

LNPA WORKING GROUP
March 3-4, 2015 Meeting
FINAL Minutes

Alpharetta, GA	Host: Verizon Wireless
-----------------------	-------------------------------

TUESDAY March 3, 2015
Attendance

Name	Company	Name	Company
David Alread	AT&T	Fariba Jafari	Neustar
Lonnie Keck	AT&T	Gary Sacra	Neustar
Ron Steen	AT&T	Jim Rooks	Neustar
Teresa Patton	AT&T	John Nakamura	Neustar
Renee Dillon	AT&T (phone)	Marcel Champagne	Neustar
Tracey Guidotti	AT&T (phone)	Mubeen Saifullah	Neustar
Aelea Christofferson	ATL	Pamela Connell	Neustar
Lisa Jill Freeman	Bandwidth.com	Paul LaGattuta	Neustar
Matt Ruehlen	Bandwidth.com	Shannon Sevigny	Neustar Pooling (phone)
Ryan Henley	Bandwidth.com	Towanda Russell	RCN (phone)
Allyson Blevins	Bright House (phone)	Rosemary Emmer	Sprint
Matt Nolan	Bright House (phone)	Suzanne Addington	Sprint
Marian Hearn	Canadian LNP	Karen Riepenkroger	Sprint (phone)
Jan Doell	CenturyLink (phone)	Shaunna Forshee	Sprint (phone)
Mary Retka	CenturyLink (phone)	Darren Post	Synchronoss
Eric Chuss	ChaseTech (phone)	Bob Bruce	Syniverse
Brenda Bloemke	Comcast (phone)	Andrea Malfait	Telus (phone)
Tim Kagele	Comcast (phone)	Luke Sessions	T-Mobile
Beth O'Donnell	Cox (phone)	Paula Campagnoli	T-Mobile
Doug Babcock	iconectiv	Jennifer Pyn	T-Mobile (phone)
George Tsacnaris	iconectiv	Jason Lee	Verizon
Joel Zamlong	iconectiv	Jermaine Wells	Verizon Wholesale
John Malyar	iconectiv	Annette Montelongo	Verizon Wireless
Steven Koch	iconectiv	Deb Tucker	Verizon Wireless
Natalie McNamer	iconectiv (phone)	Kathy Rogers	Verizon Wireless
Bridget Alexander	JSI	Imanu Hill	Vonage
Karen Hoffman	JSI (phone)	Edgar Santiago	Vonage Bus Solutions
Bonnie Johnson	Minnesota DoC (phone)	Scott Terry	Windstream (phone)
Lynette Khirallah	NetNumber (phone)	Dawn Lawrence	XO
Dave Garner	Neustar		

NOTE: OPEN ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “March 3-4, 2015 WG ACTION ITEMS” FILE AND ATTACHED HERE.



March 3-4, 2015
LNPA WG ACTION ITI

LNPA WORKING GROUP MEETING MINUTES:

January 6-7, 2015 Draft LNPA WG Meeting Minutes Review:

The January 6-7, 2015, meeting minutes were reviewed and approved as final as written.

February 19, 2015 Draft LNPA WG Conference Call Minutes Review:

The February 19, 2015, conference call 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 January 27, 2015 to have a checkpoint meeting to determine if there were any new issues raised as a result of the completion of Issue 3450, LSOG: Standard Validation and Submission Fields for REQTYPE “C” Simple and Non-Simple Port Orders. No new issues were voiced during the meeting.

Participants discussed fatal errors sent by some wireline carriers that result in the canceling and resubmission of port requests. It was noted that companies can make their own determination of what constitutes a fatal error. Concerns with a specific provider’s response actions should be addressed directly with the provider.

The next WSO meeting is scheduled for June 9, 2015.

OBF
ORDERING SOLUTIONS COMMITTEE
LOCAL SERVICE ORDERING SUBCOMMITTEE

Since the January, 2014 LNPA WG meeting, the LSO Subcommittee met January 22, 2015, to continue discussion of 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).

Agreement Reached: Participants agreed to review all of the Response Types for each REQ TYP (OBF-LSO-2014-00018R003.3373a2v4 LR) to determine whether they are applicable for each REQ TYP and, if not, whether they can be deleted if no companies are using them.

