

**North American Numbering Council
Meeting Minutes
June 18-19, 2001 (Final)**

I. Time and Place of Meeting. The North American Numbering Council held a meeting commencing at 8:30 a.m., at the Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W., TW-C305, Washington, D. C.

II. List of Attendees.

Voting Council Members:

- | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Robert Atkinson | Columbia University |
| 2. Ed Gould | AT&T |
| 3. Wendy Potts | Bell Canada |
| 4. Randy Sanders | BellSouth |
| 5. Michael Altschul | CTIA |
| 6. Lori Messing | CTIA |
| 7. Maureen Flood | CompTel |
| 8. Switzon Wigfall | NARUC |
| 9. Gregory Pattenau | NARUC |
| 10. Peter Pescosolido | NARUC |
| 11. Nancy Brockway | NARUC |
| 12. Dan Kearney | NARUC |
| 13. Hon. Robert B. Nelson | NARUC |
| 14. Natalie Billingsley | NASUCA |
| 15. Philip McClelland | NASUCA |
| 16. Beth O'Donnell | NCTA |
| 17. James Goldstein | Nextel |
| 18. David Bench | Nortel Networks |
| 19. Trent Boaldin | OPASTCO |
| 20. C. Courtney Jackson | OUR, Jamaica |
| 21. Harold Salters | PCIA |
| 22. Deborah Bell | SBC Communications, Inc. |
| 23. Ron Havens | Sprint |
| 24. Gerry Rosenblatt | TIA |
| 25. Paul Hart | USTA |
| 26. Chuck Eppert | Verizon |
| 27. Anna Miller | VoiceStream |
| 28. Peter Guggina | WorldCom |

Special Members (Non-voting):

- | | |
|-----------------|-------|
| John Manning | NANPA |
| Jean-Paul Emard | ATIS |

Commission Employees:

Cheryl Callahan, Designated Federal Officer (DFO)
Sanford Williams, Alternate DFO
Diane Harmon, Acting Chief, Network Services Division
Patrick Forster, Policy Division (PD), Wireless Telecommunications Bureau
Jennifer Salhus, Policy Division (PD), Wireless Telecommunications Bureau

III. Estimate of Public Attendance. Approximately 42 members of the public attended the meeting as observers.

IV. Documents Introduced.

- (1) Agenda
- (2) February 20-21, 2001 Meeting Minutes
- (3) March 20-21, 2001 Meeting Minutes
- (4) April 17-18, 2001 Meeting Minutes
- (5) NANPA Report to the NANC
- (6) 2001 NRUF and NPA Exhaust Analysis
- (7) Status of Area Code Relief Exhausting within 36 Months
- (8) NANPA Annual Performance Evaluation
- (9) Overview of the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions (ATIS) and the Industry Numbering Committee (INC)
- (10) ATIS Flow Chart
- (11) NANC Federal Advisory Committee Directory
- (12) NRO Working Group Report
- (13) NANP Expansion/Numbering Optimization (NENO) IMG
- (14) INC Report to the NANC
- (15) NANPA Fund Performance Status Report & Funds Projection
- (16) LNPA Working Group Status Report to NANC
- (17) Wireless Number Portability Operations Status Report to NANC
- (18) Report of the North American Portability Management (NAPM), LLC to the NANC
- (19) NANC Guidelines and Operating Principles
- (20) North American Numbering Council Charter
- (21) Report and Order in the Matter of Administration of the North American Numbering Plan – CC Docket No. 92-237, FCC 95-283, Released July 13, 1995

V. Summary of the Meeting.

A. Opening Remarks. Cheryl Callahan, DFO, welcomed Robert Atkinson, the new NANC Chair. Ms. Callahan announced that the Bureau is pleased and grateful to have

Bob Atkinson serve as the new NANC Chair. She noted that he has 25 plus years experience in the telecommunications industry and was formerly a Deputy Bureau Chief in the FCC's Common Carrier Bureau from January 1999 to June 2000. Chairman Atkinson expressed that he is pleased to serve as the NANC Chair. He advised that he followed the developments of the NANC when he was Deputy Bureau Chief and knows that it is a very important subject. Chairman Atkinson noted that he brings both an industry and a regulatory perspective to the position. Prior to joining the FCC Chairman Atkinson was in the telecommunications industry.

Sanford Williams, Alternate DFO, advised that the Commission selected NeuStar, Inc. as the National Thousands-Block Pooling Administrator. Mr. Williams advised that national rollout for thousands-block pooling is scheduled to begin in March 2002.

Chairman Atkinson advised that on June 13, 2001, the Common Carrier Bureau's Industry Analysis Division issued a report entitled, "FCC Releases Numbering Resource Utilization Report." Chairman Atkinson noted that the report provides very useful background information and statistics on number utilization.

Chairman Atkinson noted Yog Varma's resignation from the FCC, effective Friday, June 22, 2001. Chairman Atkinson volunteered to write a Resolution of Appreciation for Yog and advised that he is open to suggestions and ideas from council members who want to note specific items in the Resolution.

B. Review of February 20-21, March 20-21, and April 17-18, 2001 Meeting Minutes. Minor modifications were made to the February, March, and April NANC meeting minutes. There was no NANC meeting in May. The minutes were approved as modified.

C. North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA) Report to the NANC. John Manning, NANPA, provided the report to the Council.

NPA Exhaust Projections (from NRUF). Mr. Manning reported that the NPA exhaust projections were published on the NANPA web site at the end of May. He reported on the methodology that NANPA used to project area code exhaust. Due to the implementation of number pooling, the methodology used is slightly different from previous years. Mr. Manning explained how the area codes were arranged in three categories: (1) NPAs that are presently without pooling; (2) NPAs where pooling was implemented pooling prior to December 31, 2000; and (3) NPAs where pooling will be implemented after January 1, 2001. Mr. Manning explained that with the February 1, 2001 NRUF submission cycle, service providers were directed to provide their forecast (e.g., by 1K blocks or CO codes) based upon the status of the NPA on December 31, 2000.

