|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SBC Data Center** | **St. Louis, MO** | **Host: SBC** |

**Wednesday, March 6, 2002 – 8:30 AM – 5:00 PM**

Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** |
| Jeannie Hatchett | Cox (phone) | Jean Anthony | Telecom Software |
| H.L. Gowda | AT&T | John P. Malyar | Telcordia Technologies |
| Anne Cummins | ATTWS | Colleen Collard | Tekelec |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth (phone) | Dave Garner | Qwest (phone) |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Gary Sacra | Verizon |
| James Grasser | Cingular Wireless | Jason Lee | WorldCom |
| Maggie Lee | Illuminet | Steve Addicks | WorldCom |
| Rick Jones | NENA (phone) | Marcel Champagne | Neustar |
| Gene Johnston | Neustar | Dennis Robbins | ELI (phone) |
| Charles Ryburn | SBC | Robert T. Jones | US Cellular Corp. |
| Leah Luper | SBC | Richard Scheer | Neustar |
| Kathleen Tedrick | Sprint | Jim Rooks | Neustar |
| Linda Godfrey | Verizon Wireless | John Nakamura | Neustar |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T | Ron Stutheit | ESI |
| Chris Bowe | Nextel | Lisa Marie Maxson | Telecom Software |
| Suzanne Stelmock | LTC International, Inc.(phone) | Scott Wagner | Intrado(phone) |
| Ankur Shah | Tekelec(phone) | Cara Hiltz | Adelphia(phone) |
| Dawn Lawrence | XO(phone) | Sharion Lively | NUVOX(phone) |
|   |   |   |   |

**Review of Previous Month’s Minutes:**

The team reviewed the February meeting minutes and corrections were made.  They are now marked as final and will be distributed with the draft of the March minutes.

**Change Order Review:**

Each of the existing accepted change orders was assigned a champion who is to report at the April meeting whether the change order should be retained and, if so, what changes to the business need description are necessary*.*

**New Change Orders – Part of Release 4.0 Package:**

A “son of ILL 5” change order is proposed by Neustar to be included in the group of change orders comprising the Release 4.0 package.  This change order allows for two SOA associations: one for notifications only and the other for the rest of the SOA/NPAC traffic.

**Long Term Interface – Elimination of Aborts:**

Neustar proposed a new set of association rules:

·         Association may remain if reply is received within 60 minutes AND

·         Response to anything within past 15 minutes has occurred.

·         Absence of traffic will not trigger abort.

A separate “event timer” will be required to implement this approach to association aborts.  With this approach in place, Users will be able to request recovery of only messages actually missed, so User no longer would have to recover all data for given time frame.  This improves the Recovery process and reduces NPAC load during Recovery periods.

Tekelec asked whether the 15-minute abort is a common event.  ESI asked whether these aborts are due to dead- or merely slow- systems.  TSE pointed out that their clients’ observations indicate about 80% of aborts are caused by network issues, not by application-level problems.  If this behavior is typical, a change in NPAC to eliminate aborts would address only 20% of the problemsInstead, rigorous, frequent testing of circuits should be required during the weekly SP maintenance windows.

Neustar has data on aborts and took an action item to provide its data to the group..

There was agreement that the Users need the ability to recover only those messages actually missed.  Less certain was how helpful the Neustar proposal on aborts would be.  The objective is to make a decision in the April meeting on Neustar’s new proposal for triggering association aborts.

BellSouth asked that the issues being addressed by each proposal be listed for each change order and further commented that the use of “linked replies” should be presumed in every proposal.

**Mass Updates**

There still appears to be severe limiation on quantity of mass updates that Users can process in the Northeast region.  Neustar had changed the broadcast format in release 3.0 to include a “SPID filter.”  This filter allowed NPAC to send groups of contiguous numbers with indication in message that only those numbers in the group with a given SPID were to be changed per the requested modification.

There had been some confusion over this new SPID filter requirement; release documentation had not included mention of the new use of a SPID filter, and at least two vendors did not design to accommodate the change gracefully.  The User problems have not been resolved, so NPAC has eliminated use of SPID filter on mass update messages.  The change is ad hoc – stored in NPAC library – but will be made permanent in next NPAC software release.  A pending change order for documentation changes, to highlight the SPID filter’s use, now no longer appears urgent.  But there is need to eventually accept the filter as it will someday be introduced again and the documentation change still is necessary.

