# ATTENDANCE:

No Highlight – Attended on both days

Green – Attended on Day 1

Yellow - Attended on Day 2

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** |
|  |  |  |  |
| H.L. Gouda | AT&T | Dave Garner | Qwest |
| Rick Jones | NENA | Stephen Addicks | NeuStar |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Rob Coffman | NeuStar |
| Susan Ortega | NEXTEL | Meredith Cummings | NEXTEL |
| Rick Dressner | Sprint PCS | Jan Spitzer | Qwest Wireless |
| John Malyar | Telcordia | Jean Anthony | Telecom Software |
| Glenn Mills | TSI Telecommunications Services | Bob Jones | U. S. Cellular |
| Charlotte Holden | U. S. Cellular | Chuck Bohl | U. S. Cellular |
| Maggie Lee | VeriSign | Stephen Sanchez | AT&T Wireless |
| Linda Godfrey | Verizon Wireless | Gary Williams | T-Mobile |
| Susan Tiffany | Sprint PCS | Sean Hawkins | AT&T Wireless |
| Jim Grasser | Cingular Wireless |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Janet Bishop | AT&T Wireless | Susan Sill | AT&T Wireless |
| Ron Wuesthoff | AT&T Wireless | Joe Charles | Cingular Wireless |
| Kathleen Tedrick | Sprint | David Alexander | Sprint PCS |
| Paul Warga | Telcordia | Marlene Nolan | U. S. Cellular |
| Jeff Manning | U. S. Cellular | Joel Hartstein | U. S. Cellular |
| Julie Groenen | Verizon Wireless | Gary Eads | U. S. Cellular |
|  |  |  |  |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **On the phone** |  |  |  |
| Scottie Parish | Alltel | Kathy McGinn | Rural Cellular Corporation |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Wireless | Liz Coakley | SBC |
| Barry Bishop | NeuStar | Shannon Collins | NeuStar |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Jeff Adrian | Sprint PCS |
| Jessica Burrell | Accenture | Melissa Flicek | NEXTEL Partners |
| Brittany Bowen | CTIA | Pat Gendernalik | SBC |
|  |  |  |  |
| Mubeen Saifullah | Nightfire | Carol Valesquez | Verizon |
| Chuck Dodsley | Verizon Wireless | Ann Valdez | Sprint |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

# MEETING MINUTES FROM DAY #1 (1/13/03)

1. **Combined WNPO / WTSC Meeting**

* **Updates from past testing**
* **Updates to the test schedule**
* **NPAC Test Environment Availability for Wireless Service Providers Neustar presentation -- Rob Coffman**

Current release software on NPAC testbed is version 3.1.

It was clear that WTSC needed to hear what environments were available for testing processes.

SOW 34 about testing environment release 3.1.

Testbed is currently available. There will be no use fee. Also, there will be a dedicated engineer or regression testing. This dedicated engineer can be scheduled in 4-hour blocks of time where you may need more specialized testing. A fee will be charged for supported testing by service providers to verify their software.

There is a separate testbed for release certification, and a 3rd for mechanized for new entry certification.

Neustar has 3 to 4 engineers scheduled to cover hours for test beds.

Contacting can be done through e-mail and live.

Janice James 571-434-5442

Hours are Monday to Friday 8:00am to 6:00pm CT. Testbed available 24/7.

Escalations: Rob Coffman, KY Quan

Available 90% of month, 10% time for Maintenance.

SOW 35 3.2 in March testing to start and continues through May.

In June testbed for 3.3 will overlay SOW 34.

There is the need to take into account ICP testing in test environment – ICP cannot occur on 3.2 testbed until June, however regression testing can be done.

* **Testing Schedule Updates**

Testing SBC postponed Hartford. Testing to start this week with SBC and AWS. More companies in by 10th of February. Sprint PCS not testing with AWS in Hartford because of connectivity problems with SNET. This may change if the issues are solved.

Washington, Baltimore scheduled for Jan 20th. Won’t have as much participation as 3 companies pulled out—Nextel, Cingular, Verizon Wireless—Sprint PCS and AWS remain. Per Ron, markets have been ID’d up to May.

Testing results – Ron Wuesthoff had no updates from previous testing. CNAM was an issue with AWS in testing environment. There were problems with disconnects in LIDB with SNET being LIDB provider and carrier. This will be a major problem issue going forward. If number is in CNAM database, there is a need to know what is entered and what needs to taken out or put in. CNAM information is entered at the request of the wireless carriers. For Qwest, they do not put into their LIDB, any wireless information. It needs to be determined who owns population of this CNAM record and how does it get changed. Wireless providers should know that they have numbers in a LIDB database. How does CNAM affect wireless-to-wireless porting? Wireless to Wireline porting could cause a problem. Numbers have to come out of CNAM to activate the port with a Wireline company. The error received seems that if Wireline carrier is the provider of CNAM database then it has to be first removed so that it can be put back in under the wireless company. This needs to be addressed. The CNAM entry must be deleted prior to activation.

