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DRAFT Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Seattle, Washington** | **Host: T-Mobile** |

**TUESDAY November 3, 2015**

**Attendance**

| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Li Young | AT&T | Fariba Jafari | | Neustar |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T | Gary Sacra | | Neustar |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T | Jim Rooks | | Neustar |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | John Nakamura | | Neustar |
| David Alread | AT&T (phone) | Lavinia Rotaru | | Neustar |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T (phone) | Marcel Champagne | | Neustar |
| Tracey Guidotti | AT&T (phone) | Meenakshi Parthasarathy | | Neustar |
| Jackie Voss | ATIS (phone) | Michael O'Connor | | Neustar |
| Michael Rothchild | ATL | Mubeen Saifullah | | Neustar |
| Lisa Jill Freeman | Bandwidth.com | Pamela Connell | | Neustar |
| Matt Ruehlen | Bandwidth.com | Paul LaGattuta | | Neustar |
| Matt Nolan | Bright House (phone) | Shannon Sevigny | | Neustar Pooling (phone) |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LNP | Rosemary Emmer | | Sprint |
| Jan Doell | CenturyLink | Suzanne Addington | | Sprint |
| Mary Retka | CenturyLink (phone) | Darren Post | | Synchronoss |
| Betty Sanders | Charter Communications | Bob Bruce | | Syniverse (phone) |
| Randee Ryan | Comcast | Margie Mersman | | TCA (phone) |
| Jennifer Hutton | Cox (phone) | Greg Ortmon | | T-Mobile |
| Wendy Rutherford | GVNW (phone) | Jesse Ochoa | | T-Mobile |
| Doug Babcock | iconectiv | Luke Sessions | | T-Mobile |
| George Tsacnaris | iconectiv | Paula Campagnoli | | T-Mobile |
| John Malyar | iconectiv | Cathie Capita | | T-Mobile (phone) |
| Ken Havens | iconectiv | David Lund | | US Cellular (phone) |
| Steven Koch | iconectiv | Jason Lee | | Verizon (phone) |
| Bridget Alexander | JSI (phone) | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Bonnie Johnson | Minnesota DoC (phone) | Kathy Rogers | | Verizon Wireless |
| Lynette Khirallah | NetNumber (phone) | Scott Terry | | Windstream (phone) |
| Dave Garner | Neustar | Dawn Lawrence | | XO |

NOTE: OPEN ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “NOVEMBER 3-4, 2015 WG ACTION ITEMS” FILE AND ATTACHED HERE.



**LNPA WORKING GROUP MEETING MINUTES:**

**Draft LNPA WG Meeting Minutes Review:**

The September LNPA WG DRAFT minutes were approved with minor typo corrections and will be issued as FINAL.

The October LNPA WG Conference Call minutes were approved as written and will be issued as FINAL.

**Updates from Other Industry Groups**

**OBF Committee Update – Deb Tucker:**

**OBF**

**ORDERING SOLUTIONS COMMITTEE**

**LNPA WG Readout**

**November 3, 2015**

**WIRELESS SERVICE ORDERING SUBCOMMITTEE**

The Wireless Service Ordering Subcommittee has not met since the September LNPA WG meeting. The next checkpoint call is scheduled for January 8, 2016. In the event industry activity occurs prior to that date that may impact the Subcommittee, meetings will be scheduled accordingly.

**LOCAL SERVICE ORDERING SUBCOMMITTEE**

The LSO Subcommittee met October 1, 2015 to progress Issue 3373.

**Issue 3373, *LSOG: Standardization of RT of “Z” in the 099 practice for REQTYP “C” to be utilized by all providers***

This Issue addresses a standardization work effort to determine Response Types (RTs) and fields that may be eliminated. It was noted that this Issue will not drive internal company changes, but updates to the guidelines might be helpful.

In regards to identifying fields that can be eliminated, it was suggested to focus the review of fields on the 099 practice and review which fields use which RTs regardless of REQTYP. This approach should allow the determination of which fields on the 099 practice can be deleted.

