LNPA WORKING GROUP

September 2005 Meeting

Final Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Bellevue, Washington | Host: T-Mobile |

**TUESDAY 09/13/05**

Tuesday, 09/13/05, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Cheryl Gordon | Alltel (phone) | Lavinia Rotaru | | Sprint/Nextel |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T (phone) | Rosemary Emmer | | Sprint/Nextel |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth (phone) | Cindi Jones | | Sprint LTD |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth (phone) | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint/Nextel |
| Michelle Gwaltney | Cingular | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint (phone) |
| Lonnie Keck | Cingular (phone) | Steve Moore | | Sprint LTD |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox | Rob Smith | | Syniverse |
| Laurie Itkin | Cricket Communications | Darren Paffenroth | | Syniverse |
| Dennis Robins | Electric Lightwave (phone) | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec (phone) |
| Jean Anthony | Evolving Systems | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Jason Lee | MCI (phone) | Jason Kempson | | Telcordia |
| Rick Jones | NENA (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Gary Williams | | T-Mobile |
| Shannon Sevigny | NeuStar Pooling | Alice Frailinger | | T-Mobile |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Derek Roth | | T-Mobile |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Katie Hoffman | | T-Mobile |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar | Nancy Davies | | Verizon (phone) |
| Gene Johnston | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Julie Anderson | | Verizon |
| Dave Garner | Qwest | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| David Taylor | SBC | Deborah Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

Attached are the Action Items assigned at the September, 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 “SEPTEMBER 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 | Sprint/Nextel | Ft. Lauderdale |
| November | 30th |  | 15-16th | Cingular | Atlanta |
| December |  |  | 6-7th | Evolving Systems | Denver |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

08/05 Minutes Review:

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

* On page 14, SPID Migration Discussion, 1st bullet under Action Item 0705-15, change last sentence to read, “Steve Addicks, NeuStar, stated that he had taken a sample and found over a 1,000 codes that were migrated but could have been deferred.”

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, Rob Smith, Syniverse, and Steve Moore, Sprint):

* At the upcoming OBF 92 during the week of October 24th, ATIS will hold their annual meeting. The USTA Telecom ‘05 conference will also take place.
* At OBF 91, an issue called Supplier Partner Settlements for Packet-based Services using a Service-Neutral Protocol Specification was submitted. A new committee called the Internet Protocol Network to Network Committee will address the issue and work with other industry groups. A kickoff call should be held before the October OBF meetings.
* There will be an after-hours session with the NIIF, PTSC, and TMOC during OBF 92 to address ordering and billing for IP.

# Wireless Committee:

* The Wireless Committee held a conference call on 8/16/05.
* Issue 2911, which addresses the use of the customer’s SSN on the Wireless Port Request (WPR): There was concern about eliminating it completely because of how much it is currently used. The group agreed to leave the field as is. It is a conditional field. The first 5 digits will be zeroed out. Only the last four digits of the SSN will be required if the SSN is to be used for validation. The new SP still has the option to provide the customer’s Account No.
* The group is discussing minimum data elements in an effort to streamline the process for porting. This will be fed into the ISC discussion on the same issue.
* The Uniform Ordering Model is making progress. This is an ATIS TOPS Council initiative to develop a uniform ordering process regardless of service or technology. WICIS is being rewritten. A draft should be available soon.
* Issue 2753: The Wireless to Wireline FAX form has been completed and is posted on the ATIS secure website. Carriers wishing to use it can post it on their website at no charge. The issue is moved into Closure. Clearinghouses are ready to go with its use. They will read the FAX form in and convert it to a WPR. Implementation could possibly be in approximately 90 days for those wireless carriers that choose to use the new form.

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

* Issue 2943 – Minimal data exchange for porting requests: An interim meeting on this issue was held last week. Agreement was reached on several issues. Question – should this only apply to inter-modal porting or all types of porting? Action for those on the committee to determine. The group’s direction is to come up with a non-complex set of minimal data elements. The group is not discussing what is required for validation at this point, but it is also an objective to attempt to address the number of fields required for validation.

