

**LNPA WORKING GROUP**  
**January 6-7, 2015 Meeting**  
**FINAL Minutes**

<b>Scottsdale, AZ</b>	<b>Host: iconectiv</b>
-----------------------	------------------------

**TUESDAY January 6, 2015**  
**Attendance**

Name	Company	Name	Company
Lonnie Keck	AT&T	Gary Sacra	Neustar
Ron Steen	AT&T	Jim Rooks	Neustar
David Alread	AT&T (phone)	John Nakamura	Neustar
Penn Pfautz	AT&T (phone)	Lavinia Rotaru	Neustar
Renee Dillon	AT&T (phone)	Marcel Champagne	Neustar
Teresa Patton	AT&T (phone)	Mubeen Saifullah	Neustar
Tracey Guidotti	AT&T (phone)	Pamela Connell	Neustar
Lisa Jill Freeman	Bandwidth.com (phone)	Paul LaGattuta	Neustar
Marian Hearn	Canadian LNP	Shannon Sevigny	Neustar Pooling (phone)
Mary Retka	CenturyLink (phone)	Ramesh Chellamani	Oracle Communications
Brenda Bloemke	Comcast	Towanda Russell	RCN (phone)
Linda Birchem	Comcast (phone)	Chad Younger	Sprint
Beth O'Donnell	Cox (phone)	Rosemary Emmer	Sprint
Wendy Trahan	GVNW (phone)	Suzanne Addington	Sprint
Doug Babcock	iconectiv	Karen Riepenkroger	Sprint (phone)
George Tsacnaris	iconectiv	Shaunna Forshee	Sprint (phone)
Joel Zamlong	iconectiv	Darren Post	Synchronoss
John Malyar	iconectiv	Jeanne Kulesa	Synchronoss
Steven Koch	iconectiv	Bob Bruce	Syniverse
Pat White	iconectiv	Luke Sessions	T-Mobile
Natalie McNamer	iconectiv (phone)	Paula Campagnoli	T-Mobile
Kim Isaacs	Integra (phone)	Jason Lee	Verizon (phone)
Lynette Khirallah	NetNumber (phone)	Deb Tucker	Verizon Wireless
Dave Garner	Neustar	Scott Terry	Windstream
Fariba Jafari	Neustar	Dawn Lawrence	XO (phone)

**NOTE: OPEN ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “January 6-7, 2015 WG ACTION ITEMS” FILE AND ATTACHED HERE.**

## **LNPA WORKING GROUP MEETING MINUTES:**

### **November 4-5, 2014 Draft LNPA WG Meeting Minutes Review:**

The November 4-5, 2014, meeting minutes were reviewed and approved as final as written.

### **Updates from Other Industry Groups**

#### **OBF Committee Update – Deb Tucker:**

#### **OBF**

#### **ORDERING SOLUTIONS COMMITTEE**

#### **WIRELESS SERVICE ORDERING SUBCOMMITTEE**

The Wireless Service Ordering Subcommittee met November 25 and December 10, 2014 to perform a final review of the LSOG fields that were updated under Issue 3450, LSOG: Standard Validation and Submission Fields for REQTYPE “C” Simple and Non-Simple Port Orders. It was determined that no changes to WICIS fields are required as a result of this Issue. The LSOG changes could potentially result in intermodal mapping changes, but it was noted that mapping changes are out of the scope of the subcommittee work.

**Agreement Reached:** Participants agreed that without an FCC mandate on simple and non-simple/non-complex port orders, there is no need at this time to update WICIS as a result of the LSOG field changes from Issue 3450. If an FCC mandate occurs in the future, WSO will revisit certain WICIS fields for modification.

The next WSO meeting is scheduled for January 27, 2014.

#### **QUESTION FROM WG**

John Nakamura asked if the only difference between simple ports and non-simple/non-complex ports is that a reseller is involved.

#### **ANSWER**

No, there are other differences as well. Issue 3450 attempts to address the gray areas between simple and non-simple/non-complex ports and develop a standard list of fields for non-simple/non-complex ports.

