# MEETING MINUTES FROM DAY #1 (9/15/03)

# ATTENDANCE: Day 1

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** |
|  |  |  |  |
| Susan Ortega | Nextel | Stephen Sanchez | AT&T Wireless  |
| Mark Wood  | Cingular  | Jason Kempson | Telcordia |
| Dave Garner  | Qwest | Steve Addicks | NeuStar |
| Paula Jordan | T-Mobile  | Rick Jones | NENA |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox Comm. | Marcel Champagne  |  NeuStar |
| Craig Bartell | Sprint | Susan Tiffany | Sprint  |
| Maggie Lee | VeriSign | Jeff Adrian  | Sprint  |
| Hong Liu | NeuStar | Rick Dressner | Sprint  |
| Chuck Bohl | US Cellular | Deborah Stephens | Verizon Wireless |
| Ron Stutheit | Contract |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **On the phone** |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Wireless | Kathy McGinn | RCC |
| Theresa Patton | Cingular | Chris Duckett-Brown | Verizon Wireless |
| Jim Grasser | Bell South  | Scottie Parish | ALLTEL |
| Jean Anthony  | TSE | Earl Scott  | Verizon  |
| Jennifer Goree | ALLTEL  | Shannon Collins  | NeuStar  |
| Lori Messing  | CTIA | Charlotte Holden | US Cellular |
| Adele Johnson | AT&T Wireless | Liz Coakley  | SBC |
| Ron Steen | Bell South | Robin Meier | SBC |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

# MEETING MINUTES FROM DAY #1 (9/15/03

1. **2004 Meeting HOST VOLUNTEERS for WTSC, WNPO and LNPA-WG:**

Tentative - Volunteers, Months and Locations for 2004 meetings. These volunteer efforts will be submitted to LNPA at this Sept. Meeting.

Sprint, May, Overland Park, KS; Cox, June, Atlanta; NeuStar, April, Sterling, Virginia; Cingular will check but location would be Atlanta; Nextel will check for a location other then Virginia; TMobile, ALLTEL and Verizon Wireless will tentatively volunteer. Approvals are needed; TSI; Telcordia

1. **COMBINED WNPO / WTSC MEETING**

**WTSC Read-Out by Susan Sill of AT&T Wireless**

1. ‘Lessons Learned’ was reviewed at the August meeting and will be posted to the NPAC website these lessons learned are global lessons (i.e. filters, profiles, set-up issues).

**9.B.1 ACTION ITEM: If both Trading Partners agree to share info and the ‘problem’ is not an internal issue or process but an industry level or ICP or SOA functionality problem would they be willing to share publicly? Susan will take that as an action.**

1. Some basic test results were shared, all info located at the WTSC button at www.npac.com.

AWS, NEXTEL – retesting in Oct

NEXTEL, Cingular – retesting in Oct.

Sprint, VZW – No Report

Sprint LD, Nextel – postponed

1. Each testing carrier has provided the # of test cases executed and # of pass/fail results. Question raised if carriers are willing to post that info are they willing to also post why those cases failed.

 **9.B.2** **ACTION ITEM: Susan Sill will question at the WTSC** **if carriers are also willing to post why cases failed.**

1. WTSC will discuss at this meeting the sunset of this team and report back with suggestions, decisions on Tues AM. Carriers that are involved in the May launch may still want to test as new entrants with trading partners. It was previously suggested that the team remain active until June 2003. [Update as of 9/16/03, WTSC has agreed to remain in place until June.]
2. Question was raised regarding whether the announced ‘quiet periods’ encompass both the test production environment or can testing still be done in the test environment – do carriers have resources?

**9.B.3 ACTION ITEM: Susan will ask the WTSC if any testing can take place with any SP on a test platform during the specified quiet periods.**

1. Any additional testing required, needed, requested after January 2003 will be agreed upon between the participating carriers.
2. Lonnie Keck requested of the WTSC that, if there are interoperability issues found during testing to please get out to the distribution quickly for OBF fast track process in order to get on the bi-weekly agenda to get worked.
3. MCI informed the WTSC they can be available for testing from 9/15/03 to 10/03/03 in a test bed environment. MCI’s test template and test cases will be reviewed at this meeting.

