July LNPA Working Group Meeting

**ACTION ITEMS:**

The following ACTION ITEMS are contained throughout these meeting minutes and are compiled and highlighted here to ensure they are readily recognized.

1. In response to a question from the LNPA to the WNPO asking for the WNPO’s definition of “porting activity” with regard to the maintenance window, Jim Grasser reported that the WNPO agreed with the definition in the 6/02 LNPA draft minutes, but questioned if it should also include audits. **H. L. Gowda, AT&T**, took an ACTION ITEM to rewrite the Maintenance Window document that resulted from PIM 2 to add audits and recovery requests. This will reviewed at the August LNPA meeting.
2. Dave Garner, Qwest, requested that NeuStar discuss the impacts of new service providers’ LSMSs coming up and down in production. **NeuStar** took an ACTION ITEM to discuss at the August WNPO.
3. With regard to the M&P for NANC 356, **Rob Coffman, NeuStar**, took an ACTION ITEM to provide a timeline at the next NAPM/LLC meeting for when all existing SPIDs will be identified and broadcast. This timeline will also be distributed to the LNPA. Advanced notification will be sent to users announcing the timeframe over which these changes will be made.
4. The notifications containing the service provider name with the new delimiter are not recoverable. **NeuStar** took an ACTION ITEM to include a step in the NANC 356 M&P to create a Bulk Data Download (BDD) file with the initial Network Data changes. The BDD will be for Network Data. Only the SPID file is necessary to be downloaded from the FTP site. **Rob Coffman, NeuStar**, also took an ACTION ITEM to investigate if new entities can be identified on the NPAC secure website ongoing for any service provider that may have missed the broadcast.
5. **Rob Coffman, NeuStar**, took an ACTION ITEM to modify the Turn-up Testing Requirements document and distribute it to the team. See section in these minutes on Turn-up Testing Requirements for agreed upon changes.
6. With respect to the M&Ps for Reassociation, **Rob Coffman, NeuStar**, took the following ACTION ITEMS.
7. Add note to M&P explaining if a service provider’s SOA and LSMS are on the same router, the service provider must hold off bringing up their SOA by manually taking it off-line.
8. Confirm that the ILECs’ SOA and LSMS systems are on different routers.
9. Check with NeuStar network SMEs to see if service providers’ systems can be put on separate routers in cases where they currently are on the same router.
10. Per H. L. Gowda’s request (AT&T), change the title of the document to read, “**Methods and Procedures for Service Providers Reassociation to the NPAC After Extended Region Service Unavailability Due to NPAC Outage**.”
11. PIMs 14 and 15 – At the request of the LNPA, Barry Bishop, NeuStar Pooling Administrator, has modified the CO Code Transfer process document to specify that the new LERG-assignee is not required to take all ten 1K blocks when a code with active ported numbers is transferred and pooled. **LNPA members** have an ACTION ITEM to come prepared to the August meeting to discuss the attached proposed changes and finalize the document.



