LNPA WORKING GROUP

July 2007 Meeting

Final Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Monterey, California | Host: NeuStar |

**TUESDAY 07/10/07**

Tuesday, 07/10/07, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Tina Plaisance | Alltel (phone) | Paul LaGattuta | | NeuStar |
| Joe Cudo | Alltel (phone) | Dave Garner | | NeuStar |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Mike Panis | | NeuStar |
| George Guerra | AT&T | Mike Whaley | | Qwest (phone) |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | Mary Retka | | Qwest |
| Adele Johnson | AT&T Mobility | Howard Hawbaker | | Smartcom Telephone (phone) |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian Consortium | Matt Kohly | | Socket (phone) |
| Cal Shimshaw | Century Tel (phone) | Donnie Bennett | | South Central Tel. (phone) |
| Nancy Sanders | Comcast (phone) | Kyle Jones | | South Central Tel. (phone) |
| Joan Ferrance | Consolidated Comm. (phone) | Dave Davis | | South Central Tel. (phone) |
| Chris Brown | Cox | Lavinia Rotaru | | Sprint Nextel |
| Vicki Goth | Embarq | Rosemary Emmer | | Sprint Nextel |
| Liz Gray | ESCI (phone) | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint Nextel |
| Jane Jackson | Evolving Systems | Doug Babcock | | Syniverse (phone) |
| Therese Mooney | Global Crossing (phone) | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW (phone) | Pat White | | Telcordia |
| Dennis Robins | Integra Telecom (phone) | Neil Clessen | | Three River Telco (phone) |
| Stephanie Reynolds | Nationsline (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Tina Tyree | Nationsline (phone) | Mohamed Samater | | T-Mobile |
| Lynette Khirallah | NetNumber (phone) | Ron Maby | | Veracity Comm. (phone) |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Marty Rich | | Veracity Comm. (phone) |
| Ed Barker | NeuStar | Chipp Nelson | | VeriSign |
| Charles Ryburn | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| Shannon Sevigny | NeuStar Pooling (phone) | Jason Lee | | Verizon (phone) |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar (phone) | Sara Hooker | | Verizon Wireless (phone) |
| Larry Vagnoni | NeuStar | Tom Zablocki | | Vonage (phone) |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Scotty Terry | | Windstream (phone) |
|  |  |  | |  |

Attached are the Action Items assigned at the July, 2007 LNPA meeting. Also included are the remaining open Action Items from previous meetings.

****

NOTE: ALL ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “JULY 2007 LNPA ACTION ITEMS” FILE ATTACHED ABOVE.

**MEETING MINUTES:**

2007 LNPA WG Meeting/Call Schedule:

Following is the meeting schedule for the 2007 LNPA Meetings and calls.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MONTH/**  **DATE**  **(2007)** | NANC | LNPA-WG | HOST | LOCATION |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| January | TBD | 9th-11th | Cingular | Jackson, Mississippi |
| February | TBD | No meeting.  2/12/07 call from 3pm to 5pm Eastern time, dial-in bridge number is 888-412-7808, pin 23272# |  |  |
| March | TBD | 13th-15th | Comcast | Denver, Colorado |
| April | TBD | No meeting.  4/10/07 call from 10am to 6pm Eastern time, dial-in bridge number is 888-412-7808, pin 23272# |  |  |
| May | TBD | 8th-10th | Canadian Consortium | Banff, Canada |
| June | TBD | No meeting.  6/12/07 call from 1pm to 5pm Eastern time, dial-in bridge number is 888-412-7808, pin 23272# |  |  |
| July | TBD | 10th-12th | NeuStar | Monterey, California |
| August | TBD | No meeting.  8/7/07 call from 1pm to 4pm Eastern time, dial-in bridge number is 888-412-7808, pin 23272# |  |  |
| September | TBD | 11th-13th | Verizon Wireless | Franklin, Tennessee |
| October | TBD | No meeting.  10/9/07 call if necessary |  |  |
| November | TBD | 13th-15th | Sprint Nextel | Ft. Lauderdale, Florida |
| December | TBD | No meeting.  12/11/07 call if necessary |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

* Continuing evaluation during 2007 will determine if interim conference calls are needed or if the decision to meet face-to-face every other month should be revisited.

05/07 Meeting Minutes Review:

* No changes were made to the Draft May 2007 LNPA WG minutes and they were accepted as Final.

06/07 Call Minutes Review:

* No changes were made to the Draft June 2007 LNPA WG minutes and they were accepted as Final.

OBF LSOP Committee Update

* No report was given at this meeting. Carol Frike, Sprint Nextel, has replaced Steve Moore and will provide LSOP readouts at future LNPA WG meetings.

