LNPA WORKING GROUP

April 2005 Meeting

Final Minutes

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

**TUESDAY 04/12/05**

Tuesday, 04/12/05, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Wendy Wheeler | Alltel (phone) | Dave Garner | | Qwest |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T (phone) | David Taylor | | SBC |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Leah Luper | | SBC (phone) |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Kelly Gracie | | SNET (phone) |
| Jason Powell | Centennial Wireless | Craig Bartell | | Sprint |
| Lonnie Keck | Cingular | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint |
| Melanie Wilkerson | Cingular | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox | Steve Moore | | Sprint |
| Lori McGarry | CTIA (phone) | Rob Smith | | Syniverse |
| Jean Anthony | Evolving Systems | Darren Paffenroth | | Syniverse |
| Jamie Sharpe | Interstate FiberNet (phone) | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Karen Mulberry | MCI | Jason Kempson | | Telcordia |
| Rick Jones | NENA | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Mark Dahlen | NeuStar | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| Dara Sedano | NeuStar (phone) | Jim Castagna | | Verizon |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Julie Anderson | | Verizon |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Nancy Briggs | | Verizon |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Sara Hooker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Larry Vagnoni | NeuStar | Jeff Harmon | | Verizon Wireless (phone) |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar | Deborah Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Holly Jacobs | NeuStar |  | |  |
| Susan Ortega | Nextel |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

Attached are the Action Items assigned at the April, 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 “APRIL 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 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

03/05 Minutes Review:

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

* Page 3, Wireless Committee readout, 3rd bullet, change 1st sentence to read, “PIM 45 (LSOP Issue 2817) is on the LSOP agenda for the May OBF 90 meeting in Denver.”
* Page 4, PIM 51, delete 8th sentence in readout, which reads, “Getting the ownership data from NANPA would require an FCC Change Order.”
* Page 8, PIM 36, change 2nd sentence to read, “NANC 321 is included in the recommended package for the next NPAC software release.”

Change 4th sentence to read, “The PIM was revised to eliminate the verbiage on LRNs because there is often more than one region that is correct for an LRN.”

* Page 8, PIM 38, change 2nd sentence of readout to read, “NANC 394 is included in the recommended package for the next NPAC software release.
* Page 11, Sunset Discussion, change all bullets to reflect “will not be sunset,” instead of “will not be sunsetted.”

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:

* A call was held last week to discuss the code in WICIS 3.0. A change was made to take out the single line IDL structure. This issue has been fast tracked. The resolution statement will go in the Best Practices document.
* The ATIS Board is still working on obtaining resources for the order form initiative, which will provide a cross-picture of all data elements on the various order forms. The overall objective is to determine if they can be standardized. An update of this initiative will be provided at the May OBF.

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

* Wireless Fax form will be presented at the next OBF meeting for approval.
  + ATIS Legal has been reviewing where this is to be posted and how it can be accessed. Update expected shortly from ATIS Legal.
  + Only ATIS members will be able to access. ATIS has been asked to place the form on their website, accessible by all.
* Issue 2801/2802 matrix: The matrix is complete and under review by providers. Five ILECs and one CLEC have provided their input. The analysis will identify Change Management initiatives that will be taken to the appropriate wireline carrier by wireless carriers.

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

* Jean Anthony, Evolving Systems, reported that a conference call was held on 3/31/05. 13 companies (combination of providers and vendors) participated.
* Vendor-to-vendor testing is scheduled to start 5/10/05, but it is not yet definite. NeuStar stated that their 3.0 system and resources will be ready 5/10. Syniverse stated their 3.0 system will be available on 5/10, but need resources to support. Verisign stated they will be ready for vendor-to-vendor testing in July.
* Service Providers are to come to the next WTSC Committee meeting with preliminary information on test environments and availability.
* The Committee is working on a WTSC Contact List that will be on the website by the end of the month.
* The next call is scheduled for 4/20/05 from 4-5pm eastern. The dial-in bridge information is on the website.

NENA Report (Rick Jones, NENA):

* Rick Jones, NENA, reported that the following issues are currently being worked in NENA:
* Some Wireless and VoIP N11 calls are being mis-routed. Calls are being sent back to the home network for routing instead of routing the call within the network where the customer has roamed. Roaming wireless is not a universal issue.
* Still having 911 data issues with VoIP. No clear-cut answer at this time. Non-native and nomadic numbers are still an issue. Some VoIP providers do not provide 911. In some porting scenarios from wireline to VoIP, the unlock/migrate 911 database process is appropriate. In others, the record should be deleted. They are not being deleted in the latter case. A member said the VoIP issue is not national in scope, but an issue in some areas of the country. Rick Jones agreed.
* For those VoIP providers that do provide 911, only the underlying network CLEC provider can be identified.
* NENA is working a wireless-like solution for nomadic VoIP that uses a pseudo-ANI.
* NENA is working closely with the IETF on resolving these issues.

