LNPA WORKING GROUP

September 10-11, 2013 Meeting

Final Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Denver, CO | Host: Comcast |

**TUESDAY September 10, 2013**

**Attendance**

| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T | Bridget Alexander | | JSI (phone) |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T (phone) | Karen Hoffman | | JSI (phone) |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T (phone) | Angel Acosta | | Level 3 |
| Ron Steen | AT&T (phone) | George Barajas | | Level 3 |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T (phone) | Lynette Khirallah | | NetNumber (phone) |
| Tracey Guidotti | AT&T (phone) | Bill Reidway | | Neustar |
| Cristy Permenter | Bright House (phone) | Dave Garner | | Neustar |
| Frank App III | Bright House (phone) | Jim Rooks | | Neustar |
| Matt Nolan | Bright House (phone) | John Nakamura | | Neustar |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian Consortium (phone) | Larry Vagnoni | | Neustar |
| Jan Doell | CenturyLink | Lavinia Rotaru | | Neustar |
| Mary Retka | CenturyLink | Marcel Champagne | | Neustar |
| Karin Fahrenbruch | CenturyLink (phone) | Pamela Connell | | Neustar |
| Brenda Bloemke | Comcast | Paul LaGattuta | | Neustar |
| Linda Birchem | Comcast | Ed Barker | | Neustar (phone) |
| Beth O'Donnell | Cox (phone) | Fariba Jafari | | Neustar (phone) |
| Jennifer Hutton | Cox (phone) | Shannon Sevigny | | Neustar Pooling (phone) |
| Dena Hunter | Cricket (phone) | Karen Riepenkroger | | Sprint (phone) |
| Devang Naik | DSET (phone) | Suzanne Addington | | Sprint |
| Linda Peterman | Earthlink Business | Rosemary Emmer | | Sprint (phone) |
| Joe Mullin | Edge Communications | Jeanne Kulesa | | Synchronoss (phone) |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW (phone) | Rosalee Pinnock | | Syniverse (phone) |
| Wendy Trahan | GVNW (phone) | Luke Sessions | | T-Mobile |
| George Tsacnaris | iconectiv | Paula Campagnoli | | T-Mobile |
| John Malyar | iconectiv | Deb Tucker | | Verizon |
| Pat White | iconectiv | Jason Lee | | Verizon (phone) |
| Steven Koch | Iconectiv | Scott Terry | | Windstream |
| Kim Isaacs | Integra (phone) | Dawn Lawrence | | XO (phone) |

NOTE: ALL ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “September 10-11, 2013 WG ACTION ITEMS” FILE AND ATTACHED HERE.

****

**LNPA WORKING GROUP MEETING MINUTES:**

**2013 LNPA WG Meeting/Call Schedule:**

Following is the current schedule for the 2013 LNPA WG meetings and calls.

| **MONTH**  **(2013)** | **NANC MEETING DATES** | **LNPA WG**  **MEETING/CALL**  **DATES** | **HOST COMPANY** | **MEETING LOCATION** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| January |  | 8th-9th | Ericsson/  Telcordia | Scottsdale, Arizona |
| February |  | No meeting or call.  Scheduled time on 2/5/13 for conference call to be used by APT. |  |  |
| March |  | 5th-6th | DSET | Atlanta, Georgia |
| April |  | No meeting or Conference Call.  04/09/2013 call if necessary |  |  |
| May |  | 7th-8th | Neustar | Miami Beach, FL |
| June |  | No meeting.  06/17/2013 Conference Call |  |  |
| July |  | 9th-10th | T-Mobile | Seattle, Washington |
| August |  | No meeting.  08/06/2013 call if necessary |  |  |
| September |  | 10th-11th | Comcast | Denver, Colorado |
| October |  | No meeting.  10/08/2013 call if necessary |  |  |
| **November** |  | **5th-6th** | **Comcast** | **Denver, Colorado**  ***Note that this is a change!*** |
| December |  | No meeting.  12/03/2013 call if necessary |  |  |

**July 9-10, 2013 Draft LNPA WG Meeting Minutes Review:**

The July 9-10, 2013, meeting minutes were reviewed. After a few minor changes, they were approved as FINAL.

**August 6, 2013 Draft LNPA WG Conference Call Minutes Review:**

The August 6, 2013, conference call minutes were approved without change. They were approved as FINAL.

