# Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** |
| Jim Grasser | Cingular Wireless | Brigitte Brown | TeleCorp PCS |
| Anne Cummins | AT&T Wireless | Gary Sacra | Verizon |
| Scotty Parish | AllTel | Kathleen Tedrick | Sprint |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Rosemary Emmer | Nextel |
| Ron Steen | Bell South | Ron Stutheit | Evolving Systems |
| Jean Anthony | Telecom Software | Jeff Adrian | Sprint PCS |
| H.L. Gowda | AT&T | Patricia Smith | Voicestream Wireless |
| Karen Mulberry | WorldCom | Chris Duckett-Brown | Verizon Wireless |
| Maggie Lee | Illuminet | Stephen Addicks | WorldCom |
| Jason Lee | WorldCom | Julie Neumann | AT&T Wireless |
| Patrick Lockett | Sprint | Gene Johnston | NeuStar |
| Tracy Frank | Business Edge Solutions | Melissa Flicek | Nextel Partners |
| Robert Jones | U.S. Cellular | Colleen Flury | AT&T Wireless |
| Denise Thomas | WorldCom | Linda Godfrey | Verizon Wireless |
| Charlotte Holden | U.S. Cellular | Anna Miller | Voicestream Wireless |
| John Malyar | Telcordia |  |  |
| Participants Via the Conference Bridge: | |  |  |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Dennis Rose | CHR Solutions |
| Mark Wood | Cingular Wireless | Liz Coakley | SBC Wireline |
| Dave Garner | Qwest | Jennifer Gory | Altell |
| Sheryl Gordon | Altell | Rick Dressner | Sprint PCS |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Wireless | Steve Hallbauer | CHR Solutions |
| Mary Brien | Sprint PCS | Kirby ? | Sprint |

# Meeting Minutes:

Introductions and Agenda Review

Introductions were made and the agenda reviewed.

Reviewed Minutes from Previous Month

Team identified the following changes that need to be made to the November 2001 minutes:

1. The two references to “9/16/01” need to be changed to “9/16/02”.
2. Under “NPAC’s Readiness for Wireless Portability – Patrick Lockett” make the following change:

Replace

*“One team member commented that NeuStar provides help desk support 24 hours/day and that as carrier revenues increase it supports the increased staffing of the help desk.”*

with

*“In response to concerns expressed over increased charges for extended Help Desk operating hours, Steve Addicks (WorldCom) pointed out that one should not assume there necessarily is an additional charge for extended Help Desk operating hours due to wireless porting. This is because the Help Desk is largely funded by porting transaction charges and this revenue stream is increased by the same activities driving the need for longer Help Desk operating hours.”*

**ACTION:** Modify the November 2001 minutes and email updated version to the team. (Brigitte Brown)

Introduction of New Business Items:

1. *NANC Updates:*
   1. The WNPO does not have authorization from the NANC to send a letter to the FCC regarding the updated implementation timeline and stating the issues that have caused delays in inter-carrier testing.
   2. The WNPO does not have authorization from the NANC to send a letter to vendors requesting input on their ability to support porting and pooling.
   3. Any letter written by the WNPO must go through NANC approval before being sent out.
   4. The NANC indicated that individual companies with concerns or issues should send letters directly to the FCC and vendors.
   5. CTIA sent a letter to the FCC on 11/21/01 (attached below) reiterating the concerns that the WNPO had communicated to NANC in October 2001. CTIA’s letter also referenced the letter that NANC sent to the FCC on 11/20/01.
2. *Revised Implementation Timeline:*
   1. The revised timeline that was discussed at the November 2001 meeting (attached below) will need to be further revised.
   2. WTSC Input:
      1. At the December WTSC meeting there was reluctance by the team to agree upon a new testing timeline.
      2. The WTSC has indicated that at least 6 weeks of testing will be required for each region and a new region should begin testing every three weeks (overlapping regions).
   3. One team member stated that they did not believe that inter-carrier testing would be needed for pooling. Other team members disagreed. The WTSC considered what would be required for number pooling inter-carrier testing (in isolation of porting testing). The ICP testing would be eliminated, however the network testing would remain. The WTSC does not feel that removing porting would change the testing dates for pooling.
   4. **ACTION:** Jim Grasser and Brigitte Brown will further revise the implementation timeline for discussion at the January WNPO meeting. There is no NANC meeting in December, so the timeline that will be discussed at the January WNPO meeting can also be presented at the January NANC meeting.
3. *Wireline to Wireless Reseller Flows – Contribution from Anne Cummins*