**OBF  
ORDERING SOLUTIONS COMMITTEE  
LOCAL SERVICE ORDERING SUBCOMMITTEE**

Since the November, 2014 LNPA WG meeting, the LSO Subcommittee met November 6, 2014, to discuss Issues 3373 and 3477.

**Issue 3373, LSOG: Standardization of RT of “Z” in the 099 practice for REQ TYP “C” to be utilized by all providers.** Response Type of “Z” = Completion.

Participants reviewed the following action items associated with this Issue:

**Action Item:** Service Providers to document the minimum number of fields they would like to receive for each response type.

Service Providers to document the current list of fields being returned for each response type today.

The goal is to identify the minimum set of fields, updating the 099 practice once consensus is reached.

See OBF-LSO-2014-00018R002.3373a2v3\_LR, RT = C (FOC) and E (Error) – populate columns C and D with Y (always sent), N (never sent) or M (maybe). Maybe is for conditional and optional fields. Focus on REQ TYP = C for the next meeting, with additional REQ TYPs to follow.

Service Providers need to review OBF-LSO-2014-00018R002.3373a2v3\_LR for RT = C (FOC) and E (Error) as entities that submit LSRs and receive LSRs when filling out columns C and D, based on their company and not individual responsibility (some participants may only represent wholesale, ILEC, CLEC and vendor.

Participants reviewed and modified the minimum set of fields on the 099 practice for Response Type of C (FOC) and E (Error) (OBF-LSO-2014-00018R003.3373a2v4\_LR). Participants agreed to continue entering the data for the various Response Types during a future meeting. It was noted that the next steps are to determine whether a field can be deleted for REQ TYP C if no companies are using it.

**Action Item:** Participants to update section 2.4 of the 099 practice to reflect the current fields (update REMARKS to REMARKS1 and REMARKS2) and replace the picture with a table by the November 6 virtual meeting.

**Agreement Reached:** Participants agreed to determine if section 2.4 can be deleted.

As a result of the analysis of the fields on the 099 practice, the following new action item was opened:

**Action Item:** In an effort to decide whether to reduce the number of unused fields, participants are to review practice by practice to determine which fields/practices can potentially be eliminated from the document by the January 22 virtual meeting.

**Agreement Reached:** Issue 3373 will remain open.

There was not enough time in the meeting to discuss **Issue 3477, LSOG: Standard field length minimums identified and repeating/# of occurrences on each field.** Issue 3477 remains open.

The next LSO meeting is scheduled for January 22, 2015.

### **INC Update – Dave Garner:**

#### **INC Issues Report**

LNPA WG Meeting – January 2015

#### **INC Issue 748: Assess Impacts on Numbering Resources and Numbering Administration with Transition from Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN) to Internet Protocol (IP)**

Issue Statement: As the industry and regulatory bodies move from the current Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN) towards Internet Protocol (IP), consideration needs to be given to the numbering scheme. Will the current telephone number format be utilized, in whole or part, in the IP environment or will some other numbering addressing format be used? It is necessary for INC to be aware of regulatory mandates and industry activities addressing the numbering protocol to be used for IP technology as well as numbering impacts during the PSTN to IP transition in order to update or create new numbering guidelines.

At the November meeting, INC continued to discuss developments regarding the PSTN to IP transition.

INC received informational presentations to learn more about the IP Network architecture. These presentations were:

VoIP Tutorial – Brian Rosen, Neustar

- Note: this presentation addressed the same subjects as Mr. Rosen presented to the LNPA WG at the July 2014 meeting.

IP & SIP Interconnection – Penn Pfautz, AT&T

- Note: this presentation addressed the same subjects as Mr. Pfautz presented to the LNPA WG at the July 2014 meeting.

ATIS/SIP Forum's IP-NNI TF IP Interconnection Routing report – Penn Pfautz, AT&T

- Note: the review of this report addressed the same subjects as Mr. Pfautz reviewed with the LNPA WG at the November 2014 meeting.

