

**North American Numbering Council  
Meeting Minutes  
January 16-17, 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. John Hoffman                     | Spring PCS               |
| 2. Beth Kistner                     | ALTS                     |
| 3. Ed Gould                         | AT&T                     |
| 4. Wendy Potts                      | Bell Canada              |
| 5. Randy Sanders                    | Bell South               |
| 6. Keith McIntosh                   | CWTA                     |
| 7. Lori Messing                     | CTIA                     |
| 8. Hon. Thomas Dunleavy             | NARUC                    |
| 9. Greg Pattenaude                  | NARUC                    |
| 10. Peter Pescosolido               | NARUC                    |
| 11. Helen Mickiewicz                | NARUC                    |
| 12. Hon. Nancy Brockway             | NARUC                    |
| 13. Hon. Robert B. Nelson           | NARUC                    |
| 14. Natalie Billingsley             | NASUCA                   |
| 15. Philip McClelland               | NASUCA                   |
| 16. Barbara Meisenheimer            | NASUCA                   |
| 17. Beth O'Donnell                  | NCTA                     |
| 18. James Goldstein                 | Nextel                   |
| 19. David Bench                     | Nortel Networks          |
| 20. Trent Boaldin                   | OPASTCO                  |
| 21. C. Courtney Jackson             | OUR, Jamaica             |
| 22. Harold Salters                  | PCIA                     |
| 23. Gilbert Orozco                  | SBC Communications, Inc. |
| 24. Ron Havens                      | Sprint                   |
| 25. Gerry Rosenblatt/David Thompson | TIA                      |
| 26. Paul Hart                       | USTA                     |
| 27. Chuck Eppert/Jim Castagna       | Verizon                  |
| 28. Anna Miller                     | VoiceStream              |
| 29. Peter Guggina                   | WorldCom                 |
| 30. Dawn Lawrence                   | XO Communications        |

Special Members (Non-voting):

John Manning

NANPA

Commission Employees:

Cheryl Callahan, Designated Federal Officer (DFO)

Sanford Williams, Acting Alternate DFO

Deborah Blue, Assistant to the DFO

Patrick Forster, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau

**III. Estimate of Public Attendance.** Approximately 55 members of the public attended the meeting as observers.

**IV. Documents Introduced.**

- (1) Agenda
- (2) NANC Federal Advisory Committee Directory
- (3) November 28-29, 2000 Meeting Minutes (Draft)
- (4) NANPA Report to the NANC
- (5) NANPA Oversight Working Group Report to the NANC
- (6) NANPA Performance Improvement Plan for 2000
- (7) NANPA Annual Performance Survey - January - December 2000
- (8) NANC/NANP Number Utilization and Forecasting Report Requirements Document
- (9) NRO Working Group Report
- (10) California Pooling Summary for 4th Quarter 2000
- (11) INC Report to the NANC
- (12) CTIA Imminent Exhaust Procedures Contribution
- (13) NANC Toll Free IMG Status Report & Activity Summary
- (14) NIIF's Report to the NANC on Issue #0173, "Toll Free Record Applications Performance Guidelines"
- (15) LNPA Working Group Status Report to NANC
- (16) Wireless Number Portability Subcommittee Report
- (17) NANPA Fund Performance Status Report & Funds Projection
- (18) CIC IMG Report
- (19) Procedures IMG Report
- (19) NANC Procedures Report
- (20) Outline of NANC Discussion of NANP Exhaust and Comprehensive Consideration of Alternatives
- (21) Summary of NANP NPA/NXX Status as of December 6, 2000
- (22) Methods to Extend the Life of the NANP/NPA's

## **V. Summary of the Meeting.**

**Opening Remarks.** The November meeting minutes were distributed and approved as corrected. An updated membership directory was distributed. Chairman Hoffman welcomed Commissioner Robert Nelson to the NANC. Mr. Nelson expressed his delight in being a member of NANC and noted the increased presence of state commission representatives is an indication of the importance of numbering issues to the states and the state commissions.

