

III. Estimate of Public Attendance. Approximately 45 members of the public attended the meeting as observers.

IV. Documents Introduced.

- (1) Agenda
- (2) NANPA Report to NANC
- (3) NANPA Oversight Working Group Report
- (4) NANC letter to Chief, CCB Re: CO Code Volume Applications, 9/20/00
- (5) j2 Global Communications – Unified Messaging Presentation
- (6) Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report
- (7) Number Resource Optimization Working Group Report
- (8) NRO WG letter to NANC Chairman, Re: Recommendation on Individual Telephone Number (ITN) Pooling - draft
- (9) Local Number Portability Administration Working Group Report
- (10) Wireless Number Portability Subcommittee Report
- (11) Wireless Pooling Alternative Evaluation
- (12) LNPA WG 3rd Report on Wireless Wireline Integration, 9/30/00 draft
- (13) WorldCom Minority Report for the LNPA-WG Third Report to NANC
- (14) NANPA Fund Performance Status Report & Funds Projection
- (15) Review of NBANC Payment Obligations for Year 3
- (16) Table of NANC Projects
- (17) Finalized letter to Chief, CCB re: NANC Recommendation on ITN Pooling
- (18) NANC Toll Free Issue Management Group Activity Summary & Status Report
- (19) Copy of Hunter Communications Law Group letter dated 9/18/00 to Deputy Chief, CCB re: Referral of Issues to North American Numbering Council

V. Summary of the Meeting.

A. Opening Remarks. Chairman Hoffman provided opening remarks and announced the Chief, Common Carrier Bureau's appointment of a new member to the Council, William L. Smith, Executive Vice President, Network Planning & Chief Technology Officer, BellSouth and Alternate member, Randy Sanders, Director, Network and Technology Matters.

B. North American Numbering Plan Administration (NANPA) Report. John Manning, NeuStar, provided the report to the Council. Enterprise services -- NANPA is in the processing of developing a concise list of standard reports and proposed customized reports. To better analyze the cost implications, the NANPA Oversight Working Group (NOWG) will review the proposed reports. NANPA is scheduling meetings with state commissions to discuss their data requirements and how NANPA can address the matter with minimal costs to the states commissions and NANPA. Nancy Brockway, NARUC, commended NANPA for its willingness to work with the states but expressed that reports are important for the states to exercise their delegated authority. Mr. Manning added that NeuStar will continue to work with the states to try to meet their needs. NANPA will report on the impact to NANPA for development of these reports.

**North American Numbering Council
Meeting Minutes
October 17-18, 2000 (11.29.00 final)**

Paul Hart, USTA, questioned whether reports will be available to NANC or the industry. Mr. Manning responded that NANPA will advise NANC as to the type of reports that will be prepared for the states and the financial impact to NANPA. Natalie Billingsley, NASUCA, requested NANPA to consider allowing states access to its database on a read only basis.

NRUF Update. NANPA has received over 3000 FCC 502 forms. Of those 3000, over 1700 forms contained errors. Over 750 were rejected for the use of multiple OCNs, missing utilization or forecast data and service provider information. At least 350 were received without any error. In the case of the 750 rejected submissions, NANPA has contacted the service providers. NRUF must be on file in order to receive numbering resources. Where service providers make revisions to NRUF they must resubmit an entire NRUF to replace what is in the existing database for that specific OCN.

State Access to NRUF Data. NANPA has received requests from a few states for the data. States will be provided the data in the format filed by the service providers and must ensure appropriate confidentiality protections are in place. The data is expected to be available by mid-November. This will allow NANPA time to receive revised NRUF forms and more complete data will be available by then. In response to a question regarding how much data is missing in a given NPA to date, Mr. Manning stated that NANPA has not identified missing data on specific NPAs. NANPA will contact carriers with specific direction to correct errors in NRUF forms.

