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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 and processes/procedures. In December 2018 it was renamed the TOSC (Transition Oversight Sub Committee) and managed issues 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 and issues related to Number Portability.*

*This PIM Tracking Matrix document tracks the status of Number Portability related issues raised by the Industry. It includes all PIMs (Problem and Issues Management) from the original LNPA WG through the current NPIF (Number Portability Industry Forum).*

# Legend

* ***Item #*** *- 4 digit Problem Identification Management tracking number. The Item # contains a hyperlink to the PIM document located on the PIM landing page of the numberportability.com website.*
* ***Orig Date*** *- Date the Problem/Issue is submitted to NPIF (Number Portability Industry Forum)*
* ***Originator -*** *Company that submitted the problem/issue.*
* ***Name/Description*** *– Problem/Issue statement, description and notes*
* ***Resolution -*** *Identify / track the action items leading to resolution and provide a final resolution statement.*
* ***Referred To -*** *Committee/Organization that was tasked with resolving the problem/issue.*
* ***Resolution Date -*** *Date the Problem/Issue was resolved/closed*
* ***Status -*** *Status of Change Order shown on NPAC website*
  + *Open - ID and Description Form submitted and pending assessment by NPIF.*
  + *Withdrawn - The submitter of the Problem/Issue has agreed to withdraw the Problem/Issue from further consideration.*
  + *Not Accepted - Problem/Issue was not accepted by the NPIF to be worked or referred to another group.*
  + *Accepted - Problem/Issue has been assessed by the NPIF and has been accepted to be addressed.*
  + *Referred - Problem/Issue referred to Industry Committee/Organization for consideration (list referred-to Committee/Organization).*
  + *Tracking - A resolution has been identified and is awaiting implementation, or the Problem/Issue has been referred to Industry Committee/Organization and has been accepted to be addressed.*
  + *Closed - Problem/Issue has been resolved.*

| **Item #**  **Link** | **Orig. Date** | **Originator** | **Name/Description/Notes** | **Resolution** | **Referred To:** | **Resolution Date** | **Status** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [PIM 151](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/8502/PIM_145_-_Check_for_Associated_-Xs_When_Deleting_a_Service_Provider.docx) | 4/12/23 | 10X People | SV Query Results T2 - If a SOA notification is missed, there is no way to tell if T2 has expired.  04/12/2023 NPIF   * Lisa M. (10X People) reviewed this draft PIM. * Neustar has encountered this issue as well and would support this PIM. * This draft PIM was accepted and assigned #151 * New AI - 10X People to gather information of how often the T2 notification query is needed. | **Suggested Resolution**:  Add a Timestamp to the SV Query Reply indicating when either, T2 has expired, OR, the OSP has concurred a port request.  If it has not yet expired or been concurred, the value will be blank.  Add a new SPIDable, Service Provider LSMS SV Query T2 Indicator, Boolean, to indicate whether or not this Service Provider supports the T2-Expiration Timestamp. This will allow all LSMSs to maintain backwards compatibility, and only LSMSs that choose to implement this new feature will be affected.  Add a new SPIDable, Service Provider SOA SV Query T2 Indicator, Boolean, to indicate whether or not this Service Provider supports the T2-Expiration Timestamp. This will allow all SOAs to maintain backwards compatibility, and only SOAs that choose to implement this new feature will be affected.  **Final Resolution:** | NPIF |  | Accepted |
| [PIM 150](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/8502/PIM_145_-_Check_for_Associated_-Xs_When_Deleting_a_Service_Provider.docx) | 11/08/22 | iconectiv | End Support for fax – The FRS has requirements for the LNPA to support faxing reports. Since taking over the LNPA service in 2018, iconectiv has not faxed a single report. It appears that support for faxing of reports is no longer needed.  11/08/2022 NPIF   * Steve K. (iconectiv) reviewed this draft PIM * Fax support has not been utilized in 4 ½ years This draft PIM was accepted and assigned #150 * iconectiv to draft a CO   12/13/2022 NPIF   * Draft CO will be reviewed later in the meeting | **Suggested Resolution**:  If there is no need for reports to be faxed, a change order should be created to update the FRS and remove the option to fax reports.  **Final Resolution:** | NPIF |  | Accepted |
| [PIM 149](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/8502/PIM_145_-_Check_for_Associated_-Xs_When_Deleting_a_Service_Provider.docx) | 11/08/22 | 10X People | LSMS Internal Create Download Reason - There is no mechanism to identify an Inter-Service Provider Port as a port within the same Company that is using different SPID values.  11/08/2022 NPIF   * John N. (10X People) reviewed the draft PIM * Steve K. (iconectiv) – Would the SOA originate this request with new value? * John N. (10X People) – The SOA would initiate the request with the new value * Renee D. (AT&T) – Don’t we have this functionality today? * John N. (10X People) – The current download on activates does not show both SPIDs * What are the benefits to porting? * John N. (10X People) – The benefit is to the backend systems * Matt T. (iconectiv) – Another option would be to add a new value to an optional feature. * This draft PIM was accepted and assigned #149 * New AI – 10X People to add some additional info/use cases to the PIM   12/13/2022 NPIF   * AI 11082022-01 – 10X People is still working with some SPs on the use cases * AI remains open   1/10/2023 NPIF   * AI 11082022-01 – 10X People is working with their users on use cases. * One of 10X People’s customers has developed a work around and 10X People indicated they should have an update later this month | **Suggested Resolution**:  Add a new Download Reason, internal-create, which would indicate that the TN is being ported between two different SPID values but is within the same Company.  Add a new attribute to the SV Create Request, internal-create-boolean, which would indicate that the TN is being ported between two different SPID values but is within the same Company. This applies to the XML interface.  Add a new SPIDable, Service Provider LSMS Internal Create Indicator, Boolean, to indicate whether or not this Service Provider supports the internal-create Download Reason. This will allow all LSMSs to maintain backwards compatibility, and only LSMSs that choose to implement this new feature will be affected. If an LSMS does NOT support this new feature, then the existing Download Reason of new1 will continue to be sent for all SV Create downloads to the LSMS.  Add a new SPIDable, Service Provider SOA Internal Create Indicator, Boolean, to indicate whether or not this Service Provider supports the internal-create-boolean in an SV Create Request and the internal-create Download Reason in an SV Query Reply. This will allow all SOAs to maintain backwards compatibility, and only SOAs that choose to implement this new feature will be affected. If a SOA does NOT support this new feature, then the existing Download Reason of new1 will continue to be sent for all SV Query Replies to the SOA. In an SV Create Request, this new feature would not be sent or would be ignored if sent.  **Final Resolution:** | NPIF |  | Accepted |
| [PIM 148](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/8502/PIM_145_-_Check_for_Associated_-Xs_When_Deleting_a_Service_Provider.docx) | 10/05/22 | AT&T | LNP Admin Process for SPID Migrations – LNPA Process for handling Pending ‘like’ Subscription Versions impacted by a SPID Migration  10/05/2022 NPIF  Draft PIM was reviewed, accepted and assigned #148  02/08/2023 NPIF   * At a future NPIF meeting iconectiv will present the current process for SPID Migrations   04/12/2023 NPIF   * Steve K. (iconectiv) - presented a PowerPoint of the current process for SPID Migrations * Renee D. (AT&T) – If there are a lot of Pending SVs and they are not originated by the providers involved (New & Old) in the SPID migration, this causes a lot of manual cleanup and customers could lose call routing because the Pending SVs are deleted * Was there a change where the appropriate people within AT&T are no longer receiving the notification emails? * Previously if there were a large number of Pending SVs related to the SPID Migration, the LNPA would contact the SP and in some cases postpone the SPID Migration * AT&T is asking for the LNPA to make the additional contact/outreach to the SPs with Pending SVs and the potential postponement of a SPID Migration * Postponing a SPID Migration is not trivial and there could be LERG updates tied to the migration * iconectiv can look to increase communications for SPID Migrations. * iconectiv would look to the Industry to define the parameters/process of these addition communication * Also maybe create guidelines (an M&P or BP) to address this process * New AI – AT&T to draft a BP to address proposed additional communication guidelines/process associated with SPID Migrations * Can iconectiv add the files to the email notifications * iconectiv would need to investigate this as files are not normally included in email notifications. This would require a Change Order to implement these changes * Is the detailed notification included in the FRS? | **Suggested Resolution**:  TBD  **Final Resolution:** | NPIF |  | Accepted |
| [PIM 147](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/8502/PIM_145_-_Check_for_Associated_-Xs_When_Deleting_a_Service_Provider.docx) | 07/12/22 | Somos | PAS API Interface Modifications - NANPA is in the process of developing a new system that will combine the functionality provided today in the existing NANP Administration System (NAS), Pooling Administration System (PAS) and Routing Number Administration System (RNAS) into a single system as required per Section 1.5 of the Combined NANPA/PA Technical Requirements Document (“TRD”) which states one of the main objectives of the NANPA is to “Develop and implement a single system to facilitate all activities of the NANPA/PA and the assignment, tracking, and data reporting requirements for all Numbering Resources”.  As required per Section 2.6. of the TRD “The NANPA/PA shall maintain a direct and mechanized interface to the Number Portability Administration Center (NPAC) to transmit and access data that the NANPA/PA needs to perform its responsibilities. The data shall be obtained from the NPAC administrator per the details defined by the North American Portability Management, Limited Liability Corporation (NAPM LLC) that oversees the vendor of the local number portability systems and administration or as otherwise provided by FCC requirements.”. The existing mechanized interface that is used today between PAS and the NPAC is the SOAP API interface. The SOAP API interface enables the NPAC to automatically retrieve and update the Part 1B and Part 5 work items created for new thousands-blocks, modifications to existing thousands-blocks and thousands-block disconnects that are requested by the service providers.  The existing SOAP API interface will not be backwards compatible with the new system. For the NPAC to continue to use a SOAP API interface with the new system, changes are required by NPAC to align with the new system requirements.  07/12/2022 NPIF  Florence W. (Somos) reviewed this draft PIM which suggests changes to the PAS to NPAC API  Suggestion was made to include the other relevant sections of the TRD (2.14.3)  Clarification – the NPAC agreed to utilize a SOAP interface technology  Statement was made that the type (SOAP) is not changing but the interface/messaging is changing  Statement was made that the NPAC already supports a SOAP interface  Somos to update the language in this section of the PIM to capture these statements  Statement was made that the SOAP API is being modified, not changing. This was discussed at ATIS INC  Somos to clarify this wording  Somos indicated that the changes to the Forms does change the message format  Statement was made that the form changes would not impact the interface itself  Question was asked if the changes to the forms actually need to be made. Since this will actually change the interface, should it go back to ATIS INC  Somos indicated that they would notify ATIS INC that the form changes would have an impact on the interface  New combined system goes live 4Q 2024  Would there be a long period of downtime when system cutover occurs?  Somos does not anticipate a long downtime  PIM was accepted and assigned #147  Steve K. and Matt T. (iconectiv) reviewed the comparison iconectiv created on the API changes  iconectiv to send the presentation to the NPIF distribution  08/02/2022 NPIF  Florence W. - Somos reviewed version 2 of this PIM.  Lisa Marie M. – 10X People asked if there were any changes from an NPAC perspective to the API.  Statement was made that changes to the forms were required.  Statement was made that the changes to the Part 1B and Part 5 forms were accepted at ATIS INC with the understanding that there would be no changes to the API.  Statement was made that INC was notified after the Issue (913) was accepted at ATIS INC, that there would be changes to the API.  Statement was made that the NPAC is a vital Industry system and the NPIF as good stewards need to ensure that changes do not impact the NPAC SMS. Implementing the changes themselves as well as the requirement of a flash cut has risks.  Statement was made that Somos is aware of the level of effort to make the changes to the NPAC SMS API.  Statement was made that the changes to the NPAC SMS would be substantial.  Is there a business need for the Part 1B and Part 5 form changes?  NPIF tri-chairs will refer this issue to ATIS INC  09/13/2022 NPIF  ATIS INC provided a response to the NPIF referral  Will include in October NPIF agenda  The actual response was included in the body of the email to the NPIF tri-chairs, so participants are urged to read the email as well as the attached document  10/05/2022 NPIF  Florence W. (Somos) - reviewed the analysis Somos performed on the proposed changes to the PAS-NPAC API.   * Domain name change - Namespace URLs – This change will be implemented * Byte to Character – No issue. This change will be implemented * Change PA to NA - Form will reflect the change from PA to NA but the interface will remain the same * Field Lengths (Pwd & UserID) – Pwd currently 8 (max of 60) increasing to 16 (max of 64). UserID currently 1 (max of 200) changing to 6 (max of 25). This change will be implemented and WSDL is changing but this should not be an issue for the NPAC because NPAC generates the Pwd & UserID * ApplicantName – Reduced characters are not an issue for the NPAC. * Field name changes - PAName – Not allowing special characters is a non-issue for the NPAC * Fields no longer exist – The fields that were removed (Override NPAC validation and For Info Only) can be added back in and the PA can send these fields (Override NPAC validation and For Info Only) with an entry of NO * Fields changing from optional to required – The NPAC can accept these fields today, so this is a non- issue for the NPAC * Address fields (Part 1B & 5 forms) being combined - The new combined fields would be mapped back to the original PAADDR1 field and PAADDR2 field would be blank * City/State/Zip fields will be kept but sent over blank * Comments Field – Was renamed to Comments. This field would be sent over as blank * New AI - Somos to put resolutions for PAS-NPAC API analysis (PIM 147) in the document so it can be reviewed at the November NPIF meeting   11/08/2022 NPIF   * AI 10052022-03 – Somos to put resolutions for PAS-NPAC API analysis (PIM 147) in the document so it can be reviewed at the November NPIF meeting * Florence W. (Somos) reviewed the update to PIM 147. If agreement is reached on this Suggested Resolution, Somos will work on an update to the WSDL for the NPAC. * iconectiv would need to see the updated WSDL before the resolution to this PIM can be approved * Updated WSDL target is end of January 2023. * PIM will be kept open until WSDL has been reviewed * Somos is changing the namespace and will not go back on that * iconectiv went on record that the updates to the namespace are not required. * The namespace change will necessitate changes by the NPAC * There is no benefit from a porting perspective to changing the namespace. That flash cut presents a risk * What is the development effort from an NPAC perspective to update the namespace? * New AI - iconectiv to determine the level of effort to make a change to the namespace or possibly support both namespaces after delivery and review of WSDL   Somos is looking to release the new system in 4Q 2024. A more definitive date should be available by the January NPIF meeting  12/13/202 NPIF   * AI 11082022-03 – No update * AI remains open   1/10/2023 NPIF   * Tara F. (Somos) – Somos will have updated WSDL sent to iconectiv by end of January 2023 * AI 11082022-03 - iconectiv is investigating internally and plans to have the assessment for the January NPIF meeting. * LNPA reviewed a document with an update on the Level of Effort for modifying the namespace * LNPA would create an updateable configuration setting * Await updated WSDL for confirmation of the changes before determining next steps * Providers indicated that proposed solution is really good way to implement the change and for iconectiv being practical in their solution. * New AI – iconectiv to review the updated WSDL (once received) and provide feedback   02/08/2023 NPIF   * AI 01102023-01 – Matt T. (iconectiv) reviewed a PowerPoint update on review of the revised WSDL * AI is now closed * New AI – Somos to review this PIM 147 and provide any proposed updates including a Suggested Resolution   04/12/2023 NPIF   * Florence W. (Somos) – reviewed the draft Final Resolution for PIM 147 * This PIM is now closed * CMA to accept changes to this PIM and post updated version to the website | **Suggested Resolution**:  NANPA has agreed to maintain the existing naming convention used today in PAS and in the event a field exceeds the current PAS maximum characters, the new system will truncate the data to fit the new system character maximum. NANPA has also agreed to add the fields that were removed by INC as it relates to INC Issues 913 and 927, these fields will be made optional, and no data will be sent. NANPA has agreed to retain the existing statuses of Optional or Required, where Required, NANPA will send the data. However, the domain name in the Namespace URL will be updated to npac-api.nanpa.com, the references from BYTE to character will remain as is, and the NPAC users will conform to the new system username and password requirements.    NPAC stated that they can accept special characters if sent, so NANPA will send special characters when applicable.  **Final Resolution:**  NANPA shall maintain the existing naming convention used today in PAS and in the event a field exceeds the current PAS maximum characters, the new system will truncate the data to fit the new system character maximum. NANPA shall add the fields that were removed by INC as it relates to INC Issues 897 and 940, these fields will be made optional, and no data will be sent. Per INC Issues 913 and 927, NANPA will only send the Part 1B when the “Override SPID and LRN Validations” is set to “N” value, “For Information Only” is set to “N” value, and “Is Thousands-Block being allocated back to the Code Holder on the switch where the CO Code resides?” field is set to an “N” value. NANPA shall retain the existing statuses of Optional or Required, where Required, NANPA will send the data. NANPA shall update the domain name in the Namespace URL to npac-api.nanpa.com, update the references from BYTE to character and the NPAC users will conform to the new system username and password requirements.    NANPA shall send special characters when applicable understanding that the NPAC can accept special characters. | NPIF | 04/12/2023 | Accepted |
| [PIM 146](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/8502/PIM_145_-_Check_for_Associated_-Xs_When_Deleting_a_Service_Provider.docx) | 06/07/22 | SOS Sub team | Load Testing for TPS increase - Prior to a decision to increase the transaction per second (TPS) rate, industry production load testing is recommended to ensure any increase will not adversely impact industry service provider system and network element performance.  06/07/2022 NPIF  This PIM was reviewed, accepted, and assigned #146  .Joy M. (Lumen) – reviewed this draft PIM which suggests performing Industry testing of transaction rates  PIM was accepted and assigned #146  CMA to post new PIM to the website  Teresa P. (AT&T) – How was the 11 TPS number arrived at?  It was based on suggestions by SPs at the GUST  Testing needs to be per region (250K TNs across all 7 regions)  Steve K. (iconectiv) reviewed the PowerPoint presentation originally presented at the GUST. It framed how testing could be performed.    Cheryl F. (Intelliquent) may be able to offer TNs (Project work) for this testing  New Action Item for SPs to reach out to iconectiv if they have TN resources to support this testing  There are several moratoriums in September/October and November/December  Bob B. (Syniverse) – What is the urgency for this testing?  Cheryl F (Inteliquent) – it’s not necessarily a sense of urgency but it is something we’ve been working on for over a year and we need to get to a point where we can make some decisions regarding a potential TPS increase.  Consensus was reached on utilizing the MUMPs process for this testing.  Tentative Test Dates:  Tuesday October 25th  Tuesday November 1st  New Action Item for LNPA to determine if they can support suggested timeframes for proposed transaction rate testing  New AI for vendors to review by LSMS transaction types if there would be different performance characteristics based on the receipt of the NPAC Broadcast events - Renee D. (ATT) to provide detail for this AI  Need preliminary answers to these questions by July NPIF meeting  Testing procedural notes/questions to be answered:  What happens if LSMS’ go down during testing?  Should there be an Industry bridge during testing?  What do we do if other porting transactions (larger numbers/volume) are sent during the testing  To allow more time for discussion on this topic, the July NPIF is being extended to 2:00 (11-2 PM ET)  07/12/2022 NPIF  Steve K. and Michael D. (iconectiv) reviewed a presentation addressing a high-level schedule and additional topics related to testing  06070222-03 – Vendors to validate if modifying a value to a same value (LRN) with the same information would actually result in a transaction  Answers to the AIs and the impact of certain porting transactions are critical to creation of test plan.  08/02/2022 NPIF  The LNPA reviewed their recommendations for when load testing should be a GO and when/IF it should be suspended  12/13/2022 NPIF   * Additional GUST meetings will be scheduled after Load testing results data are reviewed at NPIF   02/08/2023 NPIF   * GUST will reconvene to discuss the results of the Production Load Testing and come to the full NPIF with recommendations and potentially a Final Resolution will be drafted for PIM 146   04/12/2023   * Joy M-C (Lumen) – reviewed the draft Final Resolution for PIM 146 * This PIM is now closed * CMA to accept changes to this PIM and post updated version to the website | **Suggested Resolution**:  NPIF should determine if there is a desire to proceed with production load testing, per the recommendation from the GUST. If there is a desire to proceed, the following should be discussed and agreed to:   * A timeframe for load testing * A method for performing coordinated industry load testing at a rate of 11 TPS for 60 minutes per LSMS * Which data will be collected during the test in order to monitor carrier systems, including any network related impacts. * Criteria for determining adverse impacts to local systems and associated network components (e.g. STP, SCP) for any network related impacts. * A referral to the NAPM LLC to request the LNPA vendor coordinate and perform production load testing once the above items are agreed to.   **Final Resolution:**  The NPIF agreed to the production load test criteria recommended by the APT during the September 13, 2022, NPIF meeting and the load test was conducted on October 25, 2022.  Results of the load test are included in the attached ‘2022 Load Test Results Summary’ report. | NPIF | 04/12/2023 | Accepted |
| [PIM 145](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/8502/PIM_145_-_Check_for_Associated_-Xs_When_Deleting_a_Service_Provider.docx) | 05/03/22 | iconectiv | Check for Associated -Xs when Deleting a Service Provider - 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.  05/03/2022 NPIF   * This PIM was reviewed by iconectiv, accepted, and assigned #145 * PIM proposes to introduce a new requirement to validate that a Service Provider cannot be removed unless all of the NPA-NXX-Xs associated with the Service Provider ID have been removed.   06/07/2022 NPIF   * iconectiv reviewed a draft Change Order related to this PIM which was accepted and assigned #562   08/02/2022 NPIF  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution  This PIM is now resolved | **Suggested Resolution**:  Introduce a new requirement to validate that a Service Provider cannot be removed unless all of the NPA-NXX-Xs associated with the Service Provider ID have been removed.  **Final Resolution:**  This PIM resulted in the creation of Change Order 562 which recommends adding a requirement to the FRS for NPAC SMS to validate that there are no NPA-NXX-Xs associated with the Service Provider. For further information refer to CO 562. | NPIF | 08/02/2022 | Closed |
| [PIM 144](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/8498/PIM_144_-_976_NXX_Data_in_NPAC.docx) | 05/03/22 | iconectiv | 976 Data in NPAC - Portable NPA-NXXs, Number Pool Blocks, and SVs for 976 NXXs (i.e., codes of the form NPA-976) exist within three NPAC regions. According to the TBCOCAG Section 7.3.8, the “976 CO Code shall only be used for Information Delivery Services” and “shall not be marked as portable and shall not be pooled as the CO Codes’ numbers are not Assigned to end-user customers.” Existence of 976 NXX data in the NPAC appears to contradict the TBCOCAG guidelines and is not aligned with existing assignment information available from NANPA/PA in many cases.  05/03/2022 NPIF   * This PIM was reviewed by iconectiv, accepted, and assigned #144 * The 976 numbers can be assigned to SPs. There are some 976 numbers assigned to an OCN. These would pass NPAC validation. * The 976 code effective dates – some are 10-15 years old. There are some more recent assignments in 2013. * Suggestion was made to open an issue & contribution with ATIS INC. * Consensus reached to investigate the codes and language prior to opening an issue with ATIS INC * New AI - iconectiv to send a list of codes that are in NPAC to the NANPA including the dates of recent activity on those codes * New AI - NANPA will look into the 976 language located in the TBCOCAG   10/05/2022 NPIF   * New AI - iconectiv to determine if there are any 976 NPA-NXXs still in the NPAC   11/08/2022 NPIF   * AI – 10052022-02 -iconectiv to determine if there are any pooled 976 NPA-NXXs still in the NPAC * There has been no change in amount of pooled 976 NPA-NXXs in the NPAC. As the LNPA we will not remove these numbers without any guidance from the SPs or the Numbering Administrator * New AI – LNPA reach out to the SPs and work with Pooling Administrator to determine if these Pooled 976 NPA-NXXs can be removed from the NPAC   12/13/2022 NPIF   * AI 11082022-02 – iconectiv is investigating * AI remains open   1/10/2023 NPIF   * AI 11082022-02 – iconectiv is working with providers and NANPA on these numbers. iconectiv continues to work with providers and will have an update for the February NPIF meeting   02/08/2023 NPIF   * AI 11082022-02 – Steve K. – The LNPA continues to work with SPs on pooled 976 NXXs in the NPAC. 20 NXXs were identified of which 18 have been removed. 90 thousands blocks have been removed with the concurrence of the providers that have those codes * Teresa P. (AT&T) – AT&T was contacted by a provider that had assigned 976 numbers to one of its customers. They have been experiencing routing issues to these numbers. * AT&T recommends to all providers that if they have 976 numbers that they do not assign them to actual customers. * PA/NANPA (Somos) – all 976 codes are now marked as unassignable   04/12/2023 NPIF   * AI 11082022-02 – Steve K. (iconectiv) provided an update * Of the 21 NPA-NXXs referenced in the PIM, 20 have been removed from the NPAC as portable NPA-NXXs. * The 21st could not be removed as it is assigned and has numbers in service. * Of the 90 -Xs and blocks referenced in the PIM, 90 have been removed (de-pooled) from the NPAC. * Of the 2,723 active, non-pool SVs, 522 were disconnected. The remaining 2,201 are associated with the remaining NPA-NXX that could not be deleted. * iconectiv will provide a draft Final Resolution for this PIM and ensure that is covers/discusses any potential routing issues associated with assigning these numbers * Renee D. (AT&T) – raised an issue that the SP that has the working line range should be notified that 976 routing is not officially supported * Sheri P. (Frontier) – Their customer has been notified and they have returned the associated 976 numbers. This update is from last week * iconectiv will follow up to determine if the code can be removed | **Suggested Resolution**:  NPIF should discuss and determine whether there is a valid reason for 976 NXX codes, blocks, and SVs to be in the NPAC, including the case where they are assigned by the NANPA. If there is not a valid reason in some or all scenarios, the LNPA will engage the assigned SPIDs to request 976 NXX data be deleted.  **Final Resolution:** | NPIF |  | Accepted |
| [PIM 143](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/8218/PIM_143_-_Valid_Portable_NPA-NXX_Effective_Date_Values.docx) | 03/08/22 | iconectiv | Valid Portable NPA-NXX Effective Date Values - The FRS allows for a Portable NPA-NXX to be created with an Effective Date in the past but does not specify a reasonable limit for the past date allowed.  03/08/2022 NPIF   * This PIM was reviewed by iconectiv, accepted, and assigned #143 * New AI - CMA to post new PIM 143 to the website * Suggestion was made to make the date validation be later than July 1, 1996 * This change would require updates to the FRS * New AI - iconectiv to propose a Change Order for PIM 143   04/05/2022 NPIF   * iconectiv has drafted a Change Order which will be discussed later in the meeting * CO 561 was discussed and accepted   08/02/2022 NPIF  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution  This PIM is now resolved | **Suggested Resolution**:  The NPIF could establish a reasonable validation on how far in the past the Portable NPA-NXX Effective Date can be.  **Final Resolution:**  This PIM resulted in the creation of Change Order 561 which recommends adding a requirement to the FRS for NPAC SMS to validate the Portable NPA-NXX Effective Date. For further information refer to CO 561. | NPIF | 08/02/2022 | Closed |
| [PIM 142](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/8258/PIM_142_-_DDoS_Attack_1.docx) | 02/08/22 | 10X People | DDoS Attack – VoIP service providers are susceptible to IP network attacks, as evident by recent DDoS attacks (see definition in section F below), both domestically and abroad in the last several months. In order to restore service to end-customers, porting was required to move customers to unimpacted networks, to resolve these customer outages. The current NPAC transaction rates defined in the FRS specification are insufficient to support the porting volumes required. There were no provisions for exceeding the documented transaction rates.  02/08/2022 NPIF   * PIM TBD – DDoS Attack * 10X People (Lisa-Marie Maxson) - Reviewed the draft PIM * Comcast (Randee Ryan) asked - Will the porting from one network to another network be voluntary? * Consensus was that this porting would be voluntary * AT&T (Renee Dillon) – Some states have transaction throughput requirements (from their state PUC). Increasing the throughput could impact those providers since there are penalties if those requirements are not met. * The NAOWG should be made aware of this. Lisa-Marie will follow up with the NAOWG * Do any of those PUCs have waivers for those requirements for emergencies * AT&T (Renee Dillon) – Has not seen any waivers * 10X People is going to update the PIM with this information * PIM was accepted and assigned #142 * CMA to post to website * This PIM will be worked at a new sub-team of the NPIF * Should also ensure we include M&P/notification processes in discussion * Lisa-Marie will coordinate this new sub-team * New AI - CMA to send e-mail to distribution list letting everyone know to contact Lisa Marie at lisamarie@10xpeople.com if interested in participating on the DDOS sub-team   03/08/2022 NPIF   * Being worked by SOS Sub Team * Consensus was reached on the proposed language in this PIM * CMA to post PIM to website   04/05/2022 NPIF   * Being worked at the SOS Sub Team * Team reviewed a draft issue referral letter to refer this issue to the NGIIF * This referral letter will be sent from the NPIF tri-chairs to the NGIIF   07/12/2022 NPIF   * A BP is being drafted by the SOS sub team. * In addition, the team is working with the NGIIF and NRSC on BPs and Industry procedures that may be relevant   08/02/2022 NPIF   * SOS Sub-team is working on a draft BP that should be available for review at the September NPIF   09/13/2022 NPIF   * Michael D. (iconectiv) reviewed the BP drafted by SOS * Consensus was reached to accept the BP * It was assigned #78 and will be worked at future NPIF meetings   10/05/2022 NPIF   * New AI – SOS to propose a Final Resolution for PIM 142   11/08/2022 NPIF   * Michael D. (iconectiv) reviewed the proposed Final Resolution for this PIM. Consensus was reached on this Final Resolution * This PIM is now closed | **Suggested Resolution**:  Raise existing throughput requirements to allow for increased porting volumes.  Consider exceptions to transaction volume limitations in these situations to allow higher porting volumes.  Put M&P in place for the NPAC and the industry for when these situations arise.  **Final Resolution:**  This PIM resulted in the creation of a Best Practice (#78 – Service Outage Prevention and Mitigation). | NPIF | 11/08/2022 | Closed |
| [PIM 141](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/8098/PIM_141_-_Limit_Quantity_of_Delegate_SPIDs_v2.docx) | 11/02/21 | iconectiv | Limit Quantity of Delegate SPIDs - Currently, there is no limit to the number of delegate SPIDs that a single grantor SPID can have. There are currently grantor SPIDs that have multiple delegate SPIDs. Adding delegate SPIDs can significantly increase the overall volume of notifications, as notifications to a grantor SPID may also be sent to each of its delegate SPIDs.  11/02/2021 NPIF   * iconectiv reviewed this draft PIM * PIM was reviewed, accepted and assigned #141 * PIM suggests that one Grantor SPID can have up to 5 Delegate SPIDs per region * CMA to post PIM to website   01/11/2022 NPIF   * Consensus reached on proposed Final Resolution for this PIM. * This PIM is now closed * CMA to accept changes to the PIM and post updated version to the website | **Suggested Resolution**:  Currently, there is no limit to the number of delegate SPIDs that a single grantor SPID can have. There are currently grantor SPIDs that have multiple delegate SPIDs. Adding delegate SPIDs can significantly increase the overall volume of notifications, as notifications to a grantor SPID may also be sent to each of its delegate SPIDs.  **Final Resolution:**  This PIM resulted in the creation of Change Order 559 which recommends updates to the Industry Specifications. For further information refer to CO 559. | NPIF | 01/11/2022 | Closed |
| [PIM 140](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/8102/PIM_140_-_Sunset_SP_to_SP_delegation_v3.docx) | 10/04/21 | iconectiv | Sunset SP to SP Delegation v2 - Currently, service provider SPIDs are allowed to be delegates of other service provider SPIDs. However, no two service provider SPIDs have entered into a delegation arrangement since the delegation functionality was introduced in late 2013. Supporting the ability of a service provider SPID to be a delegate of another service provider SPID requires relatively complex processing logic for notifications in the NPAC.  10/04/2021 NPIF   * iconectiv reviewed this draft PIM * PIM was reviewed, accepted and assigned #140 * Steve K. (iconectiv) reviewed the PowerPoint presentation discussed at the GUST. * Suggestion was made to clarify language that this is only for delegation between 2 SP SPIDs * 10042021-03 - iconectiv to make updates to PIM 140 to clarify language that this is only for delegation between 2 SPIDs * CMA to post to website   11/02/2021 NPIF   * iconectiv reviewed version 2 of this PIM * AI 10042021-03 is now closed * New AI – 11022021-02 – iconectiv to draft a Doc Only CO to update M&Ps and wording in FRS as outlined in PIM 140 * CMA to post updated version to website   01/11/2022 NPIF   * Consensus reached on proposed Final Resolution for this PIM. * This PIM is now closed * CMA to accept changes to the PIM and post updated version to the website | **Suggested Resolution**:  Sunsetting the ability of two service provider SPIDs to enter into a delegation configuration would reduce system and vendor certification complexity. Through M&Ps, introduce procedures to prohibit a service provider SPID, based on Service Provider Type, from being a delegate of another service provider SPID.  In the long term, the group may want to consider a change order to prohibit such a configuration via software.  **Final Resolution:**  This PIM resulted in the creation of Change Order 559 which recommends updates to the Industry Specifications. For further information refer to CO 559**.** | NPIF | 01/11/2022 | Closed |
| [PIM 139](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/7685/PIM_139_-_LSMS_Disconnect_Download_Reasons.docx) | 08/03/21 | 10X People | LSMS Disconnect Download Reasons - 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 1.) because the number has been disconnected and is no longer in service, or 2.) it is a Port-to-Original of a still-working TN and is reinstating default routing.  08/03/2021 NPIF   * PIM TBD – LSMS Disconnect Download Reasons * Lisa Marie M. (10X People) - Reviewed this draft PIM * PIM was reviewed, accepted and assigned #139 * CMA to post to website * New AI - 10X People to draft a CO to address the issue raised in this PIM   09/07/2021 NPIF   * CO TBD – LSMS Disconnect Download Reasons – 10X People * This CO was reviewed, accepted and assigned #556 * Refer to CO Summary – Open COs or the Change Order itself for additional details   02/08/2022 NPIF   * 02082022-02 - 10X People will draft a Final Resolution for PIM 139 based on CO 556 being changed back to Requested status   03/08/2022 NPIF   * Consensus was reached on Final Resolution * This PIM is now closed | **Suggested Resolution**:  Add a new Download Reason, delete-pto, which would indicate that the TN is still working, but is returning to the owner, and would revert to default routing.  Add a new SPIDable, Service Provider LSMS Delete PTO Indicator, Boolean, to indicate whether or not this Service Provider supports the delete-pto Download Reason. This will allow all LSMSs to maintain backwards compatibility, and only LSMSs that choose to implement this new feature will be affected. If an LSMS does NOT support this new feature, then the existing Download Reason of delete will continue to be sent for both still-working TNs (PTO) and disconnected-service TNs.  **Final Resolution:**  This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a Change Order. For further detail, refer to the Change Order 556 identified in the Related Documents field of the PIM**.** | NPIF | 03/08/2022 | Closed |
| [PIM 138](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/8054/PIM_138_-_AltSPID_population_v2.docx) | 08/03/21 | iconectiv | AltSPID Population - Population of the AltSPID and Last Alt SPID fields for internal use is a common occurrence and could result in misinterpretation of the entries by other Service Providers that receive this data. Creating guidelines in the form of a Best Practice for population and subsequent use of these fields would help avoid confusion that may occur when the fields are populated for different purposes.  08/03/2021 NPIF   * PIM TBD – AltSPID population * Michael D. (iconectiv) - PIM was reviewed, accepted and assigned #138 * CMA to post to website * New AI – 08032021-02 - iconectiv to draft a BP to address the population/uses for the AltSPID fields * If any providers are interested in working with Michael on the draft BP, they should contact him @ [mdoherty@iconectiv.com](mailto:mdoherty@iconectiv.com)   10/04/2021 NPIF   * Draft Best Practice - AltSPID-LastAltSPID field population was reviewed by iconectiv accepted and assigned #76 * For additional details on this Best Practice refer to BP 076 located on the NPIF website   11/02/2021 NPIF   * New AI – 11022021-01 - iconectiv to draft Final Resolution language for PIM 138 to be reviewed at the December NPIF   01/11/2022 NPIF   * Consensus reached Final Resolution proposed by Michael Doherty (iconectiv) for this PIM. * This PIM is now closed * Michael Doherty to accept changes to the PIM and post updated version to the website | **Suggested Resolution**:  Create a Best Practice that addresses the uses of the AltSPID and LastAltSPID fields.  The Best Practice should address situations where the first subtending Service Provider is the same as the last subtending Service Provider, as well as when they are different.  • The (existing) Alternative SPID is populated when there is a subtending Service Provider serving the telephone number.  • The Last Alternative SPID is populated whenever the identity of the Service Provider with the retail relationship with the end-user is known.  • In the case where there is only one subtending Service Provider and that fact is known, then both Alternative SPID values are populated, with the same SPID value.  • When the fields are utilized for iTRS service to move an end user from one TRS provider to another by populating the new TRS provider's SPID in the Alternative SPID parameter.  **Final Resolution:**  This PIM resulted in the creation of Best Practice 076 - AltSPID – LastAltSPID field population which provides recommendations for the population of these optional fields. Refer to BP 076 for additional details**.** | NPIF | 12/07/2021 | Closed |
| [PIM 137](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/7525/PIM_137_-_Clarification_On_OLSP_Removing_Transalations_when_10-Digit_Triggers_5IbKGCq.docx) | 05/04/21 | Electric Lightwave dba Allstream | Clarification on OLSP removing translations when 10-digit triggers - Clarification on ONSP Obligations to Remove Translations When 10-Digit Triggers Cannot Be Set  05/04/2021 NPIF   * Kim Isaacs (Allstream) – introduced this PIM * PIM was accepted and assigned #137 * What is the process/requirement to remove the translations after port has occurred? * Since this was a coordinated order the call to the OLSP should trigger the removal of the translations * What is the expectation for SPs to participate in the NPIF to address these type issues? * What is the expectation when the process isn’t followed? * Deb T. (Verizon) – NANC flows need to be followed * BP 026 addressed 10 digit triggers but was deleted March 2011 and the information incorporated into the NANC flows * New AI – Allstream to draft a new BP (related to PIM 136) to address this issue   06/08/2021 NPIF   * Kim Isaacs (Allstream) - reviewed the draft of a new BP – Incomplete ONSP LNP Provisioning * Consensus was reached to accept this BP and it was assigned #75 * New Action Item - Allstream to update the draft BP based on feedback from today’s discussions   08/03/2021 NPIF   * 06082021-03 - Allstream to update the draft BP based on feedback from June NPIF discussions * Kim Isaacs (Allstream) – reviewed draft BP * Title was changed to better capture reason for BP * If provisioning tasks are incomplete, both parties will, in an expedited manner, use best effort to complete those activities in 4 business hours after notification of user experiencing an issue * There was discussion about carrier’s ability to complete the tasks within the 4 hour window. * New AI – SPs take this draft BP back internally, review this wording and provide feedback at the September NPIF meeting   09/07/2021 NPIF   * SPs expressed concerns about the 4 hour turnaround suggested in the BP * New AI – Verizon to draft language for this BP * There was discussion on creating or updating a contact list so SPs know who to contact for assistance should an issue occur. * iconectiv shared that there is contact information available on the Customer Portal * New AI - SPs to review their contact information on the Customer Portal and make any updates required * New AI - Michael Doherty (iconectiv) to send out instructions on how to update the contact information on the Customer Portal * 08032021-01 - SPs to review BP 75 internally and provide feedback at the September NPIF meeting * After discussion this AI is now closed * Three new action items associated with BP 075 related to this PIM were opened: * 09072021-01 - Verizon to draft language for BP 075 * Verizon targeting review of draft language at November NPIF * This AI remains open * 09072021-02 - Michael Doherty (iconectiv) to send out instructions on how to update the contact information on the Customer Portal * Michael Doherty (iconectiv) reviewed the process that was sent out * This AI is now closed * 09072021-03 - SPs to review their contact information on the Customer Portal and make any updates required * This AI remains open to provide SPs time to make the updates   11/02/2021 NPIF   * 09072021-01 - Verizon to draft language for BP 075 * Verizon reviewed draft language * This AI remains open to allow SPs to provide additional comments to the proposed language   12/07/2021 NPIF   * 09072021-01 - Verizon to draft language for BP 075 * This AI remains open to allow SPs to provide additional comments to the proposed language * 09072021-03 - SPs to review their contact information on the Customer Portal and make any updates required * Michael Doherty presented results of updates to Contact information on the Customer Portal      * This AI remains open to allow SPs more time to make updates   01/11/2022 NPIF   * 09072021-01 - Verizon to draft language for BP 075 * No edits to Verizon’s proposed language were received * Cheryl F. (Intelliquent) - has some proposed language. Recommendation was to send them to CMA in track changes mode so that they can be distributed to the NPIF for discussion at the next meeting   02/08/2022 NPIF   * Inteliquent is targeting the March NPIF meeting to propose some language for this PIM   03/08/2021 NPIF   * No further updates/changes at this time. * Inteliquent is still working on some proposed language * AI 09072021-01 - will remain open   04/05/2022 NPIF   * AI – 09072021-01 - Verizon to draft language for BP 075 * Cheryl F. (Inteliquent) – has draft wording and should have available for distribution tomorrow (April 6th)   05/03/2022 NPIF   * 09072021-01 - Verizon to draft language for BP 075 * This AI is now closed since Verizon did provide the draft language. * A New AI was opened for Inteliquent to provide proposed language   09/13/2022 NPIF  New AI – NPIF tri-chairs to reach out to Allstream to draft a Final Resolution for PIM 137  10/05/2022 NPIF   * Kim I. (AllStream) reviewed the proposed Final Resolution. * Consensus was reached on proposed Final Resolution. * This PIM is now Resolved | **Suggested Resolution**:  A NPIF consensus clarification on the timing of removing translations.  **Final Resolution:**  NPIF discussions resulted in BP 075 - Best Practice Response Interval Guidelines for End User Issues after Port Activation | NPIF | 10/05/2022 | Resolved |
| [PIM 136](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/7502/PIM_136_-_LSMS_Performance.docx) | 04/06/21 | 10X People/  iconectiv | LSMS Performance - LSMS Systems are not meeting industry throughput requirements  04/06/2021 NPIF   * 10X People presented a draft PIM created in conjunction with iconectiv * PIM was accepted and assigned #136 * Suggested Resolution was to create a new sub-group to work the issue (Giddy Up Group) * Cheryl Fullerton (Inteliquent) – This definitely needs to be looked at deeper * Bob Bruce (Syniverse) – also supports the review of these limits * Bandwidth also supports the review of these limits * CenturyLink/Lumen – also supports the review of these limits * For SPs that want to become a part of the new subgroup please send an email to the CMA * The following people volunteered to lead the new sub group: * Cheryl Fullerton (Inteliquent) volunteered to chair * Joy McConnell Couch (Lumen) – volunteered to chair * Annalyce Grogan (Bandwidth) – volunteered to chair   05/04/2021 NPIF   * Joy McConnell-Couch (Lumen) – There was a meeting of the new sub team (Giddy Up) on April 30, 2021 * Ongoing meetings are scheduled weekly on Fridays. If you are interested in joining send an email to Joy McConnell Couch * There were 2 Action Items * #1 – iconectiv as LNPA to take an Action Item to provide more info on requirements related to TPS * #2 - Industry participants to come to next meeting prepared to discuss their needs * Steve K. (iconectiv) – the FRS states 7.0 TPS “per association” not “per SPID”. Proposed that the wording of this PIM be changed to accurately reflect the FRS.   06/08/2021 NPIF   * Being worked in Giddy Up Sub Team (GUST) * Action Item 04022021-02 The PIM was updated to reflect the per region aspect of this PIM. But the further review of this wording was never completed. Therefore, this Action remains open for further discussion at the GUST   08/03/2021 NPIF   * John N. (10X People) – reviewed proposed wording changes * Consensus was reached on wording changes * AI 05042021-02 is now closed * Continues to be worked in GUST   09/07/2021 NPIF   * This PIM continues to be worked at the GUST   10/04/2021 NPIF   * SPs are encouraged to come to the next GUST with business needs regarding proposed changes to the transaction per second rates   11/02/2021 NPIF   * Continues to be worked at the GUST * A form to gather tps information was sent to the NPIF distribution on Friday October 29th * Responses are requested by November 22nd. CMA to send reminder to NPIF distribution 1 week prior to Nov 22nd deadline   12/07/2021 NPIF   * Continues to be worked at GUST * SPs are encouraged to fill out and submit TPS data to CMA by December 15th   02/08/2022 NPIF   * Continues to be worked at the GUST * TPS form was simplified and sent to the NPIF distribution on February 2nd requesting that the form be filled out and returned to the CMA via email * In addition, a PowerPoint slide providing summary data on TPS requirements was included   03/08/2022 NPIF   * GUST continues to work this PIM. * No further update for this PIM   05/03/2022 NPIF   * At the GUST meeting the group discussed production load testing   10/05/2022 NPIF   * Joy M-C - GUST may meet after Production Load Test to discuss the testing and possibly propose a Final Resolution | **Suggested Resolution**:  Creation of a new “Giddy-up” sub-group to focus on understanding the business requirements and the LSMS throughput and capacity required to meet today’s needs.  The sub-group should review existing industry requirements to ensure common understanding and to determine if any clarifications to the industry specifications are needed.  The Giddy-up group can leverage past methods of calculating throughput needs used to determine increased performance requirements in the NPAC 3.3 and 3.4 releases.  **Final Resolution:** | NPIF |  | Accepted |
| [PIM 135](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/7697/PIM_135_-_XML_Testing_Backward_Compatibility_v2.docx) | 04/06/21 | iconectiv | XML Testing Backward Compatibility - The XIS indicates that systems should accept a schema\_version value with a different minor version than the XSD schema version used by the system. However, there are no vendor test cases that verify this functionality.  04/06/2021 NPIF   * iconectiv presented a draft PIM * PIM was accepted and assigned #135 * Steve Koch (iconectiv) reviewed the draft PIM and a PowerPoint outlining details of the Schema Version Element and existing Test Cases * All local system vendors should complete this new testing * Vendors should consider working with their providers if changes are required to the local systems to support this new schema * No draft Test Case(s) has been created yet, but the Suggested Resolution would be to create one * Suggestion was to refer this to the APT for creation of the Test Case(s) * Renee Dillon (AT&T) – Have we seen any indication that local system vendors have an issue? * NPAC cannot speak for Local system vendors, but not aware of any issues * Renee Dillon (AT&T) - Will CO 554 require local systems to recertify? * Current thinking is that utilizing the CO 554 functionality would be optional. All vendors would need to complete this test prior to implementation of this CO 554 functionality. * COs currently in R 5.1 do not require this regression testing * LNPA will follow up with local system vendors regarding this feature and testing   05/04/2021 NPIF   * Steve K. (iconectiv) – We will have draft Test Cases for APT meeting as well as for CO 554. iconectiv is also reaching out to all vendors regarding the need for testing * John M. (iconectiv) – Would one test case (CO 554 or PIM 135) take precedence over the other or would they both be handled together? * Steve. K. (iconectiv) – Together   07/06/2021 NPIF   * Testing schedule was discussed. Testing for R 5.1 will be January 2022. * CO TBD – Turn-Up Test Cases – Doc Only was reviewed, accepted and assigned #555. * This CO adds two new test cases to Chapter 17 of the Vendor Certification and Regression Test Plans   08/03/2021 NPIF   * Being worked in APT * Steve K. (iconectiv) – reviewed the proposed Final Resolution. * Consensus reached on Final Resolution * PIM is now closed | **Suggested Resolution**:  Develop a new, required test case for XML SOA and XML LSMS vendors to ensure ability to process messages with different minor version values in the schema\_version element. Vendors would need to demonstrate their ability to pass this new test case prior to the next NPAC release that introduces a new schema\_version value.  The APT could be engaged to work details of this new test case.  **Final Resolution:**  This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a Doc-only Change Order. The NPIF accepted this Change Order (CO 555) to add two new mandatory test cases to Chapter 17 of the Vendor Certification and Regression Test Plan. The APT reviewed the new test cases. For additional information refer to CO 555. | NPIF | 08/03/2021 | Closed |
| [PIM 134](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/8050/PIM_134_-_LNP_Record_Management_v3.docx) | 2/09/21 | Lumen | LNP Record Management - Given the high-volume porting activity occurring across the industry, there has been an increase in LSMS LNP record growth rate for providers resulting in record capacity issues and concerns.  2/9/2021 NPIF   * Lumen presented a draft PIM * PIM was accepted and assigned #134 * The CMA will post the PIM to the website * Lumen is seeing increased activity * 2 activities are suggested in the Draft PIM: * Cleanup of existing records * Perform an audit of duplicate/redundant records * Suggestion was made to review the INC guidelines on returning TNs to the block owner when they are disconnected * New AI – The LNPA will perform an audit to gather info when Pooled Block data is duplicated on the SV (i.e. LRN) and propose any other analysis for reduction in records. * New AI – iconectiv to determine what data can be shared with Users in a graphical representation over time * New AI -Tri-Chairs to determine if its acceptable for iconectiv to share with NAPM LLC individual SP behaviors that may be contributing to the increase in size of records in LSMS (PIM 134) * Suggestion was made to ensure that we have a broad representation at the NPIF meetings * Sarah Halko (Telnyx) – Increased volume could be related to need for attestation (STIR/SHAKEN mandate) * New AI – iconectiv to identify service providers that have had large increases of porting activity and reach-out to them to get their participation the NPIF meetings * Add an agenda item to discuss the possibility for SPs to provide forecast data to the LNPA   03/02/2021 NPIF Meeting   * There were no updates to the PIM * Steve K. (iconectiv) reviewed the audit data in response to AI 02092021-05 which was related to this PIM * 17.4M duplicate records across all 7 regions representing 4% of all SVs * 370 distinct SPIDS across all 7 regions * Below is the audit results document presented at the March 2, 2021 meeting      * Deb T. (VZ) – How recently were these duplicate records created? * Steve K. (iconectiv) – Don’t have exact details but in general there is a non-trivial amount that has been in the system for many years. The majority are from the last several years * Doug B. (iconectiv) – Are there next steps related to this data. * Michael D. (iconectiv) - Outreach efforts with SPs will include discussion on the duplicate records   04/06/2021 NPIF   * AI - 02092021-06 – iconectiv in discussion w the NAPM looked at the existing reports. There is an existing capacity report located on the portal in the Knowledge Base – Search Capacity Report. Excel file that covers 24 months historical based on averages broken out by LRN.   + This AI is now Closed * 03022021-01 - SPs to come prepared to discuss forecasting at the next meeting * Frank Schmidt (iconectiv) – reviewed a PowerPoint on Forecasting   + This AI is now closed * 02092021-08– iconectiv to identify service providers that have had large increases of porting activity and reach-out to them to get their participation the NPIF meetings * iconectiv completed the Outreach effort by contacting and discussing porting increases, duplicate records and NPIF participation   + This AI is now Closed   05/04/2021 NPIF   * Duplicate record cleanup – Next steps * Joy McConnell Couch (Lumen) - Lumen is looking at BP 057 and potential updates to the document. Should have some proposed updates for the June NPIF meeting   07/06/2021 NPIF   * Joy McConnell-Couch – GUST continues to discuss forecasting and cleanup of duplicate records * Will we need to look at this differently for the long term * New Action Item - iconectiv to review large port projects and provide feedback on reasons and duration * Renee D. (ATT) – Given designs for network routing there are secondary reasons why SPs use the NPAC (Network Routing/Planning, etc.) porting * Steve K. (iconectiv) – It would be helpful if the SPs would share additional information that the LNPA * Steve B. (Oracle) – The key is how long will this increase last? * Steve K. (iconectiv) – iconectiv would need to obtain that information from the SPs to make any short term forecast worthwhile. * Randee R. (Comcast) - Can the tool/portal be updated to show if large port activity is part of a large project? * Cheryl F. (Inteliquent) – Modifying the portal would make it easier for providers to notify the LNPA of large projects   08/03/2021 NPIF   * Steve K. – Duplicate/Redundant records were reduced by ~700K due to a cleanup effort by an SP * This is still being worked at the GUST   10/04/2021 NPIF   * Lumen reviewed updates to the PIM * No objections to the Suggested Resolution * CMA to post updated PIM to website * Draft BP – LSMS Record Management was reviewed * Acceptance discussion of draft BP will wait until the November NPIF meeting to give SPs more time to review   11/02/2021 NPIF   * Lumen reviewed the draft BP - LSMS Record Management. It was accepted and assigned #077 * For additional information about BP 077 refer to the Best Practice itself located on the NPIF website   12/07/2021 NPIF   * Joy McConnell-Couch (Lumen) presented the proposed Final Resolution for this PIM. * Resolution was accepted and this PIM is now closed * BP 057 updates were reviewed and accepted * BP 077 was reviewed, accepted at the November NPIF meeting and posted to the website * CMA to post the updated PIM and BPs to website | **Suggested Resolution** :  iconectiv should publish a monthly long-term forecast of at least 12 months of LNP ported record growth by region based on both historical trends as well as known carrier driven porting projects.  In addition, regular audits should be performed by iconectiv to identify possible unnecessary records to be removed such that unnecessary capacity is not being consumed across all of industry’s LNP platforms.  The audit by iconectiv of carrier porting records would identify by SPID records that may be unnecessary and subject to deletion, which would free up record space on each industry LSMS. Specifically, ported TNs within an NPA-NXX-X where the valid LRN of the NPA-NXX-X is the same as the valid LRN for the ported TN should be identified in the audit as redundant records and sent as a report to each carrier encouraging them to initiate a cleanup effort. An overall report should also be made available to all of industry  **Final Resolution:**  This PIM resulted in the creation of a new Best Practice (BP 077) which provides recommendations for LSMS Record Management. In addition, changes to existing BP 057 – Impact of breaking pooled blocks into individual SVs, were made. Refer to these Best Practices for additional detail. | NPIF | 12/07/21 | Closed |
| [PIM 133](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6802/PIM_133_-_NPAC_Data_Population_for_Fraud_Identification.docx) | 8/11/20 | 10X People | NPAC Data Population for Fraud Identification - Use of NPAC Data for preventing financial fraud is difficult due to missing or potentially inaccurate data. When numbers are given to Virtual Network Operators, it is difficult to find the service provider who is contracted with the customer and the length of that relationship. Similarly, SV Type may not accurately reflect the Line Type.  8/11/2020 LNP Informal Meeting   * Reviewed draft PIM * PIM was accepted and assigned #133   12/8/2020 NPIF Meeting   * PIM 133 – NPAC Data Population for Fraud Identification v2 * Lisa Marie Maxson reviewed this PIM * Suggestion was made to update or create a new Best Practice to populate the SV Type field in the NPAC * ATT and Verizon would not be supportive of going back and manually updating this data in for their lines in the NPAC. * ATT stated that the level of accuracy would be low because there are so many ported numbers in the NPAC that do not have this field populated. * Leave this PIM open with possibility of drafting a BP for population of this data.   1/5/2021 NPIF Meeting   * PIM 133 BP proposal * 10x People reviewed the draft of a new Best Practice to populate the SV Alt SPID and Line Type fields in the NPAC * Should add LastAltSPID to the BP * New AI – 10x People to update the proposed BP with references to BP 043 and NANC 438 * New AI – Industry participants to review NANC 438 and BP 43 to familiarize themselves with the use of AltSPID and LastAlt SPID * AT&T wanted to clarify that this was a recommendation to populate this data and not a mandate to go back and populate those fields for all SVs * The BP was not officially accepted yet but will remain on the agenda for future meeting discussions * PIM 133 will also remain open for further discussion   2/09/2021 NPIF Meeting   * AT&T and VZ have some concerns about supporting the BP in its current version * Sara Cleland (ATL) – had a question about the use of Alt SPID. Any Alt SPID information would be provided by the New SP ID (Network Provider) * Kim Isaacs (Allstream) – How will this help prevent fraud? * Lisa Marie Maxson (10x People) – If it’s not utilized by the Industry at large, then the value is less. * Cathy McMahon (iconectiv) shared some details about PortData Validate. The intention of PortData Validate is an ancillary service to support Industries (like financial) that utilize the TN as an ID. Where there is recent porting activity, it could indicate there is potential fraud. These fields provide additional detail about the account and could identify a higher risk for fraud. * Renee Dillon (AT&T) – since the fields are optional, the data is not consistent. * Vince Hamrick (Oracle) – If this data was accurate, it could benefit providers. * iconectiv – Even some data is useful. It doesn’t have to be “all in” to be useful * ATT – Many resellers don’t have SPIDs. Suggested to add information to BP 043 regarding the SV Type to urge companies to populate the information properly. * New AI – 10x to draft wording updates to the existing BP (043) to address the use of these fields * New AI – investigate if there are any existing BPs related to SV Type * iconectiv – It might be beneficial to clarify in a BP the proper use of these fields     04/06/2021   * 10X People reviewed the updates to this PIM * 02092021-01 – 10X People to update BP 043 * No additional updates except to add the LastAltSPID * Deb Tucker (Verizon) – Not sure how SV Type can be determined for wireline and enterprise wireline port ins. Not sure how feasible this would be. * New AI – SPs to take back and review updated BP 043 for discussion at next NPIF meeting * New AI – 10X People to update PIM 133 to reflect today’s discussion * CMA to post updated version to website   07/06/2021 NPIF   * Lisa Marie Maxson (10X People) – Updated PIM with draft Final Resolution * There was no objection to the Final Resolution * This PIM is now closed * New PIM was not created because 10X felt the current PIM addressed the issue * Cathy M. (iconectiv) – Thought it would be helpful to create a new PIM to identify how it is currently being utilized * 10X People will open a new PIM to clarify how the fields are being utilized (internal use by SPs) today | **Suggested Resolution**:  Create a new best practice for population of NPAC data for Fraud Prevention that includes:  **•** Populate Alt-SPID with reseller SPID values.  • Population of SV Type when the SV Type is not the same as the Service Provider Type  **Final Resolution:**  Use of alt-SPID, last-alt-SPID fields vary from Service Provider to Service Provider. Some Service Providers do not support or utilize these optional fields. Service Providers that choose to populate the optional fields do so, as needed, to support their own company’s business needs. The business needs or reasons for populating any of these optional fields may vary or be unique to that Service Provider. Due to the different use of the fields, it was determined that no action should be taken.  Service Providers that support SV Type can choose to provide a value to support their own business needs.  SV Type is defaulted to the Service Provider type if a Service Provider does not support use of this field. This behavior is well documented in the FRS. | NPIF | 07/06/2021 | Closed |
| [PIM 132](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6798/PIM_132_-_Use_of_SP_Name_for_Identification.docx) | 8/11/20 | iconectiv | Use of SP Name for Identification - SPID Naming Standards adopted in PIM 117 need further updating to reflect another scenario  8/11/2020 LNP Informal Meeting   * Reviewed draft PIM * PIM was accepted and assigned #132   12/8/2020 NPIF Meeting  iconectiv gave an update on the status of this PIM   * Notification was sent out and SPIDS were updated to follow the standard * There were no issues associated with these updates * Consensus was reached on Final Resolution * CMA to add Final Resolution to PIM Tracking Matrix and post updated PIM to website | **Suggested Resolution:**  Industry should select from the following 2 options:  1) Remove all identification of porting agents for Service Providers in the SPID Name data attribute  2) Identify the porting agent for all Service Providers in the SPID Name data attribute  Both these options ensure standard and consistent level of information is provided on behalf of service providers and administration of such is straightforward by the LNPA.  In either option the “SPID Naming Reference” created as per PIM 117 should be updated accordingly.  Noting that in some cases a SPID may have multiple porting agents.  **Final Resolution:**  The “SPID Naming Reference” created as per PIM 117 is updated and posted in the Knowledge Base area of the secure Customer Portal.  Industry Participants were given 30 days after notification (sent 10/8/20) of the forthcoming change to make any necessary internal preparations.  Updates to existing SPID Names in support of the new standard have been implemented in each NPAC region. | NPIF | 12/8/2020 | Closed |
| [PIM 131](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6677/PIM_131_-_N-1_Carrier_Methodology_Modification_v2.docx) | 05/13/20 | iconectiv | N-1 Carrier Methodology Clarification v2 - LNP Best Practice 0004 – N-1 Carrier Methodology addresses the FCC requirement that the “N-1” carrier (2nd to last carrier) should perform the number portability database query. FCC 18-95 eased the Commission’s “N-1” requirement to allow carriers flexibility in conducting number portability database queries to promote NNP (Nationwide Number Portability) and efficient network routing thus changing the process and thereby necessitating an update to Best Practice 0004  05/13/20 LNP Informal Meeting   * Reviewed draft PIM * Agreement reached to work this issue at the APT * PIM was accepted and assigned #131   6/2/20 LNP Informal Meeting   * Draft of proposed changes to BP 0004 – N-1 Carrier Methodology Clarification was reviewed. * Consensus was to resend draft BP to Industry distribution for further consideration. Will be reviewed at next LNP Informal meeting   7/7/2020 APT Meeting   * Michael Doherty walked the group through the updates made to version 3 of the N-1 Best Practice (BP #4) * Deb Tucker requested iconectiv to send out a notification via Cross-Regional distribution informing the industry of the updated best practice. iconectiv agreed to take this back and determine if this notification is appropriate.   7/7/2020 LNP Informal Meeting   * Reviewed and accepted proposed modifications to BP 0004 – N-1 Carrier Methodology Clarification. * Action Item created for iconectiv to send updated BP notification to Industry. * BP was posted to website and Industry Notification sent out 7/22/2020   8/11/2020 LNP Informal Meeting   * Reviewed and accepted proposed Final Resolution. * PIM was closed | **Suggested Resolution:**  LNP Best Practice 0004 – N-1 Carrier Methodology should be updated to match current FCC requirements for number portability database queries.  **Final Resolution:** This PIM resulted in updates, based on FCC 18-95, to BP 004 – N-1 Carrier Methodology Clarification | LNP | 8/11/2020 | Closed |
| [PIM 130](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6605/PIM_130_-_XML_Interface_Enhancements.docx) | 04/07/20 | iconectiv/10x People | XML Interface Enhancement - As of 2020, the XML interface has been in production for several years. Over the past two years, there has been an increase in the number of systems using the XML interface. Through experience of using the interface, both the LNPA and 10x People believe there are areas that can be improved to provide value to the industry.  04/07/20 LNP Informal Meeting   * Reviewed draft PIM * Agreement reached to work this issue at the APT * iconectiv and 10x People to work on details to facilitate future APT discussions * APT discussions will be scheduled once the iconectiv/10X details are available * PIM was accepted and assigned #130   7/7/2020 APT   * Steve Koch walked the group through the updated proposal * There is a need for the vendor community to provide feedback to the proposal. * The APT group requests an action item be opened up to the full LNP Forum: Vendors to review the recovery/suspend functionality for local system proposal and provide feedback at the next APT meeting.   2/09/2021 NPIF Meeting   * iconectiv reviewed this PIM since it is still open * LNPA noted that the XML interface has the ability to inject a higher volume than the CMIP interface * This is more of a rate issue than a capacity issue and may provide an opportunity to take a deeper look at the XML interface. * 10X People suggested bringing back the Slow Horse sub- committee. The use of the NPAC is different than it was 20 years ago and there is a need to revisit the Transaction Per Second limits for LSMS’ * This is somewhat related to the issue being brought by Lumen in the draft PIM * New AI - 10X will work with iconectiv to expand the details in PIM 130 to handle these new issues as it relates to XML interface volumes * New AI - 10X People to work with iconectiv on a new PIM to address the LSMS performance (volume handling)   04/06/2021 NPIF   * Steve Koch (iconectiv) reviewed version 2 of this PIM * Suggested Resolution will be updated to state that these issues will be worked at the APT * 4 suggested resolutions were included in the draft PIM * The APT will start back up   06/08/2021 – 01/11/2022 NPIF   * This PIM continues to be worked at the APT.   10/05/2022 NPIF   * iconectiv will propose language for the remaining item from the APT   11/08/2022 NPIF   * Steve K. (iconectiv) reviewed the proposed Final Resolution for this PIM. Consensus was reached on this Final Resolution * This PIM is now closed | **Suggested Resolution:** As of 2020, the XML interface has been in production for several years. Over the past two years, there has been an increase in the number of systems using the XML interface. Through experience of using the interface, both the LNPA and 10x People believe there are areas that can be improved to provide value to the industry**.**  **Final Resolution:**  After discussions at the APT, several topics were advanced to the NPIF. These resulted in the separate PIMs and Change Orders listed in the “Related Documents” at the end of this PIM. | NPIF | 11/08/2022 | Closed |
| [PIM 129](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6602/PIM_129_-_Large_Port_Notification_v2.docx) | 02/25/20 | iconectiv | Large Port Notification v2 - Existing Best Practice 0069 indicates that users should inform the LNPA of large ports – defined as 25,000 or more TNs affected per hour – in advance of such porting activity, so that all service providers can be informed of the activity. The 25,000 TN threshold would result in 7 TN downloads per second to each LSMS, which is equivalent to the entire required throughput rate of the LSMS interfaces. iconectiv suggests that the 25,000 threshold be revisited.  2/25/20 LNP Informal meeting   * Reviewed draft PIM * PIM as accepted and assigned #129.   4/07/20 LNP Informal Meeting -   * Reviewed Final Resolution. No objections to accepting this resolution * PIM was Closed | **Suggested Resolution:** iconectiv suggests that Best Practice 0069 be revised to lower the existing 25,000 TN/hour threshold for notification.  **Final Resolution**:Best Practice 0069 was revised to indicate a new threshold of 12,500 TN/hour. The revised best practice was posted to numberportability.com, and related user M&Ps were updated to reflect the new threshold. An email notice was sent to the cross-regional distribution list in March 2020 to inform users of the updates.  PIM was Closed | LNPA TOSC | 04/07/20 | Closed |
| [PIM 128](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6603/PIM_128_-_LSMS_Availability_v2.docx) | 02/25/20 | iconectiv | LSMS Availability v2 - The LNPA observes that LSMS operators are performing maintenance tasks outside of the scheduled maintenance windows on Sundays. When LSMS systems are unavailable, it has a detrimental effect on porting activities.  2/25/20 LNP Informal Meeting   * Reviewed draft PIM * Service Providers commented that maintenance should be done during the maintenance window * Consensus reached that the Sunday maintenance window does not need to be revisited. * PIM was accepted and assigned #128   4/07/20 LNP Informal Meeting    Reviewed version 2   * We continue to see the same behavior even after the notification was distributed. * Final Resolution - The LNPA will follow up with users when systems are repeatedly unavailable due to maintenance outside the normal Sunday maintenance window. * The LNPA will remind them of the Best Practice when this occurs * iconectiv will update the PIM with the Final Resolution for review at the next LNP meeting   5/13/20 LNP Informal Meeting  Reviewed version 3 with Final Resolution   * Final Resolution was reviewed and accepted * PIM was Closed * Document will be posted to website | **Suggested Resolution:** Users should review the related best practices and, where possible, adhere to the guidelines they provide.  Discuss if any further clarification should be made to best practices.  The LNPA send a notification to Users reminding them of existing best practices related to the issues described in this PIM.  The LNPA follow up directly with users whose systems are repeatedly unavailable due to maintenance outside of the Sunday maintenance window.  **Final Resolution:** Consensus reached at the February 25-26, 2020, LNP Informal meeting that local systems should adhere, when possible, to the regularly scheduled maintenance window.  LNPA sent notifications to mechanized users in March 2020, reminding them of existing best practices related to availability and scheduled maintenance.  The LNPA has a process in place to send mail to user contacts whenever a local system is taken offline for scheduled maintenance outside of the Sunday maintenance window. | LNP | 5/13/20 | Closed |
| [PIM 127](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6417/PIM_127_-_Billing_ID_and_Alt-Billing_ID_Consistency.doc) | 09/10/19 | iconectiv | Billing ID and Alt-Billing ID Consistency v2 - The Billing ID field for SVs is defined in the FRS as: “For future use. Can be variable 1-4 alphanumeric characters.” The Alt-Billing ID field is defined as a variable 1-4 character string (no limitation on the characters being alphanumeric). It is not clear why these two similar fields have different data definitions.  2/25/2020 LNP Informal Meeting   * The proposed Final Resolution for this PIM was reviewed and accepted * PIM was Closed | **Suggested Resolution:** From a standardization point of view, iconectiv recommends that the Billing ID and Alt-Billing ID fields have a similar data definition. Update the FRS definition of the Alt-Billing ID field definition on SVs and Blocks to identify that it should be limited to alphanumeric characters similar to the definition of the Billing ID field.  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field below. | LNPA TOSC | 2/25/2020 | Closed |
| [PIM 126](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6297/PIM_126_-_XML_Content_Type_m4jo4fq.doc) | 07/09/19 | iconectiv | XML Content Type v2 - The XML Interface Specification (XIS), currently does not specify the Content Type to be used in interface messages except in the message examples. Since multiple Content Types can be used and have been implemented, the XIS should be updated to identify the supported Content Type(s) other than in example messages. This will make the implementation clear to any vendor that wants to build the XML interface in the future.  2/25/2020 LNP Informal Meeting   * The proposed Final Resolution for this PIM was reviewed and accepted * PIM was Closed | **Suggested Resolution:** Update the XIS document to identify the applicable Content Types supported by the current NPAC SMS. Update all message examples for messages sent from the NPAC SMS to local systems using a Content Type of application/xml.  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail, refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field below.  PIM was Closed | LNPA TOSC | 2/25/2020 | Closed |
| [PIM 125](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6298/PIM_125_-_Notification_Suppression_Test_Plan_Integration_Qvha2M6.doc) | 07/09/19 | iconectiv | Notification Suppression Test Plan Integration v2 - Prior to the NPAC Transition, a separate test plan document outside of the Certification and Regression Testing Plan was developed to test Notification Suppression (for XML) in NANC Release 3.4.8, published on August 31, 2015. This test plan should be integrated into the existing Vendor Certification and Regression Test Plan in order to provide a single consolidated Test Plan for NPAC functionality.  2/25/2020 LNP Informal Meeting   * The proposed Final Resolution for this PIM was reviewed and accepted * PIM was Closed | **Suggested Resolution:** Fold the separate Notification Suppression Test Plan into the Vendor Certification and Regression Test Plan. The Notification Suppression Test Plan does not introduce any new Test Cases, rather it identifies a strategy of re-executing around 15 existing Test Cases multiple times using different notification suppression parameters (suppress to self, suppress to delegates and/or grantor, suppress to Other SPID (involved in port), suppress to Other SPID’s delegates) as well as different roles on who submits a request (delegate, grantor, business as usual SPID). Suggestion is to not make this its own chapter in the Vendor Certification and Regression Test Plan (since it is more a strategy for testing and not any new test cases). Suggestion is to make this a new sub-section of Chapter 15, and a note can be added to each identified existing test case that explains it may need to be executed multiple times and points to the new Chapter 15 sub-section**.**  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field below. PIM was Closed | LNPA TOSC | 2/25/2020 | Closed |
| [PIM 124](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6570/PIM_124_-_Multiple_Simultaneous_Requests_v2.doc) | 03/05/19 | iconectiv | Multiple Simultaneous Requests v2 - The LNPA has observed that on several occasions that the current service provider has attempted to modify an active subscription version (SV) by simultaneously submitting both a modify active request and a new LISP activation request. This may result in a rare occurrence of two active SVs for the same telephone number.  5/8/19 LNP TOSC Meeting   * Draft PIM was reviewed, accepted and assigned #124   2/25/2020 LNP Informal Meeting   * The proposed Final Resolution for this PIM was reviewed and accepted * PIM was Closed | **Suggested Resolution:** Inform the Service Providers that the two simultaneous requests are unnecessary and not only increase the workload but could result in an error condition due to the concurrent processing. A best practice could provide the enforcement regarding what is expected for modifying an active subscription version. Also reviewing the current FRS to ensure this situation has the appropriate requirements to take action to prevent the duplicate active SV situation.  **Final Resolution:** After review of the data collected, consensus from the Industry was that a new Best Practice is not warranted. Given the infrequent nature of the race condition and the elapsed time from the last identified case, the recommendation was to close this PIM with no action taken. PIM was Closed | LNPA TOSC | 2/25/2020 | Closed |
| [PIM 123](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/5591/PIM_123_-_Time_Based_Recovery_Limit_v2.doc) | 03/03/19 | iconectiv | Time Based Recovery Limit v2 - iconectiv developed recovery capabilities based on NPAC SMS FRS requirements to allow CMIP-based local systems to recover Subscription Version and Network data elements. During industry discussions, some industry participants expressed a need for additional recovery support beyond the assumed 24 hour period.  3/5/19 – LNPA TOSC Meeting   * Reviewed draft of PIM * PIM was accepted and assigned #123 * Next steps to create NANC TBD with recommended resolution to update the FRS   5/7/19 – LNPA TOSC Meeting   * Draft Change Order – Time Based Recovery Limit was reviewed, accepted and assigned #541   6/2/20 LNP Informal Meeting   * Consensus reached on Final Resolution.   PIM was closed | **Suggested Resolution:** Define the Time Based Recovery process and support timeframes in more detail to remove the ambiguity surrounding the current Time Based Recovery process.  **Final Resolution:**  This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail, refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field below. | LNPA TOSC | 6/2/2020 | Closed |
| [PIM 122](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/5589/PIM_122_-_Retry_Timer_intervals_v2.doc) | 03/05/19 | iconectiv | Retry Timer Intervals v2- The Industry, through a series of discussions (dating back approximately 20+ years), concluded that the appropriate retry and time interval would be 1x15 due to messages not lost on interface so retries are not necessitated. This has been the adopted methodology prior to Transition. Post Transition it was observed that at least one local system is not replicating the NPAC behavior and has chosen to continue to implement the original retry interval of 3x5. This does not take advantage of the reduced messaging.  3/5/19 LNPA TOSC Meeting   * Reviewed Draft PIM * PIM was accepted and assigned #122 * Create a BP for Industry to utilize 1x15 retry timers   5/7/19 – LNPA TOSC Meeting   * Draft Change Order – Retry Time Intervals was reviewed, accepted and assigned #542 * Draft of new Best Practice – Retry Timers Intervals was reviewed * There were no objections to accepting and posting this new BP. It was assigned #074   6/2/20 LNP Informal Meeting   * Consensus reached on Final Resolution.   PIM was closed | **Suggested Resolution:** Align the expected behavior of local systems with regard to retrying requests with the production NPAC SMS.  Two possible approaches include: firstly, draft Best Practice to reinforce the Industry recommended approach; secondly, identify required Test Cases to certify local system behavior.  **Final Resolution:**  This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail, refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field below. | LNPA TOSC | 6/2/2020 | Closed |
| [PIM 121](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/5433/PIM_121_-_SP_Deletion_and_Alt_SPID_and_Last_Alt_SPID_validations_v3.docx) | 09/11/18 | iconectiv | SP Deletion and Alt SPID and Last Alt SPID validations v3- During transition, it became apparent to iconectiv that there were a number of SPIDs in the NPAC database that were no longer in use. iconectiv has carefully planned a clean-up process for obsolete SPIDs. One way that a SPID is designated as obsolete is that the owner of that SPID definitively indicated to iconectiv that it should not be Onboarded to the iconectiv NPAC. The clean-up process has now begun. A user noticed that two of the deleted SPIDs were still indicated in the Last Alt SPID field. One SPID was in 14 records; one SPID was in 1 record.  9/11/18 – LNPA TOSC Meeting   * Draft PIM was reviewed, accepted and assigned #121 * New Action Item - iconectiv to draft a NANC CO to address this PIM   11/6/18 – LNPA TOSC Meeting   * Draft Change Order – SP Deletion Validations for Alt SPID and Last Alt SPID was reviewed, accepted and assigned NANC 535 * Action Item 09072018-02 was Closed   6/2/20 LNP Informal Meeting   * Consensus reached on Final Resolution.   PIM was closed | **Suggested Resolution:** If the current definition of requirements for the Alt SPID and Last Alt SPID fields as well as SPID deletion validations are deemed to be “not clear”, then the TOSC should identify/clarify requirements in a NANC Change Order and schedule the Change Order in a future Industry release.  **Final Resolution:**  This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail, refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field below. | LNPA TOSC | 6/2/2020 | Closed |
| [PIM 120](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/5431/PIM_120_-_altSPIDs_v2.docx) | 09/11/19 | iconectiv | altSPIDs v2 - The Alternate SPID attribute was introduced in NANC 399 in Release 3.3.  The Last Alternate SPID attribute was then added in NANC 438 in Release 3.3.4.  During transition, iconectiv noticed that a number of altSPIDs were not or never used in the NPAC database, not in the altSPID or last altSPID fields on Subscription Versions or NPBs.  iconectiv had solicited Users for their altSPIDs during onboarding. This was done via a separate form to be filled out with their Transition User Agreement (TUA). Because the incumbent did not provide copies of registration forms when service providers requested altSPIDs, iconectiv relied on Users providing feedback. The result was very little feedback from service providers on what altSPIDs they use or requested to be created in the past. After further research, iconectiv noticed that a significant portion of altSPIDs in the regional database are not used/were never used and therefore are candidates to be removed.  9/11/18 LNPA TOSC Meeting   * Draft PIM was reviewed, accepted and assigned #101   10/10/18 – LNPA TOSC Meeting   * Update on cleanup efforts was provided by PE | **Suggested Resolution:** iconectiv will first send a notification to the Cross Regional mailing list. The notification will inform the Service Providers that iconectiv posted a list of unused altSPIDs to the iconectiv Customer Portal.  Service Providers will then have an opportunity to review the listing and, if necessary, provide any feedback within three weeks.  If a Service Provider observes an altSPID that their company previously requested to be created and intended to use, but did not denote this on their Onboarding Form and have not used it in the past (not on any existing NPAC records), the Service Provider should inform iconectiv.  If no feedback is given during those three weeks, the unused altSPIDs will be removed from the NPAC database.  The exact deadline dates will be specified in the notification.  **Final Resolution:** Unused altSPIDs, not present on any Subscription Versions or NPBs, were removed from the NPAC regional databases | LNPA TOSC | 12/31/18 | Closed |
| [PIM 119](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/5429/PIM_119_-_Reference_Data_Updates_for_new_NPA-NXXs_v3.docx) | 09/11/19 | iconectiv | Reference Data Updates for New NPA-NXXs v3 - The NPA-NXX Create will be rejected if the ownership information is not present in the NPAC SMS industry reference data. Service Providers sometimes experience NPA-NXX Create rejections when they attempt to open up the NPA-NXX for portability in the NPAC within industry defined guidelines, but ownership information is not present in the NPAC SMS industry reference data. This causes calls to the help desk and workarounds to get the proper NPA-NXX ownership reference data loaded so the NPA-NXX Create (opens an NPA-NXX for portability) will not fail.  9/11/18 LNPA TOSC Meeting   * Action Item 07102018-02: iconectiv CMA will open a PIM to reconcile the COCAG and FRS requirements regarding adding new codes in the NPAC. * Reviewed draft PIM * PIM was accepted and assigned PIM #119 * New Action Item – iconectiv to create a new NANC CO for this PIM   11/6/19 LNPA TOSC Meeting  Draft Change Order Reference Data Updates for new NPA-NXXs was reviewed accepted and assigned #534.  6/2/20 LNP Informal Meeting   * Consensus reached on Final Resolution. * PIM was closed | **Suggested Resolution:** Align appropriate processes or guidelines so users following such processes/guidelines do not experience issues.  **Final Resolution:**  This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail, refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field below. | LNPA TOSC | 6/2/2020 | Closed |
| [PIM 118](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/5349/PIM_118_-_Not_Onboarding_SPIDs_with_Active_SV_Data_v2.docx) | 07/05/18 | iconectiv | Not Onboarding SPIDs with Active SV Data v2 - During transition, iconectiv was required to outreach to every SPID defined in the NPAC database or assigned to an NPAC user. One discovery was that some SPIDs were either choosing to not onboard or Out of Business. In most cases this was benign with no impact.  However, further investigation led iconectiv to see that some of these SPIDs had Active or Pending SVs, LRNS, NPA-NXXs, or NPA-NXX-Xs in the NPAC regional database.  7/10/19 LNPA TOSC Meting   * Draft PIM was reviewed, accepted and assigned #118 * Create a sub-team to gather more detail on this issue and process from INC. – T. Patton to lead sub-Team. M. Doherty as liaison to INC will be a member of that team. All others interested in being on the sub-team should send an email to T. Patton   NPAC Clean-up Sub-team Update   * The Sub-team (PIM 118) is proposing the following and would like approval from the TOSC during the November meeting.   NOTE: These are all focused on the 202 SPIDs remaining unresolved with some Active Data in NPAC, yet the SPID is either associated with a company that is now Out of Business or has informed the LNPA during transition onboarding they no longer want/use the SPID.   * Allow the LNPA to submit SPID Migrations via an expedited process to re-assign code ownership in the NPAC to match what the NANPA reflects on their Utilized Code Reports (www.nationalnanpa.com/reports/reports\_cocodes.html). Engagement of the impacted companies to follow the normal process is a challenge. * There are around 65 SPIDs covering about 700 NPA-NXX codes for which this step can be taken. The number of actual SPID Migrations would be much less than 700 as some of the correct assignments are for the same Previous Owner-New Owner pair in the same region. * It would still take a multi-month period to fit these Migrations into the weekly rotation. Service Provider requested Migrations would take priority over the cleanup Migrations should regional threshold be reached. * Allow the LNPA to remove LRNs for these SPIDs when no other data exists for that SPID. For some SPIDs this would be the first and only step. For other SPIDs it would be a secondary step conducted after other updates have been made. * Allow the LNPA to submit disconnect requests for the Active SVs which are not in service and have been individually dialed. * Allow the LNPA to submit cancel request for Pending SVs. This is a small set and the SVs have Future Dates. * Allow the LNPA to remove NPA-NXX codes which appear to have been created in NPAC by mistake in the past. These codes are not in the NANPA records. This is a very small set – less than 5. * New Action Item 10102018-02: Service Providers to review the NPAC Cleanup Sub-team proposal from the October 10, 2018 meeting related to out of business entities that no longer want/use SPIDs that have active NPAC data and provide feedback during the November meeting.   7/10/19 LNPA TOSC Meeting   * No objections to completing PIM 118. Final Resolution to be reviewed at next meeting before PIM will be officially closed   9/10/19 LNPA TOSC Meeting   * Final Resoluition for this PIM was reviewed and accepted. * Acion Item 07092019 -05 – Final Resolution on PIM 118 – was closed * PIM was Closed | **Suggested Resolution:** There should be a procedure in place for SPIDs (Not Onboarding or out of business) with Active or Pending SVs, or LRNs, NPA-NXXs, and NPA-NXX-Xs, that includes:  -Releasing TNs that have been held can be snapped back to the Code Holder or Block Holder  -Reassigning numbering resources  to allow the (obsolete) SPID to be properly handled within the NPAC.  The LNPA would like to do an additional outreach via email to the in-business/ reachable SPIDs that choose not to Onboard stating that some action will need to be taken within 30 days. These companies have previously been notified of this situation. This will give these companies another chance to proactively take action. iconectiv suggests these service providers use the available channels (PA, NANPA) to address the NPA-NXX and NPA-NXX-X codes.    The LNPA will work with any company thru the Account Management team to implement changes, such as Disconnects, Cancels, or SPID Migrations, since the company does not have access to the NPAC themselves.  iconectiv will provide a list of impacted obsolete SPIDs (Out of Business and not reachable SPIDs and Not Onboarding) to the NANPA and PA for those groups to complete their defined due diligence.  In separate efforts, both the NANPA and PA do contact iconectiv on an as needed basis to verify NPAC records, which at times result in the removal of NPAC records. This includes using established industry processes, which involve both the NANPA and PA recovering relinquished and/or abandoned number resources.  Although such processes exist it appears there are many resources assigned to Company/SPIDs that iconectiv has determined are currently out of business and have not been determined otherwise by the other Administrators or the previous LNPA.  Going forward the LNPA will attempt to be proactive in identifying companies/SPIDs that have gone out of business to engage in more timely data resolution.  The LNPA would like the LNPA TOSC to provide direction for the LNPA to take actions on the data for the SPIDs that are Out of Business and are not reachable and SPIDs that were reached, but did not onboard (by choice), and have not cooperated in the data cleanup efforts. This cleanup will be done once for the particular group of Not Onboarding or no longer in business SPIDs with Active or Pending SVs.  To support this activity the LNPA TOSC will form a sub-team to focus on this subject to be chaired by Teresa Patton AT&T. That team will be open to participants from the NANPA and PA.  **Final Resolution:** The LNPA Account Management team collected and analyzed the scope of this Active Data: NPA-NXX codes, LRNs, NPA-NXX-X codes, SVs, NPBs.  The TOSC formed a sub-team which has reviewed the original analysis and provided a set of proposals (now closed Action Item 10102018-02) as to how further progress in data cleanup can be achieved. Other numbering administrators (NANPA, PA) have supported the sub-team.  The 150,000 Active or Pending SVs for the SPIDs that did not Onboard to iconectiv or were no longer in business has been reduced, by disconnects causing snapbacks to the correct Code or Block Holder, to 25.5K LSPP/LISP and 60K POOL SVs amounting to a 43% resolution . In addition, 72% of the 220 SPIDs that were OOB/Did Not Onboard that had Active Data have been fully resolved. Additional metrics include a 74% resolution on NPA-NXX codes, decreasing from 876 to 227, a 95% resolution on LRNs, decreasing from 687 to 34, and a 50% resolution on NPA-NXX-Xs, decreasing from 124 to 62.  NANPA and PA will continue their processes and gradual updates are expected to reflect in the NPAC. Once those updates occur action to remove the obsolete SPID will be implemented. The LNPA Account Management team will continue to monitor the Disconnect Pending SVs and once any reach a state where they are cleared up – the Obsolete SPID (Old SPID on the SV) will be removed.  The LNPA Account Management team will also try again with the 1 company that has an Obsolete SPID populated in altSPID fields on many SVs.  The LNPA Account Management team has already put in place a new Form that all NPAC Users can submit to document a change in their situation – such as service shutting down, merger, acquisition, etc. The form can be found on the Customer Portal in the Knowledge Base.  The LNPA will also put in place a regular review of available material to determine/deduce if a User may have gone out of business.  Primary resources are: 499-A Filing, Invoice Status, Porting Status, Rejected Emails, Press Releases. | LNPA TOSC | 9/10/19 | Closed |
| [PIM 117](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/5347/PIM_117_-_SPID_Naming_v3.docx) | 07/05/18 | iconectiv | SPID Naming v3 - One function of the LNPA is to assign SPIDs (NPAC Customer ID) and Names for approved applicants to NPAC. During the transition, iconectiv presented its SPID Naming methodology. No such defined methodology has existed in the past. For future clarification, LNPA TOSC members suggested to have certain specifications regarding the assignment of Names put in place.  The FRS Data Model states that a User must have two things:  1. R4-6 An NPAC Customer ID (4 characters): An alphanumeric code which uniquely identifies an NPAC Customer.  2. R4-8 A NPAC Customer Name (40 characters): A unique NPAC Customer Name (including slash indicator, 38 +2)  7/10/18 LNPA TOSC Meeting   * Draft of PIM – SPID Naming Convention was reviewed, accepted and assigned #117 * New Action Item for iconectiv to develop a naming convention/M&P document that can be posted on the Knowledge Base   8/8/18 LNPA TOSC Meeting   * SPID Naming – a reference aid was posted on the Customer Portal and iconectiv has completed that work. * The Resolution Statement for PIM 117 will be updated. * Best Practices are not necessary. * Final versions of the documents will be available for review at the September meeting.   9/11/18 LNPA TOSC Meeting   * Final Resolution for this PIM was reviewed and accepted. * PIM was Closed | **Suggested Resolution:** A more standard SPID assignment and naming process can be put in place as follows:  - The core portion of any SPID name will be based upon the name of the company that is applying to become an NPAC User or PTRS User. The core portion of the name assigned to an altSPID is based upon the requested name coming from an existing NPAC User.  - Service Provider SPIDs used for porting will be assigned based on the company’s OCN.  - Assignment of the SPID value for PTRS/Non-Carriers and altSPIDs will start with an ‘X’. This includes SPIDs used by Service Providers for non-porting purposes.  - The name for SPIDs requested by Service Providers to use in the altSPID or lastaltSPID attribute on porting requests will be prefixed by “alt\_” for identification purposes.  - VoIP Providers that are categorized in NPAC as PTRS, because they do not obtain number resourcing from NANPA and do not have an OCN, will be assigned a SPID starting with an ‘X’.  - Indication of the Service Bureau providing SOA porting support for a SPID will be included in the name as an abbreviation preceded by a ‘-‘. (See the list below).  - Abbreviations will be used in SP names in order to keep within the 38 available character limit.  - The SP Name is suffixed with the SP Type (/1, /2, /3, /4).  Informational points – these would not become requirements:  - No changes to existing names made (no mass cleanup) unless a future event occurs, such as changes with their Service Bureau.  - The SPID is not embedded in the SP name unless needed for regional uniqueness.  Service Bureau abbreviations – these will change over time:  ATLC – ATL Communications  Bright – Bright  EESP – EESPRO INC  FPC – Fairpoint Communications (Grandfathered)  GVNW – GVNW CONSULTING, INC.  ICORE – ICORE CONSULTING, LLC  IST – Interstate Telecom  NSR – Neustar  NYAB – New York Access Billing  S&A – Strachan and Associates  SVR – Syniverse  TCA – TCA  New Service Bureau abbreviations should be 4 characters or less unless a constraint exists. This allows up to 33 characters for the Service Provider’s actual Name (33 plus a dash plus 4 character SB abbreviation plus 2 character Type suffix, such as /1)  The above information is filed as a reference on the NPAC customer portal Knowledge Base.  **Final Resolution:** The new SPID Naming file has been posted to the iconectiv NPAC Customer Portal under the Knowledge Base. It includes the elements in the Suggested Solution section of this PIM. | LNPA TOSC | 9/11/18 | Closed |
| [PIM 116](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/5345/PIM_116_-_Customer_Types_v3.docx) | 07/05/18 | iconectiv | Customer Types v3 - Over time the Typing of SPIDs was inconsistent manifesting in X SPIDs that were created for use for Associations to receive LSMS downloads.  Previously some of these SPIDs were typed as Wireless or Wireline because the Service Provider requesting the SPID was Wireless and Wireline. As time went on, newer SPIDs were Typed correctly utilizing the Non-Carrier Type with a /3 suffix in their Name.  It would be beneficial to reset the type on Non-Carrier SPIDs to match the other SPIDs that exist with a /3 suffix (type) to allow for proper alignment and consistency going forward.  7/10/18 LNPA TOCS Meeting   * Draft PIM was reviewed * There were no objections to performing this cleanup and the PIM was accepted and assigned PIM #116. * iconectiv will work with carriers on the specific changes   8/8/18 – LNPA TOSC Meeting   * iconectiv followed up with a small group of impacted companies (10 – 12 entities) who had no concerns with the updates for the incorrect customer types. * iconectiv made the changes at the end of July in the NPAC   9/11/18 LNPA TOSC Meeting   * PIM is closed – iconectiv LNPA made changes at the end of July in the NPAC | **Suggested Resolution:** iconectiv to inform the Service Providers that are assigned the SPIDs in question of the upcoming corrections.  Update the impacted SPIDs to be Non-Carrier, which will result in the /3 suffix (type) on their name.  It will allow proper alignment of all Customer Types for SPIDs and will also allow consistency going forward.  **Final Resolution:** The LNPA informed the Service Providers that were assigned the SPIDs in question of the upcoming corrections.  The LNPA updated the impacted SPIDs (described in the problem/issue description above) to be Non-Carrier, which resulted in the change to /3 suffix (type) on their name.  It allowed proper alignment of all Customer Types for SPIDs and will provide consistency going forward | LNPA TOSC | 9/11/18 | Closed |
| [PIM 115](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/5305/PIM_115_-_Audits_with_Activation_Time_Range_v3.docx) | 05/09/18 | iconectiv | Audits with Activation Time Range v3 - iconectiv has observed that Audits created with an Activation Time Range are not executing as expected.  5/9/18 LNPA TOSC Meeting   * PIM draft was reviewed accepted and assigned #115   9/11/18 LNPA TOSC Meeting   * iconectiv to draft a NANC CO to update documentation. Even though the capability isn’t supported. * Action Item - 06052018-10 was closed   11/6/18 – LNPA TOSC Meeting   * Draft NANC CO Audits with Activation Time Range was reviewed, accepted and assigned #533   6/2/20 LNP Informal Meeting   * Consensus reached on Final Resolution. * PIM was closed | **Suggested Resolution:** If the industry requires audits with activation time range, Industry Test Cases for audits using activation time range should be defined and LSMS vendors should be re-certified for this capability. If different behavior for audits with activation time range is needed, then the TOSC should identify/clarify requirements in a NANC Change Order and schedule the Change Order in a future Industry release  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail, refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field below. | LNPA TOSC | 6/2/2020 | Closed |
| [PIM 114](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/5303/PIM_114_-_Mulitple_SVs_for_Same_TN_in_SV_BDD_v2.docx) | 05/09/18 | iconectiv | Multiple SVs for same TN in SV BDD v2 - Based on feedback from SV BDD users in regions where the LNPA has transitioned, there appears to be implementation differences between the Neustar and iconectiv NPAC’s implementation of full SV BDD files.  5/9/18 – LNPA TOSC Meeting   * Draft PIM was reviewed, accepted and assigned #114   6/5/18 – LNPA TOSC Meeting   * This would cause a problem for Synchronoss. * iconectiv agreed to monitor volume of how often this happens and provide a readout at July LNPA mtg. * New Action Item 06052018-09: iconectiv to determine the frequency of multiple SVs appearing for a given TN in the full SV BDD file that are generated on a daily basis by monitoring for a week long period and to provide a readout at the July LNPA TOSC meeting.   7/10/18 LNPA TOSC Meeting  Subsequent to the meeting the following volume was provided by S. Koch:   * Below are the results of the analysis, based on examining the content of the files for 7 days. * Average (mean) number of TNs that have more than one record in a single full SV BDD file: 9 * Range of number of TNs that have more than one record in a single full SV BDD file: 0 to 49 * Median number of TNs that have more than one record in a single full SV BDD file: 7 * In terms of total quantity of SV records in the full SV BDD files, the files range from about 43.7 million to 69.8 million records, depending on region and SPID settings. * New Action Item 07102018-11: iconectiv to investigate if there is a secondary sort that will help providers understand which of the multiple TN records should be used and what would be needed to report this information.   9/11/18 LNPA TOSC Meeting   * Action Item 05092018-01: Service Providers to provide feedback on expectations related to multiple SVs for the same TN appearing in the SV BDD file. Change Order 529 was created and this action item was closed. Deb Tucker sent Change Order 529 to the NAPM LLC so that an SOW could be generated for it. * Action Item 07102018-11: iconectiv LNPA to investigate if there is a secondary sort that will help providers understand which of the multiple TN records should be used and what would be needed to report this information.   + The Sending record occurs first in the file and the active record occurs second.   + Action Item Closed. | **Suggested Resolution:** If the implementation by iconectiv is determined to be an Industry issue to be worked by the LNPA Transition Oversight Subcommittee, then the TOSC should identify/clarify requirements in a NANC Change Order and schedule the Change Order in a future Industry release.  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field below. | LNPA TOSC | 10/28/18 | Closed |
| [PIM 113](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/5301/PIM_113_-_Modify_SV_No_AVC_v2.docx) | 05/09/18 | iconectiv | Modify SV no AVC v2 - SV modify requests on pending SVs that contain a due date that is identical to and does not modify the due date on the SV in the NPAC DB does not send Attribute Value Change (AVC) notifications to the submitting SP SOA. A Service Provider indicated that the Neustar NPAC does generate AVC notifications in these situations.  5/9/18 – LNPA TOSC Meeting   * Draft PIM was reviewed, accepted and assigned #113   6/5/18 LNPA TOSC Meeting   * Draft Change Order (Modify SV no AVC) was reviewed, accepted and assigned #527 * New Action Item 06052018-08: Service Providers and Local Vendors impacted by the Modify SV No AVC Notification issue are to review the changes in the Change Order requirements and verify that the requirements are correct | **Suggested Resolution:** If the implementation by iconectiv is determined to be an Industry issue to be worked by the LNPA Transition Oversight Subcommittee, then the TOSC should identify/clarify requirements in a NANC Change Order and schedule the Change Order in a future Industry release.  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail, refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field below. | LNPA TOSC | 10/28/18 | Closed |
| [PIM 112](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/5285/PIM_112_-_Recovery_and_Roll-up_v3.docx) | 04/24/18 | iconectiv | Recovery and Roll-up v3 - Based on discussions at the April 4, 2018 NANC (LNPA) Transition Oversite Sub-Committee (TOSC) conference call, there is differences in implementation between the Nuestar and iconeciv NPAC concerning rolling-up SV/Block Broadcasts while LSMSs are in recovery.  4/24/18 LNPA TOSC Meeting   * Draft PIM Recovery and Roll up was reviewed, accepted and assigned #112   9/11/18 LNPA TOSC Meeting   * Draft Change Order (Recovery/Roll Up) was reviewed accepted and assigned #531   6/2/20 LNP Informal Meeting   * Consensus reached on Final Resolution. * PIM was closed | **Suggested Resolution:** If the implementation by iconectiv is determined to be an Industry issue to be worked by the LNPA Transition Oversight Subcommittee, then the TOSC should identify/clarify requirements in a NANC Change Order and schedule the Change Order in a future Industry release.  **Final Resolution:**  This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail, refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field below. | LNPA TOSC | 6/2/2020 | Closed |
| [PIM 111](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/5283/PIM_111_-_SIC-SMURF_File_Production_v2.docx) | 04/24/18 | iconectiv | SIC SMURF File Production v2 - During SPID Migration processing, a local system had issues in processing the SPID Migration files produced by the iconectiv NPAC. The SPID Migration only involved NPA-NXXs being migrated and the iconectiv NPAC only produced NPA-NXX SIC-SMURF files for the SPID Migration. Local System expected all SPID Migration Files to be produced, even those that were empty.  4/24/18 LNPA TOSC Meeting   * Draft PIM (SIC SMURF File Production) was introduced to address the handling of zero byte SMURF files. * PIM was reviewed, accepted and assigned #111 * Action Item 04242018-02: Feedback request for Service Providers and Vendors to determine what if any impact there will be if empty files are not received for LRN and –X SPID Migration files. Also, is there value in receiving the files even though the file is empty? Should the LRN and –X be there, even if blank   6/5/18 LNPA TOSC Meeting   * Action Item 04242018-02 - There are no concerns with producing the blank files. * Action Item Closed * Draft Change Order (SIC SMURF File P:roduction) was reviewed accepted and assigned #526 | **Suggested Resolution:** If the industry determines that NPA-NXX, LRN, and NPA-NXX-X SIC-SMURF files should always be produced for a SPID Migration even though one or two of the files may be empty, the NPAC SMS FRS requirements will need to be updated to reflect the required functionality in a new change order and the change order once accepted should be forwarded to the NAPM LLC for the purpose of requesting a Statement of Work (SOW) from iconectiv.  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail, refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field below. | LNPA TOSC | 9/11/18 | Closed |
| [PIM 110](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/5281/PIM_110_-_Implicit_NPAC_SMS_Requirements_v2.docx) | 03/12/18 | iconectiv | Implicit NPAC SMS Requirements v2 - In a typical Software Development process, requirements are explicitly defined and numbered so that such requirements can be developed and fully tested and the traceability to verify that every requirement has been appropriately developed and tested can be tracked. Some NPAC SMS requirements are implicit in that the explicit behavior of the NPAC SMS needs to be inferred from narratives defined in non-FRS NPAC SMS documents, such as in error code descriptions in interface specifications. This can lead to requirement needs not fully being understood and implementation having differences.  4/4/18 LNPA TOSC Meeting   * Draft PIM (Implicit NPAC SMS Requirements) was reviewed, accepted and assigned #110 * Action Item 04042018-01: iconectiv to develop a Change Order to accompany PIM 110. Closed 4/24/18 * Draft Change Order was reviewed, accepted and assigned #523 | **Suggested Resolution:** If it is determined that this is an issue to be worked, a change order for future implementation should be worked that explicitly defines and implements the implicit requirements defined here.  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail, refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field below. | LNPA TOSC | 10/28/18 | Closed |
