LNPA WORKING GROUP

WICIS Sub-team

May 26, 2009 Meeting Minutes

Meeting Attendance:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Mobility |
| Nancy Sanders | Comcast |
| Bonnie Johnson | Integra Telecom |
| Stephanie Prull | Integra Telecom |
| Steve Addicks | NeuStar |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar |
| Mubeen Saifullah | NeuStar |
| Rosemary Emmer | Sprint Nextel |
| Mohamed Samater | T-Mobile |
| Adam Newman | Telcordia |
| John Malyar | Telcordia |
| Deb Tucker | Verizon Wireless |

Deb Tucker briefly discussed the minutes from the previous meeting. She updated the group on the decision to come up with an augmented WICIS format to use for Wireline and Intermodal porting rather than using the existing WICIS format. It was previously agreed that using WICIS 100% was not acceptable.

In order to quickly come up with an augmented list of fields to use, Mubeen Saifullah suggested and provided a draft worksheet that the ATIS OBF Intermodal Subcommittee created that had the basis for an agreed upon set of fields that both wireless and wireline carriers could potentially use for simple ports. The attached worksheet was distributed to participants on the call via e-mail and desktop meeting sharing. It was explained that the team would be reviewing only the Simple Port Request tab. Column A is the list of fields that the OBF LSOP committee came up with for the Simple Port Service Request (SPSR) and column B is a list of simplified fields from WICIS that wireless carriers agreed upon for use in an intermodal fashion. Column C is still a list in progress at OBF, but it is a place to start with fields that are needed by both wireless and wireline service providers when processing intermodal port requests. Clarification – the term “repeatable” used on the spreadsheet refers to having more than one TN on a request. Use of this type of element may take this of request beyond a “simple” port request.



Discussion items:

Questions were raised about the various fields that needed to be used to accomplish a port and there was concern that there shouldn’t be more fields added than necessary. Some clarification regarding wireless use of account numbers and password/pin was given.

It was mentioned that the OBF list was a result of months of OBF committee efforts and that this sub-team lacked the time to go through and work each field individually. Participants needed time to review the list internally.

Action item for participants: using Column C of the Simple Port Request tab, discuss the use of the list of these data elements internally. Is it acceptable to have all of the fields listed as required fields? What challenges are presented if the decision is made to require all of these fields? What are your recommendations for the use of each data element?

Deb Tucker requested responses to be returned prior to the Thursday, 5/28/09, LNPA WG meeting, if possible.

***Next Sub-team Meeting …******June 2, 2009, 1:00 PM – 2:00 PM ET***

Telephone Number: 1-888-899-2444 OR 614-560-8900

Meeting ID: 123789