LNPA WORKING GROUP

November 2008 Meeting

Final Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Irvine, California | Host: T-Mobile |

**TUESDAY 11/11/08**

Tuesday, 11/11/08, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Joe Cudo | Alltel (phone) | Marcel Champagne | | NeuStar (phone) |
| Tina Plaisance | Alltel (phone) | Paul LaGattuta | | NeuStar |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Dave Garner | | NeuStar |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T | Shannon Sevigny | | NeuStar Pooling (phone) |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T (phone) | Linda Peterman | | One Communications |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | Richard Finnigan | | Oregon Telco Assn. & Washington Independent Telco Assn. (phone) |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Mobility (phone) | Mary Retka | | Qwest |
| Barbara Hjelmaa | Brighthouse Networks | Jan Doell | | Qwest |
| Michael Reith | Brighthouse Networks | Rosemary Emmer | | Sprint Nextel |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian Consortium | Lavinia Rotaru | | Sprint Nextel |
| Mike Lofton | CenturyTel | Michael Klappa | | Sprint Nextel (phone) |
| Nancy Sanders | Comcast | Rosalee Pinnock | | Syniverse |
| Cindy Sheehan | Comcast | Mark Greene | | Tekelec |
| Vicki Goth | Embarq (phone) | Raghav Rao | | Tekelec |
| Greg Council | Evolving Systems (phone) | Ramesh Chellamani | | Tekelec |
| Steve Zacharzuk | Fairpoint (phone) | Matt Timmerman | | Telcordia (phone) |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW (phone) | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Wes Robinson | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Pat White | | Telcordia |
| Bridget Alexander | John Staurulakis, Inc. | Dennis Rose | | Texas Statewide Tel. Coop. (TSTCI) (phone) |
| Karen Hoffman | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Jason Loyer | | Time Warner Cable |
| Angie Mackey | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Stacy Hannah | | Time Warner Cable |
| Shaun Giesler | Level 3 | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Marge Pisciotta | NECA (phone) | Mohamed Samater | | T-Mobile |
| Tony DiFiore | NECA (phone) | Chipp Nelson | | VeriSign |
| Lynette Khirallah | NetNumber (phone) | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Jason Lee | | Verizon (phone) |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Sara Hooker | | Verizon Wireless (phone) |
| Mike Panis | NeuStar (phone) | Kathy Rogers | | Verizon Wireless |
| Charles Ryburn | NeuStar (phone) | Tom Zablocki | | Vonage (phone) |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar Clearinghouse | Darren Krebs | | Vonage (phone) |
|  |  |  | |  |

NOTE: ALL ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “NOVEMBER 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 from 11am to 3pm Eastern time, dial-in bridge number is 888-412-7808, pin 23272# |  |  |
| November | TBD | 11th-12th | T-Mobile | Irvine, California |
| December | TBD | No meeting or call. |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

09/08 Meeting Minutes Review:

* Page 11, INC Issue 591: Add title of issue – **Reduction of NANPA’s Timeline to Respond to Part 1**

10/08 Meeting Minutes Review:

* No changes were made to the DRAFT October 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):

* The OBF Wireless Committee met during OBF #104 with primary areas of focus being continuing work on the Jeopardy Issue #3118 and to further develop improvements for Intermodal porting.
* **Issue 3118**, addressing Jeopardies, remains open.  The committee worked through details of the message structure, data dictionary changes and documentation updates.  An Interim Wireless meeting is scheduled for November 21, 2008 with the expectation of placing the issue into Initial Closure during the meeting.

The actual document updates for WICIS 5.0.0 to incorporate Jeopardy Responses will be done during OBF #105.  Vendors will provide an estimate of how long it will take to develop and conduct inter-vendor testing by November 21, 2008.  Based on the information provided by the vendors, the committee will move forward with discussion regarding a potential sunrise date for WICIS 5.0.0 and sunset date for WICIS 4.0.0.  Carriers will provide their feedback regarding a sunset date of 4.0.0 by OBF #105.  An interim meeting is scheduled for January 16, 2009 to review WICIS 5.0.0 updates in preparation for finalizing the document during OBF #105.

