Minutes of September 22-25, 1998 - NANC LNPAWG Number Pooling Sub Committee Meeting, Overland Park, Kansas

Attendees: Dean Handy(WorldCom), Jim Rooks(ESI), John Maylar(Bellcore), Dave Garner(Sprint), Jackie Klare(Pacific Bell), Bob Angevine(GTE), Gary Sacra(Bell Atlantic), Kent Thayer (Bell South), Donna Navickas(Ameritech), Gustavo Hannecke (MCI), Beth Watkins (ATT), John Nakamura(TSE), Pat White (Bellcore),Tom McGarry (Lockheed Martin), Mike Pannis (ESI), Michelle Finnerty (ESI), Mike Panis(ESI), Charles Ryburn (SBC), H.L. Gonda (AT&T), Maggie Lee (Illuminet), Eleanor Willis (Winstar), Gus Samba (Lucent),

---

Donna Navickas chaired meeting. John Nakamura led the requirements sessions.
Jackie Klare led the process flow discussions.

Agenda:
1. Review & Upgrade process flows.
2. FRS review and open list action item review.
3. Joint meeting with INC on Thursday.
4. Begin IIS review.

FRS review
1. LNPA-WG recommends that SPs not assign numbers in pooled blocks until the effective date + 1 – referred to INC .
2. Donna/Dave will talk to LM Jan/Jeanine about requirement B-130 - one button access to report of errors in creating block/sub-block. This would facilitate a seamless and error free process.
3. Current NPA-Split processing in NPAC for porting: after NPA-Split is over, NPAC leaves the old NPA-NXX as a network data owned by the same SP. Will be reviewed at X-Regional meeting.
4. Add a change order for a documentation change to FRS to add validations of SPIDs on messages (SPID of request and SPID of access control) and SPID of access control = SPID of the owner of the association.
5. Number pooling requirements will be aligned with any pending change orders when the SOW for those change orders are approved.
6. The following was reviewed on Friday, please take the time to review once more and send your upgrade to John Nakamura **ASAP**.

For all sub-block broadcasts, the NPAC SMS shall ensure that the sub-block broadcast status is properly synchronized with the broadcast status of the individual SVs transmitted to the non-EDR SPs. This includes performing the following:
-   The Failed SP list for the sub-block must contain both EDR SPs which failed to successfully receive the sub-block and any non-EDR SP which failed to successfully receive one or more individual SVs within the range.
-   The Failed SP list for each SV within the range must contain any EDR SPs which failed to successfully receive the sub-block and any non-EDR SP which failed to successfully receive the that specific SV.
-   Upon successful retry of the sub-block to an EDR SP, that SP must be removed from the Failed SP list for the sub-block and the Failed SP list for all the SVs within the range.
-   Upon successful retry of an SV within the range to a non-EDR SP, that SP can be removed from the Failed SP list for that SV.

- A non-EDR SP must be removed from the Failed SP list for the sub-block only when that SP does not reside on the Failed SP list of any individual SV within the range.

Process Flow review
1. Reviewed and revised process flows. Revised flows will be distributed by Oct. 2, 1998.

Joint INC & LNPAWG meeting
INC representatives in attendance - Al Bolden (Bell South), Jo Gallagher (Bell Atlantic) Steve Engleman (MCI), Pete Tanna (USWest), Shawn Murphy (AT&T), Mark Welch (SBC),

1. Definition of Terms
Passed out a page from the Number Pooling requirements overview to assist on the alignment of the definition of terms.
Agreed effective   date will be the cornerstone date & is the date to align on.
- ED allows for Snapback to the Block Holder
- ED = Code Holder to Block Holder

2. Issue #1.
Operational flows developed call for the PA to forward 1K allocation information to the NPAC.   The information required is:
        1K block
        Effective Date of allocation
        PID (donor & recipient)
        Default Routing Data (LRN & DPC)
        NPAC Activation Indicator

The activation indicator is required for those SPs who choose to have the NPAC personnel activate the 1K block upon allocation. The NANC LNPA Pooling flows allow SPs to choose SOA or NPAC activation. This indicator would enable that flow.

Jointly reviewed the INC forms. Clarified that the Block Effective Date: = effective date & and the Block Assigned field is 7 digits.

The group agreed that LNPAWG needs to draft contribution to INC to clarify OCN - SPID.   INC wants to know where and how to get a SPID. (NPAC SOA/SPID) they want to be identified by. Clarify for new entrant.

Per our discussion LNPAWG is withdrawing the request for donor SPID.   If an NPA/NXX must be open for porting it will be referred back to the PA for handling. M&P will make specific reference to this.

Default Routing Data, this is used when NPAC is doing the activation.   The PA would not have to screen or validate but would be required in NPAC activated. Recommended having a separate section on the form.
INC needs to know the difference between the two, added activity vs imperative activity. ie: DPC Identify what it is, why we need it and where you get it.

NPAC Activation Indicator.

