# ATTENDANCE:

No Highlight – Attended on both days

Green – Attended on Day 1

Yellow - Attended on Day 2

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** |
| Jim Grasser | Cingular Wireless | Brigitte Brown | TeleCorp PCS |
| Liz Coakley | SBC Wireline | Rick Jones | NENA |
| Maggie Lee | Illuminet | Chris Bowe | Nextel |
| Jean Anthony | Telecom Software | Jeff Adrian | Sprint PCS |
| H.L. Gowda | AT&T | Linda Godfrey | Verizon Wireless |
| John Malyar | Telcordia | Rick Dressner | Sprint PCS |
| Jeanne Manis | First Cellular of Southern Illinois | Stephen Addicks | WorldCom |
| Suzanne Stelmock | LTC International Inc. | Chuck Bohl | U.S. Cellular |
| Ron Stutheit | Evolving Systems | Holly Henderson | Southern LINC |
| Denise Thomas | WorldCom | Jaci Daniel | Alltel |
| Paul Warga | Telcordia | Gene Johnston | NeuStar |
| Jason Lee | WorldCom | Charlotte Holden | U.S. Cellular |
| Robert Jones | U.S. Cellular | Gene Perez | TSI Telecommunication Services |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Chris Duckett-Brown | Verizon Wireless |
| Lee Mercury | LTC International | Kathleen Tedrick | Sprint |
| Karen Mulberry | WorldCom | Gary Sacra | Verizon |
| Tania Seger | First Cellular of Southern Illinois | Scott Wagner | Intrado |
| Charles Ryburn | SBC Wireline | Anne Cummins | AT&T Wireless |
| Laurie Itkin | Leap Wireless | Mitch Kaufman | NCS Pearson |
| **Participants via the Conference Bridge:** | |  |  |
| Dave Garner | Qwest | Scotty Parish | AllTel |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Lonnie Keck | AT&T Wireless |
| Steve Hallbauer | CHR Solutions | Alex Heien | Excel |
| Mark McClanahan | Dobson Cellular | Melissa Flicek | Nextel Partners |
| Cheryl Gordon | AllTel | Michelle Gordon | AllTel |
| Doug Graves | Verizon Wireless |  |  |

# MEETING MINUTES FROM DAY #1 (3/4/02):

## Introductions and Agenda Review

Made introductions and reviewed agenda.

## Reviewed January 2002 & February 2002 Minutes

1. Changed the year in the header of the January minutes to 2002 instead of 2001. Version v.04 of the January minutes is attached below.



1. The following changes were made to the February 2002 minutes (the updated version v.03 is attached below):
   1. Changed the year in the header of the February minutes to 2002 instead of 2001.
   2. Changed the wording of section C – 2 – d:
      1. FROM: Puerto Rico has indicated that they are on the pooling schedule for 2Q02. Amy Putnam indicated that the FCC approved schedule goes through 1Q02, however there is a proposed schedule that goes out a couple of years.
      2. TO: Puerto Rico has indicated that they are on the proposed pooling schedule for early 2003. Amy Putnam indicated that the FCC has approved only the first 3 months of the proposed schedule (which includes mid-March through mid-June of 2002), however there is a proposed schedule that goes out a couple of years.



