LNPA WORKING GROUP

July 27-28, 2009 Meeting

Final Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Irvine, California | Host: T-Mobile |

##### LNPA WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION:

**MONDAY 07/27/09**

Monday, 07/27/09, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** |
| Mary Gail Sullivan | 360 Networks (phone) | Syed Saifullah | NeuStar Clearinghouse |
| Aelea Christofferson | ATL Communications | Shannon Sevigny | NeuStar Pooling (phone) |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Linda Peterman | One Communications |
| Tracey Guidotti | AT&T | Peggy Rubino | Paetec (phone) |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T | Jan Doell | Qwest |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T | Mary Retka | Qwest (phone) |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | Carol Frike | Sprint Nextel |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Mobility | Lavinia Rotaru | Sprint Nextel |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian Consortium | Sue Tiffany | Sprint Nextel |
| Nancy Cornwell | Cellcom (phone) | Maureen Norcenrucski | SRE (phone) |
| Vicki Goth | Century Link (phone) | John Guzman | Synchronoss (phone) |
| Bill Solis | Comcast | Bob Bruce | Syniverse |
| Cindy Sheehan | Comcast | Raghav Rao | Tekelec |
| Jennifer Aspeslagh | Comcast (phone) | Devesh Agarwal | Tekelec |
| Ida Bourne | Cox (phone) | John Malyar | Telcordia |
| Steve Farnsworth | Evolving Systems | Adam Newman | Telcordia |
| Therese Mooney | Global Crossing (phone) | Pat White | Telcordia |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW (phone) | Paula Jordan | T-Mobile |
| Bonnie Johnson | Integra (phone) | Mohamed Samater | T-Mobile |
| Bridget Alexander | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Heather (Tackett) Patterson | TNS |
| Karen Hoffman | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Stacy Hannah | TW Cable (phone) |
| Lynette Khirallah | NetNumber (phone) | Shelly Pedersen | TW Telecom (phone) |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar | David Lund | US Cellular |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Cindy Olson | US Cellular |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | Verizon |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar  | Jason Lee | Verizon (phone) |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar (phone) | Deb Tucker | Verizon Wireless |
| Dave Garner | NeuStar | Darren Krebs | Vonage |
| Marybeth Degeorgis | NeuStar | Tom Zablocki | Vonage |
|  |  | Paula Hustead | Windstream (phone) |
|  |  | Tiki Gaugler | XO Comm. (phone) |
|  |  |  |  |

NOTE: ALL ACTION ITEMS AND PARKING LOT ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “LNPA WG FCC 09-41 OPEN ACTION ITEMS (v3 080709)” 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 ConsortiumT-Mobile | Ottawa, Ontario CanadaIrvine, 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  | ComcastVerizon | Denver, ColoradoPhiladelphia, 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.

FCC Order 09-41 Implementation – All:

* July 16th NANC Meeting Readout – LNPA WG Co-Chairs



* + Gary Sacra and Paula Jordan, LNPA WG Co-Chairs, provided a summary of the attached NANC report, presented to the NANC at their July 16, 2009 meeting. Gary and Paula reported that the NANC expressed their thanks for the LNPA WG’s hard work and progress to date in development of the FCC Order 09-41 implementation plan.
* Sub-team Updates and Discussions – Sub-team Chairs:
	+ One Business Day – Jan Doell, Qwest:

  

Jan Doell, Qwest, presented the attached status documents of the One Business Day Sub-team, detailing the recommendations to date that have been made by the sub-team and the issues that remain to be addressed. In addition, Jan provided the attached tool, developed by Don Gray, Nebraska PSC, for determining when the FOC is due back to the New SP.

A question was asked regarding the current wording of the requirement for service provider staffing hours. It currently states, “Mandatory “staffed” Business Hours to be 8am to 5pm on a Business Day.” It was agreed that we need to clarify that the Old SP needs to staff to meet therequirements and not specify specific staffing hours.

A question was asked regarding a Supp cutoff time to change the due date. A service provider questioned whether there was any need to change the current process with respect to Sups. Another provider stated that this question is relevant to the discussion on disconnect timing.

A question was asked if it was the intent of the sub-team that any LSR received by the Old SP before 8am would be rejected because it arrived before the start of the SP Business Day. The answer is no, but the 4 hour FOC clock for Simple Ports would not start until 8am in the predominant time zone of the NPAC region where the number was being ported.

* + Simple Port – Bill Solis, Comcast:

Bill Solis, Comcast, gave readout of the Simple Port Definition Sub-team.

He explained that the sub-team has reached consensus in the area of UNEs and that the UNEs of E911/911, Operational Support Systems (OSSs), and Dedicated Transport are not considered by the industry to be UNEs that would lead a port to be Non-Simple.

The remaining current criteria for a Simple Port, i.e., Single Line, Complex Switch Translations, and Resellers, will be discussed on future sub-team calls.

Sue Tiffany, Sprint Nextel, volunteered to chair the sub-team going forward. The WG wishes to recognize and thank Nancy Sanders, Comcast, for her leadership and contribution in chairing the sub-team.

* + LSR – Linda Peterman, One Communications:

Linda Peterman, One Communications, reported that one sub-team meeting has been held since the last LNPA WG to discuss and develop the feedback to be submitted to the LNPA WG and what steps could be taken in the interim while the sub-team awaits the OBF data.

The sub-team will review the standard data fields submitted by the OBF when available.

The sub-team is also awaiting any decisions from the Out-of-the-Box Sub-team for possible LSR process impacts.

* + Out-of-the-Box – Teresa Patton, AT&T:

Teresa Patton, AT&T, reported that the sub-team held a conference call the previous Monday.

She reported that a concern was raised in the sub-team that solutions have not been fully vetted yet in terms of impacts. A substantial amount of work still needs to be done with regard to the NPAC expansion solution.

A service provider stated that the Service Bureau option is an individual SP business case decision. Another provider agreed.

It was stated that the NPAC expansion solution could be a significant developmental level of effort in service provider OSSs and so there is concern that it would be unlikely to be completed in the mandated 9 month implementation schedule is a concern.

It was asked if the NPAC expansion solution was being considered for both Simple and Non-Simple ports. It was stated that maintaining two solutions would be an issue.

It was agreed to place any further work on the NPAC expansion solution on hold for now and perhaps do a deeper dive at a later time to see if it makes sense to consider implementation in the future.

Teresa Patton stated that no one is precluded from contracting with a vendor for the Service Bureau solution. She also stated that there will be WICIS impacts based on the OBF standard data field work and the data information is needed by the end of August.

NANC Flow Diagram Format Determination – All:



* The group reviewed the first three files above in order to determine which format to use for the revised NANC Flow diagrams. It was agreed to use the format contained in the 3rd file: NANC Flows v4.0 Draft v4.ppt.
* A provider raised a concern regarding whether providing additional data beyond the standard set of data fields would drive a port to be considered Non-Simple. Linda Peterman, Chair of the OBF LSOP Committee, stated that this was not an issue. Linda explained that the OBF is determining how to work through whether or not the Old SP can validate on any additional data provided.
* The group then reviewed the NANC Flows v4.0 Draft v4.ppt version of the draft revised flow diagrams and made further revisions. Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will make the following revisions to the flows for review on the August 11, 2009 LNPA WG conference call.
1. Change Figure 1 Box 7 to read, “Does NLSP consider this a Simple Port?”
2. In Figure 2 Box 7, change “concur” to “agree.”
* Discussion then ensued on how to treat Simple Port requests when the New SP requests a due date later than next day. Some providers felt that the Old SP should FOC in 4 hours, while others expressed concern that this would force the Old SP to complete work unnecessarily early in a timeframe when they are also required to complete work for next day port requests. It was pointed out that the Old SP still needs to know whether the account is Simple or Non-Simple.
* After a very lengthy discussion, it was agreed that Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, would send out the question for consideration and the options to be considered by the group. Following is the question and options that were sent out to the group Monday evening for consideration during Tuesday’s meeting:

Question: What is the FOC interval for a port that is due-dated beyond next business day?

Option 1: All simple ports (as determined by the Old SP), regardless of New SP-requested due date, are responded to (FOC or Reject, whichever is applicable) in 4 hours.

Option 2: If New SP-requested due date is 1-2 business days after LSR, FOC or Reject (whichever is applicable) is due in 4 hours.  If New SP-requested due date is 3 or more business days after LSR, FOC or Reject (whichever is applicable) is due in 24 hours.

Option 3: If New SP-requested due date is 1-3 business days after LSR, FOC or Reject (whichever is applicable) is due in 4 hours.  If New SP-requested due date is 4 or more business days after LSR, FOC or Reject (whichever is applicable) is due in 24 hours.

