LNPA WORKING GROUP

November 8-9, 2016 Meeting

FINAL Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Atlanta, GA** | **Host: AT&T / Verizon** |

**TUESDAY November 8, 2016**

**Attendance**

| **Name** | **Company** | **Name** | **Company** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Lisa Marie Maxon | 10xpeople (phone) | John Nakamura | | Neustar |
| Kyle Belcher | ATL Communications | Mubeen Saifullah | | Neustar |
| David Alread | AT&T | Paul LaGattuta | | Neustar |
| Lonnie Keck | AT&T | Gary Sacra | | Neustar |
| Suzy Green | AT&T | Shannon Sevigny | | Neustar Pooling (phone) |
| Teresa Patton | AT&T | Marcel Champagne | | Neustar |
| Renee Dillon | AT&T | Lavinia Rotaru | | Neustar |
| Anna Kafka | Bandwidth.com | Vikram Mehta | | Oracle Communications |
| Lisa Jill Freeman | Bandwidth.com | Rosemary Emmer | | Sprint (phone) |
| Glenn Clepper | Bright House/Charter | Suzanne Addington | | Sprint |
| Nancy Cornwell | Cellcom (phone) | Bob Bruce | | Syniverse |
| Mary Retka | CenturyLink (phone) | Paula Campagnoli | | T-Mobile |
| Jan Doell | CenturyLink | Luke Sessions | | T-Mobile |
| Lee Brummett | Centurylink | Deb Tucker | | Verizon Wireless |
| Randee Ryan | Comcast | Kathy Rogers | | Verizon Wireless |
| Doug Babcock | iconectiv | Imanu Hill | | Vonage |
| George Tsacnaris | iconectiv | Dawn Lawrence | | XO Communications |
| Joel Zamlong | iconectiv |  | |  |
| John Malyar | iconectiv |  | |  |
| Steven Koch | iconectiv |  | |  |
| Joel Zamlong | iconectiv |  | |  |
| Pat White | iconectiv |  | |  |
| Kimberly Issaac | Integra telecom (phone) |  | |  |
| Bridget Alexander | JSI (phone) |  | |  |
| Bonnie Johnson | Minnesota |  | |  |
| Lynette T. Khirallah | Netnumber (phone) |  | |  |
| Anand Rathi | Neustar |  | |  |
| Dave Garner | Neustar (phone) |  | |  |
| Syed Ali | Neustar |  | |  |
| Jim Rooks | Neustar |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |

NOTE: OPEN ACTION ITEMS REFERENCED IN THE MINUTES BELOW WERE CAPTURED IN THE “November 8-9, 2016 LNPA WG ACTION ITEMS” FILE AND ATTACHED HERE.



**LNPA WORKING GROUP MEETING MINUTES:**

In order to align more closely with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) the FCC has received a list of nominees for membership and membership approval has been completed. Below are the names of those that have been vetted and approved as voting members of the LNPA WG.

**Local Number Portability Administration (LNPA) WG**

Approved Co-Chairs:   Paula Jordan Campagnoli, T-Mobile

Dawn Lawrence, XO

Deb Tucker, Verizon

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Organization** | **Primary** | **Alternate** |
| 800 Response | David Greenhaus | N/A |
| AT&T | Teresa Patton | N/A |
| ATL | Brian Lynott | N/A |
| Bandwidth.com | Lisa Jill Freeman | Anna-Valeria Kafka |
| CenturyLink | Jan Doell | Mary Retka |
| Charter | Glenn Clepper | Allyson Blevins |
| Comcast | Randee Ryan | N/A |
| Cox | Jennifer Hutton | Beth O’Donnell |
| Integra Holdings | Kim Isaacs | Laurie Roberson |
| JSI | Bridget Alexander | N/A |
| LNP Alliance | Dave Malfara | James Falvey |
| Minnesota DOC | Bonnie Johnson | N/A |
| SIP Forum | Richard Shockey | N/A |
| Sprint | Suzanne Addington | Rosemary Leist |
| T-Mobile | Paula Campagnoli | Luke Sessions |
| Townes Telecommunications Service Corp. | Amanda Molina | N/A |
| Verizon | Deborah Tucker | Jason Lee |
| Vonage | Darren Krebs | N/A |
| Windstream | Scott Terry | N/A |
| XO | Dawn Lawrence | N/A |

**September 13-14, 2016 Draft LNPA WG Meeting Minutes Review:**

The September 13-14, 2016, LNPA WG DRAFT minutes were reviewed and approved with no changes and no objections to approving the minutes. There were no changes and they will be issued as FINAL.