| [PIM 109](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/5289/PIM_109_-_CMIP_only_Hold_-_Replay_v2.docx) | 03/12/18 | iconectiv | CMIP only Hold-Replay v2 - Based on feedback from current users of the Neustar NPAC, there appears to be a need to utilize Hold – Replay functionality for CMIP mechanized users that is not related to those users transitioning from a CMIP implementation to an XML implementation.  6/5/18 LNPA TOSC Meeting   * Action Item 06052018-12: Service Providers and Local Vendors to provide feedback at the July LNPA TOSC meeting on the use of Hold/Replay for CMIP (PIM 109). Action Item Closed. * L.M. Maxson – Would move to withdraw this PIM (109) * ATT agrees that this PIM should be withdrawn * iconectiv has received no feedback that this is required and would concur * Sprint – Agrees to withdraw the PIM * T-Mobile – Agrees to withdraw the PIM * No providers were opposed to withdrawing PIM 109 * PIM will be withdrawn with no further action required | **Suggested Resolution:** If the implementation by iconectiv is determined to be an Industry issue to be worked by the LNPA Transition Oversight Subcommittee, then the TOSC should identify/clarify requirements in a NANC Change Order and schedule the Change Order in a future Industry release.  **Final Resolution:** After Industry discussion at the LNPA TOSC meetings, it was determined by the Industry that there is no need for this functionality and therefore the PIM was resolved. | LNPA TOSC | 7/10/18 | Withdrawn |
| [PIM 108](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/5287/PIM_108_-_Hold_-_Replay_Long_Duration_v2.docx) | 03/06/18 | iconectiv | Hold – Replay Long Duration v2 - Based on feedback from a current user of the Neustar NPAC, there appears to be implementation differences between the Neustar and iconectiv NPAC’s implementation of the XML Hold/Replay functionality. This functionality can be used when a SOA or LSMS SPID transitions from using a CMIP implementation to using an XML implementation or is initially onboarding to an XML interfacing system.  3/6/18 LNPA TOSC Meeting   * Draft PIM was reviewed, accepted and assigned #108 * New Action Item 03062018-07: iconectiv to explain how inbound processes are being handled while a system is on hold and to provide the behavior of inbound messages in general.   4/24/18 – LNPA TOSC Meeting   * Action Item 03062018-07: iconectiv to explain how inbound processes are being handled while a system is on hold and to provide the behavior of inbound messages in general. Closed – explanation included in PIM 108 | **Suggested Resolution:** If the implementation by iconectiv is determined to be an Industry issue to be worked by the LNPA Transition Oversight Subcommittee, then the TOSC should identify/clarify requirements in a NANC Change Order and schedule the Change Order in a future Industry release.  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field below. | LNPA TOSC | 10/28/18 | Closed |
| [PIM 107](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/5239/PIM_107_-_MUMP_File_Layouts_v2.docx) | 03/06/18 | iconectiv | MUMP File Layouts v2 - An issue was raised in the industry concerning documenting and maintaining the MUMP File spreadsheets. The understanding was that the implementation was vendor specific, and the implementations may be different between the NPAC vendors. The FRS requirements identified a view of the MUMP files and only identified a subset of the fields that can appear in a MUMP File. | **Suggested Resolution:** Industry should consider if there is value in standardizing the MUMP File forms and if so, then the TOSC should identify/clarify requirements in a NANC Change Order and schedule the Change Order in a future Industry release.  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of two NANC Change Orders. For further detail refer to the NANC Change Orders identified in the Related Documents field in the PIM. | LNPA TOSC | 9/11/18 | Closed |
| [PIM 106](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/5241/PIM_106_-_BDD_File_SSN_Field_v2.docx) | 03/06/18 | iconectiv | BDD File SSN Field v2 - iconectiv implemented the BDD files based on the NPAC SMS FRS BDD requirements and examples in Appendix E. During certification and regression testing of the iconectiv NPAC vendors and mechanized service providers, no one identified any issues with iconectiv’s BDD implementation. While onboarding non-mechanized BDD file only users, a small set of users identified issues with the content and format of some fields in the SV BDD file as compared to the incumbent NPAC implementation. This particular issue concerns the content of the SSN field in SV and Number Pool Block BDD files. iconectiv would like clarification on the correct behavior for producing BDD files that contain the SSN fields. | **Suggested Resolution:** If it is determined that this is an issue to be worked, a change order for future implementation should be developed.  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field in the PIM. | LNPA TOSC | 10/28/18 | Closed |
| [PIM 105](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/5199/PIM_105_-_SIC-SMURF_Naming_Convention_v2.docx) | 02/14/18 | iconectiv | SIC SMURF Naming Convention v2 - During iconectiv LNPA transition testing of a local system, issues were discovered that impact the execution and/or verification of an Industry Group Test Case. These issues relate to a nonconformance to Industry Specification(s), an undocumented capability or feature, or a difference of interpretation (between LNPAs) of an Industry Specification. The specific issue herein needing resolution concerns SIC-SMURF (Selection Input Criteria – SPID Migration Update Request Files) naming convention. | **Suggested Resolution:** Local System should identify the impact of functionality not being supported. If the issue is a nonconformance to industry specifications, local system should provide remediation for the nonconformance if impacted. If issue is related to undocumented or misinterpreted functionality that is required by the Industry, the appropriate Industry Specifications will need to be updated to reflect the required functionality and the change order once accepted should be forwarded to the NAPM LLC for the purpose of requesting a Statement of Work (SOW) from iconectiv.  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field in the PIM. | LNPA TOSC | 9/11/18 | Closed |
| [PIM 104](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/5197/PIM_104_-_BDD_File_Compression_v2.docx) | 01/26/18 | iconectiv | BDD File Compression - Based on feedback from current users of the Neustar NPAC and based on iconectiv’s own experience with BDD files from Neustar, it appears as though full BDD files – though not delta BDD files – may be compressed using gzip. It is not clear whether full BDD files are compressed for all Users. iconectiv requests consensus as to whether all full BDD files produced by the iconectiv NPAC for all Users should be in gzip format. | **Suggested Resolution:** LNPA Transition Oversight Subcommittee should determine approach for iconectiv NPAC. Suggest that a change order be created in the future to document the functionality if the approach determined can be made clearer via updates to the industry documentation (e.g., FRS).  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field in the PIM. | LNPA TOSC | 9/11/18 | Closed |
| [PIM 103](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/5129/PIM_103_-_XML_messages_and_Extraneous_SPIDs_1_v2.docx) | 07/11/17 | iconectiv | XML Messages and Extraneous SPIDs v2 -During iconectiv LNPA transition testing of a local system, issues were discovered that impacts the execution and/or verification of an Industry Test Case (ITC) required for certification. These issues relate to a nonconformance to Industry Specification(s), an undocumented capability or feature, or a difference of interpretation (between LNPAs) of an Industry Specification. The specific issue herein needing resolution concerns extraneous SPIDs in XML messages. | **Suggested Resolution:** Local System should identify the impact of functionality not being supported. If not conforming to industry specifications, local system should provide support for the nonconformance. If undocumented or misinterpreted functionality is required by the Industry, the appropriate Industry Specifications will need to be updated to reflect the required functionality and the change order once accepted should be forwarded to the NAPM LLC for the purpose of requesting a Statement of Work (SOW) from iconectiv.  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field in the PIM. | LNPA WG | 6/15/18 | Closed |
| [PIM 102](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6368/PIM_102-Recovery_of_Modified_SVs.doc) | 08/22/17 | iconectiv | Recovery of Modified SVs v2 - During iconectiv LNPA transition testing of a local system, issues were discovered that impacts the execution and/or verification of an Industry Test Case (ITC) required for certification. These issues relate to a nonconformance to Industry Specification(s), an undocumented capability or feature, or a difference of interpretation (between LNPAs) of an Industry Specification. The specific issue herein needing resolution concerns recovery of Active SVs that were modified. The modified SV data recovered was different than the local system was expecting.  Current NPAC SMS Specifications on Recovery of SVs that were modified are not clear on the data that is recovered. Clarity is needed so that CMIP LSMS Users can successfully recover SVs that were modified when the LSMS was down. | **Suggested Resolution:** Local System should identify the impact of functionality not being supported. If the issue is a nonconformance to industry specifications, local system should provide remediation for the nonconformance if impacted. If issue is related to undocumented or misinterpreted functionality that is required by the Industry, the appropriate Industry Specifications will need to be updated to reflect the required functionality and the change order once accepted should be forwarded to the NAPM LLC for the purpose of requesting a Statement of Work (SOW) from iconectiv.  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field in the PIM. | LNPA WG | 6/5/18 | Closed |
| [PIM 101](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6367/PIM_101-LSMS_Query_Response_Attributes.doc) | 08/22/17 | iconectiv | LSMS Query Response Attributes v2 - During iconectiv LNPA transition testing of a local system, issues were discovered that impacts the execution and/or verification of an Industry Test Case (ITC) required for certification. These issues relate to a nonconformance to Industry Specification(s), an undocumented capability or feature, or a difference of interpretation (between LNPAs) of an Industry Specification. The specific issue herein needing resolution concerns the SV Query Response for an Audit. The local system SV Query Response did not match the specifications. | **Suggested Resolution:** Local System should identify the impact of functionality not being supported. If the issue is a nonconformance to industry specifications, local system should provide remediation for the nonconformance if impacted. If issue is related to undocumented or misinterpreted functionality that is required by the Industry, the appropriate Industry Specifications will need to be updated to reflect the required functionality and the change order once accepted should be forwarded to the NAPM LLC for the purpose of requesting a Statement of Work (SOW) from iconectiv.  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field in the PIM. | LNPA WG | 6/5/18 | Closed |
| [PIM 100](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6366/PIM_100-SP_Recovery_Request_RDN.doc) | 08/04/17 | iconectiv | SP Recovery Request RDN v2 - During iconectiv LNPA transition testing of a local system, issues were discovered that impacts the execution and/or verification of an Industry Test Case (ITC) required for certification. These issues relate to a nonconformance to Industry Specification(s), an undocumented capability or feature, or a difference of interpretation (between LNPAs) of an Industry Specification. The specific issue herein needing resolution concerns recovery of Service Provider Relative Distinguished Name (RDN). The RDN did not match specifications. | **Suggested Resolution:** Local System should identify the impact of functionality not being supported. If the issue is a nonconformance to industry specifications, local system should provide remediation for the nonconformance if impacted. If issue is related to undocumented or misinterpreted functionality that is required by the Industry, the appropriate Industry Specifications will need to be updated to reflect the required functionality and the change order once accepted should be forwarded to the NAPM LLC for the purpose of requesting a Statement of Work (SOW) from iconectiv.  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field in the PIM. | LNPA WG | 6/15/18 | Closed |
| [PIM 99](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/4909/PIM_099_-_Diff-SV_Query_Response_RDN_v2.docx) | 08/04/17 | iconectiv | Diff-SV Query Response v2 - During iconectiv LNPA transition testing of a local system, issues were discovered that impacts the execution and/or verification of an Industry Test Case (ITC) required for certification. These issues relate to a nonconformance to Industry Specification(s), an undocumented capability or feature, or a difference of interpretation (between LNPAs) of an Industry Specification. The specific issue herein needing resolution concerns an SV Query Response Relative Distinguished Name (RDN). The RDN did not match specifications. | **Suggested Resolution:** Local System should identify the impact of functionality not being supported. If the issue is a nonconformance to industry specifications, local system should provide remediation for the nonconformance if impacted. If issue is related to undocumented or misinterpreted functionality that is required by the Industry, the appropriate Industry Specifications will need to be updated to reflect the required functionality and the change order once accepted should be forwarded to the NAPM LLC for the purpose of requesting a Statement of Work (SOW) from iconectiv.  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field in the PIM. | LNPA WG | 6/5/18 | Closed |
| [PIM 98](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/4907/PIM_098_-_NPANXX_Delete_Recovery_v2.docx) | 08/04/17 | iconectiv | NPANXX Delete Recovery v2 - During iconectiv LNPA transition testing of a local system, issues were discovered that impacts the execution and/or verification of an Industry Test Case (ITC) required for certification. These issues relate to a nonconformance to Industry Specification(s), an undocumented capability or feature, or a difference of interpretation (between LNPAs) of an Industry Specification. The specific issue herein needing resolution concerns recovery of Network Data delete transactions. The local system expected optional attributes to be present in the recovered data. | **Suggested Resolution:** Local System should identify the impact of functionality not being supported. If the issue is a nonconformance to industry specifications, local system should provide remediation for the nonconformance if impacted. If issue is related to undocumented or misinterpreted functionality that is required by the Industry, the appropriate Industry Specifications will need to be updated to reflect the required functionality and the change order once accepted should be forwarded to the NAPM LLC for the purpose of requesting a Statement of Work (SOW) from iconectiv.  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field in the PIM. | LNPA WG | 6/5/18 | Closed |
| [PIM 97](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/4905/PIM_097_-_ModifyPendingOldSPAuth_v2.docx) | 07/31/17 | iconectiv | Modify Pending Old SP Auth v2 - During iconectiv LNPA transition testing of a local system, issues were discovered that impacts the execution and/or verification of an Industry Test Case (ITC) required for certification. These issues relate to a nonconformance to Industry Specification(s), an undocumented capability or feature, or a difference of interpretation (between LNPAs) of an Industry Specification. The specific issue herein needing resolution concerns Modifying the Old SP Authorization by the Old SP. The local system expected different results than were exhibited. | **Suggested Resolution:** Local System should identify the impact of functionality not being supported. If the issue is a nonconformance to industry specifications, local system should provide remediation for the nonconformance if impacted. If issue is related to undocumented or misinterpreted functionality that is required by the Industry, the appropriate Industry Specifications will need to be updated to reflect the required functionality and the change order once accepted should be forwarded to the NAPM LLC for the purpose of requesting a Statement of Work (SOW) from iconectiv.  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field in the PIM. | LNPA WG | 6/5/18 | Closed |
| [PIM 96](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/4931/PIM_096_-_RecoverySPName_v2.docx) | 07/31/17 | iconectiv | Recovery SP Name v2 - During iconectiv LNPA transition testing of a local system, issues were discovered that impacts the execution and/or verification of an Industry Test Case (ITC) required for certification. These issues relate to a nonconformance to Industry Specification(s), an undocumented capability or feature, or a difference of interpretation (between LNPAs) of an Industry Specification. The specific issue herein needing resolution concerns recovery of Network Data objects. The Local System expected optional attributes in recovery messages. | **Suggested Resolution:** Local System should identify the impact of functionality not being supported. If the issue is a nonconformance to industry specifications, local system should provide remediation for the nonconformance if impacted. If issue is related to undocumented or misinterpreted functionality that is required by the Industry, the appropriate Industry Specifications will need to be updated to reflect the required functionality and the change order once accepted should be forwarded to the NAPM LLC for the purpose of requesting a Statement of Work (SOW) from iconectiv.  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field in the PIM. | LNPA WG | 6/5/18 | Closed |
| [PIM 95](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/4929/PIM_095_-_EffReleaseDateDisc_v2.docx) | 07/11/17 | iconectiv | EffReleaseDateDisc v2 - During iconectiv LNPA transition testing of a local system, issues were discovered that impacts the execution and/or verification of an Industry Test Case (ITC) required for certification. These issues relate to a nonconformance to Industry Specification(s), an undocumented capability or feature, or a difference of interpretation (between LNPAs) of an Industry Specification. The specific issue herein needing resolution concerns Disconnect Requests with Effective Release Date in the Past. Local System expected behavior does not match specifications. | **Suggested Resolution:** Local System should identify the impact of functionality not being supported. If the issue is a nonconformance to industry specifications, local system should provide remediation for the nonconformance if impacted. If issue is related to undocumented or misinterpreted functionality that is required by the Industry, the appropriate Industry Specifications will need to be updated to reflect the required functionality and the change order once accepted should be forwarded to the NAPM LLC for the purpose of requesting a Statement of Work (SOW) from iconectiv.  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field in the PIM. | LNPA WG | 6/5/18 | Closed |
| [PIM 94](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6365/PIM_094-NOT_Filter.doc) | 07/11/17 | iconectiv | NOT Filter v2 - During iconectiv LNPA transition testing of a local system, issues were discovered that impacts the execution and/or verification of an Industry Test Case (ITC) required for certification. These issues relate to a nonconformance to Industry Specification(s), an undocumented capability or feature, or a difference of interpretation (between LNPAs) of an Industry Specification. The specific issue herein needing resolution concerns scoped and filtered queries for SVs including a NOT filter. NOT filters are not required to be supported in the specifications. | **Suggested Resolution:** Local System should identify the impact of functionality not being supported. If the issue is a nonconformance to industry specifications, local system should provide remediation for the nonconformance if impacted. If issue is related to undocumented or misinterpreted functionality that is required by the Industry, the appropriate Industry Specifications will need to be updated to reflect the required functionality and the change order once accepted should be forwarded to the NAPM LLC for the purpose of requesting a Statement of Work (SOW) from iconectiv.  **Final Resolution**: This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field below. | LNPA WG | 6/5/18 | Closed |
| [PIM 93](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/4925/PIM_093_-_PTO_SV_Create_v2.docx) | 07/11/17 | iconectiv | PTO SV Create v2 - During iconectiv LNPA transition testing of a local system, issues were discovered that impacts the execution and/or verification of an Industry Test Case (ITC) required for certification. These issues relate to a nonconformance to Industry Specification(s), an undocumented capability or feature, or a difference of interpretation (between LNPAs) of an Industry Specification. The specific issue herein needing resolution concerns the creation of port-to-original (PTO) SVs. The PTO SV create message did not conform to the specifications. | **Suggested Resolution:**  Local System should identify the impact of functionality not being supported. If not conforming to industry specifications, local system should provide support for the nonconformance. If undocumented or misinterpreted functionality is required by the Industry, the appropriate Industry Specifications will need to be updated to reflect the required functionality and the change order once accepted should be forwarded to the NAPM LLC for the purpose of requesting a Statement of Work (SOW) from iconectiv.  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field in the PIM. | LNPA WG | 6/5/18 | Closed |
| [PIM 92](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6364/PIM_092-SVModXSD.doc) | 07/11/17 | iconectiv | XVMod XSD v2 - During iconectiv LNPA transition testing of a local system, issues were discovered that impacts the execution and/or verification of an Industry Test Case (ITC) required for certification. These issues relate to a nonconformance to Industry Specification(s), an undocumented capability or feature, or a difference of interpretation (between LNPAs) of an Industry Specification. The specific issue herein needing resolution concerns the Optional Data XML string not in certain messages. The XML string does not conform to the XSD specification. | **Suggested Resolution:** Local System should identify the impact of functionality not being supported. If the issue is a nonconformance to industry specifications, local system should provide remediation for the nonconformance if impacted. If issue is related to undocumented or misinterpreted functionality that is required by the Industry, the appropriate Industry Specifications will need to be updated to reflect the required functionality and the change order once accepted should be forwarded to the NAPM LLC for the purpose of requesting a Statement of Work (SOW) from iconectiv.  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field in the PIM. | LNPA WG | 6/5/18 | Closed |
| [PIM 91](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6363/PIM_091-Generalized_Time.doc) | 07/11/17 | iconectiv | Generalized Time v2 - During iconectiv LNPA transition testing of a local system, issues were discovered that impacts the execution and/or verification of an Industry Test Case (ITC) required for certification. These issues relate to a nonconformance to Industry Specification(s), an undocumented capability or feature, or a difference of interpretation (between LNPAs) of an Industry Specification. The specific issue herein needing resolution concerns the Completion Timestamp in the SWIM Processing Results notification. The Completion Timestamp field does not conform to the industry specification. | **Suggested Resolution:** Local System should identify the impact of functionality not being supported. If the issue is a nonconformance to industry specifications, local system should provide remediation for the nonconformance if impacted. If issue is related to undocumented or misinterpreted functionality that is required by the Industry, the appropriate Industry Specifications will need to be updated to reflect the required functionality and the change order once accepted should be forwarded to the NAPM LLC for the purpose of requesting a Statement of Work (SOW) from iconectiv.  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field in the PIM. | LNPA WG | 6/5/18 | Closed |
| [PIM 90](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6362/PIM_090-CMISSync.doc) | 07/11/17 | iconectiv | CMISSync v2 - During iconectiv LNPA transition testing of a local system, issues were discovered that impacts the execution and/or verification of an Industry Test Case (ITC) required for certification. These issues relate to a nonconformance to Industry Specification(s), an undocumented capability or feature, or a difference of interpretation (between LNPAs) of an Industry Specification. The specific issue herein needing resolution the Synchronous field in messages. The Synchronous field does not conform to the industry specification. | **Suggested Resolution:** Local System should identify the impact of functionality not being supported. If the issue is a nonconformance to industry specifications, local system should provide remediation for the nonconformance if impacted. If issue is related to undocumented or misinterpreted functionality that is required by the Industry, the appropriate Industry Specifications will need to be updated to reflect the required functionality and the change order once accepted should be forwarded to the NAPM LLC for the purpose of requesting a Statement of Work (SOW) from iconectiv.  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field in the PIM. | LNPA WG | 6/5/18 | Closed |
| [PIM 89](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6361/PIM_089-UserID.doc) | 07/11/17 | iconectiv | UserID v2 - During iconectiv LNPA transition testing of a local system, issues were discovered that impacts the execution and/or verification of an Industry Test Case (ITC) required for certification. These issues relate to a nonconformance to Industry Specification(s), an undocumented capability or feature, or a difference of interpretation (between LNPAs) of an Industry Specification. The specific issue herein needing resolution concerns the user ID field in the access control structure of messages. The user ID field does not conform to the industry specification. | **Suggested Resolution:** Local System should identify the impact of functionality not being supported. If the issue is a nonconformance to industry specifications, local system should provide remediation for the nonconformance if impacted. If issue is related to undocumented or misinterpreted functionality that is required by the Industry, the appropriate Industry Specifications will need to be updated to reflect the required functionality and the change order once accepted should be forwarded to the NAPM LLC for the purpose of requesting a Statement of Work (SOW) from iconectiv.  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field in the PIM. | LNPA WG | 6/5/18 | Closed |
| [PIM 88](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6618/PIM_088_-_SP_Email_Guidelines_BP_Language_v4docx_rOb7pPc.docx) | 07/12/16 | Sprint, JSI and Verizon | SP Email Guidelines BP Language v3 - Some Service Providers do not have a contact number to assist with porting fallout questions. Instead, the carriers rely on e-mail. There are not any documented guidelines around using email  for porting fallout such as timing of the response and an escalation path if a response is not received via e-mail.  4/7/20 LNP Informal Meeting   * Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:**  Create a best practice for managing email responses, escalation paths and related timeframes.  This includes accurate email addresses (accurate as in destined for personnel who can assist with  LNP order issues) and toll free TNs in TPPs and on websites.  Suggested Best Practice Language 72:  There are some service providers (including resellers) who choose to respond to port out requests  and/or communicate via email. These providers (including resellers) can be small to mid-size  carriers and either wireless or wireline providers.  This best practice is intended to provide guidelines for those service providers (including  resellers) who respond and/or communicate via email.  An email response to port out or supplemental requests must be sent by the Old Service Provider  (OSP) (including resellers) within four (4) business hours of receipt.  The email must include the following:  1. A thorough response to allow the New Service Provider (NSP) to correct any and all  information on the next iteration of the port out request. (Best Practice 39)  2. An escalation point of contact name and number.  Email responses to NSP communications must be sent within four business hours of receipt.  \*\*This Best Practice should also apply to carriers who utilize fax for responding to port out  **Final Resolution**:  This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of Best Practice 072. This BP provides information for managing email responses, escalation paths and related timeframes. This includes accurate email addresses (accurate as in destined for personnel who can assist with LNP order issues) and toll free TNs in TPPs and on websites. | LNPA WG | 9/13/17 | Closed |
| [PIM 87](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6617/PIM_087_-_Donor_Carrier_Edits_to_BP_0004_-_N-1_Carrier_Methodology_v2_P6EbVRN.docx) | 03/30/16 | Bright House Network Information Systems | N-1 Carrier Methodology Clarification v2 - LNPA WG best practices reflect the consensus of the working group regarding the preferred processes for porting. Best Practice 0004, N-1 Carrier Methodology Clarification, was originally submitted by the working group in December 2001. The most current version 5.0 was a result of revisiting the practice in January 2005.  The best practice states that the N-1 carrier is responsible for performing the dip and describes the role of a “donor carrier” in certain situations. To clarify the meaning of this term, the LNPA WG confirms the donor carrier is the A-Block Code Holder designated in the LERG for the NPA-NXX of the called number (default carrier for routing calls based on the NPA-NXX of the called number).  The LNPA WG periodically reviews the Best Practices to determine whether each remains applicable to the current porting environment. Based on these reviews, a practice may be modified or deleted.  Bright House believes BP4 requires additional detail and edits as it relates to donor carrier.  Betty Sanders from Charter introduced the embedded file with proposed revisions to BP4  that was submitted by Bright House.  4/7/20 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:**  Option #1, add language stating the originating carrier is responsible for dip and routing of interLATA calls to EAS codes or entering into an agreement with another entity for dip and routing or upon prior  agreement relying on the donor carrier for dip and routing.  On interLATA calls to EAS codes, the originating carrier is responsible for performing the database dip and  routing the call to the switch serving the terminating carrier  (1) or entering into an agreement with another  entity to perform the dip and routing on its behalf so that the call is not sent to the donor carrier (A code holder and so that the call is not dropped).  (2) Or the originating carrier may…  On interLATA calls to EAS codes where the originating carrier does not support the function to route the  call as a local call to ported numbers via an interLATA LRN, originating carrier and donor carrier will  establish a prior agreement.  (3) The donor carrier in the terminating LATA performs the role of the N-1 carrier (i.e does the database dip and routes the call to the switch serving the ported number). In this instance, the donor carrier will perform the LNP query in the terminating LATA in either that carrier’s donor end office or terminating LATA tandem, whichever terminates trunks from the originating LATA on calls to EAS codes. (Note that the terminating LATA tandem case is only applicable if the donor carrier has a tandem in the terminating LATA, and all switches in the originating LATA that can place local calls to the EAS codes in the terminating LATA have trunking to the tandem in the terminating LATA per mutually accepted interconnect agreements.) The originating carrier is responsible for compensation to the donor carrier for performing the N-1 database dip function.  (1) Added language that is similar to local & toll section of BP4, describing originating carrier as responsible for dip and routing  (2) Added new language, or is responsible for entering into an agreement with 3rd party to dip and routing  (3) Added new language. Will establish an agreement….  Option #2, same as above minus the reference to the donor carrier. Remove the donor carrier concept  from BP4 entirely.  On interLATA calls to EAS codes, the originating carrier is responsible for performing the database dip and routing the call to the switch serving the terminating carrier or entering into an agreement with another entity to perform the dip and routing on its behalf.  N-1 carrier to follow the FCC rules for dip and routing as mentioned in toll section of BP4.  “N-1 carrier is responsible for ensuring that databases are queried, as necessary, to effectuate number portability.  The N-1 carrier can meet this obligation by either querying the number portability database itself or by arranging with another entity to perform database queries on behalf of the N-1 carrier.” (4) Regardless of the status of a carrier’s obligation to provide number portability, all carriers have the duty to route calls to ported numbers. In other words, carriers must ensure that their call routing procedures do not result in dropped calls to ported numbers.  In this regard, the Commission stated clearly:  We emphasize that a carrier operating a non-portability-capable switch must still properly route calls originated by customers served by that switch to ported numbers. When the switch operated by the carrier designated to perform the number portability database query is non-portability-capable, that carrier could NANC – LNPA Working Group Problem/Issue Identification Document PIM 87  Revised 5/3/2016 either send it to a portability-capable switch operated by that carrier to do the database query, or enter  into an arrangement with another carrier to do the query.(5)  (4) New language referencing toll section of BP4, page 7, section 73  (5) New language referencing toll section of BP4, page 10, last cite referencing DA 04-1304  **Final Resolution**:  This PIM resulted in the updating of BP 004 - N-1 Carrier Methodology Clarification | LNPA WG | 9/13/16 | Closed |
| [PIM 86](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6616/PIM_086_-_Process_to_handle_Unauthorized_Ports_v2_HOUXLWm.docx) | 05/12/15 | Bandwidth | Process to handle Unauthorized Ports v2 - Originally submitted as per below, seeking consensus to amend the scope of this PIM to address overall challenges related to claims of an unauthorized port in order  to develop one cohesive PIM and resulting Best Practice (“BP”).  Currently there are a variety of PIMs and BPs covering such things as, (including but not limited to) “Inadvertent Ports”, “Disputed Ports”, Fraudulent VanityNumber Ports”, “Unauthorized Ports”, etc. All of which are in part or wholeaddressed in a variety of PIMs and/or BPs, (including but not limited to, PIM 53, BP  42, and BP 58) which have been developed over a broad time frame. Some of these  areas, definitions, practices, etc., overlap, have opportunities for refinement  especially in light of newer technologies and systems, and/or are scattered across  the various resources. Because of this there is a need to bring together all the  information related to this overall topic/issue in order to replace the existing various  PIMs/BP with one all inclusive updated cohesive PIM/BP.  Original Submission:  In the event of a claim of a disputed port, for any reason, there are:  1. No existing clear guidelines around how providers will work together to research  and resolve the claim of a disputed port.  2. Based on the outcome of the research, there is an opportunity for clearer broad  recommendations around the circumstances under which a number will be  released back to the then losing provider (or “OSP”).  For the purposes of this PIM, the term “disputed” shall mean any port which for  whatever reason resulted in the OSP receiving a report from their customer and/or  end user and/or another service provider that the port-out was in error; this is  regardless if the OSP provided FOC or otherwise was not aware of an issue with the  port prior to its completion.  In the end, although the losing carrier may not necessarily agree with the veracity  of a given port, they should feel confident they verified to the fullest extent possible  and can defend the position of the winning provider (or “NSP”) to their claiming  customer and/or end user.  It should be noted that while pre-FOC validations afford a level of prevention, there  are multiple factors which negate the full utility (including, but not limited, to an  increasing amount of identity theft, and CSR validation which provides an avenue  chance for an individual to learn the account information required to port).  Many providers may not view these instances as immediately impacting to their  customers’ continuity of service at present. However, the FCC’s movement toward  opening numbering authority to non-CLEC/LEC entities creates a forward-looking  reality of an increase in LNP participants that could quickly make the disputed port  landscape more complicated if a best practice does not already exist.  This issue was discussed and accepted at the 07/07/15 LNPA WG meeting. A Subcommittee was formed to work on potential revisions to the dispute resolution process.  4/7/20 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution**: Revisit definitions of various types of disputed ports and consider broadening the definition and scenarios of what constitutes “disputed” and “unauthorized” – i.e. at no time should there be a “slam” allegation; this is meant to be a cooperative cross carrier effort to examine port requests and exchange some information so that each/both can feel satisfied that the situation has been clearly examined and each/both can manage their customer accordingly.  - Define potential specific actions NSP will undertake to verify the authenticity of the disputed port (review and provide LOA, review/request bill copy from their customer/end user, etc.)  - Define a list of specific information which providers MAY potentially be able to exchange and who provides what; such as copy of LOA, exact name on an LOA, copy of recent end user bill, etc., (recognizing that some providers may have legal or other reasons to redact or only provide oral verification of some information) – but the essence is for the NSP to provide the information to the OSP since it is the OSP who has the original information and hence avoid the situation of the  OSP providing it first and the NSP simply agreeing (i.e. similar to the pitfalls present in the current CSR practice).  - An agreed upon time frame for NSP response – i.e. acknowledge inquiry within XX hours, provide agreed upon information such as name on or copy of LOA within XX hours  - An agreed upon time frame for losing provider to respond to whatever comes out of NSP’s response – the OSP who started the inquiry needs to be responsive and engaged, and promptly advise the NSP if there is any reversal of the inquiry so as not to waste the time and efforts of the NSP.  - Resolution/outcome method to close out the inquiry, i.e. OSP agrees/understands position of NSP such that they can manage their customer appropriately (even if they still don’t agree with the port), or, both providers work together to determine best path to return the number back to the OSP.  - Agreed upon point of stalemate (when should the complaining party file request for resolution through FCC/PUC?)  - Are there time bounded considerations to claiming a port is disputed (i.e. must be within XX days of port – current best practice is unbounded)  - For all of the above, consider various customer types and create criteria which may be applicable to such various customer types and how they will be handled.  For example, in the event the port in question involves a wholesale/resale  arrangement what timing considerations apply for both providers, agreement that any LOA being used for verification must be from the end user, reseller relationships do not negate the need for bill copy or other verification methods.  - Providers to establish initial and escalation contact information, maintained by the providers themselves and possibly posted on the LNPA WG website.  - Considerations for special and sensitive cases (an out of service hospital number as a result of a mistaken port).  Example:  - A port is disputed and OSP contacts NSP and provides NSP’s usual porting contacts with the name and other relevant information of the end user disputing the port.  - NSP should respond to OSP within eight (8) business hours with information from the LOA (and if applicable the bill copy) related to the name and other relevant information of the end user who initiated the NSP port.  - If information does not match, NSP will release the number back to the OSP - If information matches, NSP will attempt to contact the end user to verify; OSP will provide bill copy and other supporting documentation to NSP if OSP is still attempting to regain the number in question.  - If NSP does not hear back from their end user within twenty four (24) business hours the number will be released back to the OSP.  - If NSP can verify, the OSP will advise their end user of such verification.  - In the event there is any further dispute or concern with a disputed port, the two providers involved shall work together and escalate to resolve accordingly.  **Final Resolution:**  BP 073 – Unauthorized Port Flow was reviewed and accepted at the 05/2/17 LNPA WG meeting. PIM was Closed | LNPA | 5/2/17 | Closed |
| [PIM 85](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6615/PIM_085_-_Reseller_Validations_v7_B3twU9e.docx) | 04/01/15 | Sprint | Reseller Validations v7 - Consumers are experiencing negative porting experiences as a result of the lack of uniformity and clarity in processes that drives port completion timeframes. We are allowing resellers to validate  on any field at whim and this is causing significant impacts to the porting process. We need uniformity in the resellers porting requirements, we need set guidelines surrounding wireless reseller port out validation requirements and we feel a best practice is the place to start.  This issue was discussed and accepted at the 07/07/15 LNPA WG meeting. Industry continued discussing this PIM and associated Best Practice.  4/7/20 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:**  Create a best practice outlining validation standards for all wireless resellers to follow across the industry. Suggested best practice language is below:  Wireless reseller validation requirements are not consistent across the industry ranging from zero validations to obscure validations such as a customer’s birthdate. The lack of port out validation uniformity confuses service providers as well as end users when the port request is not completed in a timely manner.  To best serve the end user, Sprint recommends the wireless resellers follow the simple port validation guidelines which include validation on one of the following fields:   * TN * Account Number * Zip Code * End User Provided Password/PIN   Sprint supports reseller validations mirror the wireless simple port guidelines to help ensure porting is more consistent across the industry to speed up the porting process for end users.  Recommended Best Practice Language:  Wireless reseller port out validations are not consistent across the industry ranging from zero validations to obscure validations such as a customer’s birthdate. The lack of port out validation uniformity by wireless resellers confuses service providers, as well as end users, when the port  out request is not completed in a timely manner.  It is the position of the LNPA WG that wireless reseller end user validations must be reasonable and should adhere to the wireless simple port validation fields allowed by the FCC. Those four   * fields are: * Ported Telephone Number * Active Account Number * Zip Code * End User Provided Password/PIN (if applicable)   Use of other validations on port out fields delays the port request unnecessarily and causes confusion for end users.  **Final Resolution**:  Consensus was reached on BP 071 – Wireless Reseller Port Out Validation Requirements at the 11/3/15 LNPA WG meeting. PIM was officially closed at the 11/3/15 meeting. | LNPA WG | 11/3/15 | Closed |
| [PIM 84](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6614/PIM_084_-_Reseller_Response_Times_Final_v2_PpkCOzR.docx) | 12/05/14 | Sprint | Reseller Response Times v2 - There is not an industry defined process interval for Wireless to Wireline and Wireless to Wireless reseller ports. Reseller ports are not considered simple ports, they are complex. There is not any documentation to date around expectations of the timing of a port out response when the losing service provider is a reseller. In other words, how long does a reseller have to respond to a wireless port out or an intermodal port out request?  4/7/20 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** Sprint is suggesting a new best practice be created to assist the industry with documented timeframes. We believe reseller ports should remain complex. However, wireless response times should mirror wireless response guidelines.  Suggested Best Practice Verbiage:  Wireless reseller response times are not consistent across the industry ranging from a few hours to greater than 24 hours. This range in response times and the ability to complete a port confuses end users when port  requests take longer than expected. Wireless resellers are reliant on the wireless network provider to receive the port out request from other carriers.  To best serve the end user, it is recommended the wireless network provider provide the request to the wireless reseller as quickly as possible. Once the wireless reseller receives the request, and it is within the  reseller’s business hours, it is the recommendation of the LNPA WG that the reseller respond to the port out request within an average of 2.5 or less mirroring the wireless response times guidelines.  **Final Resolution**: As discussed during the July 2015 LNPA WG meeting there were objections to the 2.5 hours raised by two wireless carriers, and no agreement reached on the porting timeframe for wireless Resellers. PIM 84 was placed in a status of closed with no agreement. Suzanne stated that Sprint is withdrawing PIM 84 and 85, but reserving the right to reopen at a later date if they so choose. | LNPA WG | 7/7/15 | Withdrawn |
| [PIM 83](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6613/PIM_083_-_Periodic_Reporting_of_NPAC_Timers_Bus_Hrs_Bus_Days_v2_U7IA3hE.docx) | 01/06/15 | Neustar | Periodic Reporting of NPAC Timers Bus Hrs Bus Days v2- Initially, a request was made by a number of Service Providers in the LNPA Working Group for Neustar to create a report that reflects all wireless Service Providers that have  Long T1 and T2 Timers set in their NPAC SP Profiles.  At the November 2014 LNPA WG meeting, this PIM 0083 was accepted for further discussion. During the discussion, Service Providers requested that the report be expanded to include additional information as outlined below in Section 2.  4/7/20 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** For the creation of this requested Service Provider Timer Support Indicator Report, Neustar proposes the identical approval process that was taken in 2010 for the creation of the Medium Timers Support Indicator Report, as outlined below:  At the January 2015 LNPA WG meeting:  a. Determine if consensus is reached on the creation of a report, one for each  NPAC Region, to be updated monthly, containing the following (see  embedded example report):  i. Every Service Provider mechanized SOA, LTI, and Help Deskonly SPID listed in numerical order,  ii. The SP Type for each SPID,  iii. The NPAC SP Profile setting for port-in timer value for the  SPID,  iv. The NPAC SP Profile setting for port-out timer value for the  SPID,  v. The NPAC SP Profile setting for Business Hours/Business Days for the SPID,  vi. The NPAC SP Profile setting for Medium Timer Indicator Support for the SPID.  b. If consensus is reached at the LNPA WG for the creation of the report, the LNPA WG Tri-Chairs would then send a request to the NAPM LLC for a Statement of Work (SOW) from Neustar, for possible consideration at the January 2015 NAPM LLC meeting.  c. If approved by the NAPM LLC, as was the case with the Medium Timers Support Indicator Report, the Service Provider Timer Support Indicator Report will be placed and maintained on the NPAC.com secure website in .csv format.  **Final Resolution:**  SOW was approved to create report. PIM was CLOSED. | LNPA WG | 3/4/15 | Closed |
| [PIM 82](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6612/PIM_082_-_JEP_Reject_FOC_v2_5LVUXIb.docx) | 10/30/12 | CenturyLink | JEP Reject FOC v2 - 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.  1/8/13 LNPA WG meeting discussion:  • Discussion among the companies present indicates that this PIM can be a problem, but that the frequency of occurrence is low.  CenturyLink feels that this is a problem, but frequency is low. They feel that all companies should pay attention to jeps.  4/7/20 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **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.  **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. | LNPA WG | 1/8/13 | Closed |
| [PIM 81](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6611/PIM_081_-_Utilizing_Modify_Request_to_move_up_Due_Date_v2_vpf64uO.docx) | 10/16/12 | CenturyLink | It has come to the attention of Providers that a New Provider is using an NPAC modify message to unilaterally move up the port due date once the T1/T2 timers have been stopped due to both matching SV Creates arriving at NPAC. This unilateral acceleration of the Due Date (DD) by the New Provider, when not agreed to via a concurred LSR  Supplement, is service affecting to the end user and goes against industry practice and the intent of the FCC mandated NANC’s LNP Process Flows, Figure 9, Flow A, Step 3 and  Figure 10, Flow AA Step 4, which both state, “No NPAC SV may activate before the SV due date/time.”  This issue was discussed and accepted at the 11/6/12 LNPA WG meeting. A Subcommittee was formed to work the issue.  4/7/20 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** The LNPA WG should clearly state the expectation that all providers follow the intent of the FCC mandated NANC LNP Process Flows. Providers should not look for the absence of defining each and every possible action as a loophole which would allow them to circumvent the correct porting process. The New Provider(s) who are currently performing this inappropriate action should immediately cease doing so and should send a SUPP to the Old Provider should they want to re-negotiate a new due date.  A potential solution could be a NPAC change order made that will put in systemic blocks at NPAC to stop the unilateral “taking” of a port earlier than the mutually agreed upon FOC due date. This would mean any port modifies affecting the timers or the due date at NPAC after the T1/T2 timers have stopped would have to be concurred to by both Providers. There would be a cost to the industry to do this.  Another solution could be for Old Providers to “not” send the matching SV Create or to delay the ‘send’ of the initial matching SV Create to NPAC, which will then allow the T1/T2 timers to run their agreed upon course and will prevent the New Provider from unilaterally moving up a due date unless it is concurred by the Old Provider. This would not be the preferred solution, but may be the only option available to the Old Provider to prevent service impacts on not only the porting end user, but other end users of the Old Provider whose calls to the ported end user’s TN might fail.  **Final Resolution:**  Consensus was reached to make the recommended change to the NANC flows. (AT&T asked to be noted as disagreeing with the changes.)  Changes will be made in the flows and they will be submitted to the NANC for approval and forwarding to the FCC.  Consensus was not reached to extend the definition of Cause Code 51 in the NANC Flows or in Best Practice 61.  PIM was CLOSED. | LNPA WG | 3/5/13 | Closed |
| [PIM 80](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6610/PIM_080_-_Ported-pooled_TNs_w_LRN_in_different_LATA_v2_PIjwT2K.docx) | 10/04/10 | Verizon | Ported-Pooled TNs w LRNs in Different LATA v2 - A significant quantity of ported/pooled NPAC database records currently contain LRNs that are in a different LATA than their associated ported/pooled telephone numbers (TNs).  This is resulting in customer complaints that they are not receiving all of their telephone calls.  11/9/11 LNPA WG - The LNPA WG’s recommendation to the NAPM LLC to request a Statement of Work (SOW) from Neustar for PIM 80 was sent to the NAPM LLC. PIM 80 will remain in a tracking state awaiting implementation of SOW 82.  1/11/12 LNPA WG - “The LNPA WG’s recommendation to the NAPM LLC to request a Statement of Work (SOW) from Neustar for PIM 80 was sent to the NAPM LLC. It was decided to perform the work without an SOW. PIM 80 will remain in a tracking state.”  3/13/12 LNPS WG - March 2012 status: 98% of SVs and 75% of blocks have been completed  7/10/12 LNPA WG - July 2012 status: 27 SVs remain, of which 12 will be taken care of in August. The remaining 15 will likely remain for awhile due to inability to make SP contact. 2 pooled blocks remain and the SP is unable to be contacted.  4/7/20 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** Neustar has previously worked with Service Providers during cleanup efforts related to out-of-LATA LRNs. Verizon requests that the LNPA WG recommend to the NAPM LLC that Neustar be directed to develop a Statement of Work (SOW) in order to begin another cleanup process with involved Service Providers as soon as possible so that these routing issues can be eliminated  **Final Resolution:**  An analysis was performed of SVs with incorrect LATAs and at the 1/11/12 LNPA WG it was decided to perform the cleanup work without an SOW. Neustar completed the removal of the 3,976 SVs and 9 pool blocks in May ’13.  3/7/13 this PIM was CLOSED | LNPA WG | 3/7/13 | Closed |
| [PIM 79](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6609/PIM_079_-_Modifications_to_BP_0036_-_Porting_Obligations_v2_vQJdx4W.docx) | 09/07/10 | Qwest | Modifications to BP 0036 – Porting Obligations v2 –  Item 1.) Url link inside BP36 which says, ““NANC Inter-Service Provider LNP Operational Flows” is broken.  Item 2.) Change title of BP to be “VoIP Porting Obligations  Item 3.) Add some helpful VoIP cites to the BP  9/14/10 LNPA WG – PIM 79 was reviewed and accepted  4/7/20 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:**  Item 1.) The link to the most current NANC LNP Process Flows should be embedded in place of the broken one shown. The good url is:  http://www.npac.com/cmas/documents.shtml#ProcFlows  Item 2.) Change title of BP to be “VoIP Porting Obligations”  Item 3.) Add the following VoIP cites to the Related Regulation /Document Ref section:  FCC 07-188 VoIP LNP Order 1  NANC – LNPA Working Group Problem/Issue Identification DocumentDA 08-1317 (FCC’s Small Entity and VoIP Compliance Guide)  **Final Resolution:**  At the September 2010 LNPA WG meeting, it was agreed to leave the title of Best Practice 36 unchanged. Regarding the attached PIM 79, Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will update the link in Best Practice 36 and send the revised Best Practice to Luke Sessions, T-Mobile, to be uploaded to the LNPA WG Best Practice website. | LNPA WG | 9/14/10 | Closed |
