LNPA WORKING GROUP

February 2004 Meeting

Final Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Tampa, Florida | Host: TSI |

**TUESDAY 2/3/04**

Tuesday, 2/3/04, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Charlie Case | Alltel (phone) | Rosemary Emmer | | Nextel |
| Cheryl Gordon | Alltel (phone) | Alain Richard | | Qwest Wireless |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T | Dave Garner | | Qwest |
| Jeanne Kulesa | AT&T (phone) | Charles Ryburn | | SBC (phone) |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | ATTWS | Leah Luper | | SBC |
| Sean Hawkins | ATTWS (phone) | Craig Bartell | | Sprint |
| Lonnie Keck | ATTWS | Rick Dressner | | Sprint PCS |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint PCS (phone) |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint PCS) |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LLC | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec (phone) |
| Mark Wood | Cingular | John Malyar | | Telcordia |
| Teresa Patton | Cingular | Jean Anthony | | Telecom Software |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox | Dan Deneweth | | Telecom Software |
| Laurie Itkin | Cricket Communications | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Dennis Robins | Electric Lightwave (phone) | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile |
| Keagan O’Rourke | Evolving Systems | Rob Smith | | TSI |
| Scott Wagner | Intrado | Stan Haney | | US Cellular |
| Jeff Harmon | (phone) | David Murphy | | US Cellular |
| Jason Lee | MCI (phone) | Brian Foster | | US Cellular |
| Karen Mulberry | MCI (phone) | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign (phone) |
| Rick Jones | NENA | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
|  |  | Earl Scott | | Verizon |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Julie Groenen | | Verizon Wireless (phone) |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Deborah Stephens | | Verizon Wireless |
| Shannon Collins | NeuStar (phone) | Anne Hoskins | | Verizon Wireless (phone) |
| Larry Vagnoni | NeuStar | Chris Duckett-Brown | | Verizon Wireless (phone) |
| Darius Irani | NeuStar | Keft McCullough | | Verizon Wireless (phone) |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Blaine Reeve | | Western Wireless Corp. |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar |  | |  |
| Mindi Patterson | NeuStar |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

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

**MEETING MINUTES:**

2004 Meeting Schedule:

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

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

01/04 Minutes Review:

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

* NOTE: Due to the limited time allowed to review the DRAFT January 2004 LNPA Minutes, they were left in DRAFT status during the February LNPA meeting and will be finalized at the March LNPA meeting. Following are the changes agreed to at the February LNPA meeting.
* Page 7, 2nd bullet under Port Protection Change Order 382 Discussion – clarify that the LNPA group agreed that the policy questions should not be taken outside of the LNPA at this time.
* Page 10, 3rd bullet under NPAC Architecture – The current plan is to implement the migration in production during 2Q04.
* Page 10, 5th bullet under NPAC Architecture – Currently, NPAC uses a Sun E10K (1 Region per Domain) as its database server.
* Page 13, 1st bullet under Recovery of Contaminated Codes – change to read:

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

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

* The WNPO has developed a new issue contribution form with a new field for the Issue Number. The attached form will be placed on the website.



* The NANC Issue Management Group (IMG) is still discussing the inter-modal porting interval. There is no resolution date set at this time.
* NeuStar reported that there has been no significant increase in calls to the Help Desk since 11/24/03. NeuStar is proposing a return to the normal Saturday and Sunday Help Desk support hours (see attached). This proposal must go to the NAPM LLC.



