LNP Problem/Issue Identification and Description Form

**Submittal Date** (mm/dd/yyyy): 07/08/2004 **PIM 41 v8**

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

**Contact(s): Name:** Deborah Tucker

**Contact Number:** 615-372-2256

**Email Address:** deborah.tucker@verizonwireless.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.)

Outside of NANC 323 – SPID Migrations, when carriers acquire or trade markets, unexpected fallout can occur for their LNP trading partners during the time the markets are being transitioned from one SPID to the other. This fallout can be difficult to resolve, customer expectations may be set incorrectly, and general porting confusion may occur if trading partners are not informed of the changes within a reasonable time period prior to the changes taking place.

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

**A. Examples & Impacts of Problem/Issue:** Verizon Wireless recently experienced a high volume of fallout due to some NPA NXX ranges moving from one wireless carrier (Carrier A) to another

wireless carrier (Carrier B) where SPIDs changed from A to B. This caused a high volume of manual work and port completion times spanned many days. Many of these numbers were also affected by the mandatory 5 day waiting period for porting activity on new -x blocks at NPAC.

Carrier B was listed as the code owner in the Telcordia LERG™ Routing Guide, but the code owner at the NPAC was Carrier A. This caused much confusion around where to send the WPRs. Many WPRs were sent to Carrier A and confirmed. Due to the transitional status of the numbers in the NPAC, some of these confirmed ports failed at the NPAC and yet some of them actually went through and activated under Carrier A. The failed ports needed to have port requests submitted to Carrier B. Resubmitting the port requests was complicated further because the customers did not have bills from Carrier B and did not know their new account numbers. After getting port confirmation from Carrier B, SV creates failed at the NPAC for Carrier B because of the mandatory waiting period on the new -x blocks.

B. Frequency of Occurrence: All port requests involving the affected market(s) are impacted during the transition period.

1. NPAC Regions Impacted:

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

 West Coast\_\_\_ ALL: XXX

D. Rationale why existing process is deficient: A recommended “best practice” does not currently exist to guide carriers during SPID transitions.

E. Identify action taken in other committees / forums: None that we are aware of. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

F. Any other descriptive items: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. **Suggested Resolution:**

Service providers involved in moving customers from one SPID to another need to coordinate their moves to be on or as soon as possible after the published Telcordia LERG™ Routing Guide effective dates. The NPAC SPID assignments for the affected codes also need to align with the published Telcordia LERG™ Routing Guide effective dates.

Additionally, service providers are urged to follow the processes listed below for required SPID changes:

**INDUSTRY SPID CORRECTION SELECTION PROCESS:**

**If No Ported or Pooled Numbers Exist In The Code(S) Affected By The Move:**

 If no ported or pooled numbers are in the code, the new code holder should contact the current code owner as shown in the NPAC to have the code deleted in the NPAC. The new code holder will then add the code in the NPAC under their SPID.

**If Ported or Pooled Numbers Exist In The Code(S) Affected By The Move:**

 **1. Coordinated Industry Effort:** The new code holder should identify the number of ported and/or pooled TNs within the NXX(s) in question and the number of involved service providers to determine if this option is feasible.Based on the number of involved service providers, the new code holder should coordinate a conference call to determine if the delete/recreate process is acceptable among all affected service providers. If this process is deemed acceptable, the affected service providers shall coordinate the deletion and recreation of all ported and/or pooled TN records in the code(s). Note that the delete/recreate process is service affecting for those ported and/or pooled subscribers. Type of customer should also be considered when determining if this option is feasible. It is recommended that this process be considered when there are five (5) or fewer Service Providers involved and less than one hundred and fifty (150) working TNs and no pooled blocks.

 **2.** **NANC 323 SPID Migration:** If Option 1 above cannot be used to change NXX code ownership in NPAC, the industry preferred process is to perform a NANC 323 SPID migration.

 **3.** **CO Code Reallocation Process:** The following process should be considered only as a **last resort when Options 1 and 2 above cannot be used to change NXX code ownership in NPAC!**  Service providers may utilize the CO Code Reallocation Process (pooling the blocks within the code at NPAC).

When ported numbers exist, Service Providers are to determine which of the above 3 options best fit their needs based on time constraints, number of carriers involved, number of SVs involved, type of customer, etc.

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: 9/13/2005

Item Number: 0041v8 Related Documents: NANC 323

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

Why Issue Referred: \_\_\_\_This Issue also required updates to documents maintained by ATIS INC\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_