

North American Numbering Council
Meeting Minutes
May 23-24, 2000 (Final 7.21.00)

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., Room TW-C305, Washington, DC.

II. List of Attendees.

Voting Council Members:

- | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|
| 1. Beth Kistner | ALTS |
| 2. Ed Gould | AT&T |
| 3. Dan Hochvert/Jim Castagna | Bell Atlantic |
| 4. Teresa Muir | Bell Canada |
| 5. Ron Binz | CPI |
| 6. Lori Messing | CTIA |
| 7. Norm Epstein | GTE |
| 8. JoAnne Sanford/Erin Duffy | NARUC |
| 9. Peter Pescosolido | NARUC |
| 10. Greg Pattenaude | NARUC |
| 11. Philip McClelland | NASUCA |
| 12. Barbara Meisenheimer | NASUCA |
| 13. James Goldstein | Nextel |
| 14. Dawn Lawrence | Nextlink |
| 15. David Bench | Nortel Networks |
| 16. Trent Boaldin | OPASTCO |
| 17. Harold Salters | PCIA |
| 18. Bill Adair | SBC |
| 19. Hoke Knox | Sprint |
| 20. John Hoffman | Sprint PCS |
| 21. David Thompson | TIA |
| 22. Paul Hart | USTA |
| 23. Cathie Capita | VoiceStream |
| 24. Peter Guggina | WorldCom |

Special Members (non-voting):

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

Commission Employees:

Cheryl Callahan, Designated Federal Officer (DFO)
Jeannie Grimes, Alternate DFO
Diane Griffin Harmon, Deputy Chief, Network Services Division, CCB
Aaron Goldberger, NSD, CCB
Barry Payne, NSD, CCB

III. *Estimate of Public Attendance.* Approximately 39 members of the public attended the meeting as observers.

IV. *Documents Introduced.*

- (1) Agenda
- (2) NANC Directory
- (3) NANPA Report to the NANC
- (4) 2000 COCUS and NPA Exhaust Analysis
- (5) Rationed and Non-Rationed NPA Exhaust Analysis
- (6) NANPA Oversight Working Group, NANPA Annual Performance Evaluation
- (7) Number Resource Optimization Working Group Report
- (8) NRO WG NANP Exhaust Projection Assumptions, draft 5/18/00
- (9) Status of Inconsistent Submission Criteria: COCUS Tests
- (10) Fees for Extensions of Reserved Number Issues
- (11) NANC Meeting Minutes, April 25-25, 2000 (5/22/00 draft)
- (12) Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report
- (13) LNPA Working Group Report
- (14) Wireless Number Portability Subcommittee Report
- (15) NANC Assumptions IMG Report, draft 5/18/00
- (16) Transmittal letter to Chief, Common Carrier Bureau, Re: Assumptions Report
- (17) North American Numbering Plan Billing and Collection Agent (NBANC)
- (18) NBANC Accounts Receivable by Industry Type
- (19) Table of NANC Projects
- (20) Cost Recovery Working Group Report

V. *Summary of the Meeting.*

A. *Opening Remarks.* Chairman Hoffman provided opening remarks, and welcomed Bell Canada representative, Teresa Muir to the Council. The April 25-26, 2000 NANC meeting minutes were distributed by hard copy for review by Council members for approval at the Wednesday, May 24, 2000 session.

B. *North American Numbering Plan Administration Report.* John Manning provided the report to the Council which included an overview of the April 2000 COCUS results and NPA exhaust analysis; a review of the proposed NANP exhaust projection assumptions, and update on state specific CO code administration processes and procedures.

Mr. Manning stated that the NPA by NPA exhaust projections are sorted by NPA and by state and described the methodology used to develop the projections. NANPA is responsible for providing NPA by NPA exhaust projections as well as to predict NANP exhaust, which will be available at the June 20-21, meeting. The April 2000 COCUS form was distributed to carriers in January with a March 1, 2000 due date. The data

requested includes company name, service provider type, operating company number (OCN), point of contact information, yearly forecasted CO codes for 2000 through 2004, and telephone number utilization. Service provider data received by April 20, in addition to historical data from the past three years were used to create the NPA exhaust projection. The NPA exhaust analysis also used historical CO code assignment data by industry segment for the past three years and the total number of service providers, service providers' expansion into rate centers within an NPA over the same time period, and NPA relief activity. This analysis includes area code assignments for January through March 2000.

Mr. Manning explained that the growth pool for each NPA is the quantity of CO codes identified to absorb anticipated and non-forecasted demand. The non-forecasted demand along with the linear regression analysis for monthly demand was combined to come up with the projected demand in an NPA and the projected exhaust date for that area code.

