**LNPA WORKING GROUP**

**MEETING MINUTES:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Sheraton Harborside Hotel | Portsmouth, New Hampshire | Host: Verizon |

**Wednesday, October 15, 2003 – 8:30 AM – 5:00 PM**

Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T | Susan Ortega | | Nextel |
| Lonnie Keck | ATTWS (phone) | Dave Garner | | Qwest |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | ATTWS | Charles Ryburn | | SBC (phone) |
| Reza Rahsaz | ATTTWS | Leah Luper | | SBC |
| Jennifer Gorre | ALLTEL (phone) | Tim Walters | | SNET Div. Group |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth (phone) | Craig Bartell | | Sprint |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Rick Dressner | | Sprint PCS |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LLC | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint PCS |
| Mark Wood | Cingular | Susan Tiffany | |  |
| Jim Grasser | Cingular (phone) | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox | Adam Newman | | Telcordia Technologies |
| Dennis Robbins | Electric Lightwave | John Malyar | | Telcordia Technologies |
| Keagan O’Rourke | Evolving Systems (phone) | Jean Anthony | | Telecom Software |
| Scott Wagner | Intrado | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Greg Roberts | NeuStar | Glenn Mills | | TSI |
| Larry Vagnoni | NeuStar | Chuck Bohl | | US Cellular |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Gene Johnston | NeuStar | Sharon Bridges | | Verizon |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Kevin Lewis | | Verizon |
|  |  | Chris Duckett-Brown | | Verizon Wireless |
| Marcelle Champagne | NeuStar | Deborah Stephens | | Verizon Wireless |
| Shannon Collins | NeuStar Pooling (phone) | Sally Anderson | | Ward Progressive Concepts |
| Randy Buffenbarger | NeuStar | Jason Lee | | WorldCom (phone) |
|  |  | Karen Mulberry | | WorldCom |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

Attached are the Action Items assigned at the October, 2003 LNPA meeting. Also included are the remaining open Action Items from previous meetings.



NOTE: ALL ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “OCTOBER 2003 LNPA ACTION ITEMS” FILE ATTACHED ABOVE.

2004 Meeting Schedule:

* Sue Tiffany, WNPO Co-Chair, will place the topic of possibly combining the LNPA and WNPO groups in 2004 on the agenda for the November WNPO meeting. There were no objections expressed from the LNPA Working Group with regard to combining the two groups. If approved by the WNPO, a timeline for combining the groups will be discussed. It was suggested that combining the two groups could possibly occur beginning with the April 2004 meeting, if both groups approve.
* It was proposed that beginning with the January 2004 LNPA meeting, the LNPA Working Group would meet from Tuesday 1pm local time until Wednesday 5pm local time, and the Architecture Planning Team (APT) would meet starting 8:30am local time on Thursday and go no later than mid-afternoon Thursday. If the LNPA needs more time, the group could go longer on Tuesday or Wednesday evening. There were no objections expressed regarding this proposal. This will become effective at the January meeting if no objections are raised.
* The Wireless Testing Subcommittee (WTSC) will meet all day on Monday and ½ day on Tuesday of LNPA week until at least June, 2004, when the group’s continuation will be re-evaluated.
* Telcordia and Sprint PCS stated that they could serve as backup hosts for 2004, and with a few month’s notice, they could host a meeting if it becomes necessary.
* Following is the schedule for 2004, the host companies, and the meeting locations. Also indicated is the date of the month’s NANC meeting, if applicable:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MONTH  **(2004)** | **LNPA MEETING**  **DATE** | **HOST COMPANY** | **MEETING LOCATION** | **NANC MEETING DATE** |
| JANUARY | WEEK OF 1/5 | QWEST AND NEUSTAR | PHOENIX, ARIZONA  (TENTATIVE) | 1/13/04 |
| FEBRUARY | WEEK OF 2/2 | TSI | TAMPA, FLORIDA | NO NANC |
| MARCH | WEEK OF 3/8 | BELL SOUTH | ATLANTA, GEORGIA (TENTATIVE) | 3/16/04 |
| APRIL | WEEK OF 4/5 | NEUSTAR | STERLING, VIRGINIA | NO NANC |
| MAY | WEEK OF 5/3 | SPRINT | OVERLAND PARK, KANSAS | 5/18/04 |
| JUNE | WEEK OF 6/14 | COX | ATLANTA, GEORGIA | NO NANC |
| JULY | WEEK OF 7/19 | TEKELEC | RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA | 7/13/04 |
| AUGUST | WEEK OF 8/9 | T-MOBILE | TBD IN CALIFORNIA | NO NANC |
| SEPTEMBER | WEEK OF 9/6 | CANADIAN CONSORTIUM | TBD IN CANADA | 9/14/04 |
| OCTOBER | WEEK OF 10/4 | NEXTEL | RESTON, VIRGINIA OR LAS VEGAS, NEVADA | NO NANC |
| NOVEMBER | WEEK OF 11/1 | VERIZON WIRELESS | TBD | 11/9/04 |
| DECEMBER | WEEK OF 12/6 | AT&T | NEW YORK, NEW YORK | NO NANC |

