

Tejal Mehta, NSD, Common Carrier Bureau (CCB)
Patrick Forster, NSD, CCB
Jeannie Grimes, NSD, CCB

III. **Estimated Public Attendance:** Approximately 43 members of the public attended the meeting as observers.

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

- (1) Agenda
- (2) April 21-22, Meeting Minutes
- (3) LNPA Working Group Status Report to NANC
- (4) Wireless Subcommittee Report
- (5) LNPA Matrix
- (6) INC Report 500/900 Portability
- (7) Straw Man Recommendation for NANC Response to FCC Request Concerning Implementation of 500/900 Service
- (7a) Straw Man, revised May 25, 1999
- (8) NRO Report to NANC, COCUS Replacement Tool
- (9) NRO Draft COCUS Report
- (10) Hybrid Approach for COCUS Replacement
- (11) NANPA Fund Performance Status Report & Funds Projection
- (12) NANPA Oversight Working Group Report
- (13) LM letter dated May 21, 1999 to Chairman Hasselwander,

Re: Audits

- (14) Number Portability N-1 Network Query
- (15) 1999 COCUS and NPA Exhaust Analysis
- (16) 1999 COCUS and NPA Exhaust Projection
- (17) GTE Comments to the NANC Regarding Forecasted Exhaust of the NANP

V. **Summary of the Meeting:**

A. Welcoming Remarks. Alan Hasselwander, Chairman of the Council, provided welcoming remarks and introduced new participants.

B. Local Number Portability Administration (LNPA) Working Group Report. Co-Chairs Tom Sweeney, AT&T, and Anna Miller, BellSouth Cellular, presented the report to the Council. Ms. Miller reviewed the key wireless issues contained in the Wireless Number Portability Subcommittee (WNPSC) Report.

The WNPSC identified three options for resellers: (1) No change; (2) indirect access to the NPAC through facilities-based provider's SOA; and (3) direct access to the NPAC. Evaluation of these options will continue. Chairman Hasselwander, Frontier, questioned what the no-change option entailed. Ms. Miller explained that with this option, resellers do not have direct access to the NPAC; instead, as in the wireline context, they

would have to use facilities-based carriers to access the NPAC. The WNPSC completed review of items for the Wireless Number Portability (WNP) Implementation Work Plan. A new issue, U. S. and Canadian roaming, was also addressed. Bell Mobility submitted a contribution on the differences in U. S. and Canada LNP requirements. The WNPSC noted that Canadian wireless carriers are not required to provide local number portability and, thus, do not support MIN/MDN separation. The WNPSC identified some of the impacts of MIN/MDN separation not being supported in Canada.

Ms. Miller reviewed the action items contained in the WNPSC report, as well as updates to the WNPSC Work Plan. With regard to the Work Plan, Ms. Miller noted that Linda Godfrey was elected as co-chair and regular meetings are scheduled to develop a test plan for turn-up and wireless-to-to-wireless intercarrier testing. CTIA accepted the task of analyzing alternatives for an intercarrier communications process. The WNPSC will request that standards fora overview proposed standards in accordance with the WNPSC workplan. Chairman Hasselwander questioned whether there was good participation, and Ms. Miller replied in the affirmative. Ms. Miller also noted that she had already received feedback on the letter concerning wireless carriers' participation in meetings.

Mr. Sweeney reviewed the remainder of the LNPA WG report, noting that two co-chairs had been elected: Charles Ryburn, SBC (ILEC segment) and Shelley Shaw, Nextlink (CLEC segment). There were no nominations for the Wireless segment; the WG decided to leave this position open until a wireless candidate is identified.

Mr. Sweeney reviewed the "Next Steps" items for LNP Problem Identification and Management (PIM), which were prepared in response to the NANC's IMG recommendation. Three high-level steps were identified: (1) Establish a PIM sub-team to scope out the process; (2) Review the previously drafted dispute resolution process; and (3) Identify a suitable website for PIM communications. A sub-team was formed, headed by Brad Baxter, Nextlink, which began work on articulating the scope of PIM, the PIM Process Flow, Problem Submittal Form, Problem Tracking Form, and a communications plan (e.g., website utilization).

Chairman Hasselwander asked how large is the sub-team. Mr. Sweeney replied that there are either six or seven members, and that all three industry segments (ILEC, CLEC, Wireless) are represented. The WG decided that the PIM process should be established before a workshop is considered. WG members are also concerned about authority and enforcement issues. Chairman Hasselwander asked Mr. Sweeney to elaborate on the authority and enforcement issues. Mr. Sweeney replied that some members are not convinced that there will be a problem with non-compliance,

and won't know how it will be handled until a problem occurs. Beth Kistner, ALTS, questioned whether there was a time frame for establishment of the process. Mr. Sweeney replied that a time frame had not yet been drawn up, but that substantial progress had been made.

