North American Numbering Council
Meeting Minutes
March 21-22, 2000 (draft 4-25-00)

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	Bell Atlantic
4.	Ron Binz	CPI
5.	Lori Messing	CTIA
6.	Norm Epstein	GTE
7.	Peter Guggina	MCI WorldCom
8.	Jo Anne Sanford	NARUC
9.	Jack Goldberg	NARUC
10.	Thomas Dunleavy	NARUC
11.	Philip McClelland	NASUCA
12.	Natalie Billingsley	NASUCA
13.	Barbara Meisenheimer	NASUCA
	Beth O'Donnell	
15.		Nextlink
	David Benc	Nortel
	Carl Hansen	
18.	Boaldin	
19.	Salters	
20.	Adair	
21.		Sprint
	John Hoffman	PCS
	Gerry	TIA
	Paul Hart	

Special Members (non-voting)
Maria   ATIS
    Mevel
John Manning

Commission Employees
Tejal
Jeannie Grimes, Alternate DFO

Cheryl

Goldberger, NSD, CCB

Les

III. *Estimate of Public Attendance.* Approximately 38 members of the public attended the meeting as observers.

Documents Introduced
(1)   Agenda

(3)   NANPA Oversight Working Group Report

Property

(6)   Local Number Portability Administration (LNPA) Working Group Report

(8)   Wireless Number Portability Subcommittee Status Report
WorldCom Unassigned Number Porting

(10) SBC Contribution re: UNP

(12) Cox Communications letter of February 18, 2000, re: UNP Policy Issues

(14) February 22-23, 2000 Meeting Minutes (draft)

(16) San Diego County Board of Supervisors letter of February 18, 2000

V.   *f the Meeting.*

. Chairman Hoffman provided opening remarks. The February

Council members for approval at the Wednesday, March 22, 2000 session.

VoiceStream/
Hansen, formerly of
VoiceStream. Mobility Canada advised that Darlene
representative.

th

NANC Chairman will be provided to the Council members later in the day.

FCC Staff Overview of the Numbering Resource Optimization (NRO) Report
On March 17, 2000, the Commission adopted the NRO *Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*
Bureau press release was issued on March 17   which described the actions taken by the

Commission and outlined the issues raised in the FNPRM. The *Report and Order* is expected to be released by March 31st. Presentations by Network Services Division staff members were provided regarding the adopted definitions; report and utilization requirements; thousands block pooling (roll out, selection of PA and current states with delegated authority), inventory levels, reclamation of NXX codes, and sequential numbering assignment. Diane Harmon, Deputy Chief, Network Services Division responded to questions and provided clarification on the FCC's decision to play a more active role in the selection of the thousands-block pooling administrator through a competitive bid process. Since the *Report and Order* had not yet been released, a limited discussion of the specifics was allowed and only general guidance provided.

Bill Adair, SBC questioned whether the adopted pooling framework addresses the state delegated authority. Ms. Harmon stated that states with delegated authority will have 6 months to transition to comply with the *Report and Order* requirements.

JoAnne Sanford, NARUC questioned whether states would have access to the utilization data reported to the NANPA. Ms. Harmon stated that States may have access to such data from either carriers, NANPA or both.

Norm Epstein, GTE questioned whether the PA IMG would be involved in the evaluation of the bids under PA competitive bid process. Ms. Harmon stated that the Bureau will continue to rely on NANC to assist with the technical requirements. With respect to rollout, Philip McClelland, NASUCA questioned whether pooling would be limited to the top 100 MSAs or would it be allowed in other areas. Ms. Harmon stated pooling would be required in LNP capable areas. Other areas may be considered, but would not be a priority on the pooling schedule.

With respect to assignment of initial codes and numbering activation, Greg Pattenaude, NARUC, questioned what the facilities readiness requirement applied. Ms. Harmon stated that carriers must demonstrate readiness within 60 days. In response to a question regarding reclamation, the NANPA will determine which resource should be reclaimed. Beth Kistner, ALTS questioned whether the determination of a carrier's need for blocks of numbers would be made by NANPA. Ms. Harmon stated that NANPA could question a carrier about a specific customer order.