**Updates from Other Industry Groups**

**OBF Committee Update – Randee Ryan:**

**WIRELESS SERVICE ORDERING SUBCOMMITTEE**

The Wireless Service Ordering subcommittee met October 19th, 2016 and continues to monitor activities related to Nationwide Number Portability for potential impacts to the wireless porting process. There was an update on the Network Functions Virtualization (NFV) Forum Issue 4 that was considered closed by the committee. The next checkpoint call is scheduled for February 15th, 2017.

New Issue

California is considering an NPA split in San Diego. It was suggested that if the NPA split does occur, that WSO may want to test some of the WICIS scenarios.

**LOCAL SERVICE ORDERING SUBCOMMITTEE**

The LSO Subcommittee met September 1st, 2016, September 29th, 2016 and October 14th, 2016

**New Issues**

No new issues were presented.

**UOM Schema Review**

Participants continue to review and make updates to model diagrams and schemas for the following LSR forms: CSI 122, DL 111 and POP120.

A detailed review of all fields and sections will take place with the goal of publishing a new version of the LSOG that will include closed Issues since LSOG 2Q14 along with updates to models and diagrams in LSOG Volume I and in Volume II and Schemas in Volume III. This will assist LSO in moving forward in a similar direction as ASO with four UOM parts (Base, Order, Preorder, Post Order) and a Notification section vs. just using a Local Response.

**Next Meeting:**

As of the posting of this readout the LSO will meet October 26th, 2016 and November 17, 2016.

**No questions from members.**

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

**INC Update – Dave Garner:**

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

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

At the September INC meeting, it was noted that this Issue is in “Tabled Status” awaiting new regulatory developments or progress in other industry groups.

**INC Issue 825: Update the COCAG Appendix C – Procedures for Code Holder Exit, to address a returned NXX with an LRN that does not belong to the code holder**

Issue Statement: The COCAG Appendix C – Procedures for Code Holder Exit, directs that the CO code return must be denied if the code holder has failed to remove the LRN. See Section 2.17 – “NANPA shall deny the return of a pooled NXX code with blocks assigned to other SPs if the Code Holder has LRNs, assigned blocks, retained blocks ….).

There are some cases in which an NXX (pooled and/or non-pooled) is returned and there is an LRN associated which does NOT belong to the code holder. If NANPA denies the return, the code holder attempting to return the code would have no way to remove an LRN belonging to a different service provider. Our practice has been to request the NPAC to remove the LRN if there is an LRN which is associated with an SP that is NOT the code holder. There should be language added to the COCAG Appendix C, Section 3.1 to state, “If the NPAC reports show an LRN(s) that does not belong to the code holder returning the code, the Pooling Administrator or NANPA will request the NPAC to remove the LRN, in order for the return/transfer process to continue.

At the September INC meeting, INC agreed to make changes to section 3.1 of COCAG Appendix C to direct NANPA or the PA to request NPAC to remove an LRN, if the NPAC report shows an LRN that is not assigned to the code holder returning the code.

**INC position on Overlay Verses Split**

During the INC Issue readout at the September LNPA WG meeting, Paula Campagnoli (T-Mobile) raised a question regarding INC’s position on performing Overlays over NPA Splits. She asked if INC could document or has documents stating the recommendation that an Overlay is performed instead of a Split.

During the September INC meeting, the questions raised by Paula Campagnoli were asked. INC indicated that in their whitepaper on 10-digit dialing provided to Dr. Henning Schulzrinne (former FCC Chief Technology Officer) in January 2014, the recommendation statement of this paper sites that Overlays are preferred. This document can be found at:

<http://www.atis.org/01_legal/Docs/INC/ATIS_Letter_to_Schulzrinne_Jan2014.pdf>

It was also noted that in the ATIS – INC NPA Code Relief Planning and Notification Guidelines, Section 6.3: “All-Services Overlay Method”, the footnote of this section points to the LNPA WG Best Practice 30. The footnote states: “The LNPA Working Group Best Practice 30 supports the all-services overlay as the preferred form of area code relief, and was endorsed by the North American Numbering Council (NANC) on September 18, 2013. See: <http://www.nanc-chair.org/docs/documents.html>

* Paula indicated that there is also a NARUC paper being worked on that recommends that Overlays/10-digit dialing is the preferred form of area code relief.
* Bonnie Johnson- Minnesota- there are some reasons why states may prefer to do splits and the determination should be done at the state level. MN PUC states some of these reasons in their response to the FCC when the BP was sent out.

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

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

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

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

**Status:**

* The FoN WG held its quarterly meeting on October 5, 2016.
* Industry updates from INC, LNPA WG, Numbering Testbed, and ATIS SIP Forum were given during the call.
* Continue to have FCC Wire Center trial update (GN Docket No. 12-353) on the agenda for open discussion
* Continue to have Area Code Relief and implementing 10-digit dialing on the agenda for open discussion
* Scheduled calls:

**Future Quarterly Calls for 2017**

February 1, 2017

April 12, 2017

August 2, 2017

October 11, 2017

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

No questions from members.

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

**NANC Meeting Readout – Paula Campagnoli**

Paula Campagnoli informed the LNPA WG that the next NANC meeting is scheduled for December 1, 2016. The Tri-chairs will work on the report and share it with the members for approval.

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

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

Current Status of Certification Test Cases

10 Test Cases Open

136 Test Cases Closed

A letter was received by the co-chairs of the APT from Neustar regarding additional test cases that might be added to the overall industry test plans related to MUMP, SPID Migrations, Dual NPAC operations, Performance Testing, Failover to Back-up Data Site, Contingency Roll back, and LTI.



ATT – Doesn’t believe that the APT should make this decision to expand the test plan as a sub-group. It was questioned why we want to expand the scope of the industry test plans as the certification test plan was put in place to ensure that each SP’s “system” didn’t break.

Neustar - believes that the test plan should be expanded as a “transition sub-category” to the certification testing plan and that these issues should be evaluated and worked at the LNPA WG since the LNPA WG is where the “experts” are and the most inclusive forum which includes service providers, local vendors and various industry representatives and that the LNPA WG is the forum for the development of NPAC requirements, processes and procedures and the forum where local system vendors and SPs can address requirements and tests for the various scenarios presented, especially in a critical scenario where carriers or vendors have to possibly resubmitting transactions that were lost. There are gaps in testing areas that should be considered.

A different participant at the LNPA brought up that the “gaps” indicated which the LNPA WG is missing areas of testing, is not the case, as those other areas are being tested by iconectiv outside of certification testing.

iconectiv – the Continuing Certification Testing (CCT) under SOW 24 is just one aspect of the total testing to be done for the NPAC. Multiple sets of tests will be used to accept the new NPAC. The LNPA vendor has to test and demonstrate functionality of the NPAC. The CCT is optional for service providers and failover testing is outside of CCT. The CCT is the only test plan that the LNPA WG will see.

John Malyar gave a presentation during this meeting.



Neustar asked questions about when the test cases would be presented to the LNPA WG. iconectiv responded that the TOM discusses this during their calls and webcast updates to the industry and they won’t involve the LNPA WG. iconectiv indicated that the LNPA WG has not changed their scope/process.

Neustar said that these webcasts with the TOM are not interactive and therefore do not give the ability for SPs or vendors to ask interactive questions, work through issues, processes, or provide their input.

AT&T indicated that the LNPA WG has a limited scope on what they need to do as part of the Transition.

iconectiv indicated that they have begun giving webinars and seminars that give information about on-boarding and that conversations have begun.

Lisa Marie Maxon 10xpeople– looking at the areas listed for test from iconectiv, there are several things that have never been worked on in the LNPA WG. There are several areas which iconectiv presented that don’t relate to the vendor certification testing and some that don’t relate to the Service Provider certification testing.

CenturyLink indicated that once the SP and vendors begin the onboarding process that they will receive a lot of information.

iconectiv noted that there is a lot of testing that is happening outside of the acceptance testing plans and that iconectiv needs to pass to become the new LNPA. All industry participants need to be able to verify that they can connect to the NPAC and pass certification using the certification test plans.

Neustar noted that during testing execution there will be a test plan and the results will be recorded. Neustar asked how will those results be shared.

