LNPA WORKING GROUP

February 2005 Meeting

Final Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Tampa, Florida | Host: Syniverse |

**TUESDAY 02/15/05**

Tuesday, 02/15/05, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T | Dave Garner | | Qwest |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Fred Archer | | SBC (phone) |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Kelly Gracie | | SNET (phone) |
| Brigitte Haysom | Centennial Wireless | Craig Bartell | | Sprint |
| Lonnie Keck | Cingular | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | Cingular | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint |
| Michelle Gwaltney | Cingular | Bill Riley | | Sprint (phone) |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox | Rob Smith | | Syniverse |
| Dennis Robins | Electric Lightwave (phone) | Darren Paffenroth | | Syniverse |
| Kevin Pool | Evolving Systems | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Jean Anthony | Evolving Systems | Jason Kempson | | Telcordia |
| Jamie Sharpe | Interstate FiberNet (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Jason Lee | MCI (phone) | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile |
| Rick Jones | NENA | Ginny Cashbaugh | | US Cellular |
| Jason Loyer | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| Holly Jacobs | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar | Julie Anderson | | Verizon |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Scott Hillman | | Verizon |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| Shannon Sevigny | NeuStar (phone) | Sara Hooker | | Verizon Wireless (phone) |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Jeff Harmon | | Verizon Wireless (phone) |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Deborah Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar |  | |  |
| Gene Johnston | NeuStar |  | |  |
| Rosemary Emmer | Nextel |  | |  |
| Danielle Estrada | Nextel |  | |  |
| Juan Aguirre | Nextel |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

Attached are the Action Items assigned at the February, 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 “FEBRUARY 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 |  | 13-14-15th | T-Mobile | Seattle |
| October |  | Week of 22nd | 18-19-20th | Nextel | Ft. Lauderdale |
| November | 30th |  | 15-16-17th | Cingular | Atlanta |
| December |  |  | 6-7-8th | Evolving Systems | Denver |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

01/05 Minutes Review:

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

* Page 13, 2nd bullet, 1st sentence, change to read, “A local system vendor stated that their analysis of the GDMO and ASN.1 changes for these Change Orders resulted in no issues with breakage with the functionality turned off.”
* In the Optional Fields in Release 3.3 discussion on page 13, add a bullet: “A local system vendor asked if the Change Orders were needed to support the porting of VoIP numbers; it was noted that they were not to the extent that they are ported today, however, issues such as efficient routing and service interoperability are not currently addressed.”
* In the Optional Fields in Release 3.3 discussion on page 14, add a bullet: “A local system vendor asked if the inclusion of URI data associated with TNs could lead to discrepancies with a public ENUM database and if the ENUM Forum or ENUM LLC TAG were aware of this suggested change to the NPAC.”
* In the Optional Fields in Release 3.3 discussion on page 14, add a bullet: “A local system vendor asked if the Change Orders were to support carrier to carrier ENUM. NeuStar noted that the Change Orders were independent of carrier to carrier ENUM.”

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):

# Wireless Committee:

* OBF 89 met last week.
* Updates from ATIS:
* ATIS has asked its Committees to look at Name, Address, and Date fields in the different ATIS forms, e.g., LSOG, WICIS, etc., to see if they can be standardized in terms of definitions and data elements.
* ATIS is waiting on a response from the ATIS Board to get feedback on head count to do this work.
* An INC meeting has been scheduled on 3/7 (new date) in Reston, VA with the Navy to discuss their request for a dedicated NPA. This will be a web meeting from 8:30am to 5pm Eastern. An audio bridge be available but will be listen only. Questions can be submitted during the meeting over the Internet. INC has developed a matrix on all of the feedback from the various industry groups. The matrix will be posted on the INC website under contributions as NPA 205. Navy responses to the questions will be on the Navy website prior to the 3/7 meeting. The Navy website is not yet available.
* An oversight has been identified in the WICIS document. The Group Request and Group Response numbers are incorrectly identified as alpha-numeric instead of alpha-numeric plus, which would allow for spaces. This is being worked in the Wireless Committee – Fast Track Issue 2859. This will be in the next release of the document.
* Issue 2733 – FAX acknowledgement and acceptance forms are completed. They cannot be utilized until 2.1.0 sunsets on 2/12/06. Issue is in Initial Closure.
* Issue 2664 – How a provider should treat multiple port requests on the same TN. Consensus is that you can accept multiple requests on a TN, but once you confirm one, you should not confirm any others (wireless only issue and consensus).
* Issue 2742 – Opened to consider relaxing due date and time edit on wireless to wireless ports similar to what was done on wireline to wireless ports.
* Issue 2743 – Addressing multiple errors on a WPR. Currently, can only reflect one error code on response to an errored WPR. May propose more than RCODE per LNUM.