Caller Identity Spoofing – Brian Rosen, Neustar

This presentation provided:

- Some background on the problem of calling party name and number spoofing which is at the root of the problem of illegal robocalls, “vishing” (impersonation with intent to defraud), and “swatting” (causing SWAT team deployment).
- Provided a quick primer on public key cryptography and certificate authorities, which can be used to address some of the problematic spoofing.
- Noted the IETF (Internet Engineering Task Force) has chartered a working group, the Secure Telephone Identity Revisited (STIR) WG, to look at this issue. Their charter is limited to numbers and they are working on two mechanisms: In band - Signature of TN and other information in SIP headers passed in the signaling; Out of Band- Called and calling TNs, timestamp, etc. signed by originator. The IETF work is now creating detailed technical standards for the headers and queries and should be stable by early 2015. The next issue will be deployment.

### **Toll Free Exhaust Forecast and 833 Code Opening**

In a letter dated October 8, 2014, the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions (ATIS) SMS/800 Number Administration Committee (SNAC) provided an update to the NANPA on the projected exhaust of the toll-free resource. This letter can be found on the NANPA website under Reports, NRUF ([http://www.nationalnanpa.com/reports/reports\\_nruf.html](http://www.nationalnanpa.com/reports/reports_nruf.html)).

Based upon a study conducted by SMS/800, Inc., the SNAC recommends the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) consider opening the next toll-free resource (the 833 NPA) on or about June 30, 2017.

NANPA makes this information available to the industry in accordance with the NPA Code Relief Planning and Notification Guidelines. Specifically, per Section 14.0 of the NPA Relief Planning and Notification Guidelines, the NANPA is to request a forecasted exhaust from the SMS/800 Number Administration Committee (SNAC) of the toll-free resource on a semi-annual basis. When the forecasted exhaust is within 30 months, the NANPA shall notify the industry, and the industry shall determine if there is a need for any relief planning or implementation meetings (plans for call-through testing, date numbers available for reservations in SMS/800, date calls are expected to be completed in the new NPA, etc.). NANPA provided the 30 month notification via the NANP Notification System on October 17, 2014. The Guidelines also required that NANPA shall announce the new Toll Free NPA availability 24 months ahead of expected 833 NPA opening. The expected opening is currently June 30, 2017, so the NANPA Planning Letter will likely be published on June 30, 2015.

-

### **ATIS INC Webinar**

At the November meeting, INC agreed to hold an educational and information sharing Webinar on December 11, 2014, that would be available to ATIS members and non-members. Title: Spotlight on the All-IP Transition: The Numbering Impacts

Description:

ATIS is seizing the opportunity the All-IP transition brings to advance solutions to help our numbering system innovatively adapt to the future—now. As the evolution to the All-IP network advances, numbering will continue to play a vital role in important transactions related to customer service, billing, repair, account inquiries, network routing and network provisioning. To ensure our numbering system is ready for an All-IP future, ATIS’ work is covering dynamic new territory such as nationwide 10-digit dialing, a numbering testbed, large-scale rate center consolidation, and more. This webinar provides insight into this work, and also informs on the critical dialogue taking place with the FCC on the evolution of numbering in the All-IP transition. Attend to learn how your company can become part of the strong and united industry voice that is advancing numbering in the All-IP transition.

If you were unable to attend or wish to view the presentation again, the webinar is now available on the ATIS website.

Access the digital recording and PowerPoint slides below:

The link for the audio is <https://www144.livemeeting.com/cc/ATIS/view?id=8F9964>.

The link for the slides is [http://www.atis.org/newsandevents/webinar-pptslides/the\\_numbering\\_impacts\\_webinar121114.pdf](http://www.atis.org/newsandevents/webinar-pptslides/the_numbering_impacts_webinar121114.pdf).

