LNPA WORKING GROUP

March 5-6, 2013 Meeting

Final Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Atlanta, Georgia | Host: DSET |

##### FULL LNPA WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION:

**TUESDAY March 5, 2013**

Tuesday, 03/05/2013, Attendance:

| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Lavinia Rotaru | | Neustar |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T | Jim Rooks | | Neustar |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T | Paul LaGattuta | | Neustar |
| Tracey Guidotti | AT&T (phone) | Stephen Addicks | | Neustar |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T | John Nakamura | | Neustar |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T | Marcel Champagne | | Neustar (phone) |
| Matt Nolan | Bright House (phone) | Michael O’Connor | | Neustar |
| Cristy Permenter | Bright House (phone) | Pamela Connell | | Neustar |
| Frank App III | Bright House (phone) | Larry Vagnoni | | Neustar |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LNP Consortium | Dave Garner | | Neustar |
| Greg Darnell | Cbeyond | Fariba Jafari | | Neustar |
| Jan Doell | CenturyLink | Tara Farquhar | | Neustar |
| Kerri Burke | Comcast (phone) | Mubeen Saifullah | | Neustar Clearinghouse |
| Dena Hunter | Cricket (phone) | Shannon Sevigny | | Neustar Pooling (phone) |
| Devang Naik | DSET | Suzanne Addington | | Sprint Nextel |
| Robin Rice | DSET | Rosemary Emmer | | Sprint Nextel (phone) |
| Dilip Naik | DSET | Karen Riepenkroger | | Sprint Nextel (phone) |
| Darius Irani | DSET | Jim Seigler | | Synchronoss |
| Linda Peterman | Earthlink Business (phone) | Rosalee Pinnock | | Syniverse (phone) |
| Jeff Sonnier | Ericsson | Ramesh Chellamani | | Tekelec |
| John Malyar | iconectiv (phone) | Margie Mersman | | TCA |
| Adam Newman | iconectiv (phone) | Paula Campagnoli | | T-Mobile |
| George Tsacnaris | iconectiv | Luke Sessions | | T-Mobile |
| Pat White | iconectiv (phone) | Jesse Ochoa | | T-Mobile |
| Steven Koch | iconectiv | Glenn Andrews | | TNS |
| Crystal Hanus | GVNW (phone) | Kayla Sharbaugh | | TNS (phone) |
| Kim Isaacs | Integra (phone) | Jason Lee | | Verizon |
| Bridget Alexander | John Staurulakis, Inc. | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Therese Mooney | Level 3 (phone) | Imanu Hill | | Vonage |
| Lynette Khirallah | NetNumber (phone) | Traci Brunner | | Windstream |
| Ed Barker | Neustar (phone) | Dawn Lawrence | | XO (phone) |

NOTE: ALL ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “March 5-6 2013 FULL LNPA WG ACTION ITEMS” FILE ISSUED IN A SEPARATE E-MAIL FROM THESE MINUTES AND ATTACHED BELOW.

****

**LNPA WORKING GROUP MEETING MINUTES:**

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

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

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

**INC Issue 748: Assess Impacts on Number Resources and Numbering Administration with Transition from PSTN to IP – Presentation by Mark Lancaster – AT&T** *(Hard start at 1:30 due to Mark’s schedule)*

* Mark presented concepts concerning transition from the PSTN to an IP network.
* Mark’s slides are embedded here:

 

**January 8-9, 2013 Draft Full LNPA WG Meeting Minutes Review:**

* No changes were made to the January 8-9, 2013 DRAFT Full LNPA WG meeting minutes, and they were approved as FINAL.

**Updates from Other Industry Groups**

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

The Wireless Service Ordering Subcommittee met February 7, 2013.  No new issues were introduced.

The Subcommittee reviewed the WICIS requirements to determine if any changes would be necessary as a result of due date decisions made at the LNPA related to PIM 81.  Participants agreed that the WICIS document does not need to be modified as a result of PIM 81.

The Subcommittee continues to follow the Local Service Ordering Subcommittee efforts related to Issue 3450, Standard Validation and Submission fields for REQTYPE “C” Simple and Non-Simple Port Orders, to determine if WICIS changes will be required as a result of their efforts.  With the current status of Issue 3450, participants agreed that service address fields could be mapped to the SANO field and a new field will not be required in order to accommodate Service Address Number on the LSR.

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

The next OBF Ordering Solutions Wireless Service Ordering Subcommittee meeting is scheduled for March 27, 2013.

**OBF Ordering Solutions Local Service Ordering (LSO) Subcommittee Update (Linda Peterman, EarthLink Business / Presented by Mubeen):**

Since the January, 2013 LNPA WG meeting, one Local Service Ordering Subcommittee (LSO) face-to-face meeting was held. Issues 3381 and 3450 were the primary topics discussed.

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

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

Participants reviewed and modified the proposed path forward for non-simple port validations (3450a2v3.doc).

Participants outlined the differences between simple and non-simple ports. After analysis, it was determined that the category of non-simple ports included two sub-categories: non-complex and complex ports. It was further determined that complex ports are out of the scope of this Issue.

Simple ports, as noted in FCC 09-41:

* + do not involve unbundled network elements (REQTYP = C (number portability))
  + involve an account only for a single line
  + do not include complex switch translations (e.g., Centrex, ISDN, AIN services, remote call forwarding, or multiple services on the loop)
  + do not include a reseller
  + includes directory with End User Listing Treatment as no modification or delete (ELT = A or B)\*

Non-simple ports (REQTYP = C (number portability) only)\*:

* + Non-complex ports:
    - meets the simple port criteria, with the following exceptions:
      * can include more than one line but must involve a single LSR for a single service address
        + quantity of TNs may not exceed 50 based on the current project criteria in LNPA WG Best Practice 67
      * could include a resold service
    - is not considered a project
  + Complex ports:
    - When the port does not meet the criteria for either simple or non-complex, it is categorized as complex and considered out of scope for this Issue.

**\* not defined in FCC 09-41**

The following validation fields have tentatively been agreed upon:

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

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

Additional work is scheduled to occur in a May 2013 face-to-face meeting.

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

Issues in **Final Closure**: None.

Issues **Withdrawn:** None

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

**Open** Issues

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3471 | **LSOG: Cleanup of the LTEXT, OMTN and RTY fields in the oii, 102, 111 and 122 practices**. | | |
| [3450](http://www.atis.org/obf/_Com/Docs/Issues/3450.doc) | **LSOG: Standard Validation and Submission fields for REQTYPE “C” Simple and Non-Simple Port Orders – Participants to socialize suggested path forward for non-simple port validations for potential internal impacts.** | | |
| [3449](http://www.atis.org/obf/_Com/Docs/Issues/3449.doc) | **LSOG – Allow for multiple Pilot Numbers on Hunt Group (HGI) form – Deferred while different options for vendor solutions are reviewed. Will be withdrawn if vendor solution is reached.** | | |
| 3448 | **LSOG – Add new Line Activity (LNA) value to require disposition of each Telephone Number when converting – Deferred while being reviewed internally by issue champion.** | | |
| [3443](http://www.atis.org/obf/_Com/Docs/Issues/3443.doc) | | **LSOG: Increase the Name fields’ length in the 71 and 72 practices –** **Deferred until issues 3381 and 3382 are completed & to be worked in conjunction with issue 3450.** |
| [3382](http://www.atis.org/obf/_com/docs/issues/3382.doc) | | **LSOG: Standardization and consolidation of Directory Listings Inquiry/Response and Listing Reconciliation (from LSOG6) all into the 111 Practice – Following 3381** |
| [3381](http://www.atis.org/obf/_com/docs/issues/3381.doc) | | **LSOG: Standardization of directory listings in the 102 Practice – Work in progress** |
| [33](http://www.atis.org/obf/_com/docs/issues/3369.doc)73 | | **LSOG: Standardization of RT of “Z” in the 099 practice for REQTYP “C” to be utilized by all providers - Deferred until issues 3381 and 3382 are completed**. |

.

**New** Issues: None

The LSO has the following meeting scheduled:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DATE** | **CALL DETAILS** |
| 2/26/13 | **LSO Virtual Meeting**  **10:00am-12:00pm ET**  **Agenda**:   * Issue 3381 |
| 3/26/13 | **LSO Virtual Meeting**  **10:00am-12:00pm ET**  **Agenda**:   * Issue 3381 |
| 4/30/13 | **LSO Virtual Meeting**  **10:00am-12:00pm ET**  **Agenda**:   * Issue 3381 |
| 5/20 – 5/23/13 | **LSO Face-to-Face Meeting**  **Location: Denver, CO**  **Host: CenturyLink**  **Agenda**:   * Issues 3381 and 3450. |

**Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Update (Dave Garner, Neustar):**

**INC Issue 719: Available “Red” Blocks where PSTN Activation has not been confirmed**

Issue Statement: Most of the pools are being replenished by the opening of new codes for pool replenishment or for LRN purposes. When a new code is opened the blocks not assigned to the code holder are placed in the available pool with a future effective date and show up on the block available report in “red” until the code holder confirms activation in the PSTN and all other code holder responsibilities have been met. Currently the guidelines allow an SP that is not the code holder to request the assignment of these “red” blocks as long as they acknowledge that they are willing to accept a block in “red” and that they explicitly understand that the underlying CO code may not yet be activated in the PSTN and loaded in the NPAC on the block effective date.

SPs who have been assigned these “red” blocks are encountering delays with the activation of the blocks in these codes. This has caused an increased volume of requests by the SP receiving the block, for the PA to follow up with code holders who have not confirmed PSTN activation by the code effective date. The PA is asked to act as the mediator between the two companies which is causing a lot of extra work.

In addition, the assignment of “red” blocks is causing additional work for the NPAC pooling team since they are often not able to create the block records in the NPAC database at the time of the block assignment because the code holder has not yet established the code in the NPAC database. This is causing the NPAC pooling team to keep separate lists of blocks where the code has not yet been established and then follow up until they are able to create the block record.

At the February INC meeting, it was agreed that we had concluded our review of this issue and the issue was placed into initial closure based on the following agreed to items.

INC added text to the TBPAG:

* Outlining the negative impacts to Blockholders when Codeholders fail to fulfill their responsibilities. New text was inserted in Section 4.2.2.
* To note that after the Codeholder has belatedly loaded the code in the NPAC, NPAC personnel will now have two business days to add a Blockholder’s block in NPAC. New text was inserted in Section 8.3.7.
* Expanding the PA’s ability to facilitate and stream line communication between the Blockholder and the Codeholder when the Codeholder hasn’t fulfilled its responsibilities. New text was inserted in Section 5.7.

**INC Issue 751: Clarify 8.3.11 of the TBPAG (instances where a TN is assigned to more than one customer)**

Issue Statement: Pooling has recently received several questions regarding Section 8.3.11 (instances where a TN is assigned to more than one customer). The language in Section 8.3.11 was difficult to follow and understand. The PA is proposing changes to Section 8.3.11 in order to make the section easier to read and understand what action is to be taken in a situation where a TN is assigned to more than one customer.

During the February INC meeting, the issue was reviewed and agreement was reach to accept the issue to be worked. This issue contribution suggested edits to the layout of Section 8.3.11 language to clarify how to resolve the situation when more than one customer is being serviced by different SPs using the same TN. The suggested edits did not include substantive changes to the existing text. The process agreed to by INC is consistent with the process in LNPA WG best practice #42.

INC agreed to the following revised text for Section 8.3.11:

In instances where a pooled unavailable TN is assigned to more than one customer served by different SPs (i.e., the Block Holder and the Code Holder of the pooled NXX) due to an error made by the Code Holder, the conflict shall be resolved as follows:

* If the TN was assigned before the block was donated and the Code Holder made an error in the population of unavailable TNs in the LNP database (NPAC) at the time of donation, the customer of the original SP (i.e., the customer to whom the TN was originally assigned) shall retain assignment of the TN and the Block Holder shall assign its customer a new TN
* If the TN was not assigned at the time of the donation and the Code Holder failed to protect the block from further assignment in their databases and assigned the TN after block donation, the customer of the Block Holder shall retain assignment of the TN, and the Code Holder that assigned the TN to its customer in error shall assign its customer a new TN

. Given this agreement, the issue was placed into Initial Closure and the guidelines will be updated.

