LNP Problem/Issue Identification and Description Form

**Submittal Date** (mm/dd/yyyy): 02/27/2006 **PIM 53 v6**

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

**Contact(s): Name: Sara Hooker**

**Contact Number**: 615-372-2015

**Email Address: sara.hooker@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.)

Carriers are taking back numbers that have been ported out several months or even years because their systems do not reflect a valid FOC was sent. In many cases they have not removed the number from their number inventory and they have re-assigned the TN to another customer.

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

A. Examples & Impacts of Problem/Issue:

TN was ported in March of 2004; our systems reflected a valid FOC was received. For almost 2 years the customer was with Verizon Wireless. In February of 2006, the OSP tried to take the number back in the NPAC. When we called the OSP we learned that their systems did not reflect a valid FOC was ever issued for the port. In order to be able to keep the number we had to allow the OSP to take the number back and start the port from the beginning. We had to change the customers number to a temporary TN, the OSP had to set up a remote call forwarding account for the customer and forward the calls to the temporary number. We then started a new port request and got another FOC. The steps taken to resolve the issue were extremely time consuming and directly impacted the customer.

1. Frequency of Occurrence:

We have had 3 occurrences in the last 30 days.

1. NPAC Regions Impacted:

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

 West Coast\_\_\_ ALL\_X\_

1. Rationale why existing process is deficient:

We feel the existing processes are deficient due to a lack of auditing. Before a number is released back in to inventory carriers need to check to insure that the TN has not already ported.

E. Identify action taken in other committees / forums: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

1. **Suggested Resolution:**

This PIM addresses instances where it was the intent of the end user to port to the New SP.

* Providers should not arbitrarily port back numbers without attempting to

 contact and work with the New SP to resolve any disputes/issues related

 to the port.

* For an activated port that is disputed by the Old SP or not recognized

in the systems of the Old SP, if it is determined that it was in fact

the intent of the end user to port his/her number to the New SP, both

providers should work together in resolving any systems true-up issues, e.g. reissuance of any necessary LSRs, when possible, without impacting the end user’s service.

* In the case of a double assignment, between the two end users involved, the end user with the longer continuous service with that number shall retain the number, unless otherwise agreed to by the providers involved.
* In any case of an inadvertent port, defined here as a port where it was

 not the intention of the end user to port his/her number to the New SP,

 both providers will work together to restore the end user’s service with

 the Old SP as quickly as possible, regardless of the time interval

 between activation of the inadvertent port and discovery of the

 inadvertent port.

We would recommend that the resolution be included in the Best Practices Matrix.

1. **Final Resolution:**

This PIM resulted in the creation of Best Practice 042 - Reclamation of ported numbers when no record that FOC was sent.

**LNPA WG:** (only) Final Resolution Date: 07/11/2006

Item Number: PIM 53 v6 Related Documents: BP 042

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

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