Chairman Hoffman ended the discussion at this point. The Order will be released and NANC will be in a better position by the April meeting to determine its next steps. It is not clear what the OGC and OMD are going to assume regarding the PA procurement process. There are questions regarding whether the NANPA and PA contracts should be co-terminus contracts. Chairman Hoffman asked Ms. Harmon whether the FCC is looking to combining the two for the next bid. Ms. Harmon stated that the intent is to keep the functions separate. Ms. Harmon stated that the nature of the task would be better defined going forward. The auditor selection will be addressed in the *Second Report and Order*. Carl Hansen commented that with the PA contract expected in the next 8 months with a mid-2001 roll out of pooling, there could be NANP administration

turn over problems should another entity be selected at the end of the current NANPA term in November 2002.

COCUS and modify its estimates accordingly.

C.   . John
Manning provided the update to the Council beginning with an update on the COCUS
                                        th NANP had received 1095 COCUS submissions. Some
                                                    OCNs and, multiple submissions
with different data reported from the same service provider. It appears that the larger the
                                                                          th if carriers do

resources. CO Code administration procedures have been developed, as part of the CO
code application review process, which requires verification of all CO code applications

cases where there is no COCUS on file, the application for resources will be suspended
and the service provider will be notified.

_____. At this time, the Michigan PSC has no jurisdiction over NPA relief.
NANPA determined that the 810 NPA
questioned whether NANPA and the industry alone were empowered to conduct area
code relief planning without the benefit of public comment. It was determined that NPA
                                                            NeuStar filed a
petition with the FCC to facilitate the process of building a record with public comment

soon place the petition on public notice with a comment cycle. In the meantime,
NANPA has reviewed all the
unavailable codes could be made available for assignment. Over 22 codes have been
returned to NANPA for assignment, increasing the overall number available for

Tejal Mehta commented that the Common Carrier Bureau plans to act on the petition

not something that the FCC would normally be involved in – the FCC has appropriately,
delegated that authority to the states because such decisions are better left to state
                                        Kistner, ALTS asked what is being done in
Michigan with respect to future area code relief matters? Ms.
has asked the Michigan PSC to speak to its legislature.

State Specific CO Code Administration Processes and Procedures
action item from the February 22-23 NANC meeting, NANPA prepared a list of all
states where exceptions to the CO Code Administration guidelines were in effect. The

authority or state order. The state exception report includes a description of measures in
effect in the following jurisdictions

Florida, Illinois, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Tennessee, Texas and Washington.

Chairman Hoffman stated that the report provided was responsive to the action item and suggested that the NANPA Oversight Working Group work through the report, and advise the NANPA if it identifies problems. Beth Kistner suggested that the NANPA Oversight WG take it one step further and identify where NANPA has been directed and acted outside the guidelines, and then go through this report and determine the deviations from policy that need to be addressed. Norm Epstein stated that this report is a catch up on what has already happened. John Manning added that because there are constant changes, the report provided already needs to be updated.

With respect to the CO code returns taking place in the BellSouth region, Mr. Manning advised that NANPA is contacting service providers to verify the list of codes assigned -- the ultimate goal is to return those codes to the pool by mid-April.

Beth Kistner, noting that the NRO R&O does not have fill rate requirements, questioned when fill rates are established what would happen to states which have state specific fill rates in place. Tejal Mehta stated that those states would be required to conform to the rates established by the FCC in a subsequent R&O.

In response to a question regarding the situation in Arizona, where the Arizona Commerce Commission (ACC) has requested review and approval of all large quantity code (5 or more in a single submission), Ms. Mehta stated that theACC and the Common Carrier Bureau are working on this issue.