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

* Issue 2753 – Wireless to Wireline FAX form. Mapping work is still ongoing. Still questions on ownership, where it should reside, copyrighting of document. One thought is to make it part of the WICIS, but it contains LSOG fields.
* PIM 42 (Issue 2802), and PIM 44 (Issue 2801) – Matrix is progressing to show what fields are required on LSRs and if they are validated in back-end systems. Matrix is available for OBF members on ATIS website. Input is in from 5 of the major carriers. Awaiting a 6th. Expecting completion with the 5 ILECs and major CLECs in the next couple of weeks. Will then compare to see if any standardization can be accomplished. A formal response to the LNPA will be provided on Issues 2801 and 2802 after OBF 90 in May.
* Next OBF is May 2nd through 6th in Denver.

NENA Update (Rick Jones, NENA):

* Two issues under discussion in NENA:
* Navy request for a dedicated NPA – In 2004, NENA did an analysis of 911 issues related to geographic portability – some PSAPs have a 4 NPA limit and some Selective Routers have a 4 NPA limit.
* VoIP and LNP – It cannot be determined if the port should be treated as a fixed wireline port or a wireless port where the record is deleted. There is no indication. Some fixed VoIP providers provide Enhanced 911. Nomadic VoIP poses 911 challenges.
* An LNPA member raised an issue where a police department ported to that wireless carrier and the old handsets were donated. Someone from a homeless shelter called 911 and the callback went to the policeman’s handset. Rick Jones explained that the ESIF agreement is that in Phase II 911, uninitialized sets will not deliver the phone number on a call to 911. Phase II is not mandatory and this occurs on a daily basis.

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

* Jean Anthony, Evolving Systems, reported that a conference call was held on 1/25/05. 11 companies (combination of providers and vendors) participated. Vendor-to-vendor testing was discussed.
* Comments to the test plan have been incorporated and posted on the WTSC website.
* The next call is scheduled for 2/28/05, 3-5pm Eastern. The bridge information is on the website. The testing schedule will be discussed on the next call.

PIM Discussion:

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

 

* PIM 24 – This PIM, submitted by the Pool Administrator and AT&T Wireless, addresses instances where service providers are not following guidelines for block donation. For example, in some instances, contaminated blocks are being donated as non-contaminated blocks, or blocks with greater than 10% contamination are being donated. This is causing customers to be taken out of service or blocks to be exchanged for a less contaminated or non-contaminated block.



The LNPA and NAPM/LLC had previously approved the sharing of information between NPAC and the Pool Administrator whereby the Pool Administrator is able to obtain the necessary information from NPAC to ensure, to the extent possible, that service providers are complying with the pooled block donation process. The PA submitted Change Order 23 for FCC consideration. PA Change Order 23 was subsequently withdrawn and PA Change Order 24 was submitted to the FCC by the PA. The Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG) recommended to the FCC a trial of the proposed resolution in selected pools initially. The FCC subsequently recommended that the PA submit another Change Order based on the NOWG recommendation for a trial. On 2/9/04, the PA submitted Change Order 26 based on this recommendation to conduct a trial in one NPA in each NPAC region. The FCC approved PA Change Order 26. The PA has since received reports for each trial NPA in each region and worked with service providers to resolve discrepancies in what is in PAS vs. NPAC. The PA then aggregated the information and sent the findings and a recommendation to the FCC. Attached is the PA’s summary and a recommendation to the FCC that the PA receive reports for all NPAs and that it be repeated annually. The NOWG was then asked by the FCC to review the results and provide a recommendation.

