LNPA WORKING GROUP

November 2005 Meeting

Final Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Atlanta, Georgia | Host: Cingular |

**TUESDAY 11/15/05**

Tuesday, 11/15/05, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Cheryl Gordon | Alltel (phone) | David Taylor | | SBC |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T (phone) | Leah Luper | | SBC (phone) |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Kelli Gracy | | SNET (phone) |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Chris Smith | | Sprint/Nextel (phone) |
| Renee Dillon | Cingular | Lavinia Rotaru | | Sprint/Nextel |
| Michelle Gwaltney | Cingular | Jim Gamper | | Sprint/Nextel (phone) |
| Adele Johnson | Cingular | Cyndi Jones | | Sprint LTD |
| Lonnie Keck | Cingular (phone) | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint/Nextel |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox | Michael Klappa | | Sprint/Nextel (phone) |
| Suzanne Howard | Cox | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint/Nextel (phone) |
| Dennis Robins | Electric Lightwave (phone) | Steve Moore | | Sprint LTD |
| Jean Anthony | Evolving Systems | Rob Smith | | Syniverse |
| Therese Mooney | Global Crossing (phone) | Darren Paffenroth | | Syniverse |
| Jamie Sharpe | ITC DeltaCom | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec (phone) |
| Jason Lee | MCI | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Alisha Truxell | | Telcove (phone) |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Kevin Greenwood | | Telcove (phone) |
| Dara Sedano | NeuStar Pooling (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile (phone) |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Chris Elijah | | VeriSign |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Nancy Davies | | Verizon (phone) |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Pamela Connell | NeuStar | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| Mike Panis | NeuStar | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Dave Garner | Qwest |  | |  |
| Kathy McGinn | Rural Cellular Corp. (phone) |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

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

**MEETING MINUTES:**

2005 Meeting Schedule:

Following is the meeting schedule for the 2005 LNPA Meetings.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 |  | 13-14th | T-Mobile | Seattle |
| October |  | Week of 22nd | 18-19th | Sprint/Nextel | Ft. Lauderdale |
| November | 30th |  | 15-16th | Cingular | Atlanta |
| December |  |  | 6-7th | Evolving Systems | Denver |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

10/05 Minutes Review:

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

* Page 12, 3rd bullet under the heading Compliance to LRN Assignment Practices, change to read, “Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will send out a proposed revision tonight to the contribution attached above for discussion on Wednesday.”
* Page 12, 4th bullet under the heading Compliance to LRN Assignment Practices, change to read, “A participant asked if there are any restrictions on how many LRNs per switch can be opened in the LERG. Adam Newman, Telcordia, responded that there are no edits for this. There is an edit in BIRRDS that requires the OCN associated with the LRN to match the OCN of the NXX holder.”
* Page 12, 1st bullet under the heading VoIP Provider Participation in LNPA, change to read, “Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, reported that NANC, upon hearing that the LNPA was considering drafting a letter to VoIP providers encouraging their participation at the LNPA, requested at their September meeting that the LNPA develop a letter to be sent to the associations that sit on NANC.”
* Page 13, 4th bullet under the heading Evidence of Authorization Issue, change to read, “Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will send out a revised Position Paper tonight that includes the CSR issue for the group to review and discuss on Wednesday.”
* Page 14, bullet for SPID Migration M&P Update, change Items 1 and 2 under Action Item 0905-03 to read:

“NeuStar will modify the SPID migration M&P to:

1. allow the SP the alternative to indicate that the LERG-effective date is anticipated, and,
2. reflect in the NPAC SPID Migration calendar the LNPA’s agreed-upon new limits on the number of migrations that can be supported during a maintenance window, i.e., 7 per region and 25 nationally (pending LLC approval).”

* Page 17, heading Evidence of Authorization Issue, change to reflect that the discussion was continued from Tuesday.
* Page 17, heading Compliance to LRN Assignment Practices, change to reflect that the discussion was continued from Tuesday.
* Page 19, NANC 401 Discussion, change bullet to read, “Since NANC 400 is still undecided at this time, the group agreed not to discuss the NANC 401 requirements until NANC 400 is considered for inclusion in the NPAC. NANC 401 is not needed until if and when NANC 400 is put into the NPAC and activated.”
* Page 21, change 2nd bullet to read, “The LNPA agreed to form a Disaster Preparedness Subteam to assess the technical and/or operational details regarding the relaxation of the LRN LATA Edit in Southeast and Southwest NPAC Regions.”