09/03 Minutes Review:

The following changes were made to the DRAFT September 2003 LNPA Minutes during the October meeting. These changes will be reflected in the FINAL September 2003 LNPA Minutes.

* No revisions were made to the DRAFT September LNPA Minutes.

Wireless Number Portability Operations (WNPO) Committee Report as reported by Maggie Lee, WNPO Co-Chairperson:

* Wireless Testing Subcommittee (WTSC) Report –
* Testing is still in progress, including end-to-end testing with back office systems involved.
* Lessons learned:
* Major carriers do have connectivity to each other,
* Some issues were discovered with inter-carrier communications during round robin testing regarding populating the address field and possibly the name field. This was deemed due to some providers not following the WICIS standards. This is not an issue in WICIS. Some manual workarounds to force completion may be required in production.
* Ordering & Billing Forum (OBF) Jurisdictional Information Parameter (JIP) issue (identifying the call origination of wireless roaming customers for intra-state vs. inter-state settlements): The WNPO will respond to the attached NIIF liaison that requests making JIP a required field. Implementing JIP across cell sites would be expensive. Implementing JIP at the switch level would require standards changes as well as switch changes.



* The Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF) is meeting the week of 11/17. Any wireless issues should be submitted to the Wireless Workshop by 10/22.
* The Fallout Reduction Taskforce (FORT), formed by the WNPO to investigate reasons why porting transactions do not flow through, has drafted its charter. The Taskforce will hold weekly conference calls each Friday from 10am-12 noon Central Time. The group’s Chairs have been elected. They are:
* Kathleen Tedrick, Sprint
* Jennifer Goree, Alltel
* Sheena Strickland

Contributions to FORT will be a slightly modified PIM form, but will be a separate process from the LNPA PIM process. The FORT readout to the WNPO will be given during the WNPO meeting at 1pm local time on Monday during LNPA week.

* Going forward, if consensus cannot be reached on an issue in the WNPO, the issue will be clearly documented, and opposing positions will be clearly articulated before it is reported to NANC.
* The AT&T Wireless PIM requesting development of a test bed for volume and performance testing has been referred to the Architecture Planning Team (APT) for discussion.
* WNPO reminder to go out to the industry: Basic company contact information needs to be shared among trading partners. It is strongly recommended that this contact information be shared by 11/3/03 to avoid any negative impact to the end user porting experience.
* The NANC Change Order 291 edit has been turned on in all U.S. Regional NPACs. This edit requires the Subsystem Number (SSN) associated with all Destination Point Codes (DPCs) to be 000 in the New Service Provider CREATE message to NPAC.
* The possibility of combining the National Number Portability Operations (NNPO) Team and the WNPO was briefly discussed. No conclusions were reached. NNPO participation in the OBF’s Inter-species Task Force was strongly encouraged.
* The current wireless porting Implementation Guideline and Narrative are attached.

 

Architecture Planning Team (APT) Report (Jim Rooks, NeuStar):

* Mission Statement: To assess Number Portability industry production technical issues within the purview of the LNPA Working Group and develop recommendations for the strategic direction of the Number Portability architecture.
* The APT met on 10/14/03. Attached is the meeting agenda.



* NeuStar presented the attached revised team working document to serve as a framework for the APT’s continued discussions on the strategic direction of the LNP architecture.