 

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

At the February LNPA, it was stated that the NOWG recommendation does not support the INC’s solution to Issue 364, which addresses portability of abandoned blocks (TBPAG Appendix 7). The PA Change Order will support NOWG’s recommendation on PIM 24. The NOWG recommends running the report once a year. Nextel and T-Mobile expressed concern that a once a year scrub will not solve the problem. T-Mobile recently received a block with 600 working customers. Adam Newman, INC Vice Chair, said that the INC guidelines have an issue pending the FCC decision related to the PA doing a contamination check on returned blocks, but the check is not being done pending the FCC decision on this issue. This could result in over-contaminated blocks in the pool. Due to the continuing problems cited, it was the consensus of the LNPA that the NOWG should revisit the original suggested resolution of PIM 24. Rosemary Emmer, now Co-Chair of the NOWG, will take the original LNPA contribution sent to the PA back to the NOWG as a result of renewed interest in implementing the original PIM 24 resolution recommended by the LNPA. A member suggested that we must resolve this issue from 3 fronts 1) SP education, 2) Allowing the PA to check returned blocks, and 3) Doing the scrub more often than once a year. The PA agreed to hold off on the latest Change Order until feedback is received from NOWG. Rosemary Emmer, NOWG Co-Chair, will keep the LNPA apprised of NOWG deliberations.

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

  

* PIM 28 – This PIM, submitted by Sprint PCS, addresses interface differences between the WPRR (wireless) and FOC (wireline). The FOC allows for a due date and time change on confirmations, however, the WPRR does not. When a wireline carrier sends an FOC with a change in due date or time, the wireless carrier cannot process the change and does not allow the port to complete. This accepted PIM was referred to the Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF) Wireless Committee and Local Ordering and Provisioning (LSOP) Committee, and is being worked in the OBF Wireless Committee Technical Subcommittee (Issue 2744). The proposed resolution is for the WICIS standard to be modified to relax edits to allow the Inter-carrier Communications Process (ICP) to accept due date and time changes. This resolution will be in WICIS 3.0, which must be implemented between 5/22/05 and 2/12/06 (new sunset date for WICIS 2.1.0).

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



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



Action Item 0904-09: In process.

Action Item 1204-14: Closed. Change Orders are only being submitted to those companies where a problem exists.

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



Action Item 1204-21: 90% of data has been collected. Action Item remains open.

Action Item 0105-07: Closed.

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

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



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

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



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

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



It was asked what the expectation is on how much time is to be invested in investigating a manual approach before deciding to do a 323 migration. It is the migrating-to SPID’s shot to call as to whether to do a NANC 323 migration or a manual approach. PIM 41 will remain open until the INC COCAG is reviewed this week at the LNPA. The group should review the document revisions in light of the migrating-to SPID having the decision to do a NANC 323 migration or a manual process.

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



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

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



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

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



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



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

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



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

 

At the February LNPA, the group agreed that the NIIF response addresses our issue. Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will send a response to the NIIF stating that NIIF Issue 0255 has addressed the LNPA’s PIM 48, and thanking them for resolving the issue. PIM 48 was closed at the February 2005 LNPA meeting.

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



Action Item 0105-17 was completed. Syniverse stated that they have collected Type 1 data from their customers and is discussing implementation of the proposed resolution with their customers. PIM 49 will stay open while implementation discussions take place. Wireless carriers should indicate if the Type 1 number is a pager number so it can be indicated that it should not be ported.

* NEW 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. The PIM was accepted at the February meeting. Wireline Service Providers are to report back at the March LNPA meeting on how they handle the issue described.



* During the PIM discussion, a member raised an issue with answering services that do not always allow numbers to port even though the underlying carrier would permit it. It was questioned if these service providers are certified as resellers. If so, they would perhaps be obligated to port; if not, they would not be required. The member raising the issue will check.

NIIF LNP Trouble-shooting Guidelines (NIIF Issue 248):

* Maggie Lee, VeriSign, teed up the issue. The document has been on the NIIF website for some time but has not been updated for wireless or for lessons learned.
* The NIIF held a call on the issue but no input was provided from the industry.
* Maggie Lee proposed that the LNPA send a response to NIIF thanking them and stating that there will be no further contributions from the LNPA and that they can close the issue. The group agreed.

Dept. of Navy request for Dedicated NPA:

* An INC meeting has been scheduled on 3/7 (new date) in Reston, VA with the Navy to discuss their request for a dedicated NPA. This will be a web meeting from 8:30am to 5pm Eastern. An audio bridge be available but will be listen only. Questions can be submitted during the meeting over the Internet. INC has developed a matrix on all of the feedback from the various industry groups. The matrix will be posted on the INC website under contributions as NPA 205. Navy responses to the questions will be on the Navy website prior to the 3/7 meeting. The Navy website is not yet available.

