

LNPA WORKING GROUP
March 4-5, 2014 Meeting
FINAL Minutes

Greenwood Village, CO	Host: Comcast
------------------------------	----------------------

TUESDAY March 4, 2014
Attendance

Name	Company	Name	Company
Lonnie Keck	AT&T	Bill Quimby	LocalVanityNumbers.com
Ron Steen	AT&T	Lynette Khirallah	NetNumber (phone)
Tracey Guidotti	AT&T	Dave Garner	Neustar
David Alread	AT&T (phone)	Fariba Jafari	Neustar
Mark Lancaster	AT&T (phone)	Gary Sacra	Neustar
Lindsey Carr	Bandwidth.com	Jim Rooks	Neustar
Lisa Jill Freeman	Bandwidth.com	John Nakamura	Neustar
Cristy Permenter	Bright House (phone)	Larry Vagnoni	Neustar
Matt Nolan	Bright House (phone)	Marcel Champagne	Neustar
Marian Hearn	Canadian LNP	Mubeen Saifullah	Neustar
Jan Doell	CenturyLink	Paul LaGattuta	Neustar
Mary Retka	CenturyLink	Steve Addicks	Neustar
Brenda Bloemke	Comcast	Shannon Sevigny	Neustar Pooling (phone)
Linda Birchem	Comcast	Rosemary Emmer	Sprint
Beth O'Donnell	Cox (phone)	Suzanne Addington	Sprint
Dena Hunter	Cricket	Jeanne Kulesa	Synchronoss (phone)
Linda Peterman	Earthlink Business (phone)	Rosalee Pinnock	Syniverse (phone)
Joe Mullin	Edge Communications	Margie Mersman	TCA (phone)
Wendy Trahan	GVNW (phone)	Luke Sessions	T-Mobile
George Tsacnaris	iconectiv	Paula Campagnoli	T-Mobile
Joel Zamlong	iconectiv	Barry Orrel	tw telecom
John Malyar	iconectiv	Shelly Pedersen	tw telecom (phone)
Steven Koch	iconectiv	Jason Lee	Verizon (phone)
Kayla Sharbaugh	10xpeople (phone)	Deb Tucker	Verizon Wireless
Pat White	iconectiv (phone)	Imanu Hill	Vonage (phone)
Bridget Alexander	JSI (phone)	Scott Terry	Windstream (phone)
Karen Hoffman	JSI (phone)	Dawn Lawrence	XO
Angel Acosta	Level 3 Communications		

NOTE: ALL ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “March 4-5, 2014 WG ACTION ITEMS” FILE AND ATTACHED HERE.



March 4-5, 2014
LNPA WG ACTION ITI

LNPA WORKING GROUP MEETING MINUTES:

January 7-8, 2013 Draft LNPA WG Meeting Minutes Review:

The January 7-8, 2013, meeting minutes were reviewed and approved with minor changes.

Updates from Other Industry Groups

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

The OBF Ordering Solutions Wireless Service Ordering Subcommittee has not held a meeting since the January 2014 LNPA WG meeting, so there is nothing new to report. Our next meeting is scheduled for March 11, 2014 at 3PM Eastern. An updated report will be provided at the May LNPA WG meeting.

OBF Local Service Ordering Subcommittee – Linda Peterman:

OBF
ORDERING SOLUTIONS COMMITTEE
LOCAL SERVICE ORDERING SUBCOMMITTEE

Since the January, 2014 LNPA WG meeting, one Local Service Ordering Subcommittee (LSO) face-to-face meeting was held. Issue 3450 was discussed.

Issue 3450, LSOG: Standard Validation and Submission fields for REQTYPE “C” Simple and Non-Simple Port Orders

Participants reviewed the correspondence from WSO regarding the usage of the NPQTY field on the NP Form. WSO is requesting that the usage be changed to remove any prohibition since some companies still find it a useful indicator on most requests.

Agreement Reached: Participants agreed to change the usage of the NPQTY field back to Optional in order to remove the restriction for companies that require the field. It is not necessary to clarify between simple and non-simple ports and it meets the original field requirements for FCC simple ports.

