LNPA WORKING GROUP

May 2004 Meeting

Final Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overland Park, Kansas | Host: Sprint |

**TUESDAY 5/4/04**

Tuesday, 5/4/04, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Wendy Wheeler | Alltel | Marty Pollard | | SNET (phone) |
| Cheryl Gordon | Alltel | Lee Swindle | | Southern (phone) |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T (phone) | Anne Mardick | | Sprint |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T | Cheryl Scott | | Sprint |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | ATTWS | Stephanie Baughman | | Sprint |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Craig Bartell | | Sprint |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LLC | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox | Steve Cornish | | Sprint (phone) |
| Mark Wood | Cingular | Glenn Mills | | Syniverse |
| Laurie Itkin | Cricket Communications | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec (phone) |
| Dennis Robins | Electric Lightwave (phone) | John Malyar | | Telcordia |
| Therese Mooney | Global Crossing (phone) | Jason Kempson | | Telcordia (phone) |
| Karen Mulberry | MCI (phone) | Jean Anthony | | Telecom Software |
| Jason Lee | MCI (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Rick Jones | NENA | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Chris Toomey | | US Cellular |
| Dara Sedauno | NeuStar (phone) | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| Gene Johnston | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Sara Hooker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Larry Vagnoni | NeuStar | Deborah Stephens | | Verizon Wireless |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Blaine Reeve | | Western Wireless Corp. |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar |  | |  |
| Rosemary Emmer | Nextel (phone) |  | |  |
| Dave Garner | Qwest |  | |  |
| Charles Ryburn | SBC (phone) |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

Attached are the Action Items assigned at the May, 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 “MAY 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:
* NOTE THE CHANGE TO THE OCTOBER MEETING LOCATION.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | FT. LAUDERDALE  FLORIDA | 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 |

04/04 Minutes Review:

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

* Page 17, 3rd bullet: Change first sentence to read, “A note will be added in the NANC 323 Narrative and Service Provider Checklist saying that involved service providers in a canceled port as a result of a migration should properly address their respective LSRs/WPRs.”
* Page 25: NANC Change Order 353 should be ranked No. 11 and NANC Change Order 349 should be ranked No. 12.

NANC Intermodal Issue Management Group (IMG) Update – Sue Tiffany, Sprint PCS and WNPO Co-Chair:

* Sue Tiffany provided the following readout on the efforts of the Intermodal Porting IMG to develop a recommendation for the intermodal porting interval.
* The IMG presented its paper to NANC and it was accepted and forwarded to the FCC. Option C2/A3 was accepted.

 

* The Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) interval option that was accepted was:
* C2: 5 hours for an error-free order.
* The Activation interval option that was accepted was:
* A3: Old Network Service Provider (ONSP) sends Create and sets 10-digit trigger no later than 24 hours before established due date.
* These intervals apply only to an error-free simple port with completely automated interfaces between carriers. This recommendation, if implemented, would reduce the porting interval to 2 days and 5 hours.
* It is a consideration in the report that the industry choose one LSOG version for porting and choose the one that has minimal impact. A member stated that it may be costly for wireline carriers to migrate to one version for porting and have other LSOG versions for other activities.

Inter-species Task Force (ITF) Update and Inter-modal Port Issues referred to OBF – Lonnie Keck, AT&T Wireless and OBF Wireless Committee Co-Chair:

* Issue 2729 - Due date and time changes on FOC:
* WICIS standard will be modified to relax edits to allow the Inter-carrier Communications Process (ICP) to accept due date and time changes. The ITF will be closing this issue.
* Issue 2731 - Development of a standard wireless FAX form for porting from wireless to wireline carriers:
* 3 ICP vendors are developing a new LSOG 6-like FAX form with data elements required for a wireless to wireline port. This issue has been accepted by the ITF.
* WICIS Release 2.2.0 will be out in the fall to catch up on some of the guidelines changes. The OBF will decide which issues get in Release 3.0 for code changes. 3.0 is expected to be implemented in the June/July 2005 timeframe (not firm).
* The ITF may not meet face-to-face for their next meeting.
* A member asked the status of the issue where only one fax number could be used per company. It was stated that this issue is vendor-specific and is being worked internally within that vendor.

National Emergency Number Association (NENA) Update – Rick Jones (NENA):

* Rick Jones, NENA, reported that there were no major 911 problems since the 11/24/03 launch of Wireless Number Portability. He expressed concern that not all providers coming on board on 5/24/04 know about the established porting process relevant to 911. There is a porting customer information package that can be obtained from Rick at [rjones@nena.org](mailto:rjones@nena.org).

