LNPA WORKING GROUP

January 2004 Meeting

Final Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Phoenix, Arizona | Hosts: Qwest and NeuStar |

**TUESDAY 1/6/04**

Tuesday, 1/6/04, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T (phone) |  |  |
| Lonnie Keck | ATTWS (phone) |  |  |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | ATTWS | Susan Ortega | Nextel  |
|  |  | Dale Samuels | Qwest (phone) |
|  |  | Dave Garner  | Qwest  |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Charles Ryburn | SBC |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Leah Luper  | SBC (phone) |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LLC | Donna Deveretti  | SBC (phone) |
| Mark Wood | Cingular | Craig Bartell | Sprint |
| Teresa Patton | Cingular |  |  |
| Monica Dahmen |  Cox (phone) | Rick Dressner | Sprint PCS |
|  |  | Jeff Adrian | Sprint PCS (phone) |
|  |  | Susan Tiffany | Sprint PCS) |
|  |  | Colleen Collard | Tekelec (phone) |
|  |  | John Malyar | Telcordia |
|  |  | Adam Newman | Telcordia |
|  |  | Jason Kempson | Telcordia |
| Jason Lee | MCI (phone) | Jean Anthony | Telecom Software  |
| Karen Mulberry | MCI | Dan Deneweth | Telecom Software |
| Rick Jones | NENA | Paula Jordan | T-Mobile |
|  |  | Frank Reed | T-Mobile |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar  | Glenn Mills | TSI |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar  | Ginny Cashbaugh | US Cellular  |
| Darius Irani | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | VeriSign  |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar  | Gary Sacra | Verizon |
| Hong Liu | NeuStar |  |  |
| Mindi Patterseon | NeuStar | Julie Groenen | Verizon Wireless |
| Peggy Rehm | NeuStar | Deborah Stephens | Verizon Wireless |
|  |  |  |  |

Attached are the Action Items assigned at the January, 2004 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 “JANUARY 2004 LNPA ACTION ITEMS” FILE ATTACHED ABOVE.

**MEETING MINUTES:**

2004 Meeting Schedule:

* NOTE: Recent changes to the 2004 meeting schedule are reflected below and highlighted in yellow.
* The Wireless Number Portability Operations (WNPO) team will meet all day on Monday and ½ day on Tuesday of LNPA week. It remains an open question if the WNPO and WTSC will meet separately or in a combined session.
* Starting with the January 2004 LNPA meeting, the LNPA Working Group will meet from Tuesday 1pm local time until Wednesday 5pm local time. If the LNPA needs more time, the group could go longer on Tuesday or Wednesday evening.
* The Architecture Planning Team (APT) will meet starting 8:30am local time on Thursday and go no later than mid-afternoon Thursday. NOTE: At the February 2004 APT meeting, the group will adjourn at 3pm local time on Thursday.
* Following is the schedule for 2004, the host companies, and the meeting locations. Also indicated is the date of the month’s NANC meeting, if applicable:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MONTH**(2004)** | **LNPA MEETING****DATE** | **HOST COMPANY** | **MEETING LOCATION** | **NANC MEETING DATE** |
| JANUARY | WEEK OF 1/5 | QWEST AND NEUSTAR | PHOENIX, ARIZONA | 1/13/04 |
| FEBRUARY | WEEK OF 2/2 | TSI | TAMPA, FLORIDA | NO NANC |
| MARCH | WEEK OF 3/8 | BELL SOUTH | BIRMINGHAM ALABAMA | 3/16/04 |
| APRIL | WEEK OF 4/5 | NEUSTAR | CHICAGO, ILLINOIS | NO NANC |
| MAY | WEEK OF 5/3 | SPRINT | OVERLAND PARK, KANSAS | 5/18/04 |
| JUNE | WEEK OF 6/14 | CANADIAN CONSORTIUM | OTTAWA, CANADA | NO NANC |
| JULY | WEEK OF 7/19 | TEKELEC | RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA | 7/13/04 |
| AUGUST | WEEK OF 8/16 | T-MOBILE | NEWPORT BEACH, CALIFORNIA | NO NANC |
| SEPTEMBER | WEEK OF 9/7 | COX | ATLANTA, GEORGIA | 9/14/04 |
| OCTOBER | WEEK OF 10/4 | NEXTEL | RESTON, VIRGINIA OR LAS VEGAS, NEVADA | NO NANC |
| NOVEMBER | WEEK OF 11/1 | VERIZON WIRELESS | NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE | 11/9/04 |
| DECEMBER | WEEK OF 12/6 | AT&T | NEW YORK, NEW YORK | NO NANC |

12/03 Minutes Review:

The following changes were made to the DRAFT December 2003 LNPA Minutes during the January 2004 meeting. These changes will be reflected in the FINAL December 2003 LNPA Minutes.

* The August 2004 meeting will be held the week of 8/16, not 8/17, and will be held in Newport Beach, CA.
* The November 2004 meeting will be held in Nashville, Tennessee.
* Due to the Labor Day Holiday, the September 2004 meeting will begin on Tuesday, 9/7.
* On page 5, the second bullet under “Lessons Learned,” change to read, “Testing issues have been identified for the future. It was suggested that carriers perform negative (break and destroy) type testing and interoperability testing in the future.
* Add in the attendee list to the final meeting minutes.

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

* NeuStar provided the following readout:
* There has been no significant increase in calls to the NPAC Help Desk.
* Additional Wireless training is to take place in January.
* There has been no documented use of Statement of Work (SOW) 19 utilizing NPAC to put customers back in service due to inadvertent ports since 11/24/03.
* The Wireless Testing Subcommittee (WTSC) will hold a conference call to discuss the next steps for the group. Currently, the group has no Chairperson.
* The Fallout Reduction Taskforce (FORT), formed by the WNPO to investigate reasons why porting transactions do not flow through, continues to work a number of issues.
* The NAPM/LLC will discuss if NeuStar can share wireless porting volumes on the Daily NPAC Report. The LLC Co-Chairs have given temporary approval to NeuStar. This will come up for an official full LLC membership vote subsequently.
* The WNPO would like to remind the industry that the WNPO Decision & Recommendation Matrix is not a requirements document, but is a document of recommendations.
* AT&T Wireless (AWS) submitted the attached contribution stating that some wireless carriers are using the long T1 and T2 timers when porting. AWS is proposing creation of a matrix where providers could indicate which set of timers, short or long, they are currently supporting. This is not proposed to be a maintained list but a snapshot so carriers know what timers their trading partners use.



* As a reminder: WNPO contributions should not specify vendors or products.
* Top 100 MSAs – The WNPO agreed to recommend use of an October MSA list that contains about 5200 rate centers and a list from November that contains an additional 11 rate centers. Alltel did not support the recommendation. The WNPO recommends that wireless carriers begin using this MSA list by 1/16/04 to reduce fallout. Carriers not supporting this recommended list would have to deal with any fallout on an individual basis.



* The attached Port Protection contribution from Sprint PCS was accepted by the WNPO and will be worked to determine how customers are to be removed from being protected. Some providers offer this to customers now via the Inter-carrier Communications Process (ICP). Note: This is different than the NANC Change Order 382 Port Protection proposal.



* Paul LaGattuta, LNPA Co-Chair, requested that the WNPO revisit the WNPO Forecast Model for 2004. This model is incorporated into the NPAC Forecasting Group (NFG) Data Model. The WNPO model was developed in 2002. It was suggested that NeuStar should bring the NFG group together to discuss and an NFG representative should make this request of the WNPO. Paul LaGattuta will tee this up at the January NFG meeting and request the WNPO to revisit their model in their February WNPO meeting.

PIMs:

 .

* PIM 22 – PIM 22 remains open. At the January meeting, Gary Sacra, Verizon, in response to an action item, presented the attached revised PIM 22 resolution proposal and NPAC Change Order.

 

The PIM 22 proposal was revised to:

1. Include Cause Value 51 (Firm Order Confirmation Not Issued) in addition to Cause Value 50 (Local Service Request not received).
2. Reflect that only the Old Service Provider can remove a port from Conflict status for these two Cause Values.

The proposed Change Order reflects the NPAC changes proposed in the revised PIM 22. Nextel, Sprint, and AT&T Wireless stated they will review the documents and provide comments at the February LNPA meeting. SBC stated that they have had 92 customers ported since 10/10/03 after they had placed the ports in Conflict. SBC stated that they support the revised proposals. It was agreed that NeuStar will open up a Document Only Change Order for the FRS and IIS to include the Wireless Port Request (WPR) and Wireless Port Request Response (WPRR) in the descriptive text for Conflict Cause Values 50 (currently “LSR Not Received”) and 51 (currently “FOC Not Issued”), respectively. The revised PIM 22 contribution and Change Orders will be reviewed at the February LNPA meeting.

