LNPA WORKING GROUP

November 2004 Meeting

Final Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Nashville, Tennessee | Host: Verizon Wireless |

**TUESDAY 11/2/04**

Tuesday, 11/2/04, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Wendy Wheeler | Alltel (phone) | Dave Garner | | Qwest |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T | Charles Ryburn | | SBC (phone) |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Tim Waters | | SNET |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Craig Bartell | | Sprint |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian Consortium | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint |
| Amy Donovan | Centennial Wireless | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint |
| Lonnie Keck | Cingular (phone) | Joe Leeper | | Sprint |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | Cingular | Rob Smith | | Syniverse |
| Elton Allen | Cingular | Darren Paffenroth | | Syniverse |
| Laurie Itkin | Cricket Comm. | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Dennis Rose | CSR Solutions (phone) | Jason Kempson | | Telcordia |
| Steve Farnsworth | Evolving Systems | Martha Wolf | | Tekelec |
| Jean Anthony | Evolving Systems | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Deborah Friedel | Focal Communication | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile |
| Jamie Sharpe | Interstate FiberNet (phone) | Ginny Cashbaugh | | US Cellular |
| Rick McClaussin | Level 3 | Brian Foster | | US Cellular |
| Jason Lee | MCI (phone) | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| Karen Mulberry | MCI | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| Shannon Sevigny | NeuStar (phone) | Nancy Davies | | Verizon (phone) |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Jeff Harmon | | Verizon Wireless (phone) |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Sara Hooker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Deborah Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Rosemary Emmer | Nextel |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

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

**MEETING MINUTES:**

2004 Meeting Schedule:

* The December 2004 meeting in Overland Park, Kansas, will be held from Tuesday, December 7th through Thursday, December 9th, from 8:30am-5pm Central time for all days.

**NOTE: At the September 2004 LNPA meeting, VeriSign volunteered to host the December 2004 meeting in Overland Park, Kansas. Meeting dates will remain the same.**

* Following is the remaining 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** |
| DECEMBER | 12/7 – 12/9 | **VERISIGN** | **OVERLAND PARK, KANSAS** | NO NANC |

The following is a TENTATIVE meeting schedule for the 2005 LNPA Meetings. Hosts and Locations are tentative and are subject to change.

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 | ??? |
| 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 | ??? |
| 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** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

10/04 Minutes Review:

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

* In the readout for PIM 34, change the first sentence to read, “BellSouth stated that they provide the Type 1 account information requested and notes that it is a Type 1 account.”

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:

* The Wireless Committee met at OBF 88 and closed out WICIS 3.0. There is a call scheduled this coming Friday to go over the document before it goes to the printer.
* The sunrise date for WICIS Release 3.0 is still May 22nd, 2005. The sunset date for WICIS 2.1.0 was previously 10/16/05, however, some carriers have expressed concern with this timeline and have recommended a sunset date of 2/12/06. This recommendation will be discussed on the next Wireless Committee call. The new version of WICIS has a section on backwards compatibility.
* Kevin Reynolds, US Cellular, will fill Rosemary Emmer’s (Nextel) remaining term as Co-Chair of the Wireless Committee. Lonnie Keck, Cingular, was re-elected as Co-Chair.
* Wireline and Wireless carriers are invited to participate in the development of Phase 2 of the Local Service Migration Guidelines. The Guidelines are on the ATIS website and are not password protected. A kickoff call took place and subsequent calls will be held for two hours on Mondays. No OBF or ATIS membership is required. See ATIS OBF website for schedule.
* The Unified Ordering Model (UOM) addresses the end-to-end data exchange dictionary. EDI is migrating to later technologies such as XML and CORBA.

# Inter-species Task Force (ITF):

* The ITF did not meet face-to-face at OBF 88, but did hold some conference calls.
* Regarding PIM 42 (Issue 2802), and PIM 44 (Issue 2801) – feedback from wireline participants indicated that some edits cannot be relaxed due to individual state commission requirements. Syniverse stated that some RBOCs have moved to reduce the number of LSR validation fields. Address validation fields have been significantly reduced in some cases. A wireline member stated that some fields are still required even though they are not validated. Point-of-Service (PoS) questions have been developed by wireline carriers participating in the ITF and suggested for use by wireless carriers. T-Mobile stated that they have been using these questions in their PoS locations.

Wireless FAX Form (Sue Tiffany, Sprint):

* Sue Tiffany, Sprint, reported that the business rules for the Wireless FAX Form will be reviewed by the Wireless Committee on their December call and then taken to the full ITF at their February 2005 meeting.

Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Issue 434 (Adam Newman, Telcordia):

* The LNPA had previously requested that the INC stipulate in their code reclamation guidelines that NPAC receive written regulatory authority to remove active SVs in a reclaimed code. Adam Newman, Telcordia, reported that INC Issue 434, which was opened to address this request, is in INC Initial-Pending status, pending FCC action on the Change Order (NANPA Change Order 1).

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

* Jean Anthony, Evolving Systems, reported that the committee did not have any activity in October and is still on schedule to hold their 11/12 call. A notice for the call is to go out this week to the entire LNPA.

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.

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 10/16/05.

There is a workaround in the interim. This PIM will continue to be tracked by the LNPA.



* PIM 30 – This PIM, submitted by Alltel, seeks to clarify the N-1 LNP architecture query responsibilities, and whether wireless carriers are obligated to perform default number portability queries when the N-1 carrier fails to dip the call.



The attached cites defining the N-1 Local Number Portability architecture were forwarded to LNPA members to assist in the discussion.



At the November 2004 LNPA meeting, Dave Garner, Qwest, presented the attached contribution on Extended Area Service (EAS) in the N-1 architecture, explaining that the term “transit” consists of transport and switching costs.



A concern was raised regarding the phrase, “at rates as shall be determined.” The concern raised was that this may imply that the LNPA may somehow determine these rates. Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will revise the PIM 30 Extended Areas Service (EAS) N-1 document to remove the text on cost determination.

After some additional discussion, the consensus was to move forward with Alternative 2 in order to address EAS in the N-1 architecture. Gary Sacra, Verizon, presented the attached contribution suggesting some clarifying changes to Alternative 2 of the EAS N-1 document. The group accepted these changes.



Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will add an explanation to the attached LNPA WG N-1

Interpretation Working Document that the yellow highlighting is meant to highlight text from the various cites that is most relevant to the stated interpretation.



Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will incorporate the LNPA-approved EAS N-1 document into the LNPA WG N-1 Interpretation Working Document and distribute to the LNPA for final review and approval at the December LNPA meeting. Any final comments or revisions will be discussed at the meeting.

This PIM remains open and will be discussed further at the December meeting. The LNPA’s objective continues to be to finalize documentation of its consensus on N-1 responsibilities based on its assessment of FCC cites and industry documentation. This will be documented in LNPA meeting minutes and the PIM 30 resolution for possible reference by a service provider seeking to escalate if they feel they are receiving an inordinate amount of default routed calls. The LNPA will provide to NANC its consensus on N-1 responsibilities, including EAS areas and carriers with waivers or operating outside mandated areas, and whether the NANC should recommend to the FCC any rule changes relevant to the N-1 architecture.

* PIM 31 – This PIM, submitted by Syniverse (formerly TSI), seeks to address fallout that occurs in cases where the wireline Old Service Provider involved in a port issues a jeopardy notification with a change in due date to the wireless New Service Provider. Wireless carriers currently cannot support jeopardy notices with changes to the due date and time.



Based on additional data gathering and the observed reduction in the number of jeopardies, Rob Smith, Syniverse, proposed to close PIM 31. PIM 31 is CLOSED.

* 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.



Rob Smith, Syniverse, stated that some ILECs have profiles that allow carriers to receive CSRs for reseller numbers. Rob also suggested that another possible solution is to reduce the number of validation fields so that the LSR will be accepted. In this case, the profile solution would be moot. BellSouth stated that their web-based system allows a profile update for a company to have their company code put on the profile with the permission of each reseller. The reseller must update the profile to add the requesting company’s company code. Most state commission websites have a list of resellers and their contacts. BellSouth further stated that another source for the LSR information is the customer’s bill. Qwest stated that they do not require permissions and that CSRs are available through their normal CSR system.

Wireline Service Providers are to provide answers at the December LNPA meeting to the following questions from Syniverse related to Reseller profiles.

#### Does your company use a reseller “profile” to determine if another service

provider is authorized to receive CSRs?

1. If not, is there some other means for trading partners to become authorized to receive a CSR on a reseller end user?
2. What information is used to determine if the entity requesting a CSR is authorized? i.e. company code or OCN; CCNA?
3. Would there be any problem with a clearinghouse using this information to obtain the CSR to process their customer's ports?
4. If a reseller needs to change their “profile” to authorize other service providers or clearinghouses to receive CSRs, who would they contact to make these changes?

