LNPA WORKING GROUP

March 2008 Meeting

Final Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Denver, Colorado | Host: Comcast |

**TUESDAY 03/11/08**

Tuesday, 03/11/08, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Tina Plaisance | Alltel (phone) | Stephen Addicks | | NeuStar |
| Joe Cudo | Alltel (phone) | Marcel Champagne | | NeuStar |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Paul LaGattuta | | NeuStar |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T (phone) | Dave Garner | | NeuStar |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | Mike Panis | | NeuStar |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Mobility | Linda Peterman | | One Communications |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian Consortium | Mary Retka | | Qwest |
| Mike Lofton | CenturyTel | Matt Kohly | | Socket |
| Bill Solis | Comcast | Carol Frike | | Sprint Nextel (phone) |
| Cindy Sheehan | Comcast | Rosemary Emmer | | Sprint Nextel |
| Nancy Sanders | Comcast | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint Nextel |
| Jen Asptsuagh | Comcast | Michael Klappa | | Sprint Nextel (phone) |
| Chris Brown | Cox | Adam Newman | | Telcordia (phone) |
| Vicki Goth | Embarq | Dawn Kaplan | | Telcordia (phone) |
| Therese Mooney | Global Crossing (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW (phone) | Mohamed Samater | | T-Mobile |
| Angie Beckett | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Craig Burton | | VeriSign (phone) |
| Bridgette | Metro PCS (phone) | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Lynette Khirallah | NetNumber (phone) | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| Karen Mulberry | NeuStar | Jason Lee | | Verizon (phone) |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Sara Hooker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Michael O’Connor | NeuStar | Kathy Rogers | | Verizon Wireless |
| Charles Ryburn | NeuStar (phone) | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar Clearinghouse | Tom Zablocki | | Vonage |
| Tara Farquhar | NeuStar Pooling (phone) | Darren Krebs | | Vonage |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

NOTE: ALL ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “MARCH 2008 LNPA ACTION ITEMS” FILE ISSUED IN A SEPARATE E-MAIL FROM THESE MINUTES.

**MEETING MINUTES:**

2008 LNPA WG Meeting/Call Schedule:

Following is the meeting schedule for the 2008 LNPA WG meetings and calls.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MONTH/**  **DATE**  **(2008)** | NANC | LNPA WG | HOST | LOCATION |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| January | TBD | 8th-9th | Telcordia | Scottsdale, Arizona |
| February | 22nd | No meeting.  2/5/08 call from 1pm to 5pm Eastern time, dial-in bridge number is 888-412-7808, pin 23272# |  |  |
| March | TBD | 11th-12th | Comcast | Denver, Colorado |
| April | TBD | No meeting.  No call scheduled for 4/8/08. |  |  |
| May | TBD | 6th-7th | Sprint Nextel | Overland Park, Kansas |
| June | TBD | No meeting.  6/10/08 call if necessary. |  |  |
| July | TBD | 15th-16th | NeuStar | Boston, Massachusetts  (TENTATIVE) |
| August | TBD | No meeting.  8/12/08 call if necessary. |  |  |
| September | TBD | 9th-10th | Canadian Consortium | Ottawa, Canada |
| October | TBD | No meeting.  10/14/08 call if necessary |  |  |
| November | TBD | 11th-12th | T-Mobile | Irvine, California |
| December | TBD | No meeting.  12/16/08 call if necessary |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

* Continuing evaluation during 2008 will determine if interim conference calls are needed or if the decision to meet face-to-face every other month should be revisited.

01/08 Meeting Minutes Review:

* No changes were made to the DRAFT January 2008 LNPA WG Minutes and they were accepted as FINAL.

02/08 Call Minutes Review:

* No changes were made to the DRAFT February 2008 LNPA WG Minutes and they were accepted as FINAL.

# OBF Wireless Committee and Intermodal Subcommittee Update (Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless and OBF Wireless Committee Co-Chair):

# During OBF 101, the Wireless Committee discussed the need for an Intermodal porting process with a standardized implementation. The committee developed a minimal list of long term objectives to use in developing such a process along with a list of preferred fields to be used for Intermodal porting that were submitted and discussed during the Intermodal Subcommittee meeting on January 30th. The objectives were modified during the Intermodal Subcommittee meeting and the revised list includes the following 6 objectives.

Intermodal Long Term Objectives:

* 1. Ensure that electronic versions will support XML only and manual process will support FAX/GUI.
  2. Define a standardized process that supports a potential reduction of the porting interval.
  3. Define a process for all Intermodal porting, ie. simple and complex
  4. Reach an agreement that this is a bilateral Intermodal porting mechanism
  5. This will be integrated into the LSOG and WICIS.
  6. To reduce interoperability issues, agreement on message structures, element definitions and descriptions is needed.

It was noted that while the committee develops an Intermodal process, Service Providers are to use Wireless porting forms when porting away from Wireless and use Wireline porting forms when porting away from Wireline.

* The Wireless Committee worked on the action item from the LNPA WG to develop a list of fields needed to accomplish a Wireless to Wireless port. Correspondence for the LNPA WG was developed that is currently being reviewed by ATIS leadership. Essentially, the correspondence notes that WICIS has been implemented by Wireless carriers in a standardized fashion thereby eliminating system management and operational issues that result from providers having differing implementations. In 2007 approximately 85% of all wireless ports were completed in under 3 hours using at least 25 fields, with only 3 fields being used for end user validation.
* Issues:
* Issue 3221 addressing potential changes from the FCC Order 07-188 remains open.
* Issue 3029 (Data Mapping between LSOG and WICIS) was tabled during OBF 100. The Issue champion, Telcordia, noted that the mapping analysis performed between LSOG and WICIS could be of value in developing a long term Intermodal porting process. If there is consensus between the LSOP and Wireless Committees on a standard Intermodal porting process, then the mapping analysis is not needed. However, if the LSOP and Wireless Committees cannot agree on a standard process for Intermodal porting the mapping analysis document would assist vendors when sending the LSR to Wireline carriers. Issue 3029 remains tabled pending standard Intermodal porting process discussion results.
* Issue 3062 addressing the creation of a separate fax document for porting from Wireless providers was placed into Initial Closure. Subsequent to OBF 101, a document error was found and a new Issue was accepted to remove the dash in the Group Request Number and Group Response Number examples. This issue is in Initial Closure.
* Issue 3118, WICIS support of Wireline Jeopardy Responses, was worked. The committee agreed to add a new WPRR-JEOPARDY message to WICIS that is similar to the WPRR-Resolution Required message. JCODE and JDET fields will be used instead of RCODE and RDET to display the information sent from the Wireline carrier. This issue remains open while data dictionary documentation and process flows are updated. In an effort to provide the WICIS release following 4.0.0 as soon as possible, the participants agreed to close the issue after review and acceptance of the updated documentation and without updates to the XML or WSDL. It was noted that a timeline for sunrise of 3Q 2009 could be possible if the jeopardy documentation is completed and the scope of necessary changes understood by the end of August 2008.
* Issue 3235 addresses a discrepancy in WICIS 4.0.0 between the data dictionary and the LNUM field definition in the XSD. It was agreed that in ICP to ICP communication, the LNUM field will be sent as a simple integer (no leading zeros). In ICP to OSS communication, the LNUM field may contain leading zeros if desired. No change will be made to the WICIS 4.0.0 data dictionary or XSD. A future issue will be necessary to update the appropriate WICIS documentation for the LNUM field. This issue was Fast Tracked and has gone to Final Closure.
* Issue 3236 addresses a discrepancy in the message element definitions for Group Request Number and Group Response Number in the WICIS 4.0.0 Data Dictionary. It was agreed that in the next version of WICIS, the examples for these two fields will be edited to remove the dashes. In WICIS 4.0.0 the dashes won’t be allowed in the Group Request Number and Group Response Number fields. This issue was Fast Tracked and has gone to Final Closure.