* 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 submitted Change Order 23 for FCC consideration. PA Change Order 23 was subsequently withdrawn and PA Change Order 24 was submitted to the FCC by the PA. The Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG) has recommended to the FCC a trial of the proposed resolution in selected pools initially. The PIM will remain open pending the FCC’s decision on the Change Order.

* NEW PIM 28 – This PIM, submitted by Sprint PCS, addresses interface differences between the WPRR (wireless) and FOC (wireline). The FOC allows for a due date and time change on confirmations, however, the WPRR does not. When a wireline carrier sends an FOC with a change in due date or time, the wireless carrier cannot process the change and does not allow the port to complete. This PIM was accepted and will be referred to the Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF). It will be tracked by the LNPA.



Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will send a liaison to the OBF Wireless Workshop and the Local Service Ordering and Provisioning (LSOP) Committee referring this accepted PIM to these groups. Gary Sacra will work with Rick Dressner and Sue Tiffany, Sprint PCS, and Julie Groenen, Verizon Wireless, in developing the liaison. The deadline for new OBF issues is 1/26/04.

* NEW PIM 29 – This PIM, submitted by Sprint PCS, addresses scenarios where customers porting from a wireline carrier are disconnected in the donor switch before the wireless carrier activates the port. This PIM was accepted by the LNPA.



It was mentioned that this PIM is similar to a previous PIM (PIM 13). Members were advised to review that PIM and its resultant resolution.

 NOTE: Subsequent to the January LNPA meeting, Sprint PCS submitted a revised PIM 29 (attached) for discussion at the February meeting.

 

* The attached LSR-related problems contribution was briefly discussed, but was not submitted as a PIM. In order to get these issues before the appropriate industry group as quickly as possible, the LNPA advised that these should be referred to the OBF Wireless Workshop and LSOP Committee rather than waiting to be submitted to the LNPA as a PIM. If the submitter chooses to do so, the contribution may subsequently be submitted as a PIM to the LNPA.



Port Protection Change Order 382 Discussion:



* At the January LNPA meeting, the group again briefly discussed the open policy questions that need to be answered regarding NANC Change Order 382 – Port Protection.
* The group agreed that the policy questions are not yet ready to be taken outside the LNPA Working Group, but will be discussed within the LNPA. One member further stated that we may have to implement this functionality at some point if so ordered by a regulator. That same member also expressed some concern regarding the level of administration required to implement this functionality.
* Verizon was asked if their proposed Change Order 375, which would only allow the Old Service Provider to remove a port placed into Conflict for Cause Values 50 and 51, would address the problems that drove the proposal for NANC 382. Verizon responded that NANC 375 could address truly inadvertent ports, but only if the Old Service Provider catches the mistake in time, while NANC 382 would also address malicious (e.g. terrorist sabotage) ports.

* Service Providers are to come to the February LNPA meeting prepared to provide their respective company’s position on the following policy questions that need to be answered regarding NANC Change Order 382 – Port Protection. The responses provided will be compiled to ascertain where we stand as a group on these policy questions.
1. What types of numbers can be placed on the protection list?
* Any number?
* Only those slammed previously?
* Service Provider Administration numbers?
* Homeland Security numbers?
* Emergency numbers?
* Telco-defined essential lines (e.g. payphones, police, fire)?
1. Who can put a number on the list and remove a number from the list (authorization)?
2. What is the process for putting numbers on and taking numbers off the list?
3. Who can have access to the list?
4. What is the process to access the list?
* Ping the list?
* View the list?