May 24th Rollout of Wireless Number Portability Outside the Top MSAs – Sue Tiffany, Sprint PCS and WNPO Co-Chair:

* Sue Tiffany reported that the Wireless Testing Subcommittee (WTSC) is meeting every Thursday at 11am Central in preparation for the May 24th rollout.
* A great deal of time during the testing meetings was being devoted to non-testing questions. As a result, the CTIA agreed to conduct a series of calls to answer questions from carriers operating outside the top MSAs that are affected by the rollout.

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

* Paul LaGattuta led the group in a discussion of the latest changes to the NFG Traffic Model resulting from the modifications agreed to in the WNPO Traffic Model. The WNPO gave authorization to lower the churn rate assumption from 50% to 35%, and the assumed % of ported numbers within the churn from 80% to 50%. A 10 Million billable transaction financial contingency factor is currently applied as a line item at the end of the year in the NFG Model. Some expressed concern that including this factor in the traffic projections will significantly increase the interface throughput requirements. Including the 10M in the 2nd half of the year could add 20% to SOA interface requirements. Others felt that it should be included in the traffic projections if it is to stay as a budgetary item. A member suggested that we separate the two Models, NFG for budgeting, and the APT Model for traffic projections. Paul stated that we should take our cue from the APT as to whether the factor should be included in the traffic projections.

* It was stated that a significant number of the volume-related issues experienced in the last 4th quarter was due to wireless technology migrations. A wireless member stated that we should not be doing that in the upcoming 4th quarter and that wireless carriers should refrain from doing rehomes during the 4th quarter Busy Season.
* The NFG Model takes into account the 5/24/04 implementation of wireless porting outside the top MSAs.
* The WNPO will discuss how to treat the 10 Million contingency factor at next month’s meeting. WNPO Team Members are to come prepared to the June meeting to determine how to treat the 10 million contingency factor in the WNPO and NPAC

Forecasting Group Models.

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

* Regarding the need for accurate jurisdictional information for accurate billing, the ATIS Network Interconnection Interoperability Forum (NIIF) and Network Inter-Operability Committee (NIOC) are working with the TR45 standards group on Jurisdictional Information Parameter (JIP) population. The attached resultant document was sent to the WNPO and LNPA for input. Also attached is the response from the WNPO asking for modifications to the proposed standards language for JIP. The catalyst for the requested change in the proposed language is the fact that wireless carriers do not have NPA-NXXs assigned at the cell site level.

 

* Participation in the Wireless Testing Subcommittee (WTSC) has improved. New test schedules are on the website. A request was made that large carriers step up to round robin testing.
* Fallout Reduction Taskforce (FORT) continues to hold calls every other Friday at 10am Central time. They currently have 3 open issues remaining

.

* NeuStar led a discussion of the Help Desk only option. Service Provider Name and SPID is broadcast for this option. These providers have very low transaction volumes and each transaction requires NPAC assistance.
* A Wireless member asked if there are any industry guidelines on scrubbing back office systems during NPA splits. The group consensus was no and that it is up to each provider to manage their systems. A discussion then ensued on an upcoming split. It was agreed that the ICP process should use the new NPA. The OBF recommends that the New Service Provider use the new NPA when initiating a port during permissive dialing. The Old Service Provider can translate to the old NPA. The WNPO will ask the LNPA to send out a message to the industry asking any provider not planing to follow established guidelines to contact the WNPO Chairs. The WNPO will send a request to the LNPA.
* The NIIF National LNP Directory contact list is still being updated.
* The attached Best Practice (WNPO Issue 4-11) is being updated. This contribution documents industry validation guidelines agreed upon for wireless to wireless porting.



* The WNPO discussed the proposed requirements for the Performance and Volume Test Bed and decided no changes will be made. The APT will be so advised and the WNPO will request that the LNPA proceed with the next steps in Change Management.
* The attached contribution on purging old port requests (WNPO Issue 4-13) will be reworded. Service providers are to be prepared to discuss at the June meeting as to when to purge old port requests.



* The CTIA is formulating an opinion for wireless carriers on the requirements for Bona-fide Requests (BFRs) set forth in the FCC Order. Most wireless carriers participating in the WNPO stated they will open up areas outside the top 100 MSAs without a BFR.

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

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



* The APT is continuing evaluation of the projected traffic volumes to determine SOA and LSMS interface throughput requirements.
* A member asked if it is possible for a single provider to utilize the total NPAC bandwidth for a region for a peak period of time. Answer is yes, however, the way NPAC sets priorities (e.g. activates and requests are higher than notifications), and the first-in first-out nature of the queue, would likely minimize the amount of time a single provider could monopolize the entire NPAC bandwidth.
* The projected sustained rate of 4.3 messages per second for the SOA interface was developed from the highest SOA participation percentage of 40% in the Mid-Atlantic Region. It was stated that the APT still needs to determine the volume distribution of lower participating SOAs.
* The APT also finalized the rankings of the 14 Change Orders under development in the group. NeuStar requested guidance from the LNPA on how best to proceed with these Change Orders. It was agreed that these 14 Change Orders and their rankings by the APT will be submitted to the LNPA for inclusion in their discussions and ranking session for the next NPAC software release package. It was further agreed that the LNPA should recognize that the APT holds in high regard the top ranked Change Orders that they reviewed and should recognize the benefits of implementing them in the next release. During the Change Management portion of this LNPA meeting, the LNPA group will begin discussing the Open and Accepted Change Orders and determine when we will conduct a ranking session for the next software package.

Rural Wireless Carrier Question and Answer Session:

* The LNPA hosted a Q&A session to assist in answering carrier questions related to the upcoming 5/24/04 rollout of wireless porting outside the top MSAs. A number of small rural wireless carriers participated in the session via conference bridge. Following are the questions discussed and the answers provided.
* Question: “How would you explain to the customer what ‘other regulatory fees’ are when the fees are recovering LNP costs? What is the industry standard?”

Answer: There is no industry standard explanation. It is up to each individual carrier to explain to their customers their respective fee and the costs being recovered.

* Question: “I am interested in hearing any carrier suggestions/ideas on handling porting of type 1 numbers. Have the porting-in carriers (NSP) been working with the LECs directly to set up the process for this, or are they working with the old wireless carrier who is using the type 1 numbers as well?”

Answer: LECs are working with the current wireless local service providers of the type 1 numbers to get them migrated to that wireless carrier. This in essence converts these type 1 numbers to type 2. After the migration, a port of one of these numbers in response to a customer’s request will be completed between the two wireless carriers without the wireline LEC involved. PIM 34 has been opened to address issues related to porting individual type 1 numbers from the wireline LEC to the new wireless service provider in response to a customer’s request to port prior to migrating the numbers to the current wireless local service provider.

* Question: “When a number is ported out, are carriers terminating the out-porting subscriber's service as of the due date of the port, or are they waiting for notification from the subscriber to terminate service/billing? What are carrier's reasons/justifications for the decision?”

Answer: The NANC LNP Provisioning Flows describe the accepted timeframes for disconnecting the ported customers service in the old donor switch when the 10-digit Unconditional LNP trigger is applied to the number in the donor switch. The flows state: “The removal of these translations (1.) will not be done until the old Service Provider has evidence that the port has occurred, or (2.) will not be scheduled earlier than 11:59 PM one day after the due date, or (3.) will be scheduled for 11:59 PM on the due date, but can be changed by an LSR supplement received no later than 9:00 PM local time on the due date. This LSR supplement must be submitted in accordance with local practices governing LSR exchange, including such communications by telephone, fax, etc.”

In cases where the 10-digit Unconditional LNP trigger is not applied to the number in the donor switch, the switch translations should be removed ASAP upon activation of the port via NPAC.

Carriers should not tell customers to contact the old carrier to disconnect.

* Question: “What is the purpose of listing LRNs in the LERG? I thought that all LRN data was supplied by the NPAC when dipping the number?”

Answer: Not all providers utilize the LERG as a source for LRN information. One provider stated that they use this information for their telephone number inventory system and for trouble-shooting. For purposes of call routing to ported numbers, the routing databases that carriers’ switches query contain the appropriate LRNs that have been downloaded from the NPAC.

* Question: “Is there a fine if a carrier is not ready to port on 5/24?”

Answer: It depends on whether the carrier received a BFR and if another carrier files a complaint with the FCC. In that event, imposition of a fine is possible.

* Question: “For those carriers that are using the Help Desk only process or the LTI for porting, how are you going to perform the ICP process?”

Answer: No carriers on the phone replied that they were planning to use either option.

* Sue Tiffany, WNPO Co-Chair, asked if there were any questions on the Help Desk only option. There were none.
* Rick Jones, NENA, advised carriers using Phase 1 or Phase 2 E911 to check with their switch vendors to ensure that they have the right settings so that 911 calls are routed properly. Carriers should distribute the porting information package to educate customers on mixed service. It can be obtained from Rick at [rjones@nena.org](mailto:rjones@nena.org).