**NANC Future of Numbering Working Group Update – Suzanne Addington**

**Future of Numbering (FoN) Working Group Report to the LNPA WG  
January 6, 2015**

FoN Tri-Chairs: Carolee Hall, Idaho PUC, Dawn Lawrence, XO Communications, Suzanne Addington, Sprint

**Status:**

- In December 2014, it was announced Mark Lancaster, ATT, would step down from the FoN WG tri-chair position effective December 31, 2014. Elections were conducted via email in December and Dawn Lawrence was voted in as the new tri-chair for the FoN WG.
- AT&T’s contribution, “Numbering Testbed Parameters” primary objective is to develop functional parameters that could be used in the numbering testbed trial proposed in FCC 14-5 (para 151-170) under WC Docket No. 13-97.
  - This contribution was withdrawn due to the ATIS new subcommittee created for the Testbed Landscape.

- FTN 4 – The Geographic Numbering sub-committee was discussing the consumer perspective and service implications regarding the geography of toll free telephone numbers and the decoupling or disassociation of numbers from geography.
  - The sub-committee created a white paper; it was subsequently approved by the FoN WG and presented to the NANC in December. The NANC chose to give the NANC members time to review the document before submitting to the FCC.
- FTN 8 – All IP Addressing sub-committee primary objective is to define future identifiers in support of IP industry trends beyond the e.164 numbering plan (including M2M impacts). The team meets once a month.
- Scheduled calls:
  - The first Wednesday of each month, from noon-2:00 PM ET
  - Next meeting: 1/07/15 @ 12:00 ET.

### **December 9, 2014 NANC Meeting Readout**

There were no questions from the NANC about the LNPA WG report.

Paula Campagnoli asked about the status of Best Practices 67 and 70. Follow up email from the FCC included this information:

The FCC put out Public Notices (PNs) on BP 67 and 70, but the PNs requested comments on whether the FCC should adopt the BPs as Commission rules (see attached PNs). The Commission does not have a mechanism for adopting “best practices” except through a rulemaking. BP 67 would change the actual rules – currently there is a 4 business-day interval for non-simple ports, and BP67 would change that for “project ports.” The rules cannot be changed unless they are published in the Federal Register as an NPRM. BP70 would impose a new requirement for standardized fields for requesting CSRs. CSRs have not been regulated before, so the Commission cannot just adopt a new “best practice.”



DA-11-1558.doc



DA-11-1954.doc

Kim Isaacs asked about the status of the cancellation flows and why they have not been posted in the Federal Register. Marilyn Jones, FCC, indicated at the NANC meeting that she would check.

## **Change Management – Neustar**

### **Discussion of NPAC Functionality that should be considered for Sunsetting**

**Action Item 110414-05** – Neustar to verify the number of service providers using any of the features still on the Sunset List to the extent possible (especially feature listed in 3.1). They are to make the lists clear as to which items are being sunset and which are not to be sunset. Additionally, Neustar will clarify the description of each item on the list (examples: 3.4 and 3.5).

NPAC-Related Sunset List

1 NPAC Agenda Item – Determine what NPAC Functions

Gary Sacra provided the document embedded above with the latest changes to the list of items being reviewed for possible sunsetting. Comments and discussion are as follows:

- Item 1.1 would have ASN.1 and GDMO impact to remove from interface. Local systems that allow it today would have to be changed to remove capability. It would be a minor change to disable at the NPAC end. Either an operations change or a functionality change to disable. Gary has an action item to update document.
- Item 1.3 – lists can be queried over XML and CMIP interface. To completely remove the capability would have interface impact. Gary has an action item to update local system impact. Lists can be updated over CMIP interface but not over XML.
- Item 3.1 – Gary has an action item to find out for the 5 SOA SPIDs that do not support range notifications if their respective vendors support range notifications.
- Item 3.4 – Gary has an action item to find out for the 11 SOA SPIDs if their respective vendors support Cause Code 2. Figure 12 Step 24 in the NANC Flows applies to this functionality.
- Item 3.5 – Gary has an action item to find out for the 11 SOA SPIDs if their respective vendors support receiving the AVC.
- Item 5.1 – Action item for local system vendors to determine impact.
- General action item for local system vendors to determine LOE, if any, for each item on the list.
- Item 8.2 will stay. The group needs to determine if the report has any value.
- Item 9.3 – Gary has an action item to clarify that it is only the highlighted items being considered for sunset.
- Item 10.1 – Gary has an action item to add a clarifying sentence to the description.

