LNPA WORKING GROUP

March 2004 Meeting

Draft Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Birmingham, Alabama | Host: BellSouth |

**TUESDAY 3/9/04**

Tuesday, 3/9/04, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Wendy Wheeler | Alltel | Susan Ortega | | Nextel |
| Cheryl Gordon | Alltel | Alain Richard | | Qwest Wireless |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T | Dave Garner | | Qwest |
|  |  | Charles Ryburn | | SBC (phone) |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | ATTWS | Leah Luper | | SBC |
| Sean Hawkins | ATTWS (phone) | Craig Bartell | | Sprint |
| Lonnie Keck | ATTWS (phone) | Rick Dressner | | Sprint PCS |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint PCS (phone) |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint PCS) |
| Mel Clay | BellSouth |  | |  |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LLC | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec |
| Mark Wood | Cingular | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Leslie Miklos | (phone) | Jason Kempson | | Telcordia |
|  |  | Jean Anthony | | Telecom Software (phone) |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox (phone) |  | |  |
| Laurie Itkin | Cricket Communications | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Dennis Robins | Electric Lightwave (phone) | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile |
| Keagan O’Rourke | Evolving Systems (phone) | Rob Smith | | TSI |
|  |  |  | |  |
| Dena Hunter | Level 3 (phone) |  | |  |
| Pascale Lacroix | Microcell | Brian Foster | | US Cellular |
|  |  | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
|  |  | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
|  |  | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar |  | |  |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Deborah Stephens | | Verizon Wireless |
| Shannon Sevigny | NeuStar (phone) |  | |  |
| Larry Vagnoni | NeuStar |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Blaine Reeve | | Western Wireless Corp. |
| Mindi Patterson | NeuStar |  | |  |

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

**MEETING MINUTES:**

2004 Meeting Schedule:

* Starting with the April 2004 meeting, the Wireless Number Portability Operations (WNPO) team will meet all day on Monday of LNPA week from 8:30am to 5pm local time.
* Starting with the April 2004 LNPA meeting, the LNPA Working Group will meet on Tuesday from 8:30am to 5pm local time and Wednesday from 8:30am to 5pm local time.
* The Architecture Planning Team (APT) will meet from 8:30am to 3pm local time on Thursday of LNPA week.
* 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 DRAFT January 2004 LNPA Minutes were approved at the March 2004 LNPA meeting and will be issued as the FINAL January 2004 LNPA Minutes.

02/04 Minutes Review:

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

* Page 3, 2004 meeting schedule: Change the April meeting location from Sterling, Virginia to Chicago, Illinois.
* Page 6, PIC freeze questionnaire bullet: Change “Local PIC freeze” to read “Local Account freeze.”
* Page 21, first bullet under Performance Requirements: Change “activate requests” to read “activates.”
* Page 22, fourth bullet under Performance Requirements: Change to read, “There are periods of time when 2 CMIP messages per second are not adequate.”

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

* The NANC Issue Management Group (IMG) is still discussing the inter-modal porting interval. There is no resolution date set at this time.
* Subsequent to the NAPM LLC’s approval, NeuStar returned to the pre-11/24/03 Help Desk support hours (see attached).



* Regarding the need for accurate jurisdictional information for accurate billing, the ATIS Network Interconnection Interoperability Forum (NIIF) and Network Inter-Operability Committee (NIOC) will work with the TR45 standards group on Jurisdictional Information Parameter (JIP) population.
* Ordering & Billing Forum (OBF) Wireless Workshop Resadout:
* The Workshop will discontinue the conference bridge during meetings if it is not used.
* Deployment of WICIS Release 2.1 will be a flash cut. The weekend for the cut is yet to be determined.
* Frank Reed, T-Mobile, was elected Co-Chair of the Fall Out Reduction Team (FORT), joining Craig Bartell, Sprint. The FORT Metrics Team has been disbanded.
* Deborah Stephens, Verizon Wireless, gave a readout of the joint CTIA/USTA calls on inter-modal porting issues. She stated that the main goal of the calls is to provide trading partner profile information and contacts to clean up existing porting fallout.
* The WNPO will have a call on 3/23/04 for two hours to discuss the request from the NPAC Forecasting Group (NFG) to revisit the 4Q04 wireless Busy Season forecast. Any resultant recommended changes to the forecast will be sent to the NFG in April. The WNPO will work with the NFG to ensure the NFG’s expectations are met.
* The WNPO reviewed the attached NPA Split Matrix and made necessary changes. This matrix reflects carriers’ NPA requirements, Old NPA or New NPA, on LSRs received during the permissive dialing period of an NPA split. The goal is for carriers, both wireline and wireless, to update the matrix and post to the website.



