LNPA WORKING GROUP

January 2005 Meeting

Final Minutes

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

**TUESDAY 01/11/05**

Tuesday, 01/11/05, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T | Dave Garner | | Qwest |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | David Taylor | | SBC (phone) |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Craig Bartell | | Sprint |
| Jason Powell | Centennial Wireless (phone) | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint |
| Lonnie Keck | Cingular (phone) | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | Cingular | Steve Moore | | Sprint |
| Michelle Gwaltney | Cingular | Rob Smith | | Syniverse |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox | Darren Paffenroth | | Syniverse |
| Laurie Itkin | Cricket | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Jean Anthony | Evolving Systems | Jason Kempson | | Telcordia |
| Jamie Sharpe | Interstate FiberNet (phone) | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec |
| Jason Lee | MCI (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Larry Vagnoni | NeuStar | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile |
| Holly Jacobs | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Nancy Davies | | Verizon (phone) |
| Shannon Sevigny | NeuStar (phone) | Jeff Harmon | | Verizon Wireless (phone) |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Deborah Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Sara Hooker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar |  | |  |
| Gene Johnston | NeuStar |  | |  |
| Susan Ortega | Nextel |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

Attached are the Action Items assigned at the January, 2005 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 2005 LNPA ACTION ITEMS” FILE ATTACHED ABOVE.

**MEETING MINUTES:**

2005 Meeting Schedule:

Following is the meeting schedule for the 2005 LNPA Meetings.

Recent changes are indicated in **Red**.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MONTH/**  **DATE**  **(2005)** | NANC | OBF | LNPA-WG | HOST | LOCATION |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| January | 19th |  | 11-12-13th | Qwest & NeuStar | Phoenix |
| February |  | Week of 7th | 15-16-17th | Syniverse | Tampa |
| March | 15th |  | 8-9-10th | NeuStar | **Napa, California** |
| April |  |  | 12-13-14th | VZ Wireless | Nashville |
| May | 17th | Week of 2nd | 10-11-12th | Sprint | Kansas |
| June |  |  | 14-15-16th | SBC | San Ramon |
| July | 19th | Week of 25th | 12-13-14th | Canadian Consortium | St. Sauveur, Montreal |
| August |  |  | 9-10-11th | Tekelec | Raleigh |
| September | 20th |  | 13-14-15th | T-Mobile | Seattle |
| October |  | Week of 22nd | 18-19-20th | Nextel | Ft. Lauderdale |
| November | 30th |  | 15-16-17th | Cingular | Atlanta |
| December |  |  | 6-7-8th | Evolving Systems | Denver |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

12/04 Minutes Review:

The following changes were made to the DRAFT December 2004 LNPA Minutes during the January 2005 meeting. These changes will be reflected in the FINAL December 2004 LNPA Minutes.

* No changes were made to the DRAFT December 2004 LNPA Minutes. They will be issued as the FINAL December 2004 LNPA Minutes.

Inter-species Task Force (ITF) Update and Inter-modal Port Issues referred to OBF (Lonnie Keck, Cingular Wireless and OBF Wireless Committee Co-Chair):

# Wireless Committee:

* WICIS Release 3.0 is final and closed. The new Wireless FAX forms will be provided on the website but are not to be used until the Release 2.1.0 sunset date of 2/12/06.
* Mike Witkowski, T-Mobile, has been elected Co-Chair. Lonnie Keck, Cingular, was re-elected to serve as the other Co-Chair.
* OBF 89 will be held the week of 2/7/05 in Long Beach.
* Development of Phase 2 of the Local Service Migration Guidelines: Another working call will be held on 1/24/05. This is an effort by ATIS OBF to develop a Best Practices document containing process flows for inter-modal porting. The Committee is using the NANC LNP Provisioning Flows and adding underlying detail, e.g., directory services, fraud prevention, etc. The Committee’s objective is to complete the document in Spring 2005 with approval at OBF 90. This is a public document on the ATIS website.
* Steve Moore, Sprint, walked through the draft OBF wireline resale to wireless flows. The Loss Alert should come from the New Network SP (NNSP) and sent to the Old Local SP (OLSP) for information related to requests such as reuse of the local loop. This Loss Alert is different than the Loss Alert that is depicted in the NANC flows, per Steve Moore. In the OBF flows, the Loss Notification is sent from the ONSP to the OLSP, usually post-port. There was agreement that once these flows are completed, the LNPA should do a comparison with the NANC flows to make sure there is consistency. The OBF is looking to complete in May. The OBF LSOP Committee’s Local Service Migration Task Force’s website can be accessed at:

http://www.atis.org/obf/local\_service\_migration.asp

* Carrier Interface Uniform Modeling: This is not a push to migrate from CORBA to XML, but to come up with a potential standard internet interface. The Wireless Committee has accepted the issue and will address this at OBF 89 to determine how this fits into the WICIS document The objective is to create a uniform ordering model for inter-carrier communication.

# Inter-species Task Force (ITF):

* Regarding PIM 42 (Issue 2802), and PIM 44 (Issue 2801) – Wireline providers continue to provide input on what fields they validate on. The matrix reflecting what fields carriers require on LSRs and if they are validated in their back-end systems is progressing. The matrix is available to OBF members on the ATIS website. Syniverse stated that one ILEC reduced the number of LSR fields that they validate on and their FOC return rate increased from 50% to 80%. They did not reduce the number of fields that need to be populated, but reduced the ones that they validate on up front to return an FOC.
* The ITF will meet face-to-face at OBF 89 to discuss the Wireless FAX forms (Issue 2753). There is an open question as to where these forms should reside, WICIS or LSOG.

WTSC Committee for WICIS 3.0 (Jean Anthony, Evolving Systems):

* Jean Anthony, Evolving Systems, reported that no conference calls have been held since the last LNPA meeting. The WICIS 3.0 Test Plan was sent out last Friday and can be obtained along with call details on the NPAC website under WTSC. The next call to review the plan is scheduled for 1/25/05.
* Jean reported that only three service providers and one vendor have contributed to the test plan to date.

Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Update (Adam Newman, Telcordia):

* Adam Newman, Telcordia, reported that the INC has sent a liaison (Issue 459) to the LNPA asking for input on the Department of Navy’s request for their own NPA.
* This liaison will be discussed at this meeting during New Business.

PIM Discussion:

* PIM 22 – PIM 22 remains open in a tracking state awaiting implementation of NANC Change Order 375, which will be included in the next NPAC software release package.

 

* 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) recommended to the FCC a trial of the proposed resolution in selected pools initially. The FCC subsequently recommended that the PA submit another Change Order based on the NOWG recommendation for a trial. On 2/9/04, the PA submitted Change Order 26 based on this recommendation to conduct a trial in one NPA in each NPAC region. The FCC approved PA Change Order 26. The PA has since received reports for each trial NPA in each region and worked with service providers to resolve discrepancies in what is in PAS vs. NPAC. The PA then aggregated the information and sent the findings and a recommendation to the FCC. Attached is the PA’s summary and a recommendation to the FCC that the PA receive reports for all NPAs and that it be repeated annually. The NOWG was then asked by the FCC to review the results and provide a recommendation.

 

The NOWG subsequently issued the attached recommendation that the PA provide an updated proposal with cost details for Change Order #24 to the FCC, for review by the NOWG, prior to the FCC authorizing a one-time scrub of PAS by the PA. The FCC responded that the PA should submit a new Change Order based on NOWG’s recommendation for a one-time scrub of all NPAs, and for ongoing data collection to determine if subsequent scrubs are needed. The PA is in the process of putting together the Change Order to the FCC.

PA Change Order 26 is completed. PA Change Order 24 will remain open. The PIM will remain open pending the outcome of the final FCC decision.

  

* 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 accepted PIM was referred to the Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF) Wireless Committee and Local Ordering and Provisioning (LSOP) Committee, and is being worked in the OBF Wireless Committee Technical Subcommittee (Issue 2744). The proposed resolution is for the WICIS standard to be modified to relax edits to allow the Inter-carrier Communications Process (ICP) to accept due date and time changes. This resolution will be in WICIS 3.0, which must be implemented between 5/22/05 and 2/12/06 (new sunset date for WICIS 2.1.0).

There is a workaround in the interim. This PIM will continue to be tracked by the LNPA until the sunset of WICIS 2.1.0 to allow all providers to test and implement the fix in 3.0.