Team discussed the contribution from Anne Cummins proposing that the wireless reseller porting model (as approved by NANC) be used for ports between wireless and wireline resellers. The contribution is attached below. Below are some of the points made during the discussion and the action items that were identified:

* 1. Background:
     1. On 08/07/01 the LNPA voted to accept the NNPO's proposed process flows comprised of only Option B (Network SP to Network SP flows) and recommend it as an industry standard for wireline to wireline reseller ports.
     2. In September of 2000 the WNPSC sent the to the NANC *the Wireless LNP Technical, Operational, and Implementation Requirement Document* for approval. The NANC approved the report and sent it forward to the FCC. In the report the wireless industry established the wireless to wireless reseller porting process. In this process the reseller is responsible for the ICP/pre-port process and the new reseller tells the facilities-based provider to send a notification to the NPAC. Wireless resellers do not share any account information with the facilities based wireless provider.
     3. The two flows are the exact opposite of each other - therefore porting process between wireline and wireless resellers must be determined.
  2. Anne Cummin’s Recommendation:
     1. Wireless facility based service providers cannot send the LSR/WPR forward to the old facility based service provider because the reseller's subscriber account information is considered by the reseller to be proprietary. As a consequence the information is never shared with the facility based service provider.
     2. Since the LSR/WPR purpose is to validate account information the reseller must have the capability of sending the LSR/WPR and receiving the FOC/WPR. Without this capability their customers would not be able to port.
     3. Recommendation: For ports between wireless and wireline resellers use the wireless reseller porting model.
  3. One SP suggested that the wireless-to-wireless reseller flows be changed, however, it was determined that modifications to that process should not be entertained at this time as they were previously defined by the WNPSC in May 2000 and approved by NANC in September 2000. That SP was represented at the NANC meetings where the process was discussed and approved. So the focus is now on the wireline to wireless reseller flows and not the wireless to wireless flows.
  4. WorldCom and Sprint indicated their desire to use the wireline reseller flows for the wireline to wireless reseller flows.
  5. There are two types of reseller ports: a) one reseller can port all of their numbers to another facilities-based provider, or b) one customer of the reseller wants to port to another provider.
  6. Charles Ryburn suggested that this issue get opened up as a PIM at the LNPA WG.
  7. **ACTION:** Open a PIM at the LNPA WG on updating the NANC flows and narratives to a) add flows for wireless resellers and b) review the narratives for existing flows to ensure they are compatible with wireless business models. (Jim Grasser)
  8. **ACTION:** WNPO to work on updating the NANC flows and narratives to a) add flows for wireless resellers and b) review the narratives for existing flows to ensure they are compatible with wireless business models and then forward it to the LNPA WG.



Update from NeuStar:

1. Three SPs have completed their turn up testing (Cingular, Illuminet, and Sprint). Six more have submitted requests to NeuStar for the testing, but have not provided dates yet.
2. **ACTION:** Team member asked that NeuStar look into how many providers requested a test date that NeuStar could not support due to release 3.1 activities. (Gene Johnston)
3. **ACTION:** NeuStar to provide the number of SPs who have established a profile with NeuStar. (Gene Johnston)
4. Release 3.1:
   1. Two LSMS providers have completed testing.
   2. Ten providers are scheduled to test.
   3. Seven have not registered yet.
   4. There are a total of 19 that need to test in the Northeast region.
5. NeuStar confirmed with the FCC that there are 102 MSAs in the pooling rollout (the original 100 specified for porting, plus two additional ones). **ACTION:** Gene Johnston will provide the additional two MSAs required for pooling and Jim Grasser will distribute the information to the team.
6. Gustavo Hannecke is no longer with NeuStar.

