

LNPA WORKING GROUP
March 13-14, 2012 Meeting
Final Minutes

Denver, Colorado	Host: Comcast
-------------------------	----------------------

LNPA WORKING GROUP ARCHITECTURE PLANNING
TEAM (APT) DISCUSSION:

TUESDAY 03/13/12

Tuesday, 03/13/12, Attendance:

Name	Company	Name	Company
Tracey Guidotti	AT&T	Marcel Champagne	Neustar
Ron Steen	AT&T	Dave Garner	Neustar
Teresa Patton	AT&T (phone)	Mubeen Saifullah	Neustar Clearinghouse
Mark Lancaster	AT&T (phone)	Shannon Sevigny	Neustar Pooling (phone)
Lonnie Keck	AT&T Mobility	Jeff Sonnier	Sprint Nextel
Renee Dillon	AT&T Mobility	Ken Havens	Sprint Nextel
Matt Nolan	Bright House (phone)	Ann Fenaroli	Sprint Nextel
Jan Doell	CenturyLink	Suzanne Addington	Sprint Nextel
Tim Kagele	Comcast	Nancy Conant	Synchronoss
Brenda Bloemke	Comcast	Rosalee Pinnock	Syniverse (phone)
Joan Bridgeman	Cricket	Ramesh Chellamani	Tekelec
Dena Hunter	Cricket	Joel Zamlong	Ericsson/Telcordia
Julie Hock	Cricket	Pat White	Ericsson/Telcordia
Devang Naik	DSET	Lisa Marie Maxson	Ericsson/Telcordia
Jim Seigler	DSET	Adam Newman	Ericsson/Telcordia
Linda Peterman	Earthlink Business	John Malyar	Ericsson/Telcordia
Crystal Hanus	GVNW (phone)	George Tsacnaris	Ericsson/Telcordia
Bonnie Johnson	Integra (phone)	Kayla Sharbaugh	Ericsson/Telcordia (phone)
Bridget Alexander	John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone)	Steven Koch	Ericsson/Telcordia (phone)
Angie Beckett	John Staurulakis, Inc.	Paula Jordan	T-Mobile
Karen Hoffman	John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone)	Luke Sessions	T-Mobile
Eric Monkeliën	Level 3	Glenn Andrews	TNS

Name	Company	Name	Company
Lynette Khirallah	NetNumber (phone)	George Stonesifer	US Cellular
Jim Rooks	Neustar	Tanya Golub	US Cellular (phone)
Paul LaGattuta	Neustar	Gary Sacra	Verizon
Stephen Addicks	Neustar	Jason Lee	Verizon (phone)
John Nakamura	Neustar	Deb Tucker	Verizon Wireless
Larry Vagnoni	Neustar	Traci Brunner	Windstream
Ed Barker	Neustar (phone)		
Randy Buffenbarger	Neustar		

NOTE: ALL APT ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “MARCH_13_2012 LNPA WG APT ACTION ITEMS” FILE ISSUED IN A SEPARATE E-MAIL FROM THESE MINUTES AND ATTACHED BELOW.



MARCH_13_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 or call.		
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

MONTH (2012)	NANC MEETING DATES	LNPA WG MEETING/CALL DATES	HOST COMPANY	MEETING LOCATION
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.

January 10, 2012 APT Meeting Minutes Review:

- No changes were made to the DRAFT January 10, 2012 APT meeting minutes, and they were approved as FINAL.

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

- Review of SOW 24 Test Requirements



SOW 24 testing requirements for ITP.

- In leading the review of the attached SOW 24 ITP testing requirements, John Nakamura, Neustar, stated that the objective is to perform more business flow testing with vendors. If that is the case, it would make sense for vendors to perform turn-up regression test cases. Currently there are 101. John stated that Neustar also recommends that SPs would perform the regression test cases as part of their turn-up testing. New features that vendors would have to implement would require additional test cases. These would be the minimum required test cases for vendors.
 - For a new release with no new features, at a minimum, vendors would do the turn-up regression test cases. The group agreed.