* PIM 32 - This PIM, submitted by Syniverse (formerly TSI), seeks to address issues related to the process for obtaining a Customer Service Record (CSR), which contains information necessary to complete a Local Service Request (LSR) for porting in a reseller number.



Action Item 0904-09 – NeuStar, as a Clearinghouse Vendor, researched the current CSR/LSR process for ILECs and provided the attached readout.



Action Item 09094-09 remains open. A number of wireless carriers stated their preference of obtaining permission to review CSR information for resold accounts based on a profile set up by the underlying network provider that would allow resellers to grant permissions based on Company Code (similar to what BellSouth has implemented). It was stated that if an ILEC requires wireless carriers to go through their respective Account Manager to enter into their Change Management Process, each carrier should do so. If wireless carriers can interface directly into an ILEC’s Change Management Process, it is the hope of wireless carriers that their respective Clearinghouse Vendor can represent them, but if the issue is not getting enough attention, wireless carriers may have to get on the Change Management calls.

Action Item 1204-14 remains open.

* PIM 34 – This PIM, submitted by Syniverse (formerly TSI), seeks to address issues related to the process for obtaining a Customer Service Record (CSR), which contains information necessary to complete a Local Service Request (LSR) for porting in a Type 1 Cellular number.



Action Item 1204-21 remains open. Syniverse stated that the collection of the data is feasible. Wireless Service Providers are to furnish their Type 1 provider name and billing address (if needed), their Type 1 Account TNs (ATNs or Billing TNs [BTNs]), the underlying Type 1 end user working TNs, and any additional necessary LSR information based on discussions between the Type 1 provider and their underlying wireline network provider, to their respective Clearinghouse Vendor. Clearinghouse Vendors will use this information to identify a number to be ported as a Type 1 number and to complete the LSR.

A wireless carrier stated that some small network providers are holding up porting individual Type 1 numbers awaiting migration, which is taking 3-4 months. Suggestions included going to the FCC or other applicable regulatory body.

Migrations of Type 1 numbers to Type 2 are continuing. This PIM will continue to be tracked for Type 1 to Type 2 migrations.

* PIM 36 – This PIM, submitted by Syniverse, proposes an edit in NPAC to prevent NPA-NXX codes from being opened in the wrong NPAC regional database by service providers.



NANC Change Order 321 addresses this issue, and has been modified to address an area in Kentucky where two regions serve the same NPA. NANC 321 will be included in the recommended package for the next NPAC software release. This PIM is now in a tracking state awaiting implementation of NANC 321. The PIM was revised to eliminate the verbiage on LRNs because there is no such thing as the correct region for LRNs. LRNs can be in more than one region. NeuStar will continue a manual cleanup of NXXs opened in the wrong region until NANC 321 is implemented. NeuStar has increased the frequency of the manual cleanup.

* PIM 38 – This PIM, submitted by AT&T Wireless, seeks to eliminate the current 5 day minimum interval between when a pooled block is created in NPAC, and the effective date of block activation, if the 1st port has already occurred in the NXX code containing the pooled block.



NANC Change Order 394 addresses this issue. NANC 394 will be included in the recommended package for the next NPAC software release. This PIM is now in a tracking state awaiting implementation of NANC 394.

* PIM 41 – This PIM, submitted by Verizon Wireless, seeks to address fallout that can occur during SPID migrations when methods other that NANC 323 are used to accomplish the migration.



This PIM will stay open until the INC issue addressing the LNPA’s request for related revisions to the COCAG Appendix C goes into Initial Closure. Adam Newman, Telcordia, will provide to the LNPA Co-Chairs the resolution text to the COCAG when the issue goes into Initial Closure in the INC. Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will update the NP Best Practices document to reflect the latest PIM 41 version number.

Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, took an action to change the 1st paragraph in Item

34 addressing PIM 41, in the NP Best Practices document, to reflect that a SPID migration is allowed to occur before the LERG effective date provided however that the LERG effective date is no later than the following Wednesday. In general, however, SPID migrations should be scheduled as soon after the LERG-effective as possible.

PIM remains open until all related Action Items are completed.