Participants reviewed the proposed fields for simple, non-simple/non-complex, and non-simple complex ports (3450a1v5).

There was extensive discussion on the previous decision to make the SANO field the one additional validation field for the non-simple/non-complex porting. The concern raised was that populating the SANO field may result in further address edits. It was suggested to add a non-simple/non-complex port indicator for the next categories of porting. It was alternately suggested to use the SANO field only for validation (similar to the FCC Order for simple port) but continue to require the other address fields. Continued discussion was deferred to a future meeting.

Action Item: Participants to revisit discussion on adding a non-simple/non-complex port indicator during a future meeting.

3450a10 – participants created a definition for Non-Simple/Non-Complex Port in the 070 practice:

Non-Simple/Non-Complex Port

Port Requests that:

- (1) do not involve unbundled network elements
- (2) may include more than one line but the quantity of TNs being ported may not exceed 50 (based on the current project criteria in LNPA WG Best Practice 67)
- (3) have a single service address on a single LSR
- (4) do not include complex switch translations (e.g., Centrex, ISDN, AIN services, remote call forwarding, or multiple services on the loop)
- (5) may include a reseller
- (6) do not have a negotiated project ID on the LSR
- (7) do not include hunting
- (8) involve all telephone numbers of an account (no partial ports)
- (9) do not include a directory listing change (ELT of “C”).

Additional work will continue to complete Issue 3450.

It was asked if Issue 3450 would be part of the next LSOG release. It was noted that the next LSOG release closed for Issues in September 2013. Any Issues closing after that date will be included in a future LSOG release. The future LSOG date will be discussed upon completion of the next LSOG, which is currently targeted for 2Q14.

Issues in Final Closure: None.

Issues Withdrawn: None.

Issues in Initial Closure or Initial Pending: None.

Participants prioritized the open LSO Issues:

High Priority

1. Issue 3477, LSOG: Standard field length minimums identified and repeating/# of occurrences on each field (next LSOG publication dependent on this Issue)
2. Issue 3450, LSOG: Standard Validation and Submission fields for REQTYPE "C" Simple and Non-Simple Port Orders

Medium Priority

1. Issue 3443, LSOG: Increase the Name fields' length in the 71 and 72 practices (to be worked after Issue 3450)
2. Issue 3373, LSOG: Standardization of RT of "Z" in the 099 practice for REQTYPE "C" to be utilized by all providers

Low Priority

1. Issue 3478, LSOG: Replace LALO with LD/LV fields on Directory Listing form

It was noted that Issues 3448, LSOG – Add new Line Activity (LNA) value to require disposition of each Telephone number when converting, and 3449, LSOG – Allow for multiple Pilot Numbers on Hunt Group (HGI) form, are on hold pending internal review.

New Issues: None

The LSO has the following meetings scheduled:

DATE	CALL DETAILS
3/17/14 1-3 PM ET	LSO Virtual Meeting Agenda: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discussion on remaining UOM schema for LSOG 2Q14 Forms• TOS Summary impact to 3450
3/20/14 1-3 PM ET	LSO Virtual Meeting Agenda: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discussion on remaining UOM schema for LSOG 2Q14 Forms
3/24/14 10 AM -12 PM ET	LSO Virtual Meeting Agenda: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discussion on remaining UOM schema for LSOG 2Q14 Forms
3/27/14 1-3 PM ET	LSO Virtual Meeting Agenda: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discussion on remaining UOM schema for LSOG 2Q14 Forms

INC Update – Dave Garner:

INC Issues Report

LNPA WG Meeting – March 2014

INC Issue 769: Direct Petition by NANPA for Overlay NPA Codes – New or Additional and Addition of LNPA WG Best Practice Supporting the utilization of overlays as the preferred form of area code relief.

Issue Statement: New Sections (5.6.1 and 5.6.2) should be added to the NPA Code Relief Planning & Notification Guidelines, to reflect a streamlined process when the NPA overlay alternative is the only relief that meets the Section 5.0. This streamlined process would be used when an additional NPA is required for (a) an existing overlay complex, or (b) a single NPA area and NANPA has determined that only an overlay alternative will meet the guidelines; the Initial Planning Document and relief planning meeting and consensus are not required. NANPA should directly petition the appropriate regulatory agency when NPA relief is needed and notify the industry. Once regulatory approval has been received, NANPA shall proceed with the implementation process as usual. This will simplify the relief planning process by reducing the number of industry meetings/conference calls.

The LNPA Working Group of the FCC Advisory Committee's North American Numbering Council has provided a recommendation supporting the utilization of overlays as the preferred form of area code relief, and this documentation should be added as reference to Section 6.3 of the NPA Code Relief Planning and Notification Guidelines.

At the February INC meeting, INC agreed to add new sections 5.6.1 and 5.6.2 as proposed and also to add a footnote in Section 6.3 referencing LNPA WG Best Practice 30.

Shown below is Section 6.3 with the new footnote:

6.3 All-Services Overlay Method - An NPA overlay occurs when more than one NPA code serves the same geographic area. In an NPA overlay, code relief is generally provided by opening a new NPA code covering the same geographic area as the NPA(s) requiring relief. NXX codes from this new NPA are assigned on a carrier-neutral basis, i.e., first come, first served. With the overlay method, the FCC requires mandatory 10-digit local dialing between and within the old and new NPAs. Some states require 1 + 10 digit local dialing and some require 10-digit local dialing and allow 1 + 10 digit local dialing at the SP's discretion.

The overlay method eliminates the need for customer number changes as required under the split and boundary realignment methods. In areas where an overlay is already in place, a subsequent overlay allows the option to eliminate the permissive dialing period as part of implementation. Other potential implementation strategies have been identified for an NPA overlay. They are listed below:

Footnote:

The LNPA Working Group Best Practice 30 supports the all-services overlay as the preferred form of area code relief, and was endorsed by the North American Numbering Council (NANC) on September 18, 2013. See <http://www.nanc-chair.org/docs/documents.html>

INC Issue 774: Add definition of “Exiting the Market” to the TBPAG

Issue Statement: The PA has been receiving block returns where the SP is maintaining ported in TNs and claiming to be exiting the market. Our understanding of the term “Exiting the Market” when it was introduced by INC was that an SP would no longer be providing service in the market and therefore should not be maintaining any customers (ported in or otherwise).

Currently the guidelines do not have a definition for the term “Exiting the Market.” The PA suggests that INC add a definition to the TBPAG for the term “Exiting the Market.”

At the February INC meeting, the issue was reviewed and accepted. It was noted that this Issue does not change the current policy, but provides clarification regarding the current PA process. The following definition was developed:

“Exiting the Market: When a Service Provider no longer intends to provide service in the rate center where an NPA-NXX-X block or NPA-NXX code resides. The SP may not retain any NPA-NXX-X blocks, NPA-NXX codes, LRNs or ported TNs in the rate center. “

The Issue remains open so participants can review internally before moving the Issue to Initial Closure.

VoIP Trial Report – DA 14-118

The FCC released a report on the VoIP Trials on January 31, 2014. Comments on the report are due on March 3, 2014.

The following information was extracted from the report:

- the Introduction and Conclusion paragraphs; and
- paragraph 7 and 8 are shown as they address comments regarding, “Now that the trial is complete ---“.

Note: For your information, a complete copy of the report is attached to the distribution email.

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Bureau issues this Report of a six-month technical trial in which interconnected Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) providers were permitted to reserve telephone numbers for their end users directly from the numbering administrators rather than indirectly through a separate telecommunications carrier. The results of this trial reflect that it is technically feasible for interconnected VoIP providers to obtain telephone numbers directly from the numbering administrators. The trial did not identify technical problems regarding number porting, VoIP interconnection, or intercarrier compensation. The trial did indicate that there may be some confusion regarding parties’ rights and obligations with respect to porting and interconnection, but the Bureau believes that these matters could be addressed in pending rulemakings addressing those topics.

Paragraphs 7 and 8

7. Now that the trial is complete, participants may not obtain direct access to additional numbers unless and until the Commission changes any applicable rules. While trial participants are not required to return the numbers they have received during the trial, the Commission reserves the right to order the return of such numbers. Trial participants may continue to assign to end-user customers numbers that

the trial participant obtained during the trial. However, they may not port-in a number for a new customer post-trial; rather, they must instead use a CLEC partner when porting in a new number. Trial participants must port-out directly-held numbers upon request.

