

**North American Numbering Council
Meeting Minutes
May 21-22, 2002 (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. Chuck Eppert | Co-Chairman |
| 2. Teresa Gaugler | ALTS |
| 3. Pamela Connell | AT&T |
| 4. Wendy Potts | Bell Canada |
| 5. Michael Altschul | CTIA |
| 6. Maureen Flood | CompTel |
| 7. Switzon Wigfall | NARUC |
| 8. Gregory Pattenaude | NARUC |
| 9. Peter Pescosolido | NARUC |
| 10. Jody O'Marra | NARUC |
| 11. Joel Cheskis | NASUCA |
| 12. Beth O'Donnell | NCTA |
| 13. David Bench | Nortel Networks |
| 14. John McHugh | OPASTCO |
| 15. C. Courtney Jackson | OUR |
| 16. Deborah Bell | SBC Communications, Inc. |
| 17. Hoke Knox | Sprint |
| 18. Rose Travers | USTA |
| 19. Michael O'Connor | Verizon |
| 20. Anna Miller | VoiceStream |
| 21. Peter Guggina | WorldCom |

Special Members (Non-voting):

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

Commission Employees:

Sanford Williams, Designated Federal Officer (DFO)
Jennifer Gorny, Alternate DFO
Pam Slipakoff, Alternate DFO
Deborah Blue, Special Assistant to the DFO

Patrick Forster, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau
Jennifer Salhus, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau

III. Estimate of Public Attendance. Approximately 44 members of the public attended the meeting as observers.

IV. Documents Introduced.

- (1) Agenda
- (2) March 12-13, 2002 NANC Meeting Minutes
- (3) NANPA Report to the NANC
- (4) NANP Expansion/Numbering Optimization IMG
- (5) NANPA Oversight Working Group Status Report to the NANC
- (6) Draft NANPA 2001 Performance Review and Rating Report
- (7) NANPA 2001 Performance Review Ratings
- (8) INC Report to the NANC
- (9) LNPA Working Group Status Report to the NANC
- (10) Change Management Administrator (CMA) Report
- (11) Change Management Administration for the LNPA Working Group
- (12) Wireless Number Portability Operations Status Report to the NANC
- (13) Wireless Number Portability Subcommittee Pooling Task Force Report
- (14) Letter from Robert Atkinson to Dorothy Attwood, Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, regarding Possible Jeopardy for Wireless Number Pooling and Portability Deadline
- (15) North American Portability Management (NAPM), LLC May 21, 2002 Report to the NANC
- (16) NANPA Fund Performance Status Report & Funds Projection
- (17) Table of NANC Projects/Activities to be addressed in the next six to twelve months as of May 21, 2002

V. Summary of the Meeting.

Announcements and Recent News. Co-Chairman Eppert announced the appointment of Sanford Williams, staff attorney in the Telecommunications Access Policy Division (TAPD), Wireline Competition Bureau (WCB), to serve as the Designated Federal Officer (DFO) to the NANC. Mr. Williams introduced Jennifer Gorny and Pam Slipakoff, staff attorneys in the TAPD, WCB, who will serve as Alternate DFOs to the NANC. Co-Chairman Eppert reported that Yog Varma is recovering nicely from the bypass surgery that he had undergone as a result of his recent heart attack. He noted that in a card sent to the NANC members, Yog expressed his appreciation for the bouquet of flowers.

A. Approval of Meeting Minutes. Minutes of the March 12-13, 2002 NANC meeting were approved as modified.

B. North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA) Report to the NANC. John Manning, NANPA, provided the report to the Council. Mr. Manning advised that the NANPA report entitled, “The Status of Area Code Relief Exhausting Within 36 Months,” is posted on the NANC-Chair web site. He indicated that it is a report on all of the area codes and relief planning efforts that are underway.

May 2002 NPA Exhaust Projections. Mr. Manning reported that, as a result of the publication of the national pooling rollout schedule on April 24, 2002 by the FCC, NANPA had to revise its timeline for making the NPA exhaust projections available by the May NANC meeting. He stated that NANPA did not want to move forward with NPA exhaust projections that did not include the rollout schedule. Mr. Manning reported that NANPA has gone through each area code with the projections and will be putting that information together in a report format over the next couple of weeks. He stated that the information will be posted in the first week of June. Mr. Manning reported on the methodology that NANPA used in doing the NPA exhaust projections is very similar to the methodology used in developing the May 2001 NPA exhaust projections. He stated that NANPA will include the impact of wireline pooling on NPA exhaust. For those NPAs where a specific start date for pooling is not available, NANPA will use the mid-point of the quarter as the start date for each NPA marked for pooling in that quarter of the rollout schedule. Mr. Manning reported that the NPA exhaust analysis does not attempt to reflect the impact of wireless pooling, presently schedule for November 2002. He advised that due to the absence of any actual data indicating the potential impact of wireless pooling on wireless CO code demand, NANPA did not develop and incorporate any generic assumptions concerning wireless pooling in the individual NPA exhaust projections. Mr. Manning stated that NANPA grouped the area codes into three primary categories: (1) NPAs without pooling, (2) NPAs in pooling prior to December 31, 2001, and (3) NPAs with pooling ordered to start after December 2001. He further stated that the forecast methodology used by NANPA was driven by the particular category that the NPA was in and explained the methodology used for each category.

2002 NANP Exhaust Assumptions. Mr. Manning provided a list of assumptions that NANPA would like to use in formulating the 2002 NANP Exhaust forecast. He reported that these assumptions were reviewed and approved by the NENO IMG at their May 2, 2002 meeting. Mr. Manning stated that with the approval of the NANC, NANPA intends to publish the NANP exhaust projection in time for the July 2002 NANC meeting. He stated that, for the most part, the assumptions are the same as the previous two years. Mr. Manning noted, however, one major change. He stated that with the national pooling rollout schedule, NANPA will not have to guess which NPA will be implementing pooling and at what time. Therefore, NANPA will factor the pooling schedule into the individual NPA exhaust projections. Mr. Manning indicated that the only remaining assumption is the assumption regarding the impact of wireless pooling. The NANP Exhaust assumptions were approved by the NANC. Mr. Manning advised that the exhaust projections will be available at the July NANC meeting.

Central Office (CO) Code Activity Report. Mr. Manning provided the Central Office Code Activity Report for the period January 2000 through April 2002. Mr. Manning reported that there has been a general decrease in the demand rate for CO Codes. The total assignments in the first four months of 2002 were 2,627 codes. The net assignments were 759 codes. He stated that in comparing the first four months of 2002 with the same time period in 2001 (3,849), assignments are down by 1,222 codes or 32%. The total returns in the first four months of 2002 were 1,868. In comparing the 2002 returns with the same time period in 2001, (2,059) total returns are down by 191 or 9%.

INC Issues 322 and 327 – NANPA Change in Scope. Mr. Manning reported that Issue 322 is an issue in which the proposed resolution is to remove some information from the Part 1, Part 3, and Part 4 application forms. It involves the removal of the switch identification which is currently a requirement in filling out a Part 1 application form to receive a Central Office Code. It also involves removing a homing switch identification on the Part 1 application form as well. The switch identification is also included on the Part 3 and Part 4 application forms. Mr. Manning reported that Issue 327 proposed some changes in the months-to-exhaust worksheet, which is a requirement when filling out a Part 1 for a growth resource. It added a new field called the operating company number. It modified some existing fields and modified some text on the form that provides explanations to the reader regarding filling out the application. Mr. Manning stated that both issues had some impact on the code administration system that NANPA uses to make CO Code Assignments. He advised that on March 19, 2002, NANPA sent a letter to the NANC Chair and the INC Moderator informing them that this was a change in scope of work and, in order to make these changes, some additional time was needed to review that change in scope to determine what the cost estimate would be in terms of modifying the Code Administration System (CAS). On April 19, 2002, NANPA followed up with a letter to Dorothy Attwood indicating what the cost estimate would be for the changes in Issue 322 and 327. Mr. Manning advised that the issue is still open in terms of whether or not these changes will be made and whether or not the cost estimates provided in the letters are still good or not based upon the ultimate resolution.

Returned Codes with Ported Telephone Numbers (TNs). Mr. Manning explained that NANPA had been receiving a large quantity of code returns in which many of the codes are portable NXXs, and as such, have portable TNs in them. He stated that in June and July 2001, NANPA reported to the NANC that it had been working with the FCC staff on a process that it could use to handle these situations to insure that codes that had ported TNs were not disconnected. Over the past several months, the quantity of returned codes have been substantial. The quantity of returned codes with ported TNs has also been substantial. As a result of discussions with the FCC, an interim process was put together. Mr. Manning stated that at the April INC meeting, NANPA summarized the problems associated with the interim process. As a result, NANPA proposed a modified process to the INC in hopes of speeding up the process in which it finds new code holders. Peter Guggina, Worldcom, questioned inconsistent statements regarding the new interim process. Mr. Manning stated that even though NANPA is moving forward with the disconnect, in which there are ported TNs, both the carriers involved as well as the state commission will be well aware of that event. If necessary, they can take steps to prevent

that disconnect from occurring. Rose Travers, USTA, questioned whether NANPA has had circumstances where no one wants to assume a code for utilization, and the customer has to take a number change. Mr. Manning stated there may only be a small quantity, approximately ten or less, where this situation has occurred. A carrier who has those ported TNs, instead of deciding to take the entire code, has made arrangements with its customers to actually move their number out of the code being disconnected so that the code can be returned. Michael Altschul, CTIA, questioned the FCC rules on number utilization and the strict guidelines that the rules impose on carriers requesting codes, and what could be done to protect customers with ported TNs. Mr. Manning advised that certain items did not necessarily have to be met by a carrier taking over the code. Rose Travers pointed out that the INC did not know that the process was broken. She commended NANPA for bringing this in and developing a set of procedures that tightened up the timeframe. Ms. Travers stated that there was not general awareness of the scope of the refusal to take the codes, and the carrier that is exiting the market is left hanging, and the customers' service is potentially going to be interrupted. Mr. Manning advised that NANPA will keep both the NANC and INC informed on how the new interim process is working.

