# ATTENDANCE:

No Highlight – Attended on both days

Green – Attended on Day 1

Yellow - Attended on Day 2

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** |
| H.L. Gouda | AT&T  |  |  |
| Rick Jones | NENA  | Gene Johnston | NeuStar |
| Melissa Flicek  | Nextel Partners | Barry Bishop  | NeuStar |
| Rick Dressner | Sprint  | Meredith Cummings | NEXTEL |
| John Malyar | Telcordia | Lonnie Keck  | ATW |
| Glenn Mills | TSI Telecommunications Services | Bob Jones | U. S. Cellular |
| Keagan O’Rourke | Evolving Systems | Chuck Bohl | U. S. Cellular |
| Maggie Lee | VeriSign | Stephen Sanchez | AT&T Wireless  |
| Jeff Adrian  | Sprint  | Jim Gary  | T-Mobile |
| Rob Smith  | TSI | Sean Hawkins | AT&T Wireless  |
| Adam Newman | Telcordia | Melissa Murray | Triton PCS |
| Janet Bishop | AT&T Wireless | WIlliam Phillips  | Verizon Wireless, Wholesale |
| Shamik Mukherjee | USCELL | Joe Charles | Cingular Wireless |
| Joe Steies | USCELL  | David Alexander | Sprint  |
| Paul Warga | Telcordia | Marlene Nolan | U. S. Cellular |
| Jeff Manning | U. S. Cellular | Darren Paffenroth | TSI |
| Julie Groenen | Verizon Wireless | Gary Eads | U. S. Cellular |
| Patricia Smith  | T-Mobile |  |  |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Marcel Champagne | NeuStar |
| **On the phone** |  |  |  |
| Dave Garner  | Qwest | Jim Grasser  | Cingular Wireless  |
| Jean Anthony  | TSE | Liz Coakley | SBC |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Susan Ortega  | Nextel  |
| Jessica Burrell | Accenture | Ron Steen  |  BellSouth  |
| Gary Williams | T-Mobile | Scotty Parish  | ALLTEL  |
| Gaston Mdongloo | Bering Point | Susan Williams  |  |
| Jennifer Goree | ALLTEL | Ray Waters  | SouthernLInc |
| Mubeen Saifullah | Nightfire | Kathy McGinn | Rural Cellular Corporation |
| Robin Myier | SBC | **Sam Jha** | Nextel |
| Chuck Dodsley | Verizon Wireless | Kathleen Tedrick | Sprint |
| David Taylor  | SBC |  |  |
| Gigi Neelis | Level 3 | Hala Mowafy | Telcordia  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

# MEETING MINUTES FROM DAY #1 (2/17/03)

1. **COMBINED WNPO / WTSC MEETING**

**New co-chair of WTSC Gary Eads of U.S. Cellular**

* **Updates from past testing**

No new updates from January testing

* **Updates to the test schedule**

No new updates currently

* **Testing Schedule Updates**

Testing was postponed in Hartford until March 17th.

WTSC had a meeting on January 22nd to discuss the possible addition of ICC test cases to be introduced at the February WTSC. Also, the WTSC is looking to the Wireless Workshop for new test cases that can further test the ICC process. Jim Grasser will initiate the dialog between WTSC and the Wireless Workshop to begin joint discussion.

**Database Testing Issues:**

In January WTSC created a subcommittee to examine database (CNAM, LIDB, ALI, 911 etc) issues with regards to testing. Several responses to the request for information on date base updates by the WNPO in January were received. The database issues are more of a process problem and timing according to Janet Bishop of AT&T Wireless Services. It’s transparent to the subscriber; it’s an issue internal to the company. This is all dependent on implementations on how one update’s database.

Dave Garner of Qwest announced they do not put wireless providers in LIDB and in CNAM. If they do have wireless providers, they are in the city/state database.

WTSC would like to put together a list of test cases that can help point out possible database issues. These test cases should be designed for both success and failure.

Other issues discussed included adding and deleting entries being linked to the activation or deletion of a number at the NPAC via an LSMS linkage; implications associated with pooled blocks and default routing situations.

WNPO cannot specify the architectural solution but can make recommendations for wireless providers to dialogue with their database providers on timing, process, entry requirements etc.

