LNPA WORKING GROUP

May 2008 Meeting

Final Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overland Park, Kansas | Host: Sprint Nextel |

**TUESDAY 05/06/08**

Tuesday, 05/06/08, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Joe Cudo | Alltel (phone) | Charles Ryburn | | NeuStar (phone) |
| Mark Birkholz | Arvig Comm (phone) | Syed Saifullah | | NeuStar Clearinghouse |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | John Nakamura | | NeuStar |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T (phone) | Stephen Addicks | | NeuStar |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T | Marcel Champagne | | NeuStar |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | Paul LaGattuta | | NeuStar |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Mobility | Dave Garner | | NeuStar |
| Joan Johnson | Big Bend Tel (phone) | Shannon Sevigny | | NeuStar Pooling (phone) |
| Mike Lofton | CenturyTel | Linda Peterman | | One Communications |
| Cal Simshaw | CenturyTel | Rick Finnigan | | Oregon Tel Assn and Washington Ind. Tel Assn  (phone) |
| Bill Solis | Comcast (phone) | Steve Trimble | | Palmer Mutual Tel (phone) |
| Cindy Sheehan | Comcast | Kathy Faircloth | | Peoples Telecom (phone) |
| Nancy Sanders | Comcast | Mary Retka | | Qwest |
| Jennifer Hutton | Cox (phone) | Jean Thaxton | | Randolph Tel (phone) |
| Chris Brown | Cox (phone) | Harold Oster | | Rio Virgin Tel (phone) |
| Angela Reid-Jordan | Embarq | Paul Stowman | | Rothsay Tel (phone) |
| Kathee Glodowski | Embarq | Matt Kohly | | Socket |
| Judy Whitney | Embarq | Carol Frike | | Sprint Nextel |
| Tonya Woods | Embarq | Lavinia Rotaru | | Sprint Nextel |
| Vicki Goth | Embarq | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint Nextel |
| Bob Malone | Evolving Systems | Michael Klappa | | Sprint Nextel |
| Greg Council | Evolving Systems (phone) | Don Lawrence | | Stayton Coop Tel (phone) |
| Robert Binder | Frontier (phone) | Sara Cole | | TDS Telecom (phone) |
| Beth O’Donnell | GCI Consulting (phone) | Doug Babcock | | Syniverse |
| John Hoffmann | Gervais Tel (phone) | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Therese Mooney | Global Crossing (phone) | John Malyar | | Telcordia |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW (phone) | Pat White | | Telcordia |
| Ann Vick | GVNW (phone) | Matt Timmerman | | Telcordia (phone) |
| Ken Snow | GVNW (phone) | Steve Hanson | | Tenino Tel (phone) |
| Courtney Spears | GVNW (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Connie Stufflebeem | Iowa Network Services (phone) | Mohamed Samater | | T-Mobile |
| Wes Robinson | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Amanda Molina | | Townes Telecom (phone) |
| Karen Hoffman | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Dennis Rose | | TSTCI (phone) |
| Angie Beckett | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Chipp Nelson | | VeriSign |
| Rick Vitzthum | Kalama Tel (phone) | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Trip England | Mo. RLECs | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| Craig Johnson | Mo. RLECs | Jason Lee | | Verizon (phone) |
| Geoff Feiss | Montana Telecom (phone) | Sara Hooker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Karen Mulberry | NeuStar | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Tom Zablocki | | Vonage (phone) |
| Michael O’Connor | NeuStar |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

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

****

**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.  6/9/08 call from 11am to 3pm Eastern time, dial-in bridge number is 888-412-7808, pin 23272# |  |  |
| July | TBD | 15th-16th | NeuStar | Boston, Massachusetts |
| 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.

03/08 Meeting Minutes Review:

* No changes were made to the DRAFT March 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):

* Since the March LNPA WG meeting, the Wireless Committee met April 28th – 30th at OBF 102 and held interim meetings March 24th and March 31st, 2008. The Intermodal Subcommittee met on April 28th at OBF 102 as well as on April 7th, 2008.