In response to a question on how NANPA deals with an area code that is in rationing, Mr. Manning stated this was determined by taking the rationed amount divided into the total number of available codes to come up with the exhaust date. There is no "growth pool" because there is an artificial limit on the number of codes that can be assigned.

Bill Adair, SBC, questioned whether the assumptions used for competitive local exchange carriers (CLEC) footprint expansion were the same as those used last year. Mr. Manning pointed out that the growth assumptions in the current NPA exhaust analysis are different from the assumptions used last year, but the matrix is the same.

Hoke Knox, Sprint, asked whether number pooling was factored in the matrix, and if not when would the NANPA reflect the impact of pooling on NPA exhaust. Mr. Manning stated that when an NPA goes into pooling, then the impact of pooling will be considered in the demand. NANPA will not use the Illinois trial as the model to gauge the impact of pooling because it is the opinion of NANPA that pooling impacts each NPA differently.

Chairman Hoffman observed that doing a NANP exhaust projection (based on the exhaust study) without analyzing the impact of pooling is probably a good baseline; however, there is a need to take the second step and study the impact of pooling. Chairman Hoffman further stated that if a report is published with an exhaust date that does not consider pooling, after the FCC has ordered mandatory nation-wide pooling, then it tells only half the story.

Mr. Manning stated that the assumptions in the NANP exhaust study do not take into account the impact of the *NRO Order*. NANPA ran a sensitivity analysis by increasing or decreasing total demand over the NANP to see exactly what would happen. For example, the NANPA planned to run an analysis where demand is decreased by 10, 20, 30 percent, then look at the impact on the NANP exhaust timeframe. Mr. Manning suggested that this analysis would account for some impact of the *NRO Order*. He noted that, trying to identify which NPAs will be pooled at this point would be a difficult process with a lot of differing assumptions that perhaps would not be agreed upon. Mr. Manning stated that

the NANP exhaust projection based on the information today without pooling, then going forward, would provide a benchmark by which to compare the impact of pooling and utilization thresholds. In order to gauge the impact of pooling now would require knowing when pooling will be implemented, the donation rates and the demand after donation, etc., on each NPA. These determinations will be subject to a lot of assumptions.

Chairman Hoffman acknowledged the difficulty with reflecting the impact of pooling on NANP exhaust, but suggested there is a need to run an analysis based on pooling as outlined in the *NRO Order*.

Paul Hart commented that pooling will change the rate of NXX consumption and agreed that a forecast of NANP exhaust with pooling should be done as soon as possible. Norm Epstein added that we definitely need to look at the effect of pooling and develop a model that represents the real world and recommended upgrading the current model to incorporate the *NRO Order* based on reality. He further suggested that the NANPA and the Council should discuss how to reflect the pooling impact. Mr. Manning added that NeuStar is just now gathering the information from the 310 NPA interim pooling trial.

With regard to the code reclamation process in the *NRO Order*, Mr. Manning stated that the NANPA did not take reclamation into consideration when it generated the current NPA exhaust report; and that NANPA would need about six months to understand the effect of pooling and reclamation.

Barbara Meisenheimer noted that the Missouri Commission used the Lockheed Martin (LM) pooling model to gauge the effect of pooling. She suggested it would be a useful tool to estimate change in demand. Chairman Hoffman added that several parties have used the LM model to determine the effect of pooling and have found the model to be a very effective tool. In response to whether the FCC would like to see an exhaust projection with pooling factored in, Cheryl Callahan, Designated Federal Officer (DFO) agreed that it would be helpful to the FCC to have such information.

Helen Mickiewicz, California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), stated that California has seen a significant decline in NXX requests since the implementation of pooling. She noted that carriers are requesting one-fourth of their original projections. Mr. Manning stated that pooling administration donation rates are not used to put NPA exhaust projections together, but rather CO code administration assignment history. Barry Bishop, NeuStar, stated that with the interim pooling trials there are separate entries and that NeuStar is willing to work with trial data and provide the spreadsheet used to collect data. He pointed out that it takes about six months to see data once pooling is implemented because service providers are allowed a six-month inventory. Mr. Adair recommended doing a NANP exhaust analysis reflecting the impact of pooling and again in six months when we have more complete data. Phil McClelland, NASUCA, added that the *NRO Order* has a projected schedule, which is fairly gradual, and that it should be reflected in whatever NeuStar is doing.