1. Testing of a WICIS new release and support for such testing as well as the question of whether there are any testing guidelines for these new releases was brought up. WW members advised that OBF only creates the document and OBF does not support testing. There are currently no guidelines for regression testing.
2. Qwest has documented mandatory data fields and are creating their recommended test cases. They will be finalizing their test plans this month.
3. **WNPO MEETING – Monday**
4. **INTRODUCTIONS, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AND AGENDA REVIEW**

Marion Hearn, of the Canadian Consortium hosted meeting in Banff, Alberta, CA.

1. **REVIEW AND APPROVE MINUTES**

August minutes were reviewed. Changes discussed and updates will be incorporated and resubmitted to the team for acceptance as final at the October meeting.

****

1. **OBF UPDATE – JIP Issue, Sue Tiffany:**

No activity this month around this issue although there was discussion of this at the NIIF

Robin Meier of SBC joined the call to advise that NIIF supports the position by all carrier members that all carriers should populate this field. Robin explained that, in the eyes of NIIF, the field is not mandatory because if it is not populated the call will still complete but it is a required field when your switch becomes LNP capable.

A letter and attachment was sent to the WNPO co-chair looking for feedback to the NIIF on this issue. Team agreed that it would be up to each individual company to give feedback but not for WNPO to collectively respond on the behalf of individuals. NIIF would like a response from WNPO stating that.



**9.C.4 ACTION ITEM: Maggie will draft letter to be sent back to NIIF. Response should go to Stu Goldman, and Veronica Lancaster, David Lynch.**

Robin Meier advised us that there is also a new item #0233 “Terminating Switch ID architecture Issue” (NIIF related issues are: 207, 208, and 215; OBF related issues are: 2308, 2349) proposed by SBC, which will be distributed to the team.

**9.C.5 ACTION ITEM: Robin Meier, SBC to send the new NIIF contribution (0233) to WNPO co-chairs for distribution.**



**4) WW and ITF Update – Lonnie Keck**

A) WIRELESS WORKSHOP Meet in San Diego in August at OBF 83

1. Minutes are posted at the ATIS website.
2. The Fast track process has been agreed and finalized. There will be weekly calls on Tues. afternoons at 1:00 pm ET. The priority of the WW team will be fast track issues take precedence and will be worked first and open issues are worked after that.
3. Rosemary Emmer of Nextel has been elected as a new co-chair to the Wireless Workshop.
4. Any interoperability testing issues should be sent to the co-chairs of the WW.
5. 11 new issues were presented at the San Diego meeting with 7 not being accepted. There are currently 30 open issues and 12 at final closure.
6. Changes or errors affecting the WICIS are typically corrected in a new release of the WICIS document. However there is a re-release of WICIS 2.0.1 officially due out to the industry on Friday Sept 19 [as of 9/16 released date has changed to 9/26]. Typically a re-release with the same version number ID is not business as usual, however, due to the timing (Nov 24th is very close) WW decided and received official approval to re-release the document.

B) ITF Read-Out Meet on Wednesday in San Diego at the OBF 83.

1. There are two-hour calls every other Thursday. There are 6 open issues they have been asked to review. All issues have been submitted by the WW while none have come from LSOP.
2. New PIC lock or freeze. Some LECs on port-out requests treat these as a cancelled order. There is no official paper work on this yet but it and is scheduled for discussion on 9-25.
3. It has been determined that there are challenges on sending a Sup 2. ITF is proposing verbiage as alternative to this issue that will be sent in a formal communications to the WNPO to add that verbiage to the WNPO Decision/Recommendation Matrix.

**9.C.6 ACTION ITEM: Lonnie Keck will send the verbiage associated with sending Sup 2’s to WNPO co-chairs by 9/25 for distribution and inclusion into the Decision Matrix.**

1. WW and ITF would like to see if there is a way to provide a link from the OBF to the NPAC wireless website and vica versa. Can we get a link from NPAC to OBF URL and with a fairly quick implementation times.

**9.C.7 ACTION ITEM – WNPO co-chairs will determine the exact location of the button from the WNPO location and provide to Steve Addicks by next Friday, 9/26/03.**

**5) READ-OUT from CTIA Critical Issues Forum 9/11/2003 – Maggie Lee**

 **A)** David Furth, Associate Bureau Chief of the FCC Wireless Bureau

WNP is a high priority for both the FCC and the Bureau for both wireless and wireline and there are no plans to move the Nov. 24, 2003 date. Audience should proceed on the assumption that 11-24-03 will happen.

The Bureau is looking at three parallel tracks:

1. Monitor implementation. A recent letter has been sent to the largest 4 wireless carriers for them to identify progress including a request for certain operational facts. Most carriers are working very hard to reach compliance. Others, those that did not receive a letter, should take a look at those letters.
2. Consumer impact and public information:
	1. Working on a consumer fact sheet
	2. Ensure no false expectations are set
	3. Reduce customer complaints
3. Regulatory Clarifications on Implementation issues:
	1. Guidance is necessary particularly on
		1. Business issues
		2. Consumer Service issues

Bureau is under the impression that wireless to wireless is appropriately the main focus for the initial guidance (CTIA took the opposite view later). Bureau anticipates most of the activity in this arena first (wireless to wireless) and claims that this will have more straightforward answers. The main focus of work now is on:

1. Business Rules
2. BFRs and what constitutes a BFR
3. Interval Issues

Mr. Furth suggested that advice for other issues might be contained in the letter of guidance provided by John Muleta, dated July 3, 2003. Statement was made that if ‘cost recovery’ [methods] were used to deter porting it would be a concern to them even though cost recovery is appropriate. Goal is to make the process as streamlined as possible for the consumer without adding a huge cost. The Bureau does not want to micro manage the process (es) nor does it want to see barriers to porting being put in place by some carriers. The continued argument of what it is going to cost carriers is not a compelling argument from the Bureau’s perspective.

The I-M (intermodel porting) has a more profound impact and the Bureau/FCC will respond soon. Bureau/FCC will address particular questions already put forth to them but will not provide specific guidelines.

2) Mike Altschul, Senior Vice President, Regulatory, CTIA

In particular the Rate Center Issue is holding up a bunch of stuff including Intercarrier testing; possibly obtaining new numbering resources among other things.

November 24th is too late for customer care issues, education, methods and procedures.

Mike talked about what the industry deems as the 3 largest unresolved issues:

1. The kinds of agreements that are needed. CTIA contends that SLAs are sufficient and IA’s are not appropriate.
2. Rate Center Issue (ILEC and RWWG agree that the wireline rate center dictates the scope of wireless porting.)
3. Business Rule Issues

Four carriers filed a writ of Mandamus petition with the court of appeals. These are considered extraordinary writs and are typically outside the normal rules and typically are not granted. However, the court did state recently that the FCC should respond by 9/19 with carrier comments due back by 9/24.

CTIA filed a separate, 2nd writ of Mandamus for responses to the open issues. (Have not heard back on this one yet). CTIA disagrees with the Bureau on what will be the most important issue and they see the wireline to wireless issues more critical.

3) Greg Whiteaker, Rural Telecomm Group (RTG) representing RWWG

Reviewed the voluntary business practices that were sent to the FCC recently. The members of the RWWG will follow the LEC standards, which are currently the only standards out there. Maggie did state that she would not attempt to interpret any items related to the questions, answers or dialogue discussed with the audience.

**6) PIM UPDATE – Maggie Lee**

Read out from the LNPA-WG distribution from the August Meeting.