| [PIM 78](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6608/PIM_078_-_Standardized_LSR_for_intermodal_ports_v2_4PeQN18.docx) | 03/05/10 | Sprint and Syniverse | Standardized LSR for intermodal ports v2 - Per LNPA WG Recommendations, carriers will use the “standardized” LSR as developed by OBF for simple wireline-to-wireline and intermodal ports to support 1DP. Small carriers have until Feb. 2, 2011 to adopt 1DP. However, until all ONSP carriers are supporting 1DP and using the OBF standard LSOG for intermodal or wireline ports an NNSP will need to send some carriers the "old" type of LSRs and other carriers the "new standard" LSR. The "standardized" LSR will have only 8 to 14 mandatory fields (pending FCC ruling) and the current mixture of non-standardized LSRs may have many more mandatory and ONSP proprietary fields. Therefore, NNSP carriers supporting 1DP will have to support two types of LSRs during the transition period until Feb. 2, 2011 and track which carrier uses which. Otherwise, they will have to  deal with more fallout caused by sending an incompatible LSR to the ONSP.  This will also affect wireless to wireline ports since wireless carriers use WICIS 4.0 currently and will use WICIS 5.0 (the sunrise date for WICIS 5.0 is June 6 but each carrier may adopt WICIS 5.0 as they deem fit until Feb. 13, 2011 when WICIS 4.0 sunsets and all carriers must be on WICIS 5.0). WICIS 5.0 was adopted for supporting 1DP but until all wireless carriers support 1DP some will still require certain fields to be in an LSR so they can be mapped to a WPR.  However, until the FCC rules on the 8 vs. 14 mandatory fields, and all carriers are supporting 1DP (and have had time to modify their systems), there may be carriers that support medium timers but utilize a prior version of port request (e.g. WICIS 4.0 or prior version of LSOG).  At the May 2010 LNPA WG meeting, it was agreed to place PIM 78 in a Tracking mode awaiting implementation of FCC 09-41.  At the July 2010 LNPA WG meeting, it was agreed to leave PIM 78 open and in a Tracking state awaiting implementation of the final phase of FCC 09-41 on February 2, 2011.  4/7/20 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** The suggested resolution is that NNSP carriers must check whether the ONSP supports medium timers prior to sending a port request. The NNSP must send the appropriate version of the port request based on whether the ONSP supports medium timers through Feb. 2.  This will ensure that NNSP carriers will still be able to port from all ONSP trading partners even if that trading partner is on WICIS 4.0 or WICIS 5.0 or uses LSOG 1Q10, LSOG 1Q09 or any prior version of  LSOG or whether it supports 1DP or not. The alternative to this is either increased fallout due to carriers supporting 1DP sending "new" standard LSRs to carriers that do not support them. This fallout would be more expensive for both ONSP and NNSPs.  **Final Resolution:**  The August 2, 2010 implementation of FCC 09-41, it was agreed to close PIM 78. | LNPA WG | 8/2/10 | Closed |
| [PIM 77](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6607/PIM_077_-_Porting_delays_during_data_validation_stage_v2_aO3crEv.docx) | 05/11/10 | QWest | Porting Delays During Validation Stage v2 - 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.  5/11/10 LNPA WG - PIM 77 was accepted to be worked at the May 2010 LNPA WG meeting  At the July 2010 meeting, Qwest discussed ways to break PIM 77 into separate PIMs  This proposal was accepted by group with no objections.  4/7/20 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **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 OLSPreseller, (be it regarding CSR data retrieval, ONSP system updates for the end user info, or LSR 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.  **Final Resolution:**  PIM 77 was withdrawn by Qwest at the September 2010 LNPA WG meeting. | LNPA WG | 9/14/10 | Withdrawn |
| [PIM 76](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6606/PIM_076_-_SP_System-Process_changes_v4_efoDYOb.docx) | 01/13/10 | AT&T | SP System Process Changes v4 - inadequate notification by service providers when they make changes to their systems or processes that other service providers must use to request a customer service record or to initiate a request to port a telephone number.  1/12/10 LNPA WG – It was agreed that AT&T, will revise the proposed related Best Practice to address the revisions agreed to at the January 12-13, 2010 LNPA WG meeting, e.g., change the proposed 30 day minimum notification to 60 day minimum notification, remove the X-Regional as a means to distribute and leave in “normal notification procedures.”  4/7/20 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** AT&T recommends that the Working Group adopt a Best Practice stating that a 30-60 calendar -day notice should be given before implementing any change that affects the way other companies interface for porting purposes. Suggested wording of the Best Practice entry is included below.  Suggested Best Practice:  When a service provider implements changes to LNP systems or processes that require other service providers to change the way they interface with them, adequate notice should be given. Such changes will  require other service providers to implement changes as well. These changes may involve educating employees or may involve reprogramming of systems.  The LNPA Working Group recommends as a Best Practice that service providers planning to implement changes to their Local Number Portability interface systems or processes give as much lead time as  possible with a minimum of 60- calendar days notice to the industry before implementing those changes. This will allow time for other service providers to make necessary adjustments.  The service provider making changes to their LSR interface systems or processes should make reasonable effort to notify other service providers who port with them.  **Final Resolution:**  BP 064 - Industry Notification of Service Provider LNP System and Process Changes was updated to change the proposed notification interval, reviewed and accepted at the 2/9/10 LNPA WG PIM 076 was CLOSED | LNPA WG | 2/9/10 | Closed |
| [PIM 75](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6515/PIM_075_-_Port_Delays_related_to_PIN_verification_v4.docx) | 09/28/09 | Integra Telecom | Port Delays Related to PIN Verification v4 - The LNPA-WG reached consensus on a best practice related to pass code/PIN verification (Best Practice 60). The best practice states that a provider cannot use a provider assigned pass code/PIN as validation or require the pass code/PIN to obtain a CSR. The new best practice will help in preventing unnecessary delays of porting, whether the delay is intentional or not. However it may leave room for the potential of using pass code/PIN information in a manner in which the industry agrees it was not intended (to delay a port request), and, may not go far enough to resolve the issue that Qwest identified in PIM 72. Integra believes the best practice requires some additional clarity and detail, including that it applies to all ports, not only simple ports.  The following bullets capture the discussion that took place at the January 2010 LNPA WG meeting.  It was agreed to remove “or” before (CPNI) and to spell out CPNI (Customer Proprietary Network Information).  The Co-Chairs then asked for any objections to accepting the proposed Best Practice as revised at the January 12-13, 2010 meeting. Objecting were:  - Windstream  With no other Service Providers in attendance objecting, the Co-Chairs determined that consensus was reached to accept this Best Practice.  It was agreed to take this Best Practice to NANC and request their endorsement for industry implementation immediately.  The group agreed to close PIM 75  6/2/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:**  Revised version 11-24-09  For the LNPA-WG to revise Best Practice #60 so it states:  It is the position of the LNPA WG that only pass codes/PINs requested and assigned by the End User for the purposes of limiting or preventing activity and changes to their account (and not, for example, a password or PIN the end user uses to access their account information on-line or [Customer Proprietary Network Information ((CPNI)]) may be utilized as an End User validation field on an incoming port request by the Old Network Service Provider/Old Local Service Provider. In addition, any service provider assigned pass code/PIN may not be utilized as a requirement in order to obtain a Customer Service Record (CSR). This Best Practice applies to all ports (not just simple ports.)  **Final Resolution:** The LNPA-WG reached consensus on a best practice related to pass code/PIN verification (Best Practice 60). The best practice states that a provider cannot use a provider assigned pass code/PIN as validation or require the pass code/PIN to obtain a CSR. | LNPA WG | 01/12/10 | Closed |
| [PIM 74](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6514/PIM_074_-_ONSP_LSR_response_v4.docx) | 01/13/10 | Syniverse Technologies | ONSP LSR response v4 - The provisioning flows narratives currently state: “ONSP sends FOC confirming Simple Port request to NNSP.” (emphasis added). In addition, FCC 03-284 Footnote 129 states: “ …Firm Order Confirmation refers to the response the old service provider sends to the new service provider upon receiving the new service provider’s request to port a number… ” (emphasis added). Some providers with their own GUIs for LSR submission only place or post their Local Responses (e.g., FOCs, Rejects) on their GUI website for  retrieval by the New Service Provider rather than sending it (e.g. transmitting it via fax or e-mail or some other method). This places a burden on the new service provider to check if the response is posted. Providers have questioned if posting the Response (FOC or Reject) is consistent with “sends”.  1/13/2010 LNP WG meeting  The following bullets capture the discussion that took place at the January 2010 LNPA WG meeting.   * Bob Bruce, Syniverse, presented the attached revised PIM 74 (v2). * E-mail addresses and fax numbers are no longer on the OBF-recommended LSR for Simple Ports. * The group agreed that the intent of this Best Practice is not to force the Old SP to deliver an FOC via fax to the New SP if the Old SP chooses not to support fax transmission for FOCs. It was agreed that at the option of the Old SP, they can send the FOC via e-mail, for example. * A Service Provider stated that they will post on their GUI that if the New SP wants a response sent to them, they must provide their e-mail address on the LSR. This was viewed as acceptable by the group. * The group agreed to add a statement that this Best Practice does not imply that the Old SP has to accept LSRs in a manner that they do not currently support. * At the suggestion of a Service Provider, there were no objections to the addition of “default e-mail address” in the last bullet of the attached. * Regarding the attached PIM 74, Bob Bruce, Syniverse, will revise the proposed related Best Practice to address the revisions agreed to at the January 12-13, 2010 LNPA WG meeting, e.g., change OSP to ONSP and NSP to NNSP, add a statement that this Best Practice does not imply that the ONSP has to accept LSRs in a manner that they do not support, add “default e-mail address” in the last bullet. The revised PIM and Best Practice will be reviewed on the February 9, 2010 LNPA WG conference call. * The group agreed that the responsibility of any errors due to inaccurate or missing e-mail addresses on the LSR is that of the New SP. * The Co-Chairs then asked for any objections to accepting the proposed Best Practice as revised at the January 12-13, 2010 meeting and with the agreements reached by the group and reflected in these minutes. Objecting were:   + One Communications   + Comcast   With no other Service Providers in attendance objecting, the Co-Chairs determined that consensus was reached to accept this Best Practice.   * The Co-Chairs then asked for any objections to closing PIM 74. Objecting were:   + Comcast   With no other Service Providers in attendance objecting, the Co-Chairs determined that consensus was reached to close PIM 74.   * A Service Provider expressed concern related to enforceability of the Best Practice and stated that some providers may go to the expense of implementing the necessary system changes while others may choose not to. It was agreed to take this Best Practice to NANC and request their endorsement for industry implementation by Feb 2, 2011. * Bob Bruce, Syniverse, discussed the revisions to PIM 74 and the associated Best Practice per Action Item 011210-01. * There were no objections to this becoming a Best Practice. * This will become Best Practice 63. It was agreed to close PIM 74 as a result.   6/2/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:**  LNPA Working Group should adopt the following best practice:  The word “Sends” in the porting flows means a valid response to the LSR (FOC, Reject, Jeopardy or other appropriate response) is delivered by the ONSP to the NNSP in much the same way as an LSR is sent from the NSP to the OSP . To ‘send’ in this context does not mean to just post or transmit the response to the O N SP’s GUI as this can cause delay and confusion as the NNSP struggles to know when or if the response is available and to know if subsequent responses have been issued. This delay and confusion is especially impactful during a reduced simple port  interval. By actually sending the response directly to the NNSP, it gives the NNSP an immediate and positive notice of the response.  The LNPA-WG continues to support and encourage the use of automated methods for sending LSR ’ s and FOC ’ s where possible, to reduce the amount of manual interaction necessary for all parties involved. Sending the response to the LSR (FOC, Reject, Jeopardy or other appropriate response to the NNSP ) in one of the following methods, notifies the NNSP of its presence and allows for the maximum processing time possible so the port can complete on time for the end user. This best practice is not meant to imply that the ONSP would need to accept LSRs via a method that they do not support.  Therefore, the LNPA Working Group Best Practice is for an O N SP to do one of the following:   * If XML /EDI/API is used to send the LSR to the O N SP, then the response to the LSR (FOC,Reject, Jeopardy or other appropriate response to the NNSP ) should be sent back to the NNSP via XML /EDI/API. * If a GUI is used to submit the LSR to the O N SP, then the response to the LSR (FOC, Reject, Jeopardy or other appropriate response to the NNSP ) should be sent back to either: the NNSP ’s e-mail address or fax number indicated on the LSR or to a default email address for the N N SP agreed to by the NNSP and ONSP. * A less desirable but acceptable alternative method would be for the ONSP to send a notification that a response has been produced and is now available for review in the GUI by the NNSP. This notification should be sent back to either: the NNSP ’s e-mail address or fax number indicated on the LSR or to a default email address for the NNSP agreed to by the NNSP and ONSP. This email notification should clearly indicate the PON or Order number involved. * If email is used to send the LSR to the O N SP, then the response to the LSR (FOC, Reject, Jeopardy or other appropriate response to the NNSP ) should be sent to either: the N N SP ’s e-mail address or fax number indicated on the LSR , or to a default email address for the NNSP agreed to by the N N SP and ONSP . * If fax is used to deliver the LSR to the O N SP, then the response to the LSR (FOC, Reject, Jeopardy or other appropriate response to the NNSP ) should be sent to either: the NNSP ’s e-mail address or fax number indicated on the LSR or to a default fax number /email address for the NNSP agreed to by the NNSP and ONSP.   **Final Resolution:**  This PIM resulted in the creation of BP 063 - ending of the LSR Response to the New Network Service Provider (NNSP) | LNPA WG | 2/9/10 | Closed |
| [PIM 73](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6513/PIM_073_-_Customer_originated_disconnect_and_associated_port_request_v2.docx) | 09/08/09 | Vonage | Customer originated disconnect and associated port request v2 - Customers porting their telephone number are sometimes unaware that they need not directly request disconnection from their service provider (OSP) and that the port request system undertakes that task for them. When the customer requests disconnection from their existing service provider (OSP) and then shortly thereafter requests the new provider (NSP) port in the same telephone number it is apparent that the customer does not understand the industry guidelines.  9/15/09 LNPA WG meeting  NEW PIM 73 – This PIM, submitted by Vonage, seeks to address instances where the porting customer, unaware that they do not need to and should not do so, requests that their service be disconnected by the Old SP.  During the discussion, Vonage stated that this scenario results in approximately 18% of their fallout. Vonage stated that this is being commented on by them in the FCC 09-41 FNPRM. Vonage was asked if they instruct their customers not to call the Old SP to disconnect their service prior to the port. In response, another provider stated that this proposal could place an unnecessary burden on the Old SP when the customer should be following instructions from New SP not to request a disconnect. Vonage stated that their proposal does not include disconnects for non-payment.  At the conclusion of the discussion, the Co-Chairs requested a show of hands as to which providers objected to accepting the proposed PIM 73. Objecting were:  o Qwest  o Integra  o Townes  o Verizon  o AT&T  o Brighthouse  o Sprint Nextel  o One Communications  o JSI  It was determined that there was no consensus to accept PIM 73 for further discussion.  6/2/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution**: For the LNPA-WG to make a Best Practice and statement that if a port request is made within seven (7) calendar days from the date the customer requested the termination of service, the OSP will reactivate the TN and provide a FOC for that telephone number. Again, this will provide priority to the customer’s latest directive and prevent customers looking to retain their existing telephone number from losing it.  **Final Resolution:**  It was determined that there was no consensus to accept PIM 73 for further discussion | LNPA WG | 9/15/09 | Closed |
| [PIM 72](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6512/PIM_072_-_Port_delay_due_to_Security_Code-PIN_v2.docx) | 07/14/09 | Qwest | Port Delay due to Security Code-PIN v2 - A service provider (OSP) has assigned a security code/password/pin to every one of their end users accounts  and as of 6/1/09 requires that the NLSP/NNSP provide this new security code/password/pin on all CSI request’s and all LSR request’s (not just Simple Ports) to port away an end user from that OSP. Many of the end users desiring to port their numbers are unaware of their security code/password/pin, thus this requirement causes a delay in the porting process and negatively affects the end user.  7/14/09 – LNP WG Meeting  NEW PIM 72 – This PIM, submitted by Qwest, seeks to address the practice of service providers assigning passcodes to their customers’ accounts as a general practice and the impact that practice has on the porting process.    During the discussion of PIM 72, Qwest stated that they are seeking development of a Best Practice that makes it clear that this is an unacceptable practice. Another provider, while offering support for the suggested resolution proposed in PIM 72, recounted their use of an end user opt-in process in the 2002-2003 timeframe and issues encountered with its impact on the porting process. The provider decided to halt the practice after discussions at the LNPA WG. Another provider stated that they do not oppose PIM 72 but did not necessarily agree with its conclusions or suggested resolution.  PIM 72 was accepted at the July 2009 LNPA WG meeting for further discussion. Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will develop a draft Best Practice for review and discussion at the September 2009 LNPA WG meeting.  6/2/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** For the LNPA-WG to make a Best Practice and statement that this specific practice is not acceptable and actually goes against the FCC order, causing an increase in the delay and complexity of porting for end users who want to change providers. And for the LNPA-WG to then forward the Best Practice to the NANC for endorsement due to the negative impact on the end user.  **Final Resolution:**  This PIM resulted in the creation of Best Practice 060 – Impact to the porting process of SP-assigned pass codes/PINs to End User accounts | LNPA WG | 9/16/09 | Closed |
| [PIM 71](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6511/PIM_071_-_Cancellation_Flow_for_Provisiong_Process_v3.docx) | 04/23/09 | Comcast | Cancellation Flow for Provisioning Process v3 - The 1997 NANC Flows developed the process for LNP to include the service order/subscription cancelation flow (Figured 9). The process allows either the Old Local Service Provider (OLSP) or the New Local Service Provider (NLSP) to cancel the port request. The industry has adopted a practice that when a customer contacts the OLSP for a cancellation of the port request the OLSP refers the customer to the NLSP to initiate the cancelation. This practice has satisfied the industry and should be documented in the NANC flows. Cancellation Flow For Provisioning Process – LNPAWG.ppt\_\_\_\_  5/19/09 LNP WG Meeting  NEW PIM 71 – This PIM, submitted by Comcast, seeks to revise the NANC LNP Provisioning Flows to reflect that only the New SP can initiate a port cancellation in NPAC.    Comcast presented the attached NEW PIM 71. Comcast stated that allowing the Old SP to cancel a port at the request of the end user would give the Old SP a marketing retention opportunity.  Another service provider stated that abiding by the end user’s wishes is in the best interest of consumers and the FCC would likely not want to remove that choice.  Another service provider stated that forcing the customer to go back to New SP is also an opportunity for retention marketing.  Another service provider stated that the customer still has a contract with the New SP even though they have cancelled the port via the Old SP.  AT&T, Verizon, Qwest, Embarq, One Communications, and Verizon Wireless voted against accepting this PIM.  It was determined that there was not consensus to accept this PIM  6/2/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** A sub-committee within the LNPA-WG re-write the NANC narratives and flows Figure 9 to only allow the NLSP to initiate a cancelation to the port.  **Final Resolution:**  It was determined that there was not consensus to accept this PIM. | LNPA WG | 5/19/09 | Closed |
| [PIM 70](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6510/PIM_070_-_Utilizing_WICIS-ICP_standards_for_intermodal_ports_v2.docx) | 11/11/08 | T-Mobile and Sprint | Utilizing WICIS-ICP standards for intermodal ports v2 - After considerable industry discussion regarding intermodal ports, it was proposed that for wireless to wireline ports, the WICIS/ICP standard format would be utilized for the processing of the port requests. In essence, when sending a port request to a wireless carrier, the WICIS/ICP  based format for a port must be sent.  In today’s version of the NANC flows, both slides 1 and 2 indicate the LSR-FOC process should be used for the processing of ALL intermodal ports (both wireless and wireline). This needs to be revisited and updated to reflect the industry decision.  1/7/09 LNPA WG Meeting  NEW PIM 70 – This PIM, submitted by T-Mobile and Sprint Nextel, seeks to modify the NANC LNP Provisioning Flows to add intermodal porting flows that indicate that the Wireless Port Request (WPR) will be used for wireless-to-wireline porting and the wireline Local Service Request (LSR) will be used for wireline-to-wireless porting.    There were no objections to accepting PIM 70 for further discussion. The submitter asked if it is everyone’s understanding that the Old SP’s process and form should be used. Two wireline providers stated that it has been acknowledged to date that an exception exists for intermodal ports in that the LSR/FOC process is to be used in the flows. A number of providers asked for time to review the impacts internally. There were no objections to this request. Wireless carriers in the room stated that they would still accept a WPR via fax or e-mail. Automated carriers would have to purchase the WICIS document from ATIS to fully integrate into the WICIS.  A provider then asked if it was worth the expense of system changes for the number of wireless-to-wireline ports that occur.  Discussion then ensued on the additional required administration fields that are in addition to the 4 end user validation fields mandated by FCC 07-188. Comcast stated that they adhere to the LNPA WG Best Practice 55, which recognizes the need for New Service Provider SPID and Desired Due Date, and further stated that they will not reject an LSR for a missing PON.  Service Providers are to analyze the attached PIM 70 for impact and come to the March 2009 LNPA WG meeting prepared to discuss. Applicable Local System Vendors are to analyze the attached PIM 70 and come to the March 2009 LNPA WG meeting prepared to discuss the timeframe necessary to implement a solution in their systems should the industry decide to move forward with the proposed solution.  NOTE: PIM 70 was subsequently withdrawn by the submitters on the February 10, 2009 LNPA WG conference call. Please refer to the February 10, 2009 LNPA WG conference call minutes for further details.  2/10/09 LNPA WG Meeting  Mohamed Samater, T-Mobile, stated that PIM 70, which proposes that the Wireless Port Request (WPR) be used for wireless-to-wireline ports instead of the wireline Local Service Request (LSR), is being withdrawn in order to allow the industry to concentrate on higher priority issues, such as development of a standard porting form.  6/2/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** Slide 1 of the NANC Flows should show 2 alternative paths for intermodal ports  (1) Wireless to Wireline porting  (2) Wireline to Wireless porting  These paths should reflect the respective formats for which the port requests should be sent.  **Final Resolution:**  PIM 70 was subsequently withdrawn by the submitters on the February 10, 2009 LNPA WG conference call. | LNPA WG | 2/10/09 | Withdrawn |
| [PIM 69](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6509/PIM_069_-_Porting_a_TN_bundled_with_DSL_v2.docx) | 10/15/08 | Vonage | Porting a TN bundled with DSL v2 - The process for porting telephony service when bundled with Digital Subscriber Line (DSL) service in some cases requires the customer to contact the current service provider requesting the DSL be split from the telephony service. Failure by the customer to contact their current provider results in a loss of both telephony and internet services when the gaining carrier is providing telephony via Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP). This differs from the majority of  carriers offering bundled/multiple services who assume the customer did not intend to cancel his or her other services. These providers do not cancel these other services but instead convert them to stand alone products and adjust customer billing accordingly.  11/8/2008 – LNPA WG Meeting  NEW PIM 69 – This PIM, submitted by Vonage, seeks to address issues related to porting numbers that are associated with DSL service in the Old SP’s network.    Vonage explained that when the Old SP disconnects the telephony piece and also disconnects the associated DSL service, and the customer is porting to a VoIP provider, the customer cannot get voice service with the new VoIP provider. Vonage, in their PIM, suggests that the Old SP convert the customer to standalone DSL.  It was stated by a participant that the FCC did not require standalone DSL and that not all carriers offer standalone DSL. Another participant stated that they do not feel that this issue belongs in the LNPA WG because it has to do with how providers offer DSL service and not to do with porting a number.  Several rural ILECs expressed concerns that customers would be unknowingly paying a higher price for their DSL service. Vonage was asked if they are partnering with a network provider that offers DSL service. The questioner stated that they feel that it is the New SP’s (Vonage in this case) responsibility to educate their incoming customer on the need to retain their existing DSL service or obtain it from the new network provider in the port. Vonage was also asked if they port in customers that do not currently have a high-speed internet connection. Vonage responded that they reject the order and instruct the customer to obtain it and to call them back.  It was stated that the issuance of the LSR for porting is being interpreted as a disconnect for other products and services and is this appropriate. It was questioned whether it is appropriate to convert the customer to standalone DSL and have their bill possibly increase for DSL unknowingly.  It was stated that one ILEC accepts a note in the LSR to retain the customer’s DSL service and strips it down to standalone DSL. It was further stated that what the PIM is suggesting is to require providers to provide standalone DSL when the FCC has not ordered it.  Consensus in the room and on the bridge appeared to suggest that the best way to ensure a good customer experience is for the New VoIP SP to instruct the customer to obtain DSL service or to contact the Old SP to retain standalone DSL. This would address the DSL cost issue and the loss of voice service issue.  PIM 69 was not accepted for further discussion.  6/2/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** The problem would be resolved if ALL carriers did not require the customer to contact them during the port out process to request a split of the DSL from the telephony but instead automatically  converted the service to stand alone.  As an example, this is the practice followed by all Cable TV (CATV) providers offering additional services such as telephony and high speed internet  **Final Resolution:**  PIM 69 was not accepted for further discussion. | LNPA WG | 11/8/08 | Closed |
| [PIM 68](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6508/PIM_068_-_LSMS_capacity_issues_related_to_large_quantity_ports_v6.docx) | 08/18/08 | AT&T Mobility | LSMS capacity issues related to large quantity ports v6 - A carrier created a very large quantity of ISP subscription versions (aka TN ports) in their pooled 1K blocks with the same routing information carried at the block level over a short time period, causing a significant increase in ports and leading to a performance and capacity issue for a number of Industry LSMS’s.  9/9/08 LNPA WG Meeting  Renee Dillon, AT&T Mobility, presented the attached version of PIM 68, which seeks to address the recent events that led to a rapid increase in the number of records in the NPAC which exceeded the planned forecasted record exhaust of some carriers.  10/14/2008 LNPA WG meeting  Paula Jordan, LNPA WG Co-Chair, led the group in the discussion of PIM 68, which was introduced by AT&T Mobility. PIM 68 seeks to address the recent events that led to a rapid increase in the number of records in the NPAC, which exceeded the planned forecasted record exhaust of some carriers. The PIM has been revised since it was first introduced at the September 2008 LNPA WG meeting. PIM 68 was accepted by the group.  Discussion then ensued on why providers would port individual TNs out of pooled 1K blocks for migrations. One reason cited is that they have to move customers one at a time for whatever reason. For discussion at the November 2008 LNPA WG meeting, Service Providers are to identify reasons why they may need to intra-SP port individual TNs from within a pooled 1K block during a migration project. Why is it necessary to intra-SP port any TN out of a 1K block? Why is it necessary to intra-SP port all of the pooled numbers within a 1K block? Reasons cited will be used to tee up discussion in order to identify any potential Best Practices on large projects such as technology and network migrations.  2/10/09 – LNPA WG Meeting  The group reviewed that draft proposed Best Practice above addressing breaking out individual SV records from pooled 1K blocks, which is related to PIM 68 submitted by AT&T Mobility.  Some changes were made to the Verizon proposal (captured in the file attached above), after which the proposed Best Practice was accepted by the group.  Refer top November, 2008, January 2009 meeting minutes for additional detail on the discussion of this PIM  6/2/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:**  A) Implementation of the attached NANC Change Order 436 as soon as possible to address the current mismatch of data fields between the pooled 1K block record and the individual SV.  B) Upon implementation of NANC 436, the NPAC Administrator should develop an appropriate X-Regional notice to educate providers on its use and approach providers regarding identifying  opportunities for collapsing individual SVs into pooled 1K blocks where they can.  C) Discussions should be initiated in the LNPA WG to determine and define industry use(s) of the Billing ID, End User Location Value, End User Location Type fields, and the Alt-Billing ID, AltEnd User Location Value, or Alt-End User Location Type parameters.  D) Discussion should be initiated in the LNPA WG to identify best practices in regards to intraservice provider porting Subscription Versions (aka TN’s) within a 1k block.  **Final Resolution:**  This PIM resulted in the creation of Best Practice 057 Impact of breaking pooled blocks into individual SVs | LNPA WG | 2/10/09 | Closed |
| [PIM 67](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6507/PIM_067_-_SMS_issues_are_port_in_v3.docx) | 05/02/08 | Verizon Wireless | SMS issues are port in v3 - The Verizon Wireless Network Repair Bureau (NRB) is experiencing a marked increase in the number of trouble tickets opened for Intercarrier SMS problems related to customers who have Ported In their numbers to Verizon Wireless (VZW). These new VZW customers are unable to  receive text messages from customers of the carrier they left due to the data in the Old Service Provider’s system(s) not being fully deactivated or cleaned-up.  5/6/08 LNPA WG Meetings  PIM 67 – This PIM, submitted by Verizon Wireless, seeks to address instances where newly ported-in customers are unable to receive text messages from customers of the carrier they left due to the data in the Old Service Provider’s system(s) not being fully deactivated or cleaned-up.    Verizon Wireless stated that they are experiencing about 650 to 1000 occurrences per month. PIM 67 was accepted at the May 2008 LNPA WG meeting. Service Providers that support text messaging are to report at the July 2008 LNPA WG meeting on their disconnect process, their escalation process for addressing this problem, and their cleanup process when they receive a trouble ticket.  Action Item 0508-10: Regarding the attached PIM 67, submitted by Verizon Wireless, Service Providers that support text messaging are to report at the July 2008 LNPA WG meeting on their disconnect process, their escalation process for addressing this problem, and their cleanup process when they receive a trouble ticket.  7/15/08 LNPA WG Meeting  Action Item 0708-05: Regarding the attached PIM 67, Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, will develop a proposed NP Best Practice and Resolution statement for review by the LNPA WG  11/11/08 LNPA WG Meeting  Action Item 1108-04: Regarding the attached PIM 67, Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will develop a new Best Practice item based on the Suggested Resolution in PIM 67, and send it to Mohamed Samater, T-Mobile, to be uploaded onto the LNPA WG Best Practice portion of the website.  1/7/09 LNPA WG Meeting  The group reviewed and approved Best Practice Item 56 related to PIM 67 (see attached Best Practice document). Action Item 1108-04 and PIM 67 are closed.  6/2/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** A Best Practice needs to be established that directs Old Service Providers to ensure they are “cleaning” out their service databases associated with MDNs at the same time they are disconnecting ported out numbers from their switches and HLRs. The suggested turnaround time for cleaning out the ancillary systems is 24 hours.  Possible Best Practice verbiage:  Old Service Providers are to ensure that ancillary service databases associated with MDNs that are porting out are cleared for the MDN within 24 hours of the switch/HLR disconnect.  **Final Resolution:**  This PIM resulted in the creation of Best Practice 056 Call Termination issue related to LNPA database update deficiency v2 | LNPA WG | 1/7/09 | Closed |
| [PIM 66](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6506/PIM_066_-_svDonorDisconnect_notifications_v2_olHRDmT.docx) | 08/24/07 | Verisign | svDonorDisconnect Notifications v2 - This PIM, submitted by VeriSign, seeks to address the data that is received when Mass Updates are performed.  10/9/07 LNPA WG Meeting  Chipp Nelson, VeriSign, presented the attached PIM 66 to the group. PIM 66 seeks to address the data that is received when Mass Updates are performed.  For a Mass Modify initiated via the NPAC GUI, VeriSign seeks to receive the data contained in the Modify request in a notification to their SOA.  NeuStar stated that current behavior for Modify requests initiated via a mechanized SOA is to transmit a status change notification back to that SOA that does not contain routing data.  PIM 66 was accepted. VeriSign will work with NeuStar to develop a Change Order for review at the November 2007 meeting.  11/13/07 LNPA WG Meeting  PIM 66 was accepted on the October 2007 LNPA WG conference call. Chipp Nelson, VeriSign, submitted NANC Change Order 426 to address the issue identified in PIM 66.  PIM 66 is now in a Tracking state.  6/2/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution**: Ensure that data is persisted in the Modify requests when NPAC performs Mass Updates.  **Final Resolution:**  This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail, refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field below. | LNPA WG | 11/13/07 | Closed |
| [PIM 65](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6505/PIM_065_-_Modify_Request_Data_for_Mass_Updates_v2_CpDS9Hs.docx) | 08/28/07 | Verisign | Modify Request Data for Mass Updates v2 - This PIM, submitted by VeriSign, proposes a priority scheme in NPAC for the notifications generated by the disconnection of pooled thousands blocks.  9/11/07 LNPA WG Meeting  NEW PIM 65 – This PIM, submitted by VeriSign, proposes a priority scheme in NPAC for the notifications generated by the disconnection of pooled thousands blocks.    PIM 65 was accepted at the September 2007 LNPA WG meeting. It was stated that range notifications could provide some relief. Chipp Nelson, VeriSign, will submit a NANC Change Order (not related to NANC 419) to address the issue identified in PIM 65.  11/13/07 LNPA WG Meeting  PIM 65 was accepted at the September 2007 LNPA WG meeting. Chipp Nelson, VeriSign, submitted NANC Change Order 424 to address the issue identified in PIM 65. PIM 65 is now in a Tracking state.  6/2/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** Modify existing Change order 419 to include disconnect-date notifications generated from Pooled Block  disconnects.  **Final Resolution:**  This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail, refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field below | LNPA WG | 11/13/07 | Closed |
| [PIM 64](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6504/PIM_064_-_Filtering_LTI_transactions_v2.docx) | 08/24/07 | Verisign | Filtering LTI Transactions v2 - This PIM, submitted by VeriSign, proposes a new tunable parameter in NPAC to allow the suppression of LTI-initiated transactions to the mechanized SOAs.  9/11/07 – LNPA WG Meeting  NEW PIM 64 – This PIM, submitted by VeriSign, proposes a new tunable parameter in NPAC to allow the suppression of LTI-initiated transactions to the mechanized SOAs.    PIM 64 was accepted at the September 2007 LNPA WG meeting. Chipp Nelson, VeriSign, will submit a NANC Change Order to address the issue identified in PIM 64.  11/13/07 LNPA WG Meeting  PIM 64 was accepted at the September 2007 LNPA WG meeting. Chipp Nelson, VeriSign, submitted NANC Change Order 423 to address the issue identified in PIM 64. PIM 64 is now in a Tracking state.  6/2/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** Add a tunable parameter to allow the suppression of LTI initiated transactions to the SOAs  **Final Resolution:**  This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail, refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field below | LNPA WG | 11/13/07 | Closed |
| [PIM 63](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6503/PIM_063_-_Minimum_Service_Time_before_port_out_v3.docx) | 08/09/07 | T-Mobile/Verizon Wireless | Minimum Service Time before port out v3 - This PIM, submitted by T-Mobile and Verizon Wireless, seeks a consensus statement/report from the LNPA WG to be presented to the NANC, as well as an industry Best Practice stating that the length of time a customer has service should not dictate if they can port out.  9/11/07 – LNPA WG Meeting  NEW PIM 63 – This PIM, submitted by T-Mobile and Verizon Wireless, seeks to address instances where some carriers are requiring that the customer have service for 30 days before they will approve a port out request.    PIM 63 was accepted at the September 2007 LNPA WG meeting. Paula Jordan, T-Mobile, will revise the PIM to add applicable FCC Order cites. The objective of the submitters of this PIM is to place the issue and its Suggested Resolution in the Best Practices document.  2/5/08 LNPA WG Meeting  The group reviewed new Item 54 in the attached NP Best Practices document related to PIM 63, which was submitted by T-Mobile and Verizon Wireless and addresses instances where some carriers are requiring that the customer have service for 30 days before they will approve a port out request. There were no objections to the wording of Best Practice Item 54 and the group accepted the Best Practice.  PIM 63 is now closed.  6/2/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** A consensus statement/report should be presented at the next NANC Meeting as well as an Industry Best  Practice should be agreed upon that the length of time a customer has service should not dictate if they can  port out.  **Final Resolution:**  This PIM resulted in the creation of Best Practice 063 - Sending of the LSR Response to the New Network Service Provider (NNSP) | LNPA WG | 2/5/08 | Closed |
| [PIM 62](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6502/PIM_062_-_Planned_maintenance_duration_v3.docx) | 07/05/07 | Verizon Wireless | Planned Maintenance Duration v3 - This PIM, submitted by Verizon Wireless, seeks to address the duration of some porting outages due to planned service provider maintenance, and the notification requirements for planned maintenance outages.  9/11/07 LNPA WG Meeting  PIM 62 – This PIM, submitted by Verizon Wireless, seeks to address the duration of some porting outages due to planned service provider maintenance, and the notification requirements for planned maintenance outages.    It was stated that this PIM is not meant to address maintenance during the standard Sunday window. It was agreed to add PIM 62 to the LNPA WG Best Practices document. Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will add PIM 62 and its Suggested Resolution as Item 53. PIM 62 was closed at the September 2007 LNPA WG meeting.  6/2/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** An Industry Best Practice should be agreed upon to limit the length of time for planned service provider  downtime to a maximum of 60 consecutive hours as it relates to Local Number Portability outages.  Additionally, Trading Partners should provide 30 days notice of planned porting outages. If 30 days is not  possible, a minimum of 14 days notice should be provided.  It is recognized that there may be emergency situations that could require outages within the proposed  minimum 14 day planned outage notification window. The Suggested Resolution of PIM 62 is not meant to  prevent any required outages under these extreme emergency conditions.  **Final Resolution:**  This PIM resulted in the creation of Best Practice 053 - Duration of Porting Outages Due to Planned SP Maintenance | LNPA WG | 9/11/07 | Closed |
| [PIM 61](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6501/PIM_061_-_Dial_up_access_to_LTI_v3.docx) | 05/25/07 | South Central Rural Telephone Coop. Corp. Inc., Duo  County Telephone Cooperative Corp., Inc, North Central Rural Telephone Coop., PNG  Telecommunications. | Dial Up Access to LTI v3 - This PIM, submitted by South Central Rural Telephone Coop. Corp. Inc., Duo County Telephone Cooperative Corp., Inc, North Central Rural Telephone Coop., and PNG Telecommunications, seeks to have implemented a VPN access solution for LTI users.  7/10/07 LNPA WG Meeting  • NEW PIM 61 – This PIM, submitted by South Central Rural Telephone Coop. Corp. Inc., Duo County Telephone Cooperative Corp., Inc, North Central Rural Telephone Coop., and PNG Telecommunications, seeks to have implemented a VPN access solution for LTI users.    PIM 61 was teed up by Donnie Bennett from South Central Telephone. It was suggested that another possible solution could be a secured website access over a broadband internet connection. NeuStar stated that it would not be appropriate to put a portion of the network over the vulnerable internet. A VPN access solution requires substantial hardware to support U.S. LTI users. PIM 61 was accepted. There were no objections to making a technical recommendation to the NAPM LLC to request an SOW from NeuStar. Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will:  1. Change the Problem/Issue Statement to read, “Out-dated dialup access to the LTI (Low Tech Interface) producing slow and unreliable compliances with mandated FCC number porting requirements and procedures.  2. Send a recommendation to the NAPM LLC to request an SOW from NeuStar for a VPN access solution for LTI users.  9/11/07 – LNPA WG Meeting  Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, has sent a recommendation to the NAPM LLC to request an SOW from NeuStar for a VPN access solution for LTI users. This recommendation will be discussed at the September 2007 NAPM LLC meeting. PIM 61 is now in a Tracking state.  3/11/08 LNPA WG Meeting  The SOW for VPN access was reviewed and approved at the NAPM LLC’s November 2007 meeting. NeuStar implemented VPN access for LTI users in January 2008. PIM 61 is now Closed.  6/2/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** Internet based VPN solution even if a special VPN client software is required. Possibly a universal VPN option is available today that would continue to work with the ‘Key Fob” provided for secure access.  VPN is considered more reliable in terms of a constant bandwidth and would save the Dial Up  users Long distance charges  **Final Resolution:**  NeuStar implemented VPN access for LTI users in January 2008 | LNPA WG | 3/11/08 | Closed |
| [PIM 60](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6500/PIM_060_-_Location_Portability_v2.docx) | 03/07/07 | Socket Telecom | Location Portability v2 - This PIM, submitted by Socket Telecom, requests that the LNPA WG provide an opinion on whether or not a customer, who is physically relocating to a different Rate Center, should be allowed to port their number.  03/07/2007 LNP WG Meeting  This PIM, submitted by Socket Telecom, requests that the LNPA WG provide an opinion on whether or not a customer, who is physically relocating to a different Rate Center, should be allowed to port their number.    Socket Telecom was present at the March LNPA WG meeting and provided the attached presentation.    Socket Telecom provides voice and data services. Socket wants to port a customer from another provider and add an FX component to the customer’s service. The customer is relocating to a different rate center but wants to keep their number associated with the old rate center. Service Providers are to review the documents internally and come prepared to discuss on the April 10th LNPA WG conference call. (Action Item 0307-18)  05/08/2007 LNP WG Meeting  At the May 2007 LNPA WG meeting, the group reviewed the criteria necessary for this to be considered a legitimate porting scenario. Matt Kohly, Socket, agreed that these bullets were accurate. Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will add, “This customer will be served out of the Socket FX tariff” to Bullet 5 below. These bullets serve as the agreed-upon caveats in order for the LNPA WG to consider the port request outlined in PIM 60 to be a legitimate request.   The Socket customer would like to receive calls to their Willow Springs number(s) at a location of theirs that is physically outside of the Willow Springs Rate Center.   The customer understands that these numbers must continue to be rated as Willow Springs numbers and does not want them to take on the rating characteristics of the Rate Center of their new location.   Socket already serves the Willow Springs Rate Center out of the same switch to which they want to port this customer's Willow Springs number(s).   The Socket switch that already serves the Willow Springs Rate Center has an existing POI at the ILEC's tandem over which calls to Willow Springs-rated numbers are routed. If this customer's Willow Springs number(s) are ported into the Socket switch, they would be routed over the same POI, and then Socket would deliver the calls to the customer's premise that is located outside of the Willow Springs Rate Center.   Socket has a tariffed Foreign Exchange (FX) service that would cover this situation. Calls to and from customers located in the Willow Springs exchange and the customer served by Socket will be routed exactly the same whether Socket assigns the customer a phone number from its 1K block of Willow Springs numbers or whether Socket ports the numbers.   The LSR submitted by Socket reflects the customer’s original service location as recorded by the Old SP.  At the May 2007 LNPA WG meeting, consensus was reached that this is a legitimate port request if each of these caveats outlined above are satisfied.  Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will respond via e-mail to Century Tel’s request to modify the April 2007 meeting minutes to document their objections.    NOTE: This Action Item was completed on 5/14/07. The response to Century Tel indicated that their comments will be documented in the May 2007 LNPA WG minutes since they were discussed during the May 2007 meeting.  07/10/2007 LNP WG Meeting  Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will revise the bullets accepted at the May 2007 LNPA WG meeting, which serve as the LNPA WG’s consensus criteria for the PIM 60 porting scenario to be considered a legitimate scenario in the eyes of the LNPA WG, to read as follows (revisions are in red):  • The customer would like to receive calls to their number(s) at a location of theirs that is physically outside of the Rate Center associated with their number(s).  • The customer understands that these numbers must continue to be rated in accordance with the Rate Center currently associated with their number(s) and does not want them to take on the rating characteristics of the Rate Center of their new location.  • The New Service Provider already serves the Rate Center associated with the customer’s number(s) out of the same switch to which they want to port this customer's number(s).  • The New Service Provider switch that already serves the Rate Center of the customer’s number(s) has an existing POI at the ILEC's tandem over which calls to these numbers are routed. If this customer's number(s) are ported into the New Service Provider switch, they would be routed over the same POI, and then the New Service Provider would deliver the calls to the customer's premise that is located outside of the Rate Center associated with the customer’s Number(s).  • The New Service Provider offers a tariffed and/or publicly published foreign exchange (FX) service in accordance with regulatory requirements that would cover this situation. Calls to and from customers located in the Rate Center associated with these ported numbers and the customer served by the New Service Provider will be routed exactly the same whether the New Service Provider assigns the customer a phone number from its 1K block of numbers in that Rate Center or whether the New Service Provider ports the numbers. This customer will be served out of the New Service Provider’s tariffed and/or publicly published FX service offering in accordance with regulatory requirements.  • The LSR submitted by the New Service Provider reflects the customer’s original service location as recorded by the Old Service Provider.  These revisions will be made in the NP Best Practices document.  Century Tel, Windstream, and South Central objected to the wording of the criteria, stating that they feel that they cover all forms of Virtual NXX and do not include all necessary criteria. Alltel abstained. There were no objections to removing the caps on “Foreign Exchange,” but the acronym “FX” will remain capitalized.  PIM 60 was closed with Century Tel and Windstream objecting to its closure.  6/2/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:**  Socket is not seeking to have this particular dispute resolved by the LNPA working group. Instead, Socket  would like a recommendation from the LNPA working group as to whether the port described above  constitutes geographic or location portability and whether, in the its opinion, a LEC is required to port the  number in the situation described above.  **Final Resolution:** This PIM resulted in updates to BP 050 - Porting in conjunction with Foreign Exchange (FX) Service | LNPA WG | 7/10/2007 | Closed |
| [PIM 59](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6499/PIM_059_-_Unlocking_the_911_record_v2.doc) | 11/09/06 | Neustar | Unlocking the 911 Record v2 - This PIM, submitted by NeuStar Clearinghouse Vendor, addresses issues related to the unlocking of the 911 database when numbers are ported to VoIP providers.  6/12/2007 LNP WG Meeting  The group reviewed and accepted the text for PIM 59 (Item 49 in the NP Best Practices document)  8/11/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution**: It is important for both wireline, wireless and VoIP carriers to work together to resolve this issue. Perhaps the engagement of Mr. Rick Jones or the creation of a task force which can be charged with documenting a  process for this issue.  It is important for all types of participants to be part of this effort as VoIP carriers will have a tremendous  amount to gain from the experience from wireless and wireline carriers which have been dealing with this  issue for years.  **Final Resolution:** This PIM resulted in the creation of BP 0049 - Unlocking of 911 record on ports to VoIP providers which was accepted at the June 12, 2007 LNPA WG meeting | LNPA WG | 6/12/07 | Closed |