- Concerns were raised regarding the suggestion to make the regression test cases optional for SPs if vendors have performed them already.
 - Neustar stated that their recommendation would not preclude vendors doing surrogate testing for their SPs. It was asked if this meant that they would have to do the regression test cases twice as a vendor and then as a surrogate for their customer. Neustar responded that the software level, patch level, and NPAC profile level would have to be the same for both vendor and SP systems in order to avoid having to run the test cases twice.
 - There was agreement that SPs would also be required to do the turn-up regression test cases.
 - For new releases with new features that the vendor and SP are going to implement, each would run the associated new test cases.
 - John then reviewed the SOW 24 requirements. He stated that we will have to revise this document for submission to the LLC. It will no longer be called ITP testing. It will be called vendor testing. Neustar will revise the attached SOW 24 testing requirements based on changes discussed at the March 13, 2012 APT meeting for review at the May 8, 2012 APT meeting.
 - It was asked how it would be coordinated if the SP had different SOA and LSMS vendors. There should not be any difference in how it is done today.
 - It was stated that we also need to look at the current ITP test cases to see what we need to carry over into the turn-up regression test cases for vendor testing.
- Review of Current Turn-up Test Plan Matrix



TUT Plan - TC matrix
- chap 7 - based on R

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:

1. New Service Provider and New Vendor,
2. New Service Provider and Experienced Vendor,
3. Experienced Service Provider and New Vendor,
4. 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 051011-16 stays open. We will review the test plan in the sub-team and bring a recommendation to the APT.

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.

- Action Item 091311-APT-02 stays open.

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



NANC TBD - NPAC
support of IPv6.docx

- The group reviewed the attached NANC 447 Change Order for NPAC support of IPv6.
- **Neustar** will add a note in the attached NANC 447 Change Order stating that dual stacks (IPv4 and IPv6) will be supported.
- There was no objection to recommending to the full LNPA WG that a request be sent to the NAPM LLC for an SOW from Neustar for NANC 447. Neustar said that the level of effort would likely be medium to high.

Sunset of Non-EDR Support – All:

Action Item 011012-APT-01: **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, and ask if any entities are currently requesting BDDs with pooled SVs.

- Neustar stated that they have not received any feedback from the notice sent out per Action Item 011012-APT-01.
- **Neustar** will contact directly those users that request BDDs with pooled SVs to let them know that support of non-EDR will sunset at the end of 2Q2012. Neustar will provide feedback at the May 8, 2012 APT meeting. There are 34 such users.
- Action Item 011012-APT-01 is closed.
- Neustar reviewed changes to NANC 448 related to pooled SVs.

- There was no objection to recommending to the full LNPA WG that a request be sent to the NAPM LLC for an SOW from Neustar for NANC 448. The actual implementation of NANC 448 would be done over time.

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

Action Item 011012-APT-02: 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.



NANC 372 -
Alternative NPAC Inte



NANC 372 - CMIP
and HTTPS pics in PDF

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

- Neustar reviewed the attached NANC 372 discussion document and recapped the discussion that took place at the January 2012 APT meeting.
- XML or JSON – not yet decided. AT&T and Verizon stated that they prefer JSON at this point. CenturyLink prefers XML at this point.
- The current working assumption is connectionless and session-less.
- Neustar will create a tracking document of key questions that need answered and what decisions are made in order to focus our ongoing discussions. Pros and cons of each needed decision will be included in the document, e.g., JSON vs. XML. Vendors may also provide input to the document. The document will be developed also for SPs to use as a discussion tool internally with their IT and Security SMEs.
- Action Item 011012-APT-02 is closed.
- Action Item 110911-APT-03 is closed.
- Neustar teed us a discussion of push vs. pull. Push is what we have today with CMIP. There is a pre-established connection with an open association. SPs request the NPAC to open up an association. A push will require a hole to be open in SP

firewalls with a server behind the firewall in a connectionless environment. In a pull environment, the only time the NPAC will send is at the request of the SP. Having a hole in a firewall in a closed network is similar to what is allowed today with VPNs. Today, there is a hole in the NPAC firewall to allow SPs to connect. In a pull environment, SPs would poll the NPAC for anything new. In determining how frequently to poll, we must keep in mind that there are benefits to getting updates in bulk. Neustar said that they do not envision a poll any more frequently than 60 seconds.