The question was raised as to when the LNPA Working Group would start working on the “Industry Projected Load”.  This will be an agenda item for April.

**Subcommittee Reports:**

**Wireless Testing Sub-Committee (WTSC) Report:**

·         Testing is on track.

·         Plan to meet with every carrier.

·         Test schedule is on the web site.

·        Eight wireless providers & one wireline provider have signed-up for testing.

**Wireless Number Portability Operations Report:**

·         Updated the decision matrix and will publish at the CTIA meeting.

·         All of the latest updates are on the WNPO web site.

·         Steve Addicks presented a contribution.

·         Trouble shooting guideline will be developed.

·         Reviewed the timeline that will be sent to NANC (no changes were made).

·         A jeopardy paragraph was added relating to vendor delays.

·         Reviewed updates to WTSC.

**Agreement Reached: The Service Provider  maintenance window will start on Sundays at 2:00 AM and continue to 8:00 AM.  This is a change from pervious 6:00 AM to 12:00.  Also, wireless said they will need an extended maintenance window the first Sunday of the month from 12 AM to 11 AM CT Since there can only be one Service Provider maintenance window per region, both wireline and wireless carries agreed.**

**The wireless and wierline industry agreed to the following:**

·         **The Service Provider maintenance Window will start on Sundays at 2 AM and continue to 8 AM CT.**

·         **Also, there will be and extended maintenance Window on the first Sunday of the month from 12 AM to 11 AM CT, also applies to the wireline service providers.**

The WNPO  will send a letter  to the NAPM LLC, requesting a change in the service provider's maintenance window times

**ACTION:  Jim to get the letter to Charles and he will put it on the web.**

·         Start the application process with Neustar ASAP.

·         Four companies have completed their turn up testing.

·         NENA is providing information.

·         Reseller flows WNPO is asking for contributions by 3/21.

·         Type 1, Ron Steen contribution was reviewed.

·         Code Openings call has been scheduled for 4/5 (800 503-2899 PC 6046644).

·         Spread out the LERG updates by NPAC regions.

·         Consider the cost of opening the codes, especially when using an AOCN.

·         If a switch serves more then one customer in more than one NPAC Region, its LRN must be entered in each of the applicable NPAC Regions.

·         Normal and extended = Long and short impact was discussed.

·         Is it voluntary for testing between wireless and wireline testing?

Per Rick Jones, NENA and CTIA are sponsoring a forum at the Neustar location in Washington for SMEs on April 16 & 17, 2002, related to E911 issues involving porting and pooling.  The forum will address technical issues and is intended for both wireline and wireless providers.  Providers will need to advise their vendors.

**Problem / Issues Management (PIMs):**

Two new PIMs were submitted, however, numerous attempts at contacting the submitter for additional information have failed.  Therefore, the PIMs will not be numbered or discussed at the April meeting.

**PIM-1: Reseller Role in Porting Process.**

This PIM is now closed, but the work to incorporate the LNPA-WG’s decisions on wireline resellers’ participation in porting -- the facility-based providers coordinate the port with one another on the resellers’ behalf – is not yet done.  The LNPA-WG awaits receipt of information from WNPO on the role of wireless resellers in ports in order to do the process flow revisions one time.

**PIM-5:   Unilateral Back-out of Inadvertent Port**

This PIM concerns the correction of ports in error (or failures-to-port in error) when one of the involved SPs cannot assist in the correction and so the NPAC acts on its behalf.  The NAPM LLC has requested a Statement of Work (SOW) from Neustar and Neustar has provided it.  Negotiation between the LLC and Neustar continues on legal points in the SOW.  Meanwhile, Neustar has prepared a draft M&P for the process and is working with the LLC’s PEs to complete it.

**PIM-6:   Modify 911 Record Migration Process & End User Move Indicator (EUMI)**

This PIM concerns updating the ALI database when a new SP attempts to update it after a customer ports his number, but the ALI “unlock” message has not been received from the old SP.  NENA has proposed a Standard for this situation that requires the ALI database provider to query NPAC (or do some equivalent activity) to confirm whether the new SP actually is the telephone number’s owner.  If so, the ALI database update will be accepted even though the database is not “unlocked.”

