

## 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	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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. <b>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.</b></p> <p>04/11/00 OPWest presented the completed flows for discussion. Anthony Zerillo(Sprint) presented on behalf of the OpWest Team. There were other members of the team present to assist with any questions that the WG might have. The LNPA WG would like to express</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- These flows do not include wireless entities. Just resellers for wireline. Should be documented as only wireline/wireline.</li> <li>- The narratives contain wireless references that may need to be deleted.</li> <li>- <b>Action Item: Clean up NANC/OBF acronyms.</b></li> <li>- Box 3 needs to be a square.</li> <li>- Flows deviate from OBF flows - the OPWest tried to portray</li> </ul>	Open/ Process Issue

			<p>the flows as what really happens today in operations. OPWest is asking the LNPAWG group to support and hopefully better the process. Since the flows show a deviation from the OBF process it may be necessary for the LNPA/WG to prepare a presentation for OBF to have OBF alter their process flows.</p> <p>05/06/00 Kristen McMillan from Nextlink gave a quick review of what the OPWest/East Coast changed from the Multi-service Provider Flows/Narratives that were presented last month to the group. The following is a list of those changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Box 3 on the Main Provisioning Flow was changed from a hexagon shape to a rectangle for conformity.</li> <li>2. Titles on all flows and narratives were shortened.</li> <li>3. Timeframes were added on all FOC steps (OSP sends FOC to NSP within 24 hours)</li> <li>4. Timeframes were added back in to narratives where times were needed.</li> <li>5. All Wireless references were deleted from narratives.</li> <li>6. The Loss Alert step was moved in front of the LSR step on flows <b>K: (OPTIONAL) NSP (NLSP) sends loss alert to OSP (OLSP) and L: (Optional) NSP (NNSP)sends Loss Alert to OSP (OLSP)</b></li> </ol> <p>Sprint would strongly suggest that the LNPA WG compare last month's flows to this month's and supports last month's flows accuracy where the loss alert is concerned. A copy of the revised flows was sent to the LNPA Working Group on May 11. Members are requested to review and be ready to discuss at June meeting.</p> <p>Anne Cummings from AT&amp;T and Jim Grasser presented the Wireless to Wireless Reseller Process</p> <p>06/12/00 This PIM issue was handed to the WG by the operations team at the last meeting. The flows will need to be reviewed by the group for acceptance as standard process flows. Each SP was encouraged to review the flows and come prepared to discuss changes at the July meeting. US West feels that the Loss Alert box should be returned to the original position as an optional step under box 5.</p> <p>07/10/00 <u>Discussion of OPI Reseller Process Flows</u>: Several companies expressed exceptions to the reseller process flows contributed by OpWest. (Note: since the flows were turned over to LNPA, the OpWest and Ops East teams have merged to become National Number Portability Operations, NNPO.) The exceptions fall into the following categories:</p> <p><b>Key:</b> NNSP – New network service provider          ONSP – Old network service provider          NRSP – New resale service provider</p> <p>ORSP – Old resale service provider          NLSP – New local service provider, can be either a facilities provider or a reseller          OLSA – Old local service provider, can be either a facilities provider or a reseller</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NNSP does not have control of the process necessary to meet their</li> </ol>	
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>commitment to provide FOC to NRSP within 24 hrs. In the OBF flows, the ONSP is responsible for sending the FOC to the NRSP.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The pre-order process between resellers is not defined.</li> <li>3. Loss alert is inappropriately assigned to the NNSP. (several SPs think this should be the responsibility of the NLSP.)</li> <li>4. The ORSP does not get a “completion notification” stating that the port has completed, so they know when to stop billing.</li> </ol> <p>Verizon stated that they cannot approve the flows as they currently are structured. Verizon would rather retain the current process defined in the OBF flows than accept flows that make the NNSP responsible for the FOC to the NRSP. Specifically optional box 6 in flow I, and box 7 in flow K, are mandatory for Verizon. Using the NNPO flows Verizon will not be able to meet commitments to their resellers when they are the NNSP. After the NNSP receives an LSR from the NRSP, the NNSP must send the ONSP an LSR, wait for the ONSP to send FOC to NNSP, then NNSP forwards FOC to reseller. Verizon is required to send FOC to the new provider reseller an FOC within 24 hrs, and is measured on performance. Verizon has agreements with their regulatory commissions to meet this metric and is subject to penalties if they are not met.</p> <p>Several SPs at LNPA prefer having the NNSP be responsible for coordinating the port, as in the NNPO flows. At least as many SPs at LNPA think the NRSP should be responsible for coordinating a port. <i>(The current OBF flows have the NRSP coordinate the port.)</i></p> <p><u>Operational Experience:</u> Verizon’s current experience in the Northeast region is that the OBF process works now that they have educated resellers on the LNP process.</p> <p><u>Jurisdiction:</u> Consensus of the LNPA is that SP to SP communications are the responsibility of the OBF, not LNPA. LNPA is responsible for processes between SPs and NPAC</p> <p><u>Path Forward:</u> Consensus is that LNPA should forward the flows to OBF, but not imply that these flows are endorsed by LNPA. There is disagreement over what should be in the letter from LNPA describing our concerns with the flows. Worldcom favors limiting our comments to whether the porting process should be coordinated by the NNSP or the NRSP. The majority wants to include details of the four deficiencies. Service providers are to send their comments to Charles Ryburn who will draft a letter and send it out for comments. The LNPA will finalize the letter at the August meeting.</p> <p><u>Wireless Impact:</u> the Wireless Number Portability Committee will send Charles a letter explaining the impact of this issue on completion of processes for wireless/wireline integration. Charles will add the</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

