LNPA WORKING GROUP

July 2004 Meeting

Final Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Raleigh, North Carolina | Host: Tekelec |

**TUESDAY 7/20/04**

Tuesday, 7/20/04, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Cheryl Gordon | Alltel (phone) | Tim Waters | | SNET (phone) |
| Wendy Wheeler | Alltel (phone) | Craig Bartell | | Sprint |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint |
| Lonnie Keck | ATTWS (phone) | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint |
| Sean Hawkins | ATTWS | Tony Ramsey | | Syniverse (phone) |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | ATTWS | Rob Smith | | Syniverse |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Michael Xu | | Tekelec |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec |
| Elton Allen | Cingular | John Malyar | | Telcordia |
| Laurie Itkin | Cricket Communications | Adam Newman | | Telcordia (phone) |
| Dennis Robins | Electric Lightwave (phone) | Jason Kempson | | Telcordia (phone) |
| Karen Mulberry | MCI | Jean Anthony | | Telecom Software |
| Jason Lee | MCI (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile (phone) |
| Shannon Sevigny | NeuStar (phone) | Chris Toomey | | US Cellular |
| Greg Roberts | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| Larry Vagnoni | NeuStar | Sara Hooker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Deborah Stephens | | Verizon Wireless |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Blaine Reeve | | Western Wireless |
| Rosemary Emmer | Nextel |  | |  |
| Dave Garner | Qwest |  | |  |
| Charles Ryburn | SBC (phone) |  | |  |
| Leah Luper | SBC |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

Attached are the Action Items assigned at the July, 2004 LNPA meeting. Also included are the remaining open Action Items from previous meetings.

****

NOTE: ALL ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “JULY 2004 LNPA ACTION ITEMS” FILE ATTACHED ABOVE.

**MEETING MINUTES:**

2004 Meeting Schedule:

* Starting with the August 2004 meeting, the Wireless Number Portability Operations (WNPO) group and the LNPA Working Group will combine. The combined group will retain the name of LNPA Working Group.
* The August 2004 meeting schedule in Newport Beach, California, will be as follows:
* Monday, August 16th, through Wednesday, August 18th, the LNPA will meet from 8:30am-5pm Pacific,
* The Architecture Planning Team (APT) will not hold a separate session.
* The September 2004 meeting schedule in Atlanta, Georgia, will be abbreviated as follows due to the Labor Day Holiday:
* Wednesday, September 8th, and Thursday, September 9th, the LNPA will meet from 8:30am-5pm, Eastern.
* The Architecture Planning Team (APT) will not hold a separate session.
* The October 2004 meeting in Ft. Lauderdale, Florida, will be held from Tuesday, October 5th through Thursday, October 7th, from 8:30am-5pm local time for all days.
* The November 2004 meeting in Nashville, Tennessee, will be held from Tuesday, November 2nd through Thursday, November 4th, from 8:30am-5pm local time for all days.
* The December 2004 meeting in New York, New York, will be held from Tuesday, December 7th through Thursday, December 9th, from 8:30am-5pm local time for all days.
* There will be an agenda item for the August 2004 LNPA meeting to start identifying 2005 meeting dates, hosts, and locations.
* Following is the schedule for 2004, the host companies, and the meeting locations. Also indicated is the date of the month’s NANC meeting, if applicable:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MONTH  **(2004)** | **LNPA MEETING**  **DATE** | **HOST COMPANY** | **MEETING LOCATION** | **NANC MEETING DATE** |
| JANUARY | WEEK OF 1/5 | QWEST AND NEUSTAR | PHOENIX, ARIZONA | 1/13/04 |
| FEBRUARY | WEEK OF 2/2 | TSI | TAMPA, FLORIDA | NO NANC |
| MARCH | WEEK OF 3/8 | BELL SOUTH | BIRMINGHAM ALABAMA | 3/16/04 |
| APRIL | WEEK OF 4/5 | NEUSTAR | CHICAGO, ILLINOIS | NO NANC |
| MAY | WEEK OF 5/3 | SPRINT | OVERLAND PARK, KANSAS | 5/18/04 |
| JUNE | WEEK OF 6/14 | CANADIAN CONSORTIUM | OTTAWA, CANADA | NO NANC |
| JULY | WEEK OF 7/19 | TEKELEC | RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA | 7/13/04 |
| AUGUST | 8/16 – 8/18 | T-MOBILE | NEWPORT BEACH, CALIFORNIA | NO NANC |
| SEPTEMBER | 9/8 – 9/9 | COX | ATLANTA, GEORGIA | 9/14/04 |
| OCTOBER | 10/5 – 10/7 | NEXTEL | FT. LAUDERDALE FLORIDA | NO NANC |
| NOVEMBER | 11/2 – 11/4 | VERIZON WIRELESS | NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE | 11/9/04 |
| DECEMBER | 12/7 – 12/9 | AT&T | NEW YORK, NEW YORK | NO NANC |

