


## NP Best Practices Matrix 2/11/2005


**Please Note: All items from 1 - 33 were developed and agreed to by the WNPO (Wireless Number Portability Operations) team.**

Item #	Date Logged	Recommend Chg to Reqs	Submitted by Team	Major Topic	Decisions/Recommendations
0001	10/9/01	Yes		Time Stamp on SV Create	The WNPO decided that for an inter-species port (between wireless and wireline) the time stamp on an SV create sent to the NPAC must be set to zero. For wireless-to-wireless SV creates, specific times can be set. There are still some operational problems associated with the time stamps today, and they may be exacerbated with the introduction of wireless porting.
0002	10/9/01	Yes		Type 1 Trunk Conversion	Recommend that project management processes be put in place for Type 1 trunk conversions.
0003	12/10/01	Yes		BFR Contact Information	Sending the BFR form to the recipient contact information in the WNPO BFR Matrix or the LERG contact information guarantees that you have made the request for another service provider to support long-term Local Number Portability (LNP) and open <b>ALL</b> codes for porting within specified Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) and the specified wireline switch CLLI (Common Language Location Identifier) codes. The intended recipient is responsible for opening the necessary codes for porting. It is the recipient's responsibility for ensuring that the contact information in the WNPO BFR Matrix and/or the LERG is correct.
0004	12/10/01	Yes		N-1 Carrier Methodology Clarification	The N-1 carrier (i.e. company) is responsible for performing the dip, not the N-1 switch. If there is a locally terminated call then the originating carrier needs to perform the dip, because they cannot be sure whether the tandem switch belongs to the N-1 carrier or the N carrier (terminating carrier). For all local terminations the originating carrier needs to perform the dip, however, for any calls going through an IXC the IXC must perform the dip. Following are examples that were discussed:  a) Wireless to a ported local wireless – the originating wireless carrier should perform the dip (unless they intend to default route and pay the terminating carrier to perform the dip for them). b) Wireless to a ported local wireline – the originating wireless carrier should perform the dip, since they cannot be sure whether a tandem switch belongs to a different carrier than the terminating switch (unless they intend to default route and pay the terminating carrier to perform the dip for them).
0005	1/7/02	Yes		BFR Requirements	The NRO 3 <sup>rd</sup> Report & Order, released on 12/28/01, clarified that BFRs (Bonafide Requests) are not needed within top 100 MSAs – all codes within the top 100 MSAs must be open for porting by 11/24/02. This applies to both wireline and wireless SPs.
0006	1/9/02	Yes		Sufficient Testing Prior to Turn-Up	Service providers must sufficiently test all equipment prior to turning it up in production. If service providers are unable to complete sufficient testing they should not turn up equipment that is not ready for production use.
0007	2/4/02	Yes		Database Query Priority	Number portability queries should be performed prior to HLR queries for call originations on a wireless MSC.
0008	3/10/03			DELETED	<b>Team consensus was to remove this issue.</b>

