LNPA WORKING GROUP

January 12-13, 2010 Meeting

Final Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scottsdale, Arizona | Host: Telcordia |

**ARCHITECTURE PLANNING TEAM (APT) DISCUSSION:**

**TUESDAY 01/12/10**

Tuesday, 01/12/10, Attendance:

| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Mary Gail Sullivan | 360 Networks (phone) | Mubeen Saifullah | | Neustar Clearinghouse |
| Tina Plaisance | Alltel (phone) | Shannon Sevigny | | Neustar Pooling (phone) |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Linda Peterman | | One Communications |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T (phone) | Peggy Rubino | | Paetec (phone) |
| Tracey Guidotti | AT&T (phone) | Mary Retka | | Qwest (phone) |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T | Jan Doell | | Qwest |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | Towanda Russell | | RCN (phone) |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Mobility | Matt Kohly | | Socket (phone) |
| Barbara Hjelmaa | Brighthouse Networks | Carol Frike | | Sprint Nextel (phone) |
| Vicki Goth | CenturyLink (phone) | Sue Tiffany | | Sprint Nextel |
| Tim Kagele | Comcast (phone) | Rosemary Emmer | | Sprint Nextel |
| Jennifer Hutton | Cox (phone) | Jeanne Kulesa | | Synchronoss (phone) |
| Steve Farnsworth | Evolving Systems | Bob Bruce | | Syniverse (phone) |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW (phone) | Joel Zamlong | | Telcordia |
| Bonnie Johnson | Integra (phone) | 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 |
| Stephanie Hudson | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Kayla Sharbaugh | | Telcordia (phone) |
| Lynette Khirallah | NetNumber (phone) | George Tsacnaris | | Telcordia |
| Paul LaGattuta | Neustar | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Jim Rooks | Neustar | Mohamed Samater | | T-Mobile |
| Stephen Addicks | Neustar | Heather Patterson | | TNS |
| Marybeth Degeorgis | Neustar | David Lund | | US Cellular |
| Randy Buffenbarger | Neustar | Tanya Golub | | US Cellular |
| Michael O’Connor | Neustar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| John Nakamura | Neustar | Jason Lee | | Verizon (phone) |
| Bill Reidway | Neustar | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Marcel Champagne | Neustar | Tom Zablocki | | Vonage |
| Dave Garner | Neustar | Tana Henson | | Windstream |
| Pamela Connell | Neustar | Tiki Gaugler | | XO Comm. (phone) |
| Ed Barker | Neustar (phone) |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

NOTE: ALL ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “JANUARY 12-13 2010 LNPA ACTION ITEMS” FILE ISSUED IN A SEPARATE E-MAIL FROM THESE MINUTES.

**MEETING MINUTES:**

**2010 LNPA WG Meeting/Call Schedule:**

Following is the current schedule for the 2010 LNPA WG meetings and calls.

| **MONTH**  **(2010)** | NANC MEETING DATES | LNPA WG  **MEETING/CALL**  **DATES** | HOST COMPANY | MEETING LOCATION |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| January |  | 12th-13th | Telcordia | Scottsdale, Arizona |
| February |  | No meeting.  2/9/2010 call from 11am to 5pm Eastern time, dial-in bridge number is 888-412-7808, pin 23272# |  |  |
| March |  | 9th-10th | Comcast | Denver, Colorado |
| April |  | No meeting.  4/13/2010 call if necessary |  |  |
| May |  | 11th-12th | Brighthouse and Syniverse | **St. Petersburg, Florida**  **(tentative)** |
| June |  | No meeting.  6/8/2010 call if necessary |  |  |
| July |  | 13th-14th | Neustar | Seattle, Washington |
| August |  | No meeting.  8/10/2010 call if necessary |  |  |
| September |  | 14th-15th | Tekelec | Morrisville, North Carolina |
| October |  | No meeting.  10/12/2010 call if necessary |  |  |
| November |  | 9th-10th | Sprint Nextel | **Location TBD in Florida (tentative)** |
| December |  | No meeting.  12/7/2010 call if necessary |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

* Continuing evaluation during 2010 will determine if interim conference calls are needed or if the decision to meet face-to-face every other month should be revisited.

November 10-11, 2009 Meeting Minutes Review:

* With the following change to the DRAFT November 10-11, 2009 LNPA WG meeting minutes, they were approved as FINAL.
  + Delete the extra “the” in the 2nd bullet under NANC 440 and 441 Change Order Review on page 7.

December 8, 2009 Conference Call Minutes Review:

* With the following change to the DRAFT December 8, 2009 LNPA WG conference call minutes, they were approved as FINAL.
  + Pluralize the word “carrier” in the 1st bullet at the top of page 5.

FCC Order 09-41 Implementation Discussion – All:

* Industry Implementation Timeline (Standing Agenda Item):
  + The Public Notice for comments on standard LSR data fields have not yet been published in the Federal Register.

NOTE: Subsequent to the January 12-13, 2010 LNPA WG meeting, the Public Notice was published in the Federal Register on February 1, 2010. Comments are due on or before February 16, 2010, and Reply Comments are due on or before February 22, 2010. See attached Federal Register Summary.



* + Interoperability Testing (ITP) is scheduled for 3/15/2010 through 4/9/2010.
  + A provider asked if Service Providers could provide more notice to the industry on their FCC 09-41-related system changes than their normal Change Management notice period. Service Providers are to come to the February 9, 2010 LNPA WG conference call prepared to provide their planned notification date to the industry on their system changes.
  + 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).
  + Neustar discussed the highlights of the attached SOW 77 Project Plan with the group:



* + - Regarding the attached project plan for SOW 77 (Release 3.3.4), Neustar will determine and provide feedback to the LNPA WG Co-Chairs by January 22, 2010 if they can advance turn-up testing from the current June 1, 2010 start, and if so, to what date.

NOTE: Subsequent to the January 12-13, 2010 LNPA WG meeting, Neustar determined that turn-up testing could be advanced and sent the following notice out to the industry:

“Upon further review of the various activities surrounding Turn-Up Testing between the NPAC and Service Provider SOAs/LSMSs, Neustar will be able to accommodate the request made during last week’s LNPAWG meeting, and move the start date two weeks to the left.  The new TUT dates will be Mon, 5/17 through Fri, 7/23.  Group testing remains Mon, 7/26 through Fri, 7/30.  TUT must be completed by all SOAs and LSMSs in a given region prior to the software installation weekend.”

* + - Service Provider NPAC Profile changes for the new Medium Timer will be done during the maintenance window on 8/1/2010. The form to request a profile change will be sent out over Cross-Regional prior to June 1st. It is also available on the website.

NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Deeper Dive Analysis (Action Items 101909-04, 111009-11, 120809-05, 120809-06) – 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.

Action Item 120809-05: Regarding NANC 437, Neustar will distribute documentation to the LNPA WG related to any race condition issues they have identified and documentation related to current Methods & Procedure (M&Ps) that may require inter-NPAC communication (reference open Action Item 111009-11). This documentation is to be distributed to the LNPA WG by January 4, 2010, even if in draft form, for review prior to the January 12-13, 2010 LNPA WG meeting.

* Neustar presented the attached slide deck to the group discussing their concerns with regard to possible race conditions related to NANC 437’s peered NPAC architecture.



* + Slide 2 – Neustar stated that they believe that every peered NPAC needs to be considered a golden database and not treated as an LSMS and a SOA as proposed by NANC 437. Neustar stated that before any request is considered complete, all databases have to be in synch or the request should be considered failed. Neustar feels that if peered NPACs are treated as LSMSs and SOAs, they will eventually get out of synch because LSMSs and SOAs do get out of synch today.
  + Slide 3 – This slide depicts Neustar’s concern related to a race condition resulting in the failure to propagate the creation of an NXX code on a peered NPAC and its downstream LSMSs and SOAs, resulting in an out-of-synch condition between peered NPACs and their downstream systems. With NXXs that do not get propagated, Telcordia stated that failure to process an SV create request would be an indication to get it fixed. Neustar responded that they believe this would be a manual fix to something that is automated today.
  + Slide 4 – This slide depicts Neustar’s concern related to a race condition resulting in the failure to propagate the deletion of an NXX code on a peered NPAC and its downstream LSMSs and SOAs, resulting in an out-of-synch condition between peered NPACs and their downstream systems. Telcordia stated that what takes place to address this is implicit in the flows in that steps are taken today outside the IIS to resolve this and that should be the case with peered NPACs.
  + Slide 5 – This slide depicts Neustar’s concern related to a race condition resulting in the failure to propagate the creation of an LRN on a peered NPAC and its downstream LSMSs and SOAs, resulting in an out-of-synch condition between peered NPACs and their downstream systems. Telcordia responded that NPAC logs would capture failed attempts to create an LRN and NPAC personnel would resolve manually between NPACs.
  + Slide 6 – This slide depicts Neustar’s concern related to a race condition resulting in the failure to propagate the creation of a –X on a peered NPAC and its downstream LSMSs and SOAs, due to a Port-To-Original (PTO) request hitting the peered NPAC prior to the –X being propagated to it by the peered NPAC where the –X was initially created by NPAC personnel. The Codeholder is on NPAC B and the Blockholder is on NPAC A. The –X has to be created on NPAC B by NPAC personnel. A provider asked how an effective date change gets made on NPAC B when the Blockholder driving the date change is on NPAC A. Telcordia will verify how NPAC B communicates to the Blockholder who is served by NPAC A, e.g., how does an effective date change get made on NPAC B when the Blockholder is on NPAC A?
  + Slides 7 and 8 – These slides depict Neustar’s concern related to a race condition resulting in problems when creating and activating a pooled block due to the –X being deleted or the effective date being changed to a future date in the Codeholder’s NPAC. The result is that one NPAC activates the pooled block and the other does not. Neustar stated that application locks prevent this from happening today and inter-NPAC locking would have performance impacts. Neustar proposed moving Step 2 down past Step 6 so that the work is done before the Step 2 response is sent. Neustar further proposed moving Step 5 down past Step 7 so that NPAC B knows that it failed.
  + Slide 9 – This slide depicts Neustar’s concern that the SV flows in NANC 437 do not reflect any error checking on responses sent over the inter-NPAC interface, resulting in an operation failing on one of the peered NPACs and causing an out-of-synch condition.
  + Slide 10 – In summary, Neustar proposed the following (extracted from Slide 10) to address the race conditions depicted in their presentation and keep NPAC behavior the same as today from a Service Provider perspective:
    - Use inter-NPAC locking to ensure all peered NPACs remain in sync.
    - Consider inter-NPAC responses before responding to a request.
    - Fail the transaction if any NPAC peer fails to successfully complete the request.
    - For environments where more than 2 NPACs operate, messaging is needed to instruct peers to rollback work.
  + Discussion Summary – it was stated that there is a fundamental difference in architectural views of a peered NPAC environment among vendors.
  + Neustar states that NANC 437 proposes treating peered NPACs as LSMSs/SOAs and they can and will become out of synch as LSMSs and SOAs do today.
  + Telcordia states that NANC 437 is not any different from today’s environment in that data is persistently stored in the Master NPAC and then propagated to all other entities in the region and no single entity holds up or causes work to start over again.
  + Evolving Systems states that out-of-synch problems are identifiable and the fixes are modest and they feel that the proposed fixes are worse than the problem. Evolving Systems stated that they looked at the frequency over the last year of how often providers attempted to create the same NXX or LRN within a 24 hour period and stated that the probability of that happening equated to about 33 seconds of operations time to address per year. They stated that they only looked at network data race conditions and not call-related race conditions.
  + A provider expressed concern about misrouted calls resulting from peered NPACs being out of synch and stated that they believe keeping peered NPACs in synch is critical due to all subtending LSMSs of an out-of-synch NPAC being out of synch with the rest of the region.
  + Another provider stated that they are analyzing any added layers of complexity to the overall porting process that may result from a peered NPAC architecture.