NRUF Update – August 1, 2002 Reporting Cycle. Mr. Manning stated that the next NRUF submission date is August 1, 2002. He advised that NANPA will be distributing a formal notification via the NRUF mailing list on or before June 1, 2002. Mr. Manning advised that the FCC has expressed that it would like to add a new data field called the Federal Registration Number (FRN) to the NRUF form. He indicated that all carriers have an FRN. Mr. Manning emphasized that it will be a required field. He stated that when NANPA receives official notification from the FCC, the NRUF Form 502 will be updated, and the existing NRUF Form 502 will become obsolete. Mr. Manning indicated that NANPA will update its data base, the job aides, etc. He stated that the FCC has been made aware that this may impact carriers' current systems, programs, software, etc., in terms of how their NRUF submissions are put together. Mr. Guggina inquired as to how NANPA will get the word out in a timely manner. Mr. Manning stated that NANPA will use all of its distribution methods, primarily the NRUF mailing list. He stated that NANPA is awaiting official notification from the FCC.

Utilization of Intermediate Numbers. Mr. Manning stated that at the March 2002 NANC meeting, NANPA created an action item to examine NRUF data associated with the February 1, 2002 reporting cycle and report on the use of intermediate numbers by resellers. He reported that NANPA examined all submissions where the service provider reported it had received intermediate numbers from another service provider. According to carrier submissions, 21.3M numbers were classified as intermediate numbers received from another carrier. Of this amount, 7.75M were categorized as assigned. This translates into a 36% utilization rate. Mr. Manning emphasized that this is what the carriers reported. Co-Chairman Eppert pointed out that the results were supposed to be compared with the intermediate numbers in the denominator and out of the denominator to see if this was really an important issue. He inquired whether any of the service providers had a feel as to whether inclusion of the intermediate numbers in the denominator made a difference. Deborah Bell, SBC, stated that SBC took a look at

several MSAs. She noted that there is a range from three percent to five percent difference when they compared the inclusion in the numerator. Ms. Bell indicated that it depended on which part of the country that you are in. Ms. Travers pointed out that since the MTE utilization is 60% and on June 30 goes to 65%, it makes it harder for carriers to meet their MTE in order to obtain numbers. They can not always obtain utilization information from the resellers because of competitive reasons. Beth O'Donnell, NCTA, stated at least in one state, soft dial tone numbers are going to dramatically affect the carriers. Co-Chairman Eppert stated that the conclusion is that it is an important issue. He inquired as to what the next step is for the NANC to take. There was no response from the Council Members.

Ms. Bell wanted clarification on what the NANC is looking to do on a going forward basis regarding intermediate numbers. She inquired as to what the plan is. Mr. Guggina stated that he would support going forward with an analysis from the entities that are involved in the issue. He suggested that their observations and analyses could be combined and brought back to the NANC. Ms. Travers advised that it is urgent. Co-Chairman Eppert asked for a volunteer to take leadership on this issue. Ms. Bell volunteered to take the leadership responsibility. Pat Caldwell, Peter Guggina, Hoke Knox, and Courtney Jackson volunteered to participate. Michael Altschul volunteered Lori Messing to participate. Beth O'Donnell suggested that the group also include the soft dial tone number issue as well.

3Q2001 NeuStar Neutrality Audit. Mr. Manning provided a copy of the results of NeuStar's 3Q2001 Neutrality Audit to the Council.

C. NANP Expansion/Numbering Optimization (NENO) IMG. Rose Travers, USTA, provided the report to the Council. Ms. Travers stated that there has been some loss of enthusiasm for NENO. There is a third draft of the NENO Report. She further stated that there are individual number optimization measures that the NENO is trying to complete in terms of basic assumptions, definitions and the pro and con analysis which is now called other considerations. Ms. Travers stated that there is also a major report that is feeding into this. She expressed hope that Sections 1 and 3 get completed at the next NENO meeting. The templates of each optimization measure are approximately 75% complete. Ms. Travers stated that the NENO intends to do an impact analysis after NANPA has completed its NRUF, and the NENO knows fully what the NANP exhaust study indicates. She reviewed the future meeting dates with the Council.