Trent Boaldin, OPASTCO, thanked NANPA for working with the service providers to correct their filings and added that the form itself needs to be revised. Paul Hart, USTA, stated that both associations should work together with the NANPA to improve the process (instructions and forms) and begin an outreach effort to better acquaint service providers with the new form. Mr. Manning noted that many have volunteered to work on this matter to modify the forms to correct problems. However any suggested changes to the NRUF FCC Form 502 must be approved by OMB. In response to a question on how many carriers used the NRUF/EFT format, Mr. Manning stated that very few submissions were received in that manner. He further stated that the OMB emergency approval for first six months will expire at the end of December 2000 and therefore another submission to OMB for a three year approval is required. NANPA will work with the FCC to improve the format in the November timeframe. Bill Adair, SBC, suggested that any changes to the form or the process should be made quickly so that carriers will have sufficient time to respond.

Revenue Accounting Office (RAO) Requirement – INC Issue #220. INC developed a new guideline that service providers supply an RAO code as part of their CO Code applications. By letter dated September 27, 2000, Ron Conners, Director, NANPA, notified NANC Chair Hoffman and Norm Epstein, INC Moderator, that resolution of INC Issue 220 may require changes in the current NANPA operations. The letter advised that NANPA would assess the impact of the new guideline and recommend an appropriate cost recovery adjustment if necessary. NANPA has completed its assessment and is pleased to report it does not see a cost adjustment for this change.

**North American Numbering Council
Meeting Minutes
October 17-18, 2000 (11.29.00 final)**

Ron Havens, Sprint, commented that in an OBF context, billing messages are guided by the RAO code and added that the INC guideline is in initial closure and will be implemented after final closure. Julie Petersen, SBC, added the proposed revisions to the Part 1 form would help prevent downstream problems. The updated forms are posted on the on INC and NANPA web sites. Notice will be provided to all carriers.

Larry Vagnoni, NeuStar, announced that NPAC testing of Release 3.0 in the Northeast region would be delayed by at least five weeks due to software problems during testing. Nancy Brockway questioned whether state pooling trials could go forward with Release 1.4 in the interim prior to the roll out of national pooling standards. Mr. Vagnoni stated that most of the North East Region has begun pooling activities in an interim fashion. With regard to status of the testing schedule for Release 3.0, NeuStar expects to reassign a firm date within the next two weeks. However, if there are unforeseen complications it could be longer.

C. NANPA Oversight Working Group Report. Pat Caldwell provided the report to the Council. NANPA developed a new mechanized system designed to track historical and current data for the purpose of producing reports. With regard to the 1999 NANPA Performance Improvement Plan (PIP), the NOWG have expressed its concern to NeuStar regarding the NANPA numbering newsletter content because it includes pooling information *i.e.*, references pooling web sites and NeuStar as a pooling administrator. It is continuing to work with NANPA on this issue. NOWG also expressed concern that the CAS system delivery is late and the system under development for NRUF is the CAS system as originally envisioned.

2000 NANPA PIP. The WG is developing the 2000 PIP survey and has received participation from the Connecticut PSC. The rating scheme will be revised to “does not meet,” “sometimes meets,” “meets,” or “exceeds.”

Beth O’Donnell, NCTA, questioned whether surveys are confidential and when will the complaint form be developed. Mr. Caldwell responded that the development of a NANPA complaint form, designed to provide feed back from state commissions and service providers on a real time basis, has been delayed due to competing priorities. Nancy Brockway, NARUC, commented that state delegated authority and industry guidelines must be synchronized and that carriers are required to comply with state law. She noted that this issue needs to be addressed because at times there are conflicts with delegated authority and the guidelines. Mr. Caldwell stated that the survey will encourage written comments and will specifically refer to NANPA’s application of the industry guidelines. He noted, however, it is not practical to have the form designed for 50 states.

Chairman Hoffman clarified that the purpose of the form is to identify, if any, shortfalls in NANPA’s performance. The question is what are you evaluating NANPA’s performance against. Phil McClelland, NASUCA, noted that under the current system NANPA is scored according to its compliance with INC guidelines, which are developed

**North American Numbering Council
Meeting Minutes
October 17-18, 2000 (11.29.00 final)**

by service providers. Dan Hochvert, Verizon, commented that there are differences between state guidelines pursuant to proper delegated authority and INC guidelines and both parties should strive to find the best way to accomplish compliance with both. Norm Epstein, INC Moderator, clarified that INC guidelines are always superceded by state authority. Ms. Brockway further added that NeuStar needs to understand its obligation to avoid conflict with state commissions' delegated authority.

