LNP Problem/Issue Identification and Description Form

**Submittal Date** (mm/dd/yyyy): 07/21/2004 **PIM 44 v3**

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

**Contact(s): Name:** Paula Jordan, Sue Tiffany, Debbie Stevens, Rosemary Emmers, 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.)

Wire line carriers rules for developing a local service request (LSR) in order to port a number are unique to each carrier, dynamic and complex requiring dozens of different fields. Each carrier can set their own rules and requirements for porting numbers from them. Each field may be required to match exactly to the information as it appears in validation fields for both wire line and wireless ports. Any difference, even slight, can result in a port request being rejected. The number of validation fields for wire line LSR porting process makes it very difficult and costly to port numbers from wire line carriers. Porting to these complex requirements takes a great deal of time and typically requires manual intervention, which inhibits and discourages porting and the automation of the porting process.

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

Wireless carriers rules for porting are uniform, constant, simple and relatively fast and inexpensive. Only a few key fields are required to match customer records in order to validate and port a number. Wireless experience has proven that when two or three key validation fields match the old service provider records there is no risk of inadvertent ports.

Wireless processes do not collect the data or have access to data as wire line carriers may require on an LSR. For example wireless carriers collect all address information for a street address within a single field. Wire line collects the same address information in 5 or more distinct fields. The one address field in wireless does not map to the 5 or more fields in wire line. If wire less does not provide the ‘FLOOR’ number or the ‘ROOM/MAIL STOP’ in these specific fields, a wire line carrier may reject the port request. Wireless processes do not validate on the street address field because it is nearly impossible to correctly match this information and it has been determined to have no bearing on whether a port would be inadvertent if it does not match provided other key fields match.

While data requirements to complete an LSR are often extensive and complex, wire line carriers will provide much of the needed information to complete their LSR by providing a customer service record (CSR) in response to a query provided a minimal amount of customer information. Since a minimal amount of customer information is needed to obtain the CSR it should stand to reason that the port could take place with the same minimal amount of information, and that transferring data from the carrier’s CSR to the carrier’s LSR is in fact an exercise that only increases complexity without really adding value. It is after all only returning the wire line carrier’s own information back to them. Wireless experience has proven that inadvertent ports do not occur when only two or three key fields of information are presented and match the old service provider’s records.

1. Frequency of Occurrence:

100s of time each day.

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 needles and excessive cost, time, error and fall-out to complete a port.

1. Identify action taken in other committees / forums:

The LNPA WG felt that this issue should be referred to OBF ITF.

1. Any other descriptive items: \_\_

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

1. **Suggested Resolution:**

Wire line port request can be validated with very minimal risk of inadvertent ports when the following fields correctly match the old service provider records:

 1) The telephone number being ported

 2) The old service provider account number from the EAN field

 3) The porting customer’s billing ZIP code

Other customer and field information should be provided to the extent that it is possible, but should not be used to reject a port request if it fails to match exactly.

Information that might be needed to complete the disconnection processes can be obtained by the wire line service provider’s own customer service records.

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 Task Force (ITF) as Issue 2801 and 2943. Wireless providers and Clearinghouse Vendors worked with wireline carriers and their respective change management processes through their Account Management to identify possible process enhancements. PIM 44 was closed with the implementation of FCC 09-41

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

# Item Number: 0044 v3 Related Documents: FCC 09-41

Issue Resolution Referred to: \_OBF Interspecies Taskforce\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Why Issue Referred: \_\_\_\_\_LSOG expertise and responsibility is at this committee\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_