LNPA WORKING GROUP

February 10, 2009 Conference Call

Final Minutes

**TUESDAY 02/10/09**

Tuesday, 02/10/09, Conference Call Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Charles Ryburn | NeuStar |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T | Tara Farquhar | NeuStar Pooling |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Mobility | Mubeen Saifullah | NeuStar Clearinghouse |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | Linda Peterman | One Communications |
| Barbara Hjelmaa | Bright House | Jan Doell | Qwest |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian Consortium | Mary Retka | Qwest |
| Brigitte Witt | Centennial Wireless | Rosemary Emmer | Sprint Nextel |
| Cindy Sheehan | Comcast | Susan Tiffany | Sprint Nextel |
| Nancy Sanders | Comcast | Michael Klappa | Sprint Nextel |
| Chris West | Comcast | Lavinia Rotaru | Sprint Nextel |
| Chris Brown | Cox | Carol Zimmerman | Synchronoss |
| Ida Bourne | Cox | Rosalee Pinnock | Syniverse |
| Vicki Goth | Embarq | Joel Zamlong | Telcordia |
| Greg Council | Evolving Systems | Adam Newman | Telcordia |
| Beth O’Donnell | GCI | Pat White | Telcordia |
| Therese Mooney | Global Crossing | John Malyar | Telcordia |
| Dave Garner  | NeuStar | Lisa Marie Maxson | Telcordia |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Mohamed Samater | T-Mobile |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar | Paula Jordan | T-Mobile |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Chipp Nelson | VeriSign |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar  | Gary Sacra | Verizon |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Jason Lee | Verizon |
| Bill Reidway | NeuStar | Deb Tucker | Verizon Wireless |
| Rhea Kwon | NeuStar | Tom Zablocki | Vonage |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

2009 Meeting and Call Schedule/Hosts/Locations:

Following is the meeting schedule for the 2009 LNPA WG meetings and calls.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MONTH/****DATE****(2009)** | NANC | LNPA WG | HOST | LOCATION |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| January  | TBD | 7th-8th  | Telcordia | Scottsdale, Arizona |
| February  | TBD | No meeting.2/10/2009 call from 1pm to 4pm Eastern time, dial-in bridge number is 888-412-7808, pin 23272# |  |  |
| March | TBD | 10th-11th | Comcast | Denver, Colorado |
| April | TBD | No meeting.4/14/2009 call if necessary |  |  |
| May | TBD | 12th-13th  | Sprint Nextel | Overland Park, Kansas |
| June | TBD | No meeting.6/9/2009 call if necessary |  |  |
| July | TBD | 14th-15th  | Canadian Consortium | Ottawa, Ontario Canada |
| August | TBD | No meeting.8/11/2009 call if necessary |  |  |
| September | TBD | 15th-16th  | Verizon | Baltimore, Maryland |
| October | TBD | No meeting.10/6/2009 call if necessary |  |  |
| November | TBD | 10th-11th  | NeuStar | TBD |
| December | TBD | No meeting.12/8/2009 call if necessary |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

* Continuing evaluation during 2009 will determine if interim conference calls are needed or if the decision to meet face-to-face every other month should be revisited.

**CONFERENCE CALL MINUTES:**

Attached are the Action Items assigned on the February 10, 2009 LNPA WG conference call. Please note that these Action Items are in addition to the ones assigned at the January 2009 LNPA WG meeting. Both sets of Action Items will be addressed at the March 2009 meeting.

****

NOTE: ALL ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “FEBRUARY 2009 LNPA ACTION ITEMS” FILE ATTACHED ABOVE.

**Conference Call Minutes:**

Status of Action Item 0109-02 – Telcordia:

Action Item 0109-02: John Malyar, Telcordia, will distribute proposed revisions to industry documents, e.g., IIS, FRS, ASN.1, GDMO, related to Telcordia’s attached multi-vendor NPAC proposal in time for review in preparation for discussion at the March 2009 LNPA WG meeting.

  

* Telcordia provided an update to Action Item 0109-02. Telcordia stated that documents in revisions mode will be distributed to the LNPA WG Co-Chairs during the week of February 23rd. The Co-Chairs will then distribute the documents to the LNPA WG for review prior to the March 2009 meeting.
* Telcordia stated that the submitted documents during the week of February 23rd will include an expanded NANC 437, which will frame the proposed architecture and provide a more detailed overview of changes, the Functional Requirements Specification (FRS) with change bars, and a set of representative IIS flows (approximately 20-25% of the flows). The remaining IIS flows, ASN.1, and GDMO will be submitted subsequently.

Proposed PIM 68 Best Practices (Action Items 0109-09, 0109-10) – All:



Action Item 0109-09: Service Providers are to review the attached proposed Best Practice on pooled blocks and come prepared on the February 10, 2009 LNPA WG conference call to suggest any revisions. See related Action Item 0109-10.



* The group reviewed that draft proposed Best Practice above addressing breaking out individual SV records from pooled 1K blocks, which is related to PIM 68 submitted by AT&T Mobility.
* Verizon offered that attached revision to the proposed Best Practice, which recommends that, “it is the position of the LNPA-WG that service providers, or others working on their behalf, should limit to the extent possible breaking pooled thousands blocks apart and creating individual Subscription Versions (SVs) in order to facilitate projects or for other purposes.”



* Some changes were made to the Verizon proposal (captured in the file attached above), after which the proposed Best Practice was accepted by the group. Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will accept the revisions, create a new Best Practice, and forward it to Mohamed Samater, T-Mobile, for uploading to the LNPA WG’s Best Practice website location.
* Action Item 0109-09 was closed.

Action Item 0109-10: In preparation for the February 10, 2009 LNPA WG conference call, Service Providers are to review the attached two proposed Best Practice options on the use of the “Future Use” fields and be prepared to discuss which of the following three options is preferred. See related Action Item 0109-09.

1. Attached Option A which proposes that the 3 “Future Use” fields, or their “Alt” Optional Data counterparts, not be populated until such time that the LNPA WG has defined their use(s).



1. Attached Option B which proposes that the 3 “Future Use” fields, and their “Alt” Optional Data counterparts, may be populated as long as it is done concurrently with porting/pooling transactions.



1. As a 3rd option, do nothing in terms of developing a Best Practice related to the use of these fields/parameters, and work to define industry-approved use(s)/definition(s) for them.
* During the discussion, concerns were expressed by a number of providers with regard to Option A and the potential repercussions of attempting to prohibit the use of these fields which have been available for use since the inception of porting. There was also concerns expressed regarding possible creation of individual SVs solely for the purpose of populating one or more of these fields/parameters, actions which could possibly lead to service provider database capacity exhaust.
* During the discussion, a service provider proposed a modified version of Option B, which would allow population of any of these fields/parameters as long as it was in conjunction with the normal creation of an SV or a modify of an existing SV. In addition, the provider proposed that the LNPA WG should designate the use of these fields/parameters as “memo” fields/parameters. Another provider asked how we would know that an individual SV was being created solely for the purpose of populating these fields. NeuStar stated that there is really no way to tell because the NPAC does not track what fields are modified on any given transaction.
* Gary Sacra, Verizon, will work with Renee Dillon, AT&T Mobility, to rewrite

the attached proposed Best Practice Option B on the use of the “future use” fields and their “alt” Optional Data parameter counterparts. As agreed to on the February 10, 2009 LNPA WG conference call, the rewrite proposal will reflect the following:

1. population of the fields and parameters is acceptable provided that a new record is not being created solely for the purpose of populating one or more of these fields/parameters,
2. population of the fields and parameters is acceptable if done via a modify of an existing record,
3. The LNPA WG will not attempt to define strict usages or definitions for these fields/parameters. These fields/parameters will be considered “memo” or “scratch pad” fields/parameters to reflect their varied use over the years and continued use by service providers. Discussion will need to take place on how, or if, any requirements changes will be made to reflect this.

Once rewritten, the proposed Best Practice will be distributed to the LNPA WG for review and discussion at the March 2009 LNPA WG meeting.

* Action 0109-10 remains open. All options, including the new one described above will be discussed at the March 2009 LNPA WG meeting.

Readout of January 25, 2009 Fairpoint SPID Migration – All:

* NeuStar reported that there were no Help Desk issues as a result of the January 25th SPID Migration..
* Verizon Telecom, Verizon Wireless, and Sprint Nextel provided feedback that they did not experience any issues processing the SMURF files. Verizon Telecom reported that it took less than 45 minutes to process the files.
* Comcast reported that they were having some issues with Fairpoint getting their LSRs processed.
* Based on a discussion with Fairpoint prior to the February 10, 2009 LNPA WG conference call, Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, reported the following in response to Action Item 1108-06:

Action Item 1108-06: 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.

* Fairpoint reported that they were processing some LSRs received for port outs during the week of January 25th. There was a blackout on processing LSRs during the week of February 1st in order for Fairpoint to bring their systems online. The blackout was lifted on Monday, February 9th.
* Action Item 1108-06 is closed.

Discussion of SPID Migration Limitations (Action Item 1108-10) – All:

Action Item 1108-10: 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.

 

NOTE: While not directly addressed in the attached M&P, the current limitations are no more than 7 SPID migrations in a region, and no more than 25 over all U.S. regions. In addition, the quantity of LRNs involved will not exceed 100 nationally (any mix; any region) in a migration window. These limitations are spelled out on the NPAC Secure website under SPID Migrations.

* Based on no issues reported with the January 25, 2009 SPID Migration which had 364 LRNs, a service provider proposed raising the LRN limit from 100 to 500. No concerns were expressed on the LRN proposal, but some concerns were raised over the lack of a TN limit. Some suggested 100K per region as a limit. It was stated that on 9/21/2008, there were about 600K TNs involved in a SPID migration in the SE region. Also, on 6/8/2008, there were 534K TNs involved in a SPID migration in the SE region.
* LNPA WG Participants are to come to the March 2009 LNPA WG meeting prepared to discuss whether or not they can support the following proposed SPID migration limitations:
1. No more than 7 SPID migrations in a region, and no more than 25 over all U.S. regions. (NOTE: This is the existing requirement.)
2. The quantity of LRNs involved will not exceed 500 nationally (any mix; any region) in a migration window. (NOTE: The current limit is 100 LRNs.)
3. In addition, a limit on the number of impacted SVs will also be discussed and possibly quantified at the March 2009 LNPA WG meeting.

New Business – All:

* Mohamed Samater, T-Mobile, stated that PIM 70, which proposes that the Wireless Port Request (WPR) be used for wireless-to-wireline ports instead of the wireline Local Service Request (LSR), is being withdrawn in order to allow the industry to concentrate on higher priority issues, such as development of a standard porting form.
* Jan Doell, Qwest, reported that LNPA WG Best Practice 14, which addresses the portability of paging codes, contains a link to the INC’s COCAG Job Aid that does not work. Jan Doell, Qwest, will rewrite LNPA WG Best Practice 14 to addresspermissible porting of paging numbers, i.e., requested by the paging company and not the end user.

Mohamed Samater, T-Mobile, will correct the numbering of Best Practices at the beginning of the document on the LNPA WG Best Practice website.

***Next LNPA WG Meeting …******March 10-11, 2009, Denver, Colorado – Hosted by***

 ***Comcast***