PIMs:

.

* PIM 22 – PIM 22 remains open. The group has begun developing the technical requirements for NANC Change Order 375. It was proposed to use “Initial Confirming FOC/WPRR Not Issued” as the definition for Cause Value 51.

 

NOTE: Subsequent to the May LNPA meeting, at their 5/18/04 meeting, the NANC assigned an action item to the LNPA to “finish technical requirement for PIM 22 (NANC change order 375) and submit to NAPM LLC for next software release.”

* 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 has since approved PA Change Order 26. 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 outcome of the trial and final FCC decision.

* PIM 28 – This PIM, submitted by Sprint PCS, addresses interface differences between the WPRR (wireless) and FOC (wireline). The FOC allows for a due date and time change on confirmations, however, the WPRR does not. When a wireline carrier sends an FOC with a change in due date or time, the wireless carrier cannot process the change and does not allow the port to complete. This accepted PIM was referred to the Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF) Wireless 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) and referred it to be worked by the Interspecies Task Force (ITF). 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 would likely be in a major WICIS release in 2005. This PIM will continue to be tracked by the LNPA.

 

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



During the discussion at the May meeting, Service Providers responded to the following action item assigned at the March LNPA meeting:

* 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?

During the discussion, some providers stated that they do send up an Old SP Create message to NPAC, while others do not. This is optional on the part of the Old SP. Other providers wait until they receive a New SP Create notification from NPAC before they send their Old SP Create. One provider stated that their technician launches a query from their switch to see if another carrier’s LRN is returned. If it is, then the technician knows it is ok to disconnect the customer’s service because the port has been activated. A member asked if there is something in the WICIS standard that results in a follow-up if the FOC has not been received in 24 hours. It was stated in reply that this is something that may be implemented in a particular provider’s back office systems. There was no LNPA consensus to sanction this proposal as an industry-wide solution.

It was also stated that Issue 2730 in the ITF is addressing discrepancies between LSOG and WICIS.

* 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.



The attached cites defining the N-1 Local Number Portability architecture were forwarded to LNPA members to assist in the discussion.



At the May LNPA meeting, Gary Sacra, Verizon Communications, discussed the attached Verizon contribution detailing their interpretation of the N-1 carrier’s query responsibilities and the cites used to develop that interpretation:



Gary Sacra, as Verizon’s representative to the LNPA, will amend the attached Verizon interpretation of N-1 architecture responsibilities to identify direct quotes from FCC Orders and industry documentation. In addition, any relevant T1S1 LNP switching and signaling standards requirements will be identified.

A member asked if wireless carriers were required to be able to route a call to a ported number by 12/31/98. The consensus view is yes. That member stated that this is not the understanding among all wireline carriers and IXCs.

This PIM remains open and will be discussed further at the June meeting. The LNPA’s objective is 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.

NOTE: Subsequent to the May LNPA meeting, at their 5/18/04 meeting, the NANC assigned an action item to the LNPA to “Review PIM 30 taking into account EAS implications and Enforcement Bureau Decision regarding N-1 responsibilities and recommend whether or not NANC should recommend a rules change to the FCC?”

* 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.



Verizon and BellSouth stated that issues with the LSR or a Service Order error encountered after the confirmation could jeopardize the due date and a jeopardy would be issued. Rob Smith, Syniverse, will send specific examples of jeopardy notices sent after confirmation to the appropriate providers who sent the jeopardy notices. These will become part of the discussion of PIM 31. Rob will also submit an issue to the OBF to investigate changing WICIS standards to support a jeopardy notification after confirmation.

**PIMs Discussed on Wednesday, 5/5/04:**

* 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. This PIM was accepted by the LNPA.



Attached are the minutes to the 4/30/04 PIM 32 conference call.



During the discussion at the May LNPA meeting, Qwest stated that the Account No. required on the LSR is normally the end user telephone number and a 3-digit customer code, but if the name and address matches up, the customer code is not mandatory. The customer code can be obtained from the CSR. Verizon and BellSouth stated that account information required on the LSR can be obtained through the reseller via a CSR query.

It was suggested to have agents place in the remarks field the name of the current local service provider after asking the customer at the point of sale. If different than the SPID that the system places on the WPR, if the CSR request falls out, the clearinghouse will have the necessary information to send the CSR to the OLSP.

A member asked what % of ports are resellers and Type 1s, and what % of each are falling out. Related to PIMs 32 and 34, Rob Smith, Syniverse, took an action to determine what % of ports are reseller numbers and Type 1 Cellular numbers and what % of each are falling out.