Item #	Date Logged	Recommend Chg to Reqs	Submitted by Team	Major Topic	Decisions/Recommendations
0009	3/4/02	Yes		Ensuring Timely Updates to Network Element Subsequent to NPAC Broadcasts	The appropriate network elements should be updated with the routing information broadcast from the NPAC SMS within 15 minutes of the receipt of the broadcast.
0010	3/4/02	Yes		No NPAC Porting Activities During the SP Maintenance Windows	NPAC porting activities should not be carried out during the service provider maintenance window timeframes AND service providers should start maintenance at the start of the window.
0011	3/4/02	Yes		NeuStar Application Process	At a minimum, NeuStar recommends that all SPs start the application process with NeuStar no later than July 1, 2002 to secure the necessary NeuStar resources in order to comply with the mandated dates. A carrier cannot begin participation in intercarrier testing until the application process is completed.
0012	4/8/02	Yes		Wireless Reseller Flows	The WNPO took a vote on 4/8/02 and decided that <b>Option B</b> (as described in a contribution from Sprint), an alternative wireless reseller flow, would be used instead of those documented in the Technical, Operational and Implementation Requirements document (Option A). The flows and narratives for Option B will be documented in upcoming WNPO meetings.
0013	4/9/02	Yes		FCC 3 <sup>rd</sup> Order on Reconsideration and NPRM (FF 02-73)	The issuance of the FCC 3 <sup>rd</sup> Order on Reconsideration and NPRM (FCC 02-73) in March 2002 has caused uncertainty within the wireless industry. The WNPO has agreed upon the assumptions below in an effort to minimize the uncertainty and effectively manage the implementation of WLNP and pooling. 1) Wireless service providers participating at the WNPO are agreeing to open all their codes within the Top 100 MSAs prior to 11/24/02 (without receiving a BFR), regardless of whether BFRs are required in the future. The original mandate specifies that BFRs must be submitted no less than nine months prior to implementation. 2) Wireless service providers participating at the WNPO will assume the Top 100 MSAs are those defined in the 3 <sup>rd</sup> NRO Report and Order – FCC 01-362 issued in December 2001 (including CMSAs). <b>Note:</b> Participating service providers are defined as those in attendance at the 4/8/02 WNPO meeting.
0014	4/23/02	Yes		Paging Codes	Paging Codes should not be marked as portable in the LERG. Refer to the Telcordia™ Routing Administration (TRA) Central Office Code Assignment Guidelines (COCAG) Forms Part 2 Job Aid for additional information.
0015	5/14/02	Yes		Staggered Approach to Opening Codes in the LERG & NPAC	The WNPO has published a schedule for opening codes in the LERG and the NPAC. It is recommended that this staggered schedule be followed by wireless carriers in order to manage workload for pooling and porting implementation.
0016	5/14/02	Yes		LRN Assignments	Wireless carriers should define their LRNs per switch, per LATA, per wireless point of interconnect (in the case of multiple points of interconnect to multiple LECs in the same LATA).
0017	5/14/02	Yes		Troubleshooting Contacts	Carriers should update their troubleshooting contact information on the NIIF (Network Interconnection & Interoperability Forum) website under <a href="http://www.atis.org">www.atis.org</a> .
0018	5/14/02	Yes		LSOG Version	Wireless and wireline carriers should support at least LSOG 5.0.
0019	6/10/02	Yes		Clearinghouse Maintenance Windows	Maintenance on all systems used exclusively for LNP should be scheduled to occur during the regular Service Provider Maintenance Window that occurs each Sunday morning.


Item #	Date Logged	Recommend Chg to Reqs	Submitted by Team	Major Topic	Decisions/Recommendations
0020	08/13/02	Yes		NPDI Field on LSR	In a wireline to wireless port, wireless service providers will always populate the NPDI field on the LSR with a value of "C".
0021	11/25/02	Yes		Permissive Dialing Periods	Due to the fact that wireless and wireline service providers will be sharing codes in the pooling/porting environment, extended Permissive Dialing Periods for wireless service providers can no longer be supported.
0022	11/25/02	No		Porting/Pooling and Telemarketing	In a pooling or porting environment, there will be a potential impact from telemarketers after November 24, 2002 on the wireless customer. As required by current law, it remains the responsibility of the Telemarketing Industry to ensure that wireless customers are not adversely impacted (see Rules and Regulations for Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991, CG Docket No. 02-278 and CC Docket No. 92-90).
0023	2/25/03	No		Vertical Services Database Updates	The recommendation is that all Service Providers analyze their internal processes by which the various databases are updated with their individual database provider to assess timing requirements and determine potential issues. This will be placed on the decision recommendation matrix.
0024	3/10/03	Yes		WICIS 2.0	Carriers will use ICP systems that are OBF WICIS 2.0 compliant for production on 11/24/2003. Letter from OBF dated 2/14/03 to industry.
0025	4/07/03	No		In-Vehicle Services	The process of porting a vehicle MDN is based on a formal arrangement between any and all impacted partners.
0026	7/10/03			10-Digit Trigger	As a reminder to wireless carriers: In your operating agreements with wireline trading partners make the 10-digit trigger functionality a default and to the extent that you are issuing an LSR for a third party provider, ensure the 10-digit trigger box on the LSR is checked.
0027	7/10/03			Retail Holiday Hours	<b>If Service Providers [mutually] agree to do the Intercarrier Communication Process on holidays then by default the Service Providers agree to follow normal intervals for concurrence in order to complete the port.</b>
0028	10/14/03		Wireless Workshop	Supplemental Type 2 Usage	<p>The OBF Wireless Workshop has learned that some implementations of the Wireless Intercarrier Communications Interface Specifications, (WICIS), may automatically kick off SOA/NPAC activity prior to the full customer validation process being completed. When a confirmed Port Response is sent for a Supplement Type 2 request, which only changes the Due Date or Time, prior to confirming the original port request or Supplement Type 3 (other), the SOA/NPAC activity may begin pre-maturely. We ask that the following recommendation be added to the WNPO Decision Matrix as an operational guideline to assist in limiting inadvertent ports.</p> <p>Recommendation Title: Limit the usage of a Supplement Type 2.</p> <p>A Supplement Type 2 should not be sent unless the NSP has received a confirmed response to the original port request or subsequent Supplement Type 3. If the original request or a Supplement Type 3 has not been confirmed, the only viable Resolution Required</p>