* Items added to agenda:
* Possibility of sunsetting support of non-EDR
* This discussion in the APT was requested by the WNPO to ascertain the impacts if the industry decided to make support of Efficient Data Representation (EDR) mandatory, what would be gained, the timeframe necessary for providers and vendors, e.g. budgetary considerations, enforcement, etc.
* NeuStar stated that they administratively limit daily activations of pooled blocks to 40 blocks, activating them at 15 minute intervals. If more than 40 are scheduled on a given day, NeuStar contacts the providers to spread out the schedule. No dates are pushed out, they are advanced to smooth the schedule out. This was raised as a concern in the WNPO in that a maximum of 40 blocks daily might not be enough. One carrier stated that at this time of year, they need to order additional blocks to augment their inventory, and the 40 block daily limit is a concern because utilization rules require them to order at the last minute.
* It was questioned if this limit resulted from some carriers not being EDR-capable. NeuStar stated that when 40 was exceeded, they received calls from some non-EDR providers to slow down the broadcasts. The last time NeuStar checked, about 80% of providers were EDR-capable. NeuStar stated that there is less traffic to an EDR-capable provider when a pooled block is activated. Non-EDR providers receive 1K Subscription Version IDs in the download.
* NeuStar stated that pooled SVs in pooled blocks are not stored as singles in NPAC, but if a query is sent for a particular pooled TN in that block, it is responded to as a single SV.
* Question asked: Is this a volume issue or an EDR vs. non-EDR issue?
* A number of providers at the APT meeting asked that NeuStar continue this restriction for the time being. NeuStar will contact the providers requesting this limit to ensure they are aware of the porting volume increase expected on 11/24/03, and to make them aware that NeuStar is getting pushback from the industry on continuing the 40 block limit. NeuStar will provide feedback from these discussions with the carriers at the November WNPO.
* Service Providers are to come prepared to the November LNPA to discuss any

supporting data regarding the benefits of sunsetting support of non-Efficient Data Representation (EDR) capability.

* AT&T Wireless Test Bed Issue:
* AT&T Wireless submitted a request for creation of a test bed that mirrors a production NPAC for volume and performance testing. This request does not include failover capability.
* The current SOW 34 test bed does not support load and performance testing to the extent required by wireless providers without affecting other providers that are testing.
* Question – how would the load be simulated? NeuStar stated that they have production-like hardware for load simulation.
* NeuStar requires input on what the test bed requirements are, e.g., multiple database instances that can be used by multiple providers at the same time for volume testing, a single instance that can only be scheduled to be used by one provider at a time, etc. The proponents of this new test bed require one production-like system that can be utilized by multiple providers simulating a number of SOAs and LSMSs. It was felt that 5 or less SOA and LSMS simulators would be adequate to inject the necessary volumes. NeuStar stated that the typical production region has between 20 and 30.
* Next step: NeuStar to develop a Change Order for review next month in the APT meeting. This Change Order will incorporate AT&T Wireless’ PIM 26 contribution. NeuStar stated that a test bed that has more capacity than what is available today will require more hardware. Question to be answered – Does this test bed need to support replication?
* Discussion of Performance Requirements:
* Discussion of LNPA LSMS Traffic Model



NeuStar walked the group through the attached traffic model.

* It was reported that year-end projections went up by about 1 million records as a result of adding in July and August actuals. This may have been driven by wireless technology migrations. Some wireless providers stated they have a quiet period during November/December for migrations but there may not always be a choice on deferring them in every case. It was requested that migrations not be performed during this period.
* Wireline actuals for 3Q were incorporated. Some data input from wireless providers was received and incorporated into the projections for Busy Day and Busy Hour. The traffic model projections still reflect about 11 CMIP operations/second over the LSMS for all regions combined (< 2/second per region).
* Discussions of Plans for a SOA Model:
* There was significant discussion on whether the industry will have a SOA interface problem with increased porting volumes. There was concern expressed that 2 CMIP transactions/second, the current FRS requirement, will not be sufficient. NPAC has implemented performance improvements that will enable NPAC to meet projected SOA processing requirements, but the interface is a concern. It was noted, however, that the Incumbent LEC’s percentage of involvement in porting activity will decrease drastically when wireless porting begins on 11/24.
* Telcordia, as a Local SOA vendor, raised a concern regarding the assumption that the industry is scaled to handle the projected Wireless Number Portability volumes at both the NPAC SMS and SOA platforms, however, the requirements of the SOA interface connecting the platforms has not been modified. That is, the current NPAC requirements to support the SOA

message traffic is still 2 CMIP messages per second sustained and 5.2 CMIP messages per second peak. A concern was raised that if the wireless volume is truly going to be several factors greater than the current traffic, and that there currently exists a perception that in some circumstances there is backup and congestion over this interface, the additional load of wireless porting traffic may require a modification to these interface throughput requirements.

* NeuStar walked through the SOA notification worksheets that were added to the attached traffic model. The number of notifications generated per LSMS operation was calculated in the Busy Hour that was previously identified in the LSMS model.
* Question asked: What would a wireless provider do if they feel they have a SOA throughput problem based on their expected involvement in porting activity?
* NeuStar agreed to make the spreadsheet more usable for providers to determine their projected percentage of involvement in overall porting activity, add response traffic into the model, and determine if range operations are influencing the ratio of notifications to operation.
* It was stated that there are two ways of approaching a SOA traffic model – take the forecasted LSMS operations and back into the quantity of notifications, or take the actual notification counts we are seeing today and project them forward.
* CMIP Interface Improvements:
* The group agreed that we needed to further develop throughput requirements before we continue development of Change Order requirements. As a result, no discussion of Change Order requirements took place during this APT meeting.
* Any discussion of requirements for the following Change Orders, and any additional Change Orders submitted to address performance, will take place after the completion of the LSMS and SOA traffic models.
* ILL 5 – Round-Robin across LSMS Associations.
* NANC 353 – Round-Robin across SOA Associations
* NANC 383 – Dedicated SOA Notification Association
* ILL 130 – Enhanced Error Messaging
* NANC 384 – NPAC Change Order Effectiveness Metrics

PIMs:

At the October LNPA meeting during the PIM discussion, the group agreed that we need to discuss how votes will take place when a company has representation from both wireline and wireless arms in a potential combined WNPO and LNPA meeting scenario. This will be an agenda item for the November meeting.

.

* PIM 22 – PIM 22 remains open. At the October meeting, BellSouth stated that they have an internal group that addresses inadvertent ports on an emergency basis. BellSouth will investigate the frequency of occurrences. Verizon and Sprint PCS supported keeping PIM 22 open. Verizon continues to request that the LNPA explore ways to satisfactorily resolve this issue. Service Providers have an open action item to investigate internally how often the scenario described in PIM 22 occurs for further discussion at the LNPA.



* PIM 24 – This PIM, submitted by the Pool Administrator and AT&T Wireless, addresses instances where service providers are not following guidelines for block donation. For example, in some instances, contaminated blocks are being donated as non-contaminated blocks, or blocks with greater than 10% contamination are being donated. This is causing customers to be taken out of service or blocks to be exchanged for a less contaminated or non-contaminated block.

 

The LNPA and NAPM/LLC had previously approved the sharing of information between NPAC and the Pool Administrator whereby the Pool Administrator is able to obtain the necessary information from NPAC to ensure, to the extent possible, that service providers are complying with the pooled block donation process. The PA submitted Change Order 23 for FCC consideration. PA Change Order 23 was subsequently withdrawn and PA Change Order 24 was submitted to the FCC by the PA. The Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG) has recommended to the FCC a trial of the proposed resolution in selected pools initially. The PIM will remain open pending the FCC’s decision on the Change Order.

* PIM 25 – This PIM, submitted by Wireless Retail, Inc., seeks to give retailers access to “the porting database” to determine which carriers/markets to/from which customers can port. The submitter of this PIM stated that there are over 2,000 retail locations with 4500 sales reps that need training on wireless number portability. They need to know if a customer is eligible to port their number. The sales reps currently do not have any concept of rate center. Wireless Retail is seeking access to a central database to determine eligibility. Wireless Retail further explained that each wireless carrier provides different on-line access to their systems and that wireless carriers have not released training material yet regarding wireless number portability. The LNPA agreed that they should work with each individual carrier and pursue to see if any vendors have an offering that could satisfy their need. This PIM was CLOSED at the October meeting.