Inter-modal Subcommittee (ISC) (formerly Inter-species Task Force [ITF]) Update and Inter-modal Port Issues referred to OBF (Lonnie Keck, Cingular Wireless and OBF Wireless Committee Co-Chair, Rob Smith, Syniverse, and Steve Moore, Sprint):

# Wireless Committee:

* At OBF 92, the Wireless Committee accepted 4 new issues related to WICIS 3.0 clean-up.
* Issue 2970 – NPDI field modifications for VOIP for Inter-modal porting - was introduced and accepted. A communiqué was drafted and sent to NENA asking to clarify VPC vs. E911 approaches when the port is from a VoIP to a wireless service provider. It also asked for clarification of NPDI descriptors. This is Issue 2953 in LSOP.
* In WICIS 3.0, a broadcast message within the interface that may not be as useful as once thought is being looked at.
* Issue 2847 – The 4.0 release of the WICIS interface, or the next release after that, is being considered for possible support of XML protocol. The sunrise date for 4.0 is 4/15/07 and the sunset of 3.0 will be 10/7/07 or 10/14/07.
* Issue 2753 – Wireless FAX form for porting from wireless to wireline – is in Initial Closure and will move to Final Closure 21 days from posting to the ATIS website on Friday, November 11th. The form does not have SSN or Tax ID fields.
* On wireless to wireless ports, wireless carriers requiring SSN are being encouraged to begin validating on last 4 digits only of SSN.

# Inter-modal Subcommittee (ISC) (formerly Inter-species Task Force (ITF):

* The ISC is continuing work on Issue 2943 – Minimum Data Exchange.

LSOP Committee:

* The LSOP Committee is continuing activity on critical data for Issue 2943 – Minimum Data Exchange. The Committee is identifying any data elements that are not necessary. This will be fed into the ISC work on Issue 2943.
* Issue 2915 – SSN field. The SSN field and Tax ID field are being removed from the LSR with Release 13 of LSOG. The issue was moved to Initial Closure and will move to Final Closure 21 days from posting on Friday, November 11th.
* Issue 2953 – LSOG: NPDI field modifications for VoIP Inter-modal Porting: The work has been completed on this issue and it is now in Pending Initial Closure, pending a response from NENA on their review. On wireline to wireline ports, if the “End User Moving” field is marked yes, the 911 record is deleted. If marked no, it is just unlocked for migration. This has been sent to NENA.
* Issue 2951 – Enhancement to the Local Service Migration Guidelines (LSMG)-Issue 3. This issue will address Wireline Data Services Migrations relative to Line Share, Line Split, etc.



* Issue 2952 – LSMG: Enhancement to the Local Service Migration Guidelines (LSMG)-Issue 4. This issue will address Wireline to VoIP, VoIP to Wireline, Wireless to VoIP and VoIP to Wireless, etc. As appropriate, the issue will be worked in the OBF Inter-modal Sub Committee (ISC).



IP-NNI (IP Network to Network Interface) Forum:

* The OBF has created a new forum, called the IP-NNI (IP Network to Network Interface) Forum. The group will ensure industry groups such as TMOC, PTSC, and NIIF are not addressing the same issues. It is a full OBF Committee.
* The IP-NNI’s Mission is as follows:

“The Internet Protocol Network-to-Network Interface (IP-NNI) Committee is charged with developing standards and processes related to accounting and settlements between suppliers and partners for use of the packet-based network and associated service elements, as well as analyzing and identifying issues associated with IP-NNI service establishment functions. Related international standards work and regulatory activity in the IP environment will also be addressed. Packet-based services may include VoIP, Wi-Fi Roaming, IPTV and various multimedia services. Liaisons with other internal and external SDOs will be established to facilitate committee work.”

* The IP-NNI is holding virtual meetings.
* The IP-NNI is working an issue related to developing a billing medium for Internet usage.