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

* Jean Anthony, Evolving Systems, reported that a conference call was held in August. Thirteen companies (8 providers and 5 vendors) participated.
* Vendor to vendor testing is in progress. NeuStar and Syniverse have completed testing together. Verisign and Syniverse have completed their 3.0 to 3.0 testing. They are scheduled to start 3.0 to 2.1 and 2.1 to 3.0 testing. Verisign and NeuStar are to start testing the week of 9/19.
* SP testing continues. No new issues to report. No indication anyone has gone live with 3.0 yet. Some have indicated they will go live in the January/February 2006 timeframe.
* The next call is scheduled for 9/21/05. Logistics are on the website.
* All SP testing is optional. Wireline providers are encouraged to participate in testing with wireless carriers. One scenario that requires testing is changes to due date and time on wireline confirmation, which is now allowed in 3.0.
* Sprint volunteered to participate as a wireline carrier and test with multiple wireless carriers. Carriers interested in testing with Sprint should contact Cyndi Jones at Cyndi.C.Jones@mail.sprint.com or 913-345-7881 to co-ordinate.

NENA Report (Rick Jones, NENA):

* The NENA LNP Working Group is addressing VoIP, LNP, and E911 issues.
* Issue: The LSR has the Number Portability Directional Indicator (NPDI) field that is a migration indicator that is used to determine how to treat 911 data. NENA is considering using it for VoIP. NENA is investigating possibly adding 12 more choices (there are 4 now) to the field or to expand the definitions of the current 4 choices. Rick asked if any provider uses the NPDI field for anything other than 911? Service Providers are to determine if they use the Number Portability Directional Indicator (NPDI) field on the Local Service Request (LSR) for any purpose other than determining the disposition of 911 data. Responses in the affirmative should be e-mailed to Rick Jones, NENA, at rjones@nena.org. Responses should be sent to Rick no later than Friday, September 23, 2005. It was also suggested that Rick contact the LSOP and Wireless Committees to ask the same the question of their members.
* Issue: The lack of a testing plan when VoIP providers are involved in porting. This was a concern raised at NENA. NENA is trying to address the 911 testing that would be necessary.
* Issue: There is currently no work in the industry on adding VoIP porting to timelines, e.g. 911 data timelines.
* Issue: Mixed service in VoIP porting. There currently is no work on that issue yet. Rick stated that there may be a need for functionality equivalent to the 10-digit trigger.
* Wireline Issue: NENA is checking the FCC’s Katrina Order for negative 911 impacts. Providers have been using Interim Number Portability (INP) via Remote Call Forwarding (RCF).

INC Issues Update (Adam Newman, Telcordia and INC Vice Chair):

* INC Issue 482
  + Action Item 0605-11:

**The following text changes were made to the Coordinated Industry Effort Process bullet in Section 3 of the COCAG Appendix C:**

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 ported TNs and no pooled blocks (see LNPA Best Practices posted on the NPAC Public Site: [www.npac.com](http://www.npac.com)).



* + There were no objections from the LNPA on INC’s added text. Action Item 0605-11 is closed.
* INC Issue 483
  + The LNPA had suggested strengthening language in the INC COCAG Guidelines around transferring a code to another provider to get an LRN. See attached LNPA liaison to INC.



* + INC could not agree on accepting the LNPA’s proposed language. Concerns were raised regarding the 60 months to exhaust stipulation, the sentence that states, “In no event should an NXX code be considered for transfer if the LERG-assignee has assigned an LRN in the code,” and the three 1K block stipulation. Adam Newman stated that the INC would agree to hold a joint call with the LNPA to further discuss the wording.
  + Regarding the attached draft text addressing technical considerations when a provider is asked to volunteer to transfer an NXX code to another provider in order for that provider to assign an LRN, LNPA Participants are to work with their INC representatives, if applicable, for possible ways to reword the text and come prepared to participate on a joint LNPA/INC conference call to resolve. Possible dates for the joint call are October 4th, the afternoon of October 5th, October 6th, October 12th, and October 13th. See related Action Item 0905-08.



* Adam Newman, Telcordia and INC Vice Chair, will check the schedule of INC members in order to schedule a joint LNPA/INC conference call to discuss text for addressing technical considerations when a provider is asked to volunteer to transfer an NXX code to another provider in order for that provider to assign an LRN.

NOTE: The joint call will take place on Thursday, October 6, 2005, from 3pm to 5pm Eastern.