With regard to the development of the new NANPA Technical Requirements Document, Peter Guggina, WorldCom, noted that the NOWG should assume that the next NANPA contract will be a competitively bid firmed fixed price contract.

D. CO Code Volume Request Draft NANC Letter Referral to the FCC. Peter Guggina stated that based on a review of a transcript prepared by WorldCom from tapes of the September NANC meeting discussion, in his opinion the proposed WorldCom letter captures what transpired at the September NANC meeting. He proposed changing the letter to reflect the outcome of meeting and not offline discussions. Beth O'Donnell opined that the Chairman's letter reflects an accurate account of the agreement that was reached but that perhaps the three alternatives may need a second vote. Bill Adair, SBC, commented that SBC agreed to refer the issue to the FCC but at the same time supported the NOWG recommendation. However, referral to the FCC by NANC was not a statement of support for additional compensation.

Dan Hochvert commented that issues should be worked while the Council is together in public and that the Council should ensure that when a question is called that it is called clearly. Peter Guggina stated that some level of support for additional compensation should be reflected in the letter.

Chairman Hoffman acknowledged that it was a mistake that the letter was not sent out for review by the full Council. There was no intention to circumvent the process. The original letter, sent to the Chief, Common Carrier Bureau (CCB) and posted to the NANC web page, has subsequently been removed and the letter sent to the Bureau was retrieved. With regard to the vote at the meeting, NANC operates by consensus and votes tend to polarize. In this case, a vote was taken to get a reading of the group. With regard to lobbying of the NANC Chair, lobbying occurs frequently before and after meetings. Furthermore, there are many discussions everyday with folks in between meetings, which are very helpful.

Beth Kistner, ALTS, commented that there may be room for improvement of the NANC process and encouraged the Council not to rush through its agenda just to move things along. Ms. Kistner suggested inserting a summarization of the gist of where NANC was coming from be inserted in the letter and circulate it for comment by the full Council. Chairman Hoffman stated from an efficiency standpoint, the Council should avoid drafting by committee. He noted that the main reason he did not adopt the WorldCom version was because he believed there was some support for NOWG recommendation to pay NANPA nothing. Peter Guggina suggested that going forward the Council should strive to capture the consensus better.

D. J2 Global Communications Presentation. Leo D'Angelo, Chief Technical Officer, j2 Global Communications, presented the tutorial to the Council. Mr. D'Angelo advised that Global Communications was in the process of acquiring eFax and was changing its name to j2. This company delivers communications services that are central to the lives of the mobile professional and the subject matter expert (SME). Mr. D'Angelo described j2's products - send and receive faxes, voice mail and email by phone, call handling and conferencing. Currently, j2 offers three classes of service. There is a free service to receive faxes and voice mail on a non-local number (from the customer point of view). This is marketed with the intent to upgrade the customer to the j2 "Lite" or "Premier" service. Telephone numbers are recycled if customers do not migrate from free service to paid service after 90 days. Approximately 30,000 to 90,000 TNs are recycled monthly. Lite service provides the ability to send and receive fax and voicemail on a non-local number and access to call handling. The Premier service features send/receive fax and voicemail capability on a local or toll free number, access to call handling and access to email by phone and text to speech capability.

Currently, j2 has network operations centers (NOCs) in Los Angeles and New York and has 65 points of presence (POPs) around the world – equipment in carrier co-locations. J2 maintains a private frame relay network to connect the POPs to the NOCs. J2 works with multiple carriers to obtain direct inward dial (DIDs) and public switched telephone network (PTSN) access. The j2 network is configured to work through a LEC to IXC to frame relay for all circuit based voice traffic. Telephone numbers are aged for 120 days before reassignment to another customer. The j2 business strategy is to port numbers and not to consume more numbers. J2 is working to obtain number portability capability and access to SS7 functionality. It is believed that with evolving technology, j2 will not have to give out telephone numbers in order to provide service.

E. Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report. Norm Epstein provided a brief update to the Council and announced that INC will release the next issue of the Thousands-Block Number (NXX) Pooling Administration Guidelines on November 13, 2000. This version reflects all *NRO Order* related matters. INC will present its unassigned number porting (UNP) report at the November 28-29, 2000 NANC meeting. The next full meeting of the INC will be held at Tyson's Corner, Virginia from November 13-17, 2000 and the INC will not meet again until after the holidays on January 8-12, 2001.