* The WNPO discussed PIM 30, which addresses N-1 query responsibility. A number of wireless carriers stated that default routed calls are driving up their network costs due to the need to perform the query of last resort. See further LNPA discussion on PIM 30.

* An industry outage notification has been developed cooperatively by the Service Bureau/Clearinghouse vendors to notify each other and customers of unplanned outages using a standard message format.



* A new WNPO Subcommittee, the Carrier Contact Taskforce, will work with the NIIF to get the NIIF contact list updated.
* A new contribution on the Wireless Conflict Timer was submitted by AT&T Wireless. The contribution recommends raising the value of the timer higher than its current six business hour value. Carriers are to discuss internally and vote next month on whether to make a change to the timer and to what value.



* New business – account code processing in the ICP process is causing problems in some instances. In some cases, when the New Service Provider uses the account number as shown on the customer’s bill and submits the Wireless Port Request to the ICP process, leading or trailing digits being dropped or added causes the account number to be rejected. It was agreed that this appears to be a training issue and carriers should send out an internal memo. This is a carrier specific issue and does not appear to be industry wide.

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

* The APT met on 02/05/04. Attached is the meeting agenda.



* Performance Requirements:
* The APT continues to focus on determining SOA interface throughput requirements. The current FRS requirement of 2 CMIP Operations per second is adequate for most, but not all SOAs.
* NeuStar reviewed the % participation of the top 5 participants for activates in each region for December, spread over the month. The concept here is that those who are doing activates are the ones doing the porting and other notification traffic projections can be based on these percentages. The eventual goal is to identify what a new requirement for the SOA interface would be. The group will identify both sustained and peak SOA interface throughput requirements.
* Currently, the SOA interface throughput requirement is the same for every SOA. The APT discussed the differences between having bandwidth and NPAC processing power for the same requirement of X per second for Y SOAs vs. engineering for X per second sustainable for an hour for the high SOA with Z messages per second total for the hour. The group agreed we need to identify peak duration and total throughput if we are to develop different requirements for different types of providers.
* CMIP Interface Improvements/Performance related Change Orders:
* NeuStar distributed the Change Order Matrix under development in the APT containing the High, Medium, and Low priorities assigned by the group in the February meeting.
* The APT team agreed to 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. These rankings will be compiled and eventually serve as recommendations to the LNPA.
* Current Issues:
* Requirements for the proposed volume and performance testbed developed in the WNPO were discussed:
* 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 be discussed further in the March APT meeting.

* The APT discussed the need for service providers to access historical copies of

SVs. The group walked through an example of how historical copies are created and stored. NeuStar would like to submit a Change Order to eliminate creation and storage of the “snapshots” of SVs that are currently created in the background and not broadcast to LSMSs. Creation of these historical copies consume a tremendous amount of bandwidth. Historical copies of SVs created when a number is ported to another service provider will be maintained and accessible per the current rules.

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, as well as the attached updated NFG traffic model. He reported that the February results were similar to January’s in terms of the variance between the forecasted wireless ports and the actual wireless ports.

 

* Paul stated that the key thing to focus on for the WNPO review of the projected 4Q04 Busy Season is the churn rate assumptions and if they are still valid. He suggested that we may want to filter out technology migrations from the churn rate if they are included in that variable. He further stated that we should use actual data as it becomes available to bang against the churn rate assumptions as a validity check.
* An LNPA member stated that technology migrations need to be accounted for somewhere in the model. It is not clear where they appear in the current model. Paul suggested that the churn rate variable be just that in the model and anything else, if included in the churn rate, should be broken out separately.
* It was requested that the WNPO review what is included in the model’s churn rate calculation for the upcoming Nov/Dec Busy Season.

CTIA/USTA Inter-modal Porting Conference Calls:

* Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, gave a readout of the ongoing joint CTIA/USTA member conference calls to discuss issues related to inter-modal porting.
* The group is working to facilitate the sharing of trading partner profile information between carriers and contact information to address inter-modal porting fallout.

PIMs:

.

* PIM 22 – PIM 22 remains open. The group will move forward with developing the requirements for NANC Change Order 375.

 

* 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. PA Change Order 24 will remain open. The results of the trial will dictate the disposition of Change Order 24. The PIM will remain open pending the FCC’s 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 Workshop and Local Ordering and Provisioning (LSOP) Committee. On 2/24/04, the OBF sent the attached response stating that the Local Service Ordering and Provisioning Committee (LSOP) accepted this issue (Issue 2729) on February 9, 2004, during OBF #85 and referred it to be worked by the Interspecies Task Force (ITF). During the March LNPA, it was stated that a workaround has been implemented for the vendor that wireless providers use to communicate with RBOCs. This PIM will continue to be tracked by the LNPA as it is worked in the ITF.

 

* 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.



During the discussion at the March meeting, BellSouth stated that they do not perform the disconnect until they get an NPAC activate notification. SBC currently has a similar process in the West Coast and is in the process of implementing it throughout their footprint. Qwest and Verizon will take a Supplemental LSR until late in the evening on the due date to stop the disconnect if the New Service Provider is not going to activate the port. Cox has put a process in place to monitor the NPAC and will not pull translations until they see an NPAC activation. Some CLECs said that they still see some disconnects before activation but it is not as bad as it once was. Verizon and Qwest said that mechanizing a process for monitoring the NPAC for an activation notification to serve as a trigger to perform the switch disconnect would take extensive system and process changes. Electric Lightwave stated that their technicians send a query through the switch when they get a disconnect order and will not disconnect until they get an LRN in the response. Qwest stated that the New Service Provider is the agent for the porting customer and should be responsible for contacting the Old Service Provider if they are not going to activate. Qwest further suggested that if the wireless service provider has not received a Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) after 24 hours, they should follow up with the Old Service Provider.

Service Providers took the following action items for discussion at the April LNPA meeting:

1. to investigate internally if it is feasible for them to monitor the NPAC for evidence that the port has occurred before removing donor switch translations associated with the ported number.
2. to answer the following question: If they send up an authorizing Old Service Provider Create, can its notification be used by the New Service Provider to indicate that an FOC/WPRR not received has been issued and lost in transit and approval to activate the port on the due date on that SV Create is granted? NOTE: It was suggested by some members that this breaks the NANC flows, which require receipt of the FOC before the activate can take place. Another member also reminded the group that the Old Service Provider confirming Create message is optional.

* 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.



Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, forward to the LNPA and WNPO distribution list the attached cites sent to him by LNPA members defining the N-1 Local Number Portability architecture. This PIM has been accepted by the group.



At the March LNPA meeting, a member expressed concern that in the WNPO, some carriers felt that they did not have to do default queries until 5/24/04. Concern was further expressed that this issue may get worse on 5/24. This PIM has two issues – identifying the N-1 carrier and whether or not wireless carriers are obligated to do the default query. It was suggested that the question of default routing should be taken to the WNPO to determine what can be put in place to allow wireless carriers to charge for default queries. No one disagreed that the donor switch should NOT be getting these default routed calls. All carriers are strongly urged to perform the query when they are the N-1 carrier.

Another member stated that the following was their company’s interpretation of the N-1 carrier’s query responsibilities based on a reading of the industry documentation and end office switch functionality:

* LOCAL CALL:

The originating carrier is the N-1 carrier and is responsible for performing the query in its network or entering into an agreement with another entity to perform the queries on its behalf.

* TOLL CALL:
* For an interLATA Toll call, the IXC is the N-1 carrier and is responsible for performing the query in its network or entering into an agreement with another entity to perform the queries on its behalf.
* For an intraLATA Toll call where the originating carrier is the Pre-subscribed IntraLATA Carrier for the calling party, the originating carrier is the N-1 carrier and is responsible for performing the query in its network or entering into an agreement with another entity to perform the queries on its behalf.
* For an intraLATA Toll call where the originating carrier is NOT the Pre-subscribed IntraLATA Carrier for the calling party, the Pre-subscribed IntraLATA Carrier is the N-1 carrier and is responsible for performing the query in its network or entering into an agreement with another entity to perform the queries on its behalf.
* DEFAULT QUERIES (A.K.A. QUERY OF LAST RESORT OR DONOR SWITCH QUERIES)
* If an LNP query is not performed previously in the call path, the call will continue to route on the dialed digits until it could eventually reach the LERG-assigned switch for the dialed NPA-NXX. This will put that LERG-assignee in the position of performing a default LNP query if the dialed digits are within a portable NPA-NXX.
* A carrier may bill the N-1 carrier for performing the default query when the N-1 carrier default routes a call unqueried.
* Unless specified in business arrangements, carriers may block default routed calls incoming to their network in order to protect against overload, congestion, or failure propagation that are caused by the defaulted calls.