PIM Discussion:

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

 

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



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

At the April LNPA meeting, it was reported that the LNPA and the INC held a joint call to discuss PIM 24 and to brainstorm possible approaches to resolve this issue. INC members have an action item to discuss this further with their LNPA members to develop a unified company position. INC has developed a draft response to LNPA that is now in ATIS Legal review. This will be furthered discussed at the June INC meeting. INC concerns are cost and the fact that the PIM 24 proposed resolution does not address all error scenarios, e.g., when the donor does not indicate a contaminated block, when in fact it is, and does not perform the required contaminated ports. A member asked if the INC guidelines address what a recipient provider should check when they receive a block before they put it into their inventory for assignment. The member said that this is the same as what we are asking the PA to do. Another member responded that the difference is that the PA check would prevent them from getting a block that they have to return, which increases the time before they can get the needed inventory. The first member stated that if we cannot get the reports for the PA, we should look into reducing the interval for the PA to get an emergency block to the recipient provider. The PA responded that they do work with affected providers to get another block ASAP. A discussion then ensued on why there is a need for a 33 day lead time before the block can be activated. Adam Newman, INC Vice Chair, explained that industry guidelines allow for a 19 day LERG notification interval so that carrier systems can be updated. Paula Jordan, LNPA Co-Chair, will obtain a status of PA Change Order 26.

The PIM will remain open.

  

* 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.



Questions still remain with some providers regarding the legal question as to whether this information can be provided. Sprint is attempting to identify ATNs on customer bills so they can instruct the customer on providing it to them. Progress in Change Management groups has been slowed somewhat in order to address legal questions. Syniverse has been told that eliminating the ATN is not an option in terms of edits.

* 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.



The proposed resolution for PIM 49, if implemented, will also address PIM 34.

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 is included in the recommended package for the next NPAC software release. This PIM is now in a tracking state awaiting implementation of NANC 321. The PIM was revised to eliminate the verbiage on LRNs because there is often more than one region that is correct for an LRN. LRNs can be in more than one region. NeuStar will continue a manual cleanup of NXXs opened in the wrong region until NANC 321 is implemented. NeuStar has increased the frequency of the manual cleanup.

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



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

* PIM 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.



INC Issue 466 has been taken to Initial Closure after addressing LNPA input.

* 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.

Syniverse stated that the CCNA field has been eliminated as a field that is causing an issue. Syniverse also stated that the recent FCC ruling means that the TOS field may no longer be as big of an issue because Service Providers must allow port requests on numbers with DSL to go through. A wireline member said that they will send back a clarification notifying the other carrier that there is DSL on the line. If the New Service Provider sends a Sup, they will then let it go through. The member said that this process is at the request of the CLECs that they port with. A wireless member asked if there is a way to indicate on the initial LSR that the line has DSL on it.

* 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 in tracking mode now that the LSOP Committee has opened a new issue to address guidelines for the return of errors (Issue No. 2817). PIM 45 (LSOP Issue 2817) is on the agenda for the May OBF 90 meeting in Denver. The OBF will work the issue extensively.

* 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.



Syniverse has received most of the necessary data. One carrier has quite a few Type 1s and is not active in LNPA. They are working with them. Syniverse has developed a software fix and is discussing this with wireless carriers. The fix is scheduled for a software release in their inter-modal porting software. If it is determined from the database that it is a Type 1 number, the software will populate the LSR with the necessary information. Rob Smith, Syniverse, will verify that the software also addresses flagging Type 1 pager numbers.

* 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. Syniverse is working with individual carriers to understand their process. Syniverse is still receiving additional information from carriers and is analyzing the data.



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



* + Action Item 0205-04: NeuStar said that there have been 0 reports at the Help Desk in the past 5 weeks, but this wouldn’t catch where a SPID migration was used to correct the problem. NeuStar will continue to track at the Help Desk and during SPID migrations. Susan Ortega, Nextel, will check internally to determine the current frequency of this issue experienced by Nextel and report back to the LNPA.
  + Action Item 0305-13:
    - SBC reported that they have experienced this issue, about 6 in recent history.
    - Verizon reported about 3-4 have occurred in the past year.
    - BellSouth reported that a handful have occurred in recent history and they are painful to fix
    - Qwest reported similar occurrences as BellSouth.
    - Verizon Wireless reported similar occurrences as BellSouth.
    - T-Mobile reported similar occurrences as BellSouth.

It was agreed that a sub-team will be formed to discuss a means of developing a SPID to OCN association: Susan Ortega (Nextel and Co-Chair), Steve Addicks (NeuStar), Deb Tucker (Verizon Wireless), Dave Cochran (BellSouth), Sue Tiffany (Sprint), Jeff Adrian (Sprint and Co-Chair), David Taylor (SBC), and Frank Reed (T-Mobile) will participate on the sub-team. The sub-team will meet before the May LNPA meeting. A readout will be on the May LNPA agenda.

3/30/05 Intermodal Call Readout (Sara Hooker, Verizon Wireless):

 

* A call was held to discuss the attached Court of Appeals intermodal porting stay judgment in order to be proactive and come up with a process to react to the order. It is a voluntary order in that those carriers impacted by the order can still opt to port. Carriers with 1500 or less employees can opt not to port.
* The attached template is designed to provide a list of carriers that will not be porting as a result of the court order.
* The issue is how to identify what carriers qualify for opting not to port and which ones will still port. It was suggested that the Small Business Association (SBA) may be a source.
* Sara Hooker, Verizon Wireless, will send to Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, the

current Intermodal Stay List, which addresses the porting intentions of those carriers identifying themselves as impacted by the U.S Court of Appeals’ stay on the future enforcement of the FCC’s intermodal porting order against carriers that are deemed “small entities,” until the FCC prepares and publishes a final regulatory flexibility analysis. Sara will also send any further updates to Gary Sacra.

* Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will upload the current Intermodal Stay List to the LNPA website and inform the LNPA members where the document will reside.
* Jeff Adrian, Sprint, will research additional sources for identifying carriers that qualify for the Intermodal Stay List.
* Maggie Lee, VeriSign, will solicit input from OPASTCO and USTA on requesting their members to identify if they qualify for the Intermodal Stay List and if they will opt out of porting.
* It was suggested that it would be good to have a list of qualifying carriers in the event that a wireless carrier gets a reject for that reason and they could then verify if they actually qualify.

Co-Chair Election Discussion:

* Paula Jordan and Gary Sacra will remain as Wireless and Wireline ILEC Co-Chairs, respectively. There are no nominations for the Wireline CLEC Co-Chair position at this time.

INC Issue 462 Discussion (Action Item 0305-14) (Dave Garner, Qwest):



* Previously, at the March LNPA meeting, Qwest raised a concern with the attached INC Issue 462, which adds text to the COCAG related to regulators asking providers to voluntarily transfer a code to another provider so they could get an LRN. Qwest suggested that the LNPA suggest revisions to the COCAG addressing thresholds when this should not be considered. Attached are Qwest’s proposed text changes to Issue 462.
* SBC stated that they have to issue individual service orders even on the working numbers in the 1K blocks they are retaining.
* Service Providers are to review the attached INC Issue 462 and attached Qwest contribution proposing text changes internally with their respective INC representatives, if applicable, and Regulatory/Legal, and come prepared to the May LNPA meeting to propose any modifications and to determine if the LNPA will send a contribution to INC.

Letter of Authorization (LOA)/Best Practices (Dave Garner, Qwest):

* Dave Garner, Qwest, reported that they have received port rejections from some carriers requiring that they see an LOA to prove that the customer wants to port before they will confirm the port request, even though Qwest has indicated on the LSR that they have an LOA from the customer on file.
* Service Providers are to review internally the attached revised Qwest contribution regarding Letters of Authorization (LOAs) and come to the May LNPA meeting prepared to determine if we will place the position statement in the LNPA NP Best Practices document.



Cingular Industry Announcement:



* Cingular announced they will combine their port processing for SPID 6010 and SPID 6214 under one ICP vendor. Only SPID 6010 is changing vendor and the only one impacted. Cingular wants to do it during the extended maintenance window on the 1st Sunday in August. Unconfirmed ports in the hopper when the old system is taken offline would have to be cancelled and resubmitted. This impacts wireless and wireline ports.
* Sprint and T-Mobile stated that they do not want to cancel pending ports.
* Cingular stated that they have brainstormed how to accomplish this and have not identified an alternative.

Industry VoIP Feedback and LNPA Vote on NANC 399 and 400:

(Action Item 0105-21)

 

* March NANC Report feedback – Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair:
  + The LNPA’s VoIP Obligations Letter was well-received by NANC. The LNPA’s position has been sent to the NANC Future of Numbering (FoN) Working Group to work on a recommendation to the FCC.



* + NANC released the LNPA to vote on whether or not to recommend to the NAPM LLC the inclusion of NANC Change Orders 399 and 400 in NPAC Release 3.3 in an inactive state, with the understanding that the votes are not final until the FoN WG completes its analysis. The Change Orders are to be voted on separately.
* The LNPA then discussed the feedback received from a number of industry groups in response to the attached LNPA VoIP Information Letter. The industry responses are embedded above.



* + ENUM Forum feedback – The need for VoIP URI data has not been studied in the context of Carrier ENUM. Karen Mulberry, ENUM LLC Chair, stated that the ENUM Forum is a contribution driven forum.
  + TMOC stated that they stand ready to assist the LNPA as this further develops.
  + ENUM LLC – Karen Mulberry, ENUM LLC Chair, explained that the ENUM LLC only addresses the IP space and not the PSTN. She stated that it is a multi-step process to implement ENUM for the 19 countries in Country Code 01.
    - Current timeline:
      * RFP out by end of year
      * ENUM trial by summer next year

A local system vendor stated that URI data is not currently usable on the PSTN. NeuStar stated that this is a possible means of updating DNS when a number ports. Karen Mulberry agreed.

* The voting members of the LNPA on Change Order activity (Service Providers and Service Bureaus) then voted on whether or not to recommend to the NAPM LLC the inclusion of NANC Change Orders 399 and 400 in NPAC Release 3.3 in an inactive state, with the understanding that the votes are not final until the FoN WG completes its analysis. The Change Orders were voted on separately in a technical context.
  + NOTE: Prior to the vote, Adam Newman, Telcordia, requested that vendors be allowed to vote on Change Orders 399 and 400. A brief discussion ensued regarding the history of LNPA votes on Change Orders. It was explained that, historically, vendors have not voted on Change Orders in the LNPA because they have a financial stake in the outcome of which ones are included. A number of service provider members expressed concern about changing the LNPA’s process immediately prior to a vote, and stated that those allowed to vote should be limited to those members that pay for the implementation of NPAC Change Orders, as has been the LNPA’s process. It was agreed that the LNPA’s historical voting process would be followed for these votes. Service Providers and Service Bureaus will vote on 399 and 400.
* Following are the results of the two votes. Again, the question asked for both 399 and 400 was:

Are you, or are you not, in favor of recommending to the NAPM LLC the inclusion of NANC Change Orders 399 and 400 in NPAC Release 3.3 in an inactive state?

* + NANC 399:
    - In favor: 12
    - Not in favor: 1
    - Abstention: 1
  + NANC 400:
    - In favor: 9
    - Not in favor: 3
    - Abstention: 2
  + As a result of these two votes, it was the consensus of the LNPA that a recommendation will go to the NAPM LLC to include both NANC Change Orders 399 and 400 in Release 3.3 in an inactive state.

Discussion of Bulk Data Downloads (Action Item 0205-08):

* Maggie Lee, VeriSign, provided feedback on Action Item 0205-08. It took 4 hours to load a full BDD in an LSMS in a single region. It also took 4 hours to load a full BDD in an LSMS in multiple regions because they can be run simultaneously. This does not include time to load downstream.
* Action Item 0305-01: Still ongoing.
* Action Item 0305-11: Dave Cochran (BellSouth), David Taylor (SBC), Jean Anthony (Evolving Systems), Maggie Lee (VeriSign), Dave Garner (Qwest), Gary Sacra (Verizon), NeuStar, and LSMS vendors will participate in a sub-team to discuss possible alternative solutions to full BDDs. Dave Cochran will Co-Chair.
* The LNPA will end at 10am local time on Thursdays for the May and June meetings. The BDD Subteam will meet from 10am to 12 noon local time on each Thursday.

**WEDNESDAY 04/13/05**

Wednesday, 04/13/05, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Wendy Wheeler | Alltel (phone) | Dave Garner | | Qwest |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T | David Taylor | | SBC |
| Bob Frasca | AT&T (phone) | Leah Luper | | SBC (phone) |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Kelly Gracie | | SNET (phone) |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Craig Bartell | | Sprint |
| Jason Powell | Centennial Wireless | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint |
| Lonnie Keck | Cingular | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint |
| Melanie Wilkerson | Cingular | Steve Moore | | Sprint |
| Sean Hawkins | Cingular (phone) | Rob Smith | | Syniverse |
| Michelle Gwaltney | Cingular (phone) | Darren Paffenroth | | Syniverse |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec |
| Jean Anthony | Evolving Systems | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Jamie Sharpe | Interstate FiberNet (phone) | Jason Kempson | | Telcordia |
| Karen Mulberry | MCI | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Jason Lee | MCI (phone) | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile |
| Rick Jones | NENA | Ginny Cashbaugh | | US Cellular (phone) |
| Mark Dahlen | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Jim Castagna | | Verizon |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Julie Anderson | | Verizon |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Nancy Briggs | | Verizon |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| Larry Vagnoni | NeuStar | Sara Hooker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar | Jeff Harmon | | Verizon Wireless (phone) |
| Mindi Patterson | NeuStar (phone) | Deborah Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Susan Ortega | Nextel |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