Draft VoIP Letter to NANC:

* Sue Tiffany, Sprint, walked the group through the revised draft letter to NANC expressing the LNPA’s position on porting obligations of VoIP providers.



* A discussion ensued on what the LNPA is asking NANC to do. We will advise NANC in the letter that we are putting the following statement in the NP Best Practices matrix and are asking NANC to forward to the FCC with their endorsement.

“VoIP service providers along with Wireless and Wireline service providers, have the obligation to port a telephone number to any other service provider when the consumer requests, and the port is within FCC mandates. Porting of telephone numbers used by VoIP service providers should follow the industry porting guidelines and the NANC Inter-Service Provider LNP Operations flows.”

* Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will send the attached draft VoIP Porting

Obligations letter to the LNPA distro with an action to the LNPA to review internally with their respective Regulatory and/or Legal organizations and provide any concerns by 2/28/05. Gary will then forward the final letter to NANC in time for the 3/15/05 NANC meeting. LNPA Working Group Members have an action item to review the attached draft VoIP Porting Obligations letter internally with their respective Regulatory and/or Legal organizations. Any concerns with the letter should be sent to Gary Sacra no later than February 28, 2005. If no concerns are received by that date, Paula Jordan and Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chairs, will add the appropriate to and from information and send this letter to NANC for discussion at the March 2005 NANC meeting.

**WEDNESDAY 02/16/05**

Wednesday, 02/16/05, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T | Dave Garner | | Qwest |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Fred Archer | | SBC (phone) |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | David Taylor | | SBC (phone) |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian Consortium (phone) | Craig Bartell | | Sprint |
| Brigitte Haysom | Centennial Wireless | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint |
| Lonnie Keck | Cingular | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint |
| Michelle Gwaltney | Cingular | Bill Riley | | Sprint (phone) |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox | Rob Smith | | Syniverse |
| Dennis Robins | Electric Lightwave (phone) | Darren Paffenroth | | Syniverse |
| Kevin Pool | Evolving Systems | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec |
| Jean Anthony | Evolving Systems | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Jamie Sharpe | Interstate FiberNet (phone) | Jason Kempson | | Telcordia |
| Jason Lee | MCI (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Jason Loyer | NeuStar | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile |
| Holly Jacobs | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Julie Anderson | | Verizon |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Scott Hillman | | Verizon |
| Shannon Sevigny | NeuStar (phone) | Ashraf Yussouff | | Verizon |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Nancy Davies | | Verizon (phone) |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Sara Hooker | | Verizon Wireless (phone) |
| Gene Johnston | NeuStar | Jeff Harmon | | Verizon Wireless (phone) |
| Rosemary Emmer | Nextel | Deborah Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Danielle Estrada | Nextel |  | |  |
| Juan Aguirre | Nextel |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

NANC 399, 400, and 401 Discussion:

 

* The group reviewed the Business Needs, technical requirements, GDMO, ASN.1, and IIS changes for the proposed Change Orders.
* Based on a request from Adam Newman, Telcordia, the following bullets were added to the January 2005 LNPA minutes under the discussion of the Optional Fields in Release 3.3:
  + “A local system vendor asked if the Change Orders were needed to support the porting of VoIP numbers; it was noted that they were not to the extent that they are ported today, however, issues such as efficient routing and service interoperability are not currently addressed.”
  + “A local system vendor asked if the inclusion of URI data associated with TNs could lead to discrepancies with a public ENUM database and if the ENUM Forum or ENUM LLC TAG were aware of this suggested change to the NPAC.”
  + “A local system vendor asked if the Change Orders were to support carrier to carrier ENUM. NeuStar noted that the Change Orders were independent of carrier to carrier ENUM.”

