LNPA WORKING GROUP

June 23, 2009 Conference Call

Final Minutes

**TUESDAY 06/23/09**

Tuesday, 06/23/09, Conference Call Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Mary Gail Sullivan | 360 Networks | Jan Doell | | Qwest |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Mary Retka | | Qwest |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T | Towanda Russell | | RCN Corporation |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T | Matt Kohly | | Socket |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Mobility | Carol Frike | | Sprint Nextel |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | Lavinia Rotaru | | Sprint Nextel |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian Consortium | Sue Tiffany | | Sprint Nextel |
| Nancy Cornwell | Cellcom | Cat Thornburg | | SureWest |
| Jennifer Aspeslagh | Comcast | John Guzman | | **Synchronoss Technologies** |
| Nancy Sanders | Comcast | Bob Bruce | | Syniverse |
| Bill Solis | Comcast | Pat White | | Telcordia |
| Cindy Sheehan | Comcast | John Malyar | | Telcordia |
| Suzanne Howard | Cox | Jason Loyer | | Time Warner Cable |
| Jennifer Hutton | Cox | Stacy Hannah | | Time Warner Cable |
| Beth O’Donnell | Cox | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Matthew Gerst | CTIA | Anna Miller | | T-Mobile |
| Michael Altschul | CTIA | Mohamed Samater | | T-Mobile |
| Dennis Robins | DER-Consulting | Heather Tackett | | TNS (formerly VeriSign) |
| Vicki Goth | Embarq | Amanda Molina | | Townes Telecommunications |
| Therese Mooney | Global Crossing | David Lund | | US Cellular |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Kala Ahue | Hawaiian Telcom | Jason Lee | | Verizon |
| Sari Gueco | Hawaiian Telcom | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Burrelle Alamillo | Hawaiian Telcom | Sara Hooker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Bonnie Johnson | Integra Telecom | Darren Krebs | | Vonage |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar | Tom Zablocki | | Vonage |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Paula Hustead | | Windstream |
| Mubeen Saifullah | NeuStar Clearinghouse | Tana Henson | | Windstream |
| Shannon Sevigny | NeuStar Pooling | Dawn Lawrence | | XO Communications |
| Linda Peterman | One Communications |  | |  |

**JUNE 23, 2009 CONFERENCE CALL MINUTES:**

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



* After review of the agenda, LNPA WG Co-Chairs Paula Jordan and Gary Sacra facilitated the group’s 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 group walked through the attached v3 of the DRAFT changes. Proposed changes that were identified on the June 9, 2009 conference call are identified in blue.



* During the review of the DRAFT flows attached above, the following additional revisions were identified. NOTE: These revisions are reflected in green in the attached v4 of the DRAFT flows.

1. Add the missing “No” out of Decision Box 4 in Figure 2.
2. Change the wording in Box 9 in Figure 2 to reflect that the ONSP “rejects” the LSR rather than “returns” the LSR due to insufficient Non-Simple data.
3. Address the “unhappy path” in Figure 2 where the ONSP concurs that it is a Simple Port but the LSR has insufficient Simple data.
4. Address the “unhappy path” in Figure 3 where the LSR has insufficient Non-Simple data.
5. In Figure 2 Box 2 and Figure 3 Box 4 add “VoIP” to “interconnection service.”
6. Add note under Box 6 in Figure 1 that CSRs are not available from Wireless Carriers.



* After the review of the DRAFT revisions, the group reviewed the status of the following questions that were identified on the May 28, 2009 conference call for further discussion and consideration :

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?

STATUS: The CSR box was moved to Step 6 in Figure 1. Question 1 is closed.

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

STATUS: It was agreed to clarify in the Narratives that the Old SP must deploy the 10-digit trigger if technically feasible or, if not, monitor the NPAC for activation in order to trigger the disconnect. A Parking Lot item has been established for tracking. Question 2 is closed.

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?

STATUS: 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 Parking Lot item has been established for tracking. Question 3 is closed.

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.

STATUS: 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 Parking Lot item has been established for tracking. Question 4 is closed.

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.

STATUS: On the June 23, 2009 call, the group agreed to use the term “VoIP interconnection service.” Question 5 is closed.

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

STATUS: Question 6 remains open awaiting input from the OBF and LSR Sub-team.

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

STATUS: It was agreed to add reference to Type 1 cellular numbers in the Non-Simple port flow. Question 7 is closed.

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

STATUS: Question 8 remains open for discussion at the July 2009 LNPA WG meeting.

The following Action Items were assigned related to Question 8:

For discussion at the July 2009 LNPA WG meeting, NeuStar will determine if the T1 timer expiration notification can be shut off via the SP profile in NPAC.

For discussion at the July 2009 LNPA WG meeting, NeuStar will determine the NPAC level of effort to develop one single timer (one timer interval) vs. two timers (two timer intervals) if the industry determines a new additional timer(s) is needed for Simple Ports.

For discussion at the July 2009 LNPA WG meeting, Local SOA System Vendors will determine the SOA local system level of effort to develop one single timer (one timer interval) vs. two timers (two timer intervals) if the industry determines a new additional timer(s) is needed for Simple Ports.

NOTE: Telcordia reported on the June 23, 2009 call that moving to a single timer interval for any additional new timer was not a big impact.

For discussion at the July 2009 LNPA WG meeting, Service Providers are to determine if they use the T1 timer expiration notification in any of their systems or processes to drive any action.

* The following Parking Lot items were logged during the June 23, 2009 LNPA WG conference call:

PARKING LOT ITEM: Determine if we will state in the Narratives that data for any of the 4 end user validation fields required by the Old SP on an incoming LSR must be available on the CSR. NOTE: Concerns were expressed regarding privacy issues with placing end user-assigned passcodes on the CSR.

PARKING LOT ITEM: Determine if we will state in the Narratives that the end user passcode validation field only applies to end user-assigned passcodes and does not apply to SP-assigned passcodes. Also determine if we will state in the Narratives that any SP-assigned passcodes must be on the CSR.

PARKING LOT ITEM: Ensure that the entrance and exit schema for the Figures in the Flows are consistent.

PARKING LOT ITEM: Need to address the scenario, e.g., timers, FOC interval, etc., in the Flows when the requested due date for a Simple Port is greater than one Business Day. NOTE: This issue has been raised in the One Business Day Subteam.

* It was stated that the OBF is developing a standard set of data for Simple Ports and a superset of standard data elements for Non-Simple Ports.

Discussion of Additional Process Flow Submissions – All:

* The following process flow revision submissions were reviewed by the group:
  + AT&T



NOTE: This updated version was submitted by AT&T after the 6/23/09 call.

* + - Teresa Patton, AT&T, presented the attached process flow contribution to the group, which proposes combining the port type determination steps and the Simple Port process steps into the same Figure.
  + Sprint Nextel



* + - Sue Tiffany, Sprint Nextel, presented that attached process flow contribution to the group, which proposes revisions to the port type determination flow, and the Simple Port and Non-Simple Port flows.
    - During the discussion of the attached flows, it was asked if we should address the scenario where a Simple Port is requested with a due date beyond the next Business Day. NOTE: See the last Parking Lot item logged above.
  + Vonage



* + - Tom Zablocki and Darren Krebs, Vonage, presented that attached process flow contribution to the group, which proposes the addition of steps related to a VoIP provider, as the New SP, that is porting in a number from an Old SP that is providing DSL on the line to the customer. Vonage is proposing that these steps be added for both Simple and Non-Simple Ports
    - Tom Zablocki, Vonage, will provide a proposal as to where these steps should be inserted into the flows for discussion at the July 2009 LNPA WG meeting.

Discussion of Next Steps – All:

* Process Flows:
  + LNPA WG Participants are to come to the July 2009 LNPA WG meeting prepared to discuss which of the attached flow contributions, or portions, or hybrids, will be used in moving forward with development of the necessary revisions to the Narratives.



* Narratives
  + Paula Jordan, LNPA WG Co-Chair, has begun work on draft proposed revisions to the Narratives. A number of details are dependent on work taking place in the Sub-teams.
* As of the day of the call, June 23, 2009, FCC Order 09-41 had not been published in the Federal Register. Once it is published, that will start a 120 day clock for the LNPA WG to complete its work on the implementation package.
* All Sub-team Chairs took an Action Item to provide the following information to the LNPA WG Co-Chairs by **July 2, 2009**, in order for the July 16th NANC Report to be developed:

1. Goal of the Sub-team,
2. Number of participants broken down by type, i.e., service provider, vendor, consultant, association, and the name of the company each represents,
3. List of major issues/questions being addressed by the Sub-team,
4. List of issues/questions where consensus has been reached,
5. Status of open major issues/questions,
6. List of any dependencies on other Sub-teams or issues/questions.

Discussion of Status of Subteams:

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

* + There have been 7 calls to date. There were 29 participants on the last call.
* Consensus has been reached on a number of issues (refer to attached June 22, 2009 Sub-team minutes).



* Five options on the Business Day definition, including LSR cutoff time and FOC return interval, are being ranked by participants for discussion on the next call, which is scheduled for Monday, June 29, 2009. They are:
  + - **Option A:**

8am- 1pm to receive valid LSR

FOC by 5pm (gives maximum 4 hr FOC interval)

Ready for port by 12:01am next business day

* + - **Option B:**

8am- 2pm to receive valid LSR

FOC by 5pm (gives maximum 3 hour FOC interval)

Ready for port by 12:01am next business day

* + - **Option C:**

8am- 3pm to receive valid LSR

FOC by 5pm (gives maximum 2 hr FOC interval)

Ready for port by 12:01am next business day

* + - **Option D: Chunking Option**

Valid LSR in before noon, (FOC interval still negotiable by team), ready for port by 12:01am next business day

Valid LSR in after noon, (FOC interval still negotiable by team), ready for port at noon, next business day

* + - **Option E: Rolling 24-hour Due Time Option**

Example, valid LSR in at 2pm, (FOC interval still negotiable by team), ready for port at 2pm next business day

Consensus reached:

All time zones indicated below are local time in the Time Zone of the NPAC Region that the end user is in.

* + It was asked if there had been any discussion of possible different FOC intervals for wireless-to-wireline ports due to manual conversion ofr the LSR to WPR. The response was no.
  + The contact information for Jan Doell, Qwest and Chair of this subteam, is **jan.doell@qwest.com**.

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

* This subteam has 25 members.
* The team has developed assumptions that are key to using the LSR for intermodal and wireline-to-wireline ports. The team also determined that the LSR would not be suitable for wireless-to-wireless ports, but is suitable for intermodal and wireline-to-wireline ports.
* It was asked if there had been any discussion of placing some sort of indicator on the LSR for Simple Ports. Not to date.
* The upcoming calls are currently planned for 1 hour each:
* June 24th
* July 1st
* July 8th
  + 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):

* + By agreement of the Sub-team members, the WICIS Sub-team has disbanded and no further meetings have been scheduled.
  + 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 subteam is exploring possible alternatives to utilization of the LSR/FOC and WICIS for processing port requests.
  + The subteam is continuing exploration of 2 ideas:

1. One or more Clearinghouse Service Bureaus that will take a standardized set of data elements and convert to a service provider’s specific requirements, which include an exercise to map LSR and WPR data elements.
2. Enhance the Service Provider Create message sent to the NPAC to include a standard set of data elements.

* The Sub-team is developing a presentation for the July 2009 LNPA WG 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):

* + Four calls have been held to date, with four more scheduled. There are currently 27 Sub-team members.
  + Much of the time to date has been spent discussing the Unbundled Network Element (UNE) criteria, especially local loops. Members are to provide statements related to UNEs by Wednesday, June 24, 2009 for discussion on the next call scheduled for Friday, June 26, 2009.
  + The next step will be to discuss 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:**

* July 27-28, 2009 face-to-face meeting in Irvine, California
  + Dial-in bridge is 888-412-7808 Pin 23272#
* August 11, 2009 conference call
  + Details to be provided
* September 1-2, 2009 face-to-face meeting in Denver, Colorado
  + Details to be provided

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