* PIM 42 – This PIM, submitted by Syniverse, seeks to review the wireline requirement for certain fields on the LSR.



This PIM has been accepted at OBF as Issue 2802 and is now in tracking status only for LNPA. See readout of Issue 2802 in the ITF Report in these minutes.

* PIM 44 – This PIM, submitted by T-Mobile, Sprint, Verizon Wireless, Nextel, Cingular, and US Cellular, seeks to address varying rules among wireline carriers for developing a Local Service Request (LSR) in order to port a number.



This PIM has been accepted at OBF as Issue 2801 and is now in tracking status only for LNPA. See readout of Issue 2801 in the ITF Report in these minutes.

* PIM 45 – This PIM, submitted by T-Mobile, Sprint, Verizon Wireless, Nextel, Cingular, and US Cellular, seeks to address instances when there are errors in Local Service Requests (LSRs) to port a number and some service providers respond identifying a single error only. Additional LSRs and responses are required until all errors are finally cleared. This can result in a need to create many LSRs in order to clear all errors and complete a port.



This issue was referred to OBF. Attached is the OBF LSOP Committee response.



This PIM is now in tracking mode based on the LSOP liaison above, which states that the LSOP Committee will introduce a new issue to address guidelines for the return of errors (Issue No. 2817). This issue is planned for discussion at the February 2005 OBF. Lonnie Keck, Cingular, to obtain status and provide feedback to the LNPA.

* PIM 47 – This PIM, submitted by Sprint, seeks to address minimum industry intermodal standards for purging old/abandoned ports.



This PIM pertains to service provider systems and addresses inter-modal porting.

This PIM proposes that the port request be considered abandoned after 30 days and may be purged anytime after that.

Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will:

1. Copy the 1st sentence in Section 2 of the PIM (“This is the solution only when a carrier has not or is unable to use the recommended cancel process as documented in the NANC Process Flows.”) into the 1st standalone paragraph in Section 3.
2. Put the Suggested Resolution in the NP Best Practices document.

The group agreed to close PIM 47.

* PIM 48 – This PIM, submitted by VeriSign, T-Mobile, and Nextel proposes a new category in the NIIF National LNP Contact Directory for post-port carrier-to-carrier support. It also suggests more publicity in order to encourage carriers not listed to do so.



This PIM was accepted at the October LNPA meeting. This PIM was referred to NIIF/NIOC. NIOC responded that they have opened Issue #0255, NIIF Company Specific Contact Directory and LNP Contact Directory New Category Proposal and Processes for Updating Contacts in response the LNPA correspondence. See attached NIIF liaison to the LNPA and Issue 0255.

 

Maggie Lee, VeriSign, will obtain the status of Issue 0255 from the NIIF and provide a status report to the LNPA.

* PIM 49 – This PIM, submitted by T-Mobile and Verizon Wireless, seeks to modify the NANC Flows to address issues related to the porting of reseller and Type 1 numbers. It also seeks to address the inadvertent porting of paging numbers.



A Clearinghouse Vendor stated that they are not prepared at this time to go with either option in Action Item 1204-19. They stated that there is not a lot of support from their SP customers. A wireless carrier questioned whether the cost to address this in the NANC flows is justified.

Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, will revise the PIM 49 Resolution Statement to read:

The Wireless New Local Service Provider (NLSP) submits the Wireless Port Request (WPR) to their respective Clearinghouse Vendor. The Clearinghouse Vendor sends the CSR to the Wireline Old Network Service Provider (ONSP), and if rejected with an indication that the account is not found and/or it is a Type 1 number, the Clearinghouse Vendor, using information optionally provided by the Wireless Type 1 provider, can manually validate the port request with that Wireless Old Local Service Provider (OLSP). If validated, the Clearinghouse Vendor then sends the LSR to the Wireline ONSP using information provided by the Type 1 provider to correctly populate the LSR. If the port request does not pass validation by the OLSP, the Clearinghouse Vendor will send a notification to the NLSP, who should then cancel the port request. If the Type 1 information is not available to the Clearinghouse Vendor, the Clearinghouse Vendor will proceed with the port request without a validation attempt.

Wireless providers who process ports manually should validate the Type 1 end user information whenever possible prior to submitting the LSR to the Old Network Service Provider.