With reference to the Second Report and Order, Chairman Hoffman stated that the comment date on the Further Notice is February 12, with replies due on March 5. Chairman Hoffman indicated that he did not see any specific assignments to NANC, so he does not see NANC taking action. He stated that it is up to individual companies to respond. He questioned the DFO as to whether it had been published in Federal Register yet. Cheryl Callahan, the DFO, indicated that the order should be published soon. Chairman Hoffman pointed out that some sections of the order were effective when upon release of the order while some will be effective 30 days from publication and some 3 months from publication.

Chairman Hoffman noted FCC Chairman Kennard's resignation, effective Friday, January 19, 2001. Chairman Hoffman announced the IIR seminar on wireless number portability that will be held February 5-7, 2001. The cost of the seminar is approximately \$2,000-\$3,000. There was some concern that the brochure looks like the seminar is being co-sponsored by NANC. Several members of NANC are speakers. Chairman Hoffman clarified that NANC is not co-sponsoring the seminar and encouraged members to add a disclaimer that they are not speaking on behalf of NANC and that the views expressed are their own.

Lori Messing, CTIA, noted that CTIA is hosting industry tutorial for non-porting carriers. Non porting carriers outside the top 100 MSAs have been invited to the Critical Issues Forum. She agreed to report back any progress at the next NANC meeting.

Chairman Hoffman asked the DFO to clarify seating arrangements at the NANC table, because people other than the designated member or alternate have been attending in place of some members. There may be some confusion about who are members, who are alternates, who can sit at table, how members are appointed, etc.

Ms. Callahan explained that in some situations the designated members have not been regularly attending the NANC meetings. She encouraged members to advise her and the Chairman when they can no longer serve on the Council. Requests for changes to membership or alternates must be approved by the Bureau. If a council member has a recommendation for someone else to be appointed to the NANC, that recommendation should include information on that person's background and their experience in the area of numbering issues.

Chairman Hoffman advised members to please let him or the DFO know in advance when they are not going to be able to attend a particular NANC meeting and that the alternate will be attending instead. Chairman Hoffman advised that the e-mail distribution list has gotten unwieldy and includes substantially more people than NANC members. NANPA has been asked to keep current e-mail list of members, alternates, working group chairs, IMG chairs, and FCC staff, which will be the primary e-mail distribution list for NANC working documents. Working groups should send documents to John Manning, NANPA, before the NANC meetings. He will post the documents on the NANC Chair web site, [www.NANC-Chair.org](http://www.NANC-Chair.org). The NANC Chair web site will be the primary source for documents covered at NANC meetings. Each member should always check the web site before meetings. When documents have been officially adopted or official action has been taken, these documents will be posted on the FCC's NANC web site, [www.FCC.gov/ccb/NANC](http://www.FCC.gov/ccb/NANC).

***North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA) Report.*** Document #4 John Manning presented the report to the Council. Documentation provided to Chairman concerning 2nd Quarter NeuStar neutrality audit.

Update on NRUF. Mr. Manning reported that approximately 45-50 people attended the NRUF seminar held by NANPA on December 1, 2000. He reviewed the revised 502 form and a job aid that NANPA put together to assist service providers in completing the NRUF form. The job aid has been posted to the NANPA web site and is being updated as new items and additional areas of clarification are needed. In regards to the revised 502 form - in November, FCC had submitted a form to OMB for approval. The Office of Management & Budget approved the revised 502 form on January 9, and effective January 10 NANPA has been accepting the revised 502 form exclusively. From January 1 - 9, NANPA accepted the expired 502 form if a carrier needed to update its NRUF form support of a code application. The revised 502 form can be found on the FCC web site and the NANPA web site. The new form only has been out for a week or so and NANPA has received 100 applications so far, with a lot less errors. At the end of January 9, NANPA had received over 3900 submissions. Approximately 3300 were actual submissions. Several were revisions or updates that made previous submission obsolete.