 **7) NENA REPORT – Rick Jones**

A. Consumer Education Package: CTIA worked with NENA to distribute. Potentially this will also be distributed to the Rural Carrier Association as well as the FCC.

B. Rick reminded us that a request for volunteers for Phase 2 E911 has nothing to do with WNP but just asking all wireless groups to have individual carriers participate.

C. ATIS ESIF (Emergency Services Interconnection Forum):

The ATIS ESIF does not want emergency routing keys to be ported or pooled numbers. This issue is at INC and T1P1 now and multiple solutions are being discussed. INC is accepting contributions. This discussion will go on thru October and into INC in November. Documents are posted at both INC and ATIS websites. INC issue number is LNPA 448 and ATIS number is 25.

D. Rick Jones reminded team that while there are no documented standards E9-1-1 Phase 1 and Phase 2 implementation carriers should be testing with a handset that has the MIN/MDN (mobile identification and mobile directory number) separated.

E. The Rate Center Issue and the impact to 911 may include ports between wireline to wireline that inadvertently extend outside the rate center the individual lives in. NENA thinks this issue may also impact a wireless to wireline port. The impact includes things such as:

* + 1. Default routing will fail to a PSAP
		2. Address information may not be displayed.

F. Remind all wireless carriers that there are individual switch settings related to the emergency calls. Wireless carriers should make sure that have completed settings to allow call back on ported and pooled numbers.

**8) Fall-Out Management Contribution:**

This is a contribution made jointly by four companies including Sprint, US Cellular, Nextel and Verizon Wireless. The contribution proposes the formation of a WNPO sub-committee to collaborate on the analysis and reduction of fallout arising from number porting. The main purpose of this team is to increase the automatic flow-thru more efficiently or reduce the number of issues that are handled manually.



This team will report directly back to the WNPO. [Update: LNPA sees no issues with the creation of this sub-committee.]

**9.C.8 ACTION ITEM: Remove from original contribution the line “Identify chronic service provider and exert group influence to improve” not be part of the official guidelines in order to ensure that no carrier, vendor or service bureau names are vocalized during these discussions.**

The first meeting, as a conference call, is scheduled for Oct 2nd, 11:00 AM to 1:00 PM ET. This call will be to determine the guidelines, determine the leadership and determine the meeting or call schedule etc.

Chuck Bohl, US Cellular, has agreed to moderate this first meeting **only** as well create an agenda for this meeting and make the necessary corrections to the original contribution.

Conference Call Information:

Bridge Sponsored by Cox Communication

Dial-In number: 888-847-8686

PASSCODE: 2970388

**9.C.9 ACTION ITEM: The creation of this new sub-committee will be reported on the NANC report.**

**9.C.10 ACTION ITEM: Distribute information to all teams regarding the scheduled conference call for the Fall-Out Management sub-committee**.

**9) Modification of NPAC Conflict Timers Contribution:**

Submitted by Sprint to modify conflict timers from 6 to 24 hours to assist in the resolution of attempted and successful inadvertent ports involving wireless subscribers. After discussion this Contribution was not accepted by the WNPO.

 

Team was reminded that dissenting Service Providers could submit a minority report to the NANC regarding this issue. The cut-off for submission to get on the next NANC meeting is by this Friday (Sept. 19, 2003). A request was made for us distribute the NANC guidelines to the team.

**9.C.11 ACTION ITEM: Nextel requested that the NANC process flows (Page 8, Section 2) be changed to reflect the modified conflict time in order to reflect the industry standard.**

**9.C.12 ACTION ITEM: Obtain and distribute NANC Working Group Guidelines.**

**10) CHANGE THE CANCEL PENDING TIMERS SUBMITTED BY NEXTEL.**

The contribution recommends that the two “Cancellation Acknowledgement Window” intervals be changed from nine hours each to two hours each for Wireless.



