

**LNPA WORKING GROUP**  
**November 5-6, 2013 Meeting**  
**Final Minutes**

<b>Denver, CO</b>	<b>Host: Comcast</b>
-------------------	----------------------

**TUESDAY November 5, 2013**

**Attendance**

Name	Company	Name	Company
Lonnie Keck	AT&T	Karen Hoffman	JSI (phone)
David Alread	AT&T	Lynette Khirallah	NetNumber (phone)
Ron Steen	AT&T	Dave Garner	Neustar
Mark Lancaster	AT&T (phone)	Gary Sacra	Neustar
Renee Dillon	AT&T (phone)	Jim Rooks	Neustar
Tracey Guidotti	AT&T (phone)	John Nakamura	Neustar
Lindsey Carr	Bandwidth.com	Kristen Hamilton	Neustar
Lisa Jill Freeman	Bandwidth.com	Larry Vagnoni	Neustar
Cristy Permenter	Bright House (phone)	Lavinia Rotaru	Neustar
Matt Nolan	Bright House (phone)	Marcel Champagne	Neustar
Marian Hearn	Canadian Consortium	Meenakshi Parthasarathy	Neustar
Jan Doell	CenturyLink	Mubeen Saifullah	Neustar
Brenda Bloemke	Comcast	Pamela Connell	Neustar
Frances Augustine	Comcast	Steve Addicks	Neustar
Linda Birchem	Comcast	Fariba Jafari	Neustar
Beth O'Donnell	Cox (phone)	Ed Barker	Neustar (phone)
Jennifer Hutton	Cox (phone)	Paul LaGattuta	Neustar (phone)
Dena Hunter	Cricket	Shannon Sevigny	Neustar Pooling (phone)
Linda Peterman	Earthlink Business	Jeff Sonnier	Sprint
Joe Mullin	Edge Communications	Suzanne Addington	Sprint
Crystal Hanus	GVNW (phone)	Darren Post	Synchronoss
Wendy Trahan	GVNW (phone)	Jeanne Kulesa	Synchronoss (phone)
George Tsacnaris	iconectiv	Rosalee Pinnock	Syniverse
Joel Zamlong	iconectiv	Luke Sessions	T-Mobile
John Malyar	iconectiv	Paula Campagnoli	T-Mobile
Kathy Timko	iconectiv	Shelly Pedersen	tw telecom
Pat White	iconectiv	Deb Tucker	Verizon
Steven Koch	Iconectiv	Imanu Hill	Vonage
Kim Isaacs	Integra (phone)	Dawn Lawrence	XO (phone)
Bridget Alexander	JSI		

**NOTE: ALL ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “September 10-11, 2013 WG ACTION ITEMS” FILE AND ATTACHED HERE.**



November 5-6, 2013  
LNPA WG ACTION ITI

**LNPA WORKING GROUP MEETING MINUTES:**

**2013 LNPA WG Meeting/Call Schedule:**

Following is the current schedule for the 2013 LNPA WG meetings and calls.

<b>MONTH (2013)</b>	<b>NANC MEETING DATES</b>	<b>LNPA WG MEETING/CALL DATES</b>	<b>HOST COMPANY</b>	<b>MEETING LOCATION</b>
January		8 <sup>th</sup> -9 <sup>th</sup>	Ericsson/ Telcordia	Scottsdale, Arizona
February		No meeting or call. Scheduled time on 2/5/13 for conference call to be used by APT.		
March		5 <sup>th</sup> -6 <sup>th</sup>	DSET	Atlanta, Georgia
April		No meeting or Conference Call.  04/09/2013 call if necessary		
May		7 <sup>th</sup> -8 <sup>th</sup>	Neustar	Miami Beach, FL
June		No meeting.  06/17/2013 Conference Call		
July		9 <sup>th</sup> -10 <sup>th</sup>	T-Mobile	Seattle, Washington
August		No meeting.  08/06/2013 call if necessary		
September		10 <sup>th</sup> -11 <sup>th</sup>	Comcast	Denver, Colorado
October		No meeting.  10/08/2013 call if necessary		
<b>November</b>		<b>5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup></b>	<b>Comcast</b>	<b>Denver, Colorado</b> <i>Note that this is a change!</i>
December		No meeting. <b>Conference Call Canceled.</b> 12/03/2013 call if necessary		

## **September 10-11, 2013 Draft LNPA WG Meeting Minutes Review:**

The July 9-10, 2013, meeting minutes were reviewed and approved with no changes. They will be marked as FINAL and distributed.