F. Numbering Resource Optimization (NRO) Working Group Report. Eleanor Willis provided the report to the Council. The NRO WG continues to work with NANPA on exhaust projections, and advised that the WG has not drafted any new assumptions based on the data collected to date. The WG will report out on the impact of number pooling trials at the January 2001 NANC meeting.

Individual Telephone Number (ITN) Pooling. The letter report was sent to the Chairman Hoffman with copy of the ITN Pooling Report (Appendix A). Brian Baldwin, Co-Chair, NRO WG commented that ITN is a monumental change to the network system and is

**North American Numbering Council
Meeting Minutes
October 17-18, 2000 (11.29.00 final)**

comparable to the toll free system. The NRO WG recommends waiting until national roll out of 1K pooling before proceeding with ITN. Beth O'Donnell, Co-Chair, stated the WG did not deal with UNP. If UNP and 1K pooling are implemented then possibly that is enough. She further noted that the technology platforms for both ITN and UNP exist now. Phil McClelland commented that he was uncomfortable with writing items off before closely looking at them. The proposed letter states that ITN should not be considered for quite sometime because it is too difficult or not the best alternative. Ms. Willis added that the WG believes the past work on ITN was considered exhaustive and complete, and without further data, the October 1998 recommendation remains unchanged. Nancy Brockway expressed concern with declaring it off the table and suggest deleting the language "delay until all of the conservation measures ordered by the FCC" Brian Baldwin stated that the intent is to wait for results and data and to assess before revisiting ITN pooling -- at this juncture it is too soon to consider.

Jack Goldberg, NARUC, commented that with no additional data and no cost data, it is understandable to put this off, but would not support putting this off for another three years. Thomas Dunleavy, NARUC, suggested that a date certain does place a requirement to revisit the issue. Dan Hochvert suggested removing "all conservation measures" and consider re-commissioning a study in early 2002 and see if we could learn about the cost of implementation – administrative effort to assign numbers one number at a time. Peter Guggina added that the Steering Group (SG) will consider the "big picture" and may clarify what NANC will do on that date. Phil McClelland stated that with NANP expansion on the horizon and more information on the performance of thousand-block pooling, ITN should be revisited no later than first quarter 2002. Chairman Hoffman noted that the *NRO Order* requests a report by January 2001 and that NANC should suggest to the Commission that NANC come back to the matter in first quarter 2002.

Dan Hochvert added that the NRO report is accurate today; but the industry and the Council will learn a lot over the next year. Peter Guggina suggested keeping the language more general and that NANC re-look at ITN after implementation of thousand block pooling. Brian Baldwin stated that in his opinion the NRO WG October 1998 report conclusions still have a lot of merit. It was a very comprehensive study and it was concluded at the time that ITN would be very costly. It was agreed that the NANC letter will be revised to reflect that the Council will revisit the issue by 4thQ 2001.

COCUS (NRUF) Requirements Document (RD). Mr. Baldwin reported that a draft RD is available on NRO WG web page and encouraged the NANC to look at reports section on COCUS data and in light of discussion by the NANPA consider what kind of standard reports would you like to see on the data. Nancy Brockway stated that NARUC would provide input to the NRO WG on suggested standard reports.

G. Local Number Portability Administration (LNPA) Working Group Report.
Charles Ryburn, Brian Egbert and Anna Miller provided the reports to the Council.

**North American Numbering Council
Meeting Minutes
October 17-18, 2000 (11.29.00 final)**

Brian Egbert reviewed the Wireless Number Portability Subcommittee's (WNPSC) activities. The subcommittee has completed a final review of the inter-carrier test plan and will make upgrades and incorporate edits to the test plan after review by the LNPAWG. The SC evaluated a wireless demand model approach and updated assumptions to be used to forecast NPAC TN per second requirements for porting volumes in 2003 through 2005 and will be presented to the LLC at the November meeting. A charter and scope of the Wireless Operations Team is being created and will be discussed at the November LNPA WG meeting. With regard to the Sunday porting issue, the WNPSC has requested NeuStar to provide a presentation on timers, long/short days and hours, default FRS requirements, maintenance windows and impacts on LSOA and LSMS.