**9.C.13 ACTION ITEM: Susan Ortega will resubmit contribution on a WNPO form separating proposed short-term resolution from the long-term resolution, which would possibly need to be a NANC Change Order submission. Long-term solution is on the LNPAWG agenda for this month.**

**9.C.14 ACTION ITEM: Carriers need to go back to internal resources to discuss short-term solution contribution at the next meeting.**

**9.C.15 ACTION ITEM: If the short-term solution is agreed upon a notice, from NeuStar, needs to go out to all carriers via the cross-regional distribution list advising specifically what the change will be and when it will take effect. WNPO must notify the LNPA who will forward to the LLC who will then tell NeuStar to do make the change.**

**11) AT&T WIRELESS CONTRIBUTION – NPAC TEST BED HARDWARE**

The NPAC test bed hardware platform does not reflect a production environment to support volume performance tests.



**9.C.15 ACTION ITEM: Steve Sanchez will rewrite and resubmit the contribution to WNPO.**

**12) MONDAY WRAP-UP AT 4:45P:**

Reviewed action Items. Meeting was successfully adjourned.

# MEETING MINUTES FROM DAY #2 (9/16/03)

# ATTENDANCE: Day 2

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** |
|  |  |  |  |
| Gary Sacra | Verizon | Steve Addicks | NeuStar |
| Maggie Lee | VeriSign | Paul LaGattuta | AT&T |
| Jeff Adrian  | Sprint  | Paula Jordan  | T-Mobile  |
| Rob Smith | TSI | Stephen Sanchez | AT&T Wireless  |
| Susan Tiffany | Sprint  | Mark Wood | Cingular  |
| Craig Bartell  | Sprint  | Deborah Stephens | Verizon Wireless |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Hong Liu | NeuStar |
| Rick Jones  | NENA | Rick Dressner | Sprint |
| Dave Garner  | Qwest | Monica Dahmen | Cox Communications |
| Charles Ryburn | SBC | Jason Kempson | Telcordia |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **On the phone** |  |  |  |
| Jennifer Goree | ALLTEL | Charlotte Holden | US CELLULAR |
| Earl Scott  | Verizon  | John Weakly | Qwest Wireless |
| Liz Coakley | SBC | Jean Anthony | TSE |
| Ron Steen | Bell South  | Lori Messing  | CTIA |
| Lonnie Keck  | AT&T Wireless  | Shannon Collins | NeuStar Pooling |
| Scottie Parish | ALLTEL |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

###### D) WNPO MEETING - TUESDAY

**1. CTIA Concerns Regarding NANC FLOWS discussion:**

CTIA and some wireless carriers recently challenged the current NANC flows particularly related to the porting intervals having changed from TBD to 4 days. CTIA’s concern is that the porting intervals in the document did not have consensus and that the change of verbiage from TBD to 4 BDAs was not specifically raised to the NANC at any meeting after the change. It was reiterated that the team developed NPAC functionality to reflect these flows.

 

LNPA-WG Co-Chair, Charles Ryburn strongly objects to the wording in the letter to NANC. These flows were not made in secret but yet in open forums, no objections were raised in January when the change was made, there was no mention of these ‘controversy’ at NANC prior to this letter being sent. There was no politicking of these flows. Reports are given by both the WNPO and the LNPA-WG. Participants of these groups are entitled to participate in the creation of these flows.

July 15, 2003 The NANC meeting report reviewed the adopted flows from the LNPA-WG and adopted the LNPA recommendation. August 21, 2003 Chairman Atkinson forwarded a letter to the FCC. Current status of the flows as of 9/16 is that NANC has adopted the LNPA-WG recommended flows to be sent to the FCC

If there is no additional direction from the FCC these flows should be the ones currently in use by service providers. This will be further discussed at the Sept LNPA-WG and the members at that meeting will provide direct, clear cut info as well as rebuttal statements for delivery at the next NANC meeting 9/26/03.