## Introduction of New Business Items

1. Clarify 6-Month Wait for Bonafide Request Outside the Top 100 MSAs
   1. Per the mandate, outside the Top 100 MSAs SPs have six months after 11/24/02 to comply with a Bonafide Request.
   2. This item will be closed unless any team members provide differing opinions on this matter based upon the information in the order.
2. Communication of WNPO Decisions/Recommendations Matrix to the Industry
   1. The team determined that the decisions/recommendations of the WNPO will be publicized via the following actions:
      1. **ACTION:** Present the WNPO Decisions/Recommendation Matrix at the upcoming CTIA Critical Issues forum in May 2002. (Brigitte Brown)
      2. The matrix has already been posted on the NPAC website.
      3. **ACTION:** Separate sections will be created on the NPAC website for WNPO items: one section will contain the WNPO minutes and agendas; another will contain any additional WNPO documentation. (Jim Grasser)
   2. Note: Currently the WNPO contribution form is on the NPAC website under “wireless”, then select “WNPO” and the contribution form is in the middle of the page.
3. NAPM LLC Meeting Updates – Jim Grasser
   1. NeuStar and the NAPM LLC have agreed to the WNPO’s request for the adjustment of the Long Business Day timers to 3am to 11pm central 7-days a week (to support intercarrier testing) to occur on March 1st, 2002.
   2. Reviewed the latest NPAC 3.1 rollout schedule:
      1. February 18th Northeast
      2. March 18th Western
      3. April 8th Southwest
      4. April 22nd West Coast
      5. May 6th Mid-Atlantic
      6. May 20th Southeast
      7. June 10th Midwest
4. Escalation Path for Jeopardies with Porting

**ACTION:** Add a new item to the WNPO Issues / Action Items list identifying the need for a discussion on mapping an escalation path to an external entity for porting issues and ports in jeopardy. (Brigitte Brown)

1. Slow Updates to LNP SCPs – Steve Addicks
   1. Steve Addicks voiced a concern regarding the timeliness of updates to the LNP databases used for call routing (see contribution attached below). He mentioned that subsequent to a large customer cut-over they could not receive calls from wireless numbers for one week. The NPAC broadcasts were being received by the wireless SPs (no failure messages were issued). Steve mentioned that while the dip was being performed by the wireless SPs, the correct LRN was not obtained due to the Number Portability database not being updated, and therefore the call could not be completed. Steve further indicated that troubleshooting efforts confirmed that these wireless SPs were not default routing to wireline SPs.
   2. The team agreed to address this concern with the following actions:
      1. **ACTION:** Add the following statement in the minutes and in the WNPO Decision/Recommendation Matrix: “The appropriate network elements should be updated with the routing information broadcast from the NPAC SMS within 15 minutes of the receipt of the broadcast.”
      2. **ACTION:** Maggie Lee to provide a reference to an industry document for the statement regarding the guideline for updating LSMSs/NPDBs subsequent to an NPAC broadcast. Any other team members with further references (e.g. LNPA working group letter to NANC in 1997, or ATIS document). (Maggie Lee and Team)
      3. **ACTION:** – Add a new item to the WNPO Issues & Action Items list that the WNPO needs to create a troubleshooting guideline. Jim Grasser will provide a rough draft (Jim Grasser)

## Revised Implementation Timeline/Guideline & Narrative for NANC

1. The team decided that while the narrative needs to be updated, the timeline should not be changed as the dates still represent the critical timeframes that need to be met.
2. The team agreed that the narrative needs to indicate that the critical network elements have still not been delivered by the vendors.
3. **ACTION:** Jim Grasser and Brigitte Brown to put words together for the narrative tonight (3/4/02) for the team to review and revise tomorrow (3/5/02). The team requested that the wording clearly indicate that the lack of vendor solutions for critical network elements has created a jeopardy status.
4. On Day #2 (3/5/02) the team reviewed the wording of the narrative and wordsmith-ed collectively until agreement was reached on the following wording:

This third revision of the guidelines does not include any changes to the timeline, however, this narrative documents a jeopardy situation.

In the second revision, that was distributed to the NANC with the February WNPO status update, critical network elements were identified. The paragraph discussing those critical elements is repeated here for reference:

“Several items were identified as critical network elements: switches, HLR/VLRs, SOA/LTI, and LSMS. Delivery of the elements themselves, or upgrades to these elements, are extremely critical to the successful testing and implementation of wireless porting and pooling. In addition, installation of these new elements and upgrades to existing elements can be very time consuming and labor intensive. For these reasons, they have been identified separately as Critical Network Elements on the current revision and have the earliest completion/due date. Delivery of all other network and/or system related products and upgrades may be slightly later due to the less intensive work required to prepare them for testing and implementation.”

**JEOPARDY** – As evidenced by the timeline, vendor supplied hardware and software for these critical network elements was to be available to service providers by the beginning of March 2002. The core network vendors have not yet provided fully tested, functional, and generally available solutions for switches and/or HLR/VLRs. Since this has not occurred, testing cannot begin and this places the successful and timely implementation of pooling and porting in jeopardy status. The WNPO has deemed it necessary to identify and escalate this as an issue to the NANC. In order to meet the 11/24/02 date for pooling and porting, this issue must be addressed immediately.

1. Attached below is the updated Narrative (Revision 3; document version v.08) for presentation at the March NANC meeting on 3/12/02.



## WTSC (Wireless Testing Sub-Committee) Update

Note: Jim Grasser provided the WTSC Update:

1. Revised the test plan (version 1.4) to include 911 testing and using MDNs from traditional wireline numbers.
2. Updated the test schedule to include the new Top 100 MSAs.
   1. 7 wireless SPs and 1 wireline SP are included in the test schedule thus far.
   2. Thus far, testing is planned in 23 MSAs (out of a total of 121).
   3. Therefore, roughly 1/8 of the wireless SPs in the new Top 100 MSAs plan to test in 1/5 of the MSAs.
   4. There are over 55 wireless SPs within the new Top 100 MSAs.

## Matrix of Proposed Help Desk Hours, Timers & Maintenance Windows

The WNPO created a matrix (see attached) containing all the proposed items below. This matrix will be provided to the NAPM LLC.

1. Maintenance Window Timeframes
   1. **DECISION:** The team decided to propose 2am to 8am central (across all regions) for the SP standard maintenance window. While there were no major objections to the 3am to 9am central, the team decided to propose that it start at 2am central to avoid a one-hour overlap on the east coast with the beginning of the long business day.
   2. **DECISION:** The SP Extended Maintenance Window is still proposed for midnight to 11am central.
   3. **DECISION:**  The WNPO proposes that the changes in the standard and extended maintenance windows become effective on 11/10/02.
   4. The NPAC will pick their maintenance windows sometime within the SP maintenance window timeframes.
   5. SP should not start NPAC processes until after the maintenance window.
   6. Customers should be told that ports will not be completed until after maintenance window.
2. Contract Revision for NPAC Personnel Working Sundays & Longer Business Days:
   1. **DECISION:** The WNPO is proposing that the NPAC help desk hours be extended (effective 11/24/02) to support the proposed long business day timers. The WNPO proposed that the NPAC help desk hours run from 9am to 9pm seven days a week for each regional time zone (see the attached matrix for the specific time zones).
   2. Wireline is currently setup for 7am to 7pm central.
3. Long Business Day Timers prior to the implementation of Porting & pooling on 11/24/02:
   1. **DECISION:** For the test bed, the WNPO was requesting that the long business day timers be set to 3am to 11pm central for all regions beginning on 3/1/02 through 11/23/02.
   2. **DECISION:** For the production systems from 3/1/02 through 11/23/02, the WNPO is requesting that the long business day timers be set to 3am to 11pm per each regional time zone (see the attached matrix for the specific time zones).
4. **DECISION:** For Long Business Day Timers in the production systems from 11/24/02 and moving forward, the WNPO is requesting 9am to 9pm per each regional time zone (see the attached matrix for the specific time zones).
5. **DECISION:** Team decided that the one time zone that will be used for test lab is central time (Gene Johnston confirmed that there was no need to use another time zone.).
6. **DECISION:** The team formalized the decision to use the central time zone for the Midwest region. Wireline also uses central time for Midwest region.
7. No team members brought up any issues or impacts that need to be considered with regard to certain areas not participating in daylight savings time.
8. **ACTION:** Jim Grasser and Brigitte Brown to send a letter to the LLC proposing that the timers, help desk hours, and maintenance windows identified in the matrix be supported by the NPAC.

1. **ACTION:** Add the following statement to the WNPO decision/recommendation matrix “NPAC porting activities should not be carried out during the maintenance window timeframes.”