- An SP asked if there were any financial benefits to going to connectionless, pull, XML, etc. Neustar responded that having a CMIP developer on staff is a very specialized resource. The SP also asked if the new architecture would make the NPAC more efficient operationally. Neustar responded that the new interface would be simpler and the LSMS would not have to serve as a server.
- An SP asked if a pull environment could result in resource contention. Neustar responded that the efficiency of sending updates in bulk in a pull, and not having to place a header on each individual update, would outweigh any inefficiencies.
- An SP added that not having to maintain dedicated circuits would be a savings.

APT Action Items Not Previously Discussed in Agenda – All:



JANUARY_10_2012
LNPA WG APT ACTIO

Review of January 10, 2012 LNPA WG APT Action Items:

January 10, 2012 LNPA WG APT Action Items:

- Item 011012-APT-01: This item has been completed and is Closed.
- Item 011012-APT-02: This item has been completed and is Closed.

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.
- Item 110911-APT-03: 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 May 2012 face-to-face meeting.

Next APT Meeting ...Part of the May 8-9, 2012 LNPA WG Meeting...

Location...Key West, Florida...

Hosted by Neustar

FULL LNPA WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION:

WEDNESDAY 03/14/12

Wednesday, 03/14/12, Attendance:

Name	Company	Name	Company
Tracey Guidotti	AT&T	Marcel Champagne	Neustar
Ron Steen	AT&T	Dave Garner	Neustar
Teresa Patton	AT&T (phone)	Mubeen Saifullah	Neustar Clearinghouse
Lonnie Keck	AT&T Mobility	Shannon Sevigny	Neustar Pooling (phone)
Renee Dillon	AT&T Mobility	Jeff Sonnier	Sprint Nextel
Matt Nolan	Bright House (phone)	Ken Havens	Sprint Nextel
Tony Filippone	Cablevision (phone)	Ann Fenaroli	Sprint Nextel
Jan Doell	CenturyLink	Suzanne Addington	Sprint Nextel
Tim Kagele	Comcast	Nancy Conant	Synchronoss
Brenda Bloemke	Comcast	Rosalee Pinnock	Syniverse (phone)
Beth O'Donnell	Cox (phone)	Joel Zamlong	Ericsson/Telcordia
Joan Bridgeman	Cricket	Pat White	Ericsson/Telcordia
Dena Hunter	Cricket	Lisa Marie Maxson	Ericsson/Telcordia
Julie Hock	Cricket	Adam Newman	Ericsson/Telcordia
Linda Peterman	Earthlink Business	John Malyar	Ericsson/Telcordia
Bonnie Johnson	Integra (phone)	George Tsacnaris	Ericsson/Telcordia
Bridget Alexander	John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone)	Kayla Sharbaugh	Ericsson/Telcordia (phone)
Angie Beckett	John Staurulakis, Inc.	Steven Koch	Ericsson/Telcordia (phone)
Karen Hoffman	John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone)	Paula Jordan	T-Mobile
Eric Monkeliën	Level 3	Luke Sessions	T-Mobile
Lynette Khirallah	NetNumber (phone)	Glenn Andrews	TNS
Jim Rooks	Neustar	George Stonesifer	US Cellular
Paul LaGattuta	Neustar	Gary Sacra	Verizon
Stephen Addicks	Neustar	Jason Lee	Verizon (phone)
John Nakamura	Neustar	Deb Tucker	Verizon Wireless
Larry Vagnoni	Neustar	Traci Brunner	Windstream

Name	Company	Name	Company
Ed Barker	Neustar (phone)		
Randy Buffenbarger	Neustar		

NOTE: ALL ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “MARCH 13-14 2012 FULL LNPA WG ACTION ITEMS” FILE ISSUED IN A SEPARATE E-MAIL FROM THESE MINUTES AND ATTACHED BELOW.



MARCH 13-14 2012
FULL LNPA WG ACTIC

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 or call.		
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.

January 10-11, 2012 Full LNPA WG Meeting Minutes Review:

- No changes were made to the DRAFT January 10-11, 2012 Full LNPA WG meeting minutes, and they were approved as FINAL.