Beth O'Donnell, NCTA, requested clarification on whether the old 502 form will be able to make it through the electronic submission process. Mr. Manning advised that they will not. Norman Epstein, INC, inquired as to whether the changes proposed by INC made it into the revised form. Mr. Manning advised that those changes were raised at the December 1 meeting and proposed revisions had already been submitted to OMB. NANPA intends to use the approved forms until it receives direction to use a different form. Chairman Hoffman noted that the OMB approval is for three years, and if there are changes to be made to that form, FCC could seek OMB approval to further revise the form. He suggested that INC follow up with FCC.

Gilbert Orozco, SBC, inquired as to why the old 502 form is not being used now to allow transition to the new form. Mr. Manning stated that January 9 was the last date the old form was accepted. That form expired on December 31, 2000. Mr. Orozco asked Mr. Manning to briefly describe the changes to the form. Mr. Manning advised that the primary changes to the form included changes to the Excel spreadsheet, which included some additional checks as well as removal of some buttons to add area codes or add rate centers. The only change in the format was the on the utilization forms. Some of the columns were reordered. The data that was requested was still the same, but slightly reordered. Other changes are inherent to the spreadsheet and will not impact users.

Mr. Manning explained that effective February 1, NANPA will no longer suspend applications, but will deny applications if you do not have an NRUF on file. It is consistent with the process put in place back in the April 2000 timeframe when COCUS was made mandatory via changes in the INC CO guidelines.

State access to NRUF data. Twenty-one states have requested and received NRUF data.

Mr. Manning announced that NANPA has created an email distribution list to get general information and updates on NRUF. Currently, NANPA sends emails to the contact listed on the CO code application. For example, NANPA will send notifications of when revised forms have been posted. To subscribe send an email message to [nanp-info-request@lists.nanpa.com](mailto:nanp-info-request@lists.nanpa.com). Leave the subject line blank. In the text of the message type "Subscribe nruf-info," and delete any automatic signature lines. You will receive written confirmation once you have successfully subscribed.

Mr. Orozco questioned whether NANPA has submitted its NPA and NANP exhaust projections based on the September NRUF filings. Mr. Manning explained that per direction of the FCC in its July 18, 2000 letter NANPA will use the upcoming February submission cycle to project NPA and NANP exhaust.

Bob Nelson, NARUC, inquired as to whether the states that have requested NRUF asked for a different format. Mr. Manning responded no.

Beth O'Donnell, NCTA, questioned whether the states will have to make request every NRUF reporting cycle or whether the one request will allow states to get the information each reporting cycle. Mr. Manning advised that one request is sufficient.

CO Code Activity - Mr. Manning provided an update on the CO activities since April 2000. From April through November there have been 940 net assignments. The average number of assignments made from April - November was 1250 codes. For the period August – November there were approximately 100 fewer codes assigned per month. The net assignments are down by 130 CO codes. This decline is s a result of the measures adopted in the NRO Order. The number of disconnects or returned codes remains high. With the effective date of the Order, particularly in November when NANPA began checking whether carriers had an NRUF on file, the number of suspensions increased

dramatically. There are 68 NPAs in rationing, and this figure has remained constant since NANPA began reporting this data to the NANC.

Natalie Billingsley, NASUCA, inquired as to why CO codes are being returned. Mr. Manning suggested that carriers are grooming their inventories. Some carriers are not able to use a lot of the codes that were assigned to them. Those carriers were fairly aggressive in their marketing plans or their plans are not materializing. As a result, a substantial number of CO codes are being returned.

Ms. Billingsley questioned whether the returned codes are concentrated in any specific geographic area. Mr. Manning advised that he would have to review the data.

NPA Inventory Mr. Manning advised that nine NPAs were returned to the pool of unassigned NPAs as a result of area codes that were assigned for routing into Mexico, 521 - 529. The pool of assignable NPAs is up from 675 available to 684. From April 1, 2002 to January 1, 2001, NANPA has assigned an additional 23 area codes. Of the 23, eight are in service. Currently, there are 340 area codes that are available or unassigned of which 238 are reserved for future NPA relief in NPAs that are expected to exhaust within 20 years. NANPA is no longer reserving more than one NPA to relieve existing NPAs.

