LNPA WORKING GROUP

February 9, 2010 Conference Call

Final Minutes

**TUESDAY 02/09/10**

Tuesday, 02/09/10, Conference Call Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| Tina Plaisance | Alltel | Shannon Sevigny | | Neustar Pooling |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | Linda Peterman | | One Communications |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Mobility | Peggy Rubino | | Paetec |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Jan Doell | | Qwest |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T | Towanda Russell | | RCN |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T | Rosemary Emmer | | Sprint Nextel |
| Penn Pfautz | AT&T | Carol Frike | | Sprint Nextel |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LNP Consortium | Sue Tiffany | | Sprint Nextel |
| Vicki Goth | CenturyLink | Jeanne Kulesa | | Synchronoss |
| Tim Kagele | Comcast | Bob Bruce | | Syniverse |
| Jennifer Aspeslaugh | Comcast | Ramesh Chellamani | | Tekelec |
| Beth O’Donnell | Cox | John Malyar | | Telcordia |
| Dennis Robins | DER Consulting | Pat White | | Telcordia |
| Greg Council | Evolving Systems | Lisa Marie Maxson | | Telcordia |
| Therese Mooney | Global Crossings | Kayla Sharbaugh | | Telcordia |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW | Joel Zamlong | | Telcordia |
| Bonnie Johnson | Integra Telecom | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Stephanie Hudson | JSI | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Bridget Alexander | JSI | Mohamed Samater | | T-Mobile |
| Lynette Khirallah | NetNumber | Amanda Molina | | Townes Telecommunications |
| Dave Garner | Neustar | Heather Patterson | | Transaction Network Services |
| Paul LaGattuta | Neustar | David Lund | | US Cellular |
| Bill Reidway | Neustar | Tanya Golub | | US Cellular |
| John Nakamura | Neustar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| Jim Rooks | Neustar | Jason Lee | | Verizon |
| Stephen Addicks | Neustar | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Marybeth Degeorgis | Neustar | Tom Zablocki | | Vonage |
| Marcel Champagne | Neustar | Tana Henson | | Windstream |
| Ed Barker | Neustar | Tiki Gaugler | | XO Communications |
| Mubeen Saifullah | Neustar Clearinghouse | Dawn Lawrence | | XO Communications |

NOTE: ALL ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “FEBRUARY 9 2010 LNPA ACTION ITEMS” FILE ISSUED IN A SEPARATE E-MAIL FROM THESE MINUTES AND ATTACHED BELOW.

****

**FEBRUARY 9, 2010 CONFERENCE CALL MINUTES:**

PIM 74 Best Practice Final Review (Action Item 011210-01) – Bob Bruce, Syniverse:

**Action Item 011210-01:** 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.



* Bob Bruce, Syniverse, discussed the revisions to PIM 74 and the associated Best Practice per Action Item 011210-01.
* There were no objections to this becoming a Best Practice.
* This will become Best Practice 63. It was agreed to close PIM 74 as a result.
* Regarding the attached PIM 74, Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will create Best Practice 63, approved on the February 9, 2010 LNPA WG conference call, and send it to Mohamed Samater, T-Mobile, to be uploaded to the LNPA WG’s Best Practice website. At the February 18, 2010 NANC meeting, Gary will request on the behalf of the LNPA WG that the NANC endorse BP 63.

PIM 76 Best Practice Review (Action Item 011210-08) – Ron Steen, AT&T:

**Action Item 011210-08:** Regarding the attached PIM 76, 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.



* Ron Steen, AT&T, discussed the revisions to PIM 76 per Action Item 011210-08.
* It was agreed that the intent of the proposed Best Practices includes changes to GUIs and automated systems.
* Windstream stated an objection to the proposed minimum of 60 calendar days notice as being excessive in their view.
* There were no other objections voiced and the Co-Chairs determined that consensus was reached to accept the current wording of PIM 76 as Best Practice 64.
* Regarding the attached PIM 76, Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will create Best Practice 64, approved on the February 9, 2010 LNPA WG conference call, and send it to Mohamed Samater, T-Mobile, to be uploaded to the LNPA WG’s Best Practice website. At the February 18, 2010 NANC meeting, Gary will request on the behalf of the LNPA WG that the NANC endorse BP 64.
* It was agreed that PIM 76 will be closed.