Wireless Testing Subcommittee (WTSC) Update:

1. At the December WTSC meeting, many carriers indicated they would not be ready for inter-carrier testing in April 2002. The WTSC is asking carriers to submit test markets and dates to be complied into a matrix. It appears as though testing will not be as structured as originally anticipated. Carriers are going to submit markets for testing on a case-by-case basis.
2. One wireline carrier stated that it needs to know what testing the WTSC is planning and stated that if the testing is done sporadically, it will be much more difficult to coordinate. The WNPO questioned whether the WTSC participants understand that wireline will need a testing schedule to ensure they can participate. The WTSC indicated that it would like to have a schedule, but participants are now becoming hesitant to agree and commit to dates. The WTSC raised this issue up to the WNPO. The WNPO requested for the WTSC to provide the latest testing start date that is being communicated at the WTSC.
3. On an MSA by MSA basis, inter-species testing will begin after wireless-to-wireless testing is conducted.
4. Some carriers indicated to the WTSC that they may possibly begin ICP testing in January, however no definite dates were provided.
5. The WNPO asked whether there is a mechanism for updating test schedules once dates are provided. The WTSC plans to develop a matrix to capture each carrier’s test schedule.
6. The WTSC considered what would be required for number pooling inter-carrier testing (in isolation of porting testing). The ICP testing would be eliminated, however the network testing would remain. Therefore the WTSC does not feel that removing porting would change the testing dates for pooling.
7. The next WTSC meeting will be in Orlando, FL in January 2002.

Bonafide Request Form (BFR) Checklist & Sample Form

The team reviewed a draft BFR checklist and sample form (attached below) to be completed by wireless carriers requesting that other wireless OR wireline service providers support long-term Local Number Portability (LNP) and open all codes for porting within specified Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs). The team agreed that since the wireless industry has to implement portability using a flash-cut approach (instead of a phased approach like wireline) all a SP’s codes within designated MSAs should be opened for porting at one time.

The team reviewed a copy of a BFR form that is currently in use by wireline service providers today. The wireline service providers agreed that the only additional piece of information that they would require (above and beyond what was listed in the draft BFR form) is the wireline switch CLLI (Common Language Location Identifier) code. Those wireline service providers also confirmed that neither rate centers nor NPA NXXs need to be specified. The team agreed that one form should be used for requests being made of both wireless and wireline providers.

The team decided that a WNPO BFR Contact Matrix should be created with all the most up-to-date service provider contact information (which will be posted on the NPAC website under WNPO). Requestors completing the form should first refer to this WNPO BFR Contact Matrix for the intended recipient’s contact information. If the intended recipient has not provided this contact information to the WNPO, then the requestor should refer to the contact information in the LERG. It is the responsibility of the intended recipient carrier to ensure that their contact information is up to date. This contact information can also be specified in the SLAs between individual service providers as well.

**ACTION:** All service providers to email Jim Grasser their contact information for BFR requests by COB Wednesday 12/19/01 (include company name, contact name, contact’s address, contact’s phone number, contact’s fax number, contact’s email address).

**ACTION:** Jim Grasser to compile the WNPO BFR Contact Matrix and post it on the NPAC website (under WNPO).

Sending the BFR form to the recipient contact information in the WNPO BFR Matrix or the LERG contact information guarantees that you have made the request, and the intended recipient is responsible for opening the necessary codes for porting. It is the recipient’s responsibility for ensuring that the contact information in the WNPO BFR Matrix and/or the LERG is correct. **ACTION:** Add the preceding information to the WNPO Decision/Recommendation matrix. (Brigitte Brown)

**ACTION:** All service providers to ensure that their contact information in the LERG is up to date.

Following are the changes the team requested (which have been incorporated in the attached document below):