***ACTION ITEM:* An informal Email will be sent to several committees including OBF, LNPAWG, CTIA and RCA urging testing especially for interspecies testing due to the various issues associated with timing and process that have been detected. The WTSC is to draft the email and forward to the WNPO for review and distribution. First draft received but sent back to WTSC for revision.**

1. **OBF UPDATE:**

Lonnie Keck from AWS is the new co-chair for the OBF. Lonnie indicated the Wireless to Wireline porting taskforce had made the decision to help the WTSC set up test cases for the WICIS 1.0 to 2.0 migrations. Verizon’s Jim Mahler and Lonnie Keck will co-chair this task force. Gary Eads was curious about the focus of energy on inter-species test cases unique just to that. Are there any relevant test cases that focus on just this type of porting?

* WTSC “single line” IDL.

Lonnie Keck- took out the flow for but not the single line IDL. First day of OBF prioritizes the open issues. This is nothing we’re going to change before 11/24/03. Nobody has tested this, but that’s the only thing that could drive changes prior to 11/24/03.

Gary Eads had a note from OBF meeting for discussion of standard hours of operation. WTSC feels it is important to have test case scenarios to test business hour validation/functionality. An action item at the OBF Wireless Workshop requests service providers to submit recommendations for dealing with business hour requirements. The vendors strongly recommend that more socialization occur between service providers before a recommendation be proposed.

This should be covered in the Wireless Operations agreement, as stated in the Wireless to Wireless generic operations agreement. Team was reminded that as a team, due to legal implications, we cannot define business hours.

Feedback from wireline providers is that business hours vary based on service level agreements (SLA). QWest operates in three different time zones and hours depend on the operations agreement with their individual trading partners. The NPAC timers are 9am to 9pm in each time zone however that does not reflect actual operator porting hours. Gene Johnston advised that subscriber profiles would dictate timers.

Timing becomes a operational issue when carriers need to respond to port responses outside of the business hours. According to Rick Dressner, we don’t want individual responses by trading partner, as an industry we need to have a standardized, automated response. The way to structure this is to clarify what is the appropriate response. Question is can a standard response be defined? The ‘IDL’ does have something to account for that response such as delayed response, could be a viable answer.

Resellers also must be considered as SLAs are established around their business hours. As the facilities based provider what will you do if the reseller is down but you are still in service… you will have to act on behalf of that reseller and can the industry set business hours on this?

We can’t come up with a defined set of business hours. However we do agree that you should have a recommended and appropriate process.

***ACTION ITEM/RECOMENDATION:* The decision will not come from the WNPO, but could come from OBF. There will be an update from OBF-Wireless Workshop. Conference Call hosted by WW on March 6, 2003 to discuss the partner trading hour/response issue.**

**3) INTRODUCTIONS, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AND AGENDA REVIEW**

 Rob Smith and TSI hosted the meeting.

**4) CO-CHAIR NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS**

Only one nomination had been submitted for the second co-chair seat, vacated by Jim Grasser of Cingular Wireless who announced resignation in Jan. Maggie Lee, VeriSign, was accepted as the co-chair.

**5) REVIEW AND APPROVE JANUARY MINUTES**

January minutes were updated with various changes supplied by team members.

***ACTION ITEM***: **This document will be sent out with the draft February minutes**.

**6) CONTINUATION OF DATABASE UPDATE DISCUSSION:**

Maggie Lee presented the WNPO with a generic review presentation of LIDB and CNAM terminology, database population and network routing as well as subscription version requirements. The VeriSign processes associated with CNAM/LIDB database uses and updates for their databases were also discussed relative to the January WNPO letter to providers requesting information on database updates.

The WNPO consensus: While there could be problems with timing of updates between databases and port activity this is not an industry issue bur more a a service provider- vendor SLA issue regarding how processes will/should be handled. Each service provider will have to work directly with their individual database provider to completely understand all requirements for proper timing (when and how are TNs updated) and datafill needed to support these services for their customers**.** It is agreed that this team cannot establish how CNAM, LIDB, or other databases are updated. It is up to the SP’s and the database providers to update or change the processes within the bounds of their individual SLAs. Carriers who require changes to the timing updates also need to review with their database storage provider. This issue certainly emphasizes the need to for wireline and wireless providers to test this scenario and conduct further analysis.