Syniverse will begin contacting resellers to update their profiles where required. Rob Smith, Syniverse, will continue to work with the Change Management contacts in the relevant wireline companies to discuss possible enhancements.

* 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.



Qwest stated that they have a special center to handle Type 1 requests. The LSR must be faxed to their center. They will reject an LSR that is sent through the automated interface. BellSouth does not have CSR information for individual Type 1s, they only know about the block of numbers that are assigned to the Type 1 carrier, not the individual number assignments that the Type 1 provider has made, but they do identify on the CSR request response that it is a Type 1 account and provides information related to the carrier. Verizon will return a CSR if the correct BTN is on the request, howver, if the CSR is rejected, there is no indication that it is a Type 1 account. Verizon will accept a valid LSR for Type 1s via their automated process. 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 39 – This PIM, submitted by Syniverse, seeks to address frequent changes in wireline business practices and rules related to porting requirements.



This PIM was referred to the OBF. LSOG advised this should be worked on a carrier-to-carrier basis. LSOG put together a list of carrier change control contact names and numbers (see attached LSOP Committee liaison).



Rob Smith, Syniverse, will identify changes to carrier business rules and practices that are not merely document only changes and violate the Ordering & Billing Forum’s (OBF’s) guidelines on the frequency of “customer affecting” changes, and bring it to the attention of those carriers. Wireline Service Providers in receipt of an e-mail have an action to address internally and report back to the LNPA.

* 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.



Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, will revise the Suggested Resolution section of PIM 41 to read as follows:

Service providers involved in moving customers from one SPID to another need to coordinate their moves to be on or as soon as possible after the published Telcordia LERG™ Routing Guide effective dates. The NPAC SPID assignments for the affected codes also need to align with the published Telcordia LERG™ Routing Guide effective dates.

Additionally, service providers are urged to follow the processes listed below for required SPID changes:

INDUSTRY SPID CORRECTION SELECTION PROCESS:

If No Ported Numbers Exist In The Code(S) Or Block(S) Affected By The Move:

If no ported numbers are in the code, the new code holder should contact the current code owner as shown in the NPAC to have the code deleted in the NPAC. The new code holder will then add the code in the NPAC under their SPID.

If Ported Numbers Exist In The Code(S) Or Block(S) Affected By The Move:

1. Coordinated Industry Effort: The new code holder should identify the number of ported TNs within the NXX(s) in question and the number of involved service providers to determine if this option is feasible. Based on the number of involved service providers, the new code holder should coordinate a conference call to determine if the delete/recreate process is acceptable among all affected service providers. If this process is deemed acceptable, the affected service providers shall coordinate the deletion and recreation of all ported SVs in the code(s). Note that the delete/recreate process is service affecting for those ported subscribers. Type of customer should also be considered when determining if this option is feasible. It is recommended that this process be considered when there are five (5) or fewer Service Providers involved and less than one hundred and fifty (150) SVs.

2. NANC 323 SPID Migration: If Option 1 above cannot be used to change NXX code ownership in NPAC, the industry preferred process is to perform a NANC 323 SPID migration.

3. CO Code Reallocation Process: The following process should be considered only as a last resort when Options 1 and 2 above cannot be used to change NXX code ownership in NPAC! Service providers may utilize the CO Code Reallocation Process (pooling the blocks within the code at NPAC), however due to the shared industry cost per pooled block to utilize this method, it should be used only as a last resort if other options are not deemed acceptable.

When ported numbers exist, Service Providers are to determine which of the above 3 options best fit their needs based on time constraints, number of carriers involved, number of SVs involved, type of customer, etc.

Based on a suggestion from Adam Newman, Telcordia, Service Providers are to come to the December LNPA meeting prepared to discuss whether we want to request that INC revise the attached COCAG Appendix C guidelines to reference SPID correction Option 1 (extracted from PIM 41 below).



**1. Coordinated Industry Effort:** The new code holder should identify the number of ported TNs within the NXX(s) in question and the number of involved service providers to determine if this option is feasible.Based on the number of involved service providers, the new code holder should coordinate a conference call to determine if the delete/recreate process is acceptable among all affected service providers. If this process is deemed acceptable, the affected service providers shall coordinate the deletion and recreation of all ported SVs in the code(s). Note that the delete/recreate process is service affecting for those ported subscribers. Type of customer should also be considered when determining if this option is feasible. It is recommended that this process be considered when there are five (5) or fewer Service Providers involved and less than one hundred and fifty (150) SVs.