## NeuStar Update – Gene Johnston:

1. NeuStar has two 3.1 test beds:
   1. One test bed for the super-region (composite of every region except the Northeast region).
   2. One test bed the wireless community is using for testing.
2. Update from Day 2 (3/5/02):
   1. Two new SPs signed NDAs last month.
   2. Completed another wireless SP’s turn up testing. The entities that have completed turn-up testing include: Illuminet, Sprint, Nextel, and Cingular.
   3. Two new wireless SPs should have begun turn-up testing last week, however they have not begun yet.
   4. NeuStar resources have been available for all SPs that have requested testing.

## Review of WNPO Issues & Action Items List

1. Updates were made directly into the WNPO Issues and Action Items list – refer to the updated document (v.13) attached below (the changes are tracked in red).



1. **ACTION:** Add an issue on the WNPO Issues and Action Items list entitled “Impact of WLNP & Pooling on E911”. (Brigitte Brown)
   1. NENA update from Rick Jones:
      1. There is a NENA & CTIA Subject Matter Expert meeting to discuss technical issues related to WLNP/Pooling and E911. The meeting is scheduled for April 16th and 17th at the NeuStar facility in Washington DC (1120 Vermont Ave NW).
      2. NENA is documenting an issues list related to the impact of WLNP and Pooling on E911. A couple issues include:
         1. One 911 vendor is compliant with the NP query, and the two others are not.
         2. Wireless SPs using regular 10-digit numbers to access 911 services, not dedicated trunks like wireline.
            1. Those 10-digit numbers may be pooled or ported numbers.
            2. Today, the calls go out of the wireless network and over to wireline networks where the number portability dip is performed.
            3. For 911 calls SPs do not check registration. If uninitialized calls to 911 are allowed to go through, then all calls are passed through without registration, so a dip could not be performed. If a dip is performed, then uninitialized calls to 911 cannot be supported.
            4. Rick believes that in the future if it is not dipped and code is held by wireless carrier, then the call would receive vacant number treatment.
            5. Rick has asked TR45.2 for clarification.
            6. As Sheriff’s departments add numbers, they may be pooled (pooled from a wireless code) or ported numbers.
2. **Item 0002 - Identify group for ongoing maintenance of ICP document:** This item was closed. 2/02 - OBF will maintain the ICP document beginning with the February 2002 OBF meeting (last CTIA doc version 2.1.3).
3. **Item 0004 - PIM 0012 – Operator Services:** This item was closed. 1/6/02 – T1S1.3 accepted the contribution with the proposed changes to operator services.
4. **Item 0007 - Impact of wireless number portability on directory assistance and directory listings:** 3/4/02 – Still ongoing at OBF.
5. **Item 0009 - Generate a Wireless Pooling document based on 99-200 and review of existing industry documents:** 3/4/02 – PTF developed procedures for Native Block Pooling and developing Transition Plan to Traditional Pooling.
6. **Item 0010 – Vendor Readiness:**  **ACTION:** Brigitte Brown to email Holly Hendersen & Rick Dressner Motorola’s response to the WNPO vendor letters that were sent in 2001.
7. **Item 0011 - Only a small number of companies have communicated their intent to test with the NPAC:** Need to follow up on this previously assigned item: 6/11/01 – **ACTION**: Anne Cummins will check with CTIA regarding future mailings to wireless carriers. As of 7/9/01 no response from CTIA, Anne to resend request.
8. **Item 0012 - Monitoring & Recording Wireless NPAC Turn-Up Testing Status:**
   1. Need to follow up on this previously assigned item: 12/10/01 - **ACTION:** Team member asked that NeuStar look into how many providers requested a test date that NeuStar could not support due to release 3.1 activities. (Gene Johnston) – just one provider as of 3/4/02. **ACTION:** NeuStar will continue to monitor this and provide status updates in its monthly reports.
   2. **ACTION:** At a minimum, NeuStar recommends that all SPs start the application process with NeuStar no later than July 1, 2002 to secure the necessary NeuStar resources in order to comply with the mandated dates. A carrier cannot begin participation in intercarrier testing until the application process is completed. **ACTION:** Jim Grasser and Brigitte Brown to wordsmith and provide proposed wording next month. **ACTION:** Add this to the timeline narrative and the WNPO decision/recommendation matrix (Jim Grasser & Brigitte Brown)
9. **Item 0013 – Intercarrier Testing:** 
   1. 1/7/02 – **ACTION:** The WNPO asked that the WTSC confirm with its members whether wireline SPs need to be involved in inter-carrier testing for pooling, even if porting is no longer required. – 3/4/02 Update – WTSC confirmed that testing with wireline for pooling is needed.
   2. 1/7/02 – **ACTION:** WNPO and WTSC members to review the call completion tests in the intercarrier test plan and provide contributions if there any further pooling tests that are needed. – 3/4/02: Jim Grasser to check.
10. **Item 0014 - Vendor (Clearinghouse) for Receiving/Submitting Requests for Opening codes for Porting:** The team closed this issue because all codes covered by the mandate within the new Top 100 MSAs (121 MSAs) will be opened as of 11/24/02, therefore the WNPO determined that there is no need for a vendor to handle BFR requests outside the new Top 100 MSAs.
11. **Item 0015 - Model for Forecasting Porting Activity (NPDB capacity): ACTION:** Maggie will email the final version of her NPDB model (updated in January 2002) to Brigitte Brown so that it can be distributed to the team.
12. **Item 0019 - Short Messaging Service:** 
    1. **ACTION:** Gene Johnston indicated that SMS standards documentation was sent out by T1S1 in January 2002 for final approval. The document is located on www.ATIS.org under the T1S1 January 2002 minutes. Gene Johnston will provide the document name.
    2. **ACTION:** Brigitte Brown to forward the following SMS standards documents out to the WNPO:
       1. *“TR-45 PN-4411 ANSI-41-D Enhancements for MDN Based Message Centers (Source: TR-45.2)”*
       2. *“TR-45 PN-4411 TIA/EIA-41-D Enhancements for Wireless Number Portability Phase III (WNP-PH3) (Source: TR-45.2.AHWNP)”*
    3. **ACTION:** Kathleen Tedrick & Rick Dressner to review SMS standards and document inadequacies.
    4. (This item falls under both 0019 & 0010) **ACTION:** Invite standards bodies (T1S1.3 and TR-45) via email to the April 2002 WNPO meeting with the following list of items that the WNPO would like them to address
       1. What Short Message Service scenarios are supported with number pooling / wireless number portability.
       2. Provide clarification on the new OAA standards.
       3. Provide clarification on standards relating to Cause Code 26.
       4. Provide clarification on any standards relating to wireless porting and pooling, also with respect to an inter-networking environment.