Part 1.3.   Clarification of wording in this section, INC will upgrade to read "Block activation flag by INC. Y or N - Needs to be an indicator, not a date.   Part 3.   Will be upgraded to make the language the same on both.

3. Item #2
The NPAC SMS functional requirements allow for activation of a 1K block not equal to the effective "effective date". What this means is that although the "effective date" of an allocation may be "X". An SP may not activate the routing data within their network until "Y". Procedurally LNPA has agreed that these 2 dates should be equal. However, functionally they may not be. We believe INC should be aware of this state to assess impact to the PA guidelines. Does the PA need to be aware of blocks that are not activated on the allocation date? Would they be notifying the donor and/or other SP's?

INC's response, No and No!

4. Issue #3
Certain NPAC SMS data base conditions will prohibit the activation of 1K Block Porting activities that may occur between donation and allocation causes these circumstances. Although it is clearly understood that these types of activities should not occur, functionality is possible and we must account for this situation. If it is to occur, it is the assumption of the LNPA Number Pooling Subcommittee that these blocks will be returned to the PA for resolution between the donor and recipient.

INC discussed working the port sooner or cancel and intra port and then re-estab the pending port, however, there is a lot of coordination that must occur.   INC would like to see this earlier in the process than what LNPA Number Pooling subcommittee has been discussing. INC believes the responsibility should be on the donor. Upon receipt of identifying all the conditions INC will attempt to close the gap by enhancing the pool establishment portion of the guidelines.

- ACTION for LNPA Number Pooling subcommittee: Put all conditions in writing for pending port. Forward our recommendations with consideration of donation date to allocation date, since this will only happen with a pending subscription at the time of donation. Need to ID room for contingencies in case a pending port was missed.

Tom McGarry of Lockheed Martin noted there needs to be an understanding that there is a potential that the block can't be activated, due to not being able to resolve pending like situation, it would be an issue for the PA to work with donor until resolved.

5. Issue #4
The allocation of a donated 1K block to the donor is a scenario in which we have made certain assumptions. It is assumed that these blocks will not be "pooled" in the NPA SMS if they are allocated to the Code Holder (from their assigned NPA/NXX) and current LERG assigned switch. This would eliminate the creation of redundant routing data in the NPAC SMS and related downstream network elements.

Jo Gallagher identified 3 possible options:

1. SP choice
2. Never in NPAC
3. Always in NPAC

INC will review this issue. LNPA noted that NPAC performance is and pooling additional blocks could have a negative impact on performance.

6. De-Pooling

Reviewed process flow. INC refers to this as "reclamation". 2 flavors of "reclamation" cann occur:

 1)Reclamation (in-voluntary)
 2) Return (voluntary)

In block 2 of the process flow clarification was given that the TN's includes reserved & assigned. In block 4 Code Holder refers to the LERG Assignee, Gary Sacra of Bell Atlantic clarified that this block was added to the process flows to provide notification in the event that an SP may un-equip 1000's block in the switch that would free up memory.

- Action Item: LNPA Pooling Subcommittee members need to provide this information to the INC reps for discussion in INC. Will probably be added to the November INC agenda. The November INC meeting will be held in San Antonio the first week of November.

7. NPA/NXX Splits

There are no INC issues with area code splits.

8. Change Modify of Default Routing Data

For SPs who will use the auto activation feature, the PA currently is in the path for default routing information.

INC needs to assess whether they need to keep track of LRN data and track it so it stays current if yes need to consider combination process in order keep the integrity of the data in all places.

9. Effective/Activation Date +1 for TN assignment.

The technical recommendation is the Effective date +1 is based on our current experience, the 24 hours is to allow for a successful downloads. (allows for partial failures & network updates)

10. Contaminated flow unavailable TN validation.

It was agreed that the Recipient SP will validate contaminted TNs in the NPAC.

11. Expedite Process

INC guidelines will change to reflect our requirements.

12. PA NPAC Interface

Barry Bishop advised that there is an implied interface between the NPAC and the PA's . Once the PA system requirements are defined, there may be a need to determine the interface between the NPAC SMS and the PA system.

IIS flows
We will start the IIS flow review, Ver 0.1 in New Orleans, 10/5-10/7.

Next Meeting:

<u>Future Number Pooling Meeting Locations</u>
The following has been included in order to provide as much advance notice as possible.

Date	Meeting Location	Host	Contact	Hotels	Airports
Oct 5-7	Bell South New Orleans	Bell South			
Oct. 26-28	ESI 9777 Pyramid Ct. Denver, Colo.	ESI	Mike Panis 303-802-2406	Hotels located near the Denver Tech Center.	Denver -Rent a car suggested, approx. 35 miles from airport
Nov. 16-19	Pacific Bell 2600 Camino Ramon San Ramon, Ca	Pacific Bell	Jackie Klare 510-867-6113	San Ramon Marriott, walking distance to facility. Residence Inn, San Ramon	Oakland - 20 miles San Jose - 45 miles San Francisco -35-50 miles depending on route Rent a car suggested
Dec. 14-18	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD