# 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 (a division of AT&T Wireless) |
| Anne Cummins | AT&T Wireless | Jeff Adrian | Sprint PCS |
| Gene Johnston | NeuStar | Charlotte Holden | U.S. Cellular |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Jan Spitzer | Qwest Wireless |
| Maggie Lee | Illuminet | Stephen Addicks | WorldCom |
| Mary Briend | Sprint PCS | Karen Mulberry | WorldCom |
| Michael Wellington | Sprint PCS | Denise Thomas | WorldCom |
| Jasper Howe | Sprint PCS | Jean Anthony | Telecom Software |
| Kathleen Tedrick | Sprint | John Malyar | Telcordia |
| Scotty Parish | AllTel | Jason Loyer | Nextel |
| Patricia Smith | Voicestream Wireless | Jason Cope | Telesynthesis, Inc. |
| Mitch Kaufman | NCS Pearson | Rick Dressner | Sprint PCS |
| Anna Miller | Voicestream Wireless | Alex Heien | Excel Communications |
| Mike Panis | Evolving Systems | H.L. Gowda | AT&T |
| Paul Warga | Telcordia |  |  |
| **Participants via the Conference Bridge:** |  |  |
| Dave Garner | Qwest  | Liz Coakley | SBC Wireline |
| Steve Harvey | Sprint | Ron Steen | Bell South |
| Lori Messing | CTIA | Jaci Daniel | Alltel |
| Rick Jones | NENA | Melissa Flicek | Nextel Partners |
| Mark Wood | Cingular | Suzanne Stelmock | LTC International |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Lonnie Keck | AT&T Wireless |
| Beth West | Cingular | Kathy McGinn | Rural Cellular Corporation |
| Brittany Bowen | CTIA | Steve Hallbauer | CHR Solutions |
| Cheryl Gordon | AllTel | Jason Lee | WorldCom |
| Julie Neumann | AT&T Wireless | Alex Heien | Excel Communications |

# MEETING MINUTES FROM DAY #1 (4/8/02):

## Introductions and Agenda Review

Made introductions and reviewed agenda.

## Reviewed January, February & March 2002 Minutes

Team approved the January (v.04), February (v.03), and March 2002 (v.02) minutes.

## Introduction of New Business Items

1. NANC Letter to the FCC (dated 3/15/02):
	1. The team reviewed the letter (attached below) and concerns were expressed regarding the second paragraph, which states that “The purpose of this letter is to advise you that NANC has now been informed that there is a likelihood that some wireless carriers will, in fact, miss the deadline.” SPs felt that the WNPO’s report to the NANC in March 2002 may have been misinterpreted as the WNPO did not intend to communicate that the implementation deadline would be missed by any carriers, rather the WNPO intended only to notify the NANC that a milestone on the timeline was missed. The milestone related to critical network elements with WLNP software and hardware being available to SPs by 3/1/02.
	2. **DECISION:** Jim Grasser will include a clarification in the NANC report to indicate that the WNPO’s intent was not to communicate that carriers will miss the implementation deadline, rather a milestone was missed related to critical network elements with WLNP software and hardware being available to SPs by 3/1/02. Further, no SP has communicated that they will miss the implementation date. Additionally, it should be noted that the timeline is an industry-wide guideline, and it is assumed that individual SP’s internal schedules will vary as they work toward the 11/24/02 implementation deadline.
	3. The use of the word “jeopardy” was clarified to represent that there is a risk that something may not happen by the date specified.