This PIM remains open and will be discussed further at the April meeting. The LNPA agreed to document its consensus on N-1 responsibilities based on its assessment of FCC cites and industry documentation. This will be documented in LNPA meeting minutes and the PIM 30 resolution for possible reference by a service provider seeking to escalate if they feel they are receiving an inordinate amount of default routed calls.

* NEW PIM 31 – This PIM, submitted by Syniverse (formerly TSI), seeks to address fallout that occurs in cases where the wireline Old Service Provider involved in a port issues a jeopardy notification with a change in due date to the wireless New Service Provider. Wireless carriers currently cannot support jeopardy notices with changes to the due date and time. This PIM was accepted by the LNPA. Rob Smith, Syniverse, took an action to quantify and provide examples of why wireline carriers are placing these previously confirmed ports in jeopardy. This will determine the disposition of the PIM.



* NEW 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 or Type 1 Cellular number. This PIM was accepted by the LNPA.



Wireline Local Exchange Carriers (LECs) took an action to investigate internally the process for porting reseller numbers between wireline carriers in an effort to determine why there are issues with porting Type 1 Cellular and reseller numbers to wireless carriers. An interim call to discuss this research was scheduled for 3/25/04 from 2–4pm Eastern. The conference bridge number is 888-412-7808, passcode 23272#.

NOTE: Attached are the minutes to the call that was held on 3/25/04.



* NEW PIM 33 – This PIM, submitted by Adelphia Business Solutions, seeks to have NeuStar charges waived for non-discretionary NPAC reports produced when they take ownership of an NXX code returned by another provider. It was suggested that one alternative would be to allocate the charges across providers in the region. Another suggestion was to use data from an LSMS as the source, however, a Service Bureau member of the LNPA stated that providers that go through a Service Bureau do not have access to an LSMS. It was further stated that waiving this charge would be a Master Contract change and allocating the charge would be contrary to the FCC Order on allocation. Another member said that the only recourse so to not take the code. It was agreed that this is a regulatory issue and not in the purview of the LNPA. This PIM was not accepted.



**WEDNESDAY 3/10/04**

Wednesday, 3/10/04, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Wendy Wheeler | Alltel | Susan Ortega | | Nextel |
| Cheryl Gordon | Alltel |  | |  |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T | Dave Garner | | Qwest |
| Jeannie Kulesa | AT&T (phone) | Charles Ryburn | | SBC (phone) |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | ATTWS | Tim Waters | | SBC (phone) |
| Sean Hawkins | ATTWS (phone) | Leah Luper | | SBC |
|  |  | Craig Bartell | | Sprint |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Rick Dressner | | Sprint PCS |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint PCS |
| Mel Clay | BellSouth | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint PCS) |
|  |  | Rob Smith | | Syniverse |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LLC | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec |
| Lori Doty | Centennial Comm. (phone) | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
|  |  | Jason Kempson | | Telcordia |
|  |  | Jean Anthony | | Telecom Software (phone) |
| Dennis Robins | Electric Lightwave (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Dena Hunter | Level 3 (phone) | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar |  | |  |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Brian Foster | | US Cellular |
| Shannon Sevigny | NeuStar (phone) | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| Larry Vagnoni | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
|  |  | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Deborah Stephens | | Verizon Wireless |
|  |  |  | |  |
| Mindi Patterson | NeuStar |  | |  |
| Amy Putnam | NeuStar (phone) |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

NANC Action Item – Unified Top 100 MSA List Discussion:

* Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, again 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 pooling has its marching orders from the FCC and the PA can’t deviate from that list. Any single list would have to be their list if the PA is to buy into it. Any changes to the pooling list would require FCC authorization.
* Carriers outside the top 100 MSAs must be LNP-capable within 6 months if they receive a Bona Fide Request (BFR), if they do not have a waiver. The WNPO-recommended MSA list for porting does not displace the BFR process.
* Out of over 5200 rate centers, there are about 19 rate centers on the pooling list that are not on the WNPO porting list. There are many rate centers (those that touch a top 100 MSA but are not within) on the WNPO list that are not on the pooling list.
* After 5/24/04, the porting list is irrelevant because the BFR process takes precedence.
* PATH FORWARD:
* To mitigate any confusion as to what areas are opened to porting and pooling, the group agreed to develop a single spreadsheet with two tabs, one for the WNPO-recommended porting list and one for the FCC-mandated pooling list, arranged by the Rate Centers that are opened on each list. If the Rate Center is mandated for pooling at a future date, the date will be reflected in the pooling list. Cheryl Gordon, Alltel, graciously volunteered to develop the spreadsheet.
* The pooling list will be validated by the Pool Administrator.
* The spreadsheet containing both the WNPO-recommended porting list and the FCC-mandated pooling list will be published to the LNPA and WNPO distributions.
* The porting list will cease to exist on May 24th at which time the Bona Fide Request (BFR)/waiver process will take precedence. Carriers can refer to the LERG and NPAC to determine codes that are opened to portability.
* The pooling list will be maintained by the Pool Administrator.
* The will be reported to the NANC at their March meeting.

Clearinghouse Presentation – Rob Smith – Syniverse:

* Rob Smith, Syniverse, gave the LNPA the attached overview of the Clearinghouse architecture, explaining that a provider can interface with multiple providers via a single connection to a Clearinghouse vs. multiple connections to other providers.



* The Inter-carrier Communications Process (ICP) is strictly for wireless – wireless.
* Depending on the trading partner scenario, in some cases when the interface is electronic, the wireless carrier receives an acknowledgement from the wireline carrier when the wireline carrier successfully receives the LSR that was mapped to the WPR.

Change Management Discussion:

* **NANC 391**:
* At the February 2004 LNPA meeting, Service Providers took an action 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.”
* Some discussion ensued on the distinction between “port-authorizing” and “non-rejected” FOC/WPRR. A member raised the concern that the Old Service Provider could return an FOC authorizing the port and then subsequently reject it, hence his stated support for the definition change to “A Non-rejected FOC/WPRR Not Issued.” He is concerned that the rewording of Cause Value 51 will have an impact on how it can be used in conjunction with NANC 375, which is associated with PIM 22.
* Vote Results: 13 voting members in favor of “A Port-Authorizing FOC/WPRR Not Issued,” 1 voting member in favor of “A Non-rejected FOC/WPRR Not Issued.” The member in favor of “A Non-rejected FOC/WPRR Not Issued” stated that he wants to revisit this definition if NANC 375 is implemented.
* NeuStar took an action to determine if this is a code change or database change to change this in the GUI. NeStar subsequently determined that this is a code change. Due to the discovery that this is a GUI code change, the discussion of wording for Cause Values 50 and 51 will be moved into the NANC 375 discussion. This will prevent any changes made as a result of NANC 391 from possibly being changed again during the NANC 375 discussion.
* **NANC 323 – SPID Migration**:



* 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.
* Questions were asked regarding what the minimum number of impacted records would be to drive scheduling a migration weekend. Resource concerns were expressed over scheduling people to come in on the weekend for a minor number of changes. This is an issue to be addressed.
* Another member is concerned that providers may mistakenly load the preliminary SMURF files into production. He suggested that a disclaimer statement be put in the M&P that these should not be loaded into production. NeuStar will add.
* Readiness calls will be on the Thursday during the week preceding the week leading up to migration weekend and on the Friday immediately before migration weekend. NeuStar will begin canceling any pending-like SVs where SPID A is either the Old or New Service Provider beginning on the Saturday of migration weekend (sometime after midnight).
* Reports of canceled SVs will only go to the involved service providers. All normal SOA notifications will be sent by NPAC if a pending SV is cancelled.
* The group then reviewed the LERG timeline for a code transfer and overlaid it onto Figure 1 to synch up the two timelines.

* Figure 5, Step 6 – A bridge will be opened up by NeuStar on Monday following the migration at 11am Central to discuss success/failure, etc.
* NeuStar introduced a checklist for NPAC activities related to a SPID migration. Question asked – can we develop a service provider checklist? Jeff Adrian, Sprint PCS, took an action to coordinate a subteam to develop a draft Service Provider Checklist related to a SPID migration to be presented at the April meeting.