Maggie Lee, VeriSign, and Jeff Adrian, Sprint, will modify the NP Best Practices document and NANC 323 SPID Migration Service Provider Checklist to add the criteria for when to consider the various options for SPID correction selection, similar to the revisions made to PIM 41.

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). Gary Sacra, LNPA CO-Chair, will request a status from the LSOP after the OBF 88 meeting.

* 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.

**Verizon:** Scenario 1 is not applicable as Verizon will disconnect without a sup to change the due date or to cancel the port. For Scenario 2:

Verizon East – After 30 days, they archive the port request. The same provider would have to start over again with a new LSR (different PON). This does not block LSRs from other providers.

Verizon West – They do not query LSRs. If a problem exists, the LSR is rejected. A new LSR from the same provider with the same PON would have to up the version. They would not reject an LSR from another provider.

**BellSouth:** Response applies to simple non-coordinated ports: Scenario 1 – They expect a sup to cancel if the New SP will not activate on due date. If no sup is sent, the LSR will sit in their systems. In Scenario 2, if a resolution request is sent and no sup received, it will sit in their systems. They will not accept another port request from another carrier when in this state. If a resolution is required, it can only be cleared with a sup to cancel or a sup to correct the problem. If the LSR is flat out rejected, then another LSR from another carrier will be accepted. BellSouth stated that their systems rely on sups to make changes to port requests. Without a requirement for a sup remaining in the process, establishment of a 30 day purge policy could be problematic. Focal concurred with BellSouth. All carriers that interface with BellSouth would have to make changes if BellSouth makes changes to establish a 30 day purge policy.

**Qwest:** Scenario 1 – They will disconnect without a sup. In Scenario 2, they will not stop an LSR from another carrier. Rules for different conditions are on their website.

**Sprint:** Scenario 1 – They will disconnect on the due date without a sup. In Scenario 2, they will accept an LSR from another provider up until they have FOC’d the original LSR from the first carrier. Purge policy is 30 days.

**SBC:** Scenario 1 – They will cancel the request if the due date extends 30 days

without action from the winning provider (30 Day Cancellation Policy). In Scenario 2, again the 30 Day Cancellation Policy would be invoked if the winning provider doesn't take any action.

A member asked if Sprint is running into this problem with wireline or is this PIM a preventative measure. Sprint replied that it is more preventative. LNPA Members are to come to the December LNPA meeting prepared to identify approaches to move it forward. Wireline Service Providers who will reject a port request from a 2nd carrier when an earlier port request from the 1st carrier is in a resolution required state, are to determine how they address the case where the 1st carrier is no longer in business and cannot send a Supplemental LSR on the original port request.

* 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. This issue is on the agenda for the January 2005 NIIF meeting.

**WEDNESDAY 11/3/04**

Wednesday, 11/3/04, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Bob Frasca | AT&T (phone) | Dave Garner | | Qwest |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T | Charles Ryburn | | SBC (phone) |
| Al Bolden | BellSouth (phone) | Tim Waters | | SNET |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Craig Bartell | | Sprint |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian Consortium | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint |
| Amy Donovan | Centennial Wireless | Joe Leeper | | Sprint |
| Lonnie Keck | Cingular (phone) | Rob Smith | | Syniverse |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | Cingular | Darren Paffenroth | | Syniverse |
| Elton Allen | Cingular | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Laurie Itkin | Cricket Comm. | Jason Kempson | | Telcordia |
| Steve Farnsworth | Evolving Systems | Martha Wolf | | Tekelec |
| Jean Anthony | Evolving Systems | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Deborah Friedel | Focal Communication | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile |
| Brian Egbert | (phone) | Ginny Cashbaugh | | US Cellular |
| Rick McClaussin | Level 3 | Brian Foster | | US Cellular |
| Jason Lee | MCI (phone) | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| Karen Mulberry | MCI | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Sara Hooker | | Verizon Wireless |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Deborah Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

Continuation of PIM Discussion:

* 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.



The PIM has been revised to remove reference to reseller numbers. Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, stated that Figure 2 Step 7 in the NANC Flows, the conditional step for loss notification, is where the process is falling down leading to inadvertent ports of Type 1s. It was suggested that this issue could also be worked through the individual interconnect agreements. A member asked what was the order of magnitude of the issue in order to justify the cost of adding a loss notification requirement in their process. Wireless Service Providers are to quantify the

number of inadvertent Type 1 ports, broken down by paging vs. cellular, for a 6 month time interval, broken down month by month. This will be discussed at the December LNPA meeting.