Wireline Service Providers took an action to determine if a CSR reject issued

by them could indicate the type of account (reseller or Type 1) and the name of the provider. The Clearinghouse could then do research to try to find out who the reseller or Type 1 provider is. If they can’t determine, they would send it back to the NLSP to identify who is the correct provider to send the CSR request to.

Another reseller conference call was scheduled for 5/28/04.

NOTE: Subsequent to the May LNPA meeting the conference call referenced above was held. Attached are the minutes to that call.



* 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.



At the May LNPA meeting, Syniverse stated that they are in partnership with

another vendor to understand what is required by each wireline provider on an LSR for a Type 1 number and a reseller number. Rob Smith, Syniverse, took an action to determine if these requirements have been identified and if they are understood. See other related action items in the PIM 32 discussion above.

Verizon stated that issues related to porting Type 1 numbers should be referred to Jonna Ireson on 972-718-8060.

**WEDNESDAY 5/5/04**

Wednesday, 5/5/04, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Wendy Wheeler | Alltel | Rosemary Emmer | | Nextel (phone) |
| Cheryl Gordon | Alltel | Dave Garner | | Qwest |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T (phone) | Charles Ryburn | | SBC (phone) |
| Jeannie Kulesa | AT&T (phone) | Leah Luper | | SBC (phone) |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T | Tim Waters | | SNET (phone) |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | ATTWS | Lee Swindle | | Southern (phone) |
| Lonnie Keck | ATTWS (phone) | Stephanie Baughman | | Sprint |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Craig Bartell | | Sprint |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint |
| Mel Clay | BellSouth (phone) | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LLC | Steve Cornish | | Sprint (phone) |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox | Glenn Mills | | Syniverse |
| Mark Wood | Cingular | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec (phone) |
| Dennis Robins | Electric Lightwave (phone) | John Malyar | | Telcordia |
| Therese Mooney | Global Crossing (phone) | Jason Kempson | | Telcordia (phone) |
| Jason Lee | MCI (phone) | Jean Anthony | | Telecom Software |
| Rick Jones | NENA | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile |
| Mindi Patterson | NeuStar (phone) | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| Gene Johnston | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Sara Hooker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Deborah Stephens | | Verizon Wireless |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Blaine Reeve | | Western Wireless Corp. |
|  |  |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

Change Management Discussion:

* **NANC 323 – SPID Migration:**



* NeuStar walked the group through the attached process flows, narratives, migration form, and User M&Ps for the NANC 323 SPID Migration process and discussed the changes since last month’s review.
* A conference call was previously held on April 19th to discuss the Service Provider Checklist. Attached are the minutes to that call.



* During the review, a service provider member suggested that NeuStar should gather the time estimate responses from service providers rather than having them sent directly to SPID B. The member felt that NeuStar should use the responses and some criteria to determine if an extended maintenance window is needed for the migration. NeuStar asked what value they would be adding to the process by being the collection point for the responses. A local system vendor member then suggested a joint effort with SPID B and NeuStar to evaluate the responses. Several service providers then expressed a desire for NeuStar to serve as a facilitator/coach to discuss the options and impacts with SPID B based on the service provider responses. NeuStar suggested that a bullet be put in Step 5 of the Figure 1 narrative stating that NeuStar will share their understanding of the implications of the estimated downtime in the service provider responses in a conference call. Section D of the SPID Migration Form will be changed to reflect that the service provider responses are to be sent to SPID B (the migrating to provider) and not to NeuStar. NeuStar will check internally on the format of Section D and it that section should be left in the form or become a separate form.
* A member then stated that a minimum and maximum criteria for when to use NANC 323 functionality is needed. The member felt that a minimum criteria is especially necessary to determine if the use of 323 in a particular scenario is economically justified. The member further suggested that if open issues such as these are not resolved by 6/30/04, we may need to consider postponing the sunrise date.
* Another member asked if higher migration volumes could be tested on the test bed. NeuStar responded that service providers can request higher volumes on the 323 test calls.
* A concern was raised that a Supplemental LSR to cancel a port needs to be sent to SPID B when they are the Old Service Provider on a pending port that is canceled by NPAC in order to begin the migration. Text to that effect is in the Service Provider Checklist. After reviewing the text, the member raising the concern stated they were satisfied. That text reads, “For any New Service Provider involved in a pending port affected by the migration that will not be activated prior to the migration, cancel the pending port in NPAC and send a Supplemental LSR/WPR to the Old Service Provider to cancel the port. Sending the Supplemental LSR/WPR to the Old Service Provider also applies to any pending port canceled by NPAC upon entering the migration.”
* The Service Provider Checklist will be included on the website with the NANC 323 documentation package. Gary Sacra will forward Version 3 of the Service Provider Checklist to Mindi Patterson, NeuStar, for inclusion in the SPID Migration documentation package on the NPAC website. See attached:



* The LNPA then discussed the Open and Accepted NANC Change Orders in the attached document and determined which ones will remain for consideration during the upcoming ranking session.



