|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Sprint Campus** | **Overland Park, KS** | **Host:  Sprint** |

**Wednesday, April 10, 2002 – 8:30 AM – 5:00 PM**

Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** |
| H.L. Gowda | AT&T | Charles Ryburn | SBC |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T | Leah Luper | SBC |
| Anne Cummins | ATTWS | Kathleen Tedrick | Sprint |
| Lonnie Keck | ATTWS (phoneO) | Jeff Adrian | Sprint |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth (phone) | Colleen Collard | Tekelec |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth (phone) | Paul Warga | Telcordia Technologies |
| James Grasser | Cingular Wireless | John P. Malyar | Telcordia Technologies |
| Dennis Robbins | ELI (phone) | Jean Anthony | Telecom Software |
| Ron Stutheit | ESI | Lisa Marie Maxson | Telecom Software |
| Threse Mooney | Global Crossing (phone) | Jason Cope | TeleSynthesis, Inc. |
| Maggie Lee | Illuminet | Charlotte Holden | US Cellular |
| Gene Johnston | Neustar | Gary Sacra | Verizon |
| Jim Rooks | Neustar | Linda Godfrey | Verizon Wireless |
| John Nakamura | Neustar | Jason Lee | WorldCom (phone) |
| Larry Vagnoni | Neustar | Dawn Lawrence | XO (phone) |
| Dave Garner | Qwest (phone) | Steve Addicks | WorldCom |
|   |   |   |   |

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

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

**Subcommittee Reports:**

Wireless Number Portability Operations Team WNPO:

The FCC’s Third NRO Report (FCC 02-73) has caused uncertainty among wireless service providers regarding whether or not BFRs are required in the top 100 MSAs.  As a result, the wireless carriers present at the WNPO meeting agreed to open all NXX codes in the top 100 MSAs without the need for a BFR.  The WNPO will notify NANC of this agreement.

There will be a conference call on 4/29 at 3pm Eastern to discuss possible reasons for denying a port-out request.  Bridge no. 800-503-2899, PIN 6046644.

Jim Grasser reported that some wireless carriers may request a waiver from the FCC due to network/systems not being ready.

The WNPO wireless members voted in favor of Option B for wireless reseller flows.  Option B requires the underlying network provider to coordinate the port.  This was the same option that the wireline service providers approved by consensus.  The WNPO will prepare the wireless reseller flows, reflecting Option B, for submission to the LNPA.

Neustar reported that 24 wireless carriers have completed NPAC User Agreements.

A conference call to further discuss conversions of Type 1 cellular has been TENTATIVELY scheduled for 5/1.  Details to follow.

The Wireless Pooling Task Force agreed to open wireless NXX codes to portability in the LERG based on the following guidelines:

q       Codes will be opened to portability in the LERG following the Native Block Pooling rollout schedule,

q       These codes will be segmented into 7 phases,

q       The first Effective Date in the LERG for Phase 1 will be 7/1/02,

q       Effective Dates for subsequent phases will be two weeks apart.

**Long Term Interface Solution:**

Projected Industry Load:

The vendors would need to agree on what are the events that should be measured so a matrix may be developed.   First we need  to develop a model for the projected load, then we can measure against the actual load to validate the model.  The LSMS could be a generic model, but may not be true for the SOA.  Two views are being suggested, one is an Industry projection v. using historical projection based on NPAC data.

**ACTION ITEM: PE and Neustar will discuss if the Neustar report can be made public.  Neustar will report back to the LNPA WG, by the next meeting, as to their allowing this report to be made available to the public, absent the SPID information.**

**b**

**ACTION ITEM:  Ron Stutheit will schedule a conference call with the vendors, providers and Neustar.  The goal of the call will be to determine what the vendors need to project their path forward.  The date of this meeting is tentative for 5/2 (Thursday) at 2:00 PM ET.  LNPA WG Projected Industry Load (What data we need to gather?) conference call  (877 716-8039 PC 303 802 1376).  Vendors may send contributions to Charles and he will forward.**

Recovery Issue:

Currently, on the SOA, the maximum number of SOA notifications that can be recovered at a time is 2000.  On the LSMS, the maximum quantity of subscription versions that can be recovered is either in terms of TNs (limited to a single NPA-NXX, i.e., 10,000 TNs) or limited by time (maximum of 1 hour, but not limited to a maximum number of TNs).  With this change, the SOA remains at 2000, but the LSMS maximum for subscription data recovery is limited to a combination of TNs (maximum of 2000) AND time (maximum of 1 hour).  Therefore, the maximum number of subscriptions for a TN-based recovery is 2000 TNs, and the maximum duration for a time-based recovery is 1 hour (but also taking into account the 2000 TN limitation), This seems to have reduced the number of aborts due to service provider system inability to handle the quantity of TNs in the recovery time period.  As a further interim measure, the LNPA agreed to limit the SOA range activations to 1,000 TNs to ensure they could be recovered as a result of the 2,000 TN limitation on recovery.  This is an interim fix until implementation of linked replies (NANC Change Order 187).

**AGREEMENT REACHED: There was unanimous agreement to limit, for an interim period, the size of range activations to no more than 1,000 TNs.  This limit might be raised to higher levels from time to time, but some constraint below the current implementation limit of 10,000 TNs appears necessary until an industry solution to the current recovery limitation is implemented.**

**Long Term Interface Solution (Elimination of Aborts):**

Based on March data reviewed by Neustar, about 25% of al aborts are due to the retry failure, a situation where broadcast has been done, but User's LSMS has not responded within the allotted time.  We agreed that Neustar should proceed to flesh out some change orders they had suggested in March as means to reduce the occurrence of Association Aborts.  Fewer association aborts means fewer times a User will need to go through the Recovery process.  When user's association is aborted, the user is off-line and cannot receive NPAC broadcasts; this impacts newly ported customers since calls from that carrier's network won't have current routing information for the customer's ported number.  Further, the Recovery process itself is NPAC-resource intensive.

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

.

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

WNPO announced that they had reached a decision to go with Option “B” of the NNPO recommendation.  This option provides for LSR/FOC negotiation to be done by the underlying Network Provider.  WNPO will continue to work on flows.  They hope to have them ready for incorporation into the NANC flows by the May meeting.

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

Still in Legal review with LLC and Neustar attorneys.

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

NENA was not present to provide an update, however, Rick Jones, of NENA, did provide the attached approved NENA recommendation which states, “E911 Database Providers will compare ‘failed migrates’ to the NPAC (or LSMS database) at a minimum of once each business day.  If the NPAC Service Provider owner is the Recipient company, the current E911 DBMS record shall be unlocked without donor company participation and the (M) migrate record processed.  Both the Donor Company and the Recipient Company are sent notification of the DBMS actions taken.”

**PIM 11: Moving Blocks between Switches**

A contribution from WorldCom is outgrowth of "trials" WorldCom did in Chicago and Washington, D.C. to move inventory between its switches in the form of pooled blocks. This approach allows the spare numbers to be moved gracefully by OSS and avoids later inventory erosion due t "snap-back" processes used when ported numbers are assigned and later disconnected.  Furthermore, the process trialed avoids use of Pool Administrator.

Neustar and WorldCom jointly prepared the M&P, which was first reviewed by LNPA-WG at its March meeting.  The material, edited to reflect the LNPA-WG's comments in March, was approved and is being forwarded to the NAPM LLC for approval of the NPAC's involvement in this process.  A copy of the M&P is attached to this email.

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

The group held a discussion, with INC participation, on why Neustar was apparently requiring the new LERG-assignee to take all 10 pooled blocks when the code is transferred to them, even when that provider is not requesting all 10 blocks.  This would seem an unnecessary requirement resulting in additional cost to the industry in download transactions.  One possible reason would be to maintain “non-working number announcement” functionality if any unassigned numbers in the code are dialed, but this would not seem to be sufficient justification to incur the additional cost and paperwork to activate blocks to the LERG-assignee if that carrier does not need the numbering resources.  Neustar took an ACTION ITEM to determine what authorization they need in the short term, and from whom, to stop requiring the new LERG-assignee to take all 10 blocks if they are not requested.  INC will address this in the guidelines, as well.

The LNPA will also send a liaison letter to the INC with comments on their revised CO Code Assignment Guidelines (Appendix C) and Thousands Block Pooling Guidelines (Appendix 7), which address PIMs 14 and 15.  Attached to this email is a copy of that letter.

**ACTION ITEM (Informational): Neustar to determine what authorization they need in the short term, and from whom, to stop requiring the new LERG-assignee to take all 10 blocks if they are not requested.  INC will address this in the guidelines, as well (modified Part 1B).**

**AGREEMENT REACHED: The LNPA WG discussed if it is appropriate to send a liason letter through the LNPA WG or not.  The decision of the LNPA WG agreed to edit the letter authored by Steve Addicks, WorldCom and then forward it to the INC as the LNPA WG's contribution to INC.**

**PIM 15: NXX Codes Ownership Changes**

See update for PIM 14.

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

A discussion with Adam Newman, Telcordia TRA and CIGRR liaison, resulted in the following agreement that Adam will take back to CIGRR for their approval:

q       Only the TRA will have the ability to change the portability indicator for an NXX code in the LERG from “YES” to “NO.”

q       The TRA will only make this change upon written request (e-mail is ok) with a certification in writing that the provider has verified that the NXX code is not open in NPAC.

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

The following now appears on the npac.com wireless website home page, “On August/2001, the Wireless Number Portability Operations subcommittee (WNPO) has recommended that Wireless Service Providers subscribing for a connection to the NPAC use a different Service Provider ID (SPID) than their counterpart wireline entity side of the company.  This recommendation is to allow the wireline and wireless entities in a company to use different sets of Business Days and NPAC timers in their profiles if necessary.”

BellSouth will submit a Change Order request to put the service provider type, e.g., wireless, wireline, in the provider’s NPAC profile.  BellSouth has system requirements and processes that necessitate the need to identify SPIDs by the type of carrier.  Verizon also voiced support for this need.  An additional need is for E911 database providers whose processes may differ depending on if the providers involved in a port are wireless or wireline.

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

The WNPO wireless members voted in favor of Option B for wireless reseller flows.  Option B requires the underlying network provider to coordinate the port.  This was the same option that the wireline service providers approved by consensus.  The WNPO will prepare the wireless reseller flows, reflecting Option B, for submission to the LNPA.

**Thursday, April 11, 2002  8:30 – 5:00pm**

Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** |
| H.L. Gowda | AT&T | Dave Garner | Qwest (phone) |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T | Charles Ryburn | SBC |
| Beth Watkins | AT&T (phone) | Leah Luper | SBC |
| Anne Cummins | ATTWS | Kathleen Tedrick | Sprint |
| Lonnie Keck | ATTWS (phoneO) | Jeff Adrian | Sprint |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth (phone) | Colleen Collard | Tekelec |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth (phone) | Paul Warga | Telcordia Technologies |
| James Grasser | Cingular Wireless (phone) | John P. Malyar | Telcordia Technologies |
| Dennis Robbins | ELI (phone) | Jean Anthony | Telecom Software |
| Ron Stutheit | ESI | Lisa Marie Maxson | Telecom Software |
| Threse Mooney | Global Crossing (phone) | Pete McGuire | Telecom Software (phone) |
| Maggie Lee | Illuminet | Jason Cope | TeleSynthesis, Inc. |
| Scott Wagner | Intrado (phone) | Charlotte Holden | US Cellular |
| Gene Johnston | Neustar | Gary Sacra | Verizon |
| Jim Rooks | Neustar | Linda Godfrey | Verizon Wireless |
| John Nakamura | Neustar | Jason Lee | WorldCom (phone) |
| Larry Vagnoni | Neustar | Dawn Lawrence | XO (phone) |
| Darius Irani | Neustar (phone) | Steve Addicks | WorldCom |
|   |   |   |   |

**Change Management Administration Issue:**

Neustar made the statement that all of the documents associated with the CMA function are on the public web site.  The only document that should have been on the web, but wasn’t is the Turn-up Test Plan.  This document is now posted on the web site.

