LNPA WORKING GROUP

December 2003 Meeting

Final Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| San Diego, California | Host: Telcordia |

Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T (phone) | Shannon Collins | | NeuStar Pooling (phone) |
| Lonnie Keck | ATTWS (phone) |  | |  |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | ATTWS | Rosemary Emmer | | Nextel |
| Sean Hawkins | ATTWS | Dave Garner | | Qwest |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth (phone) | Charles Ryburn | | SBC |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth (phone) | Leah Luper | | SBC |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LLC (phone) | Tim Walters | | SNET Div. Group (phone) |
| Mark Wood | Cingular (phone) | Craig Bartell | | Sprint |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox | Rick Dressner | | Sprint PCS |
| Priscilla Craig | Cricket Communications | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint PCS |
| Valerie Endlish | Cricket Communications | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint |
| Jaon Bridgeman | Cricket Communications | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec (phone) |
| Dennis Robbins | ELI (phone) | John Malyar | | Telcordia |
| Keagan O’Rourke | Evolving Systems (phone) | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Therese Mooney | Global Crossing (phone) | Jason Kempson | | Telcordia |
| Jason Lee | MCI (phone) | Jean Anthony | | Telecom Software |
| Karen Mulberry | MCI (phone) | Dan Deneweth | | Telecom Software |
| Rick Jones | NENA | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Larry Vagnoni | NeuStar | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile (phone) |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Glenn Mills | | TSI |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Ginny Cashbaugh | | US Cellular |
| Gene Johnston | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Marcelle Champagne | NeuStar | Kevin Lewis | | Verizon |
| Mindi Patterseon | NeuStar | Julie Groenen | | Verizon Wireless |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

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

**WEDNESDAY 12/10/03**

LNPA Co-Chairs:

* As was previously announced, Charles Ryburn, SBC, will be stepping down as LNPA Co-Chair after the December meeting. Charles has served the industry with distinction in this capacity longer than any other individual. The entire LNPA Working Group would like to sincerely thank Charles for his guidance, dedication, and friendship these many years, and wishes him the very best.
* With the planned combining of the LNPA and WNPO groups in the April, 2004 timeframe, the current plan is for a member of the WNPO to become the 3rd Co-Chair of the combined LNPA and WNPO groups. Gary Sacra, Verizon, and Paul LaGattuta, AT&T, will remain as Co-Chairs.

2004 Meeting Schedule:

* NOTE: Recent changes to the 2004 meeting schedule are reflected below and highlighted in yellow.
* 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.
* The Wireless Number Portability Operations (WNPO) team will also meet all day on Monday and ½ day on Tuesday of LNPA week. It remains an open question if the WNPO and WTSC will meet separately or in a combined session.
* Starting with the January 2004 LNPA meeting, the LNPA Working Group will meet from Tuesday 1pm local time until Wednesday 5pm local time. If the LNPA needs more time, the group could go longer on Tuesday or Wednesday evening.
* The Architecture Planning Team (APT) will meet starting 8:30am local time on Thursday and go no later than mid-afternoon Thursday. NOTE: At the January 2004 APT meeting, the group will adjourn at noon on Thursday.
* 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 | CANADIAN CONSORTIUM | OTTAWA, CANADA | NO NANC |
| JULY | WEEK OF 7/19 | TEKELEC | RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA | 7/13/04 |
| AUGUST | WEEK OF 8/16 | T-MOBILE | NEWPORT BEACH, CALIFORNIA | NO NANC |
| SEPTEMBER | WEEK OF 9/7 | 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 | NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE | 11/9/04 |
| DECEMBER | WEEK OF 12/6 | AT&T | NEW YORK, NEW YORK | NO NANC |

11/03 Minutes Review:

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

* “Overland Park” was misspelled as “Overland Par” in the header on the 1st page.
* In the NANC 323 Change Order discussion on page 9, change the 4th bullet to add the following text in red.

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.

Wireless Number Portability Operations (WNPO) Committee Report as reported by Sue Tiffany, Sprint PCS and WNPO Co-Chairperson:

* National Emergency Number Association update (Rick Jones, NENA):
* One wireless carrier reported that a ported-in customer called 911 and the wireline address was displayed at the PSAP. Service providers should ensure with their 911 database providers that their database can display both sides – wireless and wireline.
* OBF Wireless Workshop update: ATIS is restructuring. You must be an ATIS member to have access to their draft documentation with the exception of the NIIF contact list (still need a password, though). Everyone, including non-members will have access to ATIS’ final guidelines.
* NPAC Help Desk update: NeuStar reported no unusual activity since the start of Wireless Number Portability.
* Since 11/24/03, there has been a gradual increase in the volume of wireless inter-Service Provider ports.
* New issues:
* Top 100 MSAs – The WNPO agreed to use an October MSA list that contains about 5200 rate centers and a list from November that contains an additional 11 rate centers. One dissenting vote was the Rural Cellular Consortium (RCC).
* Desired due date and time issue – It was asked if porting is 24x7 activity or only during the NPAC business hours? The majority of the industry wants to go in the direction of 24x7. This assumes that the old service provider has concurred on the port.
* The attached Wireless Port Protect contribution, submitted by Sprint PCS, has been withdrawn and will possibly be rewritten and resubmitted.



* The attached PIC Freeze contribution, submitted by Sprint PCS, has been accepted as an issue. The WNPO wants to create a matrix to reflect how each provider, when acting as the Old Service Provider, handles ports (reject or allow) when there is a PIC freeze on the line and how it is to be removed if it prevents the port from taking place. Sue Tiffany, WNPO Co-Chair, will send out a questionnaire to providers. The WNPO is requesting LNPA support to get this questionnaire out to wireline carriers.



* WNPO discussion on combining the WNPO and LNPA: The WNPO agreed that the two groups should not combine during the 1st quarter of 2004. This will be placed on the WNPO agenda for February 2004 to evaluate when the groups should combine.
* Fallout Reduction Taskforce (FORT) Issues (formed by the WNPO to investigate reasons why porting transactions do not flow through):
* Should XML code continue to be sent in the remarks field of the Wireless Port Request (WPR) form? It is compliant from a technical standpoint in the WICIS guidelines, however, there is currently an open issue at the OBF Wireless Workshop proposing use of English text only.
* There has been fallout from sending invalid characters in the Account Number field. WICIS requirements allow characters 0-9, A-Z, or a combination of these values. There should be no blanks.
* CORBA-level rejects are also occurring when sending a value of “No” in the Agency Authorization field on the form. A value of “Yes” or “No” should be valid. The WNPO agreed this issue should be opened up in the OBF.
* Some carriers are using Greenwich Mean Time (GMT) on the WICIS fax forms. The OBF Wireless Workshop concluded that the field should be populated with the specific time zone where the port is taking place.
* Some carriers are not populating mandatory fields in their responses to SUPs.
* Lessons learned:
* It was suggested that trading partners refrain from blaming each other for issues and problems while the customer is still on the line.
* Testing issues have been identified for the future. It was suggested that carriers perform negative (break and destroy) type testing and interoperability testing in the future.
* Vendors, including Inter-carrier Communications Process (ICP) vendors, Clearinghouse vendors, and Service Bureaus, should continue to expand their lines of communications between themselves and initiate a system to open trouble tickets to assist in resolution.
* It was questioned if 555 numbers could be ported. The response was that these numbers are assigned by NANPA at the line level only and therefore are not portable.
* A survey showed that some providers’ porting centers will be opened on Christmas Day and New Year’s Day, while others will not.

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 12/09/03. Attached is the meeting agenda.



* Discussion of Performance Requirements:
* Discussion of LNPA LSMS and SOA Traffic Models:



NeuStar walked the group through the attached traffic model.

* This version uses the latest numbers from Version 2.3 of the NPAC Forecasting Group (NFG) model, which includes the November actuals.
* The 4Q03 Max Busy Hours worksheet reflects the “worse case” calculation (as it did in previous versions) whereby the maximum value for each operation type is used for the Busy Hour calculation, and a new table showing the values for each operation type taken from the same hour when the maximum SV activations occurred. A comparison of the two approaches showed that there was not significant difference between the two. As a result, the 4Q03 Summary worksheet was not adjusted.
* There were about 1.01 Million total wireless activations (intra- and inter- provider ports) and 1.2 Million modifies in November. There were 2.8 Million non-pooled wireless activates projected for November.
* The next steps for the group are to continue to incorporate actual data into the model each month in order to continue to gain confidence in the model.
* The WNPO gave NeuStar an action item to investigate the feasibility of breaking down the daily porting report to reflect a separate count for total wireless inter-provider activates.
* Discussion of Production Issues:
* NeuStar reported experiencing provider SOA systems that are sending up large amounts of requests to NPAC at rates greater than 2 CMIP operations per second. At times, there is no chance for NPAC to send notifications back to the provider because the notifications have a lower priority than responses and the pipe is full with the requests from the provider. There is a Change Order for a separate SOA association for notifications. NeuStar stated that some provider systems have timeouts and if they don’t receive a notification from NPAC as a result of the requested action within the timeout period, the system resends the request. NeuStar has seen a request resent as many as 10 times. This is causing major SOA throughput problems at times. Service Providers have an action to

check to make sure that their systems are not resending requests after receiving a positive response to the request from NPAC. It was stated that we either need more bandwidth or make notification priorities equal to response priorities to give notifications a chance to vie for existing bandwidth in heavy activity periods.