1. FCC 3rd Order and NPRM (FCC 02-73):
	1. This order was released on 3/14/02. Comments are due in 30 days, and reply comments are due in 45 days.
	2. SPs were concerned about several items contained in this document:
		1. The FCC reversed its previous clarification that no BFRs are required within the Top 100 MSAs.
			1. Prior to this document being published, SPs assumed that they would need to open all codes within the Top 100 MSAs without any BFRs being issued.
			2. With the release of this document, the implication is that BFRs must now be submitted within the Top 100 MSAs.
			3. **ISSUE:** the minimum 9-month time period of issuing BFRs (as specified in the mandate) has passed (nine months prior to 11/24/02 is 2/24/02).
		2. The FCC is seeking comments on whether CMSAs should be included in the definition of the Top 100 MSAs.
			1. SPs were concerned from planning and implementation perspectives as they are uncertain what MSAs are part of the Top 100. For example, if BFRs will be required within the Top 100 MSAs there is uncertainty regarding for which MSAs and codes they need to be sent. Another concern expressed was how to determine which elements needed to be upgraded if it is uncertain whether or not they serve a Top 100 MSA.
		3. The FCC requested comments on whether carriers should be required to participate in pooling regardless of whether or not they are required to be LNP capable.
	3. **DECISION:** The issuance of the FCC 3rd Order on Reconsideration and NPRM (FCC 02-73) in March 2002 has caused uncertainty within the wireless industry. The WNPO has agreed upon the assumptions below in an effort to minimize the uncertainty and effectively manage the implementation of WLNP and pooling.
		* 1. Wireless service providers participating at the WNPO are agreeing to open all their codes within the Top 100 MSAs prior to 11/24/02 (without receiving a BFR), regardless of whether BFRs are required in the future. The original mandate specifies that BFRs must be submitted no less than nine months prior to implementation.
			2. Wireless service providers participating at the WNPO will assume the Top 100 MSAs are those defined in the 3rd NRO Report and Order – FCC 01-362 issued in December 2001 (including CMSAs).
			3. **Note:** Participating service providers are defined as those in attendance at the 4/8/02 WNPO meeting.
	4. The decision and wording above was approved by the WNPO on 4/8/02 & 4/9/02 and will be provided in the update to NANC.
	5. **ACTION:** Team members to provide the appropriate contact information for the WNPO BFR contact list.
2. Valid Reasons for Denying a Port-Out:
	1. There are reason codes that are used with denying a port-out. Need to make sure that the proper reason codes are captured in the ICP document.
	2. The team drafted the following tentative wording to be considered and approved for inclusion in the WNPO Decision/Recommendation Matrix: “If an MDN is assigned to a customer by a SP, that SP must allow the customer to port-out. Suspended accounts, collections issues, and fraud concerns would not constitute valid reasons to deny a customer to port-out.” **Note:** There were some SPs that had issues with this wording, however, the team worked to form this wording for further consideration.
	3. **ACTION:** Team members to email comments on the tentative wording by 4/19/02 to Jim Grasser and Brigitte Brown.
	4. **ACTION:** A conference call is scheduled for Monday, April 29th at 3:00pm eastern (800-503-2899; PIN 6046644) to discuss valid reasons for denying port-outs and the language that was drafted above. The LNPA WG members will also be invited to attend.
	5. Following are some of the points discussed on the topic:
		1. Some SPs mentioned that the WNPO may not be an appropriate forum for discussions on this matter.
		2. One SP mentioned that per 47 CFR 52.51(k) they understand that a prerequisite to a customer porting out is that they must actually be a current telecommunications service user, and therefore carriers do not have to port-out suspended accounts.
		3. Some SPs mentioned that if a customer account is suspended it is still considered active – and SPs should still allow it to port-out.
		4. If an account is suspended, one SP mentioned they were considering sending back a “resolution required”. Other SPs had issues with this.
		5. Some SPs indicated that they believe this to be an internal business process decision.
		6. Some team members indicated that they could not find documentation on whether SPs have to port-out a customer that has a suspended account.
		7. A SP indicated that if a customer is associated with a telephone number, then you must allow them to port out. This SP mentioned that they spoke with FCC lawyers to obtain clarification, and the response was that SPs could not hold customers/numbers hostage, it must be allowed to port out.
		8. A wireline SP indicated that they draw the line at the deactivation, anytime prior to the deactivation they must allow a port-out.
		9. One team member stated that reserved numbers can also be ported (only if they are associated with an active account).
3. Puerto Rico Regulatory Body Pooling & LNP Meeting - 3/21/02:

The regulatory body in Puerto Rico held a meeting on 3/21/02 to discuss the implementation of wireline and wireless portability and pooling. Following are the major updates:

* 1. The May 1, 2002 implementation date for wireline portability in Puerto Rico will probably be delayed. The new wireline portability implementation date will be set at a meeting on April 25, 2002.
	2. Currently, there are no ported wireline test numbers available for wireless carriers to begin testing Phase 1 of LNP at this point.
	3. The LEC in Puerto Rico (PRTC) indicated that they do not want to support default routing by the wireless carriers for the implementation of LNP Phase 1 (i.e. wireline portability).
1. Landline Test Numbers:
	1. In order to support the testing efforts, wireless carriers are requesting that wireline carriers publish test numbers.
	2. **ACTION:** Jim Grasser will forward a request to the LNPAWG that landline carriers provide test numbers to the WNPO.
2. Waiver Clarification:

A brief discussion was held to clarify the timeframes within which a waiver must be filed. Per the first report and order, paragraph 85, “In the event a carrier is unable to meet our deadlines for implementing a long-term number portability method, it may file with the Commission, **at least 60 days in advance of the deadline**, a petition to extend the time by which implementation in its network will be completed.