**ACTION ITEM:** Have people from SNET have a discussion about LIDB and CNAM database Pat Gendernalik, Kathleen said that she would have their person on line, also (Sprint). Discussions on what procedures are and what is necessary. There may be a timing issue that would affect porting. Can testing subcommittee lay out a flow of what happened with AWS on their test with SNET? Will databases let records be overwritten? What’s the wireless vision of all 3 databases?

**2) Introductions, announcements, and Agenda Review**

Dave Garner from Qwest Hosting

**3) Co-chair nominations and elections**

Both Sean Hawkins (AWS) and Bob Jones (US Cellular) were nominated for the co-chair position. Jim Grasser announced his intention to step down as current co-chair. On Monday it was determined that since there were now two positions there would be no election required.

**4) Review and approve December Minutes**

Page 3 item e Inadvertent ports timer conflict. Added comment about wireless inadvertent porting.

A similar situation occurred with wireless during testing. This would be tied to the extension of wireless timer for testing and the extension of conflict timer for production.

Change wording on reluctance to return.

Page 4 item 2 D.5 List of wireless Spids generated. Spid info provided because he was not going to provide report for counts. Delete item 5 from minutes.

Clean up the response on additional actions from Steve.

Minutes will be updated and sent out to be reviewed at February’s WNPO meeting.

**5) Brief Introduction of New Business Items:**

1. **Response to request to extend Wireless Conflict timers.**

The conflict timers were updated in the NPAC on Sunday January 12th

1. **LERG OCNs vs NPAC SPIDs – Ron Steen/Jim Grasser**

While it is desirable to migrate numbers that use Type 1 interconnection, there will be situations where it is necessary to port these numbers. In many cases, the wireless carrier is shown in the LERG as the owner of a “dedicated” NXX rather than the wireline provider in whose switch the NXX actually resides. The NPAC/SMS exchanges porting notifications/messages with the service provider who’s SPID is associated with the NXX. The wireline provider, as the network provider in this case, must receive the messages, and have the NPAC/SMS accept messages from them. The SPID of the service provider who opens the NXX for porting is associated with NXX in the NPAC/SMS. What procedure should be used to handle this situation?

**ACTION ITEM:** Add porting of non-migrated type one numbers to list of database updates. This would be a full code.

1. **BFRs/SLAs -- procedures**

There are questions as to what to do. For the top 100 MSAs, use 01-362 listing for BFRs.

The BFR process is to say, I want to port in these areas and open your code(s). Wireless providers had to open all switches at once. Qwest has 8 switches in 14 states that are not open and they have a website for looking at which ones are porting capable. Qwest is only interested in receiving BFRs from providers wishing to port in those eight switches that are not already portable. BellSouth stated that all of their switches are open for portability.

Would providers be willing to negotiate addendums or agreements without a BFR? SBC is only interested in taking BFRs for switches that are not open. The original order number 02-73 has the requirements for BFRs. Send both SLAs and BFRs at the same time if possible. There seems to be confusion of what exactly are the top 100 MSAs.

Orders to look at for BFR information

96-286 1ST Order

97-74 1st Reconsideration

97-289 2nd Order

98-082 3rd Order

01-362 Rescind of BFR—new list of MSAs

02-73A1 Reinstatement of BFRs

Order 97-74 1st Reconsideration paragraphs 59 to 71 has major impact on BFRs.

BFRs must be received by 2/24/03. The BFR is a request to another carrier to support long term LNP including code opening, it is not a request to port.

**ACTION ITEM:** Jim to bring in 02-73 and original order to go over.

**ACTION ITEM:** Qwest Dave to get website for lookups.

**ACTION ITEM:** Jim will send out another updated contact list.

1. **Other Issues:**
   * JIP – Is it optional?

One JIP showing for one state but originating in another will cause some billing issues. The issue is with interstate and intrastate originating calls. This would be a change for standards. JIP would have to be ID’d by cellsite. This needs to go to standards committees for additional information. Currently the Wireless switches can only provision for 1 JIP. Wireline uses the JIP for originating location. Any recommendations sent to any committees need to be approved by the NANC.

**ACTION ITEM**: HL will forward letter to JIM about JIP concerning INC. This is questioning about whether JIP is optional. T1-S1 says it is required but is this in reference to wireline?

* + Missing Intra-company Ports

If a Wireless provider gets the block and a Wireless or Wireline provider missed an ISP port, how should it be handled? Could NeuStar be involved with resolution of the contaminants or could we de-pool the block and give it back, thus allowing the Wireless or Wireline provider do the port and then re-pool the block? We agreed that both recipient block holder and the donor block holder should work with NeuStar to port the contaminated TNs back to the original code holder after the block has been donated.

.

