LNP Problem/Issue Identification and Description Form

**Submittal Date** (mm/dd/yyyy): 12/31/2003 **PIM 022 v4**

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

**Contact(s): Name** Gary Sacra

 **Contact Number** 410-736-7756

 **Email Address** gary.m.sacra@verizon.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.)

Customers have been taken out of service inadvertently in some cases when the New Service Provider continues with a port, that has been placed into Conflict by the Old Service Provider, after the 6 hour Conflict Resolution Timer has expired, instead of investigating why the port was placed into Conflict.

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

When Verizon receives a SOA notification from NPAC that another service provider has issued a CREATE message to NPAC in order to schedule a port-in of a Verizon customer, Verizon checks to see that a matching Local Service Request (LSR) has been received from that service provider regarding that specific TN. If no matching LSR is found, Verizon places the port into Conflict status with a Cause Value set to “LSR Not Received” (Cause Value 50). We are seeing an increasing rate of instances where the New Service Provider is waiting for the 6 hour Conflict Resolution New Service Provider Restriction Tunable Parameter timer to expire, and proceeding with porting the number. This has led to Verizon customers being inadvertently ported and taken out of service from a terminating call perspective because the wrong TN was entered in the original CREATE message sent by the New Service Provider to NPAC.

1. Frequency of Occurrence:

In the MA and NE Regions, approximately 20 customers are taken out of service per month on average as a result of this problem. Some of these customers have multiple TNs taken out of service.

1. NPAC Regions Impacted:

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

 West Coast\_\_\_ ALL\_X\_

1. Rationale why existing process is deficient:

Section 1.2.4 of the FRS document states, “If Service Providers disagree on who will serve a particular line number, the NPAC SMS will place the request in the “conflict” state and notify both Service Providers of the conflict status and the Status Change Cause Code. The Service Providers will determine who will serve the customer via internal processes. **When a resolution is reached**, the NPAC will be notified and will

remove the request from the “conflict” state by the new Service Provider. The new Service Provider can cancel the Subscription Version.” In addition, Section 2.4.2 of the FRS states that the New Service Provider coordinates conflict resolution activities, and further states, “The New and Old Service Providers use internal and inter-company processes to resolve the conflict. **If the conflict is resolved**, the new Service Provider sets the Subscription Version status to pending. If the conflict is not resolved with the tunable maximum number of days, the NPAC SMS cancels the Subscription Version, and sets the Cause Code for the Subscription Version.”

Clearly, the intent here is to resolve the conflict before the port takes place. Allowing the New Service Provider to remove the Conflict status after the 6 hour Conflict Resolution Timer expires bypasses the need to resolve the conflict.

1. Identify action taken in other committees / forums:

N/A

1. Any other descriptive items: \_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. **Suggested Resolution:**

The LNPA should revisit the philosophy that led to enabling the New Service Provider to remove a Subscription Version from Conflict status after a specified period of time without first resolving the original conflict with the Old Service Provider. NPAC requirements and functionality should be modified such that only the Old Service Provider is able to remove Conflict status and move a Subscription Version to Pending status when the Conflict Cause Value is set to 50, which signifies that the Old Service Provider has not received a matching Local Service Request (LSR) or Wireless Porting Request (WPR) for the telephone number received in the New Service Provider CREATE notification from NPAC, or when the Conflict Cause Value is set to 51 (Firm Order Confirmation Not Issued).

Subscription Versions should only be placed into Conflict with a Cause Value set to 50 when the Old Service Provider cannot match an LSR or WPR with the New Service Provider CREATE notification and is reasonably confident that the wrong number is about to be ported. Also, Subscription Versions should only be placed into Conflict with a Cause Value set to 51 when the Old Service Provider has a legitimate reason for withholding the Firm Order Confirmation. A Cause Value of 50 or 51 should not be used in lieu of any other appropriate Conflict Cause Value in order to inappropriately prevent the New Service Provider’s ability to remove Conflict status.

1. **Final Resolution:**

This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail, refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field below.

**LNPA WG:** (only) Final Resolution Date: 3/7/2006

Item Number: 0022 v4 Related Documents: NANC 375

Issue Resolution Referred to: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Why Issue Referred: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_