D. NANPA Oversight Working Group (NOWG) Report. Pat Caldwell, Chair, presented the report to the Council. Mr. Caldwell reported NANPA's performance rating as "More Than Met". He stated that the NOWG considered survey results, NANPA's input in operational reviews, NANPA's draft Annual Report, and its own observations during the year in order to reach that conclusion. Areas for further improvement were noted. NANPA has agreed to work on those suggestions and issues. Mr. Caldwell stated that service providers and regulators were very satisfied with NANPA's performance. Mr. Caldwell reported that there were 168 responses to the Performance Survey, 27 were from regulators, 141 from service providers. He noted that the staff in all major functions

of NANPA were praised for their customer service. NANPA improved the quality of their work product, e.g., IPD, CAS. Regulators were very pleased with the reports and data provided. NANPA's consistency improved through process improvements efforts. Mr. Caldwell identified three key areas that the NOWG would like for NANPA to focus on: (1) Internal metrics – NANPA reported 100 % codes assigned without conflict. The NOWG members are aware of two codes that were assigned that had to be retrieved because they were in conflict; (2) NRUF data verification process; and (3) CAS – the primary concern is that CAS has been delivered very late leaving little time for maturation prior to the end of NANPA's current term. Mr. Caldwell stated that a mature system would have a better utilization rate. He advised that the next steps in the NANPA Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) are that NANPA has agreed to develop a PIP and present it to the NANC and the NOWG in July. The NOWG will continue to work with the NANPA to review scope and focus of internal metrics. The NOWG will work with the NANPA to monitor the progress of this year's PIP. Mr. Caldwell stated that NANPA should: place special emphasis on CAS maturation; obtain user feedback; accelerate reconciliation of data; accelerate utilization of CAS by service providers, and verify that CAS satisfies all objectives.

Mr. Guggina suggested that, periodically, the NANC should get an updated status report on what progress is being made in the PIP. He pointed out that the NOWG did a great job with the performance analysis. Mr. Guggina noted that there are seven entities that are providing multiple surveys. He questioned whether anything is being done to address this issue. Mr. Caldwell stated that the NOWG looked to see if there was a trend that would suggest that one company was trying to tip the scale one way or another. With regard to ratings, Mr. Caldwell opined that numeric averages should be taken. He stated that opinions are mixed within the NOWG. Mr. Caldwell questioned what if one of the surveys was an NPA relief planner in that company, another survey was a CO Code administrator, and another was the NRUF Coordinator. He stated that they have opinions about all of the areas of NANPA. Mr. Caldwell questioned whether it was right for him to go in and take averages. He pointed out that another problem is corporate identity. Mr. Guggina stated that allowing multiple surveys from the same entity could cast some doubt on the integrity of the review. Ms. Travers stated that the NANC has this same discussion every year. She indicated that there was not consensus from the NANC to enforce a one-carrier/one-survey rule. Mr. Travers stated that when the NOWG received the surveys, they recognized that very often the respondents are from different regions. She noted that they are dealing with different CO Code administrators, and different NPA relief planners. The input that was provided was significantly different very often because they are actually rating along the lines of the particular people that they deal with. Ms. Travers pointed out that the benefit of taking all of that into account is that you get a broader view. She stated that the NOWG was thankful for every survey that was submitted because of the small number of responses received from past surveys. Co-Chairman Eppert commended the NANC, the NOWG, and the NANPA for the excellent work of getting the response level up. He stated that it is a much better situation than a year ago. Anna Miller, VoiceStream, questioned what the span is of NANPA's improvement plan. Mr. Caldwell responded that the CAS system should be mature by

the end of NANPA's term. He stated that CAS is a major workload, and there are significant issues that need to be worked.

E. Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report. David Bench, INC Moderator, presented the report to the Council. Mr. Bench reviewed the INC meeting schedule and the relevant INC web sites with the Council. He reported that in the LNPA workshop, there has been a considerable amount of discussion on the contract that the pooling administrator (PA) has with the FCC. He stated that the PA contract inhibits timely changes to process improvements and is inflexible relative to the change order process. Mr. Bench reported that the PA contract is based on the INC Guidelines/Forms in effect on September 9, 2000. For example, the ability to add a "remarks" field on PAS mechanized forms is hampered by the change order process. Mr. Bench stated that the INC and the PA are constantly trying to improve the industry process. He advised that the PA is willing to work with the INC within the bounds of the contract with the FCC. Mr. Bench stated that some PAS upgrades require additional funding, such as adding a "remarks" field. He indicated that the INC is frustrated with implementing current change orders in PAS because state trial processes were more flexible because there was no mechanized process. Mr. Bench advised that the INC has sent an *ex parte* letter to the FCC requesting a meeting between the INC and the FCC to establish a process where the INC can do process improvements and work with the PA and minimize change orders.

Mr. Bench reported that the INC was contacted by three states, Virginia, New York, and California regarding the removal of Switch ID from the Part 1 forms (Issue 322). The issue remains in initial closure. The INC has concluded that the Switch ID should be removed from the form because the FCC rules mandate assignments at a rate center level, not at the switch level. Switch ID is an artifact from the days when assignments were made at the switch level and is no longer used in the assignment of a Central Office Code. Service providers may move numbers between switches within a rate center to balance resources, therefore rendering the original Switch ID moot. Mr. Bench stated that state regulators have other ways to obtain Switch ID information, e.g., TRA, CCMI, NECA FCC Tariff No. 4 and other vendor products. He advised that the INC has formally responded to Virginia, California, and New York. There was participation from the state of Texas at the INC meeting. INC has kept the issue in initial closure pending any other correspondence that may come in from statement regulators. If nothing is received, that issue will be closed, and the Switch ID will be removed from the Part 1 form. Greg Pattenaude, NARUC, stated that the Switch ID is something that the states have used for various purposes. He pointed out that one way is when a company asks for a waiver of the code rules, it is used to see that it is justified. Mr. Pattenaude noted that not all states use that information. He stated that the Texas Commission represented various states at the last INC meeting. Mr. Pattenaude remarked that the INC has chosen not to adopt what the states wanted to do. He commented that it would not be that burdensome for the carriers to have to put that information on the form. Mr. Bench stated that the process that the INC has gone through is basically to follow the rules that the FCC has put in place. Mr. Guggina questioned what FCC rule states that you can not include this information. Mr. Bench stated that the FCC does not have a rule. He

reported that the INC approved interim procedures for returning non-pooled codes with active or pending TNs.

Mr. Bench also reported that final closure for the NANP Expansion Reference Document is expected at the July INC meeting. He reported that the NANC briefing on the Reference Document has been moved to September because the July NANC meeting precedes the July INC meeting. Mr. Bench advised that the INC submitted a letter to Chairman Atkinson and Co-Chairman Eppert suggesting the question and answer period be moved to the September meeting after the publication of the document. He requested that the NANC members review the document before the September NANC meeting and submit questions in writing.

F. Local Number Portability Administration (LNPA) Working Group. Gary Sacra, Co-Chair, presented the report to the Council. Mr. Sacra reported that NPAC Release 3.1 has been successfully loaded into five of the seven Regions. The latest is the Southeast Region. Release 3.1 supports national pooling with efficient data representation and addresses the performance issues that were experienced with NPAC Release 3.0. Mr. Sacra stated that the LNPA Working Group is continuing to develop requirements for addressing performance in the longer term. Those requirements are being developed at the monthly meetings and will continue until completion and will be scheduled in a future Release. Mr. Sacra reported that with regard to future NPAC Release 3.2, at the May LNPA Working Group meeting, NeuStar presented a package of Change Orders, which they stated could be delivered to the service providers for testing approximately six months after approval of the Statement of Work (SOW) by the LLC. He stated that the Change Orders proposed in this package were culled from the current approved pool of approved Changed Orders and are comprised of Change Orders that have higher priorities among the members in the industry. The LNPA accepted the proposed package after a few minor changes, and NeuStar plans to discuss its further progress with the NAPM LLC.

Mr. Sacra reported that PIM 11, which is moving 1K blocks between switches within the same company and rate center to satisfy Rate Center Administration requirements, have been completed by the LNPA and approved. The PIM is now closed. PIM 16 – Changing the portability flag in the LERG from yes to no. This issue has been resolved in the Common Interest Group on Rating and Routing. A soft edit will be placed in the LERG that will produce a message requesting that the user verify that the NXX code is not opened in NPAC before changing the portability indicator. The LNPA approved this approach. The PIM is now closed. PIM 17 – Separate SPIDs in NPAC for wireless and wireline arms of a company. The LNPA sent a request to the LLC asking that they have NeuStar recommend such service providers establish separate SPIDS in the NPAC. This recommendation now appears on the NPAC wireless web site home page and is part of the NPAC Methods and Procedures for establishing a SPID. This PIM is now closed. Mr. Sacra reported on new PIM 19 – Individual intra and inter-service provider ported records with same LRN as pooled block record. This PIM addresses instances where individual ported records have been created for numbers within a pooled 1K block when the LRN associated with the individual records is the same as the LRN associated with

the 1K block, the advantages of Efficient Data Representation (EDR) are diluted. The PIM's submitter, SBCC, will provide additional data to NeuStar for further investigation as to why this is occurring.

Change Management Administration (CMA): Mr. Sacra gave some recent history regarding CMA that have lead to some questions about this issue. He advised that both vendors, Telecom Software Enterprises (TSE) and NeuStar were invited to come and be prepared to answer any questions. Mr. Sacra stated that at the February LNPA meeting, NeuStar announced that the CMA contract with TSE had expired and that they were bringing that function in-house. Subsequent to the NeuStar decision, TSE requested time on the March LNPA agenda to discuss whether NeuStar had the authority to make such a change. Both TSE and NeuStar presented their views on the history of the CMA selection and at the April meeting, the LNPA voted unanimously, with one abstention, that the LNPA and its reporting structure had the sole authority to select the CMA.

A letter was drafted stating that NeuStar had acted inappropriately in unilaterally deciding to bring the CMA function in-house and requesting that TSE be re-established in that role. Subsequently to the drafting of that letter, and prior to its release, questions were raised within the LNPA regarding whether it had over-stepped its purview in stating it had sole authority in making the CMA selection and requesting that NeuStar transition the function back to TSE. After a number of consultations between the LNPA Co-Chairs and the NANC Chairperson, the LNPA is seeking guidance from NANC in order to resolve this issue. Beth O'Donnell, NCTA, questioned where the LNPA Working Group gets its authority to select the CMA. Mr. Sacra stated that at the March meeting, some historical documents were presented to the LNPA by both TSE, NeuStar, and also by some of the LNPA members. He further stated that the main document that was the focus of the decision that it was appropriate for the LNPA to take the vote was the FCC Second Report and Order in the Matter of Telephone Number Portability, FCC 97-289. Mr. Sacra stated that in that Report and Order, one phrase that gave the LNPA the sincere belief that they did have that sole authority was a phrase that stated that the FCC adopts the NANC recommendation concerning the Change Management Process for designing, developing, testing, and implementing changes to the NPAC SMS, the provisioning process flows and related specifications. The FCC directs the NANC to continue its oversight of architectural, technical, and operational processes and to make additional recommendations to the FCC as necessary. He further stated that the responsible teams that were named were the LNPA Working Group and the T & O Task Force. Mr. Guggina stated that it is clearly documented that the FCC directed the NANC to perform an oversight function of various things, with Change Management being one of those things. He noted that the NANC delegated the oversight task for Change Management to the LNPA in 1997. Mr. Guggina advised that one can delegate authority, but not responsibility. He stated that the NANC is the responsible entity, the LNPA is an agent of NANC and works at the NANC's direction and bequest. Michael O'Connor, Verizon, stated that in terms of contracting, the only two entities that can do the contracting are the FCC and/or the LLC. Co-Chairman Eppert questioned whether NeuStar's involvement with Change Management Administration is substantive, i.e., they really are responsible

for the function or ministerial that is responsible for paying TSE who has responsibility for the function.

Bonnie Baca, independent consultant with TSE, and Lisa Marie Maxson, TSE, presented CMA questions and answers to the Council. Ms. Baca explained that she was one of the original chairpersons of the Technical and Operational Task Force that was part of the LNPA Working Group when the NANC delegated the oversight task for Change Management to the LNPA in 1997.

Larry Vagnoni, Director, Industry Marketing, NeuStar, gave a presentation on: how Change Management evolved from the LNPA T & O Working Group; the contractual history of CMA; and the current status of the CMA issue.

After extensive discussion regarding CMA, it was decided that Mr. O'Connor and Mr. Sacra draft a letter from the NANC to the FCC stating that the NANC does not see a need for a third party; that NeuStar can continue performing the role as CMA is satisfactory; and that the cost issue should be visited. The draft letter should be sent to the Council Members by email for review and comment. The final letter should be ready for Chairman Atkinson's signature at the July NANC meeting.

Wireless Number Portability Operations (WNPO) Report to the NANC. James Grasser, Co-Chair, presented the report to the Council. Mr. Grasser reported that the WNPO met on Monday, May 13, and Tuesday, May 14, 2002. He stated nominations for Co-chairs were reviewed. The only nominations were for the existing Co-chairs. He announced that the Co-chairs for the past year will be Co-chairs for the next year.

Mr. Grasser reported that NeuStar gave a presentation on escalation procedures and priority testing on the NPAC test bed. NeuStar provided an update on new applicants and new entrant testing. Twenty-four (24) wireless service providers have completed user agreements; 7 additional application in April – some of which are wireless; 4 wireless service providers and one Service Bureau have completed New Entrant Testing – 2 wireless service providers and one service bureau have scheduled testing and 2 wireless service providers have not scheduled testing.

Guidelines for opening codes (NPA-NXXs) for wireless service providers were finalized. The current schedule includes seven groups of NPAs. All of these NPAs are either currently open for pooling or are included in the first three quarters of the FCC approved Pooling Roll-out Schedule and are referred to as "Pooling NPAs." Three more groups of NPAs will be added. These three groups will include all NPAs that are within the top 100 MSAs, but not "Pooling NPAs." These must all be open by November 24, 2002 in both the LERG and the NPAC to support wireless local number portability. A request was made of the wireline companies for test numbers. Those wireless companies that are beginning to perform their own number portability data base (NP-DB) queries would like one ported and one non-porting test number in each MSA. Preferably, these test numbers will terminate to a recorded announcement. Updates were made to the Decision/Recommendation Matrix as well as the Action Item list. There was a

presentation of the procedures and activities to be performed for NPA splits. The WNPP Implementation Guideline and Narrative were updated. Mr. Grasser reviewed the WNPP Implementation Guideline with the Council. The next meeting of the WNPO is scheduled in Atlanta, Georgia on June 10, and June 11, 2002.

Wireless Number Portability Subcommittee (WNPSC) Pooling Task Force Report. Anna Miller, Co-Chair, presented the report to the Council. Ms. Miller reported that the WNPSC has finalized the Wireless Transition Plan to Thousands-Block Pooling (TBP). She noted that the Plan identifies the process steps that the wireless carriers have to perform for each NPA and the associated deadlines for the transition period August 14 – November 24, 2002. Ms. Miller reported that as part of that transition plan, the WNPSC completed a Wireless Thousands-Block Pooling Timeline for both Native Block Pooling and Thousands-Block Pooling NPAs. The WNPSC also supported the staggered schedule for opening codes as portable in the LERG and NPAC to manage the work load and minimize problems. Ms. Miller noted that this was a joint effort with the WNPO Team.

By May 8, 2002, WNPSC provided Telcordia TRA with mass update lists by OCN for marking codes as portable in the LERG. WNPSC updated Appendix B, which is the Schedule for Opening Codes in the NPAC and LERG, to include NPAs in the 2nd and 3rd quarters of the National Roll Out Schedule (DA 02-948). Ms. Miller reviewed the main tasks and time frames for the Transition Plan catch up. She indicated that these are guidelines for the wireless industry to help to help manage and control work load during this transition period.

By May 8, 2002 WNPSC notified TRA of their intent to do mass updates for the code openings in the LERG; July 1, 2002 – October 1, 2002 – Code Opening LERG effective dates; July 12, 2002-August 23, 2002 – NPAC Notification Dates; July 12, 2002 – LRN identified and updated in BIRRDs; August 1, 2002 – NRUF filing to NANPA and Forecast Reports to Pooling Administrator for NPB NPAs with Pool Start Dates prior to November 24, 2002. September 1, 2002 – Last NPAC effective date to mark NPA NXXs as portable; September 4, 2002 – Pooling Administrator Assessment of all pool inventories by rate center; November 3, 2002 – All intra-service provider ports of contaminated numbers and block donations complete; November 24, 2002 – TBP starts and carriers receive foreign blocks from other carriers.

With regard to Native Block Pooling (NBP) participation, as of May 10, 2002, 16 carriers are participating and doing NBP in 101 NPAs from both the catch up schedule and the national roll out schedule. The First Implementation Meetings (FIMs) have been completed for NPA Blocks 1-3. Ms. Miller stated that both the Pooling Administrator and the wireless industry believe that NBP has been very successful. She further stated that the service providers believe that NBP has been a beneficial process for them.

Ms. Miller reviewed future action items. She stated that NBP FIMs will continue per the Catch Up Schedule for Blocks 4-6. On June 7th, there will be a conference call to address any NBP issues. On July 10, 2002, a face-to-face meeting will be conducted with the

Pooling Administrator to address the implementation of the Wireless Transition plan to Thousands-Block Pooling.

G. Presentation by National Thousands-Block Pooling Administrator (PA).

Barry Bishop, NeuStar, reported that the FCC issued an Order on April 24, 2002, for the rollout of the NPAs. Mr. Bishop stated in that Order, it was clarified that the schedule includes 21 NPAs per quarter but may not be limited to 3 NPAs per NPAC region. The Order delegated authority to the PA to manage the tasks, including implementation meetings, necessary to complete the rollout schedule. Mr. Bishop reported that since January 4, 2002, there have been 29 FIMS for 36 NPAs (actually count is a total of 47 NPAs, but overlays and splits in permissive dialing count as one NPA because they cover the same geographic area) in 23 states. The second quarter schedule of FIMS and pool start dates was posted to the web site on April 24, 2002. The third quarter rollout schedule was posted to the web site on May 15, 2002. The schedule for each subsequent quarter will be posted approximately 120 days prior to the first pool start date in the quarter. The FIMS will be scheduled by state so that if there is more than one NPA on the schedule in the same state, there will only be one meeting, unless requested otherwise.

Mr. Bishop advised that NeuStar sent out a letter to registered Pooling Administration System (PAS) Users with a list of updates that Neustar made to its system since it has been turned up. He stated one of the things that NeuStar has been doing since the system has been turned up is taking feedback from the actual users of the system and making some changes to the system. Mr. Bishop reviewed some of the changes that have been made to NeuStar's Pooling Administration System. These changes include the following: (1) users will now receive a confirmation Part 3 sent to their email address in addition to the work item that they receive; (2) users can now view and print the donations that they have made through PAS; (3) Users' work items will remain sorted until they refresh their screen or re-log into PAS. They will also see a count of how many work items they have working, pending and overdue; (4) the State Waiver Option is located after users submit their MTE form; (5) Time out message renewal message appears, prior to PAS logging the user out; (6) Months-to-Exhaust (MTE) field expanded to include up to 9 digits for blocks available, assigned and total numbering resources.

Mr. Bishop stated that Customer surveys were sent out by email to PAS users on May 15 asking them to share their feelings about their recent interaction with Number Pool Administration. He reviewed the Thousands-Block Pooling Reports for April and May 2002. Mr. Bishop reported that there were no new Change Orders resulting from the latest INC documents. He noted that Change Orders 4 and 5 have been withdrawn pending final documentation from INC. Change Order No. 3 (Native Block Pooling) was accepted. Change Order No. 8 was accepted without cost. Mr. Bishop reviewed the outstanding Change Orders.