***Action Item 110414-05 is CLOSED.***

**New Action Items related to the Sunset List as related in the above discussion:**

**New Action Item 010615-01** – Item 8.2 on the sunset list suggests removing the Data Integrity Sample Audit and Report. The audit runs periodically, but no service provider has ever requested that a report be generated. Service Providers are to determine if this feature should be removed from the sunset list.



**New Action Item 010615-05** – Local systems vendors are to review all items remaining on the sunset list to determine impacts and level of effort to remove for each item on the list.

**New Action Item 010615-06** – Item 1.1 on the sunset list allows service providers to modify their own CMIP network data. It would be more secure to only allow NPAC personnel to modify the data, thereby preventing incorrect modifications that could cause the service provider to lose connectivity to the NPAC. There would be ASN.1 and GDMO impact to remove this feature, and changes would be required in the local systems. It would be a simple change to disable on the NPAC end. Neustar (Gary Sacra) is to update the sunset list to reflect this.

**New Action Item 010615-07** – Item 1.3 on the sunset list allows customer contact information to be queried over the XML and CMIP interfaces. Completely removing the capability has interface impacts. Removing this feature won't affect the ability to provide data. Neustar (Gary Sacra) to update the local system impacts.

**New Action Item 010615-08** – Item 3.1 on the sunset list allows SOAs that do not support ranges to use individual TNs. There are only five local systems (three service providers) not supporting ranges. Neustar (Gary Sacra) to determine if these 5 systems do not support range TN range notifications or if it is just turned off.

**New Action Item 010615-09** – Item 3.4 on the sunset list requires SOA Support for auto conflict notification with cause code "Cancel-Pending to Conflict." Neustar (Gary Sacra) to determine if the 11 SPIDs not using this feature have vendors that support Cause Code 2.

**New Action Item 010615-10** – Item 3.5 on the sunset list requires SOA Support for AVC when an SV transitions from Cancel-Pending to Conflict due to expiration to T2 timer. Neustar (Gary Sacra) to determine if the 11 SPIDs not using this feature have vendors that support it.

**New Action Item 010615-11** – Neustar (Gary Sacra) will add text to Item 9.3 on the sunset list to clarify that only the highlighted items are being considered for sunseting (i.e., remaining on the sunset list for potential removal).

**New Action Item 010615-12** – Neustar (Gary Sacra) will add text to Item 10.1 on the sunset list to clarify that the LTI login is not disabled, but that the password must be reset.

**Action Item 110414-06** – Neustar to integrate the "Sunset Discussion – FRS Billing Section" file into the overall "Sunset List" file.

Neustar has integrated the FRS Billing Section items into the overall Sunset List File.

**Action Item 110414-06 is CLOSED.**

## **Discussion of Change Orders**

### **NANC 458 (SP Requested Notification Suppression) Discussion:**

- Gary Sacra informed the group of an SP request to separate NANC 458 from the Change order prioritization discussions and possibly implement it on a stand-alone basis. The SP has plans for some internal projects with large volume transactions and would like to be able to suppress SOA notifications.
- Dawn Lawrence, XO, stated that XO sees a benefit and need for suppressing the notifications on these upcoming projects.
- Pat White asked if the New SPID involved in the transactions could suppress notifications to the Old SPID. Jim answered yes but it is on an opt-in basis in the case of the Old SPID based on a table that would be in the NPAC.
- There were no objections to separating out NANC 458 and sending a request to the NAPM for an SOW from Neustar. Tri-Chair action item to ask NAPM to request Neustar development of an SOW. John Nakamura action to break NANC 458 out into a separate document to be sent to the Tri-Chairs.

**New Action Item 010615-02** – LNPA WG Tri-chairs will send a request to the NAPM LLC Co-chairs for them to ask Neustar to provide an SOW for implementing NANC Change Order 458. Neustar (John Nakamura) will break out NANC 458 into a separate document for transmittal to the NAPM LLC.