Peter Guggina cautioned that NANC should be careful with what it is asking of NeuStar because at this time there is not enough data on the table. He recommended NANPA look at NANP exhaust without pooling, provide empirical forecasts of impact of pooling, and then the results. Mr. Guggina further stated that there is a need to come up with an agreement and this should be built into the PA requirements as well, and suggested the NRO Working Group work this issue.

Brian Baldwin, NRO WG Co-Chair stated that the NRO WG provided input on the assumptions to be used for the NANP exhaust projection. Mr. Manning stated that NANPA would provide the NANP exhaust forecast at the June NANC meeting with data as of April 1, 2000 without pooling. To further analyze the impact of pooling on NANP exhaust on an NPA by NPA basis, NANPA would need to identify which NPAs would be involved. This projection may not be available by the June NANC. It was suggested that the NRO WG work with NANPA on developing the assumptions by June to produce the NANP exhaust analysis, which considers the effect of number pooling. It was agreed that the NANPA would provide a NANP exhaust projection, which considers the effects of pooling. Chairman Hoffman suggested delivery for the exhaust report using the pooling factor and assumptions by the July NANC meeting.

Rationed and Non-Rationed NPA Exhaust Analysis. Mr. Manning explained that the exhaust date for NPAs in rationing was based upon the established monthly rationed amount. Council members inquired as to what each NPA's forecasted exhaust date would be if rationing were not in place. NANPA used historical demand data and COCUS submissions to develop the non-rationed demand.

Helen Mickiewicz, stated that based on lottery information received from California service providers, the COCUS projections may not be an appropriate basis for determining projected demand with or without rationing.

Trent Boaldin, OPASTCO observed that NPA codes in rationing should be decreasing. Mr. Manning remarked that there had been a slight decrease in rationing. Mr. Boaldin stated that in the interest of competition, numbers need to be made available – if rationing increases, then you are limiting the number of TNs available. Chairman Hoffman opined that what drives rationing is an increase use of numbers as a result of new services and new competitors – mathematically it pushes an NPA into rationing.

Proposed NANP Exhaust Projection Assumptions. Mr. Manning provided a list of eleven assumptions to be used to calculate NANP exhaust. With regard to item 10 of the assumptions, the total quantity of NPAs is 705, however it was suggested that NANPA factor in additional resources by adding back into the total the maximum amount available. Mr. Manning noted that would mean taking the total of 800 NPAs, and subtracting only the NPAs set aside for N11, ERCs and toll free, etc., which would increase the total to 792 available NPAs, and prepare an exhaust analysis based on the adjusted total. That would mean adding back into the pool NPAs that have been set aside for NANP expansion purposes. Dan Hochvert, Bell Atlantic, also pointed out this total would include those NPAs reserved for relief planning; and noted that there is a need to

know what is the actual number of reserved NPAs that are currently set aside for this purpose. It was agreed that NANPA should provide a list of geographic NPAs with one or more reserved codes set aside for relief planning at the June meeting.

Data Collection Forms. Mr. Manning stated that NANPA is continuing to work with the FCC staff on modifications to the data forms. Chairman Hoffman noted that submission of the forms to OMB is holding up publication of the *NRO Order* in the *Federal Register*. Cheryl Callahan, DFO, stated that the staff is working on the instructions to the forms to ensure that they are clear, and every effort is being made to expedite their completion. Several concerns were noted regarding the delay in obtaining access to the proposed forms and the ability of entities to be prepared to comply with the first mandatory data submission on August 1, 2000. Paul Hart inquired as to the process by which interested parties would be able to file comments on the data collection. Jeannie Grimes, Alternate DFO, stated that parties will be given an opportunity to file comments directly with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and information on how to file comments would be provided in the Federal Register summary which is expected to be published soon.

C. NANPA Oversight Working Group Report. Pat Caldwell, Co-Chair provided the report to the Council. A summary of the NANPA performance evaluation was distributed to the Council members in advance of the meeting. Mr. Caldwell stated that the purpose of the performance evaluation is to assess whether baseline requirements are being met; to assess the quality of NANPA's performance and to make recommendations for improvement where needed. The WG distributed a performance feedback survey to service providers and state commissions, reviewed the survey responses, and conducted an operational review. Also, the analysis includes observations by NANPA OS WG participants of the NANPA and its contributions in various industry meetings.

Mr. Caldwell stated that during the analysis of the survey responses, originators were contacted for clarification if survey responses seemed contradictory or unclear. Overall, the NANPA's performance improved in 1999 as a result of efforts to comply with the 1998 performance improvement plan. There were improvements to the document distribution system, web site, staffing and internal performance measures. The WG identified areas that need improvement. The NANPA Annual Report does not comply with the specific requirements for content as outlined in the Requirements Document.

