LNPA WORKING GROUP

September 15-16, 2009 Meeting

Final Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Philadelphia, Pennsylvania | Host: Verizon |

**LNPA WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION:**

**TUESDAY 09/15/09**

Tuesday, 09/15/09, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T | Mary Conquest | | Nuvox (phone) |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Linda Peterman | | One Communications |
| Tracey Guidotti | AT&T | Jan Doell | | Qwest (phone) |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T | Towanda Russell | | RCN (phone) |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | Carol Frike | | Sprint Nextel (phone) |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Mobility (phone) | Sue Tiffany | | Sprint Nextel |
| Barbara Hjelmaa | Brighthouse Networks | Lavinia Rotaru | | Sprint Nextel |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian Consortium | Rosemary Emmer | | Sprint Nextel (phone) |
| Tim Kagele | Comcast (phone) | Bob Bruce | | Syniverse (phone) |
| Cindy Sheehan | Comcast | Joel Zamlong | | Telcordia |
| Jennifer Aspeslagh | Comcast (phone) | John Malyar | | Telcordia |
| Beth O’Donnell | Cox (phone) | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Devang Naik | DSET | Pat White | | Telcordia |
| Jim Seigler | DSET | Lisa Marie Maxson | | Telcordia |
| Steve Farnsworth | Evolving Systems | Matthew Timmermann | | Telcordia |
| Jay Hjellum | Evolving Systems | Kayla Sharbaugh | | Telcordia (phone) |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Bonnie Johnson | Integra (phone) | Mohamed Samater | | T-Mobile |
| Bridget Alexander | John Staurulakis, Inc. | Heather Patterson | | TNS (phone) |
| Karen Hoffman | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Amanda Molina | | Townes Telecomm. (phone) |
| Karen Norcross | Michigan PUC (phone) | David Lund | | US Cellular (phone) |
| Lynette Khirallah | NetNumber (phone) | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar | Jason Lee | | Verizon (phone) |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Tina Plaisance | | Verizon Wireless (phone) |
| Marybeth Degeorgis | NeuStar | Darren Krebs | | Vonage |
| Randy Buffenbarger | NeuStar | Tom Zablocki | | Vonage |
| Ed Barker | NeuStar (phone) | Imanu Hill | | Vonage |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Tana Henson | | Windstream (phone) |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar Clearinghouse | Loriann Burke | | XO Comm. (phone) |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Tiki Gaugler | | XO Comm. (phone) |
| Dave Garner | NeuStar | Dawn Lawrence | | XO Comm. |
| Tara Farquhar | NeuStar Pooling (phone) |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

NOTE: ALL ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “SEPTEMBER 15-16 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 |  | 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 |  | 1st-2nd  15th-16th | Comcast  Verizon | Denver, Colorado  Philadelphia, Pennsylvania |
| October | 15th | No meeting.  10/6/2009 call from 10am to 4pm Eastern time, dial-in bridge number is 888-412-7808, pin 23272#  10/19/09 call from 11am to 4pm Eastern time, dial-in bridge number is 888-412-7808, pin 23272# |  |  |
| November |  | 11/2/2009 call from 2:30pm to 4:30pm Eastern time, dial-in bridge number is 888-412-7808, pin 23272#  10th-11th | NeuStar | Newport Beach, California |
| December |  | 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.

July 14-15, 2009 Meeting Minutes Review:

* No changes were made to the DRAFT July 14-15, 2009 LNPA WG meeting minutes and they were approved as FINAL.

July 27-28, 2009 Meeting Minutes Review:

* No changes were made to the DRAFT July 27-28, 2009 LNPA WG meeting minutes and they were approved as FINAL.

FCC Order 09-41 Implementation Discussion – All:

* Action Item and Parking Lot Item Review

 

* + - Parking Lot Item PL090209-01, Delay Response in the Intermodal process, in the attached LNPA WG FCC 09-41 Open Action Items document, remains as the only open item that has not been transferred to the regular LNPA WG Action Item list for eventual resolution. This Parking Lot Item was introduced and teed up by Sprint Nextel.

Today, when a Wireline carrier ports a number away from a Wireless carrier that happens to be a Wireless Reseller, the Wireless Network SP carrier sends a Delay Response. Wireline carriers cannot process the Delay response. The only option that exists today is a Reject or FOC with a new Due Date and Time. The LNPA WG needs to address how a Wireless carrier should respond to a Wireline carrier for Wireless Reseller ports (Non-Simple). What kind of Response will the Wireless (OSP) send to the Wireline carrier (NSP) in the event the port is considered a Non-Simple Port? What type of Response is appropriate and what will the Wireline carrier be able to accept?

Another Wireless carrier stated that they felt the Old SP process should be used, meaning that the Wireline provider should accept a delay response. A Wireless carrier expressed concern that if the Wireless carrier sends a reject, it could initiate an endless loop if the Wireline carrier resubmits the LSR. This is not an issue today for intermodal porting because the Resellers can respond within the 24 hour FOC period.

A Wireline carrier stated that this would need to go through the OBF LSOP Committee. There are requirements in the Wireline LSOG Guidelines that an LSR be must be FOC’d or rejected, but there are no requirements for a delay.

A number of Wireless carriers stated that they are asking for something like a Reject response that simply says to wait and not to resend the LSR.

A Wireline carrier asked why Wireline carriers process the port request and send a loss notification to the Reseller and Wireless carriers send the LSR to the Reseller. The response was that some Wireless carriers do not have the necessary customer information to validate the port.

Wireless carriers can convert the delay to a reject but that would tell the Wireline New SP to resend the LSR and Wireless carriers do not prefer that. A Wireline carrier stated that working a reject as a delay would require significant systems and process work.

A Wireless carrier suggested that the OBF Intermodal Subcommittee take this back to be worked.

A Wireless carrier suggested that Wireless carriers could FOC the LSR with a 4 day due date and jep the order if the Reseller says it is a bad request. Another Wireless carrier stated that they would rather push their Resellers to respond quicker.

Wireless Service Providers are to work a solution to the following within the

current rules. Delay Response in the Intermodal process: Today, when a Wireline carrier ports a number away from a Wireless carrier that happens to be a Wireless Reseller, the Wireless Network SP carrier sends a Delay Response. Wireline carriers cannot process the Delay response. The only option that exists today is a Reject or FOC with a new Due Date and Time. The LNPA WG needs to address how a Wireless carrier should respond to a Wireline carrier for Wireless Reseller ports (Non-Simple). What kind of Response will the Wireless (OSP) send to the Wireline carrier (NSP) in the event the port is considered a Non-Simple Port? What type of Response is appropriate and what will the Wireline carrier be able to accept? (This is former LNPA WG FCC 09-41 Parking Lot Item PL090209-01.)

It was agreed to move Parking Lot Item PL090209-01 to the regular LNPA WG Action Item list. This is now Action Item 091509-05.

* Proposal to add text to NANC LNP Flow Narratives – Tiki Gaugler, XO:
  + - Tiki Gaugler, XO Communications teed up a proposal to add the following text to Figure 4 Step 3 of the NANC LNP Provisioning Flow Narratives:

If the OSP provides unrestricted access to an automated system or interface (e.g. without requirements unnecessary for use of the system or interface) for submitting an LSR to port a number, the NSP may not request a 1-2 day due date for porting that number unless the NSP submits the LSR through the provided automated system or interface.

Tiki explained that XO believes that requesting carriers should be required to submit orders through an Old SP’s automated interface and system in order to get a 1-2 day due date if the Old SP has gone through the expense of upgrading to an automated interface/system. A vendor asked if automated interface included a GUI. Tiki answered “yes.”

A provider stated that they would have to take this back to their legal group for review and this might have ICA implications. Another provider expressed a concern that small carriers that are completely manual would be precluded from participating in one day porting. In response, it was stated that there is no current rule that providers must support all modes of LSR transmission and that the Old SP’s process is typically followed on wireline-wireline ports. It was further stated that nothing precludes a provider today from requiring in their trading partner profile that other providers use their process.

Two providers stated that this should be negotiated between carriers and not codified as a blanket policy statement. They also stated that the LNPA WG should not recommend requirements that restrict porting for small carriers. Tiki responded that this is the reason that the FCC gave small carriers 15 months to implement FCC 09-41, recognizing that they would likely need to upgrade their systems to meet the requirements of one-day porting.

Service Providers are to determine if they can support the following

statement proposed by XO Communications to be added in the NANC LNP Provisioning Flows Narratives in Figure 4 Step 3. This will be further discussed on the 10-06-09 LNPA WG conference call.

