LNPA Working Group Status Report to NANC (as of 6/10/99)

Item Number Priority (H,M,L)	Cat. *	Reference	Description	Status/Resolution	Due Date
17 H Shorten Porting Interval	P	May 8, 1998 LNPA Working Group Report on Wireless Wireline Integration ¶ 3.3.3.3	The WWITF will work during the remainder of 1998 to review systems and work processes in order to determine the reduction in porting interval from wireline to wireless carriers. Monthly status reports will be made to NANC with the final recommendation presented to NANC no later than December 31, 1998	• Overviews of both wireline and wireless processes made at WWITF on 6/15 –16. • Status Report made to NANC on 6/23/98 • 11/12/98: 2nd WWI report in progress. Due date being reassessed. A wireline task group of the WWISC has been charged with determining if porting intervals can be reduced. The final report is not expected to be completed in December. • 12/10/98: Preliminary report to be delivered to NANC 2/99, final report to be delivered 6/99. • 6/17/99 The report will be delivered to the NANC, via email, June 30, 1999. • 7/15/99 NANC did not comment on the report. They will comment at the next NANC meeting. • 9/16/99 GTE presented a contribution at NANC suggesting that the 2nd report be rejected due to slamming and 911 issues. NANC wants a third integration report addressing the 911 concerns and slamming issues that were raised in GTE's contribution. Due to the level of effort and current workload of the WG, A 3rd report will be presented to NANC in the 2nd quarter of 2000.	6/30/99

Item #	Open and Close Date	Lead	Issue/Status	Resolution
21 Request to OBF To Modify/Add Fields to the LSR	Open 7/13/98	Lisa Schmidt/Jim Grasser	WWITF Liaison to OBF regarding modified LSR fields for wireless use. Change guidelines for industry use. Liaison letter signed by chairs of WWISC and forwarded to O&B co-chairs and OBF Moderators 7/27/98 2/10/99: OBF ISSUE 1732 was opened at the 11/98 OBF meeting. ISSUE 1732 recommends adding or modifying fields on the LSR to support wireless number portability. 4/15/99: Issue to be discussed at the May OBF meeting. 5/13/99: Isssue to be discussed at May OBF meeting, TOR in 8/99, Billing in 11/99, O&P in 2/99. Final closure anticipated 5/00.	Bring as new issues to August Meeting Ordering and Provisioning Task Force established with first meeting Sept 22 & 23. Wireless encouraged to attend. LSR issue will be opened at the November OBF meeting. Initial closure in Feb. '99 and final closure in May of '99.
24 NPAC Interface "Reseller Issue"	Open 7/13/98 Closed 9/14/99	Bill Mason	Can resellers communicate directly with the NPAC? Architecture and Admin Plan states "the report does not address resellers". Do we need to revise the Architecture and Admin Plan document as a result of the second report to the NANC? 1/13/99: Issue moved from the WNP SC to the LNPA WG. 2/10/99: Issue remanded back to WNP SC. The issue is limited to wireless carriers. 4/15/99: WNP SC exploring alternate reseller interfaces to the NPAC/SMS through physical service provider.	Bill presented a contribution at the November meeting. Carriers were to consider proposal and prepare responses for the December meeting. Do we want to go forward with this issue? Is there support from a marketing and policy perspective to investigate this option? If there is support we will do the analysis. This will be discussed at the January meeting.

* Category: P=Portability/A=Administration/O=Optimization/C=Cost/CL=Closed

NOTE: Closed Issues have been moved to a separate closed issue file. A copy of the file is available from the LNPA Working Group upon request.