The LNPA WG discussed the impact of the 9/9/99 date on the NPAC/SMS and service providers- LSMSs. This test case is actually included in the Y2K test plan and service providers agreed that this was not a problem. The WG plans to complete the Wireline/Wireless Integration Report in the June 1999 LNPA WG meeting, and to deliver the final version to the NANC by the end of June 1999. Lockheed Martin delivered a statement of work (SOW) for NPAC/SMS Release 3.0 to the LLCs on May 7, 1999. The Number Pooling Subcommittee is evaluating the SOW and has already identified at least one change. It is not known if the Release 3.0 development schedule will be affected. A Number Pooling SC meeting is scheduled for May 26, 1999. A SOW negotiation meeting with Lockheed Martin is scheduled for June 14-15, 1999.

With regard to the Aslow horse@ problem, Lockheed Martin agreed to provide additional data for April, May, and June without charge. A preliminary analysis of this data is scheduled for completion by July 1, 1999. Chairman Hasselwander asked what involvement the PIM team will have with the slow horse issue. Mr. Sweeney replied that this issue had not been addressed, but that the LNPA WG would consider it. Joe Kingrey, Nortel, asked what the NANC-s responsibility is with regard to the Wireline/Wireless Integration Report the LNPA WG plans to submit.

Mr. Sweeney replied that the NANC would have an opportunity to review the report and ask questions to clarify items. Chairman Hasselwander interjected that the NANC would review and consider making a recommendation on approval or non-approval, as it normally does. The WG has not decided certain issues: what is an acceptable LSMS interface performance level; what are the attendant consequences and enforcement mechanisms for not meeting that level; and the authority issue. Chariman Hasselwander suggested that such Aroadblocked@ issues could be brought to the NANC.

Chairman Hasselwander suggested that, due to the smaller agenda this month, the NANC Steering Group may be able to meet earlier than scheduled if the meeting ends early.

D. Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report. INC Moderator, Richard Round, GTE, presented the INC Report. Initially, Mr. Round reviewed the items contained in the INC Report. These items include: NANP Expansion Effort, Number Pooling Status, Status of INC 500/900 Portability Effort, and Meeting Schedule and Logistics. With regard to NANP Expansion, the NANP Expansion Workshop has tentatively planned to complete a report by December

31, 1999. INC Co-chair Norman Epstein, GTE, interjected that a short report on NANP Expansion status had already been submitted to the NANC and suggested that the submission of the additional report could be scheduled. Chairman Hasselwander suggested that a formal report could be submitted for review and discussion at the January 2000 NANC meeting.

Three new pooling issues were received in the May INC meeting, while five issues were moved to initial closure. These issues are listed on page four of the INC Report. Chairman Hasselwander asked if there was anything significant discussed about INC issue # 181 (Modification of COCUS/Survey Requirements in Thousand Block (NXX-X) Pooling Administration Guidelines). Mr. Round replied that the INC had not begun to review the issue. Mr. Epstein said that issue 181 was raised at the last NANC meeting in order to remove COCUS/Survey references from the Pooling Guidelines. Mr. Round added that this issue was being considered to eliminate any duplication of effort between the Pooling Administrator and the NANPA. Carl Hansen, Omnipoint, asked whether it was assumed that the pooling administrator and the code administrator are the same entity, in order to capitalize on efficiencies, or whether it was considered that these entities could be different. Mr. Round replied that the INC treats these functions separately, although the same entity could perform both functions. Beth Kistner, ALTS, asked if whether the COCUS/Survey requirements are those of the Pooling Administrator instead of the NANPA makes a difference. Mr. Round replied in the affirmative, and added that these issues are still being worked out.

Chairman Hasselwander interjected that the issue of whether Thousand Block and Code administration are separate issues is still being addressed by the NANC, and suggested that INC's ultimate position may be dependent on the NANC's stance on this issue. Ms. Kistner suggested that the issue of whether COCUS/Survey requirements would be those of the Pooling Administrator or of the NANPA was a critical issue, which, because it could affect contract negotiations, should be resolved by the NANC within the next month or so. Chairman Hasselwander replied that some decisions would have to be made and that the forthcoming FCC Numbering Resource Optimization NPRM could have some affect on this issue. Mr. Round replied that the intention was to eliminate duplication of payment for the same services. The INC was not overly concerned about the Thousands Block Pool Administrator Requirements Document, and noted that the COCUS/Survey would fall under the responsibility of the Pooling Administrator, whether or not it was captured in that entity's responsibilities.

Mr. Round reviewed the LNPA Workshop Work Plan: 1K Block Pooling Administrative Guidelines, Individual Telephone Number (ITN)

Administrative Guidelines, and Pooling Outside the Rate Center. Unassigned Number Porting (UNP) will be placed on the work plan, but consensus on its priority within the work plan has not been reached. Chairman Hasselwander interjected that this was not surprising, given that the NANC has not reached a conclusion concerning UNP. The FCC NPRM may give guidance on this and a number of other issues.

With regard to 500/900 Portability, the INC has planned a conference call to determine whether the Workshop will continue its efforts. Paul Hart, USTA, suggested that the draft letter to the FCC concerning 500/900 portability could be reviewed at this time and Chairman Hasselwander concurred. As the letter was being distributed, Mr. Round reviewed the INC meeting schedules and logistics contained on the final page of the INC Report. The NANC then took time to read the draft 500/900 portability recommendation to the FCC.

Mr. Hart reviewed the discussion portion of the letter. In response to Chairman Hasselwander's comment that he did not remember discussing at the last NANC meeting everything that was in the letter, Mr. Hart responded that the letter was expanded to accommodate concerns that had been raised. NANC Co-chair Ron Binz, Competition Policy Institute, asked what are the characteristics of 500/900 services that make it infeasible to use existing toll-free databases. Mr. Hart replied that the look-up instruction sequences and vertical service codes for 500/900 numbers are different from those used for 800 numbers. Also, current toll-free expansion activity, including changes to accommodate rapid expansion, precludes trying to include 500/900 portability in these databases. Peter Guggina, MCI WorldCom, suggested there are business and technical issues that could be solved by a company, but may be solved differently on a national basis. Dan Hochvert, Bell Atlantic, suggested that we should wait to see if the marketplace necessitates a change in the recommendation. There was some discussion about specific wording in the recommendation and several members suggested edits.

Mr. Hart reminded the NANC that the Telecommunications Act requires number portability for all numbers and implementing a database structure would result in portability for 500/900 numbers. It was suggested that this issue be closed because, even though 500/900 portability is technically feasible, it is not needed at this time. Chairman Hasselwander suggested that the 500/900 portability recommendation should be submitted to the FCC soon after the conclusion of the meeting. Members suggested additional edits. Chairman Hasselwander and others asked whether the recommendation is responsive to the questions in the FCC **Order**. It was determined that the recommendation answers all the questions. The group responsible for composing the recommendation will make all necessary edits and present it later

to the full NANC.

After the break, Mr. Guggina read the revised recommendation to the NANC. Answers to the questions in the FCC's *Order* will be appended to the recommendation. Members suggested minor edits, which were incorporated. The revised recommendation, with a cover letter from Chairman Hasselwander, will be forwarded to the FCC.

E. Numbering Resource Optimization (NRO) Working Group

Report. Co-Chair, Beth O'Donnell and Brian Baldwin provided the report to the Council. The WG has reviewed three COCUS model alternatives contributed by AT&T, U S West and NANPA. The WG has developed and is considering an alternative Hybrid model which contains elements from the other three models. However, there are open questions regarding the Hybrid model: whether it should incorporate a two-tier reporting requirement versus a standard reporting process for all NPAs; and whether utilization reporting should be stated as either available or unavailable versus several defined categories (reserved, aged, etc.). Section V of the draft NRO report contains a matrix of the desired attributes of a new utilization and forecasting tool. Section VII provides a discussion of the desired attributes and compares each alternative accommodates how each desired attribute. Due to concerns regarding the overall layout and lack of clarity of sections V and VII, the WG will work to revise this portion of the report.

The reporting criteria focus on what is happening at the NPA level. The growth in a given NPA will determine the reporting cycle. Five to seven year exhaust windows have been proposed in order to determine the appropriate growth threshold for an NPA, and to avoid "surprise" in predicting exhaust. Brian Baldwin added that under a voluntary submission scenario, not all carriers are willing to submit utilization data. The tool for submissions should be such that it does not create a significant burden on carriers. Peter Guggina suggested a focus on a proactive reporting structure, regardless of whether the NPA is in jeopardy.

Beth O'Donnell stated that the Hybrid model has a two tier approach with regard to how often reporting happens and at what level, with reporting at the NXX-X level where there is pooling. It is believed that this model will help NANPA meet its obligation. Ron Binz stated his belief that mandatory reporting on a periodic basis, *i. e.*, reporting every six months with enforcement and quality of analysis is needed, and that quarterly reporting may not be necessary and might be a burden on NANPA to evaluate. Brian Baldwin added that the primary objective of any COCUS replacement model should be to predict NANP exhaust. Chairman Hasselwander stated that ideally, this should be a national tool which is available to the states; the data will be

available to the states to help manage exhaust. Vince Majkowski stated, however, that states should not be precluded from obtaining data outside of the reporting cycle, especially in jeopardy