Increased occurrences of fraud could be perpetuated because of timing was mentioned, however proper network routing updates should eliminate this issue. It is imperative that carriers ensure network routing is in place when porting in subscribers and offering these types of vertical services. Creation of standards for this issue is not part of this committee to work. If any carrier believes standards creation or changes are required they should submit contributions to the appropriate standards body.

**ACTION ITEM: Sean to distribute presentation to WNPO mailing list.**

**ACTION ITEM: The recommendation is that all Service Providers analyze their internal processes by which the various databases are updated with their individual database provider to assess timing requirements and determine potential issues. This will be placed on the decision recommendation matrix.**

**ACTION/RECOMMENDATION ITEM*:* ALI E911 IS THE ONE EXCEPTION and we are duly noting that there are potential differences.**

**7)** READ-OUT of JIP (Jurisdication Information Parameter) Issue and Conference Call:

Team reviewed the conference call with WNPO team members held on Feb 5, 2003 WNPO required to respond to the December 16, 2002 OBF letter seeking assistance from WNPO (as well as T1S1 and INC) to determine the best approach to solving the JIP signaling situation. The response to OBF outlined the need for clarification of the different possible solutions before a final recommendation can be presented by the WNPO.

In addition, at OBF last week the committee could not come to a consensus and there was much frustration on the part of members. Change to standards and subsequent changes to switch software to include JIP at the cell site level rather then the switch level may get JIP 80-90% of the time.

There is a need to get together with a couple of groups (WNPO, T1S1, and encourage TR-45 and NIIF) to discuss providing JIP and determine if standards need to be created/changed. A conference call will be setup shortly – no date as of today has been set and for all participants/companies to encourage their SME’s to participate on the call. Notice of the call will be generated to us from OBF.

ATT reminded participants that requirements are already there from T1S1, for wireline companies and the need to signal JIP from a switch level. However, as wireless and CLEC switches typically cover larger areas specifications need to be changed so that all carriers can provide for JIP on a standards basis.

**8) BRIEF INTRODUCTION OF NEW BUSINESS ITEMS:**

**A) Missing Intra-Service Provider Ports (ISP) Associated with Pooled Blocks**

This issue presents costs to providers particularly the new SP through no fault of their own, but costs will not be discussed in this team. Inter-service provider ports could occur between each of the carriers involved that may not be able to do porting yet by using the NPAC to perform these duties in their place.

There is no M&P for NeuStar to act on behalf of the wireless carriers to correct the situation. We can’t use the current PIM 5 process (inadvertent port) as it is slightly different from that process but it could be used as a template.

It was suggested we must define the scope of the problem and clarify the issue including discussion of two major points: how to de-pool and some type of NeuStar interaction to assist.

INC has previously turned down the issue, as there would be a cost to changing the system from the NeuStar perspective. INC suggested that carriers read the guidelines and follow those guidelines. NeuStar could provide some help by adding additional processes but even that may not catch all the errors or missing ports. However, currently NeuStar Pooling Administrator is not allowed to do a verification of a contaminated block to validate if ISPs have been done.

Jim Grasser suggested we create a contribution to define the issue and present it that way.

***ACTION ITEM*: Submit a contribution from AWS in conjunction with the PA and send out for comments to this group. PIM will go out to the team by 2/28 for review. Final PIM submitted for April LNPA-WG agenda*.***

**B) Conflict of Meetings**

WNPO meetings now coincide with the LNPA-WG Architecture Meetings held the afternoon of each Tuesday of these industry meetings. This is causing many WNPO participants to skip the afternoon and attend Architecture meeting. Concerns were raised regarding reduced presence of WNPO attendees particularly as new WNPO issues are brought in which will require attention by all wireless carriers. In an attempt to alleviate this situation discussion on alternatives was held.

Some suggestions included:

1. Move architecture meeting to Wed. morning rather then Tues afternoon.

2. Move WTSC joint meeting or re-arrange the schedule so that we don’t overlap (begin WNPO on Monday morning, adjourn at noon on Tues. at noon so these conflicts with Architecture meeting are eliminated.

We will try for the next 2-3 meetings by rolling agenda up to a day and a half. If it does not work or issues become too excessive and do not have sufficient time to cover all issues we will look at alternatives. Sean will present ideas for upcoming ‘Test Agenda’ on Tuesday.

