LNPA WORKING GROUP

June 9, 2009 Conference Call

Final Minutes

**TUESDAY 06/09/09**

Tuesday, 06/09/09, Conference Call Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** |
| Alissa Medley | ATIS | Mary Conquest | Nuvox |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Linda Peterman | One Communications |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T | John McHugh | OPASTCO |
| Tracey Guidotti | AT&T | Peggy Rubino | Paetec |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T | Mary Retka | Qwest |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Mobility | Jan Doell | Qwest |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | Towanda Russell | RCN |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian Consortium | Thomas Panko | RCN |
| Susan Gentz | Casey, Gentz, and Magness | Matt Kohly | Socket |
| Nancy Cornwell | Cellcom | Lavinia Rotaru | Sprint Nextel |
| Jennifer Asperslagh | Comcast | Sue Tiffany | Sprint Nextel |
| Nancy Sanders | Comcast | Cat Thornburg | SureWest |
| Bill Solis | Comcast | John Guzman | **Synchronoss Technologies** |
| Cindy Sheehan | Comcast | Nancy Conant | **Synchronoss Technologies** |
| Jennifer Hutton | Cox | Bob Bruce | Syniverse |
| Dennis Robins | DER-Consulting | Pat White | Telcordia |
| Vicki Goth | Embarq | Adam Newman | Telcordia |
| Steve Farnsworth | Evolving Systems | John Malyar | Telcordia |
| Greg Council | Evolving Systems | Jason Loyer | Time Warner Cable |
| Linda Birchem | Fairpoint | Stacy Hannah | Time Warner Cable |
| Beth O’Donnell | GCI | Paula Jordan | T-Mobile |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW | Anna Miller | T-Mobile |
| Shelly Moore | Illinois Valley Cellular | Mohamed Samater | T-Mobile |
| Cheryl O’Brien | Illinois Valley Cellular | Heather Tackett | TNS (formerly VeriSign) |
| Tara Schmitz | Illinois Valley Cellular | Amanda Molina | Townes Telecommunications |
| Bonnie Johnson | Integra Telecom | Gary Sacra | Verizon |
| Colleen Stufflebeen | Iowa Network Services | Jason Lee | Verizon |
| Karen Norcross | Michigan PSC | Deb Tucker | Verizon Wireless |
| Don Gray | Nebraska PSC | Sara Hooker | Verizon Wireless |
| Lynette Khirallah | NetNumber | Darren Krebs | Vonage |
| Dave Garner  | NeuStar | Tom Zablocki | Vonage |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Paula Hustead | Windstream |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar | Tana Henson | Windstream |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Keith Wilkinson | Windstream |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar  | Dawn Lawrence | XO Communications |
| Brent Struthers | NeuStar | Loriann Burke | XO Communications |
| Mubeen Saifullah | NeuStar Clearinghouse |  |  |
| Shannon Sevigny | NeuStar Pooling |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**JUNE 9, 2009 CONFERENCE CALL MINUTES:**

Review and Approve May 28, 2009 Draft Minutes – All:



* The attached DRAFT 05-28-09 LNPA WG conference call minutes were approved as FINAL.

Continued Discussion of Attached DRAFT Revisions to NANC LNP Provisioning Flows in Support of FCC Order 09-41 – All:



* After introductions and review of the agenda, LNPA WG Co-Chairs Paula Jordan and Gary Sacra facilitated the group’s continued review of DRAFT revisions to the NANC LNP Provisioning Flows in support of the 1 business day interval for simple ports as mandated by the attached FCC Order 09-41. The straw revisions captured in the attached DRAFT v2 process flows were used to facilitate the group discussion.



* The following Action Items were previously assigned on the 05-28-09 conference call:
	+ Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, took Action Items to:
* Strike the question asked in Figure 5 (Wireless ICP Process) of the v1 DRAFT flows.
* Complete the DRAFT revisions to the remaining flows.

NOTE: These two Action Items were completed and are reflected in the DRAFT v2 flows attached above.

* LNPA WG Participants are to provide any input to the questions identified above to Paula Jordan (paula.jordan@t-mobile.com) and Gary Sacra (gary.m.sacra@verizon.com), LNPA WG Co-Chairs, by Friday, June 5th, in time for discussion on the June 9th LNPA WG conference call.

 1. Figure 1 Step 4, which references the optional CSR request, should

 this step be reworded and/or moved to a different location in Figure 1?

2. Should the use of the Unconditional 10-Digit Trigger be made a requirement on the part of the Old Network Service Provider (ONSP)?

3. In several flows (example is Figure 3 Steps 5 and 6), there are references to conditional steps where the ONSP and OLSP (a Reseller or Interconnected VoIP Provider) exchange LSR and FOC information based on contractual agreements between the two providers. Question asked – Do we still want these steps reflected in the flows?

4. It was stated that we need to ensure that we are not precluding or prohibiting in the verbiage of the flows providers who choose to consider port-outs of multiple TNs as simple ports from doing so. Perhaps some clarification in the Narratives would be appropriate.

5. Is the group ok with the wording in Step 4 in Figure 4, which states, “NLSP sends LSR or LSR information to NNSP for resale or interconnection service.”? The term “interconnection service” is also used in Figure 3 Step 2. This term is meant to distinguish between the interconnection with a PSTN network provider and an Interconnected VoIP provider and that of a Reseller.

6. Is it acceptable to remove references to the Simple Port Service Request (SPSR) in the flows?

7. We need to determine the treatment of Type 1 Wireless in the revised flows.

8. Do we want to maintain two timers (T1 and T2) or move to one timer?

**LNPA WG Participants are to provide any input to the questions identified above to Paula Jordan (paula.jordan@t-mobile.com) and Gary Sacra (gary.m.sacra@verizon.com), LNPA WG Co-Chairs, by Friday, June 5th, in time for discussion on the June 9th LNPA WG conference call.**

* Questions 1 through 8 above were discussed during the appropriate portions of the review of the draft v2 LNP Provisioning Flows. The Figure numbers referenced in the discussion below pertain to v2 of the DRAFT flows. The Figure numbers have changed in v3.
1. **Figure 1 Step 4, which references the optional CSR request, should this step be reworded and/or moved to a different location in Figure 1?**
	* PARKING LOT ITEM: It was stated that we need to make clear in the Narratives that the Old SP cannot require a CSR to be requested before accepting an LSR from the New SP.
	* PARKING LOT ITEM: It was stated that we need to specify in the Narratives a standard timeframe for return of a requested CSR.
	* One reason for the need to request a CSR is that the Old SP may require the End User Account No. on an incoming LSR, which is one of the 4 valid LSR End User validation fields per FCC Order 07-188.
	* DRAFT FLOW CHANGE: A Service Provider suggested that the CSR box in Figure 1 be moved to after Box 5, to eliminate Boxes 7 and 10. Note: These changes are reflected in v3 of the DRAFT flows at the end of these minutes.
	* DRAFT FLOW CHANGE: A question was asked as to what if the Old SP determines that the port request, requested as a Simple Port, is not in fact a Simple Port. Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will draft proposed changes to cover this scenario for review on the 06-23-09 call. Note: These changes are reflected in v3 of the DRAFT flows at the end of these minutes.
	* DRAFT FLOW CHANGE: The entry points in Figure 2 need to be straightened out. Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will draft proposed changes to cover this for review on the 06-23-09 call. Note: These changes are reflected in v3 of the DRAFT flows at the end of these minutes.
	* DRAFT FLOW CHANGE: It was suggested to move Figure 2 after Figure 5 for clarity. Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will draft proposed changes to cover this for review on the 06-23-09 call. Note: These changes are reflected in v3 of the DRAFT flows at the end of these minutes.
2. **Should the use of the Unconditional 10-Digit Trigger be made a requirement on the part of the Old Network Service Provider (ONSP)?**
* A provider suggested that an alternative to setting the 10-digit trigger could be to disconnect upon notification of NPAC activation.
* Another provider stated that the 10-digit trigger should be required if technically feasible.
* A consultant stated that an alternative could be to have the Old SP agree to coordinate the port or monitor the NPAC for activation.
* It was stated that wireless providers query on every call.
* An association representative for numerous small LECs confirmed that the switch types used by these providers typically are capable of supporting the 10-digit trigger.
* DRAFT FLOW CHANGE: Modify Box 15 in Figure 2 to ask, “Is the Unconditional 10 digit trigger being used or does ONSP query on every call?” Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will draft proposed changes to cover this for review on the 06-23-09 call. Note: These changes are reflected in v3 of the DRAFT flows at the end of these minutes.
* PARKING LOT ITEM: Need to clarify in Narratives that there is no need to require wireless providers to use the 10-digit trigger because they dip on every call.
* PARKING LOT ITEM: Need to clarify in Narratives that the Old SP must either deploy the 10-digit trigger or monitor the NPAC for activation in order to trigger the disconnect. Question: Do we want this as a requirement for just Simple Ports or also for Non-Simple Ports?
1. **In several flows (example is Figure 3 Steps 5 and 6), there are references to conditional steps where the ONSP and OLSP (a Reseller or Interconnected VoIP Provider) exchange LSR and FOC information based on contractual agreements between the two providers. Question asked – Do we still want these steps reflected in the flows?**
* PARKING LOT ITEM: It was agreed to leave these steps in the flows, but we need to clarify in the Narratives that these steps will not slow the port process down. Also, we need to state in the Narratives that the Old LSP must be notified of the port out in order to stop billing.
* A service provider stated that we need to distinguish between a TN port request and a request to establish service. For example, a VoIP provider, who is the New SP, can establish broadband service for the end user before setting up the port request. A concern was stated that this could possibly enable marketing by the Old SP, however.
* DRAFT FLOW CHANGE: In Figure 3, add a decision box for Simple Port – Yes or No. Go to Figure 4 at the right step to allow for a FOC return with a different due date if not Simple. Also, allow for a request for more data if submitted as Simple, but in fact the port is not Simple. Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will draft proposed changes to cover this for review on the 06-23-09 call. Note: These changes are reflected in v3 of the DRAFT flows at the end of these minutes.
	1. **It was stated that we need to ensure that we are not precluding or prohibiting in the verbiage of the flows providers who choose to consider port-outs of multiple TNs as simple ports from doing so. Perhaps some clarification in the Narratives would be appropriate.**
* PARKING LOT ITEM: It was agreed that we need to explicitly state in the Narratives that the Old SP is not precluded from exceeding the minimum requirements by being more permissive in their porting process.
* A scenario was raised in the form of a question where a customer would have 300 TNs on 300 separate accounts, and the New SP submitted 300 separate LSRs to the Old SP. Would this be considered 300 Simple ports? A provider responded that some SPs would consider these to be Non-Simple because they are with the same customer. Other providers stated that they felt these would be Simple port requests.
* PARKING LOT ITEM: Determine if we want to place a required range of TNs (2 to X) in the Narratives for Non-Simple ports. Also, determine if we will acknowledge “projects” and the minimum threshold in terms of TNs that constitute a project.
1. **Is the group ok with the wording in Step 4 in Figure 4, which states, “NLSP sends LSR or LSR information to NNSP for resale or interconnection service.”? The term “interconnection service” is also used in Figure 3 Step 2. This term is meant to distinguish between the interconnection with a PSTN network provider and an Interconnected VoIP provider and that of a Reseller.**
	* OPEN QUESTION: It was agreed to leave this question open for the next call.
	* One provider suggested possibly using the term “VoIP Resale.”
2. **Is it acceptable to remove references to the Simple Port Service Request (SPSR) in the flows?**
	* It was stated that the SPSR has been added to the LSOG.
	* A question was asked if the current flows are generic or specific in terms of reference to a port request. The response was that they are specific in reference to LSR/FOC, which are governed by the ATIS OBF.
	* OPEN QUESTION: It was agreed to leave this question open for later discussion.
3. **We need to determine the treatment of Type 1 Wireless in the revised flows.**
	* It was stated that the porting of Type 1 cellular numbers are Non-Simple ports because they are being ported out of a multi-TN DID group.
	* It was agreed to add reference to Type 1 cellular numbers in the Non-Simple port flow.
* DRAFT FLOW CHANGE: Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will draft proposed additions to the Non-Simple flow to cover Type 1 cellular for review on the 06-23-09 call. Note: These changes are reflected in v3 of the DRAFT flows at the end of these minutes.
1. **Do we want to maintain two timers (T1 and T2) or move to one timer?**
	* A provider asked if we can agree that this question belongs in the Business Day Sub-team. There were no objections.
	* ACTION ITEM: A provider stated that it would be helpful if vendors would respond on whether it would be a significant change to go from 2 timers (T1 and T2) to one single timer. Action Item for all System Vendors.
	* A provider asked if it were possible to find out how many providers use the timers and have business practices that require them, e.g., does the expiration of the T1 timer trigger any action in their systems?

**REVISED NANC LNP PROVISIONING FLOWS BASED ON 06-09-09 CALL:**

* Attached below is the v3 version of the flows based on the discussion items captured in the minutes above. These changes are in blue.



Discussion of Any Additional Process Flow Submissions (to be distributed if received) – All:

* Both AT&T and Sprint Nextel stated that they are developing contributions for proposed flow revisions for discussion on a future call.

Discussion of Next Steps – All:

* It was agreed that the group will continue to work to finalize the process flows and then work on changes to the Narratives as the sub-teams report their recommendations back to the full LNPA WG for discussion and finalization.

Discussion of Status of Subteams:

 Define One Business Day Subteam (Chaired by Jan Doell – Qwest):

* This sub-team has met 5 times to date, with 4 more meetings scheduled.
* The goal of the sub-team is to define how the business day is construed, e.g., start and stop time of the business day, FOC interval, and LSR cutoff time.
* To date consensus has been reached on the following:
	+ Old Providers Company-defined Holidays are not considered part of a Business Day.
	+ New SP must have FOC before they send SV Create to NPAC.
	+ Mandatory Business Days are Mon-Fri, excluding weekends and Old Providers Company-defined Holidays.
* Contributions continue to come in from providers. Participants can ask clarifying questions during each provider contribution presentation, but each contribution is not debated.
* The sub-team has identified and grouped 27 questions and providers are putting their respective positions in a spreadsheet.
* On the next call, the sub-team will first discuss if the one business day interval is the same day or next day. The sub-team is working to identify the business hours. It was agreed that there should be a cutoff time for receipt of a valid LSR. The time and time zone of the cutoff time needs to be identified.
	+ The contact information for Jan Doell, Qwest and Chair of this sub-team, is **jan.doell@qwest.com**.

LSR Subteam (Chaired by Linda Peterman – One Communications):

* + The sub-team is continuing to drill down through the assumptions and what is needed in the LSR process.
	+ A question the sub-team is working through is should there be a form for Simple ports only or should there be a combined form for Simple and Non-Simple ports.
	+ A lot of the LSR Sub-team work is dependent on the One Business Day Sub-team work.
	+ Steve Addicks, NeuStar, then discussed the attached possible approach for determining which set of wireline timers to use on a given port.



* + A provider asked if we need to maintain the current long wireline timers. Another provider stated that the ILECs need to consider any possible use of the short timers for a 4 day Non-Simple port interval in the context of required state metrics.
	+ The contact information for Linda Peterman, One Communications and Chair of this subteam, is **lpeterman@onecommunications.com**.

WICIS Subteam (Chaired by Deb Tucker – Verizon Wireless):

* + Four calls have taken place to date with a good cross-section of providers and vendors participating.
	+ The goal of the sub-team was to exploring whether or not the WICIS itself could be used for wireline-to-wireline and intermodal ports.
	+ It became quickly evident that buy-in for such use of the WICIS would be difficult to obtain and may not be feasible for such implementation.
	+ The sub-team has concluded that its participants’ time would be better spent participating in other sub-teams.
	+ The sub-team agreed to disband. No further calls are scheduled at this time.
	+ The contact information for Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless and Chair of this subteam, is **deborah.tucker@verizonwireless.com**.

“Out-of-the-Box” Subteam (Chaired by Teresa Patton – AT&T Mobility):

* This committee has been tasked with coming up with one or more possible solutions that could be utilized to support/enable One Day Porting for wireline and intermodal ports.
* Each possible solution is being analyzed by a sub-set of the overall committee. One idea that was initially on our list has been deemed not viable – that was using the ENUM solution/process.
* The committee is currently working on the following ideas:

1. Service Bureau / Clearinghouse Solution – would allow for a carrier to utilize a 3rd party vendor to assist with “translation” of messages to reduce the amount of changes required

2. Expanding NPAC’s/SOA’s role in the porting process – similar to how porting occurs in other countries around the world. This solution is considering the possibility of the adding the “Intercarrier upfront port process” into the NPAC processes. In order to get a better idea on the viability of this project the sub-team is trying to meet with different carrier types to discuss this idea in depth and obtain feedback.

3. A combination of the service bureau and NPAC/SOA expansion to ease implementations.

4. Combination of WICIS / LSR to see if they can be leveraged to facilitate interoperability to achieve the reduced porting interval. The team will be looking at a holistic approach to minimize impacts to the existing infrastructure and make recommendations. The team is focusing on wireline to wireline and intermodal porting and will work closely with the Out of the Box Sub-team analyzing the service bureau/clearinghouse idea given its synergies

* The groups working on each of these ideas are meeting on an on-going basis and providing information back to the overall committee. Our next full committee meeting is June 10th.
* The plan is to have one or more of these ideas fleshed out enough to present to the entire LNPA Working Group at the July 27th face to face meeting.
* The contact information for Teresa Patton, AT&T Mobility and Chair of this subteam, is **teresa.j.patton@att.com**.

Simple Port Definition Subteam (Chaired by Nancy Sanders – Comcast):

* Two meetings have been held to date.
* A wide representation of providers and vendors has been participating.
* The 4 criteria currently comprising the FCC’s definition of a Simple port is being analyzed. A good deal of time has been spent discussion UNEs and the single line criteria.
	+ The contact information for Nancy Sanders, Comcast and Chair of this subteam, is **nancy\_sanders@cable.comcast.com**.

**UPCOMING LNPA WG MEETING AND CALL SCHEDULE TO ADDRESS FCC 09-41:**

* June 23, 2009 conference call from 11:30am to 3:30pm Eastern
	+ Dial-in bridge is 888-412-7808 Pin 23272#
* July 27-28, 2009 face-to-face meeting in Irvine, California
	+ Dial-in bridge is 888-412-7808 Pin 23272#

***Next General LNPA WG Meeting …July 14-15, 2009, Ottawa Ontario, Canada – Hosted by Canadian Consortium***