Review of Proposed Best Practice on Supps (Action Item 011210-09) – Sue Tiffany, Sprint Nextel:

**Action Item 011210-09:** 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 011210-09 will remain open and will be on the March 2010 LNPA WG meeting agenda for discussion.

Service Provider Change Management Notification (Action Item 011210-10) – Service Providers:

**Action Item 011210-10:** At the January 12-13, 2010 LNPA WG meeting, Service Providers were asked if they could provide more advance notice than their normal change management notification period with regard to their system changes affecting other Service Providers in support of the implementation of FCC 09-41. 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.

* Verizon, Verizon Wireless, and T-Mobile stated that they will provide at least 60 calendar days notice.
* AT&T requested to keep this Action Item open until the March 2010 LNPA WG meeting.
* Action Item 011210-10 will remain open for discussion at the March 2010 LNPA WG meeting.

Review of NANC 442 – Neustar:



* Neustar reviewed the attached NANC 442 – Pseudo-LRN – Change Order with the group.
* A question was raised regarding Pseudo-LRN (p-LRN) records and SPID migrations. Could there be p-LRN records in the NPAC that the migrating-to SPID might not be aware of? A Service Provider stated that generation of a report of p-LRN records that need to be deleted, similar to that which is generated today for SPID migrations, could address this. These p-LRN records would not prevent the migrating-to SPID from doing an inter or intra port on those TNs. Regarding the attached NANC 442 (Pseudo-LRNs) Change Order, Neustar will review the Change Order in the context of SPID migrations and report any necessary requirements at the March 2010 LNPA WG meeting.
* A Service Provider stated that an SV with an LRN of all 0s would have to be prevented at the LSMS from being pushed down to the SCP to prevent any call processing issues. Possible options include:

1. Have it downloaded to the LSMS and stop there (not download to the SCP).
2. Have it downloaded to the LSMS and have it pushed down to another system (not the SCP).
3. Have it downloaded to an alternate LSMS (one already in place or a new one) that does not download to the SCP.

* Regarding the attached NANC 442 (Pseudo-LRNs) Change Order, Service

Providers are to determine if Pseudo LRN records should be considered in the SV limit for SPID migrations and considered in the context of the restriction that migrations with impacted SVs not be performed over the interface. This will be discussed at the March 2010 LNPA WG meeting.

* Regarding the attached NANC 442 (Pseudo-LRNs) Change Order, Local

System Vendors are to determine if Pseudo LRN records should be considered in the SV limit for SPID migrations and considered in the context of the restriction that migrations with impacted SVs not be performed over the interface. This will be discussed at the March 2010 LNPA WG meeting.

* Regarding the attached NANC 442 (Pseudo-LRNs) Change Order, Neustar will revise the requirements to reflect that all SPIDs a provider wishes to receive Pseudo-LRN record downloads for, including their own, must be on their accepted SPID list. This will be reviewed at the March 2010 LNPA WG meeting.
* A question was asked regarding whether to send the 1st port notification on p-LRN records. Initial response is no.
* Service Providers are to come to the March 2010 LNPA WG meeting prepared to determine the next steps for NANC 442.

2010 Meeting/Call Schedule – All:



* The July 2010 meeting is firm for Seattle, Washington.
* The May 2010 and November 2010 meeting locations are still tentative.

NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Matrix Deeper Dive Analysis – All:

 

* Matrix Item 37 (Action Item 011210-13) – Neustar:

**Action Item 011210-13:** Regarding Item 37 in the NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Matrix, Neustar will provide any example scenarios illustrating their concern raised regarding pending Port-To-Original (PTO) ports for Number Pool Block creation.

* + Neustar reviewed slide 6 in the attached deck which was discussed at the January 12-13, 2010 LNPA WG meeting.



