

**North American Numbering Council**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
November 18-19, 1998

---

**I. Time, Date and Place of Meeting:** The North American Numbering Council held a meeting, commencing at 8:30 a.m., at the Wyndam Washington Hotel, 1400 M Street, NW, Washington, DC.

**II. List of Attendees:**

A. Council Members

Voting Members

1. Emily Williams
2. David Konczal
3. Edmund Gould/Shawn Murphy
4. Dan Hochvert
5. Paul Kenefick
6. Ronald Binz
7. Carol Ann Bishop
8. Lori Messing
9. Alan Hasselwander
10. Bernard Harris
11. Peter Guggina
12. Gerry Thompson
13. Vincent Majkowski/Bruce Armstrong
14. Erin Duffy
15. David Rolka
16. Beth O'Donnell
17. Larry Krevor
18. Dan Gonzalez
19. Ray Strassburger
20. Jerry O'Brien
21. John Rose
22. Cathy Handley
23. Bill Adair
24. Hoke Knox
25. Jonathon Chambers/Scott Ludwikowski
26. Jacques Sarrazin
27. Stephanie Montgomery
28. Paul Hart

Organization

- ALTS  
American Mobile Satellite  
AT&T Corp.  
Bell Atlantic  
Cable & Wireless, Inc.  
Competition Policy Institute  
CompTel  
CTIA  
Frontier  
GTE  
MCI WorldCom  
Mobility Canada  
NARUC  
NARUC  
NARUC  
NCTA  
Nextel Communications, Inc.  
NEXTLINK  
NorTel Networks  
Omnipoint  
OPASTCO  
PCIA  
SBC Communications, Inc.  
Sprint Corp  
Sprint SpectrumPCS  
Stentor Resource Center  
TIA  
USTA

Special Members (non-voting):

- John Manning           ATIS  
Leo Mevel               Industry Canada

B. Commission Employees

Kris Monteith, Designated Federal Official  
Jeannie Grimes, NSD, CCB  
Linda Simms, NSD, CCB  
Jared Carlson, NSD, CCB  
Gayle Teicher, NSD, CCB  
Patrick Forster, NSD, CCB

**III. Estimated Public Attendance:** Approximately 62 members of the public attended the meeting as observers.

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

- (1) October 20-21, 1998 Meeting Minutes (Draft)
- (2) LNPA Working Group Report
- (3) Wireless Number Portability Subcommittee Update
- (4) NPAC System and Center Readiness for Wireless Number Portability
- (5) LNPA WG Status Report to NANC
- (6) Issue Matrix for COCUS LINUS
- (7) Reserved Telephone Number Contributions from AT&T, MCI WorldCom and SBC
- (8) NANPA Fund Performance Report
- (9) Cost Recovery Working Group Report
- (10) NANPA Lockheed Martin Summary of Positions
- (11) INC Report on Issue 105, Number Pooling
- (12) NANPA Oversight Working Group Report and Matrix
- (13) NRO Working Group Report
- (14) Statement of Mitretek Systems
- (15) System Beta Presentation by Dr. Richard Levine

**V. Summary of the Meeting:**

**A. Welcoming Remarks.** Alan Hasselwander, Chairman of the Council, provided welcoming remarks.

**B. Approval of Meeting Minutes.** The October 20-21, 1998, meeting minutes were approved with an amendment to the list of NANC members in attendance to reflect that Elizabeth McJimsey represents Sprint SpectrumPCS, not Sprint Corp.

**C. LNPA Working Group Report.** Paula Jordan and Tom Sweeney, Co-Chairs of the LNPA WG, provided the reports in accordance with the handouts provided to the NANC members. Ms. Jordan reported on key issues before the Wireless Number Portability Subcommittee (WNPSC). Ms. Jordan reported that the group reviewed and defined the wireless

testing requirements and completed a matrix of dates for NPAC System and Center Readiness for Wireless Number Portability. Ms. Jordan reported on an action item adopted by the NANC at its October 1998 meeting. In response to that action item, the WNPSC agreed to request that CTIA and PCIA issue letters requesting more participation by wireless providers at WWISC, WNPSC, and the regional LNP operations meetings.

Ms. Jordan reported that the WNPSC also discussed a proposal to permit resellers, including non-facilities based resellers, to interface directly with the NPAC. No agreement was reached, however. WNPSC participants will go to individual companies for guidance and the issue will be discussed at the WNPSC December meeting, including the question of whether to take the issue up to the LNPA working group. A discussion ensued as to whether issue will die at the WNPSC if no agreement is reached.

Ms. Jordan further reported that the WNPSC had discussed whether to eliminate the LSR process for wireless providers, (name, address, and phone number). Ms. Jordan stated that the WNPSC wants to refer to the WWISC for consideration a proposal to examine the benefits to wireline and wireless carriers of simplifying the LSR process. Ms. Jordan further stated that the WNPSC wants to send the issue to the LNPA working group and to cooperate with the wireline industry.

Ms. Jordan further reported on the issue of coordinating E911 systems when a wireless customers ports and service has not been completed. The WNPSC believes that an individual company should decide as a business matter when to activate a wireless customer before work is completed at the other end. Vince Majkowski, NARUC, noted that state rules would apply and that carriers must follow the rules of the state. A discussion ensued.

Ms. Jordan agreed with Mr. Majkowski's view. Jerry O'Brien, Omnipoint, asked whether the WNPSC had addressed the issue of TTYs, noting that wireline and wireless carriers must provide access for TTY users. Ms. Jordan noted that the group had not addressed the issue but agreed to bring the issue back to the WNPSC for consideration at its next meeting.

Ms. Jordan also reported on the Wireless Wireline Integration Subcommittee (WWISC) request for an extension of the deadline for the second draft of the Wireless Wireline Integration Report beyond December 31, 1998. Ms. Jordan reported that a meeting is scheduled for week of December 7 regarding wireline wireless porting as a result of the NANC action item. The WWISC still must reach a determination as to how much of an extension is needed to allow for the completion of the report. Ms. Jordan noted that the sense of the NANC had been communicated that the December 31, 1998 due date should be met.

Ms. Jordan noted that the two co-chairs of the WWISC are stepping down. Because no replacements had been nominated, the WWISC agreed that the work of the subcommittee should be moved to the LNPA Working Group. Chairman Hasselwander asked about the effect of moving the work to the LNPA Working Group. Ms. Jordan responded that from a practical standpoint, the impact would be minimal because the groups consist of the same individuals.

