LNPA WORKING GROUP

July 2008 Meeting

Final Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Boston, Massachusetts | Host: NeuStar |

**TUESDAY 07/15/08**

Tuesday, 07/15/08, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Wendy Compton | 360 Networks (phone) | John Nakamura | | NeuStar |
| Joan O’Neal | 360 Networks (phone) | Stephen Addicks | | NeuStar |
| Marydale Sullivan | 360 Networks (phone) | Marcel Champagne | | NeuStar |
| Michelle Nelson | 360 Networks (phone) | Paul LaGattuta | | NeuStar |
| Joe Cudo | Alltel (phone) | Dave Garner | | NeuStar |
| Tina Plaisance | Alltel | Shannon Sevigny | | NeuStar Pooling (phone) |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Linda Peterman | | One Communications |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T | Mary Retka | | Qwest |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T (phone) | Jan Doell | | Qwest |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | Matt Kohly | | Socket (phone) |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Mobility (phone) | Rosemary Emmer | | Sprint Nextel |
| Barbara Hjelmaa | Brighthouse Networks | Lavinia Rotaru | | Sprint Nextel |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian Consortium | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint Nextel |
| Cheryl Conte | CBeyond (phone) | Michael Klappa | | Sprint Nextel (phone) |
| Mike Lofton | CenturyTel | Doug Babcock | | Syniverse |
| Cindy Sheehan | Comcast | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Nancy Sanders | Comcast | Matt Timmerman | | Telcordia (phone) |
| Karen Reidy | Comptel (phone) | Pat White | | Telcordia |
| Jennifer Hutton | Cox (phone) | Jason Loyer | | Time Warner Cable |
| Chris Brown | Cox | Stacy Hannah | | Time Warner Cable |
| Beth O’Donnell | Cox (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Vicki Goth | Embarq | Mohamed Samater | | T-Mobile |
| Bob Malone | Evolving Systems | Amanda Molina | | Townes Telecom (phone) |
| Karen Hoffman | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Chipp Nelson | | VeriSign |
| Angie Beckett | John Staurulakis, Inc. | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Lynette Khirallah | NetNumber (phone) | Tim Decker | | Verizon (phone) |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Katherine Serabia | | Verizon (phone) |
| Larry Vagnoni | NeuStar | Jason Lee | | Verizon (phone) |
| Mike Panis | NeuStar | Sara Hooker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Charles Ryburn | NeuStar (phone) | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar Clearinghouse (phone) | Tom Zablocki | | Vonage |
| Tara Timblin | NeuStar | Gegi Leeger | | XO Communications (phone) |
| Karen Mulberry | NeuStar | Dawn Lawrence | | XO Communications (phone) |
| Sarah Nesland | NeuStar |  | |  |

NOTE: ALL ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “JULY 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.  No call scheduled for 8/12/08. |  |  |
| 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.

05/08 Meeting Minutes Review:

* Page 6, in the bullet for Wireless to Wireless Ports, correct spelling of “fileds” to “fields.”
* Page 10, PIM 51, add “NOTE: The SOW was submitted subsequent to the meeting on May 20th.” at the end of the item.

06/08 Meeting Minutes Review:

* No changes were made to the DRAFT June 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):