**Changes to the BFR Form:**

* 1. Include a section for wireline switch CLLI codes to be specified.
  2. Clarify that for a wireless recipient the CLLI code information does not have to be completed (only the MSAs need to be specified).
  3. In the purpose emphasize that ALL codes must be opened for porting within the specified MSAs and wireline switch CLLI codes.
  4. Add to the form that the requestor should use the contact information in the WNPO BFR Contact Matrix, and if that service provider’s contact information is no listed then use the contact information in the LERG.
  5. Reference the FCC mandate.
  6. In the “Actions Required of the Recipient” section emphasize the word “all” in the following statements:
     1. For **all** currently released codes, and those to be released at any future time, within the designated U.S. Census Bureau MSAs and wireline switch CLLI codes (where applicable), open **all** for porting within the LERG.
     2. For **all** currently released codes, and those to be released at any future time, within the designated U.S. Census Bureau MSAs and wireline switch CLLI codes (where applicable), open **all** for porting within the NPAC (Number Portability Administration Center).

**Changes to the BFR Checklist page:**

* 1. Can you set up an effective date in LERG requests to open codes for porting? **YES**.
  2. Once a code is open for porting in the LERG and NPAC, can that status ever be changed in the future? (This relates to step 1 and 2) **YES**.
  3. Look throughout the FCC orders for the need to prove the potential to port-in customers within the designated area. **THERE IS NO REQUIREMENT FOR PROOF.**
  4. Look into whether requests outside the Top 100 MSAs can be made in February 2002, or if they cannot be made until 11/25/02. **CAN MAKE A REQUEST FOR MSAs OUTSIDE THE TOP 100, BUT THE CLOCK DOES NOT START TICKING UNTIL AFTER 11/24/02.**
  5. Mention the requirement for CLLI codes.

Clarifications made:

* The clarification was made that if codes are pooling capable, then they are also porting capable.
* If a SP’s codes are in the designated MSA, but its switches are outside of that MSA, it will still have to open those switches.
* Team member stated that there is not a standardized form currently being used across wireline carriers.



NPAC Tuneables:

The team reviewed the system tuneables document attached below and agreed upon the following settings. (Note: these settings can be changed in the future if the team deems it necessary)

1. *Short Initial Concurrence Window* – leave as is – 1 business hour.
2. *Short Final Concurrence Window* – leave as is – 1 business hour.
3. *Short Conflict Resolution New Service Provider Restriction* – leave as is – 6 business hours. Team members clarified that the OSP puts it into conflict (not the NSP), and that it can stay in conflict for a maximum of 30 days.
4. *Short Cancellation Initial Concurrence Window* – leave as is – 9 business hours.
5. *Short Cancellation Final Concurrence Window –* leave as is – 9 business hours.
6. *Long Business Day Duration* – After some discussion, the majority of the team agreed to leave this Tuneable as is at 12 calendar hours (with one SP opposed). During the discussion some SPs expressed a desire to elongate the duration to 14 or 24 hours due to numerous activations being expected outside of a 12-hour period. Elongating this timeframe would require additional staffing on the part of both SPs and the NPAC.
7. *Long Business Day Start Time* – The majority of the team agreed to set the start time to 9am (by each regional time zone), so that the Long Business Day would run from 9am to 9pm (by each regional time zone). The same SP, which opposed the 12-hour day duration, also indicated that 9am to 9pm was not what it was hoping to achieve.
8. *Long Business Days* – team agreed to setting this to Sunday through Saturday.

Team members clarified that wireline SPs use short business days with long timers, and wireless SPs would use long business days with short timers.

Maintenance Windows:

The maintenance windows are based on central time across the country (i.e. they do not vary by region).