NOTE: Subsequent to the March LNPA meeting, a NANC 323 Subteam conference call was held on 3/15/04 to begin development of a Service Provider Checklist. Attached are the minutes to that call.



* NANC 323 discussion will be on the agenda for the April LNPA meeting.

NPAC Technology Migration Update – NeuStar:

* NeuStar stated that the planned NPAC technology migration is on schedule. Attached is the latest Migration Project Plan.



* The regional rollout order approved by the NAPM/LLC is as follows:
* 5/16/04 Western
* 6/6/04 Southeast and Mid-Atlantic
* 6/27/04 Southwest and Northeast
* 7/11/04 West Coast and Midwest
* A member asked NeuStar if this increased NPAC performance could have a negative impact on the service provider side. NeuStar responded that history has shown that better throughput has not negatively impacted service providers because of better flow control mechanisms. It was then asked if service providers feel that they need to do any additional throughput performance testing as a result of the new release, in addition to what is already in the test plan. If so, this should be coordinated through the NPAC testing team.

NANC Report:

* Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, reviewed the items to be included in the March LNPA Report to NANC:
* Architecture Planning Team (APT) Update
* PIMs
* Action item on Top 100 MSA lists
* NANC 323 SPID Migration Update

Port Protection Change Order 382 Discussion:



* Service Providers are to come to the April 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?

Review of February Action Items:



* Item 0204-01: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0204-02: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0204-03: This item was completed and is Closed. No IIS changes are required.
* Item 0204-04: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0204-05: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0204-06: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0204-07: This item was completed and is Closed. PIM 32 has been submitted and accepted by the LNPA.
* Item 0204-08: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0204-09: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0204-10: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0204-11: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0204-12: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0204-13: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0204-14: A number of APT members provided their rankings of the 14 Change Orders at the March APT meeting. Further input will be provided at the April APT meeting and compiled. Item remains open.
* Item 0204-15: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0204-16: This item was completed and is Closed. Attached are the minutes to the resultant 2/13/04 FORT call discussing PIM 29.



* Item 0204-17: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0204-18: Item remains open. Service providers will monitor and provide feedback on whether or not this issue is improving.
* Item 0204-19: This item is Closed. This will be incorporated into the NANC 375 discussion.
* Item 0204-20: Item remains open until the July 2004 WNPO and LNPA meetings.

Action Items Remaining Open from Previous Meetings:

* Item 1103-03: NeuStar responded that any single provider could be migrated within an 8 hour window. Multiple providers requiring migration would require further analysis to determine if an extended window or additional windows are required. Item is Closed.
* Item 1103-05: This item was completed and is Closed.
* 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 1203-09: Item remains open. NeuStar stated that this is still occurring but not to the degree it once was. Verizon, BellSouth, and Qwest responded that their systems do not auto resend the requests. Item stays open and will be discussed further at the April Architecture team meeting.
* Item 1203-11: Item remains open. To be discussed further at the April Architecture team meeting.
* Item 0104-07: This is an ongoing agenda item for the APT. The item is Closed.
* Item 0104-09: Item remains open and will be on the agenda for the April LNPA meeting.
* 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.

New Business:

* The attached liaison from the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) was briefly discussed. INC is looking to validate their technical concerns regarding the porting of numbers.



It was stated that this is not an issue for wireless to wireless porting, but for wireless to wireline porting of numbers within these grandfathered codes. A member stated that the USTA had filed a petition with the FCC on this very issue and it is premature to discuss this in this forum until the FCC responds to the petition and gives providers an opportunity to file comments. Service Providers have an action to discuss this with their respective INC representative. This INC request will be on the April LNPA agenda to determine the disposition of this request and how the LNPA will respond to INC.

* Dave Garner, Qwest, provided the following heads-up to the LNPA. The U.K. Office of Communications (OFCOM) is proposing that Voice over Broadband (VoB) services use non-geographic numbers. To make such numbers available for allocation for VoB services, OFCOM proposes to modify Britain's National Telephone Numbering Plan (NTNP). The agency also wants to know whether geographic numbers are suitable for VoB services. Dave cautioned the LNPA that if this were implemented in the U.S., issues could possibly arise due to our LNP design, e.g., issues related to serving a Phoenix number in New York City.
* NeuStar stated that after a SPID migration, if the SPID in NPAC doesn’t match the SPID in the LSMS during an audit, NPAC will send a modify over the interface. The Distinguished Name cannot be changed via a modify. An attempt would be rejected and a partial fail would occur. This is to be discussed in the APT. NeuStar is looking for guidance from the group on appropriate treatment.