March 2005 LNPA Meeting Location:

* By majority vote, the LNPA decided that the March, 2005 LNPA meeting, to be hosted by NeuStar, will be located in Napa, California. Reasons cited included our objective to evenly distribute meeting locations between East and West coasts.
* Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will send out the revised 2005 LNPA meeting schedule to the distribution.

**WEDNESDAY 01/12/05**

Wednesday, 01/12/05, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T | Susan Ortega | | Nextel |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Dave Garner | | Qwest |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | David Taylor | | SBC (phone) |
| Jason Powell | Centennial Wireless (phone) | Craig Bartell | | Sprint |
| Lonnie Keck | Cingular (phone) | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | Cingular | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint |
| Michelle Gwaltney | Cingular | Steve Moore | | Sprint |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox | Rob Smith | | Syniverse |
| Laurie Itkin | Cricket | Darren Paffenroth | | Syniverse |
| Jean Anthony | Evolving Systems | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW (phone) | Jason Kempson | | Telcordia |
| Jason Lee | MCI (phone) | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec |
| Larry Vagnoni | NeuStar | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Holly Jacobs | NeuStar | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| Shannon Sevigny | NeuStar (phone) | Jeff Harmon | | Verizon Wireless (phone) |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Deborah Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Sara Hooker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar |  | |  |
| Gene Johnston | NeuStar |  | |  |
| Darius Irani | NeuStar |  | |  |
| Mindi Patterson | NeuStar (phone) |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

NPAC Application Server Technology Migration (NeuStar):

* NeuStar walked through the attached presentation on the NPAC Application Server technology migration.



* NeuStar stated that there will be no functional impact due to replacing the HPs. There will be a one-time impact to change the IP addresses. IP addresses, for the primary and secondary NPAC, and a detailed list of instructions will be provided at the end of February. The IP address for the test bed may be available earlier.
* A service provider commented that there is a lot going on in 2005, e.g. WICIS 3.0, etc., and with all of the changes, it could be difficult to identify the source of a problem.
* There will be a single point of connection for LTI users. An IP address change will be required.
* Proposed schedule:
* Regression testing 4/11/05 to 5/6/05
* Group and fail over testing from 5/9/05 to 5/20/05
* 1st region deployed on Sunday 5/22/05
* Regions 2, 3, 4, 5 on 6/19/05
* Regions 6, 7, and Canada and SOW 34 test bed on 7/10/05.
* Regarding the planned NPAC Application Server technology migration, Service Providers are to come to the February 2005 LNPA meeting prepared to:

1. Respond to the testing and deployment schedule and provide input if not acceptable.
2. Respond if receiving IP addresses 8 weeks in advance of 1st region deployment is adequate.
3. Respond if the IP addresses and front end configuration for connectivity testing are available 4 weeks in advance of 1st region deployment is adequate.

* NeuStar stated that it is their preference that the Southeast Region not be the first region to go into production.

Change Management (NeuStar):

Release 3.3 Follow-up:

* SOW 49 negotiations are ongoing with the LLC.

Release 3.3 M&Ps Follow-up:

* No comments. As the M&Ps are being developed, they will be discussed in the LNPA. The Project Executives will also review and have final approval before they are placed on the website.

Optional Fields in Release 3.3:

* NeuStar teed up the discussion of the two Change Orders (now numbered NANC 399 and 400) and provided a brief history of the VoIP discussions that have taken place in the LNPA since September.