## **Best Practices**

**Action Item 110414-03** – Service providers are to review their internal dispute resolution processes to determine if there have been any changes. Do these processes support Best Practice 42 and Best Practice 58?

- Comcast, T-Mobile, Sprint, AT&T, Verizon, and CenturyLink adhere to the BPs and have no suggested changes. It was stated that some SPs do not adhere to the BPs.
- Most service providers work together to get the number to the correct party. Most of the problems are when there are legal issues as to who actually owns the number.
- Scott Terry, Windstream, mentioned that sometimes it is not known that a number has ported until some time later. This would likely be in the case of a seldom used number such as a fax number.
- Discussion took place on the difficulty in determining an inadvertent port from a disputed port or fraud. Lisa Jill (Bandwidth) took an action item to provide a write-up on a proposed step-by-step process with timeframes on resolving inadvertent and disputed ports.

**Action Item 110414-03 is CLOSED.**

**New Action Item 010615-03** – Bandwidth.com (Lisa Jill Freeman) will prepare a PIM suggesting some time frames and activities for a best practice to deal with disputed ports.

**Action Item 110414-04** – The LNPA Working Group has approved updated wording to Best Practice 30 and Best Practice 39. Neustar is to update the NPAC website with the changes.

The NPAC website has been updated.

*Action Item 110414-04 is CLOSED.*

## **IP Transition effects on Number Portability**

### **Non-geographic Porting Sub-Team Readout**

- Teresa Patton reported that progress has been made on the report. Two conference calls are scheduled for the week following the LNPA WG meeting.
- The Working Group agreed to have a February LNPA WG call in order to have the paper ready for the March 5<sup>th</sup> NANC meeting, per NANC's request. The call was set up for Feb. 19<sup>th</sup> from 11-3 eastern (in lieu of the call scheduled for February 11). Neustar will set up a live meeting and provide the link to Paula.
- Rosemary Emmer said that we should try to have the paper available for the March 5<sup>th</sup> NANC meeting but it is acceptable to provide a readout to NANC that we require additional time to finalize. Deb Tucker agreed and reminded everyone that the originally scheduled date for the NANC meeting was at the end of March rather than the beginning.

### **Review of ATIS NNI Joint Task Force Draft Document on IP Transition Alternatives**

**Action Item 110414-01** – LNPA Working Group Tri-Chairs will prepare response to the ATIS NNI Joint Task Force concerning their draft documents on IP Network transition alternatives. The response will contain WG input concerning impacts to number portability. Tri-chairs will circulate for comment, assimilate comments, and send to the NNI Task Force.

The correspondence has been sent to the ATIS NNI Joint Task Force.

*Action Item 110414-01 is CLOSED.*

Penn Pfautz reported that the NNI had conference calls in December and January to determine next steps. They have a face-to-face meeting planned for February. The NNI has not received many responses to the draft documents and he thanked the LNPA WG for its comments. The ATIS Landscape Test Bed committee is beginning work to establish an IP network test bed.

### **OBF Issue 3450, LSOG: Standard Validation and Submission fields for REQTYP “C” Simple and Non-Simple Port Orders**

**Action Item 110414-02** – LNPA Working Group Tri-Chairs will send correspondence to ATIS OBF LSO concerning their recent proposed solution to address standard validation and

submission fields for REQ TYP “C” and Non-Simple Port orders. Only validation fields were provided. Tri-Chairs will ask that OBF LSO provide a list of submission LSR fields.

The correspondence has been sent to the ATIS OBF LSO.

**Action Item 110414-02 is CLOSED.**

- ATIS responded and said that the same fields are required for non-simple/non-complex and simple ports. Only the SANO field is being added for validation for non-simple/non-complex ports.
- SPs stated that they would have to discuss internally if there should be any effort on the part of the LNPA WG to go to the FCC requesting endorsement of the proposed standard validation and submission fields for non-simple/non-complex port orders.
- The Working Group desires to have the Oct. 10<sup>th</sup> and December 5<sup>th</sup> letters from OBF placed on the NPAC website where they can be referenced as needed.