Iconectiv responded that due to confidentiality, the specifics will be shared between the NPAC Administrator and the tester of particular test cases. General results will be shared with the LNPA WG on how many are participating, any blockers, any issues with a test case, etc. For vendors that want to do additional testing, questions were asked related to how the testing will be recorded and how will that be handled.

Oracle asked if a Local vendor can share the results of the testing with their customers, iconectiv stated that once the vendor is certified, the vendor can share that they are certified on the new NPAC with their customers. If there is a defect during the testing, the defect will be resolved and certification will continue, but during testing no testing results can be shared with customers. Only after certification can the certification results be shared with the vendor’s customers. Neustar asked if during the process of a vendor certifying, defects are identified, can they be shared with their customers. John Malyar, iconectiv, will take this back to clarify when and what information can be shared with the customers.

There is a 100% pass rate to be certified.

As SP and Bureaus complete their certification testing, they can begin group round robin testing and ad-hoc testing if they wish.

Iconectiv asked Neustar in what situations would a local vendor share testing results, Neustar explained as an example, when doing XML testing, Neustar’s OMS division had a line of open communication with his clients that provided them X% of tests completed and identified defects.

LNP Alliance said that full transparency is essential because the NPAC is a unified system and issues can affect everyone.

Syniverse said that their two concerns are that testing doesn’t have to be repeated and that the testing is valid and relevant to the production environment.

Glenn Clepper from Charter said that he wants assurances that this testing will be tracked and it functions as it should. He said that he wants to see the test results even if internal to iconectiv.

Industry Testing Schedule is about 2Q17 thru 1Q18.

SPID Migrations – there are manual processes associated to the scenarios of the LTI. If this hasn’t been done in the past, why should we do them today? Neustar suggests having a sub-category that are not certification testing. If it is industry level testing then that is what the LNPA WG should be working on, NOT individual vendor or service provider testing.

* This should go on the LTI Test Plan that iconectiv has to certify. This will not be worked in the LNPA WG.

Dual NPAC operations – NPAC vendors should be talking to figure out the solution. John Malyar suggests that the LNPA WG send to the NAPM LLC to send to the TOM for the vendors to work on. (2 vendors = 2 SFTP sites).

The local system vendors were under the impression that there would be no changes to their local systems.

* NEW ACTION ITEM 11082016-01:  LNPA WG Tri-chairs to go to the NAPM LLC to ask the TOM to work with the two LNPAs to obtain a recommendation for resolution on support of one or more sFTP sites.

MASS Update – these will be discussed at the APT

* Processing file-based requests – manual upload of a spreadsheet – should not have a certification test.
* Self-Service MUMP is with the LTI.
* Ensuring Notification Suppression –
* Error conditions -

Performance Testing – will be completed during iconectiv’s Acceptance Test Plans.

Communication of expectations is done during onboarding. There is no current expectation that the vendors will need to participate in performance testing, but they may be able to if they choose to.

Failover to Back-up Data Site – This is covered under iconectiv’s obligation in the MSA.

Contingency Roll Back – this is being managed by the TOM with the 2 LNPA’s and the transition team. No firm decisions have been made, but once it is finalized it will be shared somehow (to be determined). This is covered in the NAPM and the TOM meetings. The TOM will continue to work with the 2 LNPA vendors.

* Jim Rooks – there may be a need to cancel and resubmit orders and this may be something that the LNPA WG could work on.
* Teresa Patton and Deb Tucker suggested that we need to wait and see what decisions are made first…this is a work in progress
* John Malyar – if the TOM shares something publically then he expects it to be worked at the LNPA WG, if necessary.
* If a Vendor has to change their systems in order to support the processes around a rollback scenario, they will need to be re-certified, even if have already been previously certified.
* Lisa Jill Freeman – this is a pretty critical topic and may not need to be flushed out today and suggests that we add time to the January agenda.
* Concerns on sunsetting items that are part of the roll back was mentioned.

