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Meeting Title: Out of the Box – Second Meeting

Committee Chair: Teresa Patton (972) 989-5126

Meeting Date: June 2, 2009

Next Meeting Date: See last page of these notes

Attendees: Teresa Patton (AT&T), Tracey Guidotti (AT&T), Jim Rooks (Neustar), Mohamed Samater (T-Mobile), Bob Bruce (Syniverse), Greg Council (Evolving Systems), Steve Farnsworth (Evolving Systems), Lavinia Rotaru (Sprint), Syed Mubeen Saifullah (NeuStar), Steve Addicks (NeuStar), Paul Lagattuta (NeuStar), Jim Rooks (NeuStar), Matt Timmerman (Telcordia), Pat White (Telcordia)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Conducted by**: Teresa Patton | **Recorded By**: Syed Mubeen Saifullah |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action Required | | | | | |
| Action # | Description | Status | Assigned To | Target Date | Actual Date |
| 1 | Interested members are asked to select one of the ideas listed below to work with a smaller group to begin the initial discovery/definition phase. Email your interest to Teresa Patton. | Assigned | Committee | 5/27/09 | 05-27-09 |
| 2 | Sub-Teams #1, #2, #3 and #4 should continue to meet | Assigned | Committee |  |  |
| 3 | Follow up with LNPA WG Chairs to gain an understanding of how in depth the committee status should be on upcoming calls | Assigned | Teresa Patton |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Decisions | | | | |
| Decision # | Description | Status | Target Date | Actual Date |
| 1 | Subteam#5 - ENUM Solution determined that this idea is not feasible at this time. | Assigned | 06-02-09 | 06-02-09 |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Record significant Topics, Presenters, Decisions:** |

# Discussions:

Received Updates from each Sub-Team (notes captured in the order of status give on the call)

**Sub-team #5: ENUM process** – (Status provided by Greg Council) the committee met on Monday (June 1, 2009) and determined that the infrastructure pieces of an EMUM solution would not be ready in time as the “main transfer functions” are not available from the ENUM LLC. The elements required for this type of solution to work for the FCC order isn’t supported by the ENUM registry at this time. Based on this, it may not be wise for the group to pursue the ENUM process as a solution for this FCC requirement.

See attached notes (embedded within this word document)



**Sub-team #1: Clearinghouse/Service Bureau** – (Status provided by Bob Bruce) – The sub-team met twice in the last week. It was determined that rather than spending time detailing field-to-field mapping, it would be more appropriate to document possible “flows” on how translations should work (from the NSP to the OSP and vice versa). One key assumption is that 1 or more vendors will “step up” and translate the messages between the NSP and OSP. There are many questions that have been documented, however one in particular is “How do carriers synchronize? Will synchronization be carrier-to-carrier? Or Vendor-to-vendor?”

* 1. **Pros**
     1. Decreases carrier cost relative to the back office system changes
     2. There isn’t an immediate need for standardization
     3. GUI(s) can replace fax
     4. This accommodates individual carrier implementations vs. an industry wide solution
     5. Speed to market
  2. **Cons**
     1. No standardization of the LSR would be required and without standardization, this may increase the cost of translation
     2. Manual ports would not be eliminated
     3. There are more touch points in the porting flows, which leaves more possible points of failure
     4. No way to force carriers to utilize this solution

More questions were documented by the group

* How do I as a carrier work with the vendor?”
* Will this translation service be OSP or NSP driven as each has its own relationship with its respective vendor?
* Will the vendors have a common standard amongst themselves?
  1. **Next Meeting**
     1. Friday June 5, 2009 2pm ET: +1-813-637-5900 #12357

See attached notes (embedded within this word document)



**Sub-team #2: Enhance NPAC SV Create & Matching Create messages** – (Status provided by Jim Rooks) – The sub-team explored the idea of an enhanced NPAC/SOA Create message as port requests that have “porting administrative fields”, allowing for the OSP to validate the data prior to issuing a concurrence for porting. This solution takes into account the inclusion of validation fields and expanded Conflict Cause Codes.

The consensus was that this is a great idea, but there was concern expressed about how the SOA systems would interface with back office automated systems.

It was noted that smaller carriers can use the Low Tech Interface (LTI) to access the NPAC for porting, and that this sub-team needed to spend additional time on how smaller carriers may be impacted.

It was also voiced that wireline E-911 and Directory service processes may add complexity to this potential solution.

Deb Tucker from Verizon Wireless indicated that per her observations, roughly 10% of wireline to wireless ports are cancelled because of the time it takes today to port. These cancelled port requests currently don’t make it into the NPAC. If this data is now being exchanged at the NPAC level, the size and the volume would potentially increase and she would like the sub-team to consider the storage needs of the NPAC to accommodate this enhanced message and the additional volume of messages.

1. **Pros**
   * 1. Single system for simple ports
     2. The capability for the validation fields to hit the carrier’s ICP or LSR systems is a must
     3. Not too many touch points
     4. May allow forcing all carriers to support this for simple ports
2. **Cons**
   * 1. Possible large impacts to legacy systems
3. **Next Meetings**
   * 1. Thursday June 4, 2009 at 12:30pm ET
        1. Conf bridge 866-858-8801, conf ID 5490
     2. Wednesday June 10, 2009 at 11am ET
        1. Conf bridge 866-858-8801, conf ID 5490

See attached notes (embedded within this word document)



**Sub-team #3: Combination of Clearinghouse and Enhanced NPAC SV Create Message** – (Status provided by Teresa Patton) – this sub-team couldn’t make a tremendous amount of headway as input from both sub-teams #1 and #2 were needed. The idea discussed were as follows

1. Use the enhanced NPAC/SOA process when the NSP believes that the port is “simple”
2. If the NSP receives a conflict indicating that the port is not simple, then the NSP could engage the clearinghouse translation process to reach the OSP through its normal porting process.

It was suggested that if the port wasn’t “simple” one possible way for the OSP to respond was to return the “confirmation type” of response with a later Due Date/Time (DDT) than the 1 day. The question was raised, “Does this happen in today’s ICP/WICIS process?” and the answer was “Yes – in today’s intermodal porting scenarios, the Wireless carrier can input a Desired Due Date/Time ( DDDT) and the OSP may return a different DDT. This has been accounted for in today’s WICIS capabilities for intermodal porting.” This idea could be explored further in sub-teams #2 and #3

1. **Next Meeting**
   1. June 10, 2009 from 2-3pm ET
   2. Conference Bridge: 877-888-4443 passcode 623 0424

See attached notes (embedded within this word document)



**Sub-team #4: Combination of LSR/WPR** – This sub-team is scheduled to meet on Friday June 5, 2009 and will receive feedback from the WICIS sub-committee (led by Deb Tucker). Deb provided some feedback/status on how her work was going. She reported that during her meetings, it was determined that the WICIS in the form it is today would not be sufficient for the wireline carriers, and thus it would need to be augmented with fields/requirements from the wireline porting process. The intermodal committee’s excel spreadsheets were reviewed, but there wasn’t consensus on the fields or their use. It was proposed in their meeting that the WICIS sub-committee be disbanded, however they will have one more meeting to make this final decision. They will be meeting on Monday June 8, 2009

1. **Next Meeting:**
   1. Friday June 5, 2009 at 10am ET
   2. Meeting will be lead by John Malyar
   3. Conference Call info: 1.888.699.0348 Pin 7192#

**Additional Notes (not related to any one sub-team)**

One participant, expressed that the NPAC is currently a forced process, and it is the single common process throughout the industry. They also stated that they didn’t believe that other processes could be “forced” and some carriers would not feel comfortable forcing the industry to use numerous clearinghouses/service bereau solutions for other pieces.

There was an objection to this reasoning, indicating that potential solutions (like the translation services) could potentially be forced.

**Questions for the Out-Of-The-Box Committee as a whole**

When do we pull all sub-teams back together into 1 umbrella group again?

When should be select “solutions” that will be presented to the LNPA Working Group?

Answer: Prior to July 14th, 2009

What are the current deliverables to the LNPA Working Group?

Answer: Processes and Diagrams are the deliverable items

**Future Meetings for the Out-Of-The-Box Committee**

June 10, 2009: 4-5pm ET: 877-888-4443 passcode 623 0424

June 16, 2009: 4-5pm ET: 877-888-4443 passcode 623 0424

June 23, 2009: 4-5pm ET: 877-888-4443 passcode 623 0424

July 9, 2009: 3:30pm-5pm ET: 877-888-4443 passcode 623 0424