06/04 Minutes Review:

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

* Page 8, 2nd sentence of INC Issue 434 bullet – Change to read, “NeuStar needs written authority from the appropriate State Regulatory Commission to delete SVs.”
* Page 18, last sentence of the NANC 390 bullet – Change to read, “NANC 390 and ILL 130 are separate Change Orders and will remain on the list for ranking.”

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

* The ITF has not met since late April. There are no open issues at this time being worked in the ITF. Existing open issues are being addressed in the OBF Wireless Workshop or LSOG Committees. The ITF has not disbanded, but is inactive at this time.
* LSOG 10 will change LSR standards to require either a Tax ID, Social Security No., or Account No. to map to the WPR.
* A member stated that we have several open PIMs that will likely be sent to the ITF to be addressed.

Discussion on Small Carrier LNP Readiness:

* A member stated that another carrier is requiring all porting communication to be done by e-mail when they port out, the New SP rep’s id, and a call from the customer so they can try to do a winback. This carrier was believed to be a small rural carrier.
* Paul LaGattuta, AT&T and LNPA Co-Chair, described a situation in Nebraska where some carriers and the State Commission are discussing porting and pooling using route indexing instead of LRN routing for number conservation so new codes do not have to be assigned for LRNs.
* It was agreed that this item will be taken off the agenda for future meetings.

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

* Remaining issues to address:
* Need agenda time at the August LNPA meeting to review the last WNPO meeting in July.
* LNPA and WNPO distribution lists will be merged by NeuStar.
* Notification to other industry groups.
* The WNPO Lessons Learned document will remain on the WNPO website.
* The attached *WNPO Best Practices* document is to be renamed *Number*

*Portability Best Practices*. Maggie Lee, VeriSign, will review the document to mark each item appropriately (wireline, wireless, or inter-modal) and send out to the LNPA. This will be on the agenda for the August meeting for feedback to the group.



* Open WNPO Issues and Actions have either been closed or referred to the LNPA.
* The FORT Team will continue with the current Chairs. A FORT Report item will be placed on the agenda for LNPA meetings.
* The WNPO agreed that the WTSC should review the WICIS 3.0 release

currently scheduled to sunrise 5/22/05, and sunset 10/16/05. It was further agreed that there is a need to form a committee to review the release and identify Co-Chairs. The LNPA took an action to identify representatives and any Co-Chair volunteers. This will be on the agenda for discussion at the August LNPA meeting.

* Lonnie Keck’s (AT&T Wireless) role as liaison between the WNPO and OBF Wireless Workshop and Inter-species Task Force will shift to the LNPA’s liaison to the OBF. Deb Stephens, Verizon Wireless, and John Malyar, Telcordia, will serve as backups. An OBF Wireless Workshop and ITF Update item will be on the agenda for LNPA meetings.

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

* The group agreed that we would benefit by having a liaison from the CTIA. Paula Jordan, T-Mobile and LNPA Co-Chair, took an action to see if anyone from CTIA will serve as a liaison to the LNPA and provide regular updates at LNPA meetings.
* Issue 2665 on abandoned ports is in initial closure in the OBF Wireless Workshop.
* Issue 2781 on WICIS support for wireline jeopardy notices has been referred to the OBF Wireless Workshop Technical Subcommittee.
* New issue (issue number to be assigned) to limit the number of Line Numbers on a WPR is also in the OBF Wireless Workshop. This is a wireless-wireless and inter-modal issue. This will be raised at the ITF so that the LSOG is aware.
* Issue on Multiple Reason Codes per LNUM: No resolution as yet. There will be a 7/29/04 call to determine if this is a high priority. In scope for WICIS 3.0.

* Standard FAX form: Recommendation has been finalized and will be discussed at the August OBF and LNPA.
* A draft letter on purging old port requests has been finalized and will be sent out.
* A new issue related to the NIIF Contact List and Trouble Reporting Guidelines will be discussed during the New Business portion of this LNPA meeting.

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

* Paul LaGattuta led the group in a discussion of the latest changes to the NFG Traffic Model.



* The NFG model has been updated to contain actuals up through 6/30/04. Year-to-date Actuals have been running higher than the NFG forecast. The NFG Team held a meeting last week to discuss the trends. The consensus was to leave the NFG forecast as is. Projected EOY actuals are running 1% higher than the forecast. Cleanup related to some NANC Change Orders have resulted in higher actuals than what was projected in the forecast, so the NFG group feels it is appropriate to leave the forecast as is.
* Type 1s and the impacts of NANC 323 need to be considered in the NFG model and will be discussed at the next meeting.
* Paul LaGattuta appealed for more wireless representation at the NFG meetings.
* It was stated that we may get additional Type 1 migrations after service provider waivers expire.

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

* In the COCAG Appendix C document, it was suggested to add, “if either method could be used to accomplish the change in CO code ownership, NANC 323 SPID Migration process is the preferred method.” This is to be placed at the end of Section 3.
* In addition, footnotes in the document need to be renumbered.
* Adam Newman will submit the attached COCAG Appendix C document to the

Industry Numbering Committee (INC), containing revisions related to NANC 323 SPID Migration, and provide feedback to the LNPA at the August meeting.



NANC 323 SPID Migration Documents (Mindi Patterson – NeuStar):

* The group reviewed the latest version of the NANC 323 SPID Migration documents in the zip file attached above.



* A shortened process for scenarios where the LERG is not involved in the migration timeline has been added. This is the only change since the documents were reviewed last month.
* Based on a request from a Service Bureau member, NeuStar will revise the NANC 323 SPID Migration documents to indicate that if the “migrating from” or “migrating to” service provider uses a Service Bureau, then the Service Bureau should be included in the planning discussions for the SPID migration. Related to NANC 323 SPID Migration Service Provider Checklist, Jeff Adrian, Sprint, will update the checklist to indicate that if the “migrating from” or “migrating to” service provider uses a Service Bureau, then the Service Bureau should be included in the planning discussions for the SPID migration. Jeff will send the updated Checklist to NeuStar.
* Related to NANC 323 SPID Migration, when the “migrating to” and “migrating from” providers use different LIDB and CNAM database providers, Destination Point Code (DPC) values need to change and data needs to be removed from the “migrating from” provider’s LIDB and CNAM provider’s database. Maggie Lee, VeriSign, will work with Jeff Adrian, Sprint, to add the appropriate text in the NANC 323 SPID Migration Service Provider Checklist and send to NeuStar.
* A member asked if a SMURF file closely resembling the upcoming planned first migration could be produced now for testing. The member will bring this up on the next test call.
* It was asked if a provider has scheduled an LSMS upgrade with their vendor months in advance, what happens if a migration is planned during that maintenance window. Who has to reschedule? We had agreed during previous discussions that the migrating to SPID determines if the planned migration date is to move forward.
* A member asked if it was felt that an extended maintenance window would be necessary to accomplish these migrations. NeuStar replied that normally it likely would be a regular window, but if necessary, will be scheduled for an extended window.
* Another member asked if the “to” SPID didn’t receive any comments from other providers, would they assume it’s a go? Yes.
* If a provider can’t support the planned migration due to a local system load, does the “to” SPID still have the deciding vote on moving forward? Yes.
* Any provider that can’t complete the processing during the window should consult their vendor.

PIMs:

.

* PIM 22 – PIM 22 remains open in a tracking state awaiting implementation of NANC Change Order 375. The group is moving forward with developing the technical requirements. NANC 375 will not be ranked during the July Change Order ranking session, but will be included in the next NPAC software release package.

 

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



* The LNPA and NAPM/LLC had previously approved the sharing of information between NPAC and the Pool Administrator whereby the Pool Administrator is able to obtain the necessary information from NPAC to ensure, to the extent possible, that service providers are complying with the pooled block donation process. The PA submitted Change Order 23 for FCC consideration. PA Change Order 23 was subsequently withdrawn and PA Change Order 24 was submitted to the FCC by the PA. The Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG) recommended to the FCC a trial of the proposed resolution in selected pools initially. The FCC subsequently recommended that the PA submit another Change Order based on the NOWG recommendation for a trial. On 2/9/04, the PA submitted Change Order 26 based on this recommendation to conduct a trial in one NPA in each NPAC region. The FCC approved PA Change Order 26. The PA has since received reports for each trial NPA in each region and 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. An LNPA member asked the PA representative why we would need to perform this audit annually per the PA recommendation. The response was to ensure that blocks that change status, e.g., going from contaminated to pristine, are updated in PAS.

The NOWG has been asked by the FCC to review the results and provide a recommendation.

 

PA Change Order 26 is completed. PA Change Order 24 will remain open. The PIM will remain open pending the outcome of the final FCC decision.

* PIM 28 – This PIM, submitted by Sprint PCS, addresses interface differences between the WPRR (wireless) and FOC (wireline). The FOC allows for a due date and time change on confirmations, however, the WPRR does not. When a wireline carrier sends an FOC with a change in due date or time, the wireless carrier cannot process the change and does not allow the port to complete. This accepted PIM was referred to the Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF) Wireless Workshop and Local Ordering and Provisioning (LSOP) Committee, and is being worked in the OBF Wireless Workshop Technical Subcommittee (Issue 2744). This issue should go before the full OBF at their next meeting. 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 likely be in WICIS Release 3.0 in June/July 2005. There is a workaround in the interim. This PIM will continue to be tracked by the LNPA.



* PIM 30 – This PIM, submitted by Alltel, seeks to clarify the N-1 LNP architecture query responsibilities, and whether wireless carriers are obligated to perform default number portability queries when the N-1 carrier fails to dip the call.



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



Subsequent to the May LNPA meeting, at their 5/18/04 meeting, the NANC assigned an action item to the LNPA to “Review PIM 30 taking into account EAS implications and Enforcement Bureau Decision regarding N-1 responsibilities and recommend whether or not NANC should recommend a rules change to the FCC?” In addition, a NANC member asked that, in light of recent FCC Enforcement Bureau action, the LNPA address carriers with waivers or operating outside mandated porting areas in its discussions of N-1 responsibilities. During the June discussion, the LNPA agreed that carriers operating outside mandated areas, or carriers with waivers, that originate local calls to ported numbers, must perform the query themselves or make arrangements. The LNPA doesn’t feel that a change is necessary in the FCC’s definition of N-1 relative to carriers with waivers or operating outside mandated areas..

At the July LNPA meeting, the group agreed to adopt as the LNPA’s interpretation the attached Verizon Communications contribution detailing their interpretation of the N-1 carrier’s query responsibilities and the cites used to develop that opinion.



Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will:

1. Change the title of the document to LNPA WORKING GROUP’S INTERPRETATION OF N-1 CARRIER ARCHITECTURE.
2. Add applicable cites from the attached FCC Order and Consent Decree (DA 04-2065) and FCC Notice of Apparent Liability and Forfeiture (DA 04-1304).



A member stated they felt that a default routed call is one that results from a network failure, not one that results because the N-1 carrier failed to do the dip or doesn’t arrange to have another carrier perform the dip. Another member asked if a small N-1 carrier came to the default carrier asking to arrange to do the queries for them and bill them, and the default carrier rejects the request, does that absolve the N-1 carrier from doing the query or arranging with another carrier. Consensus was no, it does not.

Also, related to PIM 30, N-1 Architecture, Gary Sacra will document the

alternatives to be discussed at the August meeting for addressing Extended Area Service (EAS) calls. These will be discussed at the August LNPA meeting.

NOTE: The alternatives to be discussed are as follows:

1. On calls to EAS codes, the originating carrier is the N-1 carrier. For calls to EAS codes, the call shall not be queried in the originating LATA unless every provider providing service in that EAS area who is porting in EAS-rated numbers has assigned an LRN within an NXX code that is LERG-assigned to their switch and is rated for that EAS area. When calls are queried in the terminating LATA, if the call is not queried by the N-1 carrier, the carrier performing the query may charge the N-1 carrier for the query.
2. On calls to EAS codes, the originating carrier is the N-1 carrier. For calls to EAS codes, the call shall not be queried in the originating LATA unless every provider providing service in that EAS area who is porting in EAS-rated numbers has assigned an LRN within an NXX code that is LERG-assigned to their switch and is rated for that EAS area. When calls are queried in the terminating LATA, if the call is not queried by the N-1 carrier, the carrier performing the query may **NOT** charge the N-1 carrier for the query.
3. On calls to EAS codes, the donor carrier in the terminating LATA is the N-1 carrier. The donor carrier will perform the LNP query in the terminating LATA in either that carrier’s donor end office or terminating LATA tandem, whichever terminates trunks from the originating LATA on calls to EAS codes. Note that the terminating LATA tandem case is only applicable if the donor carrier has a tandem in the terminating LATA, and all switches in the originating LATA that can place local calls to the EAS codes in the terminating LATA have trunking to the tandem in the terminating LATA per mutually accepted interconnect agreements.

NOTE: This Action Item is Completed. Also note that other alternatives or variations of these alternatives may be added by any LNPA member for the August discussion.

This PIM remains open and will be discussed further at the August meeting. The LNPA’s objective continues to be to document its consensus on N-1 responsibilities based on its assessment of FCC cites and industry documentation. This will be documented in LNPA meeting minutes and the PIM 30 resolution for possible reference by a service provider seeking to escalate if they feel they are receiving an inordinate amount of default routed calls. The LNPA has set a target for the September 2004 NANC meeting to provide its consensus on N-1 responsibilities, including EAS areas and carriers with waivers or operating outside mandated areas, and whether the NANC should recommend to the FCC any rule changes relevant to the N-1 architecture.

* PIM 31 – This PIM, submitted by Syniverse (formerly TSI), seeks to address fallout that occurs in cases where the wireline Old Service Provider involved in a port issues a jeopardy notification with a change in due date to the wireless New Service Provider. Wireless carriers currently cannot support jeopardy notices with changes to the due date and time.



Rob Smith, Syniverse, investigated occurrences of wireless providers issuing duplicate LSRs and sent the results to the appropriate wireless carrier(s) generating the duplicates. A wireless member stated that, in many cases, the reason that a duplicate LSR is being sent is because they never received the FOC after the 24 hour period. Syniverse took an action to determine if they are getting the FOC from the wireline carrier.

Wireline Service Providers are to determine if there are opportunities to tighten

up edits in up-front systems to mitigate jeopardies being sent after confirmation.

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

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

Qwest, Verizon Communications, and BellSouth explained that this type of request must go through their official Change Management process.

The OBF Wireless Workshop is taking the issue up of supporting jeopardies (Issue 2781).

Wireline Service Providers took an action to determine why a wireline carrier

would issue a jeopardy after confirmation with a due date and time change on a simple TN port to a wireless carrier?

**WEDNESDAY 7/21/04**

Wednesday, 7/21/04, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T | Tim Waters | | SNET (phone) |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | ATTWS | Leigh Swindle | | Southern LINC (phone) |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Craig Bartell | | Sprint |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint |
| Elton Allen | Cingular | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint |
| Dennis Robins | Electric Lightwave (phone) | Tony Ramsey | | Syniverse (phone) |
| Karen Mulberry | MCI | Rob Smith | | Syniverse |
| Jason Lee | MCI (phone) |  | |  |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec |
| Shannon Sevigny | NeuStar (phone) | John Malyar | | Telcordia |
| Greg Roberts | NeuStar |  | |  |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Jason Kempson | | Telcordia (phone) |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Jean Anthony | | Telecom Software |
| Gene Johnston | NeuStar | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile (phone) |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Chris Toomey | | US Cellular |
| Mindi Patterson | NeuStar (phone) | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| Rosemary Emmer | Nextel | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Dave Garner | Qwest | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| Charles Ryburn | SBC (phone) | Sara Hooker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Leah Luper | SBC | Deborah Stephens | | Verizon Wireless |
|  |  | Blaine Reeve | | Western Wireless |
|  |  |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

PIM Discussion Continued:

* 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.



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

by them could indicate the type of account (reseller) and the name of the provider (Part of Action Item 0504-15). BellSouth stated that they do provide a unique response.

For porting in reseller numbers from a wireline carrier, Wireless Service Providers are to identify the customer’s Local Service Provider up front in order to issue the CSR.

Wireless Service Providers are to remind their sales forces to stress that customers wishing to port need to bring in their bill or provide a number where they can be reached for additional information.

During the discussion at the July LNPA meeting, Rob Smith, Syniverse, ran through the details of the PIM. He stated that it is not possible to complete the LSR without information from the CSR. BellSouth stated that they do not consider the CSR for the reseller’s customer to be proprietary, but they have contractual agreements with their Wholesale customers that may be violated if they share the CSR. Verizon considers this to be proprietary and has the same contractual issues. Verizon is holding weekly internal conference calls on PIM 32 and 34. Paula Jordan, T-Mobile and LNPA Co-Chair, stated that until such time that this process is improved, wireless providers need to identify the reseller up front, if possible, and wireless carriers need to cooperate in giving CSR information between themselves. If a CSR is rejected by the codeholder, wireless carriers will do the research to identify the reseller.

* 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.



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

by them could indicate the type of account (Type 1) and the name of the provider (Part of Action Item 0504-15).

For porting in Type 1 numbers from a wireline carrier, Wireless Service Providers are to identify the customer’s Local Service Provider up front in order to issue the CSR.

Wireless Service Providers are to remind their sales forces to stress that customers wishing to port need to bring in their bill or provide a number where they can be reached for additional information.

All agreed that it is imperative that providers continue to cooperate in getting Type 1 numbers migrated to the current local service provider.

* PIM 36 – This PIM, submitted by Syniverse, proposes an edit in NPAC to prevent NPA-NXX codes from being opened in the wrong NPAC regional database by service providers. The PIM was accepted at the June 2004 meeting.



NANC Change Order 321 addresses this issue, and has been modified to address an area in Kentucky where two regions serve the same NPA. The group agreed to wait and see how NANC 321 comes out in the ranking to determine the disposition of the PIM.

Syniverse stated they are aware of 3 codes that has been opened in the wrong region for over a month.

NeuStar reported that the Help Desk will delete a code open in the wrong region and will accept requests from a 3rd party, but they will have to pay a fee. The codeholder must add it in to the right region. A member asked how the codeholder gets notified in the Help Desk process that they need to add it in the right region. NeuStar is to:

1. Investigate the Help Desk process when there are active SVs in the code,
2. Investigate how the codeholder gets notified that a code has been deleted.

NeuStar said that it would be unlikely that numbers have ported in a code in the wrong region. NeuStar cannot delete the code if there are ported numbers. The carriers involved must coordinate deletion of the ported numbers.

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



At the July meeting, the submitter, Verizon Wireless, stated that small carriers are using FAX and therefore, would like to withdraw the PIM.

* PIM 38 – This PIM, submitted by AT&T Wireless, seeks to eliminate the current 5 day minimum interval between when a pooled block is created in NPAC, and the effective date of block activation, if the 1st port has already occurred in the NXX code containing the pooled block. The PIM was accepted at the June 2004 meeting.



NeuStar developed NANC Change Order 394 that will be included in the upcoming Change Order ranking session to determine the next NPAC software release. The Change Order removes the 5-day minimum interval between –X creation and block activation now imposed on all blocks. The Change Order will cause a 5-day delay to be imposed only if the NPA-NXX from which the block is drawn has not yet experienced a “first port” notification. The Change Order also introduces a 5-day delay between the creation and activation of an individual SV when its NPA-NXX likewise has had no “first port” notification.

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



A member stated that the OBF has addressed the frequency of business rules changes in its Change Management Process document, and provided the following excerpt from the document:

Unless mandated, the provider should implement no more than four (4) customer impacting releases within a calendar year. These releases should occur no less than three (3) months apart.

Verizon stated that they have three CLEC-impacting releases per year - in February, June, and October. The changes being made are typically additions of new LSR edits or modifications to existing edits. CLECs are notified of the specific changes at 89, 73, and 45 days prior to each release. Once the 45-day notification has been made, no changes to the release coding are allowed.

A Clearinghouse vendor stated that some carriers do documentation-only changes more frequently than 4 times per year that require code changes to other providers.

The Clearinghouse vendor strongly suggested that wireless carriers attend ILEC Change Management sessions.

This PIM also requests reducing the number of fields on the LSR for validation, among other changes. Rob Smith, Syniverse, took an action to split the change frequency issue, number of fields issue, and the request to identify all errors in the 1st response into three separate PIMs. These will be referred to the OBF to be addressed.

* NEW PIM 40 – This PIM, submitted by Verizon Wireless, seeks to address minimum industry standards for LNP readiness that must be adhered to by all companies in order to port. This PIM was accepted at the July LNPA meeting.



Verizon Wireless asked if something could be placed in the NANC Flows to require codes to be opened in NPAC and marked portable in the LERG. Adam Newman, Telcordia, took an action to investigate INC guidelines for any cites that require codes to be opened in NPAC and marked portable in the LERG.

Deborah Stephens, Verizon Wireless, will revise the PIM by drafting resolution text that will be used to close the PIM.

Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will report the LNPA resolution at the September NANC and ask that it be detailed in the NANC minutes.

* NEW 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. This PIM was accepted at the July LNPA meeting.



Deb Stephens, Verizon Wireless, will work with Jeff Adrian, Sprint, to develop and add a resolution statement to the Number Portability Best Practices document.

This will also serve as the resolution to the PIM.

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



Syniverse stated that there is not consistency among wireline carriers as to whether these are required. A member suggested that maybe we should form a subcommittee to discuss the WICIS/LSOG differences. Sprint had submitted an issue in OBF to map the WPR and LSR.

Wireline Service Providers are to research if the LSR fields addressed in the PIM are required by their systems and report back to the LNPA.

This PIM will be referred to the Inter-species Task Force (ITF), which will next meet on Wednesday, August 11th.

* NEW PIM 43 – This PIM, submitted by Verizon Wireless, seeks to address concerns related to large porting volumes and mass changes, such as rehomes.



A member asked that in the case where large volumes of ported/pooled numbers are being rehomed, why not move the LRN of switch A in the LERG to switch B. Another member responded that if DPC values are changed, an NPAC transaction is required. It was asked if these rehome numbers were included in the NFG model used to drive the throughput requirements. NeuStar said that it wouldn’t matter if they were because the projected volumes were spread over a number of months and were not focused in a very short timeframe. NeuStar further stated that with the new SOA requirement of 10 messages per second, with nothing else happening, it would take about 5 hours to rehome 100K numbers using porting, but they don’t know what would happen to service provider LSMSs. An LSMS vendor stated we must look at this end-to-end and not just one component. This PIM discussion will be part of a special Architecture Planning Team (APT) session at the August LNPA meeting.

Deborah Stephens, Verizon Wireless, will submit the Business Need for a new NANC Change Order, including volume and timeframe requirements.

Change Management Discussion:

* NANC 389, Performance Test Bed
* Sprint stated that they would like to see it as a separate Statement Of Work (SOW) to see if it is worth the cost. Paul LaGattuta, AT&T and LNPA Co-Chair, stated that not all providers will see the price of the SOW. A member suggested that providers can look at their current NPAC bill to see the cost of the SOW 34 test bed to get an estimate, although it will likely be lower than the proposed performance test bed.
* NeuStar said that the SOW 34 test bed could be upgraded to meet performance requirements now that the test bed is on the new platform. This would be more cost effective than a new separate test bed. NeuStar will revise NANC 389, Performance Test Bed, to include options for upgrading the SOW 34 test bed. This will be discussed at the August LNPA meeting.
* Change Order Ranking Session
* The group then discussed the procedure for the ranking session for the Change Orders in the attached document. There will be one vote per company (wireline and wireless arms within a company should coordinate the one vote). All Change Orders to be ranked should be ranked numerically 1 through 31, with 1 being the highest rank. No two Change Orders will have the same ranking number. Vendors will not vote during the session.



* Service Providers then submitted their rankings to NeuStar, who then compiled them to arrive at the attached ranking for the 31 Change Orders.



* NeuStar will develop a proposal for which NANC Change Orders can be

included in the next NPAC software release and issue a new Change Order document containing only those proposed to be in the next release. This will be discussed at the August LNPA meeting.

* We need to consider the development cycles, planned releases, etc., of the local system vendors as well.
* Most wireless carriers have a retail freeze from mid-October through January. They would not want a new release in that period.
* There will be a full day devoted on next month’s agenda to go over Change Order requirements.