**Updates from Other Industry Groups**

**OBF Ordering Solutions Wireless Service Ordering (WSO) Subcommittee Update – Deb Tucker:**

The Wireless Service Ordering Subcommittee was scheduled to meet August 26th, however that meeting has been rescheduled for October 1st to allow the Local Service Ordering Subcommittee to further their work effort on Issue 3450 before holding a Wireless meeting. Issue 3429 remains open.

**Issue 3429** – WICIS Review for Alignment and Business Practices.  This is a blanket issue opened to review the WICIS document for any needed updates.

**OBF Local Service Ordering Subcommittee – Linda Peterman:**

OBF

ORDERING SOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

LOCAL SERVICE ORDERING SUBCOMMITTEE

The Local Service Ordering Subcommittee (LSO) has not met since the July, 2013 LNPA WG meeting. A face-to-face meeting is scheduled for 9/23 – 9/26/13 hosted by CenturyLink in Overland Park, KS, at which time Issue 3450 will be one of the primary topics of discussion.

The following is a recap of information provided during the July, 2013 LNPA WG meeting regarding Issue 3450 and LSO Open issue prioritization efforts.

**3450/** **LSOG: Standard Validation and Submission fields for REQTYPE “C” Simple and Non-Simple Port Orders**

Participants reviewed the Issue Statement and Suggested Solution (3450.doc).

It was noted that Issue 3450 only deals with non-simple/non-complex ports. Complex ports are out of scope for this Issue.

It was noted that thoroughfare information is not validated as part of this Issue. Any information outside of the five agreed upon validation fields (AN (Account Number), PORTED NBR (Ported Telephone Number), ZIP (ZIP/Postal Code), PID (Personal Identifier) and SANO (Service Address Number)) will be checked within back end systems, but will not be used for validation.

Participants discussed modifying several fields for the Standard Data Set for Number Portability only. Next steps were identified on individual fields for potential modification of the LSOG rules for simple and non-simple ports.

There was discussion on the SANO field. It was noted that SANO will be validated for non-simple/non-complex ports, but not validated for simple ports. It was further noted that in the rare case that the SANO field is blank, it will bypass validation.

There was discussion on retaining versus disconnecting listings. It was noted that deleting a listing would be considered a non-simple/non-complex port. Retaining a listing would be considered a complex port.

There was discussion on full versus partial ports. A concern was noted with trying to fit a multi-line process into a simple port. There is no way to identify that one number coming in on a port order is part of a multi-line account. Also, companies that do not currently require full disposition would now need to require it.

The following discussions are required to continue working Issue 3450:

* All companies need to review potential Issue 3450 fields for comments
* Impact of full/partial migration to non-simple/non-complex process
* Directory impacts to non-simple/non-complex process
* CSR data response needs to include data required for non-simple/non-complex LSR
* Interval discussion
* Discussion regarding max lines allowed on non-simple/non-complex

The following validation fields have tentatively been agreed upon:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FIELD NAME** | **SIMPLE PORT** | **NON-SIMPLE NON-COMPLEX** |
| AN (Account Number) | X | X |
| PORTED NBR (Ported Telephone Number) | X | X |
| ZIP (ZIP/Postal Code) | X | X |
| PID (Personal Identifier) | X | X |
| SANO (Service Address Number) |  | X |

Although a significant amount of work has been accomplished, the finalization of a standard data set for submission of non-simple non-complex ports is in progress. In depth review of the impacts to the LSOG will follow.

**Agreement Reached:** Issue 3450 will remain open.

Participants prioritized the open LSO Issues:

High Priority

1. Issue 3381, LSOG: Standardization of directory listings in the 102 Practice (proposed for Initial Closure)
2. Issue 3450, LSOG: Standard Validation and Submission fields for REQTYPE “C” Simple and Non-Simple Port Orders

Medium Priority

1. Issue 3443, LSOG: Increase the Name fields’ length in the 71 and 72 practices (to be worked after Issue 3450)
2. Issue 3373, LSOG: Standardization of RT of “Z” in the 099 practice for REQTYP “C” to be utilized by all providers
3. Issue 3477, LSOG: Standard field length minimums identified and repeating/# of occurrences on each field

Low Priority

1. Issue 3478, LSOG: Replace LALO with LD/LV fields on Directory Listing form
2. Issue 3382, LSOG: Standardization and consolidation of Directory Listings Inquiry/Response and Listing Reconciliation (from LSOG6) all into the 111 Practice (withdrawn)

It was noted that Issues 3448, LSOG – Add new Line Activity (LNA) value to require disposition of each Telephone number when converting, and 3449, LSOG – Allow for multiple Pilot Numbers on Hunt Group (HGI) form, are on hold pending internal review.