* NEW PIM 26 – This PIM, submitted by AT&T Wireless, seeks creation of a test bed that mirrors a production NPAC for volume and performance testing. The current SOW 34 test bed does not support load and performance testing to the extent required by wireless providers without affecting other providers that are testing. This PIM was discussed during the Architecture Planning Team (APT) meeting on Tuesday. NeuStar will develop a Change Order for review next month in the APT meeting. This Change Order will incorporate AT&T Wireless’ PIM 26 contribution. This PIM was CLOSED at the October LNPA meeting.

 

* PIM 27 – This PIM, submitted by Nextel, originally proposed short-term that both wireless and wireline Cancel Acknowledgement Window timers be changed from 9 business hours each to 2 business hours each. In addition, the original contribution proposed in the long term to allow a provider who cancels a pending port to be able to un-cancel. The long-term proposal requires an NPAC Change Order. Susan Ortega, Nextel, took an action item at the September LNPA meeting to resubmit PIM 27

modified to only include the proposed short-term solution of reducing the wireless and wireline Cancel Acknowledgement Window timers. Attached is the revised PIM 27 that was discussed at the October LNPA meeting.



At the September meeting, Nextel also took an action to submit an NPAC Change Order for the proposed long-term solution, extracted below from the original PIM 27 contribution.

“We recommend that the NPAC enable the SP who put an SV in Cancel Pending to remove the SV from Cancel Pending and put it in Pending status. E.g., if the Old SP put an SV in Cancel Pending, only the Old SP can remove it from Cancel Pending. If the New SP put an SV in Cancel pending, only the New SP can remove it from Cancel Pending.”

During the discussion of PIM 27 at the October LNPA, Verizon, AT&T Wireless, Qwest, Sprint, Sprint PCS, Cox, BellSouth, US Cellular, and Cingular expressed support of the long term proposal enabling removal of Cancel Pending status, but did not support any shortening of the Cancel Acknowledgement Window timers. SBC expressed support of the long term proposal and would only support shortening the timer slightly. T-Mobile and Verizon Wireless expressed support for both the short term Nextel proposal (revised PIM 27) and the long term proposal. The revised PIM 27 was not accepted at the October LNPA meeting.

NANC 323 - SPID Migration - Timeline Discussion:

* The LNPA group discussed the attached DRAFT timeline for planning and executing a SPID migration. Notes from that discussion are reflected in RED CAPS in the attached file.



Revised NANC LNP Provisioning Flows Discussion:

* The LNPA agreed to add the following footer to each page of the NANC LNP Provisioning Flows Narrative:

“**These are the flows the industry will use on November 24, 2003. These flows are subject to change pending guidance from the FCC regarding intermodal porting intervals. This is just one of the issues before the FCC that could affect these flows.**”

* In addition, it was agreed to change the Short Conflict Resolution Timer value reflected in the Narrative from 24 business hours to 6 business hours. This change is set to become effective in the production NPACs on 11/24/03.
* These changes to the Narrative will be transmitted to NANC Chairman Atkinson for NANC’s communication to the FCC.

**THURSDAY 10/16/03**

Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T | Susan Ortega | | Nextel |
| Lonnie Keck | ATTWS (phone) | Dave Garner | | Qwest |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | ATTWS | Charles Ryburn | | SBC (phone) |
| Reza Rahsaz | ATTTWS | Leah Luper | | SBC |
| Jennifer Gorre | ALLTEL (phone) | Tim Walters | | SNET Div. Group |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth (phone) | Craig Bartell | | Sprint |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Rick Dressner | | Sprint PCS |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LLC | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint PCS |
| Mark Wood | Cingular | Susan Tiffany | |  |
| Jim Grasser | Cingular (phone) | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox | Adam Newman | | Telcordia Technologies |
| Dennis Robbins | Electric Lightwave | John Malyar | | Telcordia Technologies |
| Keagan O’Rourke | Evolving Systems (phone) | Jean Anthony | | Telecom Software |
| Scott Wagner | Intrado | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Greg Roberts | NeuStar | Glenn Mills | | TSI |
| Larry Vagnoni | NeuStar | Chuck Bohl | | US Cellular |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Gene Johnston | NeuStar | Sharon Bridges | | Verizon |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Kevin Lewis | | Verizon |
|  |  | Chris Duckett-Brown | | Verizon Wireless |
| Marcelle Champagne | NeuStar | Deborah Stephens | | Verizon Wireless |
| Shannon Collins | NeuStar Pooling (phone) | Sally Anderson | | Ward Progressive Concepts |
| Randy Buffenbarger | NeuStar | Jason Lee | | WorldCom (phone) |
|  |  | Karen Mulberry | | WorldCom |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

