LNPA WORKING GROUP

June 2008 Conference Call

Final Minutes

**MONDAY 06/09/08**

Monday, 06/09/08, Conference Call Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Tina Plaisance | Alltel | John Nakamura | | NeuStar |
| Joe Cudo | Alltel | Paul LaGattuta | | NeuStar |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Jim Rooks | | NeuStar |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T | Stephen Addicks | | NeuStar |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Mobility | Karen Mulberry | | NeuStar |
| Barbara Hjelmaa | Bright House | Shannon Sevigny | | NeuStar Pooling |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian Consortium | Mubeen Saifullah | | NeuStar Clearinghouse |
| Calvin Simshaw | CenturyTel | Linda Peterman | | One Communications |
| Mike Lofton | CenturyTel | Richard Finnigan | | Oregon Telecommunications Association and the Washington Independent Telecommunications Association |
| Bill Solis | Comcast | Jan Doell | | Qwest |
| Cindy Sheehan | Comcast | Mary Retka | | Qwest |
| Nancy Sanders | Comcast | Matt Kohly | | Socket Telecom |
| Bob Malone | Evolving Systems | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint Nextel |
| Robert Binder | Frontier | Carol Frike | | Sprint Nextel |
| Therese Mooney | Global Crossing | Michael Klappa | | Sprint Nextel |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW | Dennis Rose | | Texas Statewide Telephone Cooperative |
| Ann Vick | GVNW | Mohamed Samater | | T-Mobile |
| Courtney Spears | GVNW | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Connie Stufflebeem | Iowa Network Services | Amanda Molina | | Townes Telecom |
| Angie Beckett | JSI Tel | Darla Pistulka | | Vantage Point |
| Karen Hoffman | JSI Tel | Chipp Nelson | | VeriSign |
| Wes Robinson | JSI Tel | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Dean Uher | Martin Group | Earl Scott | | Verizon |
| Trip England | Missouri RLECs | Jason Lee | | Verizon |
| Craig Johnson | Missouri RLECs | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Geoff Feiss | Montana Telecom Assn. | Tom Zablocki | | Vonage |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

2008 Meeting and Call Schedule/Hosts/Locations:

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.  4/8/08 call if necessary. |  |  |
| 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.

**CONFERENCE CALL MINUTES:**

Attached are the Action Items assigned on the June 9, 2008 LNPA WG conference call. Please note that these Action Items are in addition to the ones assigned at the May 2008 LNPA WG meeting. Both sets of Action Items will be addressed at the July 2008 meeting.

****

NOTE: ALL ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “JUNE 2008 LNPA ACTION ITEMS” FILE ATTACHED ABOVE.

Determine if INC Issue 576 Will Become LNPA WG Best Practice – All:

* The group reviewed INC Issue 576, which amended the TBPAG to add text in Section 8.3.11 to clarify the action to take when pooled TNs are double-assigned. The final text in Section 8.3.11 of the TBPAG is as follows:

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.

* It was noted that it does not matter who assigned the TN first if the donating provider failed to remove the TN from their inventory system and assigned it subsequent to donation. In any case, the Blockholder’s customer will retain the TN.
* Question asked: How would we know the TN was assigned by the LERG Assignee post donation. It was stated that the date of block donation and when the number was assigned by the donor provider could be identified.
* There were no objections to placing this text in the LNPA WG’s NP Best Practices document. Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will revise BP 42 to add the accepted text for review at the July 2008 LNPA WG meeting.

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 – NeuStar:

* This agenda item was deferred to the July 2008 LNPA WG meeting.

Review of Proposed SMS URI Change Order – All:



