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**Version History:**

This Best Practice was created by the LNPA WG (now known as the NPIF – Number Portability Industry Forum) and originally accepted on 12/10/2001 (Version 1). At the September 2016 LNPA WG changes were made to include v6 of the LNPA WG N-1 Interpretation paper. It was reviewed again at the NPIF where consensus was reached on updates related to FCC 18-95 Report and Order was issued. This Best Practice was reviewed by the NPIF on 03/08/2022 where consensus was reached that no changes were required.

**Background:**

**Recommend Change to Requirements:** Yes

1. 12/10/2001
   * Original BP document
2. 9/13/2016 – Version 2
   * This version included WG Interpretation v6
3. 6/2/2020 – Version 3

* This new version of Best Practice 004 – N-1 Carrier Methodology Clarification includes the previous modifications and the WG Interpretations v5 and v6. In July 13, 2018 FCC 18-95 Report and Order was issued and modified the N-1 requirement. The wording at the bottom of the document outlines those changes. Also included is wording from FCC 18-95.

**Related Issue:**

[**0004 LNPA WG N-1 INTERPRETATION v5**](https://numberportability.com/documents/73/0004__LNPA_WG_N-1_INTERPRETATION_v5_aeaMqI1.pdf)

**Decisions/Recommendations**

The N-1 carrier (i.e. company) is responsible for performing the dip, not the N-1 switch.  Please refer to the attached document for the definition of the N-1 carrier under specific call scenarios, including local, toll, e.g., IXC-routed calls, and Extended Area Service (EAS) calls.

Best Practice 4 and the attached “0004 LNPA WG N-1 Interpretation V5.doc” was the result of a request in 2004 by then NANC Chair Robert Atkinson for the LNPA WG to address in part, the various EAS call routing situations and recommend the parties who would perform the LNP dips necessary to insure proper call routing.  Page 11 of the “0004 LNPA WG N-1 Interpretation V5.doc” is where these EAS-related call scenarios are explained.  As shown in the January 19, 2005 NANC meeting Minutes, this LNPA WG document was reviewed with the full NANC.  These meeting Minutes also document that Page 11 would be submitted by Chair Atkinson to the FCC’s WCB for further action.  Chair Atkinson sent the letter to the WCB on 7/25/2005 as seen on the FCC’s website in the NANC 2005 Correspondence archives.

On Page 11 of the “0004 LNPA WG N-1 Interpretation V5.doc” (in the third bullet) the term “donor carrier” is used.  To clarify the meaning of this term, the LNPA WG confirms the donor carrier in this scenario is the A-Block Code Holder designated in the LERG for the NPA-NXX of the called number.  The A-Block holder is the default carrier for routing calls based on the NPA-NXX of the called number.  In the instance where a TN is ported out of a pooled thousands block, the thousands block holder is not the A-Block Code Holder nor the donor carrier in the context of these EAS N-1 responsibilities.  The call is default routed to the actual A-Block Code Holder, who is responsible for performing the LNP dip.

At its September 13, 2016 meeting, the LNPA WG approved the attached v6 of the LNPA WG N-1 Interpretation paper, specifically the section on pages 10-11 addressing Extended Areas Service (EAS) call scenarios.  Although v5 of the paper is still accessible from BP 4 due to the historical references to it in BP 4, the attached v6 paper completely supersedes v5 in its entirety.

[**0004 LNPA WG N-1 INTERPRETATION v6**](https://numberportability.com/documents/75/LNPA_WG_N-1_INTERPRETATION_v6_jOGhgUG.pdf)

***Best Practice 004 v3 - Proposed modifications***

*At the June 2, 2020 LNP Informal meeting version 3 of this Best Practice was reviewed.*

*Consensus was reached at the July 7, 2020 LNMP Informal Meeting to accept version 3 of this Best Practice*

July 13, 2018 the FCC released FCC 18-95 Report and Order easing the Commission’s “N-1” requirement to allow carriers flexibility in conducting number portability database queries to promote NNP (Nationwide Number Portability - FCC docket WCC 17-244) and efficient network routing thus changing the process and thereby necessitating this update to Best Practice 0004

Based on FCC 18-95 Report and Order, the N-1 query requirement is relaxed to allow for other carriers in the call path to perform the query of the Number Portability Administration Center/Service Management System (NPAC/SMS). The three excerpts below (Section I #1, Section II #6 and Section III #8) are from the FCC Report and Order and specifically the yellow highlighted text provides the basis of the new rule regarding the NPAC/SMS query.

This new Report and Order supplants any previous rules regarding N-1 query requirements

***The text below is copied verbatim from FCC 18-95a1***

[***FCC 18-95***](https://ecfsapi.fcc.gov/file/0713302412681/FCC-18-95A1_Rcd.pdf) ***(click to download full document)***

# *I. INTRODUCTION*

1. *The systems we use to make and route telephone calls are changing. With this Report and Order (Order), we set the stage for more efficient use of the telecommunications network and pave the way for nationwide number portability (NNP). We eliminate rules that were intended for a market that was divided along more static, segmented categories of telecommunications providers. Those rules are far less applicable to today’s more integrated providers and pricing plans, and the North American Numbering Council has identified them as barriers to the achievement of NNP.*

*…*

# *II. BACKGROUND*

*…*

# *6. N-1 Requirement. The N-1 query requirement mandates that the carrier immediately preceding the terminating carrier (the N-1 carrier) be responsible for ensuring that the local number portability database – the Number Portability Administration Center/Service Management System (NPAC/SMS) – is queried. This requirement is specified in the North American Numbering Council’s Architecture and Administrative Plan for Local Number Portability, which is in turn incorporated by reference in section 52.26(a) of the Commission’s rules. The rule was put in place in part to ensure that the costs of querying the database could be split between originating and interexchange carriers, while ensuring that calls would not be left unqueried. The rule also allowed local number portability to proceed without requiring all carriers across the country to implement it simultaneously.*

*…*

# *III. DISCUSSION*

*…*

1. *In this Order, we expand the scope of the forbearance issued in the 2015 USTelecom Forbearance Order. While that earlier order forbore from applying the dialing parity requirements of the Act to incumbent LECs, the requirements remained in place for competitive LECs, and also for a limited number of customers who were still presubscribed to stand-alone long-distance plans. This order removes that disparity by applying the forbearance to these formerly excluded categories. We also ease the N-1 query requirement to ensure that it does not prevent originating carriers, or other carriers earlier than the N-1 carrier in a call flow, from performing the number portability query if they wish. Originating carriers, or parties they contract with, should be able to perform these queries, but if they do not, the responsibility for the query continues to fall upon the N-1 carrier. This change to our rules will allow carriers to have the routing flexibility necessary for certain types of NNP.*

*…*