LNPA WORKING GROUP

August 2004 Meeting

Final Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Newport Beach, CA | Host: T-Mobile |

**MONDAY 8/16/04**

Monday, 8/16/04, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Wendy Wheeler | Alltel (phone) | Leah Luper | | SBC (phone) |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T | Charles Ryburn | | SBC (phone) |
| Lonnie Keck | ATTWS (phone) | Tim Waters | | SNET (phone) |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | ATTWS | Craig Bartell | | Sprint |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint |
| Marion Hearn | Canadian LNP | Rob Smith | | Syniverse |
| Elton Allen | Cingular (phone) | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec (phone) |
| Monica Dahmen | COX | John Malyar | | Telcordia |
| Laurie Itkin | Cricket (phone) | Adam Newman | | Telcordia (phone) |
| Dennis Robins | Electric Lightwave (phone) | Jason Kempson | | Telcordia |
| Karen Mulberry | MCI | Jean Anthony | | Telecom Software |
| Pascal Lacroix | Microcell Solutions | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile |
| Shannon Sevigny | NeuStar (phone) | Gary Williams | | T-Mobile |
| Gene Johnston | NeuStar | Ginny Cashbaugh | | US Cellular |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| Larry Vagnoni | NeuStar | Nancy Davies | | Verizon (phone) |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Sara Hooker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Deborah Stephens | | Verizon Wireless |
| Susan Ortega | Nextel | Jeff Harmon | | Verizon Wireless (phone) |
| Dave Garner | Qwest | Jarek Checinski | | Western Wireless |
| Rick Jones | NENA (phone) | Robin Meier | | SBC (phone) |
| Robert Schaefer | MCI (phone) | Lori McGarry | | CTIA (phone) |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

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

**MEETING MINUTES:**

2004 Meeting Schedule:

* The Sept 2004 meeting schedule in Atlanta, GA, will be as follows:
* Wednesday, Sept 8th, and Thursday, Sept 9h, the LNPA will meet from 8:30am-5pm Eastern,
* The Architecture Planning Team (APT) will not hold a separate session.
* The October 2004 meeting schedule in Ft. Lauderdale, FL will be as follows;
* Tuesday, October 5th, through Thursday, October 7th, the LNPA will meet from 8:30am-5pm, Eastern.
* The Architecture Planning Team (APT) will not hold a separate session.
* The November 2004 meeting in Nashville, Tennessee, will be held from Tuesday, November 2nd through Thursday, November 4th, from 8:30am-5pm Central 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.
* 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** |
| 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 |

The following is a TENTATIVE meeting schedule for the 2005 LNPA Meeting. Hosts and Locations are tentative and are subject to change.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Month/Date  (2005) | NANC | OBF | LNPA-WG | Host | Location |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| January | 19th |  | 11-12-13th | Qwest | Phoenix |
| February |  | Week of 7th | 15-16-17th | Syniverse | Tampa |
| March | 15th |  | 8-9-10th | NeuStar | ??? |
| April |  |  | 12-13-14th | VZ Wireless | ??? |
| 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 | ??? |
| August |  |  | 9-10-11th | Tekelec | Raleigh |
| Sept | 20th |  | 13-14-15th | Nextel | ??? |
| Oct |  | Week of 22nd | 18-19-20th | T-Mobile | Seattle |
| Nov | 30th |  | 15-16-17th | Cingular | Atlanta |
| Dec |  |  | 6-7-8th | ATT | NYC |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

07/04 Minutes Review:

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

* Page 17, Substitute Maggie Lee with Deb Stephens and delete items 1-4.
* Page 17, PIM 43, 3rd sentence – Change to read, “… if DPC values are changed, an NPAC transaction is required.”
* Page 21, Test bed discussion – change 3rd bullet to read “not configured for high performance.”

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 met at OBF #87 last week in Phoenix. A recap of the issues includes:

* Issue 2753 ‘Fax Forms’ - Removed the fast track designation from this issue. Due to WICIS 3.0 work there has been little progress but a sub-group has been formed to pull together definitions from LSOG 6. Later this month sub-team efforts should be complete enough for an initial wireless review of the forms.
* Issue 2744 – Wireless committee has agreed to change the interface to allow a confirmed ‘DDT’, returned back from the wireline carrier, to be different from the DDT sent on the WPR.
* Issue 2665 – ‘Abandoned ports’ – there has been recent wording changes. LNPA will be getting the official response on the new verbiage.
* Issue 2743 – ‘Multiple RCODES on responses’ – In discussion but will not be part of the WICIS 3.0.
* PIM 39 – ‘Frequency of business rule changes’ – LSOG has accepted the issue but won’t work it at OBF. LSOG advised this should be worked on a carrier-to-carrier basis. LSOG will put together a list of change control contact names and numbers and a formal response which will be sent from Lonnie Keck, ATTWS, for distribution to the LNPA WG. There are guidelines for change control but they apparently are not being followed. LNPA requests that Lonnie ask for a copy of those guidelines as well as the contact info.
* PIM 44 – The OBF Wireless Committee accepted the PIM (now Issue 2801) and it is now being worked. A resolution for this issue may encompass Issue 2802 (PIM 42) as well.

* PIM 42 – The OBF Wireless Committee accepted this PIM and it is now Issue 2802. See item above.
* PIM 45 – “Multiple errors returned at same time.” The OBF Wireless Committee did NOT accept this issue. A liaison detailing the reasons why it was rejected will be sent back to the LNPA WG, which will wait to evaluate the response prior to further discussion.
* For WICIS 3.0, the team is still working to narrow the scope of this release. It has been agreed that the Sunrise of 3.0 will be May 22,2005, and the Sunset of the WICIS 2.1.0 release is Oct. 16, 2005. No new issues will be accepted for this release after last week’s meeting, although there is still work to be done on issues that will be in the release.
* The Mission Statement for the Wireless Committee was reviewed and some changes have been proposed. The changes remove some of the wireless to wireless verbiage as well as some of the restrictive language, and will include intermodal verbiage.

* The Technical Sub-Committee (TSC) has been working on backwards compatibility for WICIS 3.0. They have 44 issues on the matrix which need to be prioritized by carriers and vendors for the 3.0 release.

* The TSC has agreed that the implementation for WICIS 2.1.0 will be covered in a 12-hour window starting at 11:00 PM CT on October 23, 2004, and ending at 11:00 AM CT on October 24, 2004.
* Bi-weekly conference calls have resumed in order to work action items.
* There apparently is a gap between the ITF participants and the LNPA WG participants for some companies. The wireline participants are not the same for the ITF as the LNPA and there is a lack of communications between the two. Lonnie Keck, ATTWS, urged that LNPA wireline participants reach out to their OBF counterparts.

# July WNPO Minutes Review (Maggie Lee, VeriSign and WNPO Co-Chair):

* There were no changes to the July WNPO minutes. They will be accepted and marked “Final.”

* Number Portability Best Practices Matrix: The following note will be placed on the Matrix in order to distinguish for the reader which items were agreed upon by the WNPO to avoid confusion. Maggie Lee, VeriSign, will include the following in the next version of the matrix:

“Please Note: All items from 1 - 33 were developed and agreed to by the WNPO (Wireless Number Portability Operations) team.”



NIIF LNP Contact List and Trouble Reporting Guidelines (Maggie Lee, VeriSign and Robin Meier, SBC and NIIF/NIOC Co-Chair):

* Contact List: Robin Meier pointed out that the LNP Contact Directory is separate from the Guidelines for reporting local service troubles in a multiple carrier environment. Robin reminded the group that the contact list is updated as changes are received, so carrier should download the list frequently. A request was made to remind carriers to update their contact info as often as changes are made.

* Trouble Reporting Guidelines: Robin Meier has been designated by NIIF as their liaison to LNPA and the NIIF has opened Issue 2448 to accommodate changes to the document. The Trouble Reporting Guidelines now deal only with wireline concerns; working the issue will involve adding wireless carriers to the process description. Inter-modal issues would be included in the Guidelines’ updates. It has not been determined whether they would be covered in a “wireless” section or there would be an inter-modal section added as well. Minutes from NIIF will be available in about ten days. Next NIIF meeting is the week of October 10th and the NIIF would like some input by that time. (Next meeting after that is January 2005.)
* An LNPA Sub-committee has been formed with Maggie Lee, VeriSign, Craig Bartell, Sprint, and Paula Jordan, T-Mobile, as Co-Chairs. Maggie Lee will set up a call with the Co-Chairs first and then send out an email on details and a call for participants.

WTSC Committee for WICIS 3.0 – (Action Item 0704-20) :

* Jean Anthony, TSE volunteered as the Co-Chair for the WTSC Committee for WICIS Release 3.0, and Sue Tiffany, Sprint, has volunteered to be the Facilitator. Sprint, Telcordia, US Cellular, and T-Mobile have already agreed to participate as members. Other companies are urged to join the committee and should contact Jean or Sue for information.
* The WICIS documentation is copyrighted and therefore may not be available to everyone on the committee if they are not currently ATIS, OBF, or Wireless Committee members, or are not willing to make a purchase of the document from ATIS. It is important to note that under no circumstances will the WTSC provide a copy of the document to any team member. Lonnie Keck, ATTWS, will work with OBF on NON-OBF funded companies having/gaining access to the WICIS, in order to carry out the WTSC/LNPAWG needs.

FORT Review (Craig Bartell, Sprint, and Frank Reed, T-Mobile):

* The last meeting was held on August 13th. The same two issues (PIM 41-SPID and PIM 42 - fields not mapping) are still open. A question was raised if the FORT team should go dormant? The consensus was that FORT should become dormant, but first Craig Bartell and Frank Reed should send notice of this to the team members and that the Co-Chairs are willing to continue to have their names associated with the FORT. Consensus: Issues can be referred to FORT in the future, once the LNPA WG has reviewed the issue and a determination is made that the FORT should handle.

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.

 

* Paul LaGattuta sent out the latest NFG model and reviewed the current numbers. Three NFG members met August 13th to discuss the diversion of actuals from forecasts in the current year. The concern is that it is not clear why the volumes are occurring, not that they happen to be different from our prior forecasts. The overrun seems to be in the wireline porting category. A member inquired whether NANC 191/291 clean-up might be the cause of the 6 million overrun. It was stated that the NANC 191/291 clean-up activity volume has been known and so reflected in the NFG forecasts. Type 1 number migrations were suggested, but these show up as “wireless ports,” so this also would not explain the diversion. One suggestion was VoIP, other suggestions were cable providers’ growth surge, and providers migrating their networks.

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

* Adam Newman submitted an Issue 445 contribution last week. INC made some changes to the issue for clarification and it is now in initial closure. The issue goes into final closure 21 days from Friday, Sept. 13th. Adam Newman will forward a final copy of the issue as it was updated by the INC.

 

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

* Nothing to report. Paul reported that he has not heard back from the Texas PUC since their last correspondence. It was suggested to close the item. Charles Ryburn, SBC, will make some inquiries and report back if there is anything new to report, otherwise the issue is closed.

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

* Mindi Patterson reviewed the latest version of the NANC 323 SPID Migration documents (available at the NPAC website), and the changes that were made. Attached is the latest documents.



NANC 323 SPID Migration Post Mortem (ALL):

* Steve Addicks, NeuStar, and Maggie Lee, VeriSign, provided feedback from the first NANC 323 SPID migration.
* A provider reported that they had not populated 2 codes in their SOA that were in the SMURF file.

* NPAC removed the SMURF files one week after the migration was completed. However, one provider called after the files were removed and requested the files.
* A request was made to include the precise counts of TNs in the migration files. Steve Addicks, NeuStar, will check if this is possible.

* ATT/COMCAST and T-Mobile Contact information for the next migration was not included when sent to the industry.
* It was reported that less then 10% of the providers responded to NeuStar’s request to provide a primary and secondary contact for the SPID migration process. NeuStar will send out another request to the X-Regional list for this information.
* Forms must be checked for completeness and information included in the NPAC notice must be reviewed for accuracy prior to distribution.

* NeuStar will change the Migration Checklist and NPAC documentation to include that the pending SV list will be sent to both the applicable provider and any associated Service Bureau for that provider.

* The migration form will also include an indication whether the NPAC SPID migration is being done in conjunction with a change in the OCN owning the code, as opposed to just being done to update NPAC data to reflect code ownership already accomplished and reflected in industry documents.
* A request was made to also include on the migration form an indication whether the Old SP had indicated that the old SPID would be retired at NPAC after the migration.
* There is a new migration form (Excel format) at [www.npac.com](http://www.npac.com) that should be used from this point forward. NeuStar will send a reminder to the distribution list.

PIM Discussion:

* 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 was not 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. 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.

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 Committee and Local Ordering and Provisioning (LSOP) Committee, and is being worked in the OBF Wireless Committee 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.



At the August 2004 LNPA meeting, discussion of PIM 30 was deferred to the September 2004 meeting.

Providers are to come prepared to continue the discussion of Extended Area Service (EAS) in the context of the N-1 architecture. Alternatives that have been documented to date for discussion are:

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.
4. On calls to EAS codes, the originating carrier is the N-1 carrier and is responsible to query all calls to portable EAS codes. For calls to EAS codes, where the query returns an LRN, the originating carrier and intermediate carriers shall route the call to the correct destination as provided in the FCC orders and requirements for LNP.

NOTE: Alternative 4 above was extracted from the attached contribution, submitted by Verizon Wireless, and discussed at the August meeting.



Qwest submitted the attached contribution for discussion of EAS and N-1.



This PIM remains open and will be discussed further at the September 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, did some follow-up research and found that after the 24-hour FOC period expired, without a request response, some wireless carriers were moving forward with the port, sending an SP Create to NPAC. Jeopardy notices are being received. Last meeting, it was said that the wireless carriers were re-issuing a port request because they had not received the confirmation response to the original port request. *Question:* Are confirmations coming to the Clearinghouse, but not being forwarded to the New SP? Rob Smith found that this had occurred, but rarely; so this is not the problem. Rob thinks some wireless carriers are sending up SV Creates even though they have not received a confirmation response. Rob found that half of jeopardy notices are due to second LSR being received. It was commented that carriers should not issue jeopardy notices in reaction to a second LSR; in such cases, the LSR should be rejected. Maggie Lee will update the NP Best Practices Matrix will clarifying language.

“Jeopardy” appears to mean different things to different carriers. A Jeopardy Notice should be sent only after the port has been agreed to, i.e., a Jeopardy should be sent by the Old SP to warn the New SP that the original port date that had been agreed to cannot be met after all, and only for that reason.

* 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.



No progress has been made but Rob Smith, Syniverse, will work directly with individual carriers to determine why the correct error messages are not being returned and will report again next month. Rob may also contact other Service Bureaus to discuss.

* 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.



No progress has been made but Rob Smith, Syniverse, will work directly with individual carriers to determine why the correct error messages are not being returned and will report again next month. Rob may also contact other Service Bureaus to discuss.

* 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.

**TUESDAY 8/17/04**

Tuesday, 8/17/04, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Company | Name | Company |
| Wendy Wheeler | Alltel (phone) | Leah Luper | SBC (phone) |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T | Charles Ryburn | SBC (phone) |
| Lonnie Keck | ATTWS (phone) | Tim Waters | SNET (phone) |
| Stephen A. Sanchez | ATTWS | Craig Bartell | Sprint |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Jeff Adrian | Sprint |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Susan Tiffany | Sprint |
| Marion Hearn | Canadian LNP | Rob Smith | Syniverse |
| Elton Allen | Cingular (phone) | Colleen Collard | Tekelec (phone) |
| Monica Dahmen | COX | John Malyar | Telcordia |
| Laurie Itkin | Cricket (phone) | Keagan O’Rourke | Evolving (phone) |
| Dennis Robins | Electric Lightwave (phone) | Jason Kempson | Telcordia |
| Karen Mulberry | MCI (phone) | Jean Anthony | Telecom Software |
| Pascal Lacroix | Microcell Solutions | Paula Jordan | T-Mobile |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Frank Reed | T-Mobile (phone) |
| Shannon Sevigny | NeuStar (phone) | Gary Williams | T-Mobile |
| Gene Johnston | NeuStar | Ginny Cashbaugh | US Cellular |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | VeriSign |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Earl Scott | Verizon (phone) |
| Larry Vagnoni | NeuStar | Nancy Davies | Verizon (phone) |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Sara Hooker | Verizon Wireless |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Deborah Stephens | Verizon Wireless |
| Susan Ortega | Nextel | Jarek Checinski | Western Wireless |
| Dave Garner | Qwest | Robert Schaefer | MCI (phone) |
| Robin Meier | SBC (phone) | Jeff Harmon | VZW (phone) |
| Tim Waters | SBC (phone) | Brad Smeal | TelCove (phone) |
| Donna Devers | SBC |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

PIM Discussion Continued:

* 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 was included in the July Change Order ranking session to determine the next NPAC software release. It was ranked No. 12 in the ranking session. 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. This will be tracked at the LNPA. No further work is required at this time on this PIM.

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



This PIM was referred to the OBF. LSOG has accepted the issue but won’t work it at OBF. LSOG advised this should be worked on a carrier-to-carrier basis. LSOG will put together a list of change control contact names and numbers and a formal response which will be sent from Lonnie Keck, ATTWS, for distribution to the LNPA WG. There are guidelines for change control but they apparently are not being followed. LNPA requests that Lonnie ask for a copy of those guidelines as well as the contact info.

* 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.



The code opening process currently in the NANC flows only mentions the actions that need to take place in the NPAC, but does not include sufficient information to ensure that the code is also opened to portability in the LERG. Deb Stephens, Verizon Wireless, will look at an NRO Order that mentions code opening and determine if that language is sufficient to address this PIM, and present a new version of the PIM next month with stronger language from the NRO Order, if applicable.

* 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 resubmit this PIM for discussion at September meeting.

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



This PIM has been accepted at OBF as Issue 2802 and is now in tracking status only for LNPA

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



This PIM will be discussed as a separate agenda item at this meeting on Wednesday. (NOTE: This PIM was subsequently withdrawn and an NPAC Change Order was submitted by Verizon Wireless.)

* NEW 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.

NEW 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 but was not accepted at the OBF Wireless Committee. A liaison detailing the reasons why it was rejected will be sent back to the LNPA WG, which will wait to evaluate the response prior to further discussion.

* NEW PIM 46 – This PIM, submitted by TelCove, seeks to address the NPAC Filter Management process which currently only allows a filter to be applied for an NPA-NXX if that particular NPA-NXX has previously been entered into NPAC.



During the discussion, NeuStar pointed out that when a new code is broadcast by NPAC, the SOA can send a message to NPAC to filter out broadcasts for that code, and it would therefore not be necessary to contact the Help Desk to implement a filter for the code. The submitter was asked whether he had spoken with his SOA vendor regarding whether their SOA platform supported this functionality. NeuStar suggested that an NPA*-*level inclusive filter would meet the TelCove need. Brad Smeal, TelCove, will discuss functionality to trigger a filter by the LSMS/SOA system with their vendor and may subsequently submit an NPAC Change Order request. It was agreed that this PIM will be withdrawn as the issue may be addressed by submitting an NPAC Change Order.

* NEW PIM 47 – This PIM, submitted by Sprint, seeks to address minimum industry intermodal standards for purging old/abandoned ports.



This issue was discussed at the OBF Inter-species Task Force (ITF). The group came to consensus on some changes to the text. The LNPA agreed to wait for the updated language to be sent back from ITF for discussion at the September meeting before updating the NP Best Practices matrix. In the meantime ALL SPs are asked to review their internal system set-up regarding reaction to a 2nd LSR for the same TN.

* NOTE: PIM Submitters are reminded that they need to update their PIMs with appropriate verbiage as changes occur as a result of discussions during the LNPA. Updated PIMs should be sent to Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, who will ensure the proper version number is placed on the document and the revised PIM is distributed and uploaded to the LNPA website.

VoIP Presentation (Jon Peterson, NeuStar and IETF Transport Area Director):



* Jon Peterson gave the attached presentation on Voice over IP (VoIP). A question was later raised if there is anything the LNPA needs to do about VoIP. Some felt they needed more time to review and share internally before making any comment. All SPs are requested to review internally in preparation for discussion at the October meeting. One suggestion was to share the NANC flows with VoIP providers.

Change Management Discussion:

* NANC 389, Performance Test Bed
* The group reviewed the updated Change Order reflecting the July meeting discussion. It was suggested that we table this Change Order until validation testing on the current platform (SOW 34) can take place to determine if SOW 34 meets the needs of the carriers. Sprint, ATTWS, and US Cellular were interested in performing internal testing. These carriers and any others should advise the LNPA in September if they can/will perform benchmark testing. NeuStar reminded the LNPA that the LLC will have to approve taking the test bed off-line prior to any validation testing taking place.

Change Order Requirements Review (All):

* The following change orders have been added to the next release package after a review agreement reached by members of the LNPA. NeuStar will make the appropriate changes to the document to reflect their inclusion.

Change Orders: NANC 285, 346, 357, 358, 386, and 392.

* The LNPA began the review of the Change Order requirements. The intent is to be prepared for a final review at the October meeting and invite the LLC to join in a review of the business needs of the Change Orders in the package. This review will be done prior to submitting the completed package to the LLC at their October 13, 2004 meeting.
* NANC Change Order 385: Timer Calculation – Maintenance Window Timer Behavior – While reviewing this Change Order, NeuStar asked that all SPs go back and review to determine what the initial expectation is for this Change Order.

**WEDNESDAY 8/18/04**

Wednesday, 8/18/04, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Paul LaGattuta | AT&T | Tim Waters | | SBC (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 (phone) |
| Elton Allen | Cingular (phone) | John Malyar | | Telcordia |
| Wendy Wheeler | Alltel (phone) | Jean Anthony | | Telecom Software |
| Karen Mulberry | MCI (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Jason Lee | MCI (phone) | Frank Reed | | T-Mobile |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Ginny Cashbaugh | | 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 | Nancy Davies | | Verizon (phone) |
| Susan Ortega | Nextel | Robert Frasca | | ATT (phone) |
| Dave Garner | Qwest | Dennis Robbins | | ELI (phone) |
| Charles Ryburn | SBC (phone) | Bill Riley | | Sprint (phone) |
| Leah Luper | SBC (phone) |  | |  |
| Donna Devers | SBC |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

###### Architecture Planning Team (APT) Session:

* PIM 43: The PIM was withdrawn last month and is to be readdressed as a change order. “Large volume port transactions and SOA throughput.” Current throughput is 4-6 TNs per second. The amount of transactions predicted could be in the arena of 7 TNs sustained over an 8-hour period. In order to really work this issue Carriers should review internally and provide feedback to Alan Stiffler on their company forecasts out 2 to 10 years. This will be discussed again in the October LNPA meeting.
* Change management discussion: Change orders were reviewed one at a time to ensure that requirements were complete and there were no conflicts with other COs. The ASN.1 and GDMO will be brought to the next meeting for review of that material. Each section affected by a change order will be identified. Full document review (FRS, IIS) will be necessary after the LLC approves the release package.

Review of July Action Items:



* Item 0704-01: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0704-02: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0704-03: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0704-04: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0704-05: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0704-06: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0704-07: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0704-08: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0704-09: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0704-10: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0704-11: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0704-12: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0704-13: This item remains Open.
* Item 0704-14: This item remains Open.
* Item 0704-15: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0704-16: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0704-17: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0704-18: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0704-19: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0704-20: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0704-21: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0704-22: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0704-23: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0704-24: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0704-25: This item has been completed and is Closed. SBC stated that they cannot think of a situation where they would issue a jep with a different due date after the FOC. They do use jeopardy notifications as part of the LNP Activate/Disconnect process, but they are not changing the due date on a LNP order.
* Item 0704-26: This item has been completed and is Closed. SBC responded N/A to this question.
* Item 0704-27: This item remains Open. Responses have been received from Sprint, BellSouth, and SBC. SBC does not require any of the LSR entries listed (exception: if a customer elects to utilize their Lite Address Validation process, they must provide the end user's address on the LSR.

Action Items Remaining Open from Previous Meetings:

* 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: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0504-15: This item has been completed and is Closed. SBC stated they provide CSRs for their customers if they are the Network Service Provider.
* Item 0604-07: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0604-09: Item remains Open. PIMs and Meeting Minutes have been uploaded. The PIM matrix must also be updated.
* Item 0604-11: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0604-20: This item remains Open. Verizon stated that change requests of this magnitude must go through their official Change Management process. SBC stated that they will not be modifying their Jeopardy process.

New Business:

* Large Port Notification – NeuStar:

The current threshold for large port notifications is 1000. NeuStar would like to raise this to 5000, but would like all SPs to review and respond to the request at the next meeting.

* 909/951 Split – Inadvertent Deletion of New NPA-NXXs:

NeuStar added all the new NPA-NXXs associated with the split and then deleted them. NeuStar explained that the process had changed slightly and the kinks have now been ironed out and the process is now working as it should. The codes should not have been deleted.

* Scheduled Annual Failover Exercise:

This process is done once a year. This year, NeuStar is planning to do it on Saturday & Sunday, 10/16/2004 and 10/17/2004, from 7:00 AM ET Saturday to 12:00 noon ET Sunday.

***Detailed Time Line of the Fail-Over Exercise***

***Saturday, 7 a.m. Eastern time***

NeuStar closes edge routers at Sterling for “network fail-over only” exercise.

All mechanized and LTI Users with dedicated circuits fail over to their Charlotte circuits, while continuing to use the Sterling NPAC’s Application and Database.

***Saturday, 7 a.m. to 8 a.m. Eastern time***

NeuStar works with Users having trouble moving to their Charlotte circuits until 8 a.m. Eastern time.

NeuStar notes for its Report which Users are unable to fail over to their Charlotte circuits by 8 a.m. Eastern time.

***Saturday, 8 a.m. Eastern time***

NeuStar restores edge routers back on line at Sterling.

Users unable to move to their Charlotte circuits re-associate with Sterling NPAC to enable normal porting activity to occur in spite of the fail-over circuit exercise.

*All Users now are running on Sterling Application and Database, albeit most are accessing their NPAC regions at Sterling over their Charlotte circuits.*

***Saturday, 8:15 am Eastern time***

NeuStar initiates fail-over from Sterling Application and Database to Charlotte Application and Database. NeuStar notes for its Report which Users are unable to fail-over to their regions at Charlotte and details of fail-over process events until 1st User appears in recovery at Charlotte. Users who were unable to fail-over to their Charlotte circuits will access the Charlotte NPAC over their Sterling circuits.

*All Users now are running normally on their regions at Charlotte; some continue to use their Sterling circuits.*

***Saturday, 9:00 am Eastern***

The short timers/long business week NPAC SMS “business hours” [referred to hereafter as “wireless timers”] resume as usual in the Mid-Atlantic, Northeast, and Southeast regions at 9:00 a.m. Eastern.

*At 10:00 a.m. Eastern, the wireless business hours resume in the Midwest and Southwest regions. At 11:00 a.m. Eastern, the wireless business hours resume in the Western region. At noon Eastern, the wireless business hours resume in the West Coast region. (There are no NPAC SMS business hours for wireline customers on Saturday or Sunday in any region.)*

***Saturday, 9:00 p.m. Eastern time***

Wireless NPAC “business hours” end in the Mid-Atlantic, Northeast, and Southeast regions at 9:00 p.m. Eastern time.

*At 10:00 p.m. Eastern, wireless business hours end in the Midwest and Southwest regions. At 11:00 p.m. Eastern, wireless NPAC business hours end in the Western region. At midnight Eastern, wireless NPAC business hours end in the West Coast region.*

***Sunday, 3:00 a.m. Eastern time [1:00 a.m,. if first weekend of October****]*

Weekly Sunday U.S. NPAC normal “SSU” maintenance window begins.

Weekly Sunday U.S. Service Provider maintenance window begins.

*Before the NPAC maintenance window ends, NeuStar initiates fail-over from Charlotte Application and Database to Sterling Application and Database. (Fail-over for the Canadian region can be delayed until later Sunday if desired by Canadian Users.)*

***Sunday, 8:00 a.m. Eastern time***

Weekly Sunday U.S. NPAC normal “SSU” maintenance window ends; NPAC comes back on line with Sterling as the active site.

***Sunday, 9:00 a.m. Eastern time***

Weekly Sunday U.S. Service Provider maintenance window ends. Users coming on line automatically associate with Sterling Application and Database. NeuStar notes for Report details of problems encountered during fail-over back to Sterling.

Wireless NPAC SMS wireless business hours begin in the Mid-Atlantic, Northeast, and Southeast regions.

*At 10:00 a.m. Eastern, the wireless business hours resume in the Midwest and Southwest regions. At 11:00 a.m. Eastern, the wireless business hours resume in the Western region. At noon Eastern, the wireless business hours resume in the West Coast region. (There are no NPAC SMS business hours for wireline customers on Saturday or Sunday in any region.)*

***Sunday, throughout the day***

Each User initiates its circuit fail-over from Charlotte back to Sterling at their convenience.

***Monday, by C.O.B.***

NeuStar tabulates results for each stage of the fail-over exercise and produces the Fail-Over Exercise Results Report for the PEs, the NAPM LLC, and the CLNPC.

***Next Meeting …******September 8-9, 2004, Atlanta, Georgia – Hosted by Cox***