Action Item 111009-11: Regarding NANC 437, Neustar will compile a list of current Methods & Procedures (M&Ps) that may require inter-NPAC communication.

* In response to Action Item 111009-11, Neustar provided the following based on their analysis of M&Ps in relation to NANC 437:

Customer facing M&Ps on the NPAC Secure Website:

* + - 73 M&P’s exist today.
    - 24 will need to be upgraded for multiple NPACs.
      * Some minor changes and others will need a complete rewrite.
    - 24 of 73 (33%) of M&P’s will be impacted.
    - Examples of major rewrites: Automatic TN Lookup System, Partial Fails, Porting in Error / Failure to Port, NPA Splits, Extended Outages, Weekly SSU, SPID Migrations.

New M&Ps based on LNPA WG NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Matrix:

* 25 items in the matrix are tagged for M&P development to support operational issues for multiple NPACs.
* Neustar identified the following additional matrix items they believe require an M&P:
* 23, 29, 36, 47
* Neustar stated that they believe there will be additional M&Ps needed to solve operational issues as we get deeper into the analysis of NANC 437.

Internal to Helpdesk:

* Neustar stated that there are hundreds of training guides and M&P’s that are used to process requests from customers or to perform obligations to the industry. These will need to be reviewed and modified as necessary based on multiple NPACs. Examples are:
  + Pooling process and procedures
  + Mass updates process and procedures
  + Helpdesk process and procedures
  + Customer requests process and procedures
  + Application support process and procedures
  + Software development process and procedures

Action Item 120809-06: Regarding NANC 437, Evolving Systems will distribute documentation to the LNPA WG related to NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Matrix Item # 53, which addresses the timing of the transfer of the Master NPAC role to the New SP’s NPAC. This documentation is to be distributed to the LNPA WG by January 4, 2010, even if in draft form, for review prior to the January 12-13, 2010 LNPA WG meeting.

* Evolving Systems presented the attached slide deck to the group discussing their findings with regard to NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Matrix Item # 53, which addresses the timing of the transfer of the Master NPAC role to the New SP’s NPAC.



* + Evolving Systems stated that they did not identify any scenarios or flows that warranted changing from the “SV Create” method to the “SV Activation” method regarding the transfer of the role of Master NPAC.

Service Providers are to come to the February 9, 2010 LNPA WG conference call prepared to decide which will be reflected in the NANC 437 requirements – the “SV Creation Method,” whereby the transfer of Master NPAC responsibility occurs upon SV Creation, or the “SV Activation Method,” whereby the transfer of Master NPAC responsibility occurs upon SV Activation.

* + Discussion ensued on historical data and that it would be included in the eBDD file to bring a new NPAC online. A question was raised as to how an NPAC that does not archive data get it if one of their customers needs it. It was asked if we need to add a functional requirement that every NPAC needs access to records archived on tape.

Service Providers are to come to the February 9, 2010 LNPA WG conference call prepared to decide if all peered NPACs should have all archived data that is stored offline.

* NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Deeper Dive Analysis
  + Telcordia provided the attached document to assist in the deeper dive analysis providing their view on how some of the open items in the NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Matrix could be resolved and closed.



* + Matrix Items 25 and 72 – ID Management:
    - Three options of possible ways to do ID management in a peered NPAC environment were discussed:
      * Modulo option which would require a resetting of the ID range when new NPACs are added to a region
      * Split of ID inventory among NPACs based on the percentage of traffic
      * Manual or automated external inventory management system
      * The use of an NPAC identifier to be added to each SV ID was suggested by a Service Provider. It was stated that this would have provider system impacts.

Regarding the 4 options listed below for SV ID management, Vendors are

1. To explore the feasibility of an NPAC identifier approach,
2. To identify the pros and cons of each of the 4 approaches.

The 4 options are as follows:

1. Use of a formula of (ID value) modulo (the number of Peered NPAC SMSs).
2. Split of inventory based on the percentage of traffic.
3. A manual or automated external inventory management system.
4. Use of an NPAC identifier added to each SV ID.

Vendor feedback is due back to the LNPA WG Co-Chairs by February 2, 2010 for distribution to the group in preparation for the February 9, 2010 LNPA WG conference call.

* + Matrix Item 99.2 – Peer Resend Message:
    - Regarding Item 99.2 in the NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Matrix which deals with the Peered Resend Message, Telordia will add an option for a list of TNs in the requirements. This will be discussed on the February 9, 2010 LNPA WG conference call.
    - Regarding Item 99.2 in the NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Matrix which deals with the Peered Resend Message, LNPA WG Participants are to come to the February 9, 2010 conference call prepared to determine if the issue can be closed.
  + Matrix Item 129 – Cancel/Modify Spanning Multiple Peered NPAC SMSs:
    - Regarding NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Matrix Item 129, Service

Providers are to determine if they send cancels or modifies for ranges of TNs across multiple providers to NPAC in order to come to the February 9, 2010 LNPA WG conference call prepared to decide if we can close Item 129.

