**LNPA WORKING GROUP**

**MEETING MINUTES:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| SBC Corp. Headquarters | San Antonio, TX | Host: SBC |

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

Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T | Cheryl Haynes | | Nuvox (phone) |
| Beth Watkins | AT&T (phone) | Dave Garner | | Qwest (phone) |
| H.L. Gowda | AT&T (phone) | Charles Ryburn | | SBC |
| Sean Hawkins | ATTWS | Leah Luper | | SBC |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | ATTWS | Diana Bordenaro | | Sprint |
| Lee Hunter | BellSouth | Rick Dressner | | Sprint PCS |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint PCS |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec (phone) |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LLC | John P. Malyar | | Telcordia Technologies |
| Kim VanDillan | Centennial | Adam Newman | | Telcordia Technologies |
| James Grasser | Cingular Wireless (phone) | Jean Anthony | | Telecom Software (phone) |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox Communications | Gary Williams | | T-Mobile |
| Dennis Robbins | Electric Lightwave (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Keagan O’Rourke | Evolving Systems | Glenn Mills | | TSI |
| Rick Jones | NENA | Gary Eads | | US Cellular |
| Gene Johnston | NeuStar | Bob Jones | | US Cellular |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Charlotte Holden | | US Cellular |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Chuck Bohl | | US Cellular |
| Rob Coffman | NeuStar (phone) | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| Darius Irani | NeuStar (phone) | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Barry Bishop | NeuStar (Pooling) | Linda Godfrey | | Verizon Wireless |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Jason Lee | | WorldCom (phone) |
| Shannon Collins | NeuStar (Pooling) | Karen Mulberry | | WorldCom (phone) |
| Rosemary Emmer | Nextel |  | |  |

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

02/03 Minutes Review:

The following changes were made to the DRAFT February, 2003 LNPA Minutes during the March meeting and will be reflected in the FINAL February, 2003 version.

* Remove reference to cost of Ad Hoc Report in 4th bullet on page 6.

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

* The January and February WNPO Minutes were approved.
* The inter-carrier network testing schedule was updated. Test cases are being developed in the Wireless Testing Subcommittee (WTSC) for Inter-carrier Communications Process (ICP), end-to-end, and round-robin testing. New schedules will be placed on the NPAC wireless website. The WTSC will continue to encourage more wireline carrier involvement and will continue to coordinate inter-carrier testing. They will send a letter to the OBF, WNPO, LNPA-WG, Rural Cellular Association (RCA), and CTIA, encouraging carrier involvement in testing (see attached DRAFT).



* The WNPO had a brief discussion regarding wireless to wireless porting from a Rate Center perspective and any impacts on testing. The team agreed that the discussion centering around Rate Centers was inappropriate for this forum, due to interpretation differences, but agreed to post the following statement:

“The FCC order applies to geographic codes with vertical and horizontal

(V&H) coordinates, which identify the Rate Center. Only geographic codes are

portable. Litmus test - When a customer ports a number (in a geographic

code), once the port is complete, the telephone number must still be associated with the same, original V&H coordinates.”

* OBF Issue No. 2529, which addresses ICP transaction hours and what happens outside those hours, was discussed on a March 4th conference call. There was no resolution reached. The next OBF meeting to discuss this issue will be April 4th.
* The NENA representative urged continuation of inter-carrier network testing, including the 911 test scenarios contained in the national test plan. He also reminded that the ALI database must be updated within 1 business day of port activation.
* Cingular Wireless discussed the attached contribution to raise awareness of potential individual State legislation governing the porting of numbers from ILECs to CLECs. If ILECs treat wireless carriers as CLECs in the context of porting, wireless carriers may have to comply with multiple porting implementations. Members were advised to take this back internally for possible action.



* The attached Sprint contribution seeks development of an accurate LNP Trouble Contact List to prevent inadvertent ports before they occur. All agreed it had merit. NeuStar will investigate if the Help Desk could, at the request of the old service provider, contact the new service provider to ask that they contact the old service provider in the case that an inadvertent port is pending. The WNPO concluded that it would be of little value to send out regular reminders to service providers to update the NIIF Contact List referred to in PIM 5.



* The Pool Administrator (PA) and AT&T Wireless raised an issue regarding service providers not adhering to the pooling guidelines upon block donation. Issues include:

1. Failure to perform intra-SP ports on contaminated TNs prior to donation,
2. Contaminated blocks donated as non-contaminated,
3. Donated blocks exceeding 10% contamination,
4. Donated blocks within NXX codes not yet opened to portability in NPAC.