# LNPA Working Group Matrix

# LNP Problem/Issue Tracking

				<p>wireless/wireline integration impacts in the statement to OBF.</p> <p>08/15/00 Last meeting we agreed that we would send PIM-1 to OBF with a letter listing our concerns. Jim Grasser who is a member of OBF thinks it would be more appropriate for NNPO to forward this to OBF. The problem with the LNPA letter idea is it does not request any action. If we want OBF to address this we need to say: "We don't agree with how this is being done, this is how we think you should do it."</p> <p>Jim Grasser stated that the issue will need a champion at OBF to carry it forward. The issue champion needs to go to OBF in person. Since we can not agree on how we think this should be done, OBF will not act.</p> <p>John Malyar asked if the reseller process needs to be integrated into the LNPA created flows. (Which were approved by NANC and are called the NANC flows.)</p> <p>CONSENSUS: Charles Ryburn will draft letter to NNPO listing concerns and suggesting that NNPO take their proposal to the OBF.</p> <p>9/12/00 Representatives of the NNPO will present the PIM-1 flows and issues to the OBF. This issue is on the OBF agenda for the 13<sup>th</sup>.</p> <p>10/10/00 NNPO will continue to rework flows and discuss with OBF in the November OBF meeting. No more updates will be reported until status changes.</p>	
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 provider requirement, there is no valid measurement of availability.	LNPA WG	<p>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.</p> <p>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 and suggested changes to the document. Shelly will take the suggestions and resubmit the proposal at the next meeting.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>12/10/99 Discussion of this issue was held until January to facilitate the completion of Release 4.0 requirements development.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Open/ Process Issue

# LNPA Working Group Matrix

# LNP Problem/Issue Tracking

				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 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.	Open/ Process Issue
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		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	Open/ Technical Issue

# LNPA Working Group Matrix

# LNP Problem/Issue Tracking

		seem counterproductive to the goals of pooling as number conservation with no impact to end users.		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.	
0005	01/11/00	<p>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.</p> <p>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".</p> <p>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.</p>		<p>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.</p> <p>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 &amp; 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.</p> <p>04/11/00 Donna presented the update to the inadvertent porting documents. These will be distributed with the minutes. There was discussion regarding the definition of an inadvertent porting event. There was discussion regarding the methodology to be used in authorizing the NPAC to perform the port back. It was made clear that the EAF will include a disclaimer stating that the SP authorizing the port takes full responsibility and liability. NeuStar is requesting that the person sending the form be a valid user, and that the company that initiates the EAF process should be held fully responsible. The group agrees on this statement. <b>Action Item:</b> Neustar will propose wording for the form that will be used (EAF) and how it will be validated. There is a need to follow the same processes that are used today (list of names, codes). The following criteria/questions were established for this scenario:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This condition only occurs when an emergency contact person can not be reached. The LNP Emergency contact list has been used but to no avail.</li> <li>- Question concerning how service provider should send the EAF after hours to the NPAC. These personnel might be at home and not able to receive a fax or email.</li> <li>- Provide info over phone (verbal) and then documentation could be sent during business hours. Web entry suggestion (web site form).</li> </ul> <p>05/06/00 There were no updates from Neustar on their action items from last month.</p> <p>Charles Ryburn gave report on PIM 5 to NANC and the chairman of NANC came back with an idea that the FCC has thought about: Charging (opposing fines) for inadvertent porting in the industry. Their issue is more with</p>	