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

* Jean Anthony, Evolving Systems, reported that a conference call was held on October 21st. Seven companies (5 providers and 2 vendors) participated.
* VeriSign and NeuStar have completed their testing.
* An issue was reported on the due date and time change testing. There is no known testing environment for end-to-end testing of an inter-modal port. This scenario could not be tested end-to-end. This was tested successfully in part with simulators.
* One provider has gone live with 3.0 with no problems to date.
* The next call is scheduled for 11/21/05 at 3pm Eastern. Logistics are on the website.

INC Issues Update (Adam Newman, Telcordia and INC Vice Chair):

* INC Issue 484 – Removal of unnecessary SVs from NPAC:



**Agreement Reached:**

It was agreed to place Issue 484, Update TBPAG Section 8.3.7 for Removal of Unnecessary SVs from NPAC, into Initial Closure with the following Resolution Statement. The issue will go to Final Closure on 11/25/05 if no substantive changes.

The following underlined text was added to the end of TBPAG Section 8.3.7:

8.3.7 When a contaminated thousands-block is allocated, the PA will notify the thousands-block applicant that the allocated thousands-block(s) is contaminated. The thousands-block applicant is responsible for obtaining a list from the LNP data bases of unavailable TNs within the contaminated thousands-block that are not available for the thousands-block applicant's use. When the thousands-block is being allocated back to the donating switch that also is the LERG Assignee, if the block contains contaminated TNs and has the same network data [e.g., switch identified by the LRN and Destination Point Code (DPC) data] as the thousands-block, the SP should remove those unnecessary individual intra-service provider ports from the NPAC.

* INC Issue 477 – NPAC Block Effective Dates for Activations, Modifications, and Disconnects



**Agreement Reached:**

A new section 2.15 was added to the TBPAG, as well as a modification to section 12.1:

* 1. The NPAC broadcast rates for activations, disconnects and modifications are set to these specified limits to accommodate service provider system thresholds. The NPAC can process a maximum of 72 block activations and disconnects per NPAC region per weekday and a maximum of 144 block activations and disconnects per NPAC region per Saturdays/holidays. The first Sunday of the month the NPAC can process a maximum of 96 block activations and disconnects per NPAC region. For all other Sundays the NPAC can process a maximum of 108 block activations and disconnects per NPAC region. Therefore, if the NPAC is unable to meet the effective date established on the Part 1B – NPAC Block Holder Data form for block activations or the NPAC Thousands-Block Reclamation form, Part 5 for block disconnects, the NPAC will notify the SP and PA of the new effective date.

For block modifications, the NPAC can process a maximum of 48 block modifications per NPAC region per weekday. No block modifications are processed by the NPAC during weekends/holidays. If the block modification effective date falls on a weekend or holiday it will be processed by NPAC on the closest business day.

Section 12.1

12.1 Option 1-PA

SP initiates intra SP block porting request (port type of "pool") by filling out the Part 1B form and submits request to the Pooling Administrator.

1. PA checks the form to make sure it has been filled out completely. In a pooling area for non-pooled NXXs when the pooling indicator is set to N, the PA will change the indicator to I. In a non-pooling NPA, the PA will not be responsible for making any LERG changes. If requested, the PA updates the BCD screen with the switch ID. The PA checks to see whether the block has been donated to the pool. If the block has been donated to the pool, the PA will deny the request. The PA will update the tracking database if necessary.
2. PA sends the Part 3 form to the SP.
3. PA forwards the completed Part 1B form to the NPAC.
4. If the NPAC is unable to meet the effective date indicated on the Part 1B the NPAC will notify the SP and PA of the new effective date..
5. NPAC builds block table for pooled and non-pooled NXXs.
6. On effective date NPAC downloads designated block with a port type of “pool”.
7. NPAC completes the Part 1B form reflecting completion.
8. NPAC forwards the completed Part 1B form to the SP and PA.

* Issue 468 – Remove TBPAG Appendix 7 and Modify COCAG Appendix C for Pooled NXX Returns



**Agreement Reached:**

See attached Issue 468. Issue will go to Final Closure on 11/25/05 if no substantive changes.

PIM Discussion:

* PIM 22 – PIM 22 remains open in a tracking state awaiting implementation of NANC Change Order 375, which is included in NPAC Release 3.3.

 

* 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 are 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.

On May 4th, the Pool Administrator (PA) submitted the attached PA Change Order 41 for a one-time scrub of all 1K blocks currently in the pools. The NOWG supports PA Change Order 41.



Prior to the July 2005 LNPA meeting, the INC sent the attached liaison to the LNPA regarding PIM 24.



The INC asked the PA to conduct an informal survey among its administrators to assess the types and numbers of misidentified blocks. The PA will also assess whether the mistakes were accidental errors, or if there was any willful disregard of the processes.

At the November LNPA meeting, the Pool Administrator (PA) reported that there has been no word yet from the FCC on the one-time scrub (PA Change Order 41). A second round of contacts was made with providers on codes that are not opened in NPAC. 35 codes remain unopened in NPAC. The PA will contact the FCC in December with a list of codes that remain unopened in NPAC, notifying the FCC that these will be removed from the pooling inventory.

The PIM will remain open while the LNPA awaits the results of the scrub.

* 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.

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.



PIM 32 is now being worked through wireline providers’ Account Management processes. Syniverse has initiated this contact with the ILECs. Syniverse will continue to work through these channels.

Action Item 1005-10: Related to Action Item 1005-14, Rob Smith, Syniverse, will:

1. identify the average time it takes to complete an inter-modal port,
2. identify the average time it takes to complete an inter-modal port of a reseller number,
3. identify the % of inter-modal ports resulting in “CSR Too Large,”
4. identify the average time it takes to complete a “CSR Too Large” port.

For No. 1, Rob Smith reported that inter-modal ports account for less than 5% of all porting activity for wireless carriers. Of that, less than 5% fall out due to the reseller issue. Where there is no fallout, the time to receive an FOC is 10-15 minutes. For No. 3, he reported that 5% of inter-modal ports fall out due to CSR Too Large. This Action Item will remain open for Nos. 2 and 4.

Action Item 1005-14: Related to the attached PIMs 32, 42, and 50, Wireless Service Providers are to:

1. identify what % of their ports are inter-modal,
2. identify what % of No. 1 are ports of reseller numbers,
3. identify what % of intermodal ports result in fallout,
4. identify what % of No. 3 fall out for ports of reseller numbers.

* Cingular stated that identifying the BTN on the ILEC’s GUI works for them. Their inter-modal process is manual. They typically receive the FOC in 10-15 minutes. They use to have a 30% cancel rate on inter-modal ports. This has been cut in half.
* Sprint/Nextel reported that 2-3% of their ports are inter-modal and upwards of 40% - 50% of these reject. 50% of these rejects are due to the reseller issue. One large ILEC does not edit for reseller and their confirmation rate is 30% higher. 20-23% of overall fallout is associated with inter-modal ports.
* Verizon Wireless stated that they have not experienced as much reseller porting. Cingular stated likewise.
* A discussion then ensued on Options A and B in the NANC flows. It was stated that the step where the Old SP requests the CSR from the reseller is consistent with NANC and OBF flows. It was also stated that modifying the NANC flows to Option A will not address the PIM 32 issue.
* A wireline CLEC participant stated that they feel this is unnecessary delay, and encouraged review of FCC 99-223, Paragraph 85, on CPNI.
* T-Mobile reported a 20% discrepancy on customer cancels between wireless intra-modal ports and wireline inter-modal ports.
* A wireless participant proposed a minority report be sent to NANC for possibly the January or March 2006 meeting.
* Action Item 1005-14 is closed.

Regarding the attached PIM 32 on porting reseller numbers, Service Providers are to quantify the average time required to work a port that falls out due to this issue.

PIM will stay open to complete action items to quantify the issue.

* 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 is 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 often more than one region that is correct for an LRN. 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 is 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 42 – This PIM, submitted by Syniverse, seeks to review the wireline requirement for certain fields on the LSR.



PIM 42 is being worked through wireline companies’ Account Management process. It is also tracking awaiting the outcome of Issue 2943 in the OBF. PIM 42 to stay open awaiting feedback from Change Control/Account Management efforts.

See readout for PIM 32 for Action Items related to PIM 42.

* 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.



PIM 44 is tracking awaiting the outcome of Issue 2943 in the OBF. See attached liaison letter from the OBF on Issue 2943. Action Item 0605-16 is still open.



