LNPA WORKING GROUP

October 19, 2009 Conference Call

Final Minutes

**MONDAY 10/19/09**

Monday, 10/19/09, Conference Call Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** |
| Mary Gail Sullivan | 360 Networks | Mubeen Saifullah | NeuStar Clearinghouse |
| Alissa Medley | ATIS | Shannon Sevigny | NeuStar Pooling |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | Linda Peterman | One Communications |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Mobility | Peggy Rubino | Paetec |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Mary Retka | Qwest |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T | Jan Doell | Qwest |
| Tracey Guidotti | AT&T | Towanda Russell | RCN |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T | Rosemary Emmer | Sprint Nextel |
| Barbara Hjelmaa | Brighthouse | Carol Frike | Sprint Nextel |
| Nancy Cornwell | Cellcom | Lavinia Rotaru | Sprint Nextel |
| Vicki Goth | Century Link | Sue Tiffany | Sprint Nextel |
| Tim Kagele | Comcast | Jeanne Kulesa | Synchronoss |
| Cindy Sheehan | Comcast | George Nesler | Synchronoss |
| Beth O’Donnell | Cox | Bob Bruce | Syniverse |
| Cary Hinton | D.C. PSC | Lisa Marie Maxson | Telcordia |
| Dennis Robins | DER-Consulting | Pat White | Telcordia |
| Greg Council | Evolving Systems | Joel Zamlong | Telcordia |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW | Adam Newman | Telcordia |
| Bonnie Johnson | Integra Telecom | John Malyar | Telcordia |
| Karen Hoffman | JSI | Stacy Hannah | Time Warner Cable |
| Bridget Alexander | JSI | Paula Jordan | T-Mobile |
| Angie Mackey | JSI | Mohamed Samater | T-Mobile |
| Sara Buyak | Missouri PSC | Amanda Molina | Townes Telecommunications |
| Lynette Khirallah | NetNumber | Heather Patterson | Transaction Network Services |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | David Lund | US Cellular |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar | Tanya Golub | US Cellular |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar  | Gary Sacra | Verizon |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Deb Tucker | Verizon Wireless |
| Ed Barker | NeuStar | Tana Henson | Windstream |
| Marybeth Degeorgis | NeuStar | Tiki Gaugler | XO Communications |
| Dave Garner | NeuStar | Dawn Lawrence | XO Communications |
|  |  |  |  |

NOTE: ALL ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “OCTOBER 19 2009 LNPA ACTION ITEMS” FILE ISSUED IN A SEPARATE E-MAIL FROM THESE MINUTES AND ATTACHED BELOW.

****

**OCTOBER 19, 2009 CONFERENCE CALL MINUTES:**

Change Management – NeuStar:

* NANC 440



* + NeuStar reviewed the change bars in the attached NANC 440 Change Order for the Medium Timers.
	+ In response to the 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? It was stated that leaving this optional is only detrimental to the provider that opts out, and not to other providers. It was decided to leave optional. Issue resolved.
* NANC 441



NOTE: As a follow-up to our 10/06/09 call, Service Providers are to determine if the NPAC functionality should be changed to accept Due Date mismatches in order for the Old SP to indicate use of Long Timers without being required to match the New SP’s shorter Due Date. In this instance, should the NPAC then defer to the Old SP’s mismatched Due Date?

* Two providers expressed concern that this is a fundamental change and questioned how it would get cascaded down to back-office OSSs. A provider stated that Conflict is existing functionality and not a dramatic change that allowing mismatches would drive. There were no objections to leaving the functionality as it is today, i.e., requiring the Due Dates to match.
	+ NeuStar reviewed the change bars in the attached NANC 441 Change Order for the Medium Timer Indicator.
* The Medium Timer Indicator will be ignored on intra-SP ports.
* If Medium Timers are being used, Medium Business Hours and Days must also be used.
* A provider requested to allow modification of the timer type indicator by providers. The scenario they cited was as follows:

The NSP submits their Create with Medium Timer Flag set to false with a Due Date of tomorrow - create sent at 5:00 pm. The NSP realizes they incorrectly set the Medium Timer Flag to false and need it to be True in order to meet the Midnight/Tomorrow Due Date immediately after sending the Create (The OSP is a carrier that does not send matching Creates).

In this scenario the timers will not expire in time for the carrier to take the customer at midnight on the Due Date as planned due to their mistake in setting the Medium Timer flag and there is no way for them to correct their mistake.

In the discussion that ensued, it was suggested that the indicator could be modified if only one provider, either Old SP or New SP, had sent in their Create. The New SP could not modify the indicator if the Old SP had sent up their Create. Race conditions and the fact that timer set has already started would have to be addressed.

The group agreed to schedule an additional conference call for Monday, November 2, 2009, from 2:30pm – 4:30pm Eastern, to finalize the discussion on whether or not to allow service providers to modify their timer indicator. The dial-in bridge number will be 888-412-7808, PIN 23272#.

NeuStar will revise the attached NANC Change Order 441 to reflect New SP and Old SP ability to modify their Medium Timer Indicator initially sent up over the interface in their respective Create messages to the NPAC. The revision will reflect that because the Old SP is in a position to determine if a port is simple, modify requests of the New SP Medium Timer Indicator will be supported from the New SP only until the Old SP sends their Create message. Modify requests of the Old SP Medium Timer Indicator from the Old SP will be supported until the port is activated. Modifies of the Old or New Medium Timer Indicator will cause a restart to T1 when the NPAC has received a create message from only one service provider. If both create messages have been received, T1 will not be restarted. After review on the November 2, 2009 LNPA WG conference call, if any of the above assumptions prove to be technically problematic, they will be revisited. **NeuStar will distribute the revised Change Order 441 by close of business on Wednesday, October 28, 2009.**

Service Providers are to come prepared to the November 2, 2009 LNPA WG conference call to determine if the attached NANC 441 Change Order will be modified to allow the New and Old SPs to modify the Medium Timer Indicator initially sent up in their respective Create messages to NPAC.

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

* Tiki Gaugler, XO Communications, teed up the discussion on XO’s proposed text for Figure 4, Step 3 of the NANC LNP Provisioning Flows Narratives. The proposed text is as follows:

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).

* A provider requested that “form” be added as defined by the OBF due to concerns that providers could interpret this to mean that they were free to use a custom non-standard form.
* Another provider stated that they do not believe this proposed text is consistent with the intent of the FCC order.
* A provider stated that this proposed text is consistent with current industry practice and did not have an issue with the proposal. The provider also stated that they would like to see this apply to the WICIS on wireless-to-wireless ports.is done today and no problem with proposal.
* Another provider stated that they do not think this is enforceable unless it goes through the NANC and FCC.
* A provider stated that they have issues with some providers that have specific requirements for e-mail subject lines when LSRs are e-mailed to the New SP.
* Another provider stated that they do not believe the intent of the FCC order is to say you can port on a next-day basis only if you submit the LSR electronically. Tiki Gaugler quoted FCC Order 09-41, paragraph 12, which states,

“12. In the *2007 LNP NPRM*, the Commission specifically sought comment on the benefits and burdens, including the burdens on small entities, of adopting porting interval rules for all types of simple port requests. A number of commenters representing small and rural provider interests argue that imposing a reduced porting interval on small and rural providers would place an undue burden on these providers and cause them economic harm. These commenters urge the Commission to leave the current porting intervals in place. We disagree. We believe that the benefits to consumers and competition discussed above outweigh the costs associated with implementing a shorter porting interval for simple wireline and simple intermodal ports. However, we recognize that some providers that do not employ automated systems for handling port requests and have limited resources to upgrade their systems may have to make more significant changes or upgrades than other providers that already employ automated porting interfaces. To address this disparity, we allow small providers, as defined below for purposes of this Report and Order, a longer period of time for implementing the porting interval of one business day. Thus, small providers are required to implement the reduced porting interval of one business day for simple wireline and simple intermodal ports no later than 15 months from the date that the NANC submits its revised provisioning flows to the Commission. For purposes of this Order, we consider providers with fewer than 2 percent of the nation’s subscriber lines installed in the aggregate nationwide and Tier III wireless carriers, as defined in the *E911 Stay Order*, to be small providers. We believe that

these categories encompass the providers whose systems will most likely require significant upgrades, and who also may have limited resources to make those upgrades. Thus, these providers may require the extended 15-month implementation period.”

* The Co-Chairs then canvassed the providers participating in the discussion by asking who objected to XO’s proposed text. Those objecting were:
	+ AT&T
	+ CenturyLink
	+ Comcast
	+ Sprint Nextel
	+ GVNW (but as written)
	+ Qwest (but as written)
	+ RCN (but as written)
	+ Verizon (but as written)
* It was agreed that XO would revise the proposed text based on the concerns expressed during the discussion and resubmit the proposal for review by the group.
* Tiki Gaugler, XO Communications, will work with Gary Sacra, Verizon, to revise the following proposed text to address concerns discussed on the October 19, 2009 conference call for review at the November 10-11, 2009 LNPA WG meeting. The revised text will be distributed prior to the November 10-11, 2009 meeting.

“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).”

* Service Providers are to come prepared to the November 10-11, 2009 LNPA WG meeting to review revisions to the following text proposed by XO Communications and to determine if it will be accepted. The following text will be revised to address concerns expressed on the October 19, 2009 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).”

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

* Gary Sacra, Verizon, teed up the discussion on Verizon’s proposed use of Conflict Cause Value 51 when the New SP has failed to comply with the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) sent by the Old SP. Verizon proposed the following use of Conflict Cause Value 51:

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 New SP has not complied with the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) returned by the Old SP and the following applies:

* + The Object Create Notification contains a Medium Timer Indicator set to True and contains a Due Date that differs from the Due Date on the Firm Order Confirmation.

Note that this does not apply for mutually agreed upon Due Date Changes.

* A provider asked if it would be more appropriate to change Cause Value 52 for Due Date Mismatches to have functionality equal to Cause Values 50 and 51, values for which only the Old SP can remove the Conflict status. Verizon responded that they may not use this for every Due Date mismatch, e.g., for Non-Simple Ports.
* The Co-Chairs then canvassed the providers participating in the discussion by asking who objected to Verizon’s proposal. Those objecting were:
	+ Comcast
* The Co-Chairs then canvassed the providers participating in the discussion by asking who supported Verizon’s proposal. Those supporting were:
	+ AT&T
	+ Integra
	+ Qwest
	+ RCN
	+ T-Mobile
	+ Verizon
	+ XO Communications
* It was determined that consensus had been reached for approval of Verizon’s proposal.

2010 LNPA WG Meeting/Conference Call Schedule – All:

* + - The group reviewed the attached 2010 LNPA WG meeting and conference call schedule.



Continuation of NANC 437 Issue Parking Lot Matrix Review – All:

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



* John Malyar and Lisa Marie Maxson, Telcordia, facilitated continued discussion of v14 of the NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Matrix attached above. The Status, Major Topic (including item classification), and Decisions/Recommendations/Discussion columns for Items 142 through 173 were reviewed for accuracy and revisions were made as determined by the group. Those revisions are reflected in v15 of the NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Matrix attached below and are identified with the date “10/19/09.”



* + - The current documentation for NANC 437 supports one Inter-NPAC LSMS

interface. Regarding the determination of how this interface will be sized and augmented if needed, LNPA WG Participants are to come to the November 10-11, 2009 meeting prepared to discuss if this analysis under various modeling assumptions will be done in the full LNPA WG or in a focused sub-team.

New Business – All:

* Jan Doell, Qwest, requested a waiver for a SPID migration on 12/13/09. There are already 25 migrations scheduled for that Sunday. It was asked if the pre-SPID migration process, involving deletes and adds of impacted SVs could be used. Jan agreed to check if this process could be done or, if not, she will bring the request for a SPID migration waiver back in for consideration.
* Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, requested a waiver for a possible emergency 11/1/09 SPID Migration to clean up some codes and blocks that should not have been migrated over the previous weekend. As a result, port requests are going to the wrong SPID. Deb explained that if a workaround cannot be identified, the SPID migration will be necessary.

Regarding Verizon Wireless’ request for approval for a November 1, 2009

SPID migration, Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, will provide the details, e.g., LRNs, impacted SVs, affected regions, etc., to the LNPA WG Co-Chairs for distribution to the group by close of business, Tuesday, October 20, 2009.

Regarding Verizon Wireless’ request for approval for a November 1, 2009

SPID migration, Service Providers are to review the migration details provided by Verizon Wireless and determine via feedback to the LNPA WG Co-Chairs by close of business on Thursday, October, 22, 2009, if they have any objections.

* Ron Steen, AT&T, request consideration for SPID migration blackout dates for 3/21/2010, 7/18/2010, and 11/14/2010 due to major system upgrades.

Regarding AT&T’s request for approval for SPID migration blackout dates of March 21, 2010, July 18, 2010, and November 14, 2010, Service Providers are to come prepared to the November 10-11, 2009 LNPA WG meeting to determine if the request will be approved.

Next LNPA WG Conference Call – All:

* + - The group agreed to schedule an additional conference call for Monday, November 2, 2009, from 2:30pm – 4:30pm 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
	+ New Business – All

***Next LNPA WG Conference Call … November 2, 2009, 2:30pm – 4:30pm Eastern … Bridge Number 888-412-7808, PIN 23272#***

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