

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

Atlanta, GA	Host: AT&T
--------------------	-----------------------

TUESDAY November 4, 2014
Attendance

Name	Company	Name	Company
David Alread	AT&T	Karen Hoffman	JSI (phone)
Lonnie Keck	AT&T	Bonnie Johnson	Minnesota DoC (phone)
Penn Pfautz	AT&T (phone)	Lynette Khirallah	NetNumber (phone)
Ron Steen	AT&T	Dave Garner	Neustar
Suzy Green	AT&T	Fariba Jafari	Neustar (phone)
Teresa Patton	AT&T	Gary Sacra	Neustar
Tracey Guidotti	AT&T	Jim Rooks	Neustar
Jackie Voss	ATIS (phone)	John Nakamura	Neustar
Lisa Jill Freeman	Bandwidth.com	Marcel Champagne	Neustar
Marian Hearn	Canadian LNP	Mubeen Saifullah	Neustar
Sean Spivey	CCA (phone)	Pamela Connell	Neustar
Jan Doell	CenturyLink	Paul LaGattuta	Neustar
Mary Retka	CenturyLink (phone)	Shannon Sevigny	Neustar Pooling (phone)
Vicki Goth	CenturyLink (phone)	Suzanne Addington	Sprint
Brenda Bloemke	Comcast	Karen Riepenkroger	Sprint (phone)
Linda Birchem	Comcast (phone)	Shaunna Forshee	Sprint (phone)
Beth O'Donnell	Cox (phone)	Jeanne Kulesa	Synchronoss
Linda Peterman	Earthlink Business (phone)	Bob Bruce	Syniverse (phone)
Wendy Trahan	GVNW (phone)	Luke Sessions	T-Mobile
Doug Babcock	iconectiv	Paula Campagnoli	T-Mobile
Gary Richenacker	iconectiv (phone)	Jason Lee	Verizon (phone)
George Tsacnaris	iconectiv	Annette Montelongo	Verizon Wireless
Joel Zamlong	iconectiv	Deb Tucker	Verizon Wireless
John Malyar	iconectiv	Kathy Rogers	Verizon Wireless
Natalie McNamer	iconectiv (phone)	Tina Young	Verizon Wireless
Steven Koch	Iconectiv	Scott Terry	Windstream (phone)
Kim Isaacs	Integra (phone)	Tiki Gaugler	XO (phone)
Bridget Alexander	JSI	Dawn Lawrence	XO (phone)

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

[November 4-5, 2014 LNPA Working Group Action Items Attached](#)

LNPA WORKING GROUP MEETING MINUTES:

September 9-10, 2014 Draft LNPA WG Meeting Minutes Review:

The September 9-10, 2014, meeting minutes were reviewed and approved as final after correcting typos.

Updates from Other Industry Groups

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

OBF Ordering Solutions Wireless Service Ordering Subcommittee:

The Wireless Service Ordering Subcommittee met October 21, 2014 to review the LSO Subcommittee’s completed work on Issue 3450, LSOG: Standard Validation and Submission Fields for REQTYPE “C” Simple and Non-Simple Port Orders. Subcommittee members will perform a final review of the LSOG fields that were updated under Issue 3450 to ensure the WICIS document is not impacted by the revisions.

Issue 3429 – WICIS Review for Alignment and Business Practices. This issue has been tabled and will be re-opened if changes to the WICIS document are anticipated as a result of future industry activity regarding number portability.

The next meeting is scheduled for November 25, 2014.

INC Update – Dave Garner:

INC Issues Report

LNPA WG Meeting – November 2014

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 September meeting, INC continued to discuss developments regarding the PSTN to IP transition. INC finalized a White Paper response to the FCC regarding the impacts of large-scale rate center consolidation during the transition from the PSTN to IP. On September 19, 2014, the final White Paper document was sent to Scott Jordan, FCC CTO, and Henning Schulzrinne, the former FCC CTO. The White Paper states:

“--- In summary, large scale rate center consolidations would extensively impact carrier networks (physical and translations), local/toll/special services, dialing plans, customer contracts, customer education, billing and provisioning systems, and the E911 network. Further, regulatory changes would be needed, such as state modification or dissolution of tariffs, and elimination of federal restrictions of transporting calls across LATA boundaries. Given the complexities related to large-scale rate center consolidation, it is premature to develop a plan for implementation. However, as carriers’ network architecture and the market drives the need for such consolidation, the industry and regulators should work collaboratively to develop a plan. ---“

The final White Paper is posted on the ATIS website at: <http://www.atis.org/legal/legal.asp>
See the ‘Legal and Public Policy’ tab under ‘Recent Activities’ dated September 19, 2014.

