Problem/Issue Identification and Description

**Submittal Date** (mm/dd/yyyy): 01/08/2025 **PIM # 158 v1**
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**Contact Name(s)**: Renee Dillon
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**Email Address:** [rd9317@att.com](mailto:rd9317@att.com)

**(NOTE: Submitting Company(s) is to complete this section of the form along with Sections 1, 2 and 3.)**

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

Currently, pseudo-LRN (LRN = 000-000-0000), aka pLRN, SVs are migrated with the NPA-NXX to the To SPID in a SPID Migration, regardless of NPBs that remain with the From SPID (or any SPID holding NPBs in the code). This leads to undesired consequences such as transfer of inventory and ‘invisible’ contaminants.

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

A. Examples & Impacts of Problem/Issue:

During a SPID Migration, the active-like SVs include both regular non-pseudo-LRN (LRN ≠ 000-000-0000 i.e. Network routing LRN) and pLRN (LRN = 000-000-0000). The Network routing LRN SVs are, by default, not migrated if they exclude, i.e. do NOT contain, an LRN specified in the LRN SIC-SMURF file, but the pLRN SVs are migrated since the pLRN isn’t/can’t? be specified in the file. The LRNs in the LRN SIC-SMURF file must be owned by the From SPID in the SPID Migration but, by default of the nature of the pLRN, this LRN cannot be specified. While there are additional consistency checks also performed, there are no specific process instructions to properly perform such checks on pLRN SVs by Service Providers or the LNPA.

Migration of SVs, with the From SPID as the current service provider and having a pseudo-LRN, however, occurs when the NPA-NXX of the SV or NPB has been specified in the NPA-NXX SIC-SMURF file. The current, but IMO incorrect or possibly not well understood, assumption behind this functionality is that the New SP of the pseudo-LRN SVs must belong to the code holder (i.e., owner of the Portable NPA-NXX), and that Pseudo-LRNs are not included in the LRN data owned by a service provider in the industry network data model defined in the FRS and *would not* appear in the LRN SIC-SMURF file as an LRN to migrate.

Those Service Providers that support pseudo-LRNs would be expected, without proper process documentation, to determine whether pseudo-LRNs should or should not be migrated and update the SVs with Network routing LRNs (to keep the SV) or Cancel the SVs (also to keep the SV e.g. NPB defaults ‘ownership’) prior to the SPID Migration. Without proper handling of pLRN SVs, the receiving (TO) Service Provider inherits pLRN SVs and EITHER may not be aware of their existence (pLRN is an optional feature) or considers that the pLRN SV provides supporting evidence to consider the inventory as being transferred but not recognizing that Network call routing will still be based on the submitting (FROM) NPB LRN, if it exists. This results in incurring delays in porting, dual assignment and, potentially, dual billing.

B. Frequency of Occurrence:

Service Providers have noticed this issue recently but requests assistance from the LNPA on quantification of pseudo-LRN SVs having been involved in SPID Migrations.

1. NPAC Regions Impacted:

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

West Coast\_\_\_ ALL  **X\_**

D. Rationale why existing process is deficient:

Some Service Providers may encounter port processing delays due to pseudo-LRN SVs causing NSP Create SV failures due to previously SPID Migrated pLRN SVs OR dual assignment issues when pLRN SVs are modified to Network Routing LRNs by TO Service Providers that indirectly ‘inherited’ TN inventory where based on Network Routing information prior to this ‘conversion’, the TN would belong to another Service Provider.

E. Identify action taken in other committees / forums:

N/A

F. Any other descriptive items:

N/A

1. **Suggested Resolution:**

Clarification could be made to the industry documents related to SPID Migrations, such as the M&Ps, to describe how Service Providers should handle pseudo-LRN SVs prior to approval of the SPID Migration, NOTE: This may not resolve issues for pLRN SVs of Service Providers that are NOT directly associated to the SPID Migration (need LNPA insight).

Best Practice on support of pLRN SVs that were involved in a SPID Migration should be considered.

1. **Final Resolution:**

**NPIF (only)**

PIM #: 158 Final Resolution Date:

Related Documents: FRS Section 3.2.2 SPID Migration Update
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