The PA and AT&T Wireless has submitted a PIM to the LNPA that will be discussed in the April meeting. This issue will also be tracked on WNPO Action Item list.



* Jim Grasser, former WNPO Chairperson, sent out the attached draft list of licensed wireless carriers in the top 100 MSAs.



* The WNPO continued discussion of the NANC LNP Provisioning Flows. The overall NANC provisioning flows will no longer be discussed in the WNPO unless any change directly impacts wireless carriers. The WNPO requested that the LNPA discussion of the flows take place on Wednesday of LNPA week, so the WNPO can have more participation.
* NeuStar report: There were no new Non-Disclosure Agreements (NDAs)/User Applications and Interconnect Plans from wireless service providers since the last WNPO (total is still 56 wireless providers).
* WNPO Action Items/Issues List and Decision/Recommendation Matrix were updated (current versions attached).

 

* Porting of non-migrated Type 1 Cellular numbers: Conclusion was reached in the WNPO that they will be treated like reseller numbers from a porting perspective. This will be discussed further during the ongoing LNPA flow discussion. Attached is the original problem statement submitted by BellSouth, and a contribution from SBC with proposed changes to the LNP Provisioning Flows to accommodate the porting of non-migrated Type 1 Cellular numbers. Also attached are the minutes of an interim conference call to discuss these changes to the flows.

  

* The current wireless porting Implementation Guideline and Narrative are attached.

 

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

* The APT met for the third time on 3/11/03. Attached is the meeting agenda.



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



* Discussion of Current Issues:
* Production Issues: There was a request to add NPAC performance as a production issue. NeuStar responded that the final root cause analysis on the recent outages has not yet been completed and they should be ready to discuss at next month’s meeting.
* Analysis of Provider Use and/or Efficiency of Past Change Orders:
* Impact of aborts on production (covers several Change Orders)

Service providers have an action item to report back if they have the capability of raising, and have they raised, the CMIP Departure Time Validation Check timer from 5 to 15 minutes in their SOA and LSMS systems, and what their resend scheme is, has it changed recently, and any improvement achieved.

* EDR vs. non-EDR

NeuStar stated that approximately 50% of LSMSs are EDR-capable. AT&T suggested collecting data on aborts for EDR vs. non-EDR LSMSs. NeuStar to investigate.

* Range notifications

NeuStar to obtain percentage of SOAs that support range notifications.

* SOA Notification prioritization

Neustar to provide statistics on the number of service providers who are prioritizing or turning off notifications vs. not at all.

* Discussion of Interface Requirements:
* Business Principals:
* Gary Sacra will check with LLC Co-Chairs to see if it’s ok to send the original Chicago LATA NPAC RFP out to the LNPA distribution in order to research the business principals that drove the selection of CMIP.
* Discussion of Interface Improvements:
* The following Change Orders were reviewed during the APT meeting:
* Outbound Flow Control discussion. NPAC should see benefit even if the service provider doesn’t implement Outbound Flow Control from their end. By throttling messages from the NPAC end using Outbound Flow Control, this should help mitigate the bursting of responses coming back from the service providers’ local systems. The local systems do not have to encrypt the responses, so there is an inequity between the overhead for NPAC to send a message vs. the local system response, thus leading to response bursts.
* NANC 351 - Send Me What I Missed (SWIM) – The group discussed the need for NPAC to support both the existing recovery process and the new SWIM process. Recovery of SPID (NANC 352) must also be included in the new SWIM process. For SWIM, NeuStar will investigate the prevention of the large PDU problem and take advantage of linked replies capability.
* NANC 352 – Recovery of SPID – No additional comments from the team. NeuStar will begin work on the detailed requirements for this Change Order.
* NANC 348 (Bulk Data Download for Notifications) and NANC 347/350 (15/60 Minute Abort Changes) were also reviewed and discussed by the team.
* Discussion of Performance Requirements:
* A revised Exhibit N is currently in the hands of the LLC for review. The APT will proceed with the performance requirements discussion after that is addressed.

NANC Multiple LRN Issue:

* This issue was raised by the Pool Administrator at the January NANC meeting. It addresses service providers requesting additional CO Codes for LRN assignments in LATAs where they already have an assigned LRN. At the January meeting, NANC requested the LNPA Working Group to investigate the issue and any appropriate resolution(s).
* At the request of the LNPA for contributions from members, T-Mobile, US LEC, and Nextel submitted the attached contributions describing their need for multiple LRNs within a LATA.

  

* In addition to the contributions above, US Cellular stated at the March LNPA that they require additional LRNs to distinguish certain services, such as pre-paid. Their pre-paid box has a separate point code and routing to it is based on NPA-NXX.
* The LNPA will continue to solicit contributions from those service providers detailing their requirements. Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will develop a matrix containing each submitted scenario, identifying any potential solution, and which industry forum, if applicable, should address a scenario. He will also develop a call flow diagram.

PIMs:

PIMs 14, 15, 20, and 21 – INC has submitted their DRAFT *Procedures for Code Holder/LERG Assignee Exit* to the LNPA for review (attached). The LNPA took an action to review the document and come prepared to the April LNPA meeting to provide any final comments. This will be placed on the April agenda for final comments before the scheduled 4/15 INC call to discuss the document.



INC requested that the LNPA also review the procedures for any possible NPAC changes. It was stated during the LNPA meeting that it appeared no NPAC changes were necessary, only M&Ps.

It was suggested to have the NAPM/LLC look at the procedure to see if there are any contractual issues between NPAC and the End User regarding removing codes from NPAC. A concern was raised that NPAC is placed in the position of removing codes. Gary Sacra will send the draft document to the NAPM/LLC and ask to have it placed on the agenda for the March LLC meeting for their review to determine if there are any contractual issues between NPAC and the End User regarding the removal of codes from NPAC.

Based on a preliminary review, it was suggested that rather than have NPAC monitor the NANPA website for Part 3 Disconnect Reports, NANPA should send the Part 3 to NPAC when they send it to the service provider (reference Paragraph 2.15). NPAC would then flag the code for 15 business days prior to the LERG-effective disconnect date for removal in NPAC. If any pending or active ports take place before the 15 day cut-off, NPAC would notify NANPA, and would not delete the code in NPAC. NANPA would then notify the TRA to cancel the LERG disconnect and NANPA would initiate the search for a new codeholder.

* PIM 18 - Review of the Reseller Flows continues in the LNPA. The porting of non-migrated Type 1 Cellular numbers is now being incorporated into the flows. The addition of Type 1 porting, which is a port between a wireline and wireless network, has not yet been completed. Upon completion of the review of the entire NANC LNP Provisioning Flows, they will be submitted to NANC for approval.
* PIM 22 - PIM remains open. Verizon requested that the LNPA continue to 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.



* NEW PIM Submission - Adam Newman, Telcordia, presented a new PIM submitted by the Common Interest Group on Rating and Routing (CIGRR), addressing inconsistencies between data in the LERG and NPAC. This PIM is seeking data validation between the LERG and NPAC for LRN, NXX, NXX-X, effective date, and Service Provider ID data that is entered into the two databases. Some questions were asked during the discussion regarding the LERG’s need for LRN data and the problems caused by the discrepancies. It was recognized that LRN discrepancies do not necessarily mean an error. Service providers took an action to discuss the need for this data cross-check between NPAC and the LERG with their respective CIGRR representatives. This PIM was not accepted at this meeting, but will be on the agenda for discussion again at the April LNPA.

# Thursday, March 13, 2003

Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T | Cheryl Haynes | | Nuvox (phone) |
| Beth Watkins | AT&T (phone) | Dave Garner | | Qwest (phone) |
| H.L. Gowda | AT&T (phone) | Charles Ryburn | | SBC |
| Sean Hawkins | ATTWS | Leah Luper | | SBC |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | ATTWS | Diana Bordenaro | | Sprint |
| Lee Hunter | BellSouth | Rick Dressner | | Sprint PCS |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint PCS |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec (phone) |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LLC | John P. Malyar | | Telcordia Technologies |
| Kim VanDillan | Centennial | Adam Newman | | Telcordia Technologies |
| James Grasser | Cingular Wireless (phone) | Jean Anthony | | Telecom Software (phone) |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox Communications | Gary Williams | | T-Mobile |
| Dennis Robbins | Electric Lightwave (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Keagan O’Rourke | Evolving Systems | Glenn Mills | | TSI |
| Rick Jones | NENA | Gary Eads | | US Cellular |
| Gene Johnston | NeuStar | Bob Jones | | US Cellular |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Charlotte Holden | | US Cellular |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Chuck Bohl | | US Cellular |
| Rob Coffman | NeuStar (phone) | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| Darius Irani | NeuStar (phone) | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Barry Bishop | NeuStar (Pooling) | Linda Godfrey | | Verizon Wireless |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Jason Lee | | WorldCom (phone) |
| Shannon Collins | NeuStar (Pooling) | Karen Mulberry | | WorldCom (phone) |
| Mindy Patterson | NeuStar | Rosemary Emmer | | Nextel |