Mr. Manning advised that NANPA used all NRUF forecasts received as of April 13, 2001. The pooling administrators that had pooling in place as of December 31, 2000 were able to provide NANPA with information about that status of the pool, which

included the number or quantity of blocks that were in that pool as of a certain date. This enabled NANPA to examine the 1K blocks that were available for assignment in the pools and also the forecast associated with those particular pools. The average NPA response rate was approximately 85%. The overall utilization was used as an indication of what the general effect of the new utilization threshold requirement in the Second NRO Order may have on the assignment of CO codes. Mr. Manning noted that the utilization data was of value to NANPA in developing the exhaust projections.

Mr. Manning reported that the method used in forecasting these NPAs is the same methodology that NANPA has been using since April 1999. This methodology included the forecast data submitted by the service providers, as well as historical CO code demand, the CLEC demand, the number of CLECs in a NPA, and the expansion of carriers' footprint. Mr. Manning advised that mandatory reporting and the withholding of resources from carriers that failed to file an NRUF have contributed to improved reporting by carriers. He noted that the quantity of codes that are being returned is an indication that the demand is not as high as originally thought. Mr. Manning also noted the economic situation and its effect on the telecommunications industry as a consideration in determining the size of growth pools. In the last twelve months, there has been a decrease in the size and frequency in the number of CO code demand spikes. As a result, NANPA slightly reduced the size of the growth pools.

Mr. Manning reported that a number of states have set aside area codes for pooling and non-pooling carriers. The states have identified the quantity of area codes that have been set aside. If the quantity of area codes for pooling carriers and the quantity of area codes for non-pooling carriers becomes unbalanced, the area code would not go into exhaust. Codes would be moved from one pool to feed the other. As a result, both pooling and non-pooling resources would automatically exhaust at the same time.

Mr. Manning reported that NANPA included the Growth Pool methodology in the area codes with pooling. The Growth Pool is designed to account for sudden peaks in demand that are usually caused by new service providers getting an initial code in each of the rate centers they intend to provide service.

The methodology used for NPAs where pooling has been ordered to start after December 31, 2000 was similar to the methodology used for NPAs where pooling was implemented before December 31, 2000. NANPA used the 30/40/50 rule to account for the impact on area code exhaust to forecast the impact of wireline pooling being implemented in the area codes in which there was no forecast. Mr. Manning reported that NANPA performed the forecast with non-rationed demand where there was rationing in place. The demand was greater than the rationing amount. When pooling was factored in, the demand was less. In those instances, NANPA went with the lesser of the two.

Natalie Billingsley, NASUCA, questioned whether NANPA is still using some form of footprint assumption. Mr. Manning responded yes. He advised that NANPA had done a slight downward adjustment to account for CLECs returning codes and the current economic decline in the industry. Mr. Manning explained that NANPA also had to adjust

them in other instances. Ed Gould, AT&T, expressed concern regarding balancing of the pooling administrators' inventory and NANPA's inventory for wireline carriers. He questioned whether the pooling administrators had blocks that did not relate to full codes that could be moved to do the balance. Mr. Manning explained that he was accounting for situations where actual CO codes had been identified and set aside for pooling. Randy Sanders, BellSouth, questioned how intermediate numbers were accounted for in the utilization. Mr. Manning explained that NANPA used the calculation as provided by the FCC, which is assigned numbers over the total quantity held by the service provider. Mr. Sanders questioned how many trials have been in existence long enough for NANPA to determine the 30/40/50 percent rule with regard to wireline adjustment. Mr. Manning advised that NANPA's determination was based on experiences with pooling trials and the data that NANPA had. Mr. Sanders also questioned whether the forecast was conservative or liberal in NPA exhaust. Mr. Manning advised that NANPA does not cast its results either way. Mr. Manning reported that the methodology that NANPA used will be the basis for the exhaust analysis of the entire NANP.

Anna Miller, VoiceStream, questioned how the service provider forecast versus the historical growth data was reconciled to produce the NPA exhaust. Mr. Manning reported that in a number of instances, NANPA found that the historical rate and forecast rate were similar. In instances where the historical rate and forecast rate are exceptionally divergent, NANPA will then examine the NPA-specific information. Mr. Manning noted that NANPA's CO Code Administrators and NPA Relief Planners are very experienced. Ms. Miller questioned whether NANPA looked at the different stages of pooling implementation. Mr. Manning explained that NANPA used information that was available on web sites as to where pooling had been ordered.

2001 NANP Exhaust Assumptions. Mr. Manning reported that over the past couple of months, NANPA and the NRO Working Group have been working on the assumptions to be used in the NANP exhaust projection. Mr. Manning provided to the NANC assumptions as of May 31, 2001. He explained that these assumptions are similar to those done in September 2000. Mr. Manning reported that previously on assumption #5, NANPA used a 50% reduction in total CO code demand as a result of pooling for area codes that had 25 or more rate centers. A 30% reduction was based upon whether an area code had 24 or less rate centers. Mr. Manning advised that NANPA will run the impact of pooling by reducing demand 50% to 80% and from 30% to 60%. NANPA will reduce only the wireline demand. Mr. Manning reported that assumption #6 is still outstanding. NANPA has received some input from some of the wireless industry as to what the percent reduction should be in wireless CO code demand as a result of wireless pooling. NANPA expects to share the results of this analysis at the next NRO working group meeting or whatever group that is directed by the NANC. Mr. Manning reported that assumption #3 is not a change.