Verizon Wireless stated that if it can be identified up front that it is a paging number it could be rejected and no validation with the Old LSP is necessary. Verizon Wireless proposed that a step be added in the flows stating that paging numbers are not portable. Currently, there is nothing on the LSR for a Type 1 that could be sent to the Old LSP to validate the end user customer. The LSR must contain the Type 1 provider as the customer to pass the Old NSP edits. LNPA Members are to come to the December LNPA meeting prepared to discuss ways that this issue may be addressed in the NANC LNP Provisioning Flows. Wireline and Wireless Service Providers are to determine if loss notifications are being sent/received for Type 1 numbers that are ported and at what point during the porting process are they being sent/received.

VoIP Impacts Discussion:

* Sprint stated that they are working with VoIP, and have plans to work with ENUM in the future. They will use the PSTN for inter-carrier IP-IP calls.
* Verizon has joined the ENUM LLC.
* A press release issued last week announced the ENUM LLC, which will develop ENUM for Country Code 1.
* SBC will be a member of the ENUM LLC.
* The architecture and technical requirements are still evolving for ENUM.
* A discussion then ensued on the difficulty in getting numbers ported from some VoIP providers. It was stated that the NY Commission has certified a VoIP provider as a facilities-based carrier. There is an open proceeding before the FCC on how VoIP providers will be considered.
* There will be a Future of Numbering symposium at tomorrow’s NANC and VoIP will be a prevalent topic in the discussion. A member asked how we could tee up VoIP with NANC to get direction from them. It was suggested that we should wait for the results of the Numbering Symposium.

ENUM Overview (Karen Mulberry, MCI):



* Karen Mulberry, MCI, gave the attached presentation on ENUM.
* It was asked if providers in the US that are selling numbers to companies in Mexico are violating any regulations. It was suggested that we can do that with our cell phones via roaming and with IP to IP connections. The violation is that numbers are not for sale.
* Slide 11: LNP in the PSTN would not be affected by ENUM, and it may be possible that nothing in the ENUM database would change as numbers port except possibly the provider, if that information is deemed relevant in ENUM.
* It was asked if we need to distinguish between public and private ENUM. This presentation does not make a distinction. This is still being debated in the standards bodies.
* Customers porting their TN would only be able to keep their same IP address if IP address portability were implemented.
* Currently, IP to IP calls from one VoIP provider to another requires touching the PSTN.

Review of Release 3.3 Change Orders (NeuStar):

* John Nakamura, NeuStar, led the LNPA members in a review of the changes to the Release 3.3 Changes orders since last month’s meeting (see attached Change Order document).

****

* Revisions were made to Change Orders 375, 351, 388, 299, 130 (a table in Appendix A in the IIS will be added with all of the error texts), 394, 352, 383, and 151. The changes are indicated by change bars in the attached document.
* NANC 357 – question on whether we need a pair of future use values, e.g., for VoIP wireline and wireless. After discussion, it was agreed that there will now be a SP Type 4, 5, and 6 with toggles for each value at the region level. To begin using one or more of the values, we will need to set a sunrise date ala NANC 323 for local systems to support the use of the new values. We would need code changes at some point to change the “SP Type” tags. A comment will be added in the FRS that these are for future use.
* The header of the attached document will be changed to “Next Release.”
* NANC 351, SWIM Recovery – It was suggested that BDDs for notifications should result in taking that provider off the SWIM list for those notifications so that if the provider uses SWIM when they come back up, they won’t have to process those same notifications. A requirement will be added to BDD for Notifications Change Order 348 for those providers that support NANC 348 and NANC 351 (SWIM).

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

* Mindi Patterson, NeuStar, described the latest changes to the NANC 323 SPID Migration documents (attached).



* In the Main Flow, Figure 1, Step 1, indicate “past” instead of N/A if the LERG-effective date has passed at the time when the SPID Migration request form is completed.

* Maggie Lee, VeriSign, and Jeff Adrian, Sprint, discussed the updated SP Checklist A discussion ensued on DPCs for WSMS. If SPID A does modifies to delete DPC data because SPID B does not support WSMS, the service will not function for SPID A’s customer after the modify.
* The SP Checklist will list the LNPA Co-Chairs as contacts.

Maggie Lee, VeriSign, and Jeff Adrian will modify the NP Best Practices document and NANC 323 SPID Migration Service Provider Checklist to add the criteria for when to consider the various options for SPID correction selection, similar to the revisions made to PIM 41 in Action Item 1104-06. Gary Sacra will distribute the revised NANC 323 SPID Migration Service Provider Checklist, upon receipt from Jeff Adrian, Sprint, with a request that comments be submitted by a date certain, after which time the Checklist will be placed on the LNPA website. Gary will also add LNPA Co-Chair contact information to the beginning of the Checklist.

