LNP Problem/Issue Identification and Description Form

**Submittal Date** (mm/dd/yyyy): 06/2/2004 **PIM 039 v4**

**Company(s) Submitting Issue**: T-Mobile, Sprint, Verizon Wireless, Nextel, Cingular, US Cellular

**Contact(s): Name:** Paula Jordan, Sue Tiffany, Debbie Stevens, Rosemary Emmer, Elton Allan, Chris Toomey

 **Contact Number**: 925-325-3325; 913-762-8024; 425-603-2282; 301-399-4332; 404-236-6447; 773-845-9070

 **Email Address:** Paula.Jordan@T-Mobile.com; Sue.T.Tiffany@mail.sprint.com; Deborah.Stephens@verizonwireless.com; rosemary.emmer@nextel.com; elton.allen@cingular.com; Chris.Toomey@uscellular.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.)

Current wire line business practices allow carriers flexibility to set their own unique “business rules” or porting requirements and change them as often as needed. Carriers may have scores of different LSR fields from one of several different versions of the LSOG guidelines (LSOG 4 to LSOG 8 +) for a local service request (LSR). Some carriers will change their business rules as often as several times a month. These frequent changes to carrier unique requirements significantly increases porting cost, error and fall-out, and inhibits the automation of porting processes.

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

Currently carriers have flexibility in defining the business rules and processes that must be followed by the winning carrier that is porting a number from them. Business rules are determined by the individual carrier’s unique needs for information or to support their unique systems and processes. Changes may specify the interface such as EDI, fax, e-mail or web GUI, or they may define fields required before a port can be validated and processed. Changes in business rules often alter not only the fields required but also the EDI interfaces, the position of fields on fax forms and tags and tokens for fields within web GUIs. The frequency of business rule changes varies between carriers. Changes to automated systems and processes are not only driven by scheduled release changes to the carrier’s interfaces; document-only changes often affect the automated systems and processes for porting numbers.

Changes to the business rules and processes makes the automating of porting processes more costly and inefficient and in most cases too costly for all except possibly the largest carriers with the highest volumes of ports. The costs of maintaining such systems are always very expensive. Every time a business rule changes it requires redesigning, recoding and retesting of automated systems.

1. Frequency of Occurrence:

The frequency of changes vary between carriers. For one carrier business rules have recently changed 9 times in 6 weeks.

1. NPAC Regions Impacted:

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

 West Coast\_\_\_ ALL\_x\_

1. Rationale why existing process is deficient:

The current process results in high cost, more time to port, error and fall-out. It makes automation of porting processes nearly impossible.

1. Identify action taken in other committees / forums:

No other yet.

1. Any other descriptive items: \_\_

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

1. **Suggested Resolution:**

Adhere to current guidelines limiting releases for interfaces. Limit all changes affecting business rules, fields and processes within these same major release dates.

1. **Final Resolution:**

It was agreed that this issue is best addressed in the Change Management meetings with the ILECs. The submitter agreed to withdraw the PIM.

**LNPA WG:** (only) Final Resolution Date: 12/4/2004

Item Number: 0039 v4 Related Documents:

Issue Resolution Referred to: \_\_**OBF LSOP committee with the recommendation to refer to the ITF**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Why Issue Referred: \_\_\_\_\_\_Expertise and responsibility for this is in these committees\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_