**LNPA WORKING GROUP**

**MEETING MINUTES:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 16221 NE 72nd Way | Redmond, WA | Host: AT&T Wireless |

**Wednesday, August 13, 2003 – 8:30 AM – 5:00 PM**

Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T | Dave Garner | | Qwest |
| Lonnie Keck | ATTWS | Charles Ryburn | | SBC |
| Sean Hawkins | ATTWS | Craig Bartell | | Sprint |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | ATTWS | Rick Dressner | | Sprint PCS |
| Fred Farmer | ATTWS | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint PCS |
| Lee Hunter | BellSouth | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint PCS |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth (phone) | Cat Baird | | Sure West |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth (phone) | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec (phone) |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LLC | Adam Newman | | Telcordia Technologies |
| Nicole Falls | Cavalier Telephone | Marybeth Degeorgis | | Telcordia Technologies |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox | Jean Anthony | | Telecom Software |
| Dennis Robbins | Electric Lightwave | Jeff Kelly | | T-Mobile (phone) |
| Keagan O’Rourke | Evolving Systems | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Barry Bishop | NeuStar | Elie De Cassis | | T-Mobile |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Glenn Mills | | TSI |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar (phone) | Bob Jones | | US Cellular |
| Gene Johnston | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Dira Sadano | NeuStar PA (phone) | Julie Groenen | | Verizon Wireless |
| Marcelle Champagne | NeuStar | Chris Ducket-Brown | | Verizon Wireless |
| Larry Vagnoni | NeuStar | Jason Lee | | WorldCom (phone) |
| Randy Buffenbarger | NeuStar (phone) | Karen Mulberry | | WorldCom (phone) |
| Rosemary Emmer | Nextel |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

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

**WEDNESDAY 08/13/03**

September/October Meeting Swap:

* The September, 2003 LNPA meeting will be hosted by the Canadian Consortium at the Banff Center in Banff, Alberta, Canada, from 9/15 – 9/18.
* The October, 2003 LNPA meeting will be hosted by Verizon at the Sheraton Harborside Hotel in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, from 10/13 – 10/16.

07/03 Minutes Review:

No changes were made to the DRAFT July 2003 LNPA Minutes during the August meeting. These Minutes will become the FINAL July 2003 version.

* Due to the size of the files containing the meeting Minutes, it was requested that the current month’s Draft Minutes and the previous month’s Final Minutes be distributed in separate e-mails.

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

* Wireless Testing Subcommittee (WTSC) Report –
* Inter-species porting and how wireline carriers will prepare for participation will be discussed at next meeting.
* Coordination to prepare for testing can take up to 2 weeks. Adding back-off systems for end-to-end testing has lengthened the testing interval.
* Some issues have surfaced in testing with some carriers regarding the Inter-carrier Communications Process (ICP) process and how to fill out the fax document. Carriers need to follow WICIS standards.
* Discussions on when the WTSC will disband will take place at next month’s meeting.

* Bob Jones, US Cellular, and Sue Tiffany, Sprint, are the newly elected WNPO Co-Chairs.
* 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 action was reported. T1P1 standards for GSM and TR45 standards for cellular do not have a JIP requirement. It is optional. It was questioned if a liaison should be sent to these groups. No new industry conference call has been scheduled to date.
* The WNPO will put together a list of frequently asked questions on wireless porting to be sent to the OBF Wireless Workshop.
* The OBF Inter-species Task Force (ITF) will have its 1st face-to-face meeting next during the August OBF meeting.
* Wireless Conflict Timer: This timer will revert from 24 business hours back to 6 business hours on 11/24/03. A vote was taken in the WNPO, and although the majority of the votes favored maintaining the timer at the current 24 business hours, it was determined that the vote result did not constitute a consensus to do so. This issue will not be revisited unless a minority report or contribution is brought in to the WNPO.
* The WNPO will provide a contribution to the LNPA to propose changing the extended Sunday Service Provider Maintenance Window from the current 11 hours to 8 hours in order to eliminate the overlap with wireless business hours on Sunday.
* 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 08/12/03. 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 LNPA LSMS Traffic Model



* NeuStar walked the group through the attached traffic model. It focuses on LSMS download rates. It is based on actual 2Q03 wireline data and traffic distribution patterns used to project 4Q03 wireline and wireless volumes. There has not yet been sufficient responses from wireless carriers to shield those who have responded with data from having their forecasts identified.
* This model uses actual 2Q03 NPAC operations data (a single request to NPAC) to build hour, day, and day of week data. The data is currently reflected in local time in each region, e.g. 10am to 6pm busy period for all regions reflects 10am to 6pm local time for each respective region. This will be reflected in Central Time for all regions in the next update of the model.
* The NPAC Forecasting Group (NFG) Data Worksheet in the attached calculates TN to Operations scale factors for each NPAC operation, e.g.
* 1.69 TNs per wireline activate in 2Q03
* 1.93 TNs per wireline disconnect in 2Q03

The worksheet also shows the projected percentages of wireless operations by region based on NFG model data. It was suggested to put in separate percentages for wireless and wireline.

* The data is trending to reflect approximately 10,000 activate operations total for all regions in a 15 minute period during the busy hour.
* NeuStar will create two additional worksheets in the front of the model listing the assumptions and changes made since the last version.
* NeuStar will continue to collect data submitted by wireless carriers. This will be incorporated into the model so that eventually wireless projections will not be based on wireline data trends, but on projected wireless data.
* This model will be used to derive a projected Operations/second metric for the projected busy hour during the busy day of 4Q03.
* Discussions of Plans for a SOA Model:
* The group discussed how to obtain data for development of a SOA model. SOA is more difficult than LSMS in that SOA requirements are sensitive to the percentage of ports individual providers are involved in. There was discussion on possibly deriving an average SOA notification per NPAC operation ratio that could be applied to the volume of operations in a region. A provider, knowing the % of porting activity they are involved in, could possibly use this to estimate the amount of traffic projected for their SOA interface. Next month the APT will begin to discuss how we can develop a SOA performance model. The group will also discuss what LSMS data would be applicable for use in the model development. Question -- Do we need to develop individual provider SOA requirements due to the fact that not all providers’ SOAs have the same performance requirements? The group will also discuss what tools or metrics are needed to determine NPAC requirements and how that maps to SOA throughput requirements of providers of different size.
* 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. The following was added to the working document for this Change Order, “The intention is to off load the interface and have it done at off peak times. The benefit is to move large volume transactions off the CMIP interface.” The group discussed the value of this Change Order and what scenarios would be applicable. One hypothetical scenario suggested related to performing a large volume of activity in a short period of time. It was further suggested that this would seem to imply that the current interface was not sufficient to handle the volume and this hypothetical scenario imposes new requirements on the Change Order in that the current business need is to move activity off of the interface that could be processed at a later time. In a lot of cases, the SOA interface needs to handle more traffic than the LSMS interface. It was agreed that the group needs to come up with a way to quantify and project SOA throughput requirements in order to drive to any of the alternatives on the table for addressing the SOA interface. Further work on this Change Order will be prioritized behind the need to develop a metric to project SOA interface throughput requirements for different providers with different loads. The APT will also discuss in parallel next month what current functionality may prevent us from possibly improving the CMIP interface performance, e.g. Digital Signatures, and are they still needed.
* NANC 353 – Round-Robin across SOA associations – This Change Order has been revised to only address SOA associations. Round-Robin across LSMS associations is addressed in ILL 5. Further work on this Change Order will be prioritized behind the need to develop a metric to project SOA interface throughput requirements for different providers with different loads.
* ILL 5 – Round-Robin across LSMS Associations - Further work on this Change Order will be prioritized behind the need to develop a metric to project SOA interface throughput requirements for different providers with different loads.
* NANC 383 – Separate SOA Channel for Notifications - Further work on this Change Order will be prioritized behind the need to develop a metric to project SOA interface throughput requirements for different providers with different loads.
* NANC 384 - NPAC Change Order Effectiveness Metrics – Evolving System’s (ESI) contribution will be discussed in the full LNPA during Change Management.
* ILL 130 – Application Level Errors – This Change Order will stay on the list for future discussion.