* The group discussed the business need of the attached Change Order, proposed by Sprint Nextel to add a field for a Short Message Service (SMS) URI. With wireline IP sets now supporting SMS messages, it can no longer be assumed that no wireline TNs are capable of supporting the receipt of SMS messages. In the case of wireless TNs, it is assumed that all are capable of supporting receipt of SMS messages.
* It was asked by a participant if the chartered purpose of the NPAC was being exceeded by the LNPA WG in adding NGN data fields to the NPAC. It was explained that this proposed data field is analogous to the data field that was added previously for the wireless SMS DPC and the purpose of this newly proposed data field is to address the need to identify which wireline TNs can support SMS and which cannot. It was then asked if this changed the end user experience. It was explained in response that, in today’s environment, wireless end users can send SMSs to wireline TNs that do not support receipt of SMS messages and could possibly be billed for failed messages or not know that the message failed. The participant stated that this is a partial solution because it would not include native numbers, only ported or pooled numbers. It was stated that providers offering IP-enabled services, such as receipt of SMSs on wireline IP sets, could likely have ported-in or pooled TNs.
* Support for this functionality would be optional in local systems and would be backwards compatible.
* It was asked if anyone has looked at the impact to record size in the LSMS. It was stated in response that that would be up to the LSMS vendors.
* A participant asked what error message was received by the originating carrier if an SMS message fails. Another participant responded that they are not sure what the carrier receives, but some carriers do not send error messages to their customers. Another participant stated that he has received them.
* The group was then polled regarding whether or not this Change Order should be accepted. AT&T and Comcast voiced objections to moving forward with this Change Order at this time. No other objections were voiced. It was determined by the Co-Chairs that consensus was reached to accept this Change Order and place it in the candidate pool of Change Orders to be prioritized at the July 2008 LNPA WG meeting.
* NeuStar will provide the NPAC Level of Effort for the attached SMS URI Change Order prior to the July 2008 LNPA WG meeting.
* Local System Vendors will provide the SOA and LSMS Levels of Effort for the attached SMS URI Change Order prior to the July 2008 LNPA WG meeting.
* NeuStar will distribute the complete Change Order package containing all Change Orders in the candidate pool for prioritization, including NPAC, SOA, and LSMS Levels of Effort, prior to the July 2008 LNPA WG meeting.
* Another participant stated that some carriers are placing non-ported/non-pooled TNs in the NPAC in order to populate the WSMSC DPC/SSN data fields.. Therese Mooney, Global Crossing, will attempt to determine why these carriers are putting these numbers in the database just to populate these data fields rather than using STP Global Title data at the NPA-NXX level to route the messages.

Finalization of Condition 4 of Best Practice 50 – All:

* Condition 4 of Best Practice 50, as proposed, 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).”

* A number of wireless carriers expressed concerns that the opening paragraph of BP50 was not explicitly clear that this Best Practice addressed wireline FX service. The second sentence in the opening paragraph of BP50 currently reads, “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.”

The group agreed to revise the second sentence to read, “The following conditions are intended as technical guidelines for porting in conjunction with wireline foreign exchange (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.”

The wireless carriers that raised the concern agreed that this change satisfied their issue. No objections were raised to making this change.

* The group then moved to the 4th condition of BP50 (please refer to the text above). When polled, there were no objections raised by the LNPA WG participants to the proposed wording. As a result, it was agreed to adopt the wording of condition 4, as proposed.
* CenturyTel stated that they were not raising objections to the changes agreed to on the call, but still objected in general to BP50 because they feel it advocates location portability. It was stated by another participant that the second sentence in the opening paragraph, which states that these guidelines, “………are not intended to address location (geographic) portability ………....” was meant to address this concern. CenturyTel responded that their general objection to BP50 still stood and that it be noted in the conference call minutes.
* As a result of the overwhelming support for the revisions to BP50 (with the exception of CenturyTel’s objection as respectfully acknowledged and noted above), it was agreed that BP50 was now finalized and could be included, as revised, in the LNPA WG’s NP Best Practices document. Attached is the finalized wording of BP50 in its entirety, as approved on the June 9, 2008 LNPA WG conference call. Thanks to all who participated and contributed in bringing this to closure.



New Business – All:

* In preparation for the upcoming session at the July 2008 LNPA WG meeting to rank all candidate Change Orders to determine which will be included in the next NPAC software release, Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, explained the guidelines for how the ranking session will be conducted. Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will distribute the guidelines for Change Order prioritization, as discussed on the June 9, 2008 conference call, prior to the July 2008 LNPA WG meeting.

NOTE: This Action Item has been completed. See attached file.



* Lonnie Keck, AT&T Mobility, stated that there have been instances where the person who is not the responsible party on the account (e.g., spouse, employee, student), but has all of the necessary information to authorize a port, ports a number and the responsible party subsequently calls up to object. Some providers are treating this as an inadvertent port while others treat this similar to identity theft. Some treat as a valid port. This issue will be placed on the July 2008 meeting agenda, entitled “PIM 53 Inadvertent Port Discussion.”

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

***NeuStar***