Problem/Issue Identification and Description
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1. **Problem/Issue Statement:** (Brief statement outlining the problem/issue.)

Pooled TNs that are part of a Number Pool Block (NPB) cannot be modified. Any modification of routing data requires a Create-and-Activate Process.

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

A. Examples & Impacts of Problem/Issue:

Background.

Service Providers are assigned NPBs from the Pooling Administrator, load those TNs into their inventory system, and assign them to customers.

Issue.

Service Providers have automated processes so that when service issues/problems occur, they move TNs to another switch. This automated process requires modifying the TNs from LRN-1 value to LRN-2 value. However, modifications are not allowed for TNs that are still associated to an NPB (i.e., the TNs contain an SV-Type of “pool”) in the NPAC. This causes operational confusion for Service Provider personnel during a period when time-is-of-the-essence getting a customer back in service.

This has led some Service Providers to create an intra-ported TN for each TN in an NPB, essentially with the same routing information (e.g., LRN).

An existing agenda item during the monthly NPIF meetings is for the LNP Administrator (iconectiv) to report and read out on “duplicate” records that exist in the NPAC database. This has been ongoing for multiple months.

B. Frequency of Occurrence:

1. NPAC Regions Impacted:

Mid Atlantic \_\_\_ Midwest\_\_\_ Northeast\_\_\_ Southeast\_\_\_ Southwest\_\_\_ Western\_\_\_

West Coast\_\_\_ ALL

D. Rationale why existing process is deficient:

E. Identify action taken in other committees / forums:

F. Any other descriptive items:

1. **Suggested Resolution:**

Allow Service Provider SOAs to continue issuing an SV Modify Request for the TN(s) that are part of an NPB that they own, and no ported TN(s) exists.

NPAC would send a Create Download Action to the LSMSs.

NPAC would return an SV Modify Response back to the requesting SOA (with status and failed-SP-List).

From a message flow perspective between the SOA and the NPAC, nothing changes. SOA initiates an SV Modify Request, and the NPAC sends back an SV Modify Response. Likewise, nothing changes between the NPAC and the LSMS. NPAC sends an SV Create Download Request, and the LSMS sends back an SV Create Download Response.

Add a new SPIDable, Service Provider SOA Pooled TN Modify Indicator, Boolean, to indicate whether or not this Service Provider SOA supports the functionality. This will allow all SOAs to maintain backwards compatibility, and only SOAs that choose to utilize this new feature will be affected.

1. **Final Resolution:**

**NPIF (only)**
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