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

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

At the February INC meeting, the INC received two presentations.

* Tom McGarry, Neustar, was asked by INC to present his “Future of Telephone Numbers – TN 3.0” presentation. This presentation was similar to a presentation given to the FoN WG in November 2012 and provided a high level, global view of how TNs may be used in the future.
* Mark Lancaster, AT&T, presented a presentation entitled” Begin the IP Transition in Numbering – Steps away from TDM standard operations”. This presentation provided a more detailed view of how TNs may be obtained, ported, routed, and reported as the industry transitions to IP.

**NANC Future of Numbering Working Group Update (Adam Newman, Telcordia and FoN Tri-Chair):**

Adam’s report was in PowerPoint Format and is embedded here:



##### FULL LNPA WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION:

**WEDNESDAY March 6, 2013**

Wednesday, 03/06/13, Attendance:

| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Paul LaGattuta | | Neustar |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T | Stephen Addicks | | Neustar |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T (phone) | John Nakamura | | Neustar |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T | Marcel Champagne | | Neustar (phone) |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T | Michael O’Connor | | Neustar |
| Matt Nolan | Bright House (phone) | Dave Garner | | Neustar |
| Cristy Permenter | Bright House (phone) | Mubeen Saifullah | | Neustar Clearinghouse |
| Frank App III | Bright House (phone) | Shannon Sevigny | | Neustar Pooling (phone) |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LNP Consortium | Suzanne Addington | | Sprint Nextel |
| Jan Doell | CenturyLink | Rosemary Emmer | | Sprint Nextel (phone) |
| Kerri Burke | Comcast (phone) | Karen Riepenkroger | | Sprint Nextel (phone) |
| Dena Hunter | Cricket (phone) | Rosalee Pinnock | | Syniverse (phone) |
| Robin Rice | DSET | Paula Campagnoli | | T-Mobile |
| Linda Peterman | Earthlink Business (phone) | Luke Sessions | | T-Mobile |
| Jeff Sonnier | Ericsson | Jesse Ochoa | | T-Mobile |
| George Tsacnaris | iconectiv | Glenn Andrews | | TNS |
| Pat White | iconectiv (phone) | Kayla Sharbaugh | | TNS (phone) |
| Steven Koch | iconectiv | Jason Lee | | Verizon |
| Bridget Alexander | John Staurulakis, Inc. | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Karen Hoffman | John Staurulakis, Inc.(phone) | Imanu Hill | | Vonage |
| Lavinia Rotaru | Neustar | Traci Brunner | | Windstream |
| Jim Rooks | Neustar |  | |  |

**Review of LNPA WG Best Practices Document**

**The group continued with the review of the attached LNPA WG Best Practices document.**



**Action Item 031511-04:** Paula Jordan, T-Mobile and LNPA WG Co-Chair, and Jason Lee, Verizon, and Teresa Patton, AT&T, and Tracey Guidotti, AT&T, will document in LNPA WG Best Practice 30 requirements for ICP during the permissive dialing period for NPA splits. This will be reviewed and discussed at the May 2011 LNPA WG meeting.

It is the LNPA WG’s recommendation that in order to limit the impacts to customers when the need for area code relief arises an area code overlay is implemented instead of an area code split. The Pros and Cons of an Overlay versus a Split can be found in the attached document.

In the case where a split is ordered, service providers shall support the following:

* If the ICP/LSR is sent prior to Permissive dialing beginning but does not complete until after permissive dialing the new and old providers shall support processing the port request under the old NPA.
* If the ICP/LSR is sent after permissive dialing begins the new and old providers shall support processing the port request under the new NPA.
* If the OSP cannot support receiving the ICP/LSR under the old NPA they shall return the ICP/LSR with the appropriate reject code letting the NSP know to cancel and start again under the new NPA.
* The NPA should remain the same throughout the life of the port request. If for any reason the NPA needs to change then the port request should be cancelled and resubmitted under the appropriate NPA.



Action Item 031511-04 is closed; however, the WG asked that they be given an opportunity to do a final review at the May meeting.

PIM Status Review

* PIM 80 – This PIM submitted by Verizon, seeks to address instances where ported/pooled NPAC database records currently contain LRNs that are in a LATA different from their associated ported/pooled telephone numbers (TNs).



* 14 of the original 3,976 SVs still remain in an incorrect LATA.
* 2 of the 9 pool blocks remain in an incorrect LATA.
* These SVs and blocks appear to belong to companies no longer in business.
* Neustar will seek permission from the NAPM LLC to remove the remaining SVs and pool blocks from the NPAC/SMS as there is almost no probability that they actively serve customers.
* PIM 81 – This PIM, submitted by CenturyLink and Windstream, seeks to address instances where a Service Provider unilaterally accelerates the activation of a pending port without agreement from the Old SP in the port.

 

**Action Item 010813-LNPAWG-02:** Action for Jan Doell prior to the March LNPA WG meeting. Modify the appropriate figures in the NANC flows to incorporate the changes made to BP61 to extend the definition of Cause Codes 50 and 51. This will be for the March meeting.

Consensus was reached to make the recommended change to the NANC flows. (AT&T asked to be noted as disagreeing with the changes.) Changes will be made in the flows and they will be submitted to the NANC for approval and forwarding to the FCC.

Consensus was not reached to extend the definition of Cause Code 51 in the NANC Flows or in Best Practice 61.

Action Item 010813-LNPAWG-02 is closed.

**Change Management**



**NANC Change Order 372 – SOA/LSMS Interface Protocol Alternatives (XML)**

Based upon the recommendation of the APT, the LNPA WG reached consensus to request the NAPM LLC to ask for an SOW from Neustar. That request has been sent by the co-chairs to the NAPM LLC co-chairs.



**NANC Change Order 452 – NPAC Ethernet Connectivity**

The LNPA WG reached consensus to request the NAPM LLC to ask for an SOW from Neustar. That request has been sent by the co-chairs to the NAPM LLC co-chairs.

**** 

**SPID Migration Black-Out Date October 20, 2013 – Neustar**

Neustar requested a black-out date for October 20, 2013, as this is the proposed date for the annual fail-over exercise. Consensus was to approve this request.

**Review of 2013 LNPA WG Meeting/Call Schedule**

****

* There will not be a April 9, 2013, conference call.
* The next face-to-face meeting will be hosted by Neustar in Miami, Florida, on March 7-8, 2013

**New Business**

Five-Day First Port Interval

* Verizon asked to have the WG reevaluate the need to have a five-day interval for the first port in an NPA-NXX.
* Service Providers were given an Action Item to come to the May meeting prepared to discuss their positions.

**030513-LNPAWG-01:** All service providers are to be prepared to discuss at the May 2013 LNPA WG meeting whether or not the 5-day porting interval is still needed for the first port in an NPA-NXX. The 5-day interval was established to allow time to change switch translations to query calls for that NPA-NXX. This eliminated the need to query on NPA-NXXs that have no ported numbers.

**Wireless Providers requiring individual LSRs for multiple numbers on the same account.**

* Verizon asked if any other service providers are having issues with some wireless service providers requiring individual LSRs for multiple ports on the same account.
* Service Providers were given an Action Item to come to the May meeting prepared to discuss this.

**030513-LNPAWG-02:** Wireline service providers are to be prepared to discuss at the May 2013 LNPA WG meeting if they are having issues with some wireless providers refusing to port multiple numbers on the same LSR even though they are on the same account. Verizon has encountered wireless providers who require a separate LSR for each number.

**Action Item Review**

* Item 031511-04: This item is CLOSED.
* Item 010813-LNPAWG-01: This item remains OPEN.
* Item 010813-LNPAWG-02: This item is CLOSED.

***Next Meeting … May 7-8, 2013… Location…*** ***Miami, FL …***

***Hosted by Neustar***

***No Conference Call in April, 2013***