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

- Since the January 2012 LNPA WG meeting, the Wireless Service Ordering Subcommittee held two interim conference calls resulting in two new issues being accepted to work.
- Issue 3441 – WICIS: ICP Validation Change for SUP 1. This issue addresses situations when an Old Service Provider does not receive port cancellation SUP 1s that the New Service Provider has sent prior to responding with Resolution Required or Confirmation responses. Issue 3441 remains open.
- Issue 3442 - WICIS: 90 Day Due Date. This issue addresses the specific situations where a wireline provider sends a port request to a wireless provider with a desired due date greater than 90 days. WICIS has a 90 day restriction on desired due date intervals where the LSR has no restriction. Issue 3442 remains open.
- Issue 3429 – WICIS Review for Alignment and Business Practices remains open.
- The OBF Ordering Solutions Wireless Service Ordering Subcommittee meets next on May 2, 2012.
- **Wireless Service Providers** are to determine how frequently they are experiencing issues due to the Old SP and the New SP not being in synch when a Supp 1 is

submitted to cancel a port request. This will be discussed at the May 2012 LNPA WG meeting.

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

- Since the January 2012 LNPA WG meeting, the Local Service Ordering Subcommittee has held two interim conference calls continuing work on the Directory Listing Practices, planning for the ATIS Annual Meeting of Committees (AMOC), and discussing the potential for a new issue surrounding standard validation/ordering fields for non-simple ports.
- Current Open Issues:

3436.doc 3436att.zip	LSOG – Correction to the ACNA and RACNA fields in the Local Service Request (LSR-071) and Resale Frame Relay (RFR-079) forms.
3382	LSOG: Standardization and consolidation of Directory Listings Inquiry/Response and Listing Reconciliation (from LSOG6) all into the 111 Practice
3381 3381att.zip	LSOG: Standardization of directory listings in the 102 Practice
3373.doc 3373att.zip	LSOG: Standardization of RT of “Z” in the 099 practice for REQTYP “C” to be utilized by all providers

- Linda Peterman will submit a new issue covering standard validation/ordering fields for non-simple ports by April 1, 2012 for review and consideration by the LSO Subcommittee at AMOC.
- The OBF Ordering Solutions Local Service Ordering Subcommittee meets next face-to-face at AMOC, the week of April 16, 2012.

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

INC Issue 692: Update the 5YY requirements for resources.

The current Personal Communications Services (PCS) 5YY NXX Code Assignment Guidelines document specifies guidelines for the assignment of non-geographic NXX codes within 5YY NXX’s used for personal communications services. INC determined the guidelines should be reviewed and updated to ensure NANPA and 5YY applicants have a clear understanding of the criteria necessary to obtain these numbers.

INC issues involving the 5YY guidelines address a broad range of updates to the 5YY

guidelines some of which include: 1) Issue 702, which created a new name for this numbering resource to better describe this numbering resource, but generic enough to cover new technologies, applications and uses. It was agreed that the 5YY Resources would now be “ Non-Geographic 5XX-NXX Codes “, 2) Issue 703, in which INC determined that Non-Geographic 5XX-NXX Code resources are mainly used for application and device communications, and therefore the NPA does not need to be an Easily Recognizable Code (ERC). Therefore, INC directed NANPA to set aside all available NXX codes in the 52X, 53X, 54X, 55X, 56X, 57X and 58X NPAs for future Non-Geographic 5XX-NXX Code use.

As part of Issue 692, the INC review and update of the current 5YY NXX Code Assignment Guidelines is focusing on these areas:

- 1) update the service description for these resources to better reflect their use for machine-type communications and applications,
- 2) provide additional definition concerning the criteria necessary to obtain and retain these non-geographic resources,
- 3) define the quantity of code resources that can initially be assigned,
- 4) define the requirements regarding a minimum utilization threshold for existing 5YY resources as a pre-requisite for the assignment of additional 5YY NXX codes.

INC Issue 497: Identify Potential Changes to INC Guidelines Based on NANC’s Report and Recommendation

On February 1, 2005, the FCC granted a waiver sought by SBC Internet Services, Inc. (SBCIS), an information service provider affiliate of SBC Communications, Inc. The Commission’s waiver order allows SBCIS to obtain numbering resources directly from the North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA) and Pooling Administrator (PA), and also asked the North American Numbering Council (NANC) to determine what changes in the numbering rules would be required to make numbering resources generally available to IP-enabled service providers.