**Wireless Committee**:

* During OBF 102, the Wireless Committee focused most of their work on Issue 3118 – WICIS Support of Wireline Jeopardy Responses – and a new Intermodal issue addressing the development of an Intermodal Porting Standards Document.
* Issues:
  + Issue 3221 addressing potential changes from the FCC Order 07-188 remains open.
  + Issue 3029 (Data Mapping between LSOG and WICIS) remains tabled pending results of the new issue that was accepted that addresses developing an Intermodal Porting document (Issue 3255).
  + Issue 3062 addressing the creation of a separate fax document for porting from Wireless providers went to Final Closure on 4/7/08.
  + Issue 3118, WICIS support of Wireline Jeopardy Responses, was worked. Changes to the WICIS Data Dictionary flows and processes were reviewed. Participants took action items to review items internally. Interim meetings were scheduled for June 12th and June 26th to continue work on the document changes related to Jeopardies and hopefully final document changes will be reviewed during OBF 103. This issue remains open.
* Three new issues were worked.
  + Issue 3256 – This issue addresses the time discrepancy between the WICIS 4.0.0 flash cut date and the NPAC maintenance window. The Wireless Committee evaluated the request and determined that there would be no impacts on SOA systems, vendor ICP systems or carrier ICP systems due to the misalignment of the two maintenance windows. The WICIS 4.0.0 changes are an ICP change and the ICP systems process independently of the NPAC systems. Changing the sunrise time to 1:00:00AM ET would negatively impact ICP systems that have been configured for 00:00:00 ET. NPAC activity will be held until systems come back on line during the cutover to the new release. It is recommended that the Wireless Committee align future WICIS release dates with the NPAC maintenance window. This issue was placed in Initial Closure and will go final after 21 days of being placed into Initial Closure.
  + Issue 3257 was accepted to work. This issue addresses storeStatus message handling when the message contains invalid characters or field lengths that are too long (or too short). A vendor meeting was scheduled for 5/5 to discuss potential interoperability issues and the Wireless Committee will meet on 5/23, 11 – 12 (ET) to discuss vendor feedback on these system validation issues.
  + Issue 3258 was accepted to work. This issue seeks clarification on the intended correct rule for the LNUM/PORTED\_NUM combination on SUP 3s when the New SP desires to remove a TN from the port request and then add a different TN and will require WICIS document changes. This issue remains open.
* The Wireless Committee discussed FCC porting waivers and State stays. It appears as though there are several stays that override the FCC date, such that they will be kept in place until the FCC resolves the rating and routing issue. It was decided that this item should be discussed in more detail at the LNPA.
* A discussion was held regarding porting data retention periods. It was determined that retention policies should be defined internally by each service provider and should not be defined at an industry level.

**Intermodal Subcommittee:**

* Issue 3223 addressing Simple Port Request changes mandated by FCC Order 07-188 remains open pending further FCC action.
* New Issue 3255 addressing the development of an Intermodal Porting Standard Document was accepted to work. The committee walked through some very high level documentation and focused on porting flows, various processes and some data dictionary definitions.
* An interim meeting was scheduled for June 2nd, 10 -12 AM (ET) to finish WICIS data dictionary review and to discuss fields required for complex and reseller ports.
* An additional interim meeting was scheduled for June 23rd, 10 -12 (ET) to discuss action items.

Next meeting:

* OBF #103 will be held the week of August 4th, 2008 in San Antonio, TX. The Wireless Committee will meet Tuesday, August 5th – Thursday, August 7th. The Intermodal Subcommittee will meet on Tuesday, August 5th at OBF #103.
* Monthly Wireless Committee meetings will be scheduled until WICIS 4.0.0 is implemented.

**LSOP Committee:**

* The Simple Port Service Request (SPSR) has been integrated into the LSOG for 3Q08 release (Issue 3261).
* Issue 3262 was created to integrate the SPSR into the Local Service Order Migration Guidelines.
* Discussion then ensued on the status of industry work, e.g., ATIS OBF, on standardizing Local Service Request (LSR) and Wireless Port Request (WPR) data fields.