* NANC 375: Only the Old Service Provider can remove conflict for Cause Values 50 and 51. No conflict timer is associated with these values. It was proposed to use “Initial Confirming FOC/WPRR Not Issued” as the definition of Cause Value 51. NANC 391 will stay open and the two will be cross-referenced. To stay on the list.
* NANC 392 – Historical copies of SVs – Any SV that was broadcast to the LSMSs is not included in the “cloned” SVs that will not be created as a result of this Change Order. To stay on the list.
* NANC 138 – To stay on the list.
* NANC 147 – NANC 392 will slow the pace of SVID exhaust. Question: With rollover, can local systems handle an SVID that is lower than the highest one they had previously received? Current SVID inventory available is 2.4 Billion SVIDs. The Midwest Region has used 39 Million SVIDs to date and the Southeast has used 31 Million. This Change Order will stay on the future list, but there is little need for its implementation at this time.
* NANC 151 – To stay on the list.
* NANC 193 – During the Permissive Dialing Period (PDP), NPAC always responds with the new NPA regardless if service provider sent up the old NPA. A wireless member stated that if a port is in the ICP process with the old NPA and mandatory dialing on the new NPA starts, then the port will be canceled and restarted with the new NPA per the WNPO. To stay on the list.
* NANC 200 – To stay on the list.
* NANC 219 – Slowhorse availability requirement – To stay on the list.
* NANC 227/254 – To stay on the list.
* NANC 232 – To stay on the list.
* NANC 285 – To stay on the list.
* NANC 299 – To stay on the list.
* NANC 300 – To stay on the list.
* NANC 321 – To stay on the list.
* NANC 346 – To stay on the list.
* NANC 355 – To stay on the list.
* NANC 357 – To stay on the list.
* NANC 358 – To stay on the list.
* NANC 362 – To stay on the list.
* NANC 363 – To stay on the list. Desire is to make it backward compatible.
* NANC 372 – Not developed enough yet.
* NANC 382 – To stay on the list. Still open policy questions.
* NANC 386 – To stay on the list. NeuStar stated we either need Ill 5 or this Change Order. Ill 5 was ranked low in APT.
* NANC 389 – LNPA action to review 389 requirements document and come prepared to decide next month on whether to forward to the LLC with our recommendation to send to NeuStar for SOW development. This will be a separate agenda item for the June meeting.

NeuStar took an action to send out a single document containing all open and accepted Change Orders by Friday, May 14th. These Change Orders, and any member’s questions, will be reviewed at the June meeting.

NOTE: This Action Item is Complete.

At the June LNPA meeting discussion on the current open and accepted Change Orders, NeuStar will provide the NPAC development level of effort for each. Local System Vendors will provide the SOA and/or LSMS development level of effort for each, if applicable.

LNPA Working Group Members are to come prepared to the June meeting to

discuss any questions they may have on the current open and accepted Change Orders. Service Providers are to come prepared to the July meeting to rank the current open and accepted Change Orders.

NPAC Technology Migration Update – NeuStar:

* NeuStar stated that the planned NPAC technology migration is on schedule. Regression testing completed last Friday, 4/30, on schedule. Group testing started on Monday, 5/3.
* 24 hour maintenance windows were approved by the LLC (12:00:01 Sunday morning to 12:00:00 Sunday night). The day will be set up as an NPAC holiday to avoid timer expirations during the window.

INC Liaison on Grandfathered Codes:

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



* At the May LNPA meeting, Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, reviewed a draft response to the INC. It was agreed that he will send the approved response to the INC on behalf of the LNPA.

Review of April Action Items:



* Item 0404-01: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0404-02: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0404-03: This item was completed and is Closed.

* Item 0404-04: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0404-05: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0404-06: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0404-07: This item remains Open.
* Item 0404-08: The reseller portion of this item is Closed, while the Type 1 portion remains Open.

