LNPA WORKING GROUP

June 2006 Conference Call

Final Minutes

**WEDNESDAY 6/14/06**

Wednesday, 6/14/06, Conference Call Attendance:

LNPA WG Participants:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** |
| Tina Plaisance | Alltel | Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar |
| Scotty McDonald | Alltel | Jim Rooks | NeuStar |
| Mark Lancaster | at&t | John Nakamura | NeuStar |
| Ron Steen | BellSouth | Mike Whaley | Qwest |
| Dave Cochran | BellSouth | Lavinia Rotaru | Sprint Nextel |
| Beth Chorosen | Comcast | Steve Moore | Sprint Nextel |
| Nancy Sanders | Comcast | Susan Tiffany | Sprint Nextel |
| Tim Kagele | Comcast | Rosalee Pinnock | Syniverse |
| Lonnie Keck | Cingular | Colleen Collard | Tekelec |
| Adele Johnson | Cingular | Kevin Greenwood | Telcove |
| Vicki Goth | Embarq | Colleen Thompson | Telcove |
| Kathee Glodowski | Embarq | Leslie Miklos | Telcove |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW | Paula Jordan | T-Mobile |
| Ann Vick | GVNW | Gary Sacra | Verizon |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar Clearinghouse | Jason Lee | Verizon |
| Shannon Sevigny | NeuStar Pooling | Deb Tucker | Verizon Wireless |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar  | Sara Hooker | Verizon Wireless |
| Dave Garner | NeuStar |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

INC Participants:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** |
| Paula Hustead | Alltel | Stacy Hartman | Qwest |
| Jean-Paul Emard | ATIS | Joe Hurlbert | Sprint Nextel |
| Margo Zeidner  | ATIS | Ken Havens | Sprint Nextel |
| Catrina Akers | ATIS | Adam Newman | Telcordia |
| Mark Lancaster | at&t | Nicole Contillo | T-Mobile |
| Bill Shaughnessy | BellSouth | Natalie McNamer | T-Mobile |
| Dena Hunter | Level 3 | Robin Smith | Verizon |
| Shannon Sveigny | NeuStar Pooling | Jim Castagna | Verizon |
| Dara Sodano | NeuStar Pooling | Dana Smith | Verizon Wireless |
| Dave Garner | NeuStar |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Attached are the Action Items assigned on the June 2006 LNPA WG conference call. Please note that these Action Items are in addition to the ones assigned at the May 2006 LNPA WG meeting. Both sets of Action Items will be addressed at the July 2006 meeting.

****

NOTE: ALL ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “JUNE 2006 LNPA ACTION ITEMS” FILE ATTACHED ABOVE.

**CONFERENCE CALL MINUTES:**

2006 Meeting Schedule:

Following is the meeting schedule for the 2006 LNPA Meetings.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MONTH/****DATE****(2006)** | NANC | LNPA-WG | HOST | LOCATION |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| January  | 24th | 10th-11th  | Syniverse | Tampa, Florida |
| February  | No meeting | No meeting.2/8/06 call from 11am to 3pm Eastern time, dial-in bridge number is 888-412-7808, pin 23272# |  |  |
| March | 14th  | 7th-8th | NeuStar | San Diego, California |
| April | No meeting | No meeting.4/12/06 call from 11am to 3pm Eastern time, dial-in bridge number is 888-412-7808, pin 23272# |  |  |
| May | 16th  | 9th-10th  | Sprint Nextel | Overland Park, Kansas |
| June | No meeting | No meeting.6/14/06 call from 10am to 5pm Eastern time, dial-in bridge number is 888-412-7808, pin 23272#. |  |  |
| July | 18th  | 11th-12th  | Canadian Consortium | Edmonton |
| August | No meeting | No meeting.8/9/06 reserved for call, if necessary. |  |  |
| September | 19th  | 12th-13th  | Verizon | Baltimore |
| October | No meeting | No meeting.10/11/06 reserved for call, if necessary. |  |  |
| November | 30th  | 14th-15th | at&t | San Antonio |
| December | No meeting | No meeting.12/6/06 reserved for call, if necessary. |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

* Continuing evaluation during 2006 will determine if interim conference calls are needed or if the decision to meet face-to-face every other month should be revisited.