* **Issue 3221** addressing potential changes from FCC Order 07-188 was tabled pending future regulatory activity.
* **Issue 3278** addressing WICIS 4.0.0 Industry Implementation Guidelines Updates was placed into Initial Closure with the following Resolution Statement:

**The Committee developed and approved an Implementation schedule and action items for carriers and vendors for WICIS 4.0.0 implementation.  Carriers and vendors agreed to a time line of implementation activities, supplied implementation contact names, and agreed to the criteria to be used to determine if the WICIS 4.0.0 should be backed out.  The implementation time line included scheduling a conference bridge that would be used for scheduled industry checkpoints before and after implementation.  The conference bridge allowed implementation participants to closely monitor and coordinate implementation activities between carriers and vendors.**

* The committee is pleased to report that the WICIS 4.0.0 implementation was very successful with only a few minor issues.

**Intermodal Subcommittee:**

* Several interim Intermodal Task Force and Subcommittee meetings took place prior to the Intermodal Subcommittee meeting during OBF #104 in an effort to develop the data fields and processes needed to handle both simple and complex Intermodal port requests and responses.
* The subcommittee agreed to move forward with a standardized method for porting from wireline to wireless and from wireless to wireline (LSR REQTYPE C and WPR).
* The following agreements were reached during the OBF #104 Intermodal Subcommittee Meeting:
  + The LSOP committee will have standardization conversations with OBF member wireline carriers not present at OBF #104 and deliver a formal response to the request for standardization by OBF #105.  The following items will be considered for standardization.

1. Standard list of fields (Standardization of LSOG porting data elements)   
   Standardization of requests (including porting business rules), SUPs and responses (including RCODEs)
2. Standardization of definitions of required, conditional and optional
3. Standardization of size, data type and valid values of fields

Wireline carriers need to determine a standardized methodology for simple and complex requests and responses, dependent upon bullet 1.

1. Initially rolled out with electronically bonded carriers (XML, EDI)
2. Need to decide implementation approach and dates
3. Consideration for standardization of pre-order processes will be addressed at a later point

* For wireless to wireline ports, the WICIS will be utilized.
* Wireless carriers need to determine a specific date for sunset of receipt and processing of any other porting format
* Wireline and wireless participants to encourage retail participation and input into both committees
* The application of the limited exception to the copyright on the LSOG fax forms will be reviewed by ATIS.  This exception would allow providers to send the same LSOG fax form to a variety of carriers without having to be concerned about having the correct carrier logo on the form.
* Following the Intermodal Subcommittee meeting, the Wireless Committee discussed giving approximately 6 months from OBF #105 (August 1, 2009) to have the WICIS as a standard for all port outs.  It was noted that there should not be any impacts to the vendors.  An issue may be needed at the LNPA WG to address porting flows with respect to intermodal porting.
* If all OBF LSOP wireline member companies do not agree with the proposed standardization process, work on developing the Intermodal Interface will need to continue.
* The Wireless committee would like to coordinate meetings with the LSOP committee in order to work issues jointly that may have impacts to the standardization.
* OBF #105 takes place January 26 - 29, 2008 in Louisville, KY.  The Wireless Committee will meet that Tuesday through Thursday with the Intermodal Subcommittee meeting the afternoon of Tuesday, January 27th.
* Discussion ensued on the LSR standardization work in LSOP and the Intermodal Subcommittee. The type of carrier you are porting from will determine which form you use – if porting from wireless, you would submit a WPR, if porting from wireline, you would submit an LSR. A participant expressed concern about not being able to provide input on behalf of their many ILEC clients.

OBF LSOP Committee (Linda Peterman, One Communications & LSOP Co-Chair):

* Linda Peterman reported that a lot of discussion took place during the Intermodal meeting surrounding rejects and sups, and the disparities between the ways wireline and wireless providers handle these pieces of the process.  From an LSOP perspective, they are looking at how best to handle standardization across the board.  However, wireline providers will continue to utilize their legacy systems, as will the wireless providers.

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

* INC Issue 589: **Saint Maarten application to join NANP**

INC has recommended approval to NANPA with some caveats. It is up to NANPA to assign code per the guidelines and they are awaiting word from the FCC.

* INC Issue 591: **Reduction of NANPA’s Timeline to Respond to Part 1**

In Initial Pending – this issue changes the timeline of Part 1/Part 3 processing (opening a new code) for NANPA by reducing the timeline that NANPA has to respond to a Part 1 from 10 business days to 7 calendar days. A Change Order was submitted to the FCC and was approved.

* INC Issue 602: **Checking returned block in NPAC**

This issue updates the guidelines so the PA can check the contamination level of a block when it is returned to the pool. The NAPM LLC did approve the PA’s request to receive NPAC data to determine contamination levels. The issue is now in Final Closure.