# OBF Wireless Committee and Intermodal Subcommittee Update (Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless and OBF Wireless Committee Co-Chair):

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

* INC Issue 510: Video Relay Service (VRS) Alternatives – INC continues to work on a recommendation report to NANC. The report will be a three-part analysis – the way in which NANP numbers will be assigned and used by VRS providers, and an analysis of two potential database solutions (1. NPAC or 2. DNS-based). The INC VoIP Subcommittee will be meeting twice a week until August to produce a final draft of the report.
* INC Issues 515, 535, and 543 affect the COCAG and TBPAG and are being worked together. All of these issues address abandoned or returned 1K blocks so a single contribution is now addressing all three.
  + Issue 515: The NAPM LLC has granted permission for an NPAC report. The PA has access to that information.
  + Issue 535 looks to add information on the Part 1A form for contamination levels of returned blocks.
  + Issue 543 updates COCAG for abandoned or returned blocks recognizing the PA’s new access to NPAC data.
* INC Issue 528: Liaison from NIIF/NIOC regarding testing and code opening guidelines. The TBPAG guidelines will reflect that SPs opening a new code in a pooling environment should perform the code opening testing that is referenced in the NIIF guidelines. A liaison will go to NIIF asking if that meets their needs.
* INC Issue 532: At the last INC meeting, INC sent a letter to Kinsale Mobile stating that their responses to INC’s questions did not meet the criteria for assignment and that INC would reject their request unless the additional information requested was provided.
* INC Issue 539 addresses clarification of Section 8.3.6. This issue is still being worked.
* INC Issue 541 addresses how to protect against the porting of numbers from 1K blocks donated to the pool. A change to Section 7.2.7 of the TBPAG will remind SPs not to keep donated 1K blocks in their inventory and not to port or assign numbers in 1K blocks that have been donated to pool.

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

* Adam Newman, Telcordia and FoN Co-Chair, provided an update of the NANC FoN Working Group.
* The FoN is working on four accepted issues based on their AID form.
  + Analysis of commons and property rights models for the allocation of NANP resources – should we move to an open market model
  + Telematics services, e.g., OnStar, and the use of NANP numbers
  + Geographic link to NANP resources and assignment – impact to services
  + New and future services brief – analyzing impact of number assignment policy and exhaust on new and future services

Wireless Testing Subcommittee (Mohamed Samater, T-Mobile and WTSC Co-Chair):

* Mohamed Samater, T-Mobile and WTSC Co-Chair, reported that the WTSC held calls on May 18th and June 8th.
* The Subcommittee is focused on finalizing the WICIS 3.1 test document, which is almost complete. This will be discussed further on the July 19th WTSC call.
* WICIS will be converted from CORBA to XML in Release 4.0. Further discussion of this activity will also take place on the July 19th WTSC call.
* WICIS 3.1 testing will start on 8/20/07.

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

* Jim Rooks, NeuStar, reported on the May 2007 APT meeting.

* The APT group reviewed and discussed the following Change Orders at the May 2007 APT meeting:
* NANC 349 – Off-line batch process. Concerns still exist over the synchronization of all provider systems and network elements for modifies of routing-related data. Batch processing is probably not applicable to routing fields. The APT will continue to discuss this Change Order.
* NANC 372 – Alternatives to CMIP protocol. The group agreed that we need to put together a business case to cost justify any migration to another protocol such as SOAP/XML.
* NANC 419 – Recovery notification prioritization. The Change Order was accepted. Options for a prioritization approach will be discussed at the July APT meeting.
* NANC 397 – The group continues to discuss the proposal to support 25K activates in an hour.

PIM Discussion:

* PIM 32 - This PIM, submitted by Syniverse (formerly TSI), seeks to address issues related to the process for obtaining a Customer Service Record (CSR), which contains information necessary to complete a Local Service Request (LSR) for porting in a reseller number.



The following resolution text for PIM 32 was approved for inclusion as Item 48 in the LNPA WG’s NP Best Practices document.

PIM 32 seeks to address issues related to the process of obtaining a Customer Service Record (CSR) for wireline reseller customers. The CSR contains information necessary to complete a Local Service Request (LSR) for porting a wireline number. In some cases, carriers are not able to obtain an end user’s specific CSR information from some wireline network service providers when attempting to port telephone numbers (TNs) associated with reseller accounts. For example, two of four RBOCs refuse to send the CSR information to the New Local Service Provider (NLSP) because they have been instructed by their resellers not to share the end user’s specific information which the resellers consider to be proprietary.

This is a critical problem. For those reseller errors where there is a workaround, many of the port requests are significantly delayed before completion. In some cases there are no workaround solutions and end users who want to port their number cannot. Those customers either give up on porting their number, or cannot keep their number and must change to a new number. It is not always possible to work with the resellers to obtain the information needed to populate the LSR. It is often difficult to find someone with the reseller that can support a port and provide the needed information.

The failure to port wireline reseller TNs can be resolved. Direction by resellers to Old Network Service Providers (ONSPs) to provide the specific customer information where possible would greatly reduce the unsuccessful ports. Resellers should not be allowed to withhold end user specific customer information necessary for the porting process.

At the April 17, 2007 NANC meeting, the LNPA WG submitted this final Position Paper in order to bring the LNPA WG’s consensus position to the attention of the NANC and the FCC.

PIM 32 was closed at the July 2007 LNPA WG meeting.

* PIM 42 – This PIM, submitted by Syniverse, seeks to review the wireline requirement for certain fields on the LSR.