1. In the definition of Backwards Compatibility, the group agreed to modify the last sentence of the 3rd bullet to read, “Also, no NPAC software changes may be made to any existing interface functionality that will require source code modifications to SOA and/or LSMS platforms.” **John Nakumura, NeuStar**, took an ACTION ITEM to make the changes and redistribute to the team.
2. Dave Garner, Qwest, asked how long upon request for a BDD during business hours will the BDD be available on the requesting service provider’s FTP site. **Rob Coffman, NeuStar**, took an ACTION ITEM to follow up with the answer.
3. Charles Ryburn, SBC, reported on a discussion that took place in the National Number Portability Operations (NNPO) team related to porting after a code is returned from a carrier going out of business and scheduled for disconnect**. Charles Ryburn, SBC**, took an ACTION ITEM to follow up on the exact scenario and determine why Gene Johnston, NeuStar, recommended a Change Order to put a freeze on porting in the NPAC for this scenario.
4. Industry recovery testing is taking place during the weeks of 7/15 and 7/22. The value of this testing was questioned by some due to the inability to recreate the problem. ESI has been able to recreate the problem with little difficulty**. Ron Stutheit, ESI**, took an ACTION ITEM to check with his test engineers to see what test cases were run to recreate the problem. Since all vendors present in the meeting use the DSET toolkit, Ron will share aspects of any toolkit investigations and changes. At this point, it is unclear if this is a Marbin stack issue, a toolkit problem, or OS implementation.
5. Dave Garner, Qwest, questioned how we will come to any conclusions if we don’t have a coordinator to serve as a data collector for the recovery testing that is taking place. **Rob Coffman, NeuStar**, took an ACTION ITEM to follow up and request that participating service providers provide summaries of their test results. Rob will compile these summaries and report them to the LNPA.
6. Jim Rooks, NeuStar, stated that a fix is in development that will return a “Criteria Too Large” notification if a service provider system requests the same timeframe again during recovery. The fix will need to be tested and put in a point release. This will require service provider testing. **Jim Rooks, NeuStar**, took an ACTION ITEM to send out an explanation of the change to the LNPA distribution.
7. NANC 319 – The current requirements do not allow for NPAC personnel to manually populate the LATA ID for an NXX code. Gary Sacra, Verizon, questioned if this was prudent in the event it was not populated in the LERG and an emergency port within that NXX needed to be performed. The question was then raised if it is actually possible to have an NXX in the LERG without a LATA ID. **Gary Sacra, Verizon**, took an ACTION ITEM to follow up with the answer.
8. **Service providers** have an ACTION ITEM to work with their vendors and local system support teams to determine if their local systems will be able to implement NANC 323 functionality on 3/4/03, the start of Release 3.2 service provider turn-up testing, and if not, what would be a reasonable sunset period for when they will be ready. Service providers should be prepared to discuss at the August LNPA. **Charles Ryburn will send a notice out to the LNPA distribution and request that NeuStar send out the same notice to their service provider distribution.**
9. Dave Cochran, BellSouth, asked where in requirements does it state that service providers must be able to accept a Bulk Data Download (BDD). Rob Coffman, NeuStar, stated it is a requirement for continued certification testing in Section 2 of Statement of Work (SOW) 24. **Rob Coffman, NeuStar**, took an ACTION ITEM to see if BDD test cases exist in the standard regression tests suite and 3.1 test plan, and if not, he will see that the appropriate test cases are included in the 3.2 test plan.
10. To Be Added to August Agenda:
11. Begin development of Release 3.2 documentation (M&Ps, Test Cases, etc.)
12. It was suggested that we may want to consider forming a sub-group to develop requirements for any Change Orders related to recovery and interface throughput. This will be discussed and determined at the August LNPA meeting.

**Meeting Minutes:**
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6/02 Minutes Review:



* On Page 2, last bullet under WNPO Report: Change the 3rd sentence in bullet to read, “Both MDN and MIN contact info (company name, contact no., where available) would be returned for the 10-digit number, but no mapping between MDN and MIN would be provided.” Delete the 4th sentence entirely (“MIN info returned is not the MIN of the 10-digit number but the MIN that IS the entered number.”).
* On Page 3, under PIM 6: Change 1st sentence to read, “NENA has developed a standard that will enable the new service provider to migrate a customer record into the 911 database without it first being unlocked by the old service provider when numbers are ported.” Change the 2nd sentence to read, “The LNPA approved this standard at the June meeting.”
* On Page 6, under Service Provider Maintenance Window: Add a 3rd paragraph which states, “The LNPA agreed to modify the Service Provider Maintenance Window document to capture the adjusted window timeframes and additional porting activity definitions.”

Wireless Number Portability Operations (WNPO) Committee Report:

* Jim Grasser, WNPO Chair, reported that the June WNPO meeting minutes were not approved due to pending changes.
* Jaci Daniel, ALLTEL, provided contributions on the Trouble Reporting Log. More updates will be provided next month.
* No additions have been submitted to Groups 8, 9, and 10 on the Wireless NPA code opening schedule. These groups were added to the schedule to address portable codes in addition to those opened to pooling. The TRA will proceed with the LERG updates in August.
* Wireless Reseller Flows – The Wireless Reseller Flows are now out for final comment. The proposed flows have been sent to both the WNPO and LNPA distributions. Comments are due by 7/31/02. The flows will again be reviewed at the August WNPO, and barring any major changes, the LNPA will incorporate the wireless reseller flows into the main NANC LNP Provisioning flows at the August LNPA meeting.
* Inter-carrier testing is scheduled to begin the week of 7/15 in Las Vegas and continue for 6 weeks. A few more dates have been added to the inter-carrier testing schedule. Only 2 wireline companies have provided test numbers.
* NeuStar reported that 3 new NDAs were signed in June (1 wireless company). Thirty-one wireless providers have now signed Non-Disclosure Agreements (NDAs). Ten carriers or Service Bureaus have requested NPAC testing dates, including the 4 that have completed NPAC testing.
* It appears that all companies will be compliant with the Number Portability Direction Indicator (NPDI) on the LSR even if they are not up on LSOG 5.
* A ½ day of next month’s WNPO meeting will be reserved for discussion of options on rehoming wireless codes. Jim Grasser will distribute White Paper.
* In response to a question from the LNPA to the WNPO asking for the WNPO’s definition of “porting activity” with regard to the maintenance window, Jim Grasser reported that the WNPO agreed with the definition in the 6/02 LNPA draft minutes, but questioned if it should also include audits. H. L. Gowda, AT&T, took an ACTION ITEM to rewrite the Maintenance Window document that resulted from PIM 2 to add audits and recovery requests. This will reviewed at the August LNPA meeting.
* Dave Garner requested that NeuStar discuss the impacts of new service providers’ LSMSs coming up and down in production. NeuStar took an ACTION ITEM to discuss at the August WNPO.
* NENA submitted a contribution to make the Number Portability Direction Indicator (NPDI) on the LSR required on all wireline to wireless ports so the wireline service provider knows to delete the ALI database record. This will be discussed at the August WNPO.

## M&P for NANC 356:

Rob Coffman, NeuStar, led a discussion on the M&Ps for NANC 356, which is the interim solution for identifying wireline vs. wireless providers. Rob stated that there are currently 30 wireless and 400+ wireline service providers identified and named in NPAC.

* Requirement RR4.4 in the FRS spec stipulates that the information is to be broadcast over the interface.
* NeuStar asked if the LNPA wants existing wireline providers identified with the /1 delimiter or just existing wireless with the /2, and then ongoing with any new wireline and wireless carriers. The LNPA consensus is the following:

1. Add a /3 delimiter for “other” (i.e. any entity that is not a service provider, such as a Service Bureau),
2. Identify all existing SPIDs with the appropriate delimiter, and ongoing, any new entities.

* Rob Coffman took an ACTION ITEM to provide a timeline at the next NAPM/LLC meeting for when all existing SPIDs will be identified and broadcast. This timeline will also be distributed to the LNPA. Barring any problems, this process should be completed by 11/24/02. Advanced notification will be sent to users announcing the timeframe over which these changes will be made.
* The notifications containing the service provider name with the new delimiter are not recoverable. NeuStar took an ACTION ITEM to include a step in the M&P to create a Bulk Data Download (BDD) file with the initial Network Data changes. The BDD will be for Network Data. Only the SPID file is necessary to be downloaded from the FTP site. Rob Coffman also took an ACTION ITEM to investigate if new entities can be identified on the NPAC secure website ongoing for any service provider that may have missed the broadcast.

Turn-up Testing Requirements:

Rob Coffman, NeuStar, also led the LNPA in a discussion of the draft requirements document for turn-up testing (see attached).



* The review led to the following changes to the draft document:
* In the 1st paragraph, 1st sentence, remove the phrase, “or anytime that a change is made to a Service provider’s system.” The 1st sentence should now read, “Turn-Up Testing, which includes new NPAC SMS software release functionality testing and regression testing, must be performed on a Service Provider’s SOA/LSMS software anytime that a change is made to the interface (GDMO or ASN.1) of the NPAC SMS.”
* Change Scenario 1 to read, “When a local product (SOA/LSMS) is compiled with the current interface model, and a new local feature (SOA/LSMS feature) is implemented that does NOT involve a change in the use of the interface model, and the NPAC SMS is compiled with the current model, then Turn-Up Testing is optional. Test cases to be performed are at the discretion of the service provider [**standard regression test cases**].”
* Change Scenario 3 to read, “When a local product is compiled with the new interface model, and no new local features implemented that involve the interface, and the NPAC SMS is compiled with the new interface model, then Turn-Up Testing is required [**standard regression test cases**].”
* Change Scenario 5 to read, “When a local product is compiled with the current interface model, and new local features are implemented that involve the interface, and the NPAC SMS is compiled with the current model, then Turn-Up Testing is required [standard regression test cases and **new functionality test cases**].”
* In Scenario 5, remove the note that reads, “Note: the regression test cases would have been addressed when the vendor upgraded the local product to the current version of the interface model.”

Rob Coffman took an ACTION ITEM to modify the document and distribute it to the team.

* Gary Sacra, Verizon, asked how a service provider would test any change related to failover software. Rob replied that the service provider would have to test during the quarterly failover testing that is conducted during the maintenance window. There is no backup NPAC test bed to which to fail over. In production, an individual service provider cannot fail over. The entire region must fail over.

M&P for Reassociation:

Rob Coffman, NeuStar, also led the LNPA in a review and discussion of the attached M&P for service provider reassociation to NPAC.