At NANC’s request in 2005, INC reviewed the NANC’s report (VoIP Service Providers’ Access Requirements for NANP Resource Assignments – NANC Report Recommendation by the Future of Numbering Working Group – July 2005) and crafted changes to relevant sections within four INC documents that may require modifications should the FCC issue an order addressing VoIP provider access to numbers. In June 2008, INC tabled this Issue until action is taken by the FCC.

On December 27, 2011, the FCC issued Public Notice DA 11-2074 asking for a refresh of the record on numerous petitions for limited waiver of section 52.15 (g) (2) (i) of the Commission’s rules to allow the requesting VoIP providers direct access to number resources from the NANPA and PA.

If the FCC adopts new numbering rules regarding VoIP provider access to numbers, INC will need to resume work on this issue. Due to the recent FCC’s action on DA 11-2074,

INC reviewed this tabled issue and agreed to remind NANC at their next meeting of the work INC would need to perform.

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

- Adam Newman, Telcordia and FoN Tri-Chair, 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_Mar2012_r2.pptx

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



LNPA_NP_Best_Practices_03-02-2012.doc

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

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 v7.c

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

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.

- Action Item 110911-LNPAWG-02 was closed. A formal issue will be submitted to the OBF LSO.

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 011012-LNPAWG-03: 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.



BP 33 draft 050311
v7.docx

- Verizon responded that they have no difference in terms of validations.
- AT&T, CenturyLink, and Earthlink responded that they do validate differently.
- Action Item 011012-LNPAWG-03 was closed.
- V7 of the proposed BP 33, attached above, is the same version that was reviewed at the January 2012 LNPA WG meeting.

Additional Submission of Proposed BP 33 – CenturyLink



BP33 v9 CTL Draft
clean.docx

- Jan Doell, CenturyLink, reviewed the attached submission with the group and stated it was submitted because CenturyLink cannot support v7 of BP 33 because it would require significant system changes.
- Jan stated that these fields are in the purview of the OBF.
- Jan also stated that pulling the CSR, if available, should solve the problem because it is a requirement that all required info on the LSR must be provided on the CSR.
- Verizon stated that CenturyLink's submission is historically accurate but does not solve their problem. Verizon still get rejects even after they pull the CSR. Verizon also preferred that the reference to the vanity number BP be removed. Comcast agreed with Verizon.
- AT&T stated that mismatches with CSR data should be dealt with differently. AT&T stated that they could not support CenturyLink's version or Verizon's version. AT&T feels this should be dealt with in the OBF. Verizon asked if v7 was modified to only apply to Req Type C, would AT&T support it. AT&T responded that they could not.

- The Co-Chairs asked how many supported Verizon’s v7 of BP 33. Comcast and Verizon said yes.
- The Co-Chairs asked how many supported CenturyLink’s submission of BP 33. CenturyLink, Windstream, and Cricket said yes. Earthlink stated that they were really in the middle and said that it should be dealt with in the OBF. Integra stated that they were leaning toward CenturyLink’s submission.
- Consensus was reached that the issue that is being submitted to the OBF’s LSO will be the avenue for addressing this issue.
- It was agreed to delete the old BP33 because it is superseded by FCC rule.

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.

- Action Item 071211-LNPAWG-09 was closed. Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair reported that all links were verified.

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)	



NANC_OPS_Flows_Narratives Figure 12 C:



BP 0063 SEND.docx

- With the exception of Integra, there were no objections to removing the phrase “to cancel the porting request” in Step 7.
- Regarding using Conflict Cause Code 50 (CC 50), Verizon, Comcast, and Level 3 expressed concerns about possible misuse of CC 50. CenturyLink stated that it would be appropriate to stop the port. Verizon believes CC50 and CC51 should only be used for the specific scenarios for which they were developed. Level 3 expressed concern about the possible loss of service if the port were to take place for reasons such as 911.
- CenturyLink and Windstream supported use of CC50. CenturyLink stated that since some wireless carriers do not immediately receive and process jeopardies, that is

more reason to use CC50. Also in favor of the use of CC50 in this scenario were Earthlink and Level 3.