* A local system vendor stated that their analysis of the GDMO and ASN.1 changes for these Change Orders resulted in no issues with breakage with the functionality turned off. They did provide some questions to NeuStar on the best use of XML. The vendor asked why the apparent push to get these Change Orders through the Change Management process. NeuStar responded that there is an open window of opportunity since there is a release currently under development.
* T-Mobile and Verizon expressed interest in accepting these Change Orders.
* A local system vendor suggested that we send a liaison to have someone from ATIS keep us abreast of what is going on with regard to the VoIP Focus Group Work Plan. It was suggested that we should communicate with other industry groups, ENUM Forum, ENUM LLC, IETF, etc.
* A service provider asked if other vendors could share any other approaches that they may be planning. No additional approaches were offered; however, one local system vendor stated that we need to distinguish between what’s required for VoIP porting vs. IP routing.
* NeuStar was asked if they supported these Change Orders as independent Change Orders. NeuStar answered yes.
* A local system vendor stated that we need to look into the impact on throughput, additional queries generated, etc. NeuStar responded that no particular solution was being pushed on the query side. NeuStar expects that the data would have to be forked somewhere downstream.
* A local system vendor asked if the Change Orders were needed to support the porting of VoIP numbers; it was noted that they were not to the extent that they are ported today; however, issues such as efficient routing and service interoperability are not currently addressed.
* Another local system vendor suggested that we may want to consider whether we should propose a new interface other than CMIP. The vendor also asked about sunsetting.
* BellSouth, Verizon, and T-Mobile expressed support for these Change Orders as potential options that may or may not be activated. Each service provider would have to build their own business case after discussions with their internal IP teams and local system vendors. There were no objections to accepting NANC 399 and NANC 400 to work the requirements.
* The LLC wants these Change Orders to go through the LNPA Change Management Process and will then determine any contractual matters.
* A local system vendor asked if the inclusion of URI data associated with TNs could lead to discrepancies with a public ENUM database and if the ENUM Forum or ENUM LLC TAG were aware of this suggested change to the NPAC.
* A local system vendor asked if the Change Orders were to support carrier to carrier ENUM. NeuStar noted that the Change Orders were independent of carrier to carrier ENUM.
* Sue Tiffany, Sprint, with assistance from Frank Reed, T-Mobile, Dave Garner, Qwest, and Michelle Gwaltney, Cingular, will draft a liaison letter and determine the appropriate recipient industry groups in order to notify them of the discussions currently taking place in the LNPA.
* Continued review of the NANC 399 and 400 requirements will be on the agenda for all day Wednesday, February 16th.

NANC 323 – SPID Migration Documents and Process (NeuStar):

* Mindi Patterson, NeuStar, described the latest changes to the NANC 323 SPID Migration documents (attached), which include conference calls change to as-needed and migrations may be scheduled to occur up to three calendar days *prior* to the LERG effective date



* Related Action Items:
* 1204-01: NeuStar has found only 1 TN post migration that 4 carriers had the wrong SPID. Closed.
* 0304-07: Closed. If anyone wants to bring in a Change Order for Option 4, they can.
* 1204-02: Closed
* 1204-03: Closed
* 1204-04: Closed
* 1204-06: NeuStar cannot commit to an earlier time than the current commitment to generate the SMURF files within 2 hours of the start of the maintenance window.
* 1204-18: Verizon Wireline, Sprint, Qwest, Nextel, Cingular, and Verizon Wireless expressed approval with the Holiday blackout dates. Closed.
* 0904-04 still open.
* 1004-21: Verizon Wireline expressed a desire to actually perform more scheduled migrations during a given maintenance window and schedule fewer Sundays. BellSouth, Nextel, Qwest and VeriSign concurred. If we go with 2 weekends per month, Nextel would like to shorten the 31 day interval for when the LERG is not involved. BellSouth has categorized migrations into simple and complex. A number of providers, including Verizon Wireline and BellSouth would like to limit the number of migration weekends even further than the agreed-upon 18. For requests between now and the February meeting, the maximum migrations will be no more than 5 in a single region and no more than 21 nationwide. Action Item remains Open.
* 1204-07: Jeff Adrian, Sprint, discussed the attached Service Provider Checklist.



Regarding the attached NANC 323 SPID Migration Service Provider checklist

(Version 2.3), Jeff Adrian, Sprint, will:

1. Add text for shortened interval when LERG-effective date is less than 66 days out.
2. Accept revisions and send to Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair.
3. Change Version No. in Header of document to 2.4.

Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, upon receipt of the revised NANC 323 SPID Migration Service Provider Checklist from Jeff Adrian, Sprint, will send the document to the LNPA distribution and have it uploaded to the LNPA website.

Action Item 1204-07 is Closed.

Draft VoIP Letter to NANC (Action Item 1204-16) (Sue Tiffany, Sprint, and Dave Garner, Qwest):

* Sue Tiffany, Sprint, and Dave Garner, Qwest, presented and discussed the attached DRAFT letter form the LNPA to NANC regarding the LNPA’s position on VoIP service providers’ LNP responsibilities. The attached version reflects changes agreed upon at the January LNPA meeting.