* + - Wireline-to-Wireline Ports:

The ATIS OBF Local Service Ordering & Provisioning (LSOP) Committee has developed the Simple Port Service Request (SPSR) for wireline-to-wireline simple ports. The SPSR contains 14 data fields, including the 4 validation fields addressed in FCC Order 07-188. ATIS has submitted the SPSR to the FCC. Some wireline service providers have indicated that they are developing their systems in support of the SPSR, while some have indicated that they will continue to support the LSR with end user validation on no more than the 4 fields addressed in FCC Order 07-188 (End User Telephone Number, End User Account Number, Zip Code, and Passcode (if applicable)). Any additional order processing fields required on the LSR may vary from provider to provider.

A provider participant stated that their interpretation of the Order is that only 4 data fields are required on a port order. They also support the LNPA WG’s Best Practice for the two additional required fields (Desired Due Date and New SP SPID). They believe that the discussion of any additional required fields are systems requirements that should not delay the port.

* + - Intermodal Ports:

At this time, wireless providers have indicated that the 14 fields on the SPSR are not adequate for wireless to wireline ports, however, work is continuing in the OBF to determine if the SPSR can be used for simple wireline to wireless ports.

The OBF Intermodal Subcommittee has opened Issue 3255 to develop an intermodal porting process. The targeted completion is October 2009. The goal is to process simple and complex intermodal ports.

For wireless to wireline ports, if the wireline carrier does not have an automated process set up, they will need to use wireless fax form.

* + - Wireless to Wireless Ports:

The wireless industry does not plan to make changes to the Wireless Intercarrier Interface Specifications (WICIS) standard for wireless to wireless porting. Wireless to wireless ports will continue to be validated as they are today and all required data fields in addition to the end user validation fields on the Wireless Port Request (WPR) will continue to be required. These additional required fields are standard among wireless providers.

* + - Attached is the correspondence from the OBF to the FCC Wireline Competition Bureau with respect to the SPSR.



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

* INC Issue 510: **Video Relay Service (VRS) Interoperability** – **Initial Closure**

NANC has set up an Issues Management Group (IMG) to continue the work. INC Issue 510 is now in Initial Closure and will close with the publication of Numbering for Internet-Based Relay Services Report. The FCC is prepared to issue an order by 6/30/08.

* INC Issue 559: **Revise NPA Code Relief Planning Guidelines to address Customer Complaints – Initial Closure**

The issue adds a new appendix with tables to help SPs address complaints during relief. Some samples from the Table 1 Area Code Splits are provided below, however, this is not the entire table:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| SITUATION | DURING PERMISSIVE | AFTER PERMISSIVE |
| Customers are not able to receive calls from, or place calls to, numbers that are changing to the new NPA using the old and/or new NPA; this may be an in-state or out-of-state complaint. | The service provider and/or the long distance carrier have not yet opened the new NPA for permissive dialing in its translations tables and/or translations tables are not set to accept the old and new NPA. | The service provider and/or the long distance carrier have not opened the new NPA in its translations tables. |
| Caller ID information received by the called party might be confusing during permissive dialing due to the fact that the called party could receive both new or old NPAs. | Consumers may not be aware of the new NPA when it is delivered in the Caller ID information during permissive dialing; this situation will no longer exist after permissive dialing. | This situation will no longer exist. |
| Calls to ported or pooled numbers may not complete using the new NPA. | A service provider may not have performed the split process in its network elements (STPs/SCPs) or received a broadcast of a ported TN or pooled block in the new NPA. | A service provider may not have received a broadcast of a ported TN or pooled block in the new NPA. |

* INC Issue 572: **Update the TBPAG to reflect the TRD requirement that the Part 1B form not be required for pooled CO code requests – Initial Closure**

Issue adds language to the TBPAG that notes that for a pooled code a Part 1B does not need to be filled out and sent to NPAC for the blocks being assigned to/retained by the Code Holder when they are being routed to the switch associated with the NXX code itself.

* INC Issue 576: **Amend TBPAG to Clarify Double-Assignment of Pooled TNs –**

**Initial Closure**

The relevant wording to the LNPA WG Best Practice that changed:

8.3.11 In instances where a pooled unavailable TN is assigned to more than one customer served by different SPs (i.e., Block Holder and LERG Assignee) due to an error made by the LERG Assignee in the population of unavailable TNs in the LNP database at the time of donation, the customer of the original SP (i.e., the customer to whom the TN was originally assigned) shall retain assignment of the TN and the Block Holder shall assign its customer a new TN. However, in instances where a pooled unavailable TN is assigned to more than one customer served by different SPs (i.e., Block Holder and LERG Assignee) due to the LERG Assignee’s failure to protect the block from further TN assignment after block donation, the customer of the Block Holder shall retain assignment of the TN, and the LERG Assignee that assigned the TN to its customer in error after block donation shall assign its customer a new TN.

