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# Preface

*Originally commissioned as a working group under the NANC (North American Numbering Council) the LNPA WG (Local Number Portability Administration Working Group) dealt with Number Portability issues, processes/procedures and changes to the NPAC SMS. In December 2018 it was renamed the TOSC (Transition Oversight Sub Committee) and managed issues/changes related to the transition of NPAC from the previous vendor to iconectiv.*

*After the re-chartering of the NANC, the group became The Informal LNP Team until November of 2020 when the group restructured into the NPIF (Number Portability Industry Forum). The NPIF works with the NAOWG (Number Administration Oversight Working Group) on any issues that require the involvement of NANC and continues its mission to manage processes/procedures, changes to the NPAC SMS and issues related to Number Portability.*

*This Change Order Summary document tracks the status of all Change Orders that were opened as part of, or after NPAC Transition (5-25-18). Information on Change Orders Implemented/Closed prior to Transition (5-25-18) and not part of Release 3.4.8 baseline, can be found in the Change Order Summary Pre Transition – Implemented COs document located on the numberportability.com website. Information on Change Orders opened after Transition and Implemented/Closed after Release 3.4.8 baseline can be found in the Change Order Summary Post Transition – Implemented COs document located on the numberportability.com website*

# Legend

* ***Release #/Target Date*** *– Number and date of development release in which changes will be made to support Change Order*
* ***Change Order Number – Description/Name*** *– Number and name assigned by CMA after CO has been accepted.*
* ***Originator –*** *Company that created the Change Order*
* ***Date Accepted –*** *Date the Change Order was accepted by NPIF (Number Portability Industry Forum)*
* ***Description*** *– Name of the Change Order and the Business Need as defined in the Change Order itself*
* ***Category –****Category where Change Order currently resides in the process*
  + *Open*
  + *Accepted*
  + *Next Doc Release*
  + *Development Release*
  + *Awaiting SOW*
  + *Approved SOW*
  + *Cancel-pending*
* ***Status –*** *Status of Change Order shown on NPAC website*
  + *Closed – The Change Order was considered and rejected.*
  + *Open – The Change Order has been considered and there may be further discussion.*
  + *Requested - The LNPA TOSC has reached agreement on the Change Order and either a SOW may be requested or the requirements updates (Doc Only) will be included in a future version of the Industry Document(s).*
  + *Implemented – The Change Order was adopted and has been implemented in the NPAC system. It will remain in the Change Order Summary – Open COs for 1 cycle then be moved to the Change Order Summary – Implemented COs document*
* ***Notes –*** *Additional detail on the Change Order status*
* ***NPAC Level Of Effort*** *– This field defines the Level of Effort to implement the Change Order (Low, Medium or High)*
* ***Systems Impacted*** *– CMIP or XML –This field indicates if there is an impact to the Local System (SOA or LSMS). Choices are: Yes or No*
* ***PIM #*** *- This is the Problem Identification Management number of the PIM associated with the Change Order.*
* ***Go To Link –*** *This is a link to the actual Change Order Detail.*

| **Change Order Summary** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Release #/ Target Date** | **Change Order # - Description/Name** | **Category** | **Status** | **PIM #** | **Go To Link** |
| R5.1.1  02/05/2023 | CO 556 – New SV Download Reason | Approved SOW | Requested | 139 | [CO556](#CO556) |
| R5.1.1  02/05/2023 | CO 557 - SPID Level Outbound Flow Control Tunables | Approved SOW | Requested |  | [CO557](#CO557) |
|  | CO 561 – Portable NPA-NXX Past Effective Date | Awaiting SOW | Requested | 143 | [CO561](#CO561) |
|  | CO 562 - Check for Associated -Xs When Deleting an SP | Awaiting SOW | Requested | 145 | [CO562](#CO562) |
|  | CO 563 – End Support for Fax – Doc Only | Next Doc Release | Requested | 150 | [CO563](#CO563) |
|  | CO 564 – FRS Appendix G – Deleted Requirements Table – Doc Only | Next Doc Release | Requested |  | [CO564](#CO564) |

| Change Order Details | | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CO # | Originator | Date Accepted | Description | Category | Notes | NPAC LevelOfEffort | Systems Impacted | | | |
| CMIP | | XML | |
| SOA | LSMS | SOA | LSMS |
| CO 556 | 10X People | 09/17/21 | Name:New SV Download ReasonBusiness Need:  * When a Delete SV message is sent from the NPAC to the LSMS, it is not clear as to why the number is being removed. The two options are: * because the number has been disconnected and is no longer in service, or * it is a Port-to-Original of a still-working TN and is reinstating default routing. * Due to the complex interactions with Service Provider OSS/BSS systems in the porting workflow, the removal of the TN from the network does not provide the reason for the delete message, and carriers could erroneously remove a still-working TN from OSS/BSS systems or leave a disconnected-service TN in an OSS/BSS system when it should be removed. Since OSS/BSS Systems need to treat the two options differently, knowing whether or not the number is still in service makes updates to internal carrier systems more efficient and accurate. See also PIM 139   [CO 556](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/7929/CO_556_-_New_SV_Download_Reason_v2.docx) | Approved SOW | 09/07/2021 NPIF MeetingThis CO was reviewed, accepted, assigned CO 556 10/04/2021 NPIF Meeting   * John N. (10X People) –to add language to the Change Order to clarify that this update only applies to XML * For Audits, if the NPAC identifies a discrepancy and sends an update to the local system with the discrepancy, the download reason will not show new “delete pto” * If a Local system wants more information on download reason they would need to query the NPAC * 10X People to make updates discussed to Change Order   12/07/2021 NPIF Meeting   * Consensus was reached to move this CO to Requested status * 12072022-01 - NPIF tri-chairs to request NAPM LLC to request an SOW for CO 556 from iconectiv * CMA to change status of CO 556 to Requested on website   1/11/2022 NPIF Meeting   * Consensus was reached to change status of this CO back to open to discuss proposed changes * Consensus was reached on proposed changes to this CO which were reviewed by 10X People and iconectiv. * 12072021-01 - NPIF tri-chairs to request NAPM LLC to request an SOW for CO 556 from iconectiv * NPIF Tri-chairs sent request to NAPM LLC chairs * NPIF tri-chairs will retract request made to NAPM chairs re: SOW * CMA will post updated CO to website and change status back to Open   03/08/2022 NPIF   * 02082022-02 - NPIF tri-chairs to contact NAPM LLC to request an SOW from iconectiv for CO 556 from iconectiv * NPIF tri-chairs contacted the NAPM LLC to request an SOW * This AI is now closed * iconectiv reviewed a typo in this CO - In the Impact/Change Assessment section the entry for SOA should be OPT rather than N * CO was updated   04/05/2022 NPIF   * Matt Timmermann (iconectiv) – Shared that one of the requirements was inadvertently removed in a prior update to this CO * Consensus was reached to re-insert the inadvertently removed language * CMA to update CO Summaries and change status on website |  | N | N | N | Opt |
| CO 557 | iconectiv | 10/04/21 | Name:SPID Level Outbound Flow Control tunablesBusiness Need: Currently the NPAC has one set of tunables for outbound flow control, which are specified at the system level. Having system tunables at the SPID level would allow for increased flexibility. Initially, these SPID-level tunables could be defaulted to different values for CMIP versus XML systems, as the two interface types have different aspects to consider as related to outbound flow control.  For example, the XML interface allows for batching of multiple requests (current maximum is 100) into a single XML document, and as such, a single XML document sent from the NPAC to a local system could instantaneously cause the NPAC to invoke outbound flow control processing for the local system. The CMIP interface does not support batching, and as such, it requires multiple protocol-level messages to be sent from the NPAC before outbound flow control processing is invoked.  While a new set of system tunables could be introduced to address the differences between the CMIP and XML interfaces, changing the tunables from system tunables to SPID-level tunables allows for the most flexibility going forward, including using different values for SOA systems versus LSMS systems.  **[CO 557](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/7933/CO_557_-_SPID_Level_Outbound_Flow_Control_Tunables_v1.docx)** | Approved SOW | 10/04/2021 NPIF MeetingThis CO was reviewed, accepted, assigned CO 557 12/07/2021 NPIF Meeting   * Consensus was reached to move this CO to Requested status * 12072021-02 - NPIF tri-chairs to request NAPM LLC to request an SOW for CO 557 from iconectiv * CMA to change status of CO 557 to Requested on website   11/08/2022 NPIF Meeting   * Steve K. (iconectiv) reviewed the presentation of APT recommendations for this CO |  | N | N | N | N |