			<p>slamming than inadvertent porting. If this is brought up again at the NANC meeting, the co-chairs will tell them that we don't feel that the slamming and inadvertent porting issues are the same.          Charles will get completed document on PIM 5 for our review from Donna Navickas.</p> <p>06/12/00 The final document was sent out on June 9 along with the Emergency Action Form. <b>Action Items</b> : Per Marcel Champagne, based on receipt of finalized process and forms, the PEs will work with NeuStar to develop the M&amp;Ps. This will follow the proper process for all changes to the M&amp;Ps and be worked through the LLCs.</p> <p>7/10/00 Gene Johnson – Neustar has worked on updated M&amp;Ps but has not had time for them to be reviewed by their legal support. Neustar expects to share the M&amp;P at the July 17<sup>th</sup> PE meeting.</p> <p>08/15/00 Dave Heath: NeuStar agrees that accidental porting can happen but with the two timers it shouldn't happen. NeuStar thinks that this violates their neutrality requirement. NeuStar will only accept this if the all liability for using the process is placed on the SP requesting the unilateral port. NeuStar also says this will require more off-hours support and hence will have a cost impact. NeuStar will only consider this if it is submitted as an SOW.</p> <p>NeuStar does not suggest any change to the process itself.</p> <p>The LNPA agreed to go forward with the SOW process. Dave will propose the SOW to the LLC in September.</p> <p>9/12/00 Inadvertent Porting, when customer's old service provider cannot contact the company who performed the inadvertent port. Dave Heath will prepare a statement of work on this issue to take to the LLCs at their 9/28 meeting.</p> <p>10/10/00 The LLC received the SOW from NeuStar and is reviewing it. A fee per use arrangement has been proposed for the pricing model.</p> <p>11/7/00 The LLC decided not to ask Neustar to develop a SOW, based on the description of the problem and solution they had on October 26. The LLC asked the LNPA to more fully develop the scenarios in which a customer might be inadvertently ported. One of the LLC's concerns is an inadvertent port when a typo causes the wrong TN to be ported. The LLC wants a process to address fixing the service of the customer who should have been ported, had their number not been mistyped, as well as the customer who should not have been ported.</p> <p>The original PIM-5 scenario was focused on an OSP needing to restore service for an inadvertently ported customer when the NSP can not be contacted. The new scenario occurs when an NSP notices that they have ported the incorrect number and cannot contact the OSP. If the</p>
--	--	--	--

				<p>NSP cannot contact the OSP they cannot just disconnect the inadvertent port, because it may have been a ported number before the inadvertent port. The NSP will also need to get customer they intended to port ported without waiting for the timers to expire.</p> <p>The group agreed this new scenario is not covered by PIM-5. We will have a write up of the new scenario for consideration at the December meeting</p> <p>12/12/00 : The working group reviewed Steve Addick's contribution, which was previously distributed. It was made clear that the Old SP would be given the option of, but not be required to take action to restore the customer who's service was physically moved without porting the number.</p> <p>Several SPs expressed concern that it is inappropriate to allow unilateral porting for the scenario where the customer is moved to a different network, but not ported. The group felt that this scenario is very unlikely to occur in practice. General concern was expressed that both the "port in error", and "failure to port" scenarios could be misused and should not be accepted.</p> <p>One SP re-iterated that the best way to address these situations is for all service providers to provide a 24x7 repair contacts.</p> <p>After discussion, the LNPA decided to go forward with the PIM and request the LLC to forward a revision adding the new failure to port scenario to Nuestar.</p> <p>After reviewing PIM-5, NeuStar is uncomfortable with the implications PIM-5 has on their role as a neutral third party and with the liability implications. SBC as the originator of the PIM will consider whether they should withdraw it, and report back to the LNPA in January. LNPA members are requested to discuss this PIM internally and be prepared to discuss its potential withdraw in January.</p> <p>AI – Action Item: Discuss you companies position on PIM 5 internally and be prepared to discuss its potential withdrawal at the January LNPA meeting.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--