**New** Issues: None

Issues in **Final Closure**: Issue 3381

Issues **Withdrawn:** Issue 3382

Issues in **Initial Closure or Initial Pending**: None

The following LSO face-to-face meeting is scheduled:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DATE** | **CALL DETAILS** |
| 9/23/13 – 9/26/13 | **LSO Face-to-Face Meeting**  **Location: Overland Park, KS**  **Host: CenturyLink**  **Agenda**:   * Issue 3450 |

**INC Update – Dave Garner:**

**INC Issues Report** LNPA WG Meeting – September 2013

**INC Issue 748: Assess Impacts on Numbering Resources and Numbering Administration with Transition from Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN) to Internet Protocol (IP)**

Issue Statement: As the industry and regulatory bodies move from the current Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN) towards Internet Protocol (IP), consideration needs to be given to the numbering scheme. Will the current telephone number format be utilized, in whole or part, in the IP environment or will some other numbering addressing format be used? It is necessary for INC to be aware of regulatory mandates and industry activities addressing the numbering protocol to be used for IP technology as well as numbering impacts during the PSTN to IP transition in order to update or create new numbering guidelines.

At the August INC meeting, INC continued to discuss developments regarding the PSTN to IP transition.

* INC continued to discuss the proposed concept of a “Just In Time” (JIT) numbering trial where SPs and Over the Top (VoIP) providers could obtain numbers at less than thousands block level using LNP.
* Discussion points included developing requirements for JIT numbering, assignment and provisioning timelines, establishment and replenishment of the number pool, NRUF and forecasting reports, and auditing.
* INC is developing potential guidelines, which could be used in the event that the JIT numbering concept is approved for trial.
* INC reviewed recent developments in the VoIP direct access to numbering trial, to assess the timeline of the trial and any impacts to INC guidelines, including a review of the August 19, 2013 Vonage initial report on its numbering trial. Some of the information included in the Vonage initial report is:
  + On July 3, 2013, Vonage was assigned 10,000 blocks in 3 LATAs. LATA 666 (Phoenix), 438 (Atlanta), 128 (Boston). Nine 1K Blocks from each 10,000 block were returned to the pool.
  + LRNs for all 3 trial markets should become effective across the industry by Sept. 1, 2013.
  + Once the LRNs become effective, Alpha and Beta testing described in its Numbering Trial Proposal will be performed and take approximately 4 weeks to complete.
  + Expects the live trial to commence on or about Oct. 1, 2013, in which it provisions new customers using Vonage-OCN-designated numbers and transitions existing customer telephone numbers in the trial markets to the Vonage OCN.
  + Vonage has established it industry facing interface for porting telephone numbers directly held by Vonage (<http://www.vonagecarrierservices.com/>). As of the time of the report, 9 carriers have established porting accounts with Vonage.

**INC Issue 758: Move the 550, 535, 536, 546, and 558 NPAs from the General Purpose Category to Set Aside for Future Non-Geographic 5XX-NXX Use**

Issue Statement: In May 2011, under Issue 703, the INC directed NANPA to set aside all available NPAs in the 52X, 53X, 54X, and 55X series for future Non-Geographic 5XX-NXX Code use. At that time, the 550 NPA was not available because it had been set aside to relieve an NPA that was exhausting within 10 years. The 550 NPA became available in September 2012, and went back to the General Purpose Category. The suggested resolution was that INC should direct NANPA to set aside 550, 535, 536, 546, and 558 for future Non-Geographic 5XX-NXX Code Use.

At the August INC meeting, the issue was reviewed and NANPA advised that they have determined the 536 NPA is the only option for relief of a specific geographic NPA because all 187 other available NPAs would result in the need for implementation of timing delays. INC agreed to set aside 550, as well as 535, 546, and 558 for future Non-Geographic 5XX-NXX Code Use. They will be assigned in this order after the codes listed in the resolution statement of Issue 703. The INC agreed not to swap 536 because it was needed to relieve a geographic NPA forecasted to exhaust.