* Ordering & Billing Forum (OBF) Wireless Workshop – A critical item currently under discussion in that group is the scope and timeline of the WICIS 3.0 release.
* Wireless Testing Subcommittee (WTSC) – Julie Groenen, Verizon Wireless, is the temporary Co-Chair of that group. The WTSC meets every Thursday by conference call for one hour at 11am Eastern. The group is developing a letter reaching out to small wireless carriers for meeting participation, company contacts, testing participation, etc.
* Fallout Reduction Taskforce (FORT) – Jen Goree, Alltel, has resigned as Co-Chair of the FORT. There are 7 open issues that the FORT is currently working. They are posted on the website.
* Wireless porting volumes – NeuStar was not granted permission by the LLC to publicize wireless to wireless porting volumes. This issue is closed in the WNPO.
* WNPO discussion on combining the WNPO and LNPA groups – The WNPO will propose the following to the LNPA:
* remove redundant topics from the WNPO meeting agenda that are also discussed in the LNPA, e.g. PIMs, NPAC Forecasting Group (NFG), etc.,
* move inter-modal issues to the LNPA (the WNPO wants to reserve the ability to discuss inter-modal issues within the WNPO meeting),
* WNPO would meet all day on Monday of LNPA week starting with the April 2004 meeting, and continue through the July meeting,
* LNPA would meet all day Tuesday and Wednesday of LNPA week starting with the April 2004 meeting, and continue through the July meeting,
* The Architecture Planning Team (APT) will continue to meet on Thursday of LNPA week,
* After this transition phase toward combining the WNPO and LNPA, a review will be conducted at the July 2004 meeting to determine the next steps toward combining the groups.
* The WNPO and WTSC is trying to reach out to non-participating providers in preparation for the rollout of porting outside the top 100 MSAs to take place on May 24, 2004..
* No new issues were reported by the National Emergency Number Association (NENA).
* Paul LaGattuta, AT&T and LNPA Co-Chair, reviewed the current NFG Model (see subsequent presentation given by Paul under NFG Meeting Update).
* The Cellular Telecommunications and Internet Association (CTIA) is gathering data on waivers granted by the FCC to carriers with less than 2% of the nation’s access lines. The CTIA feels that carriers that have already begun porting should not be exempt. The CTIA is holding a forum on 3/17/04 for carriers outside the top 100 MSAs. The FCC might be in attendance.
* The issue of inadvertent ports and conflict timers was again discussed. The WNPO discussed the possibility of expanding the 6 hour Conflict timer. Nextel and Verizon Wireless objected to bringing this issue up again unless data was produced showing a need. Some carriers voiced support for opening up the discussion again.
* AT&T Wireless had previously requested data from wireless carriers on their use of short vs. long NPAC T1 and T2 timers. Only large carriers have sent back a response. This issue has been closed by agreement from AT&T Wireless.
* PIC freeze questionnaire – This questionnaire is being developed by the WNPO to reflect which wireline providers will block or allow a number to port if there is an InterLATA, IntraLATA, or Local Account freeze on the associated line. The WNPO feels that the matrix should be brought to the LNPA before it is sent out to the industry. The WNPO plans to bring this up during the New Business portion of the LNPA meeting. The WNPO feels that long term, wireline carriers should include this information in their trading partner agreements.



* Wireless Port Protection – The WNPO agreed to recommend the following method (Alternative 1 extracted from the attached Port Protection contribution) to remove port protection from a customer’s account:

Provide the customer with a password/pin number they can use to remove the port protection service from their account. The new service provider would then send the password/pin number in the WPR to the old service provider authorizing the removal of the port protection service and the port to the new service provider.



* Bob Jones, US Cellular, has resigned as WNPO Co-Chair due to health reasons. The entire group wishes Bob the very best.
* The FORT team will begin to meet every other week starting 2/13/04. Calls to discuss inter-modal issues that went to the OBF will be scheduled. Wireless carriers will get together on Wednesday, 2/4/04, at 5pm Eastern, to clarify issues. The team will meet again on 2/18/04, at 5pm Eastern, to review OBF action on the issues.

January 2004 Architecture Planning Team (APT) Meeting Report (Jim Rooks – NeuStar):

* The APT met on 01/08/04. Attached is the meeting agenda.



* Performance Requirements:

### The APT is focusing on SOA interface throughput requirements. The APT has an action to determine how much throughput is needed on the SOA interface. Using the SOA Traffic Model in the Northeast Region, if a provider was involved in 50% of the regional volume, the SOA interface requirement for that provider in the Busy Hour would be 12.8 messages per second, including requests. One provider stated that their vendors advised that we should engineer the SOA interface at 150% of the projected Busy Hour message volume. 150% of the 12.5% provider participation spread would be 18.8%, which equates to 4.8 messages per second including requests (sustained). NeuStar will analyze actual porting data to determine a reasonable spread of percent participation in porting activity (i.e. SOA message volume) among service providers in a given region.

