

**North American Numbering Council
Meeting Minutes** March 24, 1998

I. Time, Date and Place of Meeting: The North American Numbering Council held a meeting, commencing at 8:30 a.m., at the Federal Communications Commission, 1919 M Street, NW, Room 856, Washington, DC.

II. List of Attendees:

A. Council Members

Voting Members

Organization

1. Cronan O'Connell	ALTS
2. Colette Capretz	American Mobile Satellite
3. Woody Kerkeslager/Mahal Mohan	AT&T
4. Dan Hochvert	Bell Atlantic
5. George Vinall	Cable & Wireless, Inc.
6. Ronald Binz	Competition Policy Institute
7. Todd Daubert	CompTel
8. Wendy Chow	CTIA
9. Alan Hasselwander	Frontier
10. Ted Noeker	GTE
11. Peter Guggina	MCI
12. Gerry P. Thompson	Mobility Canada
13. Vincent Majkowski/Bruce Armstrong	NARUC
14. JoAnne Sanford	NARUC
15. Beth O'Donnell	NCTA
16. Larry Krevor	Nextel Communications, Inc.
17. Ray Strassburger	Northern Telecom
18. Anna Miller	Omnipoint
19. Trent Boaldin	OPASTCO
20. Mark Golden	PCIA
21. Mike Bennett	SBC Communications, Inc.
22. Rikki Davis	Sprint Corp
23. Diane Little	Sprint SpectrumPCS
24. Richard Leroux	Stentor Resource Center
25. Ed Gould	Teleport
26. Gerry Rosenblatt	TIA
27. Paul Hart	USTA

Special Members (non-voting):

Susan Miller ATIS
Leo Mevel Industry Canada

B. Commission Employees

Marian Gordon, Designated Federal Official
Geraldine A. Matisse, Chief, Network Services Division (NSD), CCB
Erin Duffy, NSD, CCB
Jeannie Grimes, NSD, CCB
Andre Rausch, NSD, CCB
Linda Simms, NSD, CCB

III. Estimated Public Attendance: Approximately 38 members of the public attended the meeting as observers.

IV. Documents Introduced. Each member received the following handouts:

- (1) Agenda
- (2) Chief, CCB letter of March 23, 1998 to NANC, Re: National Standards for Number Pooling Report by 9/23/98
- (3) Chairman Hasselwander Proposal: Number Conservation Working Group
- (4) LNPA Working Group Status Report
- (5) Wireline/Wireless Integration Task Force Report
- (6) Industry Numbering Committee (INC)
- (7) Number Pooling Management Group (NPMG) Report
- (8) NANPA Working Group Status Report
- (9) Aging and Administration of Disconnected Telephone Numbers
- (10) Cost Recovery Working Group Report
- (11) NECA Billing and Collection Agent Report
- (12) NANC Abbreviated Dialing Ad Hoc Working Group Report
- (13) Where Have All the Numbers Gone: Long Term Area Code Relief Policies and the Need for Short-term Reform. Prepared by Economics and Technology, Inc.

V. Summary of the Meeting:

A. Welcoming Remarks. Alan Hasselwander, Chairman of the Council, provided welcoming remarks. He announced that Paul Hart will record decisions reached and action items in real time.

B. Proposal to Establish a Number Conservation Working Group. Chairman Hasselwander opened the discussion and read the March 23, 1998 letter from the Chief, Common Carrier Bureau. The letter requested the NANC to develop a report on number pooling within six months, and requested that the NANC work with state commissions on number pooling issues.

Chairman Hasselwander proposed the formation of new Working Group to work on number pooling and number conservation issues, with strong representation from: (1) NARUC; (2) the states who are working on number pooling and number conservation issues; (3) consumer groups; and (4) other numbering experts. He stated that the NANPA will need to support this effort. Chairman Hasselwander stated that, considering the time frame for the pooling report, the level of commitment for the group's members will need to be high, and the effort needed to produce the report will be significant.