| [PIM 58](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6498/PIM_058_-_Inability_to_port_when_NXX_is_not_open_for_portability_in_NPAC_v4.docx) | 10/30/06 | Bellsouth and Verizon | Inability to port when NXX is not open for portability in NPAC v4 - This PIM, submitted by BellSouth and Verizon, seeks to address a process for the legitimate opening of NXX codes to portability in the NPAC when the current codeholder cannot be contacted or refuses to open the code themselves.  11/14/2006 LNP WG Meeting  This PIM, submitted by BellSouth and Verizon, seeks to address instances where the LERG assignee of an NXX code has not opened a code to portability in NPAC, and either cannot be contacted to do so, or refuses to do so.    Ron Steen, BellSouth, and Gary Sacra, Verizon, teed up PIM 58. BellSouth experienced a scenario where a customer wanted to port from a CLEC to BellSouth, but the code was not opened in NPAC. It was marked portable in the LERG. BellSouth experienced trouble contacting the CLEC, as did NeuStar. The CLEC actually had an LRN in that code. When NeuStar finally contacted the CLEC, the CLEC said that they did not want the code opened. The State PSC finally instructed the CLEC to open the code and they eventually did. NeuStar expressed concern about their being expected to determine whether a code should be opened in NPAC’s network data. In the example given by BellSouth, every indication suggested it would be appropriate to open the code, yet the carrier instructed NeuStar not to open the code. NeuStar suggested the appropriate approach in these situations would be to have the state regulator direct NeuStar to open the code (and to indicate what SPID to show as the codeowner). The PIM was accepted for further work.  7/14/2007 LNPA WG Meeting  The following resolution text for PIM 58 was approved for inclusion as BP 45 (Porting prevented when NPA-NXX not open in NPAC) in the LNPA WG’s NP Best Practices document.  There have been instances where the LERG assignee of an NXX code has not opened a code to portability in NPAC, and either cannot be contacted to do so, or refuses to do so.  Individual circumstances may vary depending on the situation. In some cases, the NXX may have been opened for portability in the LERG but not in the NPAC SMS. In other cases, the NXX may not have been opened for portability in the LERG or the NPAC SMS. It may be that if the NSP or the NPAC Administrator contacts the OSP, the situation will be resolved. But in those situations where the OSP can’t be contacted or refuses to cooperate, the following procedure should be followed:  1. The NSP should document attempts to contact the OSP to request that the NXX be opened in the NPAC SMS.  2. If the NSP attempts to make contact are unsuccessful, the NSP should contact the NPAC Administrator. The NPAC Administrator should attempt to contact the OSP to request that the code be opened in the NPAC SMS. Attempts should be documented.  3. If neither the NSP nor the NPAC Administrator can make contact with the OSP or if the OSP refuses to cooperate, the NSP should contact the appropriate regulatory authorities for assistance. The NSP should provide details to the regulatory authority including the Service Provider Identification (SPID) of the OSP who should have opened the code.  4. The regulatory authority may convince the OSP to open the code, or may authorize the NPAC Administrator to open the code to portability in the NPAC SMS. Any such authorization directed to the NPAC Administrator shall include the NSP-provided SPID of the code holder under which the code shall be opened in the NPAC. Upon receipt of such regulatory authorization, the NPAC Administrator shall proceed with opening the code in the NPAC SMS.  5. The OSP should have the LERG updated to show the code as portable if it does not already do so.  PIM 58 was closed at the July 2007 LNPA WG meeting.  8/11/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** Develop a procedure, with appropriate checks and balances, to allow the NPAC Administrator to make an NXX portable when a service provider is unavailable or non-cooperative.  Individual circumstances may vary depending on the situation. In some cases, the NXX may have been opened for portability in the LERG but not in the NPAC SMS. In other cases, the NXX may not have been  opened for portability in the LERG or the NPAC SMS. It may be that if the NSP or the NPAC Administrator contacts the OSP, the situation will be resolved. But in those situations where the OSP can’t  be contacted or refuses to cooperate, the following procedure should be followed:  1. The NSP should document attempts to contact the OSP to request that the NXX be opened in the NPAC  SMS.  2. If the NSP attempts to make contact are unsuccessful, the NSP should contact the NPAC Administrator.  The NPAC Administrator should attempt to contact the OSP to request that the code be opened in the  NPAC SMS. Attempts should be documented.  3. If neither the NSP nor the NPAC Administrator can make contact with the OSP or if the OSP refuses to  cooperate, the NSP should contact the appropriate regulatory authorities for assistance. The NSP should  provide details to the regulatory authority including the Service Provider Identification (SPID) of the  OSP who should have opened the code.  4. The regulatory authority may convince the OSP to open the code, or may authorize the NPAC  Administrator to open the code to portability in the NPAC SMS. Any such authorization directed to the  NPAC Administrator shall include the NSP-provided SPID of the code holder under which the code  shall be opened in the NPAC. Upon receipt of such regulatory authorization, the NPAC Administrator  shall proceed with opening the code in the NPAC SMS.  5. The OSP should have the LERG updated to show the code as portable if it does not already do so.  **Final Resolution:**  This PIM resulted in the addition of language to BP 0045 - Porting prevented when NPA-NXX not open in NPAC. | LNPA WG | 7/14/2007 | Closed |
| [PIM 57](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6497/PIM_057_-_Porting_a_customer_when_a_Provider_discontinues_doing_busines_v4.docx) | 08/14/06 | Cingular and Sprint Nextel | Porting a customer when a Provider discontinues doing business v4 - This PIM, submitted by Cingular and Sprint Nextel, seeks to address issues related to attempting to port a consumer when a Reseller abruptly discontinues business and/or declares bankruptcy.  09/12/2006 LNP WG Meeting  Sue Tiffany, Sprint Nextel, raised an issue related to resellers abruptly going out of business and port requests go unanswered. Sprint Nextel wants to develop a Best Practice for dealing with authorization for the underlying network provider to port customers so they can keep their TN. This issue was accepted as PIM 57. Regarding the attached PIM 57, Service Providers are to determine how they deal with the 3 phases in the Suggested Resolution.  11/14/2006 LNPA WG Meeting  Action Item 0906-17: Regarding the attached PIM 57, Service Providers are to determine how they deal with the 3 phases in the Suggested Resolution.  Cingular attorneys are working on an addendum to a reseller’s contract to have authorization to port their customers who want to if the reseller goes out of business. Embarq abides by what the different states require. Verizon Wireless allows 10 days from the time it is identified that a reseller is going out of business to allow customers to decide what to do – could be lengthened based on volume. If they find out after the reseller goes out of business, customers are immediately disconnected, but Verizon Wireless allows a period of time where the customer can turn up service with a port to another provider or become a Verizon Wireless customer with the same number. Verizon Wireline generates a list of customers and lifts any local PIC freeze and ports the number if the customer wants to, or the customer can opt to become a Verizon customer. In some states Verizon becomes the default provider. Cingular is working on a tool to allow porting of numbers that have been disconnected and are aging. For numbers that have been disconnected and placed back in the assignment pool, Sprint Nextel and Cingular will allow the customer to port the number but they have to select that number as a vanity number. Sprint Nextel is creating a checklist to encourage their resellers not to abandon their customers and provide them with options. Sprint Nextel will bring the checklist for review at the January 2007 meeting. Cingular will bring in the port authorization text under development by their attorneys.  3/13/2007 LNPA WG Meeting  Cingular has developed a port authorization form that they are going back to get their resellers to sign so that if they go out of business, they can legally port the customers. The attached form was presented by Cingular at the March 2007 LNPA WG meeting.    Sprint Nextel has created a checklist to encourage their resellers not to abandon their customers and provide them with options. This checklist was presented by Sue Tiffany, Sprint Nextel, at the March 2007 LNPA WG meeting.  During the discussion, a provider raised the FCC’s Time Warner ruling and suggested that providers review that to see if it covers any wholesale customers, e.g., resellers, MVNOs, and not just VoIP providers. Discussion then ensued on the legal ramifications of contacting the customer to let them know that their service provider has gone out-of-business and that their service is going to be cut off by a date certain and that they have the option of going with the underlying network provider or port their number to another provider.  Service Providers are to review the attached contributions from Cingular (Authorization Form v1.doc) and Sprint Nextel (Revised Bankruptcy Checklist.doc) for discussion at the May 2007 LNPA WG meeting.  11/13/2007 LNP WG Meeting  Action Item 0907-06: Regarding the attached LNPA WG NP Best Practices document, Gary Sacra,  LNPA WG Co-Chair, will revise the document to:  1. Add PIM 56 and its Suggested Resolution as Item 51,  2. Add the link to the NIIF Guidelines for Reporting LNP Troubles to the new Item 51,  3. Add PIM 57 and its Suggested Resolution as Item 52,  4. Add PIM 62 and its Suggested Resolution as Item 53.  After revising the document per the above, Gary will send it to Mohamed Samater, T-Mobile, who will revise the HTML version of the document and have it uploaded to the LNPA WG website.  8/11/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:**  The ONSP should incorporate a “Port Authorization” form into their procedures when faced with a reseller that is ceasing business operation and will no longer provide service to their customers. This form, when  signed by the reseller, would authorize the ONSP to complete ports to other service providers on behalf of the Old Local Service Provider (OLSP) or reseller for a specified period of time, in the event the reseller ceases business operation and the reseller contract will be terminated with the ONSP.  This would be a legal form approved by the ONSPs legal department and would give the ONSP the legal right to act on behalf of the OLSP in these cases. The ONSP should incorporate this signed form into the  existing reseller contracts and should include it in the negotiation phase of any new contracts with resellers.  While the Reseller is still in business and responding to port requests, the port will process as a normal Reseller port. The form mentioned above will become effective when the Reseller’s contract expires, i.e.,  they have terminated their Reseller obligations or have not paid their bill and have gone to collections.  The Reseller should notify their customers, the end users/consumer that they, the Reseller, are going out of business and if their customers wish to keep their phone number; they should port to another carrier in a  specified period of time.  The above form will allow the ONSP to port the Reseller’s customers after the contract has ‘expired’ and before the numbers go back into the ONSPs pool of assignable numbers. (After the contract expires, the  ONSP may terminate the account in their system and start the number aging process.)  If a customer attempts to port their number after the Reseller’s contract has ‘expired’, a port request will identify the number as ‘Number Not Active’ and if they attempt to port the consumer before the contact has  expired they may get a ‘Number Not Found’. During that time period when the form is in effect, the port request should be processed according to the ONSPs procedures.  After the number has gone through the aging process, the number will be put in the ONSPs pool of numbers that can be assigned.  There are three phases with possible different responses to a consumer porting their number from a nonresponsive Reseller:   1. Reseller’s contract has not expired, but the Reseller is not responding.    1. Cingular and Sprint Nextel are working on the suggested Best Practice for this phase 2. Reseller’s contract has expired and numbers are in the aging process.    1. The Port Authorization tool previously mentioned allows the ONSP to manually port the customer after first attempting to verify customer’s identity. 3. Reseller’s contract has expired and number has been retuned to the number assignment pool.    1. If the consumer wishes to keep their number, they must contact the ONSP requesting the number as a ‘Vanity’ number and become the ONSP’s customer. The consumer may be able to keep their number if it has not already been assigned to another customer.   **Final Resolution:**  This PIM resulted in the creation of Best Practice 052 - Resellers Discontinuing Business and/or Declaring Bankruptcy | LNPA WG | 11/13/2007 | Closed |
| [PIM 56](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6496/PIM_056_-_Call_Termination_issue_related_to_LNPA_database_update_deficiency_v3.docx) | 05/03/06 | Sprint Nextel | Call Termination issue related to LNPA database deficiency v3 - This PIM, submitted by Sprint Nextel, seeks to address instances where LNP database updates are not always propagated by all providers down to their network element routing databases in a timely manner.  07/11/2006 LNPA WG Meeting  This PIM, submitted by Sprint Nextel, seeks to address instances where LNP database updates are not always propagated by all providers down to their network element routing databases in a timely manner.    This PIM was accepted at the July 2006 LNPA WG meeting and will be discussed at the September 2006 meeting, where text for the NP Best Practices document will be considered.  9/11/2007 LNPA WG Meeting  The LNPA WG has received permission from the NIIF to put the link to their Guidelines for Reporting LNP Troubles document in our Best Practices. Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will revise the Best Practices document to add PIM 56 and its Suggested Resolution and the NIIF document link as Item 51.  PIM 56 was closed at the September 2007 LNPA WG meeting.  8/11/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** Similar to the LSMS partial failures we get today, identify a mechanism to receive a notification from carriers’ LNP databases that the switch provisioning failed or was successful. A carrier’s SCP should respond to the LSMS when the update is completed and the carrier’s LSMS should return the SCP concurrence back to the NPAC. Another suggestion would be to make test calls to validate the completion of calls originating from major local networks and through major IXCs to newly ported numbers. At a minimum, perform an analysis of possible LNP troubles. The idea would be to institute a test call barrage in response to a trouble report, rather than with every port’s completion on routine basis. But if a particular port involved a sensitive  customer, then test calling could be initiated even absent a trouble report a few minutes after the port competed.  **Final Resolution:**  This PIM resulted in the creation of Best Practice 51 - Proper and Timely Updates to LNP Routing Databases | LNPA WG | 9/11/2007 | Closed |
| [PIM 55](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6495/PIM_055_-_Provider_Initiated_Activity_PIA_v3.docx) | 05/08/06 | Neustar Clearinghouse | Provider initiated activity PIA v3 - This PIM, submitted by the NeuStar Clearinghouse Vendor, seeks to address issues related to wireline Provider Initiated Activity.  06/14/2006 LNP WG Meeting  Mubeen Saifullah, NeuStar Clearinghouse, teed up the attached PIM 55. He stated that the Provider Initiated Activity (PIA), described in the attached PIM, has been around since before LSOG 9. Some wireline LECs implemented the function with their rollout of LSOG 9. Mubeen stated that the cancel function of the PIA was introduced with LSOG 7, but not implemented by some wireline LECs until LSOG 9.  Mubeen stated that the majority of these PIAs to cancel are due to the port not being activated on the due date. Discussion ensued on the three acceptable approaches addressed in the NANC LNP Provisioning Flows for preventing disconnect of the customer when the port is not activated on the due date.  “The removal of these translations (1.) will not be done until the old Service Provider has evidence that the port has occurred, or (2.) will not be scheduled earlier than 11:59 PM one day after the due date, or (3.) will be scheduled for 11:59 PM on the due date, but can be changed by an LSR supplement received no later than 9:00 PM local time on the due date. This LSR supplement must be submitted in accordance with local practices governing LSR exchange, including such communications by telephone, fax, etc.”  It was asked why providers are not sending Sups to either cancel or change the due date if the port is not going to be activated on the due date. It was stated that in some cases, the wireline carrier issues a jeopardy on the due date, and because jeopardies are worked manually by wireless carriers, the wireless carrier does not have enough time to stop the port.  PIM 55 was accepted by the LNPA WG.  A wireless carrier proposed changing the PIM’s problem statement to reflect that this is applicable to the majority of wireless carriers rather than all wireless carriers.  Service Providers are to come to the July LNPA WG meeting prepared to determine the best course of action to take to work this PIM.  7/11/2006 LNPA WG Meeting  Wireless carriers must handle a PIA after FOC manually. A wireless carrier suggested that PIAs should not be issued on or after the due date. New SPs in a port should be issuing a Sup if they are not going to activate the port on the due date. Service Providers are to identify at the September 2006 LNPA WG meeting reasons for issuing a Provider Initiated Activity (PIA) on or after the due date and what caveats they have to accepting an LNPA WG recommendation to the OBF that PIAs should not be issued on or after the due date.  Sprint Nextel stated that it is their position that it is not cost effective to automate handling of PIAs after FOC due to the small volume.  09/12/2006 LNPA WG Meeting  It was stated that the OBF Inter-modal SubCommittee did not meet at the last OBF meeting, but they were to discuss this.  Action Item 0606-06: Regarding the attached PIM 55, Service Providers are to come to the July LNPA WG meeting prepared to determine the best course of action to take to work this PIM. (NOTE: This Action Item was carried over from the July 2006 LNPA WG meeting.)  Action Item 0606-06 remains open.  Action Item 0706-15: Regarding the attached PIM 55, Service Providers are to identify at the September 2006 LNPA WG meeting reasons for issuing a Provider Initiated Activity (PIA) on or after the due date and what caveats they have to accepting an LNPA WG recommendation to the OBF that PIAs should not be issued on or after the due date.  Embarq stated that they would send a PIA JEP 10 days after the due date if the port is not activated by the New SP. Verizon discussed a scenario where they issued a JEP after the due date when the port was not activated by the New SP and the customer disconnected after the due date. BellSouth found a case where the customer had disconnected before the LSR was received and due to a timing issue in their systems, the LSR was FOC’d and then subsequently JEPed when it became evident that the customer had disconnected. Verizon Wireless expressed concern about the PIAs after the port has been activated. This becomes a PIM 53 issue. With regard to the attached PIM 55, NeuStar Clearinghouse and Service Providers are to determine when they are getting or issuing Provider Initiated Activity (PIA) messages (Jeopardy Notices) (1. after FOC but before due date, 2. on or after due date but prior to broadcast, 3. after broadcast), for what reason, and the approximate quantity if available.  Action Item 0706-15 remains open.  03/13/2007 LNPA WG Meeting  Mubeen Saifullah, NeuStar Clearinghouse, reported that he introduced an issue in the OBF’s Wireless Committee to support jeopardies for possible implementation in WICIS Release 4.1.  07/14/2009 LNPA WG Meeting  This issue is now in a tracking state awaiting inclusion in the next WICIS Release 5.0.0, which has a planned sunrise of March 2010. Issue 3118 is now in closure.  09/14/2010 LNPA WG Meeting  With the implementation of WICIS Release 5.0.0, it was agreed to close PIM 55.  8/11/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** There may be more than 1 method to solve this problem, however 2 “high level” options have been listed  below:  1) The wireline carriers may consider abandoning use of the PIA and treating a “Confirmation” as a “Firm Commitment” rather than an “initial” ok. All subsequent activity related to the port after a confirmation has been sent and the DDT has past can be done via the NPAC process using SOA systems.  2) The wireless documentation (WICIS) may consider expanding its processes to accommodate this aspect of intermodal porting. As of today, this is a “fact of life” and it may prove prudent to enhance the industry recommended wireless process to accept the 4 fields related to the LSR PIA in CONJUNCTION with NPAC processes in order to facilitate automation and minimize manual intervention.  **Final Resolution:** This PIM was referred to OBF WSO for updating of WICIS guidelines. WICIS Release 5.0.0 of the Guidelines was implemented and PIM was closed | OBF WSO | 09/14/2010 | Closed |
| [PIM 54](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6494/PIM_054_-_One_Day_Porting_v5.docx) | 04/28/06 | Comcast | One Day Porting v5 - This PIM, submitted by Comcast, seeks to investigate the feasibility of shortening the wireline-wireline and inter-modal porting interval for certain ports.  05/09/2006 LNPA WG Meeting  This PIM, submitted by Comcast, seeks to reduce the interval for certain wireline-wireline and inter-modal ports to one day.    Nancy Sanders, Comcast, teed up this new PIM by stating that the request for a shorter interval applies to simple ports of one line with no DSL using a mechanized interface. If the LSR is submitted by 3pm local time, the port could take place the next day.  Nancy Sanders, Comcast, will clarify the attached PIM 54 based on the discussion that took place at the May LNPA WG meeting and resubmit it for distribution to the group. PIM 54 will be further discussed on the June 14th conference call and it will be determined if this PIM will be accepted.  7/11/2006 LNPA WG Meeting  At the July meeting, discussion centered on whether or not the group would accept this PIM. Two participants stated that they had issues at times with providers meeting the current 4 day interval. Another participant stated that we should focus on simplifying the current LSR/FOC process, to only require the TN to be ported and the customer’s account number on the LSR. A participant in favor of accepting this PIM stated that she did not want this group to be viewed as hindering progress. It was suggested to change the resolution from next day to just shorten the interval. Nancy Sanders, Comcast, will revise the attached PIM 54 to:  1. change the proposed next day porting interval to suggest that the LNPA WG study the feasibility of shortening the intermodal and wireline to wireline porting intervals,  2. remove the reference to DSL,  3. clarify that this proposal does not apply to ports associated with loops.  Consensus reached to accept the to-be-revised PIM 54. Objecting were BellSouth, ELI, and Verizon. LNPA Working Group Participants are to come to the September 2006 LNPA WG meeting with any contributions suggesting revision of the attached PIM 54.  09/09/2008 LNPA WG Meeting  The PIM 54 proposal applies to simple ports for e-bonded (e.g., XML and EDI) providers.  Action Item 0308-13: Regarding the attached PIM 54, Service Providers are to discuss internally what caveats would have to be in place in an LNPA WG Best Practice in order to support a next day porting interval, if they can support it. This will be discussed at the May 2008 LNPA WG meeting.  In lieu of the FCC Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) tentatively concluding a 48 hour porting interval, it was agreed to await FCC action. Both Action Item 0308-13 and PIM 54 will remain open.  03/15/2011 LNPA WG Minutes  Both Action Item 0308-13 and PIM 54 are now closed with the February 2, 2011 implementation of FCC Order 09-41.  8/11/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** The LNP – WG recommend to NANC that the porting interval be changed under the conditions defined in the Problem/Issue statement to next day porting interval.  **Final Resolution:** This PIM was closed with the February 2, 2011 implementation of FCC Order 09-41. | LNPA WG | 03/15/2011 | Closed |
| [PIM 53](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6493/PIM_053_-_Take_Back_of_previously_ported_TN_v6.docx) | 02/27/06 | Verizon Wireless | Take Back of previously ported TN v6 - This PIM, submitted by Verizon Wireless, seeks to address instances of providers who are taking back numbers that had ported out from them when they do not have evidence that they issued a Firm Order Confirmation (FOC).  03/07/2006 LNPA WG meeting  This PIM, submitted by Verizon Wireless, seeks to address instances of providers who are taking back numbers that had ported out from them when they do not have evidence that they issued a Firm Order Confirmation (FOC).    Verizon Wireless requested that text be placed in the LNPA WG’s NP Best Practices document that limits the timeframe where a carrier can dispute a port to 6 months.  At the March meeting, it was stated that wireless providers do not accept mechanized jeopardies after FOC. If one is sent, it must be handled manually.  This PIM was accepted at the March meeting.  Sara Hooker, Verizon Wireless, will update the attached PIM 53 based on the discussion that took place at the March 2006 LNPA WG meeting. The revision will address jeopardy notifications submitted after the FOC. PIM 53 will be discussed on the April 12th LNPA WG conference call.  Service Providers are to review internally the revised PIM 53 for discussion on the April 12th LNPA WG conference call.  07/11/2006 LNPA WG Meeting  This PIM, submitted by Verizon Wireless, seeks to address instances of providers who are taking back numbers that had ported out from them when they do not have evidence that they issued a Firm Order Confirmation (FOC).    o Action Item 0506-10: Regarding the attached PIM 53, Mike Whaley, Qwest,  will determine if their systems can be overridden to reflect that a number has been ported out in order to prevent the need to temporarily take the number back so that the porting process can be reinitiated.  Qwest reported that they do have the ability to override their systems. Action Item 0506-10 is closed.  o There were no objections to Bullet 1 in the Suggested Resolution.  o Regarding Bullet 2, BellSouth and at&t objected to the statement that customer service will not be impacted and requested that it be revised to state impact to customer service will be minimized. Consensus was reached on the following wording for Bullet 2:  “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.”  o There were no objections to accepting Bullet 3 as revised in Version 4 of the PIM attached above. A participant raised the scenario where a number was already double-assigned in the Old SP’s network and then one of the customers ports to another provider. No additional text was suggested for Bullet 3.  o There were no objections to Bullet 4 in the Suggested Resolution.  o Action Item 0606-04: Regarding the attached PIM 53, Service Providers are to provide to Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, contact numbers within their respective companies for other providers to use to resolve issues that are addressed in the PIM.  o A participant stated that unless the contact numbers are generic in nature, and not tied to an individual, they can change frequently and become useless.  o Related to Action Item 0606-04, Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will:  1. add PIM 53, revised at the July 2006 LNPA WG meeting, to the LNPA WG’s NP Best Practices document,  2. aggregate the PIM 53 contact numbers received from Service Providers into a Word document,  3. embed the Word document into the PIM 53 item within the LNPA WG’s NP Best Practices document,  4. send the updated NP Best Practices document to Trevor Thompson, T-Mobile, who will update the HTML version of the NP Best Practices document.  PIM 53 was closed at the July LNPA WG meeting.  8/11/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **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.  **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 | 7/11/2006 | Closed |
| [PIM 52](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6492/PIM_052_-_Blocks_assigned_before_ISP_ports_are_completed_v4.docx) | 11/15/05 | Sprint Nextel | Blocks assigned before ISP ports are completed v4 - This PIM, submitted by Sprint Nextel, seeks to address issues related to carriers receiving 1K blocks from the pool in which the Intra-Service Provider ports have not been completed by the donor provider prior to block donation to the pool.  12/06/2005 LNPA WG Meeting  Action Item 1105-08: Service Providers are to come to the December 2005 LNPA meeting prepared to determine if the group will send a liaison to the INC proposing changes to their Thousand Block Pooling Administration Guidelines (TBPAG) per the attached proposed PIM addressing providers failing to perform the necessary intra-SP ports prior to donating a contaminated block to the pool.  • Verizon Wireline, Verizon Wireless, Qwest, SBC, and BellSouth stated that they could not support the proposed solution in the attached suggesting that the subsequent blockholder’s customer would retain a double-assigned telephone number if the donor provider failed to protect it by performing the necessary intra-SP ports.  • T-Mobile and Cingular stated that they handle this scenario on a case-by-case basis. If a business customer or long-time customer of the donor provider has the double-assigned number, they return the number in many cases. T-Mobile also refuses blocks from some carriers.  • No consensus was reached to send a letter to INC to change their block donation guidelines. They currently state that the original owner of the number retains it if the number is double-assigned due to the donor provider failing to do their ISP ports.  • It was suggested that we propose to INC to add a checklist on the donation form to prompt the donor to perform the necessary operations, e.g., if this is a contaminated block, have you done the necessary ISPs, have you removed the block, whether contaminated or pristine, from your TN assignment system?  • The LNPA agreed to send a liaison to the INC suggesting to add a checklist on the 1K block donation form (Appendix 2 of the TBPAG) to remind the donor service provider to perform the necessary pre-donation operations, e.g., if this is a contaminated block, have the necessary intra-SP ports been performed, has the block, whether contaminated or pristine, been removed from the donor’s TN assignment system, etc.? Sue Tiffany, Sprint/Nextel, will draft a liaison for review at the January 2006 LNPA meeting.  • If INC agrees to these changes, it may or may not drive a PA Change Order.  • Cyndi Jones, Sprint/Nextel, will revise the attached PIM (numbered as PIM 52) to be consistent with the proposed liaison to INC. This PIM will be discussed at the January 2006 LNPA meeting.  • Action Item 1105-08 is closed.  03/13/2007 LNPA WG Meeting  This PIM, submitted by Sprint Nextel, seeks to address issues related to carriers receiving 1K blocks from the pool in which the Intra-Service Provider ports have not been completed by the donor provider prior to block donation to the pool.    The LNPA WG drafted the attached liaison to the INC requesting revisions to the TBPAG Appendix 2 block donation form suggesting questions to prompt the donating service provider to perform any necessary Intra-Service Provider ports, if applicable, and protect numbers in the block to be donated from further assignment by the donating provider. The INC accepted this issue (INC Issue 506).      As part of INC Issue 506, the INC made changes to the Thousands Block PA Guidelines and form. This issue is now awaiting implementation of FCC-approved PA Change Order 51.  07/10/2007 LNPA WG Meeting  As part of INC Issue 506, the INC made changes to the Thousands Block PA Guidelines and form. PA Change Order 51 was approved and implemented in May.  PIM 52 was closed at the July 2007 LNPA WG meeting.  8/11/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** We are seeking a revision to the TBPAG Appendix 2 that will prompt donating providers to perform ISPs  and other network changes that are necessary to avoid dual-assigned numbers.  Recommendation:  Update Appendix #2 in the TBPAG with the following information:  1. Qualifying questions that need to be answered prior to block donation:   * Is the block contaminated? (Yes/No) Existing Question * If yes, how many numbers are currently assigned? * Have all ISPs been completed prior to donation? (Yes/No) * Has the block been removed from your number assignment system protected from further assignment in your number assignment system?   (Yes/No)  (i.e., removed from your number assignment system, etc)  If the ISPs have not been completed and/or the block has not been protected from further assignment by the donating provider, then the guidelines will be updated to require the PA to deny the block donation.  In addition, retain the acknowledgement of the above questions for future audits.  **Final Resolution:** This PIM was referred to ATIS INC (Issue 506) and resulted in changes to the INC TBPAG document | INC | 7/10/2007 | Closed |
| [PIM 51](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6491/PIM_051_-_Errors_when_opening_NPA-NXX_Codes_in_NPAC_v2.docx) | 03/07/05 | Sprint Nextel | Errors when opening NPA-NXX code in NPAC v2 - This PIM, submitted by Nextel, seeks the prevention of NXX codes being opened to portability in NPAC by the incorrect provider.  03/08/2005 LNPA WG Meeting  This PIM, submitted by Nextel, seeks the prevention of NXX codes being opened to portability in NPAC by the incorrect provider.    Nextel reported that this has been a significant problem. The PIM proposes a short term manual approach for a resolution. NPAC personnel would validate that a code is being opened by the correct SPID. This validation would be based on NANPA data and require a mapping of OCN to SPID. A member raised a situation where it is valid to have a code opened in NPAC that is different than in the LERG, i.e. Type 1 Cellular numbers. Another member stated that internal feedback indicates that this has not been a big problem. NeuStar stated that the trickiest aspect of the proposal is how to relate and maintain OCN to SPID association. Nextel explained that NANPA was a suggested source. Adam Newman verified that the NANPA CO Code Assignment Report contains OCN to NXX relationship. NeuStar is to provide frequency data related to this issue at the April meeting. Service Providers are to check internally and report back at the April LNPA meeting how frequently this problem occurs.  It was suggested that one possible solution is a one-time clean-up. PIM 51 was accepted.  The attached proposed Change Order 402 was submitted by Nextel as a long-term mechanized solution to the issue described in PIM 51.    The Change Order (accepted as NANC 402) recommends NPAC incorporate additional validations prior to an NXX being opened in NPAC. It proposes that any attempt to open up a code by the wrong SPID would be rejected and a message sent to the SOA. It was stated that the first step is to develop an approach for associating NPAC SPID to OCN for the manual approach. LNPA Working Group Members are to come to the April LNPA meeting prepared to discuss how to develop the matrix that associates SPID to OCN.  Discussions next month will determine if we will assign a subcommittee to resolve.  06/14/2005 LNPA WG Meeting  • At the April 2005 LNPA meeting, it was agreed that a sub-team would be formed to discuss a means of developing a SPID to OCN association: Susan Ortega (Nextel and Co-Chair), Steve Addicks (NeuStar), Deb Tucker (Verizon Wireless), Dave Cochran (BellSouth), Sue Tiffany (Sprint), Jeff Adrian (Sprint and Co-Chair), David Taylor (SBC), and Frank Reed (T-Mobile) is participating on the sub-team.  • Jeff Adrian, Sprint and PIM 51 Subcommittee Co-Chair, reported that a call was held on 6/6/05.  • The Subcommittee expanded its Mission Statement. It is as follows:  Determine how to acquire data for a NPAC SPID to OCN matrix to accommodate the manual objectives of PIM 51 or to propose an alternative method.  • The Subcommittee proposes that the LNPA adopt their recommended process for the manual approach to PIM 51. Attached is the PIM 51 Subcommittee Report and recommendation as presented by Jeff Adrian.    • Steve Addicks, NeuStar, reported that there have been no reports at the Help Desk of new code openings by the wrong provider. The Help Desk is working a trouble related to a code opened in 1999. Action Item 0205-04 remains open.  • A provider expressed a concern about developing a detailed process to address this issue when the occurrences are very low.  • Regarding the attached recommendation from the PIM 51 Subcommittee for  resolution of PIM 51, Service Providers are to review for discussion at the July LNPA meeting.  • The Subcommittee is to remain open awaiting the LNPA’s determination of whether or not to accept its recommendation.  8/11/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** We are recommending that NPAC personnel validate and audit code entries in NPAC by a TBD frequency. If the NPAC discovers a discrepancy with the code and carrier’s SPID, NPAC will contact the carrier to confirm that the NPA-NXX they opened actually belongs to the carrier. If no response is received within  TBD (e.g., 48 business hours), NPAC will delete the code.  **Final Resolution:** This PIM resulted in the creation of a NANC Change Order. NANC 414 (11/14/2006) created an automated solution | LNPA WG | 11/14/2006 | Closed |
| [PIM 50](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6490/PIM_050_-_Wireless_to_Wireline_Port_Failures_related_to_CSR_size_v2.docx) | 01/17/05 | Syniverse | Wireless to wireline port failures related to CSR size v2 - This PIM, submitted by Syniverse, seeks to address instances where wireline to wireless ports fail the automated process because they are from large accounts where the Customer Service Record (CSR) is too large to return on a CSR query.  02/15/2005 LNPA WG Meeting  Wireless to wireline port failures related to CSR size v2 - This PIM, submitted by Syniverse, seeks to address instances where wireline to wireless ports fail the automated process because they are from large accounts where the Customer Service Record (CSR) is too large to return on a CSR query.  03/13/2007 LNPA WG Meeting  Regarding PIM 50, Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, will send the applicable PIM 50 text to Mohamed Samater, T-Mobile, for inclusion in the LNPA WG’s NP Best Practices document. Upon receipt of the applicable text from PIM 50 from Gary Sacra, LNPA WG Co-Chair, Mohamed Samater, T-Mobile, will incorporate the text as Item # 46 in the LNPA WG’s NP Best Practices document.  PIM 50 was closed at the March 2007 LNPA WG meeting.  8/11/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** Porting systems could be designed within the ILECs so that only information relevant to  the particular number being ported is returned in response to a CSR query.  **Final Resolution:** This PIM resulted in the creation of BP 046 - Intermodal Port delayed due to CSR too large | LNPA WG | 3/13/2007 | Closed |
| [PIM 49](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6489/PIM_049_-_Porting_Procedures_in_NANC_Flows_for_Type_1_Numbers_v6.docx) | 09/27/04 | Verizon Wireless | Porting Procedures in NANC Flows for Type 1 Numbers v6 - This PIM, submitted by T-Mobile and Verizon Wireless, seeks to review the NANC LNP Provisioning Flows to address issues related to the porting of Type 1 numbers. It also seeks to address the inadvertent porting of paging numbers.  11/02/2004 LNPA WG Meeting  This PIM, submitted by T-Mobile and Verizon Wireless, seeks to modify the NANC Flows to address issues related to the porting of reseller and Type 1 numbers. It also seeks to address the inadvertent porting of paging numbers.    The PIM has been revised to remove reference to reseller numbers. Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, stated that Figure 2 Step 7 in the NANC Flows, the conditional step for loss notification, is where the process is falling down leading to inadvertent ports of Type 1s. It was suggested that this issue could also be worked through the individual interconnect agreements. A member asked what was the order of magnitude of the issue in order to justify the cost of adding a loss notification requirement in their process. Wireless Service Providers are to quantify the  number of inadvertent Type 1 ports, broken down by paging vs. cellular, for a 6 month time interval, broken down month by month. This will be discussed at the December LNPA meeting.  Verizon Wireless stated that if it can be identified up front that it is a paging number it could be rejected and no validation with the Old LSP is necessary. Verizon Wireless proposed that a step be added in the flows stating that paging numbers are not portable. Currently, there is nothing on the LSR for a Type 1 that could be sent to the Old LSP to validate the end user customer. The LSR must contain the Type 1 provider as the customer to pass the Old NSP edits. LNPA Members are to come to the December LNPA meeting prepared to discuss ways that this issue may be addressed in the NANC LNP Provisioning Flows. Wireline and Wireless Service Providers are to determine if loss notifications are being sent/received for Type 1 numbers that are ported and at what point during the porting process are they being sent/received.  07/12/2005 LNPA WG Meeting  At the July LNPA meeting, Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, proposed a revision to the Suggested Resolution of PIM 49 (see attached). PIM 49 was closed at the July 2005 LNPA meeting.  8/11/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** The Wireless New Local Service Provider (NLSP) submits the Wireless Port Request (WPR) to their respective Clearinghouse Vendor.  When a CSR request is included in the Clearinghouse Vendor process: The Clearinghouse Vendor sends the CSR request to the Wireline Old Network Service Provider (ONSP), and if rejected with an indication that the account is not found and/or it is a Type 1 number, the Clearinghouse Vendor and/or NLSP, using information optionally provided by the Wireless Type 1 provider, can manually validate the port request with that Wireless Old Local Service provider (OLSP) prior to LSR submission. Multiple solutions are in place for the various providers to prevent Paging numbers from being ported and for obtaining and validating Type 1 information from the Type 1 provider.  If Type 1 information is not available, an LSR can be submitted without a validation attempt, although wireless providers who process ports manually should validate the Type 1 end user information whenever  possible prior to submitting the LSR to the Old Network Service provider.  **Final Resolution:** The Wireless New Local Service Provider (NLSP) submits the Wireless Port Request (WPR) to their respective Clearinghouse Vendor.  When a CSR request is included in the Clearinghouse Vendor process: The Clearinghouse Vendor sends the CSR request to the Wireline Old Network Service Provider (ONSP), and if rejected with an indication that the account is not found and/or it is a Type 1 number, the Clearinghouse Vendor and/or NLSP, using information optionally provided by the Wireless Type 1 provider, can manually validate the port request with that Wireless Old Local Service Provider (OLSP) prior to LSR submission. Multiple solutions are in place for the various providers to prevent Paging numbers from being ported and for obtaining and validating Type 1 information from the Type 1 provider.  If Type 1 information is not available, an LSR can be submitted without a validation attempt, although wireless providers who process ports manually should validate the Type 1 end user information whenever possible prior to submitting the LSR to the Old Network Service Provider. | LNPA WG | 7/12/2005 | Closed |
| [PIM 48](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6488/PIM_048_-_Updating_Contact_Directories_v2.docx) | 09/21/04 | Verisign, T-Mobile, Nextel | Updating Contact Directories v2 - This PIM, submitted by VeriSign, T-Mobile, and Nextel, proposes a new category in the NIIF National LNP Contact Directory for post-port carrier-to-carrier support. It also suggests more publicity in order to encourage carriers not listed to do so.  11/02/2004 LNPA WG Meeting  This PIM, submitted by VeriSign, T-Mobile, and Nextel proposes a new category in the NIIF National LNP Contact Directory for post-port carrier-to-carrier support. It also suggests more publicity in order to encourage carriers not listed to do so.    This PIM was accepted at the October LNPA meeting. This PIM was referred to NIIF/NIOC. NIOC responded that they have opened Issue #0255, NIIF Company Specific Contact Directory and LNP Contact Directory New Category Proposal and Processes for Updating Contacts in response the LNPA correspondence. This issue is on the agenda for the January 2005 NIIF meeting.  02/15/2005 LNPA WG Meeting  At the February LNPA, the group agreed that the NIIF response addresses our issue. Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will send a response to the NIIF stating that NIIF Issue 0255 has addressed the LNPA’s PIM 48, and thanking them for resolving the issue.  PIM 48 was closed at the February 2005 LNPA meeting.  8/11/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** National LNP Contact Directory:  1. Create a new category “Post-Port Network Maintenance Support” This category should reflect the appropriate carrier to carrier agency to refer ‘originating numbers failing to reach a Ported TN’.  This number would also be used when carriers need to issue a ticket for this trouble type. This agency should not require any specific details typically required for account verification purposes.  2. ATIS to send out an information bulletin reminding carriers that this National LNP contact directory is available at the website and how to obtain a password to access, update and use the directory.  3. ATIS to send out a reminder on some scheduled basis (each quarter, 2X a year) to remind carriers of the importance of periodically updating the contact information.  4. ATIS could possibly contact carriers on the list individually to determine if the data is correct or needs to be updated.  5. ATIS may take referrals from carriers that find discrepancies and contact that company to update or change the information in order to alleviate that discrepancy.  This PIM should be formally sent to the NIIF co-chairs for that industry team to make changes which should result in a more current document.  **Final Resolution:** This PIM was referred to the NIIF for consideration and was worked as Issue 0255. Refer to LNPA meeting minutes for further updates. | NIIF | 2/15/2005 | Closed |
| [PIM 47](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6447/PIM_047_-_Intermodal_Standards_for_Purging_Old-Abandoned_Ports_v5.docx) | 07/12/04 | Sprint | Intermodal Standards for Purging Old-Abandoned Ports v5 - This PIM, submitted by Sprint, seeks to address minimum industry inter-modal standards for purging old/abandoned ports. Previously, the Wireless Number Portability Operations (WNPO) team recommended that old/abandoned wireless ports be purged after 30 days have elapsed.  08/16/2004 LNPA WG Meeting  This PIM, submitted by Sprint, seeks to address minimum industry intermodal standards for purging old/abandoned ports.    This issue was discussed at the OBF Inter-species Task Force (ITF). The group came to consensus on some changes to the text. The LNPA agreed to wait for the updated language to be sent back from ITF for discussion at the September meeting before updating the NP Best Practices matrix. In the meantime ALL SPs are asked to review their internal system set-up regarding reaction to a 2nd LSR for the same TN.  01/11/2005 LNPA WG Meeting  Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will:  1. Copy the 1st sentence in Section 2 of the PIM (“This is the solution only when a carrier has not or is unable to use the recommended cancel process as documented in the NANC Process Flows.”) into the 1st standalone paragraph in Section 3.  2. Put the Suggested Resolution in the NP Best Practices document.  The group agreed to close PIM 47.  8/11/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** This is the solution only when a carrier has not or is unable to use the recommended cancel process as documented in the NANC Process Flows.  Most wireless carriers have agreed to follow the following two scenarios. Other carriers can have different intervals and processes for determining when a port is abandoned.  Those carrier’s business rules for identifying an abandoned port and when and how they will purge the abandoned port from their records will be posted on their LNP web sites.  Scenario 1 – This scenario applies to the service providers that use the NPAC activation notice before disconnecting the porting end using customer. When the Old Service Provider (OSP) has confirmed the port request but does not receive an activation notice from NPAC, they can consider the port request abandoned  30 calendar days after the due date. In a similar process, the NPAC purges pending Subscription Versions (SVs) 30 days after their due dates have passed.  Scenario 2 - The OSP has responded to a port request with a Resolution  Required requiring subsequent activity from the NSP. If no subsequent activity has been received within 30 calendar days, then the port may be considered abandoned.  **Final Resolution:**  This PIM resulted in the creation of BP 035 – Abandoned Ports | LNPA WG | 01/11/2005 | Closed |
| [PIM 46](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6487/PIM_046_-_NPA_Filter_Management_Process_v2.docx) | 07/19/04 | Telcove | NPA Filter Management Process v2 - This PIM, submitted by TelCove (f.k.a. Adelphia Business Solutions) seeks to address the NPAC Filter Management process which currently only allows a filter to be applied for an NPA-NXX if that particular NPA-NXX has previously been entered into NPAC.  08/16/2004 LNPA WG Meeting  This PIM, submitted by TelCove, seeks to address the NPAC Filter Management process which currently only allows a filter to be applied for an NPA-NXX if that particular NPA-NXX has previously been entered into NPAC.    •During the discussion, NeuStar pointed out that when a new code is broadcast by NPAC, the SOA can send a message to NPAC to filter out broadcasts for that code, and it would therefore not be necessary to contact the Help Desk to implement a filter for the code. The submitter was asked whether he had spoken with his SOA vendor regarding whether their SOA platform supported this functionality. NeuStar suggested that an NPA-level inclusive filter would meet the TelCove need. Brad Smeal, TelCove, will discuss functionality to trigger a filter by the LSMS/SOA system with their vendor and may subsequently submit an NPAC Change Order request. It was agreed that this PIM will be withdrawn as the issue may be addressed by submitting an NPAC Change Order.  8/11/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** Filters should be able to be implemented for a NPA-NXX before it is entered into the NPAC or a filter should be able to be implemented at the NPA level to account for any NXX in a particular NPA.  **Final Resolution:** At the August 2004 LNPA meeting, the submitter agreed to withdraw this PIM as the issue may be addressed by submitting an NPAC Change Order. | LNPA WG | 8/16/2004 | Withdrawn |
| [PIM 45](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6966/PIM_045_-_SP_Response_to_multiple_errors_in_LSR_v2.docx) | 07/21/04 | T-Mobile, Sprint, Verizon Wireless, Nextel, Cingular, US Cellular | SP response to Multiple Errors in LSR v2 –  This PIM, submitted by T-Mobile, Sprint, Verizon Wireless, Nextel, Cingular, and US Cellular, seeks to address instances when there are errors in Local Service Requests (LSRs) to port a number and some service providers respond identifying a single error only. Additional LSRs and responses are required until all errors are finally cleared. This can result in a need to create many LSRs in order to clear all errors and complete a port.  9/13/2005 LNPA WG Meeting  PIM 45 – This PIM, submitted by T-Mobile, Sprint, Verizon Wireless, Nextel, Cingular, and US Cellular, seeks to address instances when there are errors in Local Service Requests (LSRs) to port a number and some service providers respond identifying a single error only. Additional LSRs and responses are required until all errors are finally cleared. This can result in a need to create many LSRs in order to clear all errors and complete a port.    This issue was referred to OBF. Attached is the OBF LSOP Committee response.  Wireless Service Providers continue to work change control efforts for PIM 45 through their appropriate wireline Account Management teams.  At the September LNPA meeting, it was reported that WICIS does not currently support the return of multiple error codes. It was stated that all of the major ILECs’ EDI implementations support multiple occurrences of errors and error text, but it is possible that their processes may not support their return. The group reviewed and revised the attached PIM 45 Best Practice statement developed by Rob Smith, Syniverse.    Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will place the following text in the LNPA’s NP Best Practices document under Decisions/Recommendations for the issue and upload the revised document to the LNPA website:  When a Service Provider receives a port request, they should read as much of the port request as possible to identify and provide as much information on all errors as is possible to report on the response.    Service providers should avoid a process of only reporting one error on each response to a port request resulting in a prolonged process of submitting multiple, iterative port requests for a single port, each time restarting the response timers.  PIM 45 is closed.  10/6/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** Systems should be enhanced so that the first response (LR) will identify all errors that need to be corrected on an LSR.  **Final Resolution:** This PIM was referred to the OBF for consideration and was worked in the LSOP Committee as Issue 2817. In addition BP 039 - Identification of multiple or generic, reject errors on wireline LSRs was created. | OBF | 913/2005 | Closed |
| [PIM 44](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6962/PIM_044_-_Wirleine_Carrier_rules-fields_for_LSR_v3.docx) | 07/21/04 | T-Mobile, Sprint, Verizon Wireless, Nextel, Cingular, US Cellular | Wireline Carrier rules-fields for LSR v3 - This PIM, submitted by T-Mobile, Sprint, Verizon Wireless, Nextel, Cingular, and US Cellular, seeks to address varying rules among wireline carriers for developing a Local Service Request (LSR) in order to port a number.  9/13/2005 LNPA WG Meeting  PIM 44 – This PIM, submitted by T-Mobile, Sprint, Verizon Wireless, Nextel, Cingular, and US Cellular, seeks to address varying rules among wireline carriers for developing a Local Service Request (LSR) in order to port a number.    PIM 44 is tracking awaiting the outcome of Issue 2943 in the OBF. See attached liaison letter from the OBF on Issue 2943. Action Item 0605-16 is still open.  11/10/2009 LNPA WG Meeting  The issue is now in a Tracking state awaiting resolution of LSOP Issue 3307.  9/14/2010 LNPAWG Meeting  With the implementation of FCC 09-41, it was agreed to close PIM 44.  10/6/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** Wire line port request can be validated with very minimal risk of inadvertent ports when the following fields correctly match the old service provider records:  1) The telephone number being ported  2) The old service provider account number from the EAN field  3) The porting customer’s billing ZIP code  Other customer and field information should be provided to the extent that it is possible, but should not be used to reject a port request if it fails to match exactly.  Information that might be needed to complete the disconnection processes can be obtained by the wire line service provider’s own customer service records.  As indicated in the attached correspondence from the OBF, “it was determined that no agreement could be reached within the Intermodal Subcommittee, consisting of ATIS OBF’s Wireless Committee and Local Service Ordering and Provisioning Committee, to resolve this issue due to the following factors:   * LSOG is a guideline; however, implementation of the LSOG is not standardized across wireline providers * Wireline providers implement the LSOG based on their specific business models/requirements.”   As a result, the LNPA WG has placed this PIM in a tracking state awaiting FCC action on the T-Mobile/Sprint Nextel petition.  **Final Resolution:** This PIM was referred to the OBF for consideration and was worked in the Inter-species Task Force (ITF) as Issue 2801 and 2943. Wireless providers and Clearinghouse Vendors worked with wireline carriers and their respective change management processes through their Account Management to identify possible process enhancements.  PIM 44 was closed with the implementation of FCC 09-41.  Awaiting Implementation of FCC Order 07-188 | OBF | 9/14/2010 | Closed |
| [PIM 43](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6958/PIM_043_-_Port_Transaction_Volumes_for_mass_changes_v2.docx) | 07/09/04 | Verizon Wireless | Port Transaction Volumes for mass changes v2 - This PIM, submitted by Verizon Wireless, seeks to address concerns related to large porting volumes and mass changes, such as rehomes.  8/16/2004 LNPA WG Meeting  • PIM 43 – This PIM, submitted by Verizon Wireless, seeks to address concerns related to large porting volumes and mass changes, such as rehomes.    • This PIM will be discussed as a separate agenda item at this meeting on Wednesday. (NOTE: This PIM was subsequently withdrawn and an NPAC Change Order was submitted by Verizon Wireless.)  • PIM 43: The PIM was withdrawn last month and is to be readdressed as a change order. “Large volume port transactions and SOA throughput.” Current throughput is 4-6 TNs per second. The amount of transactions predicted could be in the arena of 7 TNs sustained over an 8-hour period. In order to really work this issue Carriers should review internally and provide feedback to Alan Stiffler on their company forecasts out 2 to 10 years. This will be discussed again in the October LNPA meeting.  10/6/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** Verizon Wireless believes that the LNPA WG should discuss future SOA and NPAC throughput needs in relation to an inevitable need for large volume NPAC transactions.  **Final Resolution:** This PIM was withdrawn by the submitter at the August 2004 LNPA meeting in lieu of submission of an NPAC Change Order (NANC 397). | LNPA WG | 8/16/2004 | Withdrawn |