* Paul LaGattuta. AT&T and LNPA Co-Chair, reported that December porting actuals have been updated in the NPAC Forecasting Group Model. He further stated that this should not result in dramatic changes to Model. He was asked if we could get more current data input from Wireless providers into the NFG Model in order to develop a realistic projection for 4Q04. The NFG is scheduled to meet again on 1/22/04. This request for data will be promoted in the WNPO. This data would then be used by the APT to further refine SOA interface performance requirements.
* CMIP Interface Improvements/Performance related Change Orders:
* NeuStar presented a summary spreadsheet, sectionalized into categories (e.g. interface performance, recovery benefits, operational benefits, etc.), with a short synopsis of each Change Order, describing the benefits of each and the problem each solves. This represents the Change Orders currently being worked in the APT. NeuStar will add a column in the matrix for priority. The priority of each Change Order will be addressed later after the group considers priority ratings and definitions. This will eventually be used to provide guidance to the LNPA.
* The group reviewed NANC 390, which would provide an immediate acknowledgement from NPAC to a request. A member raised a concern that associating this new acknowledgement with satisfying SLR-3, which requires NPAC to respond within 3 seconds for 95% of responses except for miscellaneous transactions such as queries, audits, and edits, means that there would be no SLR for the actual work driven by the SOA request. This is a contractual issue and not for this group to address. The group felt it would add some traffic to SOAs, but would provide a direct benefit of getting immediate acknowledgement and better error handling.
* Review of NANC 383 – Separate SOA Channel for Notifications: It was suggested that possibly increasing the SOA interface performance to 5 messages per second could mean that everything could be done over one channel, but separating the workload over another channel could make it easier to administer and fine tune performance requirements for notifications vs. requests. NeuStar responded that ease of administration is not necessarily a good reason for a separate channel. Requirements for this will be worked in conjunction with NANC 390. It is not clear at this time which is the most cost effective approach.
* Review of NANC 388 – This would allow a provider to undo a cancel request to get it from cancel pending to pending. Initiation of this undo request constitutes new SOA functionality. Does the resultant notification for transitioning between these two states require SOA changes? If yes, this Change Order likely could not be backwards compatible. One SOA vendor said that SOA applications software doesn’t appear to be an issue, but the vendor is working with clients to see if downstream systems would require changes.
* Review of NANC 389 – Volume and Performance Testbed – The WNPO sent an e-mail to NeuStar on the results of their requirements discussion. This will be addressed at the February APT meeting.
* The APT discussed the upcoming NPAC technology migration that will take place during 2Q04. NeuStar stated that this migration is a long term strategy designed to meet future porting volumes, not just for the volumes expected next busy season.
* There remains an open question on the need for historical copies of SVs. This will be discussed further in the APT. NeuStar stated that this represents a significant portion of NPAC processing today.
* Discussion of BDD File Sizes: NeuStar reported that the average number of bytes per SV record is 90 and that roughly 24 million non-EDR records equate to 2 Gigabytes. NeuStar provided a file reflecting an estimate by region of how many TNs can be added to each database before 2 Gigabyte size is reached. Some provider LSMSs can handle greater than 2 Gig import files today.

NPAC Forecasting Group (NFG) Meeting Update (Paul LaGattuta, AT&T and LNPA Co-Chair):

* Paul LaGattuta walked the group through the attached presentation showing variances between forecasted wireless and wireline porting volumes and actual porting volumes.



* The NFG forecast for Wireless Non-Pooled (ported) numbers reflected 19.9 Million for 2003. Actuals came in at 10.8 Million.
* December 2003 results – wireless porting forecasted at 10.7 Million numbers, actuals came in at 2.6 Million.
* January 2004 results – wireless porting forecasted at 4 Million numbers, actuals came in at 2.2 Million. Projecting the January miss out through 2004 would result in a 75% miss for the year.
* Paul LaGattuta stated that he was told that the churn rate used in the forecasted wireless numbers included when a customer changes contract with the same provider, and customer disconnects. He suggested that the 50% churn rate in the NFG forecast should possibly be lowered to 35%.
* Paul then suggested that the wireless forecast for 2004 be revisited. A number of providers use the NFG forecast for budgeting and engineering. Some wireless carriers said that there are a lot of pending ports still sitting in systems from December.
* The WNPO agreed to revisit the 2004 wireless forecast for 2004 in response to Paul’s presentation and request.

PIMs:

.

* PIM 22 – PIM 22 remains open. At the February meeting, a straw vote was taken with respect to the attached revised PIM 22 resolution proposal and NPAC Change Order proposed by Verizon. The result of the straw vote was 15 carriers in favor of the proposed resolution and moving forward with Change Order requirements development, and 4 carriers against. The 4 carriers opposing the proposed resolution were from the same industry community (CLEC). One carrier favoring the proposed resolution voted as a combined entity, which includes a CLEC arm. The group will move forward with developing the requirements for NANC Change Order 375.

During the discussion at the February meeting, Nextel stated that they had experienced roughly 500 inadvertent ports after placing the port into Conflict since 11/24/03. Nextel stated that they felt this was a big problem. Carriers opposing this proposed resolution raised concerns about the potential for abuse by the Old Service Provider. Sprint PCS stated that any abuse of these cause values is provable and a provider can go to Regulators if they suffer any abuse at the hands of another provider using this functionality.

 

The PIM 22 proposal:

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

The proposed Change Order reflects the NPAC changes proposed in the revised PIM 22.

* 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. The PA is in the process of developing the Change Order. The PIM will remain open pending the FCC’s decision on the Change Order.

* 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 Workshop and Local Ordering and Provisioning (LSOP) Committee. No response has been received as yet. This PIM will be tracked by the LNPA.



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



At the February meeting, it was mentioned that this PIM is similar to a previous PIM (PIM 13). The submitter stated that PIM 13 addressed wireline-wireline porting and the issue should be revisited in the context of inter-modal porting. The resolution to PIM 13 was as follows (extracted from the NANC Flows):

After update of its databases the ONSP removes translations associated with the ported TN(s). The removal of these translations (1.) will not be done until the old Service Provider has evidence that the port has occurred, or (2.) will not be scheduled earlier than 11:59 PM one day after the due date, or (3.) will be scheduled for 11:59 PM on the due date, but can be changed by an LSR supplement received no later than 9:00 PM local time on the due date. This LSR supplement must be submitted in accordance with local practices governing LSR exchange, including such communications by telephone, fax, etc.

