**LNPA WORKING GROUP**

**MEETING MINUTES:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 225 W. Randoph St. | Chicago, IL | Hosts: SBC/US Cellular |

**Wednesday, July 9, 2003 – 8:30 AM – 5:00 PM**

Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T  | Dave Garner  | Qwest (phone) |
| Lonnie Keck | ATTWS | Charles Ryburn | SBC  |
| Sean Hawkins | ATTWS (phone) | Leah Luper | SBC  |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | ATTWS | Liz Coakley | SBC |
| Lee Hunter | BellSouth (phone) | Dan Martin | SBC |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth  | Dianna Bordenaro | Sprint |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth  | Craig Bartell | Sprint |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LLC  | Rick Dressner | Sprint PCS |
| Monica Dahmen |  Cox | Jeff Adrian | Sprint PCS |
| Dennis Robbins | Electric Lightwave (phone) | Susan Tiffany | Sprint PCS |
| Keagan O’Rourke | Evolving Systems (phone)  | Colleen Collard | Tekelec  |
| Rick Jones | NENA | John Malyar | Telcordia Technologies |
| Barry Bishop | NeuStar (phone) | Adam Newman | Telcordia Technologies |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Marybeth Degeorgis | Telcordia Technologies |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Jason Kempson | Telcordia Technologies |
| Rob Coffman | NeuStar (phone) | Lisa Marie Maxson | Telecom Software (phone) |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar  | Jean Anthony | Telecom Software |
| Dira Sadano | NeuStar PA (phone) | Jeff Kelly | T-Mobile |
| Shannon Collins | NeuStar PA (phone) | Charlotte Holden | US Cellular (phone) |
| Marcelle Champagne | NeuStar | Bob Jones | US Cellular |
| Larry Vagnoni | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | VeriSign  |
| Hong Liu | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | Verizon |
| Randy Buffenbarger | NeuStar | Julie Groenen | Verizon Wireless |
| Rosemary Emmer | Nextel  | Jason Lee | WorldCom (phone) |
|  |  | Karen Mulberry | WorldCom  |

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

**WEDNESDAY 07/09/03**

06/03 Minutes Review:

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

* WNPO Report, 3rd bullet – Change “ISTF” to “ITF” for the acronym for the Inter-species Task Force.
* WNPO Report, 4th bullet – Change the next-to-last sentence to read, “NeuStar reported that 120 service providers have SVs with DPC values that will fail the edits.”
* WNPO Report, 8th bullet – Change to reflect that the NPAC 3.1 test platform was updated to Release 3.2 on 6/29/03.
* WNPO Report, 9th bullet – Change to read, “NENA is exploring what happens to those carriers who are not compliant with MIN/MDN separation and advises that non-compliant carriers can be held accountable.”
* Change Order Discussion, 3rd bullet – Change “PIM 370” to “NANC 370.” Also, correct the spelling of “maintanance.”

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

* Testing update: The Wireless Testing Subcommittee (WTSC) reported that the latest testing schedule and test cases are posted at [www.npac.com](http://www.npac.com) for all carriers to view.
* Joe Charles, Cingular, has completed one year of service as WTSC Co-Chair. An election was held in June and Susan Sill of AT&T Wireless was elected to fill the open Co-Chair position.
* Gary Eads, US Cellular, has resigned as WTSC Co-Chair. The position is currently still open.
* Sean Hawkins, AT&T Wireless, is resigning as WNPO Co-Chair in August. Nominations are being accepted.
* The WTSC was asked to consider the potential for organizing a performance test that would focus on system processing based on volumes of transaction activity. It was determined that this could be a very difficult undertaking due to insufficient time and resources available to plan and perform this testing.
* The WTSC noted that carriers will discontinue Inter-Carrier Process Testing no later than November 15, 2003 and will not resume testing until no earlier than January 15, 2004. Carriers that have not performed ICP testing may be prohibited from using their HTI ICP for production porting during that period if they have not successfully tested with trading partners requiring testing prior to production exchange.
* Ordering & Billing Forum (OBF) Jurisdictional Information Parameter (JIP) issue (identifying the call origination of wireless roaming customers for intra-state vs. inter-state settlements): No additional information was reported. JIP population and modification of JIP standards to identify originating cell site is still viewed as the long-term solution. No short-term solution has been put forth yet in the OBF Wireless Workshop. The OBF is awaiting responses from other industry groups on the next conference call date. This issue will be discussed again at the August OBF meeting. This issue remains open and will continue to be discussed in the industry.
* OBF Inter-species Task Force (ITF) update:
* The ITF continues to discuss the use of the 10-digit trigger on inter-species ports.
* A goal of the ITF is to standardize the form used for inter-carrier communication between wireless and wireline providers involved in a port. Not all wireless providers are able to accept a mechanized Local Service Request (LSR) at this time for porting out. The ITF is awaiting feedback from wireline carriers on the use of faxed forms.
* The ITF expressed concern over the lack of wireline carrier participation in the group.
* NANC Change Order 191/291 cleanup:

These Change Orders added edits to NPAC in Release 3.2 related to Destination Point Code (DPC) and Sub-System Number (SSN) data. The cleanup of existing erroneous DPC and SSN data is taking place before the edits are activated. NeuStar reported that they plan to speak with the NAPM/LLC regarding the progress of the cleanup before providing any more monthly progress reports to the WNPO and LNPA.

* NeuStar provided the attached job aid for commonly used NPAC timers and intervals. This will be discussed at the August WNPO meeting. WNPO members are to determine what to do with the Wireless Conflict Timer now set at 24 business hours. It is set to revert back to 6 business hours on 11/24/03.



* US Cellular submitted the attached contribution on issues related to wireless/wireline overlapping service areas. This issue will also be included in the WNPO report to the July NANC meeting. The WNPO determined that it is beyond the group’s purview to resolve the issue.



* Sprint provided the attached informational presentation to the WNPO on the purpose of the 10-digit trigger and how it is used.



* Rick Jones, NENA, provided an update on the NENA subcommittee that is developing a customer education document addressing the 911 callback issues related to the mixed service interval on wireline to wireless ports. This subcommittee is also working with WNPO members. NENA will not seek FCC approval of the document, but would like to use the FCC as a distribution point for the document. The plan is to finalize the document at the September meeting. Conceptually, wireless carriers would provide it to the wireless customer at the retail outlet at the time of sale. During the discussion in the WNPO, it was noted that mixed service can also occur on wireline-wireline location ports. This NENA subcommittee’s work will also be included in the July NANC report.
* The WNPO discussed Verizon Wireless’ attached contribution addressing the fact that wireless business hours on key holidays are not included in the calculation for when NPAC timers are set to expire. This issue was addressed as follows:
* If a wireless carrier is open on a holiday, they will still perform the same concurrence function when serving as the Old Service Provider that they do on a regular business day. If they don’t concur on a port on a regular business day, however, they will not likely concur on a holiday.



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

 

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

* Mission Statement: To assess Number Portability industry production technical issues within the purview of the LNPA Working Group and develop recommendations for the strategic direction of the Number Portability architecture.
* The APT met on 07/08/03. 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 Performance Requirements:
* Discussion of NPAC Forecasting Group’s (NFG) Forecasting Model:



NOTE: The latest version of the NFG Forecasting Model can be obtained at [www.npac.com](http://www.npac.com) by clicking on the “NFG” button.

Version 1.3 of the model has been regionalized and distributes the projected 2003 Wireless Number Portability (WNP) transactions over 5 weeks (1 week in November and 4 weeks in December). The May actuals were also added in v1.3 of the model.

Paul LaGattuta, AT&T, stated that the NFG will continue to meet to further develop the model. All changes will go through Steve Addicks, NeuStar. NeuStar is continuing to solicit and collect data and projections from wireless providers to be applied to the model. The APT’s primary focus for the model are performance requirements and download rates.

NeuStar presented an analysis of actual data that showed that the highest day for download activity for the quarter analyzed (2Q03) was Thursday, with Friday being the second highest day. NeuStar stated that the goal is to derive a high day/busy hour percentage that can be applied to the transaction projections. In order to do so, the group needs to determine how to apply this actual data to the wireless projections. Wireless actuals could change the high day/busy hour percentages. NeuStar will also gather notification data for SOA performance analysis.

We must determine what throughput rate we need to sustain and what the expected peaks will be so they can be gracefully dealt with.

* CMIP Interface Improvements:
* The group then discussed the following Change Orders. These will be discussed in further detail at next month’s meeting.
* NANC 349 – Batch File Processing – This is a non-CMIP interface method of sending work to NPAC off-line to be processed at a later time. Discussion centered on the value of this Change Order and what scenarios would be applicable. In order to determine the value, providers were asked to bring in any applicable scenarios and describe what problem batching in that scenario would solve. Send any scenarios to Dave Cochran, BellSouth. The group needs to determine what business problem we are trying to solve before this Change Order can move forward.
* NANC 353 – Round-robin across SOA and LSMS associations – Requirements for a separate SOA channel for notifications was broken out as a separate Change Order (NANC 383). Change Order ILL 5 will address round-robin for the LSMS, and NANC 353 will now address round-robin for SOA. NeuStar will research the change management history of ILL 5 for future discussion of these Change Orders.
* ILL 130 – Application Level Errors – Will stay on the list for future discussion.
* Analysis of Provider Use and/or Efficiency of Past Change Orders:
* Evolving Systems (ESI) had previously presented the attached contribution which proposes metrics for evaluating the effectiveness, in terms of performance, of NANC Change Orders. This will be discussed during the full LNPA meeting on Thursday during the Change Management discussion.



* Current Issues:
* Production Issues:
* NeuStar gave the attached presentation describing a Subscription Version (SV) lock contention problem. This was a problem encountered and raised by SBC. NeuStar will deliver a 3.2 point release in late 3Q2003 to enhance the NPAC SV response rollup processing to substantially reduce lock contention and increase performance.



Maintenance Window discussion:

* Paul LaGattuta, AT&T and LNPA Co-Chair, began the discussion by describing the NAPM/LLC’s role in approving and adjusting NPAC maintenance hours. With issues under discussion such as the wireless production hours and the extended maintenance window overlap, there is an opportunity to address the entire subject of maintenance needs. He further explained that the contract governing maintenance was developed prior to an NPAC being built. He asked if we, years later, want the contract to dictate how NPAC should be maintained in today’s environment.
* NeuStar stated they have been discussing with wireless carriers the upcoming 11/24/03 wireless number portability implementation. Many wireless carriers have expressed concern regarding the extended maintenance window overlap with their business hours on the 1st Sunday of the month. West Coast carriers are concerned that the window is based on Central Time and they are 2 hours behind. Hawaii is further behind. NeuStar also stated that they have observed many providers taking maintenance longer than the 11 hours allowed during the extended maintenance window.

* Wireless carriers are also concerned that they may not always comply with PIM 2 because some of their SOA systems are designed to auto-activate when the T2 timer expires. If the timer expires during the maintenance window, they may activate the port in violation of the PIM 2 Service Provider Maintenance Window document, which states that no porting activity should take place during the Sunday service provider maintenance window.
* Some suggested that the industry should assess the feasibility of shortening the extended window to eliminate the overlap and go with more time zone specific maintenance windows. It was further suggested that service providers need to agree if the extended maintenance window can be reduced to 8 hours and then determine if NPAC can support the reduction.
* Service Providers are to discuss internally the following identified issues and potential resolutions regarding the current maintenance window:

 **Maintenance Window Issues Discussed:**

* Wireless business hour overlap during extended maintenance window on 1st Sunday of month
* Regional time zone differences
* National vs. regional maintenance needs
* NPAC SMS business days/hours (timer/interval calculations) do not reflect NPAC or service provider maintenance windows
* Non-compliance to PIM 2, which results in:
* Partial fails
* Call routing issues
* Recovery of messages
* Performance metric failures
* Can service providers and NPAC accept any change to the current Sunday maintenance window?

**Potential Resolutions Discussed:**

* Less frequent extended maintenance windows (e.g. 1 per quarter)
* Shorten the extended maintenance window to eliminate overlap with wireless business hours
* Define maintenance windows and a maintenance scheme by which any provider or NPAC can be down for maintenance without affecting another provider or NPAC
* Reflect maintenance window time in timer/interval calculations

**Exception Cases Discussed:**

* Maintenance window requirements for new NPAC releases
* Large technology migration projects
* Service providers needing extended maintenance outside the prescribed window (industry will not conform to these maintenance needs by withholding porting activity)

NANC LNP Provisioning Flows:

* The LNPA WG approved the attached flows and narratives and will forward them to NANC with a recommendation that they approve them and forward them to the FCC for adoption as the industry standard. These flows reflect today’s LNP environment and will be revisited as necessary if any subsequent actions warrant.
* Charles Ryburn, SBC and LNPA Co-Chair, took an action to draft a letter to the North American Numbering Council (NANC), with a copy to the National Number Portability Operations (NNPO) team, the Wireless Number Portability Operations (WNPO) team, the Local Number Portability Administration Working Group (LNPA WG), and the Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF) (LSOP and Wireless Workshop).



PIMs:

* PIM 18 - The LNPA WG approved the revised flows and narratives and will forward them to NANC with a recommendation that they approve them and forward them to the FCC for adoption as the industry standard. This PIM is CLOSED.

.

* PIM 22 – PIM 22 remains open. Sprint PCS and Sprint Wireline reported that they conducted a study over a 4-5 month period and had over 2,000 numbers inadvertently ported after the conflict timer expired. Sprint reported that the majority of these inadvertent ports resulted from 3 or 4 providers. Verizon continues to request that the LNPA explore ways to satisfactorily resolve this issue. Service Providers have an open action item to investigate internally how often the scenario described in PIM 22 occurs for further discussion at the LNPA.

 

* NEW PIM 23 – This PIM, submitted by the Common Interest Group on Rating and Routing (CIGRR), addresses inconsistencies between data in the LERG and NPAC. CIGRR 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. At the July LNPA, Mary Beth DeGeorgis, Telcordia, reported that CIGRR wants to make sure that LRNs are correctly populated in the LERG and providers who do not have access to NPAC also desire this validation to improve their processes. It was suggested in the LNPA that any such report would require a caveat stating that the NPAC is the golden source for LRNs. Also, any report should only reflect a provider’s own data. In response to a concern that some LRN discrepancies may be legitimate, Telcordia stated they could suppress any legitimate discrepancies on subsequently produced reports. There is still no consensus to accept this PIM. This will be discussed at the August meeting. Service Providers are to:
* Discuss this PIM with their respective CIGRR representative in order to better understand if/why it is needed.
* Invite their respective CIGRR representative to participate on a call to discuss PIM 23 with the LNPA during the August meeting. The call is scheduled to take place on Wednesday, 8/13, at 1pm Pacific (4pm Eastern) time.



* 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 has submitted Change Order 23 for FCC consideration. The PIM will remain open pending the FCC’s decision on the Change Order.

* New PIM 25: This PIM was submitted by Verizon Wireless. NPAC timers do not run on key holidays, which are big retail days for the wireless industry. This PIM proposes that the timers run on these holidays for wireless to wireless ports only. At their July meeting, the WNPO agreed to resolve this issue as follows:
* If a wireless carrier is open on a holiday, they will still perform the same concurrence function when serving as the Old Service Provider that they do on a regular business day. If they don’t concur on a port on a regular business day, however, they will not likely concur on a holiday. This issue is considered closed at this time.



US Cellular Contribution on Overlapping Wireless/Wireline Serving Areas:

* US Cellular presented the attach contribution on issues related to wireless/wireline overlapping service areas.