1. Reverse Billing Issues:
	1. Many reverse billing agreements with landline carriers are being dissolved prior to the implementation of wireless porting and pooling, due to the added complexity porting and pooling bring to these agreements. The issue presented here is that the removal of reverse billing arrangements will negatively impact the customer, as calls terminating to their mobile from a landline that previously were toll-free will now be assessed a toll charge.
	2. Reverse billing arrangements are such that wireless carriers pay the landline carrier a fee in order to allow landline terminations to their mobiles to be toll-free, where otherwise the landline caller would be assessed a toll charge.
	3. There are options available to the landline carriers to enable them to continue to support reverse billing arrangements after the launch of wireless porting and pooling.
		1. For example, wireline carriers could apply reverse billing to calls based on the LRN instead of the telephone number.
		2. Bell South indicated that it is looking into reverse billing options and have found that solutions are very expensive, and it is uncertain whether they will be able to make the necessary changes in order to continue offering reverse billing, so they may have to dissolve the current reverse billing agreements. LECs assign these agreements by NPA NXX, and if one MDN ports out to another wireless SP, then the LEC would still be charging the original wireless SP for the calls made to the ported MDN unless significant system changes are made.
	4. Some state PUCs require reverse billing to be supported by the LECs (e.g. Louisiana) – so this item needs to be addressed.
	5. An option available to wireless carriers is to obtain numbers from another rate center in order to ensure toll charges are not assessed on landline customers calling the wireless customers. However, this works contrary to number resource optimization efforts.
	6. One wireless SP mentioned that they have experienced problems with customers complaining when they perform an intra-LATA PIC change and the landline customers calling the wireless customer begin to be charged toll, where they did not previously when the PIC they used prior to the PIC change had a reverse billing agreement with the wireless carrier.
	7. LATA-wide calling is negatively impacted to due to the potential pooling of blocks within an NPA NXX. LATA-wide calling arrangements are based at the NPA NXX level.
	8. **ACTION:** Add a new item to the WNPO Issues list for reverse billing. (Brigitte Brown)
2. NPA Split Procedures:
	1. Gene Johnston discussed the NPA split procedures from a high level:
		1. There is a Methods and Procedures document specifying all of the NPA split procedures. It is located on the NPAC website (on the secure NPAC website under Documents – Methods & Procedures – Section for NPA NXX processing).
		2. It is the responsibility of the code holder to notify the NPAC via email of an NPA split.
			1. Block holders will be impacted if the code holder does not give the proper communication to the NPAC.
			2. For carriers that are going out of business, if they have codes that will be part of an NPA split and do not tell the NPAC then many people will be impacted. If another SP assumes responsibility of those codes, they must ensure they communicate with the NPAC regarding NPA splits.
		3. Per NPAC region, the NPAC will provide a notice about upcoming NPA splits, as communicated to the NPAC by the SPs.
		4. The NPAC only broadcasts the new NPA NXX. NPAC will accept SVs (subscription versions) with either the old or new NPA NXX, but will only broadcast the new.
		5. The LSMS has the responsibility to create both the old and the new NPA NXX and provide them to the NPDB.
		6. During the permissive dialing period individuals can dial either the old or new number.
		7. At the conclusion of permissive dialing, the NPAC deletes any records with the old NPA NXX. The LSMS has to delete the old NPA NXX as well.
	2. **ACTION:** Maggie Lee & Gene Johnston will revise a presentation on NPA Split Procedures for presentation at the May WNPO meeting.
	3. **ACTION:** Add a new item to the WNPO Issues list for NPA Split Procedures. (Brigitte Brown)

## Wireless Reseller Flows

1. Participants on the conference bridge at the time of this discussion included:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** |
| Dave Garner | Qwest  | Liz Coakley | SBC Wireline |
| Steve Harvey | Sprint | Ron Steen | Bell South |
| Frank Reed | Voicestream | Jaci Daniel | Alltel |
| Jason Lee | WorldCom | Melissa Flicek | Nextel Partners |
| David Gusky | Ascent | Valerie Arch | Verizon Wireless |
| Steve Trotman | Ascent | Brad Bloomer  | Onstar |
| Tom Williams | Tracfone | Chris Dobb | Onstar |
| Alec Lalanne  | WorldCom Wireless | Carol Kuglich  |  |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Wireless | Suzanne Stelmock | LTC International |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth |  |  |

1. **DECISION:** The WNPO took a vote on 4/8/02 and decided that **Option B** (as described in a contribution from Sprint attached below), an alternative wireless reseller flow, would be used instead of those documented in the Technical, Operational and Implementation Requirements document (Option A).