* INC Issue 484
  + At the September LNPA meeting, the group approved of the alternative text in the attached addressing action that should be taken when individual SVs contain the same LRN and DPC data as the pooled block in which they are contained. Adam Newman, Telcordia and INC Vice Chair, will inform the INC and report back to the LNPA as to the disposition of this issue.



PIM 51 Subcommittee Report (Jeff Adrian, Sprint and PIM 51 Subcommittee Co-Chair):



* 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 recommendation as presented by Jeff Adrian, Sprint and PIM 51 Subcommittee Co-Chair.



* Jeff reported that consensus was reached in the PIM 51 Subcommittee to recommend a historical review to identify existing mismatches and to maintain a separate service provider contact list. The concept of the historical review would be to run a report of all discrepancies and post them on the NPAC secure website for carriers to address as they see fit. This would require a Statement of Work (SOW).
* Action Item 0205-04: Steve Addicks, NeuStar, reported that there have been no new occurrences reported at the Help Desk since monitoring began in April. Two codes that were previously opened were corrected via SPID migrations. This Action Item was modified to reflect that NeuStar will provide readouts at the January 2006 and July 2006 LNPA meetings. Action Item 0205-04 remains open.
* A concern was raised regarding adding a layer of complexity onto the porting process when there are not been many occurrences of the problem. A number of providers agreed. It was suggested that we shelve the PIM 51 proposal for the time being and have NeuStar continue to report out on the occurrences in January and July 2006. PIM 51 will be placed in a tracking state. Service Providers are to determine internally if they are experiencing the problem addressed in the attached PIM 51 of having another provider opening their NXX code in NPAC and subsequently correcting the issue via a SPID migration.

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 are 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.



Prior to the July 2005 LNPA meeting, the INC sent the attached liaison to the LNPA regarding PIM 24.



The INC 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.

At the September LNPA meeting, the Pool Administrator (PA) reported no further news on the one-time scrub Change Order 41. All codes opened in the NPAC are now listed on the NPAC public website. The PA has been verifying that a code is opened in NPAC via the website since 8/29 upon donation of a block in the code. The PA has found over 580 codes that are not opened in NPAC for which they have blocks in the pool. The PA will e-mail a notice to these carriers. The PA did not verify if the codes were marked portable in the LERG. The PA will ask carriers to verify that they have marked these codes as portable in the LERG when sending the e-mail notification.

The LNPA then discussed the attached letter to the INC, drafted by Jeff Adrian, Sprint, in response to the INC liaison (cs105) attached above.



The INC does not plan any further INC activity at this time to address this issue. They prefer to see the outcome of the one-time scrub to see if this is an ongoing problem before any further action is to be taken. Adam Newman, Telcordia and INC Vice Chair, reported that the issue appears to be industry-wide and not isolated to one or two carriers. He said that until the one-time scrub is completed, it is not known if these are lingering issues for codes that were placed in the pool some time ago, or a current continuing occurrence. Jeff Adrian suggested we put this letter on hold for now. The LNPA group agreed to do so.

Upon establishing a new code in the network, the carrier must e-mail the PA verifying that they have opened up the code in the NPAC, marked it as portable in the LERG, and established the necessary trunking. The one-time scrub is still awaiting FCC approval. The scrub will check that if the block is marked as contaminated in PAS, there are ISP ports in NPAC, and if the block is not marked as contaminated in PAS, there are no ISP ports in NPAC. The PA will let the LNPA know the outcome of the one-time scrub. We will then determine if we need to proceed further. Adam Newman will relay this to the INC.

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 processes. Syniverse has initiated this contact with the ILECs. Syniverse will continue to work through these channels. Rob Smith, Syniverse, reported that one carrier suggested that the wireless carriers could pay for the requested system enhancements. Some resellers have indicated that they would not support having the underlying network provider giving access to their customers’ records. Rob said that most of the larger resellers have been supportive. PIM 32 is to stay open.

* 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.



The attached INC Issue 482 addresses the final Action Item related to PIM 41. The LNPA agreed to close PIM 41.



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



PIM 42 is being worked through wireline companies’ Account Management process. It is also tracking awaiting the outcome of Issue 2943 in the OBF. PIM 42 to stay open awaiting feedback from Change Control/Account Management efforts.

* 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.



PIM 44 is tracking awaiting the outcome of Issue 2943 in the OBF. See attached liaison letter from the OBF on Issue 2943. Action Item 0605-16 is still open.