Phil McClelland, NASUCA, stated that he understood assumption #3 to mean that if an MSA is less than 50% of the land area in the NPA, it will not be assumed that there will be thousands-block pooling in that NPA. Mr. Manning advised that Mr. McClelland's understanding is correct. Mr. McClelland inquired as to when NANPA expects to have

the results of the current NANP exhaust study. Mr. Manning responded that NANPA expects to have the results by September but assumption #6 still needs to be finalized. Harold Salters, PCIA, requested clarification on assumption #3 as to whether 50% or more of the NPA's rate areas located in the top 100 MSAs was referring to the geographic area or the number of rate centers. Mr. Manning responded that it refers to whether that rate center is within the geographic boundary of one of the MSAs. Natalie Billingsley, NASUCA, questioned where NANPA came up with an extra 8 NXXs in assumption #8. Mr. Manning responded that it includes the N11 codes. Beth O'Donnell, NCTA, questioned whether there is a methodology in determining NANP exhaust. Mr. Manning responded that NANPA will present the results with an explanation as to how it was done. Chairman Atkinson questioned whether NANPA will be using these assumptions. Mr. Manning responded that assumption #6 is still outstanding, and the NRO Working Group would like one more opportunity to revisit that assumption. The NANPA and NRO Working Group expect to have a finalized set of assumptions at the July NANC meeting.

Central Office Code Assignment Activity Report. Mr. Manning provided a summary of the CO code activity for the period January 2000 through May 2001. The summary shows a comparison of January 2001 through May 2001 dates with January 2000 through May 2000 dates. The net average assignment rate over the last five months is 500 codes. Over a similar time period in 2000, the net average rate was over 1100 codes. Mr. Manning noted that the net assignment rate is the number of assignments made, less any returns that were actually received. Mr. Manning reported that on May 8, 2001, the utilization threshold as described in the FCC NRO Order went into effect. In May, there were 1358 assignments. Lori Messing, CTIA, questioned the reason for a 60% spike in CO code denials from April 2001 through May 2001. Mr. Manning stated that a number of the denials are the result of the utilization threshold going into place. Ms. Messing stated that it would be useful to know whether it is based on the new utilization requirement or if carriers are experiencing problems in filling out the forms correctly. She suggested that in the future, if there is more than a 50% spike from month-to-month, that an analysis be done to show the reasons for the spike.

Mr. Manning reported that for the states that requested that carriers provide them a copy of their Part 1, NANPA was required in the 2nd Report and Order to notify those states that they had received a Part 1. Whenever NANPA receives an application for an assignment, an e-mail notification will be sent on a daily, weekly, or monthly basis to the states that want to have a notification sent to them. Mr. Manning reported that a CO code data base can be found under the CO code portion of the NANPA web site where you can track which codes have been assigned and to whom they have been assigned. A monthly report which reflects the quantity of CO codes assigned, and the quantity actually returned for that month, as well as year-to-date, is also available on that web site. Beth O'Donnell, NCTA, questioned whether the disconnects are the returned codes. Mr. Manning responded yes. She further questioned whether all of the categories other than the disconnects should add up to the request number. Mr. Manning responded yes.

Update of NRUF. Mr. Manning reported that NANPA is in the process of concluding the January 1 through June 30, 2001 cycle. On August 1, 2001 NANPA will be collecting service provider NRUFs. Notification has been sent to the service providers informing them that the information is due on or before August 1, 2001. The NRUF form is available on the NANPA web site. Associated job aids and other items that lend assistance in completing the forms are also available on the NANPA website. Mr. Manning advised that service providers are strongly encouraged to read the job aid before completing the NRUF form.

NRUF for the 500 and 900 NPAs. Mr. Manning reported that as of August 1, 2001, carriers must submit utilization and forecast information for the NXX assignments and codes in the 500 and 900 NPAs. This information is available on the NANPA web site. To assist service providers in completing the Form 502 for non-geographic area codes, NANPA has developed special instructions called “helpful hints”. Mr. Manning advised that even though a carrier does not presently have any 500/900 codes, an NRUF Form must still be filed if the carrier plans to get a 500/900 NXX code in the future. All 500 and 900 code holders have been notified via certified letter. Peter Guggina, questioned whether NANPA has utilization data on how many 500 and 900 codes have been assigned. Mr. Manning responded yes and stated that he would provide that information at the next NANC meeting. Anna Miller, VoiceStream, requested confirmation that the only changes to the NRUF reports were for 500 and 900 reporting. Mr. Manning stated that the Excel spreadsheet itself has not changed. Trent Boaldin, OPATSCO, questioned whether an NRUF has to be submitted within the August 1 submission cycle if a carrier wanted to offer a 500/900 service. Mr. Manning stated that if the August 1 submission cycle has passed, and a carrier wanted to get an NXX assignment out of the 900, they can file an NRUF at that time and follow up with an application.

NRUF Training for States. On May 23 and 24, 2001 NANPA held a series of conference calls with state public service commissions to provide additional training on the use of the NRUF data. Twenty-two states were represented on these calls. The primary objective of these calls was to educate state commissions on the data contained in the individual state databases provided to them by NANPA. NANPA reviewed the different tables, queries and reports provided with the database. Mr. Manning reported that the discussions went very well. Nancy Brockway, NARUC, acknowledged that the training session was excellent and very informative.

NRUF Comparison with CO Code Administration Database. Mr. Manning reported that NANPA is trying to identify codes where an NRUF has not been received. Mr. Manning stated that some service providers have received e-mails from NANPA informing them that an NRUF has not been reported for a particular NPA/NXX. NANPA requested those carriers to report an NRUF or explain why it has not been reported. Mr. Manning provided some of the comments that NANPA has received and advised that a number of them are administrative errors. In some instances, service providers quickly updated their submissions. In other instances, NANPA was told that the carrier no longer had that particular code which means that NANPA’s database is incorrect. Some carriers reported that they had been assigned the code, but the effective date was after December 31. As a

result, they did not show that code in their NRUF. Mr. Manning reported that NANPA followed up with the Commission on that particular item to seek clarification in terms of what information carriers should be reporting. Mr. Manning shared with the council members the contents of an email that NANPA sent to a couple of carriers with regard to reporting on codes with an effective date after the reporting time frame for utilization data.

Unavailable Code Project Update. Mr. Manning reported that NANPA is still working with service providers that served as code administrators, to identify and understand the unique nature of unavailable codes. He noted that NANPA has been in contact with a number of these carriers. Mr. Manning reported that once all of the comments have been received, NANPA will publish a list of currently unavailable codes on its web site that have been identified as candidates to become immediately available for assignment. For those NXXs that remain unavailable, NANPA will update its Code Administration database with the reason why the code is unavailable. This information will then be posted to the NANPA web site. Ed Gould, AT&T, questioned whether this was a large number of codes and percentages. Mr. Manning advised that the quantity of unavailable codes is not significant because many have been made available during the area code relief process.