With respect to communications, the WG recommends that NANPA provide more timely distribution of notices and meeting records, and also suggested keeping the industry informed about communications with regulatory bodies as well as service providers. The WG recommended requiring NANPA to be more consistent in interpreting the guidelines, and update the NANPA.com web site more frequently.

Other recommendations include continue training of staff; increase knowledge of local area situations with respect to CO code assignment and relief planning. The WG further opined that NANPA should diligently guard its position as an unbiased administrator in the industry, and that NeuStar should clarify when it is acting as the NANPA, or when it

is not in the role of NANPA but selling a product or service. The WG suggested the use of an *ex parte*-type process for both state and federal commission contacts and service provider meetings. In response to this suggestion, several NANC members raised concerns that competitive sensitive information may be disclosed with such a process.

Peter Guggina questioned how such a system would operate -- as a separate subsidiary which would be a very expensive proposition. Bill Adair added that this is not a case of non-neutrality, but one of perception of NeuStar and NANPA activity. Ron Binz, Competition Policy Institute, noted that is this not a neutrality issue, and cautioned that this is an issue of style and credibility of the organization, and its future success. Dan Hochvert commented that this issue is a concern to NeuStar and not a NANC concern -- this may become a concern in the NANPA rebid process. However, the real issue may have been whether there is a bias on the forecast of the exhaust of the NANP in order to improve the company's business position with respect to pooling – but steps were taken to alleviate that.

Mr. Caldwell stated that NeuStar is developing a new numbering assignment system which has web based processes, but the timing of the delivery has not been determined. Chairman Hoffman noted his concern about the systems – anxious to see where NANPA is at on delivery of the system, and with respect to neutrality there should be a response to these concerns provided at the June NANC meeting. Chairman Hoffman further noted that with the upcoming pooling administration (PA) proposal Neustar will be a bidder and at the same time is acting as the interim PA in some states.

Jo Anne Sanford, NARUC, remarked that establishing an *ex parte* procedure with a state describing the nature and extent of the contact seems unnecessary. Ron Binz added that in the alternative, perhaps NANPA could generally list with whom they have communicated. Dan Hochvert questioned what NANC would do with such a voluminous amount of information and suggested that if there are real issues, the WG should narrow it to specific instances, then maybe NANC could reach closure on the matter.

Pat Caldwell responded that several recent events prompted the WG to suggest that the industry be notified of the NANPA contacts with regulators and service providers. For example, representatives from Dade County spent three days with NANPA at its Concord offices; NANPA also created a process for large code requests. The concern is that NANPA is doing work outside its normal duties. Chairman Hoffman suggested that perhaps a listing of all contacts is more than what is necessary. Several Council members suggested dropping the notion of imposing an *ex parte* requirement on NANPA.

Chairman Hoffman reviewed the next steps -- NANPA will respond to the NANPA OS WG by June 20, and by the July NANC meeting the NANPA OS will bring its final recommendations for submission to Council, which, if accepted will be forwarded to the FCC.

C. Numbering Resource Optimization (NRO) Working Group Report. Co-Chairs Eleanor Willis-Camara and Brian Baldwin provided the report to the Council on the

NANP exhaust assumptions, uniform secondary number definitions; COCUS requirements document update; fees for reserved number extensions, unassigned number porting (UNP), and individual telephone number pooling (ITN).

NANP Exhaust Assumptions. The WG reviewed the exhaust assumptions, as prepared by NANPA, and determined that the assumptions were reasonable.

Uniform Secondary Number Definitions. In response to paragraphs 14 and 36 of the *NRO Order*, the WG using the INC thousand-block pooling definitions as a baseline, provided a set of draft definitions for the following: Employee/official number, location routing number, test number, temporary local directory (TLDN), wireless E911 ESRD/ESRK number; dealer numbering pools, ported out number, and soft dial tone number. Council members suggested edits to the employee/official number definition and modified it to read as follows: “A number assigned by a service provider *out of its inventory* for its own internal business purposes.” It was agreed that a revised document would be circulated to the NARUC members for their input prior to the June NANC meeting. NANC will complete this assignment at the June NANC meeting.

COCUS Requirement Document - Status. The WG reported that it has reached consensus on the “reasonableness test” formulas, which will be added to the draft document. An outline of the COCUS requirements document will be presented at the June NANC meeting.

Fees for extensions of number reservations. Brian Baldwin reviewed the following baseline assumptions: (1) Carriers would collect the fee; (2) the fee should be greater than a carriers’ administrative costs in maintaining the reservation; (3) the fee must be large enough to provide a disincentive to reservation extensions, and (4) revenue from fees charged for reservation extensions should not be a windfall for carriers. Additionally, the WG identified several issues during their development of the assumptions.

Status of Inconsistent Submission Criteria. Eleanor Willis-Camera reported that the WG worked with the NANPA to develop two tests, which are designed to identify inconsistencies and anomalies, as identified in paragraph 54 of the *NRO Order*. The reasonableness test is intended to aid in evaluating the accuracy of carrier forecasts, and the “non-forecasted demand additive” is intended to predict footprint and new-entrant demand. Both tests are performed on an NPA by NPA basis and compare like periods, *e.g.*, May 2005 data compared to May 2004 data. The reasonableness test formulas are applied to forecasts for growth codes/blocks (forecast for initial codes/new entrant are exempt from the tests). The first step compares the forecasted growth factor of each carrier with the actual growth factor of aggregated data of all carriers in the NPA; if there is a deviation of +/- 5% then a second test is performed. This test compares the carrier’s forecasted growth factor to its own actual growth factor and uses utilization data from the individual carrier from over a minimum of three reporting periods.

The non-forecasted demand additive was created by the NANPA staff to predict new-entrant and expanded footprint growth (growth pool).

It was reported that the NRO WG has not yet begun work on developing its report on individual telephone number pooling (ITN) and unassigned number porting (UNP), which is due to NANC by the November 28-29 meeting.

D. Industry Numbering Committee Report. Shawn Murphy, INC Moderator provided the report to the Council. The INC will complete the related updates to the Thousand Block Pooling Administration and Central Office Code guidelines as a result of the FCC's *NRO Order*. Mr. Murphy stated that some updates cannot be made at this time until a response to the list of clarification questions forwarded by the ATIS General Counsel to the FCC on May 5, 2000. A copy of the questions is included in the handout provided. Tony Pupek, USTA, added that INC would be willing to set up a conference bridge during the last hour of its meeting in Dallas (INC-50) if FCC staff could be available to participate in a dialogue on some of the clarification questions. Cheryl Callahan, DFO, stated that the FCC has limited staff available to participate in this activity, and that the Commission intends to respond in writing to the questions (to the extent possible) presented by ATIS and from other sources as well.

NANP Expansion Report. INC has set June 2001 for selection of the NANP expansion option. INC has not yet received a response from any of the 19 national regulators on the two main assumptions. Norm Epstein noted that the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) has set the issue for public comment. Teresa Muir, Bell Canada, stated that the process is two phased – June 9 for an initial set of comments, with the second phase to be completed in August, after which the CRTC will take a few months to prepare its final report/decision. Mr. Murphy noted that ATIS intends to follow-up by telephone and registered mail with each of the NANP regulators.

Phil McClelland, NASUCA, questioned the status of INC Issue 216, regarding the non-geographic use of numbering resources, noting that the New Hampshire Commission issued an order in May 2000 regarding unified messaging. Mr. McClelland added that there are some policy issues which NANC should consider, and would encourage the INC to develop guidelines for NPAs for non-geographic use. Mr. Murphy stated that Issue 216 was a contribution presented by WinStar for non-geographic applications. Rose Breidenbaugh, WinStar noted that its contribution is similar to what the New Hampshire Commission has proposed and noted that an e-fax provider has been invited to explain how it works, but has not responded to the invitation. Ms. Breidenbaugh further added that currently there is no network application available to make this non-geo use function.

Beth Kistner commented that there is a need for an in-depth look at unified messaging services and to explore the alternatives, adding that NANC should take charge to ensure that these issues are examined. One of the problems is that the term unified messaging services is not defined. Chairman Hoffman agreed that there is a need to study and understand this issue. There is a powerful argument that the market place is at work here.

Business plans are based on getting numbers for free. Could there be a better or more efficient way to provide these services? Chairman Hoffman further added there is a definite need for information on this issue to fully understand the ultimate impact on the numbering resource, and suggested communicating with e-fax providers.

Peter Guggina commented that with e-fax service can you use a non-geographic on a portable or non-portable basis. Do not need an extensive analysis on this. Cost of turning up a non-portable NXX is huge – noting that toll free was an incredibly expensive process due to the cost to load data in every switch in the United States. Beth Kistner added that while there are some technical issues, which may be understood by many, a group headed by NANC should look at the policy issues. This issue is coming up too often and NANC needs a specific, directed effort. Chairman Hoffman suggested not assigning this issue to INC so as to allow the INC to complete the PA guidelines. Helen Mickiewicz stated that this is a matter of great concern to the state commissions because turning-up NPAs nation-wide continues to create societal costs.

Chairman Hoffman volunteered to draft an assignment for an IMG with specific direction, terms and instructions for NANC consideration at the June meeting and let NANC determine whether to establish an IMG.

Peter Guggina questioned with regard to the INC NANP expansion activity and INC's communication with foreign countries on the assumptions, what, as a policy issue, is the next step. How do you formulate this policy with the other NANP countries and how does the industry's activity play into the policy making?

Continuing with the report, Mr. Murphy stated that regarding the INC UNP activity, INC has developed a working document from the contributions received from SBC, WorldCom, GTE and AT&T. With respect to the INC audit activity, revisions to CO code guidelines to address audits have been completed and the revised guidelines will be issued following the closing of INC 50.

Mr. Murphy announced that the May INC report is his last as INC Moderator and stated that Norm Epstein will be the new moderator effective in June.

E. Ad Hoc Voluntary UNP Study Group Report. Peter Guggina, WorldCom, provided a brief update to the Council. The Ad Hoc group has rescheduled a conference call for June 7th to discuss potential business rules in a local number portability (LNP) environment.

F. Local Number Portability Administration (LNPA) Working Group Report. Co-Chairs Charles Ryburn and Brian Egbert provided the report to the Council. Mr. Egbert provided an update on the Wireless Number Portability Subcommittee (WNP SC) activities, e.g., the wireless number portability report, NPAC 2001 testing notification, and reseller procedures. The WNP SC has established a schedule to complete the WNP report. A draft copy will be posted to the NPAC LNPA WG web site during the week of May 22. The WNP SC working with NeuStar has agreed to a notification process and

deadline of February 16, 2001, for wireless industry NPAC certification. The WNP SC has agreed to a wireless-to-wireless reseller process and developed a proposal for wireline-to-wireless and wireless-to-wireline process for discussion with the LNPA Working Group. With regard to the inter-carrier test plan, approval of the inter-carrier communications process is scheduled to be addressed at the June CTIA Board meeting.

Mr. Ryburn provided an update on the 3rd Report on Wireless Wireline Integration, NPAC release status, the Problem Identification Management (PIM) report, and the Slow Horse issue. The WG is reviewing the cost and the timeframe for the reduction of the current wireline/wireline porting interval – several areas of concerns are being examined. *See* handout for details. At this time there are no changes in the NPAC release status.

With regard to PIM, the issue of multi-service provider process flows (PIM-0001), a final update of the flows was presented by the OPS team to the WG for review and possible submission to the OBF. Resolution of the inadvertent porting issue (PIM-0005) is under development by the WG and NeuStar. With regard to the NENA request (for a NANC standard for unlock and migrate within 24 hours of activation) the WG has delayed submission to NENA in order to investigate some service provider internal issues.

Slow Horse. The final report on the LSMS availability requirement will be circulated to NANC prior to the June meeting, and Steve Addicks, Slowhorse Subcommittee Chair will present the report at the June meeting for discussion.

The next LNPA WG meeting will be held June 12-15 in Chicago.

G. NANC Assumptions Issue Management Group (IMG). Beth Kistner, Co-Chair reviewed the final report with the Council. The IMG reviewed the two INC assumptions in developing its report to the NANC. The INC assumptions assessed in the development of the report are: (1) the INC Uniform Dialing Plan (UDP) will be approved and implemented prior to NANP expansion; and (2) release of the D-digit will not occur prior to NANP expansion.

The recommendations are at sections 3.4. and 4.4 with the conclusion at section 5.0. With regard to UDP, the IMG report states that the NANC recommends that the FCC inform the INC that it supports the uniform dialing plan (UDP) assumption as a means of implementing the designated expansion alternatives. This recommendation considered only the need to implement UDP as part of a transitional plan for NANP expansion. NANC is not making any recommendation regarding 10-digit dialing or elimination of the 1+toll indicator as part of NANP expansion.

With regard to the D-digit assumption recommendation at 4.4, the IMG concluded that the assumption, that the D digit will not be released prior to NANP expansion, should be retained. The IMG rationale for this position is that the D-digit requires changes in the customer dialing patterns that at least some regulators find undesirable and wish to defer as long as possible. It is not clear, according to the IMG, whether the necessary NANP-wide consensus to release the D-digit can be established prior to NANP expansion.

Additionally, release of the D-digit requires clearing of all present uses of the D digit, which will require considerable expense and potential service disruption. The Council agreed with this recommendation as presented.

Peter Guggina noted that the INC is progressing on the expansion options, but questioned whether INC needs a policy directive before it go any further. With regard to next steps, Chairman Hoffman suggested forwarding the report to the FCC, and the Council supported the recommendation. Council members suggested that the FCC should issue a public notice for comment on the NANC recommendation on the expansion assumptions.

Dan Hochvert commented that 10-digit dialing already exists in many areas of the country (wireline and wireless) (cellular dialing is on a 10 digit basis) and questioned in what time frame, and under what circumstances would be prevalent before we need to do something to expand the capacity of the NANP. Mr. Hochvert further commented why force a decision that angers and frustrates people.

Chairman Hoffman complimented the IMG for its work effort stating that it approached the task in a very disciplined and logical manner. The Council adopted the IMG report, subject to inclusion of NANC edits to page 7. There were no changes to the proposed transmittal letter.

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

John Ricker, CEO provided the report to the Council. Mr. Ricker stated that the monthly status report is prepared by the 10th and since then there have been a few updates to the report, as result the current fund balance is \$6.4 million. This takes into account an additional \$300K in receivables; payment as of 5/23/00 to NeuStar, and the clearing of delinquencies totaling \$320K of the total funding amount. Mr. Ricker provided a separate list of NBANC accounts receivable by industry type. The total accounts receivable as of May 22, total \$289,665, plus approximately \$30K outstanding from the Caribbean countries. These industry categories used were created by the FCC for tracking purposes.

Adjustments to the 2000 Funding Year Contribution Factor. Mr. Ricker provided a copy of Exhibit 3 from the May 5, 2000 NBANC filing to the FCC proposing a reduction to the fund size and approval of a revised contribution factor .000043. The next step is to place this on public notice for comment for possibly a short comment cycle. NBANC expects to have an approved factor by early July, with revised projections available by the July NANC meeting.

The next NBANC Board meeting will be held June 22, from 10:00 a.m. until 2 p.m., at the International Trade Center, 1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, DC.

May 24, 2000

J. NANC Meeting Minutes. The April 25-26, 2000 draft meeting minutes were approved subject to revisions provided by Council members.

K. Steering Group. Peter Pescosolido, NARUC, provided the report to the Council. The SG meeting began with a discussion of the lottery and rationing practices of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) and was joined by Loretta Lynch, President of the CPUC. The discussion was in response to an industry petition filed with the FCC, which was highly critical of those practices, and sought relief from the FCC in form of a Commission order directing the introduction of a new area code in California. Chairman Hoffman brought this issue to the SG although the FCC had not requested a formal opinion from the NANC, and questioned whether NANC should provide comment now or wait for an official request from the FCC.

The CPUC staff advised that it was meeting FCC staff on the industry petition and was reluctant to provide any detail until after it concluded its meetings. Chairman Hoffman requested that following those meetings, if the CPUC filed a comprehensive *ex parte* that a copy be provided to NANC.

Table of NANC Projects. Norm Epstein reviewed the revisions to the table. Six completed items were moved to a new table on the reverse side of the document. The major changes to the table are highlighted, and item number 15, secondary category definitions was modified to include NARUC along with NRO as the responsible group assigned to complete the task. Item 17, was modified to include language “provide report on ‘fee structure’ for Reservation extensions . . .” A new item was added, item 18 is “Develop assumptions for impact of pooling on exhaust by NPA.” This item was assigned to the NRO WG and NANPA for delivery at the June NANC meeting.

L. Pooling Administrator Issue Management Group (IMG). Peter Guggina provided an update to the Council. The IMG is on track for completion of the technical requirement section, to be provided to the Office of the Managing Director as part of the RFP process. At this time, there are no NARUC or NASUCA members on the core team. Chairman Hoffman noted that before release of the *NRO Order*, the IMG’s process was under non-disclosure and conference calls were limited, but that is no longer the case. Mr. Guggina advised that a face-to-face meeting for integration of the piece parts of the individual work effort will be held on June 5 and 6. The central theme of this is that the pooling system must be a stand-alone system according to the direction provided by the FCC. That is the NANPA and PA are to be separate functions.

Beth Kistner questioned whether there is a legal requirement for the system separation and whether NeuStar would respond with a separate system if it were to bid the project. Mr. Guggina stated that NeuStar would have to design and build a stand-alone system like other bidders. If this is integrated, it makes it more difficult to transfer to a successor.