* Following the May LNPA WG meeting, the OBF Wireless Committee met several times to work through new issues regarding the WICIS 4.0.0 implementation and to continue work on the Jeopardy Issue #3118.
* The new issues were fast tracked in order to get resolution during the current WICIS 4.0.0 testing phase.
  + **New Issue 3257** (final closure 6/2/2008) - Add Clarification for Invalid Field Handling in Implementation Guidelines for WICIS 4.0.0. The committee needed clarification put into the Implementation Guidelines regarding treatment of messages with invalid characters or field lengths that were too long. The following resolution was agreed upon: When an ICP system receives a WICIS SOAP message with a CORRELATION\_ID, REQ\_NO, VER\_ID\_REQ, ONSP, NNSP, or RESP\_NO field containing invalid data (i.e., the field exceeds maximum length or includes an invalid character), causing the ICP system to return a negative storeStatus message, the respective field on the storeStatus message will reflect the exact value that was received (i.e., will contain the invalid data).
  + **New Issue 3258** (final closure 6/19/2008) – Clarification to WICIS for LNUM Numbering when changing LNUM/PORTED\_NUM on a SUP 3. This issue addresses handling the re-use of line numbers on supplemental requests when ported numbers are removed from the original request. The following resolution statement was agreed upon: When a previously deleted TN(s) is added back to the port request, the same LNUM/PORTED\_NUM combination that was removed or a new LNUM/PORTED\_NUM combination can be used. When a new TN(s) is added to the request, the next available LNUM(s) value will be used as long as it’s not a previously used LNUM.
  + **New Issue 3264** (final closure 6/19/2008) - Clarification with Number of Characters in REQNO & RESPNO Fields. This issue addresses interpretation differences between the Request Number and Response Number fields related to the final 6 and 8 positions of the field. Clarification was needed on whether these positions were variable or static. The following statement will be added to the Notes section for these two fields in WICIS.

REQ\_NO: This field requires a minimum of 11 Alpha Numeric characters and a maximum of 16 Alpha Numeric characters. As stated in the Data Rules Column, the final 6 positions of the field can vary in length from 1-6 positions.

RESP\_NO: This field requires a minimum of 11 Alpha Numeric characters and a maximum of 18 Alpha Numeric characters. As stated in the Data Rules Column, the final 8 positions of the field can vary in length from 1-8 positions.

* **New Issue 3265** (final closure 7/8/2008) - Clarification in regards to the Store Status Message for the BN and TMQ/TMR messages. WICIS 4.0.0 has incomplete documentation regarding Broadcast Notifications, Test Message Queries and Test Message Responses. Updates to WICIS were documented and the issue was closed with the following Resolution Statement:

“When the WICIS version 4.0 migrated to asynchronous connectivity and adopted the Store Status and Validation Status messages, the appropriate documentation was not completed. Updates regarding the BN, TMQ, TMR and the Store Status Message for the BN, TMQ and TMR (in response to the BN, TMQ and TMR message) have been made to the appropriate fields and erroneous documentation has been removed in fields which have no bearing on the above mentioned messages.”

* **New Issue 3267** - WICIS 4.0 Validation Message Sequence Implementation. This issue addresses conditions where a validation status message times out and a subsequent message is sent without the validation status being successful.

The committee agreed that an NSP’s ICP system should treat the receipt of a port response (WPRR) as acknowledgement that the OSP received the associated port request (WPR/SPR) successfully (the OSP has attempted to send a ValidationStatus message indicating Success for the WPR/SPR), and should process and validate the port response according to WPRR rules defined in WICIS.

Similarly, if an OSP has sent a port response (WPRR), the OSP should treat the receipt of NPAC notifications with the appropriate process.

These behaviors enable the porting process to continue in an expedient manner. However, an ICP system is still responsible for attempting to send the ValidationStatus message to acknowledge a WPR or WPRR.

This issue remains open as the committee refines the changes required for the WICIS document.

* Issue 3118, addressing Jeopardies, remains open. The committee continues to work on details of the message structure, data dictionary changes and documentation updates.
* The Intermodal Subcommittee has not met since the May ’08 LNPA WG meeting.
* OBF #103 takes place August 4 – 8, 2008 in San Antonio, TX. The Wireless Committee will meet that Tuesday – Thursday and the Intermodal Subcommittee will meet Tuesday afternoon from 2 – 5pm.
* The Wireless Committee has submitted all of their fields necessary for porting and the Wireline Committee has submitted all of their fields necessary for both

Simple and Complex ports.

OBF LSOP Committee (Linda Peterman, One Communications):

* The LSOP Committee has met once since the last LNPA WG meeting. Discussions surrounded the 3Q08 LSOP release.
* Embarq and One Communications were asked to provide a list of required fields and they have been provided to the Intermodal Committee. The LSOP Committee will meet again at the next OBF.

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

* The INC has had one full meeting since the last LNPA WG meeting.
* INC Issue 497: **Identify potential guidelines changes for direct assignment of TNs to VoIP providers**

Issue tabled pending FCC action on this issue.

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

Issue strengthened the language in 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. Also modified guidelines to advise against donating a 1K block with an LRN in it.

* INC Issue 580: **Clarification on block exchanges**

Issue is looking to provide clarity in guidelines on when a provider can exchange a block in their inventory with one in the pool.

* INC Issue 581: Made COCAG and COCAG Appendix C consistent related to terminology for active and pending ports.
* INC Issue 585: **Returned blocks with over 10% contamination**

INC added language in Section 7.2.7 of TBPAG noting that these blocks will not be put back into the pool and will be treated as abandoned blocks. A new assignee will be sought. Issue is in Initial Pending.

* 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. NANPA sent a letter to industry bodies asking if there were any questions or issues with St. Maarten’s request to join the NANP. INC is developing questions that will be sent to the applicant. INC will make a recommendation on the application per the guidelines.

* INC Issue 593: **Clarify COCAG section 2.11 for when an NXX code is being reallocated**

In initial closure and should be going to final closure this week.

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

* Adam Newman, Telcordia and FoN Co-Chair, reported that work is continuing on contributions related to 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. The FoN is developing a matrix of pros/cons related to having property rights to toll free numbers.
* See the 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. There has been no activity on the other FTNs.



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

* Teresa Patton (AT&T), WTSC Co-Chair, reported the WTSC is meeting on a weekly basis.
* Vendor-to-vendor function testing is 100% completed. Vendor-to-vendor performance testing is 75% complete.
* Two sets of SP testing are 97% and 95% complete. Two other test sets are now starting.
* Two issues have been identified:
  + When the order of messages received is out of order. One vendor cannot handle out of-order messages. Vendor is working on it.
  + Resolution Required Responses on multi-line ports.

* Next meeting is scheduled for Friday, July 18th, at 11am 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 May 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 July 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 was submitted by NeuStar to the LLC on May 20th. 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.



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

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.

In lieu of the FCC Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) tentatively concluding a 48 hour porting interval, it was agreed to await FCC action. 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 (Issue 3118), 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.



PIM 67 was accepted at the May 2008 LNPA WG meeting.

Action Item 0508-10: Regarding the attached PIM 67, submitted by Verizon Wireless, 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.

* + - Sprint Nextel asked if NANC Change Order 435, which proposes adding a new SMS URI field, would have any impact on the problem cited in PIM 67. The response was that it would depend on what the two providers involved in a port would expect to use for routing of the SMS messages.
    - T-Mobile stated that they pull everything out when the customer ports out.
    - Verizon Wireless stated that the activation notification triggers their disconnect process. They also have a manual process.
    - Alltel also has an auto-disconnect process for their systems.
    - Sprint Nextel stated that it is up to a 3rd party to update SMS routing tables. It was stated that some providers may not be routing the disconnect notification to the 3rd party.
    - Action Item 0508-10 was closed.
    - Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, will develop a proposed NP Best Practice and Resolution statement for review by the LNPA WG.
* A question was asked regarding the PIMs that are tracking 07-188. What is the status of the development of standard fields? It was asked if the OBF could meet via a conference call instead of awaiting the next face-to-face meeting when all involved carriers can attend. It was stated that work is continuing on the standardization of administrative fields, but not quickly. One issue is that the needs of each participant are different and reaching consensus has been difficult. Sprint Nextel and T-Mobile offered their bridges for use. The urgency to complete this work will be communicated to ATIS leadership.

Change Management **(HARD START AT 1:30 PM EASTERN)** (NeuStar):

 

* The group began by reviewing a number of the candidate Change Orders for the next NPAC software release.
  + - NANC 401 Review and Discussion
      * If a separate LSMS association to a different LSMS for Optional Data fields is desired, this Change Order enables that.
      * No open issues were identified.
    - 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?