##### LNPA WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION:

**TUESDAY 07/28/09**

Tuesday, 07/28/09, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** |
| Mary Gail Sullivan | 360 Networks (phone) | Syed Saifullah | NeuStar Clearinghouse |
| Yvonne Reigle | ATIS (phone) | Shannon Sevigny | NeuStar Pooling (phone) |
| Aelea Christofferson | ATL Communications | Mary Conquest | Nuvox (phone) |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Linda Peterman | One Communications |
| Tracey Guidotti | AT&T | Peggy Rubino | Paetec (phone) |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T | Jan Doell | Qwest |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T | Carol Frike | Sprint Nextel |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | Lavinia Rotaru | Sprint Nextel |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Mobility | Sue Tiffany | Sprint Nextel |
| Barbara Hjelmaa | Brighthouse Networks (phone) | John Guzman | Synchronoss (phone) |
| Greg Darnell | CBeyond (phone) | Bob Bruce | Syniverse |
| Nancy Cornwell | Cellcom (phone) | Devesh Agarwal | Tekelec |
| Vicki Goth | Century Link (phone) | John Malyar | Telcordia |
| Bill Solis | Comcast | Adam Newman | Telcordia |
| Cindy Sheehan | Comcast | Pat White | Telcordia |
| Jennifer Aspeslagh | Comcast (phone) | Paula Jordan | T-Mobile |
| Ida Bourne | Cox (phone) | Mohamed Samater | T-Mobile |
| Jennifer Hutton | Cox (phone) | Heather (Tackett) Patterson | TNS |
| Dennis Robins | DER Consulting (phone) | Amanda Molina | Townes (phone) |
| Steve Farnsworth | Evolving Systems (phone) | Stacy Hannah | TW Cable (phone) |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW (phone) | David Lund  | US Cellular |
| Bonnie Johnson | Integra (phone) | Cindy Olson | US Cellular |
| Angie Mackey | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Gary Sacra | Verizon |
| Bridget Alexander | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Jason Lee | Verizon (phone) |
| Karen Hoffman | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Deb Tucker | Verizon Wireless |
| Lynette Khirallah | NetNumber (phone) | Darren Krebs | Vonage |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar | Tom Zablocki | Vonage |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Tana Hanson | Windstream (phone) |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Paula Hustead | Windstream (phone) |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar  | Tiki Gaugler | XO Comm. (phone) |
| Dave Garner | NeuStar | Loriann Burke | XO Comm. (phone) |
| Marybeth Degeorgis | NeuStar | Dawn Lawrence | XO Comm. (phone) |
|  |  |  |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

NANC Flow Diagram Format Determination (CONTINUED) – All:

* After continued discussion of the question and options sent out to the group the previous evening, it was agreed to expand the options for consideration as follows. The reason cited was the concern on the part of a number of providers that if the New SP mistakenly submitted the port request as Simple, and scheduled as such with the End User (e.g., next day), if the Old SP, upon determining the port request was in fact Non-Simple, did not return the FOC or reject until 24 clock hours later, that could be later than the time that was previously arranged with the End User for port activation. The End User may not be aware that their port could not be activated as previously arranged.

**Question: What is the FOC interval for a port that is due-dated beyond next business day?**

**Option 1a.** All simple ports (as requested by the New SP), regardless of New SP-requested due date, are responded to (FOC or Reject, whichever is applicable) within 4 hours.

**Option 2a.** If the New SP-requested due date is 1-2 business days after LSR receipt, the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) or Reject (whichever is applicable) is due within in 4 hours. If the New SP-requested due date is 3 or more business days after LSR receipt, the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) or Reject (whichever is applicable) is due within 24 clock hours.

**Option 3a.** If the New SP-requested due date is 1-3 business days after LSR receipt, the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) or Reject (whichever is applicable) is due within 4 hours. If the New SP-requested due date is 4 or more business days after LSR receipt, the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) or Reject (whichever is applicable) is due within 24 clock hours.

**Option 1b**. All simple ports (as determined by the Old SP), regardless of New SP-requested due date, are responded to (FOC or Reject, whichever is applicable) within 4 hours.  If found to be Non-Simple by the Old SP, the FOC or Reject is due within 24 clock hours.

**Option 2b.** If the New SP-requested due date is 1-2 business days after LSR receipt, the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) or Reject (whichever is applicable) is due within 4 hours if found to be Simple by the Old SP.  If found to be Non-Simple by the Old SP, the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) or Reject is due within 24 hours.  If the New SP-requested due date is 3 or more business days after LSR receipt, the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) or Reject (whichever is applicable) is due within 24 clock hours.

**Option 3b.** If the New SP-requested due date is 1-3 business days after LSR receipt, the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) or Reject (whichever is applicable) is due within 4 hours if found to be Simple by the Old SP.  If found to be Non-Simple by the Old SP, the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) or Reject is due within 24 clock hours. If the New SP-requested due date is 4 or more business days after LSR receipt, the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) or Reject (whichever is applicable) is due within 24 clock hours.

* Providers were then asked to determine which of the options above they objected to:

**Option 1a.** All simple ports (as requested by the New SP), regardless of New SP-requested due date, are responded to (FOC or Reject, whichever is applicable) within 4 hours.

 Service Providers objecting to Option 1a:

* Integra
* XO
* CBeyond
* Nuvox
* Windstream
* Paetec
* Time Warner Telecom
* Townes
* Cox
* Century Link
* JSI
* Brighthouse
* Verizon
* AT&T
* Qwest
* One Communications

**Option 2a.** If the New SP-requested due date is 1-2 business days after LSR receipt, the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) or Reject (whichever is applicable) is due within in 4 hours. If the New SP-requested due date is 3 or more business days after LSR receipt, the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) or Reject (whichever is applicable) is due within 24 clock hours.

Service Providers objecting to Option 2a:

* Integra
* XO
* CBeyond
* Nuvox
* Windstream
* Paetec
* Century Link
* AT&T
* Qwest
* One Communications
* GVNW
* Vonage
* Comcast

**Option 3a.** If the New SP-requested due date is 1-3 business days after LSR receipt, the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) or Reject (whichever is applicable) is due within 4 hours. If the New SP-requested due date is 4 or more business days after LSR receipt, the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) or Reject (whichever is applicable) is due within 24 clock hours.

Service Providers objecting to Option 3a:

* Integra
* XO
* CBeyond
* Nuvox
* Windstream
* Paetec
* Century Link
* AT&T
* Qwest
* One Communications
* GVNW
* JSI
* Time Warner Telecom
* Townes
* Cox

**Option 1b**. All simple ports (as determined by the Old SP), regardless of New SP-requested due date, are responded to (FOC or Reject, whichever is applicable) within 4 hours.  If found to be Non-Simple by the Old SP, the FOC or Reject is due within 24 clock hours.

Service Providers objecting to Option 1b:

* Integra
* CBeyond
* Nuvox
* Windstream
* Paetec
* Verizon
* JSI
* Time Warner Telecom
* Townes
* Cox
* US Cellular
* Sprint Nextel
* T-Mobile

**Option 2b.** If the New SP-requested due date is 1-2 business days after LSR receipt, the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) or Reject (whichever is applicable) is due within 4 hours if found to be Simple by the Old SP.  If found to be Non-Simple by the Old SP, the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) or Reject is due within 24 hours.  If the New SP-requested due date is 3 or more business days after LSR receipt, the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) or Reject (whichever is applicable) is due within 24 clock hours.

Service Providers objecting to Option 2b:

* AT&T
* Verizon
* GVNW
* Comcast
* Vonage
* US Cellular
* Sprint Nextel
* T-Mobile

**Option 3b.** If the New SP-requested due date is 1-3 business days after LSR receipt, the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) or Reject (whichever is applicable) is due within 4 hours if found to be Simple by the Old SP.  If found to be Non-Simple by the Old SP, the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) or Reject is due within 24 clock hours. If the New SP-requested due date is 4 or more business days after LSR receipt, the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) or Reject (whichever is applicable) is due within 24 clock hours.

Service Providers objecting to Option 3b:

* Verizon
* Qwest
* GVNW
* JSI
* Cox
* Townes
* One Communications
* US Cellular
* Sprint Nextel
* T-Mobile
* The LNPA WG Co-Chairs explained that they would use the NANC consensus process to determine the group’s path forward. The following NANC consensus process, documented in and extracted from the NANC Operating Manual, was reviewed with the group.

**“Chapter I2**

## Consensus

Ideally, every decision taken by NANC and its subsidiary groups will be made by unanimous consent. The Chair and Members should make reasonable attempts to achieve unanimity. However, a requirement of unanimity would make it impossible for NANC to make any controversial decisions since each Member would hold veto power.

When a decision must be made and unanimity is not possible, NANC decisions will be made by consensus. (This means that decisions are *not* made by simple majority voting.)

But, what is “consensus” and how is it determined?

Fundamentally, determining when consensus is reached is a judgment call to be made by the Chair.  Included in the Chair’s judgment are not just the numbers of Members "for" or "against" but, more importantly, the “weight” (i.e., the experience, reputation and knowledge) of each Member who is “for” or “against.” Another judgment factor to be considered by the Chair is the intensity with which each Member’s views are held.

The Chair cannot and should not attempt to determine when consensus is achieved by some sort of mechanical “objective” process. However, the following examples illustrate how the subjective decision might be made.

Each NANC Member earns his or her consensus “weight” through regular participation, expertise, collegiality and other factors valued by the Chair. Thus, if only one “heavyweight” – a very experienced, knowledgeable and fair person – was strongly against a decision, that might be enough to defeat consensus.  Similarly, if a large number of "lightweights" (i.e., those who have earned little respect, rarely attend meetings or participate in them) attend a meeting and take one side of an issue and a similar number of "heavyweights" are on the other side, it would be reasonable for the Chair to find that the heavyweights’ view constitute the consensus. Similarly, a smaller number of heavyweight Members with intensely held views could constitute the consensus against weakly held views of lighter weight Members.

Because determining consensus is inherently a subjective judgment by the Chair, due process requires a Members who are disappointed by the Chair’s decision have an appeal. In NANC, any Member who disputes the finding of a "consensus" may bring their point of view to the next higher authority as a minority opinion. (The higher authority is the full NANC in the case of subsidiary groups’ decisions and the FCC in the case of the full NANC’s decisions).  It is better for the higher authority to receive a “consensus” decision and one or more “minority” opinions than to have no recommendations at all. Indeed, having both “consensus” and “minority” views can be very valuable to the higher authority.

In summary, unanimity is ideal. When unanimity is impossible, anything other than the admittedly subjective consensus process runs the risk of gridlock. It is much better to present a disputed consensus opinion than no advice at all. Consensus keeps things moving and the "appeal" process ensures fairness.”

* After the explanation of how the NANC Working Groups determine consensus on issues, the Co-Chairs stated that they would follow LNPA WG precedent on determining if any industry segment blocks existed with regard to how the providers objected to the 6 options considered. The 3 industry segments that have been historically used in the past in the LNPA WG to determine if an industry segment block resulted during the determination of consensus are as follows: RBOC, Wireless, and CLEC. It was further explained that Cable Providers and Interconnected VoIP Providers have historically been considered CLECs in the LNPA WG.
	+ It was determined that an industry segment block existed for the following options:
		- 1A (RBOC)
		- 1B (Wireless)
		- 2B (Wireless)
		- 3B (Wireless)
	+ Options 2A and 3A did not result in an industry segment block.
* The Co-Chairs then asked the providers in attendance and on the conference bridge the following question in order to determine the path forward on this issue. The additive to the question was offered up by the Co-Chairs as a compromise to the concern expressed by a number of the objecting providers that with Options 2A and 3A, they would be required to respond to Non-Simple Port requests within 4 hours, and FCC Order 09-41 did not require a shorter interval for Non-Simple Port requests.

**Question: Do you object or support moving forward with Options 2a and 3a, with the following additive, to determine which one of those two options will be included in the LNPA WG’s recommended implementation package?**

**Option 2a.** If the New SP-requested due date is 1-2 business days after LSR receipt, the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) or Reject (whichever is applicable) is due within in 4 hours. If the New SP-requested due date is 3 or more business days after LSR receipt, the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) or Reject (whichever is applicable) is due within 24 clock hours.

ADDITIVE:

In instances where the LSR indicates the port request is Non-Simple based on the current FCC definition and rule for a Simple Port, the Old SP must return a FOC or appropriate response within 24 clock hours.

**Option 3a.** If the New SP-requested due date is 1-3 business days after LSR receipt, the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) or Reject (whichever is applicable) is due within 4 hours. If the New SP-requested due date is 4 or more business days after LSR receipt, the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) or Reject (whichever is applicable) is due within 24 clock hours.

ADDITIVE:

In instances where the LSR indicates the port request is Non-Simple based on the current FCC definition and rule for a Simple Port, the Old SP must return a FOC or appropriate response within 24 clock hours.

 Service Providers objecting:

* Integra
* CBeyond
* XO
* Nuvox
* Paetec
* TW Telecom

Service Providers supporting:

* Townes
* JSI
* GVNW
* Brighthouse
* Cox
* Sprint Nextel
* T-Mobile
* AT&T
* One Communications
* Qwest
* Comcast
* Vonage
* US Cellular
* Verizon
	+ The Co-Chairs made the determination that there was consensus to move forward with Options 2A and 3A to determine which of the two would be the path forward for the issue. Some providers objected that they would still be required to respond with either an FOC or a Reject within 4 hours if it was not obvious on the LSR that the port was in fact Non-Simple. It was explained that if the Old SP could not FOC the LSR with a different due date within the 4 hours, they could reject the LSR back to the New SP. This would give the New SP, and thus the End User, an indication that the port could not occur when the New SP and the End User initially agreed to, rather than finding out after the agreed upon schedule. It was reiterated that the New SP still needs to due its due diligence in determining up front before they submit the LSR if the port request is Simple or Non-Simple. That could be done by pulling a CSR or by asking the End User the appropriate questions prior to LSR submission.

Objecting service providers were advised by the LNPA WG Co-Chairs that they had every right to file a minority opinion with the NANC if they wished to further their objections and appeal.

* Based on the consensus reached to move forward with either Option 2A or Option 3A, the Co-Chairs then asked the following question to the service providers in attendance and on the conference bridge:

**Question: Which of the two options, Option 2a or Option 3a, do you object to?**

**Option 2a.** If the New SP-requested due date is 1-2 business days after LSR receipt, the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) or Reject (whichever is applicable) is due within in 4 hours. If the New SP-requested due date is 3 or more business days after LSR receipt, the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) or Reject (whichever is applicable) is due within 24 clock hours.

ADDITIVE:

In instances where the LSR indicates the port request is Non-Simple based on the current FCC definition and rule for a Simple Port, the Old SP must return a FOC or appropriate response within 24 clock hours.

**Option 3a.** If the New SP-requested due date is 1-3 business days after LSR receipt, the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) or Reject (whichever is applicable) is due within 4 hours. If the New SP-requested due date is 4 or more business days after LSR receipt, the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) or Reject (whichever is applicable) is due within 24 clock hours.

ADDITIVE:

In instances where the LSR indicates the port request is Non-Simple based on the current FCC definition and rule for a Simple Port, the Old SP must return a FOC or appropriate response within 24 clock hours.

 Service Providers objecting to Option 2a:

* Integra
* XO
* CBeyond
* Nuvox
* Paetec
* AT&T
* Comcast
* Verizon
* Vonage

Service Providers objecting to Option 3a:

* Integra
* XO
* CBeyond
* Nuvox
* Paetec
* JSI
* Townes
* Cox
* Qwest
* GVNW
* The Co-Chairs, based on the results above, made the determination that Option 2A would be the path forward.
* The issue documented above was discussed for 10 hours over the two meeting days.
* Discussion then ensued on the possibility of the OBF LSOP Committee developing a new LSR response message that would serve as an indication to the New SP that the Old SP had determined that the port request, submitted as Simple, was in fact a Non-Simple Port request, and the FOC would be returned within 24 hours instead of 4 hours. Linda Peterman, One Communications and OBF LSOP Committee Co-Chair, will investigate the feasibility of industry development of a new LSR response message that would indicate to the New SP that their Simple Port request is in actuality a Non-Simple Port request and that the New SP will receive an FOC within 24 clock hours instead of 4 hours.
* Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will make the following revision to the flows for review on the August 11, 2009 LNPA WG conference call.
1. Make revisions in Figure 2 consistent with LNPA WG decision to return FOC or Reject when Simple Port request is found to be Non-Simple by ONSP.
* Discussion then took place on the possibility of the NPAC utilizing the Due Date in the SP Create messages to determine which set of wireline T1/T2 timers to use, should the industry determine that a new additional set of timers was needed for Simple Ports. It was suggested that if the Due Date in the Create message was 1-2 days beyond the date of the Create, then the shorter set of wireline timers would be used by the NPAC, and anything 3 days or more past the Create date would utilize the current 9 hour T1/T2 timers. NeuStar advised that there could be scenarios where the SP Create message, if delayed enough beyond the LSR/FOC timeframe, could result in use of the incorrect set of timers.
* Due to time constraints, the group agreed to defer the following issues to future meetings/calls:
* Time Zone Differences for Simple vs. Non-Simple Ports.

Mark Lancaster, AT&T, will develop a draft write-up on the issue of time zone differences for Simple vs. Non-Simple Ports.

* Timing of Old SP Disconnect.
* Vonage contribution to flows for scenario when DSL is on the porting out End User’s line.



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

* 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#

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