INC Issue 778: Update INC Guidelines to identify Permitted Company Code (OCN) Category Types Appropriate for Assignment of Numbering Resources

Issue Statement: Service providers (SPs) entering into the telecom/VoIP industry require a NECA assigned Company Code (OCN) in order to receive numbering resources from NANPA or Pooling Administration. The OCN must be assigned to a NECA Category Code type that is permissible to receive numbering resources; however, the list of permissible categories has never been clearly defined. This has resulted in SPs ordering an OCN with an incorrect category type for numbering resources, which may not be determined until the SP attempts to obtain numbering resources. And, this may cause a significant delay to the SP in establishing services. As well, some SPs may attempt to change the category type of their OCN after numbering resources have been assigned to it. Should this occur, the NANPA and the PA have no mechanism today to be notified of such a change to determine if the SP is permitted to retain currently assigned numbering resources and/or to deny requests for future numbering resources.

Suggested Solution: Update sections 4.1.1, 6.1.1, 8.1 and 8.2 in COCAG and sections 4.3, 4.4, 9.1.2 and 9.2 in the TBPAG to add reference of the permitted OCN category types for numbering resources and to require SPs to notify NANPA and the PA of OCN category changes to their OCN after the OCN has been added to NAS/PAS.

At the September INC meeting, agreement was reached to make edits to the COCAG, TBPAG, Non-Geographic 5XX-NXX Code Assignment Guidelines, 9YY-NXX Guidelines, and p-ANI Guidelines. The edits clarified that only certain company code category types are permissible for direct assignment of numbering resources (CO codes, thousands-blocks, 5XX-NXX, 9YY-NXX, and p-ANI) from NANPA or the PA. Those are:

Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier	ILEC
Regional Bell Operating Company	RBOC
Competitive Local Exchange Carrier	CLEC

Personal Communications Service	PCS
Unbundled Local Exchange Carrier	ULEC
Wireless Carriers	WIRE
Internet Provider Enabled Services	IPES (only permitted with FCC waiver)

It was also noted that this agreement applies only to the U.S. and its territories.

Once the guidelines were published, INC sent a letter on October 24, 2014 to NECA requesting they make changes to their website and company code documentation to indicate what company code categories are permissible for direct assignment of numbering resources.

ATIS INC Webinar

At the September meeting, INC discussed holding an educational and information sharing Webinar that would be available to ATIS members and non-members.

Subjects currently being discussed as possible items to address during the Webinar:

- Number Administration in North America
 - o History/background of numbering.
- Overview of what INC does to address and resolve industry-wide issues associated with NANP numbering resources within the NANP area.
 - o Planning, administration, allocation, assignment and use of number resources
- INC's initiatives that have been addressed to support the IP transition
 - o Permissive 10 digit dialing
 - o Numbering test bed – INC high level functional requirements.
 - o Large-scale Rate Center Consolidation

Currently the Webinar is plan to be held on Dec 11, 2014 from 1pm to 2pm Eastern.

OBF Local Service Ordering Subcommittee Update – Linda Peterman:

Linda deferred giving the OBF LSO sub-committee report until the agenda item on OBF Issue 3450 is discussed.

As of the January meeting, Deb Tucker will provide OBF LSO and OBF WSO updates in a combined OBF Ordering Solutions report due to Linda's reassignment of duties within her company.

NANC Future of Numbering Working Group Update – Suzanne Addington

Future of Numbering (FoN) Working Group Report to the LNPA WG September 8, 2014

FoN Tri-Chairs: Carolee Hall, Idaho PUC, Mark Lancaster, AT&T, Suzanne Addington, Sprint
Status:

- AT&T's contribution, "Numbering Test bed Parameters" primary objective is to develop functional parameters that could be used in the numbering test bed trial proposed in FCC 14-5 (para 151-170) under WC Docket No. 13-97.

