LNPA WORKING GROUP

March 1-2, 2016 Meeting

DRAFT Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Denver, CO** | **Host: Comcast** |

**TUESDAY March 1, 2016**

**Attendance**

| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Lane Patterson | 10xpeople | Jack Aronson | | Masergy |
| Lisa Marie Maxson | 10xpeople | Terry Ford | | Masergy |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T | Bonnie Johnson | | Minnesota DoC (phone) |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T | Cary Hinton | | NANC (phone) |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Lynette Khirallah | | NetNumber (phone) |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T | Anand Rathi | | Neustar |
| Tracey Guidotti | AT&T (phone) | Dave Garner | | Neustar |
| Jackie Voss | ATIS (phone) | Gary Sacra | | Neustar |
| Michael Rothchild | ATL | Jim Rooks | | Neustar |
| Anna Kafka | Bandwidth.com | John Nakamura | | Neustar |
| Kelly Doty | Bandwidth.com | Larry Vagnoni | | Neustar |
| Lisa Jill Freeman | Bandwidth.com | Lavinia Rotaru | | Neustar |
| Matt Ruehlen | Bandwidth.com | Marcel Champagne | | Neustar |
| Glenn Clepper | Bright House | Michael O'Connor | | Neustar |
| Allyson Blevins | Bright House (phone) | Mubeen Saifullah | | Neustar |
| Matt Nolan | Bright House (phone) | Pamela Connell | | Neustar |
| Marian Hearn | Canadian LNP | Paul LaGattuta | | Neustar |
| Jan Doell | CenturyLink | Shannon Sevigny | | Neustar Pooling (phone) |
| Mary Retka | CenturyLink | Ramesh Chellamani | | Oracle Communications |
| Betty Sanders | Charter Communications | Vikram Mehta | | Oracle Communications |
| Eric Chuss | Chase Tech Consulting (phone) | Desiree Apodaca | | RingCentral |
| Kasha Fauscett | Comcast | Troy Hess | | RingCentral |
| Randee Ryan | Comcast | Suzanne Addington | | Sprint |
| Linda Birchem | Comcast (phone) | Bob Bruce | | Syniverse (phone) |
| Jennifer Hutton | Cox (phone) | Marte Kinder | | TWC (phone) |
| Doug Babcock | iconectiv | Luke Sessions | | T-Mobile |
| George Tsacnaris | iconectiv | Paula Campagnoli | | T-Mobile |
| Joe Mullin | iconectiv | David Lund | | US Cellular (phone) |
| John Malyar | iconectiv | Tanya Golub | | US Cellular (phone) |
| Ken Havens | iconectiv | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Steven Koch | iconectiv | Kathy Rogers | | Verizon Wireless |
| Bridget Alexander | JSI | Scott Terry | | Windstream |
| Angel Acosta | Level 3 Communications | Dawn Lawrence | | XO |

NOTE: OPEN ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW HAVE BEEN CAPTURED IN THE “March 1-2, 2016 LNPA WG ACTION ITEMS” FILE AND ATTACHED HERE.



**LNPA WORKING GROUP MEETING MINUTES:**

**January 5-6, 2016 Draft LNPA WG Meeting Minutes Review:**

The January 5-6, 2016, LNPA WG DRAFT minutes were reviewed and approved without change and will be issued as FINAL.

**Updates from Other Industry Groups**

**OBF Committee Update – Deb Tucker:**

**OBF**

**ORDERING SOLUTIONS COMMITTEE**

**LNPA WG Readout**

**March 1, 2016**

**WIRELESS SERVICE ORDERING SUBCOMMITTEE**

The Wireless Service Ordering Subcommittee met January 8, 2016 for a checkpoint call. The subcommittee is monitoring activities related to Nationwide Number Portability for potential impacts to the wireless porting process; however there is currently nothing yet to review. The next checkpoint call is scheduled for April 7, 2016.

**LOCAL SERVICE ORDERING SUBCOMMITTEE**

The LSO Subcommittee met January 28, 2016 to discuss 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 was initially submitted to address standardization of Response Types (RTs) and fields that may be eliminated for REQTYP C, but the Issue grew to include all REQTYPs. It was also intended to eliminate any RTs not being used. A concern was noted that the Issue has grown too large in scope and it was suggested to close this Issue at the RT level and open a new Issue to address which fields use which RTs regardless of REQTYP.

