

**North American Numbering Council  
Meeting Minutes  
September 11-12, 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. Lori Messing         | CTIA                     |
| 6. Maureen Flood        | CompTel                  |
| 7. Peter Pescosolido    | NARUC                    |
| 8. Helen Mickiewicz     | NARUC                    |
| 9. Hon. Nancy Brockway  | NARUC                    |
| 10. Hon. Robert Nelson  | NARUC                    |
| 11. Natalie Billingsley | NASUCA                   |
| 12. Philip McClelland   | NASUCA                   |
| 13. Beth O'Donnell      | NCTA                     |
| 14. James B. Goldstein  | Nextel                   |
| 15. Ray Strassburger    | Nortel Networks          |
| 16. John McHugh         | OPASTCO                  |
| 17. C. Courtney Jackson | OUR                      |
| 18. Deborah Bell        | SBC Communications, Inc. |
| 19. Hoke Knox           | Sprint                   |
| 20. Paul Hart           | USTA                     |
| 21. Anna Miller         | VoiceStream              |
| 22. 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

**III. Estimate of Public Attendance.** Approximately 26 members of the public attended the meeting as observers.

**IV. Documents Introduced.**

- (1) Agenda
- (2) Schedule of NANC Meeting Dates for 2001/2002
- (3) July 17-18, 2001 Meeting Minutes
- (4) NANPA Report to the NANC

**V. Summary of the Meeting.**

**A. Opening Remarks.** Chairman Atkinson advised that the NANC would be meeting bimonthly starting January 2002. He stated that the Council would consider the suggestion made by Helen Mickiewicz, NARUC, that future NANC meetings start at 9:00 a.m.

**B. Approval of Meeting Minutes.** Chairman Atkinson advised that approval of minutes would be delayed until after the break so that council members would have an opportunity to draft specific edits.

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

Central Office (CO) Code Assignment Activity Report. Mr. Manning reported that 768 CO codes were assigned in July 2001. He stated that 750 codes were returned, which is a net assignment of 18 codes. Mr. Manning noted that in terms of CO code assignment activity, it is the lowest that NANPA has ever seen. He also noted that approximately 3,100 requests were processed in the month of August 2001. Mr. Manning reported that there is a downward trend with regard to the number of CO code requests. Beth O'Donnell, NCTA, inquired as to the reason for the decline in CO code assignment activity. Mr. Manning explained that it is a combination of things such as businesses closing, conservation measures, and the particular time of year. Mr. Manning responded that activity typically declines in July and August and that a better determination can be made in September and October as to whether there is a downward trend. Ms. O'Donnell further questioned whether the success of the utilization thresholds and sequential numbering can be measured. Mr. Manning responded that he would not be able to distinguish the quantity of codes associated with sequential numbering versus the quantity of codes as a result of utilization.

2001 NANP Exhaust Projection Assumptions. Mr. Manning reviewed the list of assumptions used in the development of the 2001 NANP exhaust projection prepared by NANPA. These assumptions were reviewed and approved by NANC at its July 2001 meeting. Mr. Manning noted changes to two items. The national pooling rollout will start April 1, 2002 instead of January 2002. The projections assume that the impact of

wireless pooling will begin January 1, 2003 instead of November 2002. Mr. Manning reported on how the assumptions were applied. He noted that in the June 2001 study, NANPA applied certain percentages to the total CO code demand to reflect wireline pooling and later, wireless pooling. In the September 2000 study NANPA took the percent associated with wireline pooling and applied it to the total CO code demand rate for that particular NPA. When wireless pooling was implemented, NANPA took another percentage of that particular remaining demand rate to account for the wireless pooling, and ultimately, the demand rate was rationed down based upon wireline pooling and wireless pooling.

Mr. Manning advised that the major change in the June 2001 study is that NANPA defined and separated wireline demand from CMRS demand. The appropriate percentage was applied to that demand. Mr. Manning reported on the results, based upon assumptions, of the annual CO code demand. Helen Mickiewicz, NARUC, questioned why the projections are based upon demand instead of actual take rates. Mr. Manning explained that the area code exhaust projections that NANPA published in June was used as a basis in the study. He further explained that those are the forecasted demand rates for each area code, and that is what is incorporated in the study. Philip McClelland, NASUCA, questioned whether NANPA, with regard to the rate area assumption, would go back and correct the assumption if pooling was actually implemented more widely than the 50% would demonstrate. Mr. Manning responded that if the assumption were incorrect, it would be corrected. He advised that the study is geared for an area code that has some geographic portion of it in a top 100 MSA.

Mr. Manning reported that a sensitivity analysis was conducted to understand the relative impacts of certain assumptions on the result. He noted that NANPA identified two aspects of the exhaust analysis that impacted the results of the study. The two items included: (1) the assumption that only those NPAs with 50% or more of their rate centers in the Top 100 MSAs would implement pooling and, (2) the assumed percent reduction in CO code demand to reflect the impact of pooling. Mr. Manning provided a sensitivity analysis which reflected (1) change in CO code demand where pooling exists in at least 1 rate center; and (2) sensitivity analysis with various yearly CO code demand. He reported that the assumptions used in the 2001 study remained basically the same as the assumptions in 2000 study.

NRUF Reporting. Mr. Manning reported that as of October 13, 2000, NANPA had received over 3000 NRUF forms. As of September 5, 2001, NANPA had received 3275 NRUF forms. Mr. Manning reported that during the 2000 reporting cycle, 350 forms were accepted without any errors. For the year 2001, 2,734 forms were accepted without any errors. He further reported that for the year 2000 over 1700 forms were accepted but contained errors. For the year 2001, 408 forms were accepted but contained errors.

**Cheryl Callahan, DFO, interrupted the NANC meeting with news of the World Trade Center attacks. Chairman Atkinson suggested that the Council members take a break in order to find out more information regarding these attacks. The meeting was not reconvened.**