NANC 375/NANC 388 Issue (NeuStar):



* Previously, an issue was identified in Release 3.3 with NANC 375, which prevents the New SP from removing an SV from Conflict status when Cause Values 50 or 51 are used by the Old SP, and NANC 388, which allows an undo of a Cancel. The issue resulted in the undo Cancel taking the SV back to Pending status, even in cases where the previous status prior to being placed into Cancel Pending was Conflict. NANC 388 was disabled by agreement of the LNPA WG pending a fix to the issue.
* NeuStar reported that a fix is now in Point Release 3.3.0.3 and is ready for testing. The fix will result in an undo Cancel taking the SV back to its previous state, e.g., Pending, Conflict with the proper Cause Value. There is no new state change.
* NeuStar will add a test case to verify that only the Old SP can take the SV out of Conflict after the undo Cancel if the previous state was Conflict with Cause Value 50 or 51.
* NeuStar was asked if they verified that the fix did not cause any additional conflicts. NeuStar responded yes.
* The LNPA WG agreed that if we get all test cases by Friday, 6/16, we should be able to complete testing in order to reactivate NANC 388 during the 6/25 maintenance window. NeuStar committed to distributing the test cases by Friday. NeuStar will notify the industry on the X-Regional distribution.

LNPA WG Discussion on INC Issue 504:



* INC Issue 504 relates to proposed modifications the Part 1B thousands block donation form to indicate that the block is being allocated back to the donor switch and therefore the –X does not need to be created in the NPAC.
* NPAC receives the Part 1B form through the PAS system. NPAC keys off the Information Only box when determining whether to create the –X. The Pool Administrator (PA) marks the box that the block is being allocated back to the donor switch when that is the case, but does not mark the Information Only box. The service provider is responsible for modifying the Part 1B form to indicate Information Only when the block is being allocated back to the donor switch, but this does not appear to be happening in all instances. As a result, NPAC will create the –X in this case since the Information Only box is not marked.
* It was suggested as a possible solution to have NPAC key off of two fields in PAS when determining if the –X should be created:
1. the Information Only field, and
2. the field indicating that the block allocation is to the donor switch.

If either are checked “Yes,” the –X would not be created in NPAC. If the Information Only field is not checked, but the second field is, the –X would not be created in NPAC.

Joint LNPA WG/INC Call on INC Issue 504:



* After introductions, a member of INC teed up INC Issue 504 (refer to related INC documentation attached above). The issue was initiated by the Pool Administrator in order to address the case where a block is being allocated to the donor switch, and the –X is created in NPAC even though it will not subsequently be activated. The –X must then be manually deleted in order to allow porting in the 1K block. The issue proposes modifications to the Part 1B form to make it clear that it is not necessary to create the –X in NPAC when the block is being allocated to the donor switch.
* After the Part 1B form is initially submitted, the service provider is responsible for modifying the Part 1B form to indicate it is for Information Only when the block is being allocated back to the donor switch. This appears to be falling through the cracks in some instances. Since NPAC keys off of the Information Only box on the Part 1B when determining if the –X should be created, the –X will be created in all cases where the box is not checked.
* Both the LNPA WG and INC settled on a possible solution to have NPAC key off of two fields in PAS when determining if the –X should be created:
	1. the Information Only field, and
	2. the field indicating that the block allocation is to the donor switch.

If either are checked “Yes,” the –X will not be created in NPAC. If the Information Only field is not checked, but the second field is, the –X will not be created in NPAC. NeuStar will review the block allocation/creation process to determine if this proposal would cause any issues.

* The LNPA WG thanked the INC for their participation and their contribution to what was a very productive call.

PIM Discussion:

* PIM 53 – Sara Hooker, Verizon Wireless (Action Items 0506-02, 0506-09, 0506-10):



* + Action Item 0506-02: Regarding the attached PIM 53, Cyd McInerney, at&t, will determine if their systems can be overridden to reflect that a number has been ported out in order to prevent the need to temporarily take the number back so that the porting process can be reinitiated.
		- at&t reported that they would have to take the customer out of service to correct the record. at&t stated that they could accept “minimize outage time” in Bullet 2 of the PIM. Action Item 0506-02 is closed.
	+ Action Item 0506-09: Regarding the attached PIM 53, Ron Steen, BellSouth, will determine if their systems can be overridden to reflect that a number has been ported out in order to prevent the need to temporarily take the number back so that the porting process can be reinitiated.
		- BellSouth reported that their systems cannot be overridden. Multiple systems are designed for flow-thru to make changes to inventory. BellSouth could accept “minimize outage time” in Bullet 2 of the PIM. Action Item 0506-09 is closed.
	+ Action Item 0506-10: Regarding the attached PIM 53, Mike Whaley, Qwest, will determine if their systems can be overridden to reflect that a number has been ported out in order to prevent the need to temporarily take the number back so that the porting process can be reinitiated.
		- Qwest does not have a position at this time. Qwest is awaiting input from their IT organization. Action Item 0506-10 remains open.
	+ Alltel Wireless does not support any wording that recognizes the need for customer outage. BellSouth stated that this is not the result of fault on the part of the Old SP.
	+ There was no objection to the 1st bullet in the Suggested Resolution of the PIM, which states:

“Providers should not arbitrarily port back numbers without attempting to contact and work with the New SP to resolve any disputes/issues related to the port.”

* + Bullet 2 in the Suggested Resolution of the PIM stays open. It currently states:

“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 without impacting the end user’s service.”

* + Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will revise the 3rd bullet in the Suggested Resolution to read:

“In the case of a double assignment, between the two end users involved, the end user with the longer continuous service with that number shall retain the number, unless otherwise agreed to by the providers involved.”

* + There was no objection to the 4th bullet in the Suggested Resolution of the PIM, which states:

“In any case of an inadvertent port, defined here as a port where it was not the intention of the end user to port his/her number to the New SP, both providers will work together to restore the end user’s service with the Old SP as quickly as possible, regardless of the time interval between activation of the inadvertent port and discovery of the inadvertent port.”

* + PIM 53 will be discussed at the July LNPA WG meeting.
	+ Service Providers are to come to the July LNPA WG meeting prepared to provide contact numbers within their respective companies for other providers to use to resolve issues that are addressed in the PIM.
* PIM 54 – Nancy Sanders, Comcast (Action Item 0506-08):



* + Nancy Sanders, Comcast, teed up the attached revised PIM 54. The PIM seeks a standard 1 day porting interval for specific wireline-wireline and inter-modal ports (see proposed criteria in the attached PIM).
	+ Comcast stated that the type of ports addressed in the PIM comprises 90% of their porting activity.
	+ Service Providers are to come to the July LNPA WG meeting prepared to determine if we will accept PIM 54 to be worked.
* PIM 55 – Mubeen Saifullah, NeuStar Clearinghouse:



* + Mubeen Saifullah, NeuStar Clearinghouse, teed up the attached PIM 55. He stated that the Provider Initiated Activity (PIA), described in the attached PIM, has been around since before LSOG 9. Some wireline LECs implemented the function with their rollout of LSOG 9. Mubeen stated that the cancel function of the PIA was introduced with LSOG 7, but not implemented by some wireline LECs until LSOG 9.
	+ Mubeen stated that the majority of these PIAs to cancel are due to the port not being activated on the due date. Discussion ensued on the three acceptable approaches addressed in the NANC LNP Provisioning Flows for preventing disconnect of the customer when the port is not activated on the due date.
		- “The removal of these translations (1.) will not be done until the old Service Provider has evidence that the port has occurred, or (2.) will not be scheduled earlier than 11:59 PM one day after the due date, or (3.) will be scheduled for 11:59 PM on the due date, but can be changed by an LSR supplement received no later than 9:00 PM local time on the due date. This LSR supplement must be submitted in accordance with local practices governing LSR exchange, including such communications by telephone, fax, etc.”
	+ It was asked why providers are not sending Sups to either cancel or change the due date if the port is not going to be activated on the due date. It was stated that in some cases, the wireline carrier issues a jeopardy on the due date, and because jeopardies are worked manually by wireless carriers, the wireless carrier does not have enough time to stop the port.
	+ PIM 55 was accepted by the LNPA WG.
	+ A wireless carrier proposed changing the PIM’s problem statement to reflect that this is applicable to the majority of wireless carriers rather than all wireless carriers.
	+ Service Providers are to come to the July LNPA WG meeting prepared to determine the best course of action to take to work this PIM.
	+ It was reported that the OBF Wireless Committee’s Issue 3029 is addressing wireless documentation for mapping between LSOG and WICIS. A working group will be formed and coordinated by Telcordia. The objective is to document the differences and not to resolve them. Differences to be worked will become new issues. The guidelines are not necessarily the issue, but the differences in how they were implemented.
	+ It was asked why the wireline industry is working on LSOG 13 when LSOG 9 has not been totally rolled out yet. It was stated that it is mainly due to the need to spread out the changes over time in order to allow wireline providers time to support them. The industry agreement is to roll out an LSOG version every 6 months.

Canceling a Pending Port of a Port for SPID Migration (NeuStar):

* John Nakamura, NeuStar, described this discovered issue related to SPID migrations.
	+ SV before SPID Migration:

 OSP NSP Stat

SV1 Z A active

SV2 A C pending

SV after SPID Migration: A --> B

 OSP NSP Stat

SV1 Z B active

SV2 A C pending

Based on current NPAC requirements, SV1 has NSP value changed from A to B. SV2 has no change. SV2 becomes a problem because now it is out of sync with SV1. NPAC requirements require the OSP (A) on a subsequent port (SV2) to be equal to the NSP (B) on the current active port (SV1).

* + It was agreed that the applicable requirement in the FRS will be revised to add, “***This applies to pending-like records where the OSP (migrating-from SPID) is either the code holder or the block holder, and also pending-like records where the previous port is an active record (migrating-from SPID is the NSP) that is being migrated (e.g., SV1 is active and will be migrated, SV2 is pending-like and will be cancelled).***”
	+ This will be effective with Point Release 3.3.1.

NANC 399 Test Cases (NeuStar):

* NeuStar reported that the NANC 399 ITP test cases have been sent out. The ITP test environment will be available on 6/26. Vendors should complete the normal forms to sign up. There is no defined window for ITP or the subsequent provider turn-up testing.

Schedule of NPAC Point Release 3.3.1 (NeuStar):

* This item will be discussed at the July LNPA WG meeting.

NANC 408 Discussion (NeuStar):

****

* This item will be discussed at the July LNPA WG meeting.

Review Requirements for Accepted Change Orders (NeuStar):

* This item will be discussed at the July LNPA WG meeting.

New Business:

* Gary Sacra, Verizon, described an issue where a provider was allocated 37 pooled 1K blocks associated to an LRN within an NPA-NXX that was not yet effective in the network. Shannon Sevigny, NeuStar Pooling, will check to see if it is feasible to verify that the NPA-NXX of the LRN has reached its effective date in the network before a block associated with it is allocated to a provider. This will be discussed further at the July LNPA WG meeting.
* Gary Sacra, Verizon, questioned the need to continue requiring the time portion of the due date/time to match on the Create and concurrence messages if service providers are using midnight as a default (00:00:00). Service Providers are to determine if their local systems place anything other than midnight (00:00:00) for the Due Date/Time in their SV Create messages, and, if so, on what types of ports, e.g., intermodal, intramodal, and come to the July meeting prepared to provide feedback.
* Dave Cochran, BellSouth, asked if NeuStar had verified the /1, /2, /3 SP type indicators in the SP name with the SP type identifiers implemented with NANC 357. NeuStar responded in the affirmative.

***Next LNPA Meeting …******July 11-12, 2006, Edmonton, Canada – Hosted by Canadian***

 ***Consortium***