Paul Hart, USTA, asked whether the new Working Group will respond to the March 23, 1998 letter from the Common Carrier Bureau. The Chairman stated that, like all other NANC Working Groups, the new group would make recommendations to NANC, and the NANC would make recommendations to the FCC. Paul stated that NANC needs to have a quantified statement and analysis describing the benefits of pooling at various levels. He stated that there has been discussion regarding how pooling will extend the life of the numbering resource, but that there has never been any clear understanding of what the benefits are going to be.

Chairman Hasselwander commented that one task the new Working Group would perform would be quantifying the benefits of pooling. He noted that the new Working Group may have to break into sub groups. Ron Binz, CPI, stated that he supports the proposal and added that number conservation, and pooling in particular, is probably the most important assignment the NANC faces. Due to the number crunch, public utilities commissions and the public are beginning to latch onto numbering as important. Ron stated that the states are looking for leadership from NANC.

Mark Golden, PCIA, stated that the Common Carrier Bureau letter places importance on number conservation. He stated that while there needs to be an approach for implementation of number pooling, there also needs to be assurance that all carriers have access to numbers throughout the process. Mark stated that short-term numbering resource needs cannot be ignored because of the focus on development of a long term solution. Mark stated that, with that understanding, PCIA can support the new Working Group. Chairman Hasselwander stated that number availability is an important issue, and that the existence of a competitive marketplace presumes that resources are available.

Joe Kingrey, Nortel, stated that vendors have concerns about number pooling, and specifically are concerned that technical and operational uniformity is not being addressed. He stated that the six-month time frame will help vendors in developing switch standards. Chairman Hasselwander agreed that vendors should participate in this process. He noted that there are

several other industry groups, including INC, that are working on the pooling issues and that it will be up to the new Working Group to coordinate all those efforts.

Vince Majkowski, NARUC, stated his support for the effort as proposed, with a few caveats. He noted that several states are facing exhaust and jeopardy situations and have real and immediate issues facing them. Vince stated that these states will not wait for this group or others to resolve number conservation issues. According to Vince, states are sensitive to the fact that they may have to modify their rules to conform to national standards for number pooling. Vince also stated that number conservation can be achieved through rate center consolidation, which frees up numbers for all parties. In Vince's view, the new group will need to assess rate center consolidation. Finally, Vince stated that he and JoAnne Sandford, NARUC, would get the Common Carrier Bureau letter to NARUC for distribution and discussion on the next NARUC conference call.

Chairman Hasselwander added that NANC is hoping for strong state participation in the new Working Group, and added that maybe one or more states will be the "laboratory" for NANC on number pooling and conservation. Chairman Hasselwander noted that the faster NANC moves pooling forward the less chance there will be for conflict and different standards. He stated that conservation includes pooling but is not limited to pooling.

Mike Bennett, SBC, stated that he agreed with Paul Hart's point. In Mike's view, number pooling is not a silver bullet, and rate center consolidation is another item to consider. Mike stated that number pooling, if implemented correctly, has the potential to delay NPA exhaust in some cases, but not all. It is Mike's position that a new Working Group could be useful, but that it should not supersede anything that INC is doing. Mike stated that the two things driving number exhaust are the number of new entrants and the rate center structure, and that he supports of anything that would prevent 10 or 15 different number pooling trials going on at once.

Peter Guggina, MCI, expressed concern about coordination between groups and the ability to meet the target date with so many groups and forums involved. Peter stated that setting up a "mission organization" to put all of the pooling work in one place would result in better control and less fragmentation. Chairman Hasselwander stated that NANC needs to be detailed and specific when it communicates its expectations to its Working Groups and other industry groups. He stated that delays arise when policy issues that should be debated at NANC are debated elsewhere. Paul Hart commented that a lot of work has been done in other forums and that work is a valuable resource. Paul reiterated that it would be helpful to get states actively involved early.