The LNPA WG is awaiting a letter from the OBF on the disposition of OBF Issue 2943 before determining how to proceed with PIM 42.

* 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 LNPA WG is awaiting a letter from the OBF on the disposition of OBF Issue 2943 before determining how to proceed with PIM 44.

* PIM 50 – This PIM, submitted by Syniverse, seeks to address instances where

wireline to wireless ports fail the automated process because they are from large accounts where the Customer Service Record (CSR) is too large to return on a CSR query.



The following resolution text for PIM 50 was approved for inclusion as Item 46 in the LNPA WG’s NP Best Practices document.

There have been instances where wireline to wireless ports fail the automated process because they are from large accounts where the Customer Service Record (CSR) is too large to return on a CSR query.

At the November 2006 NANC meeting, NANC recommended that carriers should be following the OBF guidelines. The OBF LSOG guidelines have options for providing a CSR for a TN with or without directory, or the entire account with or without directory. If wireline carriers sent only the information requested in the customer inquiry per the LSOG CSI guidelines, this error would be greatly reduced if not eliminated.

PIM 50 was closed at the July 2007 LNPA WG meeting.

* 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, Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will notify the NAPM LLC that the LNPA WG reached consensus at their May 2007 meeting to recommend to the LLC that they request a Statement of Work (SOW) for the manual process from NeuStar. Gary, as LNPA WG Co-Chair, will send a formal request to the LLC.



* PIM 52 – This PIM, submitted by Sprint Nextel, seeks to address issues related to carriers receiving 1K blocks from the pool in which the Intra-Service Provider ports have not been completed by the donor provider prior to block donation to the pool.



The LNPA WG drafted the attached liaison to the INC requesting revisions to the TBPAG Appendix 2 block donation form suggesting questions to prompt the donating service provider to perform any necessary Intra-Service Provider ports, if applicable, and protect numbers in the block to be donated from further assignment by the donating provider. The INC accepted this issue (INC Issue 506).



As part of INC Issue 506, the INC made changes to the Thousands Block PA Guidelines and form. PA Change Order 51 was approved and implemented in May.

PIM 52 was closed at the July 2007 LNPA WG meeting.

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



Action Item 0906-12: Nancy Sanders, Comcast, will determine if Comcast will revise the attached PIM 54 to reflect the scope of the work undertaken by the LNPA WG’s Pre-Port Subcommittee.

Action Item 0906-12 remains open.

The pre-port interval is being addressed in the Pre-port Subcommittee. The subcommittee will propose minor changes to the flows and narrative.

* PIM 55 – This PIM, submitted by the NeuStar Clearinghouse Vendor, seeks to address issues related to wireline Provider Initiated Activity.



This issue is now in a tracking state awaiting inclusion in the next WICIS Release beyond 4.0, which will likely be deployed sometime in 2009. NeuStar Clearinghouse will submit a contribution.

* PIM 56 – This PIM, submitted by Sprint Nextel, seeks to address instances where LNP database updates are not always propagated by all providers down to their network element routing databases in a timely manner.



Action Item 0307-11: Related to Action Item 0307-13, Sue Tiffany, Sprint Nextel, will review and compare the attached NIIF document with the attached draft Sprint Nextel contribution for PIM 56 for possible revision of the contribution.

 

Sue Tiffany, Sprint Nextel, reported that there is no conflict with these proposed process steps and the NIIF document. Action Item 0307-11 is closed.

Action Item 0507-09: Regarding the attached draft process addressing PIM 56, Sue Tiffany, Sprint Nextel, will revise the document to add a step between Steps 2 and 3 stating that the NNSP checks to make sure that NPAC data is correct. The PIM 56 issue and the resolution steps will be placed in the NP Best Practices document when finalized. This will be reviewed and finalized on the June 12th conference call.



Sue Tiffany, Sprint Nextel, presented the revised draft process adding the step per Action Item 0507-09. The Action Item is closed.



Regarding the attached PIM 56 and the attached associated draft process for addressing the issue, Sue Tiffany, Sprint Nextel, will revised Step 4 in the process to read, “NSP reports the problem to the Telco that is routing calls incorrectly, for example, incorrect LRN, SCP/STP is discrepant with NPAC, etc.”, and send the revised draft to the LNPA WG Co-Chairs.

The group then reviewed the attached draft letter, prepared by Sue Tiffany, Sprint Nextel, from the LNPA WG to the NIIF, requesting NIIF permission to place the link to their *Guidelines for Reporting Local Number Portability Troubles in a Multiple Service Provider Environment’ – ATIS-0300082 NIIF 0004* in the LNPA WG’s NP Best Practices document.



Regarding the attached draft letter to NIIF from the LNPA WG, Sue Tiffany,

Sprint Nextel, will revise the draft letter as follows and submit it to the LNPA WG Co-Chairs.

1. Change Step 4 in the attached to read, “NSP reports the problem to the Telco that is routing calls incorrectly, for example, incorrect LRN, SCP/STP is discrepant with NPAC, etc.”
2. Include the e-mail addresses of the NIIF leadership in the attached.