* + Neustar stated that each NPAC will reject the other’s operation in this scenario and either the PTO would have to be deleted and the –X then created, or the –X would have to be deleted and the PTO allowed to complete and the –X then recreated.
  + It was stated that these operations would have to cross the wire within the same short timeframe. It was further stated that this scenario could happen and an M&P could resolve it.
  + Neustar stated that this is handled via automation today and not via a manual M&P. Locking prevents this today but is costly in terms of performance. One of the two operations would fail today and the other would proceed forward.
  + A provider stated that we should be investigating ways of adding more automation, rather than less. Another provider commented that providers are interested in exploring automated means of addressing all race conditions. Regarding NANC 437 and the discussion of potential race conditions, Telcordia will investigate the feasibility of incorporating a database locking mechanism in the NANC 437 requirements to address the issue. This will be discussed at the March 2010 LNPA WG meeting.
  + Action Item 011210-13 is closed. Matrix Item 37 remains open.
* Matrix Item 53 (Action Items 011210-20 and 011210-21) – Service Providers:

**Action Item 011210-20:** With regard to Item 53 in the NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Matrix, described in the attached file, 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.



* AT&T, Sprint Nextel, TNS, T-Mobile, and Verizon stated that they preferred the SV Activation method. Concerns were expressed with the SV Creation method related to the operational impact and complexity with cancelled ports which would not be the case with awaiting the transfer of the Master NPAC role until the port was activated, according to those providers advocating the SV Activation method.
* Qwest initially stated a preference for the SV Creation method but subsequently stated they could support the SV Activation method.
* It was determined that consensus was reached to go with the SV Activation method in requirements. Regarding NANC 437 and the consensus reached by Service Providers on the February 9, 2010 LNPA WG conference call that the role of Master NPAC should be transferred at the point of SV Activation rather than at the point of SV Creation as currently proposed in NANC 437 requirements, Telcordia will revisit the requirements and determine what changes will need to be made and report out at the March 2010 LNPA WG meeting.
* Action Item 011210-20 is closed. Matrix Item 53 remains open.

**Action Item 011210-21:** Regarding NANC 437 requirements, 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.

* Verizon, T-Mobile, and AT&T stated that all NPACs should have all archived data that is stored offline.
* There were no objections to this being a requirement. US Cellular said that they were withholding their input as they were still reviewing.
* Action Item 011210-21 is closed.
* Matrix Items 25 and 72 (Action Item 011210-23) – Vendors:

**Action Item 011210-23:** 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.

* Telcordia provided the attached input to assist in the discussion of Action Item 011210-23. It was stated that Option 4 (NPAC identifier) could in fact be backward compatible.



NOTE: The slide deck above was updated by Telcordia based on the February 9, 2010 discussion and will be reviewed at the March 9-10, 2010 LNPA WG meeting.

* Regarding NANC 437 and the following 4 options under discussion for SV ID management, Neustar will analyze and provide a readout at the March 2010 LNPA WG meeting of the magnitude and month-over-month growth of the applicable SV IDs in order to assist the group in determining which method to use.

The 4 options currently under consideration 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.
* A provider asked what the practical limit is on the number of NPACs in a region. The provider suggested this be part of the final report.
* Action Item 011210-23 and Matrix Item 25 remain open.
* Matrix Item 99.2 (Action Items 011210-15 and 011210-17) – Telcordia/LNPA WG Participants:

**Action Item 011210-15:** Regarding Item 99.2 in the NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Matrix which deals with the Peered Resend Message, Telcordia 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. See related Action 011210-17.