* Previously, there were issues with provider LSMSs receiving large messages

during recovery. As a result, a limit was set at 2,000 TNs in a PDU during recovery. This limit caused an issue recently coming out of Sunday maintenance when approximately 15,000 TN activates were queued up. It required significant effort to get providers’ systems through recovery. NeuStar would like to investigate raising this tunable to 10,000 TNs. If this were in effect, recovery would have been much smoother in the scenario above. This is a tunable value per SPID. Service Providers have an action to determine if their systems can handle a higher tunable value and what is the maximum value. The Send Me What I Missed (SWIM) Change Order would help this issue by not sending SVs during recovery that the service provider has already received.

* NeuStar expressed a concern over the growth in Bulk Data Download (BDD) file

size. NeuStar took an action to provide where we are currently in all regions in terms of database size (in Gigabytes) from the non-Efficient Data Representation (EDR) perspective. The problem of large BDD files is more critical for non-EDR providers. NeuStar will then calculate the average number of bytes per SV and then calculate how many SVs we can accommodate before we hit the 2 Gigabyte UNIX file restriction. NPAC changes have been implemented to enable creation of BDD files greater than 2 Gigabytes in size. Provider systems’ ability to read files in excess of 2 Gigabytes would address this issue. A member asked if NPAC could support segmenting the files into multiple files. NeuStar responded that a Change Order should be opened up to document requirements.

* NeuStar asked if providers are using historical copies of data stored in NPAC?

Do historical copies of data need to be stored in the NPAC database so they can be queried or could they be spooled off-line and stored for possible access. NeuStar stated that these operations are not without NPAC processing cost. Service Providers took an action to answer the following question: Are providers querying NPAC for an SVid for a TN other than the current active version of the TN?

* Discussion of Change Orders currently under review in the APT:
* For the Change Orders under discussion in the APT meetings, NeuStar took an action to provide a summary spreadsheet, sectionalized into categories (e.g. performance-related such as SOA throughput and recovery, operational changes, etc.), with a short synopsis of each Change Order, describing the benefits of each and the problem each solves. This summary spreadsheet will include the following Change Orders:
* ILL 5 – Round-Robin across LSMS Associations
* NANC 353 – Round-robin across SOA associations
* NANC 383 – Separate SOA Channel for Notifications
* ILL 130 – Application Level Errors
* NANC 384 – Change Order benefit analysis – NeuStar asked what the NPAC would be required to do for this Change Order. It doesn’t seem to drive any NPAC changes. NeuStar to discuss with ESI to suggest that they champion this contribution again. This will not to be placed on the summary spreadsheet at this time.
* NANC 347/350 – CMIP interface enhancement related to abort behavior. This change would give “credit” if any activity is taking place over the interface and the association would not be aborted.
* NANC 348 – BDD for notifications – to go in the operational section of the spreadsheet.
* NANC 349 – Batch file processing – MCI expressed support for this Change Order. SBC stated they do not support.
* NANC 351 – Send Me What I Missed (SWIM) recovery
* NANC 352 – Recovery of SPID
* NANC 368 – Outbound flow control – to go in the performance related section of the spreadsheet.
* NANC 372 – SOA/LSMS interface protocol alternatives – will be left off of the summary spreadsheet for now.
* NANC 390 – new SOA/LSMS interface confirmation message – This would provide for an immediate confirmation acknowledgement in response to a request. This could reduce the amount of work in-flight and provide for better error messaging according to NeuStar.
* Discussion of next steps for the APT:
* The group needs to come prepared to next month’s meeting to discuss SOA traffic and today’s problems on the interface, e.g., when there are heavy volumes of requests, we can’t get notifications through.
* The group needs to identify which Change Orders address the most critical issues we are now experiencing in production.
* NeuStar was asked to spend some time discussing what we face in order to increase interface bandwidth. NeuStar responded that it is a function of database commits (access) and the group needs to identify the business need for a new FRS requirement for SOA throughput in terms of operations per second sustained and peak.