**WEDNESDAY 1/7/04**

Wednesday, 1/7/04, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T (phone) |  |  |
| Bob Froska | AT&T (phone) |  |  |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | ATTWS | Susan Ortega | Nextel  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Dave Garner  | Qwest  |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Charles Ryburn | SBC |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth |  |  |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LLC |   |  |
| Mark Wood | Cingular | Craig Bartell | Sprint |
| Teresa Patton | Cingular | Kathleen Tedrick | Sprint (phone) |
| Monica Dahmen |  Cox (phone) | Rick Dressner | Sprint PCS |
| Keagan O’Rourke | ESI (phone) | Jeff Adrian | Sprint PCS (phone) |
|  |  | Susan Tiffany | Sprint PCS) |
|  |  | Colleen Collard | Tekelec (phone) |
|  |  | John Malyar | Telcordia |
|  |  | Adam Newman | Telcordia |
|  |  | Jason Kempson | Telcordia |
| Jason Lee | MCI (phone) | Jean Anthony | Telecom Software  |
| Karen Mulberry | MCI |  |  |
| Rick Jones | NENA | Paula Jordan | T-Mobile |
|  |  | Frank Reed | T-Mobile |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar  | Glenn Mills | TSI |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar  | Ginny Cashbaugh | US Cellular  |
| Darius Irani | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | VeriSign  |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar  | Gary Sacra | Verizon |
| Hong Liu | NeuStar |  |  |
| Mindi Patterseon | NeuStar | Julie Groenen | Verizon Wireless |
| Peggy Rehm | NeuStar | Deborah Stephens | Verizon Wireless |
| Dara Sedano | NeuStar (phone) |  |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

NPAC Architecture – NeuStar:



* NeuStar walked the group through the attached presentation addressing the planned NPAC technology migration. NeuStar stated that they go through a technology evaluation roughly every 3 years.
* Some of the main focuses of the evaluation are segregation of regions, best in breed technology, and the support provided by vendors.
* The current plan is to implement the migration in production during 2Q04.
* NeuStar evaluated application servers (where NPAC software runs), database server (currently where Versant runs), disk storage, database technology, and the NPAC application.
* Currently, NPAC uses a Sun E10K (1 Region per Domain) as its database server. The plan is to migrate to IBM p650 servers, one p650 per region.
* The current plan is to stay on HPs for the Application Server, but NeuStar is also evaluating Linux.
* There will be one DMX disk array per two regions.
* Oracle 9i was selected for the database technology. This is a relational database.
* Summarizing the NPAC migration:
* Application Servers
* Continue to use HP N class server, one per region
* Database Servers
* IBM p650 server, one per region
* Disk Storage
* EMC DMX Storage Array, one for each two regions
* Database Technology
* Oracle 9i
* NPAC Application
* Release 3.2.2.0
* NeuStar stated that substantial NPAC application changes will be made to support the migration. NeuStar further stated that they are currently about half way through integration testing on these changes.
* The migration will result in no GDMO or ASN.1 changes, so the only testing necessary is regression, round-robin group, and failover. No new functionality testing is needed. Six weeks will be scheduled for testing. A new test bed will be available for this testing. The SOW 34 test bed will be upgraded with the new platform after the last region goes into production. It is strongly recommended that this testing be done by all service providers

.

* The Charlotte and Sterling NPAC sites will be done at the same time when a region is migrated.
* The Test Plan is to be distributed by NeuStar on 1/19/03, and will be on the February LNPA agenda (one hour) for discussion. Migration updates will be a standing LNPA agenda item until it is completed.
* The Architecture Team will discuss the impacts to Wireless Number Portability if we determine it will take longer to migrate than the normal maintenance window.
* Planned production dates for the migration are as follows:
* Region 1 on 5/16/04 followed by a three week burn in.
* Regions 2 and 3 on 6/6/04.

NOTE: The first three regions have to be SE, MA and WE.

* Regions 4 and 5 on 6/20/04.
* Regions 6 and 7 on 7/11/04.

The NAPM/LLC will determine which regions will fill these production slots.

Change Management Discussion:

NANC Change Order 323 (SPID Migration) Timeline/Process Details (NeuStar):



* NeuStar walked the group through the attached process flows and narratives for the NANC 323 SPID Migration process and discussed the changes since last month’s review.
* A new Figure 2 has been added on the Pre-SPID Migration decision tree.
* It will be clarified that SPID A existing means that they are still operational and able to participate in the migration process as necessary.
* There will be no region-wide post-migration blackout period.
* Pre-migration blackout discussion:
* It was agreed that any pending-like SVs in the involved codes in existence at the time of migration would have to be canceled. A concern was raised by NeuStar as to whether some SOAs would auto resubmit a Create if a cancel notification is received. Action for SPs and SOA vendors. Action for Service Providers and their SOA vendors to determine for their respective SOA systems.
* The current plan is to:
1. One week prior to migration when test SMURF files are to be created, a list of pending-like SVs will be dumped and sent to the impacted service providers for cleanup.
2. When the final production SMURF files are to be created, a final list of pending-like SVs will be dumped, NPAC cancels these pending-like ports and sends the list of canceled ports to impacted service providers. It will be necessary to dump the list with enough time to perform the cancels before the start of the maintenance window. We also need to address the race condition between the time when cancels are done and when service provider systems are taken off-line, as new pending-likes can be created.
* Next month’s agenda – we will go over changes to the flows and migration request form, and develop the pre-migration checklist.

Fallout Reduction Taskforce (FORT) Issues:

* Craig Bartell, Sprint and FORT Chairperson, presented the attached issues from the FORT group:

  

* FORT is looking for LNPA guidance on how best to address these issues.
* Multiple FAX Nos. Issue:
* It was stated that this is not an issue with RBOCs.
* The group consensus was that this issue needs to be resolved between trading partners.
* OCN vs SPID Issue:
* Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, took an action to send the following e-mail message to the LNPA and WNPO distribution lists for response by wireline carriers:

Today, during the LNPA Working Group meeting, the following question was raised. An action item was given to all wireline service providers to provide an answer to Craig Bartell, Fallout Reduction Taskforce (FORT) Chairperson, by close of business on Thursday, January 15th. Wireline service providers receiving this message should e-mail their responses to Craig Bartell at:

craig.j.bartell@mail.sprint.com

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

Yes or No:

Will your company (a Wireline Service Provider) reject a Local Service

Request (LSR) submitted for porting by a Wireless Service Provider, who is acting as the New Network Service Provider (NNSP) in the port, if that

Wireless Service Provider uses their NPAC SPID in the Company Code (CC) field of the LSR instead of their Operating Company Number (OCN)?

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

Recovery of Contaminated Codes:

* NeuStar had previously reported that during the recovery of some codes, between the time when NANPA verifies with NPAC that there are no active SVs and the time when the code is removed in NPAC (15 business days before LERG disconnect), number(s) are ported. NeuStar has no authority to remove a code from NPAC with pending or active SVs. NeuStar had requested that the LNPA send a letter to INC requesting that they cover this scenario in their code recovery guidelines and stipulate that the NANPA obtain proper regulatory authority for NPAC to delete the active SVs unilaterally so that the recovered, or to be recovered, code can be removed from NPAC by NeuStar. NeuStar further requested that the letter mention that these SVs may or may not be working numbers and the process should address the service provider notification process. NeuStar will only delete the active SVs and remove the code after the code is recovered by NANPA and with the proper regulatory authority. Not removing the code from the NPAC’s network data prevents the next LERG-assignee from enjoying the unfettered use of its new code.
* Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, and Steve Addicks, NeuStar, drafted a liaison letter from the LNPA to the INC that was reviewed at the January LNPA meeting. Attached is the letter that was subsequently sent to the INC.



* Adam Newman, Telcordia and INC’s representative to the LNPA Working Group, stated that he will be at the next INC meeting to address questions.

Review of December Action Items:



* Item 1203-01: This item was completed and is Closed. NeuStar reported that the average number of bytes per SV record is 90 and that roughly 24 million non-EDR records equate to 2 Gigabytes. The attached file reflects an estimate by region of how many TNs can be added to each database before 2 Gigabyte size is reached.



* Item 1203-02: This item was completed and is Closed. It will be discussed in the APT meeting.
* Item 1203-03: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 1203-04: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 1203-05: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 1203-06: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 1203-07: Item remains Open. Verizon Wireline, Sprint PCS, and Nextel provided feedback that they use the appropriate Cause Values when placing a port in Conflict status.
* Item 1203-08: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 1203-09: Item remains open. To be discussed at February Architecture team meeting.
* Item 1203-10: Item remains open. To be discussed at February Architecture team meeting.
* Item 1203-11: Item remains open. To be discussed at February Architecture team meeting.