- This contribution is on hold awaiting next steps of the FCC Numbering Test bed.
- FTN 4 – The Geographic Numbering sub-committee is discussing the consumer perspective and service implications regarding the geography of telephone numbers and the decoupling or disassociation of numbers from geography.
 - The sub-committee approved a white paper and shared with the FoN WG at the October meeting. It was subsequently approved and will be shared with the NANC in the near future.
- FTN 8 – All IP Addressing primary objectives are to define future identifiers in support of IP industry trends beyond the e.164 numbering plan (including M2M impacts).
- Scheduled calls:
 - The first Wednesday of each month, from noon-2:00 PM ET
 - Next meeting: 12/03/14 @ 12:00 ET.

Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, requested that “toll free” be included in references to FTN-4.

The WG requested that Suzanne share the Geographic Numbering Sub-committee when approved.

Elections to Fill Co-Chair Positions

Linda Peterman (Earthlink) announced at the September meeting that she would be resigning as CLEC Co-chair effective at the end of the year due to a change in job responsibilities. It was announced at that meeting that an election would be held at the November meeting to fill the vacant CLEC position. Additionally, the election would include the Wireless Co-chair position held by Paula Campagnoli (T-Mobile) and the ILEC Co-chair position held by Ron Steen (AT&T). Nominations for the positions were to be sent to the co-chair, but would also be accepted at the November meeting.

Brenda Bloemke, Comcast, was nominated for the CLEC Co-chair position. No other nominations were received.

Brenda was elected as Co-chair by consensus, and Paula and Ron were reelected to their respective positions by consensus. Brenda will serve as CLEC Co-chair effective with the January 2015 meeting.

Welcome, Brenda, and our thanks to Linda for her service as co-chair.

Change Management – Neustar

Discussion of Change Orders

John Nakamura reviewed the changes in the attached NANC Change Order document.

Summary of changes to the Change Order document:

1. NANC 431 – PoC URI was removed from document.
2. NANC 432 – Presence URI was removed from document.
3. NANC 458 – Notification Suppression. Embedded Word doc updated from V2 to V3, updated XML LSMS from Y to N in impact section, and accepted all previous change bars.

In response to a previous question from Steve Koch, iconectiv, Jim Rooks stated that there is no mechanism to modify a SPID during an audit.

NANC Change Order Candidates for Next NPAC Release

Neustar updated the embedded file showing the estimated Level of Effort (LOE) for each of the change order candidates for a potential next NPAC software release. The only change in the embedded matrix file is that the Oracle LOE for NANC 458 was changed to “None.”

DESCRIPTION OF NANC CHANGE ORDER CANDIDATE

Best Practices

Action Item 090914-01 – Jan Doell to reword Note 2 in Best Practice 30 to reflect that the FCC did not approve the cessation of NPA splits, and to add in the Decisions and Recommendations section that the WG developed a list of pros and cons for overlays vs. splits. This will be reviewed at the November meeting.

The red below is Best Practice 30 revision proposal, based on information from the FCC.

0909 NPA Splits

There was consensus to accept the language that Jan proposed for the Best Practice 30.

Action Item 090914-01 is CLOSED.

Action Item 090914-02 – Neustar will add the following notes to Best Practice 65 on the Best Practice website:

- NOTE-3: The NANC approved BP65 and the associated NANC LNP Process Flows in their September 2013 meeting, and the NANC forwarded their recommendation for approval to the FCC on October 17, 2013.
- NOTE-4: After a Public Comment cycle completed, Best Practice 65 was approved and mandated by the FCC in DA 14-842 dated June 20, 2014.

Neustar has updated the notes to BP 65 on the Best Practice website. It was noted that DA 14-842 has not been posted to the Federal Register. The order is not effective until 30 days after posting. Co-chairs will ask for a status at the December NANC meeting.

Action Item 090914-02 is CLOSED.