Discussion of Combining WNPO and LNPA Groups:

* The WNPO agreed that the two groups should not combine during the 1st quarter of 2004. This will be placed on the WNPO agenda for February 2004 to evaluate when the groups should combine.
* 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.
* The Wireless Number Portability Operations (WNPO) team will also meet all day on Monday and ½ day on Tuesday of LNPA week. It remains an open question if the WNPO and WTSC will meet separately or in a combined session.
* Starting with the January 2004 LNPA meeting, the LNPA Working Group will meet from Tuesday 1pm local time until Wednesday 5pm local time. If the LNPA needs more time, the group could go longer on Tuesday or Wednesday evening.
* The Architecture Planning Team (APT) will meet starting 8:30am local time on Thursday and go no later than mid-afternoon Thursday. NOTE: At the January 2004 APT meeting, the group will adjourn at noon on Thursday.
* Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, took an action to send out the 2004 LNPA meeting schedule to the WNPO and LNPA distributions, reflecting the new meeting times of the groups during LNPA week.

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 and discussed the changes since last month’s review.
* The LERG-effective date is a minimum of 66 calendar days from NANPA receipt of the Part 1 form from SPID B. This prerequisite needs to be changed in the narrative for Figure 1.
* Question: How likely is it that the effective date will change? How do we inform NPAC when a new migration date is necessary? New form or modification of same form?
* The migration form should accommodate migrations of –Xs in addition to NXX codes.
* The current plan is to have a pre-migration conference call among NeuStar, SPID A (if they exist), and SPID B. This must be incorporated into the timeline without extending the 66 calendar days. It will take place after the form is submitted by SPID B. For now, it will be reflected as a bullet in Box 2 of Figure 1. A checklist, including pre and post migration cleanup requirements, will be discussed during the meeting. The checklist will include a question regarding whether the ownership of the switch involved in the migration is shared among multiple service providers.
* Question: What if there is a service provider migration time estimate that is significantly different than the body of responses? If that provider requires additional time beyond the rest of the providers and outside of the maintenance window, they must continue to process the SMURF files and recover any data when they come back up.
* The Pool Administrator (PA) advised that there is no PA involvement necessary in the migration of pooled blocks. NANC 323 functionality can be used.

PIMs:

.

* PIM 22 – PIM 22 remains open. At the December meeting, Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, gave a readout of the Wireless Conflict Timer Minority Report presented at the November 5th NANC meeting by Sue Tiffany, Sprint PCS. 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. Some 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.



Related to this Minority Report, Sprint subsequently submitted an ex parte to the FCC recommending that the FCC instruct NeuStar to reset the Wireless Conflict Timer to 24 hours.

In response to an action item from the November LNPA meeting, Gary Sacra, Verizon, then presented the attached revised PIM 22 contribution which proposes that concurrence be required on the part of the Old Service Provider in order to remove a port from Conflict status when no LSR has been received (Cause Value 50). The revised contribution also proposes that this resolution apply to the case when no Wireless Port Request (WPR) has been received.



During this discussion, it was suggested by a member that Cause Value 51, Firm Order Confirmation Not Issued, be added to Verizon’s proposed resolution. This suggestion was supported by Verizon, T-Mobile, Bellsouth, and Sprint. Sprint stated that they would like some sort of audit capability to show if it is being abused. T-Mobile also expressed support for including the WPR in the proposed resolution. NeuStar suggested development of a new Cause Value because some systems could possibly automatically use Cause Value 50 every time they place a port into Conflict. The group agreed not to create a new Cause Value, but Service Providers are to determine if their systems automatically default to a Cause Value 50 (LSR Not Received) when they place a port into Conflict. If yes, they are to make the necessary system changes to begin utilizing the proper Cause Value.

Gary Sacra, Verizon, took an action to revise the Verizon PIM 22 contribution to:

1. Include Cause Value 51 (Firm Order Confirmation Not Issued) in addition to Cause Value 50 (Local Service Request not received).
2. Reflect that only the Old Service Provider can remove a port from Conflict status for these two Cause Values.
3. In addition, Gary Sacra will submit a Change Order request reflecting the NPAC changes proposed in the revised PIM 22.

* 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.

**THURSDAY 12/11/03**

Change Management Discussion:

* NANC 323 SPID Migration Scenarios Discussion – The group reviewed the migration scenarios in the attached file. The ensuing discussion of each scenario is also captured in the file.



Port Protection Change Order 382 Discussion:



* At the December LNPA meeting, the group briefly discussed the following policy questions that need to be answered regarding NANC Change Order 382 – Port Protection. In order to ensure maximum participation in this discussion, these questions will be placed on the January 2004 agenda for Tuesday afternoon. Service Providers are to come prepared to discuss.