8. The Order required the Bureau to report to the Commission on the results of the trial within 45 days of completion of the trial. This report satisfies that requirement. We seek comment on this Report from state commissions, industry, the general public, and other stakeholders.

IV. CONCLUSION

28. The numbering trial reflects that it is technically feasible for interconnected VoIP providers to obtain telephone numbers directly from the numbering administrators and that such arrangements do not present technical problems regarding number porting, VoIP interconnection or intercarrier compensation. To the extent that porting and interconnection disputes arose, the Bureau believes that additional clarity and guidance can be given in pending rulemakings addressing those topics.

Dave Garner also included a copy of the FCC report on the VoIP Trial – DA 14-118 released on 1/31/2014



VoIP Trial Report -
DA-14-118A1 release

NANC Future of Numbering WG Update – Suzanne Addington:

See the embedded PowerPoint presentation:



FoN Report to the
LNPA WG- March 2011

Change Management – Neustar

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

Review and Discuss changes requested to the FRS, XIS and XML Schema at the September 2013 LNPA WG Meeting.



XIS v1.5.1
02-14-2014.docx



FRS_3.4.6b_02-14-1
4.docx



IIS3_4_6b_02-14-20
14.docx



Errors-Flows3_4_6b_
02-14-2014.docx

- John reviewed the red-lined changes to the FRS and captured additional changes discussed in the meeting.
- Requirement R3-276 – need to verify this is CMIP only. iconectiv requested that current functionality and intended functionality be revisited.
- Requirement R3-66 – need to determine if CustomerName should be removed.
- Question was asked: if a pooled TN is queried from an EDR provider, is the SV returned or no SV found? *SV is returned so we need to add pooled timestamp to the SV.*
- Jim reviewed the XIS changes. There were no schema changes.

Action Item 010714-01 – All service providers and vendors who plan to implement the XML interface are to notify Neustar if an IP address is not sufficient to designate the XML connection address, and if not, why not and what designation would be preferable (e.g., URL)?

- Can have an IP address, port, or a path that is part of a URL. Neustar will support a host name in lieu of an IP address.
- Neustar local systems prefers URL, but IP address is sufficient.

THIS ACTION ITEM IS CLOSED.

Discussion of industry testing. Develop Industry Standards for Round-Robin Testing.

- Discussion deferred until a future meeting.

Action Item 010714-02 REVISED – Service Providers and Vendors should review the M&P for certificate-related activities in the NPAC XML interface. The M&P can be found on the NPAC secure web site at the following URL:

<https://www.npac.com/npac-user/access-connectivity/npac-xml-certificate-trust-authority>

Additionally, section 3.3 (NPAC Use of Certificates) in the XIS describe how this works from an application perspective.

Reviewers should consult with their information security teams to make sure these procedures are acceptable. In the current process, the User supplies basic information to the NPAC Certificate Authority (CA) via email. This basic information makes up the distinguished name of the certificate, and includes the SPID, region and system type. The NPAC CA creates a User within the system for this request, and the requestor receives the logon URL and the login credentials in separate emails. Upon login, JavaScript code is downloaded to the User's web browser. This JavaScript code calls APIs within the User's browser to generate a public/private key pair. The public portion of this key pair is then sent to the NPAC CA. The NPAC CA combines this public key with the information associated with the User to generate a signed certificate that includes the public key and the distinguished name information (the spid, the region, and the system type). This signed certificate is then downloaded to

the User's machine, where it is combined with the private key. The private key is generated on the User's machine and is never transmitted to the NPAC CA.

- Jim explained that the private key is stored in the SP system and is not seen by the NPAC, nor stored there.
- Need to update website so that it does not reflect that Neustar generates the private key. Gary Sacra will discuss internal to Neustar and update website.
- No objections were expressed, but several companies were still awaiting internal responses.

THIS ACTION ITEM WILL REMAIN OPEN.