## **Updates from Other Industry Groups**

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

The Wireless Service Ordering Subcommittee met October 1, 2013, and discussed progress made to date by the OBF OS Local Service Ordering (LSO) Subcommittee on Issue 3450. Wireless providers are encouraged to review potential changes to a variety of fields included in the issue. Additionally, a subgroup of WSO participants will form to review the recommended changes to the LSR, NP, and EU forms for WICIS impacts.

**Issue 3429** – WICIS Review for Alignment and Business Practices. This is a blanket issue opened to review the WICIS document for any needed updates and it remains open.

The next meeting is scheduled for December 5, 2013.

### **OBF Local Service Ordering Subcommittee – Linda Peterman:**

## OBF ORDERING SOLUTIONS COMMITTEE LOCAL SERVICE ORDERING SUBCOMMITTEE

Since the September, 2013 LNPA WG meeting, one Local Service Ordering Subcommittee (LSO) face-to-face meeting was held. Issue 3450 was the primary topic discussed.

### **3450/ LSOG: Standard Validation and Submission fields for REQTYPE “C” Simple and Non-Simple Port Orders**

Participants reviewed the definitions of simple and non-simple ports. (3450a2v5)

#### **Simple ports, as noted in FCC 09-41**

#### **Non-simple ports:**

- Non-complex ports
- Complex ports

It was determined that complex ports should be a separate category for “Complex” to align with standard industry terminology, re-emphasizing that complex ports are outside of the scope of this Issue. The committee also combined the categories of “non-simple” and the subcategory “non-complex” into a single category: “non-simple/non-complex”.

Simple ports, as noted in FCC 09-41

Non-simple/Non-complex ports

Complex ports

Participants reviewed the tentative agreed upon validation fields:

<b>FIELD NAME</b>	<b>SIMPLE PORT</b>	<b>NON-SIMPLE NON-COMPLEX</b>
AN (Account Number)	X	X
PORTED NBR (Ported Telephone Number)	X	X
ZIP (ZIP/Postal Code)	X	X
PID (Personal Identifier)	X	X
SANO (Service Address Number)		X

Participants reviewed and modified the proposed fields for simple, non-simple non-complex, and non-simple complex ports (3450a1v4).

Participants created a new contribution (3450a6) to modify the usage notes of several fields on the LSR Form that are prohibited when the request is for a simple port or a non-simple/non-complex port.

Participants created a new contribution (3450a7) to modify the usage notes of several fields on the NP Form that are prohibited when the request is for a simple port or a non-simple/non-complex port.

Participants created a new contribution (3450a8) to modify the usage notes of several fields on the EU Form that are prohibited when the request is for a simple port or a non-simple/non-complex port. The work on the EU Form will continue.

Additional work will continue to complete Issue 3450.

Participants determined that prior to placing Issue 3450 in Initial Closure, the subcommittee should publish an updated LSOG version including UOM models and schemas due to multiple changes from previously closed Issues. Several virtual meetings have been scheduled in order to prepare the LSOG for publication. The target publication for the next LSOG release is 1Q14.

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 meeting scheduled:

DATE	CALL DETAILS
10/10/13	<b>LSO Virtual Meeting</b> <b>Agenda:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Review Final Closure Issues for next LSOG release</li></ul>
10/17/13	<b>LSO Virtual Meeting</b> <b>Agenda:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• UOM discussion on NP, EU and LSR Forms</li></ul>
11/1/13	<b>LSO Virtual Meeting</b> <b>Agenda:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• UOM discussion on NP, EU and LSR Forms</li></ul>

11/15/13	<b>LSO Virtual Meeting</b> <b>Agenda:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UOM discussion on NP, EU and LSR Forms</li> </ul>
11/21/13	<b>LSO Virtual Meeting</b> <b>Agenda:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UOM discussion on NP, EU and LSR Forms</li> </ul>

**INC Update – Dave Garner:**

**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 October INC meeting, INC continued to discuss developments regarding the PSTN to IP transition.

- Continued to discuss the proposed concept of a “Just In Time” (JIT) numbering trial where SPs and Over the Top (VoIP) providers could obtain numbers at less than thousands block level using LNP. To clarify some of the characteristics of the JIT Trial proposal, AT&T submitted:
  1. This is a trial proposal, not a finished product proposal.
  2. Draft guidelines are a draft version for use in a trial, not guidelines for a finished product.
  3. Date for trial start is based on what the FCC might order, but had been stated that it could start January 2014.
  4. Trial would be optional on all parties, no mandatory implementation.
  5. No service provider will be asked to return inventory during the trial, nor required to apply for JIT numbers.
  6. Any service provider with inventory is able to also accept JIT numbers during the trial.
  7. The “one day” response is a maximum limit for the JIT and could be more immediate in supplying JIT numbers to a service provider.
  8. The guidelines are being developed for a potential trial as a proactive step to enable quick response in case the FCC was to order a trial.
- Reviewed a proposal for Hundreds Block Pooling trial that was submitted by John Staurulakis, Inc., ( JSI ). The summary statement of the JSI contribution states:

AT&T submitted a contribution for establishing guidelines for a proposed

“Just in Time” (JIT) numbering assignment system to allow SPs to order TNs one at a time. AT&T further recommends that JIT eventually become the only numbering process by which SPs can order TNs, which results in SPs not being allowed to retain a numbering inventory.

As JSI believes that some numbering inventory is essential for any SP to provide timely and efficient service to customers requiring new TNs, JSI disagrees with AT&T’s JIT proposal and instead recommends a conversion from Thousands Block Pooling to Hundreds Block Pooling to address numbering conservation concerns.

JSI is preparing an ex-parte to the FCC detailing the Hundreds Block Pooling recommendation along with providing input from our Rural LEC Client base identifying their concerns with the AT&T JIT proposal. Attached is a Word Document with JSI’s contribution for establishing Hundreds Block Pooling Administration Guidelines in a test environment. The test environment would allow for the processing of hundreds block assignments out of currently contaminated 1K blocks from the PA.

### **INC Issue 759: Updates to the block expedite timeframe due to upcoming changes to the NPAC 5 Business Day First-Port Notification**

Issue Statement: As indicated in the notice NPAC sent to its users: At its May 8, 2013 meeting, the LNPA Working Group re-considered the first port notification process and concluded that while the first port notification should be retained, the delay interval imposed on the activation of an SV or thousand block should be eliminated. Effective Sunday, July 14th, the 5 business day minimum interval will be reduced to 0 for initial porting activity in a code where it is the port of a telephone number that triggers the process. The minimum interval for creation of a block, where it is a block that represents the first porting activity in the NPA-NXX, also will be reduced. However, because coding is required to bring the interval all the way down to 0, the interval for a block's activation will drop to 1 business day. This minimum interval for block activation eventually will be reduced to 0 as well, but not until the coding necessary to accomplish the change is performed. We will provide notice when the block's interval can be reduced to 0.

With this change to the first port interval, INC may consider shortening the block expedite timeframes.

At the October INC meeting, INC was advised that NPAC Release 3.4.6 will be implemented in all US NPAC Regions by mid-November and as part of that release the block’s activation interval will drop to 0 business days, thus eliminating the delay.

The NPAC Pooling operations team’s e-mail to the Block Holder and Pooling Administrator (PA), when a Block cannot be created because the code has not been created in the NPAC database, is affected by the change in the 1<sup>st</sup> Port notification. Currently the e-mail reads, “---- *If the code isn’t loaded into the NPAC at least 1 business day prior to your block’s assigned effective date of MM/DD/YYYY, then your NPAC block’s effective date will be delayed.* ---- “. Once the implementation of Release 3.4.6 is complete, the NPAC Pooling operation team plans to change the e-mail to remove the reference to the 1<sup>st</sup> Port delay time, so the sentence would read, “ If the code isn’t loaded into the NPAC by your block’s assigned effective date of MM/DD/YYYY, then your NPAC block’s effective date will be delayed.” The INC members agreed with this planned change and e-mail rewording.

### **INC Issue 763: Update NPAC broadcast rates in Section 2.15 of the TBPAG**

Issue Statement: The NPAC broadcast rates for activations, disconnects and modifications of Pooled Blocks have increased beyond the rates currently stated in TBPAG Section 2.15 and need to be updated.

At the October INC meeting, the issue was reviewed and the changes were accepted as submitted. The TBPAG section 2.15 will be updated to read:

The NPAC broadcast rates for activations, disconnects and modifications are set to the following limits to accommodate service provider system thresholds. The maximum number of block requests (activations, disconnects, and/or modifications) the NPAC can process per NPAC region is:

- 1,440 block requests per day except for Sundays,
- a maximum of 720 block requests on Sundays.

If the NPAC is unable to meet the effective date established on the Part 1B – NPAC Block Holder Data form for block activations and modifications, or on the Part 5 – NPAC Thousands-Block Reclamation form for block disconnects, the NPAC shall notify the SP and PA of the new effective date via email.

### **NANC Future of Numbering WG Update – Suzanne Addington:**

Please see below the Future of Numbering (FoN) WG report for the LNPA WG meeting on Nov 5.