| [PIM 42](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6954/PIM_042_-_WPR_to_LSR_info_mapping_v4.docx) | 07/07/04 | Syniverse | WPR to LSR info mapping v4 - This PIM, submitted by Syniverse, seeks to review wireline requirements for certain fields on the LSR in order to facilitate mapping of the Wireless Port Request (WPR) to the Wireline LSR.  9/13/2005 LNPA WG Meeting  PIM 42 – This PIM, submitted by Syniverse, seeks to review the wireline requirement for certain fields on the LSR.    PIM 42 is being worked through wireline companies’ Account Management process. It is also tracking awaiting the outcome of Issue 2943 in the OBF. PIM 42 to stay open awaiting feedback from Change Control/Account Management efforts.  12/6/2005 LNPA WG Meeting  PIM 42 is being worked through wireline companies’ Account Management process. It is also tracking awaiting the outcome of Issue 2943 in the OBF. PIM 42 to stay open awaiting feedback from Change Control/Account Management efforts and outcome of OBF Issue 2943.  11/10/2009 LNPA WG Meeting  The issue is now in a Tracking state awaiting resolution of LSOP Issue 3307.  9/14/2010 LNPAWG Meeting  With the implementation of FCC 09-41, it was agreed to close PIM 44.  10/6/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** The problem would be resolved if carriers did not require these optional fields identified above to be populated on LSRs for numbers porting from wireline to wireless.  As indicated in the attached correspondence from the OBF, “it was determined that no agreement could be reached within the Intermodal Subcommittee, consisting of ATIS OBF’s Wireless Committee and Local Service Ordering and Provisioning Committee, to resolve this issue due to the following factors:   * LSOG is a guideline; however, implementation of the LSOG is not * standardized across wireline providers * Wireline providers implement the LSOG based on their specific business models/requirements.”   As a result, the LNPA WG has placed this PIM in a tracking state awaiting FCC action on the T-Mobile/Sprint Nextel petition.  **Final Resolution:** This PIM was referred to the OBF for consideration and was worked in the Inter-species Subcommittee (ISC) as Issue 2802. The OBF ISC has closed Issue 2802 and was worked under Issue 2943. Wireless providers and Clearinghouse Vendors are continuing to work with wireline carriers and their respective change management processes through their Account Management to identify possible process enhancements. PIM 42 was closed with the implementation of FCC 09-41 | OBF | 9/14/2010 | Closed |
| [PIM 41](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6950/PIM_041_-_SPID_Change_Coordination_v8.docx) | 07/08/04 | Verizon Wireless | SPID Change Coordination v8 - This PIM, submitted by Verizon Wireless, seeks to address fallout that can occur during SPID migrations when methods other that NANC 323 are used to accomplish the migration.  9/13/2005 LNPA WG Meeting  PIM 41 – This PIM, submitted by Verizon Wireless, seeks to address fallout that can occur during SPID migrations when methods other that NANC 323 are used to accomplish the migration.    The attached INC Issue 482 addresses the final Action Item related to PIM 41. The LNPA agreed to close PIM 41.  10/6/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** Service providers involved in moving customers from one SPID to another need to coordinate their moves  to be on or as soon as possible after the published Telcordia LERG™ Routing Guide effective dates. The NPAC SPID assignments for the affected codes also need to align with the published Telcordia LERG™  Routing Guide effective dates.  Additionally, service providers are urged to follow the processes listed below for required SPID changes:  **INDUSTRY SPID CORRECTION SELECTION PROCESS:**  **If No Ported or Pooled Numbers Exist In The Code(S) Affected By The Move:**  If no ported or pooled numbers are in the code, the new code holder should contact the current code owner as shown in the NPAC to have the code deleted in the NPAC. The new code holder will then add the code in the NPAC under their SPID.  **If Ported or Pooled Numbers Exist In The Code(S) Affected By The Move:**  1. **Coordinated Industry Effort:** The new code holder should identify the number of ported and/or pooled TNs within the NXX(s) in question and the number of involved service providers to  determine if this option is feasible. Based on the number of involved service providers, the new code holder should coordinate a conference call to determine if the delete/recreate process is acceptable among all affected service providers. If this process is deemed acceptable, the affected service providers shall coordinate the deletion and recreation of all ported and/or pooled TN records in the code(s). Note that the delete/recreate process is service affecting for those ported and/or pooled subscribers. Type of customer should also be considered when determining if this option is feasible. It is recommended that this process be considered when there are five (5) or  fewer Service Providers involved and less than one hundred and fifty (150) working TNs and no pooled blocks.  2. **NANC 323 SPID Migration**: If Option 1 above cannot be used to change NXX code ownership in NPAC, the industry preferred process is to perform a NANC 323 SPID migration.  3. **CO Code Reallocation Process:** The following process should be considered only as a last resort when Options 1 and 2 above cannot be used to change NXX code ownership in NPAC!  Service providers may utilize the CO Code Reallocation Process (pooling the blocks within the code at NPAC).  When ported numbers exist, Service Providers are to determine which of the above 3 options best fit their needs based on time constraints, number of carriers involved, number of SVs involved, type of customer, etc..  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail refer to the NANC Change Order(s) identified in the Related Documents field in the PIM itself (NANC 323). | LNPA WG | 9/13/2005 | Closed |
| [PIM 40](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6946/PIM_040_-_Industry_Standards_for_LNP_Readiness_v5.docx) | 05/27/04 | Verizon Wireless | Industry Standards for LNP Readiness v5 - This PIM, submitted by Verizon Wireless, seeks to address minimum industry standards for LNP readiness that must be adhered to by all companies in order to port.  9/8/2004 LNPA WG Meeting  PIM 40 – This PIM, submitted by Verizon Wireless, seeks to address minimum industry standards for LNP readiness that must be adhered to by all companies in order to port. This PIM was accepted at the July LNPA meeting.    Verizon Wireless stated that since May 24th, there have been over 1800 NPA-NXXs that have not been opened in NPAC and/or marked portable in the LERG. They have resolved 1400, but over 400 remain.  The North American Numbering Council’s Wireless Number Portability Subcommittee Report on WIRELESS NUMBER PORTABILITY Technical, Operational and Implementation Requirements, Phase II, Version 1.7, states in Section 5.4.3, “A SP will need to make sure NPA-NXXs that need to be opened for porting are marked as portable in the LERG. The code opening process must occur before processing any subscriber requests for porting numbers from a portable NPA-NXX.” The Report further states in Section 5.4.3, “Code holders notify the NPAC of NPA-NXXs to be opened for porting. This should occur within 45 days of the LERG publication.” These requirements, as reported to the NANC, will serve to resolve this PIM, and will be cited by providers seeking compliance on the part of other providers. The LNPA supports this verbiage and agreed to close this PIM.  Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless, will modify the PIM to delete the last paragraph in the Suggested Resolution (extracted here):  Since all carriers without waivers are mandated to be porting, it is reasonable to expect that all of their respective codes are marked Portable in the LERG and open for porting in the NPAC.  10/6/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** The North American Numbering Council, Wireless Number Portability Subcommittee Report on WIRELESS NUMBER PORTABILITY Technical, Operational and Implementation Requirements Phase II version 1.7 documents the process for opening codes in the Telcordia LERGTM Routing Guide and the NPAC in section 5.4.3 as follows:  5.4.3 Opening NPA NXXs for Porting  “A SP will need to make sure NPA-NXXs that need to be opened for porting are marked as portable in the Telcordia LERGTM Routing Guide. The code opening process must occur before processing any subscriber requests for porting numbers from a portable NPA-NXX. The process steps are as follows:  Individual SPs identify the NPA-NXXs targeted for porting and forward a request to the Telcordia LERGTM Routing Guide assignee (code holder) of the NPA-NXXs. Notification must occur by the 15th of the month for portability information to be included in the next Telcordia LERGTM Routing Guide update.  The code holder must respond to the SPs within five business days, indicating whether the NPA-NXX can be processed. The code holder then notifies the Telcordia LERGTM Routing Guide to open the NPA-NXXs, 45 days before the date when porting needs to be effective (if the request cannot be processed, the holder must note the reasons in the response).  The Telcordia LERGTM Routing Guide publishes notification of the NPA-NXX with the effective date, i.e. the date that the NPA-NXX is available for LNP in the NPAC customer networks. Telcordia LERGTM Routing Guide updates are published by the fifth business day of the month. Emergency updates can also be sent out daily.  SPs and N-1 service providers update GTT information in their individual networks for all appropriate services. GTT updating must occur within 45 business days of Telcordia LERGTM Routing Guide publication.  Code holders notify the NPAC of NPA-NXXs to be opened for porting. This should occur within 45 days of the Telcordia LERGTM Routing Guide publication. The SP must notify NPAC personnel via fax or email, preferably 2 weeks in advance, NPA-NXXs available for porting and their effective dates. If a SP chooses, they can input their NPA-NXX information directly in to the NPAC SMS via the LSMS, SOA, or LTI.  The NPAC updates its SP and network information. It then informs all SPs about the availability of the NPA-NXXs for porting via the NPAC SMS to LSMS and SOA to NPAC SMS interfaces. The portable NPA-NXXs and their effective dates are posted on the npac.com web site.  For porting the first ported number in a newly opened NPA-NXX, upon receipt of the first Subscription Version (SV), the NPAC broadcasts a message to all LSMSs and SOAs.  Upon receipt of the message, SPs should open routing tables and set triggers in donor switches, LNP-capable tandems and LNP-capable offices in all networks. “  The LNPA WG supports the above mentioned process for marking codes portable in the Telcordia LERGTM Routing Guide and opening codes in the NPAC.  **Final Resolution:** WIRELESS NUMBER PORTABILITY Technical, Operational and Implementation Requirements Phase II, Version 1.7 as reported to the NANC, will serve to resolve this PIM. | LNPA WG | 9/8/2004 | Closed |
| [PIM 39](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6942/PIM_039_-_Business_Rules_or_Porting_Requirements_v4.docx) | 06/02/04 | T-Mobile, Sprint, Verizon Wireless, Nextel, Cingular,  US Cellular | Business Rules or Porting Requirements v4 - Adhere to current guidelines limiting releases for interfaces. Limit all changes affecting business rules, fields and processes within these same major release dates.  6/15/2004 LNPA WG Meeting  NEW PIM 39 – This PIM, submitted by Syniverse, seeks to address frequent changes in wireline business practices and rules related to porting requirements.    Rob Smith, Syniverse, will provide data on the frequency of occurrence. The accumulated data will be made anonymous for discussion at next month’s LNPA meeting. The provider-specific data will be made available to each of the involved service providers by Friday, 6/25/04.  Sue Tiffany, Sprint PCS and WNPO Co-Chair, pointed out that the inter-modal IMG recommendation calls for an automated interface to reduce the interval. Frequent changes may make it cost prohibitive for a carrier to automate their systems. Another member suggested that the PIM should possibly include guidelines for advanced notice of changes. The PIM remains in Pending state.  11/2/2004 LNPA WG Meeting  PIM 39 – This PIM, submitted by Syniverse, seeks to address frequent changes in wireline business practices and rules related to porting requirements.    This PIM was referred to the OBF. LSOG advised this should be worked on a carrier-to-carrier basis. LSOG put together a list of carrier change control contact names and numbers (see attached LSOP Committee liaison).    Rob Smith, Syniverse, will identify changes to carrier business rules and practices that are not merely document only changes and violate the Ordering & Billing Forum’s (OBF’s) guidelines on the frequency of “customer affecting” changes, and bring it to the attention of those carriers. Wireline Service Providers in receipt of an e-mail have an action to address internally and report back to the LNPA.  12/7/2004 LNPA WG Meeting  •PIM 39 – This PIM, submitted by Syniverse, seeks to address frequent changes in wireline business practices and rules related to porting requirements.    It was agreed that this issue is best addressed in the Change Management meetings with the ILECs. The submitter agreed to withdraw the PIM.  10/6/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** Adhere to current guidelines limiting releases for interfaces. Limit all changes affecting business rules, fields and processes within these same major release dates. .  **Final Resolution:** It was agreed that this issue is best addressed in the Change Management meetings with the ILECs. The submitter agreed to withdraw the PIM | OBF | 12/4/2004 | Withdrawn |
| [PIM 38](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6938/PIM_038_-_1k_Pool_Block_tunable_v2.docx) | 05/26/04 | AT&T Wireless | 1k Pool Block tunable v2 - This PIM, submitted by AT&T Wireless, seeks to eliminate the current 5 day minimum interval between when a pooled block is created in NPAC, and the effective date of block activation, if the 1st port has already occurred in the NXX code containing the pooled block.  3/20/2004 LNPA WG Meeting  PIM 38 – This PIM, submitted by AT&T Wireless, seeks to eliminate the current 5 day minimum interval between when a pooled block is created in NPAC, and the effective date of block activation, if the 1st port has already occurred in the NXX code containing the pooled block. The PIM was accepted at the June 2004 meeting.    NeuStar developed NANC Change Order 394 that will be included in the upcoming Change Order ranking session to determine the next NPAC software release. The Change Order removes the 5-day minimum interval between –X creation and block activation now imposed on all blocks. The Change Order will cause a 5-day delay to be imposed only if the NPA-NXX from which the block is drawn has not yet experienced a “first port” notification. The Change Order also introduces a 5-day delay between the creation and activation of an individual SV when its NPA-NXX likewise has had no “first port” notification.  3//7/2006 LNPA WG Meeting  PIM 38 – This PIM, submitted by AT&T Wireless, seeks to eliminate the current 5 day minimum interval between when a pooled block is created in NPAC, and the effective date of block activation, if the 1st port has already occurred in the NXX code containing the pooled block.    PIM 38 has been closed as a result of the implementation of NANC Change Order 394 in NPAC Release 3.3.  10/6/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** A short term fix to reduction of the –x object 5 business day tunable from 5 business days to 1 business day. Or a long term solution would be to remove the 5 business day delay completely.  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail refer to the NANC Change Order(s) (NANC 394) identified in the Related Documents field in the PIM. | LNPA WG | 3/07/2006 | Closed |
| [PIM 37](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6934/PIM_037_-_Industry_Standards_for_LNP_Readiness_v3.docx) | 05/27/04 | Verizon Wireless | Industry Standards for LNP Readiness v3 -This PIM, submitted by Verizon Wireless, seeks to define in the NANC Flows that Inter-carrier Communications Process (ICP) must be electronic or manual (fax or e-mail), and not a phone call.  7/20/2004 LNPA WG Meeting  PIM 37 – This PIM, submitted by Verizon Wireless, seeks to define in the NANC Flows that Inter-carrier Communications Process (ICP) must be electronic or manual (fax or e-mail), and not a phone call.    At the July meeting, the submitter, Verizon Wireless, stated that small carriers are using FAX and therefore, would like to withdraw the PIM. | **Suggested Resolution:** The suggested resolution is to clearly define industry standards for low-tech carriers at the NANC and perhaps NAPM LLC level so as to be addressed and potentially enforced by the FCC. The suggestion for each issue is noted as follows:  Porting with no ICP process:  Clearly define a statement in Box 5, 8 & 9 of LSR/FOC NANC Flows that ICP must be electronic or manual (fax or e-mail). Manual did not mean a phone call. Add a statement in Box 3 & 5 of Wireless ICP Communication Flow that ICP based on OBF (specifically WICIS) standards for WPR.  **Final Resolution:** This PIM was withdrawn by the submitter at the July 2004 meeting. | LNPA WG | 7/20/2004 | Withdrawn |
| [PIM 36](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6930/PIM_036_-_NPA-NXXs_in_Incorrect_NPA_region_v3.docx) | 04/05/04 | Syniverse | NPA-NXXs in Incorrect NPA region v3 - This PIM, submitted by Syniverse (formerly TSI), proposes an edit in NPAC to prevent NPA-NXX codes from being opened in the wrong NPAC regional database by service providers.  3/7/2006 LNPA WG Meeting  PIM 36 – This PIM, submitted by Syniverse, proposes an edit in NPAC to prevent NPA-NXX codes from being opened in the wrong NPAC regional database by service providers.    PIM 36 has been closed as a result of the implementation of NANC Change Order 321 in NPAC Release 3.3  10/6/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** An NPAC edit should be instituted to reject NPA-NXX entries attempted in the wrong NPAC region.  The NPA-level edit is provided by proposed Change Order NANC321 and is sufficient for all NPAs except 859. The Change Order should be expanded to provide a LATA-level edit for the 859 NPA to determine whether the NPA-NXX being submitted to NPAC is in LATA 922. If it is in LATA 922, it could be opened only in the Midwest NPAC. If it is not, it could be opened only in the Southeast NPAC.  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail refer to the NANC Change Order(s) (NANC 321) identified in the Related Documents field in the PIM. | LNPA WG | 3/7/2006 | Closed |
| [PIM 35](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6926/PIM_035_-_Certification_Testing_for_SPs_vs_Vendors_v2.docx) | 03/26/04 | TelCove | Certification Testing for SPs vs Vendors v2 - This PIM, submitted by TelCove (f.k.a. Adelphia Business Solutions), seeks clarification why service providers must do local system turn-up testing when their vendors must also pass certification testing on their products.  4/06/2004 LNPA WG Meeting  NEW PIM 35 – This PIM, submitted by TelCove, seeks clarification why service providers must do local system turn-up testing when their vendors must also pass certification testing on their products. NeuStar responded that vendor certification testing verifies messaging across the interfaces, not edit or GUI behavior. Service provider turn-up testing verifies business rules, behavior, and edits. There are separate documents and test cases for certification and turn-up testing. Also, vendors cannot know every permutation of their software used by their customers. Vendors doing turn-up testing on behalf of a provider must test using a system that mirrors the provider’s production system. To do otherwise violates turn-up testing requirements. Service providers are ultimately responsible for ensuring turn-up testing is compliant because they are the NPAC User signing the User Agreement.  This PIM was not accepted.  10/6/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** Certification testing should be completed with the vendors, as it is today. Individual service providers should not be required to complete the same testing, provided their vendor has already done so.  **Final Resolution:** This PIM was not accepted at the April 2004 meeting. Refer to the LNPA meeting minutes for details. | LNPA WG | 4/06/2004 | Not Accepted |
| [PIM 34](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6922/PIM_034_-_Wireless_not_receiving_SCR_from_Wireline_on_Type_1_ports_v3.docx) | 02/27/04 | Syniverse | Wireless not receiving SCR from Wireline on Type 1 ports v3 - This PIM, submitted by Syniverse (formerly TSI), seeks to address issues related to the process for obtaining a Customer Service Record (CSR), which contains information necessary to complete a Local Service Request (LSR) for porting in a Type 1 cellular number.  4/6/2004 LNPA WG Meeting  NEW PIM 34 – This PIM, submitted by Syniverse (formerly TSI), seeks to address issues related to the process for obtaining a Customer Service Record (CSR), which contains information necessary to complete a Local Service Request (LSR) for porting in a Type 1 Cellular number. This PIM was accepted by the LNPA.    NOTE: This PIM was discussed on Wednesday, April 7th, during the April LNPA meeting.  Wireline Service Providers that require an account number on the LSR sent to them are to answer the following questions:  For porting a Type 1 number:  1. Who should the CSR request be sent to, the Old Local Service Provider or the Old Network Service Provider?  2. For LSR population, is the required account number the End User account number or the Billing Telephone Number of the Type 1 provider?  3. Can the proper account information required for LSR population be obtained from a CSR request to the Old Network Service Provider in lieu of a request to the Old Local Service Provider (Type 1 provider)?  4. In order to prevent wireless carriers from having to interface with two different providers when porting in a Type 1 number, can any edit that requires the Type 1 provider’s Billing Telephone Number on the LSR be relaxed to allow the LSR to go through with just the TN, Customer Name and Address, and End User Account Number? If not, what would it take to relax the edit?    A member questioned how it would be validated that the right customer is being ported if the process was streamlined per above.  BellSouth stated that they allow access to CSRs for porting Type 1s.  6/14/2005 LNPA WG Meeting  PIM 34 – This PIM, submitted by Syniverse (formerly TSI), seeks to address issues related to the process for obtaining a Customer Service Record (CSR), which contains information necessary to complete a Local Service Request (LSR) for porting in a Type 1 Cellular number.    The proposed resolution for PIM 49, if implemented, will also address PIM 34. Rob Smith, Syniverse, stated that nothing more remains to be done on the solution. He reported that not all wireless carriers have agreed to implement the mechanized solution. As a result, manual workarounds are in place to address the issue.  The PIM will be withdrawn.  Migrations of Type 1 numbers to Type 2 are continuing.  10/6/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** Wire line network service providers should provide the customer service record on ‘Type 1’ ports. The response message to the CSR query should include a statement that the number being ported is a ‘Type 1’ number.  **Final Resolution:**  PIM 34 has been closed without an industry-wide automated resolution. Wireless carriers have cooperated in developing alternative solutions to port a Type 1 number. Wireline and wireless providers continue to work together to migrate Type 1 numbers to Type 2. | LNPA WG | 6/14/2005 | Closed |
| [PIM 33](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6918/PIM_033_-_Active_Like_TNs_in_an_NPA-NXX_Report_v2.docx) | 02/13/04 | Adelphia Business Solutions | Active Like TNs in an NPA-NXX Report v2 - This PIM, submitted by Adelphia Business Solutions, seeks to have NeuStar charges waived for non-discretionary NPAC reports produced when they take ownership of an NXX code returned by another provider.  3/9/2004 LNPA WG Meeting  NEW PIM 33 – This PIM, submitted by Adelphia Business Solutions, seeks to have NeuStar charges waived for non-discretionary NPAC reports produced when they take ownership of an NXX code returned by another provider. It was suggested that one alternative would be to allocate the charges across providers in the region. Another suggestion was to use data from an LSMS as the source, however, a Service Bureau member of the LNPA stated that providers that go through a Service Bureau do not have access to an LSMS. It was further stated that waiving this charge would be a Master Contract change and allocating the charge would be contrary to the FCC Order on allocation. Another member said that the only recourse so to not take the code. It was agreed that this is a regulatory issue and not in the purview of the LNPA.  This PIM was not accepted.  10/6/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** We are recommending that this charge be waived in light of current guidelines listed above and the letter stating that if we do not take ownership then our customer could potentially "be taken out of service".  **Final Resolution:** This PIM was not accepted at the March 2004 meeting. Refer to the LNPA meeting minutes for details. | LNPA WG | 3/9/2004 | Not Accepted |
| [PIM 32](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6914/PIM_032_-_Wireless_not_Receiving_CSR_from_Wireline_v5.docx) | 02/27/04 | Syniverse | Wireless not Receiving CSR from Wireline v5 - This PIM, submitted by Syniverse (formerly TSI), seeks to address issues related to the process for obtaining a Customer Service Record (CSR), which contains information necessary to complete a Local Service Request (LSR) for porting in a reseller number.  3/9/2004 LNPA WG Meeting  NEW PIM 32 - This PIM, submitted by Syniverse (formerly TSI), seeks to address issues related to the process for obtaining a Customer Service Record (CSR), which contains information necessary to complete a Local Service Request (LSR) for porting in a reseller or Type 1 Cellular number. This PIM was accepted by the LNPA.    Wireline Local Exchange Carriers (LECs) took an action to investigate internally the process for porting reseller numbers between wireline carriers in an effort to determine why there are issues with porting Type 1 Cellular and reseller numbers to wireless carriers. An interim call to discuss this research was scheduled for 3/25/04 from 2–4pm Eastern. The conference bridge number is 888-412-7808, passcode 23272#.  7/12/2005 LNPA WG Meeting  PIM 32 is now being worked through wireline providers’ Account Management process. Action Item 0605-10 is now closed. Action Item 0904-09 remains open. A question was asked if the issue is related to not being able to get a CSR for resale or UNE-P. It was stated that UNE-P is going away and should lessen the problem. In some of the Change Management Process discussions, it was stated that the reseller is the owner of record for the customer’s account and some resellers have stated that it is their prerogative to give the underlying network provider permission to provide the CSR or not. Sprint is trying to acquire more information in the front-end process, whether it be to correctly submit the LSR or the CSR request. Rob Smith, Syniverse, suggested that the NANC flows could be changed to require the reseller to coordinate the port (old Option A). It was stated that resellers are required to provide a CSR upon a legitimate request for porting purposes. Wireless Service Providers are to work change control efforts for PIM 32 through their appropriate wireline Account Management teams.  7/10/2007 LNPA WG Meeting  The following resolution text for PIM 32 was approved for inclusion as Item 48 in the LNPA WG’s NP Best Practices document.  PIM 32 seeks to address issues related to the process of obtaining a Customer Service Record (CSR) for wireline reseller customers. The CSR contains information necessary to complete a Local Service Request (LSR) for porting a wireline number. In some cases, carriers are not able to obtain an end user’s specific CSR information from some wireline network service providers when attempting to port telephone numbers (TNs) associated with reseller accounts. For example, two of four RBOCs refuse to send the CSR information to the New Local Service Provider (NLSP) because they have been instructed by their resellers not to share the end user’s specific information which the resellers consider to be proprietary.  This is a critical problem. For those reseller errors where there is a workaround, many of the port requests are significantly delayed before completion. In some cases there are no workaround solutions and end users who want to port their number cannot. Those customers either give up on porting their number, or cannot keep their number and must change to a new number. It is not always possible to work with the resellers to obtain the information needed to populate the LSR. It is often difficult to find someone with the reseller that can support a port and provide the needed information.  The failure to port wireline reseller TNs can be resolved. Direction by resellers to Old Network Service Providers (ONSPs) to provide the specific customer information where possible would greatly reduce the unsuccessful ports. Resellers should not be allowed to withhold end user specific customer information necessary for the porting process.  At the April 17, 2007 NANC meeting, the LNPA WG submitted this final Position Paper in order to bring the LNPA WG’s consensus position to the attention of the NANC and the FCC.  PIM 32 was closed at the July 2007 LNPA WG meeting.  10/6/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** Wire line network service providers should provide the customer service record on porting reseller numbers. The response message to the CSR query should include a statement that the number being requested is a reseller number.  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation of Best Practice 0048 – Porting of Wireline Reseller Numbers**.** | LNPA WG | 7/10/2007 | Closed |
| [PIM 31](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6910/PIM_031_-_Wireless_Processing_Jeopardies_Following_Confirms_v3.docx) | 02/27/04 | Syniverse | Wireless Processing Jeopardies Following Confirms v3 - This PIM, submitted by Syniverse (formerly TSI), seeks to address fallout that occurs in cases where the wireline Old Service Provider involved in a port issues a jeopardy notification with a change in due date to the wireless New Service Provider. Wireless carriers currently cannot support jeopardy notices with changes to the due date and time.  3/10/2004 LNPA WG Meeting  NEW PIM 31 – This PIM, submitted by Syniverse (formerly TSI), seeks to address fallout that occurs in cases where the wireline Old Service Provider involved in a port issues a jeopardy notification with a change in due date to the wireless New Service Provider. Wireless carriers currently cannot support jeopardy notices with changes to the due date and time. This PIM was accepted by the LNPA. Rob Smith, Syniverse, took an action to quantify and provide examples of why wireline carriers are placing these previously confirmed ports in jeopardy. This will determine the disposition of the PIM.  11/2/2004 LNPA WG Meeting  PIM 31 – This PIM, submitted by Syniverse (formerly TSI), seeks to address fallout that occurs in cases where the wireline Old Service Provider involved in a port issues a jeopardy notification with a change in due date to the wireless New Service Provider. Wireless carriers currently cannot support jeopardy notices with changes to the due date and time.    Based on additional data gathering and the observed reduction in the number of jeopardies, Rob Smith, Syniverse, proposed to close PIM 31. PIM 31 is CLOSED  10/6/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** Wireless carriers should avoid sending duplicate port requests for the same number. This results in jeopardy notices when the wire line trading partner confirms a second request  only to learn that the port is already in progress.  Wire line carriers should tighten their processes for issuing confirms. Jeopardy Notices appear to be used on ports that should not have been confirmed in the first place. True  jeopardy notices should only be used when and appointment can’t be made involving a ‘loop’. Such cases would be very rare in intermodal porting.  When a jeopardy notice must be issued, providing a reason for the jeopardy notice helps reduce the research time required to learn why. Following is a list of common reasons for jeopardy notices. Including these on responses would help process jeopardy ports.   * Duplicate LSR * Contact LEC * Special feature on TN * Due Date change requested * Contact with end user required * Ported MDN has not been activated   **Final Resolution:** Based on additional data gathering and the observed reduction in the number of jeopardies this PIM was Closed at the November 2004 meeting. | LNPA WG | 11/2/2004 | Closed |
| [PIM 30](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6906/PIM_030_-_N-1_Query_Responsibilities_for_Wireless_v4.docx) | 01/23/04 | Alltel | N-1 Query Responsibilities for Wireless v4 - This PIM, submitted by Alltel, seeks clarification on the responsibilities of carriers within the context of the FCC-mandated N-1 LNP architecture. The PIM also seeks to determine if wireless carriers are required to perform an LNP database query on default routed calls when the responsible N-1 carrier has failed to do so.  11/2/2004 LNPA WG Meeting  • PIM 30 – This PIM, submitted by Alltel, seeks to clarify the N-1 LNP architecture query responsibilities, and whether wireless carriers are obligated to perform default number portability queries when the N-1 carrier fails to dip the call.    The attached cites defining the N-1 Local Number Portability architecture were forwarded to LNPA members to assist in the discussion.    At the November 2004 LNPA meeting, Dave Garner, Qwest, presented the attached contribution on Extended Area Service (EAS) in the N-1 architecture, explaining that the term “transit” consists of transport and switching costs.    A concern was raised regarding the phrase, “at rates as shall be determined.” The concern raised was that this may imply that the LNPA may somehow determine these rates. Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will revise the PIM 30 Extended Areas Service (EAS) N-1 document to remove the text on cost determination.    After some additional discussion, the consensus was to move forward with Alternative 2 in order to address EAS in the N-1 architecture. Gary Sacra, Verizon, presented the attached contribution suggesting some clarifying changes to Alternative 2 of the EAS N-1 document. The group accepted these changes.    Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will add an explanation to the attached LNPA WG N-1  Interpretation Working Document that the yellow highlighting is meant to highlight text from the various cites that is most relevant to the stated interpretation.    Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will incorporate the LNPA-approved EAS N-1 document into the LNPA WG N-1 Interpretation Working Document and distribute to the LNPA for final review and approval at the December LNPA meeting. Any final comments or revisions will be discussed at the meeting.  This PIM remains open and will be discussed further at the December meeting. The LNPA’s objective continues to be to finalize documentation of its consensus on N-1 responsibilities based on its assessment of FCC cites and industry documentation. This will be documented in LNPA meeting minutes and the PIM 30 resolution for possible reference by a service provider seeking to escalate if they feel they are receiving an inordinate amount of default routed calls. The LNPA will provide to NANC its consensus on N-1 responsibilities, including EAS areas and carriers with waivers or operating outside mandated areas, and whether the NANC should recommend to the FCC any rule changes relevant to the N-1 architecture  12/7/2004 LNPA WG Meeting  PIM 30 – This PIM, submitted by Alltel, seeks to clarify the N-1 LNP architecture query responsibilities, and whether wireless carriers are obligated to perform default number portability queries when the N-1 carrier fails to dip the call.    The attached cites defining the N-1 Local Number Portability architecture were forwarded to LNPA members to assist in the discussion.    At the December 2004 LNPA meeting, Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair presented the attached Draft Version 3 of the LNPA WG N-1 Interpretation Working Document, which incorporates the changes agreed upon at the November 2004 LNPA meeting.    Deb Tucker, Verizon Wireless walked the group through the attached contribution addressing Extended Area Service (EAS) in the N-1 architecture.    After group discussion, it was agreed to revise the contributed text as follows for incorporation into the final LNPA WG N-1 Interpretation Working Document:  This language takes into account current technical limitations and regulatory constraints as well as existing configuration issues. Carriers may consider making modifications to their querying and routing arrangements as technology upgrades and changes to interconnecting configurations permit.  Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, will finalize the LNPA WG N-1 Interpretation Working Document, and submit it to NANC for discussion at the January 2005 NANC meeting.  It was agreed to close PIM 30  10/6/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:**   * LECs need to be given clear direction/interpretation of their obligations for performing N-1 NP Queries. * Wireless carriers must agree to perform Default Queries when the N-1 does not occur. These queries can be set up as a matter of course, and should not require trouble ticket resolution which can take a matter of days.   **Final Resolution:** LNPA WG N-1 Interpretation Working Document was updated with changes included in the PIM and submitted to NANC. | LNPA WG | 12/7/2004 | Closed |
| [PIM 29](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6898/PIM_029_-_Intermodal_Process_Inconsistency_v3docx.docx) | 01/20/04 | Sprint | Intermodal Process Inconsistency v3 - This PIM, submitted by Sprint PCS, addresses scenarios where customers porting from a wireline carrier are disconnected in the donor switch before the wireless carrier activates the port.  3/9/2004 LNPA WG Meeting  PIM 29 – This PIM, submitted by Sprint PCS, addresses scenarios where customers porting from a wireline carrier are disconnected in the donor switch before the wireless carrier activates the port.    During the discussion at the March meeting, BellSouth stated that they do not perform the disconnect until they get an NPAC activate notification. SBC currently has a similar process in the West Coast and is in the process of implementing it throughout their footprint. Qwest and Verizon will take a Supplemental LSR until late in the evening on the due date to stop the disconnect if the New Service Provider is not going to activate the port. Cox has put a process in place to monitor the NPAC and will not pull translations until they see an NPAC activation. Some CLECs said that they still see some disconnects before activation but it is not as bad as it once was. Verizon and Qwest said that mechanizing a process for monitoring the NPAC for an activation notification to serve as a trigger to perform the switch disconnect would take extensive system and process changes. Electric Lightwave stated that their technicians send a query through the switch when they get a disconnect order and will not disconnect until they get an LRN in the response. Qwest stated that the New Service Provider is the agent for the porting customer and should be responsible for contacting the Old Service Provider if they are not going to activate. Qwest further suggested that if the wireless service provider has not received a Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) after 24 hours, they should follow up with the Old Service Provider.  Service Providers took the following action items for discussion at the April LNPA meeting:  1. to investigate internally if it is feasible for them to monitor the NPAC for evidence that the port has occurred before removing donor switch translations associated with the ported number.  2. to answer the following question: If they send up an authorizing Old Service Provider Create, can its notification be used by the New Service Provider to indicate that an FOC/WPRR not received has been issued and lost in transit and approval to activate the port on the due date on that SV Create is granted? NOTE: It was suggested by some members that this breaks the NANC flows, which require receipt of the FOC before the activate can take place. Another member also reminded the group that the Old Service Provider confirming Create message is optional.  6/15/2004 LNPA WG Meeting  During the discussion at the June meeting, it was stated that the acceptable timeframes for performing the disconnect is addressed in the NANC flows. Sprint agreed to close PIM 29 in lieu of the workaround in place to address PIM 28, as well as the other open PIMs that address LSR/FOC fallout.  10/6/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** Define requirements that could be utilized by wireline and wireless carriers for intermodal porting.  Develop procedures for the OSP to disconnect once the NSP has activated. Consideration for NPAC SOA and/or LSMS notification as triggers.  **Final Resolution:** At the June 2004 meeting, it was stated that the acceptable timeframes for performing the disconnect is addressed in the NANC flows. Sprint agreed to close PIM 29 in lieu of the workaround in place to address PIM 28, as well as the other open PIMs that address LSR/FOC | LNPA WG | 6/15/2004 | Closed |
| [PIM 28](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6902/PIM_028_-_Due_Date_and_Time_Change_confirms_-_Wireless_vs_Wireline_v2.docx) | 01/02/04 | Sprint | Due Date and Time Change Confirms – Wireless vs Wireline v2 - This PIM, submitted by Sprint PCS, addresses interface differences between the WPRR (wireless) and FOC (wireline). The FOC allows for a due date and time change on confirmations, however, the WPRR does not. When a wireline carrier sends an FOC with a change in due date or time, the wireless carrier cannot process the change and does not allow the port to complete.  6/15/2004 LNPA WG Meeting  PIM 28 – This PIM, submitted by Sprint PCS, addresses interface differences between the WPRR (wireless) and FOC (wireline). The FOC allows for a due date and time change on confirmations, however, the WPRR does not. When a wireline carrier sends an FOC with a change in due date or time, the wireless carrier cannot process the change and does not allow the port to complete. This accepted PIM was referred to the Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF) Wireless Workshop and Local Ordering and Provisioning (LSOP) Committee. On 2/24/04, the OBF sent the attached response stating that the Local Service Ordering and Provisioning Committee (LSOP) accepted this issue (Issue 2729) and referred it to be worked by the Interspecies Task Force (ITF). The proposed resolution is for the WICIS standard to be modified to relax edits to allow the Inter-carrier Communications Process (ICP) to accept due date and time changes. This resolution would likely be in WICIS Release 3.0 in June/July 2005. There is a workaround in the interim. A member stated that the FCC Order states that in “Phase 1” of inter-modal porting, the wireline forms will be used. This PIM will continue to be tracked by the LNPA.  3/7/2006 LNPA WG Meeting  10/6/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website.  The final resolution was implemented with the release of Wireless Carrier Interface Specification Guidelines 3.0.0. This PIM is now closed | **Suggested Resolution:**  **Final Resolution:** The final resolution was implemented with the release of Wireless Carrier Interface Specification Guidelines 3.0.0. This PIM is now closed | OBF | 3/7/2006 | Closed |
| [PIM 27](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6894/PIM_027_-_SV_cancelled_in_error_v2.docx) | 09/29/03 | Nextel | SV cancelled in error v2 - This PIM, submitted by Nextel, proposes short-term that both wireless and wireline Cancel Acknowledgement Window timers be changed from 9 business hours each to 2 business hours each. The long-term proposal is to allow a provider who cancels a pending port to be able to un-cancel. The long-term proposal requires an NPAC Change Order. Verizon opposed shortening the wireline timer, but did not object to the proposed wireless reduction or the long-term solution. SBC prefers timers shorter than they are now but not necessarily as short as the proposed 2 hours. Alltel is not in favor of reducing the wireline timer. Bellsouth is not in favor of shortening the wireline timer, however, is willing to talk more about the long-term solution.  9/17/2003 LNPA WG Meeting  NEW PIM 27 – This PIM, submitted by Nextel, proposes short-term that both wireless and wireline Cancel Acknowledgement Window timers be changed from 9 business hours each to 2 business hours each. The long-term proposal is to allow a provider who cancels a pending port to be able to un-cancel. The long-term proposal requires an NPAC Change Order. Verizon opposed shortening the wireline timer, but did not object to the proposed wireless reduction or the long-term solution. SBC prefers timers shorter than they are now but not necessarily as short as the proposed 2 hours. Alltel is not in favor of reducing the wireline timer. Bellsouth is not in favor of shortening the wireline timer, however, is willing to talk more about the long-term solution.  Susan Ortega, Nextel, took an action to resubmit the attached proposed PIM 27  modified to only include the proposed short-term solution of reducing the wireless and wireline Cancel Acknowledgement Window timers.    She also took an action to submit an NPAC Change Order for the proposed long-term solution, extracted below from the proposed PIM 27.  “We recommend that the NPAC enable the SP who put an SV in Cancel Pending to remove the SV from Cancel Pending and put it in Pending status. E.g., if the Old SP put an SV in Cancel Pending, only the Old SP can remove it from Cancel Pending. If the New SP put an SV in Cancel pending, only the New SP can remove it from Cancel Pending.”  Service Providers have an action to discuss internally if they can support a reduction of the Cancel Acknowledgement Window timers for a decision next month to accept or reject proposed PIM 27.  10/15/2003 LNPA WG Meeting  During the discussion of PIM 27 at the October LNPA, Verizon, AT&T Wireless, Qwest, Sprint, Sprint PCS, Cox, BellSouth, US Cellular, and Cingular expressed support of the long term proposal enabling removal of Cancel Pending status, but did not support any shortening of the Cancel Acknowledgement Window timers. SBC expressed support of the long term proposal and would only support shortening the timer slightly. T-Mobile and Verizon Wireless expressed support for both the short term Nextel proposal (revised PIM 27) and the long term proposal. The revised PIM 27 was not accepted at the October LNPA meeting.  10/6/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** We propose that the two wireline “Cancellation Acknowledgement Window” intervals be reduced from nine hours each to an amount of time agreeable by the industry, e.g., 4 hours each  **Final Resolution**: This PIM was not accepted at the October 2003 meeting. Refer to the LNPA meeting minutes for details. | LNPA WG | 10/15/2003 | Not Accepted |
| [PIM 26](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6890/PIM_026_-_SPs_should_coordinate_with_NPAC_when_testing_v2.docx) | 09/03/03 | ATTWS | SPs should coordinate with the NPAC when testing v2 - Enhance SOW 34 NPAC test bed hardware to handle the increased porting volumes and shorter lead times of porting intervals.  10/15/2003 LNPA WG Meeting  NEW PIM 26 – This PIM, submitted by AT&T Wireless, seeks creation of a test bed that mirrors a production NPAC for volume and performance testing. The current SOW 34 test bed does not support load and performance testing to the extent required by wireless providers without affecting other providers that are testing. This PIM was discussed during the Architecture Planning Team (APT) meeting on Tuesday. This Change Order will incorporate AT&T Wireless’ PIM 26 contribution. This PIM was CLOSED at the October LNPA meeting.  10/6/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:**  OPTION 1  Upgrade NPAC Test Bed (SOW 34) to replicate hardware platform(s) of an NPAC Production Region. Server and other network hardware requirements will be defined by existing production platform requirements. Also ensure SOW 34 testbed remains consistent and at par with NPAC production environments for future releases and/or technology advancements.  OPTION 2  Do not perform upgrade of SOW 34 testbed environment and permeate risk in production environment with service providers choosing to perform “friendly” volume tests (1-10,000 TN’s)  OPTION 3  Identify a finite number of transactions the NPAC testbed must be scalable to allow for performance and functional testing.  Example: Business Requirement would be the NPAC Testbed must support a high threshold of 30,000 port requests from a single service provider during normal business hours.  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail, refer to the NANC Change Order(s) (NANC 389) identified in the Related Documents field of the PIM. | LNPA WG | 10/15/2003 | Closed |
| [PIM 25](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6886/PIM_025_-_Retailer_access_to_NPAC_data_v2.docx) | 07/24/03 | Verizon Wireless | Retailer access to NPAC data v2 - Seeks a Change Order for NPAC to relax the validation to allow the Due Date and Time to be acceptable if it is within a tunable period before the current date.  10/15/2003 LNPA WG Meeting  PIM 25 – This PIM, submitted by Wireless Retail, Inc., seeks to give retailers access to “the porting database” to determine which carriers/markets to/from which customers can port. The submitter of this PIM stated that there are over 2,000 retail locations with 4500 sales reps that need training on wireless number portability. They NeuStar will develop a Change Order for review next month in the APT meeting. Need to know if a customer is eligible to port their number. The sales reps currently do not have any concept of rate center. Wireless Retail is seeking access to a central database to determine eligibility. Wireless Retail further explained that each wireless carrier provides different on-line access to their systems and that wireless carriers have not released training material yet regarding wireless number portability. The LNPA agreed that they should work with each individual carrier and pursue to see if any vendors have an offering that could satisfy their need. This PIM was CLOSED at the October meeting.  10/6/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** Make porting database available to all retailers. Perhaps through a website.  **Final Resolution:** The LNPA agreed that they should work with each individual carrier and pursue to see if any vendors have an offering that could satisfy their need. | LNPA WG | 10/15/2003 | Closed |
| [PIM 24](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6882/PIM_024_-_Intra-SP_port_of_TNs_in_contaminated_block_v2.docx) | 05/13/03 | ATTWS Pooling Administrator | Intra-SP port of TNs in contaminated blocks v2 - Blocks that are being assigned to Service Providers are either contaminated when they are donated as a non-contaminated block or the blocks have been contaminated over 10%. This is causing customers to be out of service or blocks being exchanged for a less contaminated or non-contaminated block.  In addition when the PA has assigned a block, at times the block is being rejected in the NPAC for not having the NXX as opened in the NPAC as portable.  10/15/2003 LNPA WG Meeting  PIM 24 – This PIM, submitted by the Pool Administrator and AT&T Wireless, addresses instances where service providers are not following guidelines for block donation. For example, in some instances, contaminated blocks are being donated as non-contaminated blocks, or blocks with greater than 10% contamination are being donated. This is causing customers to be taken out of service or blocks to be exchanged for a less contaminated or non-contaminated block.    The LNPA and NAPM/LLC had previously approved the sharing of information between NPAC and the Pool Administrator whereby the Pool Administrator is able to obtain the necessary information from NPAC to ensure, to the extent possible, that service providers are complying with the pooled block donation process. The PA submitted Change Order 23 for FCC consideration. PA Change Order 23 was subsequently withdrawn and PA Change Order 24 was submitted to the FCC by the PA. The Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG) has recommended to the FCC a trial of the proposed resolution in selected pools initially. The PIM will remain open pending the FCC’s decision on the Change Order.  11/14/2006 LNPA WG Meeting  The LNPA and NAPM/LLC had previously approved the sharing of information between NPAC and the Pool Administrator whereby the Pool Administrator is able to obtain the necessary information from NPAC to ensure, to the extent possible, that service providers are complying with the pooled block donation process. The PA submitted Change Order 23 for FCC consideration. PA Change Order 23 was subsequently withdrawn and PA Change Order 24 was submitted to the FCC by the PA. The Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG) recommended to the FCC a trial of the proposed resolution in selected pools initially. The FCC subsequently recommended that the PA submit another Change Order based on the NOWG recommendation for a trial. On 2/9/04, the PA submitted Change Order 26 based on this recommendation to conduct a trial in one NPA in each NPAC region. The FCC approved PA Change Order 26. The PA has since received reports for each trial NPA in each region and worked with service providers to resolve discrepancies in what is in PAS vs. NPAC. The PA then aggregated the information and sent the findings and a recommendation to the FCC. Attached are the PA’s summary and a recommendation to the FCC that the PA receive reports for all NPAs and that it be repeated annually. The NOWG was then asked by the FCC to review the results and provide a recommendation.    The NOWG subsequently issued the attached recommendation that the PA provide an updated proposal with cost details for Change Order #24 to the FCC, for review by the NOWG, prior to the FCC authorizing a one-time scrub of PAS by the PA. The FCC responded that the PA should submit a new Change Order based on NOWG’s recommendation for a one-time scrub of all NPAs, and for ongoing data collection to determine if subsequent scrubs are needed.  On May 4, 2005, the Pool Administrator (PA) submitted the attached PA Change Order 41 for a one-time scrub of all 1K blocks currently in the pools. The NOWG supports PA Change Order 41.    At the November LNPA WG meeting, the PA presented the attached summary reports on the work resulting from PA Change Order 41. At the beginning of the project, there were 189,552 thousand-blocks available in PAS. Out of the 189,552 available blocks, 10,758 (5.68%) resulted in a discrepancy, which meant that  either PAS was incorrect or the NPAC was incorrect. Also, out of the 10,758 available blocks, there were 506 blocks that appeared to be over 10% contaminated. These were removed from the pool. 89% of the remaining had an incorrect contamination indicator in PAS. Some providers mistakenly thought they could donate a block that was over 10% contaminated if numbers were ported away to another carrier. The NOWG and PA will get input from the industry in a year to determine if they will request another scrub from the FCC. INC Issue 485, in tabled status, was a request from the LNPA WG to determine what process improvements can be put in place. Paula Jordan, LNPA WG Co-Chair, along with Mohamed Samater, T-Mobile, will convert the explanations from carriers as to why they had discrepancies between PAS and NPAC for pooled blocks in the attached PA Change Order 41 Final Summary into best practices statements for the LNPA WG’s NP Best Practices document.    PIM 24 is now closed.  10/6/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** The following actions are proposed to resolve this issue:  Provide the PA access to the NPAC to check for contamination prior to the assignment of a thousands block.  Provide the PA access to the NPAC to check if the code is opened as portable.  **Final Resolution:** This PIM resulted in execution of PA Change Order 41 for a one-time scrub of all 1K blocks currently in the pools. In addition Best Practice 044 – Pooled Block record discrepancies between PAS and NPAC was created. | LNPA WG | 11/14/06 | Closed |