“The NNSP notifies the ONSP of the port using the LSR and sends the information in the manner specified by the ONSP (i.e., via an electronic gateway, FAX, email, or manual means).  The LSR process is defined by the Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF) and the electronic interface by the Telecommunications Industry Forum (TCIF)”

Note that the statement in the Action Item above was modified from the original version documented above at the beginning of the discussion.

FCC Order 09-41 Change Order Review – NeuStar:

  

* The group reviewed the attached use case document (NEW NPAC 3 HR TIMERS DETAILS AND USE CASES v3.doc)
  + - A question was asked – Do we need SP profile indicators for both porting in and porting out for the medium timers? It was stated that a provider may not be required to port out on a next day basis, but may want to port in on a next day basis. This led to a discussion of developing a recommendation in the Flows for a porting reciprocity requirement. Mark Lancaster, AT&T, will propose text for inclusion in the NANC LNP Provisioning Flows Narratives that addresses Service Provider reciprocity with regard to the one day porting interval. This draft text will be reviewed on Wednesday.
    - Discussion then ensued on what action the Old SP can take if the New SP does not comply with the FOC and indicates a shorter set of timers or a shorter due date than was indicated on the FOC. Gary Sacra, Verizon, proposed the following text:

The Old SP may place the port in Conflict with a Cause Value of 51 (Initial Confirming FOC/WPRR Not Issued) in instances where the following apply:

1. The New SP Object Create Notification contains a Medium Timer Indicator set to True, and the Old SP has determined that the port request is Non-Simple and indicated as such on the response to the LSR,
2. The requested Due Date on the LSR is 3 or more Business Days into the future, or
3. The New SP Object Create Notification contains a Due Date that differs from the Due Date on the Firm Order Confirmation.

Based on suggested revisions, Gary agreed to revise the proposal and send out to the group on Tuesday night for review on Wednesday.

* + - It was noted that in Use Case 10, the port does not happen.
    - Two providers asked if there would be any opportunity to review the use of Due Date instead of the Indicator. It was stated that we agreed by consensus to move forward with the Indicator Change Order until if/when we found a technical showstopper.
    - For the Indicator Change Order, it was stated that we need a rule for that the medium timers will be indicated for 1-2 day Due Dates and long timers for 3+ day Due Dates.

NANC 437 Review Parking Lot Review – Telcordia:

* Telcordia and the group continued the review of the attached NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot matrix, leaving off at Item 80. It was agreed that the discussion would continue on Wednesday. Note that all revisions made during this meeting are reflected in v14 of the document attached below during the Wednesday discussion.



##### LNPA WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION:

**WEDNESDAY 09/16/09**

Wednesday, 09/16/09, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Linda Peterman | | One Communications |
| Tracey Guidotti | AT&T | Jan Doell | | Qwest (phone) |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T | Mary Retka | | Qwest (phone) |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | Towanda Russell | | RCN (phone) |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Mobility (phone) | Anthony Lana | | Socket (phone) |
| Barbara Hjelmaa | Brighthouse Networks | Sue Tiffany | | Sprint Nextel |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian Consortium | Lavinia Rotaru | | Sprint Nextel |
| Tim Kagele | Comcast (phone) | Rosemary Emmer | | Sprint Nextel (phone) |
| Cindy Sheehan | Comcast | John Malyar | | Telcordia |
| Jennifer Aspeslagh | Comcast (phone) | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Jay Hjellum | Evolving Systems | Pat White | | Telcordia |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW (phone) | Lisa Marie Maxson | | Telcordia |
| Bonnie Johnson | Integra (phone) | Matthew Timmermann | | Telcordia |
| Angie Beckett | John Staurulakis, Inc. | Kayla Sharbaugh | | Telcordia (phone) |
| Bridget Alexander | John Staurulakis, Inc. | Stacy Hannah | | Time Warner Cable (phone) |
| Karen Hoffman | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Lynette Khirallah | NetNumber (phone) | Mohamed Samater | | T-Mobile |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar | Heather Patterson | | TNS (phone) |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Amanda Molina | | Townes Telecomm. (phone) |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Tanya Golub | | US Cellular (phone) |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Marybeth Degeorgis | NeuStar | Jason Lee | | Verizon (phone) |
| Syed Saifullah | NeuStar Clearinghouse | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Darren Krebs | | Vonage |
| Dave Garner | NeuStar | Tom Zablocki | | Vonage |
| Tara Farquhar | NeuStar Pooling (phone) | Imanu Hill | | Vonage |
| Shannon Sevigny | NeuStar Pooling (phone) | Tana Henson | | Windstream (phone) |
|  |  | Loriann Burke | | XO Comm. (phone) |
|  |  | Dawn Lawrence | | XO Comm. |
|  |  |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