Action Item 090914-03 – Lonnie Keck will draft proposed changes to Best Practice 39 recommending that when a losing carrier uses generic reject codes, clarifying information must be included in the remarks section. Examples of generic reject codes are 6C (Customer Information Does Not Match) or 1P (Other). Lonnie's proposed changes will be reviewed at the November LNPA WG meeting.

There was consensus to add the following language to Best Practice 39:

When a losing Provider issues generic Reject / Response Codes such as 1P=OTHER or 6C=CUSTOMER INFORMATION DOES NOT MATCH, REMARKS relating to which data element(s) caused the reject should be included.

Action Item 090914-03 is CLOSED.

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

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		11 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

Determine what NPAC Functionality should be considered for sunset list

The group reviewed the items remaining on the Sunset List. It was generally agreed that modification was needed for some of the feature descriptions to clarify what was being proposed to eliminate. Additionally clarification is needed to show action required on the Service Provider systems (in particular, features 3.4 and 3.5). The Working Group asked Neustar to verify (where possible) the number of service providers using any of the features still on the Sunset List.

LNPA WG - Sunset List

LNPA WG Agenda Item - Determine what NPAC Functions

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

The details of the billing categories/billing data sunset item are provided in the embedded file below. Neustar marked the file with recommendations for striking some of the requirements.

ACTION ITEM 070914-02 – Service providers are to be prepared at the September 2014 meeting to discuss their company positions on which line items of the billing categories/billing data highlighted in the embedded attachment can be sunset.

There were no objections to including the marked items in the FRS Billing Section Sunset List on the main Sunset List.

Action Item 070914-02 is CLOSED.

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

IP Transition effects on Number Portability

Non-geographic Porting Sub-Team Readout

- Bridget Alexander reported that they last met on 10/23 and finalized a first draft of the consumer impacts. Next meeting is 11/7 with a goal of having a full draft for review at the January WG meeting.
- Anyone wishing to join should contact Bridget Alexander at balexander@jsitel.com or Teresa Patton at tp1393@att.com.

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

Access the documents at: <http://access.atis.org/apps/org/workgroup/ipnni/download.php/18837/latest> (for ATIS members) or http://access.atis.org/apps/group_public/document.php?document_id=18837&wg_abbrev=ipnni (public access).

The ATIS NNI draft contains an “IP Interconnection Profile” and an “IP Interconnection Routing Report.”

Penn Pfautz led the group through the “IP Interconnection Routing Report.”

- Penn said that the Routing Report is the one that ATIS is most interested in getting comments back from the LNPA, but comments on the other report would also be welcomed.
- The concept of the 1st set of solutions is to utilize existing NANP constructs, e.g., OCN, NPA-NXX. The concept of the 2nd set of solutions is to utilize per TN constructs. None propose any changes to the porting process or propose any development changes to the NPAC.

- The solution in Section 4.1 proposes leveraging existing information from the LERG and the NPAC to route calls. Data is shared via spreadsheets bilaterally between Service Providers. The data should be relatively static unless SBCs or LRNs are added. This solution probably would not scale very well as more and more SPs interconnect via IP. This method is totally manual and all info must be exchanged in the spreadsheets.
- The solution in Section 4.2 proposes enhancing the LERG to incorporate the routing constructs into the LERG. Sharing of spreadsheets would still be required but may not require the detail of that in Section 4.1.
- The solution in Section 4.3 proposes using the LERG as a Tier 1 ENUM Registry. It still requires the bilateral exchange of spreadsheets.
- The solution in Section 5.1 proposes using the NPAC as a TN Registry by using the existing Voice URI field in the NPAC. Jan Doell asked if this would require a standard format for the 255 character URI field. Penn responded that it would be desirable to have an industry agreement on format. Penn said that the 255 characters could possibly contain a set of routes.
- The solution in Section 5.2 proposes using the NPAC as a Tier 1 ENUM Registry with a pointer to the serving carrier to send the query.
- The solution in Section 5.3 proposes a separate independent ENUM Registry. It would still have to be synchronized with the NPAC. Paula Campagnoli asked if this was seriously being looked at. Penn responded that it was agreed to put all solutions brought to the table in the report. With his AT&T hat on, Penn said that this solution was tried previously before but could not be brought to fruition.
- The solution in Section 5.4 proposes the bulk transfer of data directly between SPs or via independent Service Bureaus.
- Penn concluded by saying that ATIS would appreciate any feedback from the WG or from individual SPs and any points of consensus.
- Suzanne asked which solution is the most flexible in enabling different services associated with a TN with different providers. Penn responded that he believes a Registry-based solution provides the most flexibility.
- Ron said possible feedback could be:
 - None of the alternatives affect the porting process.
 - Some standardization of the Voice URI field could be necessary if the NPAC is used.
 - If they go with a separate ENUM Registry, it would have to be synchronized with the NPAC.
 - We stand ready to assist as ATIS continues to develop the architecture.
- Ron and Paula action to draft a response next week with the bullets directly above to be distributed to the WG for review.
- Jason suggested that the response should define the boundaries for which we are responding.