* + - * Evolving Systems, VeriSign, Telcordia, Verizon Business, and Tekelec all stated that their respective systems had no issues.
      * Action Item 0108-04 is closed.
    - Event ID Rollover Issue (Action Items 0507-03, 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.

* + - * NeuStar reported that 29 LSMSs were impacted, of which 12 have deployed the necessary updates, 10 more are scheduled by the end of 3Q08, 2 more are scheduled by the end of 4Q08, and 5 are not yet scheduled. Action Items 0507-03 and 0507-11 are closed.
    - NANC 427 (Action Items 0508-03, 09, 11)

Action Item 0508-03: 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.



Action Item 0508-09: 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. See related Action Item 0508-11.

0508-11: Service Providers 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. See related Action Item 0508-09.

* + - * Action Item 0508-03 is completed and closed.
      * Action Items 0508-09 and 0508-11 will be discussed after the ranking session.
      * Qwest stated that the LTI option would solve most of their issue.
    - NANC 428 (Action Item 0508-02)

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 reported that about 2/3 of all SPIDs are either using SFTP today or are able to use it. NeuStar suggested the end of March of 2009 as a sunset date for standard FTP.
      * It is possible to exchange keys to authenticate with SFTP and would lend itself to batch processing.
      * Action Item 0508-02 is closed.
* Review of Ranking Guidelines (Action Item 0608-06) – All:

Action Item 0608-06: Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will distribute the guidelines for Change Order prioritization prior to the July 2008 LNPA WG meeting.



* + - The group reviewed the attached guidelines for ranking the candidate Change Orders. No issues with the guidelines were identified and it was agreed to proceed with the ranking session as scheduled.
    - Action Item 0608-06 was closed.
* Service Provider Ranking Session (Action Item 0508-12):

Action Item 0508-12: 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. See related Action Item 0508-05.



* + - Service Providers were directed to submit their rankings to John Nakamura, NeuStar, by completing the attached ranking form. Those providers on the bridge were instructed to e-mail the form to John at [john.nakamura@neustar.biz](mailto:john.nakamura@neustar.biz).
    - Action Item 0508-12 was closed.
    - It was agreed that the meeting would be adjourned so that the Change Order rankings could be tabulated and reviewed on Wednesday morning.

**WEDNESDAY 07/16/08**

Wednesday, 07/16/08, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Joe Cudo | Alltel (phone) | Dave Garner | | NeuStar |
| Tina Plaisance | Alltel | Shannon Sevigny | | NeuStar Pooling (phone) |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Linda Peterman | | One Communications |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T | Mary Retka | | Qwest |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T (phone) | Jan Doell | | Qwest |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | Rosemary Emmer | | Sprint Nextel |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Mobility (phone) | Lavinia Rotaru | | Sprint Nextel |
| Barbara Hjelmaa | Brighthouse Networks | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint Nextel |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian Consortium | Michael Klappa | | Sprint Nextel (phone) |
| Mike Lofton | CenturyTel | Doug Babcock | | Syniverse |
| Cindy Sheehan | Comcast | Adam Newman | | Telcordia (phone) |
| Nancy Sanders | Comcast | Pat White | | Telcordia |
| Jennifer Hutton | Cox (phone) | Jason Loyer | | Time Warner Cable |
| Chris Brown | Cox | Stacy Hannah | | Time Warner Cable |
| Vicki Goth | Embarq | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Bob Malone | Evolving Systems | Mohamed Samater | | T-Mobile |
| Karen Hoffman | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Amanda Molina | | Townes Telecom (phone) |
| Angie Beckett | John Staurulakis, Inc. | Chipp Nelson | | VeriSign |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Mike Panis | NeuStar | Katherine Serabia | | Verizon (phone) |
| Charles Ryburn | NeuStar (phone) | Jason Lee | | Verizon (phone) |
| Tara Timblin | NeuStar | Sara Hooker | | Verizon Wireless |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Tom Zablocki | | Vonage |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

Follow-up Discussion of Change Order Ranking Session (All):

* After tabulation of the Service Provider rankings of the candidate Change Orders, NeuStar presented the attached results:



* The group agreed that ranks 1 through 18, plus the Mandatory Change Order (NANC 397), plus the Document Only Change Orders (NANCs 413, 420, 421, and 422) will be included in the recommended NPAC software release package.
* Seventeen (17) Service Providers participated in the ranking session.
* The next step for the release package is for the LNPA WG to finalize all requirements for the selected Change Orders. This will be on the agenda for the September 2008 LNPA WG meeting.
* With respect to NANC 433, Local System Vendors, and Service Providers that develop their own local SOA or LSMS systems, having systems that support the "**SV** **Type**" -- values 0, 1, 2 , 3 and 4 currently in use -- are to determine whether these systems can accommodate the use of an additional SV Type value of 5. For those systems that do support SV Type values of 0, 1, 2, 3 and 4, but cannot now support an additional SV Type value of 5, indicate how soon these systems could accommodate the additional SV Type value of 5.

Responses are due to the LNPA WG Co-Chairs (gary.m.sacra@verizon.com and paula.jordan@t-mobile.com) and Steve Addicks, NeuStar (stephen.addicks@neustar.biz), by close of business on Thursday, July 31, 2008. Failure to respond will be assumed to be an indication that your system(s) either can currently accommodate these new values or are not impacted by their use.

* With respect to NANC 434, Local System Vendors, and Service Providers that develop their own local SOA or LSMS systems, having systems that support the "**SP Type**" -- values 0, 1, and 2 currently in use -- are to determine whether these systems can accommodate use of an additional SP Type value of 3. For those systems that do support SP Type values of 0, 1, and 2, but cannot now support an additional SP Type value of 3, indicate how soon these systems could accommodate the additional SP Type value of 3.

Responses are due to the LNPA WG Co-Chairs (gary.m.sacra@verizon.com and paula.jordan@t-mobile.com) and Steve Addicks, NeuStar (stephen.addicks@neustar.biz), by close of business on Thursday, July 31, 2008. Failure to respond will be assumed to be an indication that your system(s) either can currently accommodate these new values or are not impacted by their use.

* Local System Vendors, and Service Providers that develop their own local SOA or LSMS systems, are to determine whether these systems can accommodate a user name suffix of "/4."

Responses are due to the LNPA WG Co-Chairs (gary.m.sacra@verizon.com and paula.jordan@t-mobile.com) and Steve Addicks, NeuStar (stephen.addicks@neustar.biz), by close of business on Thursday, July 31, 2008. Failure to respond will be assumed to be an indication that your system(s) either can currently accommodate these new values or are not impacted by their use.

* Once the impact on local systems is determined, based on the responses to these Action Items, NeuStar will take appropriate action to implement the new SV and SP types, including the issuance of cross-regional notifications that include lead times necessary to accommodate any local system needs as reported in the Action Item responses.

2008 LNPA WG Meeting/Call Schedule Update:

* It was agreed to leave August 12th, from 11am to 1pm eastern, open for a possible conference call in case any issues related to the July 31st data field implementation arise and need to be discussed. Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will distribute a notice to the LNPA WG regarding whether or not the August conference call, tentatively scheduled for August 12th, will be held.

**NOTE: Subsequent to the July 2008 LNPA WG meeting, it was decided to cancel the August 12th conference call.**

2009 Meeting Schedule:

* Syniverse will determine if they will host the January 2009 meeting in Tampa, Florida.
* Comcast will host the March 2009 meeting in Denver, Colorado.
* Sprint Nextel will host the May 2009 meeting in Overland Park, Kansas.
* Verizon will host the September 2009 meeting in Baltimore, Maryland.

Status of NIIF LNP Contact Directory Updates (AI 0308-14) – All:



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.

* Action Item 0308-14 is still being worked by providers and will remain open.