NANC 399:

* A service provider member stated that as a result of a reseller meeting internally, it was suggested that there is potential use for NANC 399 to assist in the issues with porting reseller numbers via the use of the Type field.
* Another service provider member stated that these are not just VoIP Change Orders, and could have other uses for the Type field. Feedback internally indicated that the Type field could have value for port-ins but would be costly to implement.
* A local system vendor member asked if non-facilities based SPs could establish a SPID at NPAC as the document seems to allude to the fact that they cannot. The response was that the Change Order is not changing who can or cannot be an NPAC User. The document is meant to say that there could be SPIDs in the validation table that are not necessarily NPAC Users.
* Another local system vendor member asked if there was a need to validate the SV Type against the SP type. Answer was no.
* A service provider member asked if these new fields needed to be added to the SS7 TRs. Answer: Only if signaled between two network elements.
* NANC 399: NeuStar will add possible additional uses mentioned in the Description of Change to the Business Need.
* It was suggested that the Alternative SPID Field be renamed to the Local Provider SPID Field. A concern was voiced that this could be confused with LSPI. It was suggested that we keep Alternative SPID and enhance the description in the Data Model. This was agreed to. Action Item 0105-18 is Closed.
* NANC 399 – Description of Change, 5th paragraph: NeuStar to revise to not make it specific to non-facilities based SPs.
* When the SV Type field is initialized and if an SP opts in, it will not result in transactions over the interface. It would be part of a BDD if the SP decides to support it in their systems.
* NANC 399 – Major Points: NeuStar to remove 2nd paragraph, “Upon LLC acceptance, NeuStar will formalize and present the requirements and assumptions, as well as the IIS, GDMO, and ASN.1 changes associated with the change order at the December 2004 LNPA WG meeting.”
* NANC 399 – SV Type: NeuStar to add VoWiFi (Value 3), and 3 others. SV Types 4, 5, and 6 will be supported over the interface but their use will be restricted by NPAC until such time that the LNPA designates their use.

NANC 400:

* A local system vendor member asked the meaning of, “No solution addresses portability of such service.” NeuStar explained that NANC 399 addresses SP Type, which could be a VoIP provider. This sentence in NANC 400 means that there is no current industry solution to porting using IP end point routing.
* A service provider member asked about synching problems between databases. NeuStar responded that this data could be distributed to any point including the Tier 1B ENUM database.
* It was asked if there were any additional attributes that should be added to the Data Model. The service provider member asking the question will review internally.
* A service provider member asked about the size of the URI. NeuStar responded that it is a variable length field up to 255 characters. NeuStar also stated that this is the standard for a URI, but the typical URI is not that long. RFC2396 is the standard for URIs. A local system vendor member stated that we have to size to whatever the standard is or risk not being able to support a longer length URI.
* A local system vendor member requested that NANC Change Orders 399 and 400 be broken out into two separate documents, each with its own IIS, GDMO, ASN.1, and XML sections. NeuStar took an action to provide a response at the March 2005 LNPA meeting.
* A service provider member asked what the current size of an SV is today, and what would it be with the additional fields proposed in NANC Change Orders 399 and 400. NeuStar took an action to provide a response at the March 2005 LNPA meeting.
* NeuStar stated that these Change Orders can be implemented independent of each other.

NANC 401:

* Maggie Lee, VeriSign, teed up the Change Order by explaining the need for a means of providing a separate LSMS association for the optional data fields. She stated that her architecture team has not had an opportunity to review NANC 401 in detail.
* NeuStar stated that one approach to this is a second LSMS SPID and second association.
* A local system vendor member stated that ports on the PSTN need to be broadcast to association1, while ports in the IP network need to be broadcast to both association1 and association2. NeuStar responded that we as a group need to develop the high-level approach.
* A service provider member suggested that the SP should be able to select what data elements on the TN record should be downloaded over which association.
* The current document reflects same SPID, different association approach. Discussion is leaning now toward different SPID, different association approach, with the ability to select what data elements will be received over each association.
* A local system vendor member suggested another possible option to add new objects, e.g., called ipinfo, to allow the ability to pick and choose the data elements to be sent over the new association. That same vendor asked if we are just talking about URI data over the separate association or also other fields in NANC 399 and NANC 400. It was suggested that NANC 399 and NANC 400 optional fields should be sent over association1, but an SP may want to receive those fields optionally over association2.
* NeuStar will rewrite NANC Change Order 401 to reflect the discussion that took place at the February 2005 LNPA meeting. NANC 401 will be on the agenda for the March 2005 meeting.