**9) LIDB Issue (c/o from December)**

**ACTION ITEM:** US Cellular contribution that states regulatory required LIDB be datafilled. This issue is tabled until Chuck (USCELL in Charlotte Holden’s absence) can get additional information from Charlotte. If no additional updates are presented this issue, it will be closed on Tuesday of current (February) meeting.

**CLOSED:** Per USCELL this issue has been satisfied and will be closed 2/18/2003.

**10) REVIEW NANC PROVISIONING FLOWS - REVIEW / COMMENTS**:

This issue is moved to Tuesday meeting.

**11) Monday Wrap-Up at 4:45P:**

New action items from the day’s discussions were not reviewed

Meeting was adjourned.

# MEETING MINUTES FROM DAY #2 (2/18/03)

**CARRY OVER FROM MONDAY’S DISCUSSION :**

1. **PORTING/POOLING OF NON-MIGRATED “TYPE 1 NUMBERS”**

Additional discussion was prompted from the NANC provisioning flow portion of this meeting held on Monday. SBC strongly believes that a new porting process between two network providers be defined when Type 1 numbers are involved. SBC proposed that this contribution be the kick-off for communication and a new process between providers.

USCELL is adamant that consensus between the wireless and wireline companies be reached and an agreed upon process be created due to the importance of this issue with USCELL and other wireless carriers.

Jim Grasser reminded the team that if the migration of Type 1 numbers were completed a good portion of this problem would be eliminated. BellSouth submitted contribution (Nov. 15, 2002) on Migration of Type 1 numbers.

Wireless can’t check for the two old network providers (wireline carrier is the code holder but numbers are Type 1’d to a wireless provider). Authoritative data sources are the LERG and the NPAC but each can only show one provider. The wireless service provider will check the owner in either the LERG or the LSMS and send LSR to that wireline carrier.

Jim Grasser suggest we look at various points in process that need to be addressed to determine what and where we need to communicate. Team agreed to move discussion out to next meeting with an interim kick-off conference call.

**Date: Monday March 3, 2003**

 **Time: 2:00 – 5:00 pm Eastern**

 **CC #:** VeriSign Conference Bridge

Telephone:   913-905-1404

Passcode:   # 349849

NOTE: To ensure enough ports we ask that companies consolidate internally so enough access is available.

***ACTION ITEM*: Agenda and guidelines will be sent to team prior to the call in order to facilitate the flow of the call and make the best use of time. All on the call should be familiar with current, documented reseller flows and the ICP and LSR processes.**

1. **NEUSTAR REPORT**
2. 3 new wireless NPAC users bringing the total wireless users to 56 with NDA and User Application
3. Number of after hours help desk NPAC calls totaled 21 for January.
4. NPAC distributed the data for the March NPAC maintenance window by region to the Cross – Regional mailing list.
5. Marcel will ensure that Steve Addicks provide updates that Marcel did not have.
6. **NENA UPDATE by RICK JONES**
7. NPDI validation—The number portability direction indicator (NPDI) field on the Local Service Request (LSR) is used by wireline service providers to identify when a wireline to wireless port is being done. This indicator is used as a trigger for their processes to delete an existing 9-1-1 address location information (ALI ) record rather than unlock it as required in wireline to wireline porting. The NENA LNP working group and the NENA WNP subcommittee members will be asked if there are any steps being taken by either wireline and/or wireless providers to validate or authenticate that the field entry is valid.
8. LIDB/CNAM—Members of the NENA LNP working group had been asked if there were any impacts to 9-1-1 (such as in callback) and/or with public safety regarding having the wrong carrier in these records. It appears from those members that there are no impacts.
9. Mixed service callback issues—polling of wireline carriers continues within the NENA LNP working group to determine if any are using the 10 digit trigger in porting and if so, in what situations. Use of the trigger can affect which phone can be called back after NPAC activation, in certain circumstances. Also, there will be a presentation at the NENA Technical Development Conference (TDC) in March by a switch vendor representative proposing a wireless callback method that would also impact this situation along with others (such as if a wireless carrier is not yet MIN/MDN separation compliant and the 9-1-1 caller has a ported/pooled number).
10. Handset call blocking—The FCC has ruled that wireless carriers can block individual handsets from calling 9-1-1 subject to any appropriate state and local laws. A NENA technical call blocking working group (comprised of wireless carrier and switch vendor representatives) has been meeting regarding this subject. It is appearing that wireless carriers in all the current wireless technologies may, at this time, be incapable of doing this within the existing 9-1-1 methodology.
11. Surrogate number and unregistered wireless phones—ATIS ESIF (Emergency Services Interconnection Forum) is expected to file with the FCC shortly in support of delivering 9-1-1 plus the seven least significant digits of the electronic serial number (ESN) in the callback number field for 9-1-1 calls from wireless phones which are not validated on the network at the time of the call.
12. Testing—Number portability 9-1-1 testing (those tests listed in the national test plan) continues to be a high priority from the NENA perspective. Of particular importance is that there be sufficient wireline/wireless intercarrier testing to be sure that 9-1-1 processes, including ALI database procedures, are correctly followed for wireline to wireless and wireless to wireline porting.