**Action Item 011210-17:** 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. See related Action Item 011210-15.

* Telcordia reviewed the changes in response to Action Item 011210-15. It was agreed that the Action Item was satisfied and could be closed. As a result, Action Item 011210-17 is closed.
* Neustar asked why the initiation of a resend is restricted to the Master NPAC? Could a port-away be prevented because of the failed-list of a non-Master NPAC? Neustar to review requirements.
* It was agreed to close Matrix Item 99.2.
* Matrix Item 129 (AI 011210-22) – Service Providers

**Action Item 011210-22:** 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.

* Verizon, T-Mobile, and Qwest stated that they do not need this functionality.
* Neustar reported that this functionality is availability and used today over the LTI.
* The group agreed that based on the functionality being used today, it should be replicated in NANC 437.
* Action Item 011210-22 is closed and Matrix Item 129 will remain open pending determination of how the functionality will be implemented in NANC 437.
* Matrix Item 144 (Action Items 011210-12 and 011210-16) – Neustar/Telcordia:

**Action Item 011210-12:** Related to Action Item 011210-16, Neustar will review Telcordia’s clarification in the NANC 437 requirements related to Item 144 in the NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Matrix and provide feedback on the February 9, 2010 LNPA WG conference call as to whether it answers their question raised at the January 12-13, 2010 LNPA WG meeting.

**Action Item 011210-16:** Regarding Item 144 in the NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Matrix, 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 all. See related Action Item 011210-12.

* Telcordia reviewed with the group the proposed text in response to Action Item 011210-16. See slides 13 and 14 in the attached deck.



* In response to Action Item 011210-12, Neustar responded that discrepant SVs should be reported as discrepant. Regarding Item 144 in the NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Matrix, Neustar will send suggested language addressing discrepant SVs to Telcordia for review.
* The group agreed to close Action Items 011210-12 and 011210-16. Matrix Item 144 remains open.
* Action Item 011210-14 – Telcordia:

**Action Item 011210-14:** Regarding Slide 6 in the attached file, 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?.



* Telcordia reviewed with the group the response to Action Item 011210-14. See slides 15 and 16 in the attached deck.



* If the Pool Administrator (PA) is involved in a change of effective date in the –X it is business as usual (NPAC pulls data from the PA). If the blockholder goes directly to NPAC to change the effective date, an M&P would be required to change the date in the codeholder’s NPAC. The codeholder’s NPAC is responsible for creating the –X, the blockholder’s NPAC creates and activates the block object.
* Regarding NANC 437, a question arose on the February 9, 2010 LNPA WG conference call related to the process necessary to affect a change of effective date in the –X when the blockholder goes directly to NPAC to make the date change rather then through the Pool Administrator and the codeholder is served by a different NPAC. Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will review the NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Matrix to determine if an existing item can serve to address this question or if a new item needs to be opened.
* Additional Matrix Items to be teed up and discussed:
  + Telcordia Items (refer to slide deck attached below):



* + Item 36
    - A provider asked if the ability to recover over inter-NPAC interface is more restricted in a 3 NPAC scenario than an LSMS is today. Telcordia responded that they do not believe it is.
    - Neustar asked if Service Providers want NPACs that remain up to stay up and continue to process ports if they can. Comcast, Verizon, Verizon Wireless, and T-Mobile responded yes.
    - Item 36 remains open and will continue to be discussed at the March 9-10, 2010 LNPA WG meeting.
  + Item 80 – Due to time constraints, this item will be discussed in more detail at the March 9-10, 2010 LNPA WG meeting.
  + Item 112:
    - Telcordia stated that the Non-Master NPACs could perform validations optionally without putting it in requirements.
    - It was agreed that the Master NPAC would do the data validations and there would be no change to NANC 437 requirements in this area.
    - Matrix Item 112 is closed.
  + Item 167 – Due to time constraints, this item will be discussed in more detail at the March 9-10, 2010 LNPA WG meeting.
  + Item 177 – Due to time constraints, this item will be discussed in more detail at the March 9-10, 2010 LNPA WG meeting.
  + Item 179 – Due to time constraints, this item will be discussed in more detail at the March 9-10, 2010 LNPA WG meeting.
* Items Requiring Service Provider Input:
  + Item 74 - Need to address both source of NPA-NXX data and management of discrepancies.
    - Due to time constraints, this item will be discussed in more detail at the March 9-10, 2010 LNPA WG meeting.
  + Item 123 - Is there a need to query a pending SV from a non-Primary NPAC? We need to discuss development of an M&P to address facilitation of completion or cancellation of pending SVs among multiple NPACs when a SPID migration is taking place.
    - Due to time constraints, this item will be discussed in more detail at the March 9-10, 2010 LNPA WG meeting.
* All revisions to the NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Matrix made on the February 9, 2010 LNPA WG conference call are captured in the attached v19 and are identified with the date 02/09/10.



