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1. **Problem/Issue Statement:** (Brief statement outlining the problem/issue.)

Service Providers do not have clear direction in the NANC flows regarding the proper porting procedure for Type 1 numbers. Some issues that have arisen due to this lack of clarification in the NANC flows are: Paging numbers that are set up through Type 1 blocks have been inadvertently ported and Type 1 account information is not being validated between the ONSP and the OLSP prior to port completion leading to inadvertent ports.

The NANC flows need to be modified to properly address porting situations related to Type 1 numbers.

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

**A. Examples & Impacts of Problem/Issue:**

Figure 2 of the NANC flows has a decision step to determine if the Old Local Service Provider is a reseller or a Type 1 wireless number is involved. If yes, then a conditional step is used whereby the ONSP sends an LSR, LSR information, or Loss Notification to the OLSP. An additional conditional step takes place where the OLSP sends an FOC or FOC information to the ONSP. These conditional steps are based on fulfilling all requirements of any service level agreements between the involved service providers.

Service Level Agreements are not required for porting, thus in the absence of such an agreement, the flows can be interpreted in such a way that these conditional steps are not required and numbers ultimately are not ported or are ported inappropriately.

B. Frequency of Occurrence: Issues with porting Type 1 arise on a daily basis.

1. NPAC Regions Impacted:

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

 West Coast\_\_\_ ALL: XXX

D. Rationale why existing process is deficient: The NANC flows were developed prior to the launch of wireless number portability where wireline porting was used as the basis for determining wireless and intermodal porting guidelines. Service Providers have encountered numerous challenges in intermodal porting since the NANC flows were last revised. Changes are needed to provide clear direction to Service Providers.

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

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

1. **Suggested Resolution:**

The Wireless New Local Service Provider (NLSP) submits the Wireless Port Request (WPR) to their respective Clearinghouse Vendor.

When a CSR request is included in the Clearinghouse Vendor process: The Clearinghouse Vendor sends the CSR request to the Wireline Old Network Service Provider (ONSP), and if rejected with an indication that the account is not found and/or it is a Type 1 number, the Clearinghouse Vendor and/or NLSP, using information optionally provided by the Wireless Type 1 provider, can manually validate the port request with that Wireless Old Local Service provider (OLSP) prior to LSR submission. Multiple solutions are in place for the various providers to prevent Paging numbers from being ported and for obtaining and validating Type 1 information from the Type 1 provider.

If Type 1 information is not available, an LSR can be submitted without a validation attempt, although wireless providers who process ports manually should validate the Type 1 end user information whenever possible prior to submitting the LSR to the Old Network Service provider.

1. **Final Resolution:**

The Wireless New Local Service Provider (NLSP) submits the Wireless Port Request (WPR) to their respective Clearinghouse Vendor.

When a CSR request is included in the Clearinghouse Vendor process: The Clearinghouse Vendor sends the CSR request to the Wireline Old Network Service Provider (ONSP), and if rejected with an indication that the account is not found and/or it is a Type 1 number, the Clearinghouse Vendor and/or NLSP, using information optionally provided by the Wireless Type 1 provider, can manually validate the port request with that Wireless Old Local Service provider (OLSP) prior to LSR submission. Multiple solutions are in place for the various providers to prevent Paging numbers from being ported and for obtaining and validating Type 1 information from the Type 1 provider.

If Type 1 information is not available, an LSR can be submitted without a validation attempt, although wireless providers who process ports manually should validate the Type 1 end user information whenever possible prior to submitting the LSR to the Old Network Service provider.

**LNPA WG:** (only) Final Resolution Date: 07/12/2005

Item Number: 0049 v6 Related Documents:

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

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