Peter Guggina asked whether the NANC wants to produce a study or an implementable report at the end of six months. Chairman Hasselwander stated that NANC does not yet know enough about what work is going on in the states. He commented that, for LNP, a great deal of work took place at the state level, which was then "tweaked" to develop national standards.

Vince Majkowski, NARUC, stated that currently Colorado is involved in addressing these issues, and that there are other states from which NANC can draw information to move this forward.

Dan Hochvert, Bell Atlantic, stated that conservation means to save numbers, but that the work needs to also focus on wise and efficient usage of numbers. Also, in Dan's view, the NANC should address cost recovery for number conservation even though it is not discussed in the Common Carrier Bureau letter. Dan commented that there needs to be a federal order resulting from NANC's ultimate recommendations on number pooling and number conservation. Chairman Hasselwander stated that the Cost Recovery Working Group is prepared to work cost recovery for number pooling. He reiterated the need for broad participation in the new Working Group, and noted that, although the number conservation issues are not yet as focused in Canada as they are in the United States, no one is excluded from the process and it would be good to have Canada's participation in the Working Group.

Anna Miller, Omnipoint, stated that coordination and consensus slow down the process. She stated that the purpose of NANC Working groups is to gather facts for the NANC to make decisions, which does not require consensus. Anna commented that the wireline LNP recommendation worked well because policy issues were brought to NANC.

Paul Hart questioned whether this new activity should be managed by the NANPA Working Group. Chairman Hasselwander opposed this suggestion, stating that, currently, the NANPA Working Group does not have broad industry representation, which has created difficulties. Chairman Hasselwander also stated that the group will probably continue after six months because of the necessity to address number conservation methods other than number pooling.

Mike Bennett commented that he would like to see a timeline for implementation of number pooling. He noted that state commissions are frustrated, and that participation by vendors and state regulators will be key to this work. In Mike's view, the new group should be a coordination group that considers policy issues for purposes of making recommendations to NANC. Chairman Hasselwander stated that there will be a Public Notice establishing the first meeting with a defined agenda. Woody Kerkeslager, AT&T, stated that the new group needs to escalate policy issues and interface quickly with NANC to move the process quickly. Woody added that it is important that the co-chairs of the new group be available for more than one meeting per month. In Woody's view, the new group does not necessarily need numbering experts *per se*, but rather managers who can identify issues and move the process forward. The new Working Group should be able to link to the LNP, NANPA and Cost Recovery working groups for quick answers in order to make the six-month schedule.

Richard Leroux, Stentor, stated that Stentor would support and participate in the new Working Group. Beth O'Donnell, NCTA, asked whether NANC would be willing to fund the travel to meetings of the new Working Group for NARUC members. Diane Little, Sprint PCS, commented that NANC should wait until Working Group members identify to NANC that they have a problem with travel expenses before committing to fund those travel expenses. Trent

Boaldin, OPASTCO, opposed any further funding assistance to NARUC members. Chairman Hasselwander stated that any funding by NANC members would be voluntary.

The Council agreed to establish the new NANC working group, and named it the Numbering Resource Optimization Working Group (NRO-WG). Trent Boaldin, OPASTCO, opposed the formation of the NRO-WG. Chairman Hasselwander summarized the discussion, stating that he would have a Public Notice released announcing the new Working Group and its agenda and seeking participation by NANC members, NARUC, state participants working on conservation issues, foreign entities, consumers, and manufacturers. Chairman Hasselwander stated that the new Working Group should have its first meeting prior to next NANC meeting, and that the Public Notice will have a short time frame for response. Broadly stated, the group will be charged with responding to the Common Carrier Bureau's March 23 letter. Chairman Hasselwander reiterated that participants should, at least initially, expect to attend more than one meeting per month. He stated that the group should have broad representation and will need to coordinate closely with other Working Groups and industry fora. Insofar as the group addresses number pooling, it may make incremental recommendations (1,000 number block pooling, individual telephone number pooling). [See NANC Meeting Minutes, October 21, 1997, for discussion regarding 1000s block pooling with migration to ITN pooling as a long term goal; and NANC letter of Nov. 5, 1997, to Chief, Common Carrier Bureau] One of the NRO Working Group's tasks will be to quantify the effects of pooling. Chairman Hasselwander stated that the NRO Working Group's initial meeting will be chaired by NANC members, with a clear agenda published before the first meeting. Three interim co-chairs were named for the organizational meeting to be held on April 16, 1998. They were Woody Kerkeslager, Mike Bennett and Beth O'Donnell. The broad mission statement for the NRO Working Group is that it is to create a report which is responsive to Common Carrier Bureau letter of March 23, 1998.

C. *Rate Center Issue.* Chairman Hasselwander opened the discussion and turned it over to Brian Foster, Chairman, Committee T1S1.6. Prior e-mails on this issue, in pertinent part, were read into the record:

Mike Bennett, SBC. As you know, once an end office determines that a dialed NXX is "ported," a database dip is done to see if the dialed number has been ported. If it has not, the call is routed normally. If the number has been ported, the database provides the LRN for the switch to which the call should be routed. Therefore, the LRN is to be used for routing purposes, not rating purposes. The rating should be based on the dialed NXX. It has recently come to my attention that some equipment vendors are designing their systems to use the LRN for rating purposes. This, in effect, would cause carriers to need an LRN for every rate center where they have customers. What this really means is the following — if carriers must request an LRN (which is an NXX) for every rate center, it appears that this would defeat the purpose of number pooling.

In response, Terry Appenzeller stated that he agreed that the LRN should not be used by switch vendors as a means of rating calls, and that the switch requirements document for LRN does not support such a use. Lucent and Nortel agree, but Siemens does not.

Brian commented that requiring a separate NPA-NXX for purposes of LRN assignment for each rate center would exacerbate the NPA-NXX exhaust issue. Committee T1S1.6 has recognized problem and is looking at solutions that do not require a separate NPA-NXX per rate center, per switch for purposes of LRN assignment. There are other mechanisms within switch software (besides LRN) that can be used for rating and routing. Chairman Hasselwander commented that NANC is interested in efficient utilization of numbers, and asked whether T1S1.6's objective is to develop a solution that does not waste numbers. Brian responded that they hoped to address that issue at their next meeting. Brian further stated that sometimes two LRNs are needed even for routing. Woody Kerkeslager stated that, if there is a type of switch with a problem, it affects all vendors and all switches. In Woody's view, NANC needs to articulate a policy of "no more than one LRN per switch" and let the industry work out the details. Peter Guggina asked whether anyone had spoken with Siemens to find out if they can change their system, noting that, if Woody's solution is impossible, they could end up stranding themselves. Gary Fleming, SBC, stated his support for Woody's suggestion, but added the caveat that what is necessary is one LRN per switch per LATA. Gary added that the discussion is getting into location portability, but the Commission's mandate is for service provider portability.

Brian indicated that it will take T1S1.6 a couple of months to resolve this issue. Chairman Hasselwander questioned whether their solution would be consistent with Woody's suggestion. Brian stated that Woody's suggestion may restrict some solutions from being considered. T1S1.6 is interested in conserving numbers. Woody Kerkeslager suggested that NANC convey its overriding desire to conserve numbers, and then ask T1S1.6 to come to NANC if there is a problem. Ted Noeker, GTE, stated that this approach would micro-manage the report, and that the appropriate solution should be effective from both a number usage and switch vendor standpoint. Gary Fleming added that the LRN equals the NPA-NXX; the four-digit line number may someday acquire significance, but it does not have it now. Woody stated that the current switch requirement in the Illinois specifications is a minimum of two per switch per LATA, but that there is no FCC requirement.

Chairman Hasselwander restated Woody's proposal. The NANC will request that no more than one LRN per switch per LATA be assigned. NANC will also request that, if T1S1.6 cannot meet the requirement, it will come back and explain its proposed alternative solution. These requests will be sent by letter to T1S1.6.