Participants reviewed usage of RTs and proposed that the following RTs can be deleted:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| A | = | Acknowledgement |
| F | = | Facility confirmation |
| K | = | Notification of network modifications required |

Participants proposed that the following RTs can be retained:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| C | = | Firm order confirmation |
| D | = | Confirmation and DLR (private line) |
| E | = | Errors only |
| I | = | LIDB confirmation |
| J | = | Jeopardy notice |
| L | = | Directory only completion |
| N | = | Confirmation of customer requested cancellation |
| P | = | Provider initiated |
| S | = | Provider initiated cancellation of the service request |
| W | = | Post to billing system |
| Z | = | Completion |

**Open Action Item:** CenturyLink to check if they are using the following RTs for any of their products:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| B | = | Firm order with facility information |
| G | = | Confirmation and DL errors (directory) |

If CenturyLink is not using B or G, those RTs will be recommended for deletion as no other carrier has identified them as being used.

Issue 3373 will remain open.

Other Issues remaining open:

***Issue 3477, LSOG: Standard field length minimums identified and repeating/# of occurrences on each field***

The main purpose of this Issue is to clarify where field minimums are required, if fields repeat and how many times they repeat, and if fields should be zero filled or not.

***Issue 3521, LSOG: Remove the RVER (071), BA and BLOCK (074 and 75), and REMARKS (072, 073, 075, 077, 078, 079 and 102)***

There is a business need to remove fields that are no longer used in the industry. It was noted that Issue 3521 is dependent upon identifying the impacts to the UOM documentation as a result of the changes to the LSOG document.

Next Meeting:

The next LSO meeting is scheduled for November 19, 2015.

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**INC Update – Dave Garner:**

**INC Issues Readout** LNPA WG Meeting – November 2015

**INC Issue 497: Identify Changes to INC Guidelines Based on NANC’s Report and Recommendation, VoIP Service Providers’ Access Requirements for NANP Resource Assignments (July 19, 2005), and FCC Order 15-70 (June 22, 2015)**

INC moved this Issue to active status on July 10th due to the release of FCC Report and Order on Numbering Policies for Modern Communications (FCC 15-70, June 22, 2015) which established a process to authorize interconnected VoIP providers to obtain telephone numbers directly from Numbering Administrators, rather than through intermediaries.

At the September meeting, INC continued their review of the FCC Report and Order (FCC 15-70) and drafted INC Guideline updates pending the publication of FCC Order 15-70 in the Federal Register. The Guideline updates included items such as authorization for obtaining resources, facilities readiness, CFR references and definitions, etc.

INC also drafted a template that interconnected VoIP providers can use to provide their 30-day notice of the intent to request numbering resources and to provide their regulatory and numbering contacts to the states.

Once the Order is published, INC will perform a final review of the Guidelines.

**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 September meeting, INC continued to discuss developments regarding the PSTN to IP transition and evaluate possible topics for a draft whitepaper on expanding the geography of number assignment.

**Nationwide Wireless Number Portability**

As mentioned in the September INC Issues readout, on July 9, 2015, FCC Chairman Wheeler was sent a letter from the members of the House of Representative Committee on Energy and Commerce asking the FCC to resolve customer confusion and support nationwide wireless number portability for all providers.

On July 27, 2015, FCC Chairman Wheeler sent a letter to CTIA requesting that CTIA work with the major mobile wireless providers and the CCA to identify, within 60 days, practical solutions for making nationwide wireless porting a practical reality, together with a timeline by which any proposed solutions identified could be implemented.

At the September meeting, INC reviewed the September 25th joint letter from CTIA and CCA to FCC Chairman Wheeler, which recommends that NANC and ATIS evaluate and recommend actions to enable nationwide number portability through modifications to the location routing number (LRN) system used to route wireless and wireline originated calls to ported numbers. A practical Near-Term Solution is identified for CMRS providers without the ability to port-in a telephone number due to lack of facilities-based presence in the original LATA of the telephone number. In this solution, a CMRS provider may voluntarily enter contractual agreements with third parties, such as LECs, non-LEC CMRS providers, interconnected VoIP providers, and others that may have access to numbering resources to offer a CMRS provider access to the local area of the telephone number outside of its network footprint.

**NANC action item to INC on the Sale, Brokering and Hoarding of non-toll free telephone numbers**

During the September 30th NANC meeting, the NANC Chair indicated she just received a response from the Wireline Competition Bureau (WCB) on her July letter to the WCB regarding an April Washington Post article on the brokering and sale of customer telephone numbers.

The WCB agreed to refer the topic to the NANC and requested that a report be provided to the FCC within 6 months. Chairman Kane assigned an action item to INC to investigate this topic, and suggested that the INC have a preliminary report available for the December NANC meeting.

