LNP Problem/Issue Identification and Description Form

**Submittal Date** (mm/dd/yyyy): 11/08/1999

**Company(s) Submitting Issue**: CBT

**Contact(s): Name** Renee W. Cagle

 **Contact Number** 513-397-5349

 **Email Address** rcagle@cinbell.com

**(NOTE: Submitting Company(s) is to complete this section of the form along with Sections 1, 2 and 3.)**

1. **Problem/Issue Statement:** (Brief statement outlining the problem/issue.)

A CLEC tries to port an incorrect number. We deny the port, but due to the timers, the port goes through. Our customer is taken out of service.

1. **Problem/Issue Description:** (Provide detailed description of problem/issue.)

A. Examples & Impacts of Problem/Issue:

A business customer with 20 lines ports to a CLEC. The CLEC tries to port the customer's 20 numbers, but includes numbers that belong to one of our residential customers (who does not want to port). CBT denies the port. The timer expires and the port goes through. Our residential customer is taken out of service. CBT contacts the CLEC about it and they say that we must issue LSRs to port the customer back. Our residential customer is really frustrated and we have to go through additional work that should never have been needed in the first place.

B. Frequency of Occurrence:

Twice a week

1. NPAC Regions Impacted:

 Mid Atlantic \_\_\_ Midwest\_\_\_ Northeast\_\_\_ Southeast\_\_\_ Southwest\_\_\_ Western\_\_\_

 West Coast\_\_\_ ALL X

D. Rationale why existing process is deficient:

The timer expiring without requiring some action is leading to customers out of service and additional work being required when none should be needed.

E. Identify action taken in other committees / forums:

I am not aware of any actions from other committees, but I am new to this process. I was curious to see if other companies are experiencing this same problem and how they were handling it.

F. Any other descriptive items:

1. **Suggested Resolution:**

If a port is denied, the timer needs to be suspended until the port has been investigated and the denial has been removed. Or there needs to be some method where the two providers can agree that the port should not have occurred and be able to reverse the port.

1. **Final Resolution:**

Upon review of the CBT issue, it was determined that the reason for the port was due to the standard NPAC procedures and porting guidelines functioning as they were designed. A communication issue between the two companies caused the problem. There was not a violation of the standard procedures. This issue will be closed and a letter will be sent to the submitter.

**LNPA WG:** (only) Final Resolution Date: 1/19/2000
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