Tom Sweeney gave the LNPA Working Group Status Report to the NANC. He reported

on the National Number Pooling Subcommittee status. Mr. Sweeney noted that the subcommittee is on schedule for a December 28 delivery date. Mr. Sweeney reported that Release 2.0 (including wireless) change orders had been incorporated into the functional requirements and interstate specifications and that the final function requirements specifications and interface interop specifications walk-through was scheduled for November 20.

Mr. Sweeney also reported on the statement of work process. That process will begin on January 2 after the December 28 delivery of the requirements specifications. Mr. Sweeney also stated that a new quality assurance measure will be introduced following the statement of work approval.

Ed Gould, AT&T, asked how long the Subcommittee estimated that the statement of work process would take. Mr. Sweeney estimated 2-3 months, based on past history.

Mr. Sweeney also reported on NPAC Release 2.0. He noted that Release 2.0 includes the wireless change orders NANC 201, 202, and 203. He also noted that Lockheed Martin had provided the project plan to the LLCs on November 5 and that the Release should be ready for testing by mid-June 1999.

Finally, Mr. Sweeney reported on the "slow horse" issue. Mr. Sweeney stated that the LNPA WG currently is brainstorming short-term solutions to "slow horse" problems, in light of service provider reports of prolonged porting intervals caused by "dead horses." Mr. Sweeney reported that ports that should take less than a few hours are, in some cases, taking days. A discussion ensued regarding the need for a short term and long term fix. Mr. Sweeney noted that the subcommittee was working to arrive at a short-term fix as soon as possible and hoped to have agreed to a long-term **solution** in January.

***D. NANC's Role Under Paragraph 41 of CC Docket No. 95-116, In the Matter of Telephone Number Portability.*** NANC's role under paragraph 41 of CC Docket No. 95-116, *Telephone Number Portability, Second Memorandum Opinion and Order on Reconsideration*, concerning issues relating to number portability for 500 and 900 numbers was discussed. Chairman Hasselwander read paragraph 41 into the record. He noted that the NANC needs to decide where to assign the task of examining the questions posed by the FCC in its order. He noted that John Manning, ATIS, had indicated that INC was willing to take on the issues if NANC determined to delegate them to the INC. Jerry O'Brien, Omnipoint, noted that AT&T was conducting a test of 500 numbers nationwide. Paul Hart, USTA, noted that since INC has worked the issue, in all likelihood, INC has considerable useful information already before it. Mr. Hart recommended that the questions be referred to INC for work.

Peter Guggina, MCI WorldCom, opined that INC does not have adequate cross-representation from industry; in particular, CLECs, are not well represented. If more CLEC participation is not achieved, Mr. Guggina stated that the project should be worked elsewhere. Paul Hart, USTA, asked where the work might be performed. Dan Hochvert, Bell Atlantic, agreed that CLEC participation is an issue within INC but noted that AT&T, MCI, and GTE participate in INC with multiple roles. He suggested that INC be asked to break the task into a form that would facilitate participation by subject matter experts from different companies. He

also suggested that INC provide a project plan for this activity at the December NANC meeting.

Chairman Hasselwander asked the INC representatives to discuss INC's current workload and its ability to handle the work. Jo Gallagher, Bell Atlantic, noted that, during a recent conference call, INC members had agreed that they could undertake the work within the time frame set by the FCC. She suggested scheduling meetings around NANC meetings to save resources.

Chairman Hasselwander asked about ideas to increase CLEC participation, noting that members of industry should send representatives to whatever group is chosen to work the issue. He noted similar problems in other industry fora where participation drops over time. He suggested CLEC associations commit to send representatives to the INC meetings to participate on this issue.

The issue of the cost of participating in the INC was discussed. John Manning, ATIS, noted that a variety of ways to participate in the INC processes are available. Although INC must recover some of its costs through dues, Mr. Manning indicated that he did not believe that the inability to pay dues should be a bar to participation. Peter Guggina, MCI Worldcom, noted that he talked to CLECs about the issue of limited resources and that smaller entities do not have the resources to devote to participation in the various industry fora. Moreover, Mr. Guggina noted that, in MCI WorldCom's experience, frequently not much of an agenda can be advanced because of the make up of the INC and lack of CLEC participation. Dan Gonzalez, NEXTLINK, stated that the resource issue was a significant one, particularly the question of where to put limited resources. He suggested that a separate forum be established to consider the 500 and 900 number portability issue delegated by the FCC, aside from other INC activities. Paul Hart, USTA, suggested that INC provide the NANC with a plan for managing the work, that also would address these issues of cost and participation. Mr. Hart also suggested that the FCC issue a public notice to announce the assignment of this work to the INC and to encourage wider participation by interested parties.

Jerry O'Brien, Omnipoint, suggested that any INC report on this issue should move forward without a consensus, because it may be difficult, at best, to achieve the desired cross-representation and consensus. Beth O'Donnell, NCTA, asked whether companies could participate to work on this issue only without paying dues to INC. John Manning, ATIS, again stated that the INC funding mechanism should not be a bar to participation; all contributions are accepted and INC would work with individual companies on the dues issue, if necessary. Mr. Manning also noted that if a company cannot participate "in person," they can monitor the work through INC's web site and through email communications.

Chairman Hasselwander asked for a discussion of the following proposal: whether the matter delegated by the FCC should be referred to the INC; whether to ask INC to come back with a project plan for NANC's consideration at its December meeting, with part of INC's plan to address the question of how to increase participation and obtain the desired cross-representation in the INC; whether a final report should be due to the NANC at least two months before the date on which the report is due to the FCC; and, whether the INC should be asked to make monthly reports to the NANC on its progress, and should be asked to refer policy issues to the NANC for

resolution as the issues arise.

Peter Guggina, MCI WorldCom, again suggested that individuals be able to attend "virtually" and suggested that the INC dues are a barrier to wider participation. He suggested that Internet web discussions may be better way of accomplishing the work than requiring face-to-face meetings, some of which are scheduled in far away sites that could be costly to attend. Beth O'Donnell, NCTA, asked whether the INC dues were \$13,000 annually. John Manning, ATIS, stated that the 1999 funding had not been finalized and that companies should participate regardless of the dues. Jo Gallagher, Bell Atlantic, added that as of January 1999, all contributions will be posted to ATIS web site as well as the all "working documents." She asked that the NANC not tie INC's hands by requiring it to accomplish its work in a particular way. Cathy Handley, PCIA, added she understands that attendance is a problem, and suggested letting INC put together a work plan, which would address the issue of participation, for presentation to the NANC at its December meeting. Jo Gallagher, Bell Atlantic, stated that the INC would provide a work plan at the next meeting. Bernard Harris, GTE, added his support for the use of new technology as a means of achieving the desired participation, but noted that even that form of participation can be costly. He also noted that INC incurs costs in maintaining its web site and in allowing for participation through the internet. Mr. Harris also noted that INC allows for minority reports, which are encouraged if parties are unable to achieve consensus.