* + Matrix Item 141 – Unique Audit Names:
    - The group agreed to close Matrix Item 141.
  + Matrix Item 144 – Audit Skipping Sending SVs:
    - Telcordia stated that the “sending” that is referred to here is local sending (i.e., Primary NPAC to subtending local systems) and not Master NPAC sending to Peered NPACs.
    - Telcordia will clarify in the NANC 437 requirements the “sending” scenario that is referenced in Item 144, i.e., “local” sending vs. Master NPAC sending. This clarification will be reviewed on the February 9, 2010 LNPA WG conference call.
  + The group then began going through the remaining open issues in the NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Matrix that have been identified to date for a deeper dive analysis:
    - Matrix Item 1 – Resolving Inter-NPAC Vendor Disputes:
      * It was stated that this will require formation of a dispute resolution process and a focused team with the expertise to resolve disputes, perhaps within the LNPA WG. A Service Provider stated that it would have to be a neutral 3rd party to guarantee impartiality. Another Service Provider stated that any outside 3rd party would have to be involved in all of the detailed discussions during requirements gathering and questioned how they would get paid.
      * Two options discussed were a focused internal LNPA WG group or an external neutral 3rd party.
      * There was no objection to the 3rd party change management entity for dispute resolution being internal to the LNPA WG.
      * Matrix Item 1 is closed.
* NANC 437 Next Steps Review – All:
  + The group reviewed v2 of the draft Next Steps document (attached).



* + It was stated that the goal for the Deeper Dive exercise is to satisfy ourselves that there are solutions to resolve the issues and determine if there are any technical or operational issues that need to be further discussed.
  + The Next Steps document was revised to add the need for development of a vendor dispute resolution process as part of Step 4. See attached v3 of Next Steps document.



* All revisions to the NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Matrix that resulted from the January 12, 2010 APT meeting are captured in v18 of the document attached below.



2010 Meeting/Call Schedule Review – All:



* The May 2010 meeting will possibly be held in St. Petersburg, Florida, but is still tentative.
* The July 2010 meeting has been firmed us and will be held in Seattle, Washington.
* The November 2010 meeting will possibly be held in Key West, Florida, but is still tentative.

##### LNPA WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION:

**WEDNESDAY 01/13/10**

Wednesday, 01/13/10, Attendance:

| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Mary Gail Sullivan | 360 Networks (phone) | Mubeen Saifullah | | Neustar Clearinghouse |
| Tina Plaisance | Alltel (phone) | Shannon Sevigny | | Neustar Pooling (phone) |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Linda Peterman | | One Communications |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T (phone) | Peggy Rubino | | Paetec (phone) |
| Tracey Guidotti | AT&T (phone) | Mary Retka | | Qwest (phone) |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T | Jan Doell | | Qwest |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | Towanda Russell | | RCN (phone) |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Mobility | Matt Kohly | | Socket (phone) |
| Barbara Hjelmaa | Brighthouse Networks | Sue Tiffany | | Sprint Nextel |
| Vicki Goth | CenturyLink (phone) | Rosemary Emmer | | Sprint Nextel |
| Tim Kagele | Comcast (phone) | Jeanne Kulesa | | Synchronoss (phone) |
| Cindy Sheehan | Comcast (phone) | Bob Bruce | | Syniverse (phone) |
| Jennifer Hutton | Cox (phone) | Ramesh Chellamani | | Tekelec |
| Steve Farnsworth | Evolving Systems | Joel Zamlong | | Telcordia |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW (phone) | John Malyar | | Telcordia |
| Bonnie Johnson | Integra (phone) | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Bridget Alexander | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Pat White | | Telcordia |
| Karen Hoffman | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Lisa Marie Maxson | | Telcordia |
| Angie Mackey | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | George Tsacnaris | | Telcordia |
| Stephanie Hudson | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Lynette Khirallah | NetNumber (phone) | Mohamed Samater | | T-Mobile |
| Paul LaGattuta | Neustar | Heather Patterson | | TNS |
| Jim Rooks | Neustar | Amanda Molina | | Townes (phone) |
| Stephen Addicks | Neustar | David Lund | | US Cellular |
| Marybeth Degeorgis | Neustar | Tanya Golub | | US Cellular |
| Michael O’Connor | Neustar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| John Nakamura | Neustar | Jason Lee | | Verizon (phone) |
| Bill Reidway | Neustar | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Marcel Champagne | Neustar | Tom Zablocki | | Vonage |
| Dave Garner | Neustar | Tana Henson | | Windstream |
| Pamela Connell | Neustar | Tiki Gaugler | | XO Comm. (phone) |
|  |  | Dawn Lawrence | | XO Comm. (phone) |
|  |  |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

OBF Wireless Ordering Task Force and Intermodal Subcommittee Update (Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless):