Intermodal Subcommittee:

* The Wireless committee requested clarification on the Account Number and Zip Code fields that are on the Simple Port Service Request (SPSR). It was noted that the Account Number field can be longer than 20 positions based on the carrier backend systems, but it can be found on the CSR and it is optional because not all Wireline carriers require that the field be populated. The Zip Code field would be validated based on what is currently found in the CSR.
* New Issue 3223 addressing Simple Port Request changes mandated by FCC Order 07-188 was accepted. The purpose of this issue is to solve the Intermodal porting problem.
* The committee reviewed a combined list of fields from the SPSR and WICIS submitted by the Wireless Committee that could potentially be used for a standard Intermodal process. The initial list did not include fields that might be needed for subsequent responses and SUPs. The Wireless Committee took an action item to identify those additional fields. The LSOP committee took an action item to review the data elements to decide what is necessary for complex requests and for resellers to develop responses.
* During subsequent interim meetings, the Wireless committee reviewed the Data Dictionary and developed a starting list of responses and SUPS.
* During the March 7th Intermodal subcommittee meeting, the LSOP committee stated that they could not reach agreement on creating an Intermodal process that could be used for both simple and complex ports. Both committees took action items to discuss this matter further.
* Next meeting:

OBF #102 will be held during the ATIS Annual Meeting of Committees. The Wireless Committee will meet Monday, April 28 – Wednesday, April 30. The Intermodal Subcommittee will meet on Monday, April 28 at OBF #102. The Wireless Technical Subcommittee will not meet at OBF #102.

* Further discussion took place during the LNPA WG meeting with regard to FCC Order 07-188.
  + It was stated, with most agreeing, that the extension to 7/31/08 granted by the FCC is in order to comply with the 4 LNP validation fields. The OBF Intermodal Subcommittee is working to identify additional fields that could be used on a single form for all simple and complex ports, including intermodal.
  + A provider stated that there is still an open question as to the intent of the FCC Order with respect to LNP validation fields and whether or not additional administrative fields could be required. Some providers are waiting for the FCC to clarify before they do any development work on additional fields.

Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Update (Adam Newman, Telcordia & INC Chair):

* INC Issue 510: Video Relay Service (VRS) Alternatives – The INC has completed its report on Issue 510 and presented it to NANC on 2/22/08. NANC will likely set up an Issues Management Group (IMG) to continue the work. The INC report outlined two primary options – NPAC and DNS-based. The report also concluded that VRS providers should utilize geographic NANP numbers for assignment to their end users obtained from NANPA/PA or an underlying LEC.
* INC Issue 572 updates the PAS guidelines.
* INC Issue 576 amends the TBPAG to address double assignment of pooled TNs. It proposes updates to clarify relevant responsibilities. Based on current guidelines, the customer assigned the number the longest gets to keep the number when double assigned. INC is reviewing that language. It was suggested that the INC and LNPA WG collaborate.
* INC Issue 577 – limit test numbers to assigned 1K blocks. This issue seeks to add language to guidelines to ensure SPs select test numbers for their assigned NXXs from assigned 1K blocks.

NANC Future of Numbering Working Group Update (Adam Newman, Telcordia & FoN Co-Chair):

* Adam Newman, Telcordia and FoN Co-Chair, walked the group through the attached 2/22/08 FoN report to NANC, focusing on the disposition of numbering issues currently under consideration by the FoN (reference slide 5).



Wireless Testing Subcommittee (Mohamed Samater (T-Mobile) and Teresa Patton (AT&T), WTSC Co-Chairs):

* Mohamed Samater (T-Mobile), WTSC Co-Chair, reported that the Subcommittee met several times since the last LNPA WG meeting. The WICIS 4.0 carrier test plan has been finalized. Vendor-to-vendor testing will start 3/8/08 and end on 5/15/08. The WICIS 4.0 flash cut is scheduled for 9/14/08.

Pre-Port Subcommittee (Sue Tiffany – Sprint Nextel/Nancy Sanders – Comcast):

* No Pre-Port Subcommittee meeting was held since the January 2008 LNPA WG meeting. The Subcommittee is on hold pending implementation of FCC Order 07-188.

Architecture Planning Team (APT) Readout (Jim Rooks, NeuStar):

* No APT meeting was held at the January 2008 LNPA WG meeting.

PIM Discussion:

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



The issue is now in a Tracking state awaiting implementation of FCC Order 07-188.

* 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.



The issue is now in a Tracking state awaiting implementation of FCC Order 07-188.

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



NeuStar developed Change Order 414 proposing an automated process to prevent the wrong service provider from opening up a code in NPAC. PIM 51 is now tracking NANC 414 for the automated solution.

Regarding the attached manual process for the PIM 51 cleanup in NPAC, the NAPM LLC approved the LNPA WG’s recommendation to request a Statement of Work (SOW) from NeuStar at their September 2007 meeting. The SOW for manual cleanup is under development by NeuStar. It is anticipated that the SOW could be submitted around the May 2008 LLC meeting. NANC 402 is the Change Order for the manual cleanup.



* PIM 54 – This PIM, submitted by Comcast, seeks to reduce the interval for certain wireline-wireline and inter-modal ports to one day.



Comcast reiterated that they still wish to pursue the one-day porting interval proposed in PIM 54. The PIM 54 proposal applies to simple ports for e-bonded (e.g., XML and EDI) providers.

It was stated that although the NPRM contained in FCC Order 07-188 tentatively concludes a 48 hour interval, it does not preclude comments on a shorter interval than 48 hours. A question was asked related to the FOC interval and when the clock starts on both the PIM proposal and the 48 hours in the NPRM. Comcast stated that in the context of PIM 54, for e-bonded, they are seeing creates and concurrences within 2 hours.

Discussion then ensued on the setting of the 10-digit trigger. Some providers stated that they set the trigger very quickly if there is no fallout, but there is no guarantee on any given port that no fallout will occur. Some providers set the trigger via a batch process.

Several providers then discussed their issues with not receiving the FOC within the required 24 hours. Some providers have responded to complaints stating that it is only a guideline and not a regulatory requirement.

Comcast suggested a Best Practice for next day porting and allowing providers to work together to implement the Best Practice. Another provider suggested that this issue could remain open and allow the Comment and Reply Comment rounds on the NPRM in FCC Order 07-188 cycle through and then the LNPA WG could discuss this issue after the FCC rules.

