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**Version History:**

This Best Practice was created by the LNPA WG (now known as the NPIF – Number Portability Industry Forum) and originally accepted on 08/14/2006 (Version 1). This Best Practice was reviewed by the NPIF on 12/07/2021 where consensus was reached to make modifications based on recent increases in record growth (Version 2).

**Background:**

Several service providers in the industry have encountered indications of imminent LSMS capacity exhaust due to full (over 90%) Pooled Blocks being broken down into individual port records, or due to the creation of individual subscription versions (aka ports of an individual telephone number).

**Documentation Referenced:**

**Recommend Change to Requirements:** NANC 436 was implemented in order to ensure that a pooled 1K block would contain ALL information that could be carried at a subscription version (telephone number) level. No other requirement changes have been recommended at this time

**Decisions/Recommendations:**

Several Service Providers in the industry have encountered indications of imminent LSMS capacity exhaust due to full (over 90%) Pooled Blocks being broken down into individual port records, or due to the creation of individual subscription versions (aka ports of an individual telephone number).

With the introduction of number pooling in 2003, an entire 1k block can be provisioned to an individual carrier. All appropriate routing information can be stored in carrier systems at the NPA-NXX-X level, overriding the code holder's routing details for the block. Porting an individual TN still works within this paradigm to allow for routing at the TN level if it would be needed to differentiate from the block level. Full pooled 1K blocks have been broken into individual port Subscription Versions (SVs) for various Service Providers' projects. This has led to a large growth in the size of LSMS instances across the industry in a short period of time (weeks/months vs. years) as it receives these individual SV records. This resulted in capacity and performance concerns for many LSMS service providers based on these actions. Based on these concerns, the LNPA-WG deems actions of this type in large volumes can potentially result in adverse impacts to the industry, e.g., accelerated database capacity exhaust, and affect the service of porting customers.

In recognition of the NPAC as a shared industry resource, it is the position of the LNPA-WG that service providers, or others working on their behalf, should limit to the extent possible breaking pooled thousands blocks apart and creating individual Subscription Versions (SVs) in order to facilitate projects or for other purposes.

The LNPA-WG further recognizes that exceptions to this Best Practice may exist, but should not be common practice, that may result in the creation of individual SVs from within a pooled 1K block. An example of a possible exception that has been identified is outside plant considerations during customer re-homes.

June 2021 Update: Several Service Providers are again experiencing indications of imminent LSMS capacity exhaust due in part to duplicate SV records in the NPAC. With industry mergers and acquisitions some duplicate records may have been created as 1K pooled blocks have changed ownership. The NPIF recommends that as Service Providers gain ownership of a new 1K block, individual SVs in the pooled 1K block that a Service Provider already owns should be identified and clean-up activity should be completed to ensure that duplicate records are not created in the NPAC and perpetuated to industry LSMS.