**OBF Wireless Ordering Task Force:**

* Deb Tucker reported that since the November 2009 LNPA WG meeting, the Wireless Committee held 5 interim conference calls to finalize WICIS 5.0.0, the Wireless fax forms and fax guidelines, and to begin working on the WICIS 5.0.0 Implementation Guidelines.  One new issue was worked to address changes associated with FCC Order 09-41 and is now in Final Closure along with nine (9) previous issues that were in Initial Closure.
* Mubeen Saifullah, Neustar, and Sue Tiffany, Sprint Nextel, are the Co-Chairs of the newly named OBF Wireless Ordering Task Force.
* The Wireless Intercarrier Communications Interface Specification (WICIS) version 5.0.0 was published 12/18/09 along with Version 2.0.0 of the Supplemental Document for Fax Transmissions for Wireless Intercarrier Communications Interface Specification (WICIS) for Local Number Portability and the accompanying fax forms.  These documents are available on the ATIS Documents site for downloading.  This WICIS release incorporates the ability to handle jeopardy responses from wireline carriers as well as modifications to the data element requirements associated with FCC Order 09-41.
* Issues that moved to Final Closure:   
  + 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 Final 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 were updated to reflect these dates.  This Issue is in Final Closure.
  + 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 Final Closure.
  + Issue 3352 - Prohibit the CHC field on Resolution Required Responses (Rejects) – The Wireless Committee agreed to make 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 Final Closure.
  + 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 appear in WICIS 5.0.0, Volume 2, Appendix A.  This Issue is in Final 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 were updated to reflect the data rule changes for each of these fields.  This Issue is in Final 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 were updated to reflect the change to OPTIONAL for this field.  This Issue is in Final 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 were updated to reflect the change to OPTIONAL for these fields.  This Issue is in Final Closure.
  + Issue 3366 - Fax forms - The Wireless fax forms that were published with WICIS 3.1.0 were revised to incorporate the changes associated with FCC Order 09-41.  This Issue is in Final Closure.
  + Issue 3371 - Change the REP and TEL\_NO\_REP fields from Conditional to Optional - In order to be in alignment with Local Response (LR) changes, REP was changed to an OPTIONAL field on responses and TEL\_NO\_REP was changed to being CONDITIONAL on responses.  If the REP field is populated, then the TEL\_NO\_REP field must also be populated on the response.  This Issue is in Final Closure.
* The OBF Wireless Ordering Task Force meets next on January 27th to discuss and finalize the WICIS 5.0.0 Implementation Guidelines.

**Intermodal Subcommittee:**

* The former Intermodal Subcommittee has two open issues that were put aside while work for FCC Order 09-41 took place.

The two issues are:

* + Issue 3223 - Intermodal Subcommittee Simple Port Request Changes Mandated By FCC Order 07-188.  The status of this issue was to be re-evaluated after July 31, 2008, but at that time the group was heavily involved in working on defining the differences between wireline and wireless porting and attempting to reach agreement on common processes and data elements.  Note - A similar issue (Issue 3221) submitted by the Wireless Committee was withdrawn.
  + Issue 3255 - Standard Intermodal Document Defining Interoperability Requirements Needed to Process Wireline to Wireless and Wireless to Wireline Ports - this issue was opened in order to develop a standard intermodal document and the work being done for this issue was preempted by work on FCC Order 09-41.
* The group will need to meet to revisit these issues, although they are being addressed, for the most part, with the current ongoing efforts in response to FCC Order 09-41.

OBF Local Ordering Task Force (Linda Peterman, One Communications):

* Linda Peterman reported that since the November 2009 LNPA WG meeting the LSOP Committee met face-to-face 11/16-11/19/09 in Overland Park, KS and held 8 interim conference calls primarily addressing open issue 3307 – Standardization of REQTYP “C” and FCC 09-041 related topics.  An additional face-to-face meeting is scheduled in Piscataway, NJ for the week of 01/18/10 to work through any remaining questions/concerns related to this issue and to review the documents involved for publication.  ATIS is continuing to work on the form templates relative to this issue as well.  Linda stated that the benefit of Wireless and Vendor participation has been enjoyed during these meetings and calls.
* Linda reported that she is no longer the Co-Chair and/or Leader of the Local Ordering Task Force.  Monet Topps, AT&T, will assume that role for the Task Force and Tracey Guidotti, AT&T, will assume any Intermodal responsibilities.  Dawn Kaplan, Telcordia, and Linda Peterman, One Communications, are the Co-Chairs for the newly formed Ordering Solutions Committee.
* Issues in Final Closure:
  + Issues 3326 & 3370 both moved to Final Closure on 1/7/10.  Both issues involved Common Language Trademark Statements as well as specific field Usage and Definition Notes updates for multiple practices.
* There are no issues in Initial Closure:
* Open Issues:
  + Issue 3306 – Schema not matching the LSOG.  The expectation is that this will be resolved with the 1Q10 publication of the LSOG
  + Issue 3307 – Standardization of REQTYP “C”.   Again, the expectation is that this will be resolved with the 1Q10 publication of the LSOG, barring any regulatory changes that may take place
  + Issue 3343 – Common Language Updates.  Diane Schlenger of Telcordia is working through the necessary Common Language Trademark Statements as well as field updates and is bringing them to the LSOP as she completes them, on an ongoing basis.
  + Issue 3362 – Request New Ordering Field AC – Account Structure Change.  This issue is in the discussion stages and the Issue Champion (Verizon) currently has an action item to bring background material for further discussion.
* New Issues:
  + New #1 – Common Language Updates
  + New #2 – Standardization of Directory Listings in 102 Practice
  + New #3 – Standardization & Consolidation of Directory Listings Inquiry/Response and Listing Reconciliation (from LSOG 6) into the 111 Practice
  + New #4 – Common Language Updates

These 4 New Issues have been agreed upon by the Committee; however, have not been assigned issue numbers at this point.  Given the change in the structure of OBF, discussion will need to be held between the Local Ordering Task Force, the Ordering Solutions Committee Leadership and potentially ATIS to determine how to handle issues in this somewhat “limbo” status.

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. Adam Newman, Telcordia, and Dave Garner, Neustar, have an action item to review the 1K block guidelines to see if they need any changes per FCC Order 09-41.