NANC 437 Review Parking Lot Review (CONTINUED) – Telcordia:

* Telcordia and the group continued the review of the attached NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot matrix, beginning at Item 80, and working through Item 141. All revisions to the document are captured in the attached v14 and are identified with either the date 09/15/09 or 09/16/09.



* Discussion of Open Architectural and Operational Issues – All
  + Due to time constraints, the group did not have time to review the attached documents, submitted by NeuStar and Evolving Systems. They will be reviewed at a later time.

 

Unfinished/New Business – All:

* FCC’s 2% rule for small carriers (Mark Lancaster, AT&T):
* Mark Lancaster, AT&T, raised an issue related to the identification of small carriers based on the FCC’s 2% rule for which the 15 month implementation timeframe would be applicable. Mark walked the group through the following analysis based on his investigation:
  + The FCC provides the formula in FCC 09-41, paragraph 12, footnote 48 where it says:

[1] *See* 47 U.S.C. § 251(f)(2). For purposes of this Order, what constitutes a 2 percent provider will be calculated based on an aggregate of incumbent LEC and competitive LEC lines, based on the Commission’s most recent industry statistics available as of the effective date of this Order. *See Trends in Telephone Service*, Industry Analysis and Technology Division, Wireline Comp. Bur., Report, at Tables 7.1, 7.3 (Aug. 2008), *available at*: <http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DOC-284932A1.pdf>.

* + If you follow the path to the FCC report and look at table 7.1, you will find that the August 2008 report shows data that came from FCC 477 forms submitted by ILEC's and CLEC's at the end of 2006 totaling 167,504,016 "lines" (not access lines or loops, just lines).
  + If you take the 2006 "lines" number x .02 = 3,350,080 lines becomes the upper limit on carriers wishing to fit under the 2% threshold.
  + If you look at the ILEC's in table 7.3 you will find, at the time of the report, the carriers that make it above the 3.3M number.  All of this is based on the yearend 2006 status of a corporate entity.
  + Mark stated that no CLEC's are listed uniquely in any report he could find, and no CMRSs are discussed.
  + Mark stated that it might be assumed all wireless carriers would comply since they port fast and they were the primary carriers asking for the reduction of the interval.
  + Ultimately, carriers seem entrusted with doing the math and supporting it with whatever logic they find sufficient.
  + It was stated that wireless companies would be subject to the above 2% rule, and each carrier needs to determine what they consider lines and determine if they are above or below 2%.
* It was suggested that carriers could be periodically canvassed over the distro to provide a positive acknowledgement if they are going to support the Order in 9 months or 15 months and the LNPA WG could start to create a list of providers that are above and below the 2% line so that operationally we know what we are dealing with. Another suggestion was to use the Medium Timer profile setting to determine this. It was stated that SP profile data is proprietary.
* No conclusions were drawn at this time.
* Reciprocity issue (continued from Tuesday discussion) (Mark Lancaster, AT&T):
* On Tuesday evening, Mark Lancaster, AT&T, sent out the following proposed language addressing his concern regarding reciprocal implementation of the one-day porting order.

“The FCC has allowed that *One Business Day* porting must be implemented either within 9 months of the NANC report to the FCC, or for carriers which qualify, implemented within 15 months (FCC 09-41, para 12).  The Local Number Portability Administration Working Group (LNPA WG) provisioning flows and *One Business Day* definition require reciprocal implementation where carriers must only port-in at the interval which that carrier also ports-out.”

* No objections were raised to the proposed language and it was agreed to add this text in the form of a note at the beginning of the recommended NANC LNP Provisioning Flows Narratives.
* Conflict Cause Code 51 (continued from Tuesday discussion) (Gary Sacra, Verizon):
* Based on feedback during the discussion on Tuesday, Gary Sacra, Verizon, revised Verizon’s proposal on what action the Old SP can take if the New SP does not comply with the FOC and indicates a shorter set of timers or a shorter due date than was indicated on the FOC. Following is the revised proposal:

The Old SP may place the port in Conflict with a Cause Value of 51 (Initial Confirming FOC/WPRR Not Issued) in instances where any of the following apply:

1. The Object Create Notification contains a Medium Timer Indicator set to True, and the Old SP has determined that the port request is Non-Simple and indicated as such on the response to the LSR, or
2. The Object Create Notification contains a Medium Timer Indicator set to True and the requested Due Date on the LSR is 3 or more Business Days into the future, or
3. The Object Create Notification contains a Due Date that differs from the Due Date on the Firm Order Confirmation.

* The group agreed to review this draft proposal internally and discuss it further on the October 6, 2009 LNPA WG conference call. Based on feedback during Wednesday’s discussion, Gary Sacra, Verizon, will draft revised proposed text for use of Conflict Cause Value 51 for use when the New SP and Old SP disagree on whether or not a port is Simple. This will be discussed on the 10/06/09 LNPA WG conference call.

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

**Overall OBF Update:**

* On Tuesday, August 18th, the Executive Committee of the ATIS Board met and unanimously approved the following changes:

1. The Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF) will be restructured to have 2 committees: an Ordering Committee and a Billing Committee. These committees will meet when work load dictates to address ordering and billing issues/requirements for future networks. Problems requiring attention in current ordering and billing processes will be addressed in the larger committee(s), if possible, or in subcommittees and/or task forces if dictated by the scope of needed work.
2. The OBF’s SMS/800 Number Administration Committee (SNAC) will become a separate and standalone committee as it has little in common with the OBF, and is believed to attract additional members by standing on its own.
3. The Network Interface, Power and Protection Committee (NIPP) and the Optical Transport and Synchronization Committee (OPTXS) will be realigned to form two new committees: the Copper/Optical Access, Synchronization, and Transport Committee (COAST), and the Sustainability in Telecom Energy and Protection Committee (STEP).
4. The Network Interconnection Interoperability Forum (NIIF) will be rebranded as the Next Generation Interconnection Interoperability Forum (NGIIF) and operate as a committee of the whole, without subgroups, to address interconnection processes for evolving and next generation networks.
5. A process will be trialed whereby all committees will identify those issues which require the expertise of the Telecom Management and Operations Committee (TMOC). The committees needing the input of TMOC will then assist TMOC in finding SMEs to work on these issues. If successful, this process will be extended to assist other non-service related committees in identifying work and resources.

The transition process has already begun for some of the committees.  All changes are targeted for January 1, 2010, although some committees may not meet until AMOC 2010.

**OBF Wireless Committee and Intermodal Subcommittee Update:**

**Wireless Committee:**

* Since the July 2009 LNPA WG meeting, the Wireless Committee held 3 interim conference calls.  One new issue is being worked to address a potential current interoperability problem and nine (9) new issues have been introduced to address changes associated with FCC Order 09-41.  All of these Issues have an Open status.

Issue 3344 - SPR1 Rules - This Issue addresses clarification regarding when new Service Providers can send a Supplement 1 to Cancel an existing port request and how the request version ID value should be validated.

Issue 3345 - Change WICIS 5.0.0 Sunrise date to accommodate new LNP FCC Order - This Issue addresses the need to modify the WICIS 5.0.0 sunrise date to allow additional WICIS changes required for FCC Order 09-41 to support 1 Business Day porting with standardized LSOG data elements.

Issue 3346 - Update WICIS Complex Port Definition/Information – This Issue was submitted in order to review WICIS section 5.2.1.3 that discusses complex ports.  It may be prudent to direct readers to other industry documentation that define simple and non-simple ports.

Issue 3347 - Change the name and address fields to be optional. (BILLFIRSTNM, BILLLASTNM, BUSNM, BILLSTNM, BILLSTNUM, COUNTRY, STATE) Also consider whether changes to ZIP CODE are needed.  This Issue was submitted to support changes to the LSR for REQTYP “C” (porting).  WICIS will need to allow submission of port requests from providers with optional name and address fields.  Also, the zip code field has different data characteristics between wireless and wireline documentation that needs to be addressed.

Issue 3348 - Change the AUTHNM and DATED fields to be optional – This Issue addresses the need to support changes to the LSR and REQTYP “C” (porting) so the AUTHNM and DATED fields can be optional.

Issue 3349 - LNUM correlation to PORTED\_NUM for intermodal ports – This Issue addresses a disparity between the way the LNUM data field is correlated to the PORTED\_NUM field in WICIS vs. LSOG.

Issue 3350 - SUP2 Prohibition on Intermodal Ports – This Issue was submitted in order to review the SUP2 process for Intermodal porting in WICIS due to the potential for interoperability issues with the current data rules.

Issue 3351 - Matching the Initiator field to Size/Data Type on the LSOG – This Issue addresses the disparity between LSOG and WICIS for the INIT field.  The field length on the LSR is 25 characters and it is only 15 in WICIS.

Issue 3352 - Prohibit the CHC field on Resolution Required Responses (Rejects) – This Issue was submitted in order to align the WICIS process for handling port requests involving coordinated hot cuts (CHC) with the LSOG.

Issue 3353 - Make Optional the Due Date & Time Field on Resolution Required Responses (Rejects) – This Issue was submitted in order to align the use of the Due Date and Time in the WICIS process with the LSOG.

* As the review of the differences between the LSOG and WICIS continues, it is expected that additional issues will be identified.  It is recognized that the WICIS Fax form will need to be updated with these changes as the Issues are worked to resolution.  The next OBF Wireless Committee meets on September 18th.  A face-to-face meeting is scheduled for September 29 – October 1 in Piscataway, NJ.  The Committee will be updating the WICIS document based on the resolutions to the above issues.

**Intermodal Subcommittee:**

* The Intermodal Subcommittee met on July 22nd and 23rd.  The meetings focused on clarification of data elements needed in the wireline process for proper wireless processing as well as those needed in the wireless process for proper wireline port processing.  These meetings have helped clarify the items that need to be addressed in the separate LSOP and Wireless Committees.  Some of the data elements that have been addressed are Old Network Service Provider (ONSP), Account Number (AN), Desired Due Date and Time (DDDT), Version (VER), Date and Time Sent (D\_TSENT), Release Version (RVER), Remarks and Zip Code.
* The Wireless Committee participants asked for clarification on how Name, Street Address, and State fields would be handled on simple ports.  It was agreed that if data is sent in optional data fields, the data characteristics of the element must be met, but the actual content of the data element will not be used for validation.
* The meeting on July 23rd was held with ATIS legal to help clarify FCC Order 09-41 and the FNPRM.  The next Intermodal meeting is scheduled for September 25th.

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

* Linda Peterman reported that the OBF LSOP Committee is continuing to work on Local Responses and is obtaining input from wireless carriers. The LSOP has worked through approximately half of the data fields in their effort to standardize.

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

* Adam Newman, Telcordia and INC Chair, reported out on the INC activities.
* There is currently one active INC issue related to work in the LNPA WG:
* INC Issue 649 – Update INC Documents for FCC 09-41 Order Reducing Simple Wireline and Intermodal Ports to One Business Day Interval

This is a placeholder issue for any guidelines changes in support of the Order.

* In Final Closure:
  + INC Issue 619 – Establish NPA Code Relief Implementation Practices to address the technical and customer education issues during the implementation of an NPA Split or an Overlay
  + INC Issue 626 – Check Porting on All Code Returns
  + INC Issue 644 – Remove exception for an additional LRN when a switch serves multiple NPAC regions

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. Contributions are being reviewed.
* A draft NANC report will be distributed to the industry before it goes to the NANC.
* The FoN determined by consensus to go back to the issues list and develop a work plan to get the issues moving again.

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.

* 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.



PIM 72 was accepted at the July 2009 LNPA WG meeting for further discussion.

Action Item 0709-01: Regarding the attached PIM 72, submitted by Qwest and accepted at the July 14-15, 2009 LNPA WG meeting, Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will develop a draft Best Practice for review and discussion at the September 2009 LNPA WG meeting.

The group reviewed BP 60 in the attached document and consensus was reached to approve its inclusion in the LNPA WG’s Best Practices document, with the one objection from Windstream. A provider stated that the New SP has an LOA to obtain the information from the Old SP.



* NEW PIM 73 – This PIM, submitted by Vonage, seeks to address instances where the porting customer, unaware that they do not need to and should not do so, requests that their service be disconnected by the Old SP.



During the discussion, Vonage stated that this scenario results in approximately 18% of their fallout. Vonage stated that this is being commented on by them in the FCC 09-41 FNPRM. Vonage was asked if they instruct their customers not to call the Old SP to disconnect their service prior to the port. In response, another provider stated that this proposal could place an unnecessary burden on the Old SP when the customer should be following instructions from New SP not to request a disconnect. Vonage stated that their proposal does not include disconnects for non-payment.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the Co-Chairs requested a show of hands as to which providers objected to accepting the proposed PIM 73. Objecting were:

* + Qwest
  + Integra
  + Townes
  + Verizon
  + AT&T
  + Brighthouse
  + Sprint Nextel
  + One Communications
  + JSI

It was determined that there was no consensus to accept PIM 73 for further discussion.

* NEW PIM 74 – This PIM, submitted by Syniverse, seeks to clarify the definition of “send” within the NANC LNP Provisioning Flows in the context of the Old SP providing a response (e.g., FOC, Reject) to the New SP in response to an LSR.



The Co-Chairs requested a show of hands as to which providers objected to accepting the proposed PIM 74. Objecting providers were:

* + Comcast
  + One Communications

No other providers present voiced an objection to the proposed PIM 74 and it was determined that there was consensus to accept PIM 74 for further discussion.

Change Management – NeuStar:

  

* It was agreed to move NANC 437 to the Accepted category.
* The group agreed to approve NANC 438 forward it to the NAPM LLC with a recommendation that a Statement of Work (SOW) be requested from NeuStar. Regarding the attached NANC Change Order 438, approved at the September 15-16, 2009 LNPA WG meeting, Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will draft and send an e-mail to the NAPM LLC Co-Chairs recommending implementation of this Change Order and that the NAPM LLC request a Statement of Work (SOW) from NeuStar.



* Doc Only NANC 439 – Due to the approval by the NAPM LLC of SOW 75 for “Elimination of Dial-Up Port to NPAC Network”, all existing dial-up access arrangements for NPAC LTI users is being eliminated. As such, the text in the FRS needs to remove all references to dial-up access.
* NANC 440, Medium Timers, was moved to the Accepted category on 9/15/09 (see attached Change Order above).
* NANC 441, Medium Timer Indicators, was moved to the Accepted category on 9/15/09 (see attached Change Order above).

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.

* Due to time constraints, it was agreed to place the SPID migration limitation discussion on the November 2009 LNPA WG meeting agenda. Action Item 0509-02 remains Open.

2009 Meeting/Call Schedule Review – All:



Discussion of Need for October 2009 Conference Calls – All:

* The group agreed to hold a conference call on Tuesday, October 6, 2009, from 10am to 4pm Eastern. The dial-in bridge number is 888-412-7808, pin 23272#. The agenda will consist of the following:
  + - Introductions/Agenda Review – All
    - Change Management – NeuStar
    - NANC 440
    - NANC 441
  + Proposed Text for FCC 09-41 Implementation Plan – Tiki Gaugler, XO Comm
  + Proposed Conflict Cause Value 51 Language – Gary Sacra, Verizon
  + 2010 LNPA WG Meeting/Conference Call Schedule – All
  + 2010 SPID Migration Blackout Date Schedule – All
  + Continuation of NANC 437 Issue Parking Lot Matrix Review – All

Review of September 1-2, 2009 LNPA WG Action Items:



**September 1-2, 2009 LNPA WG Action Items:**

* Item 090209-01: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 090209-02: This item remains Open.
* Item 090209-03: This item remains Open.
* Item 090209-04: This item remains Open.
* Item 090209-05: This item remains Open.
* Item 090209-06: This item remains Open.
* Item 090209-07: This item remains Open.

**September 1-2, 2009 APT Action Items:**

No APT Action Items were assigned at the September 1-2, 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.
* Item 0509-02: This item remains Open.
* Item 0709-01: This item has been completed and is Closed.

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

No Action Items remain open from previous APT meetings.

New/Unfinished Business (All):

* This agenda item was addressed earlier in the meeting.

***Next Conference Call …October 6, 2009: 10am – 4pm Eastern, 888-412-7808 PIN 23272#***

***Next Meeting …November 10-11, 2009: Location…Newport Beach, California***

***Hosted by NeuStar***