* 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. 

Wireless Service Providers continue to work change control efforts for PIM 45 through their appropriate wireline Account Management teams.

At the September LNPA meeting, it was reported that WICIS does not currently support the return of multiple error codes. It was stated that all of the major ILECs’ EDI implementations support multiple occurrences of errors and error text, but it is possible that their processes may not support their return. The group reviewed and revised the attached PIM 45 Best Practice statement developed by Rob Smith, Syniverse.



Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will place the following text in the LNPA’s NP Best Practices document under Decisions/Recommendations for the issue and upload the revised document to the LNPA website:

When a Service Provider receives a port request, they should read as much of the port request as possible to identify and provide as much information on all errors as is possible to report on the response.

Service providers should avoid a process of only reporting one error on each response to a port request resulting in a prolonged process of submitting multiple, iterative port requests for a single port, each time restarting the response timers.

PIM 45 is closed.

* 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.



Wireless Service Providers are working 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.

Discussion on Operating Sys Changes/Mandatory Testing with NPAC (Action Item 0805-05):

* Action Item 0805-05:

At the September LNPA meeting, the group agreed to recommend to the NAPM LLC the inclusion of the following scenarios in SOW 24 for which mandatory vendor ITP and/or service provider regression testing should be performed:

Agreed upon scenarios:

Additional local system scenarios that should require mandatory ITP and Turn-up testing:

* Upgrades to OS software that result in any stack or toolkit change (Mandatory vendor ITP regression and service provider turn-up regression testing with standard regression test cases)
* Complete OS changes, e.g. OS Vendor A to OS Vendor B (Mandatory vendor ITP regression and service provider turn-up regression testing with standard regression test cases)
* For hardware changes, service provider turn-up regression testing is required if the service provider’s system is substantially different than the system used by the vendor to perform ITP testing.
* It should be noted that when including these items, we must ensure it is clear that these scenarios refer to those systems that connect to the NPAC, i.e., SOA and LSMS. If approved, this would be a change to the User testing M&P, and ultimately SOW 24.
* The Project Executives are to communicate the LNPA’s recommendation to revise SOW 24 to the NAPM LLC at their September meeting.

California Technology Overlay (Paula Jordan, T-Mobile and LNPA Co-Chair):



* Paula Jordan, T-Mobile and LNPA Co-Chair, reported that there has been an effort to get area code relief in California since 2002. The California Commission met with carriers regarding a specialized overlay. Two new NPAs, one for northern California, and one for southern California, will contain numbers for FAX machines, ATMs, pagers, point-of-sale, and VoIP. Number changes would be involved to change the NPAs of these numbers for those providers volunteering to move their existing numbers into the new overlay NPAs. New number assignments for these services would have the new NPA.
* In August, the FCC gave the California Commission delegated authority to implement these specialized overlays with some restrictions (no take backs).
* It was stated during the LNPA meeting that numbers in these NPAs may not be able to be ported inter-modally, or blocks pooled.
* The California Commission has not decided yet if they are going to implement these specialized overlays.

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

* The Committee that is developing a recommendation for changes to the LNPA’s NP Best Practices document did meet and incorporated changes suggested from the August LNPA meeting. The Committee will have an updated document for review at the October LNPA meeting.
* The Committee is proposing that Item 26, referencing the 10-digit trigger, is no longer needed. The Committee is also questioning if Item 24, related to WICIS 2.0, is needed.
* For Item 20, the Committee is proposing to clarify that LSR Req Type C is for stand-alone LNP (no loop involved). The Committee needs to verify that this is what Type C indicates.

Compliance to LRN Assignment Practices (Dave Garner, Qwest):

* Dave Garner, Qwest, described an issue related to LRN records in the NPAC that are different from or not in the LERG at all.
* This poses an issue for Qwest in that they use the LRN to determine the service provider that they should send an access bill to. Not having the correct LRN in the LERG causes manual effort to address fallout. This also causes issues with trouble-shooting. This is not a call completion issue, but an issue of automated carrier identification to determine where to send the access bills and aid in Trouble Report resolution.
* The INC’s LRN Assignment Practice states that a provider should place their LRNs in the LERG.
* A service provider participant discussed when we had a PIM where the submitter requested a feed from the NPAC to do a bash for such things as verifying accuracy of LRNs in the LERG. The participant did not want any push to require providers to put their LRNs in the LERG. Telcordia TRA provides discrepancies to carriers requesting a report.
* Dave Garner, Qwest, will draft proposed text for the LNPA NP Best Practices document for review at the October LNPA meeting.