FOOTNOTE: “It is the recommendation of the WNPO that a footnote be added to the NANC flows that these are the flows the industry will use on Nov 24, 2003. These flows are subject to change pending guidance from the FCC regarding intermodel porting intervals.”

**2. REPORT on 291, EDIT to REQUIRE an SSN of 000, from NeuStar:**

After careful reviews NeuStar shows that currently there are 160 companies, with a total of 212 SPIDs, have active SVs with SSNs not equal to 000. NeuStar has confirmed with 59 of those carriers that they would have no problem with using an SSN of 000. No info has been collected to suggest that turning on the edit would prevent any carrier from creating SVs. There is currently no date to turn this edit on but it will be discussed at this month’s LNPAWG meeting.

Question was raised as to what would happen if something other then SSN-000 were used after NANC 291 is turned on. NeuStar reported that creates, modifies, and mass updates would fail at the NPAC if something other then 000 were input. [Intercarrier call processing and network maintenance operations can be adversely affected if SSN’s do not equal to 000.] This edit does not impact call processing.

###### 3. NNPO (National Number Portability Operations Team) Read-Out – EARL SCOTT

Scottie advised he did not have specific questions for the WNPO but felt that things are gradually getting resolved. He distributed the NIIF guidelines that were adopted by the wireline industry

some time ago.

Wireless carriers discussed the NIIF Trouble Report (brought to our attention by the NNPO) to use for developing their own trouble reporting procedures and the fact that it is a useful tool but it has not been updated recently. Also the NIIF contact list at the ATIS website should be updated when contact information changes. ATIS occasionally sends reminders to update the contact info and it is updated as soon as info has been received.

Reminder: Wireless carriers should be providing updates to contact info at the NIIF website location.

 **4. ARCHITECTURE PLANNING TEAM UPDATE**

Peak hour and day model distributed from NPAC and LSMS perspective. Again assumptions on wireless data were made since many wireless carriers have not responded to the NeuStar survey that was distributed several months ago. Therefore the same percentages as wireline peak between 3-5 pm were used in the model with a TN peak of about 15 TNs per second (operations per second, each operations can contain more then one TN) throughout the USA.

Vendors have reported that they can handle more then 15 TNs per second. The model is viewable through LNPA documents at the [www.npac.com](http://www.npac.com) website.

Team discussed how to create a SOA model and agreed that it was much harder to create this forecast but **it is very important that carriers respond to the NeuStar survey in order to get data to create the model.**

Included below is the text of the request for information of wireless carriers from NeuStar.

Subject: Wireless SP's forecast of LNP activity and load distribution

A request to each wireless service provider:

At its June 2003 meeting, the LNPA Working Group asked NeuStar to survey the wireless industry members to ask for their estimates of wireless porting volumes and their expectations of the distribution of this activity throughout the day, week, month, and year. The purpose of the inquiry is to develop a sense of the change in the pattern of NPAC transactions that will be seen by the LSMS systems receiving broadcasts from NPAC once wireless LNP is implemented.

Five questions are listed below. Please provide what information you can. No individual responses will be revealed, but a composite based on the responses received will be prepared and presented to the LNPA-Working Group. This information will be used to aid in the design and provisioning of NPAC Users' LSMS systems to accommodate the anticipated increased LNP transaction volumes resulting from with the introduction of wireless LNP this November.

We are interested in information about any anticipated use of the NPAC that will result in broadcasts of ported number data to carriers' LSMSs. Thus we are not asking about just competitive porting transactions, but rather we are requesting estimates of all NPAC transactions driven by you as a wireless provider, including, for example, pooling activity and network rearrangements. Note that the first question asks for an estimate of transaction quantities (by NPAC region) while the remaining four questions inquire about the anticipated distribution of these transactions over time.