**PIM 11: Moving Blocks between Switches**

This PIM concerns ability of SP to port inventory between its switches using LNP type of “pool” but not necessarily involving pool administrator.  Neustar submitted a draft procedure for LNPA-WG review.  Steve Addicks assigned to revise document to reflect LNPA-WG comments.  Objective is to have revised draft to Rob Coffman at Neustar in time to allow for Neustar’s review and re-circulation of the reviewed draft to LNPA-WG members before April’s meeting.

**PIM 14: Disconnect of NXX Code with Ported TN**

These PIMs (14&15) deal with method for reassignment of portable NXX codes when LERG assignee goes out of business or discontinues service in the code’s rate area.  INC has issued an appendix to its pooling guidelines to address this problem (as well as the case where only assigned thousand blocks are stranded).  WorldCom expressed concern at the February meeting that INC’s appendix may not adequately deal with these matters and asked that the LNPA-WG provide advice to INC.  Steve Addicks assigned to draft a proposed communication from LNPA-WG to INC in time for final approval at the April meeting.

**PIM 15: NXX Codes Ownership Changes**

See update for PIM 14.

**PIM –16:Removing Portability Designation on NXXs in the LERG**

This PIM deals with inappropriate changes to LERG’s NXX portability indication.  The issue was referred to the CIGRR.  Resolution appears to be that SP will verify that the code is not shown at NPAC as portable before requesting the portability indication in LERG to be changed to “no.”  Adam Newman to provide us with an update on CIGRR’s action at our April meeting.

**PIM – 17: (NEW) Mandatory Requirement for Use of Unique SPID for Wireless & Wireline Providers in the Same Company:**

This PIM deals with facilitating automatic determination of whether “other” SP in a port is wireline or wireless.  Initially, the request was that unique SPID values be assigned even when the same User handles both network types.  Now the request is being expanded to include that there be embedded intelligence in carrier names to indicate network type.  AT&T and WorldCom suggested that a Neustar web site be used to provide this information rather than altering broadcast information.

**PIM – 18: Update NANC Flows and Narratives Relating to Wireless Providers**

This PIM adds wireless reseller flows to existing NANC process flows.  The WNPO committee is developing these flows, but has not yet provided them to the LNPA-WG.

**Thursday, March 7, 2002  8:30 – 5:00pm**

Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** |
| Jeannie Hatchett | Cox (phone) | Jean Anthony | Telecom Software |
| H.L. Gowda | AT&T | John P. Malyar | Telcordia Technologies |
| Anne Cummins | ATTWS | Colleen Collard | Tekelec |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth (phone) | Dave Garner | Qwest (phone) |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Gary Sacra | Verizon |
| James Grasser | Cingular Wireless (phone) | Jason Lee | WorldCom |
| Maggie Lee | Illuminet | Steve Addicks | WorldCom |
| Rick Jones | NENA (phone) | Marcel Champagne | Neustar |
| Gene Johnston | Neustar | Dennis Robbins | ELI (phone) |
| Charles Ryburn | SBC | Robert T. Jones | US Cellular Corp. |
| Leah Luper | SBC | Richard Scheer | Neustar |
| Kathleen Tedrick | Sprint (phone) | Jim Rooks | Neustar |
| Linda Godfrey | Verizon Wireless | John Nakamura | Neustar |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T | Ron Stutheit | ESI |
| Chris Bowe | Nextel | Lisa Marie Maxson | Telecom Software |
| Suzanne Stelmock | LTC International, Inc.(phone) | Scott Wagner | Intrado(phone) |
| Ankur Shah | Tekelec(phone) | Cara Hiltz | Adelphia(phone) |
| Dawn Lawrence | XO(phone) | Sharion Lively | NUVOX(phone) |
| Rob Coffman | Neustar(phone) | Darius Irani | Neustar(phone) |
| Patrick Lockett | Sprint(phone) | Marian Hearn | Canadian LLC(phone) |
| Pete McGuire | Telecom Software(phone) |   |   |

**Change Management Administration Issue:**

The Change Management Administration (CMA) function has been provided for the LNPA-WG by TSE for several years.  Neustar contracts with TSE to perform the CMA function and pays the cost of CMA.