Returned Codes with Ported Telephone Numbers. Mr. Manning reported that NANPA continues to receive a large quantity of NXX codes being returned by code holders. In many instances, these codes are marked as portable codes, meaning that numbers could potentially be ported from the code holder to another carrier. NANPA does not know if a returned code has ported telephone numbers (TNs) and, if so, to whom the numbers have been ported. Secondly, the INC procedures were developed prior to the FCC NRO Orders, which specifically define the criteria for a service provider receiving a code. NANPA has addressed both of these issues. NANPA received direction from the FCC Common Carrier Bureau to proceed with reassigning a block/code with ported TNs to the entity that has the most ported TNs. The CCB also requested that in those areas where pooling is implemented, that the pooling carrier being given the code donate those blocks with 10% or less contamination to the pool. Mr. Manning reported that NANPA has requested from the NAPM LLC the capability to receive ad hoc reports from the NPAC. NANPA can then go to the NPAC with a list of NPA NXXs and ask whether there are any ported TNs out of these particular codes. This information will assist NANPA in reassigning a code.

Beth O'Donnell, NCTA, questioned whether the vast number of codes that are being returned are the result of carriers going out of business or carriers voluntarily returning codes. Mr. Manning advised that NANPA does not question the reason for a code being returned. Ms. O'Donnell questioned why the onus is not on the carrier returning the codes to report whether or not these are reported TNs. Mr. Manning reported that NANPA introduced an issue in the INC to change the form so that carriers would be required to report that information. Ms. O'Donnell questioned how often NANPA expects to get reports. Mr. Manning advised that it will be based on the number of codes returned. Ms. O'Donnell questioned how the NPAC will be paid. Mr. Manning stated

that per the NAPM LLC agreement for ad hoc reports, NANPA will pay for each separate report. Norman Epstein, INC Moderator, reported that INC is putting together a prioritized list of potential candidates who could take over as LERG assignee based on voluntary and involuntary redemption of the numbers. Mr. Epstein noted that resolution of this issue is being given high priority at INC. Chairman Atkinson questioned how the August 1 submission cycle will fit into INC's timeframe. Mr. Epstein stated that discussions will be taking place during upcoming interim INC meetings. He could not, however, commit to INC addressing the issue before the August time frame.

Peter Guggina, WorldCom, noted that in the event that none of the candidates takes the codes, a customer could potentially lose service or be forced to take an involuntary number change. He suggested that the NANC, INC, and the FCC take that under consideration. Chuck Eppert, Verizon, stated that one possible reason that people are reluctant to accept these codes, is that it could have an impact on their rate center level administration utilization that is not too desirable because of the number that they receive. He suggested that a possible temporary solution would be to exempt such numbers from that rate center calculation. Paul Hart, USTA, questioned how it is determined who is responsible for finding a new service provider so that the amount of down time that a customer would have could be minimized. Nancy Brockway, NARUC, reported that there has been active discussion among state regulators about the question of default service for a customer for local exchange service.

Chairman Atkinson questioned the role/responsibility of the NANC in this situation. Chuck Eppert stated that the NANC's role is strictly dealing with what happens to the numbering resource. Chairman Atkinson inquired as to who has the authority to force a code on someone. Natalie Billingsley, NASUCA, agrees with Mr. Eppert that the NANC's role is dealing with the numbering resource. She advised that the different states are going to have different rules. Mr. Manning stated that, to date, NANPA has not had a situation where someone has refused a code. He further stated that it is a potential problem, and he does not have a solution at the present time. Chairman Atkinson questioned if there is anything that the NANC should be doing. Ed Gould, AT&T stated that he thinks that there is a policy question here. Phil McClelland, NASUCA, cautioned against always reassigning orphan codes because the FCC has rules about when codes can be assigned and when they can not. Mr. McClelland stated that the carrier that may be receiving the code that they do not want may not be eligible for code assignment under the utilization rules.

Chairman Atkinson questioned whether this problem is being handled on an ad hoc basis. He stated that that might be the best way to continue to handle it for some period of time until INC and some of the states look into the situation. Mr. Manning stated that NANPA, INC, and the LNPA Working Group are all involved in this issue. He suggested that they continue to report on this matter as to progress being made within the groups. Chairman Atkinson suggested that the discussion on this issue ends at this point. Paul Hart suggested the NANC make a decision as to whether or not they will take action on this issue. Chairman Atkinson stated that the problem is something that could evolve into a national problem. He suggested that the NANC should learn a little more about it

and see what progress can be made at INC and elsewhere. He further suggested that the NANC should keep it as an item that they closely monitor.

D. NANPA Oversight Working Group (NOWG) Report. Paul LaGattuta, AT&T, presented the report to the Council. Mr. LaGattuta reviewed the 2000 NANPA Performance Review. He reported that the changes to NANPA's functions and responsibilities for the year 2000 was taken into account in the NOWG's overall evaluation. The NOWG gathered analysis and feedback from both service providers and regulators through surveys. In addition, the NOWG conducted two operational reviews. One was conducted in the Concord location, and the other operational review was conducted in the new Washington, D. C. office. The NOWG analyzed the information that was gathered and developed conclusions and recommendations. A preview of the results was discussed with the FCC and with the NANPA.