**THURSDAY 11/4/04**

Thursday, 11/4/04, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Bob Frasca | AT&T (phone) | Craig Bartell | | Sprint |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian Consortium | Joe Leeper | | Sprint |
| Lonnie Keck | Cingular (phone) | Rob Smith | | Syniverse |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | Cingular | Darren Paffenroth | | Syniverse |
| Elton Allen | Cingular | Jason Kempson | | Telcordia |
| Steve Farnsworth | Evolving Systems | Michael Xu | | Tekelec (phone) |
| Jean Anthony | Evolving Systems | Martha Wolf | | Tekelec |
| Deborah Friedel | Focal Communication | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Rick McClaussin | Level 3 | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile |
| Jason Lee | MCI (phone) | Ginny Cashbaugh | | US Cellular |
| Mindi Patterson | NeuStar (phone) | Brian Foster | | US Cellular |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| Dave Garner | Qwest | Nancy Davies | | Verizon (phone) |
| Charles Ryburn | SBC (phone) | Sara Hooker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Tim Waters | SNET | Deborah Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

Release 3.3 M&P Impact Analysis Discussion: (NeuStar):



* Mindi Patterson, NeuStar, led the group in a discussion of the attached draft M&Ps for NPAC Release 3.3.
* The analysis is designed to answer the question – do we have any operationally heavy M&Ps.
* Mindi stated that there doesn’t appear to be any M&Ps in the class of NANC 323 in terms of operational impact. The analysis reflects three categories of M&P impact:
* Basic Changes to Existing M&Ps
* No M&P Impact
* New M&P definition
* Also included were high-level draft outline M&Ps for ILL 130, NANC 227/254, and NANC 300.
* M&Ps will be on the agenda for next month.

Functionality Sunset Policy:

* The group reviewed the attached list of potential sunsettable functionality (discussion notes are in red text).



* It was agreed that the LNPA needs to assess the impact to NPAC and local systems for sunsetting a particular functionality.
* LNPA Members are to review the list of potential “sunsettable” NANC Change Orders for discussion at the December LNPA meeting.

November NANC Report:

* Due to the change in the November NANC meeting date to 11/4/04, which is a day when the LNPA also met, Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, submitted a written report to the November NANC based on the October LNPA meeting, and did not present the report to NANC in person. Attached is the submitted report.



Review of October Action Items:



* Item 1004-01: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1004-02: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1004-03: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1004-04: This item remains Open.
* Item 1004-05: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1004-06: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1004-07: This item remains Open.
* Item 1004-08: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1004-09: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1004-10: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1004-11: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1004-12: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1004-13: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1004-14: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1004-15: This item remains Open until the December 2004 meeting.
* Item 1004-16: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1004-17: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1004-18: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1004-19: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1004-20: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1004-21: This item remains Open until the December 2004 meeting.
* Item 1004-22: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1004-23: This item remains Open.
* Item 1004-24: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1004-25: This item has been completed and is Closed.

Action Items Remaining Open from Previous Meetings:

* Item 0304-07: Item remains Open. Discussions were deferred until the December LNPA meeting.
* Item 0604-09: Item remains Open. PIMs and Meeting Minutes have been uploaded. The PIM matrix must also be updated.
* Item 0804-04: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0804-20: Item remains Open. Rob Smith, Syniverse, will take another sampling to see if fallout rate has improved.
* Item 0804-21: Item remains Open. Rob Smith, Syniverse, will take another sampling to see if fallout rate has improved.
* 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.
* Item 0904-04: Item remains Open.
* Item 0904-09: Item remains Open.
* Item 0904-11: Item remains Open.
* Item 0904-15: Verizon stated that they do not have an issue with performing SPID migrations during the extended maintenance window. Sprint stated that they do not want to restrict when we can or cannot do a migration. Item remains Open and will be on the agenda of the December LNPA for discussion.
* Item 0904-16: This item has been completed and is Closed.

New Business:

* NeuStar related a request from an NPAC user that the IVR information be made available via a web-based access. The IVR provides service provider name and emergency contact number for a ported number. NeuStar will contact user to let them know they are to contact the LNPA Co-Chairs if they want this item on next month’s agenda. The user must be there to present their request.

***Next Meeting …******December 7-9, 2004, Overland Park, Kansas – Hosted by VeriSign***