Anna Miller presented the WNPSC's wireless pooling alternative evaluation. This report is in response to a NANC action item to evaluate an alternative method of number pooling, including a description of what the option is, under what circumstances it should be used, and timeframe for implementation. The principle issue is whether wireless service providers can participate in 1000 block pooling prior to Phase 2 LNP service provider local number portability implementation. The WNPSC has concluded that it is not a viable method for wireless participation in thousand-block pooling prior to Phase 2 LNP implementation deadline of November 24, 2002. Early implementation of thousand block pooling could jeopardize compliance with Phase 2. Ms. Miller reviewed the requirements: (1) Any donor or recipient wireless switch serving a pooled rate center must be capable of launching a LNP query to route and accept calls based upon the LRN; (2) only one wireless SP per pooled NPA NXX; (3) the wireless SP must be the code holder (the LERG assignee) and (4) the wireless 1000 blocks must be uncontaminated. The impact of these requirements are as follows: (1) Eliminates default routing and triggerless methods for Phase 1 LNP, (2) results in additional code holder and default routing responsibilities, (3) will require modification to wireless telephone number administration systems and procedures; (4) NPA NXX database services are at risk, pending testing and debugging. Additionally, this approach would require modification to the INC Thousand Block Pooling Administration guidelines and the PA's responsibilities. Without WNP Phase 2 software, the wireless MSC cannot process terminating calls to pooled TNs. Both phases of the software are not available and it is therefore unlikely that pooling could be implemented substantially in advance of portability.

Wireline Wireless Integration Report, 3rd. The report has been amended to include the WorldCom minority report at Appendix C. Reduction in the wireline porting interval Simple port scenario is described under section 3.2.1. It is not feasible to shorten the porting interval because the inter-company provisioning flows allow 24 hours from receipt of the LSR to transmittal of the LSC and 3 days to complete the NPAC SMS port after the LSC (FOC) is returned. Currently, the wireline porting interval is 4 days for a port between wireline to wireline service providers and many service providers find their processes and systems are challenged to consistently meet the porting interval.

**North American Numbering Council
Meeting Minutes
October 17-18, 2000 (11.29.00 final)**

Elimination of appropriate batch processing would facilitate the possibility of a reduced porting interval. However, this would require off-hours batch processing change to real time processing. Costs would be astronomical.

In section 4, the report discusses wireless to wireline porting otherwise known as a mixed service scenario. The industry is working to resolve the E911 callbacks/wireline origination issues. Basically, the callback routes to the wireless set and to the location of the emergency. The WorldCom minority report discusses the mixed service wireline to wireless port. NENA provided input under section 4.3 on the E911 issue with alternative 1 and 2.

There are three open issues remaining – the matter of inconsistent rate centers, directory listings issue and billing issues.

It was suggested that the transmittal letter should raise the rate center issue. Lori Messing, CTIA, stated that CTIA can not support the report as it stands, until it sees a better breakdown of the porting interval. Anne Cummins, AT&T Wireless, commented that the two business models need to be integrated before wireless can roll out LNP. The wireless industry is under a tight deadline, November 2002. Courtney Jackson, Cathie Capita and Lori Messing volunteered to provide input to LNPA WG for inclusion in its report. Chairman Hoffman questioned, with regard to the rate center issue, where is it with the FCC. The Council will review the report and consider it at the November NANC meeting.

NPAC Release Status. NeuStar has reported to the LLCs and WG that it is currently 4 weeks behind on Release 3.0 testing. With regard to Release 4.0, the LLC and Canadian Consortium approved only 10 of the 22 change orders in the package. Work on Release 5.0 has begun.

Problem Identification Management (PIM). PIM 6 – NENA requested a standard be established on unlock/migrate transactions during porting. It was agreed that NENA will write the standard to allow migration of 911 records without an unlock if the NPAC SMS shows the NSP as the current owner of the telephone number. The NENA committee still feels the OSPs should be required to unlock 911 records.

Slow Horse. LSMS performance certification testing approach alternatives are being developed for further discussion.

H. North American Numbering Plan Billing and Collection (NBANC) Report.

John Ricker provided the report to the Council. Mr. Ricker reviewed NBANC payment obligation for year 3. The NANPA contract is scheduled to expire in November 2002, NBANC's agreement to act as the NANPA fund billing and collection agent expires in February 2003. A matrix with a breakdown of pending activities that could effect the current and pending payment obligations was provided for the Council's information and consideration.

**North American Numbering Council
Meeting Minutes
October 17-18, 2000 (11.29.00 final)**

NANPA Fund Performance Status Report and Fund Projection. As of October 9, 2000, the fund balance is \$6.1 million; projected receivables for Year 3 are \$4.1 million; refunds to carriers (distributed in August) total \$1.07 million; payments to NeuStar \$2.83 million with \$4.1 million remaining. Funds earmarked for 1K Pooling Administration \$4.1 million; funds for the NANPA auditor total \$350K, and funds set aside for a COCUS replacement total \$203K. Board expenses for Year 3 total \$7.5k with \$30K remaining for Year 3. Mr. Ricker advised that the fund is projected to have a balance of \$1.8 million dollars by June 2001.

Anne LaLena, WorldCom, stated that the NBANC needs guidance from the Commission on when payments are expected to be made to the pooling administrator (PA). Chairman Hoffman clarified that the excess of \$1.8 million by June 2001 includes payments made to an auditor and to the PA. Therefore, it is possible that it will be more if the PA or auditor is not paid during the projected timeline. Mr. Ricker noted that the PA payment is estimated at \$680K per month. Pooling is scheduled to begin nine months from selection of the PA.

Statement of Thanks and Appreciation. Dan Hochvert, Verizon, after nearly four years with the Council will step down to assume other responsibilities. Mr. Hochvert expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to serve on the Council and stated that he learned a lot from other people's perspective. Mr. Hochvert further suggested that NANC seating positions should be rotated and with different industry and regulator segments integrated to allow for the sharing of ideas on an informal basis because better decisions are made this way. This is advice from an industry veteran who has worked for 39 years in the industry.

Wednesday, October 18, 2000.

I. Discussion of Local Number Portability Wireless Integration - Rate Center Issue. Chairman Hoffman suggested that further discussion of the open issues, *e.g.*, rate centers, billing and directory issues be discussed at the November NANC meeting. The rate center issue is of great importance and should be highlighted to the FCC and note the options on the record for resolving the matter. Brian Egbert, Sprint PCS, stated that wireless to wireless porting would not be impaired and further commented that pooling between wireless only companies seems self-defeating.

J. Steering Group Report. Rose Breidenbaugh reviewed the revised Table of NANC projects.

Peter Pescosolido, SG Co-Chair, NARUC, provided the report on the SG discussion. The SG recommends that the Council discuss "big picture" issues for optimization of NANP resources in comparison with NANP expansion and look at the non-network costs. Nancy Brockway will draft an outline for discussion at the November SG meeting which will be presented to the Council at its January 2001 meeting.

**North American Numbering Council
Meeting Minutes
October 17-18, 2000 (11.29.00 final)**

The SG discussed and proposed, with regard to improvement of communications, that NANC should form an IMG to address and develop written guidelines.

Chairman Hoffman would like the SG to encourage NANC to look at the big picture with respect to potential exhaust.

It was agreed that it would be useful to have a document of NANC methods and procedures which would be useful to new members. The document should include guidelines on communications to all sources and generally, how to conduct the Council's business.

Bill Adair noted that the current process works well, but could be valuable to record current operating practices of the Council. Regarding the Big Picture on NANP expansion, the baseline should be a mission statement. Chairman Hoffman pointed out that NANC can not ignore the fact that NANP expansion is on the horizon – and should explore what to do to fully utilize the existing NANP before exhaust.

Peter Guggina stated that the SG "big picture" outline should direct the discussion and would serve to efficiently identify the issues for discussion by the full Council. Phil McClelland added that it is important to look at what other countries are doing with respect to numbering exhaust and to consider international requirements.

Beth Kistner, ALTS will chair the NANC IMG for communications and process improvement.

Nancy Brockway volunteered to outline the NANP expansion issue and solicited comments and input to that effort. Paul Hart, USTA, suggested that the work on NANP expansion take into consideration the existing INC work effort on expansion.

K. Toll Free Issue Management Group. Ron Havens, IMG Chair, provided the report to the Council. The IMG has held both face-to-face meetings and conference calls since the September NANC update. Mr. Havens advised that several contributions have been received by AT&T on the interactive trouble reporting system, and from WorldCom on a revised timeline. Qwest has proposed system and administrative response times, and a joint contribution was provided by AT&T, SBC and Sprint on toll-free record application and end-to-end operations guidelines. The IMG has completed its review of the FSD and will finalize the FSD during a virtual meeting to be held on October 23, 2000.

The IMG's draft technical requirements are due by November NANC meeting. At that time, a detailed status on any resolved issues will be provided. With regard to the competitive bid issue, the IMG was unable to reach consensus on whether or not to recommend a competitive bid. Peter Guggina stated that the IMG needs to move on matter of competitive bid in order to spend more time on the technical requirements. Paul Hart noted that technical requirements must be coordinated with NIIF and if the IMG can not resolve the competitive bid issue, it should bring it to the NANC for

**North American Numbering Council
Meeting Minutes
October 17-18, 2000 (11.29.00 final)**

resolution. The Council agreed that the IMG's first priority is to finish the FSD, then complete the technical requirements.

L. Carrier Identification Codes (CICs) IMG. Bill Adair, IMG Chair, provided the update to the Council. Mr. Adair stated that at this time, no meetings have been held. However, the IMG plans to meet by the first week of November to develop a work plan and lay out the issues. The IMG consists of only five volunteers and much broader representation is needed. Representation from a reseller association such as TRA is desirable. Bernie Kelley, Ascend, formerly TRA Resellers Association has been invited to join the IMG.

Chairman Hoffman noted that a letter dated September 18, 2000, from the Hunter Law Group, expressed its objection to the Chief, Common Carrier Bureau concerning the Commission's CICs assignment to the NANC. The letter states that NANC's review of soft slamming is beyond scope of the its charter. A copy of the letter was provided to members of the Council for informational purposes.

M. Pooling IMG Update. Peter Guggina, provided an update to Council and advised that the Commission has contracted with Mitre to assist with the development of the Thousand Block Pooling Administration request for proposal (RFP). The Commission held a conference call with the Mitre consultants and the IMG and was advised that there should be no discussion of pooling administration with any vendors until otherwise notified by the Commission.

N. Discussion Group on Charging for Telephone Numbers. Chairman Hoffman opened the discussion by asking the Council whether it should accept the white paper from the Group and forward it to the Commission for its consideration.

Chairman Hoffman opined that the topic is of interest to the FCC and expressed his view that the Commission may address this issue in the future. The NANC issue is whether it wants to contribute to that discussion, by forwarding the report to the Commission for inclusion in the NRO docket, or leave it as part of the NANC meeting record.

Many Council members expressed the view that the report should not be forwarded to the FCC as a NANC recommendation at this time. Chairman Hoffman suggested that "big picture" analysis include charging for numbers as one option to consider.

It was noted that j2 presentation and the letter summarizing the New Hampshire eFax issue were helpful. As a result, CLECs in New Hampshire are going to use numbers in rural areas that are lying fallow. Chairman Hoffman suggested that with the prospect of UM moving into a portability environment may take away the concern that NANC would have with use of the numbering resource.

**North American Numbering Council
Meeting Minutes
October 17-18, 2000 (11.29.00 final)**

Phil McClelland stated that the earlier understanding of unified messaging was that NANP numbers were going out world-wide to consumers free, in fact anywhere in the world at no cost. Apparently, things have changed, the j2 presentation was very helpful. The 90-day free period changes the economic picture. However, he expressed concern that the use of geographic numbers for a non-geographic purpose is troublesome.

With regard to concerns expressed on the reporting of intermediate numbers, Beth Kistner stated that unified messaging providers are considered intermediate carriers and have to report utilization to the underlying carrier. She was relieved to hear that j2 would work in a responsible fashion to understand their obligations.