* INC Issue 604: **Codeholder vs. LERG assignee**

Prior to the implementation of pooling, the LERG assignee was the NXX codeholder, which had duties to donate blocks to the pool. With pooling, NXX codes and blocks within an NXX code can be assigned in the LERG and to different providers. A contribution team has been formed to work this issue with the goal of moving to one term and one definition in the INC guidelines.

* INC Issue 605: **Clarify block expedites in TPBAG**

This issue cleaned up the language in the expedite section of the TBPAG. The current text did not speak accurately to modifies and disconnects. The guideline will be published on 11/14/08. The issue is in Final Closure.

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 (Analysis of Commons and Property Rights Models for the allocation ,assignment, and administration of NANP Toll Free Numbering Resources), 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. A draft White Paper on FTN 005 is under development. Due to a concern that the draft paper was concluding that assigning property rights to end users for toll free numbers was the right thing to do, the paper is being reworked to make it more neutral.
* The FoN is now meeting once every 3 weeks.
* See the attached slide deck for the FTN-005 action plan as well as a description of the remaining FoN issues. There has been no activity on the other FTNs.



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

* WICIS 4.0 was flash cut on 9/14/2008. The cut was deemed extremely successful with some minor issues.
* The WICIS 4.0 Lessons Learned document is now complete and on the LNPA WG website.
* The WTSC is going dormant for now after a job well done.

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

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

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

* No APT meeting was held at the November 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. SOW 66 for manual cleanup was submitted by NeuStar to the LLC on May 20th. The LLC approved SOW 66 at their July 2008 meeting. NANC 402 is the Change Order for the manual cleanup.



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



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. NANC 424 is included in the recommended next NPAC software release.

* 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. NANC 426 is included in the recommended next NPAC software release.

* 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 0708-05: Regarding the attached PIM 67, Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, will develop a proposed NP Best Practice and Resolution statement for review by the LNPA WG.

Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, reviewed the proposed language inserted in the attached v2 of PIM 67. The language was accepted by the group. Action Item 0708-05 was closed.

Regarding the attached PIM 67, Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will

develop a new Best Practice item based on the Suggested Resolution in PIM 67, and send it to Mohamed Samater, T-Mobile, to be uploaded onto the LNPA WG Best Practice portion of the website.

* NEW PIM 69 – This PIM, submitted by Vonage, seeks to address issues related to porting numbers that are associated with DSL service in the Old SP’s network.



Vonage explained that when the Old SP disconnects the telephony piece and also disconnects the associated DSL service, and the customer is porting to a VoIP provider, the customer cannot get voice service with the new VoIP provider. Vonage, in their PIM, suggests that the Old SP convert the customer to standalone DSL.

It was stated by a participant that the FCC did not require standalone DSL and that not all carriers offer standalone DSL. Another participant stated that they do not feel that this issue belongs in the LNPA WG because it has to do with how providers offer DSL service and not to do with porting a number.

Several rural ILECs expressed concerns that customers would be unknowingly paying a higher price for their DSL service. Vonage was asked if they are partnering with a network provider that offers DSL service. The questioner stated that they feel that it is the New SP’s (Vonage in this case) responsibility to educate their incoming customer on the need to retain their existing DSL service or obtain it from the new network provider in the port. Vonage was also asked if they port in customers that do not currently have a high-speed internet connection. Vonage responded that they reject the order and instruct the customer to obtain it and to call them back.

It was stated that the issuance of the LSR for porting is being interpreted as a disconnect for other products and services and is this appropriate. It was questioned whether it is appropriate to convert the customer to standalone DSL and have their bill possibly increase for DSL unknowingly.

It was stated that one ILEC accepts a note in the LSR to retain the customer’s DSL service and strips it down to standalone DSL. It was further stated that what the PIM is suggesting is to require providers to provide standalone DSL when the FCC has not ordered it.

Consensus in the room and on the bridge appeared to suggest that the best way to ensure a good customer experience is for the New VoIP SP to instruct the customer to obtain DSL service or to contact the Old SP to retain standalone DSL. This would address the DSL cost issue and the loss of voice service issue.

PIM 69 was not accepted for further discussion.

Disputed Port Definition Discussion (Action Item 0708-02) – Lonnie Keck, AT&T Mobility:

Action Item 0708-02: 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.

* Lonnie Keck, AT&T Mobility, reported that carriers have not come to agreement on the definition of a disputed port for a Best Practice.
* Lonnie stated that the 2nd bullet in the Resolution Statement of the attached PIM 53, extracted here, may be acceptable.

For an activated port that is disputed by the Old SP or not recognized in the systems of the Old SP, if it is determined that it was in fact the intent of the end user to port his/her number to the New SP, both providers should work together in resolving any systems true-up issues, e.g. reissuance of any necessary LSRs, when possible, without impacting the end user’s service.



* Action Item 0708-02 remains open.

Status of NIIF LNP Contact Directory Updates (Action Item 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 remains open.
* Only the National LNP Contact Directory needs to be updated by providers, and not the Company Specific Contact Directory.

2009 Meeting/Call Schedule Review – All:



**CHANGES:**

* The January 2009 meeting will be hosted by Telcordia in Scottsdale, Arizona. The meeting dates were changed to Wednesday and Thursday, January 7th and 8th, 2009.
* The July 2009 meeting will be hosted by the Canadian Consortium in Ottawa, Ontario Canada.
* The November 2009 meeting will be hosted by NeuStar in a location TBD.
* All face-to-face meetings will start at 9am local time.

PIM 68/NANC 436 Discussion (Action Items 0908-01, 0908-05, 0908-06, 1008-01, 1008-03, 1008-06, 1008-07, 1008-08, 1008-09) (1 PM PACIFIC TIME HARD START) – All:



* Renee Dillon, AT&T Mobility, walked the group through the attached v5 version of PIM 68. She recounted the recent rise in database growth resulting from the SVs created in order to populate the future use fields that were not available at the 1K block level.
* An LSMS vendor stated that their LSMS does not currently support the storing of these new parameters in NANC 436. The individual SVs can be deleted in an LSMS even if it does not support these new parameters as SPs collapse them into 1K blocks.
* The database record count has dropped from 206M to under 198M largely as a result of collapsing the individual SVs back into 1K blocks.
* Item A in the PIM was implemented on October 5th. Item B has been completed.
* A service provider stated that this situation was unique because it was a use of unauthorized fields by a service provider that generated a large number of database records that resulted in a capacity issue.
* It was agreed that the attached draft Best Practice will be broken into two BPs – one for the use of these fields/parameters, and one for breaking out individual SVs from pooled blocks with the same data as the pooled block. Renee Dillon, AT&T Mobility, Jan Doell, Qwest, Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel, and Shaun Giesler, Level 3, will revise the attached proposed NANC 436 Best Practice discussed at the November 2008 LNPA WG meeting and create two Best Practices in its stead to address the following:

1. Use of the End User Location Value, End User Location Type, and Billing ID fields and Alt-End User Location Value, Alt-End User Location Type, and Alt-Billing ID parameters,
2. Breaking out individual SVs from pooled blocks with the same data as the pooled block.

LNPA WG Participants are to contact Renee Dillon, AT&T Mobility, at [rd9317@att.com](mailto:rd9317@att.com), if they wish to participate on the team to develop the two Best Practices related to NANC 436.

* It was stated that any provider that has a use for any of these fields should come before the LNPA WG to discuss. It was questioned if providers would be comfortable with sharing their network plans.
* A service provider asked if there was any need to develop a Change Order to prohibit the use of these fields. Another service provider responded that one possible path forward could be to prohibit the creation of new SVs or the modification of existing SVs solely for the purpose of populating these fields. Another service provider cautioned that we should attempt to understand the uses that providers have for these fields and make a decision based on that knowledge.
* Action Item 1008-06: For discussion at the November 2008 LNPA WG meeting, Service Providers are to identify reasons why they may need to intra-SP individual TNs from within a pooled 1K block during a migration project. Why is it necessary to intra-SP port any TN out of a 1K block? Why is it necessary to intra-SP port all of the pooled numbers within a 1K block? Reasons cited will be used to tee up discussion in order to identify any potential Best Practices on large projects such as technology and network migrations.

Reasons cited were:

* + All customers could not be migrated at the same time because of reasons such as outside plant considerations.
  + Some carriers give a block of numbers to a reseller at less than a 1K level.
  + Contaminated intra-SP ports.
  + ISPs in preparation for a SPID migration.
  + Rate Center administration
  + Splitting a 1K block among multiple switches
  + Location portability within the rate center or in conjunction with FX. Also inter-SP porting.
  + In preparation of an acquisition or divestiture, intra-SP porting numbers you are keeping in blocks you are giving up.
  + Migration to a different technology.
  + DPC changes for CNAM, LIDB migrations.
  + Porting of Type 1 numbers.

Action 1008-06 was closed.

* Action Item 1008-07: For discussion at the November 2008 LNPA WG meeting, Service Providers are to come prepared to discuss whether or not the End User Location Value (EULV), End User Location Type (EULT), and Billing ID fields, and the altEnd User Location Value, altEnd User Location Type, and altBilling ID parameters in the Optional Data field are appropriate for continued use by service providers.

Action Item 1008-07 will be determined at a later date and remains open.

* Action Item 1008-08: To the extent that they can, Service Providers are to come prepared at the November 2008 LNPA WG meeting to provide any of their transitional or permanent uses for End User Location Value (EULV), End User Location Type (EULT), and Billing ID fields, and the altEnd User Location Value, altEnd User Location Type, and altBilling ID parameters in the Optional Data field **if they have used them, either currently or in the past**, in order to facilitate discussion of possible defined uses of these fields/parameters.

Action Item 1008-09: To the extent that they can, Service Providers are to come prepared at the November 2008 LNPA WG meeting to **provide any suggested uses, either transitional or permanent**, for the End User Location Value (EULV), End User Location Type (EULT), and Billing ID fields, and the altEnd User Location Value, altEnd User Location Type, and altBilling ID parameters in the Optional Data field, in order to facilitate discussion of possible defined uses of these fields/parameters.

* + T-Mobile, Verizon Wireless, Verizon, Qwest, AT&T, Comcast, Sprint, Communications One, CenturyTel, Embarq, and Alltel stated that they have not any identified uses for these fields/parameters, nor have they used them in the past.
  + Level 3 stated that they do use these fields/parameters.
  + NeuStar stated that over a half dozen service providers currently use these fields and over 50 have used them in the past.
  + NeuStar will reach out to the providers that use the End User Location Value, End User Location Type, and Billing ID fields, and Alt-End User Location Value, Alt-End User Location Type, and Alt-Billing ID parameters to see if they would be willing to come to the January 2009 LNPA WG meeting to explain their uses for these fields or would be willing to have their uses described by NeuStar in the aggregate. Possible outcomes of this discussion include definition of allowable uses of these fields/parameters and suspension of projects that result in the creation of new SVs by reason of their use.
  + Level 3 stated that they are using these fields in their technology migration to identify the LRNs for their existing platform and for their new platform to facilitate the movement of the numbers. The data is not used to track the migration, but to implement the migration, which their TN administration systems are not set up to do. The SVs will be cleaned up after the migration.

Action Items 1008-08 and 1008-09 will remain open for further discussion at the January 2009 LNPA WG meeting.

**WEDNESDAY 11/12/08**

Wednesday, 11/12/08, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Joe Cudo | Alltel (phone) | Marcel Champagne | | NeuStar (phone) |
| Tina Plaisance | Alltel (phone) | Paul LaGattuta | | NeuStar |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Dave Garner | | NeuStar |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T | Shannon Sevigny | | NeuStar Pooling (phone) |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T (phone) | Linda Peterman | | One Communications |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | Mary Retka | | Qwest |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Mobility (phone) | Jan Doell | | Qwest |
| Barbara Hjelmaa | Brighthouse Networks | Rosemary Emmer | | Sprint Nextel |
| Michael Reith | Brighthouse Networks | Lavinia Rotaru | | Sprint Nextel |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian Consortium | Michael Klappa | | Sprint Nextel (phone) |
| Mike Lofton | CenturyTel | Carol Frike | | Sprint Nextel (phone) |
| Nancy Sanders | Comcast | Rosalee Pinnock | | Syniverse |
| Cindy Sheehan | Comcast | Mark Greene | | Tekelec |
| Bill Solis | Comcast (phone) | Raghav Rao | | Tekelec |
| Len Sampson | Fairpoint (phone) | Ramesh Chellamani | | Tekelec |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW (phone) | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Bridget Alexander | John Staurulakis, Inc. | Pat White | | Telcordia |
| Angie Mackey | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Jason Loyer | | Time Warner Cable |
| Shaun Giesler | Level 3 | Stacy Hannah | | Time Warner Cable |
| Lynette Khirallah | NetNumber (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Ed Barker | NeuStar (phone) | Mohamed Samater | | T-Mobile |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Chipp Nelson | | VeriSign |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Jason Lee | | Verizon (phone) |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar Clearinghouse | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
|  |  | Kathy Rogers | | Verizon Wireless |
|  |  | Tom Zablocki | | Vonage (phone) |
|  |  |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

Best Practice Discussion (Action Item 0908-04)– Deb Tucker/Sue Tiffany:

  

* Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, led the group through the attached proposed Best Practices for the MMS (NANC 430), SMS (NANC 435), and Voice (NANC 429) URI fields, which are proposed to explain the appropriate use of these data fields.
* A service provider asked if we were prematurely developing these Best Practices because the NAPM LLC has not yet approved the Change Orders. It was agreed that it made sense to hold off putting them on the website until if/when the LLC approves them, but we would still continue working them and agreeing on the language. That same service provider expressed concern that we are injecting non-porting-related data into the NPAC. Another service provider responded that this is similar to the DPC data fields that are necessary to perform message routing correction for services impacted by number portability.
* A local system vendor asked if we also need a Best Practice to address discrepancies between this data and the URIs in the ENUM database.
* RFC 2396 (attached) was developed by the IETF as a standard for URI definition and syntax. With regard to Change Orders NANC 429 (URI Fields for Voice), NANC 430 (URI Fields for MMS), and NANC 435 (URI Fields for SMS), Service Providers planning to use any of these Change Orders to identify the URIs of their gateways are to determine for discussion at the January 2009 LNPA WG meeting if industry standards accommodate the format they will use for their URIs. Refer to the attached RFC 2396, which is the IETF standard for URI Generic Syntax. ATIS members can also download the PTSC border gateway standard free of charge and non-members can download that ATIS standard for a fee.



Also attached is a link to another IETF Internet Draft related to MMS URIs.

<http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-wugofski-mms-uri-scheme-00>

* Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, will revise the attached URI Best Practices to reflect changes agreed to at the November 2008 LNPA WG meeting, which include reflecting that individual SVs will not be broken out of pooled blocks with duplicate data in these fields. These will be reviewed at the January 2009 LNPA WG meeting.

Change Management Discussion – NeuStar:

  

* The group reviewed and approved the change bars for NANCs 355, 396, 408, and 436 (implemented on 10/5/08).
* NANC 397 (Action Item 0908-07)

Action Item 0908-07: Local System Vendors are to ensure that their respective systems can support the increased throughput rates in NANC 397 and, to the extent that they can, provide feedback on their ability/inability to meet those requirements, plans to meet, etc., at the November 2008 LNPA WG meeting.

* + Telcordia, Tekelec, Syniverse, Evolving Systems, and VeriSign did not express any concerns. Action Item 0908-07 is closed.
* NANC 426 (Action Item 0908-02)

Action Item 0908-02: NANC Change Order 426 will result in the NPAC SMS sending notifications containing modified attributes as a result of a Mass Update over the SOA connection when the Service Provider SOA Mass Update Notification Flag Indicator tunable parameter is set to TRUE. Chipp Nelson, VeriSign, will determine if he wants to see all attributes or only attributes that changed as the result from a mass modify.

* + Chipp Nelson, VeriSign, stated that they only want to see the attributes that changed. Action Item 0908-02 is closed.
  + A new notification category will be added.
* NANC 433 (Action Item 0908-08)

Action Item 0908-08: Related to NANC Change Order 433, Service Providers are to come to the November 2008 LNPA WG meeting prepared to determine if they wish to establish placeholders for additional SV Types.

* + It was agreed that 3 placeholders (7, 8, and 9) will be added. Action Item 0908-08 is closed.
* NANC 390 – Action for SPs for January to determine if they have any plans to implement in their local systems.
  + For discussion at the January 2009 LNPA WG meeting, Service Providers are to determine if they have any plans to implement in their local systems NANC 390, **New Interface Confirmation Messages SOA/LSMS – to – NPAC**, which provides a positive confirmation from the NPAC that a request message was received, and that a re-send or abort is not necessary.

2009 SPID Migration Blackout Schedule Determination – All:

* The LNPA WG established the following 2009 SPID Migration blackout dates:
  + 1/4/09 (1st Sunday of month)
  + 1/18/09 (Martin Luther King Holiday)
  + 2/1/09 (1st Sunday of month)
  + 2/15/09 (President’s Day)
  + 3/1/09 (1st Sunday of month)
  + 3/22/09 (AT&T request) VZ and AT&T action to confirm)
  + 4/5/09 (1st Sunday of month)
  + 4/12/09 (Easter)
  + 5/3/09 (1st Sunday of month)
  + 5/10/09 (AT&T request)
  + 5/24/09 (Memorial Day)
  + 6/7/09 (1st Sunday of month)
  + 7/5/09 (1st Sunday of month and Independence Day)
  + 7/19/09 (AT&T request)
  + 8/2/09 (1st Sunday of month)
  + 9/6/09 (1st Sunday of month and Labor Day)
  + 10/4/09 (1st Sunday of month)
  + 11/1/09 (1st Sunday of month)
  + 11/15/09 (AT&T request)
  + 11/29/09 (Thanksgiving)
  + 12/6/09 (1st Sunday of month)
  + 12/27/09 (Christmas)
* Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, and Ron Steen, AT&T, will work together to determine if the AT&T-requested SPID migration blackout date of 3/22/09 can be accommodated.

Fairpoint SPID Migration Request (Action Item 1008-10) – Len Sampson:

* Len Sampson, Fairpoint, teed up a request to perform a SPID migration on 1/25/09, which is prior to the LERG effective date. Len explained that the migration will involve approximately 330 LRNs but only about 60,000 SVs. This led to a discussion about the practical limit of SPID migrations in terms of LRNs and SVs.
* For discussion at the January 2009 LNPA WG meeting, LNPA WG Participants will come prepared to determine what if any changes will be made to the migration limits in the attached M&P.



* A concern was expressed regarding whether or not there would be any blackout on porting away from Fairpoint during the period of time between the migration and the LERG effective date or whether it would just effect port-ins to Fairpoint. Len Sampson, Fairpoint, will determine and report to the LNPA WG Co-Chairs if there is any blackout of processing requests to port out from Fairpoint related to the period before and after the 1/25/09 SPID migration.
* The group approved the Fairpoint request for the 1/25/09 SPID migration. It was agreed that no other SPID migrations would be scheduled for 1/25/09.

iTRS Discussion – NeuStar:

* NeuStar explained that in response to their bid on an FCC RFP for a Video Relay Service (VRS) database service, they were awarded the contract.
* The plan is to use the altSPID Optional Data Parameter to contain the SPID of the new VRS provider.  The parameter has to be populated by the New Network SP when the VRS provider's customer is moving to another VRS provider.  That is, a record is created in NPAC to reflect this "port" from one VRS provider to another.  In that record, the altSPID is populated with the new VRS provider's NPAC SPID.  When the port is activated, the NPAC broadcast is used by the iTRS database to recognize the change in VRS provider serving the telephone number and to ensure that only the new VRS provider can update the iTRS database for that telephone number.  This process is analogous to limiting the SP that can update information about a telephone number in the ALI database.
* The parameter can be updated via the SOA, LTI, or the Help Desk.
* A service provider stated the following:
  + There are two services –
    - VRS (wireline type service using broadband connection) between 100K-150K users that use the service today
    - IP Relay on the wireless side (text-based service, e.g., blackberries and other wireless devices)
  + It is mandated by the FCC to provide the service by 12/31/08.
  + There are no financial implications to the deaf end user for changing VRS providers.
* Discussion then ensued on why there is a need to do this in the NPAC. It was explained that this method will be used as a mechanism to synch up the porting of a deaf user’s TN with the updating of the VRS database by the appropriate VRS provider.
* It was asked if this design was ordered by the FCC. The response was that the FCC approved NeuStar’s design.
* Sprint Nextel stated that they are a VRS provider who has discussed this with the FCC, and the FCC is fully aware of the design and has approved it.
* It was stated that the most difficult part of this process will be to know when to populate the altSPID and with what SPID, in addition to getting the routing in place from the switch to the VRS provider.
* There are 11 VRS providers requiring SPIDs.
* For review at the January 2009 LNPA WG meeting, NeuStar will develop a high-level process flow to demonstrate how the altSPID data is used in the planned process to update the Video Relay Service (VRS) database.
* VRS provider contact information is on the FCC website.

<http://www.fcc.gov/cgb/dro/trs_providers.html>

October 18th Failover Exercise Readout – NeuStar:

* NeuStar provided a report on the October 18th failover exercise.
* The first part of the exercise was to ensure that the providers could failover their circuits from the Sterling DB to the Charlotte DB. 8 providers’ auto failover did not work. Some had changed internal configurations. This was not difficult to fix.
* Next was the failover of the application to use the Charlotte NPAC system. 1 or 2 LSMSs and about 7 SOAs did not connect after 30 minutes. It took about 75 minutes for them to failover. This was better than average based on past exercises. NeuStar is working with each of the carriers to fix their issues.

Discussion of Need for December Conference Call – All:



* It was agreed that there would be no December call.

Review of September 2008 LNPA WG Action Items:



**September 2008 LNPA WG Action Items:**

* Item 0908-01: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0908-02: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0908-03: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0908-04: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0908-05: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0908-06: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0908-07: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0908-08: This item has been completed and is Closed.

**September 2008 APT Action Items:**

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

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

* Item 0906-14: This item remains Open.
* Item 0907-11: This item remains Open.
* Item 0308-13: This item remains Open.
* Item 0308-14: This item remains Open.
* Item 0608-03: This item remains Open.
* Item 0708-02: This item remains Open.
* Item 0708-05: This item has been completed and is Closed.

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

No Action Items remain open from previous APT meetings.

Review of October 2008 LNPA WG Action Items:



**October 2008 LNPA WG Action Items:**

* Item 1008-01: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1008-02: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1008-03: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1008-04: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1008-05: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1008-06: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 1008-07: This item remains Open.
* Item 1008-08: This item remains Open.
* Item 1008-09: This item remains Open.
* Item 1008-10: This item has been completed and is Closed.

New/Unfinished Business (All):

* Request to Modify SPID Migration M&P – Ron Steen



* + Ron Steen, AT&T, explained that the attached SPID Migration M&P currently only allows the To SPID to initiate a SPID migration. AT&T has had instances where they cannot contact the To SPID to initiate the necessary migration.
  + AT&T is requesting to revise the M&P to allow either SPIDs (To or From) to initiate the request.
  + AT&T is not requesting that the verification process be changed. NeuStar would still contact both SPIDs to verify the validity of the migration request. All checks and balances will remain.
  + There were no objections to AT&T’s request.
  + NeuStar will make the M&P change and if questions arise, they will be brought to the LNPA WG.
* T-Mobile and Sprint Nextel reported that the Wireless Committee at OBF 103 would like to revise the NANC flows to reflect that when numbers are moved from Wireless to Wireline, the WICIS will be used. This will be reviewed at the January 2009 meeting. Wireless carriers are currently receiving faxed LSRs for port-outs and this is problematic for them. The contribution will likely propose that the flows be augmented to include 2 new inter-modal flows – one in each direction.
* Barb Hjelmaa, Brighthouse Networks, provided a reminder that provider aging and snapback processes should be per the INC aging guidelines. It was asked if we should revisit the guidelines to see if they should be revised.

Here is the text on ported numbers in the INC TN Administration Guidelines, provided by Adam Newman, Telcordia:

**AGING AND SNAPBACK ADMINISTRATION PROCESS FOR PORTED TELEPHONE NUMBERS**

The administration processes developed for aging disconnected ported telephone numbers were based on existing local number portability (LNP) operation flows.[[1]](#footnote-1)[1][1]  These LNP operation flows should remain intact with the exception of reserved aging ported telephone numbers and re-establishing service on disconnected ported telephone numbers during the aging interval.

The following are duties to be performed by SPs, telephone number administrators, and the NPAC as a sequential process flow for disconnecting ported telephone numbers and making them available for reassignment.  Once number pooling is implemented in the industry, this process flow may be modified to incorporate new functions for the PA.

1. Subscriber initiates disconnect, identifying the desired date of disconnect and whether any specific announcement treatment is desired.
2. Current SP arranges specific announcement treatment and creates/processes a service order notifying the NPAC of the disconnect date and the effective release date of the disconnected ported telephone number.  The disconnect date signals the beginning of the aging interval.
3. Prior to the effective release date, if the subscriber desires to reconnect their telephone service using the same telephone number, the subscriber must contact the disconnecting SP to re-establish service.
4. The SP initiates/processes a service order to notify the NPAC of the intent to re-establish service for the ported number.
5. On the effective release date, the NPAC notifies the code holder/block holder of the disconnected telephone number and its corresponding effective release and disconnect dates, i.e., telephone number snaps back to code holder/block holder.
6. The NPAC then broadcasts a “subscription deletion” message to all applicable SPs and deletes the telephone number(s) from its active database.
7. The code holder/block holder of the disconnected number then makes the aged telephone number available for reassignment.

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

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

***Next LNPA WG conference call … No call is scheduled for December 2008.***

***Next LNPA WG Meeting …******January 7-8, 2009, Scottsdale, Arizona –***

***Hosted by Telcordia***

1. [1][1] Reference to the NANC’s “Interservice Provider LNP Operations Flows,” dated 4/15/97. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)