Other Change Order Discussion

John Nakamura reviewed minor red-lined edits to some change orders on the master list. NANC Change Orders 449 and 450 are ready for prioritization into a future NPAC SMS release. NANC Change Orders 450 and 452 have already been implemented.

At the May 2014 meeting, the LNPA Working Group will begin the process of prioritizing change orders for the next NPAC SMS release. Gary Sacra will send the prioritization process documentation to the WG chairs prior to that meeting.

Determine what NPAC Functionality should be considered for sunset list

Action Item 010714-03 – Neustar to provide an updated list of NPAC features that they consider possibilities for sunseting by January 24, 2014. The list should include updates from the January 2014 LNPA WG discussion and a short descriptive paragraph for each. They will also identify the CMIP features that are not carried forward to XML. Neustar will send this out via the LNPA WG distribution list.



LNPA WG Agenda
Item - Sunset List - 0:

THIS ACTION ITEM IS CLOSED.

Notes on discussion of items on the sunset list:

- 1.1 Remove capability to update CMIP network data in customer profile – most if not all service providers update their network data via the help desk and do not do it themselves. *Will stay on the sunset list for later consideration.*
- 1.2 Require support of Service Provider Type (remove “/n” indicator) – *will not be sunset and will be taken off the list.*
- 1.3 Consolidate Customer Contact information – This contact info is old data and not used anymore. *Will stay on the sunset list for later consideration.*

- 2.1 Require support for modify of effective date for NPA-NXX – *will not be sunset and will be taken off the list.*
- 2.2 Remove NPA-NXX filter management by SOA/LSMS – *Remove from sunset list since it has a Change Order already.*

- 3.1 Require TN Range Notifications – *Will stay on the sunset list for later consideration.*
- 3.2 Require Query "More" SVs – VZW needs more information to decide. Medium level of effort for Neustar local systems. Neustar action to find out how often this error of queries exceeding the 150 SV returned limit occurs. *Will stay on the sunset list for later consideration.*
- 3.3 Eliminate SV/PB TN attribute in notification – *will not be sunset and will be taken off the list.*
- 3.4 Require SOA Supports auto conflict notification with cause code "Cancel-Pending to Conflict – *Will stay on the sunset list for later consideration.*
- 3.5 Require SOA Supports AVC when an SV transitions from Cancel-Pending to Conflict due to expiration of T2 – *Will stay on the sunset list for later consideration.*

- 4.1 Eliminate SV/PB TN attribute in notification – *will not be sunset and will be taken off the list.*

- 5.1 Remove Create/Delete Audit notifications in CMIP Interface – Need to clarify going forward that the Object Creation Notification should not be sunset because it contains the Audit ID. *The Delete Audit Notification portion for CMIP will remain on the sunset list.*
- 5.2 Consolidate Audit Results in CMIP Interface – Requires a SOA change. *Will stay on the sunset list for later consideration.*

- 6.1 Remove ability for Recovery operations while not in recovery – *Remove from list since it has a Change Order already.*

- 7.1 Remove ability for BDD Response Files – *Will stay on the sunset list for later consideration.*

- 8.1 Remove unused reports – *Will stay on the sunset list for later consideration.* Neustar action to provide the list of reports.
- 8.2 Remove Data Integrity Sample (Audit and report) – *Will stay on the sunset list for later consideration.*

- 9.1 Remove Split Processing – *will not be sunset and will be taken off the list.*
- 9.2 Remove OpInfo message - *Remove from list since it has a Change Order already.*
- 9.3 Remove unused billing categories (like mass storage, audits, etc.) – Neustar action to provide a list of the billing data and billing reports. *Will stay on the sunset list for later consideration.*
- 9.4 Require ILL 130 Errors – *will not be sunset and will be taken off the list.*

- 10.1 Remove Unused User ID disable period tunable/feature – *Will stay on the sunset list for later consideration.*

NOTE: Any item that is already documented in a change order will be removed from the sunset list.

Action Item 010714-04 – WG members are to be prepared to continue discussion of the potential sunset list at the March 2014 LNPA WG meeting. WG will discuss benefit and need for each item on the list including level of effort for keeping or removing.

THIS ACTION ITEM REMAINS OPEN FOR DISCUSSION AT THE MAY 2014 MEETING.

Action Item 030414-01 – Sunset list 3.2 – Require Query “More” SVs

In R3.3 (Feb 2006), the NPAC implemented NANC 285, the enhanced SV Query capability. Similar to the LTI with the “more SVs” button, NANC 285 added a “more” capability to the CMIP SV Query. For SOAs/LSMSs that do not support the “more” capability, SV Query functionality is limited. This functionality is still optional in the XML interface. Sunset of this feature would make it required for both interfaces. Neustar to investigate how often this error of queries exceeding the 150 SV returned limit occurs.

Action Item 030414-02 – Sunset list 9.3 Remove unused Billing categories (like mass storage, audits, etc.)

Neustar to provide a list of the billing data and billing reports.

Action Item 030414-03 – Neustar to update the Sunset list based on March discussion and resend. Remove the items that the WG has decided not to sunset and remove items that already have a change order to remove.

Onboarding Feature Discussion

The onboarding feature will provide a means for LSMSs using XML to recover data after downtime. Documentation will be reviewed at the May 2014 LNPA WG meeting. There were no questions or comments.

2014 Meeting Schedule

2014 Meetings and Conference Calls

MONTH (2014)	NANC MEETING DATES	LNPA WG MEETING/CALL DATES	HOST COMPANY	MEETING LOCATION
January		7 th – 8 th	iconectiv	Scottsdale, AZ
February		11 th <i>Canceled</i>		Conference Call
March		4 th – 5 th	Comcast	Denver, CO
April		8 th <i>Canceled</i>		Conference Call
May		13 th – 14 th	Neustar	Miami, FL
June		10 th		Conference Call
July		8 th – 9 th	T-Mobile	<i>TBD</i>
August		5 th		Conference Call
September		9 th – 10 th	CenturyLink	Denver, CO
October		7 th		Conference Call
November		4 th – 5 th	AT&T	Atlanta, GA
December		9 th		Conference Call

The 2014 Meeting and Conference Call schedule was reviewed.

- The May meeting will be hosted by Neustar in Miami, FL.
- *The location of the July meeting may not be in Seattle, WA, due to the high cost of hotels.*

WEDNESDAY March 5, 2014

Attendance

Name	Company	Name	Company
Lonnie Keck	AT&T	Natalie McNamer	iconectiv (phone)
Ron Steen	AT&T	Bridget Alexander	JSI (phone)
Tracey Guidotti	AT&T	Karen Hoffman	JSI (phone)
David Alread	AT&T (phone)	Angel Acosta	Level 3 Communications
Mark Lancaster	AT&T (phone)	Bill Quimby	LocalVanityNumbers.com
Teresa Patton	AT&T (phone)	Lynette Khirallah	NetNumber (phone)
Lindsey Carr	Bandwidth.com	Dave Garner	Neustar
Lisa Jill Freeman	Bandwidth.com	Fariba Jafari	Neustar
Cristy Permenter	Bright House (phone)	Gary Sacra	Neustar
Matt Nolan	Bright House (phone)	Jim Rooks	Neustar
Marian Hearn	Canadian LNP	John Nakamura	Neustar
Carolyn Brown	CenturyLink	Marcel Champagne	Neustar
Jan Doell	CenturyLink	Mubeen Saifullah	Neustar
Mary Retka	CenturyLink	Paul LaGattuta	Neustar
Linda Lloyd	CHR Solutions (phone)	Steve Addicks	Neustar
Brenda Bloemke	Comcast	Shannon Sevigny	Neustar Pooling (phone)
Linda Bircham	Comcast	Rosemary Emmer	Sprint
Jennifer Hutton	Cox (phone)	Suzanne Addington	Sprint
Dena Hunter	Cricket	Luke Sessions	T-Mobile
Linda Peterman	Earthlink Business (phone)	Paula Campagnoli	T-Mobile
Joe Mullin	Edge Communications	Barry Orrel	tw telecom
Wendy Trahan	GVNW (phone)	Jason Lee	Verizon (phone)
George Tsacnaris	iconectiv	Deb Tucker	Verizon Wireless
Joel Zamlong	iconectiv	Imanu Hill	Vonage (phone)
John Malyar	iconectiv	Scott Terry	Windstream
Kathy Timko	iconectiv	Dawn Lawrence	XO
Steven Koch	iconectiv		