**THURSDAY 7/22/04**

Thursday, 7/22/04, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T | Tim Waters | | SNET (phone) |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | ATTWS | Craig Bartell | | Sprint |
| Lonnie Keck | ATTWS (phone) | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Rob Smith | | Syniverse |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec |
| Elton Allen | Cingular | John Malyar | | Telcordia |
| Therese Mooney | Global Crossing (phone) | Jean Anthony | | Telecom Software |
| Karen Mulberry | MCI | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Jason Lee | MCI (phone) | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile (phone) |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Chris Toomey | | US Cellular |
| Shannon Sevigny | NeuStar (phone) | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Deborah Stephens | | Verizon Wireless |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar |  | |  |
| Rosemary Emmer | Nextel |  | |  |
| Dave Garner | Qwest |  | |  |
| Charles Ryburn | SBC (phone) |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

Feedback Report from July 2004 NANC Meeting:

* Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, provided a readout of the attached LNPA WG Report presented at the July 2004 NANC meeting.



* Gary reported that most questions from the NANC group centered on PIM 30, N-1 Architecture. The LNPA’s target date for reporting the results of the LNPA’s discussion on PIM 30 is the September 2004 NANC meeting.
* It was also reported to NANC that the WNPO and LNPA will combine as of the August 2004 LNPA meeting, and that the Architecture Planning Team (APT) has gone dormant.

Texas PUC Discussion of Options A and B in the NANC Flows (Paul LaGattuta, AT&T and LNPA Co-Chair):

* Paul LaGattuta reported that there was no update available at this time. When an update is available, Paul will provide feedback to the LNPA.

Review of June Action Items:



* Item 0604-01: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0604-02: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0604-03: This item was completed and is Closed.

* Item 0604-04: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0604-05: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0604-06: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0604-07: This item remains Open.
* Item 0604-08: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0604-09: This item remains Open.
* Item 0604-10: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0604-11: This item was remains Open for the August LNPA meeting.
* Item 0604-12: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0604-13: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0604-14: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0604-15: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0604-16: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0604-17: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0604-18: PIM 37 was withdrawn by the submitter. This item is Closed.
* Item 0604-19: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0604-20: This item remains Open. Verizon stated that changes of this magnitude must go through their official Change Management process.

Action Items Remaining Open from Previous Meetings:

* Item 0204-18: Item is Closed.
* Item 0304-07: Item remains Open. The group agreed to await the results of the first SPID migration.
* Item 0504-08: Item remains Open.
* Item 0504-10: Item remains Open.
* Item 0504-13: This item was completed and is Closed.
* Item 0504-15: Item remains Open.

Discussion on Differences between Production NPAC and SOW 34 Test Bed – NeuStar:

* NeuStar led a discussion on the differences between the production NPAC and the SOW 34 test bed.
* The SOW 34 test bed’s front end server is half the CPU of the production NPAC and half the memory. It’s database server has half the CPU of the production NPAC and 1/3 the memory.
* There are 13 disks on the SOW 34 test bed and they are not configured for high performance.
* The proponents of the performance test bed proposal stated that they are open to investigating upgrading the SOW 34 test bed to meet performance test requirements as opposed to a new production-like test bed.
* Options include upgrading the application server (front end), database server (back end), and/or the disk array.
* NeuStar will revise NANC 389, Performance Test Bed, to include options for

upgrading the SOW 34 test bed. This will be discussed at the August LNPA meeting.

New Business:

* Sue Tiffany, Sprint, raised an issue related to purging old or abandoned ports. The WNPO has addressed wireless to wireless scenarios as follows:

Scenario 1: They agreed to purge 30 calendar days after confirmation if no activation.

Scenario 2: Port may be purged after 30 calendar days if the old SP sends a response to an LSR that there are errors and no activity from new SP.

This will be a new PIM for August to address inter-modal porting.



* A new issue was discussed in the WNPO where customers have trouble with routing after porting. It was suggested that a service provider list should be created for contact information. There is such a list within the NIIF. Action for LNPA members to ensure their contact information is accurate on the NIIF list. There will be an agenda item next month to discuss if we want to send correspondence to other industry groups to have their members validate their contact information
* New WICIS Release 3.0 for wireless – sunrise 5/22/05, sunset 10/16/05. Wireless carriers must be up on 3.0 by 10/16/05. Jean Anthony, TSE, volunteered to Co-Chair a WTSC Committee on WICIS 3.0. She stated that she will require two wireless volunteers with testing background to assist in Chairing the group.
* Shannon Sevigny, representing the Pool Administrator (PA), went through changes in the two attached Pool Administrator documents. There were no objections from the group. They will be posted on the PA website.

 

* The group agreed that a VoIP presentation to better understand call flows and possible LNP impacts would be beneficial. NeuStar stated that they will attempt to identify someone who could give such an overview of VoIP.