LNP Problem/Issue Identification and Description Form

**Submittal Date** (mm/dd/yyyy): 7/7/2004 **PIM 42 v4**

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

**Contact(s): Name:** Rob Smith

**Contact Number:** 813-273-3319

**Email Address:** robert.smith@syniverse.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.)

The wireless process for porting based on developing and sending a ‘wireless port request’ (WPR) does not collect and provide all the information that is needed to map to the wire line ‘local service request’ (LSR). Fields that are required for wire line porting may have no relevance to wireless porting. Where the information is not available the ports fail. The LSOP committee intentionally made these fields ‘optional’ because of wireless number portability. Some individual ILEC business rules still require these fields.

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

**The ‘EU Address’ fields – End User Address on the End User forms**

A wireless end user has a billing address but does not have or require an address where service is provided and this information is not necessary to port a number. The end user service address is used to tell wireline service personnel a location to make installations and repairs. The wireless billing address does not always map to the wireline service address since bills may be sent to a different address then the service location. The address ‘25W 450 1/2 SW Camino Ramon Lane NW, Floor 12, Building 2, Suite 23A.’ is used as an example to illustrate the service address fields.

**SAPR -** Service Address Prefix - ‘25W’

**SANO** – Service Address Number – ‘450’

**SASF** – Service Address Suffix – ‘1/2’

**SASD** – Service Address Street Directional – ‘ SW’

**SASN** – Service Address Street Name – ‘Camino Ramon’

**SAST** – Service Address Street Type – ‘LN’

**SASS** – Service Address Street Directional Suffix – ‘ NW’

**LD1** – Location Designator 1 – ‘FL’

**LV 1** – Location Value 1 – ‘12’

**LD2** – Location Designator 2 – ‘ BLDG.’

**LV2** – Location Value 2 – ‘2’

**LD3** – Location Designator 3 – ‘STE’

**LV3** – Location Value 3 – ‘23A’

**AAI** – Additional Address Information – ‘Trailer behind gas station’

This information is required on an LSR, but is subject to edit rejection even when taken from a CSR

**The TOS fields – Type Of Service on the Local Request form**

This field supports 4 different variables. The first is ‘type’ and has 5 options, which are residential, business, government, coin or home office. The second is ‘product’ and has 17 options, which include Single line, multi line, Advanced Services, ISDN, Data Voice Shared, CENTRIX, PBX trunk and Not Applicable. The third is ‘class’ and has 5 options, which are measured rate, flat rate, message, pre-pay overtime, and not applicable. The forth is ‘characterization’ and includes foreign exchange, Semi-public, Normal, Prison Inmate, RCF, 800 Service, WATS, Hotel/Motel, Hospital and Not applicable. This information is not available from the WPR. In cases where these services have not been canceled, these ports are often rejected by ILECs.

A recent FCC ruling in March 2005, Doc. No. 03-251, includes language prohibiting the rejection or delay of ports due to other services being on the line such as DSL.

This information is often required on LSRs. Some ILECs require that these services be canceled before a port may occur. End users may inadvertently cancel the phone line service rendering the number no longer portable.

**The MI – The Migration Indicator on the Number Portability form**

According to LSOG guidelines, the MI field is ‘optional’ when the ACT field is populated with ‘V’ for “Conversion of service to a new LSP” which is always the case when a number is porting. The options when a number is porting is ‘A’ for “Partial migration converting lines/numbers to a new account”, and ‘B’ for “Full migration converting lines/numbers to a new account”. This information is required on an LSR and is dependent on an end user’s decision to port one or some numbers on an account or all numbers on an account closing the account.

1. Frequency of Occurrence:

10 to 100 times daily

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 causes ports to fail and substantial fall-out and manual processing.
2. Identify action taken in other committees / forums: This could become moot if PIM 39 is first successful which would be to reduce the number of required validation fields to a small set. This was referred to the LSOP and the Intermodal Taskforce under ATIS. The recommended that since they had already taken action to make these fields ‘optional’ there was noting that they could do. They recommended that the issue be addressed directly with the ILEC’s who still require these fields.
3. Any other descriptive items: \_\_

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

1. **Suggested Resolution:**

The problem would be resolved if carriers did not require these optional fields identified above to be populated on LSRs for numbers porting from wireline to wireless.

As indicated in the attached correspondence from the OBF, “it was determined that no agreement could be reached within the Intermodal Subcommittee, consisting of ATIS OBF’s Wireless Committee and Local Service Ordering and Provisioning Committee, to resolve this issue due to the following factors:

o LSOG is a guideline; however, implementation of the LSOG is not

standardized across wireline providers

o Wireline providers implement the LSOG based on their specific business

models/requirements.”

As a result, the LNPA WG has placed this PIM in a tracking state awaiting FCC action on the T-Mobile/Sprint Nextel petition.



1. **Final Resolution:**

This PIM was referred to the OBF for consideration and was worked in the Inter-species Subcommittee (ISC) as Issue 2802. The OBF ISC has closed Issue 2802 and was worked under Issue 2943. Wireless providers and Clearinghouse Vendors are continuing to work with wireline carriers and their respective change management processes through their Account Management to identify possible process enhancements. PIM 42 was closed with the implementation of FCC 09-41.

**LNPA WG:** (only) Final Resolution Date: 9/14/2010

Item Number: 0042v4 Related Documents: FCC 09-41

Issue Resolution Referred to: Ordering & Billing Forum

Why Issue Referred: The Local Service Ordering Guideline (LSOG) is within the purview of the OBF LSOP Committee. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_