LNPA WORKING GROUP

June 2004 Meeting

Final Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Ottawa, Canada | Host: Canadian Consortium |

**TUESDAY 6/15/04**

Tuesday, 6/15/04, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Cheryl Gordon | Alltel | Jim Hamiter | | SBC (phone) |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T | Tim Waters | | SNET (phone) |
| Lonnie Keck | ATTWS (phone) |  | |  |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | ATTWS |  | |  |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth (phone) |  | |  |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth |  | |  |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LLC | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint |
| Elton Allen | Cingular | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint |
| Faith Seiders | Cingular |  | |  |
| Laurie Itkin | Cricket Communications | Rob Smith | | Syniverse |
| Dennis Robins | Electric Lightwave (phone) | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec (phone) |
| Keagan O’Rourke | ESI (phone) | John Malyar | | Telcordia |
| Karen Mulberry | MCI | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Jason Lee | MCI (phone) | Jason Kempson | | Telcordia |
| Pascale Lacroix | Microcell Solutions | Jean Anthony | | Telecom Software |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Shannon Sevigny | NeuStar (phone) |  | |  |
| Gene Johnston | NeuStar | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Ken Soltesz | | US Cellular |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Ginny Cashbaugh | | US Cellular |
| Larry Vagnoni | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| Susan Ortega | Nextel | Sara Hooker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Dave Garner | Qwest (phone) | Deborah Stephens | | Verizon Wireless |
| Charles Ryburn | SBC (phone) |  | |  |
| Leah Luper | SBC (phone) |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

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

**MEETING MINUTES:**

2004 Meeting Schedule:

* The July 2004 meeting schedule in Raleigh, North Carolina, will be as follows:
* Monday, July 19th, the WNPO will meet from 8:30am-5pm Eastern,
* Tuesday, July 20th, through Thursday, July 22nd, the LNPA will meet from 8:30am-5pm Eastern,
* The Architecture Planning Team (APT) will not hold a separate session.
* Starting with the August 2004 meeting, the Wireless Number Portability Operations (WNPO) group and the LNPA Working Group will combine. The combined group will retain the name of LNPA Working Group.
* The August 2004 meeting schedule in Newport Beach, California, will be as follows:
* Monday, August 16th, through Wednesday, August 18th, the LNPA will meet from 8:30am-5pm Pacific,
* The Architecture Planning Team (APT) will not hold a separate session.

**NOTE: The schedule for the August meeting above is a change to what was discussed at the June LNPA meeting.**

* The September 2004 meeting schedule in Atlanta, Georgia, will be abbreviated as follows due to the Labor Day Holiday:
* Wednesday, September 8th, and Thursday, September 9th, the LNPA will meet from 8:30am-5pm, Eastern.
* The Architecture Planning Team (APT) will not hold a separate session.
* The meeting days for the October, November, and December 2004 sessions will be discussed and finalized at the July LNPA meeting after consultation with the hosting companies.
* The Architecture Planning Team (APT) will go dormant at this time but will not be disbanded. Issues within the purview of the APT will be addressed during the LNPA meeting. If an issue or issues warrant a separate APT session, the group will be activated at the appropriate time.
* Following is the schedule for 2004, the host companies, and the meeting locations. Also indicated is the date of the month’s NANC meeting, if applicable:

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

05/04 Minutes Review:

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

* No changes were made to the DRAFT May 2004 LNPA Minutes at the June meeting. They will be issued as the FINAL May 2004 LNPA Minutes.

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:

* The ITF has not met since the last LNPA meeting. There are no open issues at this time being worked in the ITF. Existing open issues are being addressed in the OBF Wireless Workshop or LSOG Committees. The ITF has not disbanded.
* LSOG 10 will change LSR standards to require either a Tax ID, Social Security No., or Account No. to map to the WPR.
* The NANC Inter-modal IMG recommendation to the FCC included a requirement for an automated provider-to-provider interface as a prerequisite for reducing the wireline to wireless porting interval.

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

* Sue Tiffany reported that the rollout of wireless number portability outside the top MSAs that took place on May 24th did not result in any major issues. Most issues were related to whether or not companies had received a waiver from the FCC.
* 900 carriers across the country applied for waivers.
* Some states provided relief in the form of delays.
* A question was asked as to whether or not a company is required to port if they have filed for a waiver but have not yet been granted one. Some carriers feel they are.
* Paul LaGattuta, AT&T and LNPA Co-Chair, suggested that we keep this item on the LNPA agenda. The item will be renamed “Small Carrier LNP Readiness,” and will be a discussion item for all members.

# Combining of WNPO and LNPA – Sue Tiffany and Maggie Lee, WNPO Co-Chairs:

* The planned sunset date for the WNPO group is the July meeting. The first meeting of the combined group will be in August.
* Refer to the 2004 meeting schedule above for the July, August, and September meeting days for the LNPA.
* Host companies should keep the LNPA Chairs apprised of their flexibility should the group decide to possibly shorten LNPA week in the future.
* Need to consider:
* Disposition of the various matrices in the WNPO. It was suggested that we may change the “Decision and Recommendation Matrix” to “Best Practices.”
* Process for posting documents on the website.
* Merging the contacts of the various groups and sub-groups.
* What to do with the FORT team and the WTSC.
* A concern was expressed over ensuring that sufficient time is allotted to wireless only issues. It was agreed that this is a Co-Chair responsibility.
* The combined group will be called the LNPA Working Group.
* The last WNPO Report to NANC will be at the July NANC meeting.
* Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, is to post past minutes and PIMs on the LNPA website.

# NIOC Jurisdiction Information Parameter (JIP) Correspondence – Sue Tiffany, Sprint PCS and WNPO Co-Chair:

* Sue Tiffany reported on the WNPO’s attached response to the attached liaison from NIOC on the JIP parameter.

**** 

* In their response to the NIOC liaison, the WNPO requested that Footnote 3 in Attachment 2 be removed from the document. Footnote 3 states, “The OBF has specifically requested via liaison 030605-001 (T) that wireless carriers populated the JIP with an NPA-NXX specific to the state and LATA of the originating cell site.” Wireless companies do not have an NPA/NXX assigned at a cell site and agreed that it would be cost prohibitive to provide a JIP per cell site.
* No other industry groups responding to the NIOC liaison requested any changes that affect the change requested by the WNPO.
* Gary Sacra will send a brief note to the NIOC stating that the LNPA concurs with the WNPO response

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.

* In addition to changes related to updating the actual counts, the WNPO has decided to treat the 10 million contingency factor as a financial contingency and the factor will not be included in the traffic model. This will treated likewise in the NFG model.

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

* A new NANC Issue Management Group (IMG) has been formed on INC Issue 407, which addresses whether a customer-dedicated NXX should be poolable and/or marked portable.
* A “NANC Readout” item will be added to the LNPA agenda.
* OBF Meeting 88 will be held in Las Vegas. A final review of WICIS 3.0 will be conducted.
* OBF Issue 2664, which addresses duplicate port requests on the same number, is in final closure.
* The Wireless Testing Subcommittee (WTSC) has disbanded but a new issue on the upcoming WICIS release has been raised related to whether or not to resurrect the WTSC for testing. This will be discussed at next month’s WNPO meeting.
* Fallout Reduction Taskforce (FORT) Readout: 4 open issues remain, 1 is in Initial Closure. The National Number Portability Operations (NNPO) team may be called in to canvas wireline carriers to determine if they want to be included in the various FORT matrices on information sharing.
* The NIIF Contact List is still being updated.
* In response to the attached issue raised by Sprint regarding the timeframe for when to purge an abandoned wireless-to-wireless port in ICP systems, the WNPO agreed to the following:

1. When the Old SP has concurred but has not received an activation notice within 30 calendar days after the agreed-to due date, the Old SP could purge,
2. When the Old SP has received a port request and the Old SP sends a resolution required to the New SP, but no response has been received from the New SP in 30 calendar days, the Old SP could purge. The does not apply if the Old SP sends back a delay request.



Sue Tiffany, Sprint, is working on a submission to the LNPA to develop similar requirements for inter-modal ports.

* A new issue (attached) was introduced in the WNPO by Sprint related to routing troubles and the process and minimum data required by providers to resolve these troubles. The WNPO is reviewing the available NIIF documentation. Sue Tiffany, WNPO Co-Chair, will send out a matrix for carriers to provide contact information for resolving network routing issues. Sue will also submit this issue to the LNPA as a PIM.



* It was reported that some wireless carriers are using the long timers for wireless-to-wireless ports.
* Activation of pooled blocks – Based on current restrictions, NPAC activates a maximum of 40 blocks per day. Elimination of this restriction has been pushed out to 3Q04 because there is at least one non-EDR provider in each region.
* The objective is to finalize the Inter-modal Wireless FAX form at the August meeting.
* NPA splits – if porting has been initiated in ICP with the old NPA, but the Create has not been sent to NPAC by the end of the Permissive Dialing Period (PDP), the New SP will cancel the port in ICP and re-issue with the new NPA.

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

* The APT met on 05/06/04. Attached is the meeting agenda.



* The group reviewed the May actuals. The model reflects the decision to treat the additional 10 million transactions as a financial contingency.
* The group then reviewed the projected SOA and LSMS sustained, peak, and total bandwidth requirements for NPAC:
* LSMS – projected requirements are 4 messages per second sustained and 5.2 messages per second peak for 5 minutes (1 peak per hour). Total bandwidth of 156 messages per second (30 LSMSs assumed),
* SOA – projected requirements are 4 messages per second sustained and 10 messages per second peak for 5 minutes (1 peak per hour). Total bandwidth of 40 messages per second. The rationale for the total bandwidth of 40 messages per second is the industry goal of completing a port, including population of downstream local databases, within 15 minutes.
* These throughput requirements are now documented in NANC 393.
* It was suggested that we need to consider service bureaus with multiple providers on an association and that we may need to consider multiple associations.
* The group then reviewed the list of 14 Change Orders developed within the APT. These have now have been referred to the full LNPA for inclusion in the LNPA ranking process for the next NPAC software release. APT work is now completed on these Change Orders.
* No work was done on the CMIP alternative proposal at the May meeting.
* Issue of SPID discrepancy post-323 migration: Action Item 0304-07 on how to notify the auditing service provider of a SPID mismatch remains open. NeuStar stated that in order to resolve this issue immediately, NPAC will ignore the SPID attribute discrepancy and log an error in the NPAC error log.
* Issue of Cancel–pending to pending state (NANC Change Order 388): 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. We need to discuss profile setting in Change Management. If provider has a profile setting such that they do not support the state change, how will they take a cancel-pending SV to active eventually?
* **The APT has completed its Charter and will become dormant at this time, but will not disband, in the event that future issues warrant restarting the group. As a result, it was agreed to cancel the June APT meeting scheduled to take place on Thursday, June 17th.**

Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Responses to LNPA Liaisons (Adam Newman – Telcordia):

* INC Issue 445 is closed. This removed the footnote in the CO Code Transfer Process stating that NANC 323 is pending. INC requested that the LNPA instruct INC on the disposition of the workaround process to use pooling functionality to override NXX code ownership in NPAC now that NANC 323 is available. The consensus within the LNPA during the discussion was that the workaround should be retained as an alternative. INC also asked for guidance on whether the NANC 323 form and M&P should be included in the INC guidelines.
* INC Issue 412 is closed. This issue relates to the porting of grandfathered codes. Like the LNPA, the INC agreed that it is appropriate to await the FCC’s decision on the USTA petition.
* INC Issue 434: This issue relates to the LNPA’s liaison on deleting codes with active SVs. NeuStar needs written authority from the appropriate State Regulatory Commission to delete SVs. INC added text to Section 3 of Appendix C of COCAG.

PIMs:

.

* PIM 22 – PIM 22 remains open. 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.” The group has begun developing the technical requirements for NANC Change Order 375. NANC 375 will not be ranked during the July Change Order ranking session, but will be included in the next NPAC software release package.

 

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



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

* PIM 28 – This PIM, submitted by Sprint PCS, addresses interface differences between the WPRR (wireless) and FOC (wireline). The FOC allows for a due date and time change on confirmations, however, the WPRR does not. When a wireline carrier sends an FOC with a change in due date or time, the wireless carrier cannot process the change and does not allow the port to complete. This accepted PIM was referred to the Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF) Wireless 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 WICIS Release 3.0 in June/July 2005. There is a workaround in the interim. A member stated that the FCC Order states that in “Phase 1” of inter-modal porting, the wireline forms will be used. 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 June meeting, it was stated that the acceptable timeframes for performing the disconnect is addressed in the NANC flows. Sprint agreed to close PIM 29 in lieu of the workaround in place to address PIM 28, as well as the other open PIMs that address LSR/FOC fallout.

* 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.



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?” In addition, a NANC member asked that, in light of recent FCC Enforcement Bureau action, the LNPA address carriers with waivers or operating outside mandated porting areas in its discussions of N-1 responsibilities. During the June discussion, the LNPA agreed that carriers operating outside mandated areas, or carriers with waivers, that originate local calls to ported numbers, must perform the query themselves or make arrangements. The LNPA doesn’t feel that a change is necessary in the FCC’s definition of N-1 relative to carriers with waivers or operating outside mandated areas..

At the June LNPA meeting, Gary Sacra, Verizon Communications, discussed the attached revised Verizon contribution detailing their interpretation of the N-1 carrier’s query responsibilities and the cites used to develop that interpretation. The contribution was amended to identify direct quotes from FCC Orders and industry documentation. In addition, any relevant T1S1 LNP switching and signaling standards requirements was identified.



Verizon suggested that the LNPA adopt the attached interpretation as the group’s consensus. The LNPA is to come prepared next month to consider.

The group then discussed the attached contribution from Cingular.



A member discussed the problems that wireline switches have when an LRN returned from the routing database contains an NPA-NXX that is interLATA to the end office switch that launched the query. Some switch types drop the call, while others will route the call to an IXC and the calling party could be inappropriately billed for an interLATA toll call. Another member also pointed out that some states require a toll indication to the calling party. Cingular stated that this contribution relates to privileged calling between two carriers and not a normal EAS scenario. Addressing this carrier-specific arrangement would possibly require breaking out 10-digit numbers for routing to IXCs vs. routing non-ported numbers to the carrier to which you have the arrangement directly. The LNPA suggested that any agreement between carriers for wide area calling arrangements should include where the LNP query is to be performed and how the calls to ported numbers in those codes will be routed.

The LNPA then discussed the attached SBC contribution. SBC stated that this was not being presented to suggest that the industry adopt this as the solution for how to route calls in an EAS area. One member expressed concerns with this contribution related to the need to eliminate direct end office trunking between the LATAs and establishing EAS connectivity between end offices in LATA A to the tandem in LATA B. In addition, issues related with the inability to perform proper screening to prevent fraudulent routing were expressed.



Verizon then offered the following straw proposal for consideration in order to address the NANC action item related to EAS areas – In the EAS scenario, the originating carrier is still considered the N-1 carrier. For calls to EAS codes, the call shall not be queried in the originating LATA unless every provider providing service in that EAS area who is porting in EAS-rated numbers has assigned an LRN within an NXX code that is LERG-assigned to their switch and is rated for that EAS area. Otherwise calls will be queried in the terminating LATA. If the call is not queried by the N-1 carrier, the carrier performing the query may charge the N-1 carrier for performing the query.

This PIM remains open and will be discussed further at the July meeting. The LNPA’s objective continues to be 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. The LNPA has set a target for the September 2004 NANC meeting to provide its consensus on N-1 responsibilities, including EAS areas and carriers with waivers or operating outside mandated areas, and whether the NANC should recommend to the FCC any rule changes relevant to the N-1 architecture.

* 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.



Several wireless providers stated that they use the Conflict function to communicate to the other provider that they need to discuss the port, but they do not issue a jeopardy. Verizon and Qwest stated that they send back text messages explaining the reason for jeopardy.

Based on a request from Syniverse, Wireline Service Providers took an action to determine whether they can modify their jeopardy process to distill the jeopardy reasons cited down to a brief list of standard reasons. Syniverse suggested the following as a start based on their analysis of jeopardy notices received:

* Duplicate LSR
* Contact LEC
* Special features on TN
* Due Date change requested
* Contact with End User required
* Ported MDN has not been activated

Rob Smith, Syniverse, will investigate occurrences of wireless providers issuing duplicate LSRs and send the results to the appropriate wireless carrier(s) generating the duplicates.

* 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.



Wireline Service Providers have an open 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 (Action Item 0504-15).

During the discussion at the June LNPA meeting, a number of wireless providers stated that they have built in a validation edit in their point-of-sale process to identify when the LERG-assignee for the customer’s NPA-NXX is different than the service provider identified by the customer. Rob Smith, Syniverse, will modify PIM 32 to provide proposed resolutions to serve as suggestions for wireline providers.

* 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 June LNPA meeting, Rob Smith, Syniverse, took an action to modify PIM 34 to provide proposed resolutions to serve as suggestions for wireline providers.

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

* NEW PIM 37 – This PIM, submitted by Verizon Wireless, seeks to define in the NANC Flows that Inter-carrier Communications Process (ICP) must be electronic or manual (fax or e-mail), and not a phone call.



A member pointed out that she believes that the FCC meant for porting to be as easy as possible for the customer. Another member stated that the old service provider dictates the requirements for porting out one of their numbers as long as they are within industry standards and guidelines. The current NANC-approved flows state that the Wireless Port Request (WPR) should be sent to the new service provider via CORBA or FAX.

The LNPA is to come to the July meeting prepared to discuss how best to address this issue. Service Providers are to come to the July LNPA meeting with any examples of occurrences of Issue 1 in PIM 37, **Porting with no ICP process**. Julie Groenen, Verizon Wireless, will remove Issue 2 (**Provisioning codes in the NPAC)** and

Issue 3 (**Opening codes in the LERG)**, from PIM 37 and resubmit them as a new PIM. Julie will reissue PIM 37 to cover only Issue 1 (**Porting with no ICP process)**.

**PIMs Discussed on Wednesday, 6/16/04:**

* NEW 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. The PIM was accepted at the June 2004 meeting.



NANC Change Order 321 addresses this issue, but will need to be modified to address an area in Kentucky where two regions serve the same NPA. This is an exception area where the validation check would have to go down to the NXX level to prevent a code in this NPA from being opened up in the wrong region. NeuStar took an action to modify NANC Change Order 321 to address this case where two NPAC Regions serve the 859 NPA (Northern Kentucky). Although Kentucky is part of the Southeast Region, the portion of its 859 NPA in LATA 922 is served by the Midwest Region. The rest of NPA 859 is served by the Southeast Region. Thus an NPA-based edit function will not suffice for the 859 NPA.

NeuStar also proactively goes through manually once a quarter per agreement with the LLC in order to clean up codes opened in the wrong region. NeuStar will investigate the Help Desk process for correcting NXX codes opened in the wrong NPAC Region and provide a readout at the July LNPA meeting during the discussion of PIM 36. It was suggested that we may want the LNPA to send a request to the LLC to have NeuStar place a time limit for the code holder to correct any identified discrepancies and then NeuStar would correct if the code holder does not do so in the allotted timeframe. Syniverse took an action to modify the PIM to remove

references to LRN and unique error message and resubmit.

* NEW 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. The PIM was accepted at the June 2004 meeting.



NeuStar will develop an appropriate NPAC Change Order that will be included in the upcoming Change Order ranking session to determine the next NPAC software release. The Change Order will remove the 5-day minimum interval between –X creation and block activation now imposed on all blocks. The Change Order will cause a 5-day delay to be imposed only if the NPA-NXX from which the block is drawn has not yet experienced a “first port” notification. The Change Order also will introduce a 5-day delay between the creation and activation of an individual SV when its NPA-NXX likewise has had no “first port” notification.

* NEW PIM 39 – This PIM, submitted by Syniverse, seeks to address frequent changes in wireline business practices and rules related to porting requirements.



Rob Smith, Syniverse, will provide data on the frequency of occurrence. The accumulated data will be made anonymous for discussion at next month’s LNPA meeting. The provider-specific data will be made available to each of the involved service providers by Friday, 6/25/04.

Sue Tiffany, Sprint PCS and WNPO Co-Chair, pointed out that the inter-modal IMG recommendation calls for an automated interface to reduce the interval. Frequent changes may make it cost prohibitive for a carrier to automate their systems. Another member suggested that the PIM should possibly include guidelines for advanced notice of changes. The PIM remains in Pending state.

**WEDNESDAY 6/16/04**

Wednesday, 6/16/04, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Cheryl Gordon | Alltel | Tim Waters | | SNET (phone) |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T | Craig Bartell | | Sprint |
| Bob Frasca | AT&T (phone) | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | ATTWS | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth (phone) | Tony Ramsey | | Syniverse (phone) |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Rob Smith | | Syniverse |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LLC | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec (phone) |
| Elton Allen | Cingular | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Faith Seiders | Cingular | Jean Anthony | | Telecom Software |
| Dennis Robins | Electric Lightwave (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Keagan O’Rourke | ESI (phone) | Ken Soltesz | | US Cellular |
| Steve Farnsworth | ESI | Ginny Cashbaugh | | US Cellular |
| Therese Mooney | Global Crossing (phone) | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| Karen Mulberry | MCI | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Jason Lee | MCI (phone) | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| Pascale Lacroix | Microcell Solutions | Sara Hooker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Deborah Stephens | | Verizon Wireless |
| Shannon Sevigny | NeuStar (phone) |  | |  |
| Gene Johnston | NeuStar |  | |  |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar |  | |  |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar |  | |  |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar |  | |  |
| Dave Garner | Qwest (phone) |  | |  |
| Leah Luper | SBC (phone) |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

Change Management Discussion:



* The LNPA reviewed the following Change Orders:
* NANC 299, NPAC Monitoring of SOA and LSMS Associations via Heartbeat
* The description should be changed from a TCP level heartbeat message to an application level heartbeat message. Keep-alive messages are running today but this only checks at the TCP layer (link is alive), not the application layer. NPAC must receive a message from the SOA/LSMS within a tunable specified number of minutes timeframe or the NPAC will ping the SOA/LSMS. Encryption would not be put in this message.
* NANC 352, Recovery Enhancements – Recovery of SPID
* If you are down when a new provider is created, the only way to get the data currently is via a BDD.
* NANC 353, Round Robin Broadcast Across SOA Associations
* This would require two SOAs and split the traffic over the SOAs. NANC 383 only requires one SOA.
* NANC 375, Prevent New Service Provider from Removing Conflict Status with Certain Cause Code Values
* A requirement will be added for NPAC to generate a report on the usage of Cause Values 50 and 51 by SPID. This Change Order will not be ranked, but will be included in the package.
* NANC 384, Change Order Effectiveness Matrix:
* ESI explained that the purpose of the Change Order is to help build business cases for proposed fixes.
* This is a proposal for a testing and estimating process. ESI estimates a 300% return on investment in this Change Order.
* NANC 384 will stay on the list for prioritization.
* NANC 389, Performance Test Bed:
* A question was asked as to how the new performance requirements (NANC 393) fit into the requirements for the test bed. It was also asked if this test bed is needed post 11/24. A number of wireless carriers still expressed support for the proposed test bed.
* A question was asked on which test bed would be used for NANC 393, NPAC Performance Requirements. NeuStar stated that it would be the new release test bed. The SOW 34 test bed is for functionality only, it does not have the same hardware as production.
* It was asked if the SOW 34 test bed will be migrated to the new hardware platform. Yes, it will have the current software release with an Oracle database, but will not address the performance requirements requested in NANC 389.
* It was suggested that the LLC could request NeuStar to develop an SOW comparing a new performance test bed vs. enhancing the existing SOW 34 test bed.
* The Canadian Project Executive stated that Canada has no need for a performance test bed and requested that this be separate from a new release SOW.
* It was asked if NANC 389 needs to change in light of the performance changes proposed in NANC 393. Steve Sanchez, AT&T Wireless, will review the requirements for the proposed performance test bed (NANC 389) and modify them, if necessary, in light of NANC 393, NPAC Performance Requirements, and to address any ongoing performance requirements changes in the FRS.
* NANC 388, Undo a “cancel-pending” SV:
* No new “retract cancel” message over the interface is necessary. The existing Modify SV functionality will be used with a change to support the status change.
* NANC 390, New Interface Confirmation Messages SOA/LSMS-to-NPAC:
* This Change Order proposed a new immediate acknowledgement message to a request.
* NANC 390 also ties in ILL 130. ILL 130 was designed to provide better error messaging and get the error text over the SOA interface.
* NANC 390 introduces more traffic over the interface. NeuStar developers pointed out that there is no way to incorporate the CMIP construct of linked replies into NANC 390. In addition, the shear magnitude of the change is also a problem. NeuStar feels that the higher performance and better response times of the migrated NPACs mitigate the need for the immediate response message. NeuStar proposed dropping NANC 390 and revisiting ILL 130 for the improved error messaging. NANC 390 and ILL 130 are separate Change Orders and will remain on the list for ranking.
* The LNPA then discussed the NPAC, SOA, and LSMS level of development effort for each Change Order in the pool. NOTE: Leah Luper, SBC, stated that she was providing the level of effort for ESI.

**Change Order NPAC SOA LSMS**

ILL 5 (will not be ranked)

ILL 130 high high high

NANC 138 low low N/A

NANC 147 (will not be ranked)

NANC 151 low high N/A

NANC 193 high N/A N/A

NANC 200 (will not be ranked)

NANC 219 (will not be ranked)

NANC 227/254 med N/A low

NANC 232 (will not be ranked)

NANC 285 low med-high med-high

NANC 299 med med-high med-high

NANC 300 med med-low med-high

NANC 321 med N/A N/A

NANC 346 N/A low low

NANC 347/350 med low low

NANC 348 med med med

NANC 349 med high N/A

NANC 351 high high high

NANC 352 med med-low med-low

NANC 353 (will not be ranked)

NANC 355 low med-low low

NANC 357 low med-low med

NANC 358 low low low

NANC 362 TBD N/A N/A

NANC 363 high low low

NANC 368 low med-high med-high

NANC 372 TBD TBD TBD

NANC 375 low low N/A

NANC 382 (will not be ranked)

NANC 383 med med N/A

NANC 384 TBD TBD TBD

NANC 385 med N/A N/A

NANC 386 low low low

NANC 388 low low-med N/A

NANC 389 (separate SOW path) N/A N/A N/A

NANC 390 high high high

NANC 392 med N/A N/A

NANC 393 high low-high low-high

NANC 394 med TBD N/A

* The group then discussed the procedure for the July ranking session. There will be one vote per company (wireline and wireless arms within a company should coordinate the one vote). All Change Orders to be ranked should be ranked numerically 1 through N, with 1 being the highest rank. No two Change Orders will have the same ranking number.
* Local system vendors expressed concern over the development cycle and the expectations of when the next release will be ready for testing. One LSMS vendor stated that 9 months to a year between having a list of Change Orders and turn-up testing is doable.
* NeuStar will issue a revised Change Order document for the July ranking session. The Change Orders that are not to be ranked will not be included in the ranking document. The document will include a note that these removed Change Orders have not been placed into delete-pending status, but rather are not candidates for the next release package.
* **NANC 323 – SPID Migration:**