Chairman Hasselwander proposed that NANC approve tentatively the delegation of work to the INC, ask the INC to report back with a project plan at NANC's December meeting and address the process going forward, including methods to optimize participation, for example, by remote participation. Chairman Hasselwander stated that the INC should give the NANC a final report at least two months before the date on which the report is due to the FCC. He asked whether the FCC should issue a public notice about this issue.

Peter Guggina, MCI WorldCom, suggested that the INC may not be the right forum to address the 500/900 number portability issue and that the Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF) may be a better place for the issue to be worked because of OBF's prior experience with the toll free database. He noted that OBF's participation includes systems-oriented people, rather than numbering people, and that this issue appears to be as much a systems and architecture issue as a numbering issue. He noted that the CLECs participate extensively in the OBF forum.

John Manning, ATIS, that there were other organizations or groups under the ATIS umbrella that should be involved in this work and that he would ensure that this issue is coordinated with those other ATIS groups. Mr. Manning agreed that the project plan would address this issue, as well as those already noted. In response to questions, Kris Monteith, the Designated Federal Official (DFO) to the NANC, noted NANC is not required by the FCC order to delegate the 500/900 number portability issue to the INC, nor is it limited to delegating the work only to the INC.

Consensus was reached that a letter should be sent to INC requesting its assistance in accordance with the discussion held, as memorialized by Paul Hart, USTA. The NANC tentatively assigned the issue addressed in paragraph 41 of the FCC's order to INC, which will report to the NANC in December on the following: (1) a project plan; (2) methods to improve

participation at INC meetings; (3) optimization of options for off-site participation (e.g., virtual participation, conference calls); (4) how the INC will interact with and draw on other groups for support, including groups within ATIS; (5) completing its work at least two months prior to the date on which the NANC must report to the FCC (date to be determined based publication date in the Federal Register); and, (6) providing regular monthly reports to the NANC and referring policy disputes promptly as they develop. The NANC also may ask that the FCC publicize this activity through a public notice.

Chairman Hasselwander agreed to send a letter to the INC Moderator incorporating the NANC agreements outlined above.

**E. *NRO Working Group (NRO WG) Report.*** Chairman Hasselwander thanked Eleanor Willis and Dan Gonos, Winstar, for their considerable work on the NRO WG Report. Chairman Hasselwander stated that they had worked very hard to get the final document out and had encountered difficulty because of the multitude of formats used on various portions of the report.

Mike Whaley, US WEST, provided a report on the NRO meeting held on Monday, November 16 and 17, reviewed the NRO meeting schedule, discussed the reservation document and reviewed the agreements reached. Mr. Whaley reported that the NRO WG has agreed that the quantity and length of time telephone numbers may be held in reserved status should be limited, and outlined the NRO WG's work plan, and its objectives, including the identification of existing documents on this issue and other groups whose work is related to it.

Discussion was held on the issue of the April 1999 target date for a final report to the NANC on the issue of reserved telephone numbers. Mr. Whaley agreed and stated that the NRO WG would try to expedite consideration of that issue. In response to a question from Chairman Hasselwander on the issue of when the NRO WG expected to complete its work on the COCUS/LINUS issue, Mr. Whaley indicated that the NRO WG would have a target date of completion for NANC's consideration at its December meeting.

The NRO WG requested direction from the NANC as to whether it should address issues that are a part of the FCC's comment cycle on the NANC's NRO Report. Mr. Whaley explained that some companies feel the report is incomplete, while others say that it is final. Beth O'Donnell, NCTA, echoed these concerns. Kris Monteith, FCC, stated that the Common Carrier Bureau views the Report delivered in October as final and that the NRO WG should not address issues that are covered by the FCC's Public Notice on the Numbering Resource Optimization Report. Ms. Monteith added, however, that the FCC is comfortable with the NANC asking for future work from the NRO WG, so long as it is an efficient use of the working group's time.

Peter Guggina asked whether the NRO WG could continue addressing unassigned number porting (UNP), given that the Report did not go into great detail on this particular number optimization measure. Chairman Hasselwander stated that he believed that the answer to that question hinges on the level of analysis, and that he would be willing to accept further work on UNP if the question being answered is how UNP should be implemented if it is ordered. He would not agree that the NRO WG should be asked at this point to address the question of whether UNP should be implemented. Ms. Monteith stated that the high level policy issue of whether UNP

should be implemented is the type of question on which comment is sought through the FCC's Public Notice. Ms. Monteith also noted that the comment cycle on the NANC NRO Report was fast approaching, with comments due on December 21.

The NANC then discussed the second question posed by the NRO WG, that is, whether the NRO WG should address issues not specifically assigned it by the NANC, including additional issues addressed in the Report. General agreement was reached that the NANC directs the working groups, and that the NRO WG should only work issues that have been assigned it by the NANC.

Chairman Hasselwander then asked about the issue of whether the NRO WG's task forces should be disbanded. He stated that he would be disinclined to do so, without knowing what would be asked of the NANC and the NRO WG over the course of the next few months. Mr. Whaley stated that, currently, there was little need for the task forces, and that they could always be reconstituted. Consensus was reached that there was no further need for the task forces at the present time. At the suggestion of Vince Majkowski, NARUC, Chairman Hasselwander requested that all former task force members be invited to be a part of the NRO WG.

**F. NBANC Report.** Vince Majkowski, NARUC, provided the update on NBANC's activities to the Council. Mr. Majkowski reported that NBANC had approved the audit proposal and NBANC Board established an audit committee. Chairman Hasselwander stated that NANC needs to approve the form and substance of the audit.

John Ricker, NECA, reported that the collection factor has been approved and that currently, there is a surplus of \$800,000, half of which will be returned to the fund. Mr. Ricker reported that there are still a few non-compliant carriers. Mr. Ricker reported that the 1999 funding requirement consists of \$4.2 million with a total fund size of \$4.58 million. Approximately, \$4.43 million will be recovered from domestic carriers. Mr. Ricker also reported that the current contribution factor represents a 10% reduction from the 1998 factor. He also reported that the total amount due from non-compliant carriers is less than \$20,000.

Peter Guggina, MCI WorldCom, asked whether NBANC could credit carriers who pay their required contribution in a lump sum the interest. Mr. Ricker noted that interest income has been calculated on the fund, and is not carrier-specific. Mr. Majkowski noted that this issue has not been addressed by the Board. He will raise the issue at the January meeting as an agenda item and report back to NANC.

