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Meeting Title: Out of the Box – Third Meeting

Committee Chair: Teresa Patton (972) 989-5126

Meeting Date: June 10, 2009

Next Meeting Date: See last page of these notes

Attendees: Teresa Patton (AT&T), Syed Mubeen Saifullah (NeuStar), Tracey Guidotti (AT&T), Linda Peterman (One Communications), Jim Rooks (Neustar), Mohamed Samater (T-Mobile), Bob Bruce (Syniverse), Steve Farnsworth (Evolving Systems), Steve Addicks (NeuStar), Paul Lagattuta (NeuStar), Jim Rooks (NeuStar), Matt Timmerman (Telcordia), Pat White (Telcordia), Adam Newman (Telcordia)

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action Required | | | | | |
| Action # | Description | Status | Assigned To | Target Date | Actual Date |
| 1 | Sub-Teams #1, #2, and #4 should continue to meet | Assigned | Respective Committees |  |  |
| 2 | 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 |  |  |
| 3 | Follow up with LNPA WG Chairs to determine a consistent format for presenting the ideas from the various committees and sub-teams. | Assigned | Teresa Patton |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Decisions | | | | |
| Decision # | Description | Status | 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 | 05-27-09 |  |
| 2 | Sub-team#5 - ENUM Solution determined that this idea is not feasible at this time. | Closed/  Completed | 06-02-09 | 06-02-09 |
| 3 | Sub-team #3 – Combination of Clearinghouse and NPAC/SOA Enhancement has been put into a “dormant” mode and can reconvene when there is more detail around the materials from sub-teams #1 and #2 | Closed | 06-10-09 | 06-10-09 |
| 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 #1: Clearinghouse/Service Bureau** – (Status provided by Bob Bruce) – The sub-team met twice in the last week. Most of the time was spent reviewing and discussing the questions which were captured in the last meetings. In particular “What happens if more than 1 Service Bureau is involved in the porting process?” The sub-team spent time reviewing draft flows for the following four scenarios (related to the question):

1. NSP Service Bureau does all translations
2. OSP Service Bureau does all necessary translations
3. Both OSP and NSP Service Bureaus do translations based upon an inter-vendor standard
4. Service Bureau to translate the message only when sending to their respective clients (either the OSP or NSP)

Additional Questions were raised in these sub-team meetings

* Question: Should the Service Bureau only deal with the LSR/FOC pre-NPAC processes or also the SOA/NPAC processes?
  + Answer: This is an internal agreement between the carriers and their respective Service Bureau providers
* Question: Is an arrangement with a Service Bureau a requirement of the industry or an option?
  + Answer: Optional, as carriers could internally develop porting translations
* Question: Will the fax/email processes still be permitted?
  + Answer: the fax/email processes can be handled in 24 hours/1 business day but this requires manual staffing and may be expensive.
* Question: When will timers start? When the order reaches the OSP or the OSP’s Service Bureau?
* Question: Will the Service Bureau or OSP be required to support a GUI for order reception?
* Question: For fax/email, how should the OSP send a receipt of order reception? Should this be/could this be automated?
* Question: Can the Service Bureau arrangements/translations be in place within 9 months?
* Question: In terms of standards, would there be one ordering standards for Wireline-to-Wireline porting and another ordering standard for Intermodal porting?

More questions were documented by the sub-team and will be answered as part of the next meeting. In addition, the sub-team will spend additional time on the porting flow diagrams.

Syed Mubeen Saifullah noted an observation that the current flows submitted by this sub-team do not distinguish between Simple and Non-Simple porting scenarios. This may be something for consideration by the larger team.

* 1. **Next Meeting**
     1. Friday June 12, 2pm ET: +1-813-637-5900 #12357

See attached notes (embedded within this word document) from 06-05 & 06-08 meetings



**Sub-team #2: Enhance NPAC SV Create & Matching Create messages** – (Status provided by Jim Rooks) – The sub-team continues to 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 sub-team has met 3 times and is continuing documenting the various ideas suggested. Action Items have been assigned and flow diagrams are in progress as well. One of the primary areas of focus now lies on the impact analysis. There is a need to asses and identify the impacts by reviewing the concepts with the Service Providers and also by reviewing the IIS and GDMO. The sub-team is also in the process of documenting the Pros and Cons. Finally, they are also aiming to create a schedule “from requirements to implementation” to determine how long this type of solution will take.