At the September meeting and October interim call, INC started to discuss this subject and next steps. It was noted that the INC Guidelines state that “telephone numbers are North American Numbering Plan (NANP) resources that are considered a public resource and are not owned by the assignees. Consequently, the resources cannot be sold, brokered, bartered, or leased by the assignee for a fee or other consideration.” INC’s guidelines are related to the assignment of numbers from the Numbering Administrators to the service providers.

Regarding next steps, INC is currently in the process of developing a better understanding of the NANC action item and determining how to address/respond to the action item.

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**NANC Future of Numbering Working Group Update – Dawn Lawrence**

# Future of Numbering (FoN) Working Group Report to the LNPA WG

**October 7, 2015**

FoN Tri-Chairs: Carolee Hall, Idaho PUC; Dawn Lawrence, XO Communications; Suzanne Addington, Sprint

**Status:**

* The FoN WG meeting was held on October 7, 2015
* Numbering Testbed Update: Mary Retka gave an update that Phase I was complete and was to be sent to TOP on 10/8/2015
* FTN 4 – The Geographic Numbering sub-committee was discussing the consumer perspective and service implications regarding the geography of toll free telephone numbers and the decoupling or disassociation of numbers from geography.
  + The sub-committee created a white paper, it was subsequently approved by the FoN WG and presented to the NANC in December. David Greenhaus prepared a cover letter for the FoN to review in its May meeting requesting Chairman Kane to take some action at the next NANC meeting in June. The whitepaper and cover letter were discussed at the Sept NANC and there were no action items received for the FoN WG. The members reached consensus that FTN-4 be closed.
* FTN 8 – All IP Addressing sub-committee primary objective is to define future identifiers in support of IP industry trends beyond the e.164 numbering plan (including M2M impacts). The team meets once a month.
  + A recommendation to close this item was made to the NANC at the September 30, 2015, meeting and there were no objections. The members reached consensus that FTN-8 be closed
* Brian Rosen gave his presentation on how to handle Robocalls, Vishing and Swatting call. This was the same presentation that was given to the LNPA WG in the March 2015 meeting.
* Scheduled calls:
  + 2016 Meeting Schedule:

A proposal to have FoN WG meetings quarterly was accepted and the agreed upon meeting dates are:

February 10, 2016

April 6, 2016

August 3, 2016

October 5, 2016

Meeting times will remain 12:00ET/11:00 CT/10:00 MT/9:00 PT

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**NANC Meeting Readout – Paula Campagnoli**

Paula reported on the discussion at the September 30 NANC meeting relative to the LNPA WG. There was active discussion about Best Practice 4 concerning N-1 querying. The revision to BP4 proposed by CenturyLink was accepted. The LNPA WG was asked to look at the Best Practice again to assure that effects on VoIP providers were taken into consideration.

Next NANC meeting is Dec 1.

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**CCA and CTIA Paper on Nationwide Wireless Porting Status Report – LNPA WG Chairs**

**Action Item 090115-03:** Upon receipt of the anticipated CCA and CTIA paper on nationwide wireless number porting, Paula Campagnoli will immediately send it to the LNPA WG distribution list. A conference call will be scheduled for review and discussion of the draft document. (A tentative date/time of September 17 at 9am central time is reserved for the conference call.)

CTIA and CCA issued the letter but the WG was not included in the distribution. Therefore, the September 17 conference call was not scheduled. The FCC will issue a letter to the NANC, WG, and ATIS to work this issue, but the timeframe is not known.

**Action Item 090115-03 is closed.**

Deb Tucker and Paula Campagnoli stated that they feel wireline should also be included in any work that the Working Group undertakes. Lonnie asked if work could start without the letter, but Paula indicated that we should await direction from the FCC. The Working Group agendas now must be approved by the FCC. The Working Group will certainly move forward at FCC and NANC direction.

**VoIP Number Portability Capability – FCC DA-07-709 - Status**

**Action Item 090115-02:** All Service providers (especially VoIP providers) need to review the NANC porting flows to determine if any changes need to be made to the porting flows to accommodate the FCC VoIP order. Pay special attention to the VoIP type definitions. Responses are due by October 9. This will be for discussion at the October 14 conference call. No response means that there are no issues.

Paula Campagnoli reported that the definition of Class 1 Interconnected VoIP provider in the NANC Flows was revised on the October 14th call. She will provide both a red-lined and clean version of the flows at the December 1 NANC meeting with a recommendation to approve and forward to the FCC.

