LNPA WORKING GROUP

July 2005 Meeting

Final Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| St. Sauveur, Quebec, Canada | Host: Canadian LNP Consortium |

**TUESDAY 07/12/05**

Tuesday, 07/12/05, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Dave Garner | | Qwest (phone) |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | David Taylor | | SBC |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LNP Consortium | Cindi Jones | | Sprint (phone) |
| Michelle Gwaltney | Cingular (phone) | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint |
| Renee Dillon | Cingular | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint (phone) |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox (phone) | Steve Moore | | Sprint |
| Dennis Robins | Electric Lightwave (phone) | Rob Smith | | Syniverse |
| Jean Anthony | Evolving Systems | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec (phone) |
| Pascale Lacroix | Fido Solutions | Adam Newman | | Telcordia (phone) |
| Karen Mulberry | MCI (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile |
| Shannon Sevigny | NeuStar Pooling (phone) | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Sara Hooker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Deborah Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar |  | |  |
| Larry Vagnoni | NeuStar |  | |  |
| Danielle Estrada | Nextel (phone) |  | |  |
| Lavinia Rotaru | Nextel |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

Attached are the Action Items assigned at the July, 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 “JULY 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 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

06/05 Minutes Review:

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

* In the table on page 2 containing the 2005 meeting schedule, change the September through December 2005 meeting dates to reflect that these will be 2-day meetings, Tuesday and Wednesday.
* On page 12, change the heading of the item on mandatory testing to read, “Discussion on Operating Sys Changes/Mandatory ITP Testing with NPAC:”
* On page 12, change the 1st bullet under the Discussion on Operating Sys Changes/Mandatory ITP Testing with NPAC, to read, “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.”
* On page 12, change the 2nd bullet under the Discussion on Operating Sys Changes/Mandatory ITP Testing with NPAC, to read, “NeuStar is proposing that this scenario be added to the scenarios that require ITP and Turn-up testing.”
* On page 18, under the Change Order ILL 130 Discussion, change all occurrences of “non-action” in the 1st, 2nd, and 4th bullets to read “non-Action.”
* On page 19, under the discussion of Action Item 0505-12, change the statement to read, “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.”

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:

* Sue Tiffany, Sprint, gave the OBF Wireless Committee and ISC reports.
* A number of issues remain open in the Wireless Committee.
* A straw proposal has been submitted to make changes to the LSOG and WICIS to finalize requirements for the wireless FAX form (Issue 2753).
* Issue 2810 has been opened to clean up and standardize data in WICIS doc (2810).
* Other remaining open issue are:
  + Issue 2847 – Unified modeling issue
  + Issue 2891 – 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 2911 – Social Security Number (SSN) Issue: The Wireless Committee is investigating 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.
  + Issue 2892 – Cingular brought in an issue for handling port requests that are in ICP when the carrier is changing ICP platforms.
  + Issue 2910 – Opened to clarify the use of reason codes in response to a Sup 2 transaction on an unconfirmed wireless to wireless port.
  + Issue 2801 remains open to reduce validation fields.
* USTA Telecom ‘05 will coincide with OBF 92, October 24-28, 2005, in Las Vegas. Reserve hotel rooms early.

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

* The ISC will begin to look at defining a minimum data element set to be used for LNP standard porting data elements at OBF 91. The ISC has been developing matrices to be used in the discussions.
* The Wireless Committee and LSOG are completing local service migration guidelines for wireless <-> wireline porting. Five scenarios were added for intermodal porting. The document is in initial closure and it is assumed it will go final.

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

* Jean Anthony, Evolving Systems, reported that a conference call was held on 6/21/05. Eleven companies (7 providers and 4 vendors) participated.
* 3 companies have done 2.1.0 to 3.0.0 testing. 1 vendor has done testing with their 3.0.0 software and will have completed in time to have in their production platform by 7/17.
* Testing for this ICP testing is voluntary.
* Next call information is posted on the web.
* NeuStar, Syniverse, and VeriSign will test in early August.

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.
* The Subcommittee’s Mission Statement 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.

* Attached is the PIM 51 Subcommittee Report and recommendation as presented by Jeff Adrian.



* The proposal is being changed to eliminate the SP certification process requiring an e-mail to NeuStar every time they open up a code. The new proposal is for NeuStar to send an e-mail on an exception basis to the SP when a mismatch is identified. NeuStar will ask for a list of that provider’s OCNs. SPs can eliminate most of these e-mails ongoing by sending a list of their valid OCNs to NeuStar.
* Adam Newman, Telcordia and INC Vice Chair, stated that the public NANPA website can be relied on to determine the correct OCN for a code. It must agree with the LERG based on LERG edits.
* Action Item 0205-04: Steve Addicks, NeuStar, stated that 0 incorrect openings from years prior were reported to the Help Desk and 1 incorrect code opening was identified in a SPID migration. Action Item 0205-04 remains open.
* NeuStar asked what they should do if there is no SP response. Delete the code? Initiate a SPID migration? It was suggested that the Subcommittee develop a process analogous to the inadvertent port process for addressing incorrect code openings when the other provider is not responsive. There is a need to address the case where there are active SVs or pooled blocks in the code.
* The Subcommittee will revise the recommendation for LNPA review.

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.

 

Prior to the July LNPA meeting, the INC sent the attached liaison to the LNPA regarding PIM 24.



The INC has asked the PA to conduct an informal survey among its administrators to assess the types and numbers of misidentified blocks. The PA will also assess whether the mistakes were accidental errors, or if there was any willful disregard of the processes. Jeff Adrian, Sprint, will draft a response for LNPA review at the August meeting.

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 now being worked through wireline providers’ Account Management process. Action Item 0605-10 is now closed. Action Item 0904-09 remains open. A question was asked if the issue is related to not being able to get a CSR for resale or UNE-P. It was stated that UNE-P is going away and should lessen the problem. In some of the Change Management Process discussions, it was stated that the reseller is the owner of record for the customer’s account and some resellers have stated that it is their prerogative to give the underlying network provider permission to provide the CSR or not. Sprint is trying to acquire more information in the front-end process, whether it be to correctly submit the LSR or the CSR request. Rob Smith, Syniverse, suggested that the NANC flows could be changed to require the reseller to coordinate the port (old Option A). It was stated that resellers are required to provide a CSR upon a legitimate request for porting purposes. Wireless Service Providers are to work change control efforts for PIM 32 through their appropriate wireline Account Management teams.

* PIM 34 – This PIM was closed at the June meeting. Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will update PIM 34 in the PIM matrix on the LNPA’s website to indicate the following:
* It has been closed without an industry-wide automated resolution.
* Wireless carriers have cooperated in developing alternative solutions to port a Type 1 number.
* Type 1 migrations 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.



PIM 42 to stay open awaiting feedback from Change Control/Account Management efforts.

Rob Smith, Syniverse, rewrote PIM 42 (attached) to eliminate the CCNA field as an issue and to provide more detail. There is still an issue with some providers validating on address fields.



Steve Moore, Sprint, walked the group through the attached documents explaining how the OBF reps responded to the LSR validation matrix for Issues 2801 and 2802, and a comparison of a more recent scrub of the providers’ business rules from their websites.

 

It was suggested that the LNPA should have the oversight to directly address this issue. It was asked if there is something that the LNPA could do to add weight to wireless Account Management change efforts. Efforts to use the summary documents with wireless Account Management change processes will continue. Wireless Service Providers are to work change control efforts for PIM 42 through their appropriate wireline Account Management teams using the summary documents and recommendation documents for discussion. Wireline Service Providers are to validate and resolve any discrepancies with their original matrix responses to OBF Issues 2801 and 2802 and their current business rules. They are to update the attached and bring back to LNPA for review at the August LNPA meeting. Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will upload the attached revised PIM 42 (Version 2) to the LNPA’s website.

* 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.

At the July LNPA meeting, Rob Smith, Syniverse, presented the attached proposed revised PIM 45.



Steve Moore, Sprint, stated that Issue 2817 is in Initial Closure but does not address the issue. We are addressing Reason Codes and Reason Detail and not Errors and Error Codes, which point to the Directory Services practices and not number portability. Errors and Error Codes are not used for number portability. Rob Smith, Syniverse, and Steve Moore, Sprint, are to revise PIM 45 for eventual resubmission to the LSOP Committee to make it clear that the issue is related to identifying all discrepancies on the LSR for an LNP request before it is rejected. This will be discussed in the OBF’s Wireless Committee prior to resubmission to the LSOP Committee to determine a proposed resolution. The PIM must be addressed considering that wireless carriers cannot currently accept multiple reason codes in a response. Wireless Service Providers are to work change control efforts for PIM 45 through their appropriate wireline Account Management teams

* 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 July LNPA meeting, Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, proposed a revision to the Suggested Resolution of PIM 49 (see attached). PIM 49 was closed at the July 2005 LNPA meeting.



* 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.



Action Item 0205-19 is closed. Wireless Service Providers are to work change control efforts for PIM 50 through their appropriate wireline Account Management teams.

* 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.

CMIP Retry Attempts and Retry Timer Values (Dave Cochran, BellSouth):



* Dave Cochran, BellSouth, teed up the issue and explained the current CMIP retry timer setting of 1x60 minutes. He asked if we should consider a different setting, e.g., 1x20, 1x15.
* It was asked if this would increase the SOA and/or LSMS association aborts. NeuStar stated that we are no longer seeing the build-up in provider queues. They stated that the previous 1x15 minute timer was changed to 1x60 due to anticipated wireless volumes, but there does not seem to be an issue.
* Dave Cochran explained that the current 1x60 timer could result in not realizing that activates have been sent to a provider and it won’t become apparent for up to an hour.
* Service Providers have an action item to investigate internally if they have any objections to conducting a trial change to the timer value to 1x15 minutes in the Southeast Region NPAC only. The trial would not affect the settings in local systems. The trial would last for 60 days in order to determine if the timer change can be made permanent in all regions. Service providers are to provide objections only to Gary Sacra (gary.m.sacra@verizon.com) and Paula Jordan (paula.jordan@t-mobile.com), LNPA Co-Chairs, by Friday, July 15th.

NOTE: Completed. The NAPM LLC approved a motion at their July 20th meeting to conduct the trial in the Southeast Region. The timer value change will take place during the next available Sunday maintenance window.

Discussion on Operating Sys Changes/Mandatory Testing with NPAC (Action Items 0605-12, 0605-21):

* The LNPA is attempting to determine if we need to add scenario(s) for Operating System changes to the mandatory test scenarios for ITP and Turn-up testing in SOW 24 (Continuing Certification) and in the testing M&P.

* A local system vendor stated that changing stack software should require ITP and turn-up testing.
* NeuStar stated that different scenarios need to be covered:
  + Patch bundles or individual patches applied to OS software – difficult to determine what in patch bundles may impact stack.
  + Major upgrades to OS software
  + Complete OS changes, e.g. OS Vendor A to OS Vendor B.
* Another local system vendor stated that they would test extensively for any OS change. They do ITP and turn-up testing for their customers.
* Another local system vendor feels that full stack changes and complete OS changes, e.g., Vendor A to Vendor B, should require ITP testing. Lesser OS software changes should not drive industry mandated ITP testing, but the vendor would still test extensively.
* The group identified the following scenarios that should require mandatory ITP and/or Turn-up testing:
  + Any stack or toolkit change
  + Complete Operating System changes, e.g., OS Vendor A to OS Vendor B
  + For hardware changes, turn-up testing is required if the capacity of the service provider’s system is substantially different from the system used by the vendor to perform ITP testing.

Action for Local System Vendors, Service Providers, and Service Bureaus to review internally and come to the August LNPA meeting prepared to finalize what additional scenarios will drive mandatory ITP and/or Turn-up testing.

Inadvertent Port Discussion (Action Item 0605-20):

* At the June meeting, a wireless member reported that they are finding it difficult to address inadvertent ports through the contacts they have with some wireline carriers when the member’s company inadvertently ports a customer from the other carrier. Service Providers were 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.
* It was stated that the majority scenario is that the wireless carrier inadvertently ported the customer’s wireline number instead of their wireless number.
* Providers present reported their contacts as follows to address this issue:
  + BellSouth – Their 800 number is on their LNP site. If no LSR was received, they have an M&P to work with the other carrier. If an LSR was received, the contact has the necessary information on where to refer the caller for action.
  + SBC – If the port has been completed in their systems, there is no longer a retail record of the customer’s account. This requires the end user to call in to re-establish service.
  + Qwest – Their LNP Center is to be called at 1-888-796-9087 for situations like this. They will stay on the line while the problem is being addressed. Qwest refers to these as “work-backs.”
  + Verizon – Contact LNP Centers via 800 numbers on the website.
  + Sprint – Call 866-835-8648 for a wireless provider that inadvertently ports from Sprint. Call 800-578-8169, Option 6 if a wireline carrier ports from Sprint.
  + T-Mobile – Call 877-207-8009.
  + Verizon Wireless – call their regular Port Center at 800-711-9300.
  + Nextel – Call 877-727-1100. For escalations, call 972-556-7659.
  + Cingular – 800 numbers are available on their website.
  + ELI – handled thru their maintenance group during off-hours and thru their LNP group during business hours. Numbers are on website.

**WEDNESDAY 07/13/05**

Wednesday, 07/13/05, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Bob Frasca | AT&T (phone) | Dave Garner | | Qwest (phone) |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | David Taylor | | SBC |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Cindi Jones | | Sprint (phone) |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LNP Consortium | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint |
| Michelle Gwaltney | Cingular (phone) | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint (phone) |
| Renee Dillon | Cingular | Steve Moore | | Sprint |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox (phone) | Rob Smith | | Syniverse |
| Jean Anthony | Evolving Systems | Pat White | | Telcordia (phone) |
| Pascale Lacroix | Fido Solutions | Adam Newman | | Telcordia (phone) |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Shannon Sevigny | NeuStar Pooling (phone) | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Sara Hooker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar | Deborah Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Lavinia Rotaru | Nextel |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

NP Best Practices Format Discussion (Frank Reed, T-Mobile):



* Frank Reed, T-Mobile, walked the group through the attached html version of the LNPA’s NP Best Practices document. The Subteam identified a number of issues that they stated were no longer relevant or needed updating. It was agreed that the historical perspective of the document would be maintained.
* The Subteam is to review the issues in more detail and make recommendations for any changes.
* This will be on the agenda for the August meeting.

NPAC Network Protocols Discussion (Action Item 0605-22) – NeuStar:



* NeuStar has been conducting conference calls with vendors that are using unauthorized protocols.
* Evolving Systems, VeriSign, Sprint, and BellSouth stated that they are not using any unauthorized protocols.
* This will be discussed again next month during the action items discussion. Action Item 0605-22 stays open.

Application Server Technology Migration Update (NeuStar):



* NeuStar reported that all conversions to date have gone smoothly.
* Some providers did not make the necessary IP address changes, but they were corrected the day after the conversion. Action Item 0405-16 is closed.

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.

Release 3.3 Performance Testing (Action Item 0505-10) – Project Executives:

Action Item 0505-10: With regard to Release 3.3 testing, Project Executives are to determine if the performance testing done in Release 3.2 is adequate for Release 3.3. A readout will be provided at the July LNPA meeting.

* The current suite of performance tests are not designed to test the NPAC performance, but the performance capability of SOAs and LSMSs.
* During a discussion at the July Project Executive meeting of the performance tests that were conducted in Release 3.2, no drivers were identified for changing the current suite of performance tests that have been in place since Release 2.0.
* It was asked what we are going to do to validate the requirements of the new NPAC system. Do we ask NeuStar for a report? NeuStar stated that this is traditionally covered by SLRs that are shared with the Project Executives in ongoing meetings to review actual SLR results.

SVs in Pooled Blocks With Same LRN (Action Item 0405-06):

Action Item 0405-06: With regard to the issue of individual ported SVs having the same LRN as the pooled block in which the individual SVs are contained, Adam Newman, INC Vice-Chair, will propose text addressing this scenario for the Thousand Block Pooling Administration Guidelines (TBPAG) for review at the May LNPA meeting.

* Adam, Newman, INC Vice-Chair, proposed the following for Section 8.3.7 of the TBPAG (suggested changes are in red text and highlighted in yellow) for review by the LNPA.

8.3.7 When a contaminated thousands-block is allocated, the PA will notify the thousands-block applicant that the allocated thousands-block(s) is contaminated. The thousands-block applicant is responsible for obtaining a list from the LNP data bases of unavailable TNs within the contaminated thousands-block that are not available for the thousands-block applicant's use. When a SP is assigned a thousands-block that contains contaminated TNs belonging to the block assignee and with the same LRN of the thousands-block, the SP should remove those individual SVs from the NPAC.

* Reasons identified for this scenario:
  + Numbers ported to a provider’s switch first, then block was pooled to same switch
  + Contaminated block donated by provider then received same block back, and mistakenly created in NPAC
  + Block created to override NXX code ownership table in NPAC.
* At the July meeting, Adam Newman was asked to modify the proposed text (see additional text in blue).

8.3.7 When a contaminated thousands-block is allocated, the PA will notify the thousands-block applicant that the allocated thousands-block(s) is contaminated. The thousands-block applicant is responsible for obtaining a list from the LNP data bases of unavailable TNs within the contaminated thousands-block that are not available for the thousands-block applicant's use. When a SP is assigned a thousands-block that contains contaminated TNs belonging to the block assignee and with the same LRN and DPC data of the thousands-block, the SP should remove those unnecessary individual SVs from the NPAC.

* Action Item 0405-06 remains open awaiting new text.

Change Management – NeuStar

* ILL 130 (Action Items 0505-12, 0605-01, 02, 07, 18)

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 System’s and Tekelec’s preference is that error codes not be included unless they will be seen over the interface. If they are in the table, they will have to do additional coding and testing. NeuStar, Tekelec, and Evolving Systems agreed that the greater level of effort would be to identify and eliminate the 10% of error codes in the table that would not come over the interface. Evolving Systems stated that they will have to code for these error messages in their NPAC simulator. There were no objections to leaving these error codes in. Action Item 0505-12 is closed.

0605-01: Regarding Change Order ILL 130 in Release 3.3, NeuStar will document the 17 non-Actions related to error messaging and distribute to the LNPA by June 22nd.



* + Action Item 0605-01 is closed.

0605-02: Regarding Change Order ILL 130 in Release 3.3, 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.

* + NeuStar reported that this would be a low level of effort. Action Item 0605-02 is closed.

0605-07: Jean Anthony, Evolving Systems, will provide to NeuStar a proposed list of error messages in ILL 130 for which they want additional clarity.

* + Jean has provided the list to NeuStar. Action Item 0605-07 is closed. NeuStar will discuss with the Project Execuives.

0605-18: Related to Action Items 0605-01 and 0605-02, 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.

* + Evolving Systems reported that code and unit test only would be 300 additional hours. They are marshalling additional resources to meet dates. VeriSign needs an additional 30-45 days for additional coding and testing. Tekelec reported no delay in testing as a result. A Service Provider Profile is immaterial to Tekelec. VeriSign stated it would result in a 30 day delay in software delivery. Telcordia stated it will not impact their schedule and both Actions and non-Actions will be supported.
  + NeuStar stated that implementing a profile for SP support of Actions or non-Actions, or both, is a low level of effort, resulting in no change in schedule, and no need to take to the LLC. NeuStar is to document the service provider profile settings in the ILL 130 Change Order for review at the August LNPA meeting.
  + Project Executives are to include the attached revised Release 3.3 schedule in the July PE Report with the LNPA’s recommendation that the LLC endorse the new schedule.

 

NOTE: Completed. The NAPM LLC passed a motion at their July 20th meeting to approve the attached Project Plan.

* + As a result of the preceding discussion of the impacts of ILL 130, it was determined that there will be no impact to the Release 3.3 schedule.
* NANC 403 (Action Items 0505-01, 0605-04)

0505-01: Regarding NANC Change Order 403, it was determined that this is not a

Document Only Change Order. NeuStar will rewrite the Change Order to reflect this, and will include the impacts of sunsetting the ability to send a recovery request in normal mode.

* + 0505-01 is closed.
  + 0605-04 remains open. Gary Sacra will modify Action Item 0605-04 to include a discussion of the impacts of sunsetting the ability to send a recovery request in normal mode.
* BDD for Notifications



* NeuStar is to update the FRS with regard to Bulk Data Download (BDD) for notifications for review at the August meeting.
* A member asked if all documentation for 3.3 is final except for these few tweaks. NeuStar replied yes.

SPID Migration Discussion (Action Items 0605-05, 06):



0605-05: At the June meeting, a service provider raised a concern about having any

SPID migrations scheduled for September 11th. As a result, 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 black-out date now shown as September 18th to become instead a black-out 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 black-out date swap were performed.

**Objections raised** - If any User raises objection to the back-out 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 black-out 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.

* + Action Item 0605-05 is closed. There were no objections and the swap has been announced.

0605-06: At the June LNPA meeting, a wireless member stated that 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. It was suggested 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.

* + Action Item 0605-06 is closed. No comments from the group.



* A wireless provider asked to eliminate some of the blackout dates to allow more SPID migrations due to having to schedule them so far out now because available dates are full. This is stretching their numbering resources. In addition, a wireline provider recanted a recent migration window that included 93 LRNs. Most providers were able to handle the migrations during the maintenance window, but with little time to spare. When there are LRN's involved in a migration, it slows the processing significantly. One proposal was to have one Sunday a month when no LRN's would be migrated. With no LRN's, some providers felt that they could handle 40 or 50 migrations.

Some expressed concerns about raising the number of migrations. A provider stated that they do not want to eliminate any blackout dates, but agreed that more migrations could be accommodated in a window if there are fewer LRNs involved.

It was then suggested that we could treat some migration requests to be more optional than others, e.g., migrations being done simply to change code ownership in NPAC when a provider takes ownership of an abandoned code to keep it viable in the network and all numbering resources assignable by that provider are currently in the NPAC as ported or pooled numbers. Service Providers are to determine if they are willing to defer a SPID migration that is scheduled solely to change code ownership in the NPAC when the provider has taken over an abandoned code to keep it viable in the network. Also, Service Providers are to determine if the per Region and national caps for the quantity of SPID migrations can be increased to 8 and 35 per migration window, respectfully. The caps are currently 5 and 21 per Region and nationally, respectively. It should be noted that the more migrations that are scheduled, the later in the window the SMURF files will become available. No change to the 100 LRN cap is being proposed. The current caps result in about 1.5 hours to 2 hours to create the SMURF files. A crude extrapolation would suggest 2.5 to 3.5 hours for caps of 8 and 35. Input should also be provided on the number of acceptable deferrals for a specific migration.

Jeff Adrian, Sprint, is to add in the SPID Migration SP Checklist that if an LRN does not have any associated active SVs, there is no need to include in the migration.

New Business:

* Paula Jordan, T-Mobile and LNPA Co-Chair, stated that she has been receiving e-mails from carriers asking if the FCC has ruled that a carrier can charge another carrier for submitting a port request. One provider stated that their legal team has concluded that there are no Orders allowing such charges. A local system vendor stated that they have seen cases where charges were applied for expedited ports outside the normal interval. Another provider said that they are not aware of any Order that prohibits establishing such a rate, although the port cannot be held up.
* PIM 24 – Jeff Adrian, Sprint, stated that PA Change Order 30 impacts PIM 24. When a new code is assigned to a provider, before any pooled blocks will be assigned from the code, the codeholder must certify via an e-mail with the PA that the code is opened in NPAC, active in the PSTN, and other SP responsibilities are satisfied.

**THURSDAY 07/14/05**

Thursday, 07/14/05, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth (phone) | Dave Garner | | Qwest (phone) |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | David Taylor | | SBC |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LNP Consortium | Cindi Jones | | Sprint (phone) |
| Michelle Gwaltney | Cingular (phone) | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint |
| Renee Dillon | Cingular | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint (phone) |
| Nag | Cox (phone) | Steve Moore | | Sprint |
| Jean Anthony | Evolving Systems | Adam Newman | | Telcordia (phone) |
| Therese Mooney | Global Crossing (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Jason Lee | MCI (phone) | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile |
| Mindi Patterson | NeuStar (phone) | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Shannon Sevigny | NeuStar Pooling (phone) | Deborah Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar |  | |  |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar |  | |  |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar |  | |  |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar |  | |  |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar |  | |  |
| Lavinia Rotaru | Nextel |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

R3.3 Test Case Review (NeuStar):

  

* Mindi Patterson, NeuStar, walked the group through the attached R3.3 Test Case documents and captured changes and additions provided by the group. These will be reflected in the next iterations.

Liaisons Received from the INC:

* The group reviewed the two attached liaisons and accompanying documentation from the INC related to thousands block pooling.





* Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will draft a response to CS104 and send to the INC.

NOTE: This has been completed. See attached response.



* Jeff Adrian, Sprint, will draft a response to CS105 for LNPA review.

July NANC Report (Gary Sacra):

To include:

* App Server Migration Status
* 3.3 Schedule
* PTSC response on NANC 400



* PIMs

Review of June Action Items:



* Item 0605-01: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0605-02: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0605-03: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0605-04: This item remains Open.
* Item 0605-05: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0605-06: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0605-07: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0605-08: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0605-09: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0605-10: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0605-11: This item remains Open.
* Item 0605-12: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0605-13: This item remains Open.
* Item 0605-14: This item remains Open.
* Item 0605-15: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0605-16: This item remains Open.
* Item 0605-17: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0605-18: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0605-19: This item remains Open.
* Item 0605-20: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0605-21: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0605-22: This item remains Open.

Action Items Remaining Open from Previous Meetings:

* Item 0904-09: Item remains Open. Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, modified 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 was also modified to reflect that it is now only relevant to PIM 32 with the withdrawal of PIM 34.
* Item 0205-04: This item is ongoing and remains Open.
* Item 0205-19: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0305-01: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0405-06: Item remains Open. At the July meeting, Adam Newman, Telcordia, was asked to modify the proposed text (see additional text in blue).

8.3.7 When a contaminated thousands-block is allocated, the PA will notify the thousands-block applicant that the allocated thousands-block(s) is contaminated. The thousands-block applicant is responsible for obtaining a list from the LNP data bases of unavailable TNs within the contaminated thousands-block that are not available for the thousands-block applicant's use. When a SP is assigned a thousands-block that contains contaminated TNs belonging to the block assignee and with the same LRN and DPC data of the thousands-block, the SP should remove those unnecessary individual SVs from the NPAC.

* Item 0405-16: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0505-01: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0505-09: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0505-10: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0505-12: This item has been completed and is Closed.

NOTE: During the Action Item discussion, the group agreed that PIM 49, with its revised Suggested Resolution section, will be closed. Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will revise the Suggested Resolution of PIM 49 based on input from Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, and upload the closed PIM to the LNPA website.

Unfinished/New Business:

* No additional items were discussed.

***Next LNPA Meeting …******August 9-11, 2005, Raleigh, North Carolina – Hosted by***

***Tekelec***