Following is a listing of the votes cast at the meeting. **Note:** Companies participating in the WNPO meeting (in person or via conference bridge) who do not appear in the table below abstained from voting.

| **Company** | **Vote** |
| --- | --- |
| Cingular  | Option A |
| Alltel | Option A |
| Voicestream | Option A |
| AWS | Option B |
| Excel | Option B |
| Nextel | Option B |
| Qwest | Option B |
| Sprint | Option B |
| US Cellular | Option B |
| Verizon | Option B |
| WorldCom | Option B |
| Tracphone | Option B |
| Onstar | Option B |

1. **ACTION:** Rick Dressner to provide a draft flow and narrative for Option B in the NANC format by COB 4/26/02, and the team will review them for discussion and final approval at the May meeting.



1. Attached above are the contributions that were provided and following are some of the items discussed on the topic:
	1. The team walked through each of the flows.
	2. Some of the prerequisites for Option A include:
		1. Wireless resellers must have OCNs. Currently resellers do not have OCNs and they would need to apply for them. This is a prerequisite for Option A only. Wireless resellers do not need a SPID.
		2. Option A also requires that a reseller have connectivity to, and contact information for, all resellers that it competes with and all network providers that it must do business with. Option B does not require this.
		3. Option A also requires an SLA / Operating agreement to define how to do business with other entities.
	3. Some general assumptions that were made:
		1. The reseller customer base represents 5% of the total wireless customer base.
		2. Only 5% of reseller port-ins are from another reseller, whereas the other 95% of port-ins are from facilities-based providers.
		3. Assume about 35% of ports will fallout of the ICP process, which must be handled manually.
	4. Option A assumes that the resellers resolve all ICP issues before communicating with the facilities-based provider.
	5. While the facilities-based carrier must get involved with manually handling the 35% fallout from the ICP for resellers for Option B, only 5% of all reseller ports are from a reseller to another reseller – where the facilities based carriers would be involved in the communication between two resellers.
	6. With Option B, for trouble resolution the New Reseller contacts the New Facilities-Based Provider, who then contacts the Old Facilities-Based Provider, who then contacts the Old Reseller. However, only 5% of the overall wireless customer base is with the resellers.
	7. With Option B, the new facilities-based provider is acting on behalf of the new reseller.
	8. Sprint and WorldCom clarified that with Option B, the New Reseller knows who the Old Facilities-Based Provider is as well as the New Facilities-Based Provider. Further, it was clarified that the New Reseller does contact the Old Facilities-Based Provider (e.g. via telephone, email, etc), so the New Facilities-Based Provider ONLY acts as a conduit, and fallout is handled by the reseller working with the Old Facilities-Based Provider. This provided some clarification for many wireless providers, and made Option B appear more attractive than before.
	9. With Option B, the New Reseller will have a means to know which New Facilities-Based Provider to send information through.
	10. WorldCom indicated that the communication between the reseller and facilities-based carriers is not necessarily dependent on faxing, rather the method of communication is dependent upon the contractual relationship, and WorldCom intends to support more automated means of communication other than fax.
	11. A team member mentioned that for a port-out from a reseller, if the Old Facilities-Based Provider can have a mechanized way of getting customer validation from the Old Reseller, then Option B becomes much more attractive to wireless carriers.
	12. Question was posed related to Option B and how the old and new reseller agree upon a due date and time – answer is through the Facilities-Based Provider’s ICP process.
	13. Sprint pointed out that while Option A has been documented as the adopted wireless reseller flow since September 2000, Sprint has been trying to begin discussions on alternative flows since February 2001.
	14. With Option B as the new chosen option, the Technical, Operational and Implementation Requirements document must be revised.

