LNPA WORKING GROUP

May 11-12, 2010 Meeting

Final Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| St. Petersburg, Florida | Host: Brighthouse and Syniverse |

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

**TUESDAY 05/11/10**

Tuesday, 05/11/10, Attendance:

| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tina Plaisance | Alltel (phone) | Mubeen Saifullah | | Neustar Clearinghouse |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Shannon Sevigny | | Neustar Pooling (phone) |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T (phone) | Linda Peterman | | One Communications |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T | Peggy Rubino | | Paetec (phone) |
| Tracey Guidotti | AT&T | Mary Retka | | Qwest (phone) |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | Jan Doell | | Qwest |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Mobility | Lavinia Rotaru | | Sprint Nextel |
| Barbara Hjelmaa | Brighthouse Networks | Sue Tiffany | | Sprint Nextel |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LNP Consortium | Carol Frike | | Sprint Nextel (phone) |
| Vicki Goth | CenturyLink | Bob Bruce | | Syniverse |
| Tim Kagele | Comcast (phone) | Joel Zamlong | | Telcordia (phone) |
| Jen Aspeslagh | Comcast (phone) | John Malyar | | Telcordia |
| Beth O’Donnell | Cox (phone) | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Greg Council | Evolving Systems | Pat White | | Telcordia |
| Jay Hjellum | Evolving Systems | Lisa Marie Maxson | | Telcordia |
| Therese Mooney | Global Crossing (phone) | George Tsacnaris | | Telcordia |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW (phone) | Kayla Sharbaugh | | Telcordia (phone) |
| Bonnie Johnson | Integra (phone) | Jason Loyer | | Time Warner Cable |
| Bridget Alexander | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Karen Hoffman | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Mohamed Samater | | T-Mobile (phone) |
| Tony DiFiore | NECA (phone) | Heather Patterson | | TNS (phone) |
| Paul LaGattuta | Neustar | Chris Cordek | | TNS |
| Jim Rooks | Neustar | Amanda Molina | | Townes (phone) |
| Stephen Addicks | Neustar | David Lund | | US Cellular |
| Michael O’Connor | Neustar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| John Nakamura | Neustar | Jason Lee | | Verizon (phone) |
| Bill Reidway | Neustar | Lora Williams | | Verizon (phone) |
| Marcel Champagne | Neustar | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Dave Garner | Neustar | Tom Zablocki | | Vonage |
| Pamela Connell | Neustar | Tana Henson | | Windstream |
| Marybeth Degeorgis | Neustar | Dawn Lawrence | | XO Comm. (phone) |
|  |  |  | |  |

NOTE: ALL ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “MAY 11-12 2010 LNPA ACTION ITEMS” FILE ISSUED IN A SEPARATE E-MAIL FROM THESE MINUTES AND ATTACHED BELOW.

****

**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 from 11am to 5pm Eastern time, dial-in bridge number is 888-412-7808, pin 23272# |  |  |
| May |  | 11th-12th | Brighthouse and Syniverse | St. Petersburg, Florida |
| June |  | No meeting.  6/8/2010 call from 11am to 2pm Eastern time, dial-in bridge number is 888-412-7808, pin 23272# |  |  |
| 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 | Key West, Florida |
| 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.

March 9-10, 2010 Meeting Minutes Review:

* With the following change to the DRAFT March 9-10, 2010 LNPA WG conference call minutes, they were approved as FINAL.
  + In the NANC 408 discussion on page 25, change the 4th bullet to read, “Regarding the SPID migration e-mail notification, today it includes an Excel

spreadsheet attachment.  With NANC 408 it will have text information in the body of the e-mail since it will be automatically generated by the NPAC. Neustar will bring in examples for review when they become available.”

April 13, 2010 Conference Call Minutes Review:

* No changes were made to the DRAFT April 13, 2010 LNPA WG conference call minutes, and they were approved as FINAL.

FCC Order 09-41 Implementation Discussion – All:

* Industry Implementation Timeline (Standing Agenda Item) – All
* No issues were identified that would indicate a problem with the implementation timeline.
* The LNPA WG is assuming the following industry implementation dates:
  + August 2, 2010 for larger Service Providers,
  + February 2, 2011 for smaller Service Providers (those with fewer than 2% of the nation’s subscriber lines).
* **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.
* Service Providers are to send their planned implementation date (either

8/2/2010 or 2/02/2011) of one business day porting (FCC Order 09-41) to the LNPA WG Co-Chairs ([gary.m.sacra@verizon.com](mailto:gary.m.sacra@verizon.com), [paula.jordan@t-mobile.com](mailto:paula.jordan@t-mobile.com), and [lpeterman@onecommunications.com](mailto:lpeterman@onecommunications.com)) by May 31, 2010.

