LNP Problem/Issue Identification and Description Form

**Submittal Date** (mm/dd/yyyy): 11/19/1999 **PIM 004 v2**

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

**Contact(s): Name** David Taylor

**Contact Number** 210-886-3813

**Email Address** dt9395@txmail.sbc.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.)

Need details for how working packet service affects number ranges in context for number pooling.

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

A. Examples & Impacts of Problem/Issue:

Packet service is not portable, and therefore not poolable. There has been no direction as to the effects of this for evaluating TN ranges to be considered for Number Pooling. SWBT has packet data telephone numbers (DTN) assigned/working throughout the TN ranges used for basic rate ISDN (BRI). These numbers cannot be considered as contaminated because we cannot donate the range and port the DTNs back to ourselves. Furthermore, we cannot port the corresponding voice TN with the same identity. How does this affect Number Pooling evaluation? Is the 1K block in which these exist unavailable for Pooling? Are we expected to number change the packet users to those numbers code owned by the serving switch? If a number change is expected, there is a large impact both to the serving phone company and to the end user. The end user would have to re-program their CPE, possibly notify other agencies to which the number is published and the serving phone company would have to administer BRI usage in a range of TNs where BRI has never been assigned. This would seem counterproductive to the goals of pooling as number conservation with no impact to end users..

B. Frequency of Occurrence:

1. NPAC Regions Impacted:

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

West Coast\_\_\_ ALL X

D. Rationale why existing process is deficient:

There is no published existing process.

E. Identify action taken in other committees / forums:

Heretofore, all companies have avoided this scenario in trials or testing.

F. Any other descriptive items:

1. **Suggested Resolution:**

The TN ranges having working/assigned packet service be excluded from Pooling consideration..

1. **Final Resolution:**

Through discussion, it was determined that while packet service could not be ported, a TN assigned to packet service was portable and could be intra-SP ported to the serving switch without detriment to the packet service. Since this is the process for all contaminated TN’s in blocks to be donated, this would not be a factor that would prohibit the block from donation. It is the WG’s opinion that packet service would not meet the definition in the INC guidelines. This issue will be closed. A letter will be sent to the submitter and to INC explaining the issue and our interpretation of the pooling guidelines. If the submitter does not agree with the WG’s decision in this matter, this can be escalated as shown in the PIM process guidelines.

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

Item Number: PIM # 004 v2 Related Documents: INC Pooling Guideline 8.2.5

Issue Resolution Referred to:

Why Issue Referred: