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# Preface

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

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

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

# Legend

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

| **Change Order Summary** |
| --- |
| **Release #/ Target Date** | **Change Order # - Description/Name** | **Category** | **Status** | **PIM #** | **Go To Link** |
|  | CO 561 – Portable NPA-NXX Past Effective Date | Approved SOW | Requested | 143 | [CO561](#CO561) |
|  | CO 562 - Check for Associated -Xs When Deleting an SP | Approved SOW | Requested | 145 | [CO562](#CO562) |
|  | CO 565 – Add SV Concurrence to SV Query Reply | Open | Accepted | 151 | [CO565](#CO565) |

| Change Order Details |
| --- |
| CO # | Originator | Date Accepted | Description | Category | Notes | NPAC LevelOfEffort | Systems Impacted |
| CMIP | XML |
| SOA | LSMS | SOA | LSMS |
| CO 561 | iconectiv | 04/05/22 | Name: Portable NPA-NXX Past Effective Date Validation**Business Need:**Currently, a Portable NPA-NXX can be created with an Effective Date in the past either over a mechanized interface or via the LTI GUI. Since the date is allowed in the past, a value with year 0022, for example, is allowed. Local systems may not accept Portable NPA-NXX Effective Dates with egregious values in downloads based on their internal rules. The NPAC should validate that the Portable NPA-NXX Effective Date is within a reasonable time period. (See also PIM 143)**[CO 561](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/co-561)** | Approved SOW | 04/05/2022 NPIF Meeting* 03082022-03 - iconectiv to propose a Change Order for PIM 143
* Matt Timmerman (iconectiv) – reviewed this draft CO
* Draft CO was reviewed, accepted and assigned # 561
* CMA to post new CO to website

07/12/2022 NPIF Meeting* Consensus was reached o move this CO to Requested status
 |  | N | N | N | N |
| CO 562 | iconectiv | 06/07/22 | Name: Check for Associated -Xs When Deleting an SP**Business Need:**Currently the FRS has requirements to validate that a Service Provider can be removed only if all associated Portable NPA-NXXs and LRNs have been removed. The FRS also has requirements to validate no Number Pool Blocks associated with the Service Provider exist with a status other than old with an empty failed SP list. There is no requirement to validate that all the NPA-NXX-Xs associated with the Service Provider have been removed. (See also PIM 145)If a Service Provider is removed without checking for associated NPA-NXX-Xs, the remaining NPA-NXX-Xs would be associated with a non-existent Service Provider. The situation of concern is when the NPA-NXX-X exists, but the Number Pool Block has not been created/activated.**[CO562](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/co-562)** | Approved SOW | 06/07/2022 NPIF MeetingThis CO was reviewed, accepted, assigned CO 562* Consensus was reached to move this CO directly to Requested status
* CMA to post new CO to website
 |  | N | N | N | N |
| CO 565 | iconectiv | 9/13/23 | Name: Add SV Concurrence to SV Query Reply**Business Need:**If SOA notifications related to an SV object are missed, such the SV Object Create Notification and the Old Service Provider Final Concurrence Timer Expiration Notification, the SOA may not be able to determine whether the Final Concurrence (T2) Timer has expired and default concurrence has been achieved. The notifications may be missed primarily and inadvertently because of notification suppression. In addition, the SV Query Reply returned by NPAC in response to an SV Query Request sent by the SOA currently does not contain information about whether or not the concurrence (T2) timer has expired. See also PIM 151.[**CO 565**](https://workinggroup.numberportability.com/documents/co-565) | Open | 09/13/2023 NPIF Meeting* iconectiv (Matt T.) reviewed the draft CO.
* Consensus was reached to accept the CO and it was assigned #565
* CMA to post this new CO to the website
* New AI – SPs to review CO 565 and see if there is a reason to also include this change for the CMIP interface
 |  | N | N | OPT | N |