* Initial Pending Issues:
* INC Issue 656 – Opened to update the 1K pooling guidelines’ expedite process.
* INC Issue 604 – Changes the term “LERG assignee” to “codeholder” in the guidelines. Appendix C of the COCAG, in the area of the abandoned code return process, a lot of editing is required to make this change.
* INC Issue 663 – Check Porting on Block Donations – PA had done scrubs with PA database and NPAC and determined that blocks were being donated to pool with >10% contamination. This issue has now gone to Final Closure. The issue was closed without any changes because not a lot of donations are being done today. A Change Order would have been high cost.
* INC Issue 664 – Review NPA Allocation Guidelines to Consider NPA Sharing to New NANP Entrants – a new NANP entrant is generally a country. The INC is looking to see if there are any gateway switching issues.

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. The FoN is discussing identified regulatory issues.
* The ITU has updated its number portability supplement that provides a table of the different types of portability in the world. The U.S may be asked to fill out the number portability supplement for the U.S.

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

* Teresa Patton, AT&T, reported that a meeting has been scheduled for January 27th at 10:30am Central for 2 hours. Anyone interested in participating should contact Teresa.
* A provider requested that Service Bureaus be included in the testing.

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 awaiting 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 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 January 2010 LNPA WG meeting.

* + Bob Bruce, Syniverse, presented the attached revised PIM 74 (v2).
* E-mail addresses and fax numbers are no longer on the OBF-recommended LSR for Simple Ports.
* The group agreed that the intent of this Best Practice is not to force the Old SP to deliver an FOC via fax to the New SP if the Old SP chooses not to support fax transmission for FOCs. It was agreed that at the option of the Old SP, they can send the FOC via e-mail, for example.
* A Service Provider stated that they will post on their GUI that if the New SP wants a response sent to them, they must provide their e-mail address on the LSR. This was viewed as acceptable by the group.
* The group agreed to add a statement that this Best Practice does not imply that the Old SP has to accept LSRs in a manner that they do not currently support.
* At the suggestion of a Service Provider, there were no objections to the addition of “default e-mail address” in the last bullet of the attached.
* Regarding the attached PIM 74, Bob Bruce, Syniverse, will revise the proposed related Best Practice to address the revisions agreed to at the January 12-13, 2010 LNPA WG meeting, e.g., change OSP to ONSP and NSP to NNSP, add a statement that this Best Practice does not imply that the ONSP has to accept LSRs in a manner that they do not support, add “default e-mail address” in the last bullet. The revised PIM and Best Practice will be reviewed on the February 9, 2010 LNPA WG conference call.
* The group agreed that the responsibility of any errors due to inaccurate or missing e-mail addresses on the LSR is that of the New SP.
* The Co-Chairs then asked for any objections to accepting the proposed Best Practice as revised at the January 12-13, 2010 meeting and with the agreements reached by the group and reflected in these minutes. Objecting were:
  + - One Communications
    - Comcast

With no other Service Providers in attendance objecting, the Co-Chairs determined that consensus was reached to accept this Best Practice.

* The Co-Chairs then asked for any objections to closing PIM 74. Objecting were:
  + - Comcast

With no other Service Providers in attendance objecting, the Co-Chairs determined that consensus was reached to close PIM 74.

* A Service Provider expressed concern related to enforceability of the Best Practice and stated that some providers may go to the expense of implementing the necessary system changes while others may choose not to. It was agreed to take this Best Practice to NANC and request their endorsement for industry implementation by Feb 2, 2011.
* 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 the attached revised PIM 75 (v2) 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 account information on-line or (CPNI)) 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).”

The following bullets capture the discussion that took place at the January 2010 LNPA WG meeting.

* It was agreed to remove “or” before (CPNI) and to spell out CPNI (Customer Proprietary Network Information).
* The Co-Chairs then asked for any objections to accepting the proposed Best Practice as revised at the January 12-13, 2010 meeting. Objecting were:
  + - Windstream

With no other Service Providers in attendance objecting, the Co-Chairs determined that consensus was reached to accept this Best Practice.

* It was agreed to take this Best Practice to NANC and request their endorsement for industry implementation immediately.
* The group agreed to close PIM 75.
* 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.



Ron Steen, AT&T, presented the attached revised PIM 76 (v2) at the January 2010 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.

The following bullets capture the discussion that took place at the January 2010 LNPA WG meeting.

* A Service Provider proposed adjusting the proposed minimum notification from 30 calendar days to 60 calendar days.
* The Co-Chairs then asked for any objections to adjusting the proposed minimum notification from 30 calendar days to 60 calendar days. Objecting were:
  + - One Communications
    - Windstream

With no other Service Providers in attendance objecting, the Co-Chairs determined that consensus was reached to revise the proposed Best Practice to a minimum of 60 calendar days.

* It was further agreed to remove the X-Regional as a recommended means to distribute the notification and leave in “normal notification procedures.”
* It was further agreed that changes to the original notification should be noticed as soon as possible.
* Ron Steen, AT&T, will revise the proposed related Best Practice to address the revisions agreed to at the January 12-13, 2010 LNPA WG meeting, e.g., change the proposed 30 day minimum notification to 60 day minimum notification, remove the X-Regional as a means to distribute and leave in “normal notification procedures.” The revised PIM and Best Practice will be reviewed on the February 9, 2010 LNPA WG conference call.