Maintenance Window Discussion:

* The WNPO recommended that the extended Sunday Service provider Maintenance Window, conducted on the 1st Sunday of every month, be reduced from the current 11 hours, to 8 hours. NeuStar stated that 8 hours would be sufficient under most circumstances for NPAC maintenance during the window, however, there are times when they need to go beyond 8 hours for some maintenance. NeuStar stated they could accommodate the reduction as long as it is understood that there are times when maintenance needs require a window beyond 8 hours. Verizon, Qwest, and SBC stated they also approved of the proposed reduction with the same caveat. BellSouth stated they objected to the reduction, but will accept the change with this caveat. It was suggested to add to the PIM 2 Maintenance Document a strong recommendation that maintenance be started right at the beginning of the window to reduce the chance of going beyond the established window. NeuStar suggested that this recommendation could be placed on the Service Provider Maintenance Notification. Providers would still need to send out a notice for extended maintenance, but for beyond 8 hours instead 11 hours. Another caveat for reducing the extended maintenance window is that service providers will still have the ability to notify the industry of planned maintenance outside the established windows, just as we do today.

The LNPA agreed to change the extended Service Provider Maintenance Window time for the 1st Sunday of each month, currently conducted from midnight to 11am Central, to be conducted from midnight to 8am Central. The regular Service Provider Maintenance Window, conducted on the other Sundays of the month will remain unchanged. This change will be effective with the 11/02/03 extended maintenance window. NeuStar took an action to:

* Notify the industry via the Cross-Regional distribution list that effective 11/02/03, the timeframe for the extended Service Provider Maintenance Window, conducted on the 1st Sunday of each month, will change to midnight to 8am Central. The notice will also reflect that the regular Service Provider Maintenance Window, held on the remaining Sundays, will continue to be conducted from 2am to 8am Central.
* Add an advisory to the service provider maintenance notification to strongly recommend that maintenance be started promptly at the beginning of the window to reduce the chance of going beyond the established window interval.
* Notify the NAPM/LLC of this change to the extended maintenance window at the next LLC meeting.

In his Project Executive (PE) report to the August NAPM/LLC meeting, Gary

Sacra will advise the NAPM/LLC of the change to the extended Service provider Maintenance Window to be effective on 11/02/03.

The WNPO will modify the Timer Matrix document to reflect the change to

the extended Service provider Maintenance Window to be effective on 11/02/03.

* It was stated that this window reduction could be a temporary solution to the extended maintenance window overlap with wireless Sunday business hours if the industry proceeds with NANC Change Order 385, which would exclude wireless timer calculation time within the maintenance window. This Change Order would allow us to define a day-specific business day. With respect to NANC Change Order 385, Service Providers are to determine if there is a need to make this specific to wireless timers, e.g., short vs. long.
* The group then discussed the merits of staying with a national maintenance window (current implementation) vs. region-based maintenance windows timed in accordance with the predominant time zone of the region. No changes were made.
* NeuStar stated they could take the NPACs down during the Sunday Service Provider Maintenance Windows to prevent porting activity. SBC and Verizon voiced acceptance of this proposal. The Canadian Consortium requires the NPAC to remain on-line unless authorized for maintenance. AT&T stated acceptance with the caveat that NPAC be brought on-line 1 hour prior to the end of the maintenance window in order to allow service providers to test any changes made in local systems. NeuStar had an issue with reducing the extended Maintenance Window to 7 hours on the 1st Sunday of the month.