Change Management (Action Items 0305-04, 0305-05) (Neustar):

Revisions to Release 3.3 Change Orders:

 

* As a result of NeuStar’s system design activities, updates have been incorporated into the following Change Orders (see change bars in R3dot3Change Orders\_2005-03-21.zip file):

1. NANC 351 – added change to RR6-65, to include SWIM recovery for Number Pool Blocks (NPBs). Added Action ID to each response, and expected behavior of sending the action ID on the subsequent request. SWIM and Action ID are the only recovery ways for an SP to clear its SWIM list. Added three new requirements to cover SP-specific tunables for both SOA and LSMS. Added three new requirements to cover NPAC tunable for SOA Max and LSMS Max.
2. NANC 151 – updated requirements 5 and 8 to include AVC notifications. Updated requirements 7 and 10 to change the default value of the TN Attribute Flag Indicator from TRUE to FALSE.
3. NANC 138 – added change to GDMO behavior in cause code attribute (#103) to be consistent with description in FRS.
4. NANC 388 – deleted requirements 4 ad 6. Existing requirements already cover this restriction (R5-29.4 – Modify Subscription Version - Originating Service Provider Validation).
5. NANC 352 – corrected requirement 9 to indicate a “service-provider-ID” and not a range. Updated ServiceProviderType to an optional attribute on a SPID recovery response.
6. NANC 383 – deleted requirement 4. This restriction is too limiting to a Service Provider’s SOA. Updated requirement 9, as it was inconsistent with the documented behavior of NANC 386. New description indicates “accepts” (rather than “rejects”) a new association bind request from a SOA.
7. NANC 357 – updated table description to remove “future-use” option. Added new requirement to cover BDD support of the SP Type field based on SP-specific tunable. Added new requirement to cover query support of the SP Type field based on SP-specific tunable.
8. NANC 285 – deleted requirements 4, 5, 6 - regional tunable no longer needed. Added three new requirements to cover SP-specific tunables for both SOA and LSMS. Clarified current NPAC behavior.
9. NANC 394 – updated requirements, IIS flows, and GDMO behavior for clarity and understanding on the five-day restriction interval. Added three new requirements to cover NPAC tunable for enabling NANC 394 functionality.
10. NANC 347 – updated requirements, deleted requirements for the range activity. Will use existing range activity timer tunable. Clarified difference between abort behavior and rollup behavior. Clarified current range behavior.

* A discrepancy in the estimated SOA level of effort was identified between NANC Change Orders 227/254 (N/A) and NANC Change Order 300 (med-low). SOA Vendors are to review these Change Orders relative to their systems and determine the appropriate level of effort.
* All Doc-only Change Orders are going to be included in Release 3.3.

Release 3.3 Test Case List Review (Neustar):



* No comments were offered at this time.

NANC Change Order 401 Discussion (Action Item 0205-03) (NeuStar):



* Two options are discussed in the attached Change Order 401:

1. The NPAC would broadcast all data to association-2, and the LSMS would decide whether or not to store the data.
2. The NPAC would use a new NPB object and new SV object to transmit data between the NPAC and association2. This will be used for porting data for the NPB/SV OptionalData fields.

* A member asked if the two options in 401 could both be available for implementation or does the industry need to decide which would be implemented. NeuStar said that if the 2nd option is selected, the 1st could be supported also.
* Change Order 401 will be discussed in more detail later in this meeting.

NANC Change Order 402 (Action Item 0305-10):



* NANC 402 was submitted by Nextel. This was accepted at the March LNPA meeting. This is the mechanized solution to PIM 51.
* The group agreed to put further discussion of NANC 402 on hold until more data is collected at the NPAC Help Desk on reports of codes being opened up by the wrong SPID. NeuStar is also monitoring SPID migrations to see why each code is being migrated to see if any are because of this issue.
* Adam Newman, INC Vice-Chair, stated that the TRA has developed a SPID to OCN relationship for about 300 out of the approximately 1300 service providers. He is not sure if the TRA contract will allow the data to be shared.

NANC Change Order 397 (Action Item 0305-15):

* This Change Order will be re-evaluated after implementation of NANC 393.
* Action Item 0305-15 is closed.

NANC 403:

* This is a Doc Only Change Order addressing recovery messages only sent during recovery. To be discussed at the May LNPA meeting.

NANC 323 SPID Migration Documents Discussion – NeuStar:



* A member suggested that we have a place on the migration form to indicate why a SPID migration is being performed, e.g., to correct SPID ownership error, combining operations, etc. There was no consensus to add that to the form.
* A member stated that a migration in one region impacted over 1million SVs (222 NXXs and 144 LRNs). It took several hours to process the SMURF files. Some providers went past the maintenance window.
* LNPA Working Group Members are to come to the May LNPA meeting prepared to discuss suggested limiting factors (SVs or LRNs) for SPID Migrations and a suggested maximum number for each that would be accommodated in a SPID migration weekend (suggested maximums should be the combined total for all regions for the entire maintenance window).

Discussion of NANC 401 (continued):

* If a provider opts out of NANC 400, there is no impact to that provider’s local systems and no need to implement NANC 401.
* If a provider opts into NANC 400, the provider can receive optional fields over their current association without implementing NANC 401.
* If a provider chooses to implement NANC 401, the two options are as follows:

1. The NPAC would broadcast all data to association-2, and the LSMS would decide whether or not to store the data.
2. The NPAC would use a new NPB object and new SV object to transmit data between the NPAC and association2. This will be used for porting data for the NPB/SV OptionalData fields.

* During the review of the technical requirements, a question was asked as to whether certification testing requires support of audits. A member identified a required audit test case in the ITP test case list.
  + Paragraph b.ii. in Option 1, which states, “If LSMS only stores OptionalData, and does not support audits, no NPAC change required.”, was deleted. There is no known case where audits are not supported by a service provider.
* From an NPAC and LSMS standpoint, Option 1 has a lower level of effort.
* NeuStar is to develop detailed requirements for support of both options in NANC 401.

LNPA Position on the Use of Social Security Number (SSN) (Gary Sacra):

* Gary Sacra, Verizon, teed up the issue of some service providers requiring the customer’s SSN on LSRs for verification. He presented the attached contribution in the form of a proposed letter to NANC with the LNPA’s position stating, “It is the position of the LNPA-WG that the consumer’s Social Security Number/Tax Identification Number shall not be required on an LSR/WPR to port that consumer’s telephone number if the consumer’s Account Number associated with the Old Local Service Provider is provided on the LSR/WPR for identification.”

The LNPA accepted the issue and Verizon’s proposed letter to NANC. Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will add the issue and LNPA position to the LNPA NP Best Practices document, and forward the Position Paper to NANC with a request for NANC’s endorsement to be forwarded to the FCC. This issue will be included in the May NANC Report.



Ported TNs with Same LRN as Pooled Block (Craig Bartell):

* Craig Bartell, Sprint, teed up the issue: Some TNs that are part of a pooled block are ported to the same LRN as the block. About 600K TNs were identified.
* In some cases, all thousand individual numbers in the block were ported to the same switch as the 1K block was pooled to.
* Adam Newman, INC Vice-Chair, will propose text addressing this scenario for the Thousand Block Pooling Administration Guidelines (TBPAG) for review at the May LNPA meeting.

Application Server Technology Migration (NeuStar):



* No further comments from the group regarding the current Project Plan.
* Service Providers are to verify with their network teams that all necessary firewall changes have been performed.

NPAC Release 3.3 Project Plan (NeuStar):



* A member asked if two weeks could be placed between the production dates instead of 1 week. A second concern expressed is that the 7 weeks time allotted for testing is not enough.
* A local system vendor said that some of their customers have a concern regarding the interval (5 weeks) between the end of ITP testing (Line 70) and the beginning of SP individual testing (Line 101). The concern is that there may not be sufficient time for internal OSS systems.
* LNPA Working Group Members are to review the milestone dates, especially in the areas of testing and production loads, and provide any feedback/suggested changes at the May LNPA meeting.

Review of March Action Items:



* Item 0305-01: This item remains Open.
* Item 0305-02: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0305-03: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0305-04: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0305-05: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0305-06: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0305-07: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0305-08: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0305-09: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0305-10: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0305-11: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0305-12: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0305-13: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0305-14: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0305-15: This item has been completed and is Closed.

