LNPA Working Group
Tracking Matrix

Open / 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.	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 provider requirement, there is no valid measurement of availability.	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 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.	Open/ Process Issue
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			

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
		needed.			
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.			

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.