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

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

Linda Peterman’s OBF LSO report is included here:

OBF ORDERING SOLUTIONS COMMITTEE LOCAL SERVICE ORDERING SUBCOMMITTEE

Since the July, 2014 LNPA WG meeting, the LSO Subcommittee met July 25, 2014, to discuss the status of Issue 3450:

Participants reviewed the following Action Items associated with Issue 3450:

Action Item: Tonya Woods (CenturyLink) to check if there can be multiple TOS values on a single account and report back to the team on impact, if any.

It was noted that no impacts were discovered that were related to TOS. This action item was closed.

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

Participants noted that there was no support for a non-simple/non-complex port indicator. This action item was closed.

It was noted that partial migrations are outside the scope of this Issue.

3450a10 – participants reviewed the 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”).

Participants reviewed the usage proposed fields for simple, non-simple/non-complex, and non-simple complex ports (3450a1v6).

Participants will continue reviewing the proposed field usage during the September meeting in Overland Park, KS.

It was noted that the results of the Issue 3450 will be shared with Tom Goode (ATIS General Counsel) to determine a path forward for communication to the FCC.

Agreement Reached: Issue 3450 will remain open.

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 REQTYP “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
September 22- 25, 2014	LSO Meeting Overland Park, KS Agenda: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue 3373 • Issue 3450

The LNPA WG Tri-chairs received the correspondence embedded below from the ATIS LSO concerning the WG request to have OBF address standard validation and submission fields for REQTYP “C” and Non-Simple Port orders.



OBF to LNPA WG
Final.pdf

- Linda walked thru the embedded document that outlines the validation and submission fields per OBF Issue 3450.
- The street address number (SANO) is added as a validation field for non-simple/non-complex ports.
- The statement “does not involve unbundled network elements” means does not involve the conversion of unbundled network elements.
- Jason Lee reported that some SPs consider a 25 TN port a project and are not abiding by BP 67. Paula Campagnoli stated that BP 67 is still awaiting an Order from the FCC.
- Deb Tucker stated that these changes are not anticipated to impact anything on the wireless side, but it will be reviewed.
- Deb said that we need to understand what fields are necessary to get a non-simple/non-complex port request thru the door.
- The list of fields on page 2 is not a list of minimum required fields. It is a list of fields that had changes as a result of Issue 3450.
- Jan Doell said that she thought the OBF was tasked with identifying the validation fields only, and not the submission fields. Linda said that the request was to identify the fields for validation and for ordering.
- Deb stated that the LNPA WG should send correspondence to ATIS requesting a list of minimum required submission fields for non-simple/non-complex ports. Tri-Chairs took an action item to send correspondence to ATIS. She cautioned against requesting that the FCC order any additional fields because some SPs are allowing port requests to go thru without the SANO field.
- Deb will provide an overall ATIS Ordering Solutions update at future meetings, combining the reports given by Deb and Linda at past meetings.

New Action Item 110414-02 – LNPA Working Group Tri-Chairs will send correspondence to ATIS OBF LSO concerning their recent proposed solution to address standard validation and submission fields for REQTYP “C” and Non-Simple Port orders. Only validation fields were provided. Tri-Chairs will ask that OBF LSO provide a list of submission LSR fields.