**6) LIDB issue from December**

What happens when updates are required for CNAM, LIDB, ALI? What’s the timeframe and triggering event that causes problems? There is a need for test scenarios. Companies need to know to delete entries from their databases so that new names can be put in. ALI has legal issues. CNAM and LIDB have customer-impacting issues.

Is there any reason for Wireless to Wireless to not complete port because these databases need to be updated? Wireless has no record in ALI. It is a dynamic record goes in as call is taking place. Are there state regulations for a Wireline company to populate those databases that we as Wireless do not understand? There could be delays in porting based on the populations of these databases.

**ACTION ITEM:** Jim will send out a series of questions so that there is an understanding that there are databases like CNAM/LIDB/ALI or others that may be affected by porting. To send to LNPA and WNPO list.

**7) Updated NANC Flows -- review / comments**:

The proposed revision to the NANC flows to accommodate both wireless and wireline resellers were reviewed. Several errors/omissions were identified and noted for discussion in the LNPA WG.

**8) Monday Wrap-up at 4:45P:**

New action items from the day’s discussions were reviewed

Meeting was adjourned.

# MEETING MINUTES FROM DAY #2 (1/14/03)

1. **Carry over from Monday’s discussion**

There was a need to Redo nominations because there was a misunderstanding that there were 2 chairs being acted upon and not just one. We had an election for the one position that was vacated prior to the meeting by Bridgette Brown. Jim to count votes over lunch. Next month there will be an election to fill Jim’s spot as he is stepping down. Sean Hawkins from AWS won the election.

**Action Item:** Nominations need to be submitted for the election in February for Jim’s position.

1. **NeuStar Report**
   * 1. NDA / Application Update

Neustar 7 new wireless providers Total 53 - 47 of which have gone full process both a user app and interconnection plan.

1. Turn-up Testing Updates - No carriers are doing turn-up testing

Intra-service provider port (ISP) Volumes - ISP volumes 225,666 wireless intra ports from Oct 1st to Dec 9th

**ACTION ITEM**: Jim will put business day hour settings long business day timers into minutes that were requested from Neustar. Jim to e-mail response out to WNPO list. Neustar sent a breakdown list to Jim.

1. **Update from Rick Jones – NENA**

A request has went out to the members of the NENA LNP working group regarding LIDB/CNAM and what, if anything, would happen with public safety numbers if the carrier information was wrong. Service providers did not indicate that there would be a negative impact.

As part of the mixed service callback issue in wireline/wireless porting, being researched is which wireline carriers are utilizing the 10-digit trigger and if so, in what circumstances.

FCC has issued an order stating that none of their existing rules prohibit the blocking of an individual wireless handset from 9-1-1 calling due to fraudulent activity by that phone. The order states that it should be done, subject to the appropriate state and local laws. A NENA technical working group made up of wireless carrier and switch vendor participants is researching whether wireless carriers utilizing the different technologies are capable of any such call blocking. A question was asked regarding whether there was an impact on PSAP concerning the assignment/activation of MINs by wireless carriers in less than 10K blocks. Rick Jones replied that currently PSAPs do not have access to MIN assignments and so there is no impact at this time.

**Wrap-up**

1. Finalize Implementation Guideline/Narrative for the NANC -- the Guideline was revised to remove all references to pooling and show current date to December 2003; the narrative was similarly updated.

Jim wants to put an item on Implementation guidelines to show SLAs and negotiation

Do we want another timeline to show these SLAs?

What are the black out dates for testing in 2003 while NPAC 3.2 is being implemented?

Will there always be a test bed for testing 3.1 6/16 last region to go? If you’re testing in production, it will be 3.1 until on various weekends cut is made to 3.2. Can SOA vendor support 2 instances on test bed?

Milestone for logistics---Service providers need to remain aware during the logistic period,

of impacts to the industry caused by the implementation of WICIS 2.0 and NPAC 3.2.

It is further assumed that each service provider has access to a necessary test bed for certification to NPAC. When will full testing end? Pooling should be taken off heading.

1. Action Items and Issues list was reviewed

Sean update for this meeting and purpose making a new timeline for next meeting.

1. Updates to the Decision/Recommendation Matrix were reviewed
2. January tentative agenda was reviewed --- starting in January, there will be a joint WNPO/WTSC meeting on Monday morning. After lunch, the WTSC will meet separately from the WNPO.
3. NANC report was reviewed

Next meeting: February 17-18 and will be hosted by TSI in Tampa, FL

Items not discussed will be carried over to next month’s agenda.

**Remember:** To subscribe to the WNPO exploder list, visit: <http://lists.neustar.biz/mailman/listinfo.cgi>

select “wireless ops”, and add yourself to the list.

**Future meetings:**

WNPO Dates: Location & Host:

February 17 – 18 Tampa, FL TSI

March 10 – 11 San Antonio, TX SBC

April 7 – 8 Sterling, VA NeuStar

May 5 – 6 Overland Park, KS Sprint