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 January 22 virtual meeting.

Agreement Reached: Participants agreed to delete section 2.4 of the 099 practice.

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: Further discussion is needed regarding whether to review all fields and practices. The current plan is to continue reviewing the 099 practice.

Agreement Reached: Issue 3373 will remain open.

Issue 3477, LSOG: Standard field length minimums identified and repeating/# of occurrences on each field. This agenda item was deferred to the next meeting and Issue 3477 remains open.

The next LSO meeting is scheduled for March 3, 2015.

INC Update – Dave Garner:

INC Issues Readout

LNPA WG Meeting – March 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 January meeting, INC continued to discuss developments regarding the PSTN to IP transition.

INC is considering possible next work items in association with the transition to the all-IP network in addition to its previously submitted work on nationwide 10-digit dialing and large-scale rate center consolidation:

- Security of TNs associated with number assignment, recognizing the work of IETF (Internet Engineering Task Force) STIR (Secure Telephone Identity Revisited) Working Group to establish the cryptographic certification of TNs.
- Use of E.164 Numbers as the IoT (Internet of Things) evolves, recognizing the policy work underway in the FoN FTN8 subcommittee.
- Non-geographic Number Assignment, as the LNPA WG finalizes its whitepaper on non-geographic number portability.

INC Issue 786: Update 9YY NXX Code Assignment Guidelines and Other Guidelines as Needed to Define “YY”

Issue Statement: The question has been raised by service providers as to a valid source that defines the YY in the 9YY NXX Code Assignment Guidelines. Upon review of several ATIS INC guidelines, there is no definition identified for the YY. The assumption has been that the YY indicates repeating digits that could be 0-9. This information should be documented within the 9YY guidelines for easy access and reference, and INC should review whether the information should be incorporated into other INC guidelines as well.

Suggested Solution: Update 9YY guidelines with YY definition and review other guidelines for possible updates.

At the January meeting, INC reviewed the issue and suggested solution. Agreement was reached to make edits to the 9YY NXX Code Assignment Guidelines (ATIS-0300060) and also the NPA Allocation Plan and Assignment Guidelines (ATIS-0300055). Various paragraphs in the documents were updated to indicate that “NYY” codes signify that N = digits 2-9 and YY = repeating digits 0-9.

Example: The Glossary term for Easily Recognizable NPA Codes (ERC) was updated to read: Easily Recognizable NPA Codes (ERCs) - NPA codes that due to their unique, recognizable digit pattern (i.e., common 'B' and 'C' digit) convey certain unique knowledge regarding a call to a telephone number other than the number being dialed (e.g., 800+). **ERCs may be sometimes referred to as “NYY” codes to signify that N = digits 2-9 and YY = repeating digits 0-9.**

NANC Future of Numbering Working Group Update – Suzanne Addington

Future of Numbering (FoN) Working Group Report to the LNPA WG

March 3, 2015

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

Status:

- The FoN WG meeting was held on February 4, 2015
- 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.
 - 2/15 Update: this item will remain open pending the NANC review

- 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.
 - 2/15 Update: there were no updates as the next meeting (2/26) was after the FoN call.
- New Contributions: Sprint proposed a new contribution discussion for 10-digit nationwide dialing. After a long discussion the group agreed that instead of making this a formal contribution we would allow time on the agenda for dialogue on any numbering issue such as the 10-digit nationwide dialing to avoid creating a subcommittee.
- Scheduled calls:
 - The first Wednesday of each month, from noon-2:00 PM ET
 - Next meeting: 4/1/15 @ 12:00 ET.

Develop LNPA WG Report for NANC March 5, 2015 Meeting

The following report was developed by the LNPA WG for presentation at the scheduled March 5, 2015, NANC meeting. (*NOTE: This meeting was subsequently canceled due to inclement weather.*)

LNPA Working Group
Status Report to NANC
 March 5, 2015
 Paula Jordan Campagnoli, Co-Chair
 Ron Steen, Co-Chair
 Brenda Bloemke, Co-Chair

Report Items:

- **Local Number Portability Administration Working Group (LNPA WG) Report:**
 - Transition from PSTN to IP
 - Non-Geographic Porting

Next Face to Face Meeting..... May 12 - 13, 2015, Fort Lauderdale, Florida– Hosted by Neustar

Transition from PSTN to IP

- PSTN to IP transition effects on LNP continue to be an ongoing agenda item for the LNPA WG.
- Brian Rosen of Neustar gave the LNPA WG a presentation on “Caller Identity Spoofing/STIR.