Brian indicated that T1S1.6 will work on its number pooling contributions by July, at the latest, but will take today's discussion into consideration in their current work. Brian stated that this issue should be clearly defined in the letter to Committee T1. It was suggested that a member from the T1S1.6 who would be in a position to adjust the time frame on number pooling work

should attend the April 16 NRO-WG organizational meeting. Jerry Peterson, Chairman of T1, will be invited to attend the meeting to discuss what they need resolved to move forward and how they can proceed.

D. LNPA Working Group Status Report. Bonnie Baca, Co-Chair, Technical and Operational Requirements Task Force, presented the report to the Council. The handouts included: (1) an action plan for items following up on the Commission's instructions in the *Second Report and Order*, FCC 97-289, CC Docket No. 95-116; (2) a NPAC system and center readiness revised schedule and Phase I and II LNP Implementation Schedule. Bonnie stated that Canada will be replacing its NPAC vendor, but there has been no final selection.

Pamela Connell provided an update from the LLCs. Petitions for extensions were filed with the Commission for Phase I and Phase II by carriers in the Atlanta, Los Angeles, Minneapolis and Houston MSAs. Pamela stated that, in the absence of a Commission ruling on cost recovery for LNP, the Western and West Coast LLCs have adopted interim cost formulas.

Bonnie stated that the T&O Task Force has begun initiating NPAC changes to accommodate 1,000 block number pooling. In addition to its regular meeting schedule, the Task Force has planned additional special meetings to address pooling. The Task Force is moving toward future enhancements to accommodate individual TN pooling. The next meeting will be held on April 15-16, in Washington, DC.

Bonnie stated that the T&O wireless and wireline integration activities include five change orders and NPAC system requirements to integrate wireless porting. They are: (1) reducing time frame for porting interval for wireless; (2) accommodating early activation of wireless ports; (3) extending NPAC business days and hours for wireless porting; (4) changing to service provider communication process to accommodate differences in wireless environment; and (5) providing NPAC changes to facilitate data needs for wireless short message service. Bonnie stated that future activities include refining and finalizing the NPAC system requirements, and packaging a special NPAC SMS release request to the LLCs.

The handout included a copy of the NANC LNP Dispute Resolution Process "Binder of Decisional Principles." This will be maintained by the LNPA Working Group and attached to the current dispute resolution guidelines. The LNPA Working Group High Volume Call-in Network recommendation of February 18, 1998 will be placed on Public Notice.

Wireline/Wireless Integration Task Force. Anne Cummins provided the report to the Council. Anne stated that some members of the WWITF believe the rate center disparity issue is still open and are waiting for the Commission to direct the LNPA Working Group. She stated that, at its March 18 meeting, the LNPA Working Group directed the WWITF to resume its work. Chairman Hasselwander stated that the Commission has been alerted to the policy questions associated with the rate center disparity issue.

Anne reported that agreements have been reached on porting intervals for wireline to wireline porting. The agreements are as follows: one day for firm order commitment (FOC) and three days for implementation of porting once FOC is received. Agreements have also been reached on porting intervals for wireless to wireless porting. The agreements are as follows: Thirty minutes for FOC and 2 hours for implementation of porting once FOC is received. Anne stated that there has been no work on porting intervals between wireline and wireless carriers. WWITF will hold a conference call on April 1 to complete their report to be provided to the LNPA Working Group on April 15.

Chairman Hasselwander stated that NANC will report to the Commission on wireline/wireless integration and that cost cannot be used as an excuse not to define how that integration will happen. If the costs of integration become an issue, the issue can be brought to NANC. There is plenty of room for minority opinions, he added. Anne stated that the draft report on wireless number portability will be available to NANC members after April 15. Anne stated that the report will not address porting to resellers due to time constraints. Paul Hart suggested that, if the WWITF is not going to address porting to resellers it needs to explain why. Anne stated that the WWITF would want clear direction from the NANC, considering the time frame. Chairman Hasselwander stated that, before direction can be provided, the NANC needs to understand the issue better. Ted Noeker stated that perhaps the basic assumption is that this is not an issue because resellers do not have facilities, therefore question of porting does not exist. Peter Guggina countered that if a reseller changed from one CLEC to another for a better rate, for instance, and ported its numbers in mass, there would be situations where porting by resellers could occur. Chairman Hasselwander terminated the discussion and asked Anne to provide more information on the reseller porting issue (either wireline or wireless) at the next meeting.

Chairman Hasselwander stated that, at the last meeting, the council agreed to send to the Commission a statement identifying the potential public policy issue resulting from the rate center disparity in wireline/wireless integration for LNP. The LNPA Working Group co-chairs reviewed the report on the rate center disparity issue and were asked to modify it to reflect the facts without advocating any positions so that it could be attached to a letter to the Common Carrier Bureau Chief. Some council members felt that simply attaching the report to a cover letter did not sufficiently explain the issue to the Common Carrier Bureau. The council agreed that a second letter describing the nature of the issue would be sent to provide additional clarity. Anna Miller agreed to provide additional language for the second letter. It was agreed that the letter would be posted via email for NANC members to review before being sent to the Common Carrier Bureau.

E. Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report. Jo Gallagher, INC Moderator, presented the status report on Issue 105, Number Pooling and discussed the results of the March 16-17 INC LNPA Workshop meeting. Key agreements reached included: (1) number pooling issues list identifying 47 number issues that need to be addressed in the 1000 block pooling guidelines; (2) reaffirmation of July 1998 NANC meeting as target for completion of 1000 block number pooling assignment guidelines; (3) identification of September 18, 1998 as target date for completion of

modifications to existing INC assignment guidelines (as a result of 1000 block number pooling); (4) identification of target date of January 1999 for INC selection of individual TN number pooling alternative. Jo stated that no date has been established for development of ITN assignment guidelines.

Discussion: Peter Guggina, MCI, asked how a path forward to ITN pooling can be ensured. Jo stated that it is the objective of all INC participants to implement 1000 block pooling in a way that will not interfere with migration to ITN pooling. Peter stated that he would like INC to explain the path forward. Jo stated that the NANC would need to be very specific with any instructions to INC on this subject. Due to time constraints, the council agreed to table and discuss at another meeting the issue of assurance that 1000 block pooling will not preclude ITN.

INC Issue 111. Jo stated that NANC had requested and received from INC identification of policy issues and ambiguities in the CO Code, NPA and CIC assignment guidelines, and that the NANC reviewed and provided direction to INC on policy matters for the CO code and NPA guidelines. Jo stated that there has been INC agreement on modifications to CO code and NPA guidelines based on the NANC input. The issue has moved to initial closure and final closure is scheduled for April 1998. Finally, Jo stated that modifications to the CIC assignment guidelines remain open pending a ruling by the Commission.

Audit Framework. Jo stated that the NANPA Working Group is working on an audit framework. When that framework is finalized, Jo stated, the INC will incorporate it into any existing INC guidelines as necessary and appropriate.

F. *The Number Pooling Management Group (NPMG) Status Report.* Cathy Handley, INC Co-Chair, provided the report to the Council. The NPMG provided a draft letter to George Edwards, ATIS, discussing NANC concerns regarding the implementation of number pooling and the work ongoing in ATIS-sponsored forums and committees. Specifically, the letter discussed technical requirements for switches to support number pooling, SCP and STP/SS7 technical requirements, enhancements to the network rating and routing systems (LERG), evaluation of the impact on emergency services, and assessment of the impact on operational support systems. There was discussion about whether the letter should be edited, or if it should be sent at all, given the March 23, 1998 Common Carrier Bureau letter and the formation of the NRO Working Group. Chairman Hasselwander proposed that he send a letter to ATIS discussing the Common Carrier Bureau letter, the new Working Group, and the time frames within which the new group will work. The letter would also invite ATIS to have its staff participate in the NRO Working Group and would identify some issues that the NANC has recognized need to be worked somewhere else. Chairman Hasselwander stated that he would revise the NPMG draft letter accordingly and send it to the NANC members electronically for review.

Cathy reported that the NPMG strongly recommends that LNPA Working Group participants familiar with the T&O number pooling activities attend the INC LNPA Workshop meetings to help ensure progress in both groups and timely resolution of issues.

G. NANPA Working Group Status Report. Mark Welch, Co-Chair of the NANPA Working Group, provided the report to the Council. Mark reviewed the completed work items as follows:

Binder of Decisional Principles. Mark stated that the NANPA Working Group has developed an initial index for the binder of decisional principles. The Working Group agreed that the NANC should request input from additional entities such as NARUC, the Common Carrier Bureau, and other NANP member nations for additional index references. The NANPA Working Group further recommends that these entities provide index updates to the NANPA. Mark stated that the NANPA has volunteered to coordinate future updates and revisions to the index. The NANPA binder will be placed on the Commission's NANC web site.

Aging and Administration of Disconnected Telephone Numbers. Mark presented the NANPA Working Group's document on aging and administration of disconnected telephone numbers, stating that the Working Group recommends that the NANC concur with the contents of the document and forward the document to INC so that INC can incorporate the contents into industry guidelines as appropriate. Chairman Hasselwander stated that, due to time constraints, the council would address the document at the next meeting.

Recommendation for a Pooling Administrator. Mark reported that NANPA Working Group asked the Legal Expertise Working Group whether there is a legal requirement for the NANPA Working Group to have a competitive bidding process for selection of the 1000 block pooling administrator. It is the position of the NANPA Working Group that the work required for 1000 block number pooling is an extension of the NANPA requirements, and is a CO Code administration function. The NANPA Working Group recommends that Lockheed Martin, as NANPA, perform the number pooling administrator function. Further discussion on this issue was tabled until the next NANC meeting. The NANPA Working Group will provide an overview of the requirements for 1000 block pooling

COCUS. Chairman Hasselwander stated that, at the last NANC meeting, he was directed to refer the COCUS issue to INC, but he did not because he felt the issue was not ready for referral. The NANPA and the NANPA Working Group are to discuss what information is needed for COCUS-type reports to identify when exhaust may occur. There are questions regarding how often the data should be collected, how to turn the raw data into good, usable information, and how to enforce COCUS participation. Chairman Haselwander stated that these are questions that NANC needs to answer before sending this issue to INC.

H. Cost Recovery Working Group Report. John Banuelos, Co-Chair, provided the report to the Council. John stated that NANPA has been paid and in addition, \$1.52 million has been collected. John reported that an issue surfaced concerning whether or not aggregators (pay phone service providers) were required to make contributions to the NANPA; they are not required to do so at this time.

John stated that an ongoing issue for the Cost Recovery Working Group is the collection of international payments. Alfred Oyog of Cable & Wireless (C&W) has gathered a payment that represents C&W's contribution for NANPA services in Bermuda and Caribbean nations, with the exception of the Dominican Republic. There is still discussion on some outstanding issues regarding the amounts that the Dominican Republic and the Bahamas must contribute to the NANPA. John reported that the nations are still confused by this issue and have invited Ron Conners to speak at the June meeting of CANTO, the Caribbean Association of National Telecommunication Organizations. John stated that there is still clarification that needs to be provided because the nations are not sure what portion of the NANPA they really use and should be paying for. The Canadian Steering Council on Numbering (CSCN) has deferred a presentation by Ron Conners, suggesting that NEWCO, a company soon to be formed in Canada, will be the appropriate company to discuss the Canadian payment with NANPA.

John reported that the organizational meeting of the NBANC Board of Directors will be convened on April 22nd.

Vincent Majkowski, NARUC, asked whether the Cost Recovery Working Group has been looking into the question of who will pay the number pooling administrator, and whether, if it is NECA, the requirements for the B&C Agent are changed. John stated that the Working Group has not examined the question yet.

NECA Report. Robert Haga, NECA, provided an update and handout to the Council on the work completed since the last NANC meeting. NECA is still reviewing the forms that came in with the payments and will contact those carriers who have not reported. The NBANC Board members were notified by mail of the date and time for their first meeting. NECA is beginning to work process issues for the 1999 billing and collection. It has provided a draft collection form to the Working Group and to the Commission for review, and should have approval by July 1998.

I. Abbreviated Dialing Ad Hoc Working Group Report. Peter Guggina, Co-chair, provided the report and handout to the Council. The Co-chairs developed a proposed work plan which was circulated in advance of the first conference call meeting on March 18. Several issues were identified on the conference call, including the following: (1) whether vertical service codes (VSCs) are abbreviated dialing codes; (2) how much in the dialing, call processing and routing structure the industry is willing to support and recommend. The Working Group recognized the need to involve equipment vendors. Peter announced that a face-to-face meeting will be held in Dallas on April 7-8, and that a follow-up meeting is scheduled for May 5-6. The Working Group will deliver a report and recommendation by May 11 to the NANC.

J. Other Business. The Steering Group will meet on March 24, 1998, at the MCI building, 1133 19th Street, NW, from 8:00 - 12 noon.

VI. Statement of Action Items and Decisions reached.

1. In response to the directive of the Chief, Common Carrier Bureau of March 23, 1998, the NANC will form a new working group called the Numbering Resource Optimization Working Group. There will be a Public Notice announcing the formation of the new Working Group and requesting broad participation from NANC, state interests, NARUC, equipment manufacturers (hardware & software), all industry segments, international, consumers, and NANPA. The first organizational meeting will be held on April 16, 1998. The new group may require more than one meeting per month. Participants should: have managerial talent; focus on policy issues; manage/coordinate with other NANC working groups and other industry fora; consider number conservation methods other than pooling; quantify benefits of pooling; protect path from 1000 block to individual TN pooling. The initial meeting will be chaired by NANC members.

Mission Baseline: (1) Create a report which is responsive to Common Carrier Bureau letter of March 23, 1998 for action by September 23, 1998. The NANC report will be sufficiently detailed to support, both technically and operationally, a uniform, nationwide system for pooling by December 1999; (2) Identify and recommend alternatives for optimizing number utilization including issues of number availability.

2. NANC requests that no more than one LRN per switch per LATA be assigned. If T1S1.6 cannot meet the requirement, they will explain why to NANC and present solutions. The NANC will request that Gerry Peterson attend the first organizational meeting of the NRO Working Group.
3. LNPA Working Group High-Volume Call-In Network Report presented at the February 18, 1998 NANC meeting will be placed on Public Notice.
4. NANC reasserted ultimate goal of ITN pooling. NANC tabled until a later meeting the discussion of how to provide assurance that 1000 block pooling will not preclude future ITN pooling.
5. NANC Chairman will send a letter to George Edwards, ATIS. The NANC letter will discuss the Common Carrier Bureau's March 23, 1998 letter, indicate that action is required, and invite ATIS staff to participate in the new Working Group. The letter will be emailed for NANC review prior to forwarding to ATIS.
6. NANC Chairman will send an additional letter to the Common Carrier Bureau characterizing the open public policy issue in the WWITF (the rate center disparity issue).
The NANC Chairman will post the letter on e-mail for review by NANC members.
7. NANC requested further information from the NANPA Working Group before the next meeting regarding additional requirements for 1000 block pooling.

8. The NANPA Working Group will work with the NANPA to answer questions before the COCUS issue is forwarded to INC, i.e., what information is needed and how often. NANC will discuss the NANPA Working Group document on aging/administration of disconnected telephone numbers at its next meeting.