# MEETING MINUTES FROM DAY #2 (3/5/02):

## Approval of Revised Implementation Timeline/Guideline & Narrative for NANC

(See notes under Section D under Day 1 - 3/4/02)

## Approval of Proposed Help Desk Hours, Timers & Maintenance Windows

(See notes under Section F under Day 1 - 3/4/02)

## Discussion of Wireless Reseller Flows

1. The WNPO discussed wireless reseller flows, focusing primary on flow C (customers porting from one reseller to another reseller) and assigned the following action items and made the following decision:
   1. **DECISION:** The WNPO decided that the vote on wireless reseller flows (wireless to wireless only) should be postponed until the next WNPO meeting (April 2002), and that it will be the first item on the agenda (after new business) on Monday morning 4/8/02.
   2. The team clarified that there will be one vote per entity participating in the WNPO at the time of the vote. It was further clarified that reseller entities can participate in the vote.
   3. **ACTION:** Any additional contributions related to the wireless reseller flow discussion (including any suggestions for new flows) must be submitted to Jim Grasser no later than Friday March 22, 2002.
   4. **ACTION:** Facilities-based providers to speak with their resellers and internal resources that negotiate operating agreements with resellers prior to the April 2002 meeting in order to obtain input for the discussion and vote.
2. Below are some of the points (both opinions and facts) made by team members during the discussion of flows for customers porting from one reseller to another reseller:
   1. **Points regarding the original wireless flows documented in the Technical, Operational and Implementation Requirements (OPTION A):**