Development of February 18, 2010 NANC Meeting Report – All:

* It was agreed that the LNPA WG’s report to the NANC for the February 18, 2010 meeting will consist of a readout of the following:
* Newly Approved Number Portability Best Practices BPs 60, 61, 62, 63, and 64) and a request for NANC endorsement of each
* Status of NANC 437 Peered NPAC Analysis
* FCC 09-41 Implementation Plan and a request for any status

New Business – All:

* Request to move SP Medium Timer Profile Report start date from June 1, 2010 to July 1, 2010 – Neustar:
* Neustar teed up a request to move the implementation date of the SP Medium Timer Profile Report, which will be used to identify providers’ implementation date of FCC Order 09-41, from June 1, 2010 to July 1, 2010. The reason for the request is to reduce the time period in which the report will have to be maintained manually.
* A provider asked if this report is required for inter-carrier testing. Neustar responded that it is not.
* There were no objections to Neustar’s request for the change in start date. This will be recommended to the NAPM LLC.
* November 14, 2010 Western Region SPID Migration Blackout Exemption Request – AT&T:
* Due to the need to perform a SPID migration in the Western Region only on November 14, 2010, AT&T requested a blackout exemption for the Western Region for that date.
* Two providers stated that they need to check if they have any planned maintenance.
* Regarding AT&T’s request for an exemption in the Western Region of the

November 14, 2010 SPID migration blackout, Service Providers are to determine if they have any objections to the request. If no objections are submitted to the LNPA WG Co-Chairs by close of business on Friday, February 19, 2010, the request will be considered approved.

NOTE: No objections were received and AT&T’s exemption request was approved.

* Wireless Implementation of WICIS 5.0.0 – Rosemary Emmer and Sue Tiffany, Sprint Nextel:
* Rosemary Emmer and Sue Tiffany, Sprint Nextel raised an issue regarding the fact that some wireless providers will still be on WICIS 4.0.0 after August 2, 2010, which requires some WPR fields that were made optional in WICIS 5.0.0 to comply with the OBF 14-field recommendation. They asked how do wireline carriers plan to handle and keep track of the WICIS version that wireless carriers are using after August 1, 2010. Will they take into account the WICIS version when creating the LSR?
* They cited the following example:

* 1. In August … Wireline Carrier wants to Port-In a TN from Wireless Carrier A that is supporting Medium Timers and is on WICIS 5.0.0 … what "type" of LSR will the Wireline carrier send?
  2. In August … The same Wireline Carrier wants to Port-In a TN from Wireless Carrier B that is supporting Medium Timers and is on WICIS 4.0.0 … what "type" of LSR will the Wireline carrier send?

Will the Wireline Carrier in Examples 1 and 2 above differentiate between carriers on WICIS 4.0.0 and 5.0.0 when sending an LSR?

The difference here is that the Wireless Carrier on 4.0.0 has a number of fields on the WPR that are Mandatory and therefore required to complete the port, while the Wireless Carrier on 5.0.0 has these fields Optional. Also, WICIS 4.0.0 does not sunset until 2011 so there is a possibility for some Wireless Carriers to support Medium Timers and still use WICIS 4.0.0 after August 1, 2010.

* Sue Tiffany, Sprint Nextel, and Bob Bruce, Syniverse, will develop a

proposed draft Best Practice addressing the issue that some wireless providers will still be on WICIS 4.0.0 after August 2, 2010, which requires some fields that were made optional in WICIS 5.0.0 to comply with the OBF 14 field recommendation. This proposed Best Practice will be shared with the OBF’s LSOP Committee for review prior to bringing it to the LNPA WG.

***Next General LNPA WG Meeting …March 9-10, 2010, Denver, Colorado – Hosted by Comcast***