Discussion on LRN LATA Edit in SE Region:

* The FCC issued an Order allowing porting across rate center boundaries in the Hurricane Katrina-stricken areas.
* In addition, the LLC gave NeuStar permission to relax the LRN LATA edit in the SE Region.
* If the wireless subscriber’s home network’s MSO is down, calls will not complete if the subscriber is in another area. Porting the number to another MSO in another LATA could allow some calls, e.g., wireless originated calls, to complete.
* Porting a wireline number to another working switch would then allow a Remote Call Forwarding (RCF) scenario to another working number with a loop. There are more issues with call completion on wireline originated calls when numbers are ported across LATA boundaries.
* Ron Steen, BellSouth stated:
  + From a wireline perspective, there is no gain in originating service when a number is ported across a LATA boundary. BellSouth is not porting outside the LATA, but may port within the LATA to a working switch where it would then be RFC’d to another number with a working loop. BellSouth is exploring other methodology and will more likely use AIN- based solutions for restoration of service rather than porting.
  + Ron stated that relaxing the LRN LATA edit does not solve all problems associated with call completion, and in some cases causes additional problems, and urged restoration as quickly as possible. Wireline callers within the LATA will not be able to complete calls to local numbers ported outside the LATA, or the calls will be handed off to an IXC and toll charges generated (depending on the deployed technology).
* Rick Jones, NENA, stated that NENA is concerned if wireline providers are using geographic LNP to port customers, as an example, from New Orleans to Houston. NENA can assist in providing resolutions for 911 issues. If a wireline provider is porting to Houston, and using RCF to forward to a Houston number, then call originations from that customer to 911 will display the Houston number and not the New Orleans number.

* It was suggested that we need to develop a process for eventual cleanup of these numbers that have crossed LATA boundaries. The LNPA should document what worked and what did not. This will be an agenda item for the October LNPA meeting. Ron Steen, BellSouth, will provide an update. It was agreed that the LNPA will begin developing questions, pros, and cons, related to this experience.
* Adam Newman, Telcordia and INC Vice Chair, stated that emergency code and block openings are also taking place.

**WEDNESDAY 09/14/05**

Wednesday, 09/14/05, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth (phone) | Lavinia Rotaru | | Sprint/Nextel |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth (phone) | Cindi Jones | | Sprint LTD |
| Michelle Gwaltney | Cingular | Jeff Adrian | | Sprint/Nextel |
| Renee Dillon | Cingular | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint (phone) |
| Monica Dahmen | Cox | Steve Moore | | Sprint LTD |
| Laurie Itkin | Cricket Communications | Rob Smith | | Syniverse |
| Jean Anthony | Evolving Systems | Darren Paffenroth | | Syniverse |
| Jason Lee | MCI (phone) | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec (phone) |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Shannon Sevigny | NeuStar Pooling | Jason Kempson | | Telcordia |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Alice Frailinger | | T-Mobile |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Derek Roth | | T-Mobile |
| Gene Johnston | NeuStar | Katie Hoffman | | T-Mobile |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Maggie Lee | | VeriSign |
| Dave Garner | Qwest | Nancy Davies | | Verizon (phone) |
| David Taylor | SBC | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
|  |  | Julie Anderson | | Verizon |
|  |  | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
|  |  | Deborah Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

Discussion on Range Operations Issue (NeuStar):



* Jim Rooks, NeuStar, walked the group through the attached presentation on the range operations issue discussed at the August LNPA meeting.
* With Solution 2 in the attached, if a provider sends up a range create of 1,000 TNs, and then activates 10 singles, the range would be broken up upon the first single activate. If the provider sends up a range activate of the remaining 990 TNs, the provider would still receive a range notification for the remaining 990.
* If the group agrees on Solution 2, NeuStar stated that it could be in a point release at the end of the year, or at the latest, in Release 3.3.
* A local system vendor asked if this has any impact to the requirements in NANC 179 – Range Notifications. NeuStar stated that they would have to verify any doc only changes to NANC 179.
* NeuStar further stated that some SP regression testing for Solution 2 would be appropriate.
* No changes to local systems would be required. NeuStar stated that this is a fairly minor change from a code standpoint.
* The LNPA agreed that the most optimal solution is for NPAC to break up the range information into singles upon receipt of the first request that does not match the original create range (Solution 2). NeuStar will document this solution for review at the October 2005 LNPA meeting.
* NeuStar will investigate the feasibility of implementing the point release by November 15th that includes this solution..