Discussion of IP Transition Effects on Number Portability

Just in Time (JIT) Number Provisioning Discussion (Continued from Previous Meetings)

- Mark Lancaster, AT&T, withdrew JIT trial contribution from FoN Subcommittee 7b because number conservation is not the primary objective of JIT and that is what the

Subcommittee is focusing on. He said that JIT still remains in the context of the FCC test bed Workshop.

- Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, feels it is premature to discuss JIT in the LNPA WG since it has yet to be discussed in the FCC's test-bed Workshop.
- There were no objections to delaying JIT discussion in the LNPA WG.

FCC Order 14-5: IP Transition, released January 31, 2014

Discuss the LNPA WG involvement for number porting related impacts, based on numbering test-bed Paragraphs 151 thru 169. The Order provides for the development of a telephony numbering test bed for collaborative, multi-stakeholder research and exploration of technical options and opportunities for telephone numbering in an all-IP network.

- **Initial round of IP experiment proposals is due February 20, 2014.**
 - **Additional proposals can be filed over the next 15 months.**
 - **Proposal Deadline: Feb. 20, 2014**
 - **Public Comment on Proposals: March 21, 2014**
 - **Replies on Proposals: March 31, 2014**
 - **FCC Decisions on Proposals: May 30, 2014 (approximately)**
 - **FCC's 1st hosted workshop on the numbering test-bed is on March 25, 2014**
-
- Mary Retka stressed the importance of reading the FCC Order. Proposals and assessments will likely be discussed at the March 25th IP Transition meeting in Washington, DC.
 - Paula Campagnoli asked if/how the NPAC will be involved in any JIT test-bed.
 - Mary discussed Henning Schulzrinne's February 2013 presentation to NANC (slide 4 where he discusses near-term and long-term recommendations). Near-term is ENUM model that would be discussed in the LNPA WG. Mary said she stressed to Henning that we do not want to move to non-geographic porting before we move to non-geographic numbers due to such things as arbitrage and billing issues. Henning thinks we could transition to all IP by 2020.
 - Dave Garner read from paragraph 167 in the Order and cited the 3 objectives of the workshop. The workshop has three objectives: (1) to identify the gaps in the existing system for an all-IP environment and opportunities for simplification; (2) to facilitate proposals for a general architecture for the test-bed; and (3) to facilitate the infrastructure and organization (mailing list, conference calls) for those individuals that are interested in doing the prototyping and participating further in the test-bed process.
 - Mark Lancaster suggested that the players should meet to review each other's proposals. Rosemary Emmer challenged this suggestion because the FoN is in the middle of writing a white paper on the subject. She discussed the whitepaper and the fact that the FoN does not fully understand all of the numbering allocation contributions that are on the table. She was hoping that the white paper could be introduced at the March 25th FCC Workshop.
 - Joe Mullin, Edge Communications, stated that an LRN should be assigned to every number and that each LRN could be populated in the LERG and carriers could migrate that information into their networks for routing. Carriers could direct certain incoming calls to a specific LRN for an interconnection ingress point and then route it as they want within their network to the correct switch. He feels that this would require fewer LRNs and would eliminate the originating carrier's need for a 2nd database dip. He expressed frustration with

the road blocks that everyone has identified, but no one is working on (e.g., rate center issues).

- Bandwidth, an all IP provider, offered to bring in one of their routing SMEs to discuss how LRNs are used for routing in an IP network.

IP Transition will continue to be on the WG meeting agenda.

Develop LNPA WG Report to NANC for the NANC Meeting on March 27, 2014

Paula Campagnoli will prepare report and distribute for comment.

Items to include are NANC 372 (XML Interface) and IP transition activity as it pertains to Number Portability.

*Next Conference Call ... April 8, 2014 **This call is canceled.***

Next Meeting ... May 13-14, 2014: Location...Miami, FL ...Hosted by Neustar