Port Protection Change Order 382 (Presented by NeuStar):



* At the September LNPA meeting, service providers took an action item to come prepared to the October meeting to decide whether to accept NANC 382 in order to begin requirements discussion, or reject it. Following is the feedback provided by various service providers in attendance:
* Sprint stated that they do not support this Change Order but will not oppose its acceptance in order to move forward with requirements development.
* Cingular expressed the same position as Sprint.
* Verizon Wireless does not oppose moving forward with requirements development but wants more information on the potential need for this Change Order after wireless porting starts.
* Verizon, US Cellular, T-Mobile, AT&T Wireless, and Nextel voted to accept the Change Order.
* Qwest supports requirements development but has reservations on policy questions, as does US Cellular.
* MCI does not support this Change Order, nor sees a need for it. MCI feels that policy questions should be keyed up first, but does not strongly object to accepting the Change Order solely to begin requirements development.
* AT&T asked if PIM 22 would negate the need for this and would we be faced with the same policy issues if we implemented PIM 22. AT&T stated they have no comment at this time on the question whether to accept this Change Order for requirements development.
* BellSouth does not oppose moving forward but has strong reservations as to how it would implemented.
* Paul LaGattuta, as LNPA Co-Chair, suggested we also revisit PIM 22.
* Qwest asked NeuStar if this was a lot of work to develop requirements. NeuStar responded that this was not a high development effort. Qwest then suggested that we allow NeuStar to move forward with requirements and put a list of policy questions together.
* The Change Order was then accepted at this time for the sole purpose of working the NPAC functional requirements. There are numerous policy questions and concerns that need to be answered. The LNPA Working Group is to come prepared to the November LNPA to develop a list of policy questions that need to be answered regarding NANC Change Order 382 – Port Protection. NeuStar will bring a first draft of the functional requirements to the November meeting. At the January LNPA, we will discuss if and how to tee this up at the January NANC meeting.

Change Management Discussion:

* NANC 388 – This proposed Change Order is Nextel’s long-term proposal that was originally part of PIM 27. It would allow a provider who put a port into cancel-pending status to manually remove it from that status and put it back to pending. There were no objections from the LNPA to accepting this Change Order. NeuStar will begin working requirements.
* Qwest discussed the following scenario and proposed Change Order: Service provider personnel sends up an action to NPAC via their SOA but does not get a response from NPAC within a period of time. The provider’s operations personnel keep sending the action up. NPAC is awaiting to work the action and now has to work it multiple times. Qwest’s request is to have NPAC send back some sort of confirmation that it is awaiting to work the request so that operations personnel are notified that the action is still yet to be worked. NeuStar stated that this is an issue of the SOA interface getting so consumed that the responses get queued up. Currently, NPAC is required to respond within 3 seconds and broadcast within 60 seconds, but today NPAC must completely process the requested action before it responds. NeuStar feels it doesn’t make sense to allow 60 seconds to process the action while requiring a response within 3 seconds under this current paradigm. This proposed Change Order suggests that NPAC should have some sort of quick turnaround acknowledgement message. NPAC operates in CMIP confirmed mode. Currently, requirements are such that NPAC must process the request entirely before it can acknowledge the request. Currently, there is a TCP acknowledgement but NeuStar needs to investigate if this can be harnessed by the toolkit to satisfy this issue. If possible, Neustar stated that would be the best approach because it wouldn’t require an additional CMIP message. Telcordia stated that this does place a burden on the toolkit, however. The group discussed the possibility of raising the timeout value from 15 minutes on the service provider side to prevent the service provider from aborting the association. Some SOAs abort and when they come back up, auto resend any outstanding work it had saved and had not yet received a response back from NPAC.

