LNPA WORKING GROUP

June 8, 2010 Conference Call

Final Minutes

**TUESDAY 06/08/10**

Tuesday, 06/08/10, Conference Call Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** |
| Mary Gail Sullivan | 360 Networks | Linda Peterman | One Communications |
| Cheryl Gordon | Alltel | Peggy Rubino | Paetec |
| Tina Plaisance | Alltel | Jan Doell | Qwest |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T Mobility | Mary Retka | Qwest |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T Mobility | Towanda Russell | RCN |
| Tracy Guidotti | AT&T | Carol Frike | Sprint Nextel |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Sue Tiffany | Sprint Nextel |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T | Michele Gehl | Sprint Nextel |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T | Bob Bruce | Syniverse |
| Barbara Hjelmaa | Brighthouse | John Malyar | Telcordia |
| Melani LaCome | Brighthouse | Pat White | Telcordia |
| Tim Kagele | Comcast | Lisa Marie Maxson | Telcordia |
| Jennifer Aspeslagh | Comcast | Joel Zamlong | Telcordia |
| Beth O’Donnell | Cox | Adam Newman | Telcordia |
| Dennis Robins | DER Consulting | Stacy Hannah | Time Warner Cable |
| Greg Council | Evolving Systems | Paula Jordan | T-Mobile |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW | Mohamed Samater | T-Mobile |
| Bonnie Johnson | Integra Telecom | Amanda Molina | Townes Telecommunications |
| Bridget Alexander | JSI | Chris Cordek | Transaction Network Services |
| Karen Hoffman | JSI | David Lund | US Cellular |
| Lynette Khirallah | NetNumber | Tanya Golub | US Cellular |
| Dave Garner | Neustar | Gary Sacra | Verizon |
| Paul LaGattuta | Neustar | Jason Lee | Verizon |
| John Nakamura | Neustar | Deb Tucker | Verizon Wireless |
| Jim Rooks | Neustar | Tom Zablocki | Vonage |
| Stephen Addicks | Neustar  | Tana Henson | Windstream |
| Marybeth Degeorgis | Neustar | Tiki Gaugler | XO Communications |
| Mubeen Saifullah | Neustar Clearinghouse | Dawn Lawrence | XO Communications |
| Shannon Sevigny | Neustar Pooling |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

NOTE: ALL ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “JUNE 8 2010 LNPA ACTION ITEMS” FILE ISSUED IN A SEPARATE E-MAIL FROM THESE MINUTES AND ATTACHED BELOW.

****

**JUNE 8, 2010 CONFERENCE CALL MINUTES:**

Readout of May 21st NANC Meeting – Co-Chairs:



* The Co-Chairs provided a readout of the May 21, 2010 NANC meeting, reporting that new Best Practices 65 and 66 were endorsed by the NANC at the request of the LNPA WG.
* Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will contact NANC Chair Kane to determine if Best Practices 65 and 66, endorsed by the NANC at their May 21, 2010 meeting, will be forwarded to the FCC.
	+ The Co-Chairs further reported that the NANC requested the LNPA WG develop a “consumer-friendly” guide to the FCC 09-41 Implementation Plan. One use of the guide would be to assist state commissions in explaining the one-day porting process to their constituents.
* There were no objections to the Co-Chairs developing a draft of the guide for review at the July 2010 LNPA WG meeting. The objective is for the guide to be submitted to the NANC prior to the August 2, 2010 implementation of FCC 09-41.
* LNPA WG Co-Chairs will draft a “consumer-friendly” guide to the FCC

09-41 Implementation Plan in response to the May 21, 2010 NANC request, for review at the July 2010 LNPA WG meeting. The finalized guide will be sent to the NANC prior to the 8/2/2010 implementation of one business day porting.

* + A provider asked if those in attendance at the NANC meeting felt that they were going to set up an Issues Management Group (IMG) on Telcordia’s request for dispute resolution. Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will contact NANC Chair Kane to verify when comments are due to the NANC on the Telcordia Dispute Resolution.

FCC Order 09-41 Implementation Discussion – All:

* + Industry Implementation Timeline (Standing Agenda Item) – All
* The group was advised that a document indicating when providers will implement FCC 09-41 (either by August 2, 2010 or February 2, 2011) is being maintained on the NPAC Secure website.
* No issues were raised regarding the industry’s implementation of FCC 09-41.
* Discussion of 14 LSR Fields Requirement – All
* A discussion on the 14 LSR fields was teed up with regard to whether or not they are all required. It was stated and agreed that all 14 fields are required on order submission. It is up to the Old SP to decide whether or not they edit on them or ignore them. The same 4 fields apply for End User validation. It was further stated that the Old SP may not require any additional fields.
* A provider stated that they do not necessarily want the Account Number on incoming LSRs when they are the Old SP. It was stated that standardization was the industry goal and all 14 fields must be populated but the Old SP can ignore any of them. The Old SP cannot reject if they do not want or need the data in any of those fields. If the Account Number is not on the CSR and the Old SP does not need it, the New SP can populate the field with the TN.
* The Old SP can only validate the End User on the 4 fields but all 14 can be edited upon and the LSR could be rejected if edits are not passed.
* The OBF is going to meet on a June 21st call to determine questions such as if the New SP populates AN with the TN and there is an actual AN and the Old SP does not validate on it, what does the Old SP do with it. What gets returned in the Local Response will also be determined. Those having any additional questions that they would like the OBF to discuss should contact Linda Peterman at [lpeterman@onecommunications.com](file:///%5C%5CNJ01FIL0001%5CUser1%5Cmdoherty%5CMtgs-Forums%5CLNPAWG-NPIF%5CMinutes%20-%20Pre-Transition%5CLNPAWG-NPIF%5C2010%5Clpeterman%40onecommunications.com).

Discussion of Use of CMIP Gateway for Release 3.4 ITP Testing – Neustar:

**Action Item 051110-01:** Neustar will look into using the actual CMIP Gateway for interoperability testing for Release 3.4 and report back to the LNPA WG on the June 8, 2010 conference call.

* Neustar stated that they could make the necessary changes to the CMIP gateway to support ITP vendor testing for 12/6/10 for Release 3.4.
* It was decided by the LNPA WG to instruct Neustar to develop the CMIP Gateway and make it available in time for release 3.4 ITP testing. The LNPA WG further decided to stop using the Simulator for ITP testing.

2010 Meeting/Call Schedule – All:



* The group was reminded that those attending the July 2010 meeting in Seattle in person need to make their hotel reservations by June 14th.

Discussion of NANC 437 Feasibility Definitions – All:



**Action Item 051110-05:** 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. See related Action Item 051110-06.

**Action Item 051110-06:** 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. See related Action Item 051110-05.

* A Service Provider requested that Telcordia recap all new or revised M&Ps that were identified in the Parking Lot Matrix. Telcordia will provide a recap at the July 2010 LNPA WG meeting of all new or revised M&Ps that were identified in the NANC 437 Issues Parking Lot Matrix as necessary for development.
* The group began the review of the draft definitions of Technically Feasible and Operationally Feasible in the document attached above. The group agreed with Webster’s definition of “insurmountable,” which is as follows in Webster’s Online Dictionary:

Not capable of being surmounted or overcome; “insurmountable disadvantages”

Impossible to surmount.

Incapable of being passed over, surmounted, or overcome; insuperable; as, insurmountable difficulty or obstacle.

Being impassable, unsurmountable, unbridgeable or impracticable.

* + - * + The group made revisions to the draft definitions as reflected in the document below.



* The group agreed to accept the definition of Technically Feasible as revised in the v2 document attached above. All LNPA WG Participants that have participated in the LNPA WG’s feasibility analysis of NANC 437 will send any suggested revisions to the definition of Operationally Feasible (see attached above) to the LNPA WG Co-Chairs by June 30, 2010.  Any suggested revisions will be documented by the Co-Chairs and distributed to the group for review prior to the July 13-14, 2010 face-to-face meeting. The Service Providers that have participated in the LNPA WG’s feasibility analysis of NANC 437 will come to the July 13-14, 2010 face-to-face meeting prepared to finalize the definition of Operationally Feasible (see attached above) in the context of NANC 437.
* There were no objections to waiting to the September 2010 meeting for the NANC 437 feasibility determination. At the September 14-15, 2010 face-to-face LNPA WG meeting, the Service Providers that have participated in the LNPA WG’s feasibility analysis of NANC 437 will determine if consensus can be reached on two separate questions:
1. Based on the definition attached, is NANC 437 “Technically Feasible?”
2. Based on the definition to be finalized at the July 13-14, 2010 meeting, is NANC 437 “Operationally Feasible?”

 ****

* Action Items 051110-05 and 051110-06 are closed.

New Business – All:

* Discussion of SPID Migration M&P for PTOs and Cancellation of Pending SVs – Verizon:
* Verizon raised an issue related to the SPID Migration M&P that evidently does not address the cancellation of Pending PTOs prior to the creation of the SMURF files. Verizon also requested that the cancellation of pending SVs by Neustar be delayed until later in the day on the Saturday before the SPID migration to accommodate SPs that activate on Saturday.
* Neustar will determine the latest time on a Saturday before a SPID migration that they can wait to do cancels of Pending SVs by request of either of the two providers involved in the migration (SPIDs A and B). This will be discussed at the July 2010 LNPA WG meeting.
* Neustar will develop a table for review at the July 2010 LNPA WG meeting that reflects various NXX code and LRN SPID migration scenarios in order to facilitate a discussion to determine the desired behavior with regard to the cancelation of Pending SVs.
* For the July 2010 LNPA WG meeting, Service Providers are to provide data from past SPID migrations related to the percentage of their Pending SVs that were activated on the Saturday prior to a SPID migration vs. the percentage that were canceled and recreated after the migration. In other words, based on past data, what percentage of their Pending SVs needed to have cancelation delayed on Saturday vs. those that would not have been activated on Saturday and could have been canceled by Neustar earlier in the day.

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

***Hosted by Neustar***