At this time, no suppliers are part of the core IMG group. The IMG is working to establish the initial high level requirements; later there will be a bidder's conference. An update on this process will be provided at the June NANC meeting. In response to a question about the openness of the meetings, Mr. Guggina stated that participation is not limited, however, conference bridge information has not been widely disseminated in order to maintain the integrity of the procurement process. The IMG needs to know who is on the call and it must follow procurement rules.

M. Cost Recovery Working Group. Anne La Lena, Co-Chair provided the report to the Council. The CRWG has elected new Co-Chairs, Anne La Lena and Elsa Morris (formerly of the Ohio Public Service Commission). Ms. La Lena reported that Ms. Morris is now a consultant. The Council approved the selection of Ms. La Lena for another term as Co-Chair, and questioned the industry segment affiliation of Ms. Morris. Ms. La Lena stated that the CRWG has tried to maintain balance within the working group and has not limited participation by any specific industry segment. Chairman Hoffman stated he was not aware of an intent to balance the representation of working group co-chairs. The Council agreed to postpone confirmation of Ms. Morris until more information is provided regarding her current industry affiliation.

N. Charging for Numbers – Discussion Group. Phil McClelland provided a brief update on the group's effort to develop a recommendation of a market-based approach to allocation of numbering resources. Mr. McClelland stated that the group would develop a process to review the comments and will get together after the comments are filed and e-mail the group. Chairman Hoffman questioned what, if any, initial reactions filed to date to the FCC proposals. Mr. McClelland stated that carriers were on the call were not persuaded to charge for numbers. Chairman Hoffman asked whether there should be some kind of economic analysis that supports that conclusion, and questioned whether there is anything in the comments that should be addressed by NANC. Mr. McClelland added that the group may pull some larger issues from the comments, and will consider what NANC's role is in providing recommendations to the Commission, and what, if anything, is missing in the comments on which the NANC would add value to Commission's process.

O. Other Business. Peter Guggina suggested floating the issue of reviewing the establishment of NANC agenda and operating procedures for discussion at the next Steering Group meeting. Mr. Guggina also suggested reaffirming the NANC working group principles at the next meeting. Dan Hochvert noted that the Steering Group review of this process allows for informal discussion, which in the past was very valuable and a good use of its time. Chairman Hoffman suggested broadening the scope of the discussion to include addressing whether to reduce the number of NANC meetings per year from 10.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 a.m.

P. Next Meeting Date: June 20-21, 2000.

VI. *Action Items and Decisions Reached.*

1. North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA) Report. The NANP exhaust projection in the June report will be based upon assumptions NANPA presented at the May NANC meeting, *see* pages 5 and 6 of handout #3. The NRO will work with NANPA to develop a list of assumptions to be used to evaluate the effects of pooling under the *NRO Order* by the June NANC meeting. NANPA will target its report on the effects of pooling under the FCC *NRO Order* for the July NANC, but no later than the September NANC meeting.

NANPA will provide a list of geographic NPAs that have one and more than one reserved code(s) set aside for NPA relief planning purposes at the June NANC meeting.

2. Numbering Resource Optimization Working Group. NANC will address adopting the secondary category definitions provided by NRO WG, as modified, for forwarding to FCC; NRO WG will assemble text of modified definitions and provide to NARUC for their input before the next NANC meeting. NARUC will advise of changes desired and the NANC will conclude this matter at the June NANC meeting.

Dan Hochvert, Bell Atlantic, will discover method of assignment and form of ESRD/ESRK numbers and present at June NANC meeting.

3. Chairman Hoffman will fashion an assignment for a group, with very specific instructions, whether a specific approach should be explored to utilize geographic number resources for non-geographic uses. Chairman Hoffman will present his proposal to NANC at the June meeting.
4. NANPA Oversight Working Group. NANPA was requested to make a presentation at the June 20 NANC to detail actions to reduce the perceived NANPA credibility problem as described in the NANPA Performance Evaluation. NANC to determine details of its response in June after review of the NeuStar/NANPA presentation. NOWG will present final NANPA performance evaluation at July NANC meeting. The NOWG will work with NANPA to develop acceptable conditions of the Performance Evaluation's recommendations.
5. Assumptions IMG. NANC reached consensus on adoption of the IMG report as modified (with changes noted) to be forwarded to the Chief, Common Carrier Bureau. The proposed cover letter was unchanged. The IMG was disbanded.
6. Cost Recovery Working Group. The WG nominated Anne La Lena (WorldCom) and Elsa Morris (Consultant) as Co-chairs. The NANC affirmed the selection of Anne La Lena as Co-Chair, and requested more information on Elsa Morris'

current affiliation (Elsa was formerly with the Ohio Commission) at the next NANC meeting.