**Action Item 090115-02 is closed.**

**Best Practice 04** – **LNPA WG Interpretation of N-1 Carrier Architecture**

As noted in Paula Campagnoli’s NANC report above, the NANC requested that the LNPA WG investigate whether or not changes are needed to Best Practice 04 to include VoIP and IP Service Providers. Paula asked for a volunteer to lead a WG subcommittee. Betty Sanders, Charter, volunteered to lead the sub-committee. Matt Ruehlen – Bandwidth, Jan Doell - CenturyLink, Renee Dillon – AT&T, Deb Tucker – Verizon Wireless, Rosemary Emmer – Sprint, Randee Ryan – Comcast, and Bonnie Johnson – Minnesota DoC volunteered to participate on the subcommittee. The main issue is EAS across LATA boundaries. Focus should be on the inter-LATA part of the BP. The team will be asked to give a status report in the January 2016 meeting.

Betty will furnish Paula with logistics for a conference call for the subcommittee, and Paula will send to the distribution list. Additional participants are invited.

**Change Management**

**Determine what NPAC Functionality should be considered for Sunsetting**

**NUESTAR ACTION ITEMS;**

**Action Item 090115-04:** Neustar to send Action Item 090115-01 over the Cross Regional distribution list in case NANC Change Order 356 is used by service providers not attending the LNPA WG meetings. *(This AI is associated with AI 090115-01.)*

**Action Item 090115-04 is closed.**

**LNPA WG PARTICIPANTS ACTION ITEMS:**

**Action Item 090115-01:** NANC Change Order 356 has been removed from the Sunset List. This change order appends a “/” followed by service provider type indicator to the name of the service provider in the NPAC/SMS. The LNPA Working Group is considering putting this change order back on the Sunset List (to be removed from the NPAC/SMS). Service providers are to respond by September 30, 2015, to the LNPA WG tri-chairs as to whether or not they use this feature. No response will indicate that it is not used.*(This AI is associated with AI 090115-04.)*

**Action Item 090115-01 is closed.**

Tri-Chairs received feedback that the NANC 356 “/” SP Type indicator is still needed. It will remain off of the sunset list. Jim Rooks asked if there is any opportunity to sunset this functionality in the future. At least 2 companies indicated they still use this feature, so currently the answer is no.

Steve Koch asked if we should put requirements in the FRS for NANC 356. John Nakamura will review the industry docs to see if requirements for NANC 356 are present.

**Change Order Summary**

**NANC 449 Active/Active SOA Connection to NPAC – Same SPID**

This change order was base-lined at the September LNPA WG meeting. Comcast was the originator of this change order and expressed that they are very interested in moving it forward. It can be requested as part of the next NPAC release or the LNPA WG can request that the NAPM LLC ask Neustar for a standalone SOW. Comcast stated that they would like an SOW to be requested immediately. There being no objection from the WG, the Tri-chairs determined that there was consensus to request an SOW from the NAPM LLC. Level of Effort for the local system vendors has already been determined for this change order. John Nakamura will send the latest version of NANC 449 to the WG (version 12).

**New Action Item 110315-01 –** LNPA Working Group Tri-Chairs will request that the NAPM LLC Co-Chairs ask Neustar to prepare an SOW for NANC Change Order 449, Active/Active SOA Connection to NPAC – Same SPID.

**Review of Document Only Change Orders**



**FRS – NANC CHANGE ORDER 462**

* NANC 462 - John Nakamura reviewed the change bars. These are FRS-related Document Only changes to date that have resulted from the joint vendor transition discussions that capture current NPAC functionality and behavior.
* The Heartbeat messages are now indicated as inbound and outbound messages. John reviewed the additional changes in NANC 462. iconectiv has stated that there are only a few more FRS-related changes to be suggested and asked if 462 can be closed out and a new FRS published with the updates. Additional changes can be addressed in a new Change Order.
* Renee Dillon, AT&T, asked if there are any non-Document Only change orders pending that would affect the FRS. Jim Rooks and John Nakamura responded that there are none that are scheduled to be implemented.
* There were no objections to closing out NANC 462 and publishing a new version of the FRS with the 462 updates.

|  |
| --- |
| Separate Process Discussion for Updating the FRS – It was agreed that the NANC 462 Doc Only FRS changes and the additional Doc Only changes accepted here today will be red-lined in the next FRS version for review at the January 2016 LNPA WG meeting. |

**IIS-EFD – NANC CHANGE ORDER 463**

* These are IIS-EFD-related Document Only changes that have resulted from the joint vendor transition discussions that capture current NPAC functionality and behavior.
* There were no objections to closing out NANC 463 and publishing a new version of the IIS with the 463 updates.