# LNPA Working Group Matrix

# LNP Problem/Issue Tracking

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	<p>04/11/00 The discussion involved a review of the standards that are currently in place for performing disconnects and moves without LNP. The standards for porting were mirrored to that timeframe. Some service providers are meeting the recommended timelines, others are not. The old service provider is responsible for disconnecting the E911 record in a move but there may be issues regarding the old service provider knowing that a move is occurring. Currently the only indicator is the EUMI field on the LSR which indicates that the customer is changing locations. This is not a mandatory field on the LSR currently. Service providers agreed that when they receive an LSR with the EUMI indicator reflecting a move, they do perform the delete instead of just an unlock. The issue was accepted by the LNPA WG and will be discussed further at the next meeting.</p> <p>15/06/00 Due to concerns expressed by service providers, the NENA recommendation that had been sent to NANC was withdrawn for more discussion. Bell Atlantic is concerned with making this a requirement but not knowing the cost/time involved. BA, BS, GTE, SPRINT, USWest and AT&amp;T do not want this request to go to NANC to make a standard at this time (not knowing the actual timeframe needed to update processes/systems). Worldcom thinks the 911 unlock/migrate process should be triggered off of actual NPAC activation to help off set the non completed port issue. When you receive broadcast that the numbers are active, you do the 911 unlock/migrate piece.</p> <p>Most companies are doing the unlock at the completion of disconnect which is a batch process. USWest does not do their batch process 7 days a week. Some batches are done 5 days of the week, some 6 days. We must consider process and system changes and are unsure how quickly it can be done and costs associated with it for the 24-hour timeframe. <b>Action Item:</b> Charles Ryburn (Co-Chair) will tell NANC that we are still investigating at this time and take off the NANC agenda for this month. <b>Action Item:</b> Companies should take internally and find out how long it will take for you to be able to support the NANC standard i.e. days, months, years</p> <p>06/12/00 There was much discussion as to whether this was a LNP problem or an on-going problem regardless of whether porting was involved. SBC suggested that the issue be sent back to NENA to address the overall problem. Several CLEC representatives, notably Dennis Robbins of ELI took the position that Unlock &amp; Migrate are transactions unique to LNP, and therefore should be dealt with by the LNPA. The working group consensus was that LNPA-WG should address this issue. There was majority support opposing a motion to recommend to NANC that 911 database updates within 24 hrs of NPAC activation be made a national "requirement". Rick Jones expressed frustration that companies' positions at NENA and LNPA were not consistent and asked the LNPA representatives to coordinate with their company's NENA reps to develop a consistent position. Each SP was asked to consider how long it would take to change processes to adapt to the proposed NENA standards.</p>	
------	------------------	--	------------	---	--

			<p>07/10/00 Dennis Robbins, ELI process: ELI initiates unlock at FOC, and migrate at NPAC activation. The inability of some carriers to complete their unlocks on time is a serious concern for ELI because the NSP is legally responsible for the record's accuracy, but is unable to update the record because it has not been unlocked. Dennis asked if other providers have considered the legal risk of being unable to update a record for a ported customer.</p> <p>Dave Garner: The NENA document my representative sent me says the unlock should be sent within 24 hrs of "completion", but does not specify the meaning of completion. Our NENA rep's understanding is that we did not agree to migrate based on NPAC activation. Dennis Robbins referred to a separate section of the NENA document that defines completion as the time that the dial tone is transferred from the OSP to the NSP.</p> <p>Question for Rick Jones: What is the big concern from NENA for updating these records in when the customer does not move, but only changes service provider? The PSAPs can obtain the SP information from the IVR.</p> <p><u>Consensus:</u> The LNPA Members Agree with the Goal of Migrating within 24 hrs. However, the LNPA members cannot agree to make this a national standard, because current systems and processes do not support completion within 24 hrs 100% of the time.</p> <p><u>Path Forward:</u> Three positions were advocated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Send the recommendation that unlocks and migrates must be completed within 24 hrs of NPAC activation to NANC and ask to have it made a NANC standard.</li> <li>2. Send the issue back to NENA. That's where the expertise needed to solve this problem is located.</li> <li>3. Have NENA take the issue directly to NANC.</li> <li>4. Keep the issue at LNPA and:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Identify metrics to gather so LNPA can analyze the problem.</li> <li>b) Have NENA representatives come to LNPA, or call in to discuss the problem</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>LNPA did not come to agreement on which path forward to adopt. This item will be on the agenda for the August meeting.</p> <p>08/15/00 <b>CONSENSUS:</b> The LNPA will refer this issue back to NENA, and allow NENA to either take it directly to NANC, or to come up with improvements to the process.</p> <p>9/12/00 PIM-6 was referred to NENA. NENA is discussing whether the entire record migration process should be turned over to the control of the NSP. NENA rep's were instructed to go back to their companies and come back with comments and positions.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

# LNPA Working Group Matrix

# LNP Problem/Issue Tracking

				10/10/00 No updates will be reported until status changes.	
0007	05/01/00 ICG Telecom Group, INC.	There are continuing issues involving the on-going effects on a region of a Service Provider's association to NPAC being down. This can, in some instances, cripple the entire region.	LNPA WG	<p>05/06/00 Rebecca Heimbach from ICG has opened a new PIM. NAPM is handling right now and feels they may be able to give a solution at the time the PIM is discussion next month.</p> <p>06/12/00 This is a new PIM submitted by Rebecca Heimbach, ICG regarding Filter Issues. There needs to be a policy regarding filters. Some companies are refusing to allow a filter to be placed. This causes end users to be out of service until the outage situation is resolved. H.L. Gowda, AT&amp;T provided the following contribution:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>EMERGENCY FILTERS</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>When Customer is OUT OF SERVICE due to an error in the SV for the TN AND SV is in PARTIAL FAIL status</i></p> <p>**If an SP porting a TN has the customer OUT OF SERVICE (cannot receive calls) due to an error in the information currently in the SV for this TN, and the SV is in PARTIAL FAIL status, and the SP contacts the NPAC for assistance, the USA MUST follow this procedure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>IF after the 15 minute retry interval has expired, there is a TN that CANNOT RECEIVE CALLS due to an error in the information currently in the SV, AND the SV is in PARTIAL FAIL status, the New SP porting this TN may contact the NPAC for assistance in resolving this failure.</b></li> <li>2. <b>The USA will open a trouble ticket, and will let the caller know that they will contact the SP that is failing for this port.</b></li> <li>3. <b>The USA will attempt to contact the SP that is failing for this port. If contact is made, the USA will determine if the SP problem is being resolved in order to correct the status of this SV. The USA will notify the SP that it may be necessary to setup a filter temporarily, if the problem cannot be resolved immediately.</b></li> <li>4. <b>If the USA determines that the failing SP cannot resolve the problem now, or if after 2 hours, the failing SP cannot be contacted, the USA will contact the appropriate Director at NPAC to get approval to put up the filter temporarily.</b></li> <li>5. <b>The USA will notify the New SP porting this TN and the failing SP, if possible, that a filter will temporarily be placed against the failing SP long enough to achieve a status change for this SV to ACTIVE.</b></li> </ol>	

# LNPA Working Group Matrix

# LNP Problem/Issue Tracking

				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. The USA will setup the filter and rebroadcast this SV.</li> <li>7. The USA will monitor this TN for a status of ACTIVE.</li> <li>8. When the status of this SV is ACTIVE, the USA will immediately contact the New SP porting this TN to notify that the SV is now able to be modified.</li> <li>9. When the modify SV has downloaded successfully, the USA MUST immediately remove the filter on the failing SP.</li> <li>10. The USA will continue to attempt to contact the failing SP to notify that the filter was placed and has now been removed. If the SP is not available, a message will be left for the contact name and number that has been provided.</li> <li>11. The USA will note the trouble ticket with this information in detail, and will close the ticket when the New SP agrees that it is resolved.</li> </ol> <p>M&amp;Ps will be clarified by NeuStar, PEs, and LLC. This will be put into action immediately. Final closure of issue is projected for August. 07/10/00 M&amp;P will be presented at the next cross regional meeting.</p> <p>08/15/00 Has been implemented. PIM will be closed.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

**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.