**New Action Item 010615-13** – Neustar (Gary Sacra) to find a suitable location on the NPAC website under LNPA WG to place the correspondence between the WG and the OBF. He will provide the suggested location to the WG Tri-chairs.

## **New PIM – Reseller Response Time**



New PIM Reseller  
Response Times.doc

- Suzanne Addington, Sprint, introduced an issue with the attached New PIM request stating that there is no existing documentation around expectations of the timing of a port out response when the losing service provider is a reseller.
- It was stated that many wireline Old Network SPs return the FOC within the required interval and then notify the Old Local SP (reseller) via a Loss Notification. It varies somewhat from one wireline SP to another.
- The PIM is requesting development of a timeline for reseller response for wireless-to-wireless ports.
- Consensus was to accept this as PIM 84. It will be renamed Wireless-to-Wireless Reseller Response Time.

## **Mobile Virtual Network Operators (MVNOs) from Wireline Service Providers**

No involved SPs have committed to participate in an LNPA WG meeting to discuss this issue. It was agreed to take this item off of the agenda, and it will be added back if and when an SP agrees to participate in a future WG meeting discussion.

## Review of 2015 LNPA Working Group Meeting Schedule

### 2015 Meetings and Conference Calls

MONTH (2014)	NANC MEETING DATES	LNPA WG MEETING/CALL DATES	HOST COMPANY	MEETING LOCATION
January		6 <sup>th</sup> - 7 <sup>th</sup>	iconectiv	Scottsdale, AZ
February		11 <sup>th</sup> - 19 <sup>th</sup>		Conference Call
March		3 <sup>rd</sup> - 4 <sup>th</sup>	Verizon Wireless	Alpharetta, GA
April		8 <sup>th</sup>		Conference Call
May		12 <sup>th</sup> - 13 <sup>th</sup>	Neustar	Ft. Lauderdale, FL
June		10 <sup>th</sup>		Conference Call
July		7 <sup>th</sup> - 8 <sup>th</sup>	CLNPC	Mont Tremblant, QC, Canada
August		12 <sup>th</sup>		Conference Call
September		1 <sup>st</sup> - 2 <sup>nd</sup>	Comcast	Denver, CO
October		14 <sup>th</sup>		Conference Call
November		3 <sup>rd</sup> - 4 <sup>th</sup>	T-Mobile (tentative)	TBD
December		9 <sup>th</sup>		Conference Call

**WEDNESDAY January 7, 2015**  
**Attendance**

Name	Company	Name	Company
Lonnie Keck	AT&T	Gary Sacra	Neustar
Ron Steen	AT&T	Jim Rooks	Neustar
David Alread	AT&T (phone)	John Nakamura	Neustar
Teresa Patton	AT&T (phone)	Lavinia Rotaru	Neustar
Tracey Guidotti	AT&T (phone)	Marcel Champagne	Neustar
Michael Rothchild	ATL	Mubeen Saifullah	Neustar
Lisa Jill Freeman	Bandwidth.com (phone)	Paul LaGattuta	Neustar
Marian Hearn	Canadian LNP	Tara Farquhar	Neustar (phone)
Mary Retka	CenturyLink (phone)	Shannon Sevigny	Neustar Pooling (phone)
Brenda Bloemke	Comcast	Ramesh Chellamani	Oracle Communications
Linda Birchem	Comcast (phone)	Chad Younger	Sprint
Beth O'Donnell	Cox (phone)	Rosemary Emmer	Sprint
Wendy Trahan	GVNW (phone)	Suzanne Addington	Sprint
Doug Babcock	iconectiv	Darren Post	Synchronoss
George Tsacnaris	iconectiv	Jeanne Kulesa	Synchronoss
John Malyar	iconectiv	Bob Bruce	Syniverse
Steven Koch	iconectiv	Luke Sessions	T-Mobile
Pat White	iconectiv	Paula Campagnoli	T-Mobile
Kim Isaacs	Integra (phone)	Jason Lee	Verizon (phone)
Bonnie Johnson	Minnesota DoC (phone)	Deb Tucker	Verizon Wireless
Lynette Khirallah	NetNumber (phone)	Scott Terry	Windstream
Dave Garner	Neustar	Dawn Lawrence	XO
Fariba Jafari	Neustar		

**PIM 0083 Discussion – Review the revisions to the PIM to expand the scope to include SOA and LTI SPIDs, SP Type, Port In and Port Out timer values, and business hour/day values.**



PIM 0083  
(Submission for SP-Rc)

- Gary Sacra walked through the attached version of PIM 83 that contains the expanded report information that was requested at the November 2014 WG meeting.