1. *Standard Weekly 6-Hour SP Maintenance Window* – The WNPO agreed upon midnight to 6am central time on Sunday mornings. **ACTION:** The WNPO will propose a standard maintenance window of midnight to 6am (central) on Sunday mornings to the LNPA Working Group (Jim Grasser). Two items that were brought up during the discussion include:
   1. A study was conducted for the LLC which demonstrated that the number of activations during the holiday season on Sundays for wireless SPs was greater than wireline activations on any other day of the week. So, even though wireless activations on Sundays represented only 5% of the total, it was still greater than any other day for wireline.
   2. Starting the maintenance window at midnight central time would only cause a problem in Hawaii for 6 months out of the year because that state does not participate in daylight savings (i.e. there is only a 4 hour difference for 6 months out of the year).
2. *Extended Monthly SP Maintenance Window* – The WNPO agreed upon an 11-hour window from midnight to 11am central time on the first Sunday of every month. **ACTION:** The WNPO will propose midnight to 11am central the first Sunday of every month to the LNPA Working Group for the extended SP maintenance window (Jim Grasser). Following are some of the items that were discussed:
   1. Currently the extended SP maintenance window is 12 hours long from 6am to 6pm central.
   2. Illuminet would have preferred a 12-hour extended SP maintenance window from midnight to noon central.
   3. NeuStar uses the first 6 hours of the current extended maintenance window for their maintenance activities (i.e. 6am to noon central).
   4. Some hardware or software upgrades require at least 12 hours. If SPs need more than the current 12-hour period, then carriers must notify NeuStar in advance and NeuStar will send out a notification to all SPs.
   5. Wireline SPs do a lot of complex ports on Saturday and Saturday nights, so they do not want the maintenance window to start any earlier than midnight on Sunday morning.
3. *Should Timers Run During the SP Maintenance Windows?*

The WNPO decided that the timers should run during the SP maintenance windows, and it will be expected that SPs will agree not to port during the maintenance windows. Following are some points made during the discussion:

* 1. The timers run during the business hours and with the addition of Sundays from 9am to 9pm there will be an overlap between the business hours and the extended SP maintenance window. This was not an issue with wireline SPs because timers did not run on Sundays.
  2. If timers are running during SP maintenance windows then timers will expire while SPs are not able to process ports. If the timers continue to run and the OSP does not know that they have a port request, the impact is minimal because the NSP can activate a new handset for the customer. If the NSP is down, then the impact is greater.
  3. A major benefit of not running timers during the SP maintenance window is that it would pose less risk for a SP coming back online – there would be no risk that there were changes in the database while they were offline. However, not running timers during the SP maintenance window would require a change order with the NPAC, as well as changes to SOA software. There is a possibility that the NPAC could manually change the timer settings once a month to accommodate the extended SP maintenance window, however, the team did not believe this to be a suitable option.
  4. The maintenance hours will be known ahead of time, so SPs could agree to a porting timeframe of longer than 2.5 hours to accommodate the maintenance windows. SPs need to include this in their Service Level Agreements (SLAs) with other SPs. This would allow the timers to run during the maintenance windows and would not require a change order for the NPAC.

1. *NPAC Maintenance Window*

A discussion of the NPAC maintenance window has been tabled until agreement is reached at the LNPA Working Group on the SP maintenance windows proposed by the WNPO.

The NPAC maintenance window will need to be sometime during the SP maintenance window. If the NPAC maintenance window hours are changed, it may require a contract change.

1. *Maintenance Window & Tuneable Timeframes Across Regions*
   1. Maintenance is currently set to central time for all regions. A team member questioned whether the maintenance window should vary by region, instead of being set to central time for all regions. Other team members stated that some SPs use the same system across regions, so it is easier to use central time across all regions for maintenance.
   2. Business day hours differ by the time zone for each region. The predominant time zone for each region is used. **ACTION:** Need a contribution documenting the regional time zones for discussion in January. (Jim Grasser & Brigitte Brown) **ACTION:** SPs to be prepared to discuss having the business timers differ by region, regardless of what the time zone for an area within the region might be.

Contract Revision for NPAC Personnel Working Sundays & Longer Business Days:

A revision is needed in the NPAC contract to address business days starting to include Sundays and business days covering an additional two hours per day (wireline business days are 7am to 7pm and wireless will be 9am to 9pm, so the NPAC will need to cover 7am to 9pm).

The team discussed with the effective date for the changes to the Tuneables and maintenance windows (Note: the effective date for the Tuneables changes should be considered separately from the effective date for the maintenance window changes). Some team members indicated their belief that the changes should become effective at the beginning of November 2002 in order to accommodate intra-service provider ports and Type 1 trunk conversions. Others indicated that those types of activities may occur as early as the Soft-Launch date of 9/1/02. Team members indicated that they did not know of a specification in the mandate stating that SPs could not port before 11/24/02. One team member stated that if a SP wants to start porting on 9/1/02 it would have to provide notice 9 months ahead of time to the OSPs. SPs who do not roam might be able to begin porting earlier.

**ACTION:** All team members to determine what the effective date should be for the tuneables changes.

**ACTION:** All team members to determine what the effective date should be for the maintenance window changes.

**ACTION:** WNPO to write a letter to the LLC indicating the recommendation for the maintenance windows and Tuneables. Before the letter can be sent effective dates must be finalized and there must be agreement at the LNPA WG on the settings and dates. (Jim Grasser)

NPDB Capacity & Throughput Models – Maggie Lee’s & Anne Cummin’s Contributions:

Team reviewed and compared the number portability database capacity model (contributed by Maggie Lee) and the number portability throughput model (contributed by Anne Cummins). Following is the rough comparison:

Period Maggie’s Data (in M) Anne’s Wireless Pooled Data (in M)

4Q01 23.4 0

4Q02 56 (not available)

4Q03 82 11.3

4Q04 88 17.1

4Q05 97 19.4

4Q06 108 21.8

Assumptions:

a) Both sets of numbers are cumulative.

b) Maggie’s data includes both wireless & wireline ported volumes (wireline data includes pooled data, but Maggie’s wireless data does not).

c) Anne’s data is wireless pooled data only.

d) Need to sum the two to get the total NPDB capacity.

Anne’s data does not agree with Maggie’s model of wireless ported numbers. Anne’s data indicates a total of 80M ported wireless numbers by 2006 (about double what Maggie has).

Gene Johnston provided forecast growth figures for Anne to use. The growth rates flatten out from 2005 to 2006 at 4.3%.

Anne’s numbers include churn as her model represents throughput.

**ACTION:** Anne Cummins will revise the number portability throughput model assumptions to be sent out for discussion in January.

**ACTION:** Maggie Lee to add Anne Cummin’s wireless pooling data to the totals derived from her model for appropriate NPDB sizing assumptions. To be reviewed in January.

**ACTION:** Maggie Lee to go back and revise the capacity model to try to sync up with Anne’s numbers. Maggie will also verify the assumptions of the model (e.g. whether the numbers include new adds). For discussion at January meeting.

LLC Letter – NPAC Release 3.1 Rollout:

Dave Garner confirmed that the LLC would not change the rollout order of the regions, and therefore the WNPO will not be sending the LLC a letter with that request.

N-1 Carrier Methodology:

At the October 2001 WNPO meeting the team clarified that:

*“The N-1 carrier (i.e. company) is responsible for performing the dip, not the N-1 switch. If there is a locally terminated call then the originating carrier needs to perform the dip, because they cannot be sure whether the tandem switch belongs to the N-1 carrier or the N carrier (terminating carrier). For all local terminations the originating carrier needs to perform the dip, however, for any calls going through an IXC the IXC must perform the dip. Following are examples that were discussed:*

*a) Wireless to a ported local wireless – the originating wireless carrier should perform the dip (unless they intend to default route and pay the terminating carrier to perform the dip for them).*

*b) Wireless to a ported local wireline – the originating wireless carrier should perform the dip, since they cannot be sure whether a tandem switch belongs to a different carrier than the terminating switch (unless they intend to default route and pay the terminating carrier to perform the dip for them).”*

At the December 2001 WNPO meeting the team agreed that any recommendations or clarifications on this topic should be included in the WNPO Decision/Recommendation Matrix. One team member was concerned with the wording to be used in the matrix. He stated that in an intra-LATA wireless-to-wireless call scenario, if there is not a direct interconnection between wireless SP A and wireless SP B; wireless SP A could route to the LEC (who is the N-1 carrier) to terminate to wireless SP B. Other team members stated that in this scenario, Wireless A would still be responsible for performing the NPDB dip based on the WNPSC Technical, Operational and Implementation Requirements document. They indicated that whatever business arrangements wireless SP A makes (e.g. default routing to the LEC) is up to them, however the requirements document indicates that wireless SP A would be considered the N-1 carrier.