Non-Geographic Number Porting

- The Non-Geographic Number Porting sub-team has completed the white paper discussing technical, consumer, and regulatory impacts of Non-Geographic Number Portability.

Next Face to Face Meeting..... May 12 - 13, 2015, Fort Lauderdale, Florida– Hosted by Neustar

==== *End of Report* ====

Change Management – Neustar



NANC Change
Orders 02-28-15.doc

John Nakamura addressed two changes in the latest Change Order document:

- NANC 447 – NPAC support for CMIP over TCP/IPv6, updated note from missing status update in 2013.
- NANC 458 – Notification Suppression, category update after NAPM approval.

NANC 449 Active-Active SOA

Gary Sacra, Neustar, stated that an SP had approached them and indicated an interest in NANC 449 – Active-Active SOA – and asked if the requirements were up-to-date in light of the development work that has taken place since it was first introduced in the WG, such as XML and Notification Suppression.

- Jan Doell, CenturyLink, stated that it was CenturyLink that had made the request to Neustar.
- Jim Rooks, Neustar, stated that it would require changes to the CMIP interface.

- Teresa Patton, AT&T, asked if this would require testing on the part of the SPs. Jim responded that due to recent changes in SOW 24, only vendors would be required to do regression testing.
- Teresa asked why CenturyLink wouldn't just throw their network over to the new system. Jan responded that they wanted to avoid a flash cut and have the SPID available on both SOAs for a time.
- Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, asked if there were other Change Orders that needed to be brought up-to-date. John Nakamura and Jim Rooks responded that we do that before prioritization.
- LNPA WG consensus was to update NANC 449 per CenturyLink's request.
- Neustar will prepare a red-lined version of updates to NANC 449 in preparation for the May LNPA WG meeting.

Jason Lee, Verizon, asked if Neustar could look into Notification Suppression in CMIP outside of active-active SOA. Jim responded that NANC 458 is under development and it was the group's direction to do it in XML only. Doing it in CMIP could be done with a separate change order if the group desires. With the changes to active-active SOA, notification suppression could be done in CMIP.

Discussion of NPAC Functionality that should be considered for Sunsetting



Sunset List-
03-03-2015 (with rev

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 a simple change to disable on the NPAC end. Neustar (Gary Sacra) is to update the sunset list to reflect this.

Gary updated the Sunset list to reflect the changes noted in the action item. Local system vendors need to update the level of effort and provide to Gary.

Action Item 010615-06 is closed.

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.

Gary has updated the local system impacts.

Action Item 010615-07 is closed.

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.

The vendors for the service providers mentioned above do support ranges but the feature is turned off. Jan Doell, CenturyLink asked if we should approach these service providers and attempt to get them to support the functionality. The group agreed to hold off for now. It was suggested that we put a note in the document as a reminder but consensus was that it is not necessary.

Action Item 010615-08 is closed.

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.

Gary reported that all the vendors support Cause Code 2.

Action Item 010615-09 is closed.

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.

Gary reported that all the vendors support this feature.

Action Item 010615-10 is closed.

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 sun setting (i.e., remaining on the sunset list for potential removal).

Gary has made the clarification.

Action Item 010615-11 is closed.

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.

Neustar will prepare a document only change order to explain the current methodology. The LTI user must reinstate their account by submitting the old password and then change to a new password to reactivate the account. The FRS will be changed to accurately reflect the process. This feature will be removed from the sunset list. Neustar will present the proposed document change at the May LNPA WG meeting.

Action Item 010615-12 remains open.

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.

It was commented that even though this audit report has never been requested, the feature must be tested every time there is a new NPAC release. It was agreed to leave Item 8.2 on the sunset list.

Action Item 010615-01 is closed.

Other Action Items

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.

Neustar will place the WG to OBF correspondence on the NPAC website under the Public Archives in the LNPA Working Group section. At Ron Steen's request, the WG correspondence to the ATIS NNI concerning the IP network architecture will also be placed in that section.