* US Cellular asks if Wireless Number Portability (WNP) obligations are defined by wireless providers’ license areas, the Top 100 Metropolitan Statistical Areas within which they must provide WNP (both of which the FCC defines by counties), or are their porting obligations linked to the underlying Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier’s (ILEC’s) rate areas, whose boundaries seldom coincide with county boundaries.
* The LNPA concluded that the answer to this question should be determined by each provider’s regulatory/legal team.

NANC 323 (Migration of SPID) Method & Procedure (M&P) Discussion:

* The LNPA further discussed the following with regard to the implementation of

NANC Change Order 323, Mass Update of SPID:

1. Does it matter which service provider(s), e.g. the ILEC, have not successfully migrated when deciding to back out or move forward?
2. How many codes, LRNs, blocks, -Xs, and SVs can we migrate in a window?

At the July meeting, it was suggested that any benchmarking would only be good for the current database size. One suggestion was to have each provider work with their respective vendor(s) to perform the same “pretend migration” to determine the order of magnitude time requirement needed to import the SMURF files. If the order of magnitude is not that long, there may not be a concern regarding the ability to complete during a prescribed maintenance window interval. Once a migration is identified, there is time in the timeline for service providers to determine how long it will take to import the SMURF files.

1. The group needs to discuss further the proximity of LERG effective date and SPID migration date. Are there any local system requirements that assume the two dates are tied together?
2. The group needs to identify the various scenarios that drive SPID migration, e.g. acquiring another service provider’s switch with the code and LRN remaining intact, or absorbing another service provider’s code into your switch, and identify the steps that need to take place in the appropriate order to minimize customer impact, e.g. LRN change, DPC changes, etc. We must identify each possible scenario driving a migration, identify any differences in process based on the scenario, and identify the migration process steps and their appropriate order for each scenario.
3. Do we need a backout strategy and timeline before and after migration commit?
4. Need to understand if there are any call processing impacts when provider(s) do not migrate, e.g. any local systems that reject modifies if they have not migrated (see Action Item 0603-10).
5. What happens during an audit of a Subscription Version (SV) that has not successfully migrated? NeuStar to determine if the SPID attribute is returned in the audit result and if the SV will be deleted and added back with the new SPID?
6. Does a Modify mSET send the SPID attribute (see related Question 6 and Action Item 0603-10)?
7. What tools are available to allow a service provider to only load those records that changed in order to prevent having to load the entire database via Bulk Data Download (BDD)?

NOTE: Additions to these questions were added at the July LNPA meeting and are reflected above in red. This will be an agenda item for the August LNPA meeting.

* The LNPA decided to form a sub-team to continue the discussion of NANC 323 implementation. It will be via conference call to take place between the August and September LNPA meetings. It will likely be an all day call. Members are asked to bring in any additional expertise as needed. They should be sufficiently grounded and brought up to speed in order to make the call as productive as possible. The August LNPA meeting agenda will have 2 hours reserved to set the framework for the subsequent call. This will take place 8:30-10:30am Pacific Time on Thursday, August 14th.

**THURSDAY 07/10/03**

Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T  | Dave Garner  | Qwest (phone) |
| Lonnie Keck | ATTWS | Charles Ryburn | SBC  |
| Sean Hawkins | ATTWS (phone) | Leah Luper | SBC  |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | ATTWS | Liz Coakley | SBC |
| Lee Hunter | BellSouth (phone) | Dan Martin | SBC |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth  | Dianna Bordenaro | Sprint |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth  | Craig Bartell | Sprint |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LLC  | Rick Dressner | Sprint PCS |
| Monica Dahmen |  Cox | Jeff Adrian | Sprint PCS |
| Dennis Robbins | Electric Lightwave (phone) | Susan Tiffany | Sprint PCS |
| Keagan O’Rourke | Evolving Systems (phone)  | Colleen Collard | Tekelec  |
| Rick Jones | NENA | John Malyar | Telcordia Technologies |
| Barry Bishop | NeuStar (phone) | Adam Newman | Telcordia Technologies |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Marybeth Degeorgis | Telcordia Technologies |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Jason Kempson | Telcordia Technologies |
| Rob Coffman | NeuStar (phone) | Lisa Marie Maxson | Telecom Software (phone) |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar  | Jean Anthony | Telecom Software |
| Dira Sadano | NeuStar PA (phone) | Jeff Kelly | T-Mobile |
| Shannon Collins | NeuStar PA (phone) | Charlotte Holden | US Cellular (phone) |
| Marcelle Champagne | NeuStar | Bob Jones | US Cellular |
| Larry Vagnoni | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | VeriSign  |
| Hong Liu | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | Verizon |
| Randy Buffenbarger | NeuStar | Julie Groenen | Verizon Wireless |
| Rosemary Emmer | Nextel  | Jason Lee | WorldCom (phone) |
|  |  | Karen Mulberry | WorldCom  |