Change Management Discussion:

* NANC 323 (Migration of SPID): The LNPA reviewed the following timeline, extracted from a previous LNPA discussion captured in the April, 2001 LNPA minutes, in the context of these questions:

1. SPID Migration will be coordinated and agreed upon in an industry forum.

Do we want to establish a minimum timeframe for which notification of an

upcoming SPID Migration must be published - or is this a case-by-case

basis?

1. What form of validation must occur in order to determine service provider

production-readiness after performing (local system) SPID Migration, e.g. a “go/no-go” call?

1. What is the criteria that must be met in order for a service provider to go to

production after performing SPID Migration? Scenario: If one service provider in the region hasn't completed SPID Migration and all other service providers have successfully completed it - previous Working Group discussions covered the unsuccessful service provider taking a Bulk Data Download (BDD).

1. Do we need to tie the migration date with the LERG-effective date?

============================================================================

6. NPAC to SP final notification

To LLC

2. NPAC identifies timeframe & notifies SPs

4. SPs respond

3. NPAC goes to LLC

5. LLC responds

to NPAC

1. SP notifies NPAC

7. Migration

1. Service provider notifies NPAC.
2. NPAC reviews form, determines a time estimate to complete migration at the NPAC level. NPAC then notifies all service providers of request.
3. NPAC submits request to LLC for approval of the SPID Migration Maintenance Window if extension to maintenance window is needed.
4. Service providers respond with objections/agreements to NPAC notification in Step 2 with an estimate on how long it will take to migrate in their systems. The maintenance window will be timed to accommodate the longest estimate.
5. LLC responds with approval or denial if they are involved in a decision to approve any extension to the maintenance window.
6. NPAC sends out Final notification to all service providers.
7. Migration weekend.

Timeframe – point 1 to point 6 is 45 days; Timeframe from point 6 to point 7 is 60 days; Total timeframe from point 1 to 7 is 105 days.

============================================================================

NOTE: The text in red in the above steps was added during the discussion at the March, 2003 LNPA. Also at the March, 2003 LNPA, it was suggested to swap the sequence of Steps 3 and 4 because it won’t be known if LLC involvement is required until after the service providers respond with time estimates.

On Monday, 3/24, a subsequent conference call will be held to discuss the change bars on the overall 3.2 M&P package (attached). The final M&P package is scheduled to be distributed on 3/28. The NANC 323 M&P will be removed from the 3.2 package at this time and worked on a different path. The NANC 323 M&P will be placed on the April LNPA agenda.



* NANC 370: This Change Order introduces a new notification over the interface that will be utilized in addition to an e-mail notification. Possible use of the OP:INFO message will be investigated by NeuStar.
* NANC 380: This is a Documentation Only change.
* NANC 381: This is a Documentation Only change.
* NANC 363: This Change Order is currently not backwards compatible. NeuStar will investigate if it can be made backwards compatible. If not, this could require SOA/LSMS systems to support both Lockheed and NeuStar enterprise numbers if all Regions are not flash cut at the same time. NeuStar will investigate NPAC continuing support of the Lockheed number for a brief sunset period.

Reseller Flows:

* NeuStar walked the group through the latest draft of the incorporated LNP provisioning process flows. A number of revisions were made. The review will also continue at the April, 2003 LNPA meeting.

 

* For the porting of non-migrated Type 1 Cellular numbers, it was proposed to add “or a Type 1 Cellular number,” in Flow 2, Box 6. A similar change is proposed in Figure 3, Box 4. There is continuing discussion over whether Type 1 numbers and reseller numbers should be treated the same in the Flows. This will be discussed in the April WNPO.
* The LNPA made a decision to go with the proposed Alternate Main Flow with Figure 14 (see attached Flows above). NeuStar will renumber the Flows so they make sense sequentially. Figure 14 will become Figure 4.
* The LNPA has an action to review the Flow Narratives and get any comments back to NeuStar prior to the April LNPA meeting. The Process Flows will be placed on Wednesday’s agenda for the April meeting.

NPAC Release 3.2 Project Plan:

Attached is the latest version of the Release 3.2 Project Plan.