NNSP

ONSP

NLSP

OLSP

OLSP – Old Local Service Provider

NLSP – New Local Service Provider

ONSP – Old Network Service Provider

NNSP – New Network Service Provider

* + 1. These flows have already been adopted by the wireless industry and were included in the Technical, Operational and Implementation Requirements document in September of 2000.
    2. Many SPs have already developed to this design since this agreement was already reached in 2000. Modifying the flows would require those SPs to
    3. The NSP communicates with OSP, regardless of whether it is a reseller or a facility-based carrier. Two-way communication back and forth.
    4. There is no need for the facilities-based network service providers to communicate with one another for customers porting from one reseller to another reseller.
    5. Benefit – if the NLSP (reseller) sends a port request and gets no response, the NLSP will know which company to call to troubleshoot (old reseller).
    6. These flows would not force resellers to share their proprietary customer information with the facilities-based carriers. The alternative flow would require that this information be shared.
    7. For resolving troubles encountered during the ICP (for example if no response is received from the old reseller SP – keeping in mind that no response does not mean “default acceptance” of the port by the old reseller SP), with Option A the new reseller would contact the old reseller to resolve the problem. But Option B would require that the new reseller call the new facilities-based provider, who would then have to contact the old facilities-based provider, who would then have to handle the communication with the old reseller. So Option B would require many more communication paths to resolve an ICP trouble, whereas Option A has the new reseller communicate directly with the old reseller.
    8. A member pointed out that Option A would require less communication processes to be setup than Option B.
  1. **Points regarding the flows proposed in Sprint’s contribution - which is attached below (OPTION B):**

OLSP – Old Local Service Provider

NLSP – New Local Service Provider

ONSP – Old Network Service Provider

NNSP – New Network Service Provider

ONSP

NNSP

NLSP

OLSP



* + 1. The new SP reseller only communicates with their facilities–based SP, who then only communicates with the old facilities-based SP, who then communicates with the old SP reseller.
    2. Two resellers participated in the March 2002 WNPO meeting (WorldCom and Excel Wireless) and both indicated that as resellers they preferred Option B. Excel Wireless believed that Sprint PCS’ contribution represented the path of least resistance.
    3. WorldCom indicated that the ONSP (Old Network Service Provider) knows who its resellers are because they have a business relationship with them.
    4. A team member indicated that there is no system that ties a number to a reseller, so it is difficult to track which reseller is currently providing service to the customer.
    5. The LERG has NPA NXX tied to facilities-based providers, not the resellers.
    6. The facilities-based provider will know if the number is theirs or if it belongs to one of their resellers.
    7. The original flow would require resellers to have connectivity or a communications process in place with every reseller in that rate center. However with Sprint PCS’s recommendation, reseller-to-reseller communication is not required. The facilities-based SP just needs to communicate to the resellers with whom they already have agreements. So new resellers have to communicate with the new facilities-based carriers they already have agreements with, who then in turn communicate to the old facilities-based carriers, who then communicate with the old resellers with whom they already have agreements.
    8. A member pointed out that most resellers are small and will only support faxes.
    9. It was mentioned that the wireline industry struggled with wireline reseller flows for 4 years, so the wireless industry could learn from their experiences and adopt what they have chosen (flows that correspond with Sprint’s contribution).
    10. By selection Option B, the wireless industry would be in sync with the flows for the wireline industry.
  1. **Other points related to wireless reseller flow C (porting from one reseller to another):**
     1. In December 2001 a PIM was opened in the LNPAWG to accommodate wireless flows in the updated NANC flows.
     2. WorldCom indicated that they believe the original wireless flows to be discriminatory against resellers. However, another team member pointed out that reseller ports would be considered complex ports regardless of whether option A or B is selected, so option A cannot be considered discriminatory. Reseller involvement, involving multiple SPs, was already defined as a complex port.
     3. WorldCom indicated that Option A would place a huge burden on all resellers in order to establish communication between resellers. Another team member pointed out that the Option A flows, that had already been agreed upon by the wireless industry, have been available for over a year and a half, so resellers have had ample time to prepare to support Option A flows.
     4. A team member pointed out that the Option A flows were published at the NANC in September 2000. However, WorldCom pointed out that the Option A flows were never approved by the FCC. Another team member stated that the FCC indicated that it would not get down to the detailed level of reviewing and approving the wireless reseller flows.
     5. WorldCom indicated that 6 months ago, many SPs liked the idea of an ICP clearinghouse because they did not fathom connecting to many resellers. Another team member stated that the resellers could also connect to the clearinghouse. WorldCom responded that small resellers will not likely connect to a clearinghouse, and therefore communications would require faxing.
     6. Another suggestion was voiced: Communicating directly between the NLSP (New Local Service provider – who in this case is a reseller) to the ONSP (Old Network Service Provider – old facilities-based carrier). If the LERG has the NPA NXX mapped to the facilities-based carrier, then the NLSP (reseller) could identify the ONSP and communicate directly them, even if the OLSP (Old Local Service provider) is a reseller.
     7. A team member mentioned that the LNPAWG voted and opted to use the current wireline-only flows because wireless providers at that meeting abstained from voting. If the wireless vote were included, the voting scale would have been tipped and the current wireless flows would have been adopted for wireline.
     8. It was mentioned that resellers must abide by the rules in the agreement with their facilities-based service provider, which dictates how they will work together so that resellers can use the facilities-based SP’s network and numbers.
     9. WorldCom indicated that they communicated with the reseller association, and no reseller had voiced concerns related to sharing their proprietary customer information with the facilities-based resellers in order to support Option B.
     10. The point was made that perhaps the WNPO should consider inter-species flows while making a decision on wireless-to-wireless flows.