* Service Providers are to provide their SPID(s) associated with their planned

implementation date (either 8/2/2010 or 2/2/2011) of one business day porting (FCC Order 09-41) to the LNPA WG Co-Chairs ([gary.m.sacra@verizon.com](mailto:gary.m.sacra@verizon.com), [paula.jordan@t-mobile.com](mailto:paula.jordan@t-mobile.com), and [lpeterman@onecommunications.com](mailto:lpeterman@onecommunications.com)) by May 31, 2010.

* Verizon Business (former MCI) will update their porting web site (<http://www.verizonbusiness.com/us/lnp/lnp_guide/>) with their business rules for FCC 09-41 by the first week of June 2010.
* Qwest’s IMA release schedule for Simple Port work is posted on the following Qwest web site for access by all. (Go down to the chart indicated as “IMA Release 28.0, which is the FCC 09-41 mandate info.)

<http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/downloads/2010/100120/OSS_Calendar_Version_109.pdf>

* One Communication’s notification regarding system changes should be posted/provided no later than June 11, 2010.
* Regarding Action Item 011210-10, for those Service Providers going 8/2/2010, notice must be no later than 60 days prior to the implementation date. Action Item 011210-10 remains open.
* **Action Item 041310-02:** A question was raised as to whether the 14 Local Service Request (LSR) fields recommended by the OBF and LNPA WG for simple ports apply to only simple ports with 1-2 day due dates or do they apply to all simple ports regardless of due date. Service Providers are to come to the May 2010 LNPA WG meeting prepared to answer for their respective companies.
* CenturyLink, T-Mobile, Verizon, One Communication, AT&T, Sprint Nextel, US Cellular, Qwest, and Vonage stated that the 14 fields apply to Simple Ports regardless of due date. No Service Providers responded otherwise.
* Action Item 041310-02 remains open.

Discussion of Possible Elimination of ITP Testing – All:

* The group discussed 3 possible alternatives for ITP testing:
  + - 1. Present Method of Operation (using Simulator)

1. Eliminate ITP testing entirely
2. Continue ITP testing, but using an NPAC CMIP gateway instead of the Simulator

* A number of participants, both local system vendors and Service Providers, stated that they prefer Alternative 3 because they get better results testing CMIP with the NPAC.
* It was stated that if we go with Alternative 3, the same testing schedule would have to apply, i.e., delivering the CMIP gateway early.
* Neustar will look into using the actual CMIP Gateway for interoperability testing (Alternative 3) for Release 3.4 (SOW 73) and report back to the LNPA WG on the June 8, 2010 conference call.
* It was asked if regression tests could be regrouped to follow the porting flows more closely. Neustar stated that the regression tests do not dictate the order the tests had to be run.

NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Deeper Dive Analysis – All:

   

* Matrix Item 36 (Action Item 041310-04) – Telcordia

**Action Item 041310-04:** Related to Item 36 in the NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Matrix, if one or more NPACs are down, the NPACs that remain in service are to notify their subtending Service Providers that an NPAC(s) is down and then to notify their Service Providers when it/they come back up. Telcordia will add a requirement to include in this message a list of Service Providers associated with the down NPACs.

* Refer to slide 2 in the file above entitled Telcordia Action Items 5-11-2010 LNPA WG.ppt.
* Telcordia presented the following newly proposed requirements in response to Action Item 041310-04:
* **RT10-X2 – NPAC Notification of Peered NPAC Outage Occurrence Contents**

NPAC SMS shall include in the Peered NPAC Outage Occurrence Notification to all the Service Providers for which it is the Primary NPAC SMS the starting timestamp of the outage and the list of Service Providers affected by the outage.

* **RT10-X4 – NPAC Notification of Peered NPAC Outage Resolution Contents**

NPAC SMS shall include in the Peered NPAC Outage Resolution Notification to all the Service Providers for which it is the Primary NPAC SMS the resolution timestamp for the outage and the list of Service Providers returned to service.