Action Items Remaining Open from Previous Meetings:

* Item 0904-09: Item remains Open.
* Item 1204-21: This item is in progress and remains Open.
* Item 0105-21: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0205-03: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0205-04: This item is ongoing and remains Open.
* Item 0205-08: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0205-13: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0205-19: Item remains Open. The Action Item will be modified to reflect that the information should be sent to Rob Smith, Syniverse (robert.smith@syniverse.com).

New Business:

* Sue Tiffany, Sprint – A notice was received from Verizon that Verizon was changing their process based on an FCC Order related to porting numbers with DSL. The Agency Authorization field on the LSR now indicates that the NLSP has the end user’s authority to port number. Sue stated that the notification indicated that it will now mean to Verizon that the port is authorized and to direct Verizon to disconnect the DSL service. A member asked if this is how all wireline providers will interpret this field. Service Providers are to investigate the recent decision and come prepared to the May LNPA meeting to report on any resultant changes to their porting process, especially in the area of numbers associated with DSL. One wireless member stated that they do not want the responsibility of telling the customer that they will lose their DSL if they port their number.
* Jean Anthony, Evolving Systems, asked that documents to be discussed at the meetings be available at least a week before a meeting.
* Rob Smith, Syniverse, regarding PIM 50: Wireline Service Providers are to investigate internally any potential ways relevant CSR information can be provided in an automated manner, when the CSR is deemed too large.

***Next LNPA Meeting …******May 10-12, 2005, Overland Park, Kansas – Hosted by Sprint***
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**LNPA/FoN JOINT MEETING MINUTES:**

**Please note that the FoN WG will issue separate meeting minutes.**

****

* Hoke Knox, FoN Co-Chair, reviewed the March NANC meeting regarding the discussion of NANC Change Orders 399 and 400. The team needs to decide if the Change Orders should be loaded in Release 3.3 in an inactive state and what issues may be involved. Mark Lancaster, AT&T, introduced the idea of a joint session at NANC to get an architectural view of how LNP and IP come together so we can make an architectural choice that looks out into the future.
* Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair recapped the LNPA votes on NANC 399 and 400 that took place earlier in the week. The question asked for both 399 and 400 was:

Are you, or are you not, in favor of recommending to the NAPM LLC the inclusion of NANC Change Orders 399 and 400 in NPAC Release 3.3 in an inactive state?

Following are the results of the two votes.

* + NANC 399:
    - In favor: 12
    - Not in favor: 1
    - Abstention: 1
  + NANC 400:
    - In favor: 9
    - Not in favor: 3
    - Abstention: 2
  + As a result of these two votes, it was the consensus of the LNPA that a recommendation will go to the NAPM LLC to include both NANC Change Orders 399 and 400 in Release 3.3 in an inactive state.
  + Gary Sacra also reported that the LNPA has completed the technical review of both Change Orders.
* The group then discussed the objective and scope of what is needed to be accomplished. Suggestions were:
  + Determine how 400 fits into the evolution path of numbering.
  + Determine how this fits into LNP and does it fix anything that is broken with LNP.
  + A FoN member suggested that we have to consider regulatory and policy issues and if the NPAC is the right place to put this functionality.
  + Karen Mulberry, FoN Co-Chair, responded that this discussion is not in the context of the Internet, but is this functionality required to support LNP.
  + An LNPA member stated that the NPAC is not a vendor-specific product, but is an industry product. We need to determine if this functionality benefits the industry.
  + Karen Mulberry, FoN Co-Chair: The FoN will determine any policy and regulatory issues for consideration and the LNPA will provide technical assistance.
  + NeuStar was asked what does 400 fix? NeuStar responded that, as an example, MMS is broken with LNP. There are some carrier solutions for fixing this problem, however, NANC 400 is a method for carrier consideration.
  + FoN member: we will need to clarify what are the functions in question and do they interact with LNP.
  + Hoke Knox, FoN Co-Chair: In the LNP arena, is there a need for this functionality to enable SMS and MMS messaging to occur? What is the current need of the industry and the long-term?
* Future meeting schedule: 4/22/05 from 10am-1pm eastern, 4/29/05 from 10am-2pm eastern, and 5/6/05 from 10am-2pm eastern.
* VeriSign presentation – Tom Kershaw