**ACTION:** Add proposed wording in the WNPO Decision/Recommendation matrix to clarify the N-1 methodology for review at the January meeting (Brigitte Brown & Jim Grasser).

The 2nd CTIA report lists the problems that would be experienced if a SP performs its HLR query before the NPDB query. The recommendation is that SPs perform their NPDB dip before the HLR query.

**ACTION:** Review the CTIA 2nd report and identify key points and add them to the WNPO Decision /Recommendation matrix (Jim Grasser).

Project Management for Type 1 Number Conversions – Contribution from Ron Steen

Type 1 number conversions for dedicated NXXs (where all 10,000 numbers are dedicated to a single wireless carrier) can be completed now, because they do not require LNP technology.

Shared NXXs require the use LNP techniques. For ranges of one thousand blocks pooling can be utilized. For ranges of numbers that are less than one thousand blocks porting must be utilized.

The Snapback issue will need to be discussed and resolved. If pooling is used to perform type 1 trunk conversions then vacant codes will snapback to the wireless carrier. Problems will arise when porting is used for type 1 trunk conversions as vacant codes would snapback to the code holder, the wireline carrier. This issue is currently being tracked under item number 0032 on the WNPO Issues & Action Items matrix. One team member reminded the team that it should remain aware of the INC pooling guidelines when addressing this issue.

**ACTION:** SPs to provide contributions on how to address the Snapback issue and addressing any other issues with the project management approach for Type 1 trunk conversions for discussion at the January meeting.



Below is Ron Steen’s contribution for the December meeting.

Rehoming of Wireless Codes in an LNP Environment – Contribution from Patrick Lockett:

One SP indicated that the Rehoming process is dependent upon how a SP has its network setup, and that SP did not believe it would have any problems here.

**ACTION:** Charlotte Holden to write up a contribution for the Rehoming of Wireless codes in an LNP environment for discussion at the January meeting. The contribution should illustrate the billing system impacts.

**ACTION:** SPs to be prepared to discuss how rehoming of wireless codes should be accomplished - for discussion in January.

**ACTION:** SPs to formalize questions/issues and email them to Jim Grasser by 12/21/01so that Patrick Lockett can be prepared to respond to them at the January meeting.

Below is the contribution from Patrick Lockett that was discussed at the December meeting.

****

Other:

1. All contributions for the January meeting are due by 6pm on 1/1/02.
2. The WNPO Contribution form is located on the NPAC website (under WNPO).
3. **ACTION:** Team members must submit contributions for items to be re-addressed/re-introduced if they have already been covered in previous discussions.
4. A conference call will be held on 12/21/01 at 11am eastern to discuss the Risk Assessment Document.
5. A NENA call was held on 12/11/01 and the following WLNP issues were discussed:
   1. How are uninitialized phones handled?
   2. Is there a problem immediately powering up phone and dialing 911?
   3. What problems with roaming in not MIN/MDN compliant?
6. All agenda items that were not covered will be carried over to the next agenda.

# Next Meeting:

**January 7th 8:30am – 5:00pm (eastern time) and January 8th 8:30am – 12:00pm (eastern time) – Orlando, FL – Cingular Wireless**

# Future Meetings:

WNPO Dates: Location & Host:

February 4 – 5 Dallas, TX – Business Edge Solutions

March 4 – 5 St. Louis - SBC

April 8 – 9 Kansas City, MO - Sprint

May 13 – 14 Redmond, WA - AT&T Wireless

June 10 – 11 OPEN

July 8 – 9 U S Cellular - Chicago

August 12 – 13 Vancover, BC - Canadian Consortium

September 16 – 17 Baltimore, MD - Verizon

October 14 – 15 Denver, CO - ESI

November 11 – 12 Atlanta - Cox Communications

December 9 – 10 NeuStar (tentative)

**Subscription to WNPO Team Distribution**:

**To subscribe to the WNPO minutes, send an e-mail to** [majordomo@telecomse.com](mailto:majordomo@telecomse.com) **and in the body write <subscribe wireless\_ops>.**

**To remove yourself from the WNPO Team distribution list, send an e-mail to Majordomo@telecomse.com and in the body write <unsubscribe wireless\_ops>.**