Chairman Hoffman requested that NeuStar provide a copy to the Council of any public statement or news release it may develop in reaction to the FCC *Report and Order*.

D.   North American Numbering Plan Administration (NANPA) Oversight Working Group. Pat Caldwell, Co-Chair, provided the report to the Council. In light of the adoption of the NRO R&O, which does not address the audit issue, a question was raised whether the WG should continue on its current schedule to develop the auditor requirements document. Diane Harmon stated that the WG should stay on its proposed schedule. Mr. Caldwell reported that the WG had met with three auditing firms, KPMG, Deloitte & Touche and PricewaterhouseCoopers, to assist in the development of the technical aspects of the auditor requirements document. Each firm provided contributions. Going forward, several meetings are scheduled to finalize the requirements with a completed Audit Requirements Document to be delivered to NANC at the June 20-21 meeting. Thereafter, the Audit RD will be forwarded to the Chief, CCB for placement on public notice to solicit questions from potential bidders. Unless directed otherwise, it is estimated that August 15 will be the closing date for bid responses. A schedule has been established for the review and evaluation process. *See* handout for further details.

NANPA Performance Review
were from state public utility commissions. The draft baseline report will be provided to
NANPA in late April for its preview; a preview has been scheduled with the FCC staff
                           th. The finalized report will be presented to the Council at the

NANPA Intellectual Property Rights. Hank
Group (LEWG) provided a read out on the IPR issue and presented a draft letter to the
Chief, CCB for NANC review. The letter seeks clarification on what intellectual

successor NANPA. Because of the timing of the development of the next NANPA
Requirements document, this issue needs to be resolved by September 2000. Council

issue here is, in the case of a change in administration to a new NANPA, who would
own the property. The contract says it belongs to the FCC – does that include any off

been unable to resolve this issue with NANPA and is now seeking FCC guidance.

With regard to how to handle future bid processes with less non-disclosure, Chairman

agreements (NDAs). Hank
NDAs and the NeuStar concern was that existing bid information may later be

understand the division of responsibility of the work assignment between the Office of
the Managing Director (OMD) and NANC. All signatories to the
continue to hold bid information as confidential.

John Manning stated that   will send a letter to all NDA signatories to
reclaim the information provided during the NANC and IMG work effort. Peter

– much of the information was provided in response to a non-proprietary bid
requirements.

Numbering Resource Optimization (NRO) Working Group. Beth O'Donnell,

responsibility, the WG provided a report out on number pooling trials. The handout
listed the activities in Illinois, California, New Hampshire, Maine, Texas, New York,

states have petitions for pooling trials pending before the FCC. States with existing
authority may proceed with their trials until the national pooling roll out commences.

                                                      will revisit the
COCUS requirements, and adjust its work accordingly.   The WG finalized components

checks of forecast data. Additionally, the WG is working on developing the components
of a mechanical interface. Carl Hansen asked whether the electronic file transfer (EFT)

security issues have been addressed with NANPA. Mike Whaley responded that the WG has talked to NeuStar about EFT security.

The WG has informed the Cost Recovery Working Group (CRWG) that it cannot provide enough information to form the basis of any cost project for purposes of the NBANC calculations.

Ms. O'Donnell added that the pooling trial matrices will be updated and will be posted to the NANC Chair web page (NANC-Chair.org) as well as under the NRO document section of the INC (ATIS.org) web site.

Lori Messing, CTIA questioned whether the NRO WG meeting minutes on the ATIS site discuss the methodology of the information check to be performed. Ms. O'Donnell stated that this is red flag test to check for information – less formal than an audit. Mike Whaley added that it is an opportunity to look for the reasonableness of information. Carl Hansen stated that there could be numerous red flags. Chairman Hoffman added that as he understood it, that this is just a sanity check and not an audit point. Mr. Whaley commented that this is a tool for NANPA to use, and that the carriers know what the parameters are.