- In opposition to the use of CC50 in this scenario were Verizon, Comcast, T-Mobile, AT&T, US Cellular, and Sprint Nextel.
- In favor of the use of CC50 in this scenario were CenturyLink, Windstream, Earthlink, and Level 3.
- There was no consensus to allow the use of CC50 by the Old SP in the Cancel flow. As a result, it was not approved for use in this scenario.
- **Jan Doell**, CenturyLink, will revise the “Cancel” flow document per agreements reached at the March 2012 LNPA WG meeting and send it to Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair. Next steps for this document will be discussed at the May 2012 LNPA WG meeting.

NOTE: This Action Item has been completed. See final version attached below.



NANC_OPS_Flows_Narratives Figure 12 C:

Next Steps for Best Practices Review and Update – All:

- Review and update of the BP document will continue at the May 2012 LNPA WG meeting.
- All were advised to start thinking about next steps after we eventually complete our individual internal reviews of the revised document.

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 LATA different from 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.

March 2012 status: 98% of SVs and 75% of blocks have been completed.

Change Management – Neustar:



NANC Change
Orders 02-29-12.doc

- Neustar provided the attached Change Order document. Changes included:
 - NANC 372, alternative NPAC interface, deleted the inline text, and moved it into the separate embedded document. Also added the PDF picture that was e-mailed out last week.
 - NANC 446, pending SV interference, moved from Accepted category to Current Dev Release category. Embedded document contains redlines, version updated from V2 to V3.
 - NANC 448, sunset of non-EDR, added to document as this was approved during January LNPA WG meeting.
- There were no questions from the group.
- In response the recommendation from the APT, there were no objections to requesting that the LLC request SOWs for NANC 447 and NANC 448.
 - **Gary Sacra**, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will send a request to the NAPM LLC Co-Chairs asking that a request for Statements of Work be sent to Neustar for the attached NANC 447 (NPAC Support of IPv6) and NANC 448 (Sunset of Non-EDR Support) Change Orders.



NANC 447.docx



NANC 448.docx

NOTE: This Action Item has been completed.

- 25K/hour Industry Load Test Discussion – All:

Action Item 011012-LNPAWG-04: 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).

- Neustar reported that they has sufficient projects (modifies) to perform the load test. They plan to conduct the test similar to previous load tests.

- It was agreed that the load test will be conducted on Wednesday, April 18th, from 5am to 6am eastern.

NOTE: The April 18th load test was subsequently cancelled and will be rescheduled at the May 2012 LNPA WG meeting.

- Proposed NANC Change Order for Active/Active SOAs from the same SPID – Tim Kagele, Comcast:

- Tim Kagele, Comcast, teed up the attached proposed Change Order regarding enabling Active/Active SOAs from the same SPID.



NANC TBD - active-active SOA - s:

- NPAC today only allows one active SOA per SPID. Comcast wants the ability for multiple SOA associations per SPID in a region for diversity for disaster recovery.
- A provider stated that they believe this capability exists today. They stated that they can re-associate the other SOA with the same SPID within an hour. The backup is a warm standby.
- Comcast is trying to find a solution that will reduce or avoid the time to re-associate in order to avoid a lengthy recovery process.
- This would be optional for SPs.
- US Cellular said that they have a standby that is automatically associated very quickly.
- Tim said that the intent is for 2 or more SOAs that could operate simultaneously in the same region.
- No objections to accepting the Change Order for requirements development.

Discussion of 2012 Meeting/Call Agenda Items – All:



Brainstorming of Possible Future LNPA

Action Item 011012-LNPAWG-02: 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.



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.

- Verizon suggested compiling a list of carriers' websites for their business rules. Level 3 supported the suggestion.
- Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will add an item to the *Brainstorming of Possible Future LNPA WG Agenda Items* document related to the development of a list of carriers' websites that contain their business rules, to be placed at the top of the LOW priority category.

NOTE: This Action Item has been completed. See v9 of the document attached below.