Anne La Lena, MCI WorldCom, asked why only one-half of the \$800,000 surplus is being returned to the fund. Mr. Ricker explained that the NBANC is changing processes for next year and that it has no history for billing and collection. As a result, NBANC will retain \$400,000 as a safety factor in year one. Ms. La Lena asked whether NBANC's only "cushion" was the \$400,000. Mr. Ricker responded affirmatively.

Ms. La Lena then asked whether NECA would extend a line of credit to NBANC. Mr. Majkowski reported that although NECA committed to extending a line of credit to NBANC, the FCC later determined that the line of credit posed legal difficulties. Nonetheless, Mr. Majkowski



stated that NBANC had kept the commitment on NECA to keep a line of credit, if legally possible.

Mr. Ricker reported that NECA expects to receive the Canadian contribution by the end of the year and that due to internal administration changes in staffing, the Dominican Republic contribution check awaiting signature. Finally, Mr. Ricker stated that 1997 reported revenues were used to determine the 1999 contribution factor, and that the growth in revenues was considered in calculating the 1999 contribution factor.

**G. *Central Office Code Utilization Survey (COCUS) and Proposed Line Number Utilization Survey (LINUS).*** Karen Mulberry, MCI WorldCom, reported on this issue. Ms. Mulberry reviewed the Issue Matrix that had been developed, which addresses the following issues: code holder obligation, FCC role, state's role, reseller role, NANPA role, data collection enforcement, auditing, confidentiality, and industry guidelines. Agreement was reached that the issue of enforcement of the data collection is the key issue. Chairman Hasselwander reported that the NANC had already agreed that an FCC rule was needed, that an enforcement mechanism must be in place, that sanctions must be imposed for non-compliance and that the withholding of additional resources was the appropriate sanction.

A discussion ensued on the question of which entity is the "code holder" in the reseller situation. Bill Adair, SBC, stated that the obligation to provide data must be on the code holder and that resellers should provide forecast information to the code holder. Paul Hart, USTA noted

the reseller.

Dan Hochvert, Bell Atlantic, noted agreement that the NANC would recommend an FCC rule empowering the NANPA to withhold resources as a sanction for the failure to report forecast information. Paul Hart, USTA, noted consensus on the need for an FCC rule and the sanction of withholding resources for the failure to report data. Beth O'Donnell, NCTA, questioned whether guidelines are binding. Chairman Hasselwander indicated that an FCC rule would be binding.

Chairman Hasselwander then raised the issue of audits of company forecasts. Bernie Harris, GTE, noted that the NANPA should be audited. Chairman Hasselwander stated that the latter issue already is covered in the Requirements Document.

Chairman Hasselwander noted no disagreement on the issue of company-specific audits. The question then becomes the state's role and the confidentiality of the data. Bruce Armstrong, NARUC, remarked that the states will need this information and should be allowed to obtain it provided confidentiality agreements are in place.

A discussion followed on how to maintain the confidentiality of the data. Jerry O'Brien, Omnipoint, expressed the view that only aggregate data should be shared with state regulators. Cathy Handley, PCIA, indicated that carrier-specific data provided to states has been disclosed, despite the existence of confidentiality agreements. Peter Guggina, MCI WorldCom, indicated support for providing carrier-specific information to the states. Vince Majkowski, NARUC, stated that the NARUC position has not changed, with respect to the confidentiality of the information.

Ed Gould, AT&T, raised the question of whether the FCC or the states would have enforcement authority. Mr. Majkowski indicated that, in NARUC's view, the FCC rules would give the NANPA the authority to withhold resources, but the states would have the appropriate enforcement authority. Cathy Handley, PCIA, stated that non-disclosure agreements would need to be signed and question what remedy would be provided in the case of an accidental disclosure of information. Mr. Majkowski indicated that the question had not been addressed. Bruce Armstrong, NARUC, indicated violations of any confidentiality agreement would be redressed in court.

Larry Krevor, Nextel, suggested further discussion on where the data should be provided, and to whom. Mr. Krevor suggested that aggregate data should be provided to the states at any time. Individualized data, on the other hand, should be provided only in a code jeopardy situation, with proper confidentiality safeguards in place. Bruce Armstrong, NARUC, indicated that the states needs access to carrier-specific information in non-jeopardy situations.

Chairman Hasselwander noted agreement that the states should have access to aggregated data at any time and that states with confidentiality agreements should have access to carrier-specific data during jeopardy situations. Chairman Hasselwander asked whether the NANC could go a step further and support providing carrier-specific information to those states that have confidentiality provisions in place, with notification going to the carrier that the information will be provided to the states.

Following further discussion, the NANC agreed that it should recommend that: the FCC adopt rules requiring carriers to provide information to the NANPA; that the enforcement of that requirement should lie with the FCC; that if NANPA takes action, withholding numbering resources, for the failure to provide information as required by FCC rules, appeals should lie with the FCC; and that the FCC can delegate authority to the states. Chairman Hasselwander asked whether the NRO WG has sufficient direction to do its job. Beth O'Donnell, NCTA, asked whether the NRO WG is being asked to write rules. Peter Guggina, MCI WorldCom, and Chairman Hasselwander replied that the NRO WG is not being asked to write rules but, rather, to develop a document that sets forth the specifics of the NANC's recommendation. Mike Whaley, US WEST, suggested that the NRO WG develop a plan on how to move forward for NANC's review at its next meeting. Chairman Hasselwander agreed. Chairman Hasselwander also indicated that the NRO WG should focus on completing the work on the COCUS/LINUS as quickly as possible.

**H. Definition of Reserved Telephone Number.** Shawn Murphy, AT&T, reviewed the contributions by AT&T and Bell Atlantic. AT&T and Bell Atlantic are proposing four criteria that would help the identification of reserved telephone numbers. Mr. Murphy reported that the approach is to identify practical criteria that require that the reservation of TNs be documented in the records of the service provider in which inventory the numbers are being reserved. Dan Hochvert, Bell Atlantic, indicated that the AT&T/Bell Atlantic approach is consistent with the words in the LNP order on reserved numbers; that is, the LNP order would not need to be modified. In response to a question from Tony Pupek, USTA, Shawn Murphy clarified that the AT&T/Bell Atlantic approach applies to all numbers, not just ported numbers. Dan Hochvert suggested that the NANC should try to get an agreement on the characteristics of a reserved TN and still be consistent with the LNP order. Peter Guggina, MCI WorldCom, indicated that MCI's position is not significantly different than that proposed by AT&T/Bell Atlantic.

Following discussion on a definition of "legally enforceable written agreement," Kris Monteith, FCC, suggested that rather than attempt to define the term, it might be more appropriate to develop specific develop criteria by which a reserved TN can be identified and forward those criteria to the FCC. Bill Adair, SBC, added that SBC intends to limit the number of reservations, by developing specifically defined purposes for a reservation. Chairman Hasselwander suggested that the NANC give further consideration to what recommendation it should make to the FCC on the term "legally enforceable written agreement."