Last month, the LNPA-WG learned that Neustar had decided not to renew the CMA vendor’s contract and instead had moved the CMA function in-house.  Neustar explained that their decision reflected no dissatisfaction with TSE’s performance and was done entirely as a cost reduction measure.  Neustar pointed out that the CMA function is funded by SOW work and, with no SOW in the pipe line, cost containment had become particularly urgent.

Neustar said it would not engage in public debate with one of its sub-contractors.  Neustar assured the LNPA-WG that they have in-house staff competent to develop the ASN.1 and GDMO changes.  When asked about interpretations of requirements where there are disagreements between NPAC and Users’ vendors, Neustar said such issues are brought to the LNPA-WG as in the past.

TSE briefly reviewed the history of CMA at the LNPA.  At the time the CMA function was established by LNPA-WG, there were two NPAC vendors.  Thus a neutral CMA clearly was essential.  Although not paid by the LNPA WG the CMA acted on behalf of the LNPA WG the NPAC vendors paid the CMA vendor, the CMA operated on behalf of the LNPA.

Lisa-Maria Maxson, TSE, reminded the group that even though there is now a single NPAC vendor, the need for a neutral CMA remains to mediate disagreements on technical interpretations of NPAC requirements between NPAC and Users’ vendors.  That is, these disagreements are not routinely brought before the LNPA-WG.

The LNPA-WG pointed out that it was in the center of the CMA function, yet was not consulted about the change.  It was observed that we originally had considered issuing an RFP for the change management function and had decided instead to select TSE as the CMA.  (Lisa-Marie had originally prepared the IIS and was considered by LNPA then to be obviously suitable for the CMA role.)  It is unclear to the LNPA-WG now why the decision to move the CMA function to a different vendor is not theirs to make rather than Neustar’s.

**The discussion will continue at April’s meeting.  Neustar and TSE are to provide written discussions on CMA functions and reasons it should/should not be moved to Neustar as an in-house function.**

The following are some of the questions that were raised during the presentation:

Q.  Did Neustar feel that they would be the only vendor in the future.

A.  That is not the environment today and if there was a change in the future, then  an RFP out for bid.

Q.  Would Neustar move the work to vendor if the LNPA WG decided that was the way they wanted to operate in the future.

A.  They would move to resolve the issues.  Neustar stressed that they are not changing anything, because they have been paying TSE all along.  In essence Neustar has been doing the work all along.

Q.  If the LNPA WG is at the center of all of this, why weren't we asked before Neustar took the action they did?

A.  Neustar did not view this as a huge change.  In fact they consider this as business as usual.

Q.  TSE asked what is to be gained by having NS do this work?

A.  Neustar stated that is was an expense reduction.  Neustar said that this group should not be discussing costs.

Q.  General questions were raised relating to the ownership of the documents that have been produced and future documents.

A.  The documents are public and the only reason they are marked with the present notation is to ensure that they continue to belong to the public.

**ACTION:  Neustar will verify that all of these documents are public.  All of the documents are on the public web site, with one exception.  Neustar will respond, in writing, before the next LNPA WG meeting in April.**

Q.  What will happen if the NPAC vendor changes in the future?

**Release 3.1 Status:**

All is go for conversion of the second NPAC region (Western) to 3.1, March 18, 2002.

**New Business:**

Marcel Champagne, Neustar brought up an issue regarding NPA split problems with companies exiting the business.  Marcel will write this up to send to the INC.

**Next Meeting:**

Future meetings have been shifted forward one half day, to full days on Wednesdays and Thursdays, in order to accommodate the WNPO committee's need for additional meeting time.

The next LNPA-WG meeting will be held at Kansas City, April 10-11.

**Meeting Schedule:**

**2002 Meeting Schedule:**

LNPA WG:                                            Host:

April 10 -11                                            Sprint, Kansas City

May 14 - 16                                           AT&T Wireless, Redmond, WA

June 11 - 13                                          AT&T – Atlanta, GA

July 9 - 11                                             US Cellular - Chicago

August 13 - 15                                       Canadian Consortium, Vancouver, British Columbia,Canada

September 17 - 19                                 Verizon, Baltimore, MD

October 15 - 17                                      ESI, Denver, CO

November 12 - 14                                 Cox Communications- Atlanta

December 10 - 12                                 Nextel Partners – Las Vegas