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**ABSTRACT**

This document proposes text to be included in the Purpose Section of the Routing Document.

**NOTICE**

This is a draft document and thus, is dynamic in nature. It does not reflect a consensus of the ATIS-SIP Forum IP-NNI Task Force and it may be changed or modified. Neither ATIS nor the SIP Forum makes any representation or warranty, express or implied, with respect to the sufficiency, accuracy or utility of the information or opinion contained or reflected in the material utilized. ATIS and the SIP Forum further expressly advise that any use of or reliance upon the material in question is at your risk and neither ATIS nor the SIP Forum shall be liable for any damage or injury, of whatever nature, incurred by any person arising out of any utilization of the material. It is possible that this material will at some future date be included in a copyrighted work by ATIS or the SIP Forum.

\* CONTACT: Mark Desterdick; email: [desterdick@verizon.com](mailto:desterdick@verizon.com) ; Tel: +1212-681-5626

# Discussion

There was significant email discussion initiated by ATIS to summarize the extended routing discussion from the April 30, 2014 task force virtual meeting that included AT&T, Comcast, iconnectiv, Neustar and Verizon. That summary was not captured or reflected in the meeting notes posted in IPNNI-2014-00060R000.

Routing contribution IPNNI-2014-00050R000 which was authored by AT&T, iconnectiv and Verizon attempted to capture elements of that summary in the Purpose section of the document outline. Although the contribution was posted prior to the June 16-17, 2014 meeting in Georgetown, the contribution was not discussed or reviewed by the task force.

The Purpose section as currently shown in IPNNI-2014-00064R002 states: “Detail a simple registry approach that provides the ability to exchange routing information on a per-TN basis without aggregation via NANP data structures.” However, some SPs have already implemented a different method and the per-TN method preferred by some SPs can be achieved a few ways, including approaches which do not require the use of a shared Registry. The Purpose section from the joint contribution IPNNI-2014-00050R000 acknowledges that multiple approaches should be documented along with criteria to recognize the comparative characteristics of each of the approaches.

# Proposal

It is proposed that the Task Force replace the Purpose Section of the Routing document with the following text, as it was shown in IPNNI-2014-00050R000:

The purpose of this first report is to:

1. Provide an overview of the in-use and proposed architectures with the provisioning processes and calls flows to facilitate the exchange of VoIP traffic associated with IP-based services using E.164 addresses.
2. Present criteria that provide an overview of the routing information elements required to recognize the comparative characteristics of each of the approaches.

Based upon the output of this first report, further analysis will be presented in a final report that includes:

1. Refinement of solution(s) and criteria that includes consideration of feedback obtained from the first report.
2. How existing in use and proposed interim solution(s) may be adopted and/or coexist, and evolve for transition to a future integrated registry envisioned at the Workshop.
3. Finalization of criteria requirements
4. Development of analysis leading to a recommendation of an interim solution or set of solutions.