NANC – LNPA Working Group Problem/Issue Identification Document

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

**Submittal Date** (mm/dd/yyyy): 10/30/2012 **PIM 82 Company(s) Submitting Issue**: CenturyLink

**Contact(s): Name** Jan Doell

**Contact Number** 303-707-6992

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

Due to the automated processing of large quantities of ports, there are occasions (rare, but can happen) that an Old Provider may have auto-issued a FOC and then their downstream systems may discover a legitimate reason the port should stop. The Old Provider then is allowed by ATIS LSOG order processes, to send a Reject and/or JEP to the New Provider. It has been determined that some New Providers are not reacting to these subsequent JEP/Reject’s, even though it can be proven those messages did indeed reach the New Provider. When a New Provider ignores those subsequent messages, this in-effect means the new provider has “taken” a number without a valid LSR still in play.

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

A. Examples & Impacts of Problem/Issue:

If a New Provider fails to pay attention to a JEP/Reject at any point in the order flow (up to port activation), and takes the TN, the Old Providers systems will most likely still show the TN as being in the inventory of the Old Provider and could therefore contribute to a double-assignment or the invalid port of a number.

B. Frequency of Occurrence: Unknown, but being done today

C. NPAC Regions Impacted:

Canada Mid Atlantic Midwest Northeast Southeast Southwest Western

West Coast ALL\_X\_

D. Rationale why existing process is deficient:

The various LSOG’s all allow JEP’s and Rejects as valid order flow messages that can *and are* sent by the Old Provider during the porting process. All Providers should react appropriately to JEP’s and Rejects, regardless when they are sent, as long as they are sent prior to port activation.

E. Identify action taken in other committees / forums: As stated several times in the FCC Mandated NANC LNP Process Flows, “*The LSR/FOC process is defined by the Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF) and the electronic interface by the Telecommunications*
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*Industry Forum (TCIF). The information required on the FOC may vary based on the carriers involved.”*

F. Any other descriptive items:

Best Practice 63 (the “Sends” Best Practice) was written (agreed to by the full LNPA WG and endorsed by the NANC) to discuss the fact these messages can and are sent and the Old Provider should make sure they get to the New Provider. The industry intent is clearly that the once the JEP/Reject is given to the New Provider, that the New Provider should react to them. Otherwise, there would be no reason for the ATIS LOTF/WLOTF to have these messages as valid order flow messages.

1. **Suggested Resolution:**

Old Providers should try not to FOC when a JEP or Reject is the correct initial action, however, on those rare occurrences where a FOC was sent and the Old Provider discovers a legitimate reason to stop the port activity, the New Provider should react appropriately to the JEP/Reject and not just proceed to take the port.

1. **Final Resolution:**

 Discussion ensued and the decision was to close this PIM as the problem is

not significant enough for the WG to work.

This PIM is CLOSED.
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