Mr. LaGattuta reported that sixteen survey responses were received from state commissions and twenty six from industry. Two Caribbean countries acknowledged receipt of the surveys. The total number of respondents from the industry has dropped since the previous two years. Mr. LaGattuta reported that the NOWG contacted the originator for clarification if survey responses seemed contradictory or unclear. The NOWG aggregated the analysis of the survey ratings into a quantitative report and aggregated the analysis of the survey comments into a qualitative report. The NOWG observations and concerns as well as recommended steps for improvements are contained in the report. Mr. LaGattuta reported that the NOWG developed a table with satisfactory rating scales to ensure analytical consistency of survey ratings. He reviewed the criteria that was used for assessing the comments. Mr. LaGattuta reported that the NANPA 2000 Annual Performance Review resulted in a "Met" rating. He advised that the reader should be aware that the NOWG's performance evaluation of "Met" should not be used as a comparison to the 1999 performance review conclusion of "Above Average". The NOWG changed the rating scale, and any comparison of scales may give the reader an incorrect interpretation of NANPA's performance. In addition, it should be noted that the NANPA's "Met" rating was achieved during substantial changes in 2000. He reviewed with the Council the means by which the NOWG determined the "Met" rating.

Nancy Brockway, NARUC, commented that in principle, it is difficult to ask NANPA to do an accurate forecast. She opined that it puts NANPA in a very difficult position when they are asked to do an accurate forecast and then forced to defend it. Ms. Brockway offered a few suggestions but commented that she does not have a solution. Chairman Atkinson questioned whether the NANC should be debating each of the points in the report at this time. He stated that the report speaks for itself. He suggested that the NANC should decide what should be done in terms of responding at a later time.

Chairman Atkinson advised that NANPA will respond to the Performance Review at the September NANC meeting.

Peter Guggina questioned whether NANPA's performance has improved since last year. Mr. LaGattuta stated that there is no improvement. He advised that NANPA's performance is about the same as last year. Mr. LaGattuta noted that NANPA is adhering to contract terms and conditions. Chairman Atkinson commented that there is a tendency to respond to surveys only if there is a problem. Paul Hart, USTA, proposed that the NANC, at a future meeting, consider how the process of this evaluation can be simplified and address the issue of what the benefits are and process by which the evaluation is done. Mr. Hart suggested that the results should be targeted in a way that will be more efficient with regard to the time involved for everybody and more helpful to NANPA.

E. Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions (ATIS) Tutorial on INC Structure. Megan Campbell, General Counsel, ATIS and Jean-Paul Emard, Director, Industry Forums, ATIS, provided the tutorial. Ms. Campbell explained that this tutorial is pursuant to an action item that was assigned during the April NANC meeting. The purpose is to provide an overview of ATIS and its sponsored forums and committees as well as to provide information regarding the INC mission, scope, and operations. Ms. Campbell advised that ATIS is a member organization of global telecommunications companies with a U.S. and/or North American presence. The current membership is 116 companies. ATIS' members and participants represent every segment of the telecommunications industry. Ms. Campbell reported that a few new companies have recently become board members. She reviewed the ATIS mission with the council members. Ms. Campbell advised that ATIS is very good at technical and operational issues. She stated that ATIS does not get involved with policy issues. ATIS Forums and Committees address critical industry issues. Ms. Campbell noted that there are 116 companies at the ATIS level. Overall, there are approximately 500 companies involved with over 3000 participants. She reviewed the flow chart of ATIS Committees and Forums. She noted that ATIS is not a trade association. They do not lobby. Ms. Campbell reviewed ATIS' future, how ATIS' relationships facilitate the work of its forums and committees, ATIS' relationship with the FCC and INC's relationship with the NANC.

Jean-Paul Emard reported on ATIS' mission statement and scope as it is applicable to INC. Mr. Emard advised that INC provides an open forum to address and resolve industry issues associated with a number of areas dealing with the telecommunications, applications and services areas. Those areas are in planning, administration, allocations, assignment, use, and related dialing considerations for public telecommunications within the area covered by the North American Numbering Plan (NANP). Mr. Emard reviewed INC operations and INC leadership. He noted that meeting notices, agendas, minutes, working drafts and final documents are available via the ATIS web site and the INC pages.

Ron Havens, Sprint, advised that INC started in 1993 and the first meetings were in 1994.

Peter Guggina inquired as to how INC differentiates between a technical and operational issue versus a policy issue. Ms. Campbell, advised that the INC is addressing the technical and operational issues. She stated that INC is actively reporting to the NANC

as well as, in some cases, ex partes with the Commission identifying where there may be policy issues that would impact some of their technical and operational decisions. She advised that the technical industry experts in the INC sometimes need policy direction from the NANC and the Commission. Mr. Epstein explained that sometimes it is difficult to determine whether it is technical or policy until INC actually discusses the issue.

Chairman Atkinson inquired as to whether the ATIS presentation was purely for information or whether there was an underlying problem. Chuck Eppert, Verizon, stated that to some extent there has been tension between INC and the NANC. The ATIS presentation was to help establish a better level of understanding. Peter Guggina advised that out of that discussion, it was decided that NANC's role needed to be reviewed. Ron Havens, Sprint, stated that there has been some concern regarding the guidelines that INC produces and what weight they carry. Chairman Atkinson questioned whether regulatory bodies have the capability to technically challenge a guideline from a technical basis. Mr. Eppert, stated that states have rights to do different things. He further stated that the real goal of INC is to come up with a uniform technical approach of doing things. Ms. Brockway advised that the NANC is a forum where communication can be made between the states and the INC. Ms. Campbell advised that the INC would be delighted to have more state input at INC meetings. She stated that it would help to get the technical and operational issues deliberated. She also stated that the policy issues can be handled at the NANC meetings. Mr. Emard advised that the INC is trying to work with the NARUC staff to possibly have a permanent representative on the INC. Chairman Atkinson advised that this discussion has been helpful to him in understanding the relationship between the NANC and the INC.

E. Steering Group Report. Peter Pescosolido, NARUC, reported that at the request of Chairman Atkinson, the Steering Group discussed the purpose of the Steering Group and its membership makeup. The Group also discussed the Table of NANC Projects. Mr. Hart suggested that the Table of NANC Projects be deferred until later on in the meeting.