Action Item 010615-13 is closed.

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

Gary sent the information to the LNPA WG distribution list.

Action Item 010615-14 is closed.

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.

There were no updates on this action item.

Action Item 010615-05 remains open.

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.

Request was sent to NAPM LLC co-chairs. SOW has been provided and approved.

Action Item 010615-02 is closed.

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 010615-03 remains open.

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.

Request was sent to NAPM LLC Co-chairs. SOW has been provided and approved.

Action Item 010615-04 is closed.

Caller Identify Spoofing/STIR Presentation – Brian Rosen

Brian Rosen, Neustar, presented the embedded presentation on caller identity spoofing and the work on Secure Telephone Identity Revisited (STIR) that is taking place in the IETF.



Caller Identity
Spoofing_STIR prese

Brian's presentation prompted considerable discussion during the time allotted for questions. While not specifically related to number portability, the knowledge gained will be useful in planning the future aspects of telecommunication.

The WG expresses our thanks to Brian for taking the time to share the information with us.

IP Transition effects on Number Portability

Non-geographic Porting Sub-Team Readout

The non-geographic porting document was finalized on the February 19, 2015, LNPA WG conference call and included in the minutes from that meeting.

The document was forwarded to the NANC to be presented at the March 5th meeting. Neustar will place the document on the NPAC website under the Public Knowledgebase section.

PIM 84 – Reseller Response Time



PIM 84 Reseller
Response Times v2.d

Sprint introduced an issue with wireless reseller response times. Some wireless resellers are not responding in a reasonable time frame to port out requests. Sprint has suggested that four hours or less would be reasonable, but they have received pushback from some resellers indicating that they often don't even take their calls within four hours.

It was mentioned in the WG meeting that the contracts with the resellers should have some language regarding compliance with regulatory guidelines. Some of the contracts do have these provisions, but regulatory guidelines are not specific about reseller response times.

Sprint wishes to develop a Best Practice that standardizes reseller response times for wireless-wireless and wireless-wireline port outs. Many resellers are small organizations and have no automation which may be the reason that they don't respond quickly.

Rosemary stated that the visibility of a Best Practice would be helpful to Sprint in addressing this issue.

T-Mobile supported Sprint's response time PIM and said another PIM should be developed for validation fields.

PIM 84 will be updated and a new PIM 85 will be developed by Suzanne for validation fields. Suzanne, Luke, Lonnie, Deb, Teresa, and Aelea have an action item to develop 2 Best Practices, one for reseller response time and one for validation fields. Sprint will lead.

New Action Item 030315-01 – Sprint submitted PIM 84 addressing the need for a Best Practice to document wireless reseller response times for port authorizations. PIM 84 requests that a Best Practice be developed stating appropriate response times. A sub-committee, led by Suzanne Addington, Sprint, will update PIM 84 and draft PIM 85 to address validation fields. The subcommittee will also draft two Best Practices: one for response times, and one for validation fields. In addition to Suzanne, the sub-committee participants are Luke Sessions, T-Mobile, Lonnie Keck, AT&T, Teresa Patton, AT&T, Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, and Aelea Christofferson, ATL Communications.

New PIM(s)

Porting Process for non-carriers to perform ports - ATL Communications



It's about the End
User.pptx



ATL PIM March 2015
Aelea.docx

Aelea Christofferson, from ATL Communications, gave a presentation expressing that end users should be allowed to select non-carrier vendors to handle porting of their numbers.

Aelea stated that she has been in telecom for 30 years mainly on the toll free side. The issue she describes is about a dishonest person who gathers information to fraudulently port telephone numbers. This "crook" gathers enough information to get the NSP and OSP to process an LSR to port the number.

Her PIM relates to having a non-facilities based entity to control the port for the end user. Ron asked how the service providers can be excluded from the process by giving total control of the port to the end user or the end user's agent. He also questioned how this process would stop fraudulent porting. Aelea responded that this would keep the valid porting information from being given out to the crooks. Therefore, they would not have enough correct information to accomplish the port.

Luke questioned why propose something as complex as this as opposed to putting a new field in the NPAC to prevent a number from being inadvertently ported or slammed. Jan said that the scope of the problem does not justify the proposed resolution.