| CO 561 | iconectiv | 04/05/22 | Name: Portable NPA-NXX Past Effective Date Validation  **Business Need:**  Currently, a Portable NPA-NXX can be created with an Effective Date in the past either over a mechanized interface or via the LTI GUI. Since the date is allowed in the past, a value with year 0022, for example, is allowed. Local systems may not accept Portable NPA-NXX Effective Dates with egregious values in downloads based on their internal rules. The NPAC should validate that the Portable NPA-NXX Effective Date is within a reasonable time period. (See also PIM 143)  [**CO 561**](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/8302/CO_561_-_Portable_NPA-NXX_Past_Effective_Date_Validation_65ST7x4.docx) | Awaiting SOW | 04/05/2022 NPIF Meeting  * 03082022-03 - iconectiv to propose a Change Order for PIM 143 * Matt Timmerman (iconectiv) – reviewed this draft CO * Draft CO was reviewed, accepted and assigned # 561 * CMA to post new CO to website  07/12/2022 NPIF Meeting  * Consensus was reached o move this CO to Requested status |  | N | N | N | N |
| CO 562 | iconectiv | 06/07/22 | Name: Check for Associated -Xs When Deleting an SP  **Business Need:**  Currently the FRS has requirements to validate that a Service Provider can be removed only if all associated Portable NPA-NXXs and LRNs have been removed. The FRS also has requirements to validate no Number Pool Blocks associated with the Service Provider exist with a status other than old with an empty failed SP list. There is no requirement to validate that all the NPA-NXX-Xs associated with the Service Provider have been removed. (See also PIM 145)  If a Service Provider is removed without checking for associated NPA-NXX-Xs, the remaining NPA-NXX-Xs would be associated with a non-existent Service Provider. The situation of concern is when the NPA-NXX-X exists, but the Number Pool Block has not been created/activated.  [**CO562**](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/8550/CO_562_-_Check_for_Associated_-Xs_When_Deleting_an_SP.docx) | Awaiting SOW | 06/07/2022 NPIF MeetingThis CO was reviewed, accepted, assigned CO 562  * Consensus was reached to move this CO directly to Requested status * CMA to post new CO to website |  | N | N | N | N |
| CO 563 | iconectiv | 12/13/22 | Name: End Support for Fax – Doc Only  **Business Need:** The FRS has several sections and requirements that indicate faxing of reports is to be supported by the LNPA. Since transition of the LNPA service to iconectiv in 2018, iconectiv has not faxed a single report; no users have requested a faxed report from the LNPA, nor has any NPAC administrator requested a faxed report in that time. Faxing of reports appears to be no longer needed. (See also PIM 150) [**CO 563**](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/9039/CO_563_-_End_Support_for_Fax_-_Doc_Only.docx) | Next Doc Release | 12/13/2022 NPIF Meeting  * Matt T. (iconectiv) - reviewed this draft CO * Consensus was reached to accept this CO and it was assigned #563 * CMA to post new CO to website   02/08/2023 NPIF   * Consensus was reached to change status of this CO to Requested and update this version of The CO Summary – Open document with that change |  | N | N | N | N |
| CO 564 | iconectiv | 1/10/23 | Name: FRS Appendix G - Deleted Requirements Table – Doc Only  **Business Need:** Members of the NPIF (Number Portability Industry Forum) expressed an interest in having additional detail included in FRS - Appendix G – Deleted Requirements. The current Deleted Requirements appendix does not include the deletion date, Change Order number or Release number when the requirement was removed from the FRS. [**CO 564**](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/9031/CO_564_-_FRS_-_Appendix_G_-_Deleted_Requirements_table_-_Doc_Only_1.docx) | Next Doc Release | 01/10/2023 NPIF Meeting  * Michael D. (iconectiv) - reviewed this draft CO * Consensus was reached to accept this CO and it was assigned #564 * CMA to post new CO on website   02/08/2023 NPIF   * Consensus was reached to change status of this CO to Requested and update this version of The CO Summary – Open document with that change |  | N | N | N | N |