Greg Pattenaude, New York Public Service Commission, stated that New York now has a state wide pooling schedule which includes every NPA (and the dates for implementation by NPA) until August 2001.

Co-chair Mike Whaley announced after 2 years as co-chair he will be stepping down after the April NANC meeting. Mr. Whaley stated that there is a continuing need for cooperation and contributions to drive the process to provide information to the NANC and FCC.

F.   Local Number Portability Administration (LNPA) Working Group Report.
Shelly Shaw, Co-Chair, provided the report to the Council on the wireline/wireless integration report, NPAC release status, problem identification management (PIM) and slow horse. Anna Miller provided a read out of the Wireless Number Portability Subcommittee (WNP SC) report.

<u>Wireless Number Portability Subcommittee</u>. Ms. Miller provided an update on the NPAC testing schedule; WWIT 3rd Report open issues; wireless number portability report. NeuStar gave a presentation on the testing schedule for 2000 through 2002 and identified a potential resource problem for 2001 because Release 4.0, wireless turn up testing, and regression testing on Release 3.0 occur during the same period.

3rd <u>Wireline Wireless Integration Report</u>. The SC has concluded that there is no wireless slamming issue for prepaid porting given the current validation process required by the old service provider to confirm the port request.

<u>Wireless Number Portability Report</u>. The SC has begun review of the first draft of the

requirements.

Additionally, a CTIA industry forum reviewed and approved the wireless inter-carrier

test scripts and is on schedule for completion of the test plan by June 30, 2000.

<u>Wireline/Wireless Integration Report</u>
porting interval and will review the cost and time associated with the redesign of the
existing processes used by the
alternatives for an early activation by the wireless industry are being examined. The
assistance of the National Emergency Number Association (NENA) has been solicited on

<u>NPAC/SMS Release Status</u>. Release 3.0 development is on schedule and the project plan

this project plan is available on the NPAC.com web site.   The LLCs voted to request the
NeuStar for the Release 4.0 functionality.

<u>Problem Identification Management (PIM)</u>
PIM 0005. PIM 0001 has to do with multiple service providers – the WG and OPSWest

months ago.

<u>Slow Horse Update</u>   requirement
which is expected to be completed in April. The SC is waiting on LLC action to request

which may be completed by May.

G.   . Anne La Lena, Co-chair stated that there
was no formal report to provide to the Council at this time, and added that the CRWG

development costs for consideration in the adjustment to the NBANC factor.

F.   *)Trial Report.* Dan
Communications, and Jim Joerger, MCI
Two handouts were provided -- an overview and a detailed report. Mr. Joerger stated that

from one carrier to another, and (2) establishing carrier footprints with small quantities of
numbers. The scenarios were tested in the Chicago, New York and Los Angeles
Mr. Joerger opined that UNP moves spare numbers between carriers, and benefits

establish rate area footprint. This description of UNP places a limit of 25 numbers per
request. UNP is not intended for inventory building.

Mr. Joerger stated that the key goals of the trial were to demonstrate that the current local service request (LSR) process can handle UNP; determine whether a third party administrator is needed; ensure that LNP supports porting spare numbers; show that systems can reserve and donate numbers, and test the customer request and carrier footprint scenarios. The trial determined that LNP systems can support UNP ports; and if a carrier can mark working numbers as ported out, it can mark numbers as UNP-ported out.

Mr. Joerger stated that LERG information establishes who the potential donor is for the number requested. The framework for UNP does not require the use of NANP administration. The trial suggests that UNP and 1K pooling could co-exist. Mr. Joerger further stated that UNP is a utility that allows a customer to pick a service provider and not have to shop for a specific number. Cooperation between service providers is key towards making UNP a viable option.

