LNPA Working Group

LNP Problem/Issue Tracking Matrix

Open /Closed Referred Issues

Item Number	Orig.Date/ Company	Description	Referred To:	Resolution	Status/ Category
0001	7/12/99 SBC on behalf of SW/WC OPI	Current NANC Process Flows do not address the scenario where multiple service providers are involved as either the Old Service Provider or the New Service Provider, but are not a network or facilities based provider. Due dates are being missed , therefore customer service is interrupted and troubleshooting to resolve is different for each occurrence extending the time it takes to restore customer service.	LNPA WG	8/11/99 This issue was submitted to and accepted by the LNPA WG. This will be an agenda item for next month's meeting. 9/14/99 Jackie Klare (Pacific Bell) presented the changes to the process flows and text that were proposed by the SW/WC operations team. The WG reviewed the changes and presented additional changes. Jackie was tasked to take the suggested changes to the SW/WC operations team for further development. Jackie will present the new flows and text at the next meeting. 10/12/99 The SW/WC/W region operations team that brought this issue to the WG is working on proposed changes to the flows for WG approval. Once they are complete, they will be submitted to the WG for review. 11/9/99 It was suggested that the Operations team review the OBF flows to ensure that no duplication of effort was taking place. This will be reviewed at the next meeting. 12/10/99 The multiple service provider port flows are still being worked in the OPSWEST team. The first of the four flows was distributed to provide the WG with a picture of where the Op's team currently stands. The Ops team will present the packet of completed flows at a future meeting. 01/11/00 Shelly Shaw provided an update to the status of the proposed flows that the OpWest team is developing to present to the WG. The OpWest team has committed to having the flows ready to present to the WG at the March WG meeting. 02/15/00 The OpWest team has committed to having the proposed flows and narratives distributed to the WG prior to the WG's March meeting. 03/07/00 The draft flows from the OpsWest team were distributed and discussed. Due to a lack of understanding of the flows and some confusing language, it was decided that a sub-team would review the flows and present at the next meeting. NOTE: The Opswest team has volunteered to present the finalized flows to the WG at the April meeting. The sub-team review was canceled due to that offer.	Open/ Process Issue
0002	9/14/99 Nextlink	Currently, the service provider maintenance window is a recommended time for service providers to perform maintenance activity upon their LSMS/SOA systems.. There are no guidelines as to notification times or extended maintenance periods. The LSMS /SOA requirements address availability. Without a recognized, measured unavailability service	LNPA WG	9/14/99 This issue was accepted to be worked by the WG. She will present further information regarding this issue at the next meeting. 10/12/99 Shelly Shaw (Nextlink) submitted a proposed unavailability requirement to address the service provider maintenance window. That document will be attached to the minutes. The WG discussed the proposal	Open/ Process Issue

NOTE: 30 days following the Problem/Issue being Closed, the Problem/Issue is moved to a separate Closed Problem/Issues Matrix.
A copy of the file is available from the LNPA WG Website of www.npac.com.

Page 1

Item Number	Orig.Date/ Company	Description	Referred To:	Resolution	Status/ Category
		provider requirement, there is no valid measurement of availability.		and suggested changes to the document. Shelly will take the suggestions and resubmit the proposal at the next meeting. 11/9/99 Shelly Shaw (Nextlink) submitted the revised document for discussion. It was determined that the document should be split into two parts. One for the identification of the window and the second for the availability requirements. This will be submitted at the next meeting. 12/10/99 Discussion of this issue was held until January to facilitate the completion of Release 4.0 requirements development. 01/11/00 Shelly Shaw provided an update to the status of the proposed flows that the OpWest team is developing to present to the WG. The OpWest team has committed to having the flows ready to present to the WG at the March WG meeting. 02/15/00 After discussion and minor textual changes the Maintenance window document was approved. This will be distributed to the WG and through the NPAC to the Cross Regional distribution list. Any changes to this document will require a new PIM issue to be opened. 03/07/00 This will be posted to website sent to cross regional and to the operations teams. This will be posted on the PIM issues matrix as closed.	
0003	11/8/99 Cincinnati Bell Telephone	A business customer with 20 lines ports to a CLEC. The CLEC tries to port the customer's 20 numbers, but includes numbers that belong to one of our residential customers (who does not want to port). CBT denies the port. The timer expires and the port goes through. Our residential customer is taken out of service. CBT contacts the CLEC about it and they say that we must issue LSRs to port the customer back. Our residential customer is really frustrated and we have to go through additional work that should never have been needed in the first place. The timer expiring without requiring some action is leading to customers out of service and additional work being required when none should be needed.	LNPA WG	12/10/99 Renee Cagle of Cincinnati Bell Telephone submitted PIM Issue 0003. Basic scenario presented by CBT is that a TN is ported in error, which causes the end user to be out of service. Attempts to have the TN ported back to the switch that provides dialtone to the end user are delayed due to various reasons. The end user is out of service for an unacceptable length of time. Donna Navickas (Ameritech) provided additional documentation to support CBT's issue. A solution was proposed that would entail the Service Provider from whom the TN was ported in error to notify the NPAC and have the NPAC port the number back to that Service provider after attempts by the old service provider to contact the new service provider have failed. This would be based on the Service Provider formally requesting the NPAC to perform this service and to provide documentation upon request that the end user had been ported in error and was out of service and that the port back could not be accomplished in a timely manner without NPAC assistance. The issue was accepted and the WG will continue to work on a resolution based on the proposed solution. This will be discussed in greater detail during the January meeting. 1/19/00 Upon review of the CBT issue, it was determined that the reason for the port was due to the standard NPAC procedures and porting guidelines functioning as they were designed. A communication issue between the two companies caused the problem. There was not a violation of the standard procedures. This issue will be closed and a letter will be sent to the submitter. The WG would recommend that the submitter take any further difficulties of	Closed

NOTE: 30 days following the Problem/Issue being Closed, the Problem/Issue is moved to a separate Closed Problem/Issues Matrix.
A copy of the file is available from the LNPA WG Website of www.npac.com.