Qwest will develop the business need for this proposed Change Order.

Discussion of 2004 Meeting Frequency:

* Paul LaGattuta, AT&T teed up a discussion on the possibility of meeting every other month face-to-face in 2004, with conference call meetings in the off months.
* Sprint PCS stated opposition to accepting the proposal now due to the upcoming wireless porting activity. Sprint PCS stated they could consider this proposal for the 2nd half of 2004. T-Mobile concurred with Sprint PCS. AT&T Wireless mentioned NANC 323 SPID Migration implementation and ongoing discussions of a possible next NPAC release as a need to continue to meet monthly at this time. The group agreed to revisit AT&T’s proposal in mid-2004. Verizon, SBC, Nextel, Qwest, Verizon Wireless, and BellSouth also support revisiting the proposed change to LNPA’s face-to-face meeting frequency.

Multiple LRN Status:

* Gary Sacra and Paul LaGattuta, LNPA Co-Chairs, provided a status of the Multiple LRN issue from the September NANC meeting.
* NANPA reported that the carrier survey responses to date did not indicate any exhaust problems associated with NXX assignments for the purpose of obtaining an LRN.
* There was concern expressed from some NANC members that the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) had placed the issue in Initial Closure. INC was given an action item to bring into NANC the checklist for alternatives to assigning a new NXX code when an additional LRN is needed.

Review of September Action Items:



* Item 0903-01: This item was completed in the 10/05/03 maintenance window and is Closed.
* Item 0903-02: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0903-03: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0903-04: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0903-05: This item was completed and is Closed. This change to the Sunday maintenance windows will be implemented with the 10/26/03 window. NeuStar was asked to provide the 2004 dates for the extended Sunday maintenance windows when NPAC will be off-line the entire 8 hour window. NeuStar concurred that the dates will be 1/4/04, 4/4/04, 7/04/04, and 10/3/04.
* Item 0903-06: This item was completed and is Closed. To be revisited in mid-2004.
* Item 0903-07: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0903-08: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0903-09: This item was completed and is Closed. The NAPM/LLC approved the recommended action and instructed NeuStar to notify the industry appropriately.
* Item 0903-10: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0903-11: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0903-12: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0903-13: NeuStar has received some responses from wireless carriers and is soliciting additional data. This item will remain open for another month.
* Item 0103-11: Item remains Open. PIM 22 remains open. At the October meeting, BellSouth stated that they have an internal group that addresses inadvertent ports on an emergency basis. BellSouth will investigate the frequency of occurrences. Verizon and Sprint PCS supported keeping PIM 22 open. Verizon continues to request that the LNPA explore ways to satisfactorily resolve this issue.
* Item 0803-10: This item was completed and is Closed.

NANC Report Development:

* The LNPA Report to NANC will include the following topics:
* Report on Architecture Planning Team activity
* PIMs 22 and 24 status
* Revisions to NANC LNP Provisioning Flows
* Added footer to Narrative.
* Wireless Conflict Timer change from 24 to 6 business hours on 11/24/03.

New Business:

* T-Mobile posed the following question – How does law enforcement get notified that a number with a wiretap has ported? One member raised the NPAC IVR that was put in place for law enforcement to obtain the current provider of a ported number. The IVR reads the NPAC database via a query and audibly provides the name of the current provider of the ported number. T-Mobile questioned if there was any possible violation to the CALEA requirements if they port in a number that had a wiretap. Are carriers responsible to notify law enforcement? It was stated that the process of notification should be the same as that if the customer disconnected and perhaps the service order triggered some sort of fallout. No LNPA action to be taken.

Remaining 2003 Meeting Schedule:

* Wireless will meet on Mondays and Tuesdays, the Architecture Planning Team will meet on Tuesdays from 1pm-5pm local time, and the LNPA will meet on Wednesdays and Thursdays.
* Nov. Week of 11/10. NANC meets on 11/5. Hosted by VeriSign in Overland Park, Kansas.
* Dec. Week of 12/8. No NANC meeting. Hosted by Telcordia in San Diego.