LNPA WG Participants are to come prepared for the June 9, 2008 conference call to determine if the above wording of INC Issue 576 will be added to the LNPA WG’s Best Practices document.

* INC Issue 577: **Limit Test Numbers to Assigned Blocks – Active**

Issue looks to add language to the guidelines that notes that SPs should only assign a test number for their CO Code from a retained or assigned block only and not from a donated block that is/could be assigned to another SP.

* INC Issue 589: **Sint Maarten Application to Join the NANP – Active**

Application to join the NANP submitted to NANPA and referred to INC per the INC NPA Allocation Plan and Assignment Guidelines. INC will make a recommendation on the application per the guidelines.

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

* Adam Newman, Telcordia and FoN Co-Chair, discussed FoN Issue FTN-005, which examines a commons vs. market place model for toll free numbers. In the marketplace model, the end user would have the property rights to the toll free number. See attached slide deck for the FTN-005 action plan as well as a description of the remaining issues that are being addressed by the FoN.



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

* Mohamed Samater (T-Mobile), WTSC Co-Chair, reported that vendor-to-vendor testing has started. Some connectivity issues were experienced at first but they have been corrected. No interoperability issues have been identified and testing remains on schedule. Carrier testing is scheduled for 5/18/2008 to 8/8/2008. Weekly calls are taking place with the next call scheduled for May 9th at 12 eastern.

* 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 March 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 March 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. NOTE: The SOW was submitted subsequent to the meeting on May 20th.



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



The PIM 54 proposal applies to simple ports for e-bonded (e.g., XML and EDI) providers.

Action Item 0308-10: Regarding the attached PIM 54, Nancy Sanders, Comcast, will add text 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.

Action Item 0308-10 has been completed. See attached v4 of PIM 54 for detail.

Action Item 0308-13: Regarding the attached PIM 54, 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.

* + - One Communications stated that it would require significant development and time to meet a next-day porting interval.
    - Sprint Nextel and T-Mobile expressed support for and encourages a next-day porting interval.
    - Verizon and Embarq cited the recent FCC Notice of Proposed   
      Rulemaking (NPRM) tentatively concluding a 48 hour porting interval and stated that the current standard porting interval should be enforced and complied with by all carriers, which is not occurring today. In addition, they stated that any consideration of a shorter interval should take place after the LSR/WPR data field portion of FCC Order 07-188 is implemented in order to determine its impacts on porting and if any shorter interval is appropriate. Embarq stated that some carriers are not identifying all errors on their initial response to a rejected LSR.
    - It was suggested that two companies could bilaterally agree to port on a shorter interval. AT&T stated that they raised that question in their comments to the FCC NPRM.

Both Action Item 0308-13 and PIM 54 will remain open.

* 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 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. 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. 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. VeriSign submitted NANC Change Order 426 to address the issue identified in PIM 66. PIM 66 is now in a Tracking state.

* PIM 67 – This PIM, submitted by Verizon Wireless, seeks to address instances where newly ported-in customers are unable to receive text messages from customers of the carrier they left due to the data in the Old Service Provider’s system(s) not being fully deactivated or cleaned-up.



Verizon Wireless stated that they are experiencing about 650 to 1000 occurrences per month. PIM 67 was accepted at the May 2008 LNPA WG meeting. Service Providers that support text messaging are to report at the July 2008 LNPA WG meeting on their disconnect process, their escalation process for addressing this problem, and their cleanup process when they receive a trouble ticket.

2008 LNPA WG Meeting/Call Schedule Update:

* The July 15-16, 2008 LNPA WG face-to-face meeting is going to be held in Boston, Massachusetts, and hosted by NeuStar.
* The June 10, 2008 LNPA WG conference call will be rescheduled for June 9, 2008 from 11am to 3pm Eastern.

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



Action Item 0308-14: 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.

* + - One Communication, Verizon Wireless, Qwest, Embarq, and Cox stated that they have completed their review and updates.

* + - AT&T, T-Mobile, Sprint Nextel, Verizon (wireline), and Comcast are updating.
    - Action Item 0308-14 remains open.

New Business:

* Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless: State waivers from porting are in effect for some small entities. The federal stay was lifted by recent FCC Order. Some states say that their waiver remains in effect until 6 months after the FCC resolves the rating issue (discrepancy between wireline porting out to wireless and wireline porting in from wireless). NeuStar is to determine if a state LNP waiver list exists and provide any

updated list to the LNPA WG Co-Chairs by the end of May for distribution to the group.

NOTE: This Action Item has been completed.

* Gary Sacra, Verizon:

Action Item 1107-12: Related to Action Item 1107-07, Service Providers are to review internally the EAS N-1 interpretation documented by the LNPA WG in the attached and reinforce its interpretation within their respective companies.



A number of wireless carriers stated that this is an ongoing process to educate within their respective companies on the issue and the need to perform the donor switch query. No carriers in attendance stated that they were having current issues with getting buy-in internally to perform the donor switch query.

Action Item 1107-12 was closed.

Best Practice 50 Discussion (Action Item 0308-16) – All:

Action Item 0308-16: As discussed at the March 2008 LNPA WG meeting, Service Providers are to come to the May 2008 LNPA WG meeting prepared to discuss the following proposed revision to condition 3 of Best Practice 50 in order to determine if consensus can be reached on the proposed text change or if it requires further revision.

“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.”

* The Best Practice 50 (BP50) discussion had a pre-scheduled hard start of 2pm Central to ensure that those who wished to participate were notified of the exact start time. The discussion commenced at 2pm Central as planned.
* Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, teed up the discussion by presenting the attached proposed revisions to the opening paragraph and conditions 3 and 4 of Best Practice 50 (BP50).



* CenturyTel reiterated their objection to the current wording of BP50 because they feel it advocates location portability.
* The group initially focused on the proposed revisions to the opening paragraph of BP50. Discussion focused on the use of the word “legitimate” in the first sentence of the opening paragraph in describing the porting scenario addressed in PIM 60. It was suggested that the LNPA WG was making a policy call with the use of the word “legitimate.” After much discussion on alternative wording, two options emerged:

“Regarding the attached PIM 60 and the porting scenario described therein, the LNPA WG reached consensus at their May 2007 meeting that this is a technically feasible porting scenario provided that each of the following conditions are met in providing service to the customer by the New Service Provider.”

or

“Regarding the attached PIM 60 and the porting scenario described therein, the LNPA WG reached consensus at their May 2007 meeting that for porting in conjunction with foreign exchange (FX) service to be accomplished, each of the following conditions must be met in the providing of service to the customer by the New Service Provider.”

CenturyTel and numerous Rural ILECs on the bridge objected to the 2nd option and the use of the word “accomplished.” Socket, One Communications, and Sprint Nextel (CLEC arm) objected to the 1st option and the use of “technically feasible.” After additional discussion, consensus was reached to move forward with the 1st option for the opening sentence of BP50.

* The group then discussed the remainder of the opening paragraph of BP50. Consensus was reached to revise the 2nd sentence of the opening paragraph of BP50 to read as follows. There were no dissenting opinions voiced to the following final wording:

“The following conditions are intended as technical guidelines for porting in conjunction with FX service and are not intended to address location (geographic) portability, virtual NXX, transport obligations, or inter-carrier compensation, nor are they intended to be inconsistent with any applicable federal and/or state regulatory requirements.”

* Discussion on the proposed revisions to condition 3 then ensued. After a great deal of discussion, consensus was reached to revise condition 3 to read as follows. There were no dissenting opinions voiced to the following final wording:

“The New Service Provider offers service coverage or a tariffed or publicly published local exchange service, consistent with applicable federal and state regulatory requirements for providing local/foreign exchange service, to customers located in the same rate center to which the ported number will be rated.”

* The group agreed to place finalization of condition 4 on the agenda for the June 9, 2008 LNPA WG conference call. The proposed revision to condition 4 currently reads as follows:

“The New Service Provider switch that already serves the Rate Center of the customer’s number(s) has an existing POI, consistent with applicable federal and state regulatory requirements for service provider interconnection obligations, over which calls to these numbers are routed. If this customer's number(s) are ported into the New Service Provider switch, they will be routed and transported in a manner consistent with these applicable legal requirements. The New Service Provider would then be responsible for arranging for the transport and delivery of traffic from that existing POI to the customer's premise that is located outside of the Rate Center associated with the customer’s Number(s).”

* Due to the consensus reached on the proposed revisions to the opening paragraph and condition 3 of BP50, it was agreed that only condition 4 will be discussed on the June 9th call. If consensus cannot be reached on applicable revisions to condition 4 on the June 9th call, the current wording of condition 4 will remain in effect. That current wording is as follows:

“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).”

**WEDNESDAY 05/07/08**

Wednesday, 05/07/08, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Joe Cudo | Alltel (phone) | John Nakamura | | NeuStar |
| Tina Plaisance | Alltel (phone) | Stephen Addicks | | NeuStar |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Marcel Champagne | | NeuStar |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T | Paul LaGattuta | | NeuStar |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | Dave Garner | | NeuStar |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Mobility | Shannon Sevigny | | NeuStar Pooling (phone) |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian Consortium | Linda Peterman | | One Communications |
| Mike Lofton | CenturyTel | Mary Retka | | Qwest |
| Bill Solis | Comcast (phone) | Jan Dole | | Qwest (phone) |
| Nancy Sanders | Comcast | Matt Kohly | | Socket |
| Jennifer Hutton | Cox (phone) | Carol Frike | | Sprint Nextel |
| Chris Brown | Cox (phone) | Lavinia Rotaru | | Sprint Nextel |
| Angela Reid-Jordan | Embarq | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint Nextel |
| Kathee Glodowski | Embarq | Michael Klappa | | Sprint Nextel |
| Judy Whitney | Embarq | Doug Babcock | | Syniverse |
| Tonya Woods | Embarq | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec (phone) |
| Vicki Goth | Embarq | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Douglas Chan | Embarq | John Malyar | | Telcordia |
| Bob Malone | Evolving Systems (phone) | Pat White | | Telcordia |
| Beth O’Donnell | GCI Consulting (phone) | Matt Timmerman | | Telcordia (phone) |
| Therese Mooney | Global Crossing (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Karen Hoffman | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Mohamed Samater | | T-Mobile |
| Angie Beckett | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Amanda Molina | | Townes Telecom (phone) |
| Lynette Khirallah | NetNumber (phone) | Chipp Nelson | | VeriSign |
| Karen Mulberry | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| Michael O’Connor | NeuStar | Jason Lee | | Verizon (phone) |
| Charles Ryburn | NeuStar (phone) | Sara Hooker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar Clearinghouse | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
|  |  | Tom Zablocki | | Vonage (phone) |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

Change Management (NeuStar):



* NANC 408 (Action Item 0108-04)

  

Action Item 0108-04: Regarding the attached sample message for performing a SPID modification over the interface, Local System Vendors and Service Providers that develop their own local systems are to review the message and provide any concerns/comments. Can their system (CMIP toolkit) support a new action message that modifies the SPID attribute in the network data object?

Verizon Business stated that their systems do not have any issue. Action Item 0108-04 remains open.

* Event ID Rollover Issue (Action Items 0507-03, 0507-11)

Action Item 0507-03: Related to Action Item 0507-11, at a future TBD date, NeuStar will contact those providers from which the LNPA WG has received no status reports to determine whether they also have made the necessary local system update to resolve the Event ID rollover issue as defined in NANC 413.

Action Item 0507-11: Regarding any local system changes required to address the Event ID rollover issue as defined in NANC 413, Local System Vendors and Service Providers are to provide a monthly status on the implementation of this change until complete. See related Action Item 0507-03.

Action Items 0507-03 and 0507-11 remain open.

* Qwest Change Order (Action Item 0308-06) – Mary Retka, Qwest

Action Item 0308-06: Regarding the attached Change Order submitted by Qwest and accepted at the March 2008 LNPA WG meeting, 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.

The group reviewed NANC 427.



