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 **LNP Problem/Issue Identification and Description Form**

**Submittal Date** (mm/dd/yyyy): 05 /11/ 2010 - Version 1

**PIM 77**

**Company(s) Submitting Issue**: Qwest **Contact(s): Name** Jan Doell

**Contact Number** 303-707-6992

**Email Address** jan.doell@qwest.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.)

~~Recent p~~Porting delay problems, caused by a lack of communication/interaction between the ONSP and their OLSP (Reseller) during the data validation stage of the port, have been increasing in frequency. The result is causing delays in the end users ability to port their number.

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

**Example 1:** The NLSP has an LOA from the end user to port their number(s). The NLSP submits an LSR based on the data provider by the end user. The ONSP rejects the port. The ONSP has the customer information built in their system, which after investigation, is determined to not match with the OLSP (Resellers) CSR information on that end user. The NNSP/NLSP re-submits the LSR based on the OLSP’s CSR. The ONSP still rejects the LSR. And the ONSP will not release to the NNSP/NLSP the entries necessary to get the LSR to go thru, even when the NNSP/NLSP have submitted the LSR that matches what the OLSP’s CSR states. The ONSP refuses to update their information when presented with the OLSP-resellers CSR, from the NNSP/NLSP. The ONSP requires the OLSP-reseller to update the ONSP account information to match the OLSP CSR information to resolve the LSR rejection. The NNSP/NLSP have no way of knowing what is happening between the ONSP and OLSP-reseller and are then caught in a “catch22” and the port stalls which negatively affects the end user.

However, in LNP process Flows (v3) Figure 2, Steps 7 and 8 clearly indicate that when a Reseller is involved, *the communication between the ONSP and the OLSP with regard to the port should not delay the validation or processing of the port request.* The above ONSP process is not in line with the industry LNP Process Flows.

**Example 2:** The NLSP has an LOA from the end user to port their number(s). The NNSP/NSLP submit’s an LSR based on the information given by the end user, which then gets rejected by the ONSP for not matching on a required field. The ONSP tells the NLSP/NNSP that they have to contact the reseller (OLSP) of the ONSP service to get a CSR to determine what is wrong. CSR’s cannot be required to be pulled per LNP Process Flows (v3) Main Flow, Figure 1, Step 4. But in order for the transaction to flow, the NLSP/NNSP is being required to secure the CSR to try and determine what did not match, before the port can proceed. This ONSP/OLSP process/agreement (even if in an ICA) is not in line with industry LNP Process Flows and is causing delay in the port.

**Example 3**: When a NLSP/NNSP is processing a port for an end user, an existing NPAC record is pulled and if there is a current NPAC record, it only shows the ONSP’s SPID, and in many cases does not list the OLSP reseller SPID in the ALTSPID field. So the NLSP/NNSP submits an LSR to the SPID indicated on the port record (the ONSP SPID), and in time, receives a reject and instruction from the ONSP to contact
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the OLSP-Reseller, who up to this point may be unknown to the NLSP. This causes obvious delay in the port for the end user.

B. **Frequency of Occurrence:** Appears to be gaining in intensity as more companies decide to use other’s Networks as act as a reseller.

**C. NPAC Regions Impacted:**

Canada Mid Atlantic Midwest Northeast Southeast Southwest Western

West Coast ALL\_**X**\_

**D. Rationale why existing process is deficient:**

The existing service provider processes are many and varied, depending on the service providers involved. On an NPAC record, the “SPID of record” is the ONSP and therefore the ONSP is in the best position, and totally in control of the relationship process they have with their Reseller (OLSP), to insure smooth porting can occur.

The intent of the industry flows is to allow for a smooth transition for an end user, who is keeping their number and changing service providers. The current LNP Process Flows and Best Practices (BP48 for instance) do not go far enough to protect the end user from the excessive delays caused due to the various service provider processes involving their resellers.

**E. Identify action taken in other committees / forums:**

This problem was brought in previously in PIM32 and resulted in Best Practice 48, which in effect instructs the Reseller to inform their Old Network Service Providers (ONSPs) to provide the specific customer information where possible, and would greatly reduce the unsuccessful ports. It also states that Resellers should not be allowed to withhold end user specific customer information necessary for the porting process.

<http://www.npac.com/cmas/LNPA/best_practices_48.htm>

F. Any other descriptive items:

1. **Suggested Resolution:**

1.) The ONSP should be held responsible to perform the communication with their OLSP-reseller, to immediately secure the OLSP’s CSR when a CSR request is made by the NNSP/NLSP and then to provide the OLSP’s CSR to the NNSP/NLSP. The ONSP is the service provider indicated as the SPID on the NPAC record and therefore the only entity the NNSP/NLSP has as their official contact. The CSR should only contain the information necessary for the NNSP/NLSP to be able to submit an accurate and complete LSR to port the number(s) involved. The NNSP/NLSP should not have to contact the OLSP-reseller directly and suffer OLSP/ONSP record inconsistencies.

2.) When it is brought to the attention of the ONSP that information they are using to reject a port is in conflict to what the OLSP customer information for the end user shows, the ONSP must immediately update their systems to match the OLSP end user information so the LSR can flow.

3.) The LNPA-WG should put more detail in the LNP Process Flows regarding transactions which involve resellers, that make it clear that no communications between the ONSP and the OLSP- reseller, (be it regarding CSR data retrieval, ONSP system updates for the end user info, or LSR

NANC – LNPA Working Group Problem/Issue Identification Document

validations being done by the ONSP based on reseller information, etc.) be allowed to delay the port.

4.) The ONSP should not be allowed to reject any port on fields which the ONSP has relevant information to the successful processing of an LSR, without also being willing to immediately provide that information to the NLSP/NNSP. This is especially true when the ONSP information does not match the OLSP information regarding the end user.

5.) Best Practice 48 needs to be re-written to more thoroughly instruct that the OLSP–reseller and the ONSP must insure all relevant information is in the ONSP’s LSR system and to not allow for inappropriate rejects of an LSR and when it s determined the ONSP and the OLSP information do not match the OLSP end user information. The ONSP must immediately correct their information so the LSR can flow.

1. **Final Resolution:**

PIM 77 was withdrawn by Qwest at the September 2010 LNPA WG meeting.

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