PIM 53 Inadvertent Port Discussion (Lonnie Keck, AT&T Mobility):

* On the June 9, 2008 LNPA WG conference call, 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. AT&T Mobility is requesting a clear industry definition of an inadvertent port.
* Sprint Nextel stated that they do not agree that this issue is an inadvertent port and suggested calling them disputed ports.
* For an unauthorized port, Verizon Wireless gives the number back to the other provider. They determine authorized owner based on who is financially responsible. They agreed that this is not an inadvertent port, but a disputed port.
* It was suggested that the fix could be to port the number back at customer request, but the account number may not be known by the customer or the former provider.
* It was stated that the Verizon Wireless approach to determine who is financially responsible for the bill and side with them is the safest approach, and then let the customers resolve the dispute between themselves.
* It was agreed that, at a minimum, we should develop a Best Practice that defines this “disputed” port and make it clear that it is not an “inadvertent” port. Lonnie Keck, AT&T Mobility, in addition to Sue Tiffany, Sprint Nextel, Cindy Sheehan, Comcast, and Linda Peterman, One Communications, will develop distinct definitions of an “inadvertent port” and a “disputed port,” ensuring that there is no confusion between the two definitions, for review by the LNPA WG and possible development of an NP Best Practice.

Review of May 2008 LNPA WG Action Items:



**May 2008 LNPA WG Action Items:**

* Item 0508-01: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0508-02: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0508-03: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0508-04: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0508-05: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0508-06: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0508-07: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0508-08: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0508-09: This item remains Open.
* Item 0508-10: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0508-11: This item remains Open.
* Item 0508-12: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0508-13: This item remains Open.

**May 2008 APT Action Items:**

No APT Action Items were assigned at the May 2008 LNPA WG meeting.

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

* Item 0906-14: This item remains Open.
* Item 0507-03: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0507-11: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0907-11: This item remains Open.
* Item 0108-04: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0308-13: This item remains Open.
* Item 0308-14: This item remains Open.

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

No Action Items remain open from previous APT meetings.

Review of June 2008 Action Items:



**June 2008 LNPA WG Action Items:**

* Item 0608-01: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0608-02: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0608-03: This item remains Open.
* Item 0608-04: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0608-05: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0608-06: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0608-07: This item has been completed and is Closed.

New Business (All):

* Action Item 0508-13 – Disconnect issue raised by Comcast:

Comcast had previously 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. Comcast is requesting some way to cooperatively get this TN ported so that the customer can retain their TN, possibly a Best Practice.

Action Item 0508-13: At the May 2008 LNPA WG meeting, 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.

* + Sprint Nextel stated that they communicate with the Old SP and then instruct the customer on what to do.
  + AT&T stated it depends on where the TN is in the aging process to determine if the TN can be recovered and what steps need to be taken to do so.
  + Verizon Wireline stated that if the New SP has sent in an LSR and there is a pending port out order, Verizon should not cancel the port out order to write a disconnect order. If the customer has already disconnected the line before the New SP sends in the LSR, then the usual solution is to reinstall the line as a Remote Call Forwarding line and then go ahead with the port.
  + Comcast asked if the TN is within a certain number of days in the aging process, can they get concurrence that the number will be ported to them
  + At the upcoming September 2008 LNPA WG meeting, Service Providers are

to report on the following:

1. Their TN aging practice when a non-ported number is disconnected at customer request (provide a response for both cases when the customer requests a referral announcement and when they do not),
2. Their TN aging practice when a disconnected ported TN snaps back to them as the codeholder,
3. Their TN aging practice when a ported-in TN disconnects from them (with and without a request from the customer for a referral announcement),
4. For the cases in 1 through 3 above, what is their process, if any, for working with another provider in getting the TN back to the customer in the appropriately ported state if the customer's intent was to port their number to the other provider instead of requesting the disconnect from their current provider?
5. Their practice as the current provider of a ported number for populating the Customer Disconnect Date field in the disconnect message to the NPAC. Is it the actual customer disconnect date or the date when internal aging is completed?
   * Action Item 0508-13 is closed with the opening of this new action item.

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

* No APT meeting was held at the July LNPA WG meeting.

***Next LNPA WG Meeting …******September 9-10, 2008, Ottawa, Ontario Canada –***

***Hosted by Canadian LNP Consortium***