Review of February Action Items:



* Item 0203-01: This item was completed by NeuStar and is Closed.
* Item 0203-02: This item was completed by NeuStar and is Closed.
* Item 0203-03: This item was completed by NeuStar and is Closed.
* Item 0203-04: This item was completed by NeuStar and is Closed.
* Item 0203-05: Charles Ryburn, SBC, reported that it is true in Texas only that SBC is restricted on deleting numbers from LIDB for a client. LIDB customers can complete a ballot authorizing SBC-Southwest to delete their number from the SBC LIDB database. Item is Closed.
* Item 0203-06: Item completed and is Closed.
* Item 0203-07: Item remains Open.
* Item 0203-08: Item is Closed. Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, took a new action to discuss this issue in the LNPA Report to the March NANC meeting and send a request to the Pool Administrator to distribute an appropriate advisory to service providers recapping LERG-assignee responsibilities when donating 1K blocks.
* Item 0203-09: Item remains Open until the March Projective Executive (PE) meeting. The PEs will provide feedback to the LNPA.
* Item 0203-10: Item remains Open. The LNPA continues to solicit contributions from service providers regarding the NANC LRN issue.
* Item 0203-11: Item remains Open.
* Item 0902-17: Item is Closed.
* Item 1202-10: Item is Closed. INC has provided the draft document to the LNPA for review.
* Item 1202-17: Item is Closed. See NANC 363 readout in Change Management section of these minutes.
* Item 0103-10: Item is Closed. The LNPA decided to use the proposed Alternate Main Flow with new Figure 14.
* Item 0103-11: Item remains Open.

New Business:

* At the February LNPA meeting, Verizon raised an issue regarding certain providers donating 1K blocks to the industry pool, and not taking the necessary steps to make their donor switch LNP-capable in order to perform the query-of-last-resort. At the March LNPA, Gary Sacra reported that the INC Thousands Block Number Pooling Administration Guidelines contain sufficient text requiring service providers who donate blocks to the pool to provision their network and switches, thus enabling

them to perform the query-of-last-resort.

Section 4.1 (d), entitled "Code Holder Responsibilities," states the following:

"confirm, prior to donating the thousands-block to the industry inventory

pool, that:

1) all unavailable TNs within contaminated thousands-blocks have

been intra-service provider ported;

2) the associated NPA/NXX is currently available for call

routing, is flagged as LNP capable in the LERG Routing Guide and the NPAC, and the NPA-NXX query triggers are applied in all switches and reflected in the appropriate network databases (e.g., STP routing tables);

3) the NXX-assigned switch is currently LNP-capable and will

process terminating traffic appropriately; and

4) interconnection facilities have been established between the NXX-assigned switch and other interconnecting networks."

Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, took a new action to discuss this issue in the LNPA Report to the March NANC meeting and send a request to the Pool Administrator to distribute an appropriate advisory to service providers recapping LERG-assignee responsibilities when donating 1K blocks.

* Release 3.2 backout: NeuStar reported that no NPAC hardware changes are necessary related to Release 3.2. Backout of the release is possible and the procedure, if necessary, would require an additional 24 hour maintenance window.

Remaining 2003 Meeting Schedule:

* Wireless will meet on Mondays and Tuesdays, the Architecture Planning Team will meet on Tuesdays from 1pm-5pm local time, and the LNPA will meet on Wednesdays and Thursdays.
* Apr. Week of 4/7. No NANC meeting. Hosted by NeuStar in Sterling, Va.

NOTE that for the April meeting, attendees should fly into Dulles Airport. The NeuStar building is 5 miles north of Dulles Airport.

* May Week of 5/5. NANC meets on 5/13. Hosted by Sprint in Kansas City.
* Jun. Week of 6/9. No NANC meeting. Hosted by AT&T in New York.
* Jul. Week of 7/7. NANC meets on 7/15. Hosted by Cingular in Chicago.
* Aug. Week of 8/11. No NANC meeting. Hosted by AT&T Wireless in Seattle.
* Sep. Week of 9/15. NANC meets on 9/25. Hosted by Verizon in Portland, Maine.
* Oct. Week of 10/13. No NANC meeting. Hosted by Canadian Consortium in Banff, Alberta, Canada.
* Nov. Week of 11/10. NANC meets on 11/5. Hosted by VeriSign in Overland Park, Kansas.
* Dec. Week of 12/8. No NANC meeting. Hosted by Telcordia in San Diego.