LNP Problem/Issue Identification and Description Form

**Submittal Date** (mm/dd/yyyy): 04/17/2002 **PIM 019 v2**

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

**Contact(s): Name** Charles Ryburn

**Contact Number**

**Email Address** cr1551@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.)

We have noticed there are a lot of Intra-provider ports from a pooling block to the same SPID and LRN.

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

A. Examples & Impacts of Problem/Issue:

When preparing for EDR, we found the following situation:

TNs which are ported away from a pool block to the exact same SPID and LRN.

These are either Inter or Intra-provider ported. Is there a reason to do a subsequent port? We thought this might be associated with the assignment by the new blockholder of the TN to a user.

We believe this practice of porting will defeat the purpose of pooling if it is used as a 'practice'.

B. Frequency of Occurrence:

Once a week

1. NPAC Regions Impacted:

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

West Coast\_X\_\_ ALL

D. Rationale why existing process is deficient:

We believe this practice may be used in more than just a couple of regions.

By subsequent porting, defeats some of the benefits derived from pooling and

EDR.

E. Identify action taken in other committees / forums:

F. Any other descriptive items:

We have done counts and have found several SPIDs associated with this type

of porting.

1. **Suggested Resolution:**

Discuss this item at LNPA WG and determine if this is common practice and if there is a benefit if it continues. Determine if subsequent porting of a pooled SV is desired behavior when a TN.

is assigned (same old and new SPID - same old and new LRN)

If this is not the desired behavior, then as an industry determine what needs to be done to eliminate the practice.

1. **Final Resolution:**

At the August LNPA, the group agreed that the following advisory will be sent to the LNPA WG, WNPO, Portability, Inc., Pooling Administrator, and Cross-Regional distribution lists:

“Some service providers, after activating a pooled block, are performing intra-SP or inter-SP ports using the same LRN and GTT data as the number pooled block. In addition, some service providers have contaminated TNs, and later activate a number pooled block with an LRN and GTT data exactly the same as the contaminated TNs. In both instances, the end result is the inefficient perpetuation of individual intra-SP or inter-SP subscription versions, rather than the more appropriate pooled number block-based routing. Service providers are advised that individual intra-SP or inter-SP ports should be prevented and deleted by the blockholder when these individual subscription versions have the same routing data (LRN and GTT) as the pooled number block in which they are contained.”

**LNPA WG:** (only) Final Resolution Date: 8/14/2002
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