**INC Issue 760: Add Clarifications to NPA Relief Planning Guidelines for Interested Party Terms and for Determining Consensus**

Issue Statement: The NPA Relief Planning & Notification Guidelines reference several different terms throughout the guidelines that appear to be related, but are slightly different -- affected parties, members of the industry, industry participants, and interest groups. These terms may need to be further defined or edited to clarify which entities’ positions shall be considered by NANPA in determining consensus during NPA relief planning activities for a particular NPA.

At the August INC meeting, the issue was reviewed and INC edited the guidelines to clarify that only Affected Parties have a voice considered by NANPA when determining consensus.

Affected Parties are:

* A Service Provider with resources assigned in the affected NPA, and/or
* A Service Provider with no resources assigned yet but authorized to provide service in the affected NPA

INC modified the definition of Consensus to specify:

* A Service Provider Consultant participating on behalf of a particular Service Provider shall identify the Service Provider it is representing as an Affected Party and have a voice in the consensus determination
* Those participating that are not Affected Parties may express views, but do not have a voice in the consensus determination



**NANC Future of Numbering WG Update – Suzanne Addington:**



**Best Practice 30 – NPA Split vs. Overlays**

Service providers agreed at the July LNPA WG meeting to present Best Practice on NPA Splits to the NANC and request that they forward it to the FCC for approval.

Paula Campagnoli was given an action item to prepare draft wording for the September 2013 NANC Report.

**Action Item 070913-01:** The LNPA Working Group reached consensus to present the Best Practice 30 position about NPA splits to the NANC for endorsement and forwarding to the FCC. Paula Campagnoli will prepare draft wording for the September NANC report and distribute to the WG for comment.

****

The report to NANC is embedded here:



**Action Item 070913-01 is closed.**

Paula will also attempt to obtain a status on Best Practices 67 and 70 that have been pending FCC action for some time.

**NANC 457 – SPID Migration Limits – Increase Regional TN Threshold**

Limits on SPID migrations are based on TNS. With the elimination of non-EDR, should the definition be changed to some other parameter? Could we change to the sum of the ported TNs and pooled blocks? Could we change to this sum being 500K as we were using this as the max number of TNs?

John Nakamura stated that based on the volume of all SPID migrations during 2013, there were none that had a significant SV count (the highest on 8/11/2013 was 3140 SVs).

There was discussion as to whether there would be any impact to downstream SCPs that might not use EDR. Service providers were given an action to determine if this is an issue.

**Action Item 121013-01 –**

A – Service Providers to check to see if they are EDR or NON-EDR on internal network elements (STP, SCP).

B – With the redefining of the maximum number of SVs to not include pooled SVs, should we now have a limit on the number of pooled blocks that can be updated in a SPID migration?  If so, what should the limit be?

**Change Management – Neustar**

**Alternative Interface (NANC change Order 372) – All**

John Nakamura and Jim Rooks reviewed the updates to the FRS, XIS, XSD, and test cases. Updates will be distributed for review prior to the next WG meeting.

**NANC Change Order 449 – Active/Active SOA Connection to NPAC – same SPID**

John Nakamura reviewed the updates to the document. While discussing the change order, it was agreed that there is no need for echo of routing data to the OSP. John will remove these requirements. The updates will be reviewed at the next WG meeting.

John will convene a conference call between vendors to discuss NANC 449 and incorporating both CMIP and XML interfaces.

**NANC Change Order 453 – Decommissioned SPID**

Short term solution script has been written and tested in test bed as indicated on page two of the change order. Need to clean up in evening hours in a predefined window when the system is up and running or maintenance window with system running. WG agreed to run the short term solution on September 15 during maintenance window.

John walked WG through the changes and options for the long term solution.

ACCEPTED – This change order will be added to the list of change orders available for future release.

**NANC Change Order 454 – Remove Unused Messages from NPAC**

There are messages in the NPAC that are never used. This change order documents those messages and the documents that need to be changed.

ACCEPTED – This change order will be added to the list of change orders available for future release.

**NANC Change Order 455 – Update SP Type and SV Type for VoIP Numbering Trial**

This change order will be implemented in release 3.4.6 in October 2013.

**NANC Change Order 456 - Elimination of the Five-Day First Port waiting Period**

This change order will be implemented in release 3.4.6 in October 2013.

**WEDNESDAY September 11, 2013**

**Attendance**

| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T | Karen Hoffman | | JSI (phone) |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T (phone) | Angel Acosta | | Level 3 |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T (phone) | George Barajas | | Level 3 |
| Ron Steen | AT&T (phone) | Lynette Khirallah | | NetNumber (phone) |
| Cristy Permenter | Bright House (phone) | Bill Reidway | | Neustar |
| Frank App III | Bright House (phone) | Dave Garner | | Neustar |
| Matt Nolan | Bright House (phone) | Jim Rooks | | Neustar |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian Consortium (phone) | John Nakamura | | Neustar |
| Jan Doell | CenturyLink | Larry Vagnoni | | Neustar |
| Mary Retka | CenturyLink | Lavinia Rotaru | | Neustar |
| Karin Fahrenbruch | CenturyLink (phone) | Marcel Champagne | | Neustar |
| Brenda Bloemke | Comcast | Mubeen Saifullah | | Neustar |
| Linda Birchem | Comcast | Pamela Connell | | Neustar |
| Beth O'Donnell | Cox (phone) | Paul LaGattuta | | Neustar |
| Dena Hunter | Cricket (phone) | Ed Barker | | Neustar (phone) |
| Devang Naik | DSET (phone) | Shannon Sevigny | | Neustar Pooling (phone) |
| Linda Peterman | Earthlink Business | Suzanne Addington | | Sprint |
| Joe Mullin | Edge Communications | Karen Riepenkroger | | Sprint (phone) |
| Randy Lowe | Edge Communications (phone) | Shaunna Gorshee | | Sprint (phone) |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW (phone) | Rosalee Pinnock | | Syniverse (phone) |
| Wendy Trahan | GVNW (phone) | Luke Sessions | | T-Mobile |
| George Tsacnaris | iconectiv | Paula Campagnoli | | T-Mobile |
| John Malyar | iconectiv | Deb Tucker | | Verizon |
| Pat White | iconectiv | Dyan Adams | | Verizon (phone) |
| Steven Koch | iconectiv | Jason Lee | | Verizon (phone) |
| Joel Zamlong | iconectiv (phone) | Imanu Hill | | Vonage (phone) |
| Natalie McNamer | iconectiv (phone) | Scott Terry | | Windstream |
| Kim Isaacs | Integra (phone) | Tiki Gaugler | | XO (phone) |
| Bridget Alexander | JSI (phone) |  | |  |

**Assess Impacts on Number and Resources and Numbering Administration with Transition from PSTN to IP – Mark Lancaster** ****

Paula Campagnoli asked Mark to provide updates at the November and January LNPA WG meetings. All service providers should be considering how transition to an IP network affects their company.

**Action Item 121013-02 –** Service providers and vendors are to be prepared at the November 2013 meeting to have a meaningful discussion surrounding company positions and/or any proposals on PSTN to IP transition now that AT&T’s JIT Administrator proposal has been presented to the LNPA WG.

**2014 Meeting Schedule**

The WG agreed on meeting dates for 2014. Hosts and locations will be finalized later.

**2014 Meetings and Conference Calls**

| **MONTH**  **(2014)** | **NANC MEETING DATES** | **LNPA WG**  **MEETING/CALL**  **DATES** | **HOST COMPANY** | **MEETING LOCATION** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| January |  | 7th – 8th | iconectiv | TBD |
| February |  | 11th |  | Conference Call |
| March |  | 4th – 5th | Comcast | TBD |
| April |  | 8th |  | Conference Call |
| May |  | 13th – 14th | Neustar | TBD |
| June |  | 10th |  | Conference Call |
| July |  | 8th – 9th | T-Mobile | TBD |
| August |  | 5th |  | Conference Call |
| September |  | 9th – 10th | CenturyLink | TBD |
| October |  | 7th |  | Conference Call |
| November |  | 4th – 5th | AT&T *(tentative)* | TBD |
| December |  | 9th |  | Conference Call |

***Next Meeting … November 5-6 , 2013: Location…Denver, CO …Hosted by Comcast and Neustar***