SBC UNP Contribution. Bill Adair, SBC provided a handout entitled "UNP won't work using today's LNP systems and procedures." SBC opposes UNP and is concerned that absent restrictions, UNP could result in a free-for-all grab for numbers. In a pooling environment, service provider inventories are significantly reduced and therefore the impact of UNP on the remaining inventory could be huge. Service providers would be compelled to augment their forecasts to accommodate unanticipated inventory drain due to UNP. Despite claims to the contrary, UNP will be used to export large quantities of sequential numbers from service provider inventories. UNP is in direct conflict with efficient data representation (EDR) contained in LNP software, Release 3.0. UNP would require modifications to the service order, OSS and number inventory systems. The current service provider systems are designed to handle huge volumes of port transactions, efficiently with minimal human intervention to prevent errors.

Barbara Meisenheimer, NASUCA noted that such a small block (quantity of 25) may not contain very attractive numbers. Dan Hochvert agreed with SBC on some points, and added that if the volume is kept low and it works fine. However, with a per entity (25) limit times the number of CLECs, it could become unmanageable.

Shawn Murphy added that AT&T supports UNP in the context of a low volume footprint request. AT&T has provided a UNP contribution to INC. Peter Guggina noted that Jim Joeger proposed a UNP ad hoc meeting be held within NANC or outside, if there is interest. This would be an opportunity to flesh out some of the concerns raised and take Bill Adair's input and see what it would take to find a workable solution. Does NANC have an interest in doing this? Chairman Hoffman requested the Council to hold off on the assignment decision until after the INC report is delivered. Tom Dunleavy stated that the New York PSC has supported the use of UNP in conjunction with pooling and added that the Focal/MCI WorldCom joint trial effort is appreciated. Chairman Hoffman added that UNP has the potential to unlock numbers in contaminated blocks that can not be donated to the pool.

I.   Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report.

provided the report to the Council. Mr. Murphy announced Norm Epstein's selection as
                                                                                    document which would
describe, based on a common understanding and through industry consensus, a definition

AT&T and GTE. Norm Epstein reminded the Council that INC is driven by

information will be sifted into the report. The INC intends to highlight policy issues as
they come up and bring them to the Council.

issue; SBC raises some good issues, today's systems will require change. Is this a 4 to 6
months or 4 to 6 years process? There is industry resistance associated with the

are the benefits of UNP, and does mandatory 10-digit dialing free up more numbers.

Norm
topic. Bill Adair   Kistner stated that the
technical investigation has been done which demonstrates there is a purpose for UNP.
                                                                                    Kistner added that
the Cox memorandum states that there is a need for a fundamental policy determination.

carriers have proved that UNP works in this trial, and the FCC has said it may be used on
a voluntary basis. Mr. Hart opined that the UNP structure should remain voluntarily to

decisions can be made, the Council must understand the technical concerns. Chairman
Hoffman
facts and to present to the FCC.

Beth O'Donnell stated that the Cox memorandum (request) is based on a regulatory order

be noted that portability volumes have not been what were expected.

Shawn Murphy added that AT&T has conducted internal trials. As far as assignment to

Norm Epstein added that there were questions raised by the AT&T contribution

not to work one issue in isolation. Peter Guggina noted that some entities do not want to

Last year NANC looked at this and progress has been limited; there are policy and
operational aspects that need to be fleshed out.

definitional issues in April or May to see what is going on. MCI is willing to host an ad
hoc meeting on UNP issues. Chairman Hoffman also complimented Focal and MCI

Putting aside the definitional issue for a moment, the cost of implementation should be compared using a cost benefit analysis.

Trent Boaldin, OPASTCO, opposed the use of UNP because it is fraught with potential abuse, and further stated, that if NANC is to investigate it further, it is important to understand what it is and come to a common understanding, and not to prejudge the outcome. Chairman Hoffman commented that with respect to potential abuse, that perhaps UNP needs an administrator to avoid abuse. It is important to conduct a fact-finding in order to make a determination.

Dave Bench, Nortel Networks urged Focal and MCI WorldCom to bring their contribution to the INC. Jack Goldberg commented that Connecticut has turned down requests to use UNP due to a lack of information and suggested NANC investigate the potential. Bill Adair added that the INC report should also focus on the costs and benefits of UNP. The matter of whether UNP is competitive access to numbers or is it optimization should be determined before moving ahead on this issue.

Chairman Hoffman stated and the Council agreed that INC is the right entity to come up with the UNP definition, and that the MCI WorldCom ad hoc effort will generate some movement on this issue. The Council supported working this issue on both tracks and that the two efforts should be conducted in parallel.

Chairman Hoffman stated that the Assumptions IMG would present a draft report at the April meeting. Norm Epstein will provide an overview of the expansion effort and options and will discuss the transition triggers. The report will appear early on next month's agenda. Chairman Hoffman noted that when reading the IMG's meeting notes – breaking those issues down into sub-blocks and listing items, was very helpful. If the MCI WorldCom, in its approach to the UNP ad hoc effort, could go at it in the same way, it would be very helpful -- then make the cost judgments. Conference call meeting notes should be posted on the NANC Chair-org. web site.

INC Report continued. Mr. Murphy stated that the 1K pooling report has incorporated the NANC recommendation for sequential number reporting. Chairman Hoffman asked whether the Council needed to provide a directive to INC to revise 1K guidelines. Mr. Murphy stated that the INC would like a written directive from the Council.

Peter Guggina added that with the change to a competitive bid process, NANC would have to modify the requirements and guidelines to reflect two entities, a NANPA and a Pooling Administrator (PA). Tony Pupek, USTA stated that INC needs a directive to change the flow from the current direction (sole source/NANPA) to a separate entity as the PA.

Chairman Hoffman and Peter Guggina will draft a letter to INC moderator requesting modifications to the INC pooling guidelines based on the FCC order. Mr. Murphy stated that the INC guidelines were scheduled for re-release on April 10-14 but will be stayed based on FCC NRO *Report and Order* decision to go to a competitive bid process.

J.   **.** John
Executive Officer, NBANC provided the report to the Council. With respect to changes
to the contribution factor, NBANC will file a revised factor with the FCC by May in

NANC by the end of April in order to develop, in early May, the numerator and
denominator to be used by NBANC. The Cost Recovery Working Group will present a

FCC order and it will await the CRWG recommendation and the NANC concurrence.

NANPA Fund   Status Report and Fund Projection. The current fund balance
                                                                                            NeuStar to
date total $4.28 million for year 2. Payments to NECA in year 2 totaled $257K
expense for year 2 total $14,830 and payment to an external auditor total $19,500. With
respect to the 2000 funding process, 4,406 bills were rendered on February 23, 2000. As
                    [th], $2.7 million has been received due to a majority of carriers paying their

Wednesday, March 22, 2000

The February 22-23 meeting minutes were approved with minor modifications. The draft

rights issue was approved by the Council and will be sent to the Chief, Common Carrier
Bureau.

         Steering Group (SG) Report.
Co-Chair. Norm Epstein provided a quick review of changes to the NANC Table of

revised table will be posted to the NANC Chair.org website.

         Number Pooling Issue Management Group (IMG)   Guggina, IMG Chair
stated that the IMG is to be tasked with coming up with a technical section for the

instruction from the FCC and sample RFP for the format. Tejal
guidance would be provided.

Chairman Hoffman stated that it would be beneficial to use the PA IMG same staff and

Guggina stated that there needs to be a separate discussion with the NANPA concerning
                    Gould commented that the interface is a key issue, which will
require   Guggina added that since NeuStar will be

Chairman Hoffman suggested all face to face meetings and conference calls should
include staff from the FCC Office of General Council (OGC) and Office of the Managing

discussions. Tejal Mehta stated that the procedural next steps and process will be discussed with OGC and guidance will be provided to the Council as soon as possible.

The following is a list of the current participants on the PA IMG; the IMG is open to other participants and others are encouraged to join: Norm Epstein, Jim Castagna, Pat Caldwell, Paul Lagatutta, Karen Mulberry, Gilbert Orozco, Tony Pupek, Shawn Murphy, Ed Gould, Jim Joerger and Pam Connell.

Peter Guggina stated that the IMG will need a face to face meeting to really dig into the project elements and get organized and then go to work in view of the FCC deadline. Carl Hansen questioned whether there is any reason that potential bidders can not be part of the process. Mr. Guggina suggested that perhaps a potential bidders conference could be held, but the Council would need to first to confer with the FCC on this matter. Mr. Hansen stated that NANC must make that all bidders understand the requirements in the development of their bid.

Chairman Hoffman stated that with regard to the procurement process, comments should be obtained on the requirements before the bidding process begins. The Council should confer with NeuStar for only the interfaces so as not to give NeuStar a leg up on any other bidders. Diane Harmon stated that OGC's direction has been that any discussion should be open to all bidders. Dan Hochvert stated that the interface discussions should be open as well.

Chairman Hoffman stated that the agenda item regarding inventories in a jeopardy situation discussion would be moved to the April meeting.

With respect to a question raised concerning the NRO R&O directive that NANC work on the definitions in the secondary categories, Chairman Hoffman deferred discussion of the assignment until after release of the Report and Order. Norm Epstein noted that the definitions originally came from INC and that INC should be included in the process.

M.   New Issue Management Groups – Unified Messaging. Chairman Hoffman opened the discussion on whether or not NANC should come up with proposed comments on the issue of unified messaging. The Chairman suggested forming a small group to determine the scope of the assignment of the issue to a proposed IMG. Beth Kistner opined that there is complete consensus to look at unified messaging and charging for numbers. Paul Hart stated that these are separate issues and the group should bound the areas of discussion. Chairman Hoffman opened the discussion up on the matter of charging for telephone numbers and unified messaging. The fundamental problem is getting at NANP exhaust. Maybe the problem is labeling – the market place and unconventional use of numbers that consume the resource at alarming rates. There are a host of solutions to approach this matter -- one possibility is charging for numbers, there are other ways to get at the problem.

Phil McClelland commented that the NANC needs to think more about the real issue. There are going to be other non-traditional uses that we know very little about. Charging

for numbers is a related issue. A group needs to define the problem and issue before

Dan Gonos,   WinStar brought the issue to INC and co-authored the
white paper presented to NANC. Mr.
used for non-geographic services, and questioned whether it is fair to risk exhausting an
NPA for non-residents.

position on this issue, but that perhaps NANC should address it at a higher policy level
and consider the premature exhaust of the NANP. The ad hoc group of 4 or 5 people to
                                        comments, should come back to NANC with a
determination whether or not it is it worth
matter.

Beth O'Donnell stated that
Fruchtgott-Roth during the open meeting. What price changes behavior? Chairman

stated that there should be incentives for use of the resource without creating barriers to
competition; however, numbers can be misused – the industry has done that with vanity

Chairman Hoffman raised a question regarding reclamation – in this scenario should the
NANP reclaim unused numbers; can numbers be reclaimed if service providers have paid
                    Adair offered that this is a definitional issue and suggested that the
Council not
NANC should file comments on the topic and noted that there is at least two weeks
before the   is released.

Trent
overly concentrate on efficient use and allocation and forget about availability -- the
objective here should not be to stifle creativity. Chairman Hoffman proposed and the
                                McClelland would informally chair the discussion group to
answer 2 questions; NANC to file questions to the FCC order; if so, whether it should

Dave Bench asked if as NANC are we working INC's issue on the unified messaging.
                                                        will be worked further
at the next workshop. Chairman Hoffman stated that NANC should look at this issue.
                                                                will
define what are traditional uses.

work up – that is, can you label services differently. Peter Guggina suggested that

to turn up those numbers; what is the cost to service providers and end users to turn up the services.

It was agreed that Phil McClelland would head an informal group with Dan Hochvert, Dan Gonos, Beth Kistner, Harold Salters and Natalie Billingsley. The group will wait to see the specifics on unified messaging and charging for numbers in the FCC order, then will email the full Council to check for further participation interest. The questions to be addressed are as follows: Should NANC file comments with the FCC; what should the assignment to the IMG be?

Consideration of Rate Center Consolidation (RCC) IMG. Chairman Hoffman raised this issue as a result of his discussion with the Chief, CCB on New York PSC split and the reversal of NANC's recommendation. Is there a conflict in the Bureau's policy to encourage rate center consolidation (RCC) and the NANC/INC policy that splits not be along rate center boundaries? The consensus of the some NANC members is that this is not an IMG level issue at this time. We should be looking at the splits on a case by case basis and determine whether or not a specific case has a *de minimus* impact. However, given all the other things on NANC plate, now is not the time for an IMG to study this matter. NANC will continue to look at this issue in the future on a case by case basis.

Tom Dunleavy stated that the New York Commission recently issued an order regarding wide area rate centers, and the industry consensus was to defer rate center consolidation at this time and implement thousands-block pooling. Jack Goldberg stated that it took the Connecticut Commission and industry two years to complete its rate center consolidation. Natalie Billingsley stated that there are over 800 rate centers in California; consolidation would require intrastate rate balancing. California is not eager to undergo rate center consolidation due to revenue neutrality issues. Bill Adair added that for some areas, rate center consolidation is very simple. It made a substantial impact in Texas and many codes were returned as a result. Mr. Adair stated that it is dramatically more complicated in California.

Lori Messing, CTIA agreed that to form an IMG would be premature. Chairman Hoffman requested that the New York DPS e-mail a copy of its order on wide area rate centers for circulation to the full NANC. Natalie Billingsley suggested that if a NANC IMG looks at this issue in the future that it keep in mind what happened in Minnesota.

N. Other Business. There was discussion whether there was a need for 1.5 day meeting in April. Evaluate the need for a 1.5 day meeting.

Diane Harmon announced that the current DFO, Tejal Mehta would be leaving the Common Carrier Bureau to work for the FCC's new Enforcement Bureau. Ms. Mehta served as senior attorney on the NRO *Report and Order*. Ms. Harmon added that she would not have been able to shepherd this project without her assistance. Tejal Mehta commented that she had attended many NANC meetings over the past year and thanked the Council for its tremendous work, and also remarked that the Commission appreciates and relies on the NANC recommendations.

Callahan, formerly with the
New York Public Service Commission, as the new DFO. Ms.
having arrived at the FCC several months ago with an extensive background on
numbering that she is looking forward to working with the Council.

Next Meeting:

VII.

1. _____. The WG will go through the NANPA state
   activity report to identify the actual deviations from the INC guidelines. Deviations

   Caldwell was reaffirmed for a second term.

2. Auditor Requirements Document. The NANPA OS WG is to stay on the current

   meeting.

3. Principals from NANC will consult with the FCC Office of General Counsel (OGC)
   and Office of the Managing Director (OMD) to determine status of present
   NeuStar will request return of information it provided for the first evaluation
   sequence.

   Local Number Portability Administration Working Group
   WG's selection of Brian Egbert, Sprint

5. _____. INC will report to NANC at the
   April and May meetings the status of its UNP
   MCIWorldCom will host an ad hoc meeting to work UNP issues in parallel. Both
   will report progress to NANC on a monthly basis. NANC expects to make a

   Guggina and Chairman Hoffman will draft a letter to the INC Moderator, directing
   INC to proceed with changes to PA guidelines in accordance with FCC order.

   1K Pooling Issue Management Group (IMG)
   NeuStar regarding the PA/NANPA/NPAC interfaces; IMG will need OGC guidance
   on how this activity is to be conducted. The IMG will require ongoing process

7. Phil
   an *parte*   *Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed*
           question regarding charging for numbers. If so, should NANC form an