- The report can be developed by Neustar and placed on the secure website approximately 2 weeks after an SOW is executed.
- The WG agreed to send an SOW request to the NAPM for development of the report by Neustar as described in the attached PIM 83.
- Consensus was reached on the creation of a report, one for each NPAC Region, to be updated monthly, containing the following:
  - i. Every Service Provider mechanized SOA, LTI, and Help Desk-only SPID listed in numerical order,
  - ii. The SP Type for each SPID,
  - iii. The NPAC SP Profile setting for port-in timer value for the SPID,
  - iv. The NPAC SP Profile setting for port-out timer value for the SPID,
  - v. The NPAC SP Profile setting for Business Hours/Business Days for the SPID,
  - vi. The NPAC SP Profile setting for Medium Timer Indicator Support for the SPID.

**New Action Item 010615-04** – LNPA WG Tri-chairs will send a request to the NAPM LLC Co-chairs for them to ask Neustar to provide an SOW for implementing the provisions of PIM 83. This will provide Service Provider SPIDs, SP Type, Porting Timer Values, and business hour/day values. The information will be provided on the NPAC Secure Website, and will be updated monthly.

**Service Provider Contact List on the NPAC Website – Neustar to report on the source of the data and how often it is updated.**

- Gary reported that the contact lists on the secure website are updated by the Primary and Secondary authorized Users via the website in real-time, or they can send an e-mail to the Help Desk to have the updates processed. If sent via e-mail, the updates are processed in real-time as the Help Desk submits them.
- Users that participate on the monthly Cross-Regional calls are reminded to keep their contact information updated.
- There is a search function on the secure website that allows Users to search all contacts by SPID.
- Gary took an action item to send out the contact lists link to the WG distro.

**New Action Item 010615-14** – Neustar (Gary Sacra) will send the web-link to the Service Provider contact list on the NPAC website.

**Allow resellers and end users greater control on porting of numbers based on the process used in the toll free world. – Aelea Christofferson**

Michael Rothchild, ATL Communications, was in attendance at this meeting. Michael will create a PIM to present at the March LNPA WG meeting. ATL would like to be able to control routing for LNP in a similar way that is used in the toll free industry.

## **Develop the LNPA WG Report to the (NANC, FON, IMG, etc.)**

### **All readouts to be developed at LNPA WG meetings**

- It was stated that it is important that the presenters do not give their company positions when giving an LNPA WG report to another group.
- Reporting LNPA WG positions should not be biased by our own company positions.
- It was agreed that the liaisons to other committees are as follows:
  - INC – Dave Garner
  - FON – Deb Tucker/Suzanne Addington
  - OBF – Deb Tucker
  - NANC IMG – Bridgette Alexander
  - NANC – LNPA WG Tri-chairs
- There was a suggestion that all liaisons should submit their reports to the WG Tri-chairs prior to presenting. It was agreed that this isn't necessary as long as everyone follows the established principle of reporting only LNPA WG consensus.

## **Discussion of Need for February 2015 LNPA WG Call**

It was agreed that a February conference call is needed to discuss the Non-Geographic sub-team draft report. The date of the call was changed from February 11 to February 19 from 11:00 to 3:00 EST. Neustar will set up a WEBEX and send details to Paula for distribution.

## **New Business**

No new business was introduced.

*Next Conference Call ... February 19, 2015 **This call was rescheduled from February 11, 2015.***

*Next Meeting ... March 3-4 , 2015: Location...Alpharetta, GA ...Hosted by Verizon Wireless*