1. Note - This discussion only dealt with inter-carrier communications (ICP), not NPAC communications. It has already been decided that resellers should not connect to the NPAC, and this decision is not being questioned.

## Type 1 Trunk Conversions



1. The team reviewed the minutes from the 1/25/02 Type 1 Trunk Conversion conference call (attached below).
2. Ron Steen will be leading a team within Bell south to address Type 1 Trunk Conversions.
3. Team members indicated that it is unlikely that wireless SPs will want to request more Type 1 numbers from wireline SPs in the future.
4. Before any migration of numbers can take place, both companies affected should be in agreement and have all issues resolved.
5. **ACTION:** Ron Steen’s INC representative will take a contribution to INC to propose that the guidelines be adjusted to include this as a reason to allow for “transfer of ownership” of a 1K block.
6. **ACTION:** Ron Steen to provide a draft report on Type 1 Trunk conversions outlining the situation, issues, and proposed resolutions for discussion at the April 2002 meeting. The following issues should be considered:
   1. **ACTION:** Need to address tariff issues related to Type 1 Trunk conversions. (Ron Steen)
   2. **ACTION:** Need to address snapback issues related to Type 1 Trunk conversions. (Ron Steen)
   3. **ACTION:** Determine whether all numbers must be assigned in order to perform a “transfer of ownership”. (Ron Steen)
   4. **ACTION:** Determine if Type 1 trunk conversions are only possible where WLNP is supported. (Ron Steen)
7. **ACTION:** Team members to review Type 1 Trunk Conversion conversations and discuss them with your companies so that feedback can be provided at the April 2002 meeting. (Team)