Action Items Remaining Open from Previous Meetings:

* Item 1003-03: Deleted. Redundant with Action Item 1103-17.
* Item 1103-03: Item remains open and will be addressed at a future LNPA meeting.
* Item 1103-05: Item remains open.
* Item 1103-07: Item remains open. NeuStar is continuing the cleanup and will report back to the LNPA at the February, 2004 meeting.
* Item 1103-14: Item remains open. Note that this was changed from a Service Provider action item to a SOA Vendor action item. This will be discussed in the Architecture team.
* Item 1103-15: Item remains open and will be addressed at a future LNPA meeting.
* Item 1103-16: Item remains open. This will be discussed in the Architecture team.
* Item 1103-17: Item remains open. To be placed on the February, 2004 WNPO agenda.

New Business:

* Sue Tiffany, Sprint PCS and WNPO Co-Chair, briefly discussed the attached two contributions describing issues related to inter-modal porting. In order to get these issues before the appropriate industry group as quickly as possible, the LNPA advised that these should be referred to the OBF Wireless Workshop and LSOP Committee rather than waiting to be submitted to the LNPA as PIMs. If the submitters choose to do so, the contributions may subsequently be submitted as PIMs to the LNPA, which could then refer them to the OBF.

 

* Jean Anthony, TSE, stated that a customer identified a discrepancy in IIS Flow 5.5.4, where NPAC seems to be sending the cause code in the single notification but not in the range notification for the subscriptionVersionAVC. NeuStar stated that they should be consistent and providers should log a trouble ticket. Jean also stated that there are two versions of the GDMO published. NeuStar will investigate.
* Maggie Lee, Verisign and WNPO Co-Chair, suggested that we fill the Wireless LNPA Co-Chair position now. The LNPA Working group members have an action to submit to Gary Sacra and Paul LaGattuta, LNPA Co-Chairs, any nominees to fill the vacant Wireless Co-Chair position of the LNPA Working Group. The group is scheduled to vote on any nominee(s) at the February 2004 meeting.
* Rick Dressner, Sprint PCS, voiced a reminder to both wireless and wireline carriers to make sure that their respective call centers understand what a Type 1 number is.
* Steve Addicks, NeuStar, stated that NeuStar had previously received requests to increase the size of a query response, so it is was previously set at 1K TNs. However, the current FRS stipulates that the range size for a query response is between 10 and 150 TNs. NeuStar will submit a Document Only Change Order to reflect 1K TNs.

**THURSDAY 1/8/04 ARCHITECTURE PLANNING TEAM (APT)**

Thursday, 1/8/04, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T (phone) | Susan Ortega | Nextel  |
| Bob Frasca | AT&T (phone) | Dave Garner  | Qwest  |
| Steve Sanchez | ATTWS | Rick Dressner | Sprint PCS |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Jeff Adrian (phone) | Sprint PCS |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Susan Tiffany | Sprint |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LLC (phone) | Colleen Collard | Tekelec (phone) |
| Teresa Patton | Cingular | John Malyar | Telcordia |
| Jason Lee | MCI (phone) | Adam Newman | Telcordia |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar  | Jean Anthony | Telecom Software  |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar  | Ginny Cashbaugh | US Cellular  |
| Steve Addicks | NeuStar  | Gary Sacra | Verizon |
|  |  | Deb Stephens | Verizon Wireless |
|  |  |  |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

* 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 01/08/04. Attached is the meeting agenda.



Performance Requirements:

### The Architecture Planning Team (APT) has an action to determine how much throughput is needed on the SOA interface. Using the SOA Traffic Model in the Northeast Region, if a provider was involved in 50% of the regional volume, the SOA interface requirement for that provider in the Busy Hour would be 12.8 messages per second, including requests.

* Sprint PCS stated that their vendors advised that we should engineer the SOA interface at 150% of the projected Busy Hour message volume. 150% of the 12.5% provider participation spread would be 18.8%, which equates to 4.8 messages per second including requests (sustained).
* Paul LaGattuta. AT&T and LNPA Co-Chair, reported that December porting actuals have been updated in the NPAC Forecasting Group Model. He further stated that this should not result in dramatic changes to Model.
* Paul LaGattuta, AT&T and LNPA Co-Chair, was asked if we could get more current data input from Wireless providers into the NFG Model in order to develop a realistic projection for 4Q04. The NFG is scheduled to meet again on 1/22/04. This request for data will be promoted in the WNPO. This data would then be used by the APT to further refine SOA interface performance requirements. If we do subsequently change the requirements, this would require a Change Order and a write-up explaining and justifying the interface change.
* NeuStar will analyze actual porting data to determine a reasonable spread of percent participation in porting activity (i.e. SOA message volume) among service providers in a given region.