Sprint PCS stated that a resolution to PIM 28 would reduce PIM 29 occurrences, but not eliminate them entirely. During the ensuing discussion, a member stated that they are receiving porting requests from wireless carriers (WPR Fax forms) without contact numbers and, in some cases, the number to be ported is not even theirs. Sprint PCS stated that there are communications issues that are preventing flow-through of FOCs to wireless carriers. It was requested that a list of problems that are causing this scenario be developed to determine what the LNPA is responsible for. An action item was assigned to both Wireless and Wireline carriers to submit any contributions identifying where the fallout is occurring, and the cause, in order that they may be explored as a team. These contributions should be submitted to Craig Bartell, the Chair of the Fallout Reduction Taskforce (FORT) team. Craig's e-mail address is craig.j.bartell@mail.sprint.com. PIM 29 will be discussed on the next FORT conference call on Friday, February 13th, at 11am Eastern. Participation from both Wireless and Wireline carriers is welcomed and encouraged.

* NEW 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.

One member stated that the default carrier has an obligation as a last resort in order to ensure that calls are not dropped. Another member stated an objection to doing default dips on an ongoing basis because the N-1 carrier is not fulfilling their responsibility. It was stated that some carriers have seen a reduction in the number of default routed calls since they started billing for the queries. It was questioned whether wireless carriers could bill without filing a tariff. A number of wireline carriers stated that they did have to file a tariff. A number of cites from industry documentation and Regulatory Orders were raised during the discussion, e.g., FCC Orders 97-74, 97-289, and 98-82. In addition, the NANC Architecture Plan for LNP and the Thousands Block Pooling Guidelines were cited. It was suggested that everyone review these cites to prepare for a discussion of the N-1 responsibilities. It was also suggested that this issue may eventually need to go to NANC and/or the FCC if the answer is not clear in the available documentation. One member stated that they want to make it clear that it was not the design intent of the N-1 architecture to default route. Another member stated that this may go away on 5/24/04, with the rollout of wireless porting outside the top 100 MSAs, based on the providers they are currently having issues with. Another member disagreed.



Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will forward to the LNPA and WNPO distribution list by February 13th, relevant cites sent to him by LNPA members defining the N-1 Local Number Portability architecture (see attached). A copy of PIM 30, submitted by Alltel, will be included. This will be discussed at the March LNPA meeting. This PIM was accepted by the group.



**WEDNESDAY 2/4/04**

Wednesday, 2/4/04, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Wendy Wheeler | Alltel (phone) | Rosemary Emmer | | Nextel |
| Cheryl Gordon | Alltel (phone) | Alain Richard | | Qwest Wireless |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T | Dave Garner | | Qwest |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | ATTWS | Charles Ryburn | | SBC (phone) |
| Sean Hawkins | ATTWS (phone) | Leah Luper | | SBC |
| Lonnie Keck | ATTWS | Craig Bartell | | Sprint |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Rick Dressner | | Sprint PCS |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint PCS |
| Mel Clay | BellSouth (phone) | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint PCS) |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LLC | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec (phone) |
| Mark Wood | Cingular | John Malyar | | Telcordia |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox | Jean Anthony | | Telecom Software |
| Dennis Robins | Electric Lightwave (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Jason Lee | MCI (phone) | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile |
| Rick Jones | NENA | Rob Smith | | TSI |
| Bruce Armstrong | NeuStar (phone) | Stan Haney | | US Cellular |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | David Murphy | | US Cellular |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Brian Foster | | US Cellular |
| Shannon Collins | NeuStar (phone) | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign (phone) |
| Larry Vagnoni | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Darius Irani | NeuStar | Earl Scott | | Verizon |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Deborah Stephens | | Verizon Wireless |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Chris Duckett-Brown | | Verizon Wireless (phone) |
| Mindi Patterson | NeuStar |  | |  |
| Amy Putnam | NeuStar (phone) |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

LNPA Co-Chair Election:

* Paula Jordon, T-Mobile, was elected by acclimation as the Wireless LNPA Working Group Co-Chair. Congratulations to Paula! Gary Sacra, Verizon, and Paul LaGattuta, AT&T, will remain as the ILEC and CLEC Co-Chairs, respectively.

Port Protection Change Order 382 Discussion:



* Service Providers are to come to the March LNPA meeting prepared to provide their respective company’s position on the following policy questions that need to be answered regarding NANC Change Order 382 – Port Protection. The responses provided will be compiled to ascertain where we stand as a group on these policy questions.

1. What types of numbers can be placed on the protection list?

* Any number?
* Only those slammed previously?
* Service Provider Administration numbers?
* Homeland Security numbers?
* Emergency numbers?
* Telco-defined essential lines (e.g. payphones, police, fire)?

1. Who can put a number on the list and remove a number from the list (authorization)?
2. What is the process for putting numbers on and taking numbers off the list?
3. Who can have access to the list?
4. What is the process to access the list?

* Ping the list?
* View the list?

Change Management Discussion:

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



* NeuStar walked the group through the attached process flows and narratives for the NANC 323 SPID Migration process and discussed the changes since last month’s review.
* It was clarified in Figure 3 that SPID A existing means that they are still operational and able to participate in the migration process as necessary.
* One migration request could encompass more than one migration scenario. NeuStar stated that they cannot know all nuances of network configurations resulting from the migration and that the service providers are responsible to ensure that no customer is left behind.
* A question was asked if there is going to be a lessons learned process as part of each migration. NeuStar said that the LNPA would be a good venue for that discussion to the extent that carriers are willing to discuss in an open forum.
* The group agreed to add another readiness call in the process. Calls will take place during a regular business day and during normal business hours. The calls will be scheduled one full week before the migration and one day before the migration. SMURF files will be created one day before the calls.
* NeuStar stated that they need authority to delete pending-like SVs if they exist at the time of migration. Gary Sacra and Ron Steen will raise this in their Project Executive (PE) Report at the February LLC meeting and send a confirming e-mail to NeuStar once LLC approval is obtained.

NOTE: This was completed. The LLC confirmed NeuStar’s authority to delete these pending-like SVs. NeuStar was subsequently notified.

* No providers stated that their SOA systems would auto generate a new Create message to NPAC if they received a cancel for a pending-like SV. If any do, the SVs would have to be canceled by NPAC after the providers are taken off-line. NPAC will run a report of any cancelled SVs to be sent to the Old and New Service Providers involved in the cancelled port.
* NeuStar will determine whether they can have a first pass of the NANC 323, SPID Migration, User Method & Procedures (User M&Ps) for review at the April meeting.
* NANC 323 discussion will be on the agenda for the March LNPA meeting. The group will develop the Migration Checklist and review the changes to flows and narrative agreed to at the February meeting.

NANC Action Item – Unified Top 100 MSA List Discussion:

* Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, reviewed the NANC action item, assigned to the LNPA Working Group at the January NANC meeting, to develop a unified Top 100 MSA list for wireless and wireline porting. This action item resulted from a discussion at the NANC meeting regarding the WNPO-recommended Top 100 MSA list.
* Amy Putnam, Neustar and the Pool Administrator (PA), stated that the FCC has approved a Top 100 MSA list for wireless and wireline pooling, and the PA will continue to maintain that list for pooling. The reason the current pooling list has 104 MSAs is that once an MSA is on the list it does not drop off if it subsequently falls out of the top 100.
* A wireline member stated that they are not concerned about the WNPO-recommended list for porting because all of their switches are LNP-capable. Their concerns are related to pooling because they have not equipped all of their switches for pooling. Their concern centers around the PA list because it uses extrapolated 2002 population data which re-ranked the top 100 MSAs for pooling. The PA responded that the data was from the Census Bureau website. The PA further clarified that the Census Bureau added counties in the top 104 MSA list. The PA explained that there are 1095 additional rate centers that are mandatory under the current national rollout.
* Sue Tiffany, WNPO Co-Chair, walked the group through how the WNPO developed the recommended combined list. The wireless community didn’t have sufficient direction on a top 100 list for porting. Rate centers were included if any part was in a county in the top 100 MSAs. The October list came out to 5283 rate centers. In November, a PA list came out with 11 additional rate centers. Tier 1 companies (larger wireless providers) all agreed to go with the larger list. One Tier 2 and one Tier 3 wireless provider objected to using the combined list. This is a larger list than the current PA list. The WNPO agreed to not implement the recommended list until 1/16/04, instead of December 2003, because the additional rate centers required system changes.
* The PA list had 102 MSAs before the OMB update which added 2 additional MSAs. This came out in October 2003. Ann Arbor, Michigan and Mobile, Alabama dropped out of the top 100, but stay on the list since they were once in the top 100 MSAs.
* The WNPO list has the 1990 and 2000 MSA lists, plus the 11 additional rate centers from the PA list in November, and the expansion that added any rate center within a county in a top MSA that was not on these lists. They did not have time to add the October OMB changes.
* The WNPO recommends that their list be the unified list for porting. If some providers do not comply, one customer could be able to port, while their neighbor perhaps could not if their provider does not honor that rate center.
* Verizon Wireless requested removal of Boulder City, Nevada and Valley, Nebraska, because they are localities and not rate centers in the LERG.