#### **Status:**

- Redesigned the FoN Contribution Form
- Reviewed two new contributions in the October meeting. One was sent back to the contributor for clarifying information and the other was accepted.
- The team accepted the contribution from iconectiv with a topic of Routing Standards in an IP based environment. Whereas iconectiv agreed to monitor discussions from other industry work groups and provide status to the FoN WG. Priority is low.
- Initial discussions regarding the possibility of creating sub groups to work on issues. This discussion is ongoing.
- Scheduled calls:
  - First Wednesday of each month Noon-1:30 PM ET
  - Next Meeting: Moved due to conflict with LNPA WG is now 11/14/13
  - Contact info:  
[suzanne.m.addington@sprint.com](mailto:suzanne.m.addington@sprint.com)  
[Kathleen.Bakke@wisconsin.gov](mailto:Kathleen.Bakke@wisconsin.gov)  
[lancaster@att.com](mailto:lancaster@att.com)
- FoN meeting notes and documents are posted at:  
<http://www.nanc-chair.org/docs/documents.html>

### **September 18, 2013 NANC Meeting Read Out**

Paula Campagnoli reported that the NANC has approved Best Practice 65 regarding LSR SUPPs, Expedites, and Due Date Changes. They also approved the NANC Porting Flow changes regarding no longer having to wait 5 days to activate the first port out of an NXX and the recommendation to do NPA overlays rather than NPA splits. The NANC sent all three to the



FCC. There has been a request from the FCC for more details. Paula has made that information available to the NANC to send to the FCC.

The LNPA WG is still waiting for an FCC response on Best Practices 67 and 70. Both regard processing of simple ports and the ability to obtain Customer Service Records (CSR) from the old service provider.

**Neustar Proposed 2014 SPID Migration Black-Out Dates**

DATE	REASON
January 5	First Sunday
February 2	First Sunday
March 2	First Sunday
April 6	First Sunday
May 4	First Sunday
May 25	Memorial Day
June 1	First Sunday
July 6	First Sunday
August 3	First Sunday
August 31	Labor Day
September 7	First Sunday
October 5	First Sunday
October 19 (tentative)	Annual Fail Over Exercise
November 2	First Sunday
December 7	First Sunday
December 28	New Year

There was no objection to the schedule, and it was approved by the LNPA Working Group.

**NANC 457 – SPID Migration Limits – Increase Regional TN Threshold**

**Action Item 121013-01:**

A – Service Providers to check to see if they are EDR or NON-EDR on internal network elements (STP, SCP).

B – With the redefining of the maximum number of SVs to not include pooled SVs, should we now have a limit on the number of pooled blocks that can be updated in a SPID migration? If so, what should the limit be?

Service providers reported that there are no issues with Part A of this action item.

As to the question imposed in Part B, it was agreed that the limit should remain at 500K but that pooled 1K blocks will count as one. In other words, SVs plus 1K blocks are not to exceed 500K per region. The SPID migration document will be updated, distributed, and reviewed at the next WG meeting.

**Action Item 121013-01 is closed.**

### **SLR Dashboard Demonstration – Neustar**

Meenakshi Parthasarathy led an online demonstration of the Neustar Dashboard feature. There were no follow up questions after the demo.

### **Change Management – Neustar**

#### **NANC 372, XML Interface.**

John Nakamura and Jim Rooks reviewed the updates to the FRS, XIS, XSD, and test cases. The documents are essentially complete. Very minor updates will be applied, and then distributed. We will review at our next meeting.

#### **NANC 449, Active-Active SOA**

John Nakamura reviewed the updates to the document. Comcast (the originator) stated that the change order should include both the CMIP interface and the XML interface. John will update the document to include CMIP. The updates will be reviewed at our next meeting.

#### **NANC 453, decommissioned SPID**

The short-term solution was performed on 9/15. All applicable SPID data was updated. The description of the long-term solution will be reviewed at the next meeting.