G. Numbering Resource Optimization (NRO) Working Group Report. Eleanor Willis-Camara, Co-Chair, presented the report to the Council. Ms. Willis-Camara reported that the NRO-WG open task is to finalize the assumptions that NANPA will use to project NANP exhaust. The NRO-WG still has work to do on assumption 6 which addresses the impact of the inclusion of CMRS carriers in pooling. Ms. Willis-Camara reported that NANPA and the wireless carriers each have a set of data that they are examining. Once they complete their analyses, the NRO-WG will reconvene, finalize assumption 6, and present the set of assumptions to the NANC in July. Ms. Camara-Willis reported that the NRO-WG has no other active tasks. She noted that pooling monitoring is inactive. Ms. Camara-Willis stated that it is the recommendation of the NRO-WG that NENO should assume any new work on exhaust assumptions and that the NRO-WG remain dormant unless or until it receives a new assignment from the NANC. Chairman Atkinson inquired as to whether there was any objection from the council to the NRO-WG's recommendation. There were no objections raised.

H. Report of NANP Expansion/Numbering Optimization (NENO) IMG. Ed Gould, Co-Chair, presented the report to the Council. Mr. Gould reported that the NENO IMG is currently working on descriptions of optimization alternatives and procedures for quantifying their impact on NANP exhaust. They are approximately one month behind the original schedule. He advised that some delay is expected in the INC NANP Expansion report, thus delaying the start of work on NANP expansion. Mr. Gould reported that there have been 5 conference calls. All have been very well attended: 11-20 industry participants and 4-7 regulatory participants. To date, there are 15 optimization proposals. Contributions for 10 have been received. A face-to-face meeting is scheduled for June 20, 2001 from 8:30 AM-11:30 AM at USTA. NANPA will discuss exhaust projection methodology as the basis for optimization benefits quantification. The next monthly conference call is scheduled for July 5, 2001, 12:00–2:00 PM.

Harold Salters, PCIA, questioned whether there is any documentation on the web site as to why the extended local calling areas number conservation technique was withdrawn. Mr. Gould stated that he did not recall any specifics in regards to it. Trent Boaldin, OPATSCO, expressed concern that NENO is concentrating too heavily on number conservation. Mr. Boaldin stated that one of NANC's jobs is to make sure that numbering resources are available. Mr. Gould advised that it is not NENO's intent to do rationing plans to restrict number availability. He stated that NENO is covering both sides. Anna Miller, VoiceStream, wanted clarification on how NENO is addressing the NPA exhaust issue and the demand side in terms of adequate number of resources between now and when the conservation measures are implemented. She also questioned the benefits. Mr. Gould, advised that NENO is not attempting to address immediate demand but is exploring long-term solutions. Peter Guggina stated that it would be useful for the NANC to review NENO's mission statement. Mr. Gould agreed to present the NENO mission for NANC review at the July meeting.

I. INC Report to the NANC. Norman Epstein, INC Moderator, presented the report to the Council. Mr. Epstein reported on upcoming INC meetings. He encouraged participation and noted that details are available on the ATIS web site. Mr. Epstein advised that INC does not want to be the body to direct NANPA to reclaim 555 line number assignments because it could be viewed in some context as a competitive issue. Mr. Epstein reported that in order to document the process, INC seeks information from the NANC as to who is the appropriate authority to direct the NANPA to reclaim 555 line number assignments. He advised that in certain circumstances, according to the INC guidelines, some of the number assignments should be reclaimed. Mr. Epstein noted that this is more of a policy issue rather than a technical guidelines issue.

Randy Sanders, BellSouth, questioned whether it is the industry's belief that two years is long enough to have a number if it is not going to be used. Mr. Epstein stated that the INC has had consensus on that point in the guidelines. Mr. Guggina noted that in the 555 resource there have been difficulties obtaining access arrangements. Mr. Epstein explained that his mission today is not to discuss changing the guidelines. He further explained that the main focus of INC right now is to be taken out as being the body that makes the decision per the guidelines. Mr. Hart explained that the guidelines and the

language in the guidelines are from another era. He stated that it is not appropriate for INC to be in that situation anymore. He advised that the INC is coming to the NANC for some advice as to how to proceed. Mr. Gould suggested that the NANC recommend that the FCC has to be the final authority on what the rules are for reclaiming numbers. Chairman Atkinson opined that the FCC would be able to make that kind of decision. Mr. Hart suggested that the NANC should get more information before making the recommendation. Mr. Guggina suggested taking this step-by-step. He stated that the first step is to agree with INC's proposal that they should not be the body to direct the NANPA to reclaim 555 numbers. NANC could inform the FCC that it has reviewed this issue and that it agrees with INC. The NANC should recommend that the FCC review this with the NANPA and make the decision on how to proceed like they do in other matters.

Deborah Bell, SBC, indicated that she understands that 555 is actually a designer service. She advised that in some cases it is actually the state's jurisdiction as far as what that customer has requested for their 555 service. She stated that when you talk about 7,000 on a scheme of 10,000 you think that you are getting close to depletion. She questioned how many of those are actually working and how many would be up for reclamation. Mr. Epstein responded that he does not know exactly how many are working. Mr. Hart stated that it is not just 10,000 numbers, it depends on how the customers ask for it to be assigned and what limitations are on it. Mr. Guggina suggested that the access issue be addressed.

After extensive discussion, a consensus was reached that INC should not be the appropriate body to direct NANPA to reclaim 555 line number assignments. The NANC supports the proposal to have INC present the modified 555 guidelines at the July NANC meeting to reflect this decision. Chairman Atkinson, with the assistance of Norman Epstein, will draft a letter to the Chief, Common Carrier Bureau, advising of this decision.

Mr. Epstein reported on the NANP Expansion Workshop. INC is addressing an additional expansion concept suggested by the FCC/CCB that expands the CO code to four digits. The final report on NANP Expansion will be completed by the end of year 2001.

J. NBANC Report. John Ricker, CEO, presented the report. Mr. Ricker reported that NBANC met with their Board of Directors following the April NANC meeting. A decision was made at the Board meeting to file a contribution factor for the 2001/2002 funding year at the current contribution factor of \$0.000043. The filing was made on May 4, 2001 with the Commission. Included in the filing was a request for the Commission to clarify what NBANC is authorized to bill and collect funding for and to pay out. Mr. Ricker explained that this specifically relates to payments to MITRE Corp., which is the consultant that the FCC has been using for the Pooling Administration and the NANPA functions. Mr. Ricker reported that the only set of comments that was filed by the industry in relation to the filing that NBANC made was by WorldCom supporting their request to have the FCC make that clarification. He advised that NBANC is

currently awaiting the FCC decision on the contribution factor for the 2001/2002 funding year. NBANC received two additional letters from the FCC requesting NBANC to pay MITRE Corp. for work done in April 2001 and May 2001. The payment was sent on June 14, 2001. Mr. Ricker reported that the current fund balance is \$6.03 Million. Projected receivables are coming in for the month of June – approximately \$630,000; \$23,000 is still outstanding from the Caribbean. Payment from the Dominican Republic is expected sometime this week. This will take away approximately one third of uncollected money for the 2000/2001 funding year. Mr. Ricker advised that NBANC anticipates making the final payment for the funding year to NANPA on June 22, 2001. He stated that NBANC anticipates having a balance of \$5.99 million. Mr. Sanders, inquired as to whether NBANC has received any information regarding whether the contribution factor is sufficient to handle costs now that the new Pooling Administrator has been named. Mr. Ricker stated that NBANC expects the FCC to adjust the contribution factor accordingly.

K. Local Number Portability Administration (LNPA) Working Group Report.

Charles Ryburn, Co-Chair, presented the report to the Council. Mr. Ryburn reported that Release 3.0 was operational in the Northeast Region in March 2001. He stated that due to some problems with the SOA-NPAC interface experienced by Verizon (the ILEC in that region) the other ILECs have elected not to cut over any other regions until the situation is resolved. Mr. Ryburn reported that another reason for the delay is the large volume of notifications required. The LNPA-WG agreed with NeuStar to prioritize the notifications. The LNPA-WG is looking at short-term and long-term solutions to these problems. In order to facilitate a resolution to the problems on the SOA-NPAC interface, the LNPA-WG will commit all of its meetings to this effort. Mr. Ryburn reported on several NANC change orders: NANC 240 Elimination of SV cancel at expiration of the T2 timer; NANC 329 Prioritization of Notifications; and NANC 179 TN Range Notification. Mr. Ryburn reported that the Slowhorse subcommittee of the LNPA-WG has been looking into the SOA throughput analysis issue for several months. It will now be addressed by the LNPA-WG as a whole for resolution to the SOA-NPAC interface problems apparent with Release 3.0. Mr. Gould, stated that the performance requirements of SOAs need to be specified. Mr. Ryburn advised that it is being taken into consideration.

Chairman Atkinson questioned whether the slowness is a customer user visible phenomenon. Mr. Ryburn announced that this will be his last NANC meeting and introduced Gary Sacra, Verizon, who will be the co-chair of the LNPA Working Group. Mr. Sacra is experienced in what has been going on in Verizon with Release 3.0. Mr. Sacra stated that he is looking forward to working with the Council, and he stated that he does not think that the Release 3.0 problems are customer affecting at this time because the LSMS activations are taking place. Mr. Sacra reported that the operational impact to the various work groups seems to be causing the biggest problem at this time. Mr. Sacra explained that the initial charge of the Slowhorse subcommittee was to work on both performance requirements and availability requirements for the LSMS because that is customer affecting. Subsequent to working on the LSMS performance and availability

requirements, the Slowhorse group started discussing SOA requirements but nothing ever developed.

Mr. Ryburn reviewed the PIM Report.

PIM 1 – Multi-Service Provider (Reseller) Flows. A subteam consisting of NNPO and OBF reached a consensus on OBF issue 2189 that option B (network to network) flows should be used as guidelines for the multi-service provider (reseller) process. Option A (reseller to reseller) flows will be mentioned as an alternative. A description of both flows is on the OBF web site. A final decision is due from OBF in August. These flows address wireline to wireline porting only.

PIM 5 – Inadvertent Porting. No change from last month. A revised SOW 19 was requested by NAPM, LLC of NeuStar. The SOW will be presented to NAPM soon.

PIM 6 – NENA request for a standard on unlock/migrate transactions during porting. NENA is still working the issue. Rick Jones reported that they would require an additional two months.

PIM 9 – USLEC has explained that carriers will not accept third party trouble tickets, or do not understand LNP aspects of the report when trouble tickets were accepted. No change since last month. The PIM will be discussed in the NIIF meeting in July.

PIM10 – End-User Billing based on LRN rather than called telephone number. No examples are available from US LEC. The LNPA agreed to ask US LEC to close the PIM based on a low incidence of occurrence.

PIM 11 – A process for moving 1K blocks between switches, within the same company and rate center using EDR functionality is needed to satisfy the FCC's requirement to manage TN inventory by rate center rather than wire center.

PIM 12 – Operator Service Functionality (Wireless Number Portability). Jim Grasser presented a contribution to the LNPA regarding the issue. Service Providers are to discuss the contribution internally and report in the July meeting how this affects their Operator Services organizations.

PIM 13 – Premature Disconnect – Old Service Provider is removing switch translations on or near due date, and the number has not been ported to New Service Provider. This issue is currently being worked by the NNPO. This issue will continue to be discussed in LNPA based on updates from NNPO.

Mr. McClelland inquired as to whether the 24 hour accessibility issue with regard to PIM 5 has been resolved and how it was resolved. Mr. Ryburn explained that the LNPA-WG sent a letter to NIIF suggesting that additional language be added to the guidelines that would further promote the necessity of 24 x 7 coverage. NIIF has not made a final decision.

Mr. Ryburn advised that he will continue as ILEC co-chair of LNPA for the remainder of 2001. He will facilitate meetings, distribute minutes and set meeting agendas. Gary Sacra, Verizon, will act as ILEC co-chair in making monthly presentations to NANC. Paul Lagattuta, AT&T, volunteered for the position of CLEC co-chair. If no other nominations are received by the next meeting, he will be confirmed as CLEC co-chair.