* The WNPO list does not override the Bonafide Request (BFR) process.
* Talking points in preparation for a response to the NANC action item:
* There was not a mandated top 100 MSA list for wireless porting down to the rate center level. It was by county.
* The WNPO determined, and the LNPA agreed, it was cost effective to maintain a single list for wireless and wireline porting, and not modify it until 5/24/04, at such time when all rate centers where a BFR that has been issued will take effect and a waiver has not been granted.
* For porting, the WNPO and LNPA endorses the single list recommended by the WNPO in December and implemented on 1/16/04 by the larger wireless carriers. Not all providers have implemented the WNPO-recommended list. The historical value of showing the additional 11 rate centers separately is no longer relevant.
* This list does not override the BFR process, meaning that a provider will not be required to port any sooner than they would upon receiving a BFR.
* For pooling, the PA is implementing a cumulative top 100 MSA list mandated by the FCC. It will be managed and maintained by the PA.
* The WNPO Co-Chair took an action to create a new spreadsheet with a single MSA list incorporating the 11 additional rate centers from the November 2003 PA list.
* The discussion of this NANC action item will be on the March LNPA agenda to finalize the LNPA’s response to NANC at the March NANC meeting.

Discussion of Combining the LNPA and WNPO Groups:

* The WNPO proposed the following to the LNPA:
* remove redundant topics from the WNPO meeting agenda that are also discussed in the LNPA, e.g. PIMs, NPAC Forecasting Group (NFG), etc.,
* move inter-modal issues to the LNPA (the WNPO wants to reserve the ability to discuss inter-modal issues within the WNPO meeting),
* WNPO would meet all day on Monday of LNPA week starting with the April 2004 meeting, and continue through the July meeting,
* LNPA would meet all day Tuesday and Wednesday of LNPA week starting with the April 2004 meeting, and continue through the July meeting,
* The Architecture Planning Team (APT) will continue to meet on Thursday of LNPA week,
* After this transition phase toward combining the WNPO and LNPA, a review will be conducted at the July 2004 meeting to determine the next steps toward combining the groups. If WNPO doesn’t need to meet for a full day, they could start Monday afternoon after the July review.

The LNPA agreed to the WNPO proposal as outlined above.

* There are no plans currently for Wireless Testing Subcommittee (WTSC) face-to-face meetings. They meet via conference call every Thursday morning. Julie Groenen, Verizon Wireless, is the interim Co-Chair of the WTSC.

Yearly NPAC Failover Test Discussion:

* NeuStar raised the question to the group as to when to schedule the next full NPAC failover test. Gary Sacra and Ron Steen, Project Executives, proposed that the test should occur after the scheduled NPAC technology migration. NeuStar suggested performing the test in the August-September timeframe, which would put it well past the completion of the migration. The test schedule will be finalized at a later time.

NPAC Technology Migration Update – NeuStar:

* NeuStar presented the attached Migration Project Plan and slides detailing industry testing preparation.

  

* No vendor certification or service provider regression testing is required, but regression testing is highly encouraged. No changes to the GDMO or ASN.1 will result from the migration.
* NeuStar then walked through the attached regression test plan for the migration.



* There are a total of 397 test cases in the test plan. The full suite would be applicable for a new provider with a new vendor. This test plan adds ten Release 3.2 regression tests out of the 26 in the full 3.2 test suite.

Review of January Action Items:



* Item 0104-01: Item is Closed. NANC Change Order 391 has been opened up. NeuStar to check to see if the IIS needs to be changed. The group agreed that the wording for Cause Value 50 is acceptable (LSR/WPR Not Received). Service Providers are to come to the March LNPA meeting prepared to vote on their preferred wording for Conflict Cause Value 51 (currently “FOC Not Issued”). The two suggested rewordings are “A Port-Authorizing FOC/WPRR Not Issued” or “A Non-rejected FOC/WPRR Not Issued.”
* Item 0104-02: This item was completed and is Closed. See section on Architecture Planning Team (APT) minutes.
* Item 0104-03: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0104-04: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0104-05: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0104-06: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0104-07: Item remains open and is ongoing. The APT continues to analyze the data necessary to determine future SOA interface throughput requirements. January actual data was incorporated into the analysis.
* Item 0104-08: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0104-09: Item remains open and will be on the agenda for the March LNPA meeting.
* Item 0104-10: This item is Closed. No providers stated that their SOA systems would auto generate a new Create message to NPAC if they received a cancel for a pending-like SV. If any do, the SVs would have to be canceled by NPAC after the providers are taken off-line. NPAC will run a report of any cancelled SVs to be sent to the Old and New Service Providers involved in the cancelled port.
* Item 0104-11: At the request of the NFG, the WNPO has agreed to revisit the porting data projections for the 4Q04 Busy Season. Item remains open.