**Agreement Reached:** Participants agreed to recommend to the Ordering Solutions Committee that Issue 3373 be placed into Initial Closure with the following Resolution Statement:

*LSO Subcommittee has reviewed REQTYP C field usage and notes as part of LSOG 1Q10, which changed the direction of this Issue no longer needing standardization for one specific RT and one specific REQTYP. The team will close this Issue and open a new Issue to address all RTs across all REQTYPs. The subcommittee reached consensus to remove the following valid values for RT: A = Acknowledgement, F = Facility confirmation, G = Confirmation and DL errors (directory), and K = Notification of network modifications required.*

**Open Issues:**

**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) (Inactive)**

This Issue addresses removal of fields that are no longer used in the industry.

Next Meeting:

The next LSO meeting is scheduled for March 3, 2016.

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

**INC Update – Dave Garner:**

**INC Issues Readout** LNPA WG Meeting – March 2016

**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.

INC completed updates to 13 Guidelines pursuant to FCC Order 15-70 and placed the following notation on the cover page of any Guidelines containing updates not effective on November 30th:

“ NOTE: These guidelines contain references to FCC Order 15-70.

As noted in the Federal Register:

The Rule will become effective on November 30, 2015, except for §§ 52.15(g)(2) [Central office code administration-Initial numbering resources] & 52.15(g)(3) [Central office code administration-Commission authorization process], which include revised information collection requirements that first require OMB review and approval. The FCC will publish a further document in the Federal Register in the future announcing the effective date of the excepted rule amendments.

Once §§ 52.15(g)(2) and 52.15(g)(3) become effective, this note will be removed and all text in the guidelines will be effective. “

On February 4, 2016, the FCC published in the Federal Register, the date of the complete effectiveness of the *Report and Order* establishing rules for an authorization process to enable interconnected VoIP providers that choose direct access to request numbers directly from the Numbering Administrators.

From the announcement:

“The amendments to [47 CFR 52.15](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.federalregister.gov_select-2Dcitation_2016_02_04_47-2DCFR-2D52.15&d=CwMFAg&c=MOptNlVtIETeDALC_lULrw&r=ekAyqKuCbvzpkuC_ctIA2wRK9REngDwmXE9MU0pAAoM&m=9VZ81uEQ_DEw49FNX5wkLN37qTadw8434o8AkDVBkAM&s=G8yFxgC_rykok-1YW3S_jIeYQQ1G-4jaq0IXL002CCU&e=)(g)(2) and (g)(3) published at [80 FR 66454](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.federalregister.gov_citation_80-2DFR-2D66454&d=CwMFAg&c=MOptNlVtIETeDALC_lULrw&r=ekAyqKuCbvzpkuC_ctIA2wRK9REngDwmXE9MU0pAAoM&m=9VZ81uEQ_DEw49FNX5wkLN37qTadw8434o8AkDVBkAM&s=oO61U0jj6xQU4pArNTeONrm0lJnxyvixIiMwYzb4t3E&e=), October 29, 2015, are effective February 4, 2016.”

The Wireline Competition Bureau issued a FCC Public Notice (DA 16-129) on February 4, 2016, announcing the commencement date and process for iVoIP providers to file applications for authorization to obtain telephone numbers. It stated that on February 18, 2016, the FCC will begin accepting applications from interconnected VoIP providers for authorization to obtain telephone numbers directly from the Numbering Administrators.

**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 January meeting, INC continued to discuss developments regarding the PSTN to IP transition.

The relationship between non-geographic number assignment and non-geographic number portability was also discussed and an analysis of the potential modal disparities that could occur if non-geographic number portability is implemented without simultaneously implementing non-geographic number assignment was started.

**INC’s input to NOWG Action Items**

The Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG) was tasked with action items from the NANC in connection with analyzing the issue of nationwide non-geographic number portability.

NOWG requested input from NANPA and INC on its two action items from the NANC in connection with analyzing the topic of nationwide number portability. Those being:

* Potential impacts to the life of the NANP.
* NRUF Form impacts.

INC discussed the NOWG request during a meeting held on January 5, 2016. NANPA was in attendance at the meeting and shared with INC the direction NANPA was taking in its response to the NOWG by January 8th.

INC reviewed NANPA’s input to the NOWG and responded to the NOWG’s request, noting INC agrees with NANPA’s assumptions and input related to both action items.

One of NANPA’s assumptions is that the LRN functionality will be used in support of non-geographic number portability. Further, the ten-digit format of an LRN remains the same and is assigned from a valid NPA-NXX that has been uniquely assigned to the service provider by NANPA.