**WEDNESDAY November 6, 2013****Attendance**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Company</b>
Lonnie Keck	AT&T	Bridget Alexander	JSI
David Alread	AT&T	Karen Hoffman	JSI (phone)
Ron Steen	AT&T	Lynette Khirallah	NetNumber (phone)
Traceen Pasteur	AT&T (phone)	Dave Garner	Neustar
Mark Lancaster	AT&T (phone)	Gary Sacra	Neustar
Renee Dillon	AT&T (phone)	Jim Rooks	Neustar
Tracey Guidotti	AT&T (phone)	John Nakamura	Neustar
Lindsey Carr	Bandwidth.com	Kristen Hamilton	Neustar
Lisa Jill Freeman	Bandwidth.com	Larry Vagnoni	Neustar
Matt Nolan	Bright House (phone)	Lavinia Rotaru	Neustar
Marian Hearn	Canadian Consortium	Marcel Champagne	Neustar
Jan Doell	CenturyLink	Mubeen Saifullah	Neustar
Mary Retka	CenturyLink	Pamela Connell	Neustar
Beau Jordan	Comcast	Steve Addicks	Neustar
Frances Augustine	Comcast	Tom McGarry	Neustar (phone)
Linda Bircherm	Comcast	Paul LaGattuta	Neustar (phone)
Beth O'Donnell	Cox (phone)	Shannon Sevigny	Neustar Pooling (phone)
Jennifer Hutton	Cox (phone)	Ann Fenaroli	Sprint
Joan Bridgeman	Cox (phone)	Jeff Sonnier	Sprint
Dena Hunter	Cricket	Karen Riepenkroger	Sprint (phone)
Linda Peterman	Earthlink Business	Suzanne Addington	Sprint
Joe Mullin	Edge Communications	Darren Post	Synchronoss
Crystal Hanus	GVNW (phone)	Rosalee Pinnock	Syniverse
Wendy Trahan	GVNW (phone)	Luke Sessions	T-Mobile
George Tsacnaris	iconectiv	Paula Campagnoli	T-Mobile
Joel Zamlong	iconectiv	Shelly Pedersen	tw telecom
John Malyar	iconectiv	Deb Tucker	Verizon
Kathy Timko	iconectiv	Dyan Adams	Verizon (phone)
Natalie McNamer	iconectiv (phone)	Dana Crandall	Verizon Wireless (phone)
Pat White	iconectiv	Imanu Hill	Vonage
Steven Koch	Iconectiv	Tiki Gaugler	XO (phone)
Kim Isaacs	Integra (phone)	Dawn Lawrence	XO (phone)

## Discussion of IP Transition Effects on Number Portability

Jan Doell presented some excerpts from the Henning presentation (FCC). Jan intended as a level setting presentation. The suggestion was that we go through this again in January and maybe set up some committees to investigate.

Tom McGarry gave presentation that elicited considerable discussion and questions. Concern expressed about the practicality of JIT. Comment was made that first positive step to number conservation is to do away with rate centers. The current view of NANPA exhaust date is beyond 2043.

Bridget Alexander presented some JSI documents. JSI clients do not feel that JIT works for them. They need inventory. Bridget asked if groups feel that 100 block pooling is practical. Are there LERG changes? 100 block assignment erodes the benefits of EDR (1K blocks). There were negative comments about JIT and concerns about 100 block assignment.

Verizon stated that they are not interested in participating in any kind of trial. They are concerned that the problem being solved has not been adequately defined. Verizon does not believe that JIT is a good solution to number conservation. T-Mobile agreed.



LNPA WG  
Consideration of INC

This chart was put together by Mark Lancaster and Bridget Alexander.

Jan Doell will bring in some discussion points for the January meeting. LRN assignment may be an issue. Natalie McNamer presented iconectiv contribution from FON about routing standards IP network.



CONNECTICUT  
100102 UNP Trial 200



110102 CT UNP Trial  
Ltr.pdf



010108027 INC  
Report on UNP.doc



JSI FoN\_Contribution  
FTN8.doc



JSI ex parte -  
Hundreds Block Poolin



iconectiv Routing  
contribution.doc

**Action Item 121013-02** – Service providers and vendors are to be prepared at the November 2013 meeting to have a meaningful discussion surrounding company positions and/or any proposals on PSTN to IP transition now that AT&T's JIT Administrator proposal has been presented to the LNPA WG.

**Action Item 121013-02 is closed.**

## Discussion of 2014 Meeting/Call Agenda Items

The embedded “Brainstorming” file was reviewed and updated.



Brainstorming of  
Possible Future LNPA

## Unfinished/New Business

Verizon Wireless took control of several new blocks and announced in LERG. They ran jobs to remove LRNs from the Verizon numbers that were now theirs. They had problems with some carriers who routed incorrectly after SVs were removed from NPAC. Several carriers did not update their routing tables. Comcast said that they do not remove the SVs until 90 days after the transfer. Several providers indicate that they wait 90 days before removing from the NPAC. Deb Tucker will take this info back to see if it addresses their concerns. We will relook in January.

## Discussion of Need for a December Conference Call

**There will not be a conference call in December 2013.**

## 2014 Meeting Schedule

The WG agreed on meeting dates for 2014. Hosts and locations will be finalized later.

### 2014 Meetings and Conference Calls

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

*Next Meeting ... January 7-8, 2014: Location...Scottsdale, AZ ...Hosted by iconectiv*  
*Next Conference Call ... February 11, 2014*