Nextel Change Order Proposal:



* In response to a question asked by Verizon, it was stated that this proposal does not affect an SP’s ability to assign two different LRNs out of the same code, each under two of their different SPIDs.
* Option 6 does not require local system or interface changes. This is the most desired automated solution for Nextel.
* Option 5 does not require the SPID to OCN association table in NPAC.
* It was stated that some of the NANC 323 migrations done today are due to this problem.
* This Change Order was not accepted at this meeting. LNPA Working Group Members have an action to come prepared at the March 2005 meeting to decide if we will accept this as a Change Order. NeuStar is to see if the NPAC Help Desk can determine the number of reports of codes opened by the wrong provider. NeuStar will provide a readout at the April 2005 LNPA meeting.

**THURSDAY 02/17/05**

Thursday, 02/17/05, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T | Dave Garner | | Qwest |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Craig Bartell | | Sprint |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian Consortium (phone) | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint |
| Jason Powell | Centennial Wireless (phone) | Bill Riley | | Sprint (phone) |
| Lonnie Keck | Cingular (phone) | Rob Smith | | Syniverse |
| Michelle Gwaltney | Cingular | Darren Paffenroth | | Syniverse |
| Dennis Robins | Electric Lightwave (phone) | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec |
| Jean Anthony | Evolving Systems | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Therese Mooney | Global Crossing (phone) | Jason Kempson | | Telcordia |
| Jamie Sharpe | Interstate FiberNet (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Jason Loyer | NeuStar | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar | Ginny Cashbaugh | | US Cellular |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Nancy Davies | | Verizon (phone) |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| Gene Johnston | NeuStar | Sara Hooker | | Verizon Wireless (phone) |
| Rosemary Emmer | Nextel | Jeff Harmon | | Verizon Wireless (phone) |
| Danielle Estrada | Nextel | Deborah Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Juan Aguirre | Nextel |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

NANC 323 SPID Migration Documents Discussion (NeuStar):

* No comments were offered on the document changes.
* Action Item 0904-04: BellSouth withdrew the Action Item. Action item closed.
* Action Item 1004-21:
* It was suggested that we have made changes in blackout dates and maximum number of migrations and we should wait and see the results of these changes.
* Another member suggested that in months where we only have one blackout date, add one and make it consecutive.
* It was also asked if we are prioritizing migrations in any way. Some provider IT folks want to do more migrations on a given Sunday and have fewer Sundays with migrations.
* It was asked if there could be a time when there were so many migrations scheduled on a Sunday that NPAC couldn’t get all of the files available within the two hour commitment so that the providers could process them in the maintenance window.
* July 17th will be added as a 2nd blackout date for July.
* A member suggested setting a minimum number of migrations on a Sunday to force migrations to be bunched more together. The member also likes the suggestion of prioritizing migrations.
* It was then suggested that if a maximum is reached on a Sunday and a provider has a critical need to schedule a migration, that provider should work with other providers to see if slots could be swapped.
* Some providers agreed that it would be helpful to have two blackout dates in a month and stagger them. It is difficult to schedule regular maintenance on Sundays with migrations because of the unknown when the files will be available. August 21st, September 18th, October 16th are tentative blackout dates. Holiday blackout dates will be reviewed again in the future for 2006.

* Action Item 0105-20: Verizon stated that they oppose making the SMURF file notification an exception-only notification if the files will not be available within the 2 hour commitment. This would require operations personnel to keep checking to see if they are on the FTP site, taking them away from other critical maintenance tasks. BellSouth supported Verizon’s position. Verizon Wireless stated that they would like to have both notifications, the current one and the proposed exception-only notification.
* The group reviewed the attached INC Issue 466, which addresses LNPA-proposed changes to the COCAG Appendix C. The LNPA proposed additional changes to the document, which are reflected in the attached. Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will send the proposed revisions to the INC Chairs **before March 4th** in order to have the proposed revisions considered by INC before the issue goes to Final Closure.



Application Server Technology Migration (NeuStar):



* A provider raised a concern that 5/22/05 was too early for the 1st Region deployment.
* Key exchange is required for the test bed since this is a new test environment.
* NeuStar will develop a Project Plan for the upcoming NPAC Application Server Technology Migration in both Microsoft Projects and Word and distribute to the LNPA.
* Regions 6 and 7 and SOW 34 test bed will be moved from July 10 to July 17. Canada will stay on July 10th.
* A local system vendor member asked if the ITP start date could be pulled up. NeuStar said that it would be easier to push the date out than bring it up.
* The LLC date for deciding region slots will be pulled up to the September 2005 LLC meeting.

