

Number of NSP/OSP Coordinated Tests Scheduled / Completed	Test Case Scenario	WTSC Corresponding Test Cases	Test Results	Issues Discovered	Recommendations
24 of 24 test cases complete ALL TESTING WAS WITH THE FAX INTERFACE					
Test Case 1A	RCC sends a Port In Request to AWS/NF. AWS/NF responds with Confirmation.	4.0.7	Test Successful	None	None
Test Case 1B	AWS/NF sends a single Port In Request to RCC. RCC responds with Confirmation	4.0.7	Test Success Questionable	Time Zone section on the fax form was an issue. AWS/NF. AWS/NF sent request in PST and RCC responded with CST as the time zone checked and the DD&T was adjusted as per the CST time zone (ie – the DD&T on the original order was 12:30pm PST, the confirmation had the DD&T of 2:30pm CST)	The industry needs to define when which time zone should be checked in this situation. As per the WICIS guidelines the only mention of the time zone indicates the following: “The time value must be local to the location from which the transmission originates” which is ambiguous.
Test Case 2A	RCC to AWS/NF sends a Port In Request to RCC (Port range of numbers) NPQTY = 6	4.0.7	Test Successful	None	None
Test Case 2B	AWS/NF to RCC sends a Port In Request to RCC (Port range of numbers) NPQTY = 6	4.0.7	Test Successful	None	None
Test Case 3A	RCC to AWS/NF sends a Port In request with incorrect SS#. AWS sends RR for SS# RCC sends Sup 3 (Modify Request) to correct SS# AWS/NF responds with Confirmation	4.0.13	Test Successful	AWS/NF received the request and realized that the DD&T was under 2.5 hours The Resolution Required contained both SS# and DD&T corrections requested	None
Test Case 3B	AWS/NF sends to RCC a Port In request with incorrect SS#. RCC sends RR for SS#	4.0.13	Test Successful	None	None

Number of NSP/OSP Coordinated. Tests Scheduled / Completed	Test Case Scenario	WTSC Corresponding Test Cases	Test Results	Issues Discovered	Recommendations
	<p>AWS/NF sends Sup 3 (Modify Request) to correct SS#</p> <p>RCC responds with Confirmation</p>				
Test Case 4A	<p>RCC sends Port In request to AWS/NF.</p> <p>AWS responds with RR (Cannot meet DD).</p> <p>RCC sends SUP 2 with new DD.</p> <p>AWS sends Confirmation.</p>	4.0.14	Test Success Questionable	<p>RCC sent Sup 2 with prohibited fields AWS needed to include the new DD&T.</p> <p>AWS responded with a Resolution Required with 9 errors</p> <p>RCC sends SUP 3 to correct errors</p> <p>AWS sends Confirmation</p>	Explicitly state in the WICIS that the manual process MUST adhere to business rules outlined in the WICIS.
Test Case 4B	<p>RCC sends Port In request to AWS/NF.</p> <p>AWS responds with RR (Cannot meet DD).</p> <p>RCC sends SUP 2 with new DD.</p> <p>AWS sends Confirmation.</p>	4.0.14	Test Success Questionable	<p>RCC sent RR with error of the PM indicator on the DD&T (missing).</p> <p>AWS sent Sup 2 with system glitch on the NPQTY field (populated with aN)</p> <p>RCC sent Confirmation with Request Number missing</p>	There needs to be an outlined process of how to deal with manual or automated responses that have errors.
Test Case 5A	<p>RCC sends AWS/NF Port In request.</p> <p>AWS/NF sends Delay</p> <p>AWS/NF sends Confirmation</p>	4.0.15	Test Successful	None	None
Test Case 5B	<p>AWS/NF sends RCC Port In request to RCC</p> <p>RCC sends Delay</p> <p>RCC sends Confirmation</p>	4.0.15	Test Successful	RCC sends Delay with additional fields populated. Line Number, Ported Number and NPQTY.	There needs to be an outlined process of how to deal with manual or automated responses that have errors.

Number of NSP/OSP Coordinated. Tests Scheduled / Completed	Test Case Scenario	WTSC Corresponding Test Cases	Test Results	Issues Discovered	Recommendations
Test Case 6A	<p>RCC sends Port In request to AWS/NF.</p> <p>AWS/NF sends Confirmation</p> <p>RCC sends Sup 1 to cancel</p>	4.0.11	Test Success Questionable	<p>RCC's Sup 1 was initially missing the RESP#.</p> <p>In stead of sending another RR; AWS/NF asked RCC to simply resend the transaction with the corrections</p>	The Wireless industry will simply have to accept the fact that many carriers will not always adhere to the WICIS process. In this case, it was much more efficient to simply have RCC resend with the Response number populated.
Test Case 6B	<p>AWS/NF sends Port In request to RCC.</p> <p>RCC sends Confirmation</p> <p>AWS/NF sends Sup 1 to cancel</p>	4.0.11	Test Successful	None	None
Test Case 7A	<p>RCC sends Port In request to AWS/NF</p> <p>AWS/NF send RR for incorrect SS#</p> <p>RCC sends Sup 3 to correct SS# but inputs wrong address</p> <p>AWS/NF sends RR for wrong address</p> <p>RCC sends Sup 3 to correct address</p> <p>AWS/NF sends confirmation</p>	4.0.22	Test Successful	None	None
Test Case 7B	<p>AWS/NF sends Port In request to RCC</p> <p>RCC send RR for incorrect SS#</p> <p>AWS/NF sends Sup 3 to correct SS# but inputs wrong address</p>	4.0.22	Test Success Questionable	<p>RCC sends RR but checks the Confirmation box in the Response Type section.</p> <p>RCC resends the RR with the proper Resolution Required box checked in the Response Type section</p>	There needs to be an outlined process of how to deal with manual or automated responses that have errors.

Number of NSP/OSP Coordinated. Tests Scheduled / Completed	Test Case Scenario	WTSC Corresponding Test Cases	Test Results	Issues Discovered	Recommendations
	<p>RCC sends RR for wrong address</p> <p>AWS/NF sends Sup 3 to correct address</p> <p>RCC sends confirmation</p>				
Test Case 8A	<p>RCC sends Port In Request with multiple lines (not a range)</p> <p>AWS/NF responds with confirmation</p>	4.0.16	Test Successful	None	None
Test Case 8B	AWS/NF sends Port In Request with multiple lines (not a range)	4.0.16	Test Success Questionable	RCC sent confirmation with Request Version ID missing on second page of fax	There needs to be an outlined process of how to deal with manual or automated responses that have errors.
Test Case 9A	<p>RCC sends Port In request for Multiple Lines (not a range)</p> <p>AWS/NF sends RR for DD&T</p> <p>RCC sends Sup 2</p> <p>AWS/NF sends Confirmation</p>	4.0.18	Test Success Questionable	<p>AWS/NF sent RR for DD&T but only included one of the numbers (not all three)</p> <p>As a result, NF system generated an auto delay (at the 30 minute window; because a Multi Request needs a response with all lines, not just a single line).</p> <p>NF then resent the RR including all lines.</p>	<p>The following fields need to be clarified.</p> <p>PORTED#</p> <p>NPQTY</p> <p>LNUM</p> <p>Please see the WICIS description which doesn't state the only a partial response is ok.</p>

Number of NSP/OSP Coordinated. Tests Scheduled / Completed	Test Case Scenario	WTSC Corresponding Test Cases	Test Results	Issues Discovered	Recommendations
Test Case 9B	<p>AWS/NF sends Port In request for Multiple Lines (not a range)</p> <p>RCC sends RR for DD&T</p> <p>AWS/NF sends Sup 2</p> <p>RCC sends Confirmation</p>	4.0.18	Test Successful	None	None
Test Case 10A	<p>RCC sends Port In request for Multiple Lines (not a range)</p> <p>AWS/NF sends RR for incorrect SS#</p> <p>RCC sends Sup 3 to correct customer data</p> <p>AWS/NF sends Confirmation</p>	4.0.19	Test Successful	None	None
Test Case 10B	<p>AWS/NF sends Port In request for Multiple Lines (not a range)</p> <p>RCC sends RR for incorrect SS#</p> <p>AWS/NF sends Sup 3 to correct customer data</p> <p>RCC sends Confirmation</p>	4.0.19	Test Success Questionable	Although the Time Zone of PST was marked in the RR sent by RCC, the actual time populated in the Confirmation Date and Time Sent was entered as CST	Need clarification on the use of Time fields when implementing fax methods.

Number of NSP/OSP Coordinated. Tests Scheduled / Completed	Test Case Scenario	WTSC Corresponding Test Cases	Test Results	Issues Discovered	Recommendations
Test Case 11A	<p>RCC sends Port In request for Multi Lines (not a range)</p> <p>AWS/NF sends Confirmation</p> <p>RCC sends Sup 3 to remove the second number</p> <p>AWS/NF sends Confirmation</p>	4.0.12	Test Success Questionable	RCC sent Sup 3 but changed the LNUM value of the 3 rd line to 00002 (i.e. the second number was removed from the port request, but the 3 rd number became the second because it took the 2 nd number's LNUM)	The Wireless industry will simply have to accept the fact that many carriers will not always adhere to the WICIS process. In this case, it was much more efficient to simply process the Sup 3 request as it was.
Test Case 11B	<p>AWS/NF sends Port In request for Multi Lines (not a range)</p> <p>RCC sends Confirmation</p> <p>AWS/NF sends Sup 3 to remove the third number</p> <p>RCC sends Confirmation.</p>	4.0.12	Test Success Questionable	<p>RCC sent confirmation to AWS/NF's Sup 3, however the Confirmation Date & Time Sent was according to the CST.</p> <p>In this case it was a conflict for the reason that the DD&T was 2pm PST, but the Confirmation Date & Time Sent said 2:30pm</p> <p>So it looked as if the confirmation was sent AFTER the due date.</p>	Need clarification around the use of the time/date fields for fax.
Test Case 12A	<p>RCC sends Port In request Multi Line (not a range)</p> <p>AWS/NF sends RR for DD&T</p> <p>RCC sends Sup 2</p> <p>AWS/NF sends confirmation</p>	4.0.20	Test Successful	None	None

Number of NSP/OSP Coordinated. Tests Scheduled / Completed	Test Case Scenario	WTSC Corresponding Test Cases	Test Results	Issues Discovered	Recommendations
Test Case 12B	AWS/NF sends Port In request Multi Line (not a range) RCC sends RR for DD&T AWS/NF sends Sup 2 RCC sends confirmation	4.0.20	Test Successful	None	None