Action Items Remaining Open from Previous Meetings:

* Item 1103-14: This item was completed and is Closed. A SOA vendor stated that they require a code change for the state change. A profile setting will be required.
* Item 0104-09: Item remains Open.
* Item 0204-18: Item remains Open. Service providers will monitor and provide feedback on whether or not this issue is improving.
* Item 0204-20: Item remains Open until the July 2004 WNPO and LNPA meetings.
* Item 0304-06: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0304-07: Item remains Open and will be on the agenda for the June APT meeting.
* Item 0304-09: Item is Closed. See discussion of PIM 29 previously in these minutes.

New Business:

* Julie Groenen, Verizon Wireless, raised a concern related to providers that use the Low Tech Interface (LTI) or the Help Desk only option and are not automated to send a Wireless Port Request (WPR) through the Inter-carrier Communications Process (ICP). She suggested that it be a requirement that providers using these options use the ICP process. It was suggested that this could possibly be resolved when setting up a trading partner profile with the other provider. Another suggestion was to have the Clearinghouse call the other provider with a request to port. The NANC LNP Provisioning Flows state that manual means to communicate an LSR is acceptable. Julie took an action to submit a PIM on this issue.
* Sue Tiffany, WNPO Co-Chair, stated that any requests for inclusions in the next WICIS release must be in by this Friday, 5/7/04.

**THURSDAY 5/6/04 ARCHITECTURE PLANNING TEAM (APT)**

Thursday, 5/6/04, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T (phone) | Stephanie Baughman | | Sprint |
| Bob Frasca | AT&T (phone) | Bill Reilly | | Sprint |
| Steve Sanchez | ATTWS | Sue Tiffany | | Sprint |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec (phone) |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Jason Kempson | | Telcordia (phone) |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LLC | John Malyar | | Telcordia |
| Keagan O’Rourke | ESI | Jean Anthony | | TSE |
| Jason Lee | MCI (phone) | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile |
| Steve Addicks | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | | Verisign |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Deb Stephens | | Verizon Wireless |
| Dave Garner | Qwest |  | |  |

**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 5/6/04. Attached is the meeting agenda.



Performance Requirements:

* **How much throughput is needed on the SOA?**
* **Review the May’04 LNPA Traffic Model**
* **Review of Sustained, Peak, and Total Bandwidth SOA/LSMS Throughput Requirements**
* The APT discussed the latest LNPA Traffic Model (attached).



* A member asked if a breakdown of intra vs. inter company ports could be provided. He said he has observed that a significant portion of porting is intra based on internal reports. He suggested that we may need to factor out the intras if they are not going to be ongoing. Today, there is no line item for intras in the NFG model. Another member stated that it is difficult to say technology migrations will stop because something else always seems to come along. Paul LaGattuta, LNPA Co-Chair, stated that Alan Stiffler, NeuStar, has repeatedly offered to receive technology migration numbers from wireless carriers, keep it confidential, and adjust the model accordingly. Every month, actuals are put in the model and this affects the future projections.
* The APT is awaiting feedback from the June WNPO meeting to determine how to treat the 10 Million contingency factor. It is not in the current LNPA Traffic Model. If we are to put it in the LNPA Traffic Model, the APT needs guidance on how to spread it.

**For the following discussion, refer to the 4Q04 Summary spreadsheet in the LNPA Traffic Model attached above.**

* **LSMS Throughput Sustained and Peak Requirements Discussion:** We have now calculated the projected LSMS sustained rate to accommodate all of the work at any given time during the Busy Hour being processed within 15 minutes. This is based on the original projected sustained rate of 1 message per second which equates to 3600 messages during the Busy Hour if they were distributed evenly across the Busy Hour. However, in order to support the need to process the 3600 messages in a much shorter window than an hour, i.e. 15 minutes, the sustained rate is now calculated at 4 messages per second. **The calculated projected LSMS throughput rates are now 4 messages per second sustained with a peak of 5.2.**
* **SOA Throughput Sustained and Peak Requirements Discussion:** For SOA throughput, the highest region in terms of Total SOA Messages is the Northeast Region at 18,089 messages, and not 19,326. This reduction resulted from the lowering of some of the assumptions in the WNPO and NFG Models. The highest region in terms of Maximum Provider Participation % is still the Mid-Atlantic at 39.7%. This results in a sustained rate of 2.0 messages per second. Doubling this for requests (worst case), the SOA throughput sustained rate is calculated to be 4.0 messages per second. The peak rate, using 100% participation for that provider, is now 5.0 messages per second, doubled to 10.0 to handle requests (again worst case). The calculated peak takes the total SOA message traffic of 18,089 and dividing by 3600 seconds in an hour, which equals 5.0 messages per second. Doubling this for requests (worst case) equals 10.0 messages per second. This is the peak SOA throughput requirement and the total NPAC region bandwidth requirement.
* A member asked if it is fair to allow a single provider to take up the entire bandwidth. NeuStar stated that this would not typically happen unless nothing else is going on in the region because requests are worked first in, first out, and every provider has an equal chance of getting their requests in. If things slow down, they slow down equally. Activates have the highest priority, with other requests competing equally first in, first out. Notifications have the lowest priority.
* A member then suggested that we add a contingency to the SOA total bandwidth because of the start up costs to increase requirements, and, if we are low now, we would incur start up costs again to increase requirements.
* Conclusion: Using the 15 minute rationale for SOA total bandwidth used for the LSMS throughput in order to handle range operations within a 15 minute period, the peak rate and total SOA bandwidth projection is now calculated at 40 messages per second. **The calculated projected SOA throughput rates are 4 messages per second sustained with a peak of 40.**
* All of these projections, both LSMS and SOA, pertain to NPAC requirements. Service providers will need to consider whether they need to engineer to these numbers for their local systems.