* The group reviewed the latest version of the NANC 323 SPID Migration documents in the zip file attached above. NeuStar entertained comments on the documents.
* Adam Newman, Telcordia, will bring to the July LNPA meeting the INC’s proposed text for Appendix C of the Central Office Code Administration Guidelines (COCAG) that address the fact that NANC 323 functionality no longer is pending.
* A member asked if the 66 day interval applied if a provider needs to use NANC 323 to correct cases where the SPID is incorrect in NPAC, but correct in the LERG. A discussion then ensued on the need for a process for when the LERG and NPAC is to be changed, and one for when only NPAC is to be changed. NeuStar action to modify the NANC 323 flows and related documents to address the scenario when the LERG already reflects the appropriate code holder and the LERG is not involved in the migration timeline. The maintenance window for the migration in this scenario will be the one immediately following 31 days after the initial notification.
* BellSouth raised the following questions and concerns:

1. Is there a migration backout plan? Answer: No. It was agreed that once the migration was started, if a problem was encountered, we would work to resolve the problem and continue to move forward.
2. Will there be a call after the migration is completed? Yes. Monday morning after the Sunday maintenance window at 11am Central.
3. Does the SPID Migration Form identify all information required by NeuStar? Yes.
4. BellSouth reiterated their objection to the service provider response forms being sent back to SPID B.
5. BellSouth raised a concern about receiving the initial SMURF files by Wednesday midnight one week before migration weekend with a readiness call the next day (Thursday one week before migration weekend). BellSouth questioned if the file is necessary or of value? The group agreed to revisit this after the 1st migration.

* Gary Sacra will place a “NANC 323 Lessons Learned” item on the agenda for the August LNPA meeting. This assumes the industry will have performed its

first migration using NANC 323 functionality prior to the August meeting.

NPAC Technology Migration Update – NeuStar:

* NeuStar reported that 4 regions have been completed and are running much better (MA, SE, WE, WC).
* Canada NPAC will be migrated this weekend (6/20). The NE, MW, and SW Regions will be migrated on 6/27.

Review of May Action Items:



* Item 0504-01: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0504-02: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0504-03: This item was completed and is Closed.

* Item 0504-04: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0504-05: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0504-06: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0504-07: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0504-08: Item remains Open.
* Item 0504-09: Syniverse has developed a matrix to reflect these requirements. Item

is Closed.

* Item 0504-10: Item remains Open for discussion at the July meeting.
* Item 0504-11: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0504-12: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0504-13: Item remains Open for the July meeting.
* Item 0504-14: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0504-15: Item remains Open.

Action Items Remaining Open from Previous Meetings:

* Item 0104-09: Item is Closed.
* Item 0204-18: Item remains Open. Service providers will monitor and provide feedback on whether or not this issue is improving.
* Item 0204-20: Item is Closed.
* Item 0304-07: Item remains Open and will discussed at the July meeting.
* Item 0404-07: Item is Closed.
* Item 0404-08: Item is Closed.

New Business:

* Regarding the attached liaison from NIOC on High Volume Call-In numbers, Gary Sacra will send a response back to NIOC stating that the issue was brought before the LNPA and members were encouraged to contact their respective NIIF member to provide any comments.



* Paul LaGattuta, AT&T and LNPA Co-Chair, reported that the Texas PUC held a workshop to discuss using Option A vs. Option B for porting reseller and Type 1 numbers. He reported that some CLECs have gone to the PUC asking to use Option A, where the reseller or Type 1 provider would coordinate the port. Paul will investigate, and provide feedback at the July LNPA meeting, the recent proceedings before the Texas PUC as they relate to Option A versus Option B in the NANC LNP Provisioning Flows.