## Phased Approach to Opening Codes for Porting – Gary Sacra & Gene Johnston

1. Gary Sacra proposed that the WNPO set a schedule by NPAC region and that all the wireless carriers participating in that region could set their codes as portable with an effective date agreed upon by the WNPO. However, he proposed that the schedule not include more than two NPAC regions per month.
2. Gary Sacra indicated the some carriers key off of the LERG effective date to begin related switch translation activities. Therefore it would pose significant issues if all SPs used the same effective date for all codes.
3. Some wireless SPs expressed concern with having to pay additional fees to their AOCN in order to stagger the rollout within an OCN. John Malyar indicated that he did not believe that Telcordia would assess additional fees for not marking all codes as open at the same time in the LERG. **ACTION:** John Malyar to confirm whether or not there is an additional cost for opening the codes in the LERG.
4. Another team member cautioned against delaying marking codes portable in the LERG
5. Gene Johnston presented the attached contribution to the team:
6. **ACTION:** The WNPO needs to ensure that agreement is reached with the Pooling Task Force (PTF) with respect to a phased approach for opening codes for porting. A joint conference call between the WNPO and PTF conference call has been scheduled for April 5th from 1:00 to 3:00 (eastern). The dial in information is 800-503-2899, Passcode 6046644. (Team)
7. **DECISION:** The team identified the following **common goals with respect to opening codes for porting**:
   1. Stagger volumes for LERG updates per NPAC region with effective dates no later than September 1st, 2002, in order to accommodate intra-service provider ports. Approximately two NPAC region per month should be rolled out.
   2. Enable SPs to go into the switches one time and set the triggers.
   3. Have all triggers set by 9/1/02.
   4. Consider costs for opening codes.
   5. Cannot do any porting until the NPAC effective date (plus 5 days) has passed.
   6. Need to define LRNs per switch / per NPAC region / per LATA (to accommodate correct toll charges) in the NPAC by 9/1/02. (**ACTION:** Need to submit a contribution to the WNPO for a potential INC contribution for a modification to the INC Guidelines to address LRNs being defined per NPAC region, in addition to per switch / per LATA [Gene Johnston].)
   7. Notes:
      1. Codes utilized for testing will need to be opened as needed in order to support test efforts.
      2. The NPAC broadcast occurs the day of the creation date, not the effective date.
      3. The effective date in the NPAC can be modified.
      4. NeuStar indicated that the traffic associated with opening the codes in the NPAC will not affect NPAC performance.
      5. If there is a delay in the implementation date, then SPs can change the effective dates for the codes being opened in the NPAC and the LERG.
8. Carriers may use the LERG effective date to drive marketing campaigns.
9. **ACTION:** Telcordia to provide a contribution indicating LERG update timelines.

## Other

1. **ACTION:** Maggie Lee to provide a contribution on “ICP Clearinghouse Interoperability Testing” for discussion at the April 2002 meeting.
2. **ACTION:** Team members to review and complete action items in the WNPO issues/action items list. (Team)
3. **ACTION:** Jim Grasser to send out notification for the next OBF wireless meeting.
4. **ACTION:** Jim Grasser to forward the current NENA E911 issues list to the WNPO.
5. CTIA will be hosting another Critical Issues Forum on May 22 and 23, 2002 at the Westin Grand in Washington DC.

# NEXT MEETING:

**April 8th 8:30am – 5:00pm (local time) and April 9th 8:30am – 5:00pm (local time) – Kansas City, MO - Sprint**

# FUTURE MEETINGS:

WNPO Dates: Location & Host:

May 13 – 14 Redmond, WA - AT&T Wireless

June 10 – 11 Atlanta, GA - AT&T

July 8 – 9 Chicago – U.S. Cellular

August 12 – 13 Vancover, BC - Canadian Consortium

September 16 – 17 Baltimore, MD - Verizon

October 14 – 15 Denver, CO - ESI

November 11 – 12 Atlanta, GA - Cox Communications

December 9 – 10 Las Vegas - Nextel Partners

# SUBSCRIPTION TO WNPO TEAM DISTRIBUTION LIST:

**To subscribe to the WNPO minutes, send an e-mail to** [majordomo@telecomse.com](mailto:majordomo@telecomse.com) **and in the body write <subscribe wireless\_ops>.**

**To remove yourself from the WNPO Team distribution list, send an e-mail to Majordomo@telecomse.com and in the body write <unsubscribe wireless\_ops>.**