* It was asked how other NPACs would know when another one goes down. Telcordia responded that there are associations and when they go down it is evident by the other NPACs.
* Action Item 041310-04 is closed.
* Matrix Item 169 (Action Item 041310-05) – Telcordia

**Action Item 041310-05:** Related to NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Matrix Item 169, the LNPA WG determined that there is no reason to restrict inter-NPAC links to one. Telcordia will put together slides on how to implement multiple LSMS associations between peered NPACs for review at the May 2010 LNPA WG meeting.

* Refer to slides 3-5 in the file above entitled Telcordia Action Items 5-11-2010 LNPA WG.ppt for new and revised requirements proposed by Telcordia in response to Action Item 041310-05.
  + Action Item 041310-05 is closed.
* Matrix Item 23 (Action Item 041310-06) – Telcordia

**Action Item 041310-06:** Related to NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Matrix Item 23, Telcordia will propose a NANC 408-like method of SPID migration automation and management in a peered NPAC environment. This proposal will be shared with Neustar prior to the May 2010 LNPA WG meeting and will be reviewed by the group at the May 2010 meeting.

* + Refer to slides 6-8 in the file above entitled Telcordia Action Items 5-11-2010 LNPA WG.ppt for Telcordia’s proposals in response to Action Item 041310-06.
  + Telcordia proposed the following:
  + Each NPAC SMS would provide user interface (GUI) to subtending service providers for migration requests per NANC 408.
  + The regional NPAC SMSs would interface to an external nationwide service provided by third-party funded by NPAC vendors.
  + Potential candidates for providing the service include:
    - * NPAC SMS Vendors
      * Pooling Administrator
      * Other interested parties
* A provider asked if there was any way to have the NPACs update the centralized system instantaneously in order to avoid the possibility of being locked out because one vendor was slower than the other. Telcordia responded that there would be no manual intervention to slow the request.
* The 1st bullet on slide 8 would require new messages over the interface.

“Messaging between Peered NPAC with a Peered NPAC SMS providing the centralized system could be done over the Inter-NPAC SMS SOA and/or LSMS association.”

* NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Matrix Item 23 will remain open with no further discussion until necessary.
* It was stated that we may want to consider eliminating the national migration cap and going with a regional cap only to eliminate the need for a centralized system if 437 moves forward. NPACs in each region could communicate with each other to manage the regional cap.
* Action Item 041310-06 is closed.
* **Action Item 030910-07:** Regarding NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Matrix Items 46 and 193, Gary Sacra, Paula Jordan, and Linda Peterman, LNPA WG Co-Chairs, will put together NPAC billing requirements from the FCC Orders and develop some use cases for discussion on the April 13, 2010 conference call.



* The LNPA WG Co-Chairs teed up for discussion the attached document describing 5 porting use case scenarios in order to examine possible billing alternatives.
* The group agreed that the discussion of billing alternatives for the most part likely applied to all of the use case scenarios.
* The NPAC currently bills based on the request (Activate, Modify, Delete). It was stated that non-primary NPACs would not see that request.
* One billing alternative that was suggested was that all billable transactions could possibly go into a pool. Service Providers could then pay their allocated share to the pool. The pooled dollars could then be distributed among NPAC vendors based on the number of LSMSs they downloaded to. It was also suggested that the number of times an NPAC was the Primary NPAC in a port could be weighted in. It was then said that each NPAC vendor could discount back to their customers after the fact. It was asked how this method would be primed since new vendors with no LSMSs would be doing work for nothing initially. Also, the transaction fee to be used is an unknown. It was stated that a price point could be established, e.g., $2 per transaction, and then each vendor could refund back to their customers. It was stated that we might have to consider the type of LSMS, e.g., that of a facilities-based provider, that is behind the LSMS.
* A second billing alternative suggested was for the transaction fee to go to the Primary NPAC of the winning provider to spur vendors to lower their costs.A provider stated that they do not want to pay more or just break even.It wasquestioned if this met the competitive neutrality requirement. It was said that NPAC vendors could charge differently but must charge their own customers the same fee.
* It was asked how the current billing accuracy SLR could be maintained.
* Action Item 030910-07 is closed. Matrix Items 46 and 193 will remain open with no further discussion until necessary.
* **Action Item 041310-07:** Regarding the NPAC Service Level Requirement 3 (SLR 3) that requires that 95% of NPAC acknowledgement response times are within 3 seconds, Gary Sacra, Paula Jordan, and Ron Steen, as NAPM LLC Project Executives, will review the SLR in the context of NANC 437 and any benefits/implications, etc. of possibly relaxing the SLR and report back to the LNPA WG. This Action Item is related to NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Matrix Items 127 and 192.
* Ron Steen, AT&T, teed up the discussion on behalf of the NAPM LLC Project Executives (PEs) by recapping their discussion in response to this Action Item.
* He stated that the PEs were in agreement that the systems work well today and relaxing the SLRs would be a step backwards in performance and reliability.
* He further stated that a 3 second addition to SLR 3 would be significant for mechanized systems and providers have stated throughout this analysis that there is an absolute need to maintain transparency from a provider perspective.
* There were no objections voiced to the PEs recommendation that SLR 3 be left unchanged at 3 seconds.
* It was stated that an alternative would be to split the 3 seconds in half.
* Action 041310-07 is closed.
* Matrix Items 127 and 192 will remain open with no further discussion until necessary.
* Next Steps – All
* With respect to NANC 437, LNPA WG Co-Chairs will propose definitions of the terms “Technically Feasible” and “Operationally Feasible” to the group prior to the June 8, 2010 conference call.
* Service Providers are to come to the June 8, 2010 LNPA WG conference call prepared to finalize the definitions of “Technically Feasible” and “Operationally Feasible” in the context of NANC 437 and determine when they will be ready to answer the question of NANC 437 technical and operational feasibility.

* All revisions to the NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Matrix that resulted from the May 11, 2010 APT meeting are captured in v22 of the document attached below.



##### LNPA WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION:

**WEDNESDAY 05/12/10**

Wednesday, 05/12/10, Attendance:

| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tina Plaisance | Alltel (phone) | Peggy Rubino | | Paetec (phone) |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Mary Retka | | Qwest (phone) |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T (phone) | Jan Doell | | Qwest |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T | Towanda Russell | | RCN (phone) |
| Tracey Guidotti | AT&T | Lavinia Rotaru | | Sprint Nextel |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | Sue Tiffany | | Sprint Nextel |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Mobility | Jeannie Kulesa | | Synchronoss (phone) |
| Barbara Hjelmaa | Brighthouse Networks | Bob Bruce | | Syniverse |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LNP Consortium | John Malyar | | Telcordia |
| Vicki Goth | CenturyLink | Adam Newman | | Telcordia |
| Jen Aspeslagh | Comcast (phone) | Pat White | | Telcordia |
| Jennifer Hutton | Cox (phone) | Lisa Marie Maxson | | Telcordia |
| Greg Council | Evolving Systems | George Tsacnaris | | Telcordia |
| Jay Hjellum | Evolving Systems | Jason Loyer | | Time Warner Cable |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW (phone) | Paula Jordan | | T-Mobile |
| Stephanie Prull | Integra (phone) | Mohamed Samater | | T-Mobile (phone) |
| Bridget Alexander | John Staurulakis, Inc. (phone) | Heather Patterson | | TNS (phone) |
| Lynette Khirallah | NetNumber (phone) | Chris Cordek | | TNS |
| Paul LaGattuta | Neustar | Rochelle Jones | | TW Telecom (phone) |
| Jim Rooks | Neustar | David Lund | | US Cellular |
| Stephen Addicks | Neustar | Gary Sacra | | Verizon |
| John Nakamura | Neustar | Jason Lee | | Verizon (phone) |
| Marcel Champagne | Neustar | Lora Williams | | Verizon |
| Dave Garner | Neustar | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Marybeth Degeorgis | Neustar | Tom Zablocki | | Vonage |
| Mubeen Saifullah | Neustar Clearinghouse | Tana Henson | | Windstream |
| Shannon Sevigny | Neustar Pooling (phone) | Dawn Lawrence | | XO Comm. (phone) |
| Linda Dorsey | NY PUC (phone) | Tiki Gaugler | | XO Comm. (phone) |
| Linda Peterman | One Communications |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

**MEETING MINUTES:**

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

**OBF Wireless Ordering Task Force:**

* Deb Tucker reported that since the March 2010 LNPA WG meeting, the Wireless Ordering Task Force has held bi-weekly conference calls to monitor both the testing status of the WICIS 5.0.0 implementation and potential changes resulting from any new FCC action with respect to Order 09-41.  Additionally, the Task Force met during OBF #108 held during the ATIS Annual Meeting of Committees (AMOC).
* To date, no interoperability issues have been uncovered through vendor-to-vendor testing and vendor-to-vendor testing is ongoing.  Carriers are well into internal regression testing with positive results.
* Issue 3384 - Implementation Guideline for WICIS 5.0.0 Release - was placed into Initial Closure during OBF #108.  This document establishes guidelines for developing and deploying WICIS 5.0.0 as well as providing an intermodal mapping matrix between WICIS 5.0.0 and LSOG 1Q10.
* A new issue was discussed during the 5/7/2010 meeting and the Task Force recommended the issue for acceptance to the OBF Ordering Solutions Committee.  This issue, Accept Confirmation after Reject when NPDI = C, addresses situations where wireline carriers are responding with FOCs to requests in a rejected status.  Further discussion needs to take place during the June Task Force calls.
* The next Wireless Ordering Task Force call is 5/21/2010.  Bi-weekly calls will continue through 7/30/2010 with an additional meeting on 8/6/2010.

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

* Linda Peterman reported that since the March 2010 LNPA WG meeting, the Local Ordering Task Force (LOTF) met face-to-face at the OBF Annual Meeting of Committees (AMOC) in Orlando, FL.
* The LOTF primarily worked on the manual ordering templates and updated the 1Q10 practices and associated XML documentation. The decision was made to utilize the manual ordering templates for the LSR, EU and NP forms across the board manually rather than only for REQTYP “C”; however, the LR template is specific to REQTYP “C” only. ATIS Legal has provided language to addressing the fact that these templates may not be customized whereas the other forms in the LSOG Practices must be customized prior to use by service providers. A 5/15/10 publication date was set for the 1Q10 LSOG document. Remaining LSOG manual forms will be addressed and issues as templates in subsequent LSOG releases.

Issues in Final Closure:

1. LSOG: Modify LSOG practices in support of a standardized Local Number Portability (LNP) ordering process
2. LSOG: Standardization of the Error Codes and Error messages in the 099 Practices.

3380 LSOG: COMMON LANGUAGE reference cleanup of the NNSP and ONSP fields in the 071 and 099 practices

Issues Withdrawn:

None

Issues in Initial Closure or Initial Pending:

3306 LSOG: The schema doesn’t match the LSOG rules and fields in some places

3387 LSOG: Update ECCKT, OECCKT, RECCKT and DISC ECCKT fields in several practices.

Open Issues:

1. LSOG: Standardization of RT of “Z” in the 099 practice for REQTYP “C” to be utilized by all providers.
2. LSOG: Standardization of the Reason Codes and Jeopardy Code Detail in the 099 Practice.
3. LSOG: Address duplication of fields between product specific practices and 071 and 072 practices

3381 LSOG: Standardization of directory listings in the 102 Practice

3382 LSOG: Standardization and consolidation of Directory Listings Inquiry/Response and Listing Reconciliation (from LSOG 6) all into the 111 Practice

NOTES:

* LOTF is currently looking into meeting face-to-face with one of the other ATIS committees to reduce expenses. If that is determined to not be feasible, LOTF will meet face-to-face instead.
* LOTF has a virtual meeting scheduled for May 24th from 2-3 Eastern to touch based and determine status of FCC 09-41.

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

* Adam Newman, Telcordia and INC Chair, reported out on the INC activities. INC's last meeting was April 20-22 and its next meeting is June 22-25 in Overland Park, KS.

Active Issues:

* Issue 649: Update INC Documents for FCC 09-41, Order Reducing Simple Wireline and Intermodal Ports to One Business Day Interval

No changes needed, but issue remains active pending implementation.

* Issue 664: Review NPA Allocation Guidelines to Consider NPA Sharing

Issue to consider new NANP entrants sharing an NPA and distinguishing

international traffic by country on an NXX basis.

Issues in Initial Closure:

* Issue 679: Update Appendix C, Section 2.11 regarding timing to update records for code reallocation

Added the following language: “It is the responsibility of the new code holder to ensure its AOCN modifies the NXD in BIRRDs to reflect the new SP’s Part 2 information after Telcordia® has updated the AOCN responsibility. This update should be completed within seven calendar days after the approved Part 3 has been issued by NANPA in order to allow adequate industry notification.”

