LNPA WORKING GROUP

August 25-26, 2009 Meeting

Final Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sterling, Virginia | Host: NeuStar |

##### LNPA WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION:

**TUESDAY 08/25/09**

Tuesday, 08/25/09, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Mary Gail Sullivan | 360 Networks (phone) | Syed Saifullah | | NeuStar Clearinghouse |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Shannon Sevigny | | NeuStar Pooling (phone) |
| Tracey Guidotti | AT&T | Tara Farquhar | | NeuStar Pooling (phone) |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T | Mary Conquest | | Nuvox (phone) |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T | Linda Peterman | | One Communications (phone) |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | John McHugh | | OPASTCO |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Mobility (phone) | Peggy Rubino | | Paetec (phone) |
| Barbara Hjelmaa | Brighthouse Networks | Jan Doell | | Qwest |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian Consortium | Towanda Russell | | RCN (phone) |
| Brad Lerner | Cavalier Telecom (phone) | Carol Frike | | Sprint Nextel (phone) |
| Nancy Cornwell | Cellcom (phone) | Lavinia Rotaru | | Sprint Nextel |
| Vicki Goth | Century Link (phone) | Rosemary Emmer | | Sprint Nextel |
| Bill Solis | Comcast (phone) | Sue Tiffany | | Sprint Nextel |
| Tim Kagele | Comcast (phone) | Niraj Prakash | | Sprint Nextel |
| Cindy Sheehan | Comcast | Ian Ximmies | | Synchronoss (phone) |
| Jennifer Aspeslagh | Comcast (phone) | Sara Cole | | TDS Metrocom (phone) |
| Beth O’Donnell | Cox (phone) | Bob Bruce | | Syniverse |
| Matt Gerst | CTIA | John Malyar | | Telcordia |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW (phone) | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Bonnie Johnson | Integra | Pat White | | Telcordia |
| Bridget Alexander | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Angie Mackey | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Mohamed Samater | | T-Mobile |
| Karen Hoffman | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Heather Patterson | | TNS |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar | Amanda Molina | | Townes Telecommunications (phone) |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Jason Lee | | Verizon (phone) |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Deepak Sonar | NeuStar | Tom Zablocki | | Vonage |
| Dave Garner | NeuStar | Dawn Lawrence | | XO Comm. (phone) |
| Marybeth Degeorgis | NeuStar | Tiki Gaugler | | XO Comm. (phone) |
|  |  | Loriann Burke | | 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 (v5 082809)” 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 | 15th | 10/6/2009 Live Meeting from 10am to 4pm Eastern time, dial-in bridge number is 888-412-7808, pin 23272# |  |  |
| 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:

* Position Paper Discussion – XO Communications



* + XO Communications presented the attached position paper requesting that the LNPA WG reconsider the decision reached at the July 27-28, 2009 meeting in Irvine, California to require the Old SP to provide a response to the New SP’s LSR within 4 hours if the New SP submitted the LSR to the Old SP with a requested due date of 1 or 2 business days, regardless if the Old SP, in processing the LSR, determined that the Simple Port request was, in fact, a Non-Simple Port. That decision, referenced as Option 2A, is as follows:

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 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.

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.

* + In explaining the rationale for the position paper, XO stated that FCC Order 09-41 does not require changes to the Non-Simple Port process. XO stated that the submitters of the position paper feel that the decision reached by the WG goes beyond the scope of the Order and places a burden on the Old Wireline SP. XO expressed concerns regarding how to manually respond within 4 hours and respectfully requested that the WG reconsider its decision on Option 2A. XO stated that they believe there was intense CLEC objection to Option 2A and further believes it offers no benefit to the consumer. Cavalier and Integra stated that they agree with XO. Brighthouse, as a CLEC, stated that the opposition to Option 2A is not unanimous within the CLEC community, and that Brighthouse supports Option 2A.
  + The WG Co-Chairs explained the NANC consensus process and its subjective nature as documented in the NANC Training Binder. A Service Provider stated that they felt the Co-Chairs followed the process as set up by NANC.
  + Discussion then ensued on what some providers felt were the benefits to the consumer of Option 2A. If the New SP, after consulting with the End User wishing to establish service with them, mistakenly believed the port was a Simple Port request and submitted the LSR with a requested Due Date of 1 Business Day per the End User’s instructions, and the Old SP subsequently determined that the Port request was a Non-Simple Port, a response from the Old SP within 4 hours that the port was Non-Simple would give the New SP an opportunity to make different arrangements with the End User in a timely manner. If the Old SP were allowed to take up to 24 hours to respond, that could actually be past the appointment time agreed upon between the New SP and the End User for when the port would take place and could result in missed appointments. A response within 4 hours would enable the New SP to contact the End User to reschedule any appointment. The Old SP would have the option of returning the FOC within 4 hours with a different Due Date, or returning a Reject with a response code indicating to the New SP that it is a Non-Simple Port and the LSR should be resubmitted accordingly. XO stated that the New SP could assume their port request was Non-Simple if they do not receive an FOC within 4 hours. XO also expressed concerns that this would result in more rejected LSRs.
  + It was stated that not all porting scenarios are distinctly either Simple or Non-Simple from an end-to-end perspective, such as the case when the New SP unknowingly submits an LSR for a Simple Port that is determined to be Non-Simple by the Old SP. A number of supporters of Option 2A stated that the WG’s charge is to develop the best possible LNP process in an environment of Simple and Non-Simple Ports when some scenarios could result in a meshing of the two, while making the End User’s experience as positive as possible.
  + A CLEC expressed concern that Option 2A would require their systems to determine whether the port request was Simple or Non-Simple within 4 hours. Another provider responded that if the LSR came in with a requested Due Date of 1 or 2 Business Days, they would have to do that in any case in the event that it is truly a Simple Port, which must be responded to within 4 hours.
  + The Co-Chairs then posed the following questions to the Service Providers participating in the discussion:
    - Who objects to revisiting the WG’s decision to select Option 2A and reworking this issue?
      * Responses:
        + AT&T
        + Brighthouse
        + Comcast
        + GVNW
        + OPASTCO
        + Qwest
        + Sprint Nextel
        + T-Mobile
        + Townes
        + Verizon
        + Vonage
    - Who supports revisiting the WG’s decision to select Option 2A and reworking this issue?
      * Responses:
        + 360 Networks
        + Cavalier
        + Century Link
        + Deltacom
        + Integra
        + Nuvox
        + One Communications
        + Paetec
        + RCN
        + TDS Metrocom
        + XO Communications
    - Based on the group discussion and these responses, the Co-Chairs concluded that there was no clear consensus to revisit this issue and reminded providers that they have the option to file a minority report with the NANC if they chose to do so.
* Sub-team Updates and Discussions – Sub-team Chairs

One Business Day Sub-team – Jan Doell, Qwest

* + - The sub-team held its last meeting on Tuesday, August 18th. All remaining issues will be moved to the full LNPA WG for resolution. Those remaining issues are as follows:

Issue 30 – Timing for removal of switch translations in the donor switch.

Issue 20 – Should the Old SP be allowed to cancel the order at due date + 3 if the New SP has not activated the port?

Issue 24 – Duration and running of T1 and T2 timers

Issue 17 – Conflict cutoff time.

Simple Port Sub-team – Sue Tiffany, Sprint Nextel

The sub-team has agreed on clarifying language related to UNEs. It is as follows:

*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, or Operational Support Systems are not a factor in determining or executing a Simple Port.*

Regarding the criteria on complex switch translations, no consensus has been reached at this point on any clarifying language. There is proposed language under review by the sub-team that reads as follows:

*For single TN ports, The services cited as examples are not necessarily provided utilizing complex switch translations. If the other criteria defining a Simple Port as determined by the LNPA WG clarification would otherwise lead to classifying a port as Simple, the porting of the customer/number (9/1) with any of these services should/could be classified as Simple.*

The following Action Items were assigned to the Simple Port Sub-team participants in order to determine if consensus can be reached on clarifying language with respect to the complex switch translations criteria:

1. Carriers are to determine whether the above language needs to say “services should” or “services could.”  Carriers should determine what changes should be made to the paragraph.
2. Carriers are to determine what steps are required to port an ISDN BRI customer, i.e., are there any steps besides disconnecting to process a BRI port?
3. Each carrier representative should determine whether or not their company considers RCF telephone numbers to be provisioned using “complex translations.”  If not complex, does your company consider porting the RCF number to be Simple or Non-Simple?
4. Carriers are to determine if there are any scenarios where a single TN/line, single account number with AIN service would be considered non-simple/complex, i.e., would there be any actions required besides a disconnection?

Remaining discussions on the Simple Port definition will take place in the full LNPA WG.

LSR Sub-team – Linda Peterman, One Communications

The sub-team has reached consensus on the following recommendations for inclusion in the LNPA WG Implementation Plan related to Customer Service Records (CSRs):

The Old Local Service Provider cannot require a physical copy of the end user authorization to be provided before processing the Customer Service Record (CSR) or the port request.

The Old Service Provider shall not require the New SP to have previously obtained a CSR before they will accept an LSR from the New Service Provider.  For those New Service Providers that choose not to obtain a CSR, they understand that there is heightened risk that their LSR may not be complete and accurate.  This is not intended to preclude those providers who provide an ordering Graphical User Interface (GUI) from including a step involving a real-time CSR pull within that process, as long as an alternate ordering process is available that does not require a CSR being pulled.

CSRs must be returned within 24 clock hours, unless otherwise negotiated between Service Providers, excluding weekends and Old Service Provider holidays.

Any of the End User validation fields required by the Old Service Provider on an incoming LSR must be available on the CSR, excluding End User requested and assigned password/PIN.

Only passwords/PINs requested and assigned by the End User may be utilized as an End User validation field on an incoming LSR by the Old Network Service Provider/Old Local Service Provider. Any Service Provider assigned password/PIN may not be utilized as a requirement in order to obtain a CSR.

The OBF is meeting Thursday and Friday of this week to continue work on the justifications for the standard set of LSR data fields. The OBF is also working on standard fields that would be returned on FOCs, Rejects, and Jeopardies. The fields returned would be the same for all providers, but would not contain standardized numbering systems (error codes). That is an ATIS parking lot item for future work.

Providers have agreed to accept a Sup 1 to cancel prior to FOC.

NANC Flow Diagram Format Determination – All:

   

The LNPA WG reviewed the most recent revisions to the draft NANC LNP Provisioning Flows and accompanying Narratives. The Narratives above are reflected in a REDLINE version and a CLEAN version. The group agreed to accept the revisions in the REDLINE version and then concentrate on the questions and open issues highlighted in yellow in the CLEAN version.

**WEDNESDAY 08/26/09**

Wednesday, 08/26/09, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Mary Gail Sullivan | 360 Networks (phone) | Syed Saifullah | | NeuStar Clearinghouse |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Shannon Sevigny | | NeuStar Pooling (phone) |
| Tracey Guidotti | AT&T | Tara Farquhar | | NeuStar Pooling (phone) |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T | Mary Conquest | | Nuvox (phone) |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T | Linda Peterman | | One Communications (phone) |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | John McHugh | | OPASTCO |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Mobility (phone) | Peggy Rubino | | Paetec (phone) |
| Barbara Hjelmaa | Brighthouse Networks | Jan Doell | | Qwest |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian Consortium | Towanda Russell | | RCN (phone) |
| Brad Lerner | Cavalier Telecom (phone) | Carol Frike | | Sprint Nextel (phone) |
| Nancy Cornwell | Cellcom (phone) | Lavinia Rotaru | | Sprint Nextel |
| Vicki Goth | Century Link (phone) | Rosemary Emmer | | Sprint Nextel |
| Bill Solis | Comcast (phone) | Sue Tiffany | | Sprint Nextel |
| Tim Kagele | Comcast (phone) | Niraj Prakash | | Sprint Nextel |
| Cindy Sheehan | Comcast | Ian Ximmies | | Synchronoss (phone) |
| Jennifer Aspeslagh | Comcast (phone) | Sara Cole | | TDS Metrocom (phone) |
| Beth O’Donnell | Cox (phone) | Bob Bruce | | Syniverse |
| Matt Gerst | CTIA | John Malyar | | Telcordia |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW (phone) | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Bonnie Johnson | Integra | Pat White | | Telcordia |
| Bridget Alexander | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Angie Mackey | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Mohamed Samater | | T-Mobile |
| Karen Hoffman | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Heather Patterson | | TNS |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar | Amanda Molina | | Townes Telecommunications (phone) |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Jason Lee | | Verizon (phone) |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Deepak Sonar | NeuStar | Tom Zablocki | | Vonage |
| Dave Garner | NeuStar | Dawn Lawrence | | XO Comm. (phone) |
| Marybeth Degeorgis | NeuStar | Tiki Gaugler | | XO Comm. (phone) |
|  |  | Loriann Burke | | XO Comm. (phone) |
|  |  |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

NANC Flow Diagram Format Determination (CONTINUED) – All:

* The group continued to address the questions and open issues highlighted in yellow in the CLEAN version of the Narratives. The decisions made by the group to address those open questions are reflected in the Draft 8 versions of the Flows and Narratives attached below.
  + Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will make the revisions to the NANC

Flow Diagrams and Narratives agreed to at the August 25-26, 2009 LNPA WG meeting for review at the September 1-2, 2009 LNPA WG meeting.

STATUS: CLOSED. The draft revisions agreed to at the August 25-26, 2009 LNPA WG meeting are contained in the draft v8 flows attached below and will be reviewed and discussed at the September 1-2, 2009 LNPA WG meeting.

 

* + During the review and revision of the NANC LNP Provisioning Flows and Narratives, the following Action Items were assigned:
    - Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, and Teresa Patton, AT&T, will determine if any changes need to be made to Figure 2, Wireless ICP Service Provider Communication, for Type 1 numbers. This will be reviewed at the September 1-2, 2009 LNPA WG meeting.
    - Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, and Renee Dillon, AT&T Mobility, will develop a PIM related to the question as to whether or not we will retain the 5-day Due Date interval for the 1st time port in an NXX code. This PIM will be discussed at a future general LNPA WG meeting and will be outside the discussion of FCC Order 09-41.
  + In addition, a Parking Lot Item was logged to document the need to spell out the 1st time use of all acronyms in the Narratives.
* Review of Action Items and Parking Lot Items – All:



* + The group reviewed and updated the status of the Action Items and Parking Lot Items in the v4 LNPA WG FCC 09-41 Open Action Items document attached above. The updated status is reflected in v5 of the document attached below.



* Additional Discussion Items:
  + Time Zone Differences for Simple vs. Non-Simple Ports – Mark Lancaster, AT&T



* + - Do to time constraints, it was agreed that this item will be discussed at the September 1-2, 2009 meeting in Denver, Colorado.
    - The group then discussed the possibility of using the Due Dates in the New and Old SP Create messages for the NPAC to determine which timer set (Medium or Long) to use on a port. The following Action Items were assigned for discussion at the September 1-2, 2009 meeting in Denver, Colorado.

NeuStar will provide a high-level tentative review of the possibility of using the SV Create Due Date for determining if a wireline-wireline or inter-modal port is Simple or Non-Simple. This will be discussed at the September 1-2, 2009 LNPA WG meeting with the understanding that this is tentative at this time and could be changed as technical requirements development takes place.

Service Providers are to determine if they can identify any problematic porting scenarios related to using the SV Create Due Date for determining if a wireline-wireline or inter-modal port is Simple or Non-Simple. This will be discussed at the September 1-2, 2009 LNPA WG meeting with the understanding that this is tentative at this time and could be changed as technical requirements development takes place.

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

* September 1-2, 2009 face-to-face meeting in Denver, Colorado
  + Dial-in bridge is 888-412-7808 Pin 23272#

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