* PIM 50 – This PIM, submitted by Syniverse, seeks to address instances where

wireline to wireless ports fail the automated process because they are from large accounts where the Customer Service Record (CSR) is too large to return on a CSR query.



Wireless Service Providers are working change control efforts for PIM 50 through their appropriate wireline Account Management teams.

Action Item 1005-10: Rob Smith, Syniverse, reported that 5% of inter-modal ports fall out due to CSR Too Large. There are workarounds to reduce this over time.

Sprint/Nextel reported that 20% of inter-modal rejects are due to CSR Too Large.

See readout for PIM 32 for Action Items related to PIM 50. PIM 50 will stay open to complete action items to quantify the issue.

* PIM 51 – This PIM, submitted by Nextel, seeks the prevention of NXX codes being opened to portability in NPAC by the incorrect provider.



PIM 51 remains open awaiting January and July 2006 readouts from NeuStar.

NP Best Practices Format Discussion (Frank Reed, T-Mobile):

Action Item 1005-11: LNPA Participants are to review the revised LNPA NP Best Practices document on the LNPA website and come to the November LNPA meeting prepared to discuss. The link to the document will be distributed prior to the November meeting.

The following HTML link was established: http://www.npac.com/cmas/LNPA/index.htm

* Comments from the group indicated that the document looks very good.
* Any updates to the Best Practices document will be sent to Frank Reed, T-Mobile, who will create an HTML version and send to NeuStar for uploading to the website.
* Action Item 1005-11 was closed.

Porting of 10K TNs in an NXX code (David Taylor, SBC):

**Action Item 0905-12**: At the September 2005 LNPA meeting, David Taylor, SBC, reported observing that a service provider opened 5 NXX codes in NPAC over the course of two days and almost immediately ported thousands of numbers to the LRN of the same switch that the NXX codes were assigned to in the LERG. David will contact that carrier to determine why this was done and report to the LNPA at the October meeting.

* At the November meeting, David Taylor reported that he had not yet received an answer from the carrier that ported all numbers in an NXX code that they had just opened. This issue will be taken off the LNPA agenda. SBC will continue to work with the other carrier to obtain an explanation. If need be, the issue will be brought back to the LNPA as New Business. Action Item 0905-12 is closed.

VoIP Provider Participation in LNPA:

Action Item 1005-04: Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, and Ron Steen, BellSouth, will develop a letter to be sent to NANC and the VoN encouraging VoIP provider participation in the LNPA WG.

* Gary Sacra and Ron Steen presented the attached draft letter.



* The group reviewed the draft letter and made minor revisions.
* Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will send the attached final letter encouraging participation in the LNPA WG, to Paula Jordan, LNPA Co-Chair, for distribution to the VoN, and he will send it to the NANC for distribution to its members, including the associations that sit on the NANC.

****

Disaster Preparedness Subteam Readout (Ron Steen, BellSouth/Jeff Adrian, Sprint/Nextel):

* Ron Steen, BellSouth, and Jeff Adrian, Sprint/Nextel, presented the attached draft

*Interim Report on Out of LATA Porting & Pooling For Disaster Relief After Hurricane Katrina*



* The group made revisions and Ron Steen agreed to make the recommended changes for final review on Wednesday.

LNPA Voting Rights:

Action Item 1005-08: Gary Sacra and Paula Jordan, LNPA Co-Chairs, will contact NANC Chairman Bob Atkinson to discuss voting rights at the LNPA WG.

* Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, read Chairman Atkinson’s e-mail response indicating that he felt that the LNPA had the authority to make an initial decision on whether or not wireless carriers who are affiliated with wireline carriers should have a separate and equal vote in the LNPA. This decision would then be brought to the NANC for further guidance.
* The group then discussed how to fractionalize this within the LNPA – wireline and wireless?
* A wireless participant stated that not giving these large wireless carriers a separate vote results in a large segment of the end user population not being represented.
* The LNPA will report to NANC that if we reach consensus on allowing wireless entities to have a separate vote, we will determine how to make the fractionalization and define a separate entity for voting. Service Providers are to submit contributions and/or come prepared to the December 2005 LNPA meeting to discuss how to define a separate entity for voting purposes in the LNPA WG. This will be part of the NANC report in November to seek guidance.