Space for your responses is provided with the questions below, but feel free to answer in another format if you prefer. For example, although 24 individual one-hour intervals are listed in question 5, you might choose to respond instead by saying something like, "Most will occur 9am-9pm; evenly spread." Reply by forwarding this message, with your responses indicated next to each question, to Steve Addicks at stephen.addicks@neustar.biz. Please respond even if you cannot provide complete answers. Any questions about this survey should be directed to Steve Addicks.

Thank you in advance for your participation in this survey.

1. Total quantity of annual porting transactions? (These would include wireless numbers porting to your wireless network plus other porting transactions your wireless company might generate such as those done when pooled blocks are created, when active SVs are modified, when network rearrangements are made using LNP capabilities, when disconnects of ported customers cause deletes of active SVs, and so forth.

 x000 x000

x000 x000 x000 x000 x000

 NPAC Region: Mid-Atlantic Midwest Northeast Southeast

> Southwest West Coast Western

> 2003 (Nov-Dec)- - - -

> - - -

> 2004 - - -

> - - - -

> 2005 - - -

> - - - -

 2. % distribution, by month, of annual porting transactions for 2004?

 January:

 February:

 March:

 April:

 May:

 June:

 July:

 August:

 September:

 October:

 November:

 December:

 3. % distribution, by week, of monthly porting transactions?

 first week of month

 2nd week of month

 3rd week of month

 4th week of month

 last week of month

 4. % distribution, by day, of weekly porting transactions?

 Monday

 Tuesday

 Wednesday

 Thursday

 Friday

 Saturday

 Sunday

5. % distribution, by hour, of daily porting transactions? (Note: Activations of numbers ported to your network may not track sales activities, i.e., they may be done in batch mode, perhaps only once a day. This question refers to timeframe in which NPAC will see the load and be broadcasting it.)

 midnight to 1:00 a.m. -

 1:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m. -

 2:00 a.m. to 3:00 a.m. -

 3:00 a.m. to 4:00 a.m. -

 4:00 a.m. to 5:00 a.m. -

 5:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m. -

 6:00 a.m. to 7:00 a.m. -

 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 a.m. -

 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. -

 9:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. -

 10:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. -

 11:00 a.m. to noon -

 noon to 1:00 p.m. -

 1:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m. -

 2:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. -

 3:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. -

 4:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. -

 5:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. -

 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. -

 7:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. -

 8:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. -

 9:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. -

 10:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m. -

 11:00 p.m. to midnight -

**5. UPDATE FROM THE WTSC:**

The WTSC has agreed to continue meeting until June 2004 pending any changes regarding further guidance

**6. New Business from Sprint:** No written contribution provided

**Reminder to the industry that basic contact and connectivity information needs to be exchanged between trading partners ASAP.**

**7. NANC REPORT:**

Made minor changes to the existing document and added the Sept. meeting minutes including information regarding the new Fall-Out management team and the recommended NANC flows footnote as below:

NANC Flows: It is the recommendation of the WNPO that a footnote be added to the NANC flows that these are the flows that the industry will use on Nov. 24, 2003. These flows are subject to change pending guidance from the FCC regarding intermodal porting intervals.

 **8. MEETING AGENDA FOR OCTOBER**

Establish a draft agenda for next meeting.

Reminder: Participants wishing to discuss major issues should provide contributions 5 business days prior to the next meeting for all to review. If contributions are received after that they will be considered walk-on and discussed if time permits. Otherwise they will be on the following months agenda. Please ensure that either the header or footer of the contribution includes contributor’s name/company, date and page numbers.

**9. WRAP-UP:**

1. **Update Decision/Recommendation Matrix – Nothing to Report**
2. **Review Agenda for Next Month**
3. **Review Items to be Reported to NANC**

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

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

To subscribe to the LNPA-WG or LNP Architecture distribution list subscribe at: http://lists.neustar.biz/mailman/listinfo.cgi/lnpa

**Future meetings:**

WNPO Dates: Location & Host:

Oct.13-14 Portsmouth, NH Verizon

Nov.10-11 Overland Park, KS VeriSign

 Dec. 8-9 San Diego Telcordia