**GDMO – NANC CHANGE ORDER 464**

* These are GDMO-related Document Only changes that have resulted from the joint vendor transition discussions that capture current NPAC functionality and behavior.
* There were no objections to closing out NANC 464 and publishing a new version of the GDMO with the 464 updates.
* This will require a new version of the GDMO. The GDMO is a configuration file that is used to compile a system. Renee Dillon asked if this means it is not a Document Only change. Jim responded that he does not think so. John Malyar stated that he does not believe SPs have to make changes in their systems. Jim said that these are textual remarks that are not changing anything in the systems from an operations standpoint.

**TURN-UP TEST PLAN – NANC CHANGE ORDER 465**

* These are Turn-up Test Plan-related Document Only changes that have resulted from the joint vendor transition discussions that capture current NPAC functionality and behavior.
* There were no objections to closing out NANC 465 and publishing a new version of the Turn-up Test Plan with the 465 updates.
* Paula Campagnoli said she was contacted by the NPAC Transition Team with a request to reactivate the Architecture Planning Team (APT) to review the existing test cases and to determine if there are any new test cases needed. John Malyar, iconectiv, volunteered to chair the APT. Paula will send out the conference call schedule when available.
* The reinstated APT will look at existing test cases to determine if any need to be revised and if any new test cases are needed.

**New Change Orders**

Fourteen new change orders have been created (to consider whether or not to accept these and assign numbers):

1. FRS – Clock Resync

* iconectiv is suggesting that Requirement RN7-1 is not needed since the NPAC is synchronized to a Stratum 1 Host. They believe it to be confusing.
* Jan Doell, CenturyLink, asked if this changes something in the NPAC. Jim Rooks said no, but when removing requirements, the WG should make the decision. He also said that when synched to a Stratum 1 Host, you could have drift over time that could result in being off more than 2 minutes. There is no requirement as to how frequent the synch is done.
* A number of Service Providers objected to deleting RN7-1.
* The business requirement is to synch to a Stratum 1 Host and to be no more than 2 minutes out of synch. The requirements do not dictate the implementation in order to meet those business requirements.
* This change order was not accepted.



1. FRS – Offline Batch Download File

* The request is to remove R3-8 requiring that 4mm DAT tape be used for full recovery backup.
* Neustar stated that 4mm DAT tapes have not been used for many years, but if a Service Provider requested it, Neustar would provide it.
* Offline batch downloads are provided today via BDDs.
* There were no objections to deleting R3-8. This change order was accepted. It is NANC 466. There were no objections to making this a Document Only change.



1. ASN.1 – lnpRecoveryComplete

* Seeks to remove attributes in the CMIP lnpRecoveryComplete Action reply.
* This would require a recompile. This is not a Document Only change because it changes the structure that comes across the interface.
* This is also not backwards compatible because of the tag change.
* Neustar suggested marking these fields obsolete in a comment and it would be a Document Only change.
* Neustar’s suggestion was accepted. It will be NANC 467.



1. FRS – Phone Conversation

* Seeks to remove R7-108.3 requiring that MD5 hash for keys be exchanged manually over the phone. This was never part of the M&P.
* The MD5 hash is not exchanged manually over the phone today. The M&P calls for the MD5 hash to be calculated for each key on the list and electronically transferred. A phone conversation does still occur today.
* This would be a Doc Only change. The change order was accepted as NANC 468.



1. FRS – Network Monitoring

* iconectiv is requesting that the requirements be made more general to allow for monitoring via mechanisms other than SNMP, which is implementation specific.
* This is Document Only. Accepted as NANC 469.



1. FRS – SSL VPN

* iconectiv is requesting that the term “smart card” be made more generic to indicate use of two-factor authentication. They propose “multi-factor authentication mechanism.”
* Document Only. Accepted as NANC 470.



1. ASN.1 – SV DisconnectReply

* The current NPAC does not populate the version ID.
* Change order will be updated to reflect as obsolete so it is Document Only
* Accepted as NANC 471.



1. ASN.1 – Audit Discrepancy Report

* Seeks to modify the SVType support structure to support either a value or a no value.
* This is not Document Only nor is it backwards compatible.
* This is applicable to an SP turning up support for SVType and not populating the SV Type field. This would be a rare occurrence.
* This was accepted as NANC 472. Implementation TBD. This will need to be discussed more in the future.



1. ASN.1 – Address Information

* Seeks to update the address information in the ASN.1 to reflect what is optional.
* This requires a code change because they are populated with null characters, which would not be necessary if optional.
* NANC 461, which is the sunset change order, would make these obsolete.
* It was agreed to clarify these in the comments to say these are treated as optional and not mark these as optional, so this just describes current behavior and the change order will be Document Only.
* Accepted as NANC 473.



1. ASN.1 – SWIM Recovery

* Seeks to remove the additionlInformation attribute from the ASN.1. It is an optional field that is not used.
* Will be made obsolete in comments in order to make this Document Only.
* Accepted as NANC 474.



1. FRS – User Login Restriction

* Seeks to remove R7-39, which has text saying "NPAC SMS shall provide a mechanism to restrict user login based on time-of-day, day-of-week, and calendar date."
* No one has ever used any restrictions. The capability is in the current NPAC.
* This will be considered a Document Only change. It will no longer be required functionality. The requirement will be removed from the FRS. The next NPAC will not have to implement the functionality.
* Accepted as NANC 475.



1. FRS – Pool Block Error

* iconectiv is requesting that RR3-142.1 and RR3-142.2 wording be changed to update "page” to something more generic (e.g., "alert" or "notification").
* Because “notification” has another meaning throughout the FRS, it was agreed to change to “alert.”
* Document Only. Accepted as NANC 476.



1. GDMO – Service Provider Type

* In the GDMO, there is an extra space between “LNP-ASN1.” and “ServiceProviderType”). Some compilers ignore the extra space, others do not.
* This is not a Document Only change.
* It was accepted as NANC 477. It can be implemented at a later time.



1. FRS ASN.1 – pre cancellation status of DP

* iconectiv is seeking to remove the Disconnect Pending value since it is never used.
* It was agreed to note it as obsolete in the ASN.1 so it becomes a Document Only change.
* Accepted as NANC 478.



**Action Item Remaining Open from Previous LNPA WG Meetings**

**Action Item 070715-01** – The disputed port PIM submitted by Bandwidth.com was accepted to be worked as PIM 86. Lisa Jill Freeman (Bandwidth) will lead a sub-committee to work on details for a process to resolve disputed ports. If approved, the process will be documented as an LNPA WG Best Practice. The sub-committee participants are Suzanne Addington (Sprint), Jan Doell (CenturyLink), Bridget Alexander (JSI), Lonnie Keck (AT&T), Tracey Guidotti (AT&T), Jason Lee (Verizon), Deb Tucker (Verizon), Scott Terry (Windstream), Aelea Christofferson (ATL Communications), Randee Ryan (Comcast), and Luke Sessions (T-Mobile).



Bandwidth asked that this Action Item be postponed until the January LNPA WG meeting.

**Action Item 070715-01** **remains open.**

**IP Transition effects on Number Portability**

Mary Retka provided an update on the ATIS Test Bed Landscape Team. It is focusing on SPs testing together during the IP transition. Use cases included numbering, routing, and Provider-to-Provider items including authenticated Caller ID. Work has been going on for about a year. At last month’s TOPS Council meeting, the Phase 1 report was presented that laid out the use cases. Phase 2 dives deeper into the test plan. ATIS provided an NDA because SPs will have to disclose network capabilities during this phase. SP participants are reviewing the NDA internally with their legal teams. Phase 2 is expected to complete during 1Q or 2Q 2016.

ATIS has done a partnership with the SIP Forum called the IP-NNI. Focusing on interconnection and routing for VoIP. Looking at STIR and Token and will link into the Test Bed Team.

**NPAC Tracer Data – Status Report as to the time frame when Tracer Data will be implemented - Neustar**

Gary reported the following with regard to the status of the development of a tracer data tool to assist in the investigations of potential confidential NPAC User data misuse:

* The SOW is close to being finalized.
* Development and implementation of the tracer data tool will be in 1Q2016.
* Gary will inform the NAPM LLC Project Executives when the date is identified for the tool being ready for use.
* The LNPA WG will be kept informed as to status.
* As new information is made available, it will be placed on the WG agenda for Gary to provide an update.