**ACTION ITEM: Neustar, Rob Coffman will send a complete list of all of the documents and where they are on the web site.**

**ACTION ITEM: Neustar will review the copyright language to make sure that the language is consistent across all of the documents and report by the May meeting.**

A question of ownership of these documents was raised.  Neustar responded that  Article 24 of the Master Contract covers the transition of documents.

Q. Concern on the technical expertise on the GDMO & IIS?

A. Neustar's staff members have the required technical expertise.

Q. How would a dispute between the NPAC vendor and the SOA & LSMS vendors be resolved?

A. The LNPA WG has the authority to resolve the dispute.

**ACTION ITEM:  Neustar will provide their written response to these and all of the other questions raised during the March and April LNPA WG meetings, on or before the May meeting.**

Q What would happen if another NPAC vendor is selected?

A. The NAPM LLC would become involved in any transition to a new vendor.

Q. How will cost recovery be handled?

Q. Whose role was it to select the CMA vendor?

A. The LNPA WG should have been consulted before any change was made.

The LNPA WG voted on the following question:

Do you feel that the LNPA WG and its reporting structure has the sole authority to select the Change Management Administrator (CMA)?

After presentations from both Neustar and TSE addressing their respective sides to this issue, the LNPA voted unanimously, with one abstention (Neustar), that the LNPA and its reporting structure has the sole authority to select the Change Management Administrator.  Charles will draft a letter to Neustar on behalf of the LNPA stating that they have acted inappropriately in making the CMA change and that the function should be transitioned back to TSE by the May, 2002 LNPA meeting.

Charles stated that the Master Contract with Neustar did not directly address the CMA.  The decision to change the contract with CMA was done without this group's concurrence.  The Neustar representatives at the meeting said that they do not have the authority make a decision to change anything related to who performs the CMA function.

**ACTION ITEM: Charles will send a letter to Larry Vagnoni, Neustar, advising them that they acted incorrectly in changing the CMA and by the next meeting May 2002 the LNPA WG expect that  Neustar return the CMA activity to the prior relationship arrangement.**

**Change Order Review:**

·         The assigned “champions” of each Change Order placed their respective Change Orders in one of the following three “buckets:”

Ø       Bucket 1 – To be prioritized for next NPAC release

Ø       Bucket 2 – To be prioritized but may go in future NPAC release

Ø       Bucket 3 – Delete Pending.

·         Following is the placement of the existing accepted Change Orders as agreed to in the April meeting.  Prioritization of the Change Orders is scheduled to take place in the June meeting.

 **NANC CHANGE ORDER                         BUCKET NO.**

            ILL 5                                                     3 (to be replaced by “son of ILL 5”)

                        ILL 130                                                  2

138              1

151              3

169              1

187              1

191              1

192              1

193              2

200              1

217              3 (covered in NANC 323)

218              1

219              2

227/254                                                1

230              1

232                                                            3

246                                                            3 (if NANC 169 is implemented)

                                                                                    1 (if NANC 169 not implemented)

249              1

285              3

287                                                            1

291              1

297              1

299                                                            2

300              2

311              2

312              2

316              1

319              1

321                                                            DELETED

322              1

323              1

**Release 3.1 Status:**

All is go for conversion of the third NPAC region (West Coast) to 3.1, April 22, 2002.

**New Business:**

Ron Stutheit, ESI, raised several issues for review by Neustar.

**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 Redmond, Washington on May 15 - 16.

**Meeting Schedule:**

**2002 Meeting Schedule:**

LNPA WG:                                            Host:

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