Standardized Reports. Mr. Manning advised that NANPA is going to produce several types of standard reports. Presently, NANPA provides a weekly status of all assigned and available NXX codes on the NANPA web site. This information will be modified to include information on the date of assignment and whether or not that assignment was for an initial or for a growth CO code. The date of assignment will allow individuals looking at that information to be able to sort it and be able to get an idea of what codes and how many codes were assigned in that particular week. The second type of standard report will be available at the end of January or towards the middle of February. This report will provide the total number of CO codes assigned in a particular month, and will provide information on what is happening in an area code in terms of assignments, returns, etc. It will be updated monthly. NANPA may incorporate additional enhancements. All of the standard reports will be available on NANPA web site.

Helen Mickiewicz, NARUC, expressed concern that NANPA had not talked to the California commission about the development of the standard reports. Mr. Manning explained that NANPA conducts either monthly or bi-monthly meetings with state commissions by regions. On two separate calls in November and December, these reports were brought discussed, soliciting state commission feedback on them. NANPA developed the reports based upon the feedback that was received from the state commissions that participated in these meetings. NANPA expressed willingness to get additional feedback from the state commissions.

Ms. Billingsley suggested that NANPA work with the states to get “buy in” on what it intends to provide in specific reports. Barbara Meisenheimer, NASUCA, questioned whether NANPA could label the CO codes that are test codes or otherwise unusual.

Mr. Manning explained that the current reports indicate whether or not the CO codes are available or assigned. Nancy Brockway, NARUC, proposed that NANPA circulate the proposed standard reports process to the State Coordinating Committee liaison, Trina Bragdon, and that a conference call be set up within a week or so to discuss with NANPA.

Chairman Hoffman questioned whether NANPA is incurring additional costs to produce the standard reports. Several carriers expressed concern about the potential increased costs, and expressed a desire to be included in the discussions.

Ms. Brockway suggested that the type of reports proposed by NANPA seem to be the type produced in the ordinary course of business. She indicated that the discussions between NANPA and the states having been ongoing, and up until now carriers have not expressed a desire to participate. Ms. Brockway stated that she hoped that carrier participation would not derail the process. Mr. Manning clarified that the proposed standardized reports are designed to give states access to information in a way that minimize costs. These are not customized reports for which enterprise services requirements would apply. Mr. Manning stated that NANPA is trying to address a need that minimizes the cost to all involved.

Paul Hart, USTA, stated that it is appropriate for the carriers to participate in the conference call when the states and NANPA discuss standard reports. Peter Guggina, WorldCom, suggested that the results of the discussion between NANPA and the states should be presented to NANC for approval; and interested carriers should be allowed to participate in the conference call.

NANPA will provide proposed new standard reports to include states' requirements, and will provide notice of the conference call to the NANC members.

Reclamation Process. Mr. Manning advised the NANC of the process that will be used when a state commission decides not to be involved in the reclamation process. By the fifth business day of each month NANPA will provide the FCC a list of CO codes that are to be reclaimed. Those service providers will be notified by the tenth business of the month that the CO codes are going to be reclaimed. Ms. Billingsley inquired as to whether the process is the same when a state commission elects to perform the reclamation process. Mr. Manning advised that the process is similar, but there may be some state-specific nuances. Helen Mickiewicz, NARUC, questioned the status of NANPA's progress on getting updated service provider contact information. Mr. Manning advised that he is still working with the reclamation group to develop a solution. Nancy Brockway, NARUC, questioned whether the reclamation process could occur when telephone numbers are in use. Mr. Manning advised that the process is designed to prevent this from happening, and indicated that he is not aware of any such occurrences.