Because changes to the current LRN routing architecture could impact the life of the NANP, INC advised the NOWG that it will evaluate any recommendations for a new LRN routing scheme agreed to by the industry technical routing experts (e.g., ATIS PTSC) for impacts to the INC Guidelines, specifically the LRN Assignment Practices.

***LNPA WG Discussion:*** The INC supports the assumption that LRNs will be used in support of NGNP, but they will continue to evaluate any new routing schemes for impacts to the life of the NANP. Jan Doell asked if it would be possible to have a PTSC representative give an update on IP Transition at the next face to face LNPA Working Group meeting. Ron Steen to see if Martin Dolly can accommodate this request.

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

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

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

**March 1, 2016**

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

**Status:**

* There was a FoN WG quarterly meeting held on February 3, 2016.
* Non-Geographic Number Portability (NGNP): The Tri-chairs called a conference call on January 12, 2016 to begin working on the directive from the NANC chair for Nationwide Number Portability. The NANC Chair asked the FoN WG to respond to the following 4 questions/issues;
  + *A*pplicability and assessment of tolls, tariffs, and taxes;
  + The role of state regulatory commissions;
  + Costs, including cost recovery;
  + Conforming edits to relevant federal rules

The FoN WG submitted an interim status report on the discussions and initial findings for NNP to the NANC Chair on February 8, 2016.

The NANC Chair agreed that the working groups should use the unified term of Nationwide Number Portability (NNP), which is synonymous with Non-Geographic Number Portability (NGNP) (which is what the LNPA WG called it in the whitepaper from February 2015).

The FoN WG and the LNPA WG subcommittee are collaborating on this effort.

* Scheduled calls:
  + 2016 Meeting Schedule:

April 6, 2016

August 3, 2016

October 5, 2016

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

***LNPA WG Discussion:*** Paula Campagnoli asked how the interim report to NANC would be handled with the NGNP sub-committee and the FON combining efforts. The report will now be a FON/NGNP report. The FON has reached out to the PTSC for input. PTSC has concerns that the NANC may not understand that a final routing solution may not be selected in the timeframe necessary to meet the FCC requirement.

As noted in the FON report, working groups should begin using the term Nationwide Number Porting (NNP).

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

**NANC Meeting Readout – Paula Campagnoli**

There has not been a NANC meeting since the last LNPA Working Group meeting. Paula Campagnoli will send out a draft NANC report for review prior to the next NANC meeting.

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

**Architecture Planning Team (APT) – John Malyar/Teresa Patton**

# Architecture Planning Team (APT) Status Report to the LNPA WG

**March 1, 2016**

APT Chairs: Teresa Patton AT&T; John P. Malyar iconectiv

**Status:**

* Most recent APT call was held on 01/27/2016. The call was well attended (33 Industry participants identified)
* Document containing the latest set of Industry Test cases for clarification distributed via the LNPA WG co-chairs on 02/17/2015. The current status of the Test Case Review is:
  + 37 Closed
  + 54 Pending Doc Only Change
  + 13 Open
* Accepted “Pending Doc Changes” to be reviewed during the CMA portion of the March LNPA WG meeting.
* Next call/meeting scheduled for 3/2/2016 to be held at the end of the LNPA WG meeting. This meeting will continue to review “Open” items and any newly submitted items.

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

**Best Practice 04** – **Sub-Committee Status Report** **– Betty Sanders**



Glenn Clepper, Bright House, presented the embedded PIM concerning Best Practice 4. BP4 contains a white paper that addresses various call scenarios and who the N-1 carrier would be in each case. The main concern is the situation where there is Extended Area Service (EAS) across a LATA boundary.

The PIM offers a recommendation that the BP4 have language added to the white paper with some additional options. There was some discussion about the practicality of the proposed solutions.

Gary Sacra provided the history of the issue and the reasoning behind the solution documented in the BP4 white paper. Jan Doell and Ron Steen mentioned some technical obstacles in the proposed options.

Since the PIM was circulated the week prior to the meeting, it was decided to delay further discussion and consensus resolution until the May meeting giving all participants time to review. At the May meeting, it will be determined if there is consensus to accept this PIM to be worked.

This will be placed on the May agenda. Ron asked that all members familiarize themselves with the NANC Consensus process. The NANC Operating Manual can be found on the NANC website at <http://www.nanc-chair.org/docs/principles.html> under the “NANC Training Binder” topic.

**Letter to NANC Chair from the FCC – Nationwide Wireless Number Portability - LNPA WG Work Item # 7 - All**

**Non-Geographic Number Portability Subcommittee – Status – Teresa Patton**

* The Tri-Chairs sent a response to NANC on the LRN question saying that as long as the current routing mechanism is in place, LRNs will be used for routing calls to ported and pooled numbers.
* The LNPA WG’s NGNP work has been combined with the FON.
* Cary Hinton asked if the LNPA WG NGNP sub-group issued a report to NANC. Paula Campagnoli responded that the NGNP is now working jointly with the FON and the report will be a joint report.

**Change Management**

  

* John reviewed the doc only FRS change order.
  + RR3-662 - Modification of effective date of NXX – Steve Koch asked what it could be modified to - a future date or a past date. Steve said that the indication is that it can only be modified to a future date. John will look into this and provide a response.
  + Note in the Data Model that 2 characters for /SP Type are part of the 40 characters.
* John then reviewed the IIS/EFD doc only change order.
  + No questions or comments.
* John then reviewed the GDMO doc only change order.
  + No questions or comments.
* John then reviewed the Change Order document.



* + NANC 461 – 2 test cases would have to be eliminated if the SP’s ability to change their CMIP network data in their customer profile is sunset.
  + FRS change order was accepted and is NANC 479.
  + IIS/EFD change order was accepted and is NANC 480.
  + GDMO change order was accepted and is NANC 481.
* John then reviewed the Test Plan doc only change order.



* + Test case 8.1.2.1.1.30, 31, 32, and 33 should have similar verbiage, and not 8.1.1.1.2.10. John will make revisions.
  + Test Case 139-8 – Pat White asked if removing “optional” for LSMS means that an LSMS simulator needs to be involved to verify the error case that the broadcast is not received. Discussion of this moved to APT meeting (Row 211 in APT spreadsheet).
  + Test case 201-17 (Row 225 in APT spreadsheet) needs to have CMIP notification reviewed in APT.
  + Test case 8.1.2.3.1.7 – Pat White asked if it is invalid for XML as well. Will discuss during APT meeting.
  + The test case change order was accepted as NANC 482.

**Action Items 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).



Lisa Jill Freeman led a discussion about the PIM and proposed Best Practice. The PIM is now designated as PIM 86. The sub-committee desires to expand the scope of the issue being addressed. They want to cover all the different types of incorrect porting whether by accident or fraudulently. They wish to include inadvertent ports, disputed ports, and unauthorized ports. The LNPA WG consensus was to accept this PIM to be worked.

The Action Item will remain open, but will be modified as follows:

**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). *At the March 2016 LNPA Working Group meeting, the subcommittee reported that they would like to expand the scope of this Action Item, PIM, and proposed Best Practice to include all erroneous ports: inadvertent, slamming, and disputed. The Working Group agreed and the sub-committee will continue to work this issue, and is still led by Lisa Jill Freeman.*



**IP Transition effects on Number Portability**

Mary Retka reported that the IP Transition Test Bed Team is meeting currently. They have been reviewing test case contributions, and will be working to fine tune them. Companies interested in participating in testing should schedule time in early 2017.

**Develop Guidelines for what is needed for new Service Providers to start Porting Numbers**

Bridget Alexander reported that the New Entrant Checklist was distributed on February 18, 2016 and is considered FINAL. This item is considered to be complete and will not be included on the May agenda.