* + - Telcordia stated that some local systems already do DPC validation and suggested that NANC 427 should be optional and backwards compatible.
    - Option 1a impacts the interface and local systems. Option 1b is a new error code that does not impact the interface but may require software development in the local SOA depending on how the system handles new error codes.
    - Options 2a and 2b do not impact the interface or local systems.
    - Qwest stated that their preference is Option 1b.
    - It was suggested that we need a way to track the DPC value that was sent and in error.
    - Qwest stated that it is usually smaller providers from which they are seeing this problem.
    - Regarding the attached NANC 427, submitted by Qwest, NeuStar will include a fifth option for validation of DPC data added to the LTI GUI. The current four options involve validating requests made by SOA users, whereas this fifth option instead validates requests made by LTI users.
    - Service Providers and Local System Vendors are to review the attached NANC Change Order 427, submitted by Qwest, and be prepared for the July 2008 LNPA WG meeting to determine which option (1a, 1b, 2a, or 2b) will be selected for requirements development and if there is a need for backward compatibility.

Action Item 0308-06 is closed.

* Review of SFTP Change Order (old PIM 67) (Action Items 0308-01, 0308-11)

Action Item 0308-01: 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. See related Action Item 0308-11.

Action Item 0308-11: Regarding the attached PIM 67 (withdrawn by NeuStar at the March 2008 meeting in lieu of a new Change Order to be proposed), LNPA WG Participants are to determine if there is any objection to migrating to strictly Secure FTP. See related Action Item 0308-01.

The group reviewed NANC 428.

* + - Tekelec uses SFTP by default and supports NANC 428.
    - No NPAC release is required to implement.
    - NPAC allows both now. NeuStar stated a desire to sunset standard FTP in 6-12 months.
    - No objections were voiced regarding moving to only supporting Secure FTP (Action Item 0308-11).
    - NeuStar will report out on the June 9, 2008 LNPA WG conference call on the quantity of providers utilizing standard FTP and suggest a sunset date for support of standard FTP.

Action Items 0308-01 and 0308-11 are closed.

* Change Order to Define SV Types 3 & 5 for VoIP (Action Item 0308-04)

Action Item 0308-04: NeuStar will develop a Change Order to define existing SV Type 3 as Class 2 Interconnected VoIP and to designate SV Type 5 as Class 1 Interconnected VoIP.

The group reviewed NANC 433 and it was accepted. Action Item 0308-04 is closed.

* Change Order to Define SP Type 3 for Class 1 VoIP (Action Item 0308-05)

NeuStar will develop a Change Order to designate SP Type 3 for Class 1 Interconnected VoIP providers.

The group reviewed NANC 434 and it was accepted. Action Item 0308-05 is closed.

* Review of NANC 400 Spin-off Change Orders (Action Item 0308-03)

Action Item 0308-03: 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.

* + NANC 429 – Voice URI: It was stated that this Change Order can serve as a means of synching the association of TN to LRN and URI and distributing it to ENUM lookup engines.
  + In response to a question of why this would be needed, it was explained that there is a need to synch up the routing information in real time associated with ported/pooled numbers that are assigned to IP endpoints so that calls originating from PSTN endpoints or from IP endpoints can be routed properly as ported or pooled TNs are assigned to IP endpoints.
  + NANC 430 – MMS URI:
    - NeuStar stated that this could resolve PIM 67, which seeks to address instances where newly ported-in customers are unable to receive text messages from customers of the carrier they left due to the data in the Old Service Provider’s system(s) not being fully deactivated or cleaned-up.
    - T-Mobile stated that they are interested in this.
    - Sprint Nextel is working with NeuStar to develop a Change Order for an SMS URI.
    - It was stated that this could help with the NRRIC issue of sending a photo or video of a crime to law enforcement and facilitate a return response.
  + NANC 431 – Push to Talk over Cellular
  + NANC 432 – Presence URI
  + It was suggested that we would have to validate URIs similar to the DPC validation that is proposed in NANC 427 if any of these Change Orders were to be implemented.
  + Action 0308-03 is closed.
* NANC 401 Discussion – Refer to APT?



* + NANC 401 will be reviewed during the July 2008 meeting at the beginning of Change Management.
* NANC 397 – Mandatory in next release? (Action Item 0308-15)

Action Item 0308-15: 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.