## Letter to LLC re: Matrix of Proposed Help Desk Hours, Business Day & Maintenance Windows

1. The team reviewed and approved the following letter to be sent to the LLC. The minor edits made by the team have been incorporated.
2. **ACTION:** Letter and matrix listing the proposed help desk hours, wireless business days, and maintenance windows need to be sent to the LLC. (Jim Grasser)



## NeuStar Update – Gene Johnston

1. Testing Updates:
	1. NeuStar has received 11 new applications since last month.
	2. During the last month, four carriers completed their interconnect plan indicating how they will connect to the NPAC.
	3. One additional carrier completed turn-up testing this month (Triton PCS). Another carrier is working firewall issues before it can begin testing.
	4. One SOA Service Bureau is scheduled to begin testing shortly.
	5. There are two carriers that have notified the NPAC of their intent to test, but have not set a test date yet.
2. SPID & OCN Clarifications:
	1. A SPID is based on an OCN chosen by the carrier. OCNs are obtained from NECA.
	2. Once a SPID is created in the NPAC it “lives forever” and cannot be removed from the NPAC.
	3. Everything in the NPAC is based on the SPID.
	4. Currently, the systems do not support moving information from one SPID to another. There is a proposed change entitled ”mass update” (NANC change order 323) being reviewed at LNPA WG, which would support this capability.
	5. The inability to perform “mass updates” on the SPID presents significant issues when companies sell properties and for mergers/acquisitions.
	6. SPs were encouraged to join the NAPM LLC so that they can vote on change order 323 for “mass updates”.
	7. SPs cannot delete an NPA NXX if there is at least one SV that is active or pending.
	8. SPs cannot delete a SPID if there are any NPA NXXs under them.
	9. Advice: choose OCNs wisely.
	10. **ACTION:** Add the SPID & OCN concerns to the WNPO Issues list for tracking purposes. (Brigitte Brown)
3. 3.1 Rollout Schedule:
	1. The April 8th date was not met due to complications with the EMC file system. Power Path on the EMC has since been upgraded from release 2.0 and 2.1 and no problems have been encountered in the last five days.
	2. The next region is scheduled to implement release 3.1 on April 22nd.
	3. On 4/9/02, the LLC will reexamine the order of the remaining regions. However, it is likely that the Southwest region will convert to 3.1 on June 24th and all other regions will remain the same. In other words, the April 8th date would be skipped over and a June 24th date would be added at the end of the schedule so that the implementation date changes for only one region (as opposed to all five remaining) in order to minimize the impact to the schedule.

## Type 1 Number Conversions – Ron Steen

1. The team reviewed the following Type 1 Migration document contributed by Ron Steen.
2. Following are some of the items discussed:
	1. Use porting for a partial block. Bell South felt it would be less complex to allow the numbers to “snap-back” to the code or block holder if they were ported for Type 1 conversion to Type 2.
	2. Current INC Guidelines have the following conditions for transfer of ownership:
		1. All 1000 TNs are assigned and/or reserved for a single customer.
		2. The customer has ported all 1000 TNs to another SP that is not the block holder.
		3. Both SPs involved must mutually agree to the transfer of the thousands block.
		4. The block must be donated to the pool and assigned by the Pooling Administrator. In other words, the block is not native to the current block holder.
		5. All these conditions must be met in order to transfer an assigned block between two SPs.
	3. How do you identify who the new SP will be when you transfer ownership? There are a series of forms that have to be completed to identify the SP. The block does not get donated to the pool, it is simply a transfer of ownership (but it uses pooling in order to accomplish this transfer – so if you have subsequent ports they will snapback to the new owner).
	4. Ron Steen’s INC representative is ready to present the document to INC if the group agrees to the approach.
	5. A team member asked that section 8 (Extended Area Service and Other Dialing/Billing Arrangements) needs to be expanded. However, Ron explained that his intent was to create something generic enough to serve as a guide, yet still allow the individual carriers make their own decisions on a case-by-case basis.
3. Team members were asked to review the Type 1 Migration document Monday evening 4/8 for further discussion on Tuesday 4/9 of suggested additions or modifications.
4. **ACTION:** Ron Steen to put together final version of the Type 1 Migration document for the May meeting then pass it along to the LNPAWG.
5. Following are discussion points from Day #2 4/9/02:
	1. Section 2.1 Type 1 Interconnection Paragraph 5:
		1. A team member asked whether SS7 was in place for some Type 1 arrangements. Ron Steen indicated that SS7 is not used for Type 1, but there are workarounds in place to support Caller ID (although not through SS7 – rather using ISDN as stated in a footnote in the document).
		2. **ACTION:** Ron Steen will clarify the 5th paragraph in section 2.1 addressing MF vs. SS7 for Type 1, and how advanced services are supported (using ISDN arrangements).
		3. Ron Steen is not certain whether the GAP field is delivered using the ISDN arrangement, and while he will not be able to look into this further, he will point out the variation using ISDN.
	2. Section 3.4 – wireless carriers need to know that they must port before the implementation date – and this section captures what the wireless carriers get out of this arrangement.
	3. Not having a clear definition of Top 100 MSAs causes further confusion as carriers cannot be sure of which areas Type 1 conversions are needed. However, another member pointed out that soon after the implementation, BFRs outside of the Top 100 will eventually require the conversions to happen everywhere. Additionally, the WNPO has made an assumption of what the Top 100 MSAs are - including the CMSAs.
	4. Mutual agreement is necessary between the wireless and wireline carriers.
	5. **ACTION:** Team members should send comments on Ron Steen’s Type 1 Migration document to Jim Grasser no later than April 19th. Ron has requested that any comments be typed into the Word document with the tracking utility turned on. Based on the scope of the comments, it will be determined if we want to have a conference call to discuss the input further. The conference call is tentatively scheduled for May 1st from 4:00pm – 5:00pm eastern to review the comments. Bridge information is as follows: 800-503-2899; PIN 6046644.
	6. It was recommended by a team member that carriers using type 1 numbers as the only numbers on a switch get together and think through how they plan to handle the migration. They may not want to use porting to support this effort, as they will slowly deplete their number inventory when the numbers snapback.
	7. **ACTION:** Carriers outside of the Top 100 MSAs to put together a paragraph to add to Ron Steen’s Type 1 Migration document to address their unique situation.
	8. If the block is pooled (or if “transfer of ownership” is utilized) – then the number will snapback to wireless carrier.
	9. A team member brought up the following idea for partial blocks: The wireline company could transfer the ownership of that block to the wireless carrier, then the wireline carrier could port numbers in to itself, and then when the wireline numbers disconnected they would snapback to the wireless carrier. Ron Steen indicated that Bell South would not be willing to support this.
	10. Need to think about the implications on the Telephone Number Inventory and how type 1 numbers are handled in the TNI based on the processes defined in this document.
	11. A team member brought up the FCC Auditing program rules, and mentioned that carriers must be in sync with this process.
	12. Some of the wireline carriers confirmed that they are still providing partial blocks of Type 1 numbers. Bell South indicated that they will provide blocks of 20 TNs.