NPAC Release 3.3 (SOW 49) Project Plan (NeuStar):

* A local system vendor member asked that the ASN.1 and GDMO be made available sooner than 3/11 if possible. NeuStar said that it would be difficult to move it up but will try if possible.
* LNPA Working Group Members are to review the attached Release 3.3 Project Plan and come to the March 2005 LNPA meeting prepared to communicate any concerns/revisions.

 

Review of January Action Items:



* Item 0105-01: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0105-02: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0105-03: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0105-04: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0105-05: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0105-06: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0105-07: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0105-08: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0105-09: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0105-10: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0105-11: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0105-12: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0105-13: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0105-14: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0105-15: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0105-16: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0105-17: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0105-18: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0105-19: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0105-20: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0105-21: This item remains Open.

Action Items Remaining Open from Previous Meetings:

* Item 0804-33: This Action Item was deferred to the March 2005 LNPA meeting. NeuStar contact changed to Steve Addicks. Forecasted data due to Steve Addicks by January 31, 2005. The Action Item was modified to reflect that the forecasted numbers should specify volumes, the time period for which the activity is to be accomplished, and the calendar period for the activity. Data from four providers has been received to date.
* Item 0904-04: BellSouth agreed to close this Action Item.
* Item 0904-09: Item remains Open.
* Item 1004-21: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1104-09: This item remains Open and will be discussed at the March 2005 meeting.
* Item 1204-14: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1204-21: This item is in progress and remains Open.

VoIP Info Request Letter (Sue Tiffany, Sprint):

* Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will send the attached VoIP information request letter to the following industry groups:
* PTSC (formerly T1S1)
* ENUM Forum
* ENUM LLC and its Technical Advisory Group
* IETF (in particular the Transport Area Working Group)
* NANC Future of Numbering Working Group
* TMOC (formerly T1M1)



New Business:

BDD Discussion – Dave Cochran, BellSouth:

* Dave Cochran, BellSouth, asked if full BDDs are a viable means of recovering data based on the length of time it takes, and are there any other alternatives. New providers coming on line today would take a full BDD to load their LSMS.
* In the case where there is database corruption in primary and backup database copies, a provider would have to take a full BDD, per NeuStar. If a provider is down for a period, they could request a delta BDD based on a timeframe.
* If a provider does not have a viable backup copy of data, a provider would have to take a full BDD. BellSouth has estimated that this would take days to load and process.
* Evolving Systems stated that they have received feedback from multiple customers that indicated it takes approximately 4 hours to load a full BDD file in an LSMS in one region.
* Maggie Lee, VeriSign, will provide the time it took to load and process full Bulk Data Downloads (BDDs) recently for 7 regions in an LSMS.
* LNPA Working Group Members are to come to the March 2005 LNPA meeting prepared to discuss any concerns regarding the time required to load and process full Bulk Data Downloads (BDDs).
* This topic will be on the agenda for 1 hour in March.

Request for SS# on LSR for Porting from Wireless Carriers – Gary Sacra, Verizon:

* Gary Sacra, Verizon, teed up an issue where some wireless carriers are requiring the end user’s Social Security No. (SSN) on LSRs before they will confirm a port out. Due to the concerns over identity theft, many end users refuse to provide the information.
* A wireline service provider member stated that this sounds more like an interference. If you have the customer name and number, and an LOA, you should have all you need.
* Wireless carriers in attendance stated that the LSOG states that the end user’s SSN, Tax ID, or Account No. can be used by the New SP when submitting an LSR.
* A member said that New York and California have laws that say that service cannot be withheld if the customer refuses to provide their SSN.
* Service Providers are to investigate internally if they are experiencing this problem and how they are dealing with it.

Southeast Region high volume porting issue – Deborah Tucker, Verizon Wireless:

* Deborah Tucker, Verizon Wireless, reported that high volumes of porting activity in the SE Region recently slowed down the region. She surmised that it appeared that numbers were being moved from one SPID to another for load balancing. This was done in the middle of the day from 3 to 5pm in the afternoon. She questioned if there was some misuse of the NPAC to accomplish something other than subscriber porting.
* NeuStar took an action to send out a notice to all regions via the X-Regional distribution that large porting activity should be done in off-hours.

***Next Meeting …******March 8-10, 2005, Napa, California – Hosted by NeuStar***