SPID Migration Discussion:

* Action Item 0805-08:

Service Providers are to come to the September LNPA meeting prepared to finalize the SPID migration blackout dates for 2006.

* + 2/26/06, 3/26/06, and 4/9/06 were added as SPID migration blackout dates due to the Release 3.3 loads.
  + The 2006 SPID Migration schedule agreed upon by the group is as follows:
    - * 1st Sunday of the month will be blacked out.
    - Holiday and 3.3 load blackout dates:
      * New Year’s Day – 1/1/06 is the 1st Sunday of the month
      * President’s Day 2/19/06
      * 2/26/06 (3.3 load)
      * 3/26/06 (3.3 load)
      * 4/9/06 (3.3 load)
      * Easter 4/16/06
      * Memorial Day 5/28/06
      * July 4th - that Sunday 7/2/06 is the 1st of the month
      * Labor Day – that Sunday 9/3/06 is the 1st of the month
      * Thanksgiving – 11/26/06
      * Christmas – 12/24/06
      * New Year’s Eve – 12/31/06
* Discussion of maintenance window duration and maximum number of SPID migrations in a window (Action Items 0705-16 and 0805-07):
  + Action Item 0705-16:

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, respectively. 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. This determination should be made in the context of the proposed expansion of all Sunday maintenance windows to run from midnight to 10am Central to accommodate additional SPID migrations (see Action Item 0805-07).

* Action Item 0805-07:

At the August LNPA meeting, it was suggested that we lengthen all Sunday maintenance windows to run from midnight to 10am Central, in order to accommodate additional SPID migrations. Service Providers are to discuss this internally and come prepared to address at the September LNPA meeting.

* + - It was agreed to recommend to the LLC that maintenance windows will be midnight to 10am Central each Sunday as of January 1, 2006. NPAC will be required to come back up by 9am Central for each window.
    - A number of providers raised concerns that the number of SVs involved in the migrations determines how many migrations can be supported in a window.
    - As a result of the agreed-upon longer Sunday maintenance window, it was agreed that the new caps for SPID migrations during a maintenance window will be 7 per region, and 25 nationally. The LRN cap remains 100. This will be monitored to see if we can increase at a later time after the 1st quarter of 2006. No cap was placed on the quantity of TNs.
    - It was suggested that the SPID migration process could possibly be automated to make the changes from the SMURF files over the interface. This will be discussed at the October LNPA meeting.
* SPID Migration SP Checklist (Action Item 0805-02) (Jeff Adrian, Sprint):
* Action Item 0805-02:

Jeff Adrian, Sprint, will add text to the Service Provider SPID Migration

Checklist based on the following:

* Is this code migration due to an ownership change of an abandoned code solely to keep it active in the network?
* If so, are there alternatives that would be more appropriate (e.g., pool any blocks to be retained or delete and add back any active SVs)?



* + - Jeff Adrian, Sprint, presented the attached draft SP Checklist addressing Action Item 0805-02. There were no objections to the changes. Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will accept the revisions and upload the document to the LNPA website.
* NeuStar will modify the SPID migration M&P to:

1. eliminate the requirement that the SP indicate an actual LERG-effective date when requesting to schedule the SPID migration, and
2. reflect in the NPAC SPID Migration process description the LNPA’s agreed-upon new limits on the number of migrations that can be supported during a maintenance window, i.e., 7 per region and 25 nationally (pending LLC approval).

Discussion on the Porting of 10K TNs in an NXX code (David Taylor, SBC):

* David Taylor, SBC, stated that SBC has observed that it appears 5 NXXs were opened over the course of two days and almost immediately, thousands of numbers were ported to the LRN of the same switch that the codes were assigned to in the LERG. He asked why that provider would do this.
* The SPID against the codes is the same as the New SP SPID on the individual SVs.
* David will contact that carrier to determine why this was done and report to the LNPA at the October meeting.

2006 Meeting Schedule:

Following is the meeting schedule for the 2006 LNPA Meetings.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MONTH/**  **DATE**  **(2006)** | NANC | LNPA-WG | HOST | LOCATION |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| January | 24th | 10th-11th | Syniverse | Tampa, Florida |
| February | No meeting | No meeting |  |  |
| March | 14th | 7th-8th  9th is tentative date for X-Regional | NeuStar | TBD |
| April | No meeting | No meeting |  |  |
| May | 16th | 9th-10th | Sprint/Nextel | Overland Park, Kansas |
| June | No meeting | No meeting |  |  |
| July | 18th | 11th-12th | Canadian Consortium | TBD |
| August | No meeting | No meeting |  |  |
| September | 19th | 12th-13th | Verizon | TBD |
| October | No meeting | No meeting |  |  |
| November | 30th | 7th-8th | SBC | St. Louis, Missouri |
| December | No meeting | No meeting |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Development of the September 2005 LNPA Report to NANC (Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair):

* The group agreed that the September 2005 NANC report would contain the following items:
* Release 3.3 status
* Status of open PIMs
  + Highlight PA Change Order 41 which impacts PIM 24.
* Relaxation of the LRN LATA edit in the Southeast Region and the fact that the LNPA is being proactive in identifying any issues.
* Encouraging VoIP providers to attend the LNPA.
* Issue related to Evidence of Authorization.

Review of August Action Items:



* Item 0805-01: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0805-02: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0805-03: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0805-04: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0805-05: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0805-06: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0805-07: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0805-08: This item has been completed and is Closed.

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 0405-06: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0605-14: This item remains Open.
* Item 0605-16: This item remains Open.
* Item 0605-19: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0605-22: This item remains Open.
* Item 0705-04: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0705-16: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0705-17: This item remains Open.
* Item 0705-18: This item has been completed and is Closed.

Unfinished/New Business:

* Ron Steen, BellSouth, proposed that the group encourage VoIP providers to attend LNPA meetings. VoIP providers are starting to port, right now mainly through CLEC partners, but providers have petitioned to obtain their own numbers directly from NANPA. SBC IS has been granted a waiver. Ron suggested that the LNPA explore ways to encourage VoIP providers to attend the LNPA meetings. It was suggested that we draft a letter to the ENUM LLC, ENUM Forum, and VON Coalition encouraging participation from their members. The VON Coalition’s website is [www.von.org](http://www.von.org). This will be an agenda item for the October LNPA meeting.
* Steve Addicks, NeuStar, reported that the trial of the shortened CMIP retry timer (1x15 minutes) in the SE region has produced no issues. Positive feedback has been received from some carriers. The LNPA agreed to recommend to the LLC to make the SE timer change permanent and to extend the same change to the other 6 regions. It was also agreed that there is no need to stagger the remaining 6 regions. Project Executives will communicate this recommendation to the NAPM LLC at their September meeting. Once approved by the LLC, NeuStar will send out a notification on the X-regional distribution list as to when it will be done.
* Jeff Adrian, Sprint, raised an issue related to some service providers requiring evidence of end user authorization before they will return a requested Customer Service Record in order to begin the porting process. Jeff will revise the attached LNPA Position Paper, previously endorsed by NANC and forwarded to the FCC, for review at the October 2005 LNPA meeting.



* Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, stated that a small rural wireless carrier that has never attended the LNPA is requiring the customer’s date of birth on the WPR. It was stated that if providers have a trading partner profile with that carrier and it is not part of the requirements on their profile, they cannot require it.
* Jim Rooks, NeuStar, stated that there will not be any testing for NANC 399 in this round of testing. Tests will be conducted to ensure that nothing is broken as a result of its inclusion in Release 3.3 in an inactive state. Jim asked if the LNPA wants to integrate the NANC 399 Change Order document into the Release 3.3 FRS, IIS, ASN.1, and GDMO documentation. The LNPA agreed that it would be appropriate.

NeuStar will make it clear in the documentation that NANC 399 is currently in Release 3.3 in an inactive state. This will be on the agenda for the October 2005 LNPA meeting.

***Next LNPA Meeting …******October 18-19, 2005, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida – Hosted by***

***Sprint/Nextel***