# MEETING MINUTES FROM DAY #2 (4/9/02):

## Nominations/Elections for WNPO Co-Chairs

1. WNPO Co-chair elections will be held at the May meeting.
2. **ACTION:** Send in nominations for co-chairs by April 19th.

## WTSC (Wireless Testing Subcommittee) Update – Mark Wood

1. The WTSC met in Virginia last week and reviewed the rest of the test plan. The WTSC will have a clean version of 1.5, with the SMS and 911 test cases, to send out after the NENA meeting in Washington DC on 4/16 & 4/17.
2. The WTSC no longer needs multiple day meetings to accomplish its remaining tasks, so it will be merged into the WNPO beginning in May. The WTSC is asking for 1.5 hours on the agenda Monday afternoons. The option will remain open for break-out sessions on Tuesdays if needed.
3. **ACTION:** Mark Wood to request that WTSC participants look into their state requirements related to 911 so that it can be reviewed at the May meeting.
4. Jennifer Chartraw is no longer with AT&T Wireless and will no longer be serving as the WTSC Co-chair.

## Type 1 Number Conversions – Ron Steen

(See notes under Section G under Day 1 – 4/8/02)

## Staggered Approach to Opening Codes in the LERG & NPAC

1. The team reviewed the items discussed on the 4/5/02 conference call (see the conference call minutes below).
2. The team modified the common goals with respect to opening codes for porting that were established at the March 2002 meeting. The wording in blue is what was agreed upon in March, the changes made on 4/9/02 are in red:
	1. Stagger volumes for LERG updates per NPAC region with effective dates no later than ~~September~~ October 1st, 2002, in order to accommodate intra-service provider ports. ~~Approximately two NPAC region per month should be rolled out.~~
	2. The NPAC notification must be staggered – not the NPAC effective dates.
	3. The LERG effective dates must be staggered – not the LERG notification dates.
	4. Carriers should stagger the input into the LERG and NPAC. Carriers should provide the input by OCN. The LERG effective dates should be every two weeks for seven groups of approximately 20 NPAs. The first group of NPAs should have an effective date in July.
	5. The NPA groups will begin with the Native Block Pooling catch up NPAs, followed by traditional pooling NPAs.
	6. The LERG notification must be submitted by mid-May for an effective date of July 1, 2002.
	7. Carriers should utilize the WNPO defined schedule regardless of any potential changes to the porting implementation date.
	8. NOTE: The schedule will only apply to codes that carriers are not utilizing for internal and/or intercarrier testing. For codes that are utilized for testing, carriers will be opening them up in the NPAC and LERG earlier and those activities will not be bound by the schedule.
	9. NOTE: Carriers need to ensure they open the codes in the correct NPAC region.
	10. ~~Send notification to the LERG and NPAC at the same time (effective dates may vary in the LERG vs. the NPAC).~~
	11. Must be in the NPAC a minimum of 5-days prior to becoming effective in the NPAC (and 5 days prior to a SP’s intent to perform intra-service provider porting).
	12. The codes must be opened in the NPAC for intercarrier testing.
	13. Carriers use the LTI or SOA to open codes in the NPAC, or NeuStar can do it on behalf of the customer (for a charge of $15 per code, and $15 per LRN).
	14. The effective dates do not need to sync up between the LERG and NPAC.
	15. Enable SPs to go into the switches one time and set the triggers.
	16. Have all triggers set by ~~9~~10/1/02.
	17. ~~Consider costs for opening codes.~~
	18. Cannot do any porting until the NPAC effective date (plus 5 days) has passed.
	19. Need to define LRNs per switch, per LATA in the NPAC by 9/1/02.
	20. 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.
	21. **ACTION:** By 4/10/02, Jim Grasser & Brigitte Brown will develop a document clarifying the staggered approach for the NPAC notification dates and LERG effective dates, along with the associated NPAs – and propose that the Pooling Task Force include it in their Pooling Transition Plan.
	22. **ACTION:** A Conference Call is scheduled for 11:00am – 12:00 eastern Tuesday April 23rd (Bridge information is as follows: 800-503-2899; PIN 6046644) to finalize the schedule for NPAC notification and LERG effective dates.
	23. **ACTION:** What are the limitations, if any, to the amount of time over which carriers can notify NPAC about opening codes in the NPAC. How restrictive is the NPAC notification process? (Gene Johnston)

## Standards Bodies Presentations

1. **Bob Hall – Chairman of T1S1 – SBC –** **bhall@tri.sbc.com** **- 512-372-5842**
	1. Presentation is attached below:



* 1. Four TRQs have been published related to porting and pooling – TRQ 1-4
	2. [www.t1.org](http://www.t1.org) -- allows one free download per document per email address.
	3. Current Issues that are not included in the current documents:
		1. Adding support of ETS (Emergency Telecommunication Services) to several documents.
		2. Use of JIP. For SS7 there is a JIP but T1S1 does not specify what to put in it.
			1. JIP is currently optional for SS7 ISUP signaling, but in operations it is not optional – SPs must use JIP. Many are talking about making it mandatory in the standards.
			2. JIP – originally identified the originating switch and the jurisdiction.
			3. Wherever the numbers reside – is where the JIP is identified.
		3. Billing issues continue to arise
		4. Addition of third party number check to operator services - wireless could be considered a third party.
	4. There are billing SMEs participating in T1S1 who look at issues from a message/call record format perspective.
	5. Individuals can request that new items be addressed at T1S1. If it is a technical issue they will address it, otherwise they refer all billing issues that are business issues to OBF. T1S1 tries to remain purely technical.
	6. Future Work – no further work scheduled beyond ETS changes. If the WNPO has issues that it would like T1S1 to work on then the WNPO can refer the issues to T1S1.
	7. The original standard for call completion to a portable number has come up for reaffirmation (5 years since it was created). T1S1 is deciding if it needs to reaffirm the standards or whether changes are needed. T1S1 is requesting any groups of individuals to send them any items that might be considered problem areas.
	8. Individuals are welcome to call or email Bob with any requests for interpretation of the standards.
1. **Terry Watts – Chairman of TR-45.2: Wireless Intersystem Technology**
	1. Presentation is attached below:
	2. Porting and pooling related documents include:
		1. IS-756 – Published March 1998
		2. IS-756 A – for call completion to ported wireless numbers
		3. IS-841 – MDN Based Message Centers – Sept 2000;
		4. IS-786 Automatic Code Gapping – Sept 2000; Phase 3 Support for Overload Control
	3. If a call comes in, can do a LOC REQ to the HLR or a dip to the NPDB.
	4. Cause Code 26:
		1. If a call is routed to a SP with the wrong LRN, the SP will send a Release with cause code 26.
		2. ISSUE – Alltel mentioned that a wireless switch vendor incorrectly indicated that this was not in the standards, when it is part or the standards.
	5. ISSUES:
		1. Emergency Service Calls to ported or pooled numbers – they need a query to be performed, but with the current standards it indicates that a query is not required for calls to 911.
		2. Release with cause code 26 for pooled numbers – ISSUE – IS-756 did not address pooled numbers, so there is a case where it would falsely return cause code 26.
	6. IS-841 addresses SMS:
		1. SMS – a destination point code has to be entered into the SV in the NPAC (which gets downloaded to the NPDB).
		2. TR45.2 is not currently addressing interoperability for SMS (e.g. Cross-carrier TDMA to CDMA SMS – who performs the dip?). Anyone can make a contribution to TR45.2 and request that it take on this issue.
		3. Translations Type 12 – Short Message MIN based
		4. Translations Type 11 – NP Req (LRN type query)
		5. Translations Type 17- MDN based
	7. Any company or the WNPO can make a contribution to the standards groups.
	8. Discussion of flows for mobile to mobile SMS (MO/MT – Mobile originated/mobile terminated)
		1. Originating message center (SMSC) uses TT 17 in message that it launches to the NPDB.
		2. For all SMS messages the SMSC must launch a message to the NPDB for a destination point code. If there is no entry in the NPDB then the SMSC must use a default destination point code.
		3. The SMSC must send a query for EVERY SMS message, unless the SMSC stores a list of NPA NXXs that are open for porting.
		4. If you have the MDN to MSID relationship in the SMSC, then a carrier can determine which HLR (if there are multiple HLRs) that customer resides in.
	9. **ACTION:** Lori Messing will provide CTIA’s requirements for SMS interoperability (traffic exchange agreement) – which will be sent out to the team.