The LNPA WG will await permission from NIIF to put their document link in our Best Practices. PIM 56 will remain open.

* PIM 57 – This PIM, submitted by Cingular and Sprint Nextel, seeks to address porting issues that occur when a Reseller discontinues business and/or declares bankruptcy.



Cingular has developed a port authorization form that they are going back to get their resellers to sign so that if they go out of business, they can legally port the customers. The attached form was presented by Cingular at the March 2007 LNPA WG meeting.



Sprint Nextel has created a checklist to encourage their resellers not to abandon their customers and provide them with options. This checklist was presented by Sue Tiffany, Sprint Nextel, at the March 2007 LNPA WG meeting.



Action Item 0307-17: Regarding the attached PIM 57, Service Providers are to review the attached contributions from Cingular (Authorization Form v1.doc) and Sprint Nextel (Revised Bankruptcy Checklist.doc) for discussion at the May 2007 LNPA WG meeting.

The group reviewed the attached authorization form and checklist. Action Item 0307-17 remains open.

Regarding the attached PIM 57 and checklist, Sue Tiffany, Sprint Nextel, Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, and Adele Johnson, at&t, will revise and generalize the attached checklist such that it is not carrier-specific.

* PIM 58 – This PIM, submitted by BellSouth and Verizon, seeks to address instances where the LERG assignee of an NXX code has not opened a code to portability in NPAC, and either cannot be contacted to do so, or refuses to do so.



The following resolution text for PIM 58 was approved for inclusion as Item 45 in the LNPA WG’s NP Best Practices document.

There have been instances where the LERG assignee of an NXX code has not opened a code to portability in NPAC, and either cannot be contacted to do so, or refuses to do so.

Individual circumstances may vary depending on the situation. In some cases, the NXX may have been opened for portability in the LERG but not in the NPAC SMS. In other cases, the NXX may not have been opened for portability in the LERG or the NPAC SMS. It may be that if the NSP or the NPAC Administrator contacts the OSP, the situation will be resolved. But in those situations where the OSP can’t be contacted or refuses to cooperate, the following procedure should be followed:

1. The NSP should document attempts to contact the OSP to request that the NXX be opened in the NPAC SMS.
2. If the NSP attempts to make contact are unsuccessful, the NSP should contact the NPAC Administrator. The NPAC Administrator should attempt to contact the OSP to request that the code be opened in the NPAC SMS. Attempts should be documented.
3. If neither the NSP nor the NPAC Administrator can make contact with the OSP or if the OSP refuses to cooperate, the NSP should contact the appropriate regulatory authorities for assistance. The NSP should provide details to the regulatory authority including the Service Provider Identification (SPID) of the OSP who should have opened the code.
4. The regulatory authority may convince the OSP to open the code, or may authorize the NPAC Administrator to open the code to portability in the NPAC SMS. Any such authorization directed to the NPAC Administrator shall include the NSP-provided SPID of the code holder under which the code shall be opened in the NPAC. Upon receipt of such regulatory authorization, the NPAC Administrator shall proceed with opening the code in the NPAC SMS.
5. The OSP should have the LERG updated to show the code as portable if it does not already do so.

PIM 58 was closed at the July 2007 LNPA WG meeting.

* PIM 59 – This PIM, submitted by the NeuStar Clearinghouse Vendor, seeks to address issues related to the unlocking of the 911 database when numbers are ported to VoIP providers.



Text for the NP Best Practices document was accepted on the June 12th LNPA WG conference call. PIM 59 was closed on the June 12th call.

* PIM 60 – This PIM, submitted by Socket Telecom, requests that the LNPA WG provide an opinion on whether or not a customer, who is physically relocating to a different Rate Center, should be allowed to port their number.



Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will revise the bullets accepted at the May 2007 LNPA WG meeting, which serve as the LNPA WG’s consensus criteria for the PIM 60 porting scenario to be considered a legitimate scenario in the eyes of the LNPA WG, to read as follows (revisions are in red):

* The customer would like to receive calls to their number(s) at a location of theirs that is physically outside of the Rate Center associated with their number(s).
* The customer understands that these numbers must continue to be rated in accordance with the Rate Center currently associated with their number(s) and does not want them to take on the rating characteristics of the Rate Center of their new location.
* The New Service Provider already serves the Rate Center associated with the customer’s number(s) out of the same switch to which they want to port this customer's number(s).
* The New Service Provider switch that already serves the Rate Center of the customer’s number(s) has an existing POI at the ILEC's tandem over which calls to these numbers are routed. If this customer's number(s) are ported into the New Service Provider switch, they would be routed over the same POI, and then the New Service Provider would deliver the calls to the customer's premise that is located outside of the Rate Center associated with the customer’s Number(s).
* The New Service Provider offers a tariffed and/or publicly published foreign exchange (FX) service in accordance with regulatory requirements that would cover this situation. Calls to and from customers located in the Rate Center associated with these ported numbers and the customer served by the New Service Provider will be routed exactly the same whether the New Service Provider assigns the customer a phone number from its 1K block of numbers in that Rate Center or whether the New Service Provider ports the numbers. This customer will be served out of the New Service Provider’s tariffed and/or publicly published FX service offering in accordance with regulatory requirements.
* The LSR submitted by the New Service Provider reflects the customer’s original service location as recorded by the Old Service Provider.

These revisions will be made in the NP Best Practices document.

Century Tel, Windstream, and South Central objected to the wording of the criteria, stating that they feel that they cover all forms of Virtual NXX and do not include all necessary criteria. Alltel abstained. There were no objections to removing the caps on “Foreign Exchange,” but the acronym “FX” will remain capitalized. PIM 60 was closed with Century Tel and Windstream objecting to its closure.

* NEW PIM 61 – This PIM, submitted by South Central Rural Telephone Coop. Corp. Inc., Duo County Telephone Cooperative Corp., Inc, North Central Rural Telephone Coop., and PNG Telecommunications, seeks to have implemented a VPN access solution for LTI users.



PIM 61 was teed up by Donnie Bennett from South Central Telephone. It was suggested that another possible solution could be a secured website access over a broadband internet connection. NeuStar stated that it would not be appropriate to put a portion of the network over the vulnerable internet. A VPN access solution requires substantial hardware to support U.S. LTI users. PIM 61 was accepted. There were no objections to making a technical recommendation to the NAPM LLC to request an SOW from NeuStar. Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will:

1. Change the Problem/Issue Statement to read, “Out-dated dialup access to the LTI (Low Tech Interface) producing slow and unreliable compliances with mandated FCC number porting requirements and procedures.
2. Send a recommendation to the NAPM LLC to request an SOW from NeuStar for a VPN access solution for LTI users.

* NEW PIM 62 – This PIM, submitted by Verizon Wireless, seeks to address the duration of some porting outages due to planned service provider maintenance, and the notification requirements for planned maintenance outages.



PIM 62 was teed up by Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless. PIM 62 was accepted by the group. Service Providers are to review the PIM internally and come to the August 7th LNPA WG conference call prepared to discuss any proposed revisions.

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

* Sue Tiffany, Sprint Nextel, and Nancy Sanders, Comcast, provided a readout of current Pre-Port Subcommittee activities.
* Sue Tiffany, Sprint Nextel, stated that the Subcommittee made suggested changes to the main flows and is continuing to work on minor changes for resellers and Type 1s.
* Nancy Sanders, Comcast, stated that the Subcommittee was supposed to be looking into how the porting interval could be shortened. Subcommittee members have an action item to bring back best practices that they have experienced with other carriers that could be brought to the LNPA WG for possible inclusion in the NP Best Practices document.

Review of NP Best Practices Document (All):

* Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will send the attached revised NP Best Practices document to Mohamed Samater, T-Mobile, for inclusion on the LNPA WG’s website, after removal of the yellow highlighting.



* Upon receipt of the revised NP Best Practices document from Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, Mohamed Samater, T-Mobile, will have the HTML version of the document uploaded onto the LNPA WG’s website.
* Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will send a notice to Tom Koutsky, NANC Chair, that consensus was reached in the LNPA WG to add the resolutions of PIMs 32 and 50, and the 24 hour FOC issue, to the NP Best Practices document.

SPID Stability Update (NeuStar):



* The attached presentation, reflecting outbound flow control events, was given by NeuStar. NeuStar stated that the data shows steady improvement and that they do not see a problem.
* NeuStar said that increasing the large port threshold to 10K did not increase the flow control frequency and that is the message that we can take from this data.
* NeuStar is recommending another exercise at 15K to be run around mid-October.
* NeuStar will continue to monitor SPID stability.
* NeuStar will provide an explanation at the September 2007 meeting as to why the quantities of outbound flow control events are not cause for concern.

Annual Failover Exercise Planning (NeuStar):



* For the annual failover exercise, NeuStar is recommending a 10/20-10/21 date.
* The LNPA WG agreed to the recommended date and agreed to establish a SPID migration blackout for 10/21.
* NeuStar will issue a Cross-Regional notification announcing that October 21, 2007 has been designated as a SPID migration blackout date due to the annual failover exercise.

**WEDNESDAY 07/11/07**

Wednesday, 07/11/07, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Tina Plaisance | Alltel (phone) | Paul LaGattuta | | NeuStar |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Dave Garner | | NeuStar |
| George Guerra | AT&T | Mike Panis | | NeuStar |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | Mike Whaley | | Qwest (phone) |
| Adele Johnson | AT&T Mobility | Mary Retka | | Qwest |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian Consortium | Lavinia Rotaru | | Sprint Nextel |
| Chris Brown | Cox | Rosemary Emmer | | Sprint Nextel |
| Vicki Goth | Embarq | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint Nextel |
| Jane Jackson | Evolving Systems | Colleen Collard | | Tekelec (phone) |
| Therese Mooney | Global Crossing (phone) | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Lynette Khirallah | NetNumber (phone) | Pat White | | Telcordia |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Ed Barker | NeuStar | Mohamed Samater | | T-Mobile |
| Charles Ryburn | NeuStar | Chipp Nelson | | VeriSign |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Shannon Sevigny | NeuStar Pooling (phone) | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Jason Lee | | Verizon (phone) |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar (phone) | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Sara Hooker | | Verizon Wireless (phone) |
|  |  | Tom Zablocki | | Vonage (phone) |
|  |  |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

Review of NIIF Correspondence (All):

* The group reviewed the attached correspondence from the NIIF announcing their consideration to close NIIF Issue #248, NIIF 0004, Guidelines for Reporting Local Number Portability Troubles in a Multi-Service Provider Environment, Updates.