Rob stated that if a service provider’s SOA and LSMS are on the same router, the service provider must hold off bringing up their SOA by manually taking it off-line. Rob took the following ACTION ITEMS.

1. Add note to M&P explaining if a service provider’s SOA and LSMS are on the same router, the service provider must hold off bringing up their SOA by manually taking it off-line.
2. Confirm that the ILECs’ SOA and LSMS systems are on different routers.
3. Check with NeuStar network SMEs to see if service providers’ systems can be put on separate routers in cases where they currently are on the same router.
4. Per H. L. Gowda’s request (AT&T), change the title of the document to read, “**Methods and Procedures for Service Providers Reassociation to the NPAC After Extended Region Service Unavailability Due to NPAC Outage**.”

PIMs:

* PIM 1 – No change. This PIM is CLOSED and the LNPA is awaiting the wireless reseller flows before modifying with wireline reseller flows. The wireless flows are expected at the August LNPA meeting.
* PIM 5 – Still in Legal review with LLC and NeuStar attorneys.
* PIM 11 – Charles Ryburn, SBC, asked in what timeframe the Pool Administrator and NPAC are to accomplish the 1K block move. The group agreed that if the service provider goes through the Pool Administrator, the INC Guideline timeframes should be followed. If the service provider goes through NPAC personnel, the effective date is negotiated, however, no porting intervals (e.g. 1st port notification) will be violated. (NOTE: PIM 11 remains closed.)
* PIMs 14 and 15 – At the request of the LNPA, Barry Bishop, NeuStar Pooling Administrator, has modified the CO Code Transfer process document to specify that the new LERG-assignee is not required to take all ten 1K blocks when a code with active ported numbers is transferred and pooled. LNPA members have an ACTION ITEM to come prepared to the August meeting to discuss the attached proposed changes and finalize the document.



Upon finalization by the LNPA, the revised document will be referred to the INC.

* PIM 18 – The Wireless Reseller Flows are now out for final comment. The proposed flows have been sent to both the WNPO and LNPA distributions. Comments are due by 7/31/02. The flows will again be reviewed at the August WNPO, and barring any major changes, the LNPA will incorporate the wireless reseller flows into the main NANC LNP Provisioning flows at the August LNPA meeting.
* PIM 19 - **Individual intra and inter-service provider ported records with same LRN as pooled block record:**

This PIM addresses instances where individual ported records have been created for numbers within a pooled 1K block, however, the LRN associated with the individual records is the same as the LRN associated with the 1K block. This dilutes the advantages of Efficient Data Representation (EDR). The PIM’s submitter, SBC, is currently evaluating collected data. Some examples have been SBC-initiated due to code reallocations. SBC will continue to work with NeuStar to identify any problem areas.

Backwards Compatibility:

The LNPA discussed the current definition of Backwards Compatibility. The current definition can be viewed on page 4 of the attached document.



* The group agreed to modify the last sentence of the 3rd bullet to read, “Also, no NPAC software changes may be made to any existing interface functionality that will require source code modifications to SOA and/or LSMS platforms.” John Nakamura, NeuStar, took an ACTION ITEM to make the changes and redistribute to the team.

New Business:

* SBC reported instances where previously completed disconnects are replayed during resynchs. They must manually succeed the disconnect since there is no longer an SV to disconnect. SBC sent data to Verizon, BellSouth, and MCI/WorldCom to see if they were having similar troubles.
* SBC stated they were told by NeuStar that NPAC no longer provides Bulk Data Downloads (BDDs). Rob Coffman, NeuStar, explained that NPAC still creates nightly BDDs per region, but as of Release 3.1, they are no longer linking the BDD to service providers’ FTP sites. BDDs can be delivered to a service provider’s FTP site upon request to the Help Desk. There is no additional charge for a request made during business hours. Any out-of-hours request or any requirement for a script to set up a CRON job to automatically deliver a BDD to a provider’s FTP site will be billable at $100 per hour. This is only a one-time charge for the time required to develop the script. Dave Garner, Qwest, asked how long upon request during business hours will the BDD be available on the requesting service provider’s FTP site. Rob Coffman, NeuStar, took an ACTION ITEM to follow up with the answer.
* NeuStar reported that the Sunday (7/7/02) NPAC database crash in the Mid-Atlantic Region seems to be the same root cause as the recent Southeast Region database crash. Versant is delivering a patch that will be implemented in all regions. The cause of the crash was deemed logical log corruption.
* Charles Ryburn, SBC, reported on a discussion that took place in the National Number Portability Operations (NNPO) team related to porting after a code is returned from a carrier going out of business and scheduled for disconnect. Charles took an ACTION ITEM to follow up on the exact scenario and determine why Gene Johnston, NeuStar, recommended a Change Order to put a freeze on porting in the NPAC for this scenario.
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| Dave Cochran | BellSouth (phone) | Leah Luper | SBC |
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Recovery Issue:

* Ron Stutheit, ESI, reported on their work with HP to determine why at times they can’t handle PDUs in production during recovery, in some instances, with fewer TNs than they successfully recovered in test. HP agrees this is a stack level problem. Ron reported that HP has developed a temporary fix that is only available to ESI at this time. This fix seems to resolve the problem if a comparable increase in buffer size is made to the DSET toolkit. Both changes in toolkit and stack seem to fix the problem for ESI. Jim Rooks, NeuStar, stated that analysis is required on all platform stacks because this problem occurs in other platforms. It is not clear yet if this is related to a HP-sensitive stack or the OSI stack in general.
* John Malyar, Telcordia, stated he is unsure if this applies to all local systems. He is still seeing corrupted PDUs that would indicate they were perhaps formed incorrectly.
* Industry recovery testing is taking place during the weeks of 7/15 and 7/22. The value of this testing was questioned by some due to the inability to recreate the problem. ESI has been able to recreate the problem with little difficulty. Ron Stutheit, ESI, took an ACTION ITEM to check with his test engineers to see what test cases were run to recreate the problem. Since all vendors present in the meeting use the DSET toolkit, Ron will share aspects of any toolkit investigations and changes. At this point, it is unclear if this is a Marbin stack issue, a toolkit problem, or OS implementation.
* Dave Garner, Qwest, questioned how we will come to any conclusions if we don’t have a coordinator to serve as a data collector for the recovery testing that is taking place. Rob Coffman, NeuStar, took an ACTION ITEM to follow up and request that participating service providers provide summaries of their test results. Rob will compile these summaries and report them to the LNPA.
* Jim Rooks, NeuStar, stated that a fix is in development that will return a “Criteria Too Large” notification if a service provider system requests the same timeframe again during recovery. The fix will need to be tested and put in a point release. This will require service provider testing. Jim took an ACTION ITEM to send out an explanation of the change to the LNPA distribution.
* Jim Rooks, NeuStar, stated that the recovery issues constitute a crisis situation. Some service providers are recovering only a minute of data at a time and taking 4-5 hours to recover. The industry needs to focus their attention on zeroing in on the source(s) of the problem.

Change Order Discussion:

* NANC 319 – The current requirements do not allow for NPAC personnel to manually populate the LATA ID for an NXX code. Gary Sacra, Verizon, questioned if this was prudent in the event it was not populated in the LERG and an emergency port within that NXX needed to be performed. The question was then raised if it is actually possible to have an NXX in the LERG without a LATA ID. Gary Sacra, Verizon, took an ACTION ITEM to follow up with the answer.
* NANC 323 – The group decided to mirror the pooling approach with respect to SPID migrations. Any pending ports with the old (to be migrated) SPID as the New or Old SP must be cleaned up (activated or canceled) before the migration can take place. A report will be generated and sent to the old and new codeholder and any other service provider involved in a pending port. The report will be generated prior to migration. Ron Stutheit, ESI, raised the fact that all service providers’ local systems must load new software in order to accept the SMURF files, or be able to accept a BDD to affect the applicable SPID changes. NANC 323 functionality cannot be deployed until that time. Given that fact, service providers have an ACTION ITEM to work with their vendors and local system support teams to determine if their local systems will be able to implement NANC 323 functionality on 3/4/03, the start of Release 3.2 service provider turn-up testing, and if not, what would be a reasonable sunset period for when they will be ready.

Miscellaneous Items:

* The draft Release 3.2 project plan is due out the week of 7/15 for the NAPM/LLC meeting. The start of service provider turn-up testing is scheduled for 3/4/03.
* Dave Cochran, BellSouth, asked where in requirements does it state that service providers must be able to accept a Bulk Data Download (BDD). Rob Coffman, NeuStar, stated it is a requirement for continued certification testing in Section 2 of Statement of Work (SOW) 24. Rob took an ACTION ITEM to see if BDD test cases exist in the standard regression tests suite and 3.1 test plan, and if not, he will see that the appropriate test cases are included in the 3.2 test plan.

To Be Added to August Agenda:

* Begin development of Release 3.2 documentation (M&Ps, Test Cases, etc.)
* It was suggested that we may want to consider forming a sub-group to develop requirements for any Change Orders related to recovery and interface throughput. This will be discussed and determined at the August LNPA meeting.