* Issue 679: COCAG Appendix C and TBPAG Clarifications on Block Contamination

Change language in Appendix C and TBPAG from “less than 10% contaminated” to

“10% contaminated or less” to be consistent with the FCC order.

Issues in Initial Pending:

* Issue 604: Code Holder vs. LERG Assignee

Today many industry members use the terms Code Holder and LERG Assignee interchangeably when referencing the service provider assigned an NXX code, and it is no longer necessary to maintain separate terms and definitions. INC agreed to modify the definition of Code Holder, combining the Code Holder and LERG Assignee terms into a single definition that recognizes the responsibilities of an NXX assignee in both pooled and non-pooled areas. The revised definition of Code Holder is as follows:

“An assignee of a pooled or non-pooled NXX code that is assigned by the CO Code Administrator. The responsibilities of an assignee for a pooled NXX are defined in Section 4.2.1 of the Thousands Block Number (NXX-X) Pooling Administration Guidelines (TBPAG) and for a non-pooled NXX are defined in Section 6.3 of the Central Office Code (NXX) Assignment Guidelines (COCAG). A given Code Holder is identified in the LERG Routing Guide as the NPA-NXX-A (Assignee) OCN record holder.”

* Issue 611: Augmenting the NRUF Verification Procedures

The INC modified the NRUF Guidelines to improve the verification procedures to ensure that all assigned resources are reported. The INC also made changes to the NRUF Guidelines to clarify SP and NANPA responsibilities for reporting and verification of all allocated codes and blocks. As a result, NANPA will submit a change order to implement these changes. Finally, the INC determined that no changes to the NRUF Guidelines are required for the reporting of intermediate numbers.

* Issue 656: Update TBPAG Expedite Process for Thousands-blocks (Section 8.6)

The current expedite process is the same for new block requests, block modification requests and block disconnect requests. In all cases, to request a nine calendar day effective date, the block holder must be the LERG Assignee and no NPAC updates required. However, there are some block modification requests where the block holder is not the LERG assignee and no NPAC updates are required. Updates were made to separate the process for when the SP is/is not the Code Holder as well as for modifies/disconnects.

NANC Future of Numbering Working Group Update (Adam Newman, Telcordia & FoN Co-Chair):

* Adam Newman, Telcordia & FoN Co-Chair, provided the current status of issues currently being worked in the FoN.

Active Issues at FoN:

001 New & Future Services

Status: Accepted

Path Forward: Determine if still has value and path forward

002 Telematics and the use of NANP numbers

Status: Accepted

Path Forward: Determined still has value. Need to determine path forward re: Machine-to-Machine focus

004 Geographic Issues Impacting Numbering Policy Decisions

Status: Accepted

Path Forward: Determined still has value. Pending contributions on path forward

005 Commons vs. Market Place Model for Toll Free Numbers

Status: Accepted

Path Forward: Draft whitepaper being finalized for presentation at May 21 NANC meeting. Draft paper outlines the current environment and potential for and issues with property/licensing rights in toll-free numbers. Draft conclusion is that the NANC should send the draft to other industry bodies for input and decide a further path forward after receiving feedback.

The following are issues that are pending submission/presentation:

* What are the Network Topology and Numbering System Impacts of changes to numbering resources?
* Addressing, Interoperability, and ENUM
* Mobile/Nomadic Society Demands and Changing Numbering Requirements (Expanded FTN-4 item)

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

* Teresa Patton, AT&T and ITC Subcommittee Co-Chair, reported that the committee continues to work toward the following schedule:



* Action Items 041310-01 and 041310-03:

**Action Item 041310-01:** Regarding the attached inter-carrier test plans for one-day porting, Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will send them out to the LNPA WG distribution list.

 

NOTE: This Action Item was completed on April 14, 2010.

**Action Item 041310-03:** Regarding the attached inter-carrier test plans for one-day porting, Service Providers that are interested in participating in the testing should provide their company’s testing contact to Teresa Patton, AT&T and Co-Chair of the Inter-carrier Testing (ICT) Subcommittee, at [teresa.j.patton@att.com](mailto:teresa.j.patton@att.com), as soon as they are available. This list of testing contacts will be compiled by the ICT Subcommittee and distributed to those providers participating in the testing.