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

**Change Management**

* (updated) NANC 460 – Sunset List Items – Local System Impact = No
* 3.4 Sunset the ability to SOA to NOT support Cause Code 2 (automatic conflict from cancellation notification). The SOA vendor may support it; but, the SP may not have “purchased” this functionality from their vendor. There are 10 SPs that have not opted in to using Cause Code 2.
* The implications to leaving this in the NPAC would be to create new test cases.
* Is it possible to reach out to those 10 SPs to have them opt in to using CC 2?
* Charter asked why we would sunset it if any provider is using it?
* John Malyar- responded that everyone needs to do it the same way and moving to CC 2 had value.
  + 3.1 Sunset Single TN Notification – There are 5 SPs that do not support TN Range Notification.
* New Action Item: 110816-02 – Neustar to refresh the number of Service providers impacted by sunsetting items on the sunset list.
* New Action Item: 110816-03 – (based on the outcome of AI 110816-02) Neustar will determine if they can inform the impacted Service Providers that they are to reach out to their LSMS/SOA vendors for feedback on the sunset items.
* New Action Item: 110816-04 – based on comments from the 11-08-16 meeting, iconectiv to determine the testing certification of the sunset items.

Iconectiv proposed the following changes to 460:

* Change order 460 item 3.4 is “Sunset the ability for SOA to not support Cause Code 2 (automatic conflict from cancellation notification)”.  460 is clear that the functionality is sunset for SOAs, but there is also functionality related to Cause Code 2 for LSMS systems.  When an LSMS queries the NPAC for a subscription version that has a Cause Code value of 2, the NPAC determines whether the Cause Code 2 value can be returned based on a SPID tunable (see note after RR6-208).  iconectiv would like the LNPA WG to consider whether the ability to not support cause code 2 for LSMS systems can be sunset.  That is, with the sunset of this functionality, all LSMS systems would need to support receiving Cause Code 2 (Automatic Conflict from Cancellation) in Subscription Version query replies. The following FRS requirements would be modified/deprecated as a result of such a change.
  + R4-8 item #35 “Service Provider LSMS Supports Cancel-Pending-to-Conflict Cause Code”
  + RR6-208
  + RR6-209
  + RR6-210
* New Action Item 110816-05 - Neustar to look at the LSMS side of sunset item 3.4 that is related to SV queries and determine any impact there would be to the LSMS if this were to be sunsetted
* (updated) NANC 461 – Sunset List Items – Local System Impact = Yes
* (updated) NANC 485 – Turn-Up Test Plan Doc-Only Clarifications
* (accepted) NANC 486 – FRS Doc-Only Clarifications
* (accepted) NANC 487 – IIS-EFD Doc-Only Clarifications, NO CHANGES
* (accepted) NANC 488 – XIS Doc-Only Clarifications
* Iconectiv – Steve Koch –suggest sunsetting: Change order 454 deleted support on the CMIP interface for creating and modifying NPA-NXX Filters.  However, this change order did not remove the capability to query NPA-NXX Filters over that interface.  When NANC 372 was implemented, the capability to query NPA-NXX Filters was not included as part of the new interface.  iconectiv would like the LNPA WG to consider whether the ability to query NPA-NXX Filters over the CMIP interface can be sunset.  Such a change would deprecate/delete the following FRS requirements and EFD flows.
  + FRS Requirement RR3-769
  + FRS Requirement RR3-8
  + FRS Requirement RR3-9
  + EFD Flow B.6.3 “lsmsFilterNPA-NXX Query by the Local SMS”
  + EFD Flow B.6.6 “lsmsFilterNPA-NXX Query by the SOA”
* **New Action Item 110816-06** Service Providers to determine if they use the CMIP interface to query their own NPA-NXX filters today.

**Action Item remaining open from previous LNPA WG meeting:**

1. **Action Item** **091316-01** – APT to discuss NANC 461 to determine potential approach for sun setting SOA and/or LSMS impacting change orders.

* This will be discussed during the November 9, 2016 APT meeting.

1. **PIM 86** –**Action Item** **070715-01** – The disputed port PIM submitted by Sprint 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.

* UPDATE: Anna Kafka (Bandwidth) updated
  + Anna prefaced that this is just a draft for discussion.
  + This best practice addresses the three types of Unauthorized Ports:
    - **Disputed Port** – A disputed port is commonly a result of two or more parties each claiming to be the authorized end user. Examples may include: business partner disputes, personal relationship disputes, dissolution of franchises, etc.
    - **Inadvertent Port** – Any port which occurred as a result of an error. Errors which result in Inadvertent Ports may include, but are not limited to: incorrect number provided by End User; typographical errors in LSRs, LOAs, etc.
    - **Fraudulent Port** – A port which occurred as the result of an intentional act of fraud and/or misrepresentation. Examples may include: use of numbers for credit card fraud, vanity number which is an easily remembered sequence of numbers, etc.