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

* Discuss change orders (highest priority first) related to Interface/ Performance/Efficiency/Functionality contained in the APT Change Order working document
* **Discussion of Prioritized List of Change Orders to be sent to LNPA**
* **CMIP Alternative Discussion**
* The final ranking of the 14 NANC Change Orders under review in the APT is in the attached APT Working Document.



* The final compilation was calculated as follows for each Change Order:

1. Each member ranked each Change Order from 1 to 14, with 1 being the highest rank,
2. The submitted ranking numbers for the Change Order was summed,
3. The sum was divided by the number of APT members ranking that Change Order,
4. When this was completed for each Change Order, the Change Orders were ranked from lowest result to highest result. The lower the result, the higher the ranking for the Change Order.

* Based on discussions during this week’s LNPA meeting, it was agreed that these 14 Change Orders and their rankings by the APT will be submitted to the LNPA for inclusion in their discussions and ranking session for the next NPAC software release package. This LNPA ranking session is scheduled to take place at the July 2004 LNPA meeting. It was further agreed that the LNPA should recognize that the APT holds in high regard the top 8 ranked Change Orders that they reviewed and should recognize the benefits of implementing them in the next release.
* NeuStar will put an extra column in the open and accepted LNPA Change Order matrix capturing the APT ranking. We will put our top 8 with the ranking number in that column. A footnote will be added saying that the other 6 warrant no special consideration.
* NANC 384, Change Order effectiveness, will be on the Change Management agenda next month to review.
* New Change Order for NPAC to SOA/LSMS interface requirements will be in the matrix with a “mandatory” in the APT column. These requirements are upper bounds for SOA and LSMS systems’ requirements. Not all SOAs will need to support the upper bound.
* CMIP Alternative to be discussed next month, e.g., business drivers.
* Question for discussion: If we were developing a protocol today, what would we develop?

Current Issues:

* **Post-NANC 323 SPID mismatch discussion (Action Item 0304-07)**
* NeuStar has implemented Option 3 whereby NPAC will ignore the SPID attribute discrepancy and log an error in the NPAC error log. Action Item 0304-07 centers on the type of notification for a possible long term solution (Option 4).The relevant question is if Option 3 is acceptable as a permanent solution, or do we want to go to Option 4, and if so, what type of notification do we want?
* The group feels that Option 4 is desirable, but the type of notification to the auditing service provider and discrepant service provider is still an open question.
* An audit discrepancy notification only goes back to the service provider that initiated the audit and currently does not specify a SPID mismatch. It does not go to the discrepant service provider. There is no mechanism today to send automated e-mails.
* Item stays open and will be on the agenda for the June APT meeting.
* **SOA Vendor development for NANC Change Order 388 – Change a “Cancel Pending” SV? (Action Item 1103-14)**
* SOA vendors were asked to determine if their systems have rules that prevent support of the resultant state change from cancel pending to pending. A SOA vendor responded that their system does require a code change to support the state change. As a result, a profile setting will be required for this Change Order. Action Item 1103-14 is Closed.

**New Topics for APT:**

* **Discuss topics for next month**
* Review of current data incorporated into LNPA Traffic Model
* Discussion of disposition of 10 Million contingency factor in LNPA Traffic Model
* New Change Order for SOA and LSMS throughput requirements
* Review of full list of open and accepted Change Orders
* Review session for Q&As from the Wednesday LNPA meeting
* CMIP alternative discussion
* NANC 323 SPID mismatch notification (Action Item 0304-07)