* After reviewing the correspondence, there were no objections in the LNPA WG to its closure.
* Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will send a response to the NIIF leadership that the LNPA WG concurs with the closure of NIIF Issue # 248.

Change Management Discussion (NeuStar):



* NANC 372
  + The group briefly recapped the May 2007 APT discussion that took place regarding NANC 372. NANC 372 will be discussed further during the July 2007 APT meeting.
    - The IT industry is generally moving towards an XML/SOAP interface. However, there are performance issues and questions. Message size would be greatly increased. Need to investigate compression capabilities.
    - It will be worth pursuing for the long term. Not sure what is next step. Need to find a business driver for pursuing this.
    - The WICIS transfer is planning on implementing a flash-cut to XML (Sep ’08). Plan is to continue to support CORBA interface for testing purposes only. Keep this in mind when planning the NPAC implementation.
    - The group will discuss more during the Jul ’07 APT meeting, including pros/cons analysis, LOE, and any input on the business case.
* NANC 413 – 32-bit signed integer:
  + NANC 413 clarifies what the minimum and maximum values are and what takes place during rollover. Behavior clarification text is added to the GDMO.
* NANC 414



* Service Providers are to submit their SPID to OCN relationships to Steve Addicks ([Stephen.addicks@neustar.biz](mailto:Stephen.addicks@neustar.biz)), indicating if they have any cases where an OCN is associated with more than one SPID. If yes, this means that we cannot have an edit preventing a provider from associating another provider’s OCN to their SPID. It was proposed that an audit that could identify cases where an OCN is associated with more than one SPID that would alert NPAC personnel so that it could be verified. The M&P could state that anything other than a one-to-one relationship would spit out to be verified by NPAC personnel.
* Action Item 0507-10: Regarding the attached NANC 414 which proposes an automated NPAC mechanism to prevent the wrong provider from opening up an NXX code in NPAC, Local System Vendors are to determine if the required OCN to SPID mapping, which would be part of the SP Profile in NPAC, should modifiable over the CMIP interface.
* Action Item 0507-12: Regarding the attached NANC 414 which proposes an automated NPAC mechanism to prevent the wrong provider from opening up an NXX code in NPAC, Service Providers are to determine if the required OCN to SPID mapping, which would be part of the SP Profile in NPAC, should modifiable over the CMIP interface.
* Verizon, Verizon Wireless, AT&T, AT&T Mobility, and T-Mobile stated that they are not in favor of modifying the OCN to SPID mapping over the CMIP interface. They stated that this could be done via the GUI by NPAC personnel instead. Action Items 0507-10 and 0507-12 are closed.
* NANC 422 is a Doc Only Change Order that updates the current IIS documentation to be consistent and reflect the current behavior relative to Subscription Version Queries, for the enhanced SV Query functionality over the SOA/LSMS interfaces.
* NANC 419, Notification Prioritization, was accepted by the group for further requirements development.
* Event Id Rollover Issue:
* 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.
* Tekelec will deliver their software to their customers in August.
* Evolving Systems has delivered their software to their customers.
* Telcordia does not require a change.
* Syniverse does not require a change.
* VeriSign will be complete by end of August.
* Cox will be complete by end of August.
* Verizon Business is complete now.
* Embarq will be complete by end of August.
* NetNumber is complete now.
* Another update will be on the August conference call agenda.
* SPID Migration Discussion
* Action Item 0507-01: NeuStar is to determine how much of a delay in creating and delivering SPID migration SMURF files will result if they have a late cancellation of a provider’s migration out of a set of SMURF files. The scenario to be analyzed is 5 providers are doing migrations and one of them is cancelled at 11:45pm the Saturday night before the migration.
* NeuStar stated that cancellation of a migration that late will not affect delivery of SMURF files. Note that any pending SVs have already been cancelled and must be re-established. Action Item 0507-01 is closed. Verizon Wireless stated that they are very interested in automating the SPID migration process. This will be further explored in the APT.
* NANC 299
* Action Item 0507-14: NPAC Release 3.3 implemented a heartbeat message that contains a sequence number that NPAC treats independently from the sequence number contained in the LNPAccessControl. Some provider SOA and LSMS systems consider them to be the same sequence number. NeuStar will add flags in the SP profile in NPAC indicating whether or not the provider systems consider them to be the same and react accordingly. This is planned for an NPAC Point Release in June. Service Providers are to check to see if they support the Application Level Heartbeat message and ensure that their profile in NPAC is consistent.
* Verizon stated that they support the heartbeat message and their profile reflects that. Telcordia does not send heartbeat but supports receiving and responding to heartbeat from NPAC. The SP Profile is applicable to local the system supporting receiving the heartbeat from NPAC and responding to it. Sprint Nextel stated that they support the heartbeat message and is checking to see that their profile is consistent.

2007 Meeting/Call Schedule (All):

* Attached is the current 2007 LNPA WG schedule.



Discussion of Need for August Conference Call (All):

#### It was agreed to hold a call on August 7th from 1pm to 4pm eastern. The bridge number is 888-412-7808 PIN 23272#

* The agenda will consist of:
  + Status of PIMs 42 and 44 in light of OBF Issue 2943
  + PIM 62 Discussion
  + Status of Event ID Rollover Issue
  + 2008 Meeting and Call Schedule/Hosts/Locations
  + New Business

Development of NANC Report (Gary Sacra / Paula Jordan – LNPA WG Co-Chairs):

* The next NANC meeting has not been scheduled at this time.
* Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will send a notice to Tom Koutsky, NANC Chair, that consensus was reached in the LNPA WG to add the resolutions of PIMs 32 and 50, and the 24 hour FOC issue, to the NP Best Practices document.

Review of May 2007 LNPA WG Action Items:



**May 2007 LNPA WG Action Items:**

* Item 0507-01: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0507-02: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0507-03: This item remains Open.
* Item 0507-04: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0507-05: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0507-06: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0507-07: This item remains Open.
* Item 0507-08: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0507-09: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0507-10: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0507-11: This item remains Open.
* Item 0507-12: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0507-13: This item remains Open.
* Item 0507-14: This item remains Open.

**May 2007 APT Action Items:**

* Item 0507-15: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0507-16: This item remains Open.
* Item 0507-17: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0507-18: This item has been completed and is Closed.

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

* Item 0605-22: This item remains Open.
* Item 0706-06: This item remains Open.
* Item 0906-12: This item remains Open.
* Item 0906-14: This item remains Open.
* Item 0307-08: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0307-09: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0307-10: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0307-11: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 0307-17: This item remains Open.

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

* Item 0307-24: This item has been completed and is Closed..

Review of June 2007 Action Items:

* No Action Items were assigned on the June 2007 LNPA WG conference call.

Unfinished/New Business:

* Paula Jordan, T-Mobile, stated that an SP had denied their port request because the customer had not been in service for 30 days and that they would port on the 31st day. She asked if there was anything in FCC Orders allowing this. The group was not aware of anything allowing this in FCC Orders.
* Paula Jordan, T-Mobile, stated that a Reseller customer had ported to T-Mobile and the customer was being double-billed because the Reseller was still billing. It was stated that T-Mobile is not responsible for telling customers that they must contact their old provider to stop billing. The process is such that the Reseller should be notified of the loss by their underlying network provider.

**THURSDAY 07/12/07**

**ARCHITECTURE PLANNING TEAM (APT) MEETING**

Thursday, 07/12/07, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Tina Plaisance | Alltel (phone) | Paul LaGattuta | | NeuStar |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Dave Garner | | NeuStar |
| George Guerra | AT&T | Mike Panis | | NeuStar |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | Mike Whaley | | Qwest (phone) |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian Consortium | Lavinia Rotaru | | Sprint Nextel |
| Chris Brown | Cox | Susan Tiffany | | Sprint Nextel |
| Vicki Goth | Embarq | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Jane Jackson | Evolving Systems | Pat White | | Telcordia |
| Lynette Khirallah | NetNumber (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Mohamed Samater | | T-Mobile |
| Ed Barker | NeuStar | Chipp Nelson | | VeriSign |
| Charles Ryburn | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar | Earl Scott | | Verizon (phone) |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar (phone) |  | |  |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

**APT MEETING MINUTES:**

APT Mission Statement: To assess Number Portability industry production technical issues within the purview of the LNPA Working Group and develop recommendations for the strategic direction of the Number Portability architecture.

The current edition of the APT will focus on end-to-end LNP performance, including production needs, large ports, and testing and certification.

NANC 349 Review (Action Item 0307-24) (All):

Action Item 0307-24: APT Participants are to review NANC Change Order 349, which proposes investigating a batch processing alternative to generating all messages associated with large porting activity and sending them across the interface, and come prepared to discuss at the May 2007 APT meeting.



* There was tentative agreement previously that a batch process is not suitable for updates of routing data. Batch in this context would be an off-line file similar to a SMURF file that providers would load in their local systems based on their schedule. This is the definition of batch in NANC 349.
* AT&T Mobility is interested in the ability to do mass changes, such as DPC data and LRNs, in a shorter timeframe. A major merger took place previously and it took months to complete modification of CNAM DPC data. AT&T Mobility’s definition of batch processing is a large amount of work, not necessarily an off-line process. Their stated interest is in achieving up to100K modifications in an hour. It was stated that this is actually a NANC 397 business need.
* It was agreed that NANC 349 will be placed in delete pending. This discussion will continue in the NANC 397 discussion.
* Action Item 0307-24 is closed.

NANC 372 Review (Pros/Cons) (Action Item 0507-16, 17) (All):

Action Item 0507-16: Regarding the discussion of NANC 372, which proposes investigation of an alternative to the CMIP protocol, Sue Tiffany, Sprint Nextel, and Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, are to investigate if ATIS developed a business case to justify the migratation from CORBA to SOAP/XML.

* Sue Tiffany, Sprint Nextel, stated that the ATIS Board of Directors recommended the ATIS migration to XML in order to consolidate to a single protocol. She stated that it does not appear that a business case was developed. The OBF Committees began the migration and it is progressing slowly. Action Item 0507-16 remains open.

Action Item 0507-17: LNPA Working Group Participants are to review NANC 372 and the discussions that took place regarding its benefits/pros and cons for discussion at July 2007 APT meeting.

* If companies are moving to XML in their other systems, it was stated that CMIP could be an outlier in the future.
* Regarding NANC 372, Alternatives to the CMIP interface, Local System Vendors and Service Providers are to determine if their respective companies have embraced the ATIS migration to XML and, if so, what are the implications of staying on CMIP for the LNP application.
* Action Item 0507-17 is closed.

NANC 419 Discussion of Notification Prioritization (All):

* The group reviewed the current requirements and it was agreed that we would move the ongoing discussion and review to the full LNPA WG.
* Concern was raised about notifications coming out of order as a result of priority changes. This will be part of the ongoing discussion.

NANC 397 Review (Next Steps) (Action Item 0507-15) (All):

Action Item 0507-15: At the May 2007 APT meeting, with regard to NANC 397, it was stated that if we did not have an implied requirement to support backing out 100K transactions in a 4 hour period during the night, we could meet a requirement of 25K transactions downloaded in an 8 hour period with the current throughput requirements. It was further suggested that we should perhaps explore a faster way of backing out – perhaps a new message over the interface that could reverse what was done. NeuStar will provide a writeup for the July 2007 APT agenda.

* The APT discussed a possible message at the end of the modifies to commit the changes if all is good. That could possibly address the need to reserve 4 hours in the 8-hour period for potential backout and allow the entire 8 hours to perform the 100K modifies. But, this would not allow call testing since the SCPs wouldn’t be updated until the commit message is sent.
* If there is no benefit to a single backout message approach that would identify modified SVs that were tagged, then we will have to focus on throughput needs to meet the desired timeframe. APT Participants are to determine if there is a benefit to a single backout message approach that would identify modified SVs that were tagged. Backward compatibility and the possibility that not all providers would necessarily implement such an approach should be considered as well.
* It was stated that it took 18 months to do 20 million CNAM DPC modifies as a result of previous merger activity.
* A local system vendor suggested a possible data model that associates DPC data with an LRN and broadcasting that as network data as opposed to at the TN level. It was then stated that there are cases where resold numbers are associated with the same LRN as other numbers in the network provider’s switch but are associated with a different CNAM or LIDB database. It was suggested that these could possibly be treated as exception cases like we do with ported numbers in pooled blocks, and if the DPC data is different in the individual SV than at the LRN level, then the individual SV data could take precedence.
* Another suggestion was to augment the existing range message to enable a list of TNs, not necessarily contiguous, to be modified.
* NeuStar is to coordinate among industry participants and provide a descriptive writeup for the September 2007 APT meeting on the following proposed alternatives:

1. a single backout message approach that would identify modified SVs that were tagged. Backward compatibility and the possibility that not all providers would necessarily implement such an approach should be considered as well.
2. a data model that associates DPC data with an LRN and broadcasting that as network data as opposed to at the TN level.
3. augmentation of the existing range message to enable a list of TNs, not necessarily contiguous, to be modified.

* Action Item 0507-15 is closed.

Review of NANC 408 (Action Item 0507-18) (All):



Action Item 0507-18: LNPA Working Group Participants are to review NANC 408 for discussion at the July 2007 APT meeting.

* Modifying a NAME binding attribute over the interface violates the CMIP standard. That is one of the reasons originally cited why we did not want to modify SPID over the interface. It was stated that there is some support for eliminating SMURF files. Most SPID migrations do not result in modifications of SVs or pooled blocks, just code ownership changes in network data.
* Another approach suggested could be to perform the migration over the interface if there are no SVs involved and use the existing SMURF file process if SVs are impacted. NeuStar will provide a writeup for the September 2007 APT meeting of performing the migration over the interface if there are no SVs involved, and use of the existing SMURF file process if SVs are impacted.
* Action Item 0507-18 is closed.

Action Item Review/Topics/Agenda for Discussion at Next Meeting:

Next APT agenda for September 2007 meeting:

* NANC 372 Review
* NANC 397 Review
* NANC 419 Review
* NANC 408 Review

***Next LNPA WG Conference Call … August 7, 2007, 1pm – 4pm Eastern,***

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

***Next LNPA WG Meeting …******September 11-13, 2007, Franklin, Tennessee – Hosted by***

***Verizon Wireless***