2006 Meeting Schedule:

Following is the meeting schedule for the 2006 LNPA Meetings.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MONTH/**  **DATE**  **(2006)** | NANC | LNPA-WG | HOST | LOCATION |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| January | 24th | 10th-11th | Syniverse | Tampa, Florida |
| February | No meeting | No meeting.  2/8/06 reserved for call, if necessary. |  |  |
| March | 14th | 7th-8th  9th is tentative date for X-Regional | NeuStar | TBD |
| April | No meeting | No meeting.  4/12/06 reserved for call, if necessary. |  |  |
| May | 16th | 9th-10th | Sprint/Nextel | Overland Park, Kansas |
| June | No meeting | No meeting.  6/14/06 reserved for call, if necessary. |  |  |
| July | 18th | 11th-12th | Canadian Consortium | Edmonton |
| August | No meeting | No meeting.  8/9/06 reserved for call, if necessary. |  |  |
| September | 19th | 12th-13th | Verizon | TBD |
| October | No meeting | No meeting.  10/11/06 reserved for call, if necessary. |  |  |
| November | 30th | 7th-8th | SBC | St. Louis, Missouri |
| December | No meeting | No meeting.  12/6/06 reserved for call, if necessary. |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

* Continuing evaluation during 2006 will determine if interim conference calls are needed or if the decision to meet face-to-face every other month should be revisited.

Compliance to JIP Standards (Gary Sacra, Verizon):

Action Item 1005-13: Service Providers are to review the attached Verizon contribution on compliance to Jurisdictional information Parameter (JIP) and come to the November LNPA meeting prepared to discuss.



* Gary Sacra, Verizon, teed up the discussion on Verizon’s proposal to include JIP standards in the LNPA’s NP Best Practices document. He also presented the attached liaison from the NIIF, proposing inclusion of NIIF guidelines related to JIP.

****

* Gary Sacra, Verizon, will revise the attached contribution on Jurisdiction Information Parameter (JIP) to include the attached NIIF Guidelines, and to make it consistent with the NIIF Guidelines in that the JIP is to be sent where technically feasible. This will be discussed at the December LNPA meeting.

**WEDNESDAY 11/16/05**

Wednesday, 11/16/05, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Cheryl Gordon | Alltel (phone) | Mike Panis | | NeuStar |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Dave Garner | | Qwest |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | David Taylor | | SBC |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian Consortium (phone) | Kelli Gracy | | SNET (phone) |
| Renee Dillon | Cingular | Lavinia Rotaru | | Sprint/Nextel |
| Michelle Gwaltney | Cingular | Cyndi Jones | | Sprint LTD |
| Adele Johnson | Cingular | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint/Nextel |
| John Hicks | Cingular (phone) | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint/Nextel (phone) |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox | Steve Moore | | Sprint LTD |
| Dennis Robins | Electric Lightwave (phone) | Rob Smith | | Syniverse |
| Jean Anthony | Evolving Systems | Darren Paffenroth | | Syniverse |
| Therese Mooney | Global Crossing (phone) | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec (phone) |
| Jason Lee | MCI | Pat White | | Telcordia (phone) |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Alisha Truxell | | Telcove (phone) |
| Mindi Patterson | NeuStar (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

Disaster Preparedness Subteam Readout (Ron Steen, BellSouth/Jeff Adrian, Sprint/Nextel) DISCUSSION CONTINUED FROM TUESDAY:

* Ron Steen, BellSouth, presented the attached v7 of the Report, which incorporated the suggested revisions from the previous day.



* The group made minor additional revisions and approved the document. Attached is the final approved Report.

****

* Gary Sacra and Paula Jordan, LNPA Co-Chairs, will discuss the next steps for the attached *Interim Report on Out of LATA Porting and Pooling for Disaster Relief* with the NAPM LLC Co-Chairs.

Automation of SPID Migration (Frank Reed, T-Mobile):

Action Item 1005-03: Frank Reed, T-Mobile, will develop a NANC Change Order proposing automation of the NANC 323 SPID Migration process for discussion at the November LNPA meeting.



