LNPA WORKING GROUP

July 14-15, 2009 Meeting

Draft Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Ottawa Ontario, Canada | Host: Canadian LNP Consortium |

**ARCHITECTURE PLANNING TEAM (APT) DISCUSSION:**

**TUESDAY 07/14/09**

Tuesday, 07/14/09, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Mary Gail Sullivan | 360 Networks (phone) | Karin Fahrenburch | | Qwest (phone) |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Wanda Russell | | RCN (phone) |
| Tracey Guidotti | AT&T | Peter Lang | | Rogers Communications |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | Matt Kohly | | Socket (phone) |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Mobility | Tony Lana | | Socket (phone) |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian Consortium | Lavinia Rotaru | | Sprint Nextel |
| Vicki Goth | Century Link (phone) | Rosemary Emmer | | Sprint Nextel (phone) |
| Bill Solis | Comcast | Bob Bruce | | Syniverse |
| Cindy Sheehan | Comcast (phone) | Darren Paffenroth | | Syniverse |
| Nancy Sanders | Comcast (phone) | Ramesh Chellamani | | Tekelec (phone) |
| Jennifer Aspeslagh | Comcast (phone) | Joel Zamlong | | Telcordia |
| Sandra Banister | Deltacom (phone) | John Malyar | | Telcordia |
| Chris Peters | Eastlink/Bragg Comm. | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Steve Farnsworth | Evolving Systems | Pat White | | Telcordia |
| Jay Hjellum | Evolving Systems | Lisa Marie Maxson | | Telcordia |
| Beth O’Donnell | GCI Consulting (phone) | Jean Anthony | | Telcordia |
| Therese Mooney | Global Crossing (phone) | Kayla Sharbaugh | | Telcordia |
| Angie Mackey | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Noelle McKinley | | Telus |
| Karen Hoffman | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar | Mohamed Samater | | T-Mobile (phone) |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Amanda Molina | | Townes Telecomm. (phone) |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Stacy Hannah | | TW Cable (phone) |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Shelly Pedersen | | TW Telecom (phone) |
| Naumi White | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Meenakshi Parthasarathy | NeuStar | Jason Lee | | Verizon (phone) |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar Clearinghouse | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Tom Zablocki | | Vonage |
| Dave Garner | NeuStar | Tana Henson | | Windstream (phone) |
| Linda Peterman | One Communications | Paula Hustead | | Windstream (phone) |
| Jan Doell | Qwest | Dawn Lawrence | | XO Comm. (phone) |

NOTE: ALL ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “JULY 2009 LNPA ACTION ITEMS” FILE ISSUED IN A SEPARATE E-MAIL FROM THESE MINUTES AND ATTACHED BELOW.

****

**MEETING MINUTES:**

2009 LNPA WG Meeting/Call Schedule:

Following is the current schedule for the 2009 LNPA WG meetings and calls.

| **MONTH/**  **DATE**  **(2009)** | NANC | LNPA WG | HOST | LOCATION |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| January |  | 7th-8th | Telcordia | Scottsdale, Arizona |
| February |  | No meeting.  2/10/2009 call from 1pm to 4pm Eastern time, dial-in bridge number is 888-412-7808, pin 23272# |  |  |
| March |  | 10th-11th | Comcast | Denver, Colorado |
| April |  | No meeting.  4/14/2009 Live Meeting from 11am to 3pm Eastern time, dial-in bridge number is 888-412-7808, pin 23272#  4/16/2009 Live Meeting from 11am to 3pm Eastern time, dial-in bridge number is 888-412-7808, pin 23272# |  |  |
| May |  | 12th-14th | Sprint Nextel | Overland Park, Kansas |
| June |  | No meeting.  6/9/2009 call from 10am to 6pm Eastern time, dial-in bridge number is 888-412-7808, pin 23272#  6/11/2009 APT Live Meeting from 10am to 2pm Eastern time, dial-in bridge number is 888-412-7808, pin 23272#  6/18/2009 APT Live Meeting from 10am to 2pm Eastern time, dial-in bridge number is 888-412-7808, pin 23272#  6/23/2009 call from 11:30am to 3:30pm Eastern time, dial-in bridge number is 888-412-7808 Pin 23272# |  |  |
| July | 16th | 14th-15th  27th-28th | Canadian Consortium  T-Mobile | Ottawa, Ontario Canada  Irvine, California |
| August | TBD | 8/11/2009 call from 10am to 6pm Eastern time, dial-in bridge number is 888-412-7808, pin 23272#  8/12/2009 APT Live Meeting from 1pm to 5pm Eastern time, dial-in bridge number is 888-412-7808, pin 23272#  25th-26th | NeuStar | Sterling, Virginia |
| September | TBD | 1st-2nd  15th-16th | Comcast  Verizon | Denver, Colorado  Philadelphia, Pennsylvania |
| October | TBD | No meeting.  10/6/2009 call if necessary |  |  |
| November | TBD | 10th-11th | NeuStar | Newport Beach, California |
| December | TBD | No meeting.  12/8/2009 call if necessary |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

* Continuing evaluation during 2009 will determine if interim conference calls are needed or if the decision to meet face-to-face every other month should be revisited.

05/09 Meeting Minutes Review:

* No changes were made to the DRAFT May 2009 LNPA WG meeting minutes and they were approved as FINAL.

06/09/09 Conference Call Minutes Review:

* No changes were made to the DRAFT June 9, 2009 LNPA WG conference call minutes and they were approved as FINAL.

06/11/09 Live Meeting Minutes Review:

* Page 2, 3rd bullet, change to read as follows:
* “NeuStar explained the following:
  + These 3 URI data parameters are part of the Optional Data field implemented in NPAC Release 3.3 with NANC 399, which introduced the XML data string into an Optional Data field in the CMIP protocol. NeuStar stated that vendor certification testing and service provider turn-up testing is required for support of NANC 399 and can be done with any one of the Optional Data Parameters that have been introduced since the implementation of NANC 399. These Optional Data Parameters are:
    - altSPID (implemented with NANC 399)
    - altBillingID (implemented with NANC 436)
    - altEndUserLocationValue (implemented with NANC 436)
    - altEndUserLocationType (implemented with NANC 436)
    - Voice URI (will be available with implementation of NANC 429)
    - MMS URI (will be available with implementation of NANC 430)
    - SMS URI (will be available with implementation of NANC 435)
  + Once certification and turn-up testing has been completed by a vendor and a provider for NANC 399 using one of the Optional Data Parameters within the Optional Data field, no further testing is required by the NPAC as additional Optional Data Parameters are supported by a vendor and provider. That is not to say that local system vendors might not have test cases that they would want to run. NeuStar further stated that the introduction of the 3 URI data parameters is following the same path that was followed for the introduction of previous data parameters, e.g., NANC 436, which introduced the altBillingID, altEndUserLocationValue, and altEndUserLocationType parameters into the Optional Data field. No additional testing was required by the NPAC to support these Optional Data Parameters if a vendor and service provider had completed NANC 399 certification and turn-up testing previously with the altSPID parameter contained within the Optional Data field. The two week window for availability of the test environment with both the prior release and the new point release is consistent with testing windows for previous point releases. Once the 7 NPAC databases go into production with the new point release, the test environment with the new point release will continue to be available for industry testing. The normal course of action is to perform the necessary testing as service providers decide to support NANC 399.
  + As is the case with all of the Optional Data Parameters, a URI Optional Data Parameter would be broadcast only to service providers that indicate their support for that specific Optional Data Parameter in their Service Provider Profile in NPAC. The NPAC functionality to exclude non-supported parameters has been tested.”

06/18/09 Live Meeting Minutes Review:

* No changes were made to the DRAFT June 18, 2009 LNPA WG Live Meeting minutes and they were approved as FINAL.

06/23/09 Conference Call Minutes Review:

* No changes were made to the DRAFT June 23, 2009 LNPA WG conference call minutes and they were approved as FINAL.

NANC 437 Performance Discussion – NeuStar:

* NeuStar teed up a discussion of NPAC performance in a peered NPAC environment using the attached presentation.



* + Issues stated by NeuStar included:
    - SOA interface throughput and the impact of multiple peered NPACs in a region on Change Order NANC 397’s requirement for SOA throughput to be 70 CMIP operations a second
    - The overhead of increased database commits that would result in a peered NPAC environment
    - Increased rollup processing and lock contention impacts
    - Ability to maintain the current overall regional Service Level Requirement (SLR) of 99.9% SOA and LSMS interface reliability as NPACs are added to a region. If all NPACs in a region only met the 99.9% requirement, overall regional reliability would be less. Each time an NPAC is added in a region, each NPAC would have to increase its individual interface reliability in order for the region to maintain 99.9% reliability overall. Regarding the 3 second response requirement, one NPAC would be dependent on another for delivering a response to its subtending SOAs. It was questioned as to how this could be split among multiple NPACs and how it could be measured and tracked. Service providers stated that the expectation is that current SLR requirements would be maintained in a peered NPAC environment.
* Telcordia stated that a vendor’s implementation could impact the number of database commits, some requiring less than others. Quantifying the number of commits based on certain volume assumptions may not be an apples-to-apples comparison.
* Regarding SOA interface throughput, Telcordia stated that Parking Lot Item 174, logged on the 6/18/09 Live Meeting call, proposes clarifying the FRS requirement to reflect that it is 20 CMIP operations over a single SOA association and not 70. We need to understand how many CMIP transactions an NPAC needs to support over the inter-NPAC interface. We also need to address requirements for the inter-NPAC SOA interface needs and individual SOA interface needs.
* It was asked if it would be possible to identify the crossover point for savings when transactions are distributed over multiple NPACs vs. the additional work (e.g., database commits) that an individual NPAC has to perform. It was stated that this would be difficult to model due to possible implementation differences.
* In summary, it was stated that the LNPA WG will not discuss cost with regard to a peered NPAC architecture, but discussion of level of effort and complexity is within the purview of the LNPA WG. It was agreed that in order to perform due diligence in the detailed technical feasibility analysis of NANC 437 on behalf of the industry, our determination of whether or not NANC 437 is deemed technically feasible will be accompanied with any issues, concerns, and questions raised along with their final disposition.
* Evolving Systems requested time on the agenda to discuss their performance analysis with regard to a peered NPAC architecture. The attached presentation was used to facilitate the discussion.



* + Based on assumptions cited by Evolving Systems, e.g., multiple NPACs in a region will not increase porting volume, Evolving Systems stated that a given NPAC will not experience a higher rate than 70 CMIP transactions per second and an NPAC will not be a bottleneck for a SOA.
  + Also based on the assumptions cited, Evolving Systems stated that an NPAC will not have a higher roll-up rate in a peered NPAC environment than it would in a single NPAC environment.
  + With regard to database commits, Evolving Systems stated that the actual quantity will depend on the percentage of SVs for which an NPAC is the Master and the number of LSMSs attached to the NPAC. Evolving Systems also stated that the quantity of additional database commits would be offset by a decrease in rollup processing.

NANC 437 Review Parking Lot Review – Telcordia:

* Telcordia walked the group through the attached historical review of the LNPA WG’s technical feasibility analysis of NANC 437, the documentation that has been reviewed to date, and the rationale for development of the NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot matrix (also attached).

 

* Telcordia explained the definitions of the three categories of Parking Lot items as follows:
  + Documentation - items agreed during review to be updated in the next NANC 437 FRS/IIS 5.0.0 release.
  + M&P - items identifying existing and or new procedure updates in support of NANC 437.
  + Architecture - items raised during the NANC 437 review not categorized as documentation or M&P
* Telcordia identified 17 Architecture items to be addressed during the meeting:
  + Performance related: Items 8, 11, 12, 68.1, 91, 101, 127
  + Recovery related: Item 26
  + Downtime Notification related: Items 63, 64
  + Race Condition related: Items 9, 16
  + Pending SV related: Items 37, 123
  + Failed List related: Items 104, 138
  + Audit related: Item 70
* The group agreed to close the following Parking Lot items:
  + Item 8: Agreed to close since Chapters 6 and 10 have been reviewed and specific items have been logged. (Items 192, 101, 91, 127).
  + Item 11: Agreed to close since Chapters 6 and 10 have been reviewed and specific items have been logged (items 192, 101, 91, 127).
  + Item 12: Agreed to close.
  + Item 68.1: Agreed to close due to effort to evaluate size of links will be done in conjunction with Item 101 with evaluating the need for compression.
  + Item 63: Agreed to close. No further action required.
  + Item 9: Agreed to close. Errata 2 and 3 were introduced to address race conditions.
  + Item 16: Agreed to close.
* With regard to Item 91, a Service Provider asked if vendors implement the peered update functionality differently, will that be problematic in anyway. This needs to be addressed with further discussion if item 91.
* **PLEASE NOTE: Subsequent to the May 2009 LNPA WG meeting, a number of revisions to the NANC 437 Issue Parking Lot Matrix document were made. For the most current version of the document at the time of the writing of these minutes, please refer to the v13 attached below.**



##### LNPA WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION:

**WEDNESDAY 07/15/09**

Wednesday, 07/15/09, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Yvonne Reigle | ATIS (phone) | Syed Saifullah | | NeuStar Clearinghouse |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Shannon Sevigny | | NeuStar Pooling (phone) |
| Tracey Guidotti | AT&T | Linda Peterman | | One Communications |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T | Jan Doell | | Qwest |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | Peggy Rubino | | Paetec (phone) |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Mobility | Peter Lang | | Rogers Communications |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T | Tony Lana | | Socket (phone) |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian Consortium | Lavinia Rotaru | | Sprint Nextel |
| Vicki Goth | Century Link (phone) | Rosemary Emmer | | Sprint Nextel (phone) |
| Bill Solis | Comcast | John Guzman | | Synchronoss (phone) |
| Tim Kagele | Comcast (phone) | Bob Bruce | | Syniverse |
| Cindy Sheehan | Comcast (phone) | Darren Paffenroth | | Syniverse |
| Nancy Sanders | Comcast (phone) | Ramesh Chellamani | | Tekelec (phone) |
| Jennifer Aspeslagh | Comcast (phone) | Joel Zamlong | | Telcordia |
| Jennifer Hutton | Cox (phone) | John Malyar | | Telcordia |
| Jean Houch | Deltacom (phone) | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Dennis Robins | DER Consulting (phone) | Pat White | | Telcordia |
| Steve Farnsworth | Evolving Systems | Lisa Marie Maxson | | Telcordia |
| Jay Hjellum | Evolving Systems | Noelle McKinley | | Telus |
| Greg Council | Evolving Systems (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Therese Mooney | Global Crossing (phone) | Mohamed Samater | | T-Mobile (phone) |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW (phone) | Amanda Molina | | Townes Telecomm. (phone) |
| Bonnie Johnson | Integra (phone) | Stacy Hannah | | TW Cable (phone) |
| Bridget Alexander | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Shelly Pedersen | | TW Telecom (phone) |
| Angie Mackey | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | David Lund | | US Cellular (phone) |
| Karen Hoffman | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Tony DiFiore | NECA (phone) | Jason Lee | | Verizon (phone) |
| Lynette Khirallah | NetNumber (phone) | Lora Williams | | Verizon (phone) |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Joe Cudo | | Verizon Wireless (phone) |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Tom Zablocki | | Vonage |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Darren Krebs | | Vonage (phone) |
| Naumi White | NeuStar | Tana Henson | | Windstream (phone) |
| Meenakshi Parthasarathy | NeuStar | Paula Hustead | | Windstream (phone) |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Tiki Gauglet | | XO Comm. (phone) |
| Dave Garner | NeuStar | Dawn Lawrence | | XO Comm. (phone) |
| Charles Ryburn | NeuStar (phone) |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

OBF Wireless Committee and Intermodal Subcommittee Update (Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless and OBF Wireless Committee Co-Chair):

**Wireless Committee:**

* Since the May 2009 LNPA WG meeting, the Wireless Committee held one interim conference call and discussed the status of the WICIS 5.0.0 release in light of FCC Order 09-41.  The committee agreed to publish WICIS 5.0.0 on May 29th, 2009 recognizing the need to remain flexible in understanding that dates and content might need to be modified in the future.
* Issue 3316, Implementation Guidelines for WICIS 5.0.0, went to Final Closure on June 9, 2009.
* The Wireless Committee will not be meeting at OBF #107 in August, but the participants are actively following the activities of the LSOP Committee and attending Intermodal Subcommittee meetings with a focus on FCC Order 09-41.  As decisions regarding changes to be implemented become more firm, issues will be submitted and meetings will be scheduled to quickly address the issues.

**Intermodal Subcommittee:**

* The Intermodal Subcommittee met on June 25th and July 9th and has a meeting scheduled for July 22nd as a checkpoint to review LSOP activities regarding FCC Order 09-41.
* The Wireless Committee members of the Intermodal Subcommittee recognize and appreciate the effort and progress that the LSOP Committee has made to review, analyze, and modify the data fields in the Local Service Request (LSR), End User (EU) and Number Portability (NP) forms.  The LSOP Committee shared a working draft of the fields on each form during the July 9th meeting and, after some discussion, the Wireless committee took the following action items with the intent to provide feedback to the LSOP committee prior to the July 22nd conference call.
  1. Provide a list of fields to the LSOP Committee that could be considered for exclusion from validation.
  2. Specify fields not listed on the working draft that still need to be considered as common fields for the simple intermodal port process and state how these fields would be used.
  3. Provide any other questions or concerns to the LSOP Committee prior to the July 22nd meeting.

OBF LSOP Committee (Linda Peterman, One Communications & LSOP Co-Chair):

* Linda Peterman reported that the LSOP Committee is continuing to work on modification of LSOG practices in support of a standard LNP form for intermodal and wireline-to-wireline ports (Issue 3307).
* Linda walked the group through the attached documents, which provides a status to the LNPA WG of the LSOP Committee’s progress in standardizing the data fields for Req Type C (standalone LNP), and identifies the pieces of data that may be sent to port a telephone number using the LSR Process (REQTYP “C”).

 

* Two options being looked at in the LSOP Committee –
  + The Simple Port Service Request (SPSR) would go away and the LSOG would be utilized for both simple and non-simple forms.
  + If the New SP submits a request as simple, and if the Old SP determines it is not simple, the New SP could receive a reject for more data, or the New SP could submit a standard set of data that covers both simple and non-simple ports, and if the port is simple get a FOC for next day if requested, or if the Old SP determines it is not simple, the Old SP could FOC the request for 4 business days.
* Linda stated that if more than the standard data set is submitted, that would also have to go through up front edits. Question that needs to be answered – if you submit more than the standard fields, does that automatically make it a non-simple port?
* The current plan is to have the list of standard data fields finalized by the beginning of September.

Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Update (Adam Newman, Telcordia & INC Chair):

* Adam Newman, Telcordia and INC Chair, reported out on the INC activities.
* INC Issue 602: **Checking returned block in NPAC:**

This issue updates the guidelines so the PA can check the contamination level of a block when it is returned to the pool. The NAPM LLC did approve the PA’s request to receive NPAC data to determine contamination levels. The issue went to Initial Pending. The required PA Change Order was approved on 2/17/09. Implementation is tentatively scheduled for the July 24, 2009 release and the guidelines would need to be reissued on July 27, 2009.

* INC Issue 626: **Check Porting on All Code Returns:**

Issue’s two goals: 1) synch up all pooled code returns with the process outline for non- pooled code returns, which is the returning company may not keep any LRNs or ported TNs, or 2) check for blocks with less then ten percent contamination and place the burden for returning those blocks back with the returning SP, rather than the receiving SP. Issue remains open.

* INC Issue 644: **Remove exception for an additional LRN when a switch serves multiple NPAC regions:**

There is no technical requirement in the NPAC which requires unique LRNs for multiple NPAC regions, even when the LATA is served by two different NPAC regions and a single switch. Pooling has not received a request for an additional LRN due to multiple NPAC regions in several years.

NANC Future of Numbering Working Group Update (Adam Newman, Telcordia & FoN Co-Chair):

* Work is continuing on FoN Issue FTN-005 (Analysis of Commons and Property Rights Models for the allocation, assignment, and administration of NANP Toll Free Numbering Resources), which examines a commons vs. market place model for toll free numbers. In the marketplace model, the end user would have the property rights to the toll free number. A draft White Paper is being developed. A rough first draft has been nearly completed for presentation at the next NANC meeting.
* See the attached slide deck for the FTN-005 action plan as well as a description of the remaining FoN issues. There has been no activity on the other FTNs.



Alt SPID Change Order Discussion (NeuStar):



* NeuStar presented the attached proposed Change Order to add a new Optional Data Parameter to the existing Optional Data field called the Last Alternative SPID. The Last Alternative SPID would represent the SPID of the Service Provider having the retail relationship with the end user, rather than the SPID of the Service Provider having the wholesale relationship with the network Service Provider. The two Service Providers, and thus their SPIDs, may be different. The current Alternative SPID would continue to represent the Service Provider having the wholesale relationship with the network Service Provider, as originally intended.
* The Change Order also proposes development of a Best Practice addressing the cases where the first subtending Service Provider is the same as the last subtending Service Provider, and when they are different:
  + The (existing) Alternative SPID is always populated when there is a subtending Service Provider serving the telephone number.
  + The Last Alternative SPID is populated whenever the identity of the Service Provider with the retail relationship with the end-user is known.
  + In the case where there is only one subtending Service Provider and that fact is known, then both Alternative SPID values are populated, with the same SPID value.
* A question was asked as to why we would need this additional Alternative SPID parameter. NeuStar responded that previously there was a Change Order that added Optional Parameter altSPID to identify resellers. With TRS use of the altSPID, there is now a need to identify the entity with the retail relationship with the end user, such as a TRS provider. There is not a requirement to populate this parameter unless you support a TRS provider in your network. It will be optional to support this parameter in provider systems. The Help Desk can be used to populate the parameter.
* The group agreed to accept the proposed Change Order for further technical work. It was assigned as NANC 438.
* NeuStar stated that this Change Order would have a low level of effort from an NPAC standpoint.

PIM Discussion:

* PIM 42 – This PIM, submitted by Syniverse, seeks to review the wireline requirement for certain fields on the LSR.



The issue is now in a Tracking state awaiting resolution of LSOP Issue 3307.

* PIM 44 – This PIM, submitted by T-Mobile, Sprint, Verizon Wireless, Nextel, Cingular, and US Cellular, seeks to address varying rules among wireline carriers for developing a Local Service Request (LSR) in order to port a number.



The issue is now in a Tracking state awaiting resolution of LSOP Issue 3307.

* PIM 51 – This PIM, submitted by Nextel, seeks the prevention of NXX codes being opened to portability in NPAC by the incorrect provider.



NeuStar developed Change Order 414 proposing an automated process to prevent the wrong service provider from opening up a code in NPAC. PIM 51 is now tracking NANC 414 for the automated solution. NANC 414 is included in the recommended next NPAC software release.

Regarding the attached manual process for the PIM 51 cleanup in NPAC, the NAPM LLC approved the LNPA WG’s recommendation to request a Statement of Work (SOW) from NeuStar at their September 2007 meeting. SOW 66 for manual cleanup was submitted by NeuStar to the LLC on May 20th. The LLC approved SOW 66 at their July 2008 meeting. NANC 402 is the Change Order for the manual cleanup.



* PIM 54 – This PIM, submitted by Comcast, seeks to reduce the interval for certain wireline-wireline and inter-modal ports to one day.



The PIM 54 proposal applies to simple ports for e-bonded (e.g., XML and EDI) providers.

Action Item 0308-13: Regarding the attached PIM 54, Service Providers are to discuss internally what caveats would have to be in place in an LNPA WG Best Practice in order to support a next day porting interval, if they can support it. This will be discussed at the May 2008 LNPA WG meeting.

Both Action Item 0308-13 and PIM 54 will remain open as the LNPA WG addresses the implementation of FCC Order 09-41.

* PIM 55 – This PIM, submitted by the NeuStar Clearinghouse Vendor, seeks to address issues related to wireline Provider Initiated Activity.



This issue is now in a tracking state awaiting inclusion in the next WICIS Release 5.0.0, which has a planned sunrise of March 2010. Issue 3118 is now in closure.

* PIM 64 – This PIM, submitted by VeriSign, proposes a new tunable parameter in NPAC to allow the suppression of LTI-initiated transactions to the mechanized SOAs.



PIM 64 was accepted at the September 2007 LNPA WG meeting. VeriSign submitted NANC Change Order 423 to address the issue identified in PIM 64. PIM 64 is now in a Tracking state.

* PIM 65 – This PIM, submitted by VeriSign, proposes a priority scheme in NPAC for the notifications generated by the disconnection of pooled thousands blocks.



PIM 65 was accepted at the September 2007 LNPA WG meeting. VeriSign submitted NANC Change Order 424 to address the issue identified in PIM 65. PIM 65 is now in a Tracking state. NANC 424 is included in the recommended next NPAC software release.

* PIM 66 – This PIM, submitted by VeriSign, seeks to address the data that is received when Mass Updates are performed.



PIM 66 was accepted on the October 2007 LNPA WG conference call. VeriSign submitted NANC Change Order 426 to address the issue identified in PIM 66. PIM 66 is now in a Tracking state. NANC 426 is included in the recommended next NPAC software release.

* NEW PIM 72 – This PIM, submitted by Qwest, seeks to address the practice of service providers assigning passcodes to their customers’ accounts as a general practice and the impact that practice has on the porting process.



During the discussion of PIM 72, Qwest stated that they are seeking development of a Best Practice that makes it clear that this is an unacceptable practice. Another provider, while offering support for the suggested resolution proposed in PIM 72, recounted their use of an end user opt-in process in the 2002-2003 timeframe and issues encountered with its impact on the porting process. The provider decided to halt the practice after discussions at the LNPA WG. Another provider stated that they do not oppose PIM 72 but did not necessarily agree with its conclusions or suggested resolution.

PIM 72 was accepted at the July 2009 LNPA WG meeting for further discussion. Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will develop a draft Best Practice for review and discussion at the September 2009 LNPA WG meeting.

FCC Order 09-41 Implementation (All):

* Sub-team Presentations – Sub-team Chairs:
  + Define One Business Day Sub-team – Jan Doell, Qwest:



* + - Jan Doell, Qwest, gave the attached presentation providing the status of the Define One Business Day Sub-team, their consensus agreements to date, and remaining open issues to be addressed.
    - Consensus agreements reached include the following:
      1. Business days are Monday-Friday and exclude weekends and Old Service Provider-defined holidays.
      2. Service Provider business hours are 8am to 5pm.
      3. 1pm is the cutoff time to receive a valid LSR for a ready-to-port time of 12:01am the next business day.
      4. Valid LSRs received by the 1pm cutoff time must be responded to (FOC or Reject) within 4 hours.
      5. All time are in the predominant time zone of the NPAC region in which the number is being ported.
      * A provider asked if their preferred option for determining the Business Day time and the LSR cutoff time could be included after the fact since they voiced support for Option E only. The response was that providers participating in the ranking of options were requested to rank all 5 options, not just one, and concern was expressed regarding adding rankings after the fact. The ranking process was deemed fair and there was wide representation.
      * Another provider expressed concern about the ratio of LSR window time and the sales window time, and possible pent up LSR volume the next morning.
    - LSR Sub-team – Linda Peterman, One Communications:



* + - Linda Peterman, One Communications, gave the attached presentation providing the status of the LSR Sub-team, their recommendations to date, impacts, and their pros and cons.
    - Recommendations to date include the following:
      1. When a CSR is available and requested as part of the pre-order activity, it should be returned in a timely manner (within “X” hours of receipt of request) and will not be included in the 1-business day interval.
      2. LSR use will be limited to Wireline-to-Wireline and Intermodal porting and will not be utilized for Wireless-to-Wireless porting.
      3. The standard set of LSR fields being developed by OBF should be mandated by the FCC and utilized for both Simple and Non-Simple ports.
      4. OLSP/ONSP will determine whether a port is Simple vs. Non-Simple based on the FCC definition of a Simple port and the manner in which the order was submitted.
      5. A standard set of Local Responses will be required to address Simple vs. Non-Simple port determinations.
      * A provider asked if wireless carriers are expected to support Simple and Non-Simple data on a wireless-to-wireline port. Answer was yes. This would require development work for wireless carriers.
      * A consultant expressed a concern that the OBF is a fluid process and feels subsequent changes made to standard fields after any FCC mandate should also go through the FCC approval process.
    - Out-of-the-Box Sub-team – Teresa Patton, AT&T:



* + - Teresa Patton, AT&T, gave the attached presentation providing the status of the Out-of-the-Box Sub-team, the ideas analyzed to date, impacts, and their risks and benefits.
    - Teresa reported that out of the 5 ideas considered to date, only the Service Bureau and NPAC Expansion concepts were currently being considered for possibly moving forward.
    - The Service Bureau option does not preclude two providers from entering into that arrangement bilaterally.
    - The next steps are for the Committee participants take this information back internally for input and a conference call will be scheduled to gather feedback and discuss questions from interested carriers/vendors.
    - WICIS Sub-team – Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless:



* + - Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, gave the attached presentation providing the status of the WICIS Sub-team.
    - The benefits and strengths of using the WICIS standard format for porting were discussed and considered.
    - The team concluded that due to the tremendous level of effort required for wireline providers to move away from the LSR process to the WICIS process, given the regulated timeframe, this solution was not feasible.
    - Consensus was reached to disband this sub-team, allowing members time to participate on the sub-teams where progress towards the end goal could be more realistically achieved.
    - Simple Port Sub-team – Nancy Sanders, Comcast:



* + - * The group reviewed the attached presentation providing the status of the Simple Port Sub-team, its discussions on possible recommendations regarding the FCC’s definition of a Simple Port, and consensus agreements reached to date.
      * Consensus agreement reached to date:

The LNPA-WG’s understanding of current industry practices regarding UNE involvement in porting a Simple Port, is that the UNE’s of; Dedicated Transport, 911/E911, and Operational Support Systems are not a factor in determining or executing a Simple Port.

Open Action Items and Parking Lot Issues (All):

  

* Due to time constraints, only the open action items in the attached document were reviewed:
  + - AI062309-01: NeuStar reported that the T1 timer expiration notification can be shut off via the SP profile in NPAC, and this does not stop timer from running. The Action Item is Closed.
    - AI062309-02: NeuStar reported that there is no material difference whether the industry decides to develop one single timer (one timer

interval) vs. two timers (two timer intervals) should the industry determine a new additional timer(s) is needed for Simple Ports. The Action Item is Closed.

* + - AI062309-03: Telcordia and Evolving Systems reported that there is no material difference and minimal impact to their SOA platforms regardless of whether the industry decides to develop one single timer (one timer interval) vs. two timers (two timer intervals) should the industry determine a new additional timer(s) is needed for Simple Ports. The Action Item is Closed.
    - AI062309-04: Verizon, Verizon Wireless, AT&T, Sprint Nextel, and T-Mobile reported that they do use the T1 timer expiration notification in their systems and/or processes to drive certain actions. The Action Item is Closed.
    - AI062309-05: The format of the flows and the proposal to include steps related to DSL on the line will be discussed at the July 27-28, 2009 LNPA WG meeting. The Action Item remains Open.
    - AI062309-06: The Sub-team Chairs provided all requested information in order for the NANC report to be prepared. This Action Item is Closed.

SPID Migration Limitation Discussion (Action Item 0509-02) – All:

Action Item 0509-02: At the May 2009 LNPA WG meeting, discussions continued related to SPID migration limitations. The group is determining whether to raise or eliminate the 100 LRN limitation and whether to establish an SV limitation. Service Providers are to come to the July 2009 LNPA WG meeting prepared to discuss whether a regional and national SV limit will be established, and if so, what those limits should be. It was agreed that the 100 LRN limit will remain in effect until then.

* It was reported that the recent large SPID migration in the Southeast Region was processed successfully.
* Due to time constraints, it was agreed to place the SPID migration limitation discussion on the September 2009 LNPA WG meeting agenda. Action Item 0509-02 remains Open.

2009 Meeting/Call Schedule Review – All:



* Verizon stated that they will move the September 2009 LNPA WG meeting from Baltimore, Maryland to Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Discussion of Need for Auguat 2009 Conference Calls – All:

* The group agreed to schedule the following calls and meetings:

**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 12, 2009 conference call from 10am to 6pm Eastern
  + Dial-in bridge is 888-412-7808 Pin 23272#
* August 25-26, 2009 face-to-face meeting in Sterling, Virginia
  + Dial-in bridge is 888-412-7808 Pin 23272#
* September 1-2, 2009 face-to-face meeting in Denver, Colorado
  + Dial-in bridge is 888-412-7808 Pin 23272#

**UPCOMING LNPA WG APT CALL SCHEDULE TO ADDRESS NANC 437:**

* August 11, 2009 conference call from 1pm to 5pm Eastern
  + Dial-in bridge is 888-412-7808 Pin 23272#

Review of May 2009 LNPA WG Action Items:



**May 2009 LNPA WG Action Items:**

* Item 0509-01: This item remains Open.
* Item 0509-02: This item remains Open.

**May 2009 APT Action Items:**

No APT Action Items were assigned at the May 2009 LNPA WG meeting.

**LNPA WG Action Items Remaining Open from Previous Meetings:**

* Item 0906-14: This item remains Open.
* Item 0907-11: This item remains Open.
* Item 0308-13: This item remains Open.
* Item 0109-05: This item remains Open.
* Item 0109-11: This item remains Open.
* Item 0109-12: This item remains Open.
* Item 0309-08: This item remains Open.

**APT Action Items Remaining Open from Previous Meetings:**

No Action Items remain open from previous APT meetings.

Review of June 2009 LNPA WG Action Items:

**June 2009 LNPA WG Action Items:**

No LNPA WG Action Items that were not related to FCC Order 09-41 were assigned on the June 2009 LNPA WG conference calls. Please refer to the FCC 09-41 Open Action Items and Parking Lot Items for Action Items related to FCC Order 09-41.

**June 2009 APT Action Items:**

No APT Action Items were assigned on the June 2009 LNPA WG conference calls.

New/Unfinished Business (All):

* Sue Tiffany, Sprint Nextel, stated that we may wind up with different time zones for Simple vs. Non-Simple ports for NPAC business hours. This discussion will be placed on the agenda for the LNPA WG meeting set for July 27-28, 2009 in Irvine, California. This and the timing of the Old SP disconnect will be discussed.

***Next General LNPA WG Meeting …******September 15-16, 2009, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania – Hosted by Verizon***