Change Management – Neustar:

* Release 3.3.4 FRS, IIS, GDMO, ASN.1 – Neustar:



* Neustar reviewed changes to the attached FRS and IIS which contain change bars for the following Change Orders – NANC 416, NANC 429, NANC 430, NANC 435, NANC 436, NANC 438, NANC 440, and NANC 441.
* Regarding the attached Release 3.3.4 documents, LNPA WG Participants are to review and provide any comments and suggested revisions to Neustar by close of business, Wednesday, January 20, 2010.
* NANC 408 (Action Item 120809-04) – LNPA WG Participants:



Action Item 120809-04: Regarding NANC Change Order 408, SPID Migration Automation, LNPA WG Participants are to come to the January 12-13, 2010 meeting prepared to determine if FRS Requirement RR3-263, which instructs the NPAC to update the Old SPID in a migration when a code is migrated, can be eliminated. Keeping this requirement could reduce the number of SPID migrations that are eligible to be done over the interface.

* Regarding Action Item 120809-04, Telcordia stated that they do this requirement in their SOA.
* There were no objections to removing the requirement due to the interest in increasing the number of migrations that qualify to be done over the interface.
* Action Item 120809-04 was closed.
* Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will place a SPID Migration Discussion

topic on the March 2010 LNPA WG meeting agenda.

* Release 3.4 Change Order Review – LNPA WG Participants:



* The group reviewed the change bars in the attached Release 3.4 Change Order document.
* Separate SOA and LSMS tuneables were added for BDDs.
* It was agreed that the following requirement on page 47 in the attached is not necessary and will be deleted:

**Req X59 SPID Migration – FTP Site Date Subdirectory - Service Provider Tunable**

NPAC SMS shall provide a Service Provider SOA Automated SPID Migration Indicator tunable parameter which defines whether a SOA will receive/not-receive automated SPID Migration transactions over their SOA connection.

* Regarding the attached Release 3.4 Change Order document, LNPA WG Participants are to review and provide any comments and suggested revisions to Neustar by close of business, Friday, January 29, 2010.
* Release 3.3.4 Interop Test Case List – LNPA WG Participants:



* The group reviewed the attached Release 3.3.4 Interop Test Case List and made no changes.
* LSMS Capacity Change Order (Action Item 111009-02) – Neustar:

Action Item 111009-02: 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.



* Neustar reviewed the attached slide deck and proposed Change Order with the group in response to Action Item 111009-02.

**** ****

* The SPID of interest list allows SPs to only receive downloads for SPIDs that they want.
* A provider asked how providers could be forced to utilize this functionality in order to prevent other providers from receiving unwanted downloads of SVs. A Best Practice was suggested.
* A provider asked if these records could be accounted for separately by assigning them a new LNP Type (Type 3) in order to track NPAC growth. Neustar stated that the pseudo LRN approach was selected so as not to impact the interface.
* A provider asked if Neustar had looked at capacity and performance impacts. Neustar responded that they regularly look at that and the NPAC has not and will not become a bottleneck.
* A provider asked if the Opt-in could be just for their own SPID unless additional SPIDs are placed on the SPID of interest list. Neustar will look at that.
* There were no objections to accepting this Change Order to work. It will be NANC 442 and will be discussed on the February 9, 2010 LNPA WG conference call.

Status of FCC 09-41-Related Action Items – All:

**** ****

Action Item 111009-07 – Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair:

Action Item 111009-07: 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. See related Action Items 111009-01 and 111009-06.

* This Action Item has been completed and is closed.
* Regarding the table reflecting the planned implementation dates of FCC

09-41 by Service Providers, Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will have the table placed on the NPAC Secure website.

Action Item 111009-08 – Gary Sacra, Verizon:

Action Item 111009-08: Regarding the following language proposed by Verizon and accepted by the LNPA WG on the October 19, 2009 conference call, Gary Sacra, Verizon, will draft a related proposed Best Practice for review and discussion at the January 2010 LNPA WG meeting.

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.

* The group reviewed and accepted new Best Practice 61 in the attached document.



* Action Item 111009-08 was closed.
* Regarding the new Best Practice 61 on the use of Conflict Code 51 with

Simple Ports, Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will send the approved Best Practice to Mohamed Samater, T-Mobile, to be placed in the HTML version of the Best Practices document on the LNPA WG’s website.

* Action Item 090209-03 – Sue Tiffany, Sprint Nextel:

Action Item 090209-03: Sue Tiffany, Sprint Nextel, will submit a proposed Best Practice on Supplemental LSRs, expedites, and the respective FOC response time for Due Date changes for review by the LNPA WG.

* There is still a question in the OBF LSOP Committee as to whether or not expedites are allowed on Simple Ports. This is to be further discussed in the LSOP.
* Sue stated that the proposed Best Practice will be consistent with what comes out of LSOP.
* Regarding the proposed Best Practice on SUPPs and Expedites for Simple

Ports, Sue Tiffany, Sprint Nextel, will revise the proposed Best Practice to address the revisions agreed to at the January 12-13, 2010 LNPA WG meeting, e.g., adding the 3 acceptable options from the NANC LNP Provisioning Flow Narratives addressing the removal of donor switch translations. This will be reviewed on the February 9, 2010 LNPA WG conference call.

* Action Item 090209-05 – Service Providers:

Action Item 090209-05: Service Providers are to determine if we want to place a required range of TNs (2 to X) in the Narratives for Non-Simple Ports. Also, determine if we will acknowledge “projects” and the minimum threshold in terms of TNs that constitute a project. (This is former LNPA WG FCC 09-41 Parking Lot Item PL060909-07.)

* Regarding the proposal to establish the minimum quantity of TNs applicable

to a Non-Simple Port (e.g., 2 to X), Gary Sacra, Verizon, will draft a proposal for review at the March 2010 LNPA WG meeting.

* Action Items 090209-06 and 120809-03 – Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair:

Action Item 090209-06: Regarding time zone differences between Simple and Non-Simple Ports, Service Providers are to determine if any changes will be made for Non-Simple NPAC Business Hours. (This is former LNPA WG FCC 09-41 Parking Lot Item PL072709-02.)