* The attached proposed Change Order, developed and submitted by Frank Reed, T-Mobile, was teed up by NeuStar.
* Some providers expressed interest in automating pulling the SMURF files from the FTP site.
* One provider participant expressed concern about the cost benefit of this Change Order. They suggested reconsidering the current practice of waiting to create the final files until the beginning of the maintenance window. NeuStar responded that a provider could delete an NPA-NXX in the system up until the beginning of the window and the SMURF files could then fail.
* NeuStar said that it might be possible to automate the process of generating the SMURF files in NPAC so that they are available earlier at the beginning of the window.
* There was positive feedback from some providers regarding on-line scheduling.
* Another provider participant suggested establishing rules for edits for automation of post-migration cleanup.
* The rush to clear out the pending-like SVs has been an issue for some providers. A provider suggested a site that providers could go to identify the pending-like SVs, instead of the current e-mail notification from NPAC operations. Another provider suggested an auto-cancel function at NPAC after some identified point in time with a list provided to the provider of what was cancelled so they can recreate them later.
* A provider said that internal feedback indicated a desire to explore ways to automate the process so that files are available sooner at the beginning of the window and notification when files are available.
* Another provider said their IT folks want automation of the process to save time and labor effort.
* A question was asked if a count of SVs could be generated post migration by NPAC to validate against, and if a discrepancy exists, a list of affected TNs in order to identify which ones were not modified.
* Enhancing the interface would be a substantial amount of work. SPID is not modifiable from a pure CMIP interface standpoint. Some local systems currently would not support changing the SPID over the interface. Other systems would support SPID as a modifiable attribute over the interface.
* The group agreed that NeuStar should explore automation to provide the files sooner, notification when they are available, and post-migration reporting for validation.
* Further discussion will be on the December meeting agenda for 1 hour. Service Providers are to come to the December 2005 meeting prepared to discuss what steps, if any, they have taken to automate the SPID Migration process in their local systems.

SOW 34 Test Bed Upgrade Scheduling:

* The group discussed a proposal to schedule the SOW 34 test bed upgrade to Release 3.3 and subsequent new releases at the front end of the production load schedule as opposed to the end of the schedule.
* There were no U.S. service provider objections to pulling up the 3.3 upgrade to 2/26/06. The Canadian Consortium stated that Canada has not made a decision yet on going to 3.3 so they prefer keeping the test bed upgrade in the last slot. A provider is planning to do 3.2 testing in March 2006.
* Question asked – what would we do if we have a problem with 3.2 and need to test and the test bed has already been upgraded to 3.3? A provider responded that they would test with their NPAC simulator.
* It was then asked if we could revert back to 3.2 if it was needed for testing. NeuStar stated that this would require twice the database size to maintain both releases.
* Marian Hearn, Canadian Consortium, will determine if Canadian Service Providers can support a 2/26/06 or 3/26/06 load date for Release 3.3 in the SOW 34 test bed.
* A provider asked if the decision had been made to migrate the test data to the 3.3 environment. NeuStar responded yes.
* Another provider expressed concern if we had to roll back to 3.2 in production and we had already upgraded the test bed to 3.3. NeuStar responded we would also roll back the test bed to 3.2.

PAETEC Porting Issue:



* Steve Turner, representing PAETEC, a CLEC and long distance provider, presented the attached issue.
* A customer, currently with another provider, has a Remote Call Forwarding (RCF) arrangement where their number, associated with Rate Center 1, is forwarded to a number in Rate Center 2. This allowed the customer to physically move from Rate Center 1 to a location in Rate Center 2, while with this provider, and retain their number for terminating calls. The customer now wants to be served by PAETEC and port their RCF’d number, the one associated with Rate Center 1, to PAETEC. The current provider serving the customer has refused to port the number, stating that this is Location Portability (porting outside the Rate Center).
* The consensus of the group was that PAETEC should be allowed to provide the same service, RCF or FX, to this customer as the current provider does. Steve Turner stated that PAETEC would be providing an FX arrangement for this customer. The current provider is either utilizing an RCF or FX arrangement.
* Based on the LNPA’s understanding of this issue during the discussion, the consensus in the room was that the customer should be allowed to port their number to PAETEC in this scenario. The rating characteristics of the number are not changing in this case and it was the view of the group that this is not porting across Rate Center boundaries based on the stated plans of PAETEC to serve this customer.
* Steve Turner will communicate the LNPA’s consensus on this issue to the other provider. If need be, they will reengage the LNPA, possibly jointly.

