**LNPA WORKING GROUP**

**MEETING MINUTES:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| VeriSign | Overland Park, Kansas | Host: VeriSign |

**Wednesday, November 12, 2003 – 8:30 AM – 5:00 PM**

Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T (phone) | Rosemary Emmer | | Nextel (phone) |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | ATTWS | Dave Garner | | Qwest |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Charles Ryburn | | SBC |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Leah Luper | | SBC |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LLC | Tim Walters | | SNET Div. Group |
| Mark Wood | Cingular (phone) | Craig Bartell | | Sprint |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox | Rick Dressner | | Sprint PCS |
| Keagan O’Rourke | Evolving Systems (phone) | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint PCS |
| Jason Lee | MCI | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint |
| Karen Mulberry | MCI | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec (phone) |
| Larry Vagnoni | NeuStar | Jean Anthony | | Telecom Software |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Rob Smith | | TSI |
| Gene Johnston | NeuStar | Chuck Bohl | | US Cellular |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| Marcelle Champagne | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Shannon Collins | NeuStar Pooling (phone) | Linda Godfrey | | Verizon Wireless (phone) |
| Susan Ortega | Nextel (phone) | Deborah Stephens | | Verizon Wireless |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

Attached are the Action Items assigned at the November, 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 “NOVEMBER 2003 LNPA ACTION ITEMS” FILE ATTACHED ABOVE.

**WEDNESDAY 11/12/03**

2004 Meeting Schedule:

* NOTE: At the November LNPA, the group agreed to move the August, 2004 meeting to the week of 8/17. This change is reflected in the 2004 meeting schedule below, as well as subsequent changes made to the schedule. These changes are highlighted in yellow.
* It has been 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.
* 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 | 1/13/04 |
| FEBRUARY | WEEK OF 2/2 | TSI | TAMPA, FLORIDA | NO NANC |
| MARCH | WEEK OF 3/8 | BELL SOUTH | BIRMINGHAM ALABAMA | 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 | CANADIANCONSORTIUM | OTTAWA, CANADA | NO NANC |
| JULY | WEEK OF 7/19 | TEKELEC | RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA | 7/13/04 |
| AUGUST | WEEK OF 8/17 | T-MOBILE | TBD IN CALIFORNIA | NO NANC |
| SEPTEMBER | WEEK OF 9/6 | COX | ATLANTA, GEORGIA | 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 |

10/03 Minutes Review:

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

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

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

* Wireless Testing Subcommittee (WTSC) Report –
* Testing issues are still be worked. A second set of round robin testing is taking place in Orlando. There is some interest in scheduling a third round.
* A matrix will soon be posted related to the lessons learned during testing.
* 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 responded to the attached NIIF letter stating that there was nothing further to inject into the NIIF document, but the WNPO encouraged carriers to work with vendors to provide input to NIIF. The NIIF has stated that they are not satisfied with the WNPO response and is responding back to the WNPO.



* The Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF) Wireless Workshop will form a new Technology Task Force after the 1st of the year to address protocol changes.
* The WNPO discussed the Wireless Conflict Timer and the discussion that took place at the November 5th NANC meeting regarding the Minority Opinion requesting that the timer be kept at the current 24 business hours on 11/24/03. Some State Commissioners on NANC wanted to keep it at 24 hours. The carriers signing the Minority Opinion were advised to send a letter to the FCC if they wished to pursue this issue further. The NANC did not take any action to prevent the Wireless Conflict Timer from reverting back to 6 business hours on 11/24/03. The NANC instructed the LNPA to address this timer issue as part of PIM 22.
* The Fallout Reduction Taskforce (FORT), formed by the WNPO to investigate reasons why porting transactions do not flow through, continues to hold weekly conference calls each Friday from 10am-12 noon Central Time. A new “FORT” button is now on the NPAC website. FORT also has a new exploder list.
* New Business:
* Concerns expressed with the proposal to combine the WNPO and LNPA groups:
* Who gets a vote when there are two arms within a company – wireline and wireless,
* Don’t combine until after 1st quarter 2004,
* Need a Wireless Co-Chair for LNPA,
* Leave Monday of LNPA week as an open day in case wireless wants to meet alone,
* Still need a separate wireless section in the NANC report,
* Need sufficient time to discuss all wireless issues in an open environment.

