LNPA WORKING GROUP

June 2005 Meeting

Final Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| San Ramon, California | Host: SBC |

**TUESDAY 06/14/05**

Tuesday, 06/14/05, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Cheryl Gordon | Alltel (phone) | Dave Garner | | Qwest |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T (phone) | David Taylor | | SBC (phone) |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Leah Luper | | SBC |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Donna Devereaux | | SBC (phone) |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LNP Consortium | Kelli Gracy | | SNET DG (phone) |
| Jason Powell | Centennial Wireless (phone) | Joe Leeper | | Sprint |
| Michelle Gwaltney | Cingular | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint |
| Lonnie Keck | Cingular (phone) | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint (phone) |
| Brian Dempsey | Cingular | Steve Moore | | Sprint |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox | Rob Smith | | Syniverse |
| Dennis Robins | Electric Lightwave (phone) | Darren Paffenroth | | Syniverse |
| Jean Anthony | Evolving Systems | Jason Kempson | | Telcordia |
| Jason Lee | MCI (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Rick Jones | NENA (phone) | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| Shannon Sevigny | NeuStar Pooling | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Sara Hooker | | Verizon Wireless (phone) |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Deborah Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Jeff Harmon | | Verizon Wireless (phone) |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar |  | |  |
| Susan Ortega | Nextel (phone) |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

Attached are the Action Items assigned at the June, 2005 LNPA meeting. Also included are the remaining open Action Items from previous meetings.

****

NOTE: ALL ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “JUNE 2005 LNPA ACTION ITEMS” FILE ATTACHED ABOVE.

**MEETING MINUTES:**

2005 Meeting Schedule:

Following is the meeting schedule for the 2005 LNPA Meetings.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MONTH/**  **DATE**  **(2005)** | NANC | OBF | LNPA-WG | HOST | LOCATION |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| January | 19th |  | 11-12-13th | Qwest & NeuStar | Phoenix |
| February |  | Week of 7th | 15-16-17th | Syniverse | Tampa |
| March | 15th |  | 8-9-10th | NeuStar | Napa, California |
| April |  |  | 12-13-14th | VZ Wireless | Nashville |
| May | 17th | Week of 2nd | 10-11-12th | Sprint | Kansas |
| June |  |  | 14-15-16th | SBC | San Ramon |
| July | 19th | Week of 25th | 12-13-14th | Canadian Consortium | St. Sauveur, Montreal |
| August |  |  | 9-10-11th | Tekelec | Raleigh |
| September | 20th |  | 13-14th | T-Mobile | Seattle |
| October |  | Week of 22nd | 18-19th | Nextel | Ft. Lauderdale |
| November | 30th |  | 15-16th | Cingular | Atlanta |
| December |  |  | 6-7th | Evolving Systems | Denver |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

05/05 Minutes Review:

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

* Page 3, Issue 2891, change to read, “Issue 2891 addresses the desired due date and time on a port request and how far in the future it can be allowed. The proposal is for the due date and time to be limited to 90 days after submission of the port request. OBF members are reviewing for feedback.”
* Page 3, Issue 2897, change to reflect that Evolving Systems introduced the issue.
* Page 4, 4th main bullet under the Inter-modal Subcommittee (ISC) report, change to read, “The ISC has requested to meet for a full day in Phoenix at OBF 91 to define a core standard set of data elements for wireline to wireless and wireless to wireline porting. This is related to Issue 2801.
* Page 4, 5th main bullet under the Inter-modal Subcommittee (ISC) report, move to the Wireless Committee portion of the report, and change to read, “Social Security Number (SSN) Issue (Issue 2911) – A new issue has been submitted to the Wireless Committee to investigate removing the SSN in WICIS and making Account No. mandatory for wireless to wireline porting.
* Page 22, 2nd bullet under Action Item 0405-15, change to read, “Qwest does not hold up the port if DSL is on the line.”
* Page 23, delete 4th bullet estimating the number of records in the database.

Inter-modal Subcommittee (ISC) (formerly Inter-species Task Force [ITF]) Update and Inter-modal Port Issues referred to OBF (Lonnie Keck, Cingular Wireless and OBF Wireless Committee Co-Chair):

# Wireless Committee:

* The Wireless Committee held a conference call last week.
* Issue 2891 addresses the desired due date and time on a port request and how far in the future it can be allowed. The Committee has agreed to a process change, but implementation questions remain. Carriers are asked to review a number of options and come to OBF 91 prepared to finalize.
* Issue 2761 (FAX Form): Some subcommittee meetings have been held. Some address field information has been parsed out for better mapping. An automated process could be available for wireline carriers with LSOG 12 (later this year).
* Social Security Number (SSN) Issue (Issue 2911) – A new issue has been accepted by the Wireless Committee to investigate removing the SSN in WICIS and making Account No. mandatory for wireless to wireless porting. Two options are to be discussed at OBF 91:
  + Remove the SSN/Tax ID formatting from the field.
  + Leave it as it is and note that the Account No. should be provided.

A contribution will possibly be submitted to LSOG for removal of SSN/Tax ID, pending results from the Wireless Committee.

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

* The ISC has requested to meet for a full day at OBF 91 to start working the data elements provided by wireline carriers for the matrix that was developed by the ISC. The group will proceed with identifying those that are unique to LNP and defining a core standard set of data elements for wireline to wireless and wireless to wireline porting. The ISC will look at Issue 2801 to see what is necessary to move that issue forward.

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

* Jean Anthony, Evolving Systems, reported that a conference call was held on 5/23/05. Seven companies (combination of providers and vendors) participated.
* The Committee reviewed the test plan and schedule. No testing had taken place as of the 5/23/05 call.
* The next call will be held on 6/21/05 at 4pm Eastern. Details are on the WTSC website.

NENA Report (Rick Jones, NENA):

* Rick Jones, NENA, reported that by the end of June, NENA will have formed a group within NENA to address VoIP/LNP/911 issues.
* The FCC Order on VoIP and 911 has been issued. NENA and the VoN Coalition are holding a VoIP summit in D.C. on Thursday, July 7th, to address the points in the FCC Order.

PIM 51 Subcommittee Report (Jeff Adrian, Sprint):



* At the April 2005 LNPA meeting, it was agreed that a sub-team would be formed to discuss a means of developing a SPID to OCN association: Susan Ortega (Nextel and Co-Chair), Steve Addicks (NeuStar), Deb Tucker (Verizon Wireless), Dave Cochran (BellSouth), Sue Tiffany (Sprint), Jeff Adrian (Sprint and Co-Chair), David Taylor (SBC), and Frank Reed (T-Mobile) is participating on the sub-team.
* Jeff Adrian, Sprint and PIM 51 Subcommittee Co-Chair, reported that a call was held on 6/6/05.
* The Subcommittee expanded its Mission Statement. It is as follows:

Determine how to acquire data for a NPAC SPID to OCN matrix to accommodate the manual objectives of PIM 51 or to propose an alternative method.

* The Subcommittee proposes that the LNPA adopt their recommended process for the manual approach to PIM 51. Attached is the PIM 51 Subcommittee Report and recommendation as presented by Jeff Adrian.



* Steve Addicks, NeuStar, reported that there have been no reports at the Help Desk of new code openings by the wrong provider. The Help Desk is working a trouble related to a code opened in 1999. Action Item 0205-04 remains open.
* A provider expressed a concern about developing a detailed process to address this issue when the occurrences are very low.
* Regarding the attached recommendation from the PIM 51 Subcommittee for

resolution of PIM 51, Service Providers are to review for discussion at the July LNPA meeting.

* The Subcommittee is to remain open awaiting the LNPA’s determination of whether or not to accept its recommendation.

PIM Discussion:

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

 

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



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

 

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

On May 4th, the Pool Administrator (PA) submitted the attached PA Change Order 41 for a one-time scrub of all 1K blocks currently in the pools. The NOWG supports PA Change Order 41. Also attached is correspondence from the INC recapping the joint LNPA/INC conference call on April 5, 2005 to discuss potential solutions to PIM 24.

 

The PIM will remain open while the LNPA awaits the results of the scrub.

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

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



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



PIM 32 is being worked through the wireline carriers’ Account Management process. The request is for the underlying wireline network provider to provide CSRs for reseller numbers directly to the requesting wireless carrier. The request leaves it up to the underlying wireline network provider on how to make that happen. One wireline provider has a process in place that does not yet work for wireless carriers. Their system does not yet allow wireless OCNs in the database.

Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will modify Action Item 0904-09 to reflect that Rob Smith, will contact wireline carriers’ **Account Management** contacts to determine if their respective Customer Service Record (CSR) reject messages can be modified to indicate that a reseller or Type 1 number is involved in the port request. Action Item 0904-09 will also be modified to reflect that it is now only relevant to PIM 32 with the withdrawal of PIM 34.

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



The proposed resolution for PIM 49, if implemented, will also address PIM 34. Rob Smith, Syniverse, stated that nothing more remains to be done on the solution. He reported that not all wireless carriers have agreed to implement the mechanized solution. As a result, manual workarounds are in place to address the issue. The PIM will be withdrawn. Migrations of Type 1 numbers to Type 2 are continuing.

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



NANC Change Order 321 addresses this issue, and has been modified to address an area in Kentucky where two regions serve the same NPA. NANC 321 is included in the recommended package for the next NPAC software release. This PIM is now in a tracking state awaiting implementation of NANC 321. The PIM was revised to eliminate the verbiage on LRNs because there is often more than one region that is correct for an LRN. LRNs can be in more than one region. NeuStar will continue a manual cleanup of NXXs opened in the wrong region until NANC 321 is implemented. NeuStar has increased the frequency of the manual cleanup.

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



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

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



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



Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will:

1. Send a liaison to Adam Newman, INC Vice-Chair, requesting that the attached INC Issue 466 be modified to read as follows (requested changes in read text and highlighted in yellow:

The Coordinated Industry Effort Process is a coordinated manual delete/recreate update of the affected NXX code records. The new code holder should identify the number of ported and/or pooled TNs within the NXX code(s) to be transferred and the number of involved SPs to determine if this option is feasible. Based on the number of involved SPs, the new code holder should coordinate a conference call among all affected SPs to determine if the delete/recreate process is acceptable among all affected SPs. Affected SPs should note that the delete/recreate process is service affecting for those ported and/or pooled customers. The type of customer should also be considered when determining if this option is feasible. If the Coordinated Industry Effort process is deemed acceptable, the affected SPs shall coordinate the deletion and recreation of all ported and/or pooled TN records in the NXX code(s). It is recommended that this process should be considered when there are 5 or fewer SPs involved and less than 150 working TNs and no pooled blocks. (See LNPA Best Practices posted on the NPAC Public Site, [www.npac.com](http://www.npac.com).).

1. Modify the Suggested Resolution in PIM 41 and the LNPA’s NP Best Practices document to read as follows (suggested changes in red text and highlighted in yellow):

If No Ported or pooled Numbers Exist In The Code(S) Or Block(S) delete Affected By The Move:

If no ported or pooled numbers are in the code, the new code holder should contact the current code owner as shown in the NPAC to have the code deleted in the NPAC. The new code holder will then add the code in the NPAC under their SPID.

If Ported or pooled Numbers Exist In The Code(S) Or Block(S) delete Affected By The Move:

1. Coordinated Industry Effort: The new code holder should identify the number of ported and/or pooled TNs within the NXX(s) in question and the number of involved service providers to determine if this option is feasible. Based on the number of involved service providers, the new code holder should coordinate a conference call to determine if the delete/recreate process is acceptable among all affected service providers. If this process is deemed acceptable, the affected service providers shall coordinate the deletion and recreation of all ported and/or pooled TN records in the code(s). Note that the delete/recreate process is service affecting for those ported and/or pooled subscribers. Type of customer should also be considered when determining if this option is feasible. It is recommended that this process be considered when there are five (5) or fewer Service Providers involved and less than one hundred and fifty (150) working TNs and no pooled blocks.

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



This PIM was accepted at the OBF ISC as Issue 2802 and is now in tracking status only for LNPA. See readout of Issue 2802 in the ISC Report in these minutes. ISC Issue 2802 is now closed with the following resolution statement:

The Intermodal Subcommittee has reviewed the usage of the MI, ATN, TOS and the various service address fields and has determined that only the ATN field, or one of its sister fields (EATN or AN) is currently required for number portability for LSOG 10 usage rules. In some cases, the fields are required/conditional by individual provider business rules that differ from LSOG usage rules. Therefore, the subcommittee has recommended that wireless providers address the problem via the individual providers’ business processes. Although some wireline providers do not have a specific change management process, there is a venue for the issue to be addressed within each provider.

PIM 42 to stay open awaiting feedback from Change Control/Account Management efforts. It was reported that not all ILEC Change Control Processes recognize wireless carriers as they do CLECs. The process was developed to address regulations pertaining to CLECs. A wireless carrier suggested that it might be more efficient to have a separate process for wireless carriers. It was stated that the advocate for wireless carriers is their Account Management team. Wireless carriers will continue to work this issue through their respective Account Management teams.

Rob Smith, Syniverse, will update the PIM to eliminate the fields that are no longer at issue and provide the usage definitions of the remaining fields. At the June LNPA meeting, it was reported that the CCNA field has been resolved. Rob will also develop a document that further explains the PIM 42 and 44 issues and why these fields are not necessary for wireless providers, to be used by wireless carriers to explain and work with their ILEC Account Teams.

Steve Moore, Sprint, will provide the LSOG definitions and usage of each field addressed in the PIM, and the action items from the OBF related to OBF Issue 2802.

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



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

Rob Smith, Syniverse, will develop a document that further explains the PIM 42 and 44 issues and why these fields are not necessary for wireless providers, to be used by wireless carriers to explain and work with their ILEC Account Teams.

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



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



This PIM is in tracking mode now that the LSOP Committee has opened a new issue to address guidelines for the return of errors (included in Issue No. 2817). This issue was worked extensively at the May OBF 90 meeting in Denver. It is anticipated that this issue will be closed at the next OBF quarterly session in late July.

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



At the June LNPA meeting, Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, took an action item to craft a Suggested Resolution for the PIM.

* PIM 50 – This PIM, submitted by Syniverse, seeks to address instances where

wireline to wireless ports fail the automated process because they are from large accounts where the Customer Service Record (CSR) is too large to return on a CSR query.



At the June LNPA meeting, Syniverse reported that they are working this issue through wireline carriers’ Change Management/Account Management teams. At the May LNPA meeting, Mubeen Saifullah, NeuStar Clearinghouse, took an action item to determine if any providers are including Directory information in response to a Transaction Type E CSR request. At the June LNPA meeting, Mubeen reported that responses are not including Directory listings. It was reported, per LSOG Guidelines, with Transaction Type E and ATN there should be no directory listings being returned. Type E with WTN will return directory listings and should only return information on that TN, per LSOG Guidelines. Action Item 0505-08 is closed.

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



See the readout of the PIM 51 Subcommittee previously in these minutes.

May NANC Meeting Readout (Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair):

* Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, provided a readout of the May 2005 NANC meeting. Attached is the LNPA’s report to the May 2005 NANC meeting.
* Gary also reported that NANC endorsed the attached two LNPA Position Papers addressing the use of Evidence of Authorization and customer Social Security Numbers/Tax IDs. NANC Chairman Bob Atkinson has sent the attached letter to the FCC requesting the Commission’s endorsement of the two Position Papers.

 

Discussion on Operating Sys Changes/Mandatory Testing with NPAC:

* NeuStar reported that the scenarios describing mandatory ITP and turn-up testing in SOW 24 do not include the scenario where operating system changes with no interface changes are performed.

* NeuStar is proposing that this scenario be added to the scenarios that require ITP and Turn-up testing.
* It was suggested by a local system vendor that the vendor should perhaps perform turn-up testing rather than ITP testing. ITP does not test application functionality. The local system vendor also stated that we need to define what we mean by operating system changes.
* All Service Providers and Vendors are to come to the July meeting prepared to discuss what conditions related to operating system changes and any other scenarios in our testing guidelines should require ITP and/or turn-up testing.
* Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will send the current ITP and regression/turn-up testing guideline scenarios from Statement of Work (SOW) 24 Revision 4, to the LNPA distribution for discussion at the July LNPA meeting.

**WEDNESDAY 06/15/05**

Wednesday, 06/15/05, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Cheryl Gordon | Alltel (phone) | Susan Ortega | | Nextel (phone) |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T (phone) | Steve Showell | | Qwest (phone) |
| Martin Dolly | AT&T (PTSC) (phone) | Dave Garner | | Qwest |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | David Taylor | | SBC (phone) |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Bob Hall | | SBC (PTSC Co-Chair) (phone) |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LNP Consortium | Joe Leeper | | Sprint |
| Michelle Gwaltney | Cingular | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint |
| Brian Dempsey | Cingular | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint (phone) |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox | Steve Moore | | Sprint |
| Dennis Robins | Electric Lightwave (phone) | Rob Smith | | Syniverse |
| Lisa Marie Maxson | Evolving Systems (phone) | Darren Paffenroth | | Syniverse |
| Jean Anthony | Evolving Systems | Jason Kempson | | Telcordia |
| Therese Mooney | Global Crossing (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Jamie Sharpe | ITC DeltaCom (phone) | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile |
| Jason Lee | MCI (phone) | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Deborah Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Jeff Harmon | | Verizon Wireless (phone) |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar |  | |  |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

NP Best Practices Format Discussion (Dave Cochran):

* Dave Cochran, BellSouth, proposed updating the attached NP Best Practices document to better reflect that it is an ongoing reference document.



* It was suggested that an index page with links to the main text and a change history be added.
* Frank Reed, T-Mobile, will take the lead in forming a subcommittee to propose format changes and updates to the attached LNPA NP Best Practices document. Participating on the subcommittee will be Jeff Adrian (Sprint), Dave Cochran (BellSouth), Maggie Lee (VeriSign), Jason Lee (MCI), and Mubeen Saifullah (NeuStar Clearinghouse).

Prep for Call with PTSC on Attached PTSC Letter Regarding NANC Change Order 400:

 

* In preparation for the scheduled joint call with the ATIS Packet Technologies and Systems Committee (PTSC) to discuss their attached response to the LNPA’s request for information on their VoIP development work, the LNPA reviewed the attached clarifying questions and points previously sent to the PTSC.
* In addition to discussing the questions and comments with the PTSC, it was agreed that the LNPA would ask the PTSC to describe their VoIP development activities.
* Maggie Lee, VeriSign, then walked the group through the network layout where a VoIP provider obtains numbers from a CLEC, and connects their softswitch to the CLEC’s PSTN switch via PRIs. Numbers that port to the VoIP provider are ported using the LRN of the CLEC’s switch. Incoming calls are then routed out over the PRIs to the softswitch. Outgoing calls are routed from the softswitch to an IXC that the VoIP provider has contracted with.

Joint Call with PTSC to Discuss VoIP and NANC Change Order 400:

* Representatives from the PTSC dialed in to the conference bridge to discuss their response to the LNPA regarding our request for information related to VoIP.
* The following questions and comments were sent previously to the PTSC in preparation for the joint call:

CLARIFYING QUESTIONS:

1. With the URI/10-digit database association architecture that the PTSC

envisions, how will required LRN/DPC/SSN updates to the NPAC, when numbers

port, be synchronized with associated URI lookup database updates?

(Reference paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of PTSC letter)

2. What additional issues do the PTSC feel warrant further investigation?

(Reference paragraph 4 in PTSC letter)

3. Please explain how placing these Change Orders in NPAC in an inactive

state could have any negative impact on future network standards and

implementations. (Reference paragraph 4 in PTSC letter)

CLARIFYING POINTS:

4. NANC 400 does not propose URIs to be a queried field that would be

returned in an SS7 TCAP package in response to an LNP query from a PSTN

circuit switch. It suggests that the optional URI fields associated with

ported/pooled numbers could be provisioned in downstream routing databases

over a separate provisioning path for routing calls in the IP network.

(Reference paragraphs 4 and 7 in PTSC letter)

5. Because the vast majority of the U.S. population is within areas that

have been opened to porting and pooling, new entrants, whether PSTN or

VoIP, will assign numbers to their customers for the most part that are

either ported in with that customer, or provisioned from a non-native

pooled block. (Reference paragraph 2 and Footnote 1 in PTSC letter)

* The PTSC stated that they have a multitude of projects related to interconnection and the interface between providers and an IP routing database. ENUM has been identified as the method for routing in the IP space, specifically Carrier ENUM for routing between service providers. They have not addressed requirements for porting within the IP space.
* Martin Dolly, AT&T, stated that only 1/5 of all numbers are either ported or pooled. Members of the LNPA suggested that the number is actually closer to about 30-40%.
* The PTSC stated that ENUM will be portability corrected. An LNPA member asked how ENUM databases will be kept in synch with NPAC when customers change from one VoIP provider to another. The PTSC responded that this will be worked within the ENUM LLC. Details are still a work in progress. The PTSC stated that they would appreciate the LNPA’s insight on this issue. The LNPA member stated that NANC 400 is viewed as a potential solution to this problem.
* Bob Hall, SBC and PTSC Chair, then stated that the PTSC got off on the wrong foot regarding NANC 400 because they did not fully understand the proposal. Bob stated that the context of the PTSC’s response on NANC 400 was due to a misunderstanding in that they believed that the NPAC would be involved in real-time call processing and querying, and the Change Order could result in changes to signaling standards. The LNPA resuested that the PTSC's upcoming response to our clarifying questions and points reflect this misunderstanding.
* Paula Jordan, T-Mobile and LNPA Co-Chair, stated that NANC 400 is an option that carriers should have at their disposal for consideration. Bob Hall, SBC and PTSC Chair, responded that that is within the purview of the LNPA. It was then stated that NANC 400 was intended to enable the NPAC to support call routing as routing transitions from numbers to the next generation and to provide portability correction.
* An LNPA member then stated that the PTSC is working on how calls are to be routed while the LNPA is concentrating on how to provision data for pooled and ported numbers.
* The PTSC acknowledged that placing NANC Change Order 400 in NPAC in an inactive state would not have any negative impact on future network standards and implementations. Their concern was related to the possible activation and whether it is consistent with industry direction.
* The PTSC agreed to respond to the LNPA's clarifying questions (see attached above) in writing and to provide documentation on VoIP-related work that is taking place within the group. The LNPA and PTSC agreed to continue dialogue between the two groups to further each group's understanding.
* Follow-up points that were discussed by LNPA after the joint call:
  + The context of the PTSC’s response was influenced by their apparent misunderstanding of the NANC 400 proposal. The PTSC thought that the LNPA was proposing that the NPAC be a real-time query database and therefore, NANC 400 would drive TCAP signaling changes.
  + There is currently no solution for synching up the NPAC and URI databases (e.g. ENUM databases).

Application Server Technology Migration Update (NeuStar):



* NeuStar reported that the 5/22/05 Midwest Region migration went smoothly.
* The remaining regions are scheduled as follows:
  + 6/26/05 Southeast, Western, Southwest, and Northeast Regions
  + 7/10/05 Canadian Region
  + 7/17/05 West Coast and Mid-Atlantic Regions
* NeuStar has distributed the information on what is stored on the FTP site t providers.
* The IP address change document attached above has also been issued. Action Item 0405-16 stays open:

Regarding the upcoming NPAC Application Server Technology Migrations,

Service Providers are to verify with their network teams that all necessary firewall changes have been performed.

NPAC Release 3.3 Project Plan (Action Item 0505-02) – NeuStar



* Due to concerns raised by some members at the April LNPA meeting with regard to the testing intervals and production load dates in the 3.3 schedule, the start of turn-up testing has been shifted from 12/5/05 to 1/3/06. This has resulted in a 2 week shift in the Region 1 deployment date. The revised regional deployment dates are as follows:
  + Region 1 2/26/06
  + Regions 2, 3 3/26/06
  + Regions 4, 5 4/2/06
  + Regions 6, 7, SOW 34 4/9/06
* There were no objections raised regarding the new schedule.

Meeting Schedule Discussion:

* Beginning in September 2005, we will go to 2 day meetings on Tuesday and Wednesday.
* When it comes time to discuss next year’s meeting schedule, we will consider going to every other month meetings.

INC Issue 462 Discussion (Action Item 0405-13) (Dave Garner):



* Dave Garner, Qwest, teed up the attached INC Issue 462, which addresses the voluntary transfer of NXX codes from provider to provider in order for the receiving provider to assign an LRN. The attached Qwest contribution proposes thresholds above which an NXX code would not be considered a candidate for transfer.
* A member asked where the proposed 60 months threshold came from. Dave Garner, Qwest, explained that it was selected because it is beyond the 36 month trigger for NPA relief.
* The LNPA agreed to send a liaison to INC. Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will send a liaison to Adam Newman, INC Vice-Chair, with the attached requested wording changes, asking the INC to open up a new issue to address the LNPA’s request.

****

Change Management (NeuStar):



Change Order ILL 130 Discussion:

* Evolving Systems stated that the enhanced error capability currently being built into ILL 130 for non-Action message failures is not documented. These changes for the 17 non-Action messages means additional coding according to Evolving Systems. Evolving Systems estimated about a 50% increase in level of effort for SOA, LSMS, and simulator. Evolving Systems does not feel the response for the non-Actions is necessary and that CMIP already provides adequate error messaging for the non-Actions.
* Evolving Systems suggested ILL 130 be implemented as documented and at a later date, implement NANC 390, or open up a new Change Order to add the error message for the non-Action messages. NeuStar responded that the purpose of NANC 390 was to change the message acknowledgement structure. Implementing NANC 390 is not an option.
* NeuStar will document the 17 non-Actions related to error messaging and distribute to the LNPA by June 22nd.
* Local System Vendors are to determine if support of these 17 non-Actions will result in a delay in delivering the ILL 130 feature in their 3.3 support package and ITP testing, and if so, how much. Responses to the LNPA Co-Chairs are due by June 27th.
* NeuStar will determine the level of effort to implement 130 with an SP profile indicating whether the SP supports all of the new error messages, supports just the new error messages for Actions, or does not support the new error messages at all.
* Action Item 0505-12:

The current planned design of Change Order ILL 130 includes internal NPAC error codes that will not come across the interface. Action for Local System Vendors to determine the ramifications of leaving these error codes and text in their error table.

Evolving Systems stated that the most significant impact is to their NPAC simulator, which simulates the NPAC, and possible customer confusion with unexpected errors over the interface. Action Item 0505-12 remains open.

* Jean Anthony, Evolving Systems, will provide to NeuStar a proposed list of error messages in ILL 130 for which they want additional clarity. NeuStar stated that a new Change Order may be required to get to a greater level of detail on the error codes and text.

NANC 138:

* Action Item 0505-03: Additional steps have been added to the test case. Action item closed.

NANC 401:



* A local system vendor asked if NANC 401 was still applicable to NANC 399. NeuStar responded that it is applicable to NANC 400 only. NeuStar action to remove all references to NANC 399 from NANC 401.
* Modify option 1(b)iii in the Description of Change to remove the phrase highlighted in yellow because the LSMS must support audits : “If LSMS only stores OptionalData, and wants to support audits, then NPAC would need to ignore their discrepancy for conventional port data.”
* Action Item 0505-09 remains open. Review of NANC 401 to continue at the October 2005 LNPA meeting.
* If it is decided that NANC 400 will be included in Release 3.3 in an inactive mode, NANC 401 is not required at that time.

NANC 403:

* Current document does not state you can only send a recovery request when you are in recovery mode, and not in normal mode. This is not an interface change, but a behavior change.
* An LSMS vendor currently uses the ability to send a recovery request in normal mode for network and SV data. This Change Order would disallow this and return a rejection message.
* NeuStar is to further develop the NPAC behavior requirements for Change Order NANC 403. This will be on the July agenda and we will also discuss the local system behavior requirements for the Change Order.
* Action Item 0505-01 remains open.

BDD Subteam Readout and Action Items (Action Items 0305-01, 0505-04, 0505-11) (Dave Cochran):

* Action Item 0305-01 remains open (NeuStar is to review applicable NPAC User M&Ps to ensure that they recognize and address the existence of delta BDDs, where appropriate.). The M&Ps will be available by 7/11/05.
* Action Item 0505-04: How far back in time can you go with a delta BDD request? NeuStar responded that it is 30 days. NeuStar expressed concerned that this may be too long and it is an indication that something is very wrong if 30 days of data is missing. NeuStar suggested it be limited to 10-12 days in the M&Ps. It was decided that the M&Ps will reflect that the capability to go back 30 days is available, but requesters should consider limiting to 10-12 days.
* Action Item 0505-11: A local system vendor stated that it is feasible to create an NPAC-like BDD file in their LSMS for loading in downstream SCPs. Another vendor stated that this is proprietary and they will discuss directly with their customers. Action Item 0505-11 is closed.
* Dave Cochran, BellSouth and BDD Subteam Chair, provided a readout of the BDD Subteam’s May meeting. The Subteam:
  + Discussed alternatives, e.g. redundant systems.
  + Determined that downloading over the interface is not a feasible alternative.
  + Discussed back-up copies and IT practices
  + Asked if another media could be used that is faster. None were identified.
  + Determined next steps:
    - Update M&Ps to reflect that delta BDDs are available.
  + The Subteam will remain active in order to review M&Ps.

New Business:

* Cingular reported that, starting tomorrow, 6/16/05, all Suncom/Triton customers in their Virginia market will migrate to Cingular billing systems (around 200 ports currently process daily in this market). If any provider runs into a problem with a port out from Suncom/Triton, Cingular will start taking those calls starting tomorrow.
* Verizon Wireless stated that one small wireline carrier is not providing loss notifications on Type 1 numbers. It was stated that this has to be addressed with agreements between the two carriers.

**THURSDAY 06/16/05**

Thursday, 06/16/05, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T (phone) | Susan Ortega | | Nextel (phone) |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Dave Garner | | Qwest |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | David Taylor | | SBC (phone) |
| Brian Dempsey | Cingular | Joe Leeper | | Sprint |
| Jean Anthony | Evolving Systems | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint |
| Jason Lee | MCI (phone) | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint (phone) |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Steve Moore | | Sprint |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Darren Paffenroth | | Syniverse |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Jason Kempson | | Telcordia (phone) |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| Mindi Patterson | NeuStar (phone) | Richard Murphy | | VeriSign (phone) |
|  |  | Nancy Davies | | Verizon (phone) |
|  |  | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
|  |  | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
|  |  | Deborah Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

R3.3 Turn-Up Test Case List Review (NeuStar):



* Mindi Patterson, NeuStar, walked the group through the current document.
* Jean Anthony, Evolving Systems, provided suggested additions/modifications to the draft test case list.

Review of May Action Items:



* Item 0505-01: This item remains Open.
* Item 0505-02: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0505-03: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0505-04: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0505-05: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0505-06: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0505-07: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0505-08: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0505-09: This item remains Open.
* Item 0505-10: This item remains Open.
* Item 0505-11: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0505-12: This item remains Open.

Action Items Remaining Open from Previous Meetings:

* Item 0904-09: Item remains Open. Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will modify Action Item 0904-09 to reflect that Rob Smith, will contact wireline carriers’ **Account Management** contacts to determine if their respective Customer Service Record (CSR) reject messages can be modified to indicate that a reseller or Type 1 number is involved in the port request. Action Item 0904-09 will also be modified to reflect that it is now only relevant to PIM 32 with the withdrawal of PIM 34.
* Item 1204-21: This item has been Closed.
* Item 0205-04: This item is ongoing and remains Open.
* Item 0205-19: Item remains Open.
* Item 0305-01: Item remains Open. NeuStar to have the applicable revised M&Ps to the Project Executives by 7/11/05.
* Item 0405-05: Maggie Lee, VeriSign, reported that OPASTCO responded that their Board of Directors could not agree on sending out the request to their members. USTA previously responded that they would send out an e-mail to their members. Action item Closed.
* Item 0405-06: Item remains Open.
* Item 0405-13: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0405-16: Item remains Open.

Unfinished/New Business:

* SPID migration discussion:
  + Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, reported on lessons learned during SPID migrations. Their Code Administration group has taken LERG-ownership of a number of abandoned or returned codes while not realizing the timeline required to schedule a NANC 323 SPID migration. Deb advised that providers consider available SPID migration dates when scheduling LERG effective dates when taking ownership of codes from another provider. Jeff Adrian, Sprint, will add this suggestion to the NANC 323 SPID Migration SP Checklist.
  + Mark Lancaster, AT&T, stated that Sunday, 9/11/05, is a problem for AT&T for SPID migrations due to heightened security and increased call volume. They have instituted restrictions on loads into their systems on that date. AT&T is requesting that 9/11/05 be a blackout date for SPID migrations. 9/18/05 is currently a blackout date. The LNPA-WG assigned NeuStar an action item as follows:

1. Until further notice, do not schedule any more migrations for September 11th.
2. Contact all the carriers who have requested migrations for September 11th to determine whether they could tolerate moving their planned migrations to September 18th (or some other available dates).

**Not all of the involved SPs agree -** If the involved SPs do not all agree to move their planned migrations away from the September 11th date, take no further action. NeuStar will report the result to LNPA-WG at its July meeting.

1. If all of the carriers involved in the migrations scheduled for September 11th agree that they could change their migration date, then NeuStar, using its cross-regional and SPID migration distribution lists, is to ask industry if there is any objection to changing the SPID migration blackout date now shown as September 18th to become instead a blackout date for September 11th. NeuStar will require response within ten days. NeuStar will include a comment that migrations already scheduled for September 11th would be rescheduled if the blackout date swap were performed.

**Objections raised** - If any User raises objection to the blackout date swap, take no further action. NeuStar will report the result to the LNPA-WG at its July meeting.

1. If no objections are raised within ten days of NeuStar sending the

notice to industry, Neustar will contact the carriers involved to reschedule the September 11th migrations to September 18th (or other available dates); issue usual notice to industry for change in planned SPID migration date, and adjust the SPID migration calendar to show September 11th is a blackout date and September 18th is an available date and reflect the new SPID migrations’ dates. NeuStar will report this to the LNPA-WG at its July meeting.

* + Richard Murphy, VeriSign, reported that, post migration, the current SPID value on an SV involved in the migration is reverting back to the migrating-from SPID value when the SV is audited. NeuStar stated that this should not be happening. The SPID value does not change on an audit. Richard Murphy is to send examples to NeuStar to work with them to determine what is happening.
* NeuStar reported that some protocols are being used by provider platforms for traffic communication with the NPAC that are not supported in the requirements for the interface. NeuStar wants to open up a dialogue to tighten down on the protocols being used. A firewall for security has been put in place as part of the Linux migration. Supported protocols are listed in the attached document, e.g. CMIP. Examples of protocols being used that are not supported in requirements for the interface include Echo protocol on Port 7. The NeuStar security group has deemed this a risk area that needs to be eliminated. Implementation of controls is scheduled for the end of 2006 to enable those SPs time to adjust to the change in tightening down on those allowed protocols. NeuStar wants to open up a dialogue to see if there are any protocols that they have missed so they can be included. Service Providers and Local System Vendors are to review the document and come prepared in July to discuss.

****

* Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, reported difficulty in addressing inadvertent ports through the contacts they have with some wireline carriers when a number is inadvertently ported from that carrier. Service Providers are to investigate their internal contact(s) and number(s) and what their internal process is for handling this problem, and come prepared to discuss at the July LNPA meeting.

***Next LNPA Meeting …******July 12-14, 2005, St. Sauveur, Montreal – Hosted by Canadian Consortium***