Jim Rooks also noted that both he and Teresa Patton would be reaching out to individual Service Providers to solicit their feedback about this solution.

1. **Next Meetings**
   * 1. Wednesday June 16, 2009 at 3pm ET: Conf bridge 866-858-8801, conf ID 5490

See attached notes (embedded within this word document) from 06-10-09 meeting

 

**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. For now the sub-team will become dormant and can meet in the future when there is more detail from the industry.

As a side note, although a single solution which encompasses both simple and non-simple ports would be ideal (why support 2 processes if you only have to support 1?), the LSR Process may still be needed for wireline providers to process non-simple port requests if the solution adoption doesn’t 100% address both simple and non-simple porting scenarios.

See attached notes (embedded within this word document) from 06-10-09 meeting



**Sub-team #4: Combination of LSR/WPR** – (Presented by Teresa Patton on behalf of John Malyar) This sub-team is discussing the possible combination of the WICIS and the LSR standards as a possible new standard for wireline-to-wireline and intermodal porting. It was stated that the WICIS use for wireless to wireless porting will not be impacted at all (i.e. – it will still be used for wireless to wireless porting).

1. **Next Meeting:**
   1. TBD: The sub-team has to determine its next meeting date

See notes below from 06-05-09 meeting

06-05-09 From John Malyar: The team's proposed draft charter is "to investigate the current Industry segments infrastructure (i.e. LSR and WPR) 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 will be focused on wire line to wire line and intermodal porting. This team will work closely with the Out of the Box Sub team #1 Clearing house given its synergies"

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

The Committee had a discussion about how all these ideas would be pulled back into the LNPA. It was decided that Teresa Patton would touch base with Paula Jordan and Gary Sacra about how the LNPA would like to see the reports (i.e. format). The Committee is planning on having Teresa Patton present an overview of the ideas on July 15th in Ottawa at the LNPA WG meeting and also a detailed discussed on July 27-28th in Irvine, California.

In Ottawa, the suggestion presentation format was:

-Overview Slide

-Flow Diagram(s) Slide

-Impact Slide

-Pros/Cons Slide

Per the LNPA Implementation Work Plan (sent by Gary Sacra) the following 3 deadlines are below:

**HIGHER PRIORITY ITEMS: (TENTATIVE DUE DATE TO NANC – JULY 17, 2009)**

1. Changes to NANC porting flows & narratives in support of 1 business day porting

interval.

1. Define one business day:
   1. How to measure porting time
   2. FOC timeframe
2. ATIS coordination: LNPA WG to send liaison to ATIS Ordering & Billing

Forum (OBF) requesting list of standard Local Service Request (LSR) data fields by July 15, 2009. (Related to FNPRM)

1. Exploration of pros/cons and Service Provider and NPAC impacts related to

various 1 business day port process options. Sub-teams have been formed to explore the following:

* + 1. Out-of-the-box (non-LSR/non-WICIS) solution
    2. WICIS solution
    3. LSR solution

The objective for this item is to explore development of a 1 business day port

process using one of the above. Work on standardization of data fields would still continue for any solution. (Related to FNPRM)

1. Review of definition of a Simple Port and non-Simple Port for possible

recommendation. (Related to FNPRM)

**MEDIUM PRIORITY ITEMS: (TENTATIVE DUE DATE TO NANC – JULY 31, 2009)**

1. Standardization of data fields (yes or no; if yes what are the fields) (related to

FNPRM)

* 1. Administrative/Provisioning data fields

1. Changes to and/or standardization of LSR. (related to FNPRM)
2. Establish CSR interval. (related to FNPRM)

**LOWER PRIORITY ITEMS: (TENTATIVE DUE DATE TO NANC – AUGUST 14, 2009)**

1. Potential NPAC Change Order to support 1 business day interval.
   1. Possible new timers and indicator for which timer set to use on a port.
2. Minimum 5 business day restriction on 1st port in NXX code – keep it or not?
3. Recommendations for other efficiency improvements. (related to FNPRM).

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

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 (prepare for Ottawa)

July 20, 2009: 2-5pm ET: 877-888-4443 passcode 623 0424 (interim work call)

July 23, 2009: 12-2pm ET: 877-888-4443 passcode 623 0424 (interim work call)