**THURSDAY 3/11/04 ARCHITECTURE PLANNING TEAM (APT)**

Thursday, 3/11/04, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T | Bill Reilly | | Sprint |
| Bob Frasca | AT&T | Sue Tiffany | | Sprint |
| Steve Sanchez | ATTWS | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint PCS |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Rick Dressner | | Sprint PCS |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LLC | Jason Kempson | | Telcordia |
| Laurie Doty | Centennial Comm | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile (phone) |
| Keagan O’Rourke | ESI (phone) | Jean Anthony | | TSE (phone) |
| Steve Addicks | NeuStar | Rob Smith | | Syniverse |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Brian Foster | | US Cellular |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | | Verisign |
| Susan Ortega | Nextel (phone) | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Dave Garner | Qwest | Deb Stephens | | Verizon Wireless |
| Leah Luper | SBC |  | |  |
| Charles Ryburn | SBC (phone) |  | |  |

**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 03/11/04. Attached is the meeting agenda.



Performance Requirements:

* NeuStar teed up an issue related to a post-323 migration scenario where an LSMS has an SV that has a SPID different than NPAC. If a provider does an audit on that TN, NPAC will send a Modify to attempt to change the SPID. SPID is part of the Distinguished Name and cannot be changed via a Modify. NeuStar is seeking guidance on how to address this. Can all LSMSs handle a disconnect immediately followed by an activate with the same SV ID? Sending a Modify will not work because some LSMS implementation’s toolkit will reject the Modify and put the SV on the partial fail list with possibly no way to get it off.

Four possible options were discussed as to how NPAC should respond to an audit request on that TN. Those options are:

1. Status Quo – NPAC sends a modify in an attempt to modify the SPID, which could knock the SV onto the Partial Fail list with possibly no way to remove it from the list. Deemed not acceptable by the APT group.
2. Change the SPID attribute by sending an activate to the LSMS with the same SV ID. This was also deemed not acceptable as it would allow NANC 323 functionality to take place over the interface.
3. Ignore the SPID attribute discrepancy with no indication that the SV is discrepant. This would be logged in the NPAC error log.
4. Ignore the SPID attribute discrepancy with a notification that the SV is discrepant. This would also be logged in the NPAC error log. Questions remain as to the type of notification (e.g. automated notification over the interface, manual e-mail, etc.) and whether this notification would specifically indicate that the SPID is discrepant.

A question was asked as to what NPAC would do if it receives a modify SPID request from a SOA over the interface. NeuStar action to determine.

NeuStar took an action to investigate if something can be done in the shorter term in Option No. 4 above to utilize the logged error to notify the service provider initiating the audit of the SPID attribute discrepancy. NeuStar stated that in order to resolve this issue immediately, NPAC will ignore the SPID attribute discrepancy and log an error in the NPAC error log (Option No. 3). Action for the APT Team Members to discuss within their respective companies and come prepared to the April APT meeting to provide their option preference (No. 3 or 4).

* **How much throughput is needed on the SOA?**
* **Review the Feb’04 LNPA Traffic Model**
* **Discussion on distribution of volume across the SOAs**
* The APT discussed the latest traffic model (attached).