## NPDB Storage Capacity & Throughput Model – Anne Cummins

1. The team reviewed Anne Cummins’ updated NPDB Storage Capacity & Throughput Model (see attachment below).
2. The growth rates were provided by NeuStar. The growth rates are declining, however the base is growing.
3. The number of wireless subscribers for 2001 were pulled from the CTIA website.
4. “% new ported numbers” assumes that some of the numbers that are in the NPDB are part of the churn. So this row shows only the new entries in the database.

## Finalize Implementation Guideline/Narrative Update for NANC (3:00pm central)

1. Following is the narrative wording for the update to NANC that the WNPO team agreed upon.

**WIRELESS NUMBER PORTABILITY AND POOLING**

**IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINE**

**Update as of 4/9/02**

Milestone: Critical Network Elements Available – targeted for completion 3/02

Status:

* Some vendor software has been made generally available, and service providers are performing initial testing.
* Some vendor software is currently being tested and should soon become generally available.

Milestone: NPAC Agreement Complete – targeted for completion 7/02

Status:

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. The completion of the NeuStar application process is one of the prerequisites for participating in intercarrier testing.

To date 24 wireless service providers have filed applications with NeuStar. In addition, eleven more service providers (at least three of which are wireless) have submitted applications to NeuStar in the month of March.

Milestone: Intercarrier Test Logistics – targeted for completion 10/02

Status: The intercarrier test calendar was updated with an additional wireless carrier; there are now seven wireless carriers and one wireline carrier represented. Intercarrier testing is currently planned within 27 CMSAs/MSAs.

1. Some team member suggested that all previous reports to NANC be attached along with the latest update for historical information. After some discussion it was decided that the backup documentation would render the report cumbersome and confusing, and that historical documentation could simply be provided upon a request from NANC.
2. The team decided that the reports should list “Update as of MM/DD/YY” instead of a revision number at the top of the reports.
3. The team decided that the reports should list the milestones from the timeline along with status on the individual milestones.
4. CTIA will follow up with the carriers and provide a generic report indicating progress with various critical network elements without revealing the vendor names.
	1. **ACTION:** Develop a format for carriers to provide status updates to CTIA on their network element upgrades. (Jim Grasser, Brigitte Brown, Anne Cummins, Charlotte Holden)
	2. **ACTION:** SPs to review the status report format for critical network element upgrade status and provide feedback to CTIA.
	3. **ACTION:** SPs to provide CTIA with status of their critical network elements (MSC, HLR/VLR, LSMS) in the draft format developed in May.

## WNPO Troubleshooting Guidelines & Contacts

1. **ACTION:** SPs need to update their contacts on the NIIF website.
2. **ACTION:** Jim Grasser will send out instructions on how to update that information on the NIIF website.
3. **ACTION:** SPs to provide contact information for 3rd party LNP trouble reports. The WNPO will distribute this list on the NPAC website.

# NEXT MEETING:

**May 13th 8:30am – 5:00pm (local time) and May 14th 8:30am – 5:00pm (local time) – Redmond, WA – AT&T Wireless**

# FUTURE MEETINGS:

WNPO Dates: Location & Host:

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 **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>.**