Brainstorming of
Possible Future LNPA

Discussion of INC Issue 722: Review and Reconcile TN Administration Guidelines with Updated NANC LNP Flows – All:



NANC_OPS_Flows_Narratives v4.1 (04-16)

- Dave Garner, Neustar, teed up the issue. INC wants the LNPA WG to review the Disconnect flow to make sure the 18 month time between disconnect date and release date is consistent with FCC rules on aging.

- There is no intention that the NPAC would provide an edit.
- This does not impact Armed Forces TNs because they are considered active within a special category.
- Disconnected TNs with a referral announcement are still considered active and the aging period has not yet started.
- The 18 month maximum release interval in the flows includes any referral announcement period and any aging period.
- Related to the discussion of INC Issue 722: Review and Reconcile TN Administration Guidelines with Updated NANC LNP Flows, that took place at the March 2012 LNPA WG meeting, **Service Providers** are to come to the May 2012 LNPA WG meeting prepared to determine if we will delete or modify the reference to the 18 month maximum interval between disconnect date and effective release date in Step 7 of the attached “Disconnect” flow.

Discussion of Type 1 Number Conversion Issues – All:

- Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, teed up the discussion and stated that there are still large clusters of Type 1s that they are trying to get converted. They are submitting the LSRs to the wireline SP whose end office is serving the TN, and the SP is rejecting the LSR. These are individual TNs.
- A provider said that the ones that they have left are being served on switches of SPs with waivers.
- It was asked if they were getting rejects because the port is not being requested by the end user. Answer was that that is extremely rare.
- Deb asked for suggestions or thoughts on how to handle these situations.
- Regarding the discussion of issues related to the conversion of remaining Type 1 wireless numbers that took place at the March 2012 LNPA WG meeting, **Service Providers** are to come to the May 2012 LNPA WG meeting prepared to discuss any suggestions for improving the process.

Develop Process to Address Regulatory Non-Compliances – All:

Develop Process & Checklist to Address Future FCC Mandates – All:

- There were no objections to handling these two items together.
- **LNPA WG Participants** are to come to the May 2012 LNPA WG meeting prepared to determine sub-team participants that will develop a recommended process for

addressing Regulatory non-compliances and a recommended process and checklist for addressing future FCC mandates.

Develop March 29th NANC Meeting Report – All:

- The group agreed that the following items would be included in the March 29th NANC report:
 - Status of Best Practices refresh
 - Scheduling of the 25K industry load test
 - Reviewing and revising the Vendor and SP test plans
 - Regarding the NASUCA issue on non-simple porting passcodes, all agreed that it was the LNPA WG's intent that the passcode rules placed in the LNP flows applied to all port types, not just simple ports.

Discussion of Need for April 10, 2012 LNPA WG Call – All:

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

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 April, no other changes were made.

Action Items Not Previously Discussed in Agenda – All:



JANUARY 10-11
2012 FULL LNPA WG ,

Review of January 10-11, 2012 FULL LNPA WG Action Items:

January 10-11, 2012 FULL LNPA WG Action Items:

- Item 011012-LNPAWG-01: This item has been completed and is Closed.
- Item 011012-LNPAWG-02: This item has been completed and is Closed.
- Item 011012-LNPAWG-03: This item has been completed and is Closed.
- Item 011012-LNPAWG-04: 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 091311-LNPAWG-05: This item remains Open.
- Item 110911-LNPAWG-06: This item remains Open.

New/Unfinished Business (All):

- Discussion of Possible SPID Migration Enhancements – Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless:
 - We currently need an LTI connection to use the new SPID migration process. Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, asked if any other providers are interested in an enhancement for access, such as over the Internet through the secure website.
 - **Service Providers** are to determine if they have experienced any challenges to using the current SPID migration enhancements via the LTI and come to the May 2012 LNPA WG meeting prepared to discuss any suggestions for improving the process and its access.
 - **Neustar** will provide data at the May 2012 LNPA WG meeting regarding how often (i.e., percentage of SPID migrations) the enhanced SPID migration process is being used.
- Linda Peterman. Earthlink, asked if anyone is experiencing issues with providers requiring LOAs for CSRs. Comcast replied yes.

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

***Next Meeting ...May 8-9, 2012: Location...Key West, Florida
...Hosted by Neustar***