without an SOW. PIM 80 will remain in a tracking state.

January 2012 status: 92% of SVs and 63% of blocks have been completed.

Next Day porting Lessons Learned – All:

Action Item 110911-LNPAWG-01: Teresa Patton, AT&T, will revise the one-day porting Lessons Learned document to number the items and send it to Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair for posting on the new LNPA WG website. See related Action Item 110911-LNPAWG-04.

Action Item 110911-LNPAWG-04: Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will have the attached one-day porting Lessons Learned document uploaded to the new LNPA WG website. See related Action Item 110911-LNPAWG-01.



One Day Port
Lessons Learned.doc

- Action Items 110911-LNPAWG-01 and 110911-LNPAWG-04 have been completed and are closed.
- The Lessons Learned document has been placed on the LNPA WG's new website in the FCC documentation area.

Readout of Cancel Port Process Sub-team – Bonnie Johnson, Integra:

Action Item 091311-LNPAWG-01: Bonnie Johnson, Integra, will pull a sub-team together to discuss development of a proposed Best Practice related to the end user contacting the Old Service Provider to cancel their port request. The following volunteered to assist Bonnie in the discussion:

Jan Doell (CenturyLink)
Barb Hjelmaa (Brighthouse)

Tim Kagele (Comcast)
Linda Peterman (Earthlink)
Gary Sacra (Verizon)

- No calls have been held since the November 2011 LNPA WG meeting.
- Anyone wishing to join the sub-team should contact Bonnie Johnson at bjjohnson@integratelecom.com.
- Action Item 091311-LNPAWG-01 remains open.

Change Management – Neustar:



NANC Change
Orders 12-31-11.doc

- Neustar provided the attached Change Order document. The only changes were minor revisions to NANC 445 and newly assigned number for NANC 447. There were no questions from the group.
- 25K/hour Industry Load Test Discussion – All:
 - The group discussed the following questions related to planning the next industry load test for 25K transactions in an hour and provided the answers below.
 - **When will the exercise be performed?**
 - March or April 2012 is preferred.
 - During the week is preferred.
 - 6am to 7am eastern is preferred.
 - **How long will the exercise last?**
 - 1 hour
 - **What kind of (real) transactions would be used – ports? modifies? a mix?**
 - Whatever is available but we want a report of the mix that was used after the test.
 - **How will the transactions be generated – MUMP projects? multiple SOAs? both?**
 - Regarding the plans for a 25K/hour industry load test, **Service Providers** are to check to see if they have any planned large projects for activates, modifies, or disconnects scheduled in the March 2012 or April 2012 timeframe that could be used for the test. Any feedback (planned timeframe, quantities by type and by Region) should be provided via e-mail to the LNPA WG Co-Chairs and Steve Addicks (Neustar) by Wednesday,

February 15, 2012. E-mail addresses are:
gary.m.sacra@verizon.com (Gary Sacra), paula.jordan@t-mobile.com (Paula Jordan), lpeterman@corp.earthlink.com (Linda Peterman), and stephen.addicks@neustar.biz (Steve Addicks).

- The test will be supplemented as needed by MUMP.
- **Will all 7 regions be involved or just a subset?**
 - All 7
- **How will results data be collected and reported?**
 - SPs will report when they completed the identified last TN that is provided by Neustar. This is the same method that was used for the 15K test in October 2007.

Readout of December 15th NANC Meeting – LNPA WG Co-Chairs:



12-15-2011 NANC
LNPA WG Report.doc

- The LNPA WG Co-Chairs provided a brief readout of the December 15, 2011 NANC meeting, reporting that the NANC was kept informed of the LNPA WG's efforts to refresh the Best Practices document. The Co-Chairs also reported that the NANC was informed of the completion of the one-day porting Lessons Learned document and its placement on the LNPA WG's website.

Discussion of 2012 Meeting/Call Agenda Items – All:



Brainstorming of
Possible Future LNPA

Action Item 110911-LNPAWG-06: All LNPA WG Participants are to provide any ideas for 2012 LNPA WG meeting and call agenda items to the Co-Chairs for discussion at future meetings.

- The group reviewed the attached list of possible LNPA WG meeting agenda items for those that should be addressed in 2012.
- A number of providers discussed the difficulty they are experiencing in getting remaining Type 1 cellular numbers converted to Type 2. Some carriers are resubmitting requests to convert them. Discussion of this will be placed on the March 2012 agenda.
- Regarding the attached list of potential future LNPA WG agenda items, Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will:

1. Send out the SOW 24 testing requirements to the group and put a discussion on the March 2012 LNPA WG meeting agenda (see HIGH Item No. 4).
2. Place a discussion of the difficulty that some carriers are experiencing getting the remaining Type 1 wireless numbers converted to Type 2 on the March 2012 LNPA WG meeting agenda (see HIGH Item No. 3).
3. Place a discussion of HIGH Items No. 6 and No. 7 on the March 2012 LNPA WG meeting agenda.
4. Clarify HIGH Item No. 7 to indicate that its intent is to develop a process and checklist to serve as a guide for addressing future FCC actions and mandates.
5. Indicate that HIGH Item No. 8 is completed with the enhancements to the LTI GUI.

Discussion of Need for February 7, 2012 LNPA WG Call – All:

- The group agreed that there was not a need to hold a conference call in February.

2012 LNPA WG Meeting/Call Schedule – All:



2012 LNPA WG
Meeting and Call Sche

- The group reviewed the 2012 call/meeting schedule. Other than the change to reflect no call in February, no other changes were made.

Action Items Not Previously Discussed in Agenda – All:



NOVEMBER 9-10
2011 FULL LNPA WG

Review of November 9-10, 2011 FULL LNPA WG Action Items:

November 9-10, 2011 FULL LNPA WG Action Items:

- Item 110911-LNPAWG-01: This item has been completed and is Closed.
- Item 110911-LNPAWG-02: This item remains Open.
- Item 110911-LNPAWG-03: This item has been completed and is Closed.
- Item 110911-LNPAWG-04: This item has been completed and is Closed.
- Item 110911-LNPAWG-05: This item has been completed and is Closed.

- Item 110911-LNPAWG-06: This item remains Open.
- Item 110911-LNPAWG-07: This item has been completed and is Closed.

FULL LNPA WG Action Items Remaining Open from Previous Meetings:

- Item 031511-04: This item remains Open.
- Item 071211-LNPAWG-09: Item No. 1 of this Action Item remains Open.
- Item 091311-LNPAWG-01: This item remains Open.
- Item 091311-LNPAWG-05: This item remains Open.

New/Unfinished Business (All):

- Frontier request for 3/4/2012 SPID Migration Blackout Waiver



FTR9_Data 9
States.xlsx



FTR9_SV Data.xlsx

- The group reviewed Frontier’s request for a waiver of the March 4, 2012 SPID migration blackout in the West Coast, Midwest, and Western Regions. There were no objections to granting the waiver only for Frontier’s migrations. Frontier was subsequently informed that their waiver request was granted.
- Jan Doell, CenturyLink, asked if anyone was aware of any limitations on porting requirements on Indian reservations and if anyone has had any issues. None were reported.

No Full LNPA WG or APT conference calls are scheduled for February 2012. Sub-team calls to continue the APT’s work on revisions to the test plans will be scheduled separately.

***Next Meeting ...March 13-14, 2012: Location...Denver, Colorado
...Hosted by Comcast***