* + Slide 16 – It was suggested that the ¼ % figure may be low because when families and businesses migrate to VoIP, they will call each other.
  + An LNPA member stated that today, numbers port from PSTN to VoIP by porting to a CLEC. ENUM databases are planned in 2006. We need to figure out how we synch up LRN data with URI data changes.
  + Tom Kershaw – we need to remain as flexible as possible and not rule out options. Decisions we make today may be wrong 5 years from now.
  + Hoke Knox – Who controls URI changes in ENUM? End user? Karen Mulberry said that it is still being addressed.
  + Tom Kershaw – VoIP providers are offering numbers outside the physical rate center of the customer. They cannot port out to PSTN providers. When enough complain, the FCC will do something.
* Telcordia presentation – Adam Newman



* + Adam was asked how LNP data gets provisioned in ENUM the database? He responded that SIP address changes and how they get provisioned into ENUM is being worked in the ENUM LLC. The questioner said that where the domain change comes from is the question that 400 is trying to solve.
  + Tom McGarry, NeuStar, stated that NPAC is the fairest vehicle to deliver routing data because all carriers have access to it.
  + Adam Newman stated that, like they ruled on QoR, the FCC needs to rule on proposed changes to the LRN architecture.
  + A question was asked as to how data, where the end user only opts in to a particular carrier’s ENUM database, can only be opted in to that carrier if the data is placed in NPAC? NeuStar responded that placing the data in DNS means that the data is on the internet and available to anyone.
* Tekelec presentation – Colleen Collard



* It was pointed out that the NPAC is not controlled by a monopoly, as is

stated on Slide 4, but is controlled and managed by the NAPM LLC, which represents the industry.

* NeuStar presentation – Tom McGarry



* + It was asked if NANC 399, with the Alternate SPID, assist with the workaround solution for MMS that uses the SPID approximation? Tom responded no. The originator would not know which SPID owns the terminating customer, or it could be an MVNE, which would not show up as either SPID in the record.
  + Tom McGarry – ENUM is addressing Tier 1 and Tier 1B databases, which do not contain URI data. Tier 1 database will contain pointers to the right Tier 2 databases. Tier 2 database, which will contain URI data, will be provisioned by carriers and end users.
  + Adam Newman – The current LNP query does not expect a URI in return. Tom McGarry – It probably is not cost-effective to upgrade SS7 infrastructure to support URI data. NeuStar has implemented DNS and SIP for IP query and response protocol.
* AT&T presentation – Penn Pfautz



* + An LNPA member asked how provisioning will take place when a TN goes from one VoIP provider to another? Penn responded that the carrier of record will provision.
  + Penn Pfautz – NPAC and LERG are currently the databases of record for who the carrier is.
  + An LNPA member asked, with ENUM, how does one carrier know the URI of another carrier’s customer? Penn: Tier 2 will query Tier 1 database.
* Panel Discussion:
  + Tom Kershaw, VeriSign – For a period of time, both NPAC and ENUM databases will need to be updated when numbers port from the PSTN to the IP. LRNs will still be the method of routing in the PSTN to the IP interconnection point.
    - An LNPA member raised concern with synchronization.
  + A FoN member asked what the implementation of 400 would do in terms of slowhorse? NeuStar: What is seen today is that the slowhorse issue has been taken care of. In addition, NeuStar feels it is unlikely that every record will be populated with 4 URIs. There will be some impact but will not result in slowhorse problems as seen in the past.
    - Adam Newman stated that he didn’t suggest that it would cause a slowhorse problem, but that it hasn’t been studied yet.
    - An LNPA member stated that the record size would increase about 20% if all 4 URIs were populated based on discussions at LNPA.
    - NeuStar – This discussion of impact is only relevant if the fields are turned on, and not related to the question we are discussing today, and that is should we put in the capability to turn them on.
    - NeuStar – A discussion of the NANC Architecture and Administrative Plan for LNP ensued. The document states that, “All networks will rely on the NPAC database as the ultimate source of porting data. Synchronization of networks to a single set of routing data is paramount to network operations. Therefore appropriate restrictions must be placed upon how these network elements may interconnect from an architectural perspective.

Specifically, the NPAC shall download relevant porting data required by participating carriers or their agents for the specific subset of network nodes. Consequently, the NPAC system shall be the source of all porting data for all carriers or agents of those carriers, thereby being the sole originator of all downloads.”

NeuStar asked how ENUM will get updated? That is what 400 is trying to address.

* + - * Penn Pfautz, AT&T, stated that he doesn’t see a legal issue with carrier information from NPAC being populated in ENUM.
      * Tom Kershaw, VeriSign stated that the NANC Architecture document was developed before there were URIs.
      * A number of LNPA members again expressed a concern with updating multiple databases with separate paths and how to ensure timing and synchronization of LRN and URI updates when customers port.
* Action Item for all – develop any additional questions/presentations to clarify our path forward.