**Develop Guidelines for new Service Providers to start Porting Numbers**

Bridget Alexander reported that work is complete for wireline and wireless service providers. The sub-committee is still working on the guidelines for VoIP service providers obtaining numbers. They will continue working in December or January. Matt Ruehlen, Bandwidth.com, will join the sub-committee.

**Clarification as to when the Use of Password/PIN on Consumer Accounts is appropriate within FCC guidelines– ALL**

* Paula Campagnoli stated that passwords requested by the end user are within the boundaries of the FCC Order. She added that SPs that choose to assign passwords without the end user’s request is not within the boundaries of the FCC Order.
* Lonnie Keck stated that there is a difference between an SP assigning a password that is used as a validation field for porting and assigning a password for general account security, e.g., for the end user to make changes to their account.
* Deb Tucker said that for pre-paid wireless, there is no account number for validation so SPs use a default PIN for validation. The end user needs to use the default PIN to replenish their minutes so technically they should know their PIN number.
* FCC rules require that password/pins used for porting must be end user-requested.
  + Gary Sacra quoted the NANC Flows (Figure 1 Step 6), which says, “Only passwords/PINs requested and assigned by the End User may be utilized as an End User validation field on an incoming LSR by the Old Network Service Provider/Old Local Service Provider. Any service provider assigned password/PIN may not be utilized as a requirement in order to obtain a CSR.”
  + These flows were adopted by the FCC.
* No further actions were taken by the group.

**WEDNESDAY November 4, 2015**

**Attendance**

| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T | Gary Sacra | | Neustar |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T | Jim Rooks | | Neustar |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Lavinia Rotaru | | Neustar |
| David Alread | AT&T (phone) | Marcel Champagne | | Neustar |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T (phone) | Meenakshi Parthasarathy | | Neustar |
| Tracey Guidotti | AT&T (phone) | Michael O'Connor | | Neustar |
| Jackie Voss | ATIS (phone) | Mubeen Saifullah | | Neustar |
| Michael Rothchild | ATL | Pamela Connell | | Neustar |
| Lisa Jill Freeman | Bandwidth.com | Paul LaGattuta | | Neustar |
| Matt Ruehlen | Bandwidth.com | John Nakamura | | Neustar (phone) |
| Matt Nolan | Bright House (phone) | Tara Farquhar | | Neustar (phone) |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LNP | Towanda Russell | | RCN (phone) |
| Jan Doell | CenturyLink | Rosemary Emmer | | Sprint |
| Mary Retka | CenturyLink (phone) | Suzanne Addington | | Sprint |
| Betty Sanders | Charter Communications | Bob Bruce | | Syniverse (phone) |
| Randee Ryan | Comcast | Greg Ortmon | | T-Mobile |
| Jennifer Hutton | Cox (phone) | Jesse Ochoa | | T-Mobile |
| Doug Babcock | iconectiv | Luke Sessions | | T-Mobile |
| George Tsacnaris | iconectiv | Paula Campagnoli | | T-Mobile |
| John Malyar | iconectiv | Cathie Capita | | T-Mobile (phone) |
| Ken Havens | iconectiv | Jason Lee | | Verizon (phone) |
| Steven Koch | iconectiv | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Bridget Alexander | JSI (phone) | Kathy Rogers | | Verizon Wireless |
| Dave Garner | Neustar | Scott Terry | | Windstream (phone) |
| Fariba Jafari | Neustar | Dawn Lawrence | | XO |

**Develop the LNPA WG Report to the NANC, FON, IMG**

Paula Campagnoli will prepare a draft report for the NANC and circulate to the LNPA WG for approval prior to the December 1, 2015, NANC meeting.

The liaisons to the FON and IMG indicated that they would use the NANC report as the basis for their respective reports.

**Unfinished/New Business**

**PIM 85 Wireless Standard Validation Fields**



* Suzanne Addington, Sprint, walked through the latest version of PIM 85.
* Sprint is supporting a recommendation to develop a BP. The suggested resolution is for the wireless resellers to follow the simple port validation guidelines which include validation on no more than the following fields:
* TN
* Account Number
* Zip Code
* End User Provided Password/PIN

In addition, Sprint supports reseller validations to mirror the wireless simple port guidelines to help ensure porting is more consistent across the industry to speed up the porting process for end users.

Verizon Wireless stated that they support the Sprint recommendation. AT&T Mobility and T-Mobile also supported.