1. **WTSC MEETING WRAP-UP:**
* WTSC met yesterday afternoon, Monday and Tuesday. They accomplished putting together revisions to network testing schedule.
* A new schedule is being established for tracking ICP side between carriers to carriers.
* Each carrier will be required to note and track activities schedule for deployment as it pertains to ICC testing.
* WTSC is also identifying any blackout periods from carriers. With only 8 months remaining the intent to do is initial testing 1.0 and delta on 2.0 they are finding, the testing schedule if filling up very quickly they had a discussion to lock down testing schedule, NETWORK AND ICP testing and staying with them. When there are changes it starts this ripple effect, now it impacts every other carrier.
* WTSC is going to stress the urgency to keep the schedule adherence.
* WTSC will focus on US Cellular’s contribution, 8 additional test cases as a result of 1/22/03 to talk about additional test cases; some of the needs and scenarios have been identified (only 1.0 centric). These do not address specific 2.0 changes, but team will be looking at 1.0 versus 2.0 WICIS documents and what additional test cases will be discussed and will work in close conjunction OBF.
* There was an additional test committee subcommittee in WTSC (project planning committee)
* In two weeks they will be distributing additional material, and list of topics for next month meetings as well.

Some members were concerned about the availability of the WICIS document as it is copyrighted and therefore not ‘free’. Jim Grasser outlined the following conditions: If your company is a OBF funding and a member of the wireless workshop the document is free. If your company is not an OBF funding company you can obtain a copy of the document for $750.00. If you are a non-funding company but wish to participate in the workshop there is $7500.00 fee. Discussion at OBF on how revisions to a document will be handled in terms of fees.

 **5) WNPOSC - WIRELESS POOLING TASK FORCE:**

Sunset of the task force has taken place. All pooling issues now to go WNPO. The NeuStar Pooling Administrator (PA) committed to have someone from the PA either in person or on the call for every meeting.

 **6) MEETING AGENDA FOR MARCH:**

WNPO meeting agenda and time was further discussed after a new meeting agenda was distributed. The team has now agreed to changes at least for the March meeting in San Antonio where-by the WNPO will meet until Tuesday. at 2:30 pm local time. If this agenda does not appear to be working we will re-discuss for changes.

Reminder: Participants wishing to discuss major issues should provide documention/contributions prior to the meeting for all to review.

 **7)** **REVIEW NANC PROVISIONING FLOWS - REVIEW / COMMENTS**

Flows will be continued to be distributed through John Nakamura is at LNPAWG strategic architecture meeting. See flows for any updates.

**8) WRAP-UP:**

1. **Finalize Implementation Guideline/Narrative Update for NANC**
2. **Review Action Items and Issues List**
3. **Update Decision/Recommendation Matrix**
4. **Review Agenda for Next Month**
5. **Review Items to be Reported to NANC**

NOTE: Items not discussed will be carried over to next month’s agenda and will be documented here.

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

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

**Future meetings:**

WNPO Dates: Location & Host:

March 10 – 11 San Antonio, TX SBC

April 7 – 8 Sterling, VA NeuStar

May 5 – 6 Overland Park, KS Sprint

June 9-10 New York or Atlanta ATT

July 7-8 Chicago USCELL

August 11-12 Seattle ATW

Sept. 15-16 Portland Verizon

Oct.13-14 Banff Canadian Consortium

 Nov.10-11 Overland Park, KS VeriSign

 Dec. 8-9 San Diego Telcordia