Service Providers took an action to discuss internally the possibility of NPAC going off-line during every Sunday Service Provider Maintenance Window. Under this proposal, NPAC would be off-line for the complete 8 hour interval on the 1st Sunday of the month, but would come back up one hour before the end of the regular 6 hour Sunday maintenance windows.

* PROs of the proposal for discussion:
* More finely tuned NPAC – more flexibility to do database maintenance and indexing,
* Compliance to PIM 2 (will result in reduction of):
* Partial fails
* Call routing issues
* Recovery of messages
* Performance metric failures
* Consistency in knowing when NPAC will be down
* Reduction in partial fails and resultant calls to Help Desk
* Reduction in NPAC maintenance notifications to industry
* Reduction of NPAC service resumption pages in the middle of the night
* CONs of the proposal for discussion:
* No ability to query NPAC
* Possible need to manually re-associate local systems
* Inability to reverse an inadvertent port on an emergency basis.

.

Service Providers are to determine if they have to manually re-associate their SOA and/or LSMS platforms if NPAC were to be taken off-line during the Service Provider Maintenance Window.

* NeuStar took an action to send out a notice to the Cross-Regional distribution

on behalf of the LNPA advising that, effective 11/24/03, the “wireless” Long Business Day hours are changing to 9am-9pm in the predominant time zone of the region.

PIMs:

* PIM 23 discussion with the LNPA and CIGRR:

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 August LNPA meeting, a conference call was held to discuss this PIM request. Members of the LNPA and CIGRR participated on the call.

* T-Mobile has withdrawn support of PIM 23. They still recognize the problem, however, they don’t think BRDDS is the proper vehicle for achieving synchronization between NPAC and the LERG. T-Mobile stated they envision a new centralized platform that collects data from the Pool Administrator, LERG, and NPAC, etc., for synchronization. T-Mobile agrees that the PIM should be accepted, but they take exception to the proposed solution.
* Nextel stated support to accept the issue to work.
* Telcordia stated they did not envision that BRDDS would override NPAC data. It is an attempt on the part of CIGRR members to display their network, as reflected in NPAC, in the LERG.
* NeuStar stated that other vendor user groups would also have to be accommodated.
* It was asked how we can ensure that proper action will be taken by providers to synch up the databases. There is no obligation for them to take action. There was also concern expressed about possible misuse of the data. Telcordia responded that data would only be distributed to the applicable provider unless instructed to do otherwise by the industry. A CIGRR member stated the group is simply looking for a way to maintain the integrity of LERG data. Telcordia also stated that the PIM is focused on LRN data, but also requests validation of other like data elements between the two databases, e.g., NPA-NXX, NPA-NXX-X.
* T-Mobile suggested the PIM should be reworded more generically and resubmitted. Another LNPA member suggested that another alternative was to reject the PIM because there is not an issue. Telcordia stated it was suggested to them to bring this in to the LNPA as a PIM.
* During the discussion, it was suggested to have CIGRR discuss whether the LERG should continue to have LRN data in it.
* This issue is being sent back to CIGRR to revisit and decide whether to reword and resubmit it to the LNPA or address it in some other way. CIGRR withdraws the PIM and will take it back to discuss a path forward.

.

* PIM 22 – PIM 22 remains open. SBC discussed cases where numbers disconnected for non-payment are being ported out by other providers. BellSouth reported that they check when they receive a New SP CREATE notification to see if they have received a matching Local Service Request (LSR). If not, they place the number on an “orphan list.” BellSouth stated that they experience many of these, but will need to check on how many result in actual inadvertent ports. Sprint PCS stated they are in favor of changing both wireless and wireline Conflict timers to 24 hours. Both MCI and Qwest reported that they have experienced this issue, but have not yet been able to quantify. 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.



* 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. PA Change Order 23 has been sent to the FCC by the PA. The PIM will remain open pending the FCC’s decision on the Change Order.

* Wireless Timer/Holiday Issue: This PIM proposal was submitted by Verizon Wireless. NPAC timers do not run on key holidays, which are big retail days for the wireless industry. This PIM proposed that the timers run on these holidays for wireless to wireless ports only. At the August LNPA, this issue was withdrawn. It will be submitted to the OBF Wireless Workshop for resolution.



* Verizon Wireless Proposal on WTSC Testing Proposal: This proposal is now sponsored solely by Verizon Wireless. It is not intended to stress test the NPAC. Verizon Wireless has not found a partner yet to perform the proposed testing in production. Their desire is to get agreement from multiple partners to port 250 numbers during the day. Verizon Wireless is asking if there are any objections to the proposed testing if they can find a partner. They want to verify that ports flow end-to-end, queues function properly, etc. There would need to be a clean-up after testing to remove these TNs. There were no stated objections from the LNPA for Verizon Wireless to test if they find partner(s). It was the consensus that there is no need to make this proposal a PIM.



**THURSDAY 08/14/03**

Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T | Mindy Patterson | | NeuStar |
| Lonnie Keck | ATTWS | Rosemary Emmer | | Nextel |
| Sean Hawkins | ATTWS | Dave Garner | | Qwest |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | ATTWS | Charles Ryburn | | SBC |
| Fred Farmer | ATTWS | Craig Bartell | | Sprint |
| Lee Hunter | BellSouth | Rick Dressner | | Sprint PCS |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth (phone) | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint PCS |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth (phone) | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint PCS |
| Gene Miller | Cable Visions Systems | Cat Baird | | Sure West |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LLC | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec (phone) |
| Nicole Falls | Cavalier Telephone | Adam Newman | | Telcordia Technologies |
| Chuck Whalen | Century Tel | Marybeth Degeorgis | | Telcordia Technologies |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox | Jean Anthony | | Telecom Software |
| Dennis Robbins | Electric Lightwave | Jeff Kelly | | T-Mobile (phone) |
| Keagan O’Rourke | Evolving Systems | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Barry Bishop | NeuStar | Elie De Cassis | | T-Mobile |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Glenn Mills | | TSI |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar (phone) | Bob Jones | | US Cellular |
| Gene Johnston | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Dira Sadano | NeuStar PA (phone) | Julie Groenen | | Verizon Wireless |
| Marcelle Champagne | NeuStar | Chris Ducket-Brown | | Verizon Wireless |
| Larry Vagnoni | NeuStar | Jason Lee | | WorldCom (phone) |
| Randy Buffenbarger | NeuStar (phone) | Karen Mulberry | | WorldCom (phone) |

Multiple LRN Discussion:

* The group discussed the upcoming 8/22/03 Industry Numbering Committee (INC) call to discuss the NANC Multiple LRN Issue and NANC’s instructions at their 7/03 meeting to NANPA to perform an analysis of the Numbering Plan impact and to the INC to provide technical input to NANPA.
* Gary Sacra took an action to contact the Industry Numbering Committee (INC)

to see if the scheduled 8/22/03 INC conference call to discuss the NANC multiple LRN issue is open to all LNPA members and if it is a requirement to be an INC member to join the call.

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

* A conference call has been scheduled for 9/3/03 from 10am-2:30pm Eastern. The dial-in bridge is 888-517-2888, passcode 5593152. A follow-up call, if necessary, was tentatively scheduled for 9/9/03 from 10am-2:30pm Eastern using the same bridge. The questions below in the order listed will serve as the agenda for the call(s). Additions to these questions and NANC 323 action items were added at the August LNPA meeting and are reflected below in red.
* The LNPA will determine the following with regard to the implementation of

NANC Change Order 323, Mass Update of SPID:

1. 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.
2. A) How many codes, LRNs, blocks, -Xs, and SVs can we migrate in a window?

B) What is the maximum period of time we have on a weekend to do migration?

For how long are we willing to keep the window open?