| [PIM 23](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6878/PIM_023_-_Syncing_NPAC_and_BIRRDS_data_v2.docx) | 02/19/03 | Telcordia TRA | Syncing NPAC and BIRRDS data v2 - The LRNs, NXX data, and NXX-X data and effective dates of the data in the NPAC are not always in synch with those in the Telcordia Business Integrated Routing and Rating Database System (BIRRDS).  3/12/2003 LNPA WG Meeting  NEW PIM Submission - Adam Newman, Telcordia, presented a new PIM submitted by the Common Interest Group on Rating and Routing (CIGRR), addressing inconsistencies between data in the LERG and NPAC. This PIM is seeking data validation between the LERG and NPAC for LRN, NXX, NXX-X, effective date, and Service Provider ID data that is entered into the two databases. Some questions were asked during the discussion regarding the LERG’s need for LRN data and the problems caused by the discrepancies. It was recognized that LRN discrepancies do not necessarily mean an error. Service providers took an action to discuss the need for this data cross-check between NPAC and the LERG with their respective CIGRR representatives. This PIM was not accepted at this meeting, but will be on the agenda for discussion again at the April LNPA.  10/6/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** The following actions are proposed to resolve this issue:   * Similar to the data exchange Telcordia Routing Administration performs with NECA, have a data file, in an agreed to format, sent from NPAC to Telcordia Routing Administration (TRA) with the relevant LRN, NXX, NXX-X, effective date and Service Provider ID data that is entered into the two databases. This format should be able to be processed for data validations e.g., fixed ASCII format. TRA will validate that all the relevant data is consistent. When any data is inconsistent, TRA will provide a report on the inconsistencies to the AOCN of the company associated with the NXX, NXX-X, or LRN. This information could be copied (by either TRA or the AOCN) to the LNP contact of the company on request to facilitate communication between the routing group and the portability group for any necessary correction to the data.   **Final Resolution: S**Ps are to discuss with their respective CIGRR members and report in April meeting.  07/09/2003 – PIM was withdrawn by submitter | LNPA WG | 7/9/2003 | Withdrawn |
| [PIM 22](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6874/PIM_022_-_Removal_of_SV_when_Conflict_Timer_Expires_v4.docx) | 08/28/02 | Verizon | Removal of SV when Conflict Timer Expires v4 - Customers have been taken out of service inadvertently due to the New Service Provider continuing with a port that as been placed into conflict by the Old Service Provider after the 6 hour timer expired, instead of investigating why the port was placed into conflict.  09/18/2002 - This new PIM was submitted by Verizon. It seeks to address instances where customers have been taken out of service inadvertently due to the New Service Provider continuing with a port that has been placed into Conflict by the Old Service Provider. In these cases, the New Service Provider continued with porting the customer after the 6 hour timer had expired, instead of investigating why the port was placed into Conflict. In many of these cases, the port was placed into Conflict because no matching LSR could be identified as a result of the wrong TNs being sent up in the CREATE message from the New Service Provider.  Gary Sacra, Verizon, took an ACTION ITEM to review the Conflict Cause Values and come to October meeting with a proposal for which ones this PIM would be restricted to.  10/02 – 1/03 - This PIM, submitted by Verizon, seeks to address instances where customers have been taken out of service inadvertently after the New Service Provider continued with a port that had been placed into Conflict by the Old Service Provider. In these cases, the port was placed into Conflict Status by the Old Service Provider because of indications that the New Service Provider may possibly be porting the wrong TNs. Service providers have been asked to internally investigate the frequency of occurrence for discussion at the February LNPA.  On-going - Consensus has not yet been reached on a resolution. Service Providers have an open action item to collect data internally to determine the quantity of their customers ported by mistake and report their findings to the LNPA.  3/07/2006 LNPA WG Meeting  PIM 22 – PIM 22 has been closed as a result of the implementation of NANC Change Order 375 in NPAC Release 3.3.  10/6/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** The LNPA should revisit the philosophy that led to enabling the New Service Provider to remove a Subscription Version from Conflict status after a specified period of time without first resolving the original conflict with the Old Service Provider. NPAC requirements and functionality should be modified such that only the Old Service Provider is able to remove Conflict status and move a Subscription Version to Pending status when the Conflict Cause Value is set to 50, which signifies that the Old Service Provider has not received a matching Local Service Request (LSR) or Wireless Porting Request (WPR) for the telephone number received in the New Service Provider CREATE notification from NPAC, or when the Conflict Cause Value is set to 51 (Firm Order Confirmation Not Issued).  Subscription Versions should only be placed into Conflict with a Cause Value set to 50 when the Old Service Provider cannot match an LSR or WPR with the New Service Provider CREATE notification and is reasonably confident that the wrong number is about to be ported. Also, Subscription Versions should only be placed into Conflict with a Cause Value set to 51 when the Old Service Provider has a legitimate reason for withholding the Firm Order Confirmation. A Cause Value of 50 or 51 should not be used in lieu of any other appropriate Conflict Cause Value in order to inappropriately prevent the New Service Provider’s ability to remove Conflict status.  **Final Resolution:** This issue resulted in the creation and acceptance of a NANC Change Order. For further detail, refer to the NANC Change Order(s) (NANC 375) identified in the Related Documents field of the PIM. | LNPA WG | 3/07/2006 | Closed |
| [PIM 21](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6870/PIM_021_-_TN_records_in_NPAC_after_SP_ceases_to_exist_v2.docx) | 09/03/02 | AT&T | TN records in NPAC after SP ceases to exist v2 - Ported-In TN records left behind in NPAC Database and in SP’s Network after SPs cease to provide service (e.g. bankruptcy). This will result in incomplete calls.  09/18/02 LNPA WG Meeting  This new PIM, submitted by AT&T, addresses cases where service providers have left a market or have gone bankrupt, and previously working ported-in numbers have been abandoned by their former customers, but the ported records still remain in NPAC. Calls to these numbers fail and result in needless trouble-shooting. This PIM seeks development of a process to delete these abandoned numbers in NPAC. The LNPA is in the process of reviewing INC’s Procedures for Code Holder/LERG Assignee Exit, and will provide comments addressing this issue.  See updates to PIM 14.  11/13/2002 LNPA WG Meeting  This PIM will also be a part of the 11/22/02 INC discussion on their Procedures for Code Holder/LERG Assignee Exit. The LNPA is awaiting feedback from the INC.  6/11/2003 LNPA WG Meeting  PIMs 14, 15, 20, and 21 – The INC has addressed these issues in their Procedures for Code Holder/LERG Assignee Exit. The LNPA agreed at the June meeting to close all four PIMs. The LNPA will send a note to the INC advising of their closure and thanking the INC for their prompt and thorough efforts in resolving these issues.  10/6/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** NPAC should remove the ported-in TN records for SPs who no longer provides service in NPAC Region. Or the SP who has the ownership of NPA-NXX (or Block) should initiate to remove the ported-in TN  records from NPAC.  **Final Resolution:**  ATIS INC updated their procedures for Code Holder/LERG Assignee exit. | LNPA WG/INC | 6/11/2003 | Closed |
| [PIM 20](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6866/PIM_020_-_Porting_After_Code_Return_v2.docx) | 08/26/02 | ATT | Porting After Code Return v2 - Porting after a code is returned from a carrier going out of business and scheduled for disconnect.  9/18/2002 LNPA WG Meeting  NEW PIM 20 – This new PIM was submitted by SBC.  This PIM seeks to resolve instances where an NXX code returned to or reclaimed by NANPA, is initially found to contain no active or pending ported numbers and is published for disconnect in the LERG, only to have customers port their number after the published disconnect. NeuStar stated that they would need regulatory approval before they could take any steps to prevent a customer from porting.  The LNPA brainstormed two possible options to address this issue:  1) Always transfer any code that is opened up in NPAC to a new LERG-assignee rather than disconnect it in the LERG,  2) Set a drop-dead date based on the LERG-effective disconnect date by which the NXX will be deleted in NPAC if there are no ported numbers.  Adam Newman, Telcordia, took an ACTION ITEM to discuss this within INC at their November meeting in the context of their guidelines, Procedures for Code Holder/LERG Assignee Exit.  6/11/2003 LNPA WG Meeting  PIMs 14, 15, 20, and 21 – The INC has addressed these issues in their Procedures for Code Holder/LERG Assignee Exit. The LNPA agreed at the June meeting to close all four PIMs. The LNPA will send a note to the INC advising of their closure and thanking the INC for their prompt and thorough efforts in resolving these issues.  10/6/2020 LNP Informal Meeting  Consensus was reached on Final Resolution detail obtained from previous LNP meeting minutes. Final Resolution detail was added to this PIM and the new version uploaded to the LNPA WG website. | **Suggested Resolution:** For NXXx being returned due to a carrier leaving a market, if an industry guideline were in place that established a uniform date certain prior to scheduled disconnect of the NXX code, by which a customer must port their number should they choose to, then steps could be taken in NPAC to prevent porting in that NXX code after that date.  **Final Resolution:**  ATIS INC updated their procedures for Code Holder/LERG Assignee exit. | LNPA WG/INC | 6/11/2003 | Closed |
| [PIM 19](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/7326/PIM_019_-_New_and_Old_SPID_and_LRN_Same_v2.docx) | 04/17/02 | SBC | New and Old SPID and LRN Same v2 - Intra-Provider Ports from a Pooling Block to the same SPID and LRN  05/15/2002 - This PIM addresses instances where individual ported records have been created for numbers within a pooled 1K block, however, the LRN associated with the individual records is the same as the LRN associated with the 1K block. This dilutes the advantages of Efficient Data Representation (EDR). The PIM’s submitter, SBC, will provide additional data to NeuStar for further investigation as to why this is occurring.  06/12/02 – No change  07/10/02 – The PIM’s submitter SBC is currently evaluating collected data. Some examples have been SBC-initiated due to code reallocations SBC will continue to work with NeuStar to identify any problem areas.  08/14/02 - At the August LNPA, the group agreed that the following advisory will be sent to the LNPA WG, WNPO, Portability, Inc., Pooling Administrator, and Cross-Regional distribution lists:  “Some service providers, after activating a pooled block, are performing intra-SP or inter-SP ports using the same LRN and GTT data as the number pooled block. In addition, some service providers have contaminated TNs, and later activate a number pooled block with an LRN and GTT data exactly the same as the contaminated TNs. In both instances, the end result is the inefficient perpetuation of individual intra-SP or inter-SP subscription versions, rather than the more appropriate pooled number block-based routing. Service providers are advised that individual intra-SP or inter-SP ports should be prevented and deleted by the blockholder when these individual subscription versions have the same routing data (LRN and GTT) as the pooled number block in which they are contained.”  Gary Sacra, LNPA Co-Chair, took an ACTION ITEM, to send the above advisory text to Rob Coffman, NeuStar. Rob took an ACTION ITEM to send the advisory message to the LNPA WG, WNPO, Portability, Inc., Pooling Administrator, and Cross-Regional distribution lists.  This PIM is now CLOSED. | **Suggested Resolution:** Discuss this item at LNPA WG and determine if this is common practice and if there is a benefit if it continues.  Determine if subsequent porting of a pooled SV is desired behavior when a TN is assigned (same old and new SPID - same old and new LRN)  If this is not the desired behavior, then as an industry determine what needs to be done to eliminate the practice.  **Final Resolution:**  At the August LNPA, the group agreed that the following advisory will be sent to the LNPA WG, WNPO, Portability, Inc., Pooling Administrator, and Cross-Regional distribution lists:  “Some service providers, after activating a pooled block, are performing intra-SP or inter-SP ports using the same LRN and GTT data as the number pooled block. In addition, some service providers have contaminated TNs, and later activate a number pooled block with an LRN and GTT data exactly the same as the contaminated TNs. In both instances, the end result is the inefficient perpetuation of individual intra-SP or inter-SP subscription versions, rather than the more appropriate pooled number block-based routing. Service providers are advised that individual intra-SP or inter-SP ports should be prevented and deleted by the blockholder when these individual subscription versions have the same routing data (LRN and GTT) as the pooled number block in which they are contained.” | LNPA WG | 8/14/2002 | Closed |
| [PIM 18](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/7322/PIM_018_-_Update_NANC_Flows_and_Narratives_for_LNP_v2.docx) | 01/02/02 | WNPO | Update NANC Flows and Narratives for LNP v2  01/08/02 - When the LNPA WG closed PIM 1, last year, it was for wireline providers. Some of the wireless providers use resellers and need to develop flows reflecting their requirements. The second part of PIM 18 involves the complete review of the NANC flows and associated narratives. Questions were raised relating to the wireline to wireless integration flows.  AGREEMENT REACHED:  1) The LNPA WG accepted this PIM.  2) The WNPO will develop flows reflecting the use of resellers.  3) The WNPO will review the flows and narratives as published with the date of July 30, 1999.  4) The draft flows and narratives will be presented to the full LNPA WG in the near future.  02/06/02 – No change in status.  03/06/02 - This PIM, submitted by the WNPO, documents the need to modify the NANC LNP provisioning flows to address porting activity involving wireless resellers. The necessary flow modifications are currently being developed by the WNPO and will be submitted to the LNPA for review and approval.  04/10/02 - The WNPO wireless members voted in favor of Option B for wireless reseller flows. Option B requires the underlying network provider to coordinate the port. This was the same option that the wireline service providers approved by consensus. The WNPO will prepare the wireless reseller flows, reflecting Option B, for submission to the LNPA.  05/15/02 - This PIM, submitted by the WNPO, documents the need to modify the NANC LNP provisioning flows to address porting activity involving wireless resellers. The WNPO has voted in favor of Option B, which requires the underlying network service provider to coordinate the port. The necessary flow modifications are currently being developed by the WNPO and will be submitted to the LNPA for review and approval.  06/12/02 – No change  • 07/10/02 - The Wireless Reseller Flows are now out for final comment. The proposed flows have been sent to both the WNPO and LNPA distributions. Comments are due by 7/31/02. The flows will again be reviewed at the August WNPO, and barring any major changes, the LNPA will incorporate the wireless reseller flows into the main NANC LNP Provisioning flows at the August LNPA meeting.  • 08/14/02 0- The Wireless Reseller Flows were reviewed and modified at the August LNPA meeting. Work will continue at the September LNPA to incorporate them into the NANC LNP Provisioning flows.  09/18/02 - This PIM, submitted by the WNPO, documents the need to modify the NANC LNP provisioning flows to address porting activity involving wireless resellers. The WNPO has voted in favor of Option B, which requires the underlying network service provider to coordinate the port. The WNPO has submitted the flows to the LNPA and work will begin at the October meeting to incorporate these flows into the main NANC LNP Provisioning Flows. Upon completion, they will be submitted to NANC for approval.  07/03 – This PIM was closed with the submission of flows to the NANC, July 15, 2003. This PIM is in conjunction with PIM 1 | **Suggested Resolution:**  The Wireless Number Portability Operations team (WNPO) will develop flows for wireless resellers. In addition, WNPO will review the NANC flows and narratives for wireless compliance. The reseller flows, corresponding narratives, and requested revisions to the existing narratives will be forwarded to the LNPA WG for approval and inclusion in the overall NANC flows.  **Final Resolution:**  This PIM was closed with the submission of flows to the NANC, July 15, 2003 | WNPO | 7/15/2003 | Closed |
| [PIM 17](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/7318/PIM_017_-_Different_SPID_for_Wireless_vs_Wireline_ports_v2.docx) | 12/26/01 | Bellsouth | Different SPID for Wireless vs Wireline ports v2  01/08/02 - "Some carriers offer both wireless and wireline services. With the integration of the wireless industry into Local Number Portability, there needs to be an efficient way for other carriers to determine whether a request to port a number comes from the wireline or the wireless division of that company."  PIM 17 requests the LNPA WG consider REQUIRING the use of a different SPID, when a company owns both wireless and wireline operations. During the December NENA meeting, their technical committee documented the recommendation for the use of a unique SPID as described in this PIM. The LNPA WG decided not to request NeuStar perform edits in the NPAC, as stated in the PIM, within the "Suggested Resolution" section.  AGREEMENT REACHED:  1) The LNPA WG accepted this PIM.  2) The LNPA WG agreed to make the use of a unique SPID, for each wireless and wireline operation, within same company a mandatory REQUIREMENT.  Charles Ryburn will refer this recommendation to the NAPM LLC for their consideration and request NeuStar to develop M&P documenting this agreement/requirement.  02/06/02 - This PIM was referred to the NAPM LLC. The LLC at its January meeting agreed to make it required that unique NPAC SPIDs be assigned to wireless and wireline users, even if operated by the same carrier.  03/06/02 - Differences in wireless and wireline porting, such as the length of porting intervals, require different service provider profiles in NPAC for the wireless and wireline arms of a company. NPAC differentiates service provider profiles by Service Provider Identification (SPID) numbers. The LNPA sent a request to the NAPM/LLC asking that they have NeuStar require such service providers to establish separate SPIDs in NPAC. The LLC, at its January meeting, agreed to make it required that unique NPAC SPIDs be assigned to wireless and wireline NPAC users, even if operated by the same carrier.  04/10/02 - The following now appears on the npac.com wireless website home page, “On August/2001, the Wireless Number Portability Operations subcommittee (WNPO) has recommended that Wireless Service Providers subscribing for a connection to the NPAC use a different Service Provider ID (SPID) than their counterpart wireline entity side of the company. This recommendation is to allow the wireline and wireless entities in a company to use different sets of Business Days and NPAC timers in their profiles if necessary.”  BellSouth will submit a Change Order request to put the service provider type, e.g., wireless, wireline, in the provider’s NPAC profile. BellSouth has system requirements and processes that necessitate the need to identify SPIDs by the type of carrier. Verizon also voiced support for this need. An additional need is for E911 database providers whose processes may differ depending on if the providers involved in a port are wireless or wireline.  05/15/02 - Differences in wireless and wireline porting, such as the length of porting intervals, require different service provider profiles in NPAC for the wireless and wireline arms of a company. NPAC differentiates service provider profiles by Service Provider Identification (SPID) numbers. The LNPA sent a request to the  NAPM/LLC asking that they have NeuStar recommend such service providers to establish separate SPIDs in NPAC. This recommendation now appears on the NPAC wireless website home page and is part of the NPAC Methods and Procedures for establishing a SPID. This PIM is CLOSED. | **Suggested Resolution:** The recommendation to use separate SPIDs for the wireline and wireless portions of their business should be made a requirement. There should be an edit at the NPAC (automated or manual) to require that separate SPIDs be maintained. This should be made a part of the new carrier certification process. If that is not practical, then the LNPA Working Group should document the requirement that wireless and wireline services cannot use the same SPID for porting activities.  **Final Resolution**:  PIM was closed with the recommendation that such service providers establish separate SPIDs in NPAC. This recommendation now appears on the NPAC wireless website home page and is part of the NPAC Methods and Procedures for establishing a SPID. | LNPA WG | 2/6/2002 | Closed |
| [PIM 16](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/7314/PIM_016_-_Process_for_marking_NPA-NXXs_portable_in_LERG_v2.docx) | 09/05/01 | Sprint | Process for marking NPA-NXXs portable in LERG v2  10/9/01 - This is a new PIM submitted by Patrick Lockett - Sprint that addresses instances where the codeholder has removed the portability indicator in the LERG on an NPA-NXX that was originally opened as a portable code.  11/13/01 – PIM referred to Common Interest Group on Rating and Routing (CIGRR issue # C083)  12/11/01 – CIGRR still working issue.  01/08/02 - The issue is being worked in the Common Interest Group on Rating and Routing (CIGRR Issue No. C083). CIGRR is scheduled to meet at the end of January.  02/06/02 - This PIM was referred to CIGRR. At last month's meeting, Adam Newman reported that the CIGRR proposed that the ACON get report of ported numbers from NPAC before allowing the NXX portability indicator to be changed to "N." The LNPA-WG suggested that the ACON instead simply determine whether the NXX existed the NPAC's network data. This month Adam explained that there was some concern about the lack of a "Report" to this effect that could be submitted with a carrier's request to reverse the NXX portability indicator. Consensus at LNPA-WG was that we were satisfied with this approach in spite of its "self-reporting" nature. Adam will provide our comments to the CIGRR at their next meeting and report back to us on the outcome in March.  03/06/02 - This PIM addresses instances where the codeholder has removed, apparently in error, the portability indicator in the LERG on an NPA-NXX that was originally opened as a portable code. The issue continues to be worked in the Common Interest Group on Rating and Routing (CIGRR Issue No. C083).  04/10/02 - A discussion with Adam Newman, Telcordia TRA and CIGRR liaison (CIGAR & INC members joined via conference call during the discussion of this PIM), resulted in the following agreement that Adam will take back to CIGRR for their approval:   * Only the TRA will have the ability to change the portability indicator for an NXX code in the LERG from “YES” to “NO.” * The TRA will only make this change upon written request (e-mail is ok) with a certification in writing that the provider has verified that the NXX code is not open in NPAC.   05/15/02- This PIM addresses instances where the codeholder has removed, apparently in error, the portability indicator in the LERG on an NPA-NXX that was originally opened as a portable code. The issue has been resolved in the Common Interest Group on Rating and Routing (CIGRR Issue No. C083). A soft edit in the LERG will produce a message requesting if the user has verified that the NXX code is not opened in NPAC before changing the portability indicator. This PIM is CLOSED | **Suggested Resolution:**  **Final Resolution:**  The issue has been resolved in the Common Interest Group on Rating and Routing (CIGRR Issue No. C083). A soft edit in the LERG will produce a message requesting if the user has verified that the NXX code is not opened in NPAC before changing the portability indicator. | LNPA WG/CIGRR | 5/15/2002 | Closed |
| [PIM 15](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/7310/PIM_015_-_NXX_Code_ownership_change_v2.docx) | 06/21/01 | Verizon | NXX Code ownership change v2 - Pooling Returned NXX Codes containing Ported TNs. Edit in NPAC requires active ported TNs to be deleted before NXX code ownership can be changed. This is a service-affecting process. Pooling the thousands blocks in the code circumvents the need to make the change at the NXX code level in NPAC.  07/10/01 – New PIM. After final LNPA review, it will be referred to INC.  08./07/01 – PIM referred to INC.  10/9/01 – PIM still at INC.  11/13/01 – PIM still at INC  12/11/01 – PIM still at INC  01/08/02 – PIM still at INC  02/06/02 - WorldCom expressed their concern about the Guideline appendix on this process that INC had prepared -- WorldCom was not participating in the INC at the time the Guidelines were completed -- and asked that the LNPA-WG submit comments to improve the Guidelines. The WorldCom comments were discussed very briefly and there was agreement that Charles Ryburn will send letter to INC letting them know the LNPA-WG will be sending them a contribution on this matter.  There will be detailed discussion of the WorldCom comments at our March meeting. The LNPA-WG contribution will be prepared at that meeting.  Adam Newman commented on one aspect of a concern mentioned in the WorldCom comments. He explained that the INC PA guidelines (paragraph 7.4.7) do still indicate that LERG assignee must be assigned one block. But he agreed that this should not be a PA Guideline requirement, and that the LERG assignee should not be forced to take even a single thousand block if it does not want one.  SEE UPDATES TO PIM 14  08/02/2002 - PIMs 14 and 15 – The attached INC Issue 364 has been submitted to the INC by Barry Bishop, NeuStar Pooling Administrator, modifying the CO Code Transfer process document to specify that the new LERG-assignee is not required to take all ten 1K blocks when a code with active ported numbers is transferred and pooled. Charles Ryburn, SBC, stated that SBC’s INC representative has requested that the title of the document be changed from "CO Code Transfer Process” to “CO Code Reallocation Process.” See also the readout on ACTION ITEM 7 in the next section  09/18/2002 - PIMs 14 and 15 – The INC is developing guidelines, Procedures for Code Holder/LERG Assignee Exit, that describe the responsibilities of NANPA, service providers, and the Pool Administrator when a service provider is returning or abandoning codes/blocks that contain ported telephone numbers. The LNPA is reviewing these guidelines and will provide any comments to INC.  06/11/2003 - PIMs 14, 15, 20, and 21 – The INC has addressed these issues in their Procedures for Code Holder/LERG Assignee Exit. The LNPA agreed at the June meeting to close all four PIMs. The LNPA will send a note to the INC advising of their closure and thanking the INC for their prompt and thorough efforts in resolving these issues | **Suggested Resolution:** The following actions are proposed to resolve this issue:   * The 10 thousands blocks from a returned NXX code containing active ported numbers should be turned over to the Pool Administrator and allocated to pooling participants serving the associated rate area. Once the blocks are activated, block ownership supercedes NXX code ownership, thus enabling the porting of subsequently assigned numbers in all 10 thousands blocks. * In a non-pooling area, but one in which there are pooling-capable carriers, i.e., carriers whose systems interact with NPAC in areas where pooling is in effect and can accept pool broadcasts, the national Pool Administrator, wherever possible, should use existing procedures to instruct NPAC to generate pooled block broadcasts. This step requires INC to modify Pool Administrator guidelines to describe how service providers to whom blocks can be sent are identified and how blockholder porting information needed by NPAC is obtained. The INC should also address guidelines for any areas where this is not yet possible. * In the case where an NXX code has been returned because the current LERG-assignee has gone out of business, a new LERG-assignee should be selected in accordance with existing INC assignment guidelines. In the case where the current LERG-assignee is still viable, but has merely ceased providing service in the area served by the returned NXX code, consideration should be given to requiring that service provider to maintain their LERG-assignee responsibilities ongoing if possible. This responsibility would basically consist of performing any donor network queries of last resort, which would be expected to be minimal if at all. This proposal is regardless of whether or not this service provider receives any of the thousands blocks from the pool. This would prevent any disruption of service for customers within the NXX code in order for carriers to change routing translations to a new LERG-assignee. Note that pooled blocks given to the codeholder also must be ported under the proposed process in order to allow the NPAC's block ownership table to override the NXX ownership table for these blocks as well. Regardless of whether or not the LERG-assignee is changed, the block ownership for each of the 10 thousands blocks takes precedence in NPAC, eliminating the need to change ownership of the NXX code in NPAC. * The steps outlined above require INC action to provide for service providers to exercise the option of applying for utilization waivers in those cases where a carrier is required to accept numbering resources, i.e., actual numbers, not just the default routing responsibility for the NXX code itself.   **Final Resolution:**  The INC has addressed these issues in their Procedures for Code Holder/LERG Assignee Exit. | LNPA WG/INC | 06/11/2003 | Closed |
| [PIM 14](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/7306/PIM_014_-_NXX_Code_disconnect_v2.docx) | 06/21/01 | Verizon | NXX Code Disconnect v2  07/10/01 – This PIM was cancelled due to open issue being worked by INC.  08/07/01 - This PIM has been reopened and referred to INC at their request.  10/9/01 - This PIM has been referred to the INC as issue number 295 and is in initial closure.  11/13/01 – PIM referred to INC  12/11/01 – PIM referred to INC  01/08/02 – PIM referred to INC  02/06/02 - WorldCom expressed their concern about the Guideline appendix on this process that INC had prepared -- WorldCom was not participating in the INC at the time the Guidelines were completed -- and asked that the LNPA-WG submit comments to improve the Guidelines. The WorldCom comments were discussed very briefly and there was agreement that Charles Ryburn will send letter to INC letting them know the LNPA-WG will be sending them a contribution on this matter.  There will be detailed discussion of the WorldCom comments at our March meeting. The LNPA-WG contribution will be prepared at that meeting.  Adam Newman commented on one aspect of a concern mentioned in the WorldCom comments. He explained that the INC PA guidelines (paragraph 7.4.7) do still indicate that LERG assignee must be assigned one block. But he agreed that this should not be a PA Guideline requirement, and that the LERG assignee should not be forced to take even a single thousand block if it does not want one.  3/6/02 - This PIM was referred to INC. In a February, 4, 2002 liaison, the INC announced that they had resolved its Issue 295. The INC created new Appendices in the CO Code (NXX) Assignment Guidelines (Appendix C) and the Thousands-Block (NXX-X) Pooling Administration Guidelines (Appendix 7) addressing this issue. The LNPA is reviewing both documents and will finalize a response to INC at the April LNPA meeting.  4/10/02 - The group held a discussion, with INC participation, on why NeuStar was apparently requiring the new LERG-assignee to take all 10 pooled blocks when the code is transferred to them, even when that provider is not requesting all 10 blocks. This would seem an unnecessary requirement resulting in additional cost to the industry in download transactions. One possible reason would be to maintain “non-working number announcement” functionality if any unassigned numbers in the code are dialed, but this would not seem to be sufficient justification to incur the additional cost and paperwork to activate blocks to the LERG-assignee if that carrier does not need the numbering resources.  ACTION ITEM (Informational): NeuStar to determine what authorization they need in the short term, and from whom, to stop requiring the new LERG-assignee to take all 10 blocks if they are not requested. INC will address this in the guidelines, as well (modified Part 1B).  The LNPA will also send a liaison letter to the INC with comments on their revised CO Code Assignment Guidelines (Appendix C) and Thousands Block Pooling Guidelines (Appendix 7), which address PIMs 14 and 15. Attached is a DRAFT version of that letter.  AGREEMENT REACHED: The LNPA WG discussed if it is appropriate to send it through the LNPA WG or not. The decision of the LNPA WG agreed to edit the letter authored by Steve and then forward it to the INC as the LNPA WG's contribution to INC.  05/15/02 - The LNPA reviewed the revised INC guidelines and sent a liaison to INC with suggested modifications. These are currently under review at INC.  • 06/12/02 - The group held another discussion with the NeuStar Pool Administrator, Barry Bishop, on why NeuStar was requiring the new LERG-assignee to take all 10 pooled blocks when the code is transferred to them, even when that provider is not requesting all 10 blocks. Some service providers contend that this practice is an unnecessary requirement resulting in additional cost to the industry in download transactions. Barry stated that the guidelines in the LNP CO Code Transfer Process require the PA to allocate all 10 thousands blocks to the new LERG-assignee. Barry agreed to take the following ACTION ITEM:   * Barry will modify the LNP CO Code Transfer Process guidelines to allow service provider choice on the number of 1K blocks they will accept. * Barry will then bring the modified guidelines to the LNPA for review and approval. * Upon LNPA approval, Barry will send a liaison to the INC (in issue format) advising of the change made within the LNPA and ask INC to check their applicable guidelines for any changes for consistency.   NOTE: If INC guideline changes are required that affect the PA or NANPA, then an FCC Change Order will likely be required, which could push resolution out to 1Q03. NANC 323 could be available by then, making this process and requested change moot.  • 07/10/02 - At the request of the LNPA, Barry Bishop, NeuStar Pooling Administrator, has modified the CO Code Transfer process document to specify that the new LERG-assignee is not required to take all ten 1K blocks when a code with active ported numbers is transferred and pooled. LNPA members have an ACTION ITEM to come prepared to the August meeting to discuss the attached proposed changes and finalize the document.    Upon finalization by the LNPA, the revised document will be referred to the INC.    • 08/14/02 - The attached INC Issue 364 has been submitted to the INC by Barry Bishop, NeuStar Pooling Administrator, modifying the CO Code Transfer process document to specify that the new LERG-assignee is not required to take all ten 1K blocks when a code with active ported numbers is transferred and pooled. Charles Ryburn, SBC, stated that SBC’s INC representative has requested that the title of the document be changed from "CO Code Transfer Process” to “CO Code Reallocation Process.”    09/18/02 - The INC is developing guidelines, Procedures for Code Holder/LERG Assignee Exit, that describe the responsibilities of NANPA, service providers, and the Pool Administrator when a service provider is returning or abandoning codes/blocks that contain ported telephone numbers. The LNPA is reviewing these guidelines and will provide any comments to INC.  10/02 – 1/03 The INC continues development of guidelines, Procedures for Code Holder/LERG Assignee Exit, that describe the responsibilities of NANPA, service providers, and the Pool Administrator when a service provider is returning or abandoning codes/blocks that contain ported telephone numbers. The LNPA, as well as individual service providers, have provided input and comments related to PIMs 14, 15, 20, and 21. The LNPA has requested that INC provide the document for an additional review prior to closure.  02 – 03/03 LNPA continues review of INC document.  04-03 Document returned to INC with LNPA input.  05-07/03 Issue at INC. Closed at LNPA. Will continue to track until closure at INC.  06/11/2003 - PIMs 14, 15, 20, and 21 – The INC has addressed these issues in their Procedures for Code Holder/LERG Assignee Exit. The LNPA agreed at the June meeting to close all four PIMs. The LNPA will send a note to the INC advising of their closure and thanking the INC for their prompt and thorough efforts in resolving these issues | **Suggested Resolution:** The following actions are proposed to resolve this issue:   * Telcordia, acting in their role as Traffic Routing Administrator (TRA) for the LERG, and in collaboration with the NANPA, should immediately contact all AOCNs and instruct them that it is mandatory that they verify through NANPA that no active or pending ported numbers exist in an NXX code before they input an effective disconnect date in the LERG. If any do exist, the process to disconnect the code in the network should be immediately halted and disposition of the code should be managed per the CO Code Assignment Guidelines. * Neustar, acting in their role as the NANPA AOCN, should continue to verify via NPAC the absence of any active or pending ported numbers in an NXX code slated for disconnect in the network. If any do exist, the process to disconnect the code in the network should be immediately halted and disposition of the code should be managed per the CO Code Assignment Guidelines. * Neustar, acting in their role as the NANPA, should immediately begin accepting requests from other service providers and AOCNs to verify via NPAC the absence of any active or pending ported numbers in an NXX code slated for disconnect in the network. If any do exist, the process to disconnect the code in the network should be immediately halted and disposition of the code should be managed per the CO Code Assignment Guidelines. * The INC should revise the Central Office Code Assignment Guidelines to include the requirements outlined above.   **Final Resolution:**  The INC has addressed these issues in their Procedures for Code Holder/LERG Assignee Exit. | LNPA WG/INC | 06/11/2003 | Closed |
| [PIM 13](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/7334/PIM_013_-_Removal_of_Switch_Translations_by_OSP_v2.docx) | 04/27/01 | ATTWS | Removal of Switch Translations by OSP v2 - The OSP removes switch translations on or near due date, even if activate through the NPAC has not occurred.  05/01 – 07/01 – This issue continues to be worked by the NNPO.  08/07/01 - This issue continues to be worked by the NNPO. This issue will continue to be discussed in LNPA based on updates from NNPO.  10/9/01 - At last month's meeting, the LNPA-WG appeared to get beyond argument of whether old SP's removal of switch translations had to be after the NPAC activation. The dispute boiled down to what triggers the old SP's removal of its switch translations. WorldCom submitted a contribution to clarify that there appear to be two interpretations of what should trigger the old SP's removal of its switch translations for the ported number: (1.) the LSR due date or (2.) evidence of the NPAC activation.  Several incumbents, particularly Verizon, argue that the LSR due date is the appropriate trigger, albeit with a built in delay such as due date plus one. SBC argues that it cannot change its disconnect process, which works the disconnect on LSR due date, but is discussing a possible new process that is based on the NPAC activation. BellSouth actually uses the NPAC activation as its disconnect trigger, but would not support this as being the only valid approach.  AT&T Wireline emphasized that the text in the flows shows clearly that NPAC activation has occurred -- "the SPs update their LNP call routing databases" -- in flow diagram box 8 before the old SP switch translations are removed in flow diagram box 9. The discussion is continued to next month's meeting.  The NPAC activation trigger prevents "premature disconnection" in the event a change in LSR due date is not communicated in time to stop the process and thus engineers out of the porting process possible LSR due date error impact. However, re-engineering the process by companies using the LSR due date trigger is a significant effort and may be impractical to require at this late date, at least unless it can be demonstrated clearly that the LSR due date is not a disconnect trigger contemplated in official NANC flows (April 25, 1997 version as approved by FCC).  ***Action Item*** - During the discussion, it was recognized that the NPAC web site displays the wrong NANC process flows. The LNPA-WG will send NeuStar a letter requesting that the site display the official April 25, 1997 flows.  ***Action Item*** - AT&T will develop presentation for next meeting which will illustrate impact of premature disconnect on users. Other companies are invited to offer statistics on premature disconnect volumes.  11/13/01 - Cindy Sheehan was not in attendance to provide the group with her presentation on the latest status. Charles Ryburn will contact Cindy for the current status.  The group had a long discussion relating to how and when disconnects should occur. The following are some of the different interpretations of the NANC flows:   * The Sprint representative stated that his company was doing a cost analysis study on using the NPAC notices (query on the NPAC). He said that Sprint Local is disconnecting on the due date at 11:59 PM. Some of the group viewed this as DD+1, for non-coordinated ports with a ten-digit trigger. * The BellSouth representative said his company is using the NPAC activation notice to start there disconnect process. This will open the E911 database for updates/changes. * The Qwest representative said his company looked into changing their systems to using the NPAC activation notice, but at this time it looks very expensive. They are looking into the due date plus one. * Rick Jones offered to take this issue to the NENA committee asking for their input as to the delay in E911 update where DD+1=24 hours past actual due date. * WorldCom had asked that an NANC process flow ambiguity be clarified concerning what should trigger an old SP's removal of its switch translations for a ported-out number.   The WorldCom contribution described the problem and suggested there could be two alternatives to avoid a premature disconnect situation. It appears that a process that delays the old SP's removal of its switch translations until a day or more after the due date shown on LSR will solve the problem about (Dennis Robbins did not agree) as effectively as a process in which the old SP first confirms there was an NPAC activation. (see attachment from Steve Addicks).  **Action Item: Service providers were asked to go back to their companies and review how disconnects are being handled today. At the December meeting, these service providers, if they would like to share their findings, would present them to the group, as input to help resolve this PIM.**  **Action Item: HL Gowda requested that the service providers consider their support for the following options and describe how they would handle the E911 database updates:**   1. **Discuss Due Date + 1 Full Day after the DD, e.g. 24 hours past midnight of the DD.**   **Service providers wait until they receive the NPAC activation notice before doing there disconnects**  **12/13/01 -** Dave Taylor - SBC Speaking as SBC, not as the Co-chair of the NNPO, presented his companies activity on a trial process for the completion of disconnects (port away). He did say that the NNPO was tracking the LNPA WG activity on this PIM.  At the present time, SBC is working with AT&T Broadband to improve the disconnect process involving a port between service providers. He stated that SBC is willing to extend this process to other CLECs if they are interested in participating in this trial. They do not monitor the NPAC activation notices. Some of the state commissions have requirements/measurements related to this issue. One of the measurements related to the due date (DD), involves the "unlock and lock" of the E911 database. The company will adhere to all of the OBF recommendations related to the disconnect process. They consider the LSR as the authorized document to perform work requested by other companies. SBC will continue to look for the NPAC message that the port has occurred. In the absence of the message, they would place the order in jeopardy some time late on the DD, and advise the other service provider of this action.  During the past few months, SBC has been studying the reasons why the DD is missed. The two major problems are, customer fails to keep their appointment and/or company-related problems; e.g. equipment, cable problems, etc. The company provisioning centers can not react to a change in due date if it is late on the DD. The standard jeopardy process will resolve any problem in stopping the disconnect process.  BellSouth has a mechanized process that looks for the NPAC activation messages received, before sending the disconnect through their systems.  Some of the other service providers said they have a lot of the same issues. In the former Bell Atlantic areas the disconnect is completed on the DD at 11:59 PM. In the GTE areas, the disconnect is completed at 1:00 AM of second day after the DD, e.g. if the DD was 12/11 then disconnect would occur on 12/13 at 1AM.  Verizon urged that no vote be taken on the NANC disconnect process flow's interpretation, with respect to what triggers the old SP's disconnect work, until data could be collected to demonstrate how many premature disconnects occurred simply because the existing LSR Supp process could not prevent the disconnect. AT&T Broadband reported that it has observed (as the old SP) that the new SP fails to port by LSR due date about 12% of the time (this would have resulted in disconnect of customer "prematurely" if Broadband had not been looking for evidence of port having occurred). Some portion of these events, however, might have involved situations that would have permitted timely LSR Supp to change due date and thus reflect the failure of new SP to follow the LSR process.  Cindy Sheehan - AT&T Broadband verbally provided some numbers from her study, which was conducted nationally over a 3 - 4 month period.  Early porting occurred anywhere from 1 to 34 days before the DD. Late porting occurred anywhere from 1 to 21 days after the DD. This delay in completing the connect work, would have resulted in 12% of the customers having been taken out of service. The study included all types of providers, both CLEC and ILECs.  **Action Item: All service providers should come to the next meeting prepared to vote on accepting all or some following suggestions:**   1. **Check on the NPAC notice. Monitor the NPAC as evidence of the port.** 2. **Use the LSR process. Look at the requirements that are in place in the OBF guidelines as they relate to the New SP.**   **2/6/02** The language describing the acceptable approaches to the old SP disconnect process was agreed to. This is replaces the text which describes box 9 of the process flow diagram included with the LNPA-WG's June 1999 2nd WWI Report to NANC for provisioning using the ten-digit trigger. The FCC has received the 2nd WWI Report from NANC but has not yet acted on it.  A revised sheet with the replacement text is being submitted to NANC with request that the page be forwarded to the FCC as a replacement for the corresponding page in the report. PIM 13 also is being closed showing the approved text as solution.  The final version of the revised text, approved by the LNPA-WG February 7th, reads as follows:  *After update of its databases, the old Service Provider removes translations associated with the ported TN. The removal of these translations (1.) will not be done until the old Service Provider has evidence that the port has occurred, or (2.) will not be scheduled earlier than 11:59 PM of the day after the due date, or (3.) will be scheduled for 11:59 PM on the due date, but can be changed by an LSR supplement received no later than 9:00 PM local time on the due date.  This LSR supplement must be submitted in accordance with local practices governing LSR exchange, including such communications by telephone, fax, etc.*  New language submitted to NANC 2/12/02 for update of Inter-Service Provider LNP flows.  This PIM is Closed. | **Suggested Resolution:**  1. Check on the NPAC notice. Monitor the NPAC as evidence of the port.  2. Use the LSR process. Look at the requirements that are in place in the OBF guidelines as they relate to the New SP.  **Final Resolution:**  The final version of the revised text, approved by the LNPA-WG February 7th, reads as follows:  *After update of its databases, the old Service Provider removes translations associated with the ported TN. The removal of these translations (1.) will not be done until the old Service Provider has evidence that the port has occurred, or (2.) will not be scheduled earlier than 11:59 PM of the day after the due date, or (3.) will be scheduled for 11:59 PM on the due date, but can be changed by an LSR supplement received no later than 9:00 PM local time on the due date.  This LSR supplement must be submitted in accordance with local practices governing LSR exchange, including such communications by telephone, fax, etc.*  New language submitted to NANC 2/12/02 for update of Inter-Service Provider LNP flows. | LNPA WG | 2/12/2002 | Closed |
| [PIM 12](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/7302/PIM_012_-_Operator_Service_functions_in_a_WNP_environment_v2.docx) | 04/19/01 | Cingular | Operator Service functions in a WNP environment v2 - Some Operator Service functions will not be properly applied in a Wireless Number Portability environment.  05/15/01 - Jim Grasser reviewed the PIM for the team. Some Operator Service functions will not be properly applied in a Wireless Number Portability environment. Options have been presented and the Message Processing Committee at OBF is working the issue. There is an open issue at OBF with discussion around 2 possible solutions. OBF requested the issue and solutions be discussed both by the LNPA and WOT. OBF is looking for a recommendation from the industry.  06/12/01 - Jim Grasser distributed description of the situation and reviewed.  07/10/01 - Jim Grasser presented a contribution outlining potential solutions at the June LNPA. Service providers are to discuss the contribution internally and provide input at the August meeting as to their preferred resolution.  08/07/01 - This issue is currently being addressed at the OBF's Messaging and Processing Subcommittee.  10/9/01 - This issue is currently being addressed at the OBF's Messaging and Processing Subcommittee and will be kept open for tracking. A question was raised relating Jim Grasser - Cingular Wireless advising/updating the OBF on the input received at the last LNPA WG meeting.. Jim provided the following update: The T1S1.3 subcommittee chair and he (Jim) had a conference call.  11/13/01 - James Grasser provided the current status of the OBF issue and will continue to do so at subsequent meetings. This PIM is for tracking only.  12/11/01 - James Grasser provided the current status of the OBF issue and will continue to do so at subsequent meetings. This PIM is for tracking only.  01/08/02 - Jim Grasser reported that the T1S1.3 Standards document for Operator Services contains several flows. The resolution to the PIM was to state in the narratives for these flows that there should be no screening on the billing NPA-NXX, for the purpose of identifying wireline or wireless service, prior to launching the LIDB / NP-DB query. This PIM will be closed. | **Suggested Resolution:** M&Ps will be clarified by NeuStar, PEs, and LLC. This will be put into action immediately. Final closure of issue is projected for August.  07/10/00 M&P will be presented at the next cross regional meeting.  **Final Resolution:**  The resolution to the PIM was to state in the narratives for these flows that there should be no screening on the billing NPA-NXX, for the purpose of identifying wireline or wireless service, prior to launching the LIDB / NP-DB query. | LNPA WG/OBF | 1/8/2002 | Closed |