Aelea stated that she is not attacking the industry's porting process and that the vast majority of ports go through as planned and designed, to the satisfaction of the end user.

Luke suggested an agenda item to discuss verification rules. He stated we need to first confirm that the existing process cannot address the issues before we look at something entirely new, due to the massive system and process changes that would be required to accommodate ATL's proposal.

Verizon, T-Mobile, XO, and AT&T objected to accepting this PIM.

Matt Ruehlen, Bandwidth, and Luke Sessions, T-Mobile, will work offline with Aelea to look at the existing process to see what could be tweaked to accomplish this purpose. They will also quantify the issue, and determine if there is a valid business case. When they are ready, they will ask to be placed on the agenda of a future meeting.

LNPA WG consensus was to reject this PIM.

WEDNESDAY March 4, 2015

Attendance

Name	Company	Name	Company
David Alread	AT&T	Fariba Jafari	Neustar
Lonnie Keck	AT&T	Gary Sacra	Neustar
Ron Steen	AT&T	Jim Rooks	Neustar
Aelea Christofferson	ATL	John Nakamura	Neustar
Lisa Jill Freeman	Bandwidth.com	Marcel Champagne	Neustar
Matt Ruehlen	Bandwidth.com	Mubeen Saifullah	Neustar
Ryan Henley	Bandwidth.com	Shannon Sevigny	Neustar Pooling (phone)
Allyson Blevins	Bright House (phone)	Suzanne Addington	Sprint
Marian Hearn	Canadian LNP	Bob Bruce	Syniverse (phone)
Jan Doell	CenturyLink (phone)	Luke Sessions	T-Mobile
Brenda Bloemke	Comcast (phone)	Paula Campagnoli	T-Mobile
Doug Babcock	iconectiv	Jason Lee	Verizon
George Tsacnaris	iconectiv	Jermaine Wells	Verizon Wholesale
Joel Zamlong	iconectiv	Annette Montelongo	Verizon Wireless
John Malyar	iconectiv	Deb Tucker	Verizon Wireless
Steven Koch	iconectiv	Kathy Rogers	Verizon Wireless
Bridget Alexander	JSI	Imanu Hill	Vonage
Bonnie Johnson	Minnesota DoC (phone)	Edgar Santiago	Vonage Bus Solutions
Lynette Khirallah	NetNumber (phone)	Dawn Lawrence	XO
Dave Garner	Neustar		

Develop Guidelines for what is needed for new Service Providers to start Porting Numbers - All

Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, received a request from an SP to provide guidelines on what it takes to start porting. The SP was a reseller that is becoming facilities-based. Deb is looking for a checklist or guideline of steps necessary to become a facility based provider.

Deb's request to have the WG put together a tutorial document was supported by Vonage and AT&T. It was agreed that we will start with brainstorming ideas and then decide if we will break the work off into a sub-group.

Marian Hearn, Canadian Consortium, stated that Canada has an "On Boarding" document that they would be willing to share. She sent the document to Paula who forwarded to the distribution. It is embedded here:



BPGLTPOB12.xls

WG consensus was to develop a guideline. Dave Garner, Neustar, will interface with INC. This will be placed on the May meeting agenda as a brainstorming item. The WG may set up a subcommittee to develop a guideline.

Discussion of Need for April 2015 LNPA WG Call

The April 8, 2015 conference call is canceled.

New Business

No new business was introduced.

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 th -7 th	iconectiv	Scottsdale, AZ
February		11th 19 th		Conference Call
March		3 rd - 4 th	Verizon Wireless	Alpharetta, GA
April		8 th		Conference Call
May		12 th - 13 th	Neustar	Ft. Lauderdale, FL
June		10 th		Conference Call
July		7 th - 8 th	CLNPC	Mont Tremblant, QC, Canada
August		12 th		Conference Call
September		1 st - 2 nd	Comcast	Denver, CO
October		14 th		Conference Call
November		3 rd - 4 th	T-Mobile (tentative)	TBD
December		9 th		Conference Call

*Next Conference Call ... April 8, 2015 **This call is canceled.***

Next Meeting ... May 12-13, 2015: Location...Ft. Lauderdale, FL ...Hosted by Neustar