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? Service providers have an action to determine if their SOA determines code ownership based on LERG info. We will look at this question from 3 standpoints: migration before LERG, migration after LERG, and same date, to see what issues exist in each.
2. Do we need a backout strategy and timeline before and after migration commit? At the August meeting, it was agreed we need a backout strategy. NPAC will track each record that changes and will back those out if necessary. Would need a similar function in local systems.
3. Does it matter which service provider(s), e.g. the ILEC, have not successfully migrated when deciding to back out or move forward?
4. 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? NeuStar reported that NANC 323 requirements are silent on the treatment during an audit when there is a SPID mismatch. SPID is not modifiable. Service providers have an action to determine if it is ok for NPAC to send an activate on top of the existing SV with the new SPID. Will LSMSs accept an SV with the same SVid but a different SPID? Could possibly be a data violation. There is no audit functionality today to disconnect first and then send an activate.
5. Does a Modify mSET send the SPID attribute (see related Question 8 and Action Item 0603-10)?
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 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)? NeuStar reported that Delta BDD is not a tool for Question 9. Delta BDD would not recognize SPID changes. Action for service providers to discuss with their local system vendors if they have the ability to scan a full BDD for SPID changes so the full BDD would not have to be loaded.
8. Need to look at different combinations when Old or New SPID in a pending port are involved in SPID migration. What is necessary behavior? Also should discuss when an active Subscription Version (SV), originally an inter-SP port (LSPP), now is an intra-SP port (LISP), as a result of a SPID migration. See attached NANC 323 related to proposed treatment of pending ports.



Port Protection Change Order 382 (Presented by NeuStar):



* US Cellular expressed a concern regarding a carrier protecting its entire customer base with a blanket opt out notification. NeuStar said that the intent of this Change Order is not for a carrier to prevent numbers from being ported but to prevent an inadvertent port. US Cellular suggested that NeuStar should add in the Change Order that the customer would only go on the protection list with positive acknowledgement from that customer.
* One member suggested that this Change Order may require a change to the FCC Order that addresses PIC locks.
* AT&T Wireless stated that they supports this to prevent porting of administrative and emergency numbers.
* Sprint stated they are concerned that wireless porting model does not allow sufficient time from when the CREATE is sent to determine that the number is on the list and to have it removed. Sprint asked if we always have to send a request first to remove it in the event it is protected, then why have it? Nextel suggested possibly automating this process so the New SP could ping the list in NPAC prior to sending the CREATE. BellSouth stated they are concerned that the Change Order is being watered down to the point that it defeats its purpose.
* NeuStar asked if it is true that there are no objections to having the capability, but concerns on how to use it. NeuStar didn’t see any suggested changes to the technical design. It was suggested this may need to go to the FCC and have it put out for industry comment.
* It was agreed that the group needs further discussion on the criteria of when numbers are placed on the list, the verification process to place numbers on and their removal from the list, and the customer’s/service providers’/neutral party’s involvement and process.

NANC 191/291 Update (NeuStar):

* NeuStar reported that the NANC 191 edit is turned on. This Change Order requires a Subsystem Number (SSN) in the New SP CREATE message when there is a Destination Point Code (DPC) and vice versa. NANC 291, which requires an SSN of 000 for any DPC data has not yet been turned on.
* NeuStar reported that the initial report ran to determine how many records would fail the NANC 291 edit was not complete. The second report reflected many more records that would fail the edit.
* 6.3 million NANC 291 violations.
* 1.9 million NANC 191 violations
* NeuStar is requesting that the industry determine a drop dead date when the NANC 291 edit should be turned on in all regions.
* With regard to NANC Change Order 291, which added an edit in Release 3.2 to require a Subsystem Number (SSN) of 000 when a Destination Point Code (DPC) is contained in the New Service Provider CREATE message, NeuStar took an action to:
* Report the number of existing SVs, grouped by region and carrier (without identifying the carrier), that would fail the 291 edit,
* Indicate for the “heavy hitters” if it is known if the use of an SSN value other than “000” actually is necessary for their networks. For those carriers where Neustar is able to ascertain their situation, indicate the time when the carriers’ networks could support a “000” value in their own SVs.