.

* Renee Dillon: Discussion that Jeopardies (PIM 82) should be included in this flow. This was discussed and considered; however, it was agreed that Jeopardies should not be called out in this document.
* Step 3, in level 2 “etc..” should be clarified
* Work on the wording and come to the January 2017 meeting to vote and close this item.

**IP Transition effects on Number Portability**

The Testbed Focus Group met last on 11/1.

The test plan sub groups have continued to be encouraged to meet in between the main group meetings, to focus on moving forward with the individual test plan completion of the documentation. That work has progressed, resulting in some test plan updates being provided. Several test plans still need the documentation worked through and provided for the Testbed Focus Group to review. Some preliminary testing is underway on some test cases. The Tracking Sheet is updated on each call for each test case. The FCC/AT&T Industry RoboCalling Strike Force Reports and Handoff were reviewed on the 11/1 call, and it is understood that there is a linkage to this group’s testing efforts for the Provider to Provider Use Case 1 – Secure Telephony Identity Protocols for End to End SIP Calls.

Many companies have signed the ATIS NDA for participating in the testing, with full access to the testing documentation, and others may still come forward to sign the NDA as well. Some companies have recently determined to be involved in the testing. There is still opportunity for others to come forward to be included.

The next full team meeting is scheduled for 11/29.

**LNPA Transition Discussion - All**

The APT continues to review the industry test cases for turning up an NPAC/SMS.

**Develop the LNPA WG Report to the NANC**

Paula Campagnoli will develop and distribute a draft NANC report for approval prior to the December NANC meeting.

**Unfinished/New Business**

The following LNPA WG members announced they were retiring at the end of 2016.

* Jan Doell – CenturyLink
* Mary Retka – CenturyLink
* Lonnie Keck- AT&T

2017 Meeting Schedule

January 10-11, 2017 – iconectiv – Scottsdale, AZ

February 8, 2017 - call

March 7-8, 2017 Comcast – Denver, CO

April 5, 2017 - call

May 2-3, 2017 – Neustar -

June 7, 2017 - call

July 11-12, 2017 – Bandwidth – Durham, NC

August 9, 2017 - call

September 12-13, 2017 – CenturyLink – Denver, CO

October 4, 2017 - call

November 7-8, 2017 – T-mobile/VZ – Nashville, TN????

December 6, 2017 - call

**Discussion of Need for December 7, 2016 LNPA WG Call**

A December 7 call will take place to review the results of the Action Items from today’s meeting.

**STATUS OF ACTION ITEMS:**

**070715-01 (PIM 86)–** still being worked on

**091316-01 (**Action Item)– APT to discuss NANC 461 to determine potential approach for sun setting SOA and/or LSMS impacting change orders.

-**New Action Item: 11082016-01**:  LNPA WG Tri-chairs to go to the NAPM LLC to ask the TOM to work with the two LNPAs to obtain a recommendation for resolution on support of one or more sFTP sites.

-**New Action Item: 110816-02** – Neustar to refresh the number of Service providers impacted by sunsetting items on the sunset list.

-**New Action Item: 110816-03** – (based on the outcome of AI 110816-02) Neustar will determine if they can inform the impacted Service Providers that they are to reach out to their LSMS/SOA vendors for feedback on the sunset items.

-**New Action Item: 110816-04** – based on comments from the 11-08-16 meeting, iconectiv to determine the testing certification of the sunset items

**- New Action Item 110816-05** - Neustar to look at the LSMS side of sunset item 3.4 that is related to SV queries and determine any impact there would be to the LSMS if this were to be sunsetted?

**-Action Item 110816-06** Service Providers to determine if they use the CMIP interface to query their own NPA-NXX filters today.

**November 2016 Meeting Adjourned**

Having completed the agenda for the November 8-9, 2016, LNPA Working Group meeting, the meeting was adjourned. The remaining time allotted for meeting on November 9, 2016 will be used by the Architecture Planning Team (APT) to continue review of transition test cases.

**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 … December 7, 2016***

***Next Meeting … January 10-11, 2017: Location Scottsdale, AZ… …Hosted by iconectiv***