* Dave Garner, Qwest, with assistance from Sue Tiffany, Sprint, will make the

changes to the draft VoIP letter to NANC (see attached for revisions) agreed upon at the January 2005 LNPA meeting, and send the revised draft to Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair.

* Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, upon receipt of the revised draft VoIP letter to NANC from Dave Garner, Qwest, and Sue Tiffany, Sprint, will distribute the draft to the LNPA members for discussions internally with their respective NANC representatives and/or Regulatory groups.

**THURSDAY 01/13/05**

Thursday, 01/13/05, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T | Dave Garner | | Qwest |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | David Taylor | | SBC (phone) |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Craig Bartell | | Sprint |
| Jason Powell | Centennial Wireless (phone) | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint |
| Lonnie Keck | Cingular (phone) | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | Cingular | Steve Moore | | Sprint |
| Michelle Gwaltney | Cingular | Rob Smith | | Syniverse |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox | Darren Paffenroth | | Syniverse |
| Jean Anthony | Evolving Systems | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Jason Lee | MCI (phone) | Jason Kempson | | Telcordia |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Ginny Cashbaugh | | US Cellular (phone) |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| Gene Johnston | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Susan Ortega | Nextel (phone) | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
|  |  | Nancy Davies | | Verizon (phone) |
|  |  | Jeff Harmon | | Verizon Wireless (phone) |
|  |  | Deborah Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
|  |  | Sara Hooker | | Verizon Wireless |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

NANC 323 SPID Migration Follow-up Discussion (NeuStar):

* NeuStar stated that they would prefer that the e-mail notification for when the SMURF files are up on the FTP sites be changed to an exception notification, only sent when the files will not be loaded within the 2 hour commitment. Action for service providers and Service Bureaus to check with their operations groups to see if this is acceptable.

Department of Navy Request for Dedicated NPA:

* Adam Newman, Telcordia and INC Vice-Chair, teed up the INC liaison to the LNPA requesting input to the Navy’s request for a dedicated NPA.
* The Navy is requesting what they term a “geographic NPA (366) overlay” in the U.S. such that any number in the U.S. can call numbers in this NPA locally and vice versa. The Navy is not pursuing an 800-like toll-free solution.
* It was commented that this actually appears to be a non-geographic NPA proposal.
* The INC is asking the LNPA to weigh in on whether or not the codes in this NPA could be portable and the impacts. It was suggested that it is premature without knowing the details of the architecture.
* It was commented that this sounds a lot like VoIP.
* Regarding the INC’s liaison to the LNPA requesting input on the Navy’s request for a dedicated NPA, the LNPA, at their January 2005 meeting, developed the following list of questions/comments:
* More detail regarding the architecture design and user requirements are needed.
* What does “geographic” mean to the Navy? If they are contemplating a rate center association with every NXX, how do they contemplate customers moving their numbers anywhere in the geographic area of the NPA?
* Can the calls originate and terminate internationally?
* Do you expect to use the PSTN beyond the initial access?
* What are your requirements for 911?
* Do you expect to move numbers between service providers independent of end user movement?
* Do you anticipate these numbers working on Class 5 switches or PBXs?
* Do you anticipate end users moving from and to any point in the U.S. while retaining their number?

Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will send a response liaison to the INC including these questions/comments.

* This will be an agenda item for Adam Newman, Telcordia and INC Vice-Chair, at the February LNPA.

Continuation of NANC 399 and 400 Discussion:

* The group discussed the Business Needs and Description of Change for both NANC 399 and 400.