#### **THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1998**

**H. Definition of Reserved Telephone Number (Continued).** The discussion resumed on the definition of reserved telephone number. The NANC discussed the need for agreement on a single definition and whether it should recommend that the FCC should amend the LNP order to eliminate the term "legally enforceable written agreement." Dan Hochvert, Bell Atlantic, noted that the definition that is developed must not create a barrier to portability nor number optimization problems. Bill Adair, SBC, added that the definition should contain as many restrictions on reservation telephone numbers as possible. Jo Gallagher, Bell Atlantic, noted the possible impact of the definition on contamination levels in a number pooling situation.

Chairman Hasselwander stated that new contributions on this issue should be sent to the NANC chairs at least one week prior to the December NANC meeting for distribution to the entire NANC. Contributions should deal with the characterization of "legally enforceable written agreement." Discussion will take place at next NANC to reach a decision on a single definition of reserved telephone numbers.

***I. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission Order - Final Discussion on the NANC Response to the FCC Referral in Paragraph 58 of the Order.*** Chairman Hasselwander noted that Ron Conners, Lockheed Martin, had put together a summary of the various NANC member positions on this issue. Chairman Hasselwander reported that broad consensus appears to exist on the position that we should do our best to never reach the point where a carrier must receive an NXX outside of a rationing plan in order to provide services to customers. Chairman Hasselwander noted that the NANC is being asked to give a recommendation as to who should make the decision as to whether a carrier can receive an NXX outside of the rationing plan -- the states or the NANPA.

Bill Adair, SBC, stated that the comments received went beyond who should have the responsibility. SBC also believes that assignment to anyone outside a rationing plan should be revisited so that the exception does not become the norm and end up exhausting the NPA very quickly. Dan Hochvert, Bell Atlantic, agreed that the NANC should focus on how can we prevent the situation from ever happening.

Peter Guggina, MCI WorldCom, stated that the FCC posed the question so he believes the NANC should answer it. Bernie Harris, GTE, stated that GTE supports making the NANPA the decision-maker, to avoid 50 different state policies. Moreover, GTE believes that NANPA, by definition, is a neutral administrator. Erin Duffy, NARUC, agreed with Peter Guggina that the NANC should answer the question. NARUC believes that going outside of a rationing plan should be a very rare occurrence. Nonetheless, because these types of situations are local in nature, NARUC supports giving the states the authority to decide when a carrier should get an NXX outside of a rationing plan.

A&T, USTA, Omnipoint, Sprint, Nextel, and PCIA agreed that NANPA should be the decision-maker, with strong guidelines in place to prevent the situation from developing except in the rarest of circumstances. Uniformity and speed were noted as important considerations. Bill Adair, SBC, stated that "who" has the responsibility is not as important as the guidelines for determining when an exception should be made. Vince Majkowski, NARUC, reiterated NARUC's position that this issue is a state or local one.

The NANC then discussed the issue of guidelines for determining when a carrier should receive an NXX outside of a rationing plan. Lori Messing, CTIA, stated support for improving guidelines to make them as stringent as possible. Chairman Hasselwander remarked that the debate will continue and recommended that the NANC vote on this issue. If the NANC wishes to recommend a further step, the development of guidelines, that idea can be incorporated into the overall recommendation to the FCC. Peter Guggina, MCI WorldCom, agreed that the NANC should conclude the discussion and forward a recommendation to the commission. Paul Hart, USTA, noted, however, that guidelines will be needed and supported the including the issue of

guidelines in the recommendation to the FCC. Jerry O'Brien, Omnipoint, recommended that the NANPA be charged with drafting a set of guidelines. Bernie Harris, GTE, expressed concern with writing guidelines when it is not clear who -- the states or the NANPA -- will be applying them. Beth O'Donnell, NCTA, stated that perhaps overarching principles should be developed, rather than specific guidelines. Peter Guggina, MCI WorldCom, agreed. Tony Pupek, USTA, noted that the NANP includes countries outside of the United States and questioned whether guidelines would be applicable to those additional NANP member countries.

Chairman Hasselwander stated his position that the NANC should not dictate guidelines for the FCC. Following further discussion, Chairman Hasselwander indicated that the NANC needs further direction from the FCC on the question of whether to develop guidelines for determining when carriers can receive NXXs outside of a rationing plan. Kris Monteith, FCC, suggested that the NANC focus on the core question asked and allow the FCC to provide direction back to the NANC on the issue of guidelines. Vince Majkowski, NARUC, stated that the NARUC would want to review guidelines before determining whether to support them and also noted the question as to whether guidelines would be enforceable against the states. Kris Monteith, FCC, noted that it may well be helpful for the NANC to undertake the development of guidelines or principles by which decisions on the assignment of NXXs outside of a rationing plan will be made. At this point, however, she recommended confining the question to the core issue of who should have the responsibility for making the decision and concurred with Mr. Majkowski that enforceability of any guidelines is a key issue.

The NANC voted on the question of who should have the responsibility for determining whether a carrier is assigned an NXX outside of a rationing plan -- the NANPA or the states -- as follows: 7 votes for the states; 15 votes for the NANPA; 1 abstention. Chairman Hasselwander agreed to draft a letter to the Chief, Common Carrier Bureau, indicating the results of the vote. In the letter, the NANC will volunteer to manage the creation of enforcement type criteria. A summary of the contributions submitted to the NANC on this issue will be attached to the NANC's letter to the FCC.

***J. Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report.*** Jo Gallagher, Bell Atlantic, presented the INC report. Initially, Ms. Gallagher provided a high level review of the activities and issues pending at INC. Ms. Gallagher reported that the INC has met two times since the last NANC meeting. As a result, the INC has several contributions for editorial changes to both the Thousands Block Pooling Administration Guidelines and other existing INC guidelines, such as the CO Code Assignment, NPA Relief Planning, and NPA Allocation and Assignment Guidelines. The actual contributions are listed in the November INC report.

Ms. Gallagher pointed out the key agreements contained in the report, which the INC reached during its last two meetings. Ms. Gallagher reported that the INC had reached consensus that the dates for semi-annual submissions of the national utilization and forecast reports necessary for thousands block pooling would be April 1 and October 1. Ms. Gallagher also reported that the INC had begun modifying the CO Code Assignment Guidelines to reflect the same utilization and forecast reporting requirements and intervals as those contained in the Thousands Block Pooling Administration Guidelines. Also, these reporting requirements would apply to all carriers, not just those participating in thousands block pooling.

In addition, Ms. Gallagher reported that the draft forms noted in the INC report, which can be used to collect both forecast and utilization data for both thousands block and CO Code administration, were devised with input from INC participants, the NANPA, and the State Issues Task Force. In doing so, the INC thought that the NANC and the NRO WG could use the preliminary work on the forms and revisions to the CO Code Assignment Guidelines as a starting place for additional work on COCUS/LINUS. The draft forms are included with the November 4, 1998 draft version of the Thousands Block Pooling Administration Guidelines and can be seen on the INC web site (<http://www/atis.org/atis/clc/incdocs.htm>). Ms. Gallagher also noted that liaisons have been established with the LNPA WG Pooling Subcommittee in order to bring this group's thousands block pooling process flows for the NPAC into alignment with the INC's thousands block pooling guidelines.

Continuing with the report, Ms. Gallagher outlined the issues that will be discussed in the four days of INC meetings in December, 1998. With respect to these issues, Ms. Gallagher stated that the INC was trying to balance the administrative burdens on carriers attendant with utilization reporting at the thousand block level, with the needs of the administrators and regulators involved in analysis and planning for possible implementation of thousands block pooling. Significantly, Ms. Gallagher reported that the issue of whether or not to donate blocks in which an LRN has been assigned is an open action item, and the INC is requesting that contributions regarding this issue be submitted. Also, Ms. Gallagher reported that the issue of pending LNP ports at the time of block allocation, which is scheduled for discussion in the December INC meeting, originated with the LNPA WG Pooling Subcommittee.

Tony Pupek, USTA, questioned how a glossary of terms could be completed without a definition of "reserved telephone number." Ms. Gallagher replied that the INC may have to leave this part open, as was done for the Audit Section, pending resolution of the definition. Dan Hochvert, Bell Atlantic, questioned the meaning of the utilization forecasts issue item. Ms. Gallagher clarified that utilization and forecasts are actually separate items, and that the open action item with the INC is the utilization information. Ms. Gallagher affirmed that the forecast information is the same information the COCUS requires today, that is, the incremental requirements over and above what a carrier has in its inventory today, for the specified time period, whatever that may be. A five year period has been proposed, with reporting done on a quarterly basis for the first two years, and an annual basis for the remaining three years. Also, the utilization information is the actual utilization of currently assigned resources as of the reporting period.

Beth O' Donnell, NCTA, asked about the underlying issue or issues regarding the donation of blocks in which an LRN has been assigned. Ms. Gallagher replied that the INC may receive a technical contribution, but that, so far, this issue has only raised administrative concerns about potential conflicts with an LRN previously assigned to a block and the associated numbers, and assignment of numbers from that block by the new block holder.

Jerry O' Brien, Omnipoint, questioned whether the reporting requirements would apply to wireless carriers since those carriers have not implemented local number portability. In reply, Ms. Gallagher stated that the intent to apply the appropriate industry guidelines for CO Codes and thousands block pooling to any carrier participating in the assignment of numbers in one or

another fashions. For those carriers not participating in pooling, the CO Code guidelines would apply. This is the reason the INC began working to align, in terms of time and data content, the CO Code Assignment Guidelines' forecasting and utilization requirements with those found in the Thousands Block Pooling Administration Guidelines. Also, when queried by Mr. O'Brien, Ms. Gallagher stated that the forecasts would be submitted to the NANPA.

When questioned about whether the glossary of terms would be distributed to everyone for review and agreement on the terms included in the document, Ms. Gallagher replied that the matter has not been discussed. Ms. Gallagher stated that the INC has a document with a glossary of terms that are only specific to the Thousands Block Pooling Guidelines.

Ms. Gallagher continued with the report, and advised the NANC that the INC plans to complete the Thousands Block Pooling Administration Guidelines at its December meeting. Any contributions with respect to this effort will be handled through normal INC processes.

Reporting on the INC's review of the CO Code Assignment Guidelines, Ms. Gallagher identified a potential policy issue for the NANC. Specifically, the INC report outlines changes to the INC CO Code Assignment Guidelines requiring CO Code utilization information reporting from Type -1 Facilities-Based Wireless Service Providers allocated numbers from a local exchange carrier (LEC). The potential policy issue could occur if a Type-1 Wireless Service Provider does not provide utilization information. Several questions are raised; for example, how the issue would be handled, whether the Wireless Service Provider would be denied additional allocations of numbers, and how the denial would be enforced. With regards to this issue, Jerry O'Brien, hypothesized that it would not necessarily be a problem, when a wireless carrier is assigned an area code for use, regardless of other users in the area code, for a LEC to receive numbers from the NPA Code Administrator. Ms. Gallagher replied that this issue only concerns numbers allocated from a LEC's inventory to a Wireless Service Provider with a Type 1 interconnection. Chairman Hasselwander then suggested that this policy issue be addressed at the December NANC meeting.

Anna Miller, BellSouth Cellular, also advised the NANC of an agreement reached by the LNPA WG meeting about the issue of the identity of the code holder for numbers assigned to wireless carriers with a Type 1 interconnection. The agreement was that wireless carriers may choose to port "Type 1" numbers to themselves, so that they can be listed as the code holder for those numbers. Ms. Miller also mentioned that the matter is addressed in the LNPA WG's Second Report on Wireless/Wireline Integration, due on December 31, 1998.

Next, Ms. Gallagher reported that, for items one and two of the INC work plan, modifications had been made to a previous INC work plan to reflect plans to complete work on Thousands Block Number Pooling Assignment and other existing INC Assignment Guidelines by December 11, 1998. With respect to the development of ITN Pooling Assignment Guidelines, the INC has taken note of the fact that the NRO ITN Task Force has done work on the ITN Pooling architecture. This item and item number four, ITN pooling outside the rate center, were added to the INC work plan in response to a June 11, 1997, letter from the NANC requesting that the INC look at ITN pooling both inside and outside the rate center. Ms. Gallagher stated that a timeline has not been developed for these last two items in the work plan. Lastly, Ms. Gallagher pointed

out the logistics, contained in the INC report, for the next two LNPA Workshop meetings.

**K. Cost Recovery Working Group Report.** Anne La Lena, MCI WorldCom, provided the Cost Recovery Working Group report. Ms. La Lena reported that several issues are outstanding. With respect to the NBANC, a decision is pending on the amount of safety factor that should be adopted by 1999 billing and collection as well as on the handling of overages paid by U.S. carriers in 1998. In the international front, Ms. La Lena reported that Canada has begun to make payment on its NANP fees although an outstanding amount remains with respect to the Dominican Republic.

Ms. La Lena reported that the Cost Recovery Working Group has two issues underway: an implementation outline for Cost Recovery Working Group Thousands block number pooling/administration recommendation and a cost allocation recommendation for ITN. Finally, Ms. La Lena reported that the Cost Recovery Working Group had determined to take a short break for the remainder of November and December to allow individuals to focus on other issues. The Working Group would be available to address any issue requiring immediate action. Ms. La Lena reported that the next conference call of the group is scheduled for January 12, 1999.

**L. NANPA Oversight Working Group Report.** Andrea Cooper, Airtouch, provided the report, following the handout provided to NANC members. Ms. Cooper reported that current issues before the NANPA Oversight WG included the neutrality of Lockheed Martin, COCTTF/NPA relief planning issues, audits, development of the compliance matrix, and the pool administrator requirements document. Ms. Cooper reported that the NANPA Oversight WG had formed three subgroups -- the Audit Subgroup, the Compliance Matrix Subgroup and the Pool Administrator Requirements Document Subgroup.

With respect to the neutrality of Lockheed Martin, Ms. Cooper reported that the FCC had reported on its November 3 meeting with Lockheed Martin. During the meeting Kris Monteith, FCC, reported that Lockheed Martin had agreed to file a memorandum of understanding, or similar document, with the FCC seeking approval for the divestiture of the CIS unit of Lockheed Martin. The FCC expects that filing to be made on or before December 3, 1998. Ms. Monteith also reported that the FCC expects to put the Lockheed Martin filing out for public comment and simultaneously refer the matter to the NANC for a recommendation.

Ms. Cooper reported on several issues involving the COCTTF/NPA Relief. The NANPA Oversight WG developed letters to be sent to Maine and Massachusetts, which had been forwarded to the appropriate state officials by Chairman Hasselwander. No further communications have been received from those states. In the meantime, the California situation, involving the requirement to maintain court reporters at public meetings, remains. In the past, the incumbent code administrator had provided the court reporters and the transcripts. The responsibility for maintaining the court reporters was not clearly identified or resolved during the CO Code transition. Lockheed Martin had attempted alternatives, other than court reporting, such as tape recording, but the alternatives had not proved successful. Thus, Lockheed Martin had committed to providing the service, with costs being tracked, until a resolution could be achieved. Ms. Cooper reported that the NANPA Oversight co-chair would discuss the issue with the California industry at a statewide meeting on December 10. In response to questions from the



public, Ms. Cooper stated that the transcripts of the meetings are available to the public and are used by the state as well as by consumer groups.

Ms. Cooper stated that the NANPA Oversight WG seeks clarification on the intent of the FCC's orders and rules requiring the new NANPA to perform the numbering administration functions currently performed by Bellcore, and the CO code administration functions currently performed by the eleven CO code administrators, at the price agreed to at the time of its selection. Following some discussion, Chairman Hasselwander suggested that the NANC members review the Requirements Document, industry guidelines and the FCC's decisions and rules. Members should be prepared to discuss this issue at the December NANC meeting.

With respect to audits, Ms. Cooper stated that four agreements have been reached. Specifically, Ms. Cooper reported that the NANPA Oversight WG agrees that it has the primary responsibility for the task of developing the audit framework applicable to all NANP resources for audits of service providers and of the NANPA. The WG also has confirmed that it has accepted the responsibility of developing the audit framework for audits of service providers by the Pooling Administrator, audits of the Pooling Administrator, the audit schedule, frequency and the cause for the initial cost estimates for the pool administration. When completed, the audit framework will be liaised to the NRO WG for review and forwarded to other industry fora for action. In addition, the NANPA Oversight WG had agreed that the audit framework would not result in discriminatory auditing practices either by resource, service provider, or technology. Finally, Ms. Cooper reported that the NANPA Oversight WG had determined a short term need to complete the audit framework for the Lockheed Martin cost estimate for Thousands Block Pooling Administration, by January 1999.

Ms. Cooper next turned to the issue of the compliance matrix. Ms. Cooper stated that the Performance Matrix being developed by the NANPA Oversight WG will be a public document, targeted for delivery to the NANC before the NANC's January 1999 meeting. Ms. Cooper indicated that the matrix evaluates compliance/performance in accordance with the documents listed on page 16 of the NANPA Oversight WG handout. Ms. Cooper also noted that several sample pages from the compliance matrix had been attached to the NANPA Oversight WG Report for NANC's review.

Finally, Ms. Cooper reported on the development of the Pool Administrator Requirements Document, which is due to the NANC in January 1999. Ms. Cooper stated that the Pool Administrator Subgroup had accepted as a baseline text the June 1998 document initially distributed to the NANC. The draft document under developed will be posted to the ATIS web site on or around November 30, with contributions due from interested parties by December 11, 1998. The Subgroup also will liaison with the NRO WG, the LNPA WG and the ATIS forums for review and comment.

Ms. Cooper reported that the NANPA Oversight WG requests guidance from the NANC on the appropriate bid approach for the Pooling Administration; that is, a firm fixed overall price, a fixed transaction charge or an open bid formula. Discussion ensued on the three types of approach. Ed Gould, AT&T, and Dan Hochvert, Bell Atlantic, each remarked that a hybrid approach -- a transaction charge with a cap -- might be appropriate. Ms. Cooper stated that the

NANPA Oversight WG needs a decision on this issue in December. Chairman Hasselwander asked for contributions on this issue one week before the December NANC meeting. Contributions should address how to price the administration, collection and equity issues. The contributions will be redistributed prior to the December meeting.

Following the completion of Ms. Cooper's report, John Logan, representing Mitretek asked to make a brief statement. Mr. Logan distributed a written statement and orally reiterated Mitretek's interest in assuming the NANPA responsibilities for the remainder of the five-year NANPA term, in light of the controversy concerning the neutrality of Lockheed Martin.

**M. Steering Group Report.** Chairman Hasselwander provided the Steering Group report. He reported that the SG accepted changes to the NANC Working Group Operating Principles. The proposed changes will be discussed with the full NANC at the NANC's December meeting. Another contribution from NCTA will be discussed as well. With respect to the INC request that the SG look at 10 digit dialing policy issues, the SG determined that this issue should wait for the NANC NRO Report comment period to end on December 21, 1998. The matter will be deferred until January or February and seek contributions at that time. Regarding carrier audits, the SG will revisit this issue at its December 16th meeting, noting that carrier audits should begin as quickly as possible. There was a suggestion that NANC member mentors be added to various working groups and Chairman Hasselwander offered to develop a contribution prior to the December SG meeting for discussion at that time. The SG also discussed the possibility of returning to one-day NANC meetings. A contribution from Chairman Hasselwander will be circulated on that issue. Finally, going forward, all SG meeting notes will be distributed to the full NANC.

**N. "System Beta" Presentation.** Professor Richard Levine made a presentation on his System Beta, which he claims will solve several significant telephone industry problems, such as number exhaust, area code changes, NXX-rate center and number pooling problems for local number portability, rating and routing, as well as simplify dialing. Mr. Levine provided a handout to NANC members summarizing his presentation and outlining the benefits of System Beta. Following his presentation, the NANC agreed to review Dr. Levine's contribution and to discuss how best to proceed.

**O. Other Business.** The next meeting will be held on December 16 at the FCC and on December 17 at the Sheraton City Centre.

## **VI. Action Items and Decisions Reached.**

1. CC Docket 95-116 Portability in 500/900 Codes. Regarding NANC referral under paragraph 41, tentatively assigned issue to NANC. NANC further delegated referral to INC, which will report to NANC in December addressing the following:

- Project plan
- Methods to improve participation
- Optimization of options for off-site participation
- How the INC will interact with and draw on other groups for support including groups

within ATIS

- Date for completion of work at least 2 months prior to date required for the NANC report to the FCC.
- Provide for regular reports to NANC
- Form of action - Chairman Hasselwander letter to INC Chair.
- Identified advisability of FCC and other organizations to support activity with publicity on the activity.

2. NRO Working Group Report. NRO WG should not work issues involved in the NRO Report until further directed. NANC will approve NRO work plan including priorities. NANC will review subject matter assignments at the January NANC meeting - anticipate additional FCC direction by then. Members of disbanded NRO Task Forces will continue to be kept on NRO master list. Letter from Chairman Hasselwander will be sent to all members of disbanded groups thanking them for their efforts and soliciting their continued participation in the NRO WG.

3. NBANC Audit Plan. Proposed audit plan for NBANC approved. Vince Majkowski will put issue of carrier-specific interest credits on agenda at next NBANC and report results at the next NANC.

4. COCUS Linus. Agreements reached on the following: A FCC rule is needed and a sanction should be included. The sanction is withholding of numbers. Resellers must provide data to code holders in accordance with business relationship. The code holder is responsible for providing data to NANPA.

Conditions apply to data which has been collected by NANPA, all forecast and utilization data. States have access to aggregate data for stated purpose, states can get carrier specific data in states where a legally enforceable confidentiality agreement is in place. Sanction for violation: State loses prerogative to obtain future data. Carriers will be notified prior to provision of carrier-specific data.

Audits. Should be conducted and should be controlled by industry guidelines (development needed). An audit can be conducted on codeholders and/or resellers. NANPA Oversight WG will develop frequency and conditions.

FCC should adopt rules that require NANP resource holders to provide information to the NANPA. Failure to do so is a violation of an FCC rule, and enforcement and jurisdiction for that violation is held by the FCC. If NANPA takes enforcement, carrier appeals go to the FCC which has jurisdiction. The FCC can delegate this authority to the states.

Disposition to NRO WG. Bring to NANC a document that can be forwarded to the FCC outlining: recommendation for successor structure to COCUS; how often data collected; policy elements agreed to by NANC incorporated; produce a single report from NRO containing these elements for review by NANC. Estimate of costs of collection versus benefit; work with NANPA in development. Present work plan to NANC at December meeting. NRO WG should develop a recommendation and not write a rule.

5. Reserved Telephone Number Definition. New contributions are to be sent to NANC Chair at least one week prior to next NANC meeting for distribution to entire NANC. Contributions should deal with characterization of a "legally enforceable written agreement." Discussion will take place at next NANC to reach a decision on a single definition of reserved telephone numbers.

6. NANC Responsibility under Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission Order. In response to referral in a paragraph 41 concerning the issue of evaluation and selection of whether a state commission or NANPA should perform the function of evaluating whether a carrier who is subject to a rationing plan should receive an NXX . . . outside the parameters of a rationing plan if it demonstrates it has no numbers and cannot provide service to customers, or is relying on extraordinary or costly measures in order to provide service. Discussion of state versus NANPA. NANC Chair will write letter to Chief, CCB which will: (1) indicate results of vote; (2) volunteer to manage the creation of enforcement type criteria; and (3) contain summary of contributions submitted to NANC as an attachment to the letter. Vote results on recommendation whether state commissions or NANPA should evaluate carrier need for codes in a rationing plan (1=abstention; 7=States; 15=NANPA) as follows:

USTA - NANPA	ALTS - NANPA	AT&T - NANPA
SBC - NANPA	CompTel - NANPA	CTIA - NANPA
GTE - NANPA	Nextel - NANPA	Nortel Networks -NANPA
Nextlink - NANPA	BellAtlantic - NANPA	Omnipoint - NANPA
PCIA - NANPA	Sprint - NANPA	SprintPCS - NANPA
MCIWorldCom - States	NARUC (3 votes) - States	NCTA - States
Opastco - States	Frontier - States	

Abstained: Stentor Resource Centre.

7. NANPA Oversight Working Group. Regarding issue of NANPA responsibilities (assumption of duties of the incumbent code administrator under the FCC Order; Requirements document and industry guidelines). NANC Chairman will prepare proposal to NANC members at December meeting on how to deal with NANPA requirements and obligations under the current rules as written.

NANC members are requested to review draft of Pooling Administration Requirements document that will be posted on the ATIS web site on November 30, 1998. Comments should be sent to the NANPA Oversight WG Co-chairs.

NANC to provide guidance pertaining to appropriate bid pricing to the Working Group at the December NANC. Contributions on this subject should be sent to NANC Chairman one week prior to December NANC meeting.

8. INC. NANC to address policy issue dealing with collection of utilization information from Type 1 Service providers. (Reference WWISC agreement)

9. BETA System. NANC members review presentation material and discuss next steps at December NANC.

10. Steering Group Report. Chairman Hasselwander reported that the SG accepted changes to the NANC operating group principles and will send them out electronically to the full NANC. The SG-approved changes will be discussed at December meeting and an additional contribution from NCTA will be discussed at that time as well.

INC asked SG to look at 10-digit dialing policy issues. The SG will wait for comment period to end on December 21, 1998, and will defer action on this matter until January or February. The SG will seek contributions after comment cycle ends.

Carrier Audits. The SG will revisit in December, noting that it is important to begin carrier audits as quickly as we can.

Chairman Hasselwander will provide a contribution at the next the SG meeting regarding establishing NANC member mentors for various working groups. Additionally, Chairman Hasselwander will prepare a contribution on the possibility of compression of time (one-day) for NANC meetings. The Chairman will ensure that the SG meeting notes are sent to the full NANC.