Action Items Remaining Open from Previous Meetings:

* Item 1103-03: Item remains open and will be addressed at a future LNPA meeting.
* Item 1103-05: Item remains open.
* Item 1103-07: Item is Closed. NeuStar reported that most discrepancies have been corrected and is now awaiting authorization from the remaining service providers with name discrepancies to update their name.
* Item 1103-14: Item remains open. Note that this was changed from a Service Provider action item to a SOA Vendor action item. This will be discussed in the Architecture team.
* Item 1103-15: Item remains open and will be addressed at a future LNPA meeting.
* Item 1103-16: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 1103-17: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 1203-07: This item is Closed. No provider indicated that their systems automatically default to a Cause Value 50 (LSR Not Received) when they place a port into Conflict.
* Item 1203-09: Item remains open. To be discussed at March Architecture team meeting.
* Item 1203-10: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 1203-11: Item remains open. At the February APT meeting, NeuStar walked the group through the process for creating and maintaining historical copies of SVs in the NPAC database. Some providers stated that they use historical copies of the current/known versions of SVs to determine service provider ownership for activities such as billing dispute settlements. To be discussed at March Architecture team meeting.

New Business:

* Jean Anthony, TSE, had previously stated that a customer identified a discrepancy in IIS Flow 5.5.4, where NPAC seems to be sending the cause code in the single notification but not in the range notification for the subscriptionVersionAVC. NeuStar responded at the February meeting that they are consistent, satisfying this item for Jean. Jean still has an issue with there being two versions of the GDMO. NeuStar took an action to open up a Doc Only Change Order to change the GDMO and ASN.1 Header sections of the IIS Part I.
* In follow-up to a New Business item raised at the January LNPA meeting, Rick Dressner, Sprint PCS, stated that Sprint PCS is experiencing 100% fallout on ports of Type 1 and reseller numbers with wireline providers. Rick stated that wireline LECs are not accepting Type 1 or reseller LSRs. Wireless providers don’t know up front if it’s a Type 1 or reseller number. Rick Dressner took an action to submit this issue as a PIM. Wireline LECs have an action to investigate internally. Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will send a copy of the latest NANC Provisioning Flows to the LNPA and WNPO distribution lists as a reminder that they contain the industry-accepted procedures for porting Type 1 Cellular and reseller numbers. In follow-up to this discussion, another wireless service provider stated that their company has successfully completed 40 to 60 ports of Type 1 cellular numbers from a variety of wireline providers.
* Gary Sacra, Verizon, described an issue currently being experienced by Verizon Wireline where a significant quantity of numbers are being ported out from Verizon Wireline by wireless providers and no LSR has been received by Verizon Wireline. Verizon wishes to raise awareness in the industry that the NANC LNP Provisioning Flows must be followed. Verizon also issued a plea to wireless providers to go back internally to make sure the process is being followed, and to ensure that any customers taken out of service are cooperatively placed back in service with their appropriate provider. Wireless and Wireline Service Providers have an action to ensure internally that they follow the NANC LNP Provisioning Flows. This issue will be placed on the agenda for the March LNPA meeting to determine if it will be raised in the NANC report. Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will send an e-mail to the LNPA and WNPO, describing the issue and reminding all service providers that the NANC LNP Provisioning Flows and processes need to be followed.

Earl Scott, Verizon, stated that providers should not tell their customers to call their old provider to release their number. Dave Cochran, Bell South, said that wireless providers are giving the LNP Center telephone numbers of wireline providers to their prospective new customers if there is a problem with the port.

**THURSDAY 2/5/04 ARCHITECTURE PLANNING TEAM (APT)**

Thursday, 2/5/04, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T | Rosemary Emmer | | Nextel |
| Sean Hawkins | ATTWS | Dave Garner | | Qwest |
| Steve Sanchez | ATTWS | Charles Ryburn | | SBC (phone) |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Craig Bartell | | Sprint |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Sue Tiffany | | Sprint |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LLC | Rick Dressner | | Sprint PCS |
| Teresa Patton | Cingular | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec (phone) |
| Keagan O/Rourke | ESI | John Malyar | | Telcordia |
| Scott Wagner | Intrado | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile |
| Jason Lee | MCI (phone) | Jean Anthony | | TSE |
| Steve Addicks | NeuStar | Rob Smith | | TSI |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Brian Foster | | US Cellular |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Larry Vagnoni | NeuStar | Deb Stephens | | Verizon Wireless |
|  |  |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

* Mission Statement: To assess Number Portability industry production technical issues within the purview of the LNPA Working Group and develop recommendations for the strategic direction of the Number Portability architecture.
* The APT met on 02/05/04. Attached is the meeting agenda.



Performance Requirements:

* **How much throughput is needed on the SOA?**
* **Discussion on distribution of volume across the SOAs**
* NeuStar reviewed the % participation of the top 5 participants for activates in each region for December, spread over the month. Pooling numbers were excluded because they don’t generate notifications unless a provider activates over their SOA. If that provider is EDR-capable, they do not receive 1K notifications.