| [PIM 11](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/7298/PIM_011_-_Moving_1K_Blocks_utilizing_EDR_functionality_v2_.docx) | 03/24/01 | SBC | Moving 1K Blocks utilizing EDR functionality v2 - A process for moving 1k blocks between switches, within the same company, within the same rate center using EDR functionality is needed to satisfy the FCC's requirement to manage TN inventory by rate center rather than wirecenter.  04/10/01 - A process for moving 1K blocks between switches, within the same company and rate center using EDR functionality is needed to satisfy the FCC’s requirement to manage TN inventory by rate center rather than wire center. There is no method to do utilization of forecast by rate center. NeuStar submitted a memo with 3 possible solutions. A copy is attached with these minutes.  Gustavo recommended that solution B be taken and have it done via the Pooling Administrator. SPs would submit a request for intra-porting pooling to PA and the PA would handle. Release 3.0 must be in place. A trial should be implemented about 2 weeks after an agreement is signed. A no cost trial is being offered for 4 months. Solution A may have cost implications and require an SOW.  NeuStar would act as PA in the interim until a national PA is chosen. A proposal was made that all SPs read the paper and come to next meeting with comments. Forms submitted to NeuStar from PA, as oppose to those from SP, may have to be changed. The block contamination level of 10% will remain the same as stated in the INC guidelines. Blocks with less than 10% contamination probably would have already gone back to PA. Therefore, SPs may only be moving blocks with greater than 10%. Jim Alton proposed to not move anything less than 1000 block but at levels higher then 10%. Timeframes would consist of a 2-week period once a request is received.  LERG 13 has pooled blocks and the LRN is not opened for pooling in non-pooled areas. BCD screens in LERG are restricted to PA, and only PA can make changes. Without the involvement of the PA how would SP’s get around the BCD restriction issue without going through the PA? Network Reliability and Interoperability Council (NRIC) would have to change permissions in LERG to allow access to SPs. Common Interest Group on Rating And Routing (CIGRR), sub-committee of NRIC, is meeting this week, and discussion of this issue is taking place.  Another solution may be when the PA creates block records for every NXX pooled block, the BCD would also be created appropriately from the start. The SP could then change the LRN. LERG 13 would need to opened up for areas that are non-pooled, and current restrictions on who can update the BCD need to be addressed.  AT&T suggests that all solutions be presented to INC for decision-making process since they created Pooling guidelines.  ROLL CALL:  BellSouth expressed their opinion to not go through PA but directly the NPAC.  Verizon does not see the need to put a level of contamination in the process. If there were a level to be set, then it should be done by INC. Verizon would like to hold off until we hear the NRIC decisions before we refer anything to INC.  ELI prefers going directly to NPAC and bypass the PA.  WorldCom prefers using the PA administrator.  SBC remains neutral.  PIM will be kept open. We will hear NRIC decisions and then decide if something should be going to INC.  Action Item: Discuss issue with your internal groups, get comments to Charles and re-discuss next meeting.  05/01 – 07/01 – Issue currently under discussion at CIGRR. This PIM has been referred to INC.  08/07/01 – PIM remains at INC.  10/9/01 – This PIM has been referred to INC and the issue number is 319. The INC is conducting a trial between, Verizon and Time Warner in the Northeast Region using the EDR feature in Release 3.0. They have advised NeuStar, but do not need their assistance at this time, nor are they looking for their involvement. This method had been used following September 11th WTC attack.  Steve Addicks - WorldCom is moving blocks in the MidWest, among it legacy companies. A question was raised relating to the updating of the LERG. Some SPs use the LERG to update their internal systems. Verizon is one of those companies that use LERG 13. A question was raised relating to who controls the number of trials that are being conducted. It would be nice to know the results of these trials. David Taylor - SBC agreed with HL Gowda - relating to the number of trials being conducted. The INC will publish the results of their trial as an answer to PIM 11.  11/12/01 - This PIM has been referred to INC and the issue number is 319.  12/11/01 - This PIM is in initial closure and CIGRR concurred. The INC has requested the date when the NPAC M&P will be updated for releases 2.0 and 3.0.  01/08/02 – No change in status.  02/06/02 - WorldCom and NeuStar are working to describe the recent use of the process. The INC has asked that they be provided with this date to include in their PA Guidelines. (The INC Pooling Guidelines will not describe the process, just mention that it is an alternative to using the PA to make such moves.) NeuStar was asked to provide date to LNPA-WG by which time an M&P for this process will be completed.  3/6/02 - This PIM was referred to INC (INC Issue 319). Per INC’s request in its liaison to the LNPA on February, 4, 2002, the LNPA is developing NPAC Methods and Procedures for this process, which are expected to be finalized at the April LNPA meeting.  4/10/02 - The LNPA WG made changes to M&Ps. If the changes we made to the M&Ps are acceptable to the LNPA WG, then we will advice INC that these exist. We completed our review and made corrections. Charles will send the document to the NAPM LCC.  5/15/02 - Methods and procedures for NPAC’s involvement in this process have been completed by the LNPA and approved. This PIM is CLOSED. | **Suggested Resolution:** LNPA, INC, and the NANPM should modify the NPAC M&P, the INC Code  Administration Guidelines, and the INC Pooling Guidelines to create a process for carriers to move 1k blocks between their own switches using EDR functionality. These moves should not require preparation or submission of months to exhaust (MTE) or utilization data, because they do not involve allocation of new numbering resources to the carrier.  Two processes have been proposed for accomplishing this goal, and a combination of the two processes has be suggested for the interim period prior to the establishment of a national pooling administrator. These are briefly described below:  A. Modify the NPAC M&P to allow carriers to call the NPAC help desk and request that blocks be ported from one switch to another using the EDR functionality developed for pooling. (The port type for these subscription versions would be type = pooled.)  B. Change the INC Pooling Administration Guidelines to allow carriers to move blocks between switches without the need to meet or submit documentation for MTE or utilization. The paperwork and timeframes for intra-company block moves would be streamlined and simpler than for requesting new numbering resources. The PA would then coordinate the EDR porting of the blocks as they currently do for pooling.  C. The Hybrid Solution: For NPAs where pooling has been implemented use option B, move the blocks using the pooling administrator. For NPAs where pooling has not been implemented use the option A process, move the blocks through NPAC personnel.  The advantages and disadvantages of each option are too detailed to document on this form. Separate documentation will be provided to the LNPA to capture the points made in discussions of these options.  **Final Resolution:**  Methods and procedures for NPAC’s involvement in this process have been completed by the LNPA and approved. | LNPA WG/INC | 5/15/02 | Closed |
| [PIM 10](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/7294/PIM_010_-_End-User_Billing_base_on_LRN_rather_than_called_telephone_number_v2_.docx) | 02/21/01 | US LEC | End-User Billing base on LRN rather than called telephone number v2  03/01 - USLEC explained that some companies are rating calls from customers who call ported numbers based on the NPA-NXX of the LRN associated with the dialed number rather than the NPA-NXX of the dialed number. Thus while this at first sounded like a billing system problem, we determined that the error appeared to occur on a switch-by-switch basis. It was pointed out that there is a switch translation that if done incorrectly would cause this problem. The incorrect translation would cause the AMA module to be populated with the LRN rather than the dialed number. USLEC agreed to forward examples directly to each company represented in the LNPA with which their customers have incurred these billing problems. Each LNP member will investigate internally to make sure switch translations are correct. There was no argument that billing based on an LRN ever is appropriate. This PIM is accepted by the LNPA-WG.  04/10/01 - LNPA plans to forward this issue to NIIF. The next NIIF meeting is April 30th, 2001. If more clarification is required we will provide. Charles will ask Robin if inviting USLEC to sit in on NIIF meeting would be of assistance and suggest she extend that invitation. Our objective is to get this documented as a standard and ensure a third party can call in a trouble report for a customer.  LNPA-WG had asked that trouble tickets including dates be furnished as examples, however USLEC has not forwarded any data at this time.  07/10/01 – PIM was closed due to lack of occurrence by US LEC | **Suggested Resolution:** Establish industry standards that address where and when a new LRN is requires. For example should it be one per switch, one per lata within a switch, one per tandem we interconnect with per lata per switch, etc.  **Final Resolution:**  PIM was closed due to lack of occurrence/examples by US LEC | LNPA WG | 7/10/2001 | Closed |
| [PIM 9](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/7290/PIM_009_-_LNP_Calls_Failing_v2.docx) | 01/19/01 | US LEC | LNP calls failing v2 - 02/00 - US LEC opened this PIM because inter-exchange carriers are refusing to take trouble tickets for incoming calls to US LEC’s ported-in customers. The situation occurs when ported-in customers notice that they can not receive incoming calls from a particular IXC. It is taking as much as 10+ days to get these problems resolved. In these cases US-LEC has not found that these problems are due to partial failures of the NPAC broadcast, but rather failures in the IXC’s network. These customers have been able to receive local calls but not from IXCs. US LEC has also had problems finding people at the IXCs who are knowledgeable about LNP.  David Taylor stated that the due to the aspect of this issue, what we need to focus on is that some IXCs will only take trouble tickets from representatives of the originating customer, but not from the company representing the terminating customer. One fundamental question is: “Is there an industry expectation that companies should take trouble tickets from receiving customers (3rd party trouble reports.) ? We did not reach consensus on whether companies should take 3rd party trouble reports.  It was suggested that this issue should be discussed at the NNPO operations team. US LEC has taken this issue to the NNPO in the past, but was not able to resolve it.  It was suggested that both the inter-service provider trouble resolution process and the service provider trouble reporting contact list are the responsibility of the NIIF (Network Interoperability and Interconnection Forum, a sub-committee of ATIS, Alliance of Telecommunications Industry Solutions) The group felt this issue needs to be referred to NIIF. The LNPA co-chair will prepare a letter to NIIF referring the issue. (see www.atis.org, the NIIF link is in the stripe at the bottom of the ATIS home page.)  03/01 - This PIM is referred to the NIIF for resolution.  04/10/01 - SPs are still waiting for USLEC and Time Warner to provide examples. Verizon requests that actual TNs or real data be furnished in order to investigate.  05/15/01 – This PIM was referred to NIIF. It will be discussed in the July NIIF meeting.  08/07/01 – PIM remains under NIIF.  10/9/01 – LNPA decided to close this PIM due to lack of examples and no evidence of on-going occurrence. | **Suggested Resolution:**  **Final Resolution:**  LNPA decided to close this PIM due to lack of examples and no evidence of on-going occurrence. | NIIF | 10/09/2001 | Closed |
| [PIM 8](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/7286/PIM_008_-_TNs_get_ported_with_incorrect_LRN_v2.docx) | 10/25/00 | Allegiance | TNs ported with incorrect LRN v2 - Telephone numbers get ported from a specific JIP with the incorrect LRN which route customer to wrong receiving office.  11/00 - The problem description as written was difficult to interpret. One of the LNPA chairpersons contacted the author and was able to explain how to resolve her problem with existing LNP information resources and processes. She was referred to the ATIS website for the inter-carrier network trouble Carrier to Carrier Contact List. The author of the PIM did not call-in to, nor attend the November LNPA meeting. Based on the author’s discussion with the LNPA co-chair, this PIM will be closed. The LNPA agreed there is no need for additional documentation to track the owners of JIPs. | **Suggested Resolution:**  **Final Resolution:**  Based on the author’s discussion with the LNPA co-chair, this PIM will be closed. The LNPA agreed there is no need for additional documentation to track the owners of JIPs. | LNPA WG | 10/9/2001 | Closed |
| [PIM 7](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/7282/PIM_007_-_Filter_policies_v2.docx) | 05/01/00 | ICG Telecom Group, INC. | Filter Policies v2- There are continuing issues involving the on-going effects on a region of a Service Provider’s association to NPAC being down. This can, in some instances, cripple the entire region.  06/12/00 This is a new PIM submitted by Rebecca Heimbach, ICG regarding Filter Issues. There needs to be a policy regarding filters. Some companies are refusing to allow a filter to be placed. This causes end users to be out of service until the outage situation is resolved. H.L. Gowda, AT&T provided the following contribution:  EMERGENCY FILTERS  When Customer is OUT OF SERVICE due to an error in the SV for the TN  AND  SV is in PARTIAL FAIL status  \*\*If an SP porting a TN has the customer OUT OF SERVICE (cannot receive calls) due to an error in the information currently in the SV for this TN, and the SV is in PARTIAL FAIL status, and the SP contacts the NPAC for assistance, the USA MUST follow this procedure:  1. IF after the 15 minute retry interval has expired, there is a TN that CANNOT RECEIVE CALLS due to an error in the information currently in the SV, AND the SV is in PARTIAL FAIL status, the New SP porting this TN may contact the NPAC for assistance in resolving this failure.  2. The USA will open a trouble ticket, and will let the caller know that they will contact the SP that is failing for this port.  3. The USA will attempt to contact the SP that is failing for this port. If contact is made, the USA will determine if the SP problem is being resolved in order to correct the status of this SV. The USA will notify the SP that it may be necessary to setup a filter temporarily, if the problem cannot be resolved immediately.  4. If the USA determines that the failing SP cannot resolve the problem now, or if after 2 hours, the failing SP cannot be contacted, the USA will contact the appropriate Director at NPAC to get approval to put up the filter temporarily.  5. The USA will notify the New SP porting this TN and the failing SP, if possible, that a filter will temporarily be placed against the failing SP long enough to achieve a status change for this SV to ACTIVE.  6. The USA will setup the filter and rebroadcast this SV.  7. The USA will monitor this TN for a status of ACTIVE.  8. When the status of this SV is ACTIVE, the USA will immediately contact the New SP porting this TN to notify that the SV is now able to be modified.  9. When the modify SV has downloaded successfully, the USA MUST immediately remove the filter on the failing SP.  10. The USA will continue to attempt to contact the failing SP to notify that the filter was placed and has now been removed. If the SP is not available, a message will be left for the contact name and number that has been provided.  11. The USA will note the trouble ticket with this information in detail, and will close the ticket when the New SP agrees that it is resolved.  M&Ps will be clarified by NeuStar, PEs, and LLC. This will be put into action immediately. Final closure of issue is projected for August.  07/10/00 M&P will be presented at the next cross regional meeting.  08/15/00 Has been implemented. PIM will be closed | **Suggested Resolution:** 05/06/00 Rebecca Heimbach from ICG has opened a new PIM. NAPM is handling right now and feels they may be able to give a solution at the time the PIM is discussion next month.  .  **Final Resolution**: M&Ps were clarified as per Suggested Resolution. | LNPA WG | 8/15/2000 | Closed |
| [PIM 6](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/7278/PIM_006_-_Utilizing_unlock-migrate_to_update_911_record_on_porting_TNs.docx) | 12/07/99 | NENA | Utilizing unlock-migrate to update 911 record on porting TNs - 9-1-1 address records are taking longer to update/change when number portability involved than 9-1-1 address records when number portability not involved.  04/11/00 The discussion involved a review of the standards that are currently in place for performing disconnects and moves without LNP. The standards for porting were mirrored to that timeframe. Some service providers are meeting the recommended timelines, others are not. The old service provider is responsible for disconnecting the E911 record in a move but there may be issues regarding the old service provider knowing that a move is occurring. Currently the only indicator is the EUMI field on the LSR which indicates that the customer is changing locations. This is not a mandatory field on the LSR currently. Service providers agreed that when they receive an LSR with the EUMI indicator reflecting a move, they do perform the delete instead of just an unlock. The issue was accepted by the LNPA WG and will be discussed further at the next meeting.  15/06/00 Due to concerns expressed by service providers, the NENA recommendation that had been sent to NANC was withdrawn for more discussion. Bell Atlantic is concerned with making this a requirement but not knowing the cost/time involved. BA, BS, GTE, SPRINT, USWest and AT&T do not want this request to go to NANC to make a standard at this time (not knowing the actual timeframe needed to update processes/systems). Worldcom thinks the 911 unlock/migrate process should be triggered off of actual NPAC activation to help off set the non completed port issue. When you receive broadcast that the numbers are active, you do the 911 unlock/migrate piece.  Most companies are doing the unlock at the completion of disconnect which is a batch process. USWest does not do their batch process 7 days a week. Some batches are done 5 days of the week, some 6 days. We must consider process and system changes and are unsure how quickly it can be done and costs associated with it for the 24-hour timeframe. Action Item: Charles Ryburn (Co-Chair) will tell NANC that we are still investigating at this time and take off the NANC agenda for this month. Action Item: Companies should take internally and find out how long it will take for you to be able to support the NANC standard i.e. days, months, years  06/12/00 There was much discussion as to whether this was a LNP problem or an on-going problem regardless of whether porting was involved. SBC suggested that the issue be sent back to NENA to address the overall problem. Several CLEC representatives, notably Dennis Robbins of ELI took the position that Unlock & Migrate are transactions unique to LNP, and therefore should be dealt with by the LNPA. The working group consensus was that LNPA-WG should address this issue. There was majority support opposing a motion to recommend to NANC that 911 database updates within 24 hrs of NPAC activation be made a national “requirement”. Rick Jones expressed frustration that companies’ positions at NENA and LNPA were not consistent and asked the LNPA representatives to coordinate with their company’s NENA reps to develop a consistent position. Each SP was asked to consider how long it would take to change processes to adapt to the proposed NENA standards.  07/10/00 Dennis Robbins, ELI process: ELI initiates unlock at FOC, and migrate at NPAC activation. The inability of some carriers to complete their unlocks on time is a serious concern for ELI because the NSP is legally responsible for the record’s accuracy, but is unable to update the record because it has not been unlocked. Dennis asked if other providers have considered the legal risk of being unable to update a record for a ported customer.  Dave Garner: The NENA document my representative sent me says the unlock should be sent within 24 hrs of “completion”, but does not specify the meaning of completion. Our NENA rep’s understanding is that we did not agree to migrate based on NPAC activation. Dennis Robbins referred to a separate section of the NENA document that defines completion as the time that the dial tone is transferred from the OSP to the NSP.  Question for Rick Jones: What is the big concern from NENA for updating these records in when the customer does not move, but only changes service provider? The PSAPs can obtain the SP information from the IVR.  Consensus: The LNPA Members Agree with the Goal of Migrating within 24 hrs. However, the LNPA members cannot agree to make this a national standard, because current systems and processes do not support completion within 24 hrs 100% of the time.  Path Forward: Three positions were advocated:  1. Send the recommendation that unlocks and migrates must be completed within 24 hrs of NPAC activation to NANC and ask to have it made a NANC standard.  2. Send the issue back to NENA. That’s where the expertise needed to solve this problem is located.  3. Have NENA take the issue directly to NANC.  4. Keep the issue at LNPA and:  a) Identify metrics to gather so LNPA can analyze the problem.  b) Have NENA representatives come to LNPA, or call in to discuss the problem  LNPA did not come to agreement on which path forward to adopt. This item will be on the agenda for the August meeting.  08/15/00 CONSENSUS: The LNPA will refer this issue back to NENA, and allow NENA to either take it directly to NANC, or to come up with improvements to the process.  9/12/00 PIM-6 was referred to NENA. NENA is discussing whether the entire record migration process should be turned over to the control of the NSP. NENA rep’s were instructed to go back to their companies and come back with comments and positions.  10/10/00 No updates will be reported until status changes.  01/09/01 - The LNPA agreed that the EUMI should be a mandatory field on the LSR so Old SPs would know that they should do a delete and insert rather than an unlock and migrate. OBF has not come to agreement on this request. Most providers at OBF favor requiring either a Yes or No in the EUMI field, but some carriers would prefer a blank EUMI field default to No and orders with a Yes entry required when applicable.  02/13/01 - There are two aspects to PIM 6  • Timeliness of the data update – NENA is currently working on an error resolution process to clean up all of the unlocked and partially migrated numbers in their databases. NENA will begin work on modifying the migrate process to put it in the control of the New Service provider after they have completed the process for cleaning up the failed migrations. NENA hopes to complete the error resolution process at their March meeting.  • EUMI – Carriers should use Delete/Inserts when the end user moves. OBF has extensively discussed making the EUMI field a required field on the LSR, but some carriers are insisting that the field be left “conditional.” That is that carriers will be required to mark EUMI field “yes” when the customer is moving, but that a blank field will be interpreted as meaning “no”.  03/01 - NENA and OBF met by conference call and discussed why the mandatory EUMI is required. NENA expects OBFs response in the near future.  04/01 – 07/01 NENA continues to work on PIM resolution.  08/07/01 – NENA continues to work issue.  11/9/01 – NENA continues to work issue.  11/13/01 – NENA continues to work this issue.  12/11/01 – NENA continues to work this issue.  1/8/02 – NENA continues to work this issue.  2/6/02 - Rick Jones will bring NENA's revised Standard to the March meeting.  3/6/02 - This issue is still being worked in NENA. They are developing a recommended standard that would enable the new service provider to migrate the 911 database without it first being unlocked by the old service provider when numbers are ported. The new standard is awaiting approval by the NENA Executive Board.  4/10/02 - NENA was not present to provide an update, however, Rick Jones, of NENA, did provide the attached approved NENA recommendation which states, “E911 Database Providers will compare ‘failed migrates’ to the NPAC (or LSMS database) at a minimum of once each business day. If the NPAC Service Provider owner is the Recipient company, the current E911 DBMS record shall be unlocked without donor company participation and the (M) migrate record processed. Both the Donor Company and the Recipient Company are sent notification of the DBMS actions taken.”  5/15/02 - NENA has developed a standard that will enable the new service provider to migrate the 911 database without it first being unlocked by the old service provider when numbers are ported. This new standard has been approved by the NENA Executive Board. The LNPA will vote whether to endorse this standard at the June meeting.  6/12/02 – NENA has developed a standard that will enable the new service provider to migrate a customer record into the 911 database without it first being unlocked by the old service provider when numbers are ported. The LNPA approved this standard at the June meeting. NENA will work with member service providers to implement the standard. This PIM is closed. | **Suggested Resolution:**  **Final Resolution:**  NENA has developed a standard that will enable the new service provider to migrate a customer record into the 911 database without it first being unlocked by the old service provider when numbers are ported. The LNPA approved this standard at the June meeting. NENA will work with member service providers to implement the standard. | LNPA WG | 6/12/2000 | Closed |
| [PIM 5](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/7274/PIM_005_-_Inadvertent_porting_v2.docx) | 12/07/99 | Ameritech | Inadvertent Porting v2 - An “inadvertent port” is a condition is encountered when an out of service customer contacts their current service provider’s repair center. Repair technicians uncover an “inadvertent port” through routine trouble analysis processes. These processes include line testing to validate that the customer’s TN is provisioned within the SPs facilities (network and loop). In addition the processes include the validation of pending order activity.  If the technician finds that the customer is provisioned within their facilities, there is no evidence of requested order activity, but the customer’s line has been ported to another SP – this is considered an “inadvertent port”.  The particular process addressed by this PIM only addresses the “inadvertent port” conditions when the current service provider is unable to contact the other SP to undo the “inadvertent port”. This normally occurs in an off-hour situation.  02/15/00 Donna Navickas presented the WG with further details regarding PIM 5. That information will be distributed prior to March meeting. After discussion, Donna was requested to revise her proposal for review at the next meeting.  03/07/00 At the April meeting NeuStar will provide a yes or no as to their ability to support this PIM with regards to any legal issues. Donna will develop baseline M & Ps to be distributed for discussion at the next meeting. The documents that have already been produced will be redistributed with the changes suggested by BellSouth and ATT. The main issue that needs to be made clear is that the burden of proof for the necessity of the port and end user permission rests upon the requesting company.  04/11/00 Donna presented the update to the inadvertent porting documents. These will be distributed with the minutes. There was discussion regarding the definition of an inadvertent porting event. There was discussion regarding the methodology to be used in authorizing the NPAC to perform the port back. It was made clear that the EAF will include a disclaimer stating that the SP authorizing the port takes full responsibility and liability. NeuStar is requesting that the person sending the form be a valid user, and that the company that initiates the EAF process should be held fully responsible. The group agrees on this statement. Action Item: Neustar will propose wording for the form that will be used (EAF) and how it will be validated. There is a need to follow the same processes that are used today (list of names, codes).  The following criteria/questions were established for this scenario:  - This condition only occurs when an emergency contact person can not be reached. The LNP Emergency contact list has been used but to no avail.  - Question concerning how service provider should send the EAF after hours to the NPAC. These personnel might be at home and not able to receive a fax or email.  - Provide info over phone (verbal) and then documentation could be sent during business hours. Web entry suggestion (web site form).  05/06/00 There were no updates from Neustar on their action items from last month.  Charles Ryburn gave report on PIM 5 to NANC and the chairman of NANC came back with an idea that the FCC has thought about: Charging (opposing fines) for inadvertent porting in the industry. Their issue is more with slamming than inadvertent porting. If this is brought up again at the NANC meeting, the co-chairs will tell them that we don’t feel that the slamming and inadvertent porting issues are the same.  Charles will get completed document on PIM 5 for our review from Donna Navickas.  06/12/00 The final document was sent out on June 9 along with the Emergency Action Form. Action Items : Per Marcel Champagne, based on receipt of finalized process and forms, the PEs will work with NeuStar to develop the M&Ps. This will follow the proper process for all changes to the M&Ps and be worked through the LLCs.  7/10/00 Gene Johnson – Neustar has worked on updated M&Ps but has not had time for them to be reviewed by their legal support. Neustar expects to share the M&P at the July 17th PE meeting.  08/15/00 Dave Heath: NeuStar agrees that accidental porting can happen but with the two timers it shouldn’t happen. NeuStar thinks that this violates their neutrality requirement. NeuStar will only accept this if the all liability for using the process is placed on the SP requesting the unilateral port. NeuStar also says this will require more off-hours support and hence will have a cost impact. NeuStar will only consider this if it is submitted as an SOW.  NeuStar does not suggest any change to the process itself.  The LNPA agreed to go forward with the SOW process. Dave will propose the SOW to the LLC in September.  9/12/00 Inadvertent Porting, when customer’s old service provider cannot contact the company who performed the inadvertent port. Dave Heath will prepare a statement of work on this issue to take to the LLCs at their 9/28 meeting.  10/10/00 The LLC received the SOW from NeuStar and is reviewing it. A fee per use arrangement has been proposed for the pricing model.  11/7/00 The LLC decided not to ask Neustar to develop a SOW, based on the description of the problem and solution they had on October 26. The LLC asked the LNPA to more fully develop the scenarios in which a customer might be inadvertently ported. One of the LLC’s concerns is an inadvertent port when a typo causes the wrong TN to be ported. The LLC wants a process to address fixing the service of the customer who should have been ported, had their number not been mistyped, as well as the customer who should not have been ported.  The original PIM-5 scenario was focused on an OSP needing to restore service for an inadvertently ported customer when the NSP can not be contacted. The new scenario occurs when an NSP notices that they have ported the incorrect number and cannot contact the OSP. If the NSP cannot contact the OSP they cannot just disconnect the inadvertent port, because it may have been a ported number before the inadvertent port. The NSP will also need to get customer they intended to port ported without waiting for the timers to expire.  The group agreed this new scenario is not covered by PIM-5. We will have a write up of the new scenario for consideration at the December meeting  12/12/00 : The working group reviewed Steve Addick’s contribution, which was previously distributed. It was made clear that the Old SP would be given the option of, but not be required to take action to restore the customer who’s service was physically moved without porting the number.  Several SPs expressed concern that it is inappropriate to allow unilateral porting for the scenario where the customer is moved to a different network, but not ported. The group felt that this scenario is very unlikely to occur in practice. General concern was expressed that both the “port in error”, and “failure to port” scenarios could be misused and should not be accepted.  One SP re-iterated that the best way to address these situations is for all service providers to provide a 24x7 repair contacts.  After discussion, the LNPA decided to go forward with the PIM and request the LLC to forward a revision adding the new failure to port scenario to Nuestar.  After reviewing PIM-5, NeuStar is uncomfortable with the implications PIM-5 has on their role as a neutral third party and with the liability implications. SBC as the originator of the PIM will consider whether they should withdraw it, and report back to the LNPA in January. LNPA members are requested to discuss this PIM internally and be prepared to discuss its potential withdraw in January.  AI – Action Item: Discuss you companies position on PIM 5 internally and be prepared to discuss its potential withdrawal at the January LNPA meeting.  01/09/01 - In the December LNPA meeting, NeuStar urged Service Providers to rethink their need for PIM 5. After some discussion, SPs asked to do more internal investigation into the issues surrounding this PIM. In the January meeting, some SPs continue to see high occurrences of inadvertent ports in which no contact with the porting provider can be made for reconciliation. SPs once again asked for more time to investigate this matter further in their individual companies.  02/13/01 - We reviewed the current status of corporate positions on this subject. BellSouth does not think this process should be applied to cases where a service provider has gone out of business.  Verizon still advocates adoption of this process since there is no alternative escalation process.  Companies who would prefer that this PIM 5 be withdrawn include: Quest, WorldCom, Bell South, Sprint, AT&T,  SBC is neutral on the subject.  Verizon stated that the reason they are so adamant in their support of the PIM-5 process is that they have recently experienced having the NY City poison control hotline and the main number for a hospital inadvertently ported, where the other service provider could not be contacted.  The group’s consensus is that this problem could be resolved if all carriers maintain 7x24 hr contacts with the authority and capability to perform emergency porting and back out of porting.  The LNPA chose to:  1) Take the suggestion to NANC that all carriers be required to provide 7x24 support for emergency porting.  2) Once NANC has responded, LNPA will consider voting to close the PIM.  03/13/01 - The LNPA submitted an amended request to NeuStar for a new SOW regarding PIM 5. At the request of the NAPM/LLC, we added the situation of a port that was supposed to happen, but didn’t.  The LNPA reviewed NIIF 134 as requested by the NANC. We sent a letter to the NIIF moderator requesting additional wording to NIIF 134 that will better identify the need for 24X7 coverage by LNP participants.  04/10/01 - Charles Ryburn sent a letter to NIIF requesting clarification of the wording in NIIF 134 be considered in their meeting on April 30th. This was per an action item from NANC. Gene Perez (Intermedia) questioned the moving of a jumper in this same scenario. It was explained that the resolution proposed was to make sure that a) a call-out can be done and b) a person of authority can get the call-out done. NANC questioned PIC – if inadvertently ported, and the PIC was changed, how would you get the PIC back to original. Group agrees that PIC would not be affected in this case and is therefore not an issue.  05/15/01 - This PIM has been accepted by NIIF and will be discussed in detail in the July meeting in Canada.  06/12/01 - No change from previous minutes. A revised (requested by NAPM) SOW 19 will be presented to NAPM from NeuStar shortly.  07/11/01 - Revised SOW 19 has been received by the NAPM/LLC and will be reviewed in the July meeting.    08/07/01 - The LNPA is awaiting feedback from the NIIF on its liaison requesting modification of NIIF guidelines, and from the NAPM/LLC on Revised SOW 19.  10/9/01 – SOW 19 currently under review by NAPM/LLC attorney.  11/14/01 – SOW 19 still under review  12/12/01 – No change in status  1/8/01 – No change in status. SOW 19 still under review by LLC and NeuStar attornies.  2/6/02 – The NIIF SP contract language was revised in response to the LNPA-WG's referral of PIM 5. The revised language does not include the "authorized-to-port" aspect, but is an improvement. (The revised language was needed to better accommodate the new process being introduced to correct inadvertent ports, or failures to port, as described in NeuStar's SOW 19.) Charles Ryburn will send the NIIF a letter thanking them for the wording change. (SOW 19 is expected to be approved at the LLC's February 19th meeting.)  3/6/02 – SOW 19 Still under legal review  4/10/02 – SOW 19 Still under legal review  5/15/02 – SOW 19 Still under legal review.  6/12/02 – SOW 19 Still under legal review.  7/10/02 – SOW 19 Still under legal review.  8/14/02 – SOW 19 Still under legal review.  9/18 /02 - Legal text for Statement of Work 19, which details NeuStar’s role in this process, has been provided by the NAPM/LLC attorney to NeuStar. The SOW will be on the agenda for the next LLC meeting.  10/02 – 11/02 – SOW 19 Still under legal review  12/18/02 – Process in place. M&P posted on NPAC web site.  This PIM is closed | **Suggested Resolution:** All scenarios in which customers are out of service are unacceptable and currently there are no graceful processes, particularly in off-hours to restore customers. These scenarios usually involve the Old SP attempting to restore a customer’s service. Primarily, this condition is encountered in an off-hour. Often the contact info provided is either inaccurate (SP not available or no answer) or the emergency contact does not have either LNP expertise or authorization to assist in the solution. The following proposed process would facilitate the resolution of this problem state:  1) Old SP attempts to contact New SP  - if able to contact and resolve –OK- END  - if no – proceed to #2  Old SP contacts NPAC to perform required SP action to restore customer (create matching SV) with “emergency action” form. See attached  2) NPAC attempts to contact new SP  - if able to contact and resolve –OK- END  - if unable to contact proceed to #4  3) NPAC inputs matching create in lieu of New SP  4) NPAC personnel notify (email?) New SP of action taken  **Final Resolution:**  This PIM resulted in the creation of an M&P which has been posted to the website | LNPA WG | 12/18/2002 | Closed |
| [PIM 4](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/7270/PIM_004_-_Porting_TNs_assigned_to_packet_service_v2.docx) | 11/19/99 | SBC | Porting TNs assigned to packet services v2 - Packet service is not portable, and therefore not poolable. There has been no direction as to the effects of this for evaluating TN ranges to be considered for Number Pooling.  SWBT has packet data telephone numbers (DTN) assigned/working throughout the TN ranges used for basic rate ISDN (BRI). These numbers cannot be considered as contaminated because we cannot donate the range and port the DTNs back to ourselves. Furthermore, we cannot port the corresponding voice TN with the same identity. How does this affect Number Pooling evaluation? Is the 1K block in which these exist unavailable for Pooling? Are we expected to number change the packet users to those numbers code owned by the serving switch?  If a number change is expected, there is a large impact both to the serving phone company and to the end user. The end user would have to re-program their CPE, possibly notify other agencies to which the number is published and the serving phone company would have to administer BRI usage in a range of TNs where BRI has never been assigned. This would seem counterproductive to the goals of pooling as number conservation with no impact to end users. | **Suggested Resolution:**  The TN ranges having working/assigned packet service be excluded from Pooling consideration.  **Final Resolution:**  Through discussion, it was determined that while packet service could not be ported, a TN assigned to packet service was portable and could be intra-SP ported to the serving switch without detriment to the packet service. Since this is the process for all contaminated TN’s in blocks to be donated, this would not be a factor that would prohibit the block from donation. It is the WG’s opinion that packet service would not meet the definition in the INC guidelines. This issue will be closed. A letter will be sent to the submitter and to INC explaining the issue and our interpretation of the pooling guidelines. If the submitter does not agree with the WG’s decision in this matter, this can be escalated as shown in the PIM process guidelines. | LNPAWG | 1/19/2000 | Closed |
| [PIM 3](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/7266/PIM_003_-_TN_ported_in_error_v2.docx) | 11/08/99 | Cincinnati Bell Telephone | TN Ported in error v2 - A business customer with 20 lines ports to a CLEC. The CLEC tries to port the customer's 20 numbers, but includes numbers that belong to one of our residential customers (who does not want to port). CBT denies the port. The timer expires and the port goes through. Our residential customer is taken out of service. CBT contacts the CLEC about it and they say that we must issue LSRs to port the customer back. Our residential customer is really frustrated and we have to go through additional work that should never have been needed in the first place. The timer expiring without requiring some action is leading to customers out of service and additional work being required when none should be needed.  12/10/99 David Taylor of SBC submitted PIM issue 0004. The problem statement dealt with requesting details on packet service and number pooling. Through discussion of the issue, most members of the WG felt that there is not an issue. Packet numbers can be assigned an LRN if they contaminate a pooled block and the intra-service provider port should not interrupt packet service. SBC was uncertain as to the validity of this statement as it was contrary to information given to them by Packet SME’s. SBC was to take the issue internally and return to the next meeting with an update based on the discussion held in the WG.  1/19/00 David Taylor of SBC presented this issue at the last WG. At this meeting, he brought to the attention of the WG a clause in a draft INC pooling guideline (8.2.5 dated 12/99) that would allow a block to be ineligible for donation if the technical issues involved in donating the block were prohibitive. Through discussion, it was determined that while packet service could not be ported, a TN assigned to packet service was portable and could be intra-SP ported to the serving switch without detriment to the packet service. Since this is the process for all contaminated TN’s in blocks to be donated, this would not be a factor that would prohibit the block from donation. It is the WG’s opinion that packet service would not meet the definition in the INC guidelines. This issue will be closed. A letter will be sent to the submitter and to INC explaining the issue and our interpretation of the pooling guidelines. If the submitter does not agree with the WG’s decision in this matter, this can be escalated as shown in the PIM process guidelines. | **Suggested Resolution**: If a port is denied, the timer needs to be suspended until the port has been investigated and the denial has been removed. Or there needs to be some method where the two  providers can agree that the port should not have occurred and be able to reverse the port.  **Final Resolution:**  A communication issue between the two companies caused the problem. There was not a violation of the standard procedures. This issue will be closed and a letter will be sent to the submitter. The WG would recommend that the submitter take any further difficulties of this nature to the appropriate state regulatory bodies or if they choose to, propose a change order to alter the standard procedures. It is also recommended that CBT keep on eye on PIM 005 in regards to alternative solutions. | LNPA WG | 1/19/2000 | Closed |
| [PIM 2](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6432/PIM_002_-_SP_Scheduled_Unavailability.docx) | 09/14/99 | Nextlink | Currently, the service provider maintenance window is a recommended time for service providers to perform maintenance activity upon their LSMS/SOA systems.. There are no guidelines as to notification times or extended maintenance periods. The LSMS /SOA requirements address availability. Without a recognized, measured unavailability service provider requirement, there is no valid measurement of availability.  9/14/99 This issue was accepted to be worked by the WG. She will present further information regarding this issue at the next meeting.  10/12/99 Shelly Shaw (Nextlink) submitted a proposed unavailability requirement to address the service provider maintenance window. That document will be attached to the minutes. The WG discussed the proposal and suggested changes to the document. Shelly will take the suggestions and resubmit the proposal at the next meeting.  11/9/99 Shelly Shaw (Nextlink) submitted the revised document for discussion. It was determined that the document should be split into two parts. One for the identification of the window and the second for the availability requirements. This will be submitted at the next meeting.  12/10/99 Discussion of this issue was held until January to facilitate the completion of Release 4.0 requirements development.  01/11/00 Shelly Shaw provided an update to the status of the proposed flows that the OpWest team is developing to present to the WG. The OpWest team has committed to having the flows ready to present to the WG at the March WG meeting.  02/15/00 After discussion and minor textual changes the Maintenance window document was approved. This will be distributed to the WG and through the NPAC to the Cross Regional distribution list. Any changes to this document will require a new PIM issue to be opened.  03/07/00 This will be posted to website sent to cross regional and to the operations teams. This will be posted on the PIM issues matrix as closed. | **Suggested Resolution:**  **Final Resolution**:  After discussion and minor textual changes the Maintenance window document was approved. This was distributed to the WG and through the NPAC to the Cross Regional distribution list. | LNPA WG | 3/7/2000 | Closed |
| [PIM 1](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/6305/PIM_001_-_LNP_Process_flow_updates.doc) | 07/12/99 | SBC on behalf of SW/WC OPI | LNP Process Flow Updates - Current NANC Process Flows do not address the scenario where multiple service providers are involved as either the Old Service Provider or the New Service Provider, but are not a network or facilities based provider. Due dates are being missed , therefore customer service is interrupted and troubleshooting to resolve is different for each occurrence extending the time it takes to restore customer service.  8/11/99 This issue was submitted to and accepted by the LNPA WG. This will be an agenda item for next month’s meeting.  9/14/99 Jackie Klare (Pacific Bell) presented the changes to the process flows and text that were proposed by the SW/WC operations team. The WG reviewed the changes and presented additional changes. Jackie was tasked to take the suggested changes to the SW/WC operations team for further development. Jackie will present the new flows and text at the next meeting.  10/12/99 The SW/WC/W region operations team that brought this issue to the WG is working on proposed changes to the flows for WG approval. Once they are complete, they will be submitted to the WG for review.  11/9/99 It was suggested that the Operations team review the OBF flows to ensure that no duplication of effort was taking place. This will be reviewed at the next meeting.  12/10/99 The multiple service provider port flows are still being worked in the OPSWEST team. The first of the four flows was distributed to provide the WG with a picture of where the Op’s team currently stands. The Ops team will present the packet of completed flows at a future meeting.  01/11/00 Shelly Shaw provided an update to the status of the proposed flows that the OpWest team is developing to present to the WG. The OpWest team has committed to having the flows ready to present to the WG at the March WG meeting.  02/15/00 The OpWest team has committed to having the proposed flows and narratives distributed to the WG prior to the WG’s March meeting.  03/07/00 The draft flows from the OpsWest team were distributed and discussed. Due to a lack of understanding of the flows and some confusing language, it was decided that a sub-team would review the flows and present at the next meeting. NOTE: The Opswest team has volunteered to present the finalized flows to the WG at the April meeting. The sub-team review was canceled due to that offer.  04/11/00 OPWest presented the completed flows for discussion. Anthony Zerillo(Sprint) presented on behalf of the OpWest Team. There were other members of the team present to assist with any questions that the WG might have. The LNPA WG would like to express  - These flows do not include wireless entities. Just resellers for wireline. Should be documented as only wireline/wireline.  - The narratives contain wireless references that may need to be deleted.  - Action Item: Clean up NANC/OBF acronyms.  - Box 3 needs to be a square.  - Flows deviate from OBF flows - the OPWest tried to portray the flows as what really happens today in operations.  OPWest is asking the LNPAWG group to support and hopefully better the process. Since the flows show a deviation from the OBF process it may be necessary for the LNPA/WG to prepare a presentation for OBF to have OBF alter their process flows.  05/06/00 Kristen McMillan from Nextlink gave a quick review of what the OPWest/East Coast changed from the Multi-service Provider Flows/Narratives that were presented last month to the group. The following is a list of those changes:  1. Box 3 on the Main Provisioning Flow was changed from a hexagon shape to a rectangle for conformity.  2. Titles on all flows and narratives were shortened.  3. Timeframes were added on all FOC steps (OSP sends FOC to NSP within 24 hours)  4. Timeframes were added back in to narratives where times were needed.  5. All Wireless references were deleted from narratives.  6. The Loss Alert step was moved in front of the LSR step on flows K: (OPTIONAL) NSP (NLSP) sends loss alert to OSP (OLSP) and L: (Optional) NSP (NNSP)sends Loss Alert to OSP (OLSP)  Sprint would strongly suggest that the LNPA WG compare last month’s flows to this month’s and supports last month’s flows accuracy where the loss alert is concerned. A copy of the revised flows was sent to the LNPA Working Group on May 11. Members are requested to review and be ready to discuss at June meeting.  Anne Cummings from AT&T and Jim Grasser presented the Wireless to Wireless Reseller Process  06/12/00 This PIM issue was handed to the WG by the operations team at the last meeting. The flows will need to be reviewed by the group for acceptance as standard process flows. Each SP was encouraged to review the flows and come prepared to discuss changes at the July meeting. US West feels that the Loss Alert box should be returned to the original position as an optional step under box 5.  07/10/00 Discussion of OPI Reseller Process Flows: Several companies expressed exceptions to the reseller process flows contributed by OpWest. (Note: since the flows were turned over to LNPA, the OpWest and Ops East teams have merged to become National Number Portability Operations, NNPO.) The exceptions fall into the following categories:  Key: NNSP – New network service provider ONSP – Old network service provider  NRSP – New resale service provider ORSP – Old resale service provider  NLSP – New local service provider, can be either a facilities provider or a reseller  OLSP – Old local service provider, can be either a facilities provider or a reseller  1. NNSP does not have control of the process necessary to meet their commitment to provide FOC to NRSP within 24 hrs. In the OBF flows, the ONSP is responsible for sending the FOC to the NRSP.  2. The pre-order process between resellers is not defined.  3. Loss alert is inappropriately assigned to the NNSP. (several SPs think this should be the responsibility of the NLSP.)  4. The ORSP does not get a “completion notification” stating that the port has completed, so they know when to stop billing.  Verizon stated that they cannot approve the flows as they currently are structured. Verizon would rather retain the current process defined in the OBF flows than accept flows that make the NNSP responsible for the FOC to the NRSP. Specifically optional box 6 in flow I, and box 7 in flow K, are mandatory for Verizon. Using the NNPO flows Verizon will not be able to meet commitments to their resellers when they are the NNSP. After the NNSP receives an LSR form the NRSP, the NNSP must send the ONSP an LSR, wait for the ONSP to send FOC to NNSP, then NNSP forwards FOC to reseller. Verizon is required to send FOC to the new provider reseller an FOC within 24 hrs, and is measured on performance. Verizon has agreements with their regulatory commissions to meet this metric and is subject to penalties if they are not met.  Several SPs at LNPA prefer having the NNSP be responsible for coordinating the port, as in the NNPO flows. At least as many SPs at LNPA think the NRSP should be responsible for coordinating a port. (The current OBF flows have the NRSP coordinate the port.)  Operational Experience: Verizon’s current experience in the Northeast region is that the OBF process works now that they have educated resellers on the LNP process.  Jurisdiction: Consensus of the LNPA is that SP to SP communications are the responsibility of the OBF, not LNPA. LNPA is responsible for processes between SPs and NPAC  Path Forward: Consensus is that LNPA should forward the flows to OBF, but not imply that these flows are endorsed by LNPA. There is disagreement over what should be in the letter from LNPA describing our concerns with the flows. Worldcom favors limiting our comments to whether the porting process should be coordinated by the NNSP or the NRSP. The majority wants to include details of the four deficiencies. Service providers are to send their comments to Charles Ryburn who will draft a letter and send it out for comments. The LNPA will finalize the letter at the August meeting.  Wireless Impact: the Wireless Number Portability Committee will send Charles a letter explaining the impact of this issue on completion of processes for wireless/wireline integration. Charles will add the wireless/wireline integration impacts in the statement to OBF.  08/15/00 Last meeting we agreed that we would send PIM-1 to OBF with a letter listing our concerns. Jim Grasser who is a member of OBF thinks it would be more appropriate for NNPO to forward this to OBF. The problem with the LNPA letter idea is it does not request any action. If we want OBF to address this we need to say: “We don’t agree with how this is being done, this is how we think you should do it.”  Jim Grasser stated that the issue will need a champion at OBF to carry it forward. The issue champion needs to go to OBF in person. Since we can not agree on how we think this should be done, OBF will not act.  John Malyar asked if the reseller process needs to be integrated into the LNPA created flows. (Which were approved by NANC and are called the NANC flows.)  CONSENSUS: Charles Ryburn will draft letter to NNOP listing concerns and suggesting that NNPO take their proposal to the OBF.  9/12/00 Representatives of the NNPO will present the PIM-1 flows and issues to the OBF. This issue is on the OBF agenda for the 13th.    10/10/00 NNPO will continue to rework flows and discuss with OBF in the November OBF meeting. No more updates will be reported until status changes.  02/01 - Last month a sub-team of OBF and NNPO members worked on revised flows for porting with resellers. OBF now supports two options:  • The original process where the New Service Provider manages the overall porting process, sending LSRs to both the New Network Service Provider (NNSP) and the Old Service Provider.  • An alternate process where the (NNSP) receives the LSR from the Reseller then forwards it to the Old Network Service Provider. Current OBF processes allow an SP to designate another company as an “Authorized Agent” to send the LSR for them. This allows the NNSP to optionally send an LSR for the reseller without any change to the existing NANC flows.  A new concern has been raised for instances where a reseller chooses to manage all the LSRs. Some network service providers are concerned that a reseller will be entering NNSP data on the LSR, or committing the NNSP to timeframes without their control or knowledge. Network Service Providers are not going to accept allowing third parties to commit them to actions that are subject to performance metrics without consent and control. NNPO will discuss this issue next week.  It was stated that the root problem is that the LSR-FOC intervals and processes were not created with resellers in mind, and that state commissions who are monitoring performance metrics on some carriers make no distinction for ports with resellers. Most carriers do not think the current LSR/FOC intervals can be met in cases with resellers.  03/01 - NNPO has dedicated half of day 1 of their meetings to the subteam for this issue. Next week will be their first meeting for this on Tuesday, 3/20, all afternoon. NNPO will be working to try to resolve whether option A, where the reseller sends all necessary LSRs, is actually viable.  05/15/01 - OBF Issue 2189, LSOG flows went to initial final closure using option 2. See process flows for additional data. Finalization due in August.  06/12/01 - Reported last month incorrect OBF Issue – it is 2189 not 2289. A sub-team consisting of NNPO and OBF members came to the overwhelming consensus for Option B (a network to network model) but OBF will mention the A flow (reseller to reseller model). Description of both options are on the OBF web site, OBF Issue 2189. A final acceptance decision is due at OBF in August. These flows address wireline to wireline flows only.  07/10/01 - The NNPO submitted a contribution at the July LNPA comprised of only Option B (Network SP to Network SP flows). The OBF Guidelines include both Option A (Reseller to Reseller flows) as well as Option B. Service providers are to come to the August LNPA prepared to vote for one of the following resolutions:   Accept the NNPO contribution (Option B) and recommend as industry standard, noting difference between OBF Guidelines, or   Reject the NNPO contribution, close PIM 1 stating that service providers should refer to OBF Guidelines when resellers are involved.  These flows address wireline to wireline porting only.  08/07/01 - The LNPA voted to accept the NNPO's proposed process flows comprised of only Option B (Network SP to Network SP flows) and recommend them as an industry standard. The LNPA has contacted the OBF and NNPO in writing advising both groups of the decision. We will perform a final proofing of the NNPO flows, revise the NANC wireline provisioning flows to incorporate the NNPO approach (Option B), and submit the revised flows to NANC as a recommended standard. | **Suggested Resolution:**  **Final Resolution**:  Although PIM was resolved due to issue being resolved, the LNPA has been in the process of developing the Flows. Those flows were presented to the NANC on July 16, 2003. They are currently under NANC review. | LNPA WG | 07/10/2003 | Closed |