Ms. Travers questioned what the expected outcome is regarding the Change Order in the Connecticut Trial. Mr. Bishop advised that there will be an amendment to the Change

Order. He stated that other than the amendment, the Change Order was approved at no cost.

H. North American Portability Management (NAPM), LLC Report. Rick Theiss, Co-Chair, presented the report to the Council. Mr. Theiss reported that Release 3.1 has now been implemented in the Northeast, Western, West Coast, Mid-Atlantic, and Southeast regions. He noted that there have been performance improvements in each region. Mr. Theiss reported that the two remaining regions are the Midwest, which will be implemented on June 10, and the Southwest region, which will be implemented on June 24, 2002. He advised that the Northeast region NPAC suffered an extended outage on Wednesday and Thursday, May 15 and 16, 2002. Mr. Theiss stated that NeuStar is currently conducting a root cause analysis on that outage. He advised that NeuStar reported to the LLC on Monday, May 20, 2002 with detailed chronology of the events during failure up until restoration of service and replication of primary and backup services on Thursday, May 16, 2002. Mr. Theiss reported that while the outage cause is undetermined at this time, it is felt that there is not a relationship to the Release 3.1 software. He stated that the cause indicators point toward a data base configuration problem in the Northeast region. Mr. Theiss advised that the NAPM LLC will review the Northeast outage in more detail and will also look at the 3.2 package that NeuStar has put together and the LNPA WG has reviewed at its May 22, 2002 meeting.

I. NBANC Report. John Ricker, NBANC presented the report to the Council. Mr. Ricker reported that as of April 30, 2002, the current fund balance is \$8.42 Million. He advised that there are projected receivables of \$1 Million from monthly contributors. Mr. Ricker further advised that the projected year-end balance is approximately \$7.6 Million. He reported that the dollars delinquent, as well as the companies, is down from what he reported at the March NANC meeting. There are still a handful of Caribbean countries that have not paid. Mr. Ricker stated that NBANC is working with their Caribbean representative on the Board of Directors to clear up these delinquencies.

Mr. Ricker reported on the 2002-2003 Fund Size and Contribution Factor Filing. Mr. Ricker stated that there are outstanding NeuStar requests from July 2000 that the FCC has not acted on and that NBANC has been carrying a contingency for since 2001. Mr. Ricker stated that NBANC continues to carry NeuStar's requests to the FCC for a compensation adjustment. He reported that the projected 5th year funding requirement proposed is \$13.74 Million. He advised that NBANC is faced with making the decision of whether to keep the \$7.6 Million surplus, give it all back, or try and remain fairly stable and maintain the current contribution factor. Mr. Ricker stated that knowing that NBANC continues to have some significant unknowns, the Board of Directors felt that it was appropriate to do a phase down of the balance in a three year staggered effect. He reported that NBANC presented to the FCC a contribution factor that is consistent at the level where it has been for the last two years (0.000043 applied against end-user billed revenues). Mr. Ricker advised that that will produce the necessary amount while bringing the surplus down. He further advised that on May 2, 2002, NBANC submitted the annual fund size and contribution factor filing to the FCC recommending a continuation of the contribution factor at the level where it has been for the last two

years. Mr. Ricker reported that the FCC issued a Public Notice on Friday, May 17, 2002. Comments on the filing are due on May 31, 2002. Reply Comments are due June 7, 2002.

Mr. Ricker advised that two of the vacant seats have been filled on NBANC's Board of Directors. He noted that Bill Valley from the Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel is representing consumer interests, leaving one consumer vacancy on the Board, and Bob Kelly from Allegiance Technology is now representing competitive local exchange carriers.

Public Participation. None.

Next Meeting: July 17-18, 2002

**May 21, 2002
NANC Meeting**

Action Items and Decisions Reached:

1. North American Numbering Plan Administration (NANPA) Report

Agreement Reached:

NANC approved the assumptions presented by NANPA for use in the 2002 NANP exhaust analysis.

Action Items:

NANC agreed to the formation of an ad hoc group to study the impact of the inclusion of intermediate numbers in the Months-to-Exhaust (MTE) worksheet.

[The ad hoc group will also study the impact of soft dial tone numbers on the utilization threshold.](#)

NANPA will keep the industry apprised of the need for a Federal Registration Number (FRN) on the Number Report Utilization/Forecast Form (NRUF). NANPA indicated that the FCC has indicated that each carrier's FRN will be required when reporting number utilization on NRUF. NANPA will notify the industry using available distribution channels (e.g., Document Distribution Service (DDS), NRUF email list) when formally notified by the FCC.

NANPA will provide an update at the July NANC on the new interim process approved by INC concerning returned codes with ported TNs.

2. LNPA Working Group

Michael O'Connor of Verizon will draft a letter on the Change Management Administration (CMA) function to Bob Atkinson, and then to NANC, for approval. The letter will recommend that the NPAC is not required to contract with a third party vendor for the CMA function, and that the status quo, e.g., cancellation of the vendor by Neustar, is acceptable.