Paula Campagnoli stated that if the BP is agreed upon, it will be taken to the NANC with a request to endorse and to be forwarded to the FCC for adoption.

Paula asked for objections to developing the BP. There were none. She also asked for any objections to taking this to the NANC with a recommendation to endorse and to send to the FCC for adoption. There were no objections.

Neustar will upload the BP (will be BP 71) as documented in the PIM to the website.

**Short Timer Discrepancy**

Neustar brought up a discrepancy between the NANC Flows for placing a port into Conflict when using short timers and the test case for that scenario. Current NPAC behavior allows the port to be placed into Conflict after T2 has expired, but the NANC Flows (Flow 11 Step 1) state that the port cannot be placed into Conflict after T2 when Wireless Short Timers are being used. The test case for this scenario is consistent with current NPAC behavior. Jim Rooks asked for questions and opinions from the group. He stated that based on the input and desires of wireless SPs in the WG years ago, the current NPAC behavior allowing a port to be placed into Conflict after T2 has expired when Wireless Short Timers are being used was implemented. The wireless SPs wanted the ability to still place the port into Conflict right up to activation. The NANC Flows were not updated by the industry to reflect this. If the Flows stay as is, a change to the NPAC and the test case would be needed to make the NPAC behavior consistent with the Flows. The consensus of the LNPA Working Group was to change the Flow to be consistent with current behavior. No Service Providers voiced any issues with the current behavior and some stated that they still wanted to be able to place a port into Conflict after T2 has expired. Neustar will distribute the updated Flows to the WG by Friday, November 13.

Jason Lee, Verizon, asked if Medium Timers had been investigated. He will send some observations to Jim for consideration.

Lonnie Keck stated that there are 4 code identifiers for SPs – NNSP, ONSP, NLSP, and OLSP. He suggested that in the future we may want a code in LSOG and WICIS that identifies the SP as wireless, wireline, etc., for intermodal ports. It was agreed that this is an ATIS OBF issue. Lonnie will follow up in the OBF.

**Discussion of Need for December 9, 2015 LNPA WG Call**

Group consensus is that there is no need for a December call. The December 9 conference call will be cancelled.

**SPID Migration Blackout Dates for 2016**

The LNPA Working Group designated the SPID Migration Blackout dates for 2016. They include the first Sunday of each month, Memorial Day, Failover Exercise Date, Thanksgiving, and Christmas. New Years Day of 2017 is also shown for clarity in the following table.

**2016 SPID Migration Blackout Dates**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **January 3** / 1st Sunday of Month | **September 4** / 1st Sunday of Month |
| **February 7** / 1st Sunday of Month | **October 2** / 1st Sunday of Month |
| **March 6** / 1st Sunday of Month | **October 23** / Annual Failover Exercise |
| **April 3** / 1st Sunday of Month | **November 6** / 1st Sunday of Month |
| **May 1** / 1st Sunday of Month | **November 27** / Thanksgiving |
| **May 29** / Memorial Day | **December 4** / 1st Sunday of Month |
| **June 5** / 1st Sunday of Month | **December 25** / Christmas |
| **July 3** / 1st Sunday of Month | **January 1, 2017** / New Year |
| **August 7** / 1st Sunday of Month |  |

**2016 LNPA Working Group Meeting Schedule**

| **MONTH**  **(2016)** | **NANC MEETING DATES** | **LNPA WG**  **MEETING/CALL**  **DATES** | **HOST COMPANY** | **MEETING LOCATION** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| January |  | 5th – 6th | iconectiv | La Jolla, CA |
| February |  | 11th |  | Conference Call |
| March |  | 1st – 2nd | Comcast | Denver, CO |
| April |  | 13th |  | Conference Call |
| May |  | 3rd – 4th | Neustar | TBD |
| June |  | 8th |  | Conference Call |
| July |  | 12th – 13th | Bandwidth.com | Raleigh, NC |
| August |  | 10th |  | Conference Call |
| September |  | 13th – 14th | Sprint | Overland Park, KS |
| October |  | 12th |  | Conference Call |
| November |  | 8th – 9th | Verizon Wireless | TBD |
| December |  | 7th |  | Conference Call |

***Next Conference Call … December 7, 2015 \*\*\*CANCELLED\*\*\****

***Next Meeting … January 5-6, 2016: Location…La Jolla, CA …Hosted by iconectiv***