* Changes since the last version: Uses NPAC Forecasting Group (NFG) Model Version 2.51, updated the charts for 4Q04 (was 4Q03) estimates, added SOA participation worksheet, added Southwest Region to the summary file.
* In the Mid-Atlantic Region for one month, a service provider has 40% participation in porting activity, which equates to 9.9 SOA messages per second, including requests. The average participation of the top provider across all regions was 29%, which equates to 6.9 messages per second.
* The APT briefly discussed a contribution from John Malyar, Telcordia, that breaks up the total NPAC bandwidth requirement over the various SOA interfaces using as an example an 80/20 rule where 20% of the providers drive 80% of the activity. This will be discussed further at the April meeting.
* A wireless member stated that after the end of this quarter, restrictions will be lifted by a number of wireless providers that restrict activates to specific periods of the day. This would help smooth out the peaks over a 24 hour period.
* 4Q04 Hour Chart – reflects projections of request operations during each hour of the day, by region, by day. This is not based on actual data, but based on projection responses from service providers.
* The group agreed that the following is what we need to drive towards on a per region basis:
* Calculate the required SOA/LSMS interface sustained rate (Current SOA sustained rate in FRS requirements is 2 messages per second.)
* Calculate the required SOA/LSMS interface peak rate and duration (Current LSMS peak rate in FRS requirements is 5.2 messages per second for 5 minutes using the 80/20 rule for ranges and singles. Current SOA peak rate in FRS requirements is 5.2 messages per second with no duration specified.)
* Calculate SOA/LSMS total bandwidth requirements.
* Observations:
* Highest number of LSMSs in a region today is 30.
* 5 high volume SOAs represent 67% of overall message traffic.
* Low volume SOAs represent 33% of overall message traffic.
* The group developed the following potential proposal for LSMS interface throughput requirements based on an analysis of the current traffic model:
* Assumption is 1 TN per message.
* Proposed 2.5 messages/second sustained – 5.2 peak for 5 minutes (1 peak in a 1 hour period). The 2.5 messages per second was derived by averaging the LSMS Busy Hour messages per second across the 7 regions.
* This equates to total bandwidth of 156 messages per second (30 LSMSs \* 2.5 messages/second + 30 LSMSs \* 2.7 messages per second (peak of 5.2).
* The group developed the following potential proposal for SOA interface throughput requirements based on an analysis of the current traffic model:
* Assumption is 1 TN per operation (request).
* Using 100% for the Provider Participation % to derive total bandwidth requirement in each region, and averaging the 7 figures, a total bandwidth requirement of 26 messages per second sustained for a region was derived. The Northeast Region was the highest at 36 messages per second so this was chosen as the peak. This will need to be tweaked because some requests generate two notifications and this has been factored out from the service provider system perspective, but should not be from the NPAC perspective. NeuStar will create another spreadsheet.
* It has been established that the 5 high volume SOAs in a region represents 67% of overall message traffic.

26 messages per second total bandwidth sustained \* .67 = 17.5 messages per second total bandwidth sustained for the top 5 SOAs. Dividing this by 5 = **3.5 messages per second sustained as a possible proposal for a new FRS requirement for SOA interface sustained throughput.**

36 messages per second total bandwidth peak \* .67 = 24 messages per second total bandwidth peak for the top 5 SOAs. Dividing this by 5 = **4.8 messages per second peak as a possible proposal for a new FRS requirement for SOA interface peak throughput.**

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

* **Review of the Architecture Team Change Order Matrix. Discuss individual company feedback on priorities.**
* Discuss change orders (highest priority first) related to Interface/ Performance/Efficiency/Functionality contained in the APT Change Order working document.
* The APT began the process of numerically ranking the NANC Change Orders contained in the attached Revision 12 of the APT Working Document.



A number of APT members provided their rankings for the 14 Change Orders under discussion. Additional input is forthcoming from members. Vendor participation in the ranking process was invited and encouraged. NeuStar will compile the overall rankings when input from members is completed. This overall ranking will determine the order of the Change Orders the APT will address. The final compilation will be calculated as follows for each Change Order:

1. It is important that each member rank each Change Order from 1 to 14, with 1 being the highest rank.
2. Sum the submitted ranking numbers for the Change Order,
3. Divide the sum by the number of APT members ranking that Change Order,
4. When this is completed for each Change Order, rank the Change Orders from lowest result to highest result. The lower the result, the higher the ranking for the Change Order.

* AT&T stated that they would like to add NANC Change Orders 299 (NPAC Monitoring of SOA and LSMS Associations via Heartbeat) and 321 (Regional NPAC NPA Edit of Service Provider Network Data - NPA-NXX Data) as additional Change Orders of interest.

Current Issues:

* **Historical copies of SVs and pooled blocks. Are they needed? Discuss any questions/comments from information provided in Feb ’04 walk-thru.**
* NeuStar will create a Change Order to eliminate creation of the 110, 120, 130, etc. snapshots of active SVs that are not broadcast to the LSMS. They are only saved today for 180 days, but their creation utilizes a lot of NPAC processing power.

New Topics for APT:

* **Discuss topics for next month**
* Performance test bed (NANC 389)
* Final ranking of Change Orders
* Requirements development of high-ranked Change Orders