* A member suggested that we rename “Alternative SPID Field.” LNPA Members are to come to the February 2005 meeting with any suggestions to rename “Alternative SPID Field.” This field will be validated against the list of valid SPIDs in the NPAC SPID table. It was advised that everyone should review and understand the write-up of the Alternative SPID Field.
* NANC 400 – NeuStar explained that the URI field conceptually is like an IP LRN possibly identifying a VoIP provider’s gateway server. It is agnostic as to the URI naming convention used.
* A local system vendor advised that service providers need to work with their respective vendors to ensure that their platforms can interface with the NPAC to use the data, should the service provider want this turned on.
* A service provider asked if this could be parsed to allow some providers to get these fields over a different channel if they choose to. NeuStar responded that this could be implemented in a number of ways, e.g. another CMIP connection to send this data over. That is not what is proposed here but it could be done. A local system vendor asked how this could be made part of the Change Order for those vendors whose planned implementations will not support all data over the same channel. NeuStar suggested a separate Change Order. Action for NeuStar to develop a new Change Order with Maggie Lee, VeriSign, as the submitter. A new Change Order, NANC 401, will be distributed by NeuStar to the LNPA prior to the February 2005 meeting.
* NeuStar action to determine from NECA what are the restrictions on who can be assigned an Operating Company Number (OCN).
* Action for Service Providers and Service Bureaus to come prepared in February to decide if the LNPA will recommend to the LLC inclusion of NANC Change Orders 399 and 400 in Release 3.3.

January NANC Report (Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair):

* The January report to NANC will include:
* N-1 and EAS Readout – PIM 30 is now Closed.
* FYI to NANC (Action Item 1204-12)

An issue was raised at the December 2004 LNPA meeting related to the

portability of a Type 1 number, where the wireless carrier is required to port, but the underlying wireline carrier for the Type 1 number has a waiver. It was the consensus of the group that due to technical issues, e.g., inability to perform default queries, code not opened in NPAC or marked portable in the LERG, without LNP capability, these numbers cannot be ported or migrated. Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will address this in the January 2005 NANC report as an informational item.

* Attached is the January 2005 LNPA Report to NANC.



Review of December Action Items:



* Item 1204-01: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1204-02: This item has been completed and is Closed. Migration up to 3 days prior to the LERG effective date is permissible, however, we want to be clear that the normal process is to do the migration on or after the LERG effective date, although this alternative is now permitted as well.
* Item 1204-03: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1204-04: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1204-05: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1204-06: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1204-07: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1204-08: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1204-09: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1204-10: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1204-11: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1204-12: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1204-13: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1204-14: This item remains Open.
* Item 1204-15: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1204-16: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1204-17: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1204-18: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1204-19: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1204-20: This item has been completed and is Closed. VeriSign stated they cannot accept this information from non-customers.
* Item 1204-21: This item remains Open.
* Item 1204-22: This item has been completed and is Closed. T-Mobile stated that they cannot share this information with Clearinghouse Vendors other than their own.

Action Items Remaining Open from Previous Meetings:

* Item 0304-07: Item is Closed. If anyone wants to bring in a Change Order for Option 4, they can.
* Item 0604-09: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0804-33: This Action Item was deferred to the March 2005 LNPA meeting. NeuStar contact changed to Steve Addicks. Forecasted data due to Steve Addicks by January 31, 2005. The Action Item was modified to reflect that the forecasted numbers should specify volumes, the time period for which the activity is to be accomplished, and the calendar period for the activity. Data from one provider has been received to date.
* Item 0904-04: Item remains Open.
* Item 0904-09: Item remains Open.
* Item 1004-21: Item remains open until the February 2005 meeting to discuss the maximum number of migrations on a given weekend, the minimum and maximum thresholds of TNs per migration, and the maximum TNs for all migrations on a given weekend.
* Item 1104-09: This item remains Open and will be discussed at the February 2005 meeting.

New Business:

* Dave Cochran, BellSouth, asked if full BDDs are a viable means of recovering data based on the length of time it takes, and are there any other alternatives. He requested that this topic be discussed in the LNPA. New providers coming on line today would take a full BDD to load their LSMS. If it takes more than 24 hours to load, process, synch up SCP, and validate, they would then take a delta BDD, and then come up in recovery. A BDD discussion will be placed on the February 2005 agenda.
* Paula Jordan, T-Mobile, stated that they have worked out a process for porting Type 1s with Gulf Telephone. Gulf Telephone wants the LNPA to know that if a service provider has any Type 1s with Gulf, and wants to work out a process for porting Type 1s from them, contact Paula Jordan to get the Gulf Telephone contact.

***Next Meeting …******February 15-17, 2005, Tampa, Florida – Hosted by Syniverse***