Page 2

Item Number	Orig.Date/ Company	Description	Referred To:	Resolution	Status/ Category
				this nature to the appropriate state regulatory bodies or if they choose to, propose a change order to alter the standard procedures. It is also recommended that CBT keep on eye on PIM 005 in regards to alternative solutions.	
0004	11/19/99 SBC	Packet service is not portable, and therefore not poolable. There has been no direction as to the effects of this for evaluating TN ranges to be considered for Number Pooling. SWBT has packet data telephone numbers (DTN) assigned/working throughout the TN ranges used for basic rate ISDN (BRI). These numbers cannot be considered as contaminated because we cannot donate the range and port the DTNs back to ourselves. Furthermore, we cannot port the corresponding voice TN with the same identity. How does this affect Number Pooling evaluation? Is the 1K block in which these exist unavailable for Pooling? Are we expected to number change the packet users to those numbers code owned by the serving switch? If a number change is expected, there is a large impact both to the serving phone company and to the end user. The end user would have to re-program their CPE, possibly notify other agencies to which the number is published and the serving phone company would have to administer BRI usage in a range of TNs where BRI has never been assigned. This would seem counterproductive to the goals of pooling as number conservation with no impact to end users.	LNPA WG	12/10/99 David Taylor of SBC submitted PIM issue 0004. The problem statement dealt with requesting details on packet service and number pooling. Through discussion of the issue, most members of the WG felt that there is not an issue. Packet numbers can be assigned an LRN if they contaminate a pooled block and the intra-service provider port should not interrupt packet service. SBC was uncertain as to the validity of this statement as it was contrary to information given to them by Packet SME's. SBC was to take the issue internally and return to the next meeting with an update based on the discussion held in the WG. 1/19/00 David Taylor of SBC presented this issue at the last WG. At this meeting, he brought to the attention of the WG a clause in a draft INC pooling guideline (8.2.5 dated 12/99) that would allow a block to be ineligible for donation if the technical issues involved in donating the block were prohibitive. Through discussion, it was determined that while packet service could not be ported, a TN assigned to packet service was portable and could be intra-SP ported to the serving switch without detriment to the packet service. Since this is the process for all contaminated TN's in blocks to be donated, this would not be a factor that would prohibit the block from donation. It is the WG's opinion that packet service would not meet the definition in the INC guidelines. This issue will be closed. A letter will be sent to the submitter and to INC explaining the issue and our interpretation of the pooling guidelines. If the submitter does not agree with the WG's decision in this matter, this can be escalated as shown in the PIM process guidelines.	Closed
0005	01/11/00 Ameritech	An "inadvertent port" is a condition is encountered when an out of service customer contacts their current service provider's repair center. Repair technicians uncover an "inadvertent port" through routine trouble analysis processes. These processes include line testing to validate that the customer's TN is provisioned within the SPs facilities (network and loop). In addition the processes include the validation of pending order activity. If the technician finds that the customer is provisioned within their facilities, there is no evidence of requested order activity, but the customer's line has been ported to another SP – this is considered an "inadvertent port".	LNPA WG	02/15/00 Donna Navickas presented the WG with further details regarding PIM 5. That information will be distributed prior to March meeting. After discussion, Donna was requested to revise her proposal for review at the next meeting. 03/07/00 At the April meeting NeuStar will provide a yes or no as to their ability to support this PIM with regards to any legal issues. Donna will develop baseline M & Ps to be distributed for discussion at the next meeting. The documents that have already been produced will be redistributed with the changes suggested by BellSouth and ATT. The main issue that needs to be made clear is that the burden of proof for the necessity of the port and end user permission rests upon the requesting company.	Open Technical Issue

Item Number	Orig.Date/ Company	Description	Referred To:	Resolution	Status/ Category
		The particular process addressed by this PIM only addresses the "inadvertent port" conditions when the current service provider is unable to contact the other SP to undo the "inadvertent port". This normally occurs in an off-hour situation.			
0006	03/27/00 NENA	9-1-1 address records are taking longer to update/change when number portability involved than 9-1-1 address records when number portability not involved.	LNPA WG		Open Technical Issue

Item Number – 4 digits Tracking Number
Orig.Date – Date the Problem/Issue is submitted to LNPA WG
Company - Company (s) that are submitting the problem/issue.
Description – Problem/Issue statement and Problem/Issue Description.
Referred to – LNPA WG referred to committee/organization to resolve the problem/issue.
Resolution – Identify / track the action items leading to resolution and provide a final resolution statement.
Status –   Open – ID and Description Form submitted and pending assessment by LNPA WG.
        Referred – Problem/Issue referred to Committee or Organization for resolution. (List referred to committee/organization)
        Closed – Problem/Issue has been resolved and the issue is moved to Closed Problem/Issues Matrix for future reference.
Category – Guideline (inadequate or nonexistent), Process issue, LSR/Ordering, NPAC (design or operation), Publicity, Other.