Action Item 120809-03: Regarding open Action Item 090209-06, which addresses time zone differences between the Simple Port process and the Non-Simple Port process, Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will note in the Action Item that the LNPA WG agreed to maintain the NPAC business hours of 7am-7pm Central, Monday-Friday, for wireline-to-wireline and intermodal Non-Simple Ports, but will revisit this decision if the time zone differences become problematic after implementation of FCC 09-41.

* With the publication and reference to these Action Items in these meeting minutes, it was agreed to note both and closed them.
* Action Items 090209-07 and 120809-01 – Jan Doell, Qwest:

Action Item 090209-07: Service Providers are to discuss when the 4 hour FOC clock starts – when the Clearinghouse or Service Bureau receives the LSR or when the Old Service Provider receives the LSR.

Action Item 120809-01: Regarding open Action Item 090209-07, which addresses when the 4-hour FOC clock starts for Simple Ports submitted through a Clearinghouse or Service Bureau, Jan Doell, Qwest, will submit draft text to the LNPA WG Co-Chairs proposing that it starts upon receipt by the Old SP or the Old SP’s Clearinghouse/Service Bureau, if used. The proposed text will be reviewed and discussed at the January 12-13, 2010 LNPA WG meeting.

* The following wording was accepted for the Best Practice:

*"The 4 hour FOC/response interval starts when a complete and accurate LSR is received by the Old Network Service Provider or is received by the agent/service bureau/clearing house of the Old Network Service Provider. See Chart 1 and Chart 2 in Section 3.1 of FCC09-41 Implementation Plan."*

* Regarding the above text proposed by Qwest and approved at the January 12-13, 2010 LNPA WG meeting, addressing when the FOC clock starts on LSRs received, Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will create a new Best Practice and send it to Mohamed Samater, T-Mobile, to be placed in the HTML version of the Best Practices document on the LNPA WG’s website. Chart 1 and Chart 2 in Section 3.1 of the FCC 09-41 Implementation Plan will be included in the new Best Practice.

Discussion of Need for February 2010 Conference Call – All:

* The group agreed to hold a conference call on Tuesday, February 9, 2010, from 11am 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
    - PIM 74 Best Practice Final Review
    - PIM 76 Best Practice Review
    - Review of Proposed Best Practice on Supps
    - Service Provider Change Management Notification
    - Review of NANC 442
    - 2010 Meeting/Call Schedule
    - NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Matrix Deeper Dive Analysis
    - Development of February 18, 2010 NANC Meeting Report
  + New Business – All

Review of November 10-11, 2009 LNPA WG Action Items:



**November 10-11, 2009 LNPA WG Action Items:**

* Item 111009-01: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 111009-02: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 111009-03: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 111009-04: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 111009-05: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 111009-06: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 111009-07: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 111009-08: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 111009-09: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 111009-10: This item has been completed and is Closed.

**November 10-11, 2009 APT Action Items:**

* Item 111009-11: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 111009-12: This item remains Open.

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

* Item 0308-13: This item remains Open.
* Item 0109-05: This item has been Closed.
* Item 0109-11: This item has been Closed.
* Item 0109-12: This item remains Open.
* Item 0309-08: This item remains Open.
* Item 090209-03: This item has been Closed.
* Item 090209-05: This item has been Closed.
* Item 090209-06: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 090209-07: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 091509-05: This item has been completed and is Closed.

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

* Item 101909-04: This item remains Open.

Review of December 8, 2009 LNPA WG Action Items:



**December 8, 2009 LNPA WG Action Items:**

* Item 120809-01: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 120809-02: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 120809-03: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 120809-04: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 120809-05: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 120809-06: This item has been completed and is Closed.

Preparation for February 18, 2010 NANC Meeting – All:

* It was agreed that the LNPA WG Co-Chairs would request NANC endorsement of Best Practices approved since the last NANC meeting.
* An agenda item will be placed on the February 9, 2010 LNPA WG conference call to discuss the items to be placed on the NANC report.

New/Unfinished Business (All):

* Porting of Purchased TNs – Lonnie Keck, AT&T Mobility:
* Lonnie Keck, AT&T Mobility, raised an issue regarding the sale and purchase of telephone numbers.
* It was stated that there are INC and FCC rules prohibiting the purchasing of numbers.
* Lonnie reported that people are creating shell accounts with certain numbers and advertising them on e-Bay and Craig’s List for sale, and then assisting the buyer in getting the number ported to them.
* It was suggested that AT&T tee this up at the NANC meeting.
* A participant stated that they recall on the FCC’s orders a general prohibition of the sale of numbers without specificity as to who it applies to.
* A Best Practice prohibiting the porting of TNs that have been sold or bought was suggested.
* It was stated that this is different to the case where a business is sold and the TNs are transferred to the new business owner.
* It was stated that the sale or brokering of toll free numbers by subscribers is prohibited.
* Regarding the issue of the porting of purchased TNs, Lonnie Keck, AT&TMobility, will draft a proposed Best Practice for review by the LNPA WG.
* 2/28/10 SPID Migration Request – Renee Dillon, AT&T Mobility:

****

* Renee Dillon, AT&T Mobility, stated that the limit of 25 SPID migrations nationally for 2/28/10 has been reached and AT&T Mobility requires a SPID migration in the SE and SW Regions. Renee requested a waiver to add 1 SPID migration in each of those regions for 2/28/10.
* There were no objections to the waiver request and it was granted.

***Next Conference Call …February 9, 2010: 11am – 5pm Eastern, 888-412-7808 PIN 23272#***

***Next Meeting …March 9-10, 2010: Location…Denver, Colorado***

***Hosted by Comcast***