* Verizon Wireless, on behalf of the WTSC, presented the attached contribution addressing WTSC discussions on potentially performing volume testing. The WTSC is looking for as many test partners as possible to drive as many transactions as possible. It is to be determined if back office systems would be a part of the test. If the testing is to be performed, the WTSC would like it done in the September/October timeframe. Two providers have expressed interest so far. The NPAC region to be used has not yet been determined. Although it would not be necessary, an NPAC Test Engineer could be utilized to monitor the testing. Since this testing is proposed to take place in production, all carriers’ LSMSs would receive broadcasts. The goal would be to drive a minimum of 4,000 transactions and the TN/sec throughput would be monitored. It was suggested that an assumption should be added that all systems participating in the test must have passed certification testing. Question from the floor – the proposed volumes do not seem that high, so what is the objective of the test? Question from the floor – why not perform testing in the test bed? The objective is not to test the NPAC, but to test the Clearinghouse’s ability to handle the volumes. The possibility of testing in the test environment will be pursued. The objectives and proposed test plan will be expanded and the contribution will be resubmitted at the August LNPA meeting. The LNPA will decide then if this will become a PIM.



Change Management Discussion:

* Port Protection (NANC Change Order 382): This Change Order proposes a system and process for preventing inadvertent ports. It proposes giving end-users the ability to define their portable telephone numbers as “not-portable.”



The group discussed the current version and made the following modifications:

1. Make the validation apply only to the New SP Create,
2. Make the validation apply to intra-SP ports at the option of the SPID,
3. Make the reject message indicate it is due to the TN being on the protection list,
4. Remove the TN from the list automatically when the ported TN is disconnected.

NeuStar will update NANC 382 and distribute to the group prior to the August meeting. The LNPA will determine at the August meeting if this Change Order will be moved to Accepted.

It was stated by a member that FCC 98-334 Paragraph 130 addresses rules for PIC protection. The FCC encouraged providers to develop a validation process for removing the protection flag on an end user’s PIC. It was suggested that this proposed port protection Change Order may need NANC and FCC approval.

* Evolving Systems (ESI) discussed their proposed list of metrics and testing methods to evaluate Change Order effectiveness and asked the group if there were any questions. Question from the floor - what would we do if the evaluation showed the Change Order was not effective. Response - this could be a tool to prove in or out a potential Change Order. This proposal will become a proposed Change Order and will be assigned a number.



* NeuStar will develop an NPAC Change Order related to excluding maintenance window time from NPAC timer expiration calculations. A question will be included asking if it is desired to make this SPID-specific, where that SPID’s timers would not run if they take maintenance outside the normal service provider maintenance window.

NPAC Forecasting Model Discussion:

* The group discussed Version 1.3 of the NPAC Forecasting Group’s (NFG) Forecasting Model:



* Version 1.3 of the model has been regionalized and distributes the projected 2003 Wireless Number Portability (WNP) transactions over 5 weeks (1 week in November and 4 weeks in December). The May actuals were also added in v1.3 of the model.
* NOTE: The latest version of the NFG Forecasting Model can be obtained at [www.npac.com](http://www.npac.com) by clicking on the “NFG” button.

Review of June Action Items:



* Item 0603-01: This item was completed on 6/19/03 and is Closed.
* Item 0603-02: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0603-03: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0603-04: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0603-05: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0603-06: This item remains Open. The May NANC minutes have not yet been issued.
* Item 0603-07: NOTE: This Action Item was completed subsequent to the July LNPA meeting on 7/14/03. Closed.
* Item 0603-08: This item will be addressed at the NANC meeting on 7/15/03.

NOTE: This Action Item was completed subsequent to the July LNPA meeting at the 7/15/03 NANC meeting.

* Item 0603-09: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0603-10: Item remains Open. To be part of the discussion at the August LNPA meeting.
* Item 0603-11: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0103-11: Item remains Open. PIM 22 remains open. Sprint PCS and Sprint Wireline reported that they conducted a study over a 4-5 month period and had over 2,000 numbers inadvertently ported after the conflict timer expired. Sprint reported that the majority of these inadvertent ports resulted from 3 or 4 providers. Verizon continues to request that the LNPA explore ways to satisfactorily resolve this issue.
* Item 0503-03: At the July LNPA, Mary Beth DeGeorgis, Telcordia, reported that CIGRR wants to make sure that LRNs are correctly populated in the LERG and providers who do not have access to NPAC also desire this validation to improve their processes. In response to a concern that some LRN discrepancies may be legitimate, Telcordia stated they could suppress any legitimate discrepancies on subsequently produced reports. PIM 23 will be further discussed via conference call at the August LNPA meeting. The call is scheduled to take place on Wednesday, 8/13, at 1pm Pacific (4pm Eastern) time. LNPA members are to invite their respective CIGRR members to participate on the call. Action Item 0503-03 is Closed.
* Item 0503-10: This item remains Open. At the July meeting, additions to these questions were added and are reflected below in red. This will be an agenda item for the July LNPA meeting.

The LNPA will determine the following with regard to the implementation of NANC Change Order 323, Mass Update of SPID:

1. Does it matter which service provider(s), e.g. the ILEC, have not successfully migrated when deciding to back out or move forward?
2. How many codes, LRNs, blocks, -Xs, and SVs can we migrate in a window?
3. The group needs to discuss further the proximity of LERG effective date and SPID migration date. Are there any local system requirements that assume the two dates are tied together?
4. The group needs to identify the various scenarios that drive SPID migration, e.g. acquiring another service provider’s switch with the code and LRN remaining intact, or absorbing another service provider’s code into your switch, and identify the steps that need to take place in the appropriate order to minimize customer impact, e.g. LRN change, DPC changes, etc. We must identify each possible scenario driving a migration, identify any differences in process based on the scenario, and identify the migration process steps and their appropriate order for each scenario.
5. Do we need a backout strategy and timeline before and after migration commit?
6. Need to understand if there are any call processing impacts when provider(s) do not migrate, e.g. any local systems that reject modifies if they have not migrated (see Action Item 0603-10).
7. What happens during an audit of a Subscription Version (SV) that has not successfully migrated? NeuStar to determine if the SPID attribute is returned in the audit result and if the SV will be deleted and added back with the new SPID?
8. Does a Modify mSET send the SPID attribute (see related Question 6 and Action Item 0603-10)?
9. What tools are available to allow a service provider to only load those records that changed in order to prevent having to load the entire database via Bulk Data Download (BDD)?

The LNPA decided to form a sub-team to continue the discussion of NANC 323 implementation. It will be via conference call to take place between the August and September LNPA meetings. The August LNPA meeting agenda will have 2 hours reserved to set the framework for the subsequent call. This will take place 8:30-10:30am Pacific Time on Thursday, August 14th.

New Business:

* No new business was presented at the July LNPA meeting.

Remaining 2003 Meeting Schedule:

PLEASE NOTE THE SWAP BETWEEN THE SEPTEMBER AND OCTOBER LNPA MEETINGS. ALL DATES REMAIN THE SAME.

* 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.
* 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 Canadian Consortium in Banff, Alberta, Canada.
* Oct. Week of 10/13. No NANC meeting. Hosted by Verizon in Portsmouth, New Hampshire.
* 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.