Neutrality Audit. Mr. Manning provided the NANC a copy of the neutrality audit report for the second quarter of 2000 that was prepared by Ernst & Young. In the auditors opinion, NANPA's assertion that except for occurrences in which the CO Code Administrator did not contact the assignee to request clarification within 60 days of the end of the six month period, the NANPA complied with the Neutrality Compliance Procedures as of June 30, 2000 is fairly stated in all material respects. NANPA indicted that of 1,612 instances during the second quarter of 2000 where the CO Code assignee failed to submit a Part 4 form within six months of the initially published effective date, there were 174 occurrences in which the CO Code Administrator did not contact the assignee to request clarification within 60 days of the six month period or document the reason(s) for such delay in contacting the assignee. Subsequently, the CO Code Administrator contacted the assignees and has followed up appropriately in all 174 instances. James Castagna, Verizon, expressed appreciation for NANPA's detailed report.

***NANPA Oversight Working Group (NOWG) Report.*** Pat Caldwell, Chair, presented the report. Mr. Caldwell reported that four out of the eight NANPA Performance Improvement Plan for 1999 have been resolved. The annual report is ongoing, so it is not closed out. Clarification on NANPA vs. NeuStar representation is still being resolved. The performance measurements are an ongoing effort. The CO Code Administration System (CAS) has not been delivered yet. Ron Connors, NANPA, reported that NANPA was unable to complete deliver the CAS in September as anticipated, but it is near completion. NANPA is in the process of stress testing and data conversion.

The 2000 annual performance survey was distributed to industry associations in December and will go out to individuals in February. The NOWG expects to receive responses in March. Mr. Caldwell asked each NANC member to complete a survey. Mr. Caldwell provided an update on the schedule for developing the NANPA technical requirements. The NOWG will provide the report to the Steering Group in March. Shortly thereafter, the draft will be provided to the Legal Expertise Working Group (LEWG) for input. The NOWG will then present the technical requirements to the NANC in May for NANC action by July. Ed Gould, AT&T, asked the NOWG whether it intends to include information on standard and custom reports in the technical requirements. Mr. Caldwell agreed that this information would be included. Mr. Gould further inquired as to whether the service provider complaint process, similar to the LNPA Problem Identification Management (PIM) process, would be included. Peter Guggina, WorldCom, noted that dispute resolution is a NANC function, but it has not been exercised. Charles Ryburn, LNPA WG Co-Chair, clarified that PIM process is for operational-technical issues that can be brought to the LNPA WG for resolution. Beth O'Donnell, explained that Cox Communications is interested in having a process to address complaints rather than wait until the annual performance survey. Mr. Guggina suggested that some complaints require judgment, and NANC rather than the NOWG should resolve the complaint. Chairman explained that the NOWG could maintain a list of complaints and the NANC could decide each month how to resolve the complaints or delegate them to the NOWG for resolution.



Mr. Caldwell reviewed the NOWG accomplishments in 2000. It completed the 1999 NANPA performance review, the auditor requirements document, NANPA's price increase analysis, 2000 performance survey, and began work on the NANPA technical requirements. This year it plans to complete the NANPA technical requirements, analyze the enterprise services reports, and conduct the 2000 NANPA performance review.

***Numbering Resource Optimization Working Group (NRO WG).*** Beth O'Donnell, NCTA, presented the report. The NRO WG will review the NANP exhaust assumptions in light of the pooling impacts. The criteria for determining reasonableness/anomaly were deleted from the NRUF Requirements Document. Instead, the NANPA is asked to develop objective criteria. Ms. Mickiewicz provided a summary of pooling in California for the fourth quarter of 2000.

Bill Adair, SBC, suggested that question as to whether carriers provide NRUF data to NANPA or Pooling Administrator (PA) is important to determine who develops NPA forecast --- NANPA or PA. The NRO WG distinguishes between what the PA does to size the pool and what NANPA does to forecast exhaust. Mr. Castagna suggested that the PA should be responsible for the data to size the pool and can provide some information to NANPA for the purpose of forecasting exhaust. Mr. Guggina expressed concern about the timeliness in light of the RFP process. Brian Baldwin, Telecordia, advised that bidders are required to submit responses to the RFP next week. Nancy Brockway, NARUC, suggested that NANC approve the document after the NANC concludes the discussion on standard vs. custom reports. Wendy Potts, Bell Canada, questioned the purpose of Attachment 1, 2000 COCUS and NPA Exhaust Analysis. Ms. O'Donnell explained that the attachment is intended to be a sample of what the NANPA NPA exhaust study looks like.

NANC agreed to review the NRUF Requirements Document overnight for further discussion and decision tomorrow. The NRO WG will review the document to determine whether PA responsibilities are consistent with the RFP technical requirements and whether each provision relates to NRUF.

Mr. Castagna suggested that NANPA's proposal to provide an OCN report with contact information can be used to get updated contact information for reclamation.

***North American Portability Management (NAPM) LLC/NPAC Report.*** Mike O'Connor, Co-Chair, presented the report. The NAPM LLC completed its contract negotiations with NeuStar and executed a four year agreement on December 1, 2000. Pam Connell, AT&T, and Mike O'Connor, Verizon, will serve as co-chairs for 2001.

***Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report.*** Norman Epstein, INC Moderator, presented the report. Mr. Epstein reviewed the NANP expansion options that have been eliminated by INC – options 2A (four digit NPA with new "A" digit), 3A (national destination code), 4A (four digit NPA with new "B" digit), and the steering code proposal. Mr. Epstein explained the rationale for eliminating each option. Option 2A was eliminated by INC because (1) 0 + dialing is not supported, except by additional timing,

during the transition period; (2) 1+ prefix dialing would have to be reintroduced; and (3) it confuses the relationship with existing NPAs. Option 3A and the steering code proposal were eliminated for similar reasons. Option 4A was eliminated because it (1) requires users to insert a digit in the middle of the area code; (2) fails to address the Canadian request for identification of unique geographic resources; (3) and does not allow release of the 80 N9x NPAs for immediate assignment. Quest advised that it withdrew its steering code proposal to explore other considerations and will re-present its proposal. Beth Kistner, ALTS, questioned whether the elimination of expansion options based on the criteria that new dialing pattern, for example, steering code or N9X, would be too difficult to remember is subjective. Mr. Epstein advised that problem arises because both dialing patterns cannot be maintained during the transition period. He explained that use of the “d-digit” is recommended to identify the new dialing pattern. INC is exploring the release of the “d-digit” and to prepare a report.

***CTIA Imminent Exhaust Presentation.*** Presentation was made by Lori Messing, CTIA. CTIA recommends that imminent exhaust procedures be established with stringent criteria for allocating CO codes outside of the rationing process. Imminent exhaust procedures have been adopted with slightly different variations in Massachusetts (508 and 617), New York (516 and 914), New Jersey (201, 732, and 973), Michigan (810), and Puerto Rico (787). The New Jersey procedure is the most recently adopted and the most stringent. The open contribution at INC is modeled after the New Jersey criteria.

Mr. Manning reported that NANPA established conference calls as a result of requests received from two carriers to reopen jeopardy procedures. NANPA has postponed the calls at the request of AT&T Wireless and Sprint PCS. Mr. Epstein advised that this issue has been open at INC for about a year and believes that national procedures should be adopted. Trent Boaldin, OPASCO, agreed that the issue should be addressed by INC. Bill Adair, SBC, pointed out that the Commission has requested comment on a safety valve and NANC or INC should address the issue while it is open before the Commission. Ms. Brockway noted that states have participated in the discussions to reopen the jeopardy procedures and have an interest in this issue, especially where the state has delegated authority. Ron Havens, Sprint, recommends that NANC allow INC to address the issue rather than form an IMG. NANC agreed that the issue will be addressed by INC.

***Toll Free IMG Report.*** Ron Havens presented report. Mr. Havens reported that the IMG seeks guidance from the NANC as to whether (1) the technical requirements document should require the vendor to describe the system capabilities necessary to verify service provider compliance with FCC toll-free rules; and (2) whether the technical requirements document should require the vendor to work with the FCC to identify the system capabilities to perform audits to verify compliance with FCC toll-free rules.

Chairman Hoffman expressed concern that the vendor may be placed in the untenable position of enforcing FCC rules. Mr. Castagna explained that IMG does not intend for vendor to enforce requirement but to provide data. Mr. Guggina expressed concern that the language is too broad. He recommends that the IMG reword the language to describe

the specific things that it wants system to provide. Mr. Adair agreed and suggested that perhaps Mitre can help develop technical requirements. Mr. Gould noted that toll-free is less like pooling administration and more like LNP where technical requirements will focus on information technology issues rather than administration of the system. Mr. Guggina suggested that IMG should focus on what system should do rather than functional specifications. Chairman Hoffman noted that report is due to the Commission by March 30, 2001.

***NRO WG Report continued.*** Council discussed changes to the NRUF Technical Requirements. Section 3.3.1 was deleted and several other edits were made. Adam Neuman, Telcordia, questioned as to whether the removal of 3.3.1 resolves the issue of aggregate data vs. status. NRO will submit the corrected PA technical requirements and cover letter for posting to the NANC Chair web page. The cover letter will be finalized early next week and transmitted to the Chairman. Ms. Brockway suggested modifications to section 9 to reserve states' ability to work with NANPA. States will work with NANPA to develop a process for standard vs. custom reports. Peter Guggina presented a flow chart on the data submission process for the Pooling Administration Technical Requirements. Mr. Castagna urged that uniform reports should be sent to both PA and NANPA.

***NANPA Report continued.*** NANPA and the states have resolved issues regarding standard vs. custom reports.

***Steering Group Report.*** Peter Pescosolido presented the report. Mr. Pescosolido reported on the process to be used to distribute documents for the NANC meetings. Working Group and IMG chairs should email reports to Chairman Hoffman, FCC staff, and NANPA one week before each meeting. NANPA will post the reports on the NANC Chair web page at [www.nanc-chair.org](http://www.nanc-chair.org). Once reports have been approved by the NANC and forwarded to the Commission, the DFO will have these reports posted on the NANC web page at [www.fcc.gov/ccb/nanc](http://www.fcc.gov/ccb/nanc).

The meeting dates for July through December were established. The FCC was asked whether the September meeting could be moved back one week because of Rosh Hashanah. The Pescosolido presented "Big Picture" issues related to NANP exhaust and alternatives to NANP exhaust. WorldCom and SBC submitted a joint contribution outlining various alternatives to NANP exhaust that currently are known. Mr. Boaldin emphasized that getting documents on the NANC Chair web page before the meeting is critical. Mr. Chairman Hoffman that there will be a facilitated brainstorming session at the February meeting to discuss the "Big Picture" issues. Working Group reports will be given the first day and the second day will be devoted to the brainstorming session.

***NIIF Toll Free Report.*** Dave Bench, NIIF Moderator, presented the report. Mr. Bench reviewed the milestones reached since the November NANC meeting – SMS/800 Architecture Overview presentation to NIIF-NOC, document outline developed, contributions to draft document, and began review of draft document. New milestones

reached are: began developing performance records matrix, forwarded matrix and questions to the SMT, SMT tutorial and matrix input at NOC 26, continued editing draft Toll Free Record Applications Performance Guidelines, and consolidation of matrix contributions during NOC 26.1 netconference. Mr. Guggina inquired as to what has been accomplished. Mr. Bench advised that the matrix of what measurements are expected and who is expected to accomplish it has been prepared.

***Local Number Portability Administration (LNPA) Working Group Report.*** Charles Ryburn, Co-Chair, presented the LNPA WG report. Mr. Ryburn advised that the Statement of Work (SOW) has been prepared for Release 4.0 and sent to the NAPM, LLC on January 15. The LNPA WG is continuing to work on the change orders that will become release 5.0. This release will be the “catchall” for all change orders. Issues related to the multi-service provider (reseller) flows continue to be worked on by the LNPA WG. Mr. Ryburn reported that service providers are further exploring the issues surrounding inadvertent ports (PIM 5), and NENA continues to work on standards for unlocking/migrate transactions during porting.

Mr. Gould inquired as to what is expected on Release 5.0. Mr. Ryburn advised that that many revisions are maintenance related and “happy patches.” Mr. Gould further inquired as to why there would be any question as to the importance of PIM 5, inadvertent porting. Mr. Ryburn explained that there is some concern about NeuStar’s ability to maintain its neutrality if it becomes involved in resolving inadvertent ports. Ms. Brockway suggested that NeuStar may not want to enforce LNP requirements and that it should not be required to do so. She noted, however, that NeuStar can provide an auditing function. Mr. Gould suggested that this issue is similar to NIFF 173.

Anne Cummins, Wireless Number Portability Subcommittee (WNP SC) Co-Chair, presented the WNP SC report. Ms. Cummins reported that the WNP SC nominates Linda Godfrey, Verizon Wireless, to serve as co-chair of the WNP SC. She advised that CTIA is sponsoring a Critical Issues Forum for small wireless service providers that operate outside of the top 100 MSAs on January 31 – February 1, 2001. The IIR is sponsoring a WNP conference on February 5 –7, 2001. Ms. Cummins reported that the NENA LNP Wireless Study Group is working on PSAP display requirements in the context of mixed services. The WNP SC recommends formation of a Wireless Operations Team (WOT) to report on wireless implementation. The WNP SC will continue to analyze wireless activation data from November 15, 2000 through January 15, 2001 to determine busy hour, busy day, and Sunday activations. Once the analysis is completed, the WNP SC will develop solutions to prevent the “slow horse” problem and ensue adequate throughput process.

***NBANC Report.*** Marrison Brennan presented the report. Ms. Brennan reported on the status of numbering funds for year three operations, March 2000 – June 2001. The current fund balance is \$6 million. Projected receivables for year three is \$2.86 million, which includes \$66,559 for Canada and \$23,278 for Caribbean countries. Ms. Brennan reported that NBANC continues to pursue Caribbean countries and domestic carriers that have not paid their contributions.

***Carrier Identification Code (CIC) IMG Report.*** Julie Peterson presented report. Ms. Peterson reported that Ascent is assisting the IMG obtain information on the reseller community, namely information on the number of resellers and how likely they are to request a CIC.

***Procedures IMG.*** Beth Kistner, Chair, presented the report. Ms. Kistner noted that the IMG was formed to document current operating procedures, and it does not intend to create new procedures. Randy Sanders, BellSouth, suggested that Steering Group discuss the draft at the next meeting before the NANC takes action. Chairman Hoffman noted that he has some concerns with the draft procedures, particularly with what he perceives to be new obligations. He noted that it may be a matter of emphasis and agreed to provide his comments to Ms. Kistner.

***Other Business.*** None.

***Next Meeting.*** February 20-21, 2001

***Action Items and Decisions Reached:***

1. North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA) Report. NANPA will report the outcome of the meeting with the states on standardized reports at the next NANC meeting.
2. NANPA Oversight Working Group (NOWG). The NOWG will develop a process to resolve concerns that occur between formal performance evaluations of the NANPA.
3. Numbering Resource Optimization (NRO) Working Group. Comments on the Number Utilization and Forecasting (NRUF) Technical Requirements Document should be sent to NANPA by January 22 for posting on the NANC Chair web site. The NRO Working Group will draft a transmittal letter from the NANC Chair to Dorothy Attwood. The NANC Chairman will integrate the comments and send a revised document and transmittal letter to Dorothy Attwood on January 24. The transmittal letter to Dorothy Attwood will point out the inconsistencies in reporting of data.
4. Industry Numbering Committee Report. The INC will report to the NANC the results of the imminent exhaust procedures currently under consideration.
5. Toll Free IMG. The IMG will define what functions are necessary to evaluate vendor provision of a system that will provide data necessary to confirm compliance with FCC requirements.
6. Meeting Procedures IMG. Chairman Hoffman will provide a written response to the draft NANC procedures (Document #20). These will be posted at [www.NANC-Chair.org](http://www.NANC-Chair.org). NANC members are encouraged to respond to the posting. The IMG will report at the February NANC meeting as to any further recommendations.