**WEDNESDAY March 2, 2016**

**Attendance**

| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Lane Patterson | 10xpeople | Terry Ford | | Masergy |
| Lisa Marie Maxson | 10xpeople | Lynette Khirallah | | NetNumber (phone) |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T | Anand Rathi | | Neustar |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T | Dave Garner | | Neustar |
| Ron Steen | AT&T | Gary Sacra | | Neustar |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T | Jim Rooks | | Neustar |
| Tracey Guidotti | AT&T (phone) | John Nakamura | | Neustar |
| Michael Rothchild | ATL | Larry Vagnoni | | Neustar |
| Anna Kafka | Bandwidth.com | Lavinia Rotaru | | Neustar |
| Kelly Doty | Bandwidth.com | Marcel Champagne | | Neustar |
| Lisa Jill Freeman | Bandwidth.com | Michael O'Connor | | Neustar |
| Matt Ruehlen | Bandwidth.com | Mubeen Saifullah | | Neustar |
| Glenn Clepper | Bright House | Pamela Connell | | Neustar |
| Jan Doell | CenturyLink | Paul LaGattuta | | Neustar |
| Phil Linse | CenturyLink (phone) | Shannon Sevigny | | Neustar Pooling (phone) |
| Mary Retka | CenturyLink | Ramesh Chellamani | | Oracle Communications |
| Betty Sanders | Charter Communications | Vikram Mehta | | Oracle Communications |
| Kasha Fauscett | Comcast | Towanda Russell | | RCN (phone) |
| Randee Ryan | Comcast | Troy Hess | | RingCentral |
| Wendy Rutherford | GVNW (phone) | Suzanne Addington | | Sprint |
| Doug Babcock | iconectiv | Bob Bruce | | Syniverse (phone) |
| George Tsacnaris | iconectiv | Marte Kinder | | TWC (phone) |
| Joe Mullin | iconectiv | Luke Sessions | | T-Mobile |
| John Malyar | iconectiv | Paula Campagnoli | | T-Mobile |
| Ken Havens | iconectiv | Tanya Golub | | US Cellular (phone) |
| Steven Koch | iconectiv | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Bridget Alexander | JSI | Kathy Rogers | | Verizon Wireless |
| Angel Acosta | Level 3 Communications | Scott Terry | | Windstream |
| Jack Aronson | Masergy | Dawn Lawrence | | XO |

**LNPA Transition Discussion - All**

The only current LNPA WG involvement is that the APT continues to review the industry test cases for turning up an NPAC/SMS.

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

Paula Campagnoli will distribute a draft NANC report for group approval prior to the March 24, 2016, NANC meeting.

The FON and IMG representatives will use the NANC report to update their respective groups.

**Unfinished/New Business**

**Leased Phones**

Suzanne Addington, Sprint, stated that her company has issues with customers who have leased phones. Customers are porting to other service providers before their lease agreement ends without paying the balance of what they owe. Sprint would like to see a Best Practice dealing with this issue. Consensus was that this is a contractual issue between the service provider and the customer, and that it is not an LNPA Working Group issue. However, some suggestions were offered as to dealing with the problem. One suggestion is that the final bill should reflect any unpaid fees and that collection attempts (including collection agencies) should be made just as with any other unpaid bill. Another suggestion was that the phone could be disabled blocking its use on all networks.

**Email Service Provider Porting Communication**

Suzanne Addington indicated that Sprint is being told by some companies that they won’t accept phone calls concerning porting issues – only email. Sprint porting centers don’t have access to email. This is causing delays in resolving rejects. Suzanne suggested putting timeframes on the responses. T-Mobile and Verizon voiced concern that process used (phone calls vs. email, etc.) should not be dictated by this group. Service providers were given an Action Item to determine if this is an issue for them. At the May meeting, the LNPA WG will determine whether or not this will be worked as a PIM.

**New Action Item 030216-01 –** Sprint brought an issue to the attention of the WG. Some service providers will not accept phone calls in their porting centers, but only respond to email. This creates issues for other companies, and, in particular, introduces delay in resolution of fallout or reject situations. Service providers are to determine if this is an issue for them and be prepared to discuss at the May LNPA WG meeting. At the May meeting, determination will be made as to whether or not this warrants a PIM.

**Service Providers Who Refuse to Port**

Lisa Jill Freeman, Bandwidth.com, asked about companies who refuse to port their numbers. The company causing concern indicates that they do not port numbers. Some small companies have waivers allowing them to not participate in porting; however, it was noted that most of the waivers have expired – though some do still exist. The company in question (SPID 2595) is not on the waiver list provided by Neustar. It was suggested that Bandwidth.com might send a bona fide request to have the NPA-NXX in question available for porting. It was also noted that in many cases, state utilities commissions can aid in resolution.

**Discussion of Need for April 13, 2016 LNPA WG Call**

Group consensus is that there is no need for an April LNPA WG call. ***However, subsequent to the meeting, the Architecture Planning Team requested that the LNPA WG convene a conference call on April 13 to approve the change orders that they will be working on in their March 23 conference call.***

**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 | Miami, FL |
| June |  | 8th |  | Conference Call |
| July |  | 12th – 13th | Bandwidth.com | Durham, NC |
| August |  | 10th |  | Conference Call |
| September |  | 13th – 14th | Sprint | Overland Park, KS |
| October |  | 12th |  | Conference Call |
| November |  | 8th – 9th | Verizon Wireless & AT&T | Atlanta, GA |
| December |  | 7th |  | Conference Call |

***Next Conference Call … April 13, 2016***

***Next Meeting … May 3-4, 2016: Location…Miami, FL …Hosted by Neustar***