Unusable Blocks Issue (Jeff Adrian, Sprint/Nextel):

* Jeff Adrian, Sprint/Nextel, teed up the attached issue related to some providers not performing the necessary intra-SP ports on contaminated TNs prior to donating a contaminated block to the pool. This is causing TNs to be double-assigned, as the blockholder does not know that some TNs are already assigned by the codeholder to their customers.



* A discussion then ensued on who should retain the number when double-assigned, the codeholder’s customer or the blockholder’s customer. There were differing opinions on both sides.
* Jeff Adrian proposed a liaison to INC to change their TBPAG guidelines which currently state that the original owner of the number gets to keep their number when a double assignment occurs.
* Service Providers are to come to the December 2005 LNPA meeting prepared to determine if the group will send a liaison to the INC proposing changes to their Thousand Block Pooling Administration Guidelines (TBPAG) per the attached proposed PIM addressing providers failing to perform the necessary intra-SP ports prior to donating a contaminated block to the pool.

Unfinished/New Business:

* Dave Garner, Qwest, reported an issue related to toll fraud on ported numbers. In this scenario, Qwest receives an LSR with a due date 30 days out and they respond with an FOC. Between FOC and due date, a lot of toll charges are run up on the account and the customer fails to pay after they have ported. Dave wants to make everybody aware that this is happening in some instances and asked if anybody has experienced this and developed any solutions? Sprint stated that they prevent these offending customers from porting back to them unless they settle their bill.

Performance Tests in Regression Test Plan:



Action Item 1005-12: Service Providers are to determine if the performance tests in Sections 5 and 6 in the attached Group Service Provider Certification and Regression Test Plan still have any value and come prepared to the November LNPA meeting to decide whether they should stay in the plan or be deleted.

* There were no objections to deleting these test cases in the Test Plan. NeuStar will update the Test Plan accordingly.

Change Management (NeuStar):



* NeuStar stated that this version of the Change Order document contains the Auto SPID Migration Change Order and some new Doc Only changes.
* A local system vendor stated that at some point we need to go through the formality of accepting these Change Orders. This will be on the December meeting agenda.

November LNPA Report to NANC (Gary Sacra and Paula Jordan, LNPA Co-Chairs):

* The group agreed that the November report to NANC will include readouts of:
  + NPAC Release 3.3
  + Relaxation of LRN LATA ID edits in Southeast and Southwest Region NPACs
  + Evidence of Authorization Issue
  + LNPA Voting Rights Discussion
  + Encouragement of Provider Participation in LNPA
  + Open PIM Updates

Review of October Action Items:



* Item 1005-01: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1005-02: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1005-03: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1005-04: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1005-05: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1005-06: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1005-07: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1005-08: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1005-09: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1005-10: In response to item No. 1 in the Action Item, Rob Smith, Syniverse, reported that when there is no fallout on inter-modal ports, the time to receive the FOC is 10-15 minutes. For No. 3, he reported that 5% of inter-modal ports fall out due to CSR Too Large. This Action Item will remain open for Nos. 2 and 4.
* Item 1005-11: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1005-12: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1005-13: This item remains Open. It was agreed that Gary Sacra, Verizon, will revise the contribution on Jurisdiction Information Parameter (JIP) to include the attached NIIF Guidelines, and to make it consistent with the NIIF Guidelines in that the JIP is to be sent where technically feasible (see Action Item 1105-03). Service Providers are to review the revised version for discussion at the December LNPA meeting.

* Item 1005-14: This item has been completed and is Closed.

Action Items Remaining Open from Previous Meetings:

* Item 0904-09: This item has been Closed.
* Item 0205-04: This item is ongoing and remains Open.
* Item 0605-16: This item remains Open.
* Item 0605-22: This item remains Open.
* Item 0705-17: This item has been Closed.
* Item 0905-12: This item has been Closed.

***Next LNPA Meeting …******December 6-7, 2005, Denver, Colorado – Hosted by Evolving***

***Systems***