**CMIP Interface Improvements/Performance related Change Orders:**

* Change Order Matrix Discussion:
* NeuStar presented the attached summary spreadsheet, sectionalized into categories (e.g. interface performance, recovery benefits, operational benefits, etc.), with a short synopsis of each Change Order, describing the benefits of each and the problem each solves. This represents the Change Orders currently being worked in the APT.



* NeuStar will add a column in the matrix for priority. The priority of each Change Order will be addressed later after the group considers priority ratings and definitions. This will eventually be used to provide guidance to the LNPA.
* The group then reviewed NANC 390 (attached). This proposed Change Order would provide an immediate acknowledgement from NPAC to a request.



* A member raised a concern that associating this new acknowledgement with satisfying SLR-3, which requires NPAC to respond within 3 seconds for 95% of responses except for miscellaneous transactions such as queries, audits, and edits, means that there would be no SLR for the actual work driven by the SOA request. This is a contractual issue and not for this group to address.
* Question raised – Do we want to make this new response message (message 4.1 in the attached flow) optional? Group consensus was no.
* Question to be answered: Should the new message (4.1) be encrypted?
* The group then reviewed the Change Orders in the APT Working Document (attached in the zip file above):
* Requirements for NANC 353 and ILL 5 have been completed by this group.
* NANC 383 – Separate SOA Channel for Notifications: It was suggested that possibly increasing the SOA interface performance to 5 messages per second could mean that everything could be done over one channel, but separating the workload over another channel could make it easier to administer and fine tune performance requirements for notifications vs. requests. NeuStar responded that ease of administration is not necessarily a good reason for a separate channel. Requirements for this will be worked in conjunction with NANC 390. It is not clear at this time which is the most cost effective approach.
* The group agreed that requirements completed in the APT will be revisited in the LNPA when Change Orders are prioritized to be placed in a package.
* NANC 388 – This would allow a provider to undo a cancel request to get it from cancel pending to pending. Initiation of this undo request constitutes new SOA functionality. Does the resultant notification for transitioning between these two states require SOA changes? If yes, this Change Order likely could not be backwards compatible. One SOA vendor said that SOA applications software doesn’t appear to be an issue, but the vendor is working with clients to see if downstream systems would require changes.

* NANC 389 – Volume and Performance Testbed – The WNPO is sending an e-mail to NeuStar on the results of their requirements discussion. This will be addressed at the February APT meeting.

Current Issues:

* NPAC Architecture Migration – NeuStar stated that this migration is a long term strategy designed to meet future porting volumes, not just for the volumes expected next busy season.
* Duplicate requests from providers to NPAC – NeuStar stated that the problem has improved over the last month. They have been working with some providers. It seems that some providers have timers that react to a lack of notification even though a response had already been sent to request. To be discussed further next month.
* Historical copies of SVs and pooled blocks – Sprint stated that they use the one previous (historical) SV at times, but not any earlier SVs, for trouble shooting. Verizon uses historical copies of SVs for settlement purposes and expressed concerns if the historical database was taken off-line. How would it be accessed and how long would it take to get historical data on a TN? NeuStar will bring back requirements and scenarios on how and when historical copies are kept.
* Maximum number of SVs in recovery – This is an individual service provider item. If a service provider can handle a higher tunable value, they should contact the Help Desk to have it raised. This is an LSMS-only issue.
* BDD File Sizes: NeuStar reported that the average number of bytes per SV record is 90 and that roughly 24 million non-EDR records equate to 2 Gigabytes. The attached file reflects an estimate by region of how many TNs can be added to each database before 2 Gigabyte size is reached.



Some provider LSMSs can handle greater than 2 Gig import files today.

* NANC 385 – Exclusion of maintenance window time in NPAC timer expiration calculations – In response to concerns raised by wireless carriers, NeuStar stated that a workaround can be implemented for the NPAC architecture migration to manually reset timers that are set to expire during the maintenance window. For example, the timers could be reset to expire 1 hour beyond the end of the maintenance window. One wireless carrier stated that their preference would be to reset the timers so that they pick up what was lost during the maintenance window. NeuStar will investigate.
* The February Architecture meeting will go to 3pm Eastern time on Thursday, February 5th.