* If the activate request timestamp was for the month of December, the Old and New SPID was identified.
* The goal here is to identify what a new requirement for the SOA interface would be. The % participation is a variable in the SOA model that drives the provider messages per second (including requests). 39% in the SE Region, which was the highest participation % for a provider, drove 10.0 messages per second for that provider’s SOA.
* There are periods of time when 2 CMIP messages per second are not adequate.
* NeuStar will produce data for January to show at the March APT meeting.
* Currently, the SOA interface throughput requirement is the same for every SOA. Having bandwidth and NPAC processing power for developing the same requirement of 10 per second, for example, for 150 SOAs, is different from engineering for 10 per second sustainable for an hour for the high SOA with 100 messages per second total for the hour. We need to identify peak duration and total throughput if we are to develop different requirements for different types of providers.
* The NFG model needs accurate projections in order to develop an accurate SOA throughput requirement.
* John Malyar, Telcordia, stated he may bring in a contribution addressing a new paradigm for changing the current SOA throughput requirement where NPAC would not need to support a single requirement for every SOA interface, but would be able to support different levels of SOA throughput.

**CMIP Interface Improvements/Performance, and Operational/Functional Benefits related Change Orders:**

* **Review of the Architecture Team Change Order Matrix**
* NeuStar reviewed Rev. 11 of the APT Working Document, which contains the Change Order Matrix. A priority column has been added. This is a priority to the APT only, which will serve as a recommendation to the LNPA eventually. The priority relates to industry functional value.



* NeuStar will distribute the Change Order Matrix under development in the APT containing the High, Medium, and Low priorities assigned by the group in the February meeting. NOTE: This was completed. See attached.



* The APT team will come to the March 2004 APT meeting prepared to assign a numerical ranking to each of the Change Orders contained in the Change Order Matrix under development by the team. The Change Orders are to be ranked from 1 to 14, with 1 being the highest priority. No two Change Orders will have the same ranking.
* **Discuss all change orders related to Interface/Performance/Efficiency/ Functionality contained in the APT Change Order working document**
* NANC Change Order 385 – USAs will have the ability to enter maintenance window times so that the time is excluded from timer expiration calculation. Question – If maintenance runs over or falls short of time entered, do USAs go back in and adjust? No, but changes to maintenance window times can be made prior to a timer creation.

Current Issues:

* **Discussion on testbed requirements**

Requirements for proposed volume and performance testbed developed in the WNPO:

* 12 SOA transactions per second (this is combined bandwidth for test bed, not for each individual SOA)
* Permanent connection to test bed for every carrier (but only a few will operate at the same time)
* NPAC test bed should allow multiple NPAC associations for one primary SPID to the test environment (minimum of 2 regions (multiple connections for the same SPID))
* NPAC test bed should stay in line with the current version of NPAC production from a functionality and volume supported perspective.

Additional requirements discussed in APT:

* No failover site needed.
* Need support for a number (30?) of LSMSs in the largest region.
* Note: Would like new release test bed run at same rate.
* This will not be a Change Order. NeuStar action to develop a requirements document that will be reviewed in the WNPO/LNPA.
* **Historical copies of SVs and pooled blocks. Are they needed?**
* Neustar walked through the process of how historical copies are created in NPAC.

 

* NeuStar is proposing to eliminate historical snapshots of SVs, but not the current/ known version. An example is shown below:
* An SV is created and activated (SV-ID 100).
* The LRN is modified. SV-ID 100 is updated and a historical snapshot is created to capture the pre-modification state (SV-ID 110). The SOA/LSMSs do NOT know anything about 110.
* The NPA-NXX of the SV is involved in an NPA Split. SV-ID 100 is updated and a historical snapshot is created to capture the pre-split state (SV-ID 120). The SOA/LSMSs do NOT know anything about 120.
* The NPA-NXX is part of a NANC 323 SPID migration. SV-ID 100 is updated and a historical snapshot is created to capture the pre-migration state (SV-ID 130). The SOA/LSMSs do NOT know anything about 130.
* The TN is ported to another service provider. SV-ID 100 is updated. A new SV is created to reflect the new service provider (SV-ID 200).
* The NPA-NXX of the SV is involved in an NPA Split. SV-ID 200 is updated and a historical snapshot is created to capture the pre-split state (SV-ID 210). The SOA/LSMSs do NOT know anything about 210.
* The NPA-NXX is part of a NANC 323 SPID migration. SV-ID 200 is updated and a historical snapshot is created to capture the pre-migration state (SV-ID 220). The SOA/LSMSs do NOT know anything about 220.
* The TN is ported to another service provider. SV-ID 200 is updated. A new SV is created to reflect the new service provider (SV-ID 300).
* With NeuStar’s proposal, the historical snapshots include: 110, 120, 130, 210, 220, etc. The versions that will continue to exist are 100, 200, 300. These are the SVs that the SOA/LSMSs know about since they are the SVs that are broadcast.
* Next month – priority of Change Orders in matrix, test bed requirements document, review Change Orders we didn’t get to, historical copies, review % spread for January data, update NFG model with January data.