Mobile Virtual Network Operator (MVNO)

There were no MVNO service providers available to discuss. This will be placed on the agenda for the January 2015 LNPA Working Group meeting.

WEDNESDAY November 5, 2014

Attendance

Name	Company	Name	Company
David Alread	AT&T	Bonnie Johnson	Minnesota DoC (phone)
Lonnie Keck	AT&T	Lynette Khirallah	NetNumber (phone)
Ron Steen	AT&T	Dave Garner	Neustar
Suzy Green	AT&T	Gary Sacra	Neustar
Tracey Guidotti	AT&T	Jim Rooks	Neustar
Lisa Jill Freeman	Bandwidth.com	John Nakamura	Neustar
Jan Doell	CenturyLink	Marcel Champagne	Neustar
Mary Retka	CenturyLink (phone)	Mubeen Saifullah	Neustar
Brenda Bloemke	Comcast	Pamela Connell	Neustar
Jennifer Hutton	Cox (phone)	Paul LaGattuta	Neustar
Linda Peterman	Earthlink Business (phone)	Tara Farquhar	Neustar (phone)
Wendy Trahan	GVNW (phone)	Suzanne Addington	Sprint
George Tsacnaris	iconectiv	Jeanne Kulesa	Synchronoss
Joel Zamlong	iconectiv	Bob Bruce	Syniverse (phone)
John Malyar	iconectiv	Luke Sessions	T-Mobile
Steven Koch	Iconectiv	Paula Campagnoli	T-Mobile
Kim Isaacs	Integra (phone)	Jason Lee	Verizon (phone)
Bridget Alexander	JSI	Deb Tucker	Verizon Wireless
Karen Hoffman	JSI (phone)	Dawn Lawrence	XO (phone)

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

Aelea Christofferson, ATL Communications, was not in attendance to discuss. This item will be removed and added back at a later date if requested.

Develop the LNPA WG Report to NANC – NANC Meeting September 17, 2014

Items to be included in the LNPA WG report to NANC

- The Tri-Chair election will be reported and that Paula and Ron will continue to serve, and that Brenda Bloemke was elected to replace Linda Peterman.
- IP transition
 - Review of ATIS NNI report. LNPA WG will provide a response. Discussed potential impacts to porting process and does not appear to impact the porting process. Will continue to actively follow the NNI work.
- DA 14-842 (BPs 65 and 30) question – when will it be published in the Federal Register?
- BPs 67 and 70 – status? Paula will send in a separate e-mail to Chairman Kane and/or Cary Hinton.
- Non-Geo Sub-team – still developing a report on their findings.

New Business

- Suzanne Addington, Sprint – a Sprint reseller is pushing back on response timeframes for port outs. The reseller is a Sprint reseller. Suzanne will bring in a PIM to address response intervals between resellers and underlying carriers.
- PIM 0083, submitted by Neustar, was accepted. The original request was to create a list of wireless service providers who use long timers. It will be expanded to reflect all carriers by SOA and LTI SPIDs, SP Type, port in and port out timer values, business hour/day values. It will be reviewed in January. Neustar will revise the PIM and send to chairs prior to January 2015 meeting.



PIM Submission for
SP-Requested Wireles

- Follow-up discussion by Lonnie – Lonnie pointed out that the 2 ½ hour porting interval is not an FCC mandate even though it is in the flows that were adopted by the FCC.
- Lonnie Keck asked about the contact list on the secure website. Is there a way to get an up to date contact list from the NPAC? Neustar will identify source of carrier contact data on secure website and how often it is updated for discussion in January.
- Lisa Jill Freeman, Bandwidth, asked if there is a need to have a process to resolve disputed ports. Lonnie mentioned that the WG has attempted to address this in the past, but the various company processes were very different, and there was no consensus to proceed. Bandwidth will give consideration to bringing in a PIM to the next meeting.

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

Discussion of Need for December Conference Call

The group consensus was that there are no pending items that require a conference call in December of this year.

*Next Conference Call ... December 9, 2014 **This call is canceled.***

Next Meeting ... January 6-7, 2015: Location...Scottsdale, AZ ...Hosted by iconectiv