**MEETING MINUTES:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Verizon – 1 Pratt St.  | Baltimore, Maryland | Host: Verizon  |

**Wednesday, September 18, 2002 – 8:30 AM – 5:00 PM**

Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** |
| H.L. Gowda  | AT&T | Stephen Addicks | NeuStar |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T | Susan VonDerLinn | Nextel |
| Beth Watkins | AT&T | Dave Garner  | Qwest (phone) |
| Lonnie Keck | ATTWS (phone) | Charles Ryburn | SBC |
| Sean Hawkins | ATTWS (phone) | Leah Luper | SBC  |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | ATTWS | Donna McLaughlin | SBC (phone) |
| Lee Hunter | BellSouth | Kathleen Tedrick | Sprint |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth (phone)  | Mary Briend | Sprint PCS |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth  | Rick Dressner | Sprint PCS |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LLC | Colleen Collard | Tekelec  |
| James Grasser | Cingular Wireless | John P. Malyar  | Telcordia Technologies |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox Communications (phone) | Adam Newman | Telcordia Technologies |
| Mike Panis | ESI | Jean Anthony | Telecom Software (phone)  |
| Dennis Robbins | Electric Lightwave (phone) | Ron Stutheit | Telesynthesis |
| Gene Johnston | NeuStar | Rob Smith | TSI |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Lisa Barco | TSI |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Charlotte Holden | US Cellular |
| Larry Vagnoni | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | VeriSign |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | Verizon |
| Rob Coffman | NeuStar | Chris Duckett-Brown | Verizon Wireless |
| Mindi Patterson | NeuStar | Jason Lee | WorldCom (phone) |

Attached are the Action Items assigned at the September, 2002 LNPA meeting. Also included are the remaining open Action Items from previous meetings.



**MEETING MINUTES:**

NOTE: ALL ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “SEPTEMBER 2002 LNPA ACTION ITEMS” FILE ATTACHED ABOVE.

**WEDNESDAY 9/18/02**

Agenda Review:

* H. L. Gowda, AT&T, asked the status of the subteam to work SOA and LSMS performance requirements. Ron Stutheit responded that it was decided these requirements would be worked as part of the future Change Order discussion in the full LNPA.

8/02 Minutes Review:



* Change ownership of Action Item 0802-10 from Ron Stutheit to Mike Panis, ESI, in the assigned August, 2002 Action Items.
* John Malyar, Telcordia, requested that the placement of the assigned Action Items for the meeting be moved after the attendee list in the minutes.

Wireless Number Portability Operations (WNPO) Committee Report as reported by Jim Grasser, WNPO Chairperson:

* Two new business items were introduced:
1. AT&T Wireless contribution on the need for service providers to identify trouble reporting contacts in a number pooling environment (see attached). It was mentioned that there is a need to fund NIIF in order to make updates to the National Contact List. Jim Grasser will discuss with Stu Goldman, Co-Chair of ATIS’ T1S1.3. The WNPO is looking for a national site where service providers can enter and maintain contact information without funding an industry group.



1. The need for a service provider’s switch to be assigned an NXX code in the LERG in order to be able to assign an LRN for that switch was discussed.
* The WNPO approved a single consolidated reseller flow. It has been sent to Charles Ryburn, LNPA Co-Chair, for review at the LNPA (see attached).

 

* The WNPO has requested data from NeuStar (study of Help Desk off-hours and the number of calls received) to determine if the Help Desk needs to be lengthened this fall or next year. The WNPO will make the determination next month and will send a letter to the NAPM/LLC on wireless Help Desk and business timer needs.
* Effective 11/10/02, the Wireless industry is requesting a change to the Service Provider Maintenance Window to 2am-8am Central each Sunday, with the extended maintenance window taking place the first Sunday of each month from midnight – 11am Central. Jim Grasser, WNPO Chair, will send a letter detailing the request to the NAPM/LLC.
* All service providers that have notified NeuStar that they intend to do new entrance testing have completed their testing

.

* 27 wireless service providers have completed an interconnection plan with NPAC.
* As of this WNPO meeting, NeuStar reported that they have not seen significant wireless porting transactions, which indicates service providers are not performing intra-SP ports for contaminated numbers.
* The WNPO discussed the approved Type 1 Migration process.
* The Wireless Testing Subcommittee (WTSC) will prepare a report at the completion of testing in each MSA. Seven MSAs have been scheduled for testing before 11/24/02, with 8 wireless and 3 wireline carriers participating. The WTSC will forward the reports to the WNPO.
* The attached contributions from Alltel and Sprint on rehoming of wireless NXX codes will be put in Decision and Recommendation Matrix. Both contributions attempt to minimize NPAC porting activity when performing rehomes in order to provide switch capacity relief.