Peter Guggina commented that NANC should not approach this by focusing on j2 and not to analyze their numbers too closely. We should approach this in a generic manner. Julie Petersen stated that the Council has benefited from tutorials from both Telcordia and J2 and opined that at this juncture there is nothing further that NANC needs to. Nancy Brockway added that she would like NANC to consider a national, NPA non-geographically NPA as suggested in the September 6, letter. Chairman Hoffman commented that using SAC codes for different kinds of service raises a lot of concerns for people.

Paul Hart added that the issue of a dedicated code for a specific type of service has been addressed before and there is a lot on the record on this matter, which is probably still valid. The industry is in the process of evaluating the current 800 administration to improve service. Changes to the toll free structure will impact the entire access structure of the PSTN. Julie Petersen, SBC, stated that the industry has looked at the issue at INC from a technical network perspective. Phil McClelland noted that the subject of non-geographic SAC code has been raised before – that it is still a real problem which state commissions continue to struggle over.

Beth Kistner would like to know which states have established restrictions on the assignment of 5 or more central office codes. As a carrier, there is a need to understand the policy with respect to responding to customers needs. A carrier needs to know what gets flagged and denied because of the type of use the numbers are being put to. Thomas Dunleavy, NARUC, acknowledged that overall unified messaging is not using an inordinate amount numbers. However, states should still look at applications where five or more codes are requested. Chairman Hoffman noted that technology improvements will stimulate growth to a wider niche of people, it appears that the telephone is acting as a terminal and is the instrument of choice for consumers.

O. *Limited Liability Corporation (LLCs) Report.* Chairman Hoffman stated that Pamela Connell, AT&T, advised that there was no formal report this meeting, but noted that Release 3.0 testing was delayed in the Northeast Region, as was reported by NeuStar to the Council at the Tuesday, October 17, 2000 session.

P. *Other Business.* None.

Q. Next Meeting: November 28-29, 2000

VII. Action Items and Decisions Reached.

1. NANPA Report. USTA, OPASTCO and other trade associations will work with NANPA to develop and distribute assistance to members on filling out NRUF reporting forms and will make modification suggestions on both the form and instructions for consideration by the Commission.
2. NANPA Oversight Working Group. Development of the billing and collection technical requirements (NBANC) portion of the next NANPA requirements document is assigned to the Cost Recovery Working Group.
3. The NANPA Oversight WG will draft the 2000 Annual NANPA Performance Survey, including a question(s) regarding the COCUS/NRUF process.
4. Local Number Portability Administration Working Group. The LNPA WG will revise the draft *Third Wireline Wireless Integration Report* to include the WorldCom minority report as Appendix C. Further consideration of the open issues, *e.g.*, rate centers, billing and directory issues will be addressed by NANC at the November meeting.
5. Numbering Resource Optimization Working Group Report. The Council agreed to forward the NRO WG ITN recommendation to the Bureau. The revised text of letter to Hoffman was accepted as text for the transmittal letter to the Chief, Common Carrier Bureau.
6. CO Code Volume Recommendation. The transmittal letter from Chairman Hoffman to Chief, CCB forwarding the NOWG report will be modified. The revised text will be circulated to the full Council.
7. Steering Group Report. Nancy Brockway, NARUC will draft issue statement concerning expansion of the NANP. The draft will be presented to the SG for discussion at its November 28th session. The SG will report its results to the full Council at the January 16-17, 2001 meeting.

The SG will form an IMG to address process and procedures. The IMG will develop a document similar to what is in effect for the working groups. The SG Process and Procedures IMG recommendations will be submitted to full NANC for approval. Beth Kistner, ALTS will lead the IMG.

8. Toll Free IMG Report. The IMG will make one more attempt at the competitive bid process question. If no consensus is reached by the IMG, the matter will be addressed by the full Council at its November 28-29 meeting.

North American Numbering Council
Meeting Minutes
October 17-18, 2000 (11.29.00 final)

The TF IMG's first priority is to finish the FSD, then complete the technical requirements. A detailed progress report and presentation will be provided at the November NANC meeting.

9. CICs Issue Management Group. Bill Adair reported that there is currently no reseller representation on the IMG. The first conference call meeting will be held in early November.
10. Charging for Telephone Numbers Discussion Group. The Council agreed to not forward the Group's report to the Commission.