LNPA WORKING GROUP

October 6, 2009 Conference Call

Final Minutes

**TUESDAY 10/06/09**

Tuesday, 10/06/09, Conference Call Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Yvonne Reigle | ATIS | Mary Conquest | | Nuvox |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | Linda Peterman | | One Communications |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Mobility | Peggy Rubino | | Paetec |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T | Mary Retka | | Qwest |
| Tracey Guidotti | AT&T | Jan Doell | | Qwest |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T | Matt Kohly | | Socket |
| Barbara Hjelmaa | Brighthouse | Rosemary Emmer | | Sprint Nextel |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LNP Consortium | Carol Frike | | Sprint Nextel |
| Vicki Goth | Century Link | Lavinia Rotaru | | Sprint Nextel |
| Tim Kagele | Comcast | Sue Tiffany | | Sprint Nextel |
| Bill Solis | Comcast | Bob Bruce | | Syniverse |
| Cindy Sheehan | Comcast | Lisa Marie Maxson | | Telcordia |
| Beth O’Donnell | Cox | Pat White | | Telcordia |
| Dennis Robins | DER-Consulting | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Greg Council | Evolving Systems | John Malyar | | Telcordia |
| Steve Farnsworth | Evolving Systems | Kayla Sharbaugh | | Telcordia |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW | Stacy Hannah | | Time Warner Cable |
| Bonnie Johnson | Integra Telecom | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Bridget Alexander | JSI | Mohamed Samater | | T-Mobile |
| Angie Mackey | JSI | Amanda Molina | | Townes Telecommunications |
| Lynette Khirallah | NetNumber | David Lund | | US Cellular |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Tanya Golub | | US Cellular |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Jason Lee | | Verizon |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Ed Barker | NeuStar | Darren Krebs | | Vonage |
| Marybeth Degeorgis | NeuStar | Tom Zablocki | | Vonage |
| Dave Garner | NeuStar | Tana Henson | | Windstream |
| Mubeen Saifullah | NeuStar Clearinghouse | Tiki Gaugler | | XO Communications |
| Shannon Sevigny | NeuStar Pooling | Dawn Lawrence | | XO Communications |
|  |  | Loriann Burke | | XO Communications |
|  |  |  | |  |

**OCTOBER 6, 2009 CONFERENCE CALL MINUTES:**

Change Management – NeuStar:



* The group reviewed NANC Change Orders 440 and 441, which provide for Medium Timers and a Medium Timer Indicator, respectively.
  + NANC 440
    - The group reviewed and discussed the Business Need. Although no LSMS impact has been identified, it was agreed to leave in the statement that reads, “These changes in the NPAC will also require changes in Service Provider local systems, e.g., SOA, LSMS, Operational Support Systems (OSSs), etc.”
    - Make SOA impact a “Y.”
    - It will be reflected that the Medium Conflict Restriction Window time of 21:00 is in the predominant time zone of the NPAC region.
    - A provider raised a concern about a 4-day Simple Port that is rescheduled for the day after the original due date and asked if that scenario would require restarting the T1/T2 timers. The answer was that it does not. Another provider asked if this would be considered a Supp or an Expedite. It was agreed that this scenario does not pose a timer issue, but we will discuss this in our Action Item on Supps (Action Item 090209-03).

* + - NeuStar will revise NANC 440 based on the discussion and send out to the group.
    - Open Question: Should SOAs be allowed to continue to optionally support Timer Type and Business Type, or should this be required to support this Change Order?

.

* + NANC 441
    - Regarding the question if we want to send this attribute on intra-SP ports, it was stated that timers are not applicable on intra-SP ports. It was agreed to have the NPAC ignore it on intra-SP ports.
    - The group then discussed whether or not to allow the NPAC to accept Due Date mismatches so that the Old SP did not have to insert a Due Date on their Create message that it did not agree with in order to indicate a different timer set than that indicated by the New SP. It was stated that the reason that a Due Date match was originally required was to make it further clear that it is the same pending SV that is being processed in the NPAC. Two providers expressed a concern with allowing Due Date mismatches and deferring to the Old SP’s Due Date in their Create with respect to a current bilateral agreement to allow activations on Due Date minus 1 (typically a Saturday). Allowing Due Date mismatches on an SV in the NPAC and deferring to the Old SP’s Due Date in their Create message would require the Old SP to do a Modify Pending to allow the New SP to activate a day early. It was agreed to maintain current NPAC functionality with regard to requiring Due Date matches on New SP and Old SP Create messages.
    - Prior to the 10/06/2009 conference call, the following request was submitted by AT&T and forwarded to the LNPA WG distribution list at AT&T’s request in order to tee up a discussion on whether to continue with development of a Medium Timer Indicator to indicate to the NPAC which timer set to use, or to have the NPAC utilize the Due Date in the Create message(s) to derive the timer set.
      * “Since the LNPA WG determined to pursue a "medium timer indicator" submitted via SOA to NPAC as opposed to a "time stamp/due date derived" approach where an NPAC algorithm determines, AT&T has assessed the likely effort to our enterprise.”
      * “Even though we initially had preference for the "time stamp/due date derived" approach for processing through NPAC, we did not take a position either way during the LNPA WG meeting where the "medium timer indicator" approach was agreed upon.”
      * “This approach was taken before Change Order requirements were available.  Since this review is now underway, AT&T believes this is the proper time to discuss.”
      * “During internal requirements discussions in the last two weeks, it has been estimated that our implementation

efforts are dramatically different depending on the approach taken.”

* “Where AT&T's internal implementation effort would be approximately $X with the “time stamp/due date derived” approach, it will be $3X-to-$5X using the “medium timer indicator” based on carrier selection.”
* “Additionally, AT&T believes that the risk involved with the “medium timer indicator” method is much greater due to the number of carrier and vendor systems that may have to be extensively modified to support this approach. Undoubtedly, the vendor will pass on this difference to users of those vendor products.”
* “Since this information was not available during the Philadelphia meeting, we were unable to present it at that time.”
* “AT&T asks the LNPA WG to reconsider its design decision in favor of the “time stamp/due date derived” approach.”

With regard to the discussion of NANC 441, which proposes the development of a Medium Timer Indicator for both the New and Old SP Create messages, and AT&T’s request for the LNPA WG to reconsider its design decision in favor of the “time stamp/due date-derived interval” approach (to indicate when NPAC is to trigger the medium timers), the following question was posed by the Co-Chairs to the Service Providers in attendance:

Do you support or object to moving forward with NANC 441 as it is currently designed to develop and implement the new Medium Timer Indicator attribute?

SUPPORT OBJECT

Brighthouse AT&T

JSI Century Link

One Communications Comcast

Qwest Sprint Nextel

T-Mobile XO Communications

Townes Communications

Verizon

Based on the group discussion and these responses, it was determined that there was no clear consensus to reconsider the LNPA WG’s current design direction in favor of a “time stamp/due date-derived interval” approach, as requested.

Proposed Text for FCC 09-41 Implementation Plan – Tiki Gaugler, XO Communications:

* + - The following text was proposed by XO Communications as a revision to Figure 4 Step 3 in the LNP Provisioning Flows Narratives:

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).

* + - Due to time constraints, it was agreed to defer discussion of this agenda item to the next LNPA WG conference call.

Proposed Conflict Cause Value 51 Language – Gary Sacra, Verizon:

* + - Due to time constraints, it was agreed to defer discussion of this agenda item to the next LNPA WG conference call.

2010 LNPA WG Meeting/Conference Call Schedule – All:

* + - The group determined the following schedule for the 2010 LNPA WG meetings and conference call:
  + January 12-13, 2010 face-to-face meeting
  + February 9, 2010 conference call
  + March 9-10, 2010 face-to-face meeting
  + April 13, 2010 conference call
  + May 11-12, 2010 face-to-face meeting
  + June 8, 2010 conference call
  + July 13-14, 2010 face-to-face meeting
  + August 10, 2010 conference call
  + September 14-15, 2010 face-to-face meeting
  + October 12, 2010 conference call
  + November 9-10, 2010 face-to-face meeting
  + December 7, 2010 conference call
* The following companies volunteered to host LNPA WG meetings in 2010:
  + NeuStar
  + Sprint Nextel
  + Comcast
  + Brighthouse/Syniverse
  + Telcordia
  + Tekelec
  + Canadian Consortium
* Paul LaGattuta, NeuStar, agreed to pull a conference call together among the volunteers to determine host locations. The call will take place on Tuesday, October 13, 2009, from 2:30 PM-3:30 PM Eastern. The bridge number is 866-858-8801, PIN 1023#.
* A provider proposed that the face-to-face meetings end on the 2nd day at 3pm local time. It was agreed to trial the earlier stop time as long as the agenda permitted.
* Subsequent to the October 6, 2010 LNPA WG conference call, the attached 2010 meeting/conference call scheduled was set.



2010 SPID Migration Blackout Date Schedule – All:

* The group determined the following schedule for the 2010 SPID Migration blackout dates:
  + January 3, 2010 (1st Sunday of the month)
  + January 17, 2010 (Martin Luther King Day)
  + February 7, 2010 (1st Sunday of the month)
  + February 14, 2010 (President’s Day)
  + March 7, 2010 (1st Sunday of the month)
  + April 4, 2010 (1st Sunday of the month and Easter)
  + May 2, 2010 (1st Sunday of the month)
  + May 30, 2010 (Memorial Day)
  + June 6, 2010 (1st Sunday of the month)
  + July 4, 2010 (1st Sunday of the month and Independence Day)
  + August 1, 2010 (1st Sunday of the month)
  + September 5, 2010 (1st Sunday of the month)
  + October 3, 2010 (1st Sunday of the month)
  + October **???**, 2010 (Placeholder for Industry Failover Exercise)
  + November 7, 2010 (1st Sunday of the month)
  + November 28, 2010 (Thanksgiving)
  + December 5, 2010 (1st Sunday of the month)
  + December 26, 2010 (Christmas)
* Continuation of NANC 437 Issue Parking Lot Matrix Review – All:

NOTE: We left off at Item 142 in the attached at the Philadelphia meeting.



* + - Due to time constraints, it was agreed to defer discussion of this agenda item to the next LNPA WG conference call.

Next LNPA WG Conference Call – All:

* + - The group agreed to schedule an additional conference call for Monday, October 19, 2009, from 11am – 4pm Eastern. The dial-in bridge number will be 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
  + Continuation of NANC 437 Issue Parking Lot Matrix Review – All
  + New Business – All

***Next LNPA WG Conference Call … October 19, 2009, 11am – 4pm Eastern … Bridge Number 888-412-7808, PIN 23272#***

***Next General LNPA WG Meeting …November 10-11, 2009, Newport Beach, California – Hosted by NeuStar***