 (SEE NOTES SECTION OF SPREADSHEET) 

Release 3.2 Documentation (John Nakamura and Mindi Patterson, NeuStar):

* Mindi Patterson, NeuStar, gave following report on 3.2 FRS changes:

##### NANC 169

* RR3-199 - Mindi will add a note that time ranges local to GUI are translated to GMT for system processing. John Malyar, Telcordia, asked if the M&P documents show how a requester for a BDD specifies their needed time range. NeuStar replied that it does. The reference to Central time will be removed from the requirement.

###### NANC 187

* 8 new requirements related to linked replies for pooled blocks have been added in NANC 187.

###### NANC 191

* Added “activation” to requirements RR3-75 thru RR3-79.

###### NANC 192

* A number of GUI-based changes were made to NANC 192.
* Requirement RN3-4.5 deleted in NANC 192 because it is an invalid requirement.
* Deleted Requirement RR3-32 and RR3-300 (dash X can’t exist without NXX).
* The LNPA group then provided their comments on the 3.2 FRS document:

###### NANC 187

* John Malyar, Telcordia, asked NeuStar how long SOAs/LSMSs should wait for a linked reply before taking any action. For those local systems that time the action, should it be timed on the initial part of the linked reply, on the intermediate responses, or the last response of the linked reply? What is the expectation of the behavior now that we have linked replies? NeuStar answered that it should be the last reply. NeuStar took an ACTION ITEM to find the appropriate place in the IIS to document the expected behavior for SOA/LSMS in the context of linked replies.

###### NANC 191 and 291

* NeuStar took an ACTION ITEM to place on the 3.2 Project Plan a date to send out a notice to the various service provider contact lists advising of the need for DPC clean-up and what needs to be done to pass 191 and 291 edits for DPC data once 3.2 goes into production.

NANC 319

* John Nakamura, NeuStar, asked if NPAC should look at 3 digits or 5 digits in the LERG for the LATA ID. BellSouth uses 5 digits in some areas of Florida. The answer is that only 3 digits are required. ACTION ITEM: NeuStar will look at the M&P for Mass Updates to see if it would be appropriate to address LRN changes due to LATA ID changes as a reason for the Mass Update.

###### General Comments

* Jean Anthony, TSE, asked that the requirements in the Change Order package for 3.2 (delta document) be updated to reflect the changes to the FRS that have resulted from LNPA discussions. Mindi Patterson, NeuStar, took an ACTION ITEM to update the delta document.
* Dave Cochran, BellSouth, suggested that as changes to documentation are made on an ongoing basis, they should be highlighted as to whether they impact SOA or LSMS.
* John Malyar, Telcordia, suggested a Change Control process for updates that take place prior to finalization of documents.

PIMs:

* PIM 1 – This PIM remains CLOSED. The Wireline Reseller flows were reviewed and modified as a result of the August LNPA meeting. Work will continue at the October LNPA to incorporate them into the main NANC LNP Provisioning flows.
* PIM 5 – SOW 19 is still in Legal review with LLC and NeuStar attorneys. Legal text has been provided to the NeuStar attorney by the NAPM/LLC attorney. SOW 19 is nearing closure.
* PIMs 14 and 15 – The INC is developing guidelines, *Procedures for Code Holder/LERG Assignee Exit*, that describe the responsibilities of NANPA, service providers, and the Pool Administrator when a service provider is returning or abandoning codes/blocks that contain ported telephone numbers. The LNPA is reviewing these guidelines and will provide any comments to INC.



* PIM 18 – The WNPO approved a single consolidated reseller flow. It has been sent to Charles Ryburn, LNPA Co-Chair, for review at the LNPA (see attached).

 

Work will continue at the October LNPA to incorporate them into the main NANC LNP Provisioning flows.

* PIM 19 - The following advisory was sent to the LNPA WG, WNPO, Portability, Inc., Pooling Administrator, and Cross-Regional distribution lists:

“Some service providers, after activating a pooled block, are performing intra-SP or inter-SP ports using the same LRN and GTT data as the number pooled block. In addition, some service providers have contaminated TNs, and later activate a number pooled block with an LRN and GTT data exactly the same as the contaminated TNs. In both instances, the end result is the inefficient perpetuation of individual intra-SP or inter-SP subscription versions, rather than the more appropriate pooled number block-based routing. Service providers are advised that individual intra-SP or inter-SP ports should be prevented and deleted by the blockholder when these individual subscription versions have the same routing data (LRN and GTT) as the pooled number block in which they are contained.”

Charles Ryburn, LNPA Co-Chair, took an ACTION ITEM to send the advisory to the INC stating that it has been issued to the industry and to review for any inclusion in their guidelines.

This PIM is CLOSED.

* **NEW PIM 20** – This new PIM was submitted by SBC.



This PIM seeks to resolve instances where an NXX code returned to or reclaimed by NANPA, is initially found to contain no active or pending ported numbers and is published for disconnect in the LERG, only to have customers port their number after the published disconnect. NeuStar stated that they would need regulatory approval before they could take any steps to prevent a customer from porting.

The LNPA brainstormed two possible options to address this issue:

1. Always transfer any code that is opened up in NPAC to a new LERG-assignee rather than disconnect it in the LERG,
2. Set a drop-dead date based on the LERG-effective disconnect date by which the NXX will be deleted in NPAC if there are no ported numbers.

Adam Newman, Telcordia, took an ACTION ITEM to discuss this within INC at their November meeting in the context of their guidelines, *Procedures for Code Holder/LERG Assignee Exit*.

* **NEW PIM 21** – This new PIM was submitted by AT&T. It addresses cases where service providers have left a market or have gone bankrupt, and previously working ported-in numbers have been abandoned by their former customers, but the ported records still remain in NPAC. Calls to these numbers fail and result in needless trouble-shooting. This PIM seeks development of a process to delete these abandoned numbers in NPAC.The LNPA is in the process of reviewing INC’s *Procedures for Code Holder/LERG Assignee Exit*, and will provide comments addressing this issue.

****

The LNPA took an ACTION ITEM to review *Procedures for Code Holder/LERG Assignee Exit* and give comments/changes to Adam Newman, Telcordia, by the October LNPA for finalization for Adam to take to the November INC meeting. Adam Newman, Telcordia, took an ACTION ITEM to change the reference to removing all records related to the NXX code in paragraph 2.11 of the *Procedures for Code Holder/LERG Assignee Exit*. The same change applies to last paragraph in Section 3.0.

* **NEW PROPOSED PIM 22 (CURRENTLY ON HOLD)** – This new PIM was submitted by Verizon. It seeks to address instances where customers have been taken out of service inadvertently due to the New Service Provider continuing with a port that has been placed into Conflict by the Old Service Provider. In these cases, the New Service Provider continued with porting the customer after the 6 hour timer had expired, instead of investigating why the port was placed into Conflict. In many of these cases, the port was placed into Conflict because no matching LSR could be identified as a result of the wrong TNs being sent up in the CREATE message from the New Service Provider.



Gary Sacra, Verizon, took an ACTION ITEM to review the Conflict Cause Values and come to October meeting with a proposal for which ones this PIM would be restricted to.

**Thursday, September 19, 2002 – 8:30 AM – 5:00 PM**

Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** |
| H.L. Gowda  | AT&T | Stephen Addicks | NeuStar |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T | Susan VonDerLinn | Nextel |
| Beth Watkins | AT&T | Dave Garner  | Qwest (phone) |
| Lonnie Keck | ATTWS (phone) | Charles Ryburn | SBC |
| Sean Hawkins | ATTWS (phone) | Leah Luper | SBC  |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | ATTWS | Donna McLaughlin | SBC (phone) |
| Lee Hunter | BellSouth | Kathleen Tedrick | Sprint |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth (phone)  | Mary Briend | Sprint PCS |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth  | Rick Dressner | Sprint PCS |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LLC | Colleen Collard | Tekelec  |
| James Grasser | Cingular Wireless (phone) | John P. Malyar  | Telcordia Technologies |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox Communications (phone) | Adam Newman | Telcordia Technologies |
| Mike Panis | ESI | Jean Anthony | Telecom Software (phone)  |
| Dennis Robbins | Electric Lightwave (phone) | Ron Stutheit | Telesynthesis |
| Gene Johnston | NeuStar | Rob Smith | TSI |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Lisa Barco | TSI |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Charlotte Holden | US Cellular |
| Larry Vagnoni | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | VeriSign |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | Verizon |
| Rob Coffman | NeuStar | Chris Duckett-Brown | Verizon Wireless |
| Mindi Patterson | NeuStar | Jason Lee | WorldCom (phone) |

NeuStar Presentation on Flow Control (Jim Rooks):

Jim Rooks, NeuStar, gave the attached presentation explaining how message flow control works and fixes to problems that have been discovered.



Slide 1:

* Bullet 1: Jim Rooks, NeuStar, reported a stack abort was being sent from the NPAC stack. Fix is to put in new version of OTS stack. Will go into production in all NPACs on 9/22. Jim Rooks took an ACTION ITEM to send out a maintenance window announcement including this information.
* Bullet 2: Mike Panis, ESI, reported that HP is still analyzing trouble with large PDU aborts. Fix is expected EOY2002 or possibly later. Mike Panis, ESI, took an ACTION ITEM to identify the test case that caused the problem per John Malyar’s, Telcordia, request.
* Bullet 4: This issue is related to how the CMIP interface handles flow control. NeuStar changed how many messages could be queued from 100 to 10 for one ILEC. This results in congestion being entered 90 messages earlier and the sender won’t send any more messages until the receiver hits the low water mark.
* Bullet 5: When the sender runs faster than the receiver, messages can queue up in buffer space for longer than 5 minutes. This is viewed as a security violation and the association is aborted. Invalid departure time abort can be triggered at either end, but it is always at the receiving end.
* Jim Rooks, NeuStar, stated a concern about outbound flow control because it doesn’t allow systems to interoperate when the sender operates faster than the receiver.
* When a stack abort occurs, all messages queued in the buffers within the stack are flushed.
* Jim Rooks, NeuStar, said the answer is to make flow control work correctly, not necessarily increase speed. Jim explained that today when the sender sends faster than the receiver can process, the receiver queue fills up, this propagates to all queues in the network until it backs up to the sender side. This is a congestion state and then the sender stops sending until the queues are worked off. By modifying flow control such that the sender only sends X (tunable by provider, dynamic at the application layer) messages and waits until a response is received until sending further messages, the sender is able to control the flow before buffers are congested. This moves flow control from the network layer to the application layer.
* Dave Garner, Qwest, questioned if CMIP departure time check could be raised from 5 minutes.
* At 8:30 am Mountain Time on Thursday, 10/17, in Denver – discussion on outbound flow control and CMIP departure time check. ACTION ITEM: SPs are to discuss internally two options: raising CMIP departure time check to greater than 5 minutes, or total elimination, and come prepared next month to discuss what to recommend to the LLC. NeuStar will bring in Change Orders to change appropriate documentation. The LNPA will also discuss possible elimination of timeout aborts.

3.2 Project Plan:

* Rob Coffman, NeuStar, reported that the project plan is on track. ACTION ITEM: Rob Coffman, NeuStar, to put milestone on project plan for updating and distributing the 3.2 delta document.
* Vendor ITP is scheduled 12/2/02-2/3/03. Service Provider turn-up testing is scheduled 3/4/03-4/11/03 (only one round of testing). Group and performance testing is scheduled for 4/14/03-4/25/03. Region 1 is scheduled to go live 4/28/03. Regions 2,3,4 on 5/12/03. Regions 5,6,7 on 5/26/03. Maggie Lee, Verisign, raised issue with going in production over Memorial Day weekend. Rob Coffman, NeuStar, took an ACTION ITEM to review holiday dates, e.g. Good Friday, Easter, Mother’s Day, Memorial Day, in relation to the project plan.
* Service Providers have an ACTION ITEM to review the project plan, especially the dates from the start of turn-up testing through the first region implementation date, and come prepared for October meeting with any changes.

NANC 323 Readiness:

Service Providers were asked to respond to the following question: When will your systems support a SPID migration in production in each Region your production systems operate?

The following responses were provided based on Service Provider discussions with their respective SOA and LSMS vendors/providers, and estimates as to the amount of time to load new software in their production systems. A “?” mark indicates the Service Provider currently is unsure of their specific date and will provide a response at the October LNPA meeting.

* AT&T 2Q03

## AT&T Wireless ?

## Bell South ?

## Cox Not present

## Nextel ?

## Qwest 1Q04

## SBC 2Q03 (one region 2Q04 - SNET)

## Sprint 2Q04

## US Cellular Not present

## Verisign 1Q04

## Verizon 2Q04

## Verizon Wireless 2Q04

## WorldCom 2Q03 possibly

* It was then determine that the “Sunrise date,” based on the information the LNPA has to date, for NANC 323 is 2Q04 (earliest we can use it in production).

Test Case List Review:

* Mindi Patterson, NeuStar, led the discussion.
* NANC187: Added test cases for number pooled data.
* NANC 354: Add test case specifying NPAC personnel will create BDD for all Network Data.
* NANC 192 (NPA splits): Test cases will emulate production splits. A concern was raised by Maggie Lee, Verisign, that there isn’t enough time in the group testing schedule to accommodate this detailed testing.
* NANC 323: Test cases will be available for group testing for any providers choosing to test functionality.