			5/15/99: Update from A. Cummins: NEW ACTION ITEMS: Companies need to bring contributions to the next meeting if they support a direct interface to the NPAC for resellers. Also companies need to bring in concerns they have about letting resellers have direct interface to their SOA so that the reseller can be responsible for their own porting. 6/10/99: Companies still need to bring contributions to next meeting. Issue was not discussed at June meeting due to time constrains. 7/15/1999 This is pending a decision on wireless until a decision is reached in the WNP this will be on hold in the LNPAWG 9/14/99 The reseller issue was closed by the WNP with no changes to the existing processes.	
27 Directory issues	Open 12/9/98	WNPSC LNPAWG	Directory issues critical in a wireline to wireless port scenario 1/13/99: Results of the analysis of this issue will be reported in the final report on Wireless Wireline Integration planned for submission to NANC by June 30, 1999. 5/13/99: Issue RE-OPENED. Proposal received to look at wireline process to determine if it can be adapted to wireless. 6/10/99 wireless is still evaluating process 7/15/1999 This issue is pending action by the WNP. It wll be on hold until action is taken by that sub team.	4/15/99: CLOSED – Issue dropped. Deemed not in the purview of the LNPA Working Group. 5/13/99: Re-OPENED (see 5/13/99 status.)

Issue # Prio (H,M,L)	Schedule	Lead	Issue Description	Status/Resolution
28 H LSMS Interface Performance (SlowHorse)	Open 12/98 Target - TBD	T. Sweeney	The porting process is, reportedly, being negatively impacted by one or more ("slow horse") service providers involved in porting. A "slow horse" service provider is a service provider whose LSMS system cannot handle the offered TN download rate from the regional NPAC/SMS.	12/98 - Subcommittee formed to address two aspects: 1) short-term mitigation of the problem; 2) development of LSMS interface performance requirements. 1/13/99 - Subcommittee in the process of identifying NPAC data needed to identify "slow horse" problems. 2/10/99: Subcommittee has reviewed preliminary "slow horse" data provided by Lockheed Martin and discussed the first steps of developing LSMS interface performance requirements. 3/11/99 - Preliminary timeline prepared for presentation to the NANC 4/15/99: The slow horse team is collecting 3 months of data (Mar, Apr, May) to analyze. Analysis is scheduled to be completed by 7/1. Lockheed Martin agreed to provide March data with no additional charge, however, compensation needs to be arranged for subsequent months. Billing arrangements are currently being investigated. 5/13/99: L-M agreed to provide slow horse data for April, May, and June, at no additional charge. The Slow Horse SC discussed the "acceptable level of pain" (i..e., % successful TN downloads to the LSMSs). Consensus was not reached. Some SPs felt that 100% was the only acceptable objective level of performance, others felt something in the high 90's was acceptable. The LNPA WG needs to agree on a final plan

* Category: P=Portability/A=Administration/O=Optimization/C=Cost/CL=Closed

NOTE: Closed Issues have been moved to a separate closed issue file. A copy of the file is available from the LNPA Working Group upon request.

				for the Slow Horse issue. 6/10/99 The team agreed to the following work plan: 1.Complete the analysis of the March, April, May, Slow Horse data. 2.Develop a recommendation to the LNPA Working Group based on the data analysis. 3.Develop LSMS interface performance requirements (see timeline below). 4.Determine/recommend who the enforcement authority for LSMS interface performance requirements will be. Determine/recommend who the LSMS certification entity will be. 7/15/1999 The Slow horse team is developing a two-part plan. (1) continue to monitor performance even though the current pain level does not appear to be as great as it was. (2) move to develop long term industry LSMS performance standards. 8/12/99 Slow Horse Sub Committee is working on the initial development of LSMS requirements. 9/16/99 The LSMS performance and availability requirements were not completed. They should be ready for review at the next LNPA WG meeting. They have requested further information from LM to assist in the root cause analysis. There was agreement that the slow horse sub team was evaluating the "slice" which consists of the portion of interface between the LSMS and the NPAC. 10/14/99 The straw proposals for requirements were discussed. Preliminary due date for final recommendations to NANC is April, 2000.
29 H Billing Issue during "mixed service"	Open 4/13/99 New Issue	LNPA WG (H.L. Gowda)	During the mixed service period, as defined in the Wireline Wireless Integration Second Report, calls made through inter-exchange carriers may not be billed properly. Calls may be billed twice, rated wrong or not billed at all depending on whether the calls are originated from the old or new SP network and the billing arrangement the IXC has with the SPs. For a TN that is ported between wireless carriers or ported between wireline and wireless carriers, ANI (MDN) alone is not adequate to identify call origination as either wireless or wireline and it is not adequate to identify call origination with either the old or new SP. Before NPAC activation, the IXC will bill according to its Inter Carrier agreement with the old SP. After NPAC activation, the IXC will bill according to its Inter Carrier agreement with the new SP.	4/13/99: Proposed Solution: In order to eliminate/avoid billing errors, it is required for both wireline and wireless carriers to send SS7 JIP/MSCID and OLI parameters with all calls. Pursue these requirements for implementation through the OBF – Billing Sub Committee and NIIF. 5/13/99: Priority changed from TBD to High due to long OBF cycle time. 7/15/1999 This has passed through OBF as issue 1182. It is now is being worked in NIIF as Issue 151.
30 911 Issue	Added to List 5/13/99	H L Gowda	911 Issue Statement: During the mixed service period, as defined in the Wireline Wireless Integration Second Report (section 3.6), an unacceptable public safety situation may occur for the time period when both donor and recipient phones can make 911 calls. In the event of a disconnected 911 call before NPAC activation, the PSAP can only call back a donor wireline phone and cannot call back a recipient mobile phone that is able to originate calls. After NPAC activation, the PSAP can only call back a recipient mobile phone and cannot call back a donor wireline phone	5/13/99:

* Category: P=Portability/A=Administration/O=Optimization/C=Cost/CL=Closed

LNPA Working Group Status Report to NANC (as of 6/10/99)

			that is able to originate calls.	
31 LNP Problem Identificaion and Management	Opened 5/13/99 Closed 8/12/99	Brad Baxter	LNP Problem Identification and Management (PIM) At the April/99 meeting, the NANC charged the LNPA Working Group with "overall oversight of LNP problems". (refer to letter from NANC, dated xx/xx/xx.)	5/13/99: As requested by the NANC in the April meeting, the LNPA WG determined the "next steps" to be taken toward the implementation of the IMG's LNP Problem Identification and Management (PIM) recommendation. The following high-level steps were documented: 1. Establish PIM sub-team to scope out the process; 2. Review the previously drafted dispute resolution process; 3. Identify a suitable Website for PIM communications. 5/19/99: The subteam met via conference call. The following items are being worked: - Articulation of Scope; - PIM Process Flow, Problem Submittal Form, and Problem Tracking Form; - Communication Plan: (e.g., utilization of a website) The Working Group decided that the PIM process should be established before an industry workshop is considered. Members of the Working Group remain concerned with the issues of authority, enforcement, and resources. 6/10/99 The team is still working on the scope of PIM, trying to define the depth and the ability of the LNPA WG to manage it. The team is waiting on receipt of the official "Recommendation for LNP Problem Identification and Management" letter from NANC. Once the letter is received, the team will need one month to finalize the scope of PIM and an additional month for finalizing processes. At present, the team has developed: A form for service providers to submit issues A way to track issues from receipt to resolution A way to communicate unresolved issues to other committees/groups who are determined to be better equipped to resolve the issue. A way to track closed issues for future reference A WEB site (provided by a volunteer) has been offered, so the process information is readily accessible to the industry. The team continues to have strong concerns about resources, authority, and enforcement. 7/15/1999 Draft forms and process flows exist and are being distributed to the sub team for approval. They will have a conference call to finalize the forms and process flows prior to the next LNPA WG meeting. At the next LNPA WG meeting the final process and flows will be submitted to the entire body for approval. There would be a final report to the NANC at the August meeting. Two issues will be brought to the next LNPA WG meeting on the current draft forms to prevent any delay in resolution. 8/12/99 Final process and flows were approved. PIM issue 0001 submitted and accepted to be worked by WG. PIM will be tracked on the PIM issue matrix.

* Category: P=Portability/A=Administration/O=Optimization/C=Cost/CL=Closed

NOTE: Closed Issues have been moved to a separate closed issue file. A copy of the file is available from the LNPA Working Group upon request.