Chairman Atkinson thanked Mr. Ryburn for his great service to the LNPA-WG and the NANC.

Wireless Number Portability Operations (WNPO) Working Group Report. Charles Ryburn presented the report to the Council. Mr. Ryburn reported that the Wireless Number Portability Operations Team met on Monday, June 11, 2001 and Tuesday, June 12, 2001 in Overland Park, Kansas. Mr. Ryburn announced that Brigitte Brown was elected co-chair of the Wireless Number Portability Operations Team. He reported that NeuStar provided an update on New Entrant testing. NeuStar also provided samples of existing reports for tracking testing progress. The WNPO requested that both forms be used since they each provide unique information. Two draft letters were reviewed and discussed. The purpose of these letters is to request information regarding vendor preparedness for WNP. Mr. Ryburn advised that the letters will be sent out to vendors this week. The draft outline of a Risk Assessment Document was presented and discussed. Initial written contributions will be presented and discussed at the July WNPO meeting. Mr. Ryburn reported that review of the Wireless Inter-Carrier Test Plan continued and is expected to be completed by the next face-to-face meeting in August. Test coordination between service providers will begin at that time. He advised that the next meeting of the WNPO will be held on July 9 and 10, 2001 in Ottawa, Ontario.

Beth O'Donnell inquired as to whether all new entrants that want to participate have to test. Anna Miller responded that all new entrants that want to port have to do testing. She stated that the extent of that testing depends on whether or not the entrant has their own LSMS or SOA or they use a service bureau. Mr. Gould suggested that the future WNPO reports include information on the wireless number portability milestones schedule.

L. NAPM LLC Report. Michael O'Connor, Co-Chair, presented the report.

Release 3.0. Mr. O'Connor reported that Release 3.0 is up and working in the Northeast Region only. The 3.0 rollout schedule is currently suspended for all other regions. He reported that carriers in the other regions opted for the continued use of Release 1.4 until the SOA issues could be resolved. Mr. O'Connor advised that pooling software is now available throughout the United States. He stated that the 3.0 rollout schedule may be resumed in the other regions in the 4th quarter 2001.

Inadvertent Porting. Mr. O'Connor reported that the Inadvertent Porting Statement of Work (SOW) was presented at the May NAPM, LLC meeting. Several technical questions were raised by LLC project executives. Mr. O'Connor advised that NeuStar is

working out the answers, and the Inadvertent Porting SOW is expected to be available for the NAPM, LLC to review next week in Kansas City.

M. NANC Guidelines IMG Report. Peter Guggina, Chair, presented the report to the Council. Mr. Guggina reported that the NANC Guidelines and Operating Principles document was finalized at the April NANC meeting. Changes were made, and shortly thereafter, copies were distributed to the Council members. Those copies included (as Attachment 1) the old operating principles that applied to the NANC working groups. The old operating principles were not discussed at the April NANC meeting. Mr. Guggina advised that he included them as a matter of convenience since they were referenced in the document.

Ms. Billingsley advised that as the NARUC/NASUCA point of contact, she would like to receive reports from the Work Groups, IMGs, etc., a little sooner than the Friday before each NANC meeting. Chairman Atkinson requested that the reports be provided to him as well.

N. Review of NANC Charter. Peter Guggina reviewed the North American Numbering Council Charter. He noted that the current Charter expires on October 2, 2001. Mr. Guggina recommended that some guidance be given on how to distinguish policy issues from technical issues. The members agreed that it is not always easy to separate the issues. An extensive discussion ensued on the relationship of NANC to other entities that deal with numbering issues (e.g., INC, NANPA, NIIF).

Other Business. NANC discussed the length of future NANC meetings and the possibility of having fewer meetings. Ms. Callahan advised that the Bureau is considering this matter in the Charter renewal.

Next Meeting: July 17-18, 2001

Action Items and Decisions Reached:

1. North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA) Report. NANPA will provide final NANP exhaust assumptions in its July report.

NANPA will provide an update of the status of 500/900 NXX code assignments in the July report.

NANPA will provide an explanation of significant changes in central office code denials (+-50%).

NANC agreed to continue to monitor the progress that the NANPA, LNPA WG, and INC are making to address the issues related to the reassignment of returned central office codes with ported telephone numbers.

2. Report of the NANPA Oversight Working Group. NANPA will respond to the 2000 NANPA Performance Review in the September NANC meeting.

In the September meeting, the NANC, members of the NOWG, and NANPA will discuss how the NANPA evaluation process can be simplified and more effectively accomplished.

3. Steering Group Report.

NANC anticipates that it will be asked by the Commission to provide technical requirements to the FCC in support of the next NANPA contract selection. NANC wishes to know the date by which any information must be provided in order to support the Commission's activities. The NANC Chairman will make the necessary inquiries.

The FCC has selected the National Pooling Administrator. NANC provides oversight of the NANPA and wishes to know if the FCC intends it to provide oversight of the Pooling Administrator as well. A letter composed in the affirmative will be sent by the NANC Chair to the CCB requesting confirmation.

4. Report of the Numbering Resource Optimization (NRO) Working Group

NRO will refine NANP exhaust assumption 6, relating to the impact of including CMRS carriers in pooling, and present the result at the July NANC meeting.

After providing its recommendation on NANP exhaust assumption 6, NRO will become inactive, absent further assignments.

5. Industry Numbering Committee Report

NANC agreed with INC's determination that INC should not be responsible for directing NANPA to reclaim 555 numbers, and agreed that INC should modify its 555 guidelines to reflect this conclusion.

NANC requested that INC present the revised 555 guidelines by the July NANC meeting. If INC is unable to provide the revised guidelines by the July meeting, NANC requested INC to present them by the September NANC meeting. NANC will forward the guidelines to the Commission and advise the Commission that it agrees that INC should not be responsible for directing NANPA to reclaim 555 numbers. A letter will be sent in July advising the CCB of NANC's conclusion. Norm Epstein will assist the NANC Chair in drafting the letter.