* + There were no objections to making NANC 397 a mandatory Change Order in the next NPAC release.
  + It was stated that NANC 397 impacts local systems as well as the NPAC and it is important to understand that.

Action Item 0308-15 is closed.

* Review of NPAC, SOA, LSMS Development Levels of Effort for All Change Orders (Action Items 0308-02, 0308-12)

Action Item 0308-02: 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. See related Action Item 0308-12.

Action Item 0308-12: 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. See related Action Item 0308-02.

The NPAC, SOA, and LSMS development levels of effort were provided by NeuStar and the Local System Vendors respectively and reviewed by the group. The vendor responses have been captured in the following file as part of the Co-Chair notes. NeuStar will revise the NANC Change Order list to add the NPAC, SOA, and LSMS development levels of effort identified at the May 2008 LNPA WG meeting, and distribute the revised document to the group in order for Service Providers to develop their individual rankings of the Change Orders in preparation for the prioritization session scheduled for the July 2008 LNPA WG meeting.



All open change orders will be moved to accepted for placement in the candidate pool for consideration for the next NPAC release

Regarding the attached NANC 415, NeuStar will review the Change Order to determine if any additional requirements are needed in support of Video Relay Services (VRS) for the deaf and hearing-impaired.

.

* Determine Change Orders to be Referred to APT for Review
  + - No Change Orders were identified for referral to the APT at this time.
* Determine Next Steps for NPAC Software Release

* + - Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will distribute the LNPA WG’s NANC Change Order prioritization process in preparation for the session scheduled for the July 2008 LNPA WG meeting.
    - Service Providers are to develop their individual rankings for the Change Orders in the candidate pool for the next NPAC software release and come prepared at the July 2008 LNPA WG meeting to develop the group prioritization of the Change Orders.

Discussion of Need for June Conference Call (All):

* It was agreed that an LNPA WG conference call will be held on June 9, 2008, from 11am to 3pm Eastern **(NOTE that the call date has been changed from June 10th to June 9th)**. The bridge number is **888-412-7808 PIN 23272#.**
* The agenda will consist of the following:
  + Determine if INC Issue 576 Will Become LNPA WG Best Practice – All
  + Action Item 0508-02: NeuStar will report out on the June 9, 2008 LNPA WG conference call on the quantity of providers utilizing standard FTP and suggest a sunset date for support of standard FTP.
  + Review of Proposed SMS URI Change Order – All
  + Finalization of Condition 4 of Best Practice 50 – All
  + New Business – All

Review of March 2008 LNPA WG Action Items:



**March 2008 LNPA WG Action Items:**

* Item 0308-01: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0308-02: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0308-03: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0308-04: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0308-05: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0308-06: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0308-07: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0308-08: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0308-09: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0308-10: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0308-11: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0308-12: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0308-13: This item remains Open.
* Item 0308-14: This item remains Open.
* Item 0308-15: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0308-16: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0308-17: This item has been completed and is Closed.

**March 2008 APT Action Items:**

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

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

* Item 0706-06: This item 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 1107-12: This item is Closed.
* Item 0108-04: This item remains Open. At the May 2008 meeting, Verizon Business stated that this is not an issue for their systems.

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

No Action Items remain open from previous APT meetings.

Review of April 2008 Action Items:

* No LNPA WG conference call was held during April 2008.

New Business (All):

* Comcast identified an issue where some customers are requesting a disconnect from the Old SP in a port when their intent is to port their number to the New SP. In some of these instances, the Old SP disconnects the customer and puts the TN in an aging status in their inventory system. There is also the scenario where an already-ported TN is disconnected and snaps back to the codeholder who is not one of the two providers involved in the port. Action for Service Providers to come to the July 2008 LNPA WG meeting prepared to identify what a provider would have to do to work with them to get the number ported in these cases.

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

* A review and discussion of NANC 401 will be placed on the July 2008 agenda at the beginning of Change Management.

***Next LNPA WG Conference Call … June 9, 2008, 11am – 3pm Eastern,***

***888-412-7808, PIN 23272#***

***Next LNPA WG Meeting …******July 15-16, 2008, Boston, Massachusetts –***

***Hosted by NeuStar***