Nancy Sanders, Comcast, will add text to PIM 54 addressing the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) interval and when the clock starts on the proposed next-day interval – e.g., upon receipt of the LSR or upon transmission of the FOC.

Service Providers are to discuss internally what caveats would have to be in place in an LNPA WG Best Practice in order to support a next day porting interval, if they can support it. This will be discussed at the May 2008 LNPA WG meeting.

* PIM 55 – This PIM, submitted by the NeuStar Clearinghouse Vendor, seeks to address issues related to wireline Provider Initiated Activity.



This issue is now in a tracking state awaiting inclusion in the next WICIS Release beyond 4.0, which will likely be deployed sometime in 2009.

* PIM 61 – This PIM, submitted by South Central Rural Telephone Coop. Corp. Inc., Duo County Telephone Cooperative Corp., Inc, North Central Rural Telephone Coop., and PNG Telecommunications, seeks to have implemented a VPN access solution for LTI users.



At their September 2007 meeting, the NAPM LLC approved the LNPA WG’s recommendation to request an SOW from NeuStar for a VPN access solution for LTI users. The request for an SOW was subsequently submitted and NeuStar provided the requested SOW. The SOW for VPN access was reviewed and approved at the NAPM LLC’s November 2007 meeting. NeuStar implemented VPN access for LTI users in January 2008. PIM 61 is now Closed.

* PIM 64 – This PIM, submitted by VeriSign, proposes a new tunable parameter in NPAC to allow the suppression of LTI-initiated transactions to the mechanized SOAs.



PIM 64 was accepted at the September 2007 LNPA WG meeting. Chipp Nelson, VeriSign, submitted NANC Change Order 423 to address the issue identified in PIM 64. PIM 64 is now in a Tracking state.

* PIM 65 – This PIM, submitted by VeriSign, proposes a priority scheme in NPAC for the notifications generated by the disconnection of pooled thousands blocks.



PIM 65 was accepted at the September 2007 LNPA WG meeting. Chipp Nelson, VeriSign, submitted NANC Change Order 424 to address the issue identified in PIM 65. PIM 65 is now in a Tracking state.

* PIM 66 – This PIM, submitted by VeriSign, seeks to address the data that is received when Mass Updates are performed.



PIM 66 was accepted on the October 2007 LNPA WG conference call. Chipp Nelson, VeriSign, submitted NANC Change Order 426 to address the issue identified in PIM 66. PIM 66 is now in a Tracking state.

Unified Modeling Approach Presentation (11am Mountain Time Hard Start) (Dawn Kaplan – Telcordia):



* Dawn Kaplan, Telcordia, gave the attached presentation related to the work in the ATIS Ordering & Billing Forum (OBF) on adopting a Unified Modeling Approach to the development of processes such as ordering, provisioning, billing, repair, etc,. The goals of the OBF and the benefits to the industry for such approach are discussed in the attached Powerpoint slide deck.
* Non-OBF funding companies can purchase the documents on the ATIS website.
* It was stated that this presentation is related to our ongoing discussion of NANC 372 in the Architecture Planning Team (APT) on the possibility of migrating from CMIP to XML and the drivers that might drive such a migration.
* CMIP is considered a binary protocol and XML is ASCII and has a larger message size. CMIP uses a 96 character digital signature that is encrypted for security. XML encrypts the entire message which has much more overhead.
* It was asked what the benefit is to providers and if there is a common gateway benefit. It was stated that one benefit is that there is more development support for XML with IT groups.

2008 LNPA WG Meeting/Call Schedule Update:

* The July 2008 LNPA WG face-to-face meeting is tentatively going to be held in Boston, Massachusetts, and hosted by NeuStar.

Review of NIIF Documents (Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair):

 

* Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, discussed the request from the NIIF for service providers to update their respective company’s LNP contact list using the attached instructions for accessing the list on the NIIF website. Refer to Final CSCD instructions.doc attached above. Service Providers are to access the NIIF contact list using the attached instructions and update their respective company contacts if necessary. A readout of their efforts will be provided at the May 2008 LNPA WG meeting.
* With regard to the NIIF’s request for the LNPA WG to review the LNP section of their Mergers and Acquisitions document, the group made the attached revisions for submission to the NIIF.



Feb. 22nd NANC Meeting Readout (Gary Sacra/Paula Jordan, LNPA WG Co-Chairs):

* Gary Sacra and Paula Jordan, LNPA WG Co-Chairs, provided a readout to the group on the February 22, 2008 NANC meeting. They stated that there were no objections raised to the proposed revisions to the LNP Provisioning Flows related to the implementation of FCC Order 07-188. When asked about the disposition of the recommended two additional LSR fields – New Provider SPID and Desired Due Date – the Co-Chairs recounted the discussion that took place at the NANC meeting and stated that indications at that time were that the recommendation may not be forwarded to the FCC, although it did appear that the flows would be endorsed and submitted to the FCC.
* Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will follow up with NANC Chairman Tom Koutsky in order to determine the disposition of the revised NANC LNP Provisioning Flows that resulted from FCC Order 07-188, and the recommended two additional LSR fields – New Provider SPID and Desired Due Date.
* It was then suggested by a participant that a Best Practice be developed addressing the recommended two additional LSR fields. Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will develop a draft Best Practice addressing the recommended two additional fields (New Provider SPID and Desired Due Date). The Best Practice will also acknowledge that the industry is working on recommended additional fields that may be incorporated into the Best Practice at a future date.

See revised Best Practices for new Item 55. This was developed, reviewed, and accepted during the March 2008 LNPA WG meeting.



* A participant suggested that service providers should provide comments to the FCC on the need for the OBF to come to consensus on additional necessary LSR fields.

New PIM/Change Order (NeuStar):



* The attached PIM 67, submitted by NeuStar, proposes LNPA WG approval of an upgrade from FTP (File Transfer Protocol) to SFTP (Secure File Transfer Protocol) for all file transfers between the NPAC and the Users. It was agreed that this PIM would be withdrawn in lieu of a Change Order to be submitted by NeuStar. The number 67 will be reused for the next submitted PIM.
* NeuStar is to develop a NANC Change Order addressing the attached PIM 67, which was withdrawn by NeuStar at the March 2008 meeting. The Change Order will address moving from supporting both FTP and Secure FTP (SFTP) to supporting SFTP only.
* LNPA WG Participants are to determine if there is any objection to migrating to strictly Secure FTP.

New Business:

* Renee Dillon, AT&T Mobility, discussed the need to align the WICIS 4.0 flash cut on 9/14/08 at midnight eastern time with the Sunday Service Provider maintenance window, which begins at 1a.m. eastern time. Wireless Service Providers are to determine if there is any impact to their LSMSs if there is no alignment of the 9/14/08 WICIS 4.0 planned flash cut time (Midnight Eastern) with the Sunday Maintenance Window (1a.m. Eastern). If they are not aligned, no ICP/LSR confirmations will take place on any port involving wireless for that one hour.

**WEDNESDAY 03/12/08**

Wednesday, 03/12/08, Attendance:

| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Phil Maxwell | 3 Rivers Comm. (phone) | A. J. Passarella | | Loretto Telco (phone) |
| Jim Walter | 702 Communications (phone) | Robert Schwartz | | Madison Tel. Co. (phone) |
| Steven Katka | Albany Mutual Tel. Assn. (phone) | Dean Mohs | | Mainstream Comm. (phone) |
| Tina Plaisance | Alltel (phone) | Carol Bertram | | Melrose Tel. Co. (phone) |
| Joe Cudo | Alltel (phone) | Paula McGraw | | Minford Telco (phone) |
| Kelly Hoffman | All West Comm (phone) | Daphne Lisac | | Molalla Comm. (phone) |
| Lyle Anderson | Arctic Slope Tel. Coop. (phone) | Geoff Feiss | | Montana Telecom Assn (phone) |
| Charlie Carpenter | Arctic Slope Tel. Coop. (phone) | David Cawthon | | Moultrie Independent  Tel. Co. (phone) |
| Mark Birkholz | Arvig Comm. Systems (phone) | Lana Ingram | | Mountain Telephone (phone) |
| Donald Miller | Ayrshire Farmers Mutual Telco (phone) | Diana Coleman | | Mt. Angel Telephone (phone) |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Shannon Sevigny | | NeuStar Pooling (phone) |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T (phone) | Mubeen Saifullah | | NeuStar Clearinghouse |
| Tracy Guidotti | AT&T (phone) | Karen Mulberry | | NeuStar |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | Dave Garner | | NeuStar |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Mobility | Jim Rooks | | NeuStar |
| Peggy Briesh | Baca Valley Tel. Co. (phone) | John Nakamura | | NeuStar |
| Paul Hauer | Beaver Creek Coop. (phone) | Marcel Champagne | | NeuStar |
| James Beattie | BEV Comm (phone) | Mike Panis | | NeuStar |
| Bob Gannon | Blackduck Telco (phone) | Paul Lagattuta | | NeuStar |
| Bill Squires | Blackfoot Comm. (phone) | Steve Addicks | | NeuStar |
| Duane Bronson | Blanchard Tel. (phone) | Emory Graffis | | Northeast Nebraska Telco (phone) |
| David Carson | BPS Telephone (phone) | Rick Finnigan | | NW Rural Telcos (phone) |
| Trip England | Brydon Law (phone) | Linda Peterman | | One Communications |
| Connie DeRouen | Cameron Comm. (phone) | Jeffrey Beck | | Oregon-Idaho Utilities (phone) |
| Marty Meche | Cameron Comm. (phone) | Daryl Ecker | | Otter Tail Telcom (phone) |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian Consortium | Andrew Randol | | Panora Telco (phone) |
| Keith Galitz | Canby Telcom (phone) | Dave Bickett | | Park Region Mutual Telephone (phone) |
| Sharon Bighouse | Canby Telcom (phone) | Gary Johnson | | Paul Bunyan Telephone (phone) |
| Harold Oster | Cascade Utilities (phone) | Jerry Schlachter | | Pioneer Tel. Coop. (phone) |
| Cal Simshaw | CenturyTel | Shari Flanders | | Polar Communications (phone) |
| Max Cox | CenturyTel (phone) | Mary Retka | | Qwest |
| Doug Cooley | CenturyTel (phone) | Frank Anderson | | Range Telco (phone) |
| Mike Lofton | CenturyTel | Robin Stephens | | Range Telco (phone) |
| Brent Christensen | Christensen Comm. (phone) | Jack Plecity | | Red River Rural Tel (phone) |
| Michael East | Clay County Rural Tel. Coop. (phone) | Joyce Nelson | | Roome Telecom (phone) |
| Mitchell Moore | Clear Creek Telephone (phone) | Paul Stowman | | Rothsay Telephone (phone) |
| Gary Witt | Colorado Telecom (phone) | Becky Dooley | | RT Communications (phone) |
| Bill Solis | Comcast | Vera Landstrom | | Sacred Wind Comms. (phone) |
| Cindy Sheehan | Comcast | Debbie Ailey | | Salina-Spavinaw Telco (phone) |
| Nancy Sanders | Comcast | Kirk Petty | | Santa Rosa Tel. Coop. (phone) |
| Jen Asptsuagh | Comcast | George Wallin | | Sherburne Co. Rural Telephone (phone) |
| Chris Brown | Cox | Thomas Campbell | | Sherburne Co. Rural Telephone (phone) |
| Jennifer Hutton | Cox (phone) | James Lowers | | Siskiyou Telephone (phone) |
| Chuck Helgerson | Eastern Slope Rural Tel (phone) | Hilda Fry | | Smithville Telco (phone) |
| Sharon Snider | Egyptian Telephone (phone) | Matt Kohly | | Socket |
| Molly Heady | Ellington Tel. Co. (phone) | Gary Gilmer | | Southwest Texas Telco (phone) |
| Vicki Goth | Embarq | Michael Klappa | | Sprint Nextel (phone) |
| Linda Peterson | Emily Coop Telco (phone) | Rosemary Emmer | | Sprint Nextel |
| Bob Olson | Emily Coop Telco (phone) | Sue Tiffany | | Sprint Nextel |
| David Robinson | ENMR Tel. Coop. (phone) | Don Lawrence | | Stayton Cooperative (phone) |
| Danny Kellar | Etex Telephone (phone) | Greg Morasch | | St. John Telephone (phone) |
| Matt Atkinson | Fairpoint (phone) | Gary Schropp | | Swisher Telco (phone) |
| Steve Zacharzuk | Fairpoint (phone) | Margie Mersman | | TCA Tel. (phone) |
| Kevin Beyer | Farmers Mutual Tel (phone) | Jon D. Loe | | TCA Tel. (phone) |
| Pat Knutson | Federated Telephone (phone) | Chris Pilgrim | | TCA Tel. (phone) |
| Robert Binder | Frontier Comm. (phone) | Joel Dohmeier | | TDS Telecom (phone) |
| Aloa Stevens | Frontier Comm. (phone) | Dean Bahls | | Tekstar Comm. (phone) |
| Ingo Henningsen | Frontier Comm. (phone) | D. Goggins | | Telalaska (phone) |
| David Rudd | Gallatin River Comm (phone) | Steve Hanson | | Tenino Telco (phone) |
| Dave Wolf | Gardonville Coop. (phone) | Dennis Rose | | Texas Statewide Tel. Coop. (phone) |
| John Silk | Georgia Tel. Assoc. (phone) | Lyn Kamerman | | Texas Telephone Assn. (phone) |
| John Hoffmann | Gervais Telephone (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Rod Cotton | Grand River Mutual Telephone (phone) | Mohamed Samater | | T-Mobile |
| Renee Reeter | Green Hills Tel Corp. (phone) | Dale Merten | | Toledo Telephone (phone) |
| Robert Hunt | Guadalupe Valley Tel. (phone) | Deborah Nobles | | Townes Telecom (phone) |
| Ken Snow | GVNW (phone) | Rick Stevens | | Triangle Tel. Coop. (phone) |
| Dorrene Benthin | GVNW (phone) | Gail Rainey | | Triangle Tel. Coop. (phone) |
| Carsten Koldsbaek | GVNW (phone) | Carolyn Ricks | | Tri-County Telephone Membership Corp. (phone) |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW (phone) | Jeff Goodrich | | UBTA-UBET Communications (phone) |
| Ann Vick | GVNW (phone) | Robert Fiedler | | Valley Telephone (phone) |
| Courtney Spears | GVNW (phone) | Virgil Barnard | | Valley Telecom Group (phone) |
| Bob Weiss | Hector Communications Corp. (phone) | Chipp Nelson | | VeriSign |
| Monty Morrow | Hutchinson Telco (phone) | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| James Brooks | Inland Net (phone) | Jason Lee | | Verizon (phone) |
| Jerry Burmeister | Interstate Telcom (phone) | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Douglas Meredith | JSI Tel. (phone) | Sara Hooker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Angie Beckett | JSI Tel. (phone) | Kathy Rogers | | Verizon Wireless |
| Wes Robinson | JSI Tel. (phone) | Tom Zablocki | | Vonage |
| Craig Johnson | Johnson Law (phone) | Darren Krebs | | Vonage |
| Rick Vitzthum | Kalama Telco (phone) | Daryl Carlson | | Webster-Calhoun Coop (phone) |
| Troy Danos | Lafourche Telephone (phone) | Robert S. Snyder | | Whidbey Tel. Co. (phone) |
| Mark Irish | La Harpe Telco (phone) | Paula Hustead | | Windstream (phone) |
|  |  | Steve Weeks | | Windstream (phone) |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

PIM 60 Best Practice Discussion (All):



* The discussion of the PIM 60 Best Practice (Best Practice 50) was scheduled for a hard start at 8:30a.m. Mountain Time, on Wednesday, March 12, 2008. An unusually large number of participants joined the conference bridge for the discussion. Due to the number of participants on the bridge, it was agreed that those on the bridge would send an e-mail message to Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, at [gary.m.sacra@verizon.com](mailto:gary.m.sacra@verizon.com), and provide a positive statement of their attendance on the bridge during the discussion. It was stated that only those indicating attendance on the bridge during the March 12, 2008 discussion via the agreed-upon e-mail message would be shown as in attendance in the meeting minutes.
* Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, teed up the discussion on Best Practice 50 by recapping the discussion regarding CenturyTel’s Minority Report (attached above) and the resultant action item assigned to the LNPA WG by the North American Numbering Council (NANC) at the February 22, 2008 NANC meeting.
  + - In response to CenturyTel’s Minority Report (attached above) presented at the 2/22/08 NANC meeting, which proposed revisions to the 3rd and 4th conditions in Best Practice 50, the NANC charged the LNPA WG with revisiting the 3rd and 4th conditions in its Best Practice 50 and determining if consensus could be reached on any clarifying modifications. In setting the parameters for the discussion, the NANC Chairman directed the Working Group as follows:
      * The discussion would be limited to the 3rd and 4th conditions only.
      * Any revision of these two conditions reached by consensus would be only to clarify the original intent of the conditions, and not to change that original intent.
      * The LNPA WG would not take an up-or-down vote on the changes proposed by CenturyTel.
      * Discussion of Best Practice 50 would be limited to the March 2008 LNPA WG meeting only.
      * If consensus on any revisions could not be reached, the current text of conditions 3 and 4 would stand.
    - Conditions 3 and 4 of Best Practice 50 currently read as follows:
      * Condition 3: “The New Service Provider already serves the Rate Center associated with the customer’s number(s) out of the same switch to which they want to port this customer's number(s).”
      * Condition 4: “The New Service Provider switch that already serves the Rate Center of the customer’s number(s) has an existing POI at the ILEC's tandem over which calls to these numbers are routed. If this customer's number(s) are ported into the New Service Provider switch, they would be routed over the same POI, and then the New Service Provider would deliver the calls to the customer's premise that is located outside of the Rate Center associated with the customer’s Number(s).”
    - At the 2/22/08 NANC meeting, CenturyTel proposed the following revisions to the NANC:
      * Condition 3: “The New Service Provider provides service to customers physically located within the rate center to which the number is rated.”
      * Condition 4: “The new Service Provider's switch that serves the Rate Center of the customer's number(s) must have a POI in that Rate Center.”
      * Due to concerns expressed during the 2/22/08 NANC meeting by Council members that the proposed revisions appeared to require providers to have native numbering resources assigned to existing customers in each Rate Center that they wish to port in customers, and to have a POI in every Rate Center rather than a POI in each LATA that they wish to serve customers, the NANC did not accept the two revisions proposed by CenturyTel, and assigned the action item described above to the LNPA WG.
* The group then discussed the original intent of these two conditions. It was explained that the conditions reached by consensus for Best Practice 50 were intended to provide to the industry high-level technical guidelines on porting in conjunction with FX service, which is occurring in the industry today. It was further explained that, in developing the conditions listed in Best Practice 50, there was no intent on the part of the LNPA WG to provide any opinion on any ongoing industry discussions related to inter-carrier compensation or virtual NXX issues and disputes, which are within the purview of the FCC and appropriate state commissions and not within the purview of the LNPA WG. With regard to provider interconnection obligations, there was no intent to be inconsistent with applicable established federal and state regulations. In fact, it was reiterated that the intent of the 3rd and 4th conditions in Best Practice 50 was to ensure that the porting-in provider has the appropriate trunking facilities in place to handle traffic to/from a given rate center in order to avoid creating a situation where calls to a carrier’s switch serving a particular rate center are routed differently, depending on whether the destination number is native to the serving switch or is a ported-in number. In other words, consistent routing is maintained for calls to numbers in the rate center regardless of whether they are native to the destination switch or ported-in to the destination switch. It was further stated that the LNPA WG’s Best Practices are adopted to serve as guidelines to the industry and are not considered industry standards or enforceable requirements.
* Cal Simshaw, CenturyTel, then presented proposed changes to conditions 3 and 4, revised from the one given at the February 22, 2008 NANC meeting, for consideration by the group.
  + The 4th condition was discussed first, and currently reads, “The New Service Provider switch that already serves the Rate Center of the customer’s number(s) has an existing POI at the ILEC's tandem over which calls to these numbers are routed. If this customer's number(s) are ported into the New Service Provider switch, they would be routed over the same POI, and then the New Service Provider would deliver the calls to the customer's premise that is located outside of the Rate Center associated with the customer’s Number(s).”
  + CenturyTel proposed that condition 4 be modified to read, “The New Service Provider switch that already serves the Rate Center of the customer’s number(s) has an existing POI within the Old Service Provider’s network. If this customer's number(s) are ported into the New Service Provider switch, they would be routed over the same POI, and then the New Service Provider would deliver the calls to the customer's premise that is located outside of the Rate Center associated with the customer’s Number(s).”
    - Discussion then ensued, both in favor of and in opposition to making this modification to the language in condition 4 regarding the location of the existing POI.
    - Due to the large number of participants on the conference bridge, it was agreed that they could follow up with an e-mail message to Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, at [gary.m.sacra@verizon.com](mailto:gary.m.sacra@verizon.com), in order to “voice” their opinion of the revisions proposed by CenturyTel.
    - The following participants that also indicated their attendance at the March 12, 2008 LNPA WG meeting offered support for the revision to condition 4 proposed by CenturyTel in order to address their concerns regarding the location of the POI and the impact on inter-company compensation:

| **COMPANY** | **COMPANY** | **COMPANY** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 3 Rivers Communications | Grand River Mutual Telephone Corporation | Riviera Telephone Co. |
| Advanced Communications Technology | Guadalupe Valley Telephone Cooperative | Roome Telecommunications |
| BEV Comm | Hector Communications Corp. | Rothsay Telephone |
| Big Bend Telephone Co. | Hill Country Telephone Cooperative | RT Communications |
| Blackfoot Communications | Hood Canal Telephone Company | Sherburne County Rural Telephone |
| Brazoria Telephone Co. | Industry Telephone Co. | Siskiyou Telephone |
| Brydon Law | Lafourche Telephone | South Central Communications |
| Canby Telephone Association  Cascade Utilities | Lathrop Telephone Company | Stayton Cooperative Telephone |
| Central Texas Telephone Cooperative | Mainstream Comm. | St. John Telephone |
| CenturyTel | Mashell Telecom | St. Paul Cooperative Telephone Association |
| Clear Creek Telephone | Melrose Telephone Co. | Taylor Telephone Cooperative |
| Coleman County Telephone Cooperative | Molalla Communications | TDS Telecommunications |
| Colorado Telecommunications Association | Monroe Telephone Company | Tenino Telephone Company |
| Community Telephone Co. | Mountain Rural Telephone Cooperative Corporation | Toledo Telephone |
| Dubois Telephone Exchange | NorthStar Access | Transcascade |
| Ellington Telephone Co. | Oregon-Idaho Utilities | Tri-County Telephone Membership Corporation |
| Etex Telephone | Otter Tail Telcom | UBTA-UBET Communications |
| Farmers Mutual Telephone Company | Park Region Mutual Telephone | Valley Telecom Group |
| Frontier Communications | Paul Bunyan Telephone | Valley Telephone |
| Gervais Telephone | Pend Oreille Telephone Company | Whidbey Telephone Company |
|  | Pioneer Telephone Cooperative |  |
|  | Poka Lambro Telephone Cooperative |  |
|  | Range Telephone Cooperative |  |
|  | Rio Virgin Telephone |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

* During the discussion of the location of the POI and the potential impact on inter-company compensation, a participant raised a point that this could be an issue with porting in general and not necessarily tied to porting where the ported TN is associated with FX service. The participant went on to explain that intra-LATA calls to ported numbers are routed based on the TN’s LRN, not based on the rate area associated with the ported number’s rate area. To illustrate the point, the participant discussed a scenario with two carriers, X and Y, with each assigned a code associated with rate area “ABC.” Carrier Y serves several other rate areas as well from its switch, some of which are quite distant from the ABC rate area and not in the ABC local calling area.

A consumer with a number served by carrier X elects to port his number to carrier Y. The number is native to carrier X and is associated with the ABC rate area. The number is ported to carrier Y. But carrier Y uses an NPA-NXX for its LRN that is not its ABC code. The participant stated that the question of whether the new serving arrangement involves FX service is irrelevant to the point, so to simplify the discussion, it was assumed that there was no FX arrangement involved.

Calls routed from ABC-rated numbers at carrier X to non-ported ABC-rated numbers at carrier Y travel a “local” route based on the destination number’s NPA-NXX. But calls from ABC-rated numbers at carrier X to ported ABC-rated numbers -- that is, to ABC-rated numbers native to carrier X but now ported to carrier Y -- will route based on their LRN’s NPA-NXX. In this example, the LRN code used by carrier Y for its switch uses a code that is not a local call from carrier X’s ABC customers. Thus the route selected based on the LRN’s NPA-NXX appears, for trunk selection purposes, like an inter-exchange call.

The participant’s intent was to illustrate the fact that a call route to a non-ported number can look very different from the call route to a ported number even though both destination TNs are associated with the same rate area and served from the same switch, and even though the ported-to carrier has local trunking arrangements in place for the rate area in question. Thus it would appear that it is number portability itself that imposes route/compensation issues cited, not whether the destination number is being served under an FX arrangement. It was further stated that these situations appear most likely to occur in rural areas, particularly where the ported-to switch serves many rate areas, some of which are not local to the ported-from switch. While this could be addressed by having an LRN drawn from a code for every rate area served by a switch, it is not feasible where pooling is in effect because not every switch will have a full code assigned for every rate area it serves.

* + - The following participants voiced opposition to CenturyTel’s proposed revision to condition 4 due to concerns about possible ambiguities in the definition of “within the Old Service Provider’s network.” These providers voiced support for the original wording of condition 4 unless a clarification to the condition was proposed that they could also support:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **COMPANY** | **COMPANY** | **COMPANY** |
| AT&T | Qwest | T-Mobile |
| AT&T Mobility | Socket Telecom | Verizon |
| Comcast | Sprint Nextel | Verizon Wireless |
| One Communications |  |  |
|  |  |  |

* + - A question was raised on the bridge regarding whether or not an up-or-down vote on the revision to condition 4 proposed by CenturyTel would be taken. The LNPA WG Co-Chairs explained the process for reaching and determining consensus on issues addressed in the Working Group. The described process, using a “heavyweight” and “lightweight” determination of those participants voicing an opinion during the discussion of an issue, is detailed in the attached NANC Training Binder (Version 2 dated September 9, 2006) and is as follows:



“Ideally, every decision taken by NANC and its subsidiary groups will be made by unanimous consent. The Chair and Members should make reasonable attempts to achieve unanimity. However, a requirement of unanimity would make it impossible for NANC to make any controversial decisions since each Member would hold veto power.

When a decision must be made and unanimity is not possible, NANC decisions will be made by consensus. (This means that decisions are *not* made by simple majority voting.)

But, what is “consensus” and how is it determined?

Fundamentally, determining when consensus is reached is a judgment call to be made by the Chair.  Included in the Chair’s judgment are not just the numbers of Members “for” or “against” but, more importantly, the “weight” (i.e., the experience, reputation and knowledge) of each Member who is “for” or “against.” Another judgment factor to be considered by the Chair is the intensity with which each Member’s views are held.

The Chair cannot and should not attempt to determine when consensus is achieved by some sort of mechanical “objective” process. However, the following examples illustrate how the subjective decision might be made.

Each NANC Member earns his or her consensus “weight” through regular participation, expertise, collegiality and other factors valued by the Chair. Thus, if only one “heavyweight” – a very experienced, knowledgeable and fair person – was strongly against a decision, that might be enough to defeat consensus.  Similarly, if a large number of “lightweights” (i.e., those who have earned little respect, rarely attend meetings or participate in them) attend a meeting and take one side of an issue and a similar number of “heavyweights” are on the other side, it would be reasonable for the Chair to find that the heavyweights’ view constitute the consensus. Similarly, a smaller number of heavyweight Members with intensely held views could constitute the consensus against weakly held views of lighter weight Members.

Because determining consensus is inherently a subjective judgment by the Chair, due process requires a Members who are disappointed by the Chair’s decision have an appeal. In NANC, any Member who disputes the finding of a “consensus” may bring their point of view to the next higher authority as a minority opinion. (The higher authority is the full NANC in the case of subsidiary groups’ decisions and the FCC in the case of the full NANC’s decisions).  It is better for the higher authority to receive a “consensus” decision and one or more “minority” opinions than to have no recommendations at all. Indeed, having both “consensus” and “minority” views can be very valuable to the higher authority.

In summary, unanimity is ideal. When unanimity is impossible, anything other than the admittedly subjective consensus process runs the risk of gridlock. It is much better to present a disputed consensus opinion than no advice at all. Consensus keeps things moving and the “appeal” process ensures fairness.”

* + - Based on an evaluation of the discussion that took place on the proposed revision to condition 4 using the consensus process as described above, it was determined that consensus was not reached on acceptance of CenturyTel’s revision as proposed.
    - Discussion then moved to any other possible clarifications to condition 4. A proposal to delete the phrase “at the ILEC’s tandem” was offered as a possible compromise to move forward in addressing CenturyTel’s concern relative to the location of the POI. There were no objections voiced during the discussion to making that change. As a result, it was determined that consensus had been reached on revising condition 4 to read:

“The New Service Provider switch that already serves the Rate Center of the customer’s number(s) has an existing POI over which calls to these numbers are routed. If this customer’s number(s) are ported into the New Service Provider switch, they would be routed over the same POI, and then the New Service Provider would deliver the calls to the customer’s premise that is located outside of the Rate Center associated with the customer’s Number(s).”

Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, took an action item to make that change to condition 4 of Best Practice 50.

* + The discussion then shifted to CenturyTel’s proposed revision to condition 3, which currently reads, “The New Service Provider already serves the Rate Center associated with the customer’s number(s) out of the same switch to which they want to port this customer’s number(s).”
  + CenturyTel proposed that condition 3 be modified to read, The New Service Provider also offers local service to customers who remain physically located in the same rate center to which the ported number will be rated.”
    - Discussion then ensued, both in favor of and in opposition to making this modification to the language in condition 3.
    - Proponents of the revision proposed by CenturyTel expressed concerns that the existing language of condition 3 did not require the New Service Provider to offer local service in the rate center associated with the number that they wish to port in, and as a result, the New Service Provider could port in a number without having facilities in the rate center associated with the ported in number. The following participants that also indicated their attendance at the March 12, 2008 LNPA WG meeting offered support for the revision to condition 3 proposed by CenturyTel:

| **COMPANY** | **COMPANY** | **COMPANY** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 3 Rivers Communications | Guadalupe Valley Telephone Cooperative | Range Telephone Cooperative |
| Advanced Communications Technology | Hector Communications Corp. | Rio Virgin Telephone |
| BEV Comm | Hill Country Telephone Cooperative | Riviera Telephone Co. |
| Big Bend Telephone Co. | Hood Canal Telephone Company | Roome Telecommunications |
| Blackfoot Communications | Industry Telephone Co. | Rothsay Telephone |
| Brazoria Telephone Co. | Lafourche Telephone | RT Communications |
| Brydon Law | Lathrop Telephone Company | Sherburne County Rural Telephone |
| Canby Telephone Association  Cascade Utilities | Mainstream Communications | Siskiyou Telephone |
| Central Texas Telephone Cooperative | Mashell Telecom | South Central Communications |
| CenturyTel | Melrose Telephone Co. | Stayton Cooperative Telephone |
| Clear Creek Telephone | Molalla Communications | St. John Telephone |
| Coleman County Telephone Cooperative | Monroe Telephone Company | St. Paul Cooperative Telephone Association |
| Colorado Telecom Assn. | Mountain Rural Telephone Cooperative Corporation | Taylor Telephone Cooperative |
| Community Telephone Co. | NorthStar Access | TDS Telecommunications  Tenino Telephone Company |
| Dubois Telephone Exchange | Oregon-Idaho Utilities | Toledo Telephone |
| Ellington Telephone Co. | Otter Tail Telcom | Transcascade |
| Etex Telephone | Park Region Mutual Telephone | Tri-County Telephone Membership Corporation |
| Farmers Mutual Telephone Company | Paul Bunyan Telephone | UBTA-UBET Communications |
| Frontier Communications | Pend Oreille Telephone Company | Valley Telecom Group |
| Gervais Telephone | Pioneer Telephone Cooperative | Valley Telephone |
| Grand River Mutual Telephone Corporation | Poka Lambro Telephone Cooperative | Whidbey Telephone Co. |
|  |  |  |

* + - Those providers that voiced opposition to the proposed revision expressed concerns that the proposed revision would suggest that service providers must have existing customers assigned with native numbers in a rate center before they could port in a customer’s number associated with that same rate center. There were also concerns expressed about the definition and determination of “offers local service.” The following participants voiced opposition to CenturyTel’s proposed revision to condition 3 and voiced support for the original wording of condition 3 unless a clarification to the condition was proposed that they could also support:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **COMPANY** | **COMPANY** | **COMPANY** |
| AT&T | Qwest | T-Mobile |
| AT&T Mobility | Socket Telecom | Verizon |
| Comcast | Sprint Nextel | Verizon Wireless |
| One Communications |  |  |
|  |  |  |

* + - Based on an evaluation of the discussion that took place on the proposed revision to condition 3 using the consensus process as described above, it was determined that consensus was not reached on acceptance of CenturyTel’s revision as proposed.
    - The discussion then shifted to possible modifications to condition 3 that could address all concerns and therefore achieve consensus. A straw proposal was offered to modify the text of condition 3 as follows:

“The New Service Provider offers a tariffed and/or publicly published local exchange service to customers located in the same rate center to which the ported number will be rated.”

It was agreed that discussion of condition 3 will continue at the May 2008 LNPA WG meeting. Service providers took an action item to come to the May 2008 LNPA WG meeting prepared to discuss in order to determine if consensus can be reached on the text change proposed above for condition 3. Any proposed adjustments to the proposed language for condition 3 will also be considered.

* A request was made to include in the March 2008 LNPA WG meeting minutes a summary of the PIM 60 discussion that previously took place at the July 2007 LNPA WG meeting and the consensus reached at that time to include Best Practice 50 in the LNPA WG’s Best Practices document.
  + The discussion of PIM 60 had a hard start of 10:30am Pacific Time on the Tuesday, July 10, 2007 agenda. A review of the July 2007 LNPA WG meeting minutes provides the following summary:
    - The service providers listed as in attendance (both in person and on the conference bridge) during the discussion of PIM 60 and Best Practice 50 were as follows:

Alltel AT&T AT&T Mobility

Canadian Consortium CenturyTel Comcast

Consolidated Comm. Cox Embarq

ESCI Global Crossing GVNW

Integra Telecom Nationsline Qwest

Smartcom Telephone Socket Telecom South Central Tel.

Sprint Nextel Three River Telco T-Mobile

Veracity Communications Verizon Verizon Wireless

Vonage Windstream

* In summary, consensus was reached at the July 2007 LNPA WG meeting to establish Best Practice 50 with the conditions as currently written in the document (i.e., prior to any revisions reached by consensus at the March 2008 LNPA WG meeting), with CenturyTel, Windstream, and South Central Tel. objecting to the wording of the criteria, stating that they felt that they cover all forms of Virtual NXX and do not include all necessary criteria. Consensus was also reached to close PIM 60 with Century Tel and Windstream objecting to its closure. One change to the 5th condition was agreed to. There were no objections to removing the caps on “Foreign Exchange,” but leaving the acronym “FX” capitalized.
* There was also a request from some service providers on the conference bridge that it be noted in the March 2008 LNPA WG meeting minutes that they were raising an objection to the LNPA WG’s jurisdiction related to addressing this issue with regard to geographic or location portability. Those providers were:
  + - CenturyTel
    - Paul Bunyan Telephone
    - Hood Canal Communications
    - Mashell Telecom, Inc.
    - Molalla Communications
    - Monroe Telephone Company
    - Pend Oreille Telephone Company
    - St. Paul Cooperative Telephone Association
    - TDS Telecommunications
    - Whidbey Telephone Company
* Because of the large number of participants, the Co-Chairs stated that they would accept follow-up e-mails from participants who wish to provide statements for inclusion in the March 2008 meeting minutes as long as the submitter had also provided a positive acknowledgement of their participation on the bridge and that their submitted statement was verbalized during the actual March 12, 2008 discussion. The e-mailed statements received after the meeting discussion on PIM 60/BP50 are contained in the following attached Appendix A.



Review and Discussion of Qwest Change Order (Action Item 0208-02) (Mary Retka, Qwest):



Action Item 0208-02: Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will place a discussion of the attached Change Order, submitted by Qwest, on the March 2008 LNPA WG meeting agenda during the Change Management portion of the meeting.

* The group reviewed that attached Change Order, submitted by Qwest, proposing that a table be added to the NPAC containing valid Destination Point Code (DPC) values for use in detecting DPC data errors in New SP Create messages to NPAC.
* During the discussion, it was suggested that the port should not be rejected but an invalid DPC value could be removed from the SV with a notification to the New SP that they either need to provide a valid DPC or let NeuStar know that the original DPC is valid. The result of having no data in the applicable DPC field would be no worse than the wrong DPC in terms of SS7 TCAP routing for the given vertical service.
* Some participants stated that their preference is to reject the port up front to get the record corrected before it is allowed to go forward. In response, some expressed a concern about missing due dates awaiting corrected DPC.
* Mary Retka, Qwest, will revise the Change Order to include the options discussed at the March 2008 meeting:

1a. Clearing invalid DPC data, allowing the port, and providing a

notification over the SOA interface.

1b. Rejecting the port and providing a notification over the SOA interface.

2a. Clearing invalid DPC data, allowing the port, and providing a

notification via a report.

2b. Allowing the port and invalid DPC data, and providing a notification

via a report.

* A Local System Vendor advised that clearing the invalid data in NPAC and providing notification via a report results in data in SOA being out of synch with data in NPAC.
* The Change Order was accepted by the LNPA WG.

Change Management (NeuStar):



* In preparation for upcoming sessions to determine which Change Orders may be included in a next NPAC software release, NeuStar walked the group through the attached document containing one-line summaries of current Open and Accepted NANC Change Orders.
* NeuStar will determine the NPAC development level of effort for the proposed

Change Orders in the attached for review at the May 2008 LNPA WG meeting. Note that it was determined at the March 2008 meeting that Change Orders 382, 402, and 425 will not be considered at this time.

* Local System Vendors will determine the SOA and LSMS development level

of effort for the proposed Change Orders in the attached for review at the May 2008 LNPA WG meeting. Note that it was determined at the March 2008 meeting that Change Orders 382, 402, and 425 will not be considered at this time.

* It was agreed that NANC 382 will not be considered as a candidate for the next release.
* Service Providers are to determine for discussion at the May 2008 LNPA WG

meeting if NANC 397, Large Volume Port Transactions and SOA Throughput, is to be considered a mandatory Change Order for a next NPAC release.

* For review at the May 2008 LNPA WG meeting, NeuStar will break up NANC 400 into 4 separate and distinct Change Orders, one for each URI type.
* It was agreed that NANC 402 will not be considered since an SOW has already been requested by the LLC.
* It was also agreed that NANC 425 will be back-burnered at this time.
* NeuStar will develop a Change Order to define SV Type 3 as Class 2 Interconnected VoIP and to designate SV Type 5 as Class 1 Interconnected VoIP.
* NeuStar will develop a Change Order to designate SP Type 3 for Class 1 Interconnected VoIP providers.
* The next steps for the May 2008 LNPA WG meeting will be to review the NPAC and local system levels of effort for each Change Order, the NANC 400 split-offs, and the new Change Orders (Qwest, SFTP).

Review of January 2008 LNPA WG Action Items:



**January 2008 LNPA WG Action Items:**

* Item 0108-01: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0108-02: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0108-03: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0108-04: Telcordia reported that their system (CMIP toolkit) can support a new action message that modifies the SPID attribute in the network data object. This Action Item remains open pending reports from other Local System Vendors.

**January 2008 APT Action Items:**

No Action Items were assigned at the January 2008 APT meeting.

**LNPA WG Action Items Remaining Open from Previous Meetings:**

* Item 0605-22: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0706-06: This item remains Open.
* Item 0906-12: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0906-14: This item remains Open.
* Item 0507-03: This item remains Open.
* Item 0507-11: This item remains Open.
* Item 0907-11: This item remains Open.
* Item 0907-13: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1107-12: This item remains Open.
* Item 1107-13: This item has been completed and is Closed.

**APT Action Items Remaining Open from Previous Meetings:**

No Action Items remain open from previous APT meetings.

Review of February 2008 Action Items:



* Item 0208-01: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0208-02: This item has been completed and is Closed.

Discussion of Need for April Conference Call (All):

* It was agreed that no LNPA WG conference call will be held in April 2008.

New Business (All):

* No additional new business was discussed.

**ARCHITECTURE PLANNING TEAM (APT) DISCUSSION:**

* NANC 372: It was suggested that wireless carriers may have more input after WICIS 4.0 implementation in September 2008.
* A discussion of NANC 401 will be placed on the May 2008 agenda during Change Management in order to determine if it will be referred to the APT.
* An agenda item will be placed on the May 2008 agenda during Change Management to determine which change orders will go to the APT for a more detailed technical review.

***Next LNPA WG Conference Call … No call will take place in April 2008.***

***Next LNPA WG Meeting …******May 6-7, 2008, Overland Park, Kansas –***

***Hosted by Sprint Nextel***