Item #	Date Logged	Recommend Chg to Reqs	Submitted by Team	Major Topic	Decisions/Recommendations
					<p>Response Type is RT="R" (Resolution Required), and the only valid RCODEs (Response Codes) would be:</p> <p>1M - Requested Due Date less than Published interval  1N - Due date and time can not be met  6E - Due date can't be met  6F - Due Time can't be met</p> <p>1P - Other <b>(remarks must be DD/T specific)</b>.</p> <p>A Supplement Type 3 should be utilized by the New Service Provider to convey any change in the requested Due Date &amp; Time, when they have not received a Confirmed Response to the original port request or Supplement Type 3.</p> <p>11-15 Update: This functionality is slated for the next WICIS version. However, there is no date available.</p>
29	12/8/03		FORT	ICP Hours of Operation	<p><b>ICP process should be able to support porting 24 X7 and it is up to the trading partners to add additional restrictions.</b></p>
30	2/2/04		WNPO	NPA Splits (this was updated on 4/5/2004.)	<p><b>It is the recommendation of the OBF Wireless Committee (Issue 2570) that beginning at the start of permissive dialing the new service provider would initiate the port request using the new NPA/NXX. The old service provider must do the translation to the old NPA/NXX in their OSS if needed. Note: it is the responsibility of both providers, old and new, to manage the numbers during PDP ensuring that the TN is not reassigned in their systems during permissive dialing.</b></p> <p><b>Note: Once NNPO has reviewed and provided feedback this document will be updated and reposted.</b></p> <p>  D:\NPA Splits1.doc</p> <p><b>5/14/04 Update: NNPO has not responded with any updates.</b></p>
31	2/2/04		WNPO	NPAC Port Prior to Confirmation	<p>Raise awareness within the industry that a <b>NSP must receive a positive response</b> before a "create" is sent to the SOA. Ensure that all personnel are properly trained on the correct, agreed upon industry process. Please refer to the official NANC flows for the exact process to be followed.</p>
32	2/3/04		WNPO	Port Protection	<p><b>WNPO agreed to recommend (non-binding) that service providers utilize the following method to remove port protection from customer accounts that had port protect in place:</b></p> <p><b>"Provide the customer with a password/pin number they can use to remove the</b></p>

Item #	Date Logged	Recommend Chg to Reqs	Submitted by Team	Major Topic	Decisions/Recommendations
					<p>port protection service from their account. The new service provider would then send the password/pin number in the WPR to the old service provider authorizing the removal of the port protection service and the port to the new service provider.”</p>
33	4/5/04		WNPO	Best Practices	<p>This contribution documents specific industry guidelines agreed upon among trading partners since Nov. 24, 2003.</p>  <p>D:\Best Practices FINAL (WNPO4-11).d</p>
34	9/8/04		LNPA-WG PIM 41 V6	SPID Migrations	<p>A SPID migration is allowed to occur before the Telcordia LERG™ Routing Guide effective date provided, however, that the effective date is no later than the following Wednesday. In general, however, SPID migrations should be scheduled on or as soon after the published Telcordia LERG™ Routing Guide as possible.</p> <p>Additionally, service providers are urged to follow the processes listed below for required SPID changes:</p> <p><b><u>INDUSTRY SPID CORRECTION SELECTION PROCESS:</u></b></p> <p><b>If No Ported or Pooled Numbers Exist In The Code(S) Affected By The Move:</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p><b>If Ported or Pooled Numbers Exist In The Code(S) Affected By The Move:</b></p> <p><b>1. Coordinated Industry Effort:</b> 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.</p>

Item #	Date Logged	Recommend Chg to Reqs	Submitted by Team	Major Topic	Decisions/Recommendations
					<p><b>2. NANC 323 SPID Migration:</b> 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.</p> <p><b>3. CO Code Reallocation Process:</b> The following process should be considered only as a <b>last resort when Options 1 and 2 above cannot be used to change NXX code ownership in NPAC!</b> Service providers may utilize the CO Code Reallocation Process (pooling the blocks within the code at NPAC).</p> <p>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.</p>
35	2/11/05		LNPA-WG PIM 47v4	Abandoned Ports	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><b>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.</b></p>
36	4/7/05		LNPA-WG	Porting Obligations	<p>VoIP service providers along with Wireless and Wireline service providers, have the obligation to port a telephone number to any other service provider when the consumer requests, and the port is within FCC mandates. Porting of telephone numbers used by VoIP service providers should follow the industry porting guidelines and the NANC Inter-Service Provider LNP Operations flows.</p>
37	5/27/05		LNPA-WG	Use of Evidence of Authorization	<p>Prior to placing orders on behalf of the end user, the New Local Service Provider is responsible for obtaining and having in its possession evidence of authorization.</p> <p>Evidence of authorization shall consist of verification of the end user's selection and authorization adequate to document the end user's selection of the New Local Service Provider.</p> <p>The evidence of authorization needs to be obtained and maintained as required by applicable federal and state regulation, as amended from time to time.</p>

Item #	Date Logged	Recommend Chg to Reqs	Submitted by Team	Major Topic	Decisions/Recommendations
					<p><b>It is the LNPA WG's position that Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) of a port request shall not be predicated on the Old Local Service Provider obtaining a physical copy of the evidence of authorization from the New Local Service Provider. In the event of an end user allegation of an unauthorized change, the New Local Service Provider shall, upon request and in accordance with all applicable laws and rules, provide the evidence of authorization to the Old Local Service Provider.</b></p> <p>At its May 2005 meeting, the North American Numbering Council (NANC) endorsed the LNPA-WG's position as stated above.</p> <p>* Note: Evidence of authorization may consist of a Letter of Authorization (LOA), Proof of Authorization (POA), 3<sup>rd</sup> party verification, contract with the end user, etc.</p>
38	5/27/05		LNPA-WG	Use of End Users Social Security Number and Tax ID on Local Service Requests/Wireless Port Requests	<p>It has been brought to the LNPA WG's attention that some service providers, when acting as the Old Local Service Provider in a port, are requiring the New Local Service Provider involved in the port to provide the Social Security Number (SSN) or Tax Identification Number of the consumer wishing to port their number for identification purposes.</p> <p>Due to concerns surrounding the use of one's Social Security Number or Tax Identification Number, which in many cases can be one's Social Security Number, in the commission of crimes such as identity theft, it is understandable that many consumers are hesitant or refuse to provide that information for identification purposes.</p> <p>Guidelines for the Wireless Port Request (WPR) state that either of the forms of consumer identification, Social Security Number/Tax Identification Number or Account Number, is mandatory only if the other is not provided on the LSR/WPR.</p> <p><b>It is the position of the LNPA WG that the consumer's Social Security Number/Tax Identification Number shall not be required on an LSR/WPR to port that consumer's telephone number if the consumer's Account Number associated with the Old Local Service Provider is provided on the LSR/WPR for identification.</b></p> <p>At its May 2005 meeting, the North American Numbering Council (NANC) endorsed the LNPA-WG's position as stated above, and agreed to send a letter to the FCC with its endorsement of the LNPA-WG position.</p>
39	10/3/05		LNPA-WG	Identification of multiple errors on wireline Local Service Requests (LSRs) and Wireless Port Requests (WPRs)	<p>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 <u>on all errors</u> as is possible to report on the response.</p> <p>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.</p>

Item #	Date Logged	Recommend Chg to Reqs	Submitted by Team	Major Topic	Decisions/Recommendations
				 "PIM 45.doc"	