The purpose of this report is to facilitate a discussion of when the 291 edit can be turned on.

* This issue will be a monthly status agenda item on each Wednesday of LNPA week until the NANC 291 edit is turned on.

Change Management Discussion:

* NANC 384 – This Change Order from Evolving Systems (ESI) proposes metrics for evaluating the effectiveness of past and proposed Change Orders. It is now an accepted Change Order. Requirements will be worked in the Architecture Planning Team (APT). This Change order will be placed on the agenda for next month’s APT.
* NANC 385 – Timer calculation discussion. Sprint PCS stated they want to withdraw discussion on implementing this Change Order on a SPID profile basis. Sprint PCS stated that this Change Order no longer has the same level of urgency since it was agreed to shorten the extended Sunday Service Provider Maintenance Window to 8 hours, and if NPAC can stay within the 8 hours for maintenance. They are concerned, though, that NANC 323 migrations may push maintenance windows beyond the 8 hours. Sprint PCS further stated that this Change Order would have to be in place before they would agree to move the extended maintenance window back to 11 hours.
* NANC 386 – This Change Order would only allow a single association for each SOA/LSMS. NPAC would abort the existing association if a new request came in to establish a second association. If implemented, and if we want Ill 5 down the road, we would have to back this functionality out. Tekelec supports this Change Order but would want it fully tested because it is a behavioral change. BellSouth stated they are concerned that this would preclude multiple associations as a means of addressing interface performance. There was agreement to work the requirements for this Change Order. If the next release package contains a need for multiple associations, then NANC 386 would not be implemented. If no need for multiple associations, we could possibly implement NANC 386 in the next package.

Architecture Planning Team (APT) Schedule Discussion:

* It was proposed to start the LNPA on Tuesday afternoons at 1pm local time, end by 10am local time on Thursdays, and have the APT meetings start 10am local time on Thursdays, and end by 3pm. This is to be discussed at the September LNPA meeting.
* Charles Ryburn, LNPA Co-Chair, took an action to send a notice of the proposal and the planned discussion out to the WNPO and WTSC Co-Chairs for distribution to their teams.

Review of July Action Items:



* Item 0703-01: Item remains Open. To be part of the discussion on the 9/3/03 NANC 323 conference call.
* Item 0703-02: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0703-03: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0703-04: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0703-05: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0703-06: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0703-07: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0103-11: Item remains Open. PIM 22 remains open. SBC discussed cases where numbers disconnected for non-payment are being ported out by other providers. BellSouth reported that they check when they receive a New SP CREATE notification to see if they have received a matching Local Service Request (LSR). If not, they place the number on an “orphan list.” BellSouth stated that they experience many of these, but will need to check on how many result in actual inadvertent ports. Sprint PCS stated they are in favor of changing both wireless and wireline Conflict timers to 24 hours. Both MCI and Qwest reported that they have experienced this issue, but have not yet been able to quantify. Verizon continues to request that the LNPA explore ways to satisfactorily resolve this issue.
* Item 0503-10: This item remains Open. Refer to the NANC 323 Discussion item previously in these minutes for the latest update.
* Item 0603-06: This item is Closed. The May, 2003 NANC Minutes reflect NANC’s approval of the 15 business day cutoff.
* Item 0603-07: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0603-08: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0603-10: Item remains Open. To be part of the discussion on the 9/3/03 NANC 323 conference call.

New Business:

* NANC 323, SPID Migration, service provider certification testing: NeuStar will discuss this proposal internally. NeuStar stated they could possibly beef up the regression test suite and make NANC 323 test cases mandatory to be tested by all existing service providers connected to NPAC prior to 6/30/04. Ongoing, the NANC 323 test cases could be part of mandatory service provider turn-up testing before a new NPAC User can connect with NPAC. This will be discussed further at the LNPA.
* NeuStar requested that the NPAC 3.2.1.0 Point Release be placed on next month’s agenda on Wednesday.

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.
* 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.