* Action Item 041310-03 remains open.
* Neustar stated that there has been about 75% signup for Release 3.3.4 Service Provider turn-up testing. New test cases have been added – SOA test cases for NANC 416, 440 and 441. Neustar stressed that it is very important to talk with the tester to discuss the test cases to be run. Even if you are not doing new functionality testing until 2/2/2011, you must do regression testing by 8/2/2010.
* In response to a question, JSI stated they utilize an LTI interface via VPN and since this regression testing applies to SOAs and LSMSs, it does not involve their systems. Neustar concurred..

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 implementation of FCC 09-41.

* 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 implementation of FCC 09-41.

* 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. 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.

* NEW PIM 77 – This PIM, submitted by Qwest, seeks to address porting delay problems caused by a lack of communication/interaction between the ONSP and their OLSP (Reseller) during the data validation stage of the port.



PIM 77 was accepted to be worked at the May 2010 LNPA WG meeting.

At the May 2010 meeting, Qwest explained a number of issues that they have experienced when trying to port in numbers that were served by the ONSP’s Resellers. In one instance, it took 3 ½ months to get the number ported. The ONSP’s and OLSP’s (Reseller’s) CSR data differed and the ONSP kept rejecting Qwest’s LSR. It required the state commission to intervene to get it resolved.

A wireless provider cited a number of examples of porting problems where Resellers were involved. Another provider asked why couldn’t the ONSP just port the number and provide a loss notification to the OLSP.

Another provider cited an example where the ONSP had a trunk to the OLSP and delayed a port request because the ONSP said they had activity on the trunk group.

Qwest was asked how common this is. Qwest responded that they have had several recently.

A provider stated that the onus should be on the OLSP to get the valid data to the ONSP. That provider cited an example where the name on the account was changed by the end user of the OLSP and it was not transmitted to the ONSP. The NNSP submitted an LSR and the name did not match with the ONSP’s records and the LSR was rejected. Qwest stated that it should not be the responsibility of the NNSP to get in the middle of the ONSP’s and the OLSP’s relationship to get this resolved.

A provider said that providers are not working together to get these issues resolved in a timely manner to get the number ported.

Windstream and Vonage objected to accepting PIM 77. No other objections were voiced by providers. It was determined that consensus was reached to accept and work the PIM.

A provider suggested separating this PIM into separate issues to facilitate the discussion.

Regarding the attached PIM 77, Service Providers are to review the PIM internally and come to the July 2010 LNPA WG meeting prepared to discuss possible additional solutions and possible ways to partition the PIM into separate issues.

* NEW PIM 78 – This PIM, submitted by Sprint Nextel and Syniverse, seeks to address porting problems that may result in instances where carriers that support medium timers for one day porting still utilize a prior version of the port request (e.g. WICIS 4.0 or prior version of LSOG).



PIM 78 was accepted to be worked at the May 2010 LNPA WG meeting.

At the May 2010 LNPA WG meeting, it was agreed to place PIM 78 in a Tracking mode awaiting implementation of FCC 09-41.

Change Management – Neustar:

**** ****

* Neustar summarized the revisions to the Change Order documents.
* In the Change Order summary document, the following revisions were made:

1. NANC 437, meeting dates reference.
2. NANC 442, moved from Accepted section to Awaiting SOW section.

* In the Release 3.4 Change Order document, the following revisions were made:

1. NANC 408, moved Action Item 120809-04 from 420 to 408, as this impacts some SOAs, so it is not doc-only for all SOAs.
2. NANC 420, renumber due to move in #1 above.  Added additional doc-only FRS items to the list.
3. NANC 422, added doc-only for Release 3.3.4 error codes in Appendix A of IIS.

* No questions or issues were raised by the group.

Preparation of May 21, 2010 NANC Report – All:

* The group agreed that the following would be included in the LNPA WG’s report for the May 21, 2010 NANC meeting:
* Newly Approved Number Portability Best Practices, requesting NANC endorsement
* NANC 437 Peered NPAC Analysis
* Status of FCC 09-41 Implementation Plan and testing
* Newly Appointed LNPA WG Co-Chair

Discussion of Need for June 2010 Conference Call – All:

* The group agreed to hold a conference call on Tuesday, June 8, 2010, from 11am to 2pm Eastern. The dial-in bridge number is 888-412-7808, pin 23272#. The agenda will consist of the following:
  + - Introductions/Agenda Review – All
    - Readout of May 21st NANC Meeting – Co-Chairs
    - FCC Order 09-41 Implementation Discussion – All
    - Discussion of Use of CMIP Gateway for Release 3.4 ITP Testing – Neustar
    - 2010 Meeting/Call Schedule – All
    - Discussion of NANC 437 Feasibility Definitions – All
  + New Business – All

2010 Meeting/Call Schedule Review – All:



* No changes were made to the attached 2010 schedule.

Review of March 9-10, 2010 LNPA WG Action Items:



**March 9-10, 2010 LNPA WG Action Items:**

* Item 030910-01: This item remains Open.
* Item 030910-02: This item has been completed and is Closed.

**March 9-10, 2010 APT Action Items:**

* Item 030910-03: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 030910-04: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 030910-05: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 030910-06: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 030910-07: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 030910-08: This item has been completed and is Closed.

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

* Item 0308-13: This item remains Open.
* Item 0109-12: This item remains Open.
* Item 0309-08: This item remains Open.
* Item 011210-03: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 011210-10: This item remains Open.

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

* Item 101909-04: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 111009-12: This item has been completed and is Closed.

Review of April 13, 2010 LNPA WG Action Items:



**April 13, 2010 LNPA WG Action Items:**

* Item 041310-01: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 041310-02: This item remains Open.
* Item 041310-03: This item remains Open.

**April 13, 2010 APT Action Items:**

* Item 041310-04: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 041310-05: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 041310-06: This item has been completed and is Closed.
* Item 041310-07: This item has been completed and is Closed.

New/Unfinished Business (All):

* Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, discussed an issue related to a provider not returning the FOC until the due date. Deb stated that Verizon Wireless submits the port requests to this wireline carrier with at least 4 day due dates, but does not receive a response with a confirm until the actual due date.  The carrier does their disconnect once they send the FOC (on the due date), but they do not do anything in the NPAC and do not provide concurrence.  They are very well aware that Verizon Wireless has to wait 18 NPAC business hours in order to activate these numbers, so the customers are put out of service for over a day.

The group agreed that SOW 19 appears to apply in this situation under the “failure to port” scenario, which enables NPAC intervention to assist in getting the port activated.

* Stephanie Prull, Integra, discussed an issue related to the porting of FAX numbers. She stated that Integra received a request from an end user to port their FAX number from the provider providing their FAX service. Their policy is that they will only port out numbers that had previously ported in.

A provider stated that the FCC only exempted paging numbers and mass calling numbers and that these FAX numbers should be portable. Another provider stated that they have cases where providers have in their contracts that the numbers are not portable.

Another provider stated that electronic FAX is an information service and not a telecommunications service and the FCC only requires LNP for telecommunications services.

It was stated that this sounds like the tenant services issue and the real question is not if the number is portable but who is the customer of record. It was further stated that this is analogous to the paging case where the customer of record is the paging company and not their end users. Their end users cannot port the numbers but the paging company can.

This FAX service converts a fax received on the number to an e-mail that is sent to the end user.

It was the general opinion of the group that the customer of record is the FAX company and not their customers and that the FAX company can port their numbers but not their customers.

A provider stated that we do not have a way today of handling these types of situations and identifying these types of services that are not portable vs. Interconnected VoIP numbers which are portable.

It was suggested that Integra bring in a PIM for review and discussion.

* Gary Sacra, Verizon, discussed an issue related to provider use of master billing accounts and the impact to the End User’s ability to port in one day. He explained that some Service Providers currently bundle unrelated single-line, single number End User accounts under a master billing account. This could have impacts on the End User’s ability to port their telephone number on a next-day basis if the Old Service Provider defines this port to be a Non-Simple Port by considering it to be a port of a single telephone number from a multi-telephone number account. In this scenario, the End User has no idea that their account with the Service Provider is part of a master billing account and would expect to be able to port their number on a next-day basis as a Simple Port.

Verizon presented the attached proposed Best Practice requesting that the LNPA WG approve it in order for it to be presented at the May 21, 2010 NANC meeting requesting NANC endorsement.



The group made minor revisions to the draft Best Practice and approved the version attached below for presentation at the May 21, 2010 NANC meeting in order to seek NANC’s endorsement of the Best Practice. There were no objections to the LNPA WG’s approval of this Best Practice.



***Next Conference Call …June 8, 2010: 11am – 2pm Eastern, 888-412-7808 PIN 23272#***

***Next Meeting …July 13-14, 2010: Location…Seattle, Washington***

***Hosted by Neustar***