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)?

During the brief discussion at the December LNPA, all members who voiced an opinion agreed that Service Provider Administration numbers, Homeland Security numbers, Emergency numbers, and Telco-defined essential lines were appropriate candidates for the protection list. Verizon Wireline and Nextel stated that their position was that any number should be able to be placed on the list at the request of the customer.

The group agreed that we need to identify the document that defines “Telco-defined essential lines.”

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?

Recovery of Contaminated Codes:

* NeuStar reported that during the recovery of some codes, between the time when NANPA verifies with NPAC that there are no active SVs and the time when the code is removed in NPAC (15 business days before LERG disconnect), number(s) are ported. NeuStar has no authority to remove a code from NPAC with active SVs. NeuStar requests that the LNPA send a letter to INC requesting that they cover this scenario in their code recovery guidelines and stipulate that the NANPA obtain proper regulatory authority to delete the active SVs unilaterally so that the recovered, or to be recovered, code can be removed from NPAC by NeuStar. NeuStar further requests that the letter mention that these SVs may or may not be working numbers and the process should address the service provider notification process. NeuStar will only delete the active SVs and remove the code after the code is recovered by NANPA and with the proper regulatory authority. Not doing so prevents the eventual new LERG-assignee from opening up the code in NPAC. Gary Sacra will draft a letter before the January LNPA meeting, send to NeuStar for comment, and put on the agenda for review at the January LNPA meeting.
* Service Providers are to inform their respective INC representatives of the forthcoming LNPA letter requesting modification of their code recovery guidelines.

Review of November Action Items:



* Item 1103-01: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 1103-02: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 1103-03: This item remains Open and will be addressed at a future LNPA meeting.
* Item 1103-04: This item was completed and is Closed. The Pool Administrator (PA) advised that there is no PA involvement necessary in the migration of pooled blocks. NANC 323 functionality can be used.
* Item 1103-05: This item remains Open.
* Item 1103-06: This item was completed and is Closed. NANC Change Order 388 introduces a scenario whereby an SV moves directly from the Cancel Pending state to the Pending state, which is a new state change within the existing status change notification.
* Item 1103-07: Item remains Open. NeuStar stated that providers cannot be prevented from using slashes in their name field in addition to the /1, /2, or /3. This would require a code change. The naming algorithm calls for having a number at the end of the string, immediately preceded by a “/”. NeuStar has cleaned errant records up that violate this algorithm. NeuStar has encountered different names for the same provider in different regions, such as different spellings and typos. NeuStar is to continue the cleanup and report back to the LNPA at the January, 2004 meeting.
* Item 1103-08: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 1103-09: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 1103-10: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 1103-11: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 1103-12: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 1103-13: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 1103-14: This item remains Open. Note that this was changed from a Service Provider action item to a SOA Vendor action item.
* Item 1103-15: Item remains open and will be addressed at a future LNPA meeting.
* Item 1103-16: Item remains Open.
* Item 1103-17: Item remains Open. To be placed on the February 2004 WNPO agenda.
* Item 0103-11: Item is Closed. See readout for PIM 22 in these minutes. PIM 22 remains open.
* Item 1003-02: This item was completed and is Closed. With regard to the question of who should decide to move forward with a planned migration if one or more providers cannot support the planned migration date, the NAPM LLC feels that they should not be involved in this decision. There are technical considerations that need to be worked out with the service providers and NPAC. The LLC stated that the LNPA needs to discuss further to determine who authorizes moving forward. One member suggested that the receiving provider should be the authority.

Regarding the LNPA request to NAPM that they not deny maintenance window extensions for migrations, NAPM wishes to be in the loop for at least the first few migrations. The NAPM attorney stated that any absolution of GEP penalties for exceeding the scheduled maintenance window timeframe needs to come directly to the LLC. This will be revisited after we have completed some migrations and have more experience on the time needed to complete a migration and our ability to meet the timeline.

* Item 1003-03: Item remains Open. To be placed on the February, 2004 WNPO agenda.
* Item 1003-06: This item was completed and is Closed.

New Business:

* With regard to the FCC’s Notice for Proposed Rulemaking on the Wireless to Wireline rate center issue, the NENA representative on the LNPA Working Group stated that comments are due by 12/30/03, and reply comments are due by 1/9/04. He further stated that NENA will support whoever files first for an extension or NENA will possibly file their own request for an extension.

NOTE: Subsequent to the December LNPA meeting, the FCC did grant an extension.