This will be discussed further at the December WNPO meeting.

* Contributions to be discussed at the December WNPO meeting:
* Sprint port protection contribution:



* Sprint PIC freeze contribution:



* 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 11/11/03. Attached is the meeting agenda.



* Discussion of Performance Requirements:
* Discussion of LNPA LSMS Traffic Model



NeuStar walked the group through the attached traffic model.

* This version uses the latest numbers from Version 2.2 of the NPAC Forecasting Group (NFG) model, which includes the October actuals.
* A Traffic Model Summary page has been added and is based on 4Q03 estimated traffic. It projects LSMS Busy Hour Messages and SOA Busy Hour Notifications. The Provider Participation % can be changed to allow a service provider to customize their projected SOA interface requirements in messages per second. The SOA numbers in the summary reflect notifications and acknowledgements to the notifications. They do not include the requests. Doubling these numbers to reflect the request traffic would be the absolute worse case. These numbers also do not take bursts into consideration, they are evenly distributed over the busy hour. A concern was expressed that a single provider could be involved in greater than 12.5% of the porting activity and could exceed the 2 CMIP operations per second sustained/5.2 per second burst FRS SOA interface requirements. It is possible that SOA interface requirements may need to be increased in the future. There will likely be queuing of messages at times. It was asked if these numbers reflect a time consistent busy hour for the notifications, or are the notification counts taken from each notification’s busiest hour and added together. NeuStar responded that it is the latter. This is truly the worse case scenario in that it assumes that each notification’s individual busy hour counts will hit in the very same hour. It was agreed that we eventually want to evolve to looking at the true time consistent busy hour after we get some actual data post 11/24/03.
* It was noted that we experienced a large number of modifies in October due to NANC 191/291 corrections. This is expected to taper off.
* 4Q03 Day Chart – It was asked why the first week of Wireless Number Portability (WNP) implementation data is less than subsequent weeks. NeuStar explained that this is not an intentional depiction of the data but is likely due to how the data is spread in the model.
* Any ongoing projections in this model, e.g. 1Q04, will result from data input from the NFG.
* The group discussed the Notification Counts worksheet in the Model. This worksheet derives a ratio, using 3Q03 actual data, of SOA notifications to request type, and then uses those derived ratios to project the notification counts for 4Q03. This data is then rolled up in the Notification Table tab.
* A discussion ensued on evolving to a time consistent busy hour that is determined by the total number of notifications and requests during that hour, as opposed to determining the busy hour based on the high count of a specific operation, e.g. activates. It was suggested that we may need to determine separate busy hours for SOA and LSMS. A concern was expressed that different types of requests and notifications may drive different amounts of work in local systems.
* One member agreed that it is misleading to use the highest counts for each notification. It was suggested that we should identify the busy hour by the number of messages to determine the interface requirement, and then determine the mix of traffic overall so vendors can engineer the work requirements for their systems. NeuStar stated that we will need to discuss how to capture the data ongoing if we go to highest counts during a given hour. There is currently no report for capturing the number of messages per hour and identifying the highest count in an hour.
* NeuStar will reflect a time consistent busy hour for SOA notifications based on the Busy Hour for activates to see the difference between that approach and the worse case approach currently reflected.
* NeuStar then asked what is the group’s expectation for next month. The group agreed we will review the resultant difference in approaches to identifying the Busy Hour for SOA notifications.
* One member stated that we should visit the model quarterly ongoing.
* Discussion of restriction on the number of daily pooled block activations (currently 40):
* NeuStar reported that there are 22 LSMS associations that are non-EDR, and 159 that are (88% support EDR). This will rise to 93% by mid-2004. Most of the remaining 7% do not need this restriction of no more than 40 pooled block activations daily. Only one provider in one region stated a need to keep the restriction until January 2004. NeuStar concluded that it is not necessary to mandate support of EDR. By mid-2004, we could conceivably lift the restriction in 6 regions. At any rate, keeping the restriction is just a way of pre-empting a potential problem. It does not result in any delay in a provider getting a needed pooled block. The activation dates are actually pulled up in order to maintain the 40 block per day restriction. There were no objections from the group in keeping the restriction for the time being and not mandating EDR.
* Question of sunsetting non-EDR support: The APT group recommends to the LNPA that, based on the service provider responses presented by NeuStar, there is no need to mandate EDR. By mid-2004, we should be able to lift the 40 block limit in 6 regions, and possibly all 7 if the lone provider referenced above has implemented a non-EDR method of supporting more blocks per day. This should be in time for the ramp up when wireless providers need to obtain additional inventory.
* Review of performance test bed Change Order 389:
* NeuStar stated it is not possible to have a single test bed for performance/volume testing and a test bed for functionality testing without impacting the functionality testing.
* This Change Order will be addressed in further detail during the Change Management discussion on Thursday.

Discussion of Combining WNPO and LNPA Groups:

* The group set an objective to combine the LNPA and WNPO in April, 2004. We will re-visit this in January, 2004 to see if we are on track and determine the start day and time during LNPA week of a combined group. The Wireless Number Portability Operations (WNPO) team took an action to discuss at their December, 2003 meeting the feasibility of combining the LNPA and WNPO into one group and one meeting starting in April, 2004.
* Regarding the question of how voting would take place in a combined group if a company had both a wireline and wireless arm, the LNPA agreed that voting should take place as follows: one vote per entity as is the case today.
* Charles Ryburn took an action to send a letter to Sue Sills, Wireless Testing Subcommittee (WTSC) Co-Chair, with a list of 2004 LNPA meeting dates, locations, hosting companies and contacts, advising the WTSC that they need to contact the hosting company in advance if the WTSC will need meeting space at an LNPA meeting during 2004.
* It was suggested that the NANC Report from a combined group could possibly have 3 sections – wireless only issues, wireline only issues, and common issues.

Discussion of Lengthening the 15 minute Retry Timer:

* When NPAC sends a message to a provider’s local system (SOA or LSMS), the local system has 15 minutes to respond to that message or NPAC will abort the applicable association and the local system has to recover. Likewise, there are some provider systems who have the same type of configuration. When the association is re-established, the local system resends all work that is still in queue. NPAC receives messages over and over again in this scenario, generating extra work. NPAC has to completely process the requests repeatedly.
* The LNPA agreed to recommend to the NAPM/LLC that they approve NeuStar

raising the NPAC Retry Timer from 15 minutes to 60 minutes during the 11/23/03

Sunday maintenance window. NeuStar took the following related action items:

1. Send an immediate notification to service providers via the X-Regional distribution list that the LNPA is recommending that, by 11/24/03, any SOA system and LSMS system request response time timers be set to 60 minutes or greater. Also, SOA and LSMS timers for query and audit requests should not be set less than 60 minutes.
2. Pending LLC approval of the LNPA recommendation addressing the NPAC Retry Timer, send a follow-up notification to the industry via the X-Regional distribution list notifying the industry that the NPAC Retry Timer will be set to 60 minutes during the 11/23/03 maintenance window.

* Pending LLC approval of the LNPA recommendation addressing the NPAC Retry Timer, Charles Ryburn, LNPA Co-Chair, took an action to send a notification to the LNPA and WNPO distribution lists notifying the industry that the LLC approved the NPAC Retry Timer being set to 60 minutes during the 11/23/03 maintenance window.
* Gary Sacra, as Projective Executive (PE), will tee this recommendation up with the LLC in the PE Report to the 11/18/03 LLC meeting.

NOTE: The LLC approved the LNPA recommendation at their meeting on 11/18/03. All action items above have been completed. The timer value change will take effect during the 11/23/03 Sunday Maintenance Window.

* It was suggested that NANC Change Order 390, which would provide an immediate NPAC acknowledgement to a request from a local system, may eliminate the need for the 15 minute Retry Timer. It was also suggested that the timer could still apply with NANC 390 and abort the association if the acknowledgement is not received, for example, within 15 minutes.

NANC Change Order 323 (SPID Migration) Timeline/Process Details (NeuStar):



* NeuStar walked the group through the attached process flows and narratives for the NANC 323 SPID Migration process.
* Figure 1 of the flows assumes that the migration can be done in a regular Sunday maintenance window, and no LLC approval is needed. It was noted that we need to further discuss this process when SPID A is no longer around.
* Question asked: What is an acceptable format for service providers to notify NPAC with a SPID Migration request? SBC and Verizon would prefer a standard form that can be downloaded from a website, completed, and e-mailed back to NPAC.
* The group agreed that the SPID migration request would come from SPID B. If SPID A still exists, NPAC would verify with SPID A. If SPID A does not exist, NPAC would verify the status of the NPA-NXX with NANPA. It was stated that this is consistent with the LERG process.
* NeuStar took an action to document the NANPA code transfer timeline, which includes the LERG notification process, for use in the development of the NANC 323 timeline.
* We need to discuss the service provider contact list for SPID migrations. Question from a member – is this the contact that needs to respond to NPAC on the estimated timeframe to complete the migration in the local systems? NeuStar took an action to send a request out to service providers via the X-Regional distribution by **March, 2004** to identify their primary and secondary contacts for NeuStar to send the SPID migration notifications. Based on the current DRAFT NANC 323 timeline, service providers will have 7 calendar days to respond to these notifications.
* A pre-migration SMURF file will be generated one week prior to migration weekend prior to the readiness call.
* A member stated that their company also wants a second mock file on the Friday morning of migration weekend.
* Issue: NANC 385, which proposes excluding maintenance window time from timer expiration calculations, will not be in place prior to NANC 323 implementation. This would be an issue for wireless carriers if extended maintenance time is required to perform a migration. NeuStar and Local System Vendors (SOA/LSMS) took an action to determine how many Subscription Versions (SVs) can be processed in NPAC within an 8 hour window. Because this benchmarking is greatly dependent on the size of the database, it was agreed that this Action Item should be completed after the implementation of Wireless Number Portability, but prior to the 6/30/04 industry support date of NANC 323. A member asked if NeuStar had any historical perspective of how many SVs are modified in a typical SPID transfer of codes. NeuStar responded that they didn’t think they had any such data that would be useful.
* Question that needs to be addressed: **Do we want to specify a quiet period for porting activities related to migrating codes prior to SPID Migration?** It wassuggested that it should be a “gentleman’s agreement” rather than a hard freeze in the event that some cleanup needs to take place in the code.
* Figure 5 – NPAC generates SMURF files as the last action before going off-line for the maintenance window.
* Figure 5 – We need to discuss if we need a second status call after the migration to determine who is not yet complete. Also, should there be a quiet period on the impacted codes after migration?
* The LNPA took an action to identify the various migration scenarios in the context of the timeline and Methods & Procedures to determine if there are any differences in process. This will be an agenda item for the December LNPA meeting. Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, took an action to extract the various migration scenarios from the NANC 323 conference call minutes and include them in the November LNPA minutes for use in the December discussions.

NOTE: The following was extracted from the 9/3/03 NANC 323 conference call minutes in response to the above action item:

The group agreed to develop detailed steps in their required order for each scenario on a later call. In doing so, we must keep in mind any differences relative to the scenario being a complete migration or a partial migration: A migration involves two SPIDs. If other SPIDs are involved, e.g. part of SPID A to SPID B, and part of SPID A to SPID C, these are two separate migrations.

The group listed and discussed the following scenarios that would drive a SPID migration:

1. a) An NXX Code transfer from SPID A to SPID B, where both service

providers are still in existence. No porting or pooling activity has taken place in the code, nor are there any ported numbers from other codes that use an LRN from the code that is being transferred. The current code owner in NPAC (SPID A) has to delete the code in NPAC and the new code owner (SPID B) adds it in NPAC. No NANC 323 functionality is required for Scenario 1a.

1. Same scenario as above, but the current code owner in NPAC (SPID A) no longer exists. NeuStar must act on behalf of SPID A in this scenario in order to delete the code in NPAC. No NANC 323 functionality is required for Scenario 1b. NeuStar took an action to confirm what authority they need to delete the code in NPAC on behalf of SPID A.

2. a) An NXX Code transfer of a code with ported or pooled numbers from

SPID A to SPID B’s existing switch. This may or may not require LRN and DPC modifies. This scenario includes the intra-Company case using two different SPIDs.

1. An NXX Code transfer of a code with ported or pooled numbers from

SPID A to SPID B where SPID B assumes ownership of SPID A’s switch intact. This may or may not require LRN and DPC changes.

1. Two geographic areas are served by the same SPID A LRN. SPID A is

retaining one area and relinquishing the second area. The NXX Code containing the LRN is being transferred to SPID B. SPID A must modify the LRN of any retained ported-in records associated with the LRN within the code to be transferred prior to the migration.

* NeuStar took an action to discuss with the Pool Administrator (PA) if NANC 323 can be used to move pooled blocks between provider SPIDs, or do we have to go through the de-pool/pool process.
* A question was raised if there are any switches shared among service providers. Sprint agreed to investigate due to that issue being raised previously by a Sprint member. If there are shared switches, we will put a question about this on the form that the provider sends to NeuStar to start the migration process.
* It was suggested that, in determining the timeframe required by service providers to complete the migration, when the service provider sends the response to NPAC, they will answer if they can or cannot complete within the specified window. If they determine they cannot, then they will provide the estimated timeframe required in hours.
* It was then suggested that we should revisit the need for asking service providers the estimated timeframe to process the SMURF files in their systems. What would NeuStar do with this information? The original intent was to share this with the LLC, but it was questioned if this necessary.

# THURSDAY 11/13/03

Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T (phone) | Rosemary Emmer | | Nextel (phone) |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | ATTWS | Dave Garner | | Qwest |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Charles Ryburn | | SBC |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Leah Luper | | SBC |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LLC | Tim Walters | | SNET Div. Group |
| Mark Wood | Cingular (phone) | Craig Bartell | | Sprint |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox | Rick Dressner | | Sprint PCS |
| Keagan O’Rourke | Evolving Systems (phone) | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint PCS |
| Jason Lee | MCI | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint |
| Karen Mulberry | MCI | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec (phone) |
| Larry Vagnoni | NeuStar | Jean Anthony | | Telecom Software |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Rob Smith | | TSI |
| Gene Johnston | NeuStar | Chuck Bohl | | US Cellular |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| Marcelle Champagne | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Shannon Collins | NeuStar Pooling (phone) | Linda Godfrey | | Verizon Wireless (phone) |
| Susan Ortega | Nextel (phone) | Deborah Stephens | | Verizon Wireless |

PIMs:

.

* PIM 22 – PIM 22 remains open. At the November meeting, Sue Tiffany, WNPO Co-Chair, discussed the Wireless Conflict Timer Minority Report presented at the November 5th NANC meeting. The attached Minority Report, signed by Sprint, AT&T Wireless, and Alltel, recommended to keep the Wireless Conflict Timer at 24 business hours on 11/24/03, rather than allowing it to revert back to 6 business hours as currently planned. A number of NANC members, including regulators, expressed concern regarding the service-affecting conditions resulting from inadvertent ports. NANC decided not to block the timer from reverting to 6 hours, but charged the LNPA with addressing the Wireless Conflict Timer as part of PIM 22. The group then discussed the original Verizon proposed resolution to PIM 22 seeking to require concurrence by both Old and New Services Providers before a port in the Conflict state can be moved to Pending. Gary Sacra, Verizon, will update and reissue the original Verizon PIM 22 Conflict Timer concurrence proposal, adding some text on roles and responsibilities of providers, provider behavior, and address the Wireless Porting Request (WPR) in addition to the Local Service Request (LSR).



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.

Change Management Discussion:

* NANC 389 – This Change Order, originally proposed by AT&T Wireless as PIM 26, seeks development of a performance and volume test bed. It was suggested we need to better quantify and define the volume requirements to keep from building more into the test bed than is necessary. NeuStar stated that any volume test bed should be separate from the SOW 34 test bed, which was designed and implemented for functionality testing. A member asked if we need a production-like system in order to do volume and performance testing, and then suggested inputs we need to provide in order to design a system, e.g., number of service providers that will be testing, number of simulators, porting volumes. It was recommended that service providers need to go back and talk with their testing and production managers to define what their testing needs are, e.g., volumes, over what period of time, is it fully end-to-end, etc., before we can discuss the development requirements of a volume test bed. Wireless Service Providers took an action to define their requirements, e.g., what their testing needs are, volumes, over what period of time, is it fully end-to-end, etc., compile them, and bring into the LNPA a revised Change Order 389 Business Need.
* NANC 390 – This Change Order, submitted by Qwest, proposes that NPAC should have some sort of quick turnaround acknowledgement message. Currently, NPAC processes all work associated with a request before it acknowledges. There is a TCP acknowledgement today, but NeuStar stated that there needs to be an acknowledgement at the CMIP level, in order to be consistent with the original design of the system. Current Service Level Requirements (SLRs) do not require that NPAC process all of the work before the request is acknowledged. NeuStar stated that this Change Order will require changes in SOAs to allow them to accept the new acknowledgement message and not act upon it until the actual response is returned. SOA implementation could be done separately from the LSMS per NeuStar. This Change Order could be made backward compatible on a per service provider profile basis. NANC 390 was then accepted and moved into the Architecture Planning Team for further development of requirements.
* NANC 388 – This Change Order, submitted by Nextel, proposes that a service provider putting a port into the Cancel Pending state, be allowed to retract it and put it back into Pending status. There was a question as to whether the other SOA would require development to support the retraction and change in status. NeuStar stated that currently there is no transition in the Functional Requirements Specification (FRS) from Cancel Pending directly to Pending. NeuStar took an action to investigate if an SV that comes out of Cancel Pending (put in by the Old SP) after the timer expires can go into Conflict status if it had already gone through the Conflict cycle once previously. Service providers have an action with their SOA vendors to determine if there is any SOA development required. NOTE: Subsequent to the 11/03 LNPA meeting, NeuStar verified that an SV that is transitioning from Cancel Pending state to Pending state, currently always passes through the Conflict state before it goes to Pending. NANC Change Order 388 introduces a scenario whereby an SV moves directly from the Cancel Pending state to the Pending state, and therefore introduces a new SOA notification.

Port Protection Change Order 382 (Presented by NeuStar):



* At the October LNPA meeting, the LNPA Working Group took an action item to come prepared to the November LNPA meeting to develop a list of policy questions that need to be answered regarding NANC Change Order 382 – Port Protection. Following is the list of questions developed at the November meeting.

1. What types of numbers can be placed on the protection list?

* Any number?
* Only those slammed previously?
* Service Provider Administration numbers?
* Homeland Security numbers?
* Emergency numbers?
* Telco-defined essential lines (e.g. payphones, police, fire)?

1. Who can put a number on the list and remove a number from the list (authorization)?
2. What is the process for putting numbers on and taking numbers off the list?
3. Who can have access to the list?
4. What is the process to access the list?

* Ping the list?
* View the list?
* The group reviewed the draft NPAC requirements for the Change Order developed by the NeuStar Change Management Administrator (CMA). NeuStar stated that under the current draft requirements, the Old Service Provider Create message does not remove a number from the protection list, however, the Old Service Provider Create message will not be rejected if the number is on the list. Step 4.b.1 will be revised to reflect this.
* A check will also be made for any non-ported TNs in a pooled block. If a number is on the protection list, the pooled block cannot be activated because this is an indication where a working number has not been intra-SP ported.
* A member asked if resolution of PIM 22 would negate the need for NANC 382. Verizon responded that, in their opinion, both PIM 22 and NANC 382 are necessary.
* At the January LNPA meeting, the group will discuss if and how to tee this Change Order up at the January 2004 NANC meeting.

Multiple LRN Issue Status:

* Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, provided a status of the Multiple LRN issue from the November NANC meeting.
* The North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA) provided a readout on the survey sent to carriers asking for the number of new NXX codes required for the purpose of LRN assignments. NANPA stated that, based on the responses, no jeopardy situations were indicated. NANPA then stated that they considered their action items related to this issue to be closed. There was no objection from NANC.
* The SBC representative on NANC gave a presentation explaining call routing in Extended Area Service (EAS) areas and the need for additional LRNs in a LATA to properly route these calls.
* NANC did not object to the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) moving this issue toward Final Closure. Service providers are advised to review the INC’s TN Pooling Guidelines and LRN Assignment Practices.

Review of October Action Items:



* Item 1003-01: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 1003-02: This item remains Open. These topics were touched upon briefly at the 10/22/03 LLC meeting, but due to time constraints, will be discussed in more detail at the November LLC meeting. Gary Sacra will have it placed on the LLC agenda.
* Item 1003-03: This item remains Open. This will be placed on the December WNPO agenda.
* Item 1003-04: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 1003-05: This item was completed and is Closed. There is no recommendation to require service provider support of Efficient Data Representation (EDR).
* Item 1003-06: This item remains Open.
* Item 0103-11: Item remains Open. PIM 22 remains open. At the November meeting, Sue Tiffany, WNPO Co-Chair, discussed the Wireless Conflict Timer Minority Report presented at the November NANC meeting. The Minority Report, signed by Sprint, AT&T Wireless, and Alltel, sought to keep the Wireless Conflict Timer at 24 business hours on 11/24/03, rather than allowing it to revert back to 6 business hours as currently planned. NANC decided not to block the timer from reverting to 6 hours, but charged the LNPA with addressing the Wireless Conflict Timer as part of PIM 22. Gary Sacra will update and reissue the original Verizon PIM 22 Conflict Timer concurrence proposal, adding some text on roles and responsibilities of providers, provider behavior, and address the Wireless Porting Request (WPR) in addition to the Local Service Request (LSR) (See Action Item 1103-12). Verizon continues to request that the LNPA explore ways to satisfactorily resolve this issue.
* Item 0903-13: This item was completed and is Closed.

NOTE: During the Action Item discussion, NeuStar announced that August 1, 2004 will be the Extended Sunday Service Provider Maintenance Window for 3Q04 when NPAC will be off-line the entire 8 hour window, instead of the previously announced July 4, 2004. The other dates in 2004 when NPAC will be off-line the entire 8 hour Extended Sunday Service Provider Maintenance Window will be 1/4/04, 4/4/04, and 10/3/04.

This will be communicated to the industry via a Cross-Regional notice.

New Business:

* Bellsouth raised an issue with potential discrepancies in the NANC 356 Service Provider Name field designations (/1, /2, /3) in NPAC. One example cited was the case where some wireless providers are using long timers and a wireline designation (/1) has been placed in the name field for that provider. Bellsouth stated that discrepancies with this data invalidates their back office processes in identifying the type of carrier. It was agreed that there should be no link between what type of timers are used and the designation in the Name Field. NeuStar took an action to investigate overall any discrepancies with this carrier type designation.

NOTE: In response to the specific example cited in this Action Item, NeuStar confirmed subsequent to the 11/03 LNPA meeting that a carrier’s selection of long vs. short timers in its NPAC profile has no impact on the designation (/1 vs. /2) in the Customer Name Field. NeuStar will investigate any additional discrepancies in this data and report back to the LNPA.

Remaining 2003 Meeting Schedule:

* Wireless will meet on Monday and Tuesday, the Architecture Planning Team will meet on Tuesday from 1pm-5pm local time, and the LNPA will meet on Wednesday and Thursday from 8:30am-5pm local time.
* Dec. Week of 12/8. No NANC meeting. Hosted by Telcordia in San Diego.