Review of ITP test cases may be done on Friday of November LNPA. John Nakamura and Mindi Patterson, NeuStar, to check on this possibility.

SOW 34 Test Bed:

* The 3.1 test bed went into service on 9/16. This test bed will be used for testing the current NPAC release that is in production in all regions.
* IP addresses stayed the same as Grand test bed.
* The contact procedures for testing issues stay the same. Contact the NeuStar Test Coordinator.
* The Grand test platform is no longer available. It is moving to Sterling.
* New entrant testing will be performed on a different test bed.

Review of August Action Items:

* All reseller flows to be reviewed for next month. ACTION ITEM for all. This Action Item is now numbered 0902-14.
* H. L. Gowda, AT&T, to rewrite PIM 2 maintenance window document based on WNPO decision to request a change to the Service Provider Maintenance Window, and submit it to the LNPA.. ACTION ITEM. This Action Item is now numbered 0902-15.
* NANC 356 schedule. Rob Coffman, NeuStar, explained that changing the Service Provider Name field results in provider’s router to be bounced. NeuStar would like to change fields during the Sunday Service Provider maintenance window to reduce impact of bouncing router. Service Providers would need to take a Bulk Data Download (BDD) (which they would have to do anyway). BDD file will be produced at the completion of each region. The LNPA agreed that data will not be broadcast and all Service Providers will take a BDD. NeuStar will investigate to determine if schedule can be compressed to a single Sunday maintenance window ACTION ITEM. Schedule on hold while NeuStar investigates. This Action Item is now numbered 0902-16.
* Reassociation M&P: Change note to read, “It is recommended, if a Service Provider’s SOA and LSMS are on the same router, that the Service Provider hold off bringing up their SOA by manually taking it off-line.” This Action Item is now numbered 0902-19.
* Action Item 0802-08 for Backwards Compatibility definition: This has been posted on the NPAC website. Status of Action Item is Closed
* Action 0802-11: NeuStar to provide a SPID list to Charles Ryburn. The list of SPIDs was provided by Jim Rooks, NeuStar. Status of Action Item is Closed.
* Action Item 0802-12 -- SPID Migration Notification: NeuStar reported that the OP:INFO can be used for NPAC to send notifications to all users. Action Item 0802-12 is now Closed. Related ACTION ITEM 0902-17: Question for Service Providers as to what their systems will do with the OP:INFO notification and how they will react to it, and for NeuStar, the SPID Migration M&P must address how the determination is made that all Service Providers successfully migrated, e.g. go/no go conference call.

New Business:

* Charles Ryburn, SBC, asked if a rate center can be split during an NPA split. Answer is yes. It was mentioned that, although the FCC had weighed in and prohibited line level splits, they are still occurring. SBC asked what happens if a customer had ported to an area in the rate center that then takes on the new NPA. Does that customer have to change their NPA? The response from the group was it is not a network reason for the customer to have to change their NPA, but more of an Regulatory Order issue because they physically live on the side of the split boundary that takes an NPA change.
* Steve Addicks, NeuStar, questioned the meaning of the term “all appropriate” in Scenario 4 of the ITP Test Plan Requirements and Regression Test Plan Requirements documents. It was agreed to remove that phrase. See Action Item 0902-18 for Steve Addicks, NeuStar. SOW 24 still in NeuStar legal review.
* M&P for Reassociation – Per Dave Garner’s, Qwest, request, change note to read, “It is recommended, if a Service Provider’s SOA and LSMS are on the same router, that the Service Provider hold off bringing up their SOA by manually taking it off-line.” See Action Item 0902-19 for Steve Addicks, NeuStar. NeuStar to then post on website after modification is made.
* Leah Luper, SBC, raised an issue related with LATAs crossing NPAC boundaries in Missouri and Illinois, and the need to receive downloads from two different regional NPACs. She cited the Cincinnati Bell example where the NPAC regions were redrawn to eliminate the scenario. The LNPA group agreed this was a regulatory issue and if pursued, should be taken up with FCC. This is not an issue for the LNPA.
* To be placed on the agenda for October:
* Set 2003 LNPA meeting schedule and frequency
* Discussion points: Change Order work required for next release (3.3) and impact on meeting frequency
* Post 11/24/02 Wireless pooling/ intra-SP porting issues.
* Rick Dressner, Sprint PCS, requested that a message be sent to Jim Grasser, WNPO Chairperson, asking him to send a message to WNPO distribution encouraging them to attend the LNPA meetings. Reason for request – issues are discussed in LNPA that affect all carriers, including wireless carriers, and wireless porting and pooling issues also affect all carriers, both wireline and wireless. See Action Item 0902-20 for Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair.