LNPA WORKING GROUP

November 10-11, 2009 Meeting

Final Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Newport Beach, California | Host: NeuStar |

**LNPA WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION:**

**TUESDAY 11/10/09**

Tuesday, 11/10/09, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Yvonne Reigle | ATIS (phone) | Marcel Champagne | | NeuStar |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T (phone) | Dave Garner | | NeuStar |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Pamela Connell | | NeuStar |
| Tracey Guidotti | AT&T | Mubeen Saifullah | | NeuStar Clearinghouse |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T | Linda Peterman | | One Communications |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | Peggy Rubino | | Paetec (phone) |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Mobility | Mary Retka | | Qwest (phone) |
| Barbara Hjelmaa | Brighthouse Networks (phone) | Jan Doell | | Qwest (phone) |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian Consortium | Towanda Russell | | RCN (phone) |
| Vicki Goth | CenturyLink (phone) | Carol Frike | | Sprint Nextel (phone) |
| Tim Kagele | Comcast (phone) | Sue Tiffany | | Sprint Nextel |
| Cindy Sheehan | Comcast | Lavinia Rotaru | | Sprint Nextel |
| Jennifer Hutton | Cox (phone) | Bob Bruce | | Syniverse (phone) |
| Beth O’Donnell | Cox (phone) | Joel Zamlong | | Telcordia |
| Devang Naik | DSET | John Malyar | | Telcordia |
| Jim Seigler | DSET | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Greg Council | Evolving Systems | Pat White | | Telcordia |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW (phone) | Lisa Marie Maxson | | Telcordia |
| Bonnie Johnson | Integra | Kayla Sharbaugh | | Telcordia (phone) |
| Bridget Alexander | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Stacy Hannah | | Time Warner Cable (phone) |
| Karen Hoffman | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Angie Mackey | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Mohamed Samater | | T-Mobile |
| Lynette Khirallah | NetNumber (phone) | Heather Patterson | | TNS |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar (phone) | Tanya Golub | | US Cellular (phone) |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Jason Lee | | Verizon (phone) |
| Marybeth Degeorgis | NeuStar | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Randy Buffenbarger | NeuStar | Tom Zablocki | | Vonage (phone) |
| Michael O’Connor | NeuStar | Tana Henson | | Windstream (phone) |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Tiki Gaugler | | XO Comm. (phone) |
| Bill Reidway | NeuStar | Dawn Lawrence | | XO Comm. |
|  |  |  | |  |

NOTE: ALL ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “NOVEMBER 10-11 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 from 12:00pm noon to 5:00pm Eastern time, dial-in bridge number is 888-412-7808, pin 23272# |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

* 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.

August 11, 2009 Conference Call Minutes Review:

* No changes were made to the DRAFT August 11, 2009 LNPA WG conference call minutes and they were approved as FINAL.

August 12, 2009 Conference Call Minutes Review:

* No changes were made to the DRAFT August 12, 2009 LNPA WG conference call minutes and they were approved as FINAL.

August 25-26, 2009 Meeting Minutes Review:

* With the following change to the DRAFT August 25-26, 2009 LNPA WG meeting minutes, they were approved as FINAL.
  + In the highlighted text at the bottom of page 4, remove the word “in” from the 1st sentence.

September 1-2, 2009 Meeting Minutes Review:

* No changes were made to the DRAFT September 1-2, 2009 LNPA WG meeting minutes and they were approved as FINAL.

September 15-16, 2009 Meeting Minutes Review:

* No changes were made to the DRAFT September 15-16, 2009 LNPA WG meeting minutes and they were approved as FINAL.

October 6, 2009 Conference Call Minutes Review:

* With the following change to the DRAFT October 6, 2009 LNPA WG conference call minutes, they were approved as FINAL.
  + Add the following open question to the NANC 440 discussion on page 2:
    - 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?

October 19, 2009 Conference Call Minutes Review:

* With the following changes to the DRAFT October 19, 2009 LNPA WG conference call minutes, they were approved as FINAL.
  + In the NANC 441 discussion at the top of page 4, replace the text that reads,

“The revision will reflect that the indicator could only be modified if only one provider has sent a Create, the New SP could not modify the indicator if the Old SP has sent up their Create, and the T1/T2 timers will be restarted by the NPAC if the indicator is modified.”, with the following text:

“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.”

* + Remove the 1st instance of the word “only” in the bullet at the top of page 5.

November 2, 2009 Conference Call Minutes Review:

* With the following change to the DRAFT November 2, 2009 LNPA WG conference call minutes, they were approved as FINAL.
  + In the New Business section on page 4, change the 4th sentence in the 1st bullet related to the Qwest SPID migration request to read, “Jan reported that there is one involved LRN with one ported-in number and 7 NPA-NXX’s with 1,657 associated ported-out affected numbers in the Western Region.”

FCC Order 09-41 Implementation Discussion – All:

* NANC Implementation Plan Status Readout – Gary Sacra and Paula Jordan, LNPA WG Co-Chairs:
* Gary Sacra and Paula Jordan, LNPA WG Co-Chairs, provided a brief status of the LNPA WG’s FCC 09-41 Implementation Plan to the group, reporting that the NANC submitted the plan to the FCC as a NANC-approved consensus document with the exception of the OBF’s recommended list of 14 standard LSR data elements. The OBF’s recommended list of 14 standard LSR data elements were also submitted by the NANC to the FCC in the form of a “non-consensus recommendation” stating that it was supported by the majority of NANC members but was not able to be adopted at a publicly-noticed meeting of the full NANC due to time constraints.
* Comcast stated their objection to the process that was followed in the LNPA WG to reach consensus and approve the 14 fields recommended by the OBF. Comcast stated that they felt that there was not enough time allotted to review the OBF’s recommendation. Comcast requested that their objection be placed in the minutes. The LNPA WG Co-Chairs stated that the short timeframe for review and feedback was due to the NANC directive at their October 15, 2009 meeting to the OBF to revisit the original list of 21 recommended data elements and determine if the OBF could reach consensus on a revised list in time for submission to the FCC with the LNPA WG’s Implementation Plan.

A provider stated that they felt that the objection was out of order and should not be placed in previous meeting minutes since it was not read into the record during those meetings. Qwest, AT&T, and Verizon objected to putting this in the minutes. The Co-Chairs stated that it would be placed in these meeting minutes since it was a part of the current meeting’s discussion. Comcast provided the following objection to be placed into the minutes:

“Comcast objects to the LNPA-WG process used to determine consensus on the OBF’s recommended “required” LSR fields for Simple Ports.   Objection is based on insufficient time provided to the LNPA- WG members and lack of open discussion within the LNPA-WG on the necessity of each OBF recommended LSR required data field.”

AT&T, Qwest, Sprint Nextel, T-Mobile, and Verizon stated that they believed the proper process was followed.

* The implementation dates the LNPA WG is assuming for FCC 09-41 are August 2, 2010 (for larger carriers) and February 2, 2011 (for smaller carriers).
  + - * + NANC 440 and 441 Change Order Review (Action Item 110209-01) – NeuStar:

Action Item110209-01: NeuStar will revise the attached NANC Change Orders 440 and 441 to reflect the changes agreed upon on the November 2, 2009 LNPA WG conference call. They will be distributed prior to the November 10-11, 2009 LNPA WG meeting.

 

* NeuStar reviewed the change bars in NANC 440 and NANC 441 with the group.

 

* A provider questioned the following in NANC 441 stating a concern the Old SP could delay the port:

Modify requests from the Old SP for the Old SP Medium Timer Indicator will be supported until the port is activated.

It was stated that in this case, the Old SP has already concurred and the T1/T2 timers are off the table. The provider expressing the concern stated that they were comfortable with that.

* It was suggested to move NANC 416 up from Release 3.4 and implement it with NANCs 440 and 441. NANC 416 adds Timer Type and Business Type attributes to the BDD file and is needed for recovery. Evolving Systems and Telcordia agreed NANC 416 was necessary. There were no objections to sending NANC 416, NANC 440, and NANC 441 to the NAPM LLC with a recommendation that they request an SOW for all three Change Orders together. Regarding the attached NANC Change Orders 440 and 441, developed in support of FCC Order 09-41 and approved at the November 10-11, 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 these Change Orders, in addition to NANC 416, and that the NAPM LLC request a Statement of Work (SOW) from NeuStar.

 

NeuStar stated that this will be Release 3.3.4.

* Action Item 110209-01 was closed.
  + - * + Identification of Small Providers Taking Extra 6 Months – All:
* This item was placed on the agenda in order to tee up discussion on possible ways to identify which carriers will implement FCC 09-41 within the 9 month period, and which will implement within the 15 month period.
* It was suggested that the LNPA WG could ask which carriers are going to implement in 9 months via the distribution list.
  + - Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will send out a request over the LNPA WG distribution list asking Service Providers to self-identify whether or not they plan to implement FCC 09-41 by the 9 month implementation date of August 2, 2010.
* Another suggestion was to use the NPAC’s SP Profile to identify when carriers indicate support of the Medium Timer Indicator.
  + - Regarding the identification of Service Providers who will not be implementing FCC Order 09-41 within the 9 month implementation deadline for larger Service Providers (i.e., those smaller Service Providers who will be implementing within the 15 month implementation deadline for smaller Service Providers), the LNPA WG discussed the feasibility of having NeuStar indicate when Service Providers have their SP Profile in NPAC changed to reflect their support of the new Medium Timer Indicator. It was suggested that NeuStar could then build and maintain a table on the NPAC secure website reflecting each Service Provider’s current status with regard to the Medium Timer Indicator as an indication as to whether or not a particular Service Provider was ready to support one-day porting. Once a Service Provider requests a profile change with NeuStar, NeuStar would verify that the Service Provider has completed the necessary testing and then change their profile and reflect the change in the list of supporting Service Providers on the NPAC secure website. Since the SP Profile settings are not something that NeuStar currently divulges to other Service Providers, Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will send a request to the NAPM LLC that NeuStar be requested to provide these specific profile changes via the secure website.
    - NeuStar will investigate internally if they can legally provide the SP Profile settings related to support of the new Medium Timer Indicator for Service Providers on the NPAC secure website. NeuStar stated that when a profile change is viewed on the website, it will be in the NPAC SP Profile.

NOTE: NeuStar subsequently reported during the meeting that their internal legal review indicated that they can provide the SP Profile settings related to support of the new Medium Timer Indicator for Service Providers on the NPAC secure website as long as they were requested to do so by the NAPM LLC.

* + - It was suggested that it would be a good idea to send out a reminder periodically over the X-Regional to pull the list from the secured website.
    - A provider asked if a provider could change their mind before implementation because they are not required to go August 2, 2010. Providers can change their profile and they would be taken off the list, but this would not affect any ports in the pipe. All profiles will be set in the maintenance window prior to the implementation deadline.
    - It was asked if carriers do not notify NeuStar by February 2, 2011 if the SP Profile will automatically be set. Answer is that carriers must request a profile change.
* There were no objections to the plan described in the previous bullets above.
* A provider asked if the reciprocity statement put in the flows as part of the LNPA WG’s FCC 09-41 Implementation Plan means that a provider can reject a one day interval request if the other provider does not support the shortened interval in the other direction. The group agreed that this is consistent with the intent of the statement in the flows.
  + - * + Industry Implementation Timeline (Standing Agenda Item) – All:
* No updates at this time. Will remain a standing agenda item.
  + - * + Proposed Text for FCC 09-41 Implementation Plan (Action Items 091509-04 and 101909-02 and 101909-06) – Tiki Gaugler, XO Communications:

The most current version of the proposed text is as follows:

“The NNSP notifies the ONSP of the port using the wireline LSR process and form as defined by the Ordering & Billing Forum (OBF) and sends the information using a transmission method accepted by the ONSP (i.e., via an electronic gateway, FAX, email, or manual means).  The ONSP shall provide reasonable notice of changes in the transmission method accepted to receive LSRs. The LSR process and form is defined by the Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF) and the electronic interface by the Telecommunications Industry Forum (TCIF).”

Action Item 091509-04: 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 THE REVISED TEXT ABOVE PRIOR TO THE ACTION ITEM. THAT IS THE LATEST VERSION.**

Action Item 101909-02: 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. See related Action Item 101909-06.

“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 THE REVISED TEXT ABOVE PRIOR TO THE ACTION ITEMS. THAT IS THE LATEST VERSION.**

Action Item 101909-06: 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. See related Action Item 101909-02.

“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 THE REVISED TEXT ABOVE PRIOR TO THE ACTION ITEMS. THAT IS THE LATEST VERSION.**

* Tiki Gaugler, XO Communications, stated that this proposal is intended to address Simple Ports.
* It was stated that TCIF is no longer an ATIS committee. Its work related to the electronic interface is now addressed in the OBF.
* A provider asked why this is being brought into the LNPA WG. The provider further stated that they do not think this was the FCC’s intent. In response, it was pointed out that the FCC order requires SPs to upgrade systems to support a one day interval, and why would it not be expected that other providers would use those systems in order to request a one-day port interval. It was stated that this could necessitate reopening trading profiles. XO Communications stated that this is simply memorializing what is done today in the industry and that they do not believe the FCC thought business as usual was sufficient to accomplish one-day ports.
* Another provider asked how SPs will notify others which transmission methods they will accept. It was stated that this notification happens today.
* A concern was expressed that if a system goes down, the New SP would be blocked from submitting LSRs. It was stated that this can happen today.
* AT&T briefly discussed the attached PIM 76 suggesting a Best Practice for a minimum of 30 day notification. In some cases, they are only getting about 7 days notice when carriers turn up a GUI. This will be discussed in more detail during the PIM portion of the meeting.



* A provider stated that they were ok with the wording of the proposed text as is but is not ok with an assumption that this is intended to mean that one-day porting will not be accepted. The provider cited FCC Order 03-237, paragraph 24:

“Although our rules allow carriers to determine on their own what type of

agreement to use to facilitate porting and ensure efficient exchange of information, we are concerned about delays in implementation that could result from uncertainty regarding baseline requirements for porting or from carriers’ inability to reach agreements. In light of these concerns, we find it appropriate to address how porting should be implemented in cases where carriers cannot reach agreement. As stated above, the number portability rules require carriers to port upon receipt of a request from another carrier to do so. Under this requirement, in cases where carriers are not able to reach agreement, carriers must port numbers upon request, with no conditions. Absent an agreement setting additional terms, carriers need only share basic contact and technical information sufficient to perform the port. We trust that by clarifying this default requirement, we will eliminate uncertainty and provide an incentive for carriers to reach

agreement quickly. Moreover, this requirement will ensure that carrier negotiations do not delay the availability of portability for consumers, while permitting carriers the flexibility to negotiate porting agreements that meet their particular needs.”

* The following questions were asked by the Co-Chairs:

“Who objects to accepting this wording as a Best Practice to be submitted to NANC with a request to be forwarded to the FCC?”

Objecting were:

* + - Comcast
    - Cox
    - JSI
    - Qwest
    - RCN
    - Sprint Nextel

“Who supports accepting this wording as a Best Practice to be submitted to NANC with a request to be forwarded to the FCC?”

Supporting were:

* + - XO
    - Verizon
* The Co-Chairs determined that there was no consensus to support the proposed text. All Action Items related to this were closed.
  + - * + Next Step for Approved Conflict Cause Value 51 Language – Gary Sacra, Verizon
* The following text, proposed by Verizon, was approved by the LNPA WG on the October 19, 2009 conference call. This agenda item was requested by Verizon to determine the next step for the approved language, which is:

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.

* There were no objections to Verizon’s suggestion that a Best Practice be developed consistent with this language. Gary Sacra, Verizon, will draft a related proposed Best Practice for review and discussion at the January 2010 LNPA WG meeting.

NANC 437 Review Parking Lot Review – All:

(NOTE: We left off at Item 174 on the October 19, 2009 call)



* Telcordia and the group completed the first pass review of the attached NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot matrix. This first pass was performed in order to verify the status and major topic classification of each Parking Lot item. The group then began the next pass through the open items in order to begin the process of identifying which will be candidates for a deeper dive analysis. The group began with the open M&P items, progressing through Item 0033. It was agreed that the discussion would continue on Wednesday. Note that all revisions made during this meeting are reflected in v16 of the document attached below during the Wednesday discussion.

##### LNPA WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION:

**WEDNESDAY 11/11/09**

Wednesday, 11/11/09, Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Mubeen Saifullah | | NeuStar Clearinghouse |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | Linda Peterman | | One Communications |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Mobility | Peggy Rubino | | Paetec (phone) |
| Barbara Hjelmaa | Brighthouse Networks (phone) | Mary Retka | | Qwest (phone) |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian Consortium | Jan Doell | | Qwest (phone) |
| Tim Kagele | Comcast (phone) | Towanda Russell | | RCN (phone) |
| Cindy Sheehan | Comcast | Sue Tiffany | | Sprint Nextel |
| Jennifer Hutton | Cox (phone) | Lavinia Rotaru | | Sprint Nextel |
| Devang Naik | DSET | George Nessler | | Synchronoss (phone) |
| Jim Seigler | DSET | Bob Bruce | | Syniverse (phone) |
| Greg Council | Evolving Systems | Ramesh Chellamani | | Tekelec (phone) |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW (phone) | Joel Zamlong | | Telcordia |
| Bonnie Johnson | Integra | John Malyar | | Telcordia |
| Bridget Alexander | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Karen Hoffman | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Pat White | | Telcordia |
| Angie Mackey | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Lisa Marie Maxson | | Telcordia |
| Lynette Khirallah | NetNumber (phone) | Kayla Sharbaugh | | Telcordia (phone) |
| Paul LaGattuta | NeuStar (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Jim Rooks | NeuStar | Mohamed Samater | | T-Mobile |
| Stephen Addicks | NeuStar | Heather Patterson | | TNS |
| Marybeth Degeorgis | NeuStar | David Lund | | US Cellular (phone) |
| Michael O’Connor | NeuStar | Tanya Golub | | US Cellular (phone) |
| John Nakamura | NeuStar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Bill Reidway | NeuStar | Jason Lee | | Verizon (phone) |
| Marcel Champagne | NeuStar | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Dave Garner | NeuStar | Tom Zablocki | | Vonage (phone) |
| Ed Barker | NeuStar (phone) | Alan Everett | | Windstream (phone) |
| Shannon Sevigny | NeuStar Pooling (phone) | Dawn Lawrence | | XO Comm. |
|  |  |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

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

* Telcordia and the group continued the second pass review of the NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot matrix, continuing with the open M&P items. All revisions to the document are captured in the attached v16 and are identified with either the date 11/10/09 or 11/11/09.



* Regarding NANC 437, NeuStar will compile a list of current Methods & Procedures (M&Ps) that may require inter-NPAC communication.
* Regarding the attached NANC 437 Issue Parking Lot Matrix, LNPA WG Participants are to come prepared to the December 8, 2009 conference call to identify which Open and Pending items require deeper dive analysis. The deeper dive analysis for identified items will begin at the January 2010 meeting.
* Action Item 101909-04 – All:

Action Item 101909-04: 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.

* Action Item 101909-04 remains open.
* High-Level Review of Operational Issues List – NeuStar



* NeuStar briefly reviewed the attached list of their identified operational issues. They were asked and agreed to number each issue in the document for easier reference to any open item in the NANC 437 Issue Parking Lot Matrix. It was agreed that this document will be reviewed and discussed in more detail at the January 12-13, 2010 LNPA WG meeting.
* Review NANC 437 Next Steps – All:



* The LNPA WG Co-Chairs reviewed the attached draft straw proposal of a sequential list of next steps for NANC 437. There were no objections or suggested revisions at this time and it was agreed to follow this path forward unless revised at a later time.

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

**Wireless Committee:**

* Since the September 2009 LNPA WG meeting, the Wireless Committee met face-to face and held several interim conference calls.  One new issue was worked to address a potential interoperability problem and seventeen (17) new issues were introduced to address changes associated with FCC Order 09-41.  Nine (9) of these issues are in Final Closure, eight (8) are in Initial Closure and one (1) is still open.
* Issue 3344 - SPR1 Rules - This Issue intends to clarify 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.  This Issue is in Initial Closure.
* Issue 3345 - Change WICIS 5.0.0 Sunrise date to accommodate new LNP FCC Order - The wireless committee agreed to the Sunrise date of June 6, 2010 for 5.0.0 and a Sunset date of February 13, 2011 for 4.0.0. WICIS volumes 1, 2, 3 and the Supplemental Document for Fax Transmissions will be updated to reflect these dates.  This Issue is in Initial Closure.
* Issue 3346 - Update WICIS Complex Port Definition/Information – This Issue was submitted in order to review the WICIS section (5.2.1.3) that discusses complex ports.  Readers are directed to other industry documentation that define simple and non-simple ports.  Final Closure 11/6/2009.
* Issue 3347 - Change the name and address fields to be optional. (BILLFIRSTNM, BILLLASTNM, BUSNM, BILLSTNM, BILLSTNUM, COUNTRY, STATE).  In order to be in alignment with LSOG REQTYPE C changes, the Wireless Committee agreed to change the data rules for BILLFIRSTNM, BILLLASTNM, BUSNM, BILLSTNM, BILLSTNUM, CITY, COUNTRY, and STATE. WICIS VOL 2, VOL 3 and WICIS FAX Documentation will be updated to reflect the change to OPTIONAL for each of these fields. Final Closure 11/6/2009.
* Issue 3348 - Change the AUTHNM and DATED fields to be optional – In order to be in alignment with the LSOG REQTYPE C changes, the Wireless Committee agreed to change the data rules for AUTHNM and DATED.  WICIS Volume 2 and WICIS FAX Documentation will be updated to reflect the change to OPTIONAL for each of these fields. Final Closure 11/6/2009.
* Issue 3349 - LNUM correlation to PORTED\_NUM for intermodal ports – The wireless committee agreed to eliminate the LNUM completely in WICIS 5.0.0 thus creating a number of changes in Volume 1, Volume 2, Volume 3, Fax Form, Supplemental document for fax transmissions and in the implementation guideline.  This Issue is in Initial Closure.
* Issue 3350 - SUP2 Prohibition on Intermodal Ports – The wireless committee agreed to update the WICIS documentation in Volume 2 as well as the implementation guideline to reflect their decision of prohibiting a SUP Type 2 when NPDI=C (wireline to wireless port). In addition, a notation will be made in the implementation guide mapping a SUP 2 received from wireline carriers into a SUP 3 for wireless carriers.  Final Closure 11/6/2009.
* Issue 3351 - Matching the Initiator field to Size/Data Type on the LSOG – After consideration, the Wireless Committee agreed to expand the size of the INIT field to 25.  Appropriate changes were made in Volume 2 (Data Dictionary).  Final Closure 11/6/2009.
* Issue 3352 - Prohibit the CHC field on Resolution Required Responses (Rejects) – The Wireless Committee agreed to making the CHC field prohibited on all WPRR-Resolution Required Responses and also prohibited on a Confirmation when the NSP has sent a SUP2 or 3 with CHC not-populated. Appropriate changes were made in WICIS Volume 2 and 3 to reflect this. This Issue is in Initial Closure.
* Issue 3353 - Make Optional the Due Date & Time Field on Resolution Required Responses (Rejects) – After evaluating the issue, the committee agreed to make the DD\_T Field optional on a Resolution Required Response.  Appropriate changes were made in Volume 2 and Volume 3 to reflect it being optional on the WPRR-Resolution Required Response.  Final Closure 11/6/2009.
* Issue 3355 - Update Version ID Field Rules.  In order to be in alignment with the LSOG REQTYPE C changes, the Wireless Committee agreed to update WICIS volume 2 and WICIS FAX Documentation and change valid values for the VER\_ID\_REQ and VER\_ID\_RESP data elements to be 00 – 99.  Final Closure 11/6/2009.
* Issue 3358 - Resolution Required Code to be used when receiving non-simple port request rejection from wireline carriers.  The committee agreed to use RCODE "1C" to indicate when a non-simple port request is rejected from wireline carriers.  To reduce confusion for backward compatibility issues related to the elimination of RCODEs "6H" and "6J", the previous decision to replace these two codes with RCODE "1C" was changed to use RCODE "1L" instead.  Final Closure 11/6/2009.
* Issue 3359 - Response Type XSD Correction. The Wireless Committee agreed to add “J” for Jeopardy to the enumerated list of values for Response Type (RT) in UOM-ICP-Base.xsd (WICIS Volume 3, section 5.1.1).  Final Closure 11/6/2009
* Issue 3360 - Backward Compatibility.  The Wireless Committee will provide industry guidelines for the operational handling and mapping between WICIS 5.0 and WICIS 4.0 for backward compatibility, as documented in the suggested solution. These guidelines will appear in WICIS 5.0.0, Volume 2, Appendix A.  This Issue is in Initial Closure.
* Issue 3361 - OLSP, NLSP, NRSELLNM, ORSELLNM, RESP\_NO - In order to be in alignment with the LSOG REQTYPE C changes, the Wireless Committee agreed to change the data rules for NLSP, NRSELLNM, OLSP, ORSELLNM and RESP\_NO. WICIS Volume 2, Volume 3 and WICIS FAX Documentation will be updated to reflect the data rule changes for each of these fields.  This Issue is in Initial Closure.
* Issue 3364 - NPQTY - In order to be in alignment with LSOG REQTYPE C changes the Wireless Committee agreed to change the data rules for NPQTY. WICIS VOL 2, VOL 3 and WICIS FAX Documentation will be updated to reflect the change to OPTIONAL for this field.  This Issue is in Initial Closure.
* Issue 3365 - INIT and IMPCON - In order to be in alignment with LSOG REQTYPE C changes the Wireless Committee agreed to change the data rules for IMPCON and INIT. WICIS VOL 2, VOL 3 and WICIS FAX Documentation will be updated to reflect the change to OPTIONAL for these fields.  This Issue is in Initial Closure.
* Issue 3366 - Fax forms - The Wireless fax forms that were published with WICIS 3.1.0 are being revised to incorporate the changes associated with FCC Order 09-41.
* The OBF Wireless Committee meets next on November 20th.

**Intermodal Subcommittee:**

* The Intermodal Subcommittee met on September 25th, October 19th, and October 22nd.  The meetings focused on clarification of data elements needed in the intermodal porting process in order to develop a common and standard set of fields to use in the OBF LSOP recommendation to the LNPA WG for FCC Order 09-41.  The sub-committee also met to carefully evaluate and reach agreement on a reduction to the list of 21 required fields to 14 on the updated LSR as a result of the October 15th NANC meeting.  It was clarified that the reduced list of 14 fields would need to be augmented with additional information to accomplish non-simple ports.
* No future meetings are scheduled at this time.

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

* Linda Peterman reported that the OBF LSOP Committee is continuing to work on Issue 3307, standardization for Req Type C. Current plans are to publish the document in 1Q2010 and it will be available free of charge.
* With regard to the original 21 LSR data elements recommended by the OBF, these fields would have supported both Simple and Non-Simple Ports. The revised recommendation of 14 fields are for Simple Ports.
* It was stated that without a mandated standard for LSR data fields, one-day porting will be jeopardized.
* Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, has been elected Co-Chair of the overall OBF.
* Paula Jordan, T-Mobile, thanked the OBF for their efforts in standardizing the LSR data elements.

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

* Adam Newman, Telcordia and INC Chair, reported out on the INC activities.
* 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 FCC Order 09-41.

* INC Issue 651 – open issue – Create Ability in Guidelines for Returns/Reorders – SPs are not able to assign TNs in block for 6 month timeframe. Today, they have to take block out and put it back in industry databases, e.g., NPAC. This issue seeks to avoid that.
* INC Issue 657 – Update NPAC Broadcast Rates – relates to maximum broadcast rates for pooled blocks in a region. This issue will update language in Guidelines.
* INC Issue 663 – Check Porting on Block Donations – PA has done scrubs with PA database and NPAC and determined that blocks are being donated to pool with >10% contamination. This issue was submitted to allow PA to check for contamination. LLC approval is required. The PA does the check today for returns but not for donations.
* New INC Issue 664 – Review NPA Allocation Guidelines to Consider NPA Sharing to New NANP Entrants – a new NANP entrant is generally a country.

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 report is planned for February 2010 to be circulated among industry groups for comment.
* The FoN determined by consensus to go back to the issues list and develop a work plan to get the issues moving again.
  + FTN 001 – New & Future Services: The FoN is refreshing this work for a more definitive path forward.
  + FTN 002 – Telematics and the use of NANP numbers: On their last call, the FoN discussed what work group is interested in continuing this issue. There is interest in continuing the work. There is an action item to revise and redistribute a path forward.
  + FTN 004 – Geographic Nature of Numbers: This issue has been accepted. It addresses how the geographic nature of numbers has changed over time.

Inter-carrier Testing Subcommittee Reformation (Teresa Patton, AT&T):

* Teresa Patton, AT&T, teed up a discussion on the need for inter-carrier testing for FCC Order 09-41 implementation and the possibility of reopening the LNPA WG’s Inter-carrier Testing Subcommittee.
* Teresa stated that she would volunteer to Co-Chair the Subcommittee and would like a wireline Co-Chair. Bridget Alexander, JSI, volunteered from the wireline community to Co-Chair.
* Bob Bruce, Syniverse, volunteered to participate.
* It was agreed that there is also a need to include inter-modal testing.
* There were no objections to reforming the Subcommittee for this purpose.

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 NPAC Software Release 3.4.

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 NPAC Software Release 3.4.

* 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 NPAC Software Release 3.4.

* 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.

At the September 2009 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.



At the November 2009 meeting, agreement was reached to close PIM 72 as a result of the approved Best Practice 60.

* 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.



PIM 74 was accepted for further discussion at the September 2009 LNPA WG meeting.

The following bullets capture the discussion that took place at the November 2009 LNPA WG meeting.

* + - Bob Bruce, Syniverse, presented the attached PIM 74. He stated that there is not always a way for the New SP of knowing that a 2nd response, such as a Jeopardy after the FOC, has been posted on a GUI and the New SP has to look up on the GUI to see if a response is there. The PIM is seeking a Best Practice or a change to the porting flows that states the Old SP must physically send the FOC to the New SP.
    - A provider asked if there are cases where a provider can see postings for other providers. A provider that does post their FOCs to their GUI stated that they do not allow providers to view other providers’ FOCs, stating that it would likely be a CPNI violation to do so.
    - Another provider asked if a provider offers an alternative means of communication that does result in the sending of an FOC, such as EDI, in addition to their GUI, does this meet the spirit of the PIM. Bob Bruce, submitter of the PIM, answered yes.
    - In response to a question from a provider, Bob Bruce responded that an e-mail message that the FOC was available on the Old SP’s GUI would also be acceptable in order to satisfy the PIM. In voicing an objection to the PIM, a provider stated that they have been voluntarily offering next day porting for years now and their method is to post the FOC on their GUI. That provider further stated that they have not experienced any problems.
    - A provider expressed a concern about any method of transmission that treats FOCs differently. Another provider expressed concern that enforcement of this PIM could force providers to eliminate existing means of transmission. Bob Bruce stated that it is very important to get the FOC or a notice that it has been posted in a timely manner in order to accomplish next day porting. A provider stated that with no other option of transmission to offer, providers should send an e-mail when they post the FOC.
    - It was stated that the flows currently say “send” and a clarification is needed in a Best Practice that “sends” does not mean the FOC is posted on a GUI with no notification of its availability. A provider questioned whether it is within the purview of the LNPA WG to define the word “sends.”
    - Regarding the attached PIM 74, Bob Bruce, Syniverse, will draft a related

proposed LNPA WG Best Practice for review and discussion at the January 2010 meeting.

* NEW PIM 75 – This PIM, submitted by Integra, seeks to clarify the LNPA WG’s recommended requirement that a provider cannot use a provider-assigned pass code/PIN as LSR validation or require the pass code/PIN to obtain a CSR.



Bonnie Johnson, Integra, presented PIM 75 which suggests a revision to Best Practice 60 to state: “It is the position of the LNPA WG that only pass codes/PINs requested and assigned by the End User for the purposes of limiting or preventing activity and changes to their account (and not, for example, a password or PIN the end user uses to access their on-line or account information (CPNI) or the PIN used to activate a wireless phone at the time of purchase) may be utilized as an End User validation field on an incoming port request by the Old Network Service Provider/Old Local Service Provider.  In addition, any service provider assigned pass code/PIN may not be utilized as a requirement in order to obtain a Customer Service Record (CSR). This Best Practice applies to all ports (not just simple ports).”

* + - Verizon Wireless, T-Mobile, and AT&T Mobility stated that they use a pin for activation of handsets for porting pre-paid accounts.
    - Regarding the attached PIM 75, Bonnie Johnson, Integra, will draft a revision to the PIM for review and discussion at the January 2010 meeting.
* NEW PIM 76 – This PIM, submitted by AT&T, seeks to address instances where service providers make changes to their systems or processes without adequate notification to other service providers who interface with them.



AT&T presented the attached PIM 76 at the November 2009 LNPA WG meeting, which suggests a minimum of 30 days notification when providers plan system and process changes that would require other providers to make system or process changes on how they interface with them.

A provider stated that they felt the PIM was overly broad and not clear on when notifications are necessary and what specific problem it is trying to solve. The provider stated that they make changes that they do not feel are major changes and do not warrant industry notification.

Another provider disagreed with the suggested 30 day notification and suggested it should be 10 days. Another provider suggested it should be 45 days and asked that it be considered.

The following question was posed to the participating service providers:

* Who objects to accepting PIM 76 to work?

Objecting were:

* + Comcast
  + Windstream

The Co-Chairs determined that consensus was reached to continue to work PIM 76.

It was suggested that AT&T reference PIM 62 (Best Practice 53) which addresses industry notification for planned porting outages due to service provider maintenance.

Election of LNPA WG Co-Chairs – All:

* Gary Sacra and Paula Jordan, LNPA WG Co-Chairs, opened the floor up for nominations for any of the 3 Co-Chair positions (RBOC, Wireless Carrier, CLEC). No nominations were presented and it was agreed that Gary and Paula would continue as the Co-Chairs of the LNPA WG, filling the RBOC and Wireless Carrier Co-Chair positions, respectively. Nominations for the vacant CLEC Co-Chair position were encouraged at any time.

Change Management (Action Item 110209-02) – NeuStar:

Action Item 110209-02: In response to a concern and question raised by a carrier on the November 2, 2009 LNPA WG conference call asking if there was a way that database record increases due to Service Provider internal-purpose activity could be managed such that the records would not be pushed down to other provider LSMSs, NeuStar will investigate and provide feedback at the November 10-11, 2009 LNPA WG meeting.

* In response to Action Item 110209-02, NeuStar walked the group through the attached presentation, which proposes creation of a “null” value in the LRN field for SVs and pooled blocks as a means of addressing LSMS capacity concerns due to providers creating individual SV records that are not necessary for the routing of ported or pooled numbers.



* Under this proposal, providers would opt-in if they wished to create and/or receive null-LRN SV and thousand block records, otherwise they would not be required to receive the download of these records.
* It was asked if a risk assessment had been made on the possibility of an SP inputting an SV that should have had an LRN but was missing. NeuStar responded that it would require an education process. NeuStar could check to see how frequent the NPAC edit requiring an LRN is invoked.
* A provider asked if this could be filtered to only opt-in to get your own data – filtered by SPID. NeuStar responded that it could be made a requirement in a Change Order to only opt-in on a limited set of records.
* It was asked if it is being assumed that LRNs are not needed for some records. NeuStar responded that there are SVs that are currently being created for data purposes that are not for routing purposes. AltSPID was cited as an example for TRS and Law Enforcement routing of subpoenas. A provider suggested that the opt-in filtering could be necessary by data field. DPC data was cited as an example. NeuStar stated that populating DPC data for internal use by an SP may be only of interest to that provider and would not matter to other providers. It could be defined in requirements.
* A provider asked about null LRN records that subsequently need to be ported for LRN routing. NeuStar stated that it would look like a port away and would be business as usual.
* A question was asked about the volume of SVs that would fall into this category and would not be present today if this were in place. It was further asked if this opt-in would be on an SV by SV basis. The answer was no, it would be on an SP basis. For those that initially opt-out, but opt-in later, how do they get null LRNs? NeuStar stated that this is an open question, but an assumption is that a BDD would be used to catch up.

* A provider asked why an SV would not require an LRN. Three examples were cited: 1) The recent issue where a provider pre-positioned network migration moves by populating optional fields with data, 2) AltSPID population for reseller and VoIP provider identification, and 3) AltSPID use for Law Enforcement routing of subpoenas.
* The provider that raised the original LSMS capacity concern was asked if this proposal gets to the heart of her question and concern. The provider responded that it does because it does not require providers to take a download for other providers’ internal use projects.
* It was then asked how this would be enforced. NeuStar responded that the current situation is such that providers can use the NPAC for internal purposes and force providers to take downloads that they do not need.
* A provider requested more documentation on this concept via a Change Order, stating that this null LRN capability could be helpful with a large customer they have.
* A provider asked if NeuStar had looked at any other fields other than the LRN to identify these types of transactions. NeuStar responded that the LRN is the truest means of identifying these transactions.
* A local system vendor asked about performance impact. NeuStar stated that they are contractually required to meet their SLRs and do not see any risk to NPAC performance.
* Related to the attached presentation regarding potential LSMS capacity issues, NeuStar will develop and bring in a proposed NANC Change Order for review and discussion at the January 2010 LNPA WG meeting.

Change Management (CONTINUED) – NeuStar:

 

* NeuStar reviewed the change bars in the attached Release 3.4 Change Order document with the group. A description of each revision is contained in the attached Delta Description document. This is NeuStar’s view of Release 3.4 as of now.
* NeuStar stated that providers ongoing will need to specify if a requested BDD file is destined for a SOA or an LSMS due to the various filtering options that have been put in place over the years that have made it more complicated to produce BDD files.

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.

* In expressing a concern regarding SV limits, a provider suggested that it be set at 500K impacted SVs per region. A second provider stated that this seemed reasonable.
* There were no objections to setting a limit of 500K impacted SVs per region for SPID migrations. In addition, there were no objections to eliminating the LRN limitation entirely, currently set at 100 LRNs.
* The existing limitation of 7 migrations per region with a limit of 25 across the U.S. will be maintained.
* Action Item 0509-02 is closed.
* Action Item 101909-08:

Action Item 101909-08: 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.

There were no objections to AT&T’s request and the three requested blackout dates were approved.

* Sprint Nextel requested to add 10/31/2010 as a blackout date.

Regarding Sprint Nextel’s request to designate October 31, 2010 as a SPID

migration blackout date, Service Providers are to come to the December 8, 2009 conference call prepared to determine if the request will be approved.

NOTE: This request was subsequently approved on the December 8, 2009 LNPA WG conference call.

* NeuStar reported that 10/24/2010 will be the blackout date for the annual failover exercise.
* NeuStar requested the following region-specific blackout dates to install equipment:

January 24, 2010 in West Coast Region

February 21, 2010 in Midwest and Mid-Atlantic Regions

March 21, 2010 in Southwest and Western Regions (already a blackout date)

Regarding NeuStar’s request to designate January 24, 2010 as a SPID

migration blackout date in the West Coast Region and February 21, 2010 as a SPID migration blackout date in the Midwest and Mid-Atlantic Regions in order to install NPAC equipment, Service Providers are to come to the December 8, 2009 conference call prepared to determine if the request will be approved.

NOTE: These requests were subsequently approved on the December 8, 2009 LNPA WG conference call.

2009 and 2010 Meeting/Call Schedule Review – All:

 

* The January 2010 meeting will be in Scottsdale, Arizona, and hosted by Telcordia.

Discussion of Need for December 2009 Conference Calls – All:

* The group agreed to hold a conference call on Tuesday, December 8, 2009, from 12pm noon to 5pm Eastern. The dial-in bridge number is 888-412-7808, pin 23272#. The agenda will consist of the following:
  + - Introductions/Agenda Review – All
    - 2010 SPID Migration Blackout Requests – All
    - Change Management – NeuStar

(NOTE: As agreed at the November 10-11, 2009 meeting, this is a placeholder agenda item should there be a need to discuss any aspects of the FCC 09-41 Change Orders [NANC 440, NANC 441, or NANC 416], or any of the Release 3.4 Change Orders.)

* + - Open Action Item Discussion – All

(NOTE: As agreed at the November 10-11, 2009 meeting, this is a placeholder agenda item to discuss the status of any in-progress Action Items.)

* + 2010 LNPA WG Meeting/Conference Call Schedule – All
  + New Business – All
  + Continuation of NANC 437 Issue Parking Lot Matrix Review – All

Review of September 15-16, 2009 LNPA WG Action Items:



**September 15-16, 2009 LNPA WG Action Items:**

* Item 091509-01: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 091509-02: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 091509-03: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 091509-04: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 091509-05: This item remains Open.

**September 15-16, 2009 APT Action Items:**

No APT Action Items were assigned at the September 15-16, 2009 LNPA WG meeting.

**LNPA WG Action Items Remaining Open from Previous Meetings:**

* Item 0906-14: This item has been Closed.
* Item 0907-11: This item has been Closed.
* 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 has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 090209-02: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 090209-03: This item remains Open.
* Item 090209-04: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 090209-05: This item remains Open.
* Item 090209-06: This item remains Open.
* Item 090209-07: This item remains Open.

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

No Action Items remain open from previous APT meetings.

Review of October 19, 2009 LNPA WG Action Items:



**October 19, 2009 LNPA WG Action Items:**

* Item 101909-01: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 101909-02: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 101909-03: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 101909-04: This item remains Open.
* Item 101909-05: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 101909-06: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 101909-07: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 101909-08: This item has been completed and is Closed.

Review of November 2, 2009 LNPA WG Action Items:



**November 2, 2009 LNPA WG Action Items:**

* Item 110209-01: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 110209-02: This item has been completed and is Closed.

New/Unfinished Business (All):

* There were no new business items raised.

***Next Conference Call …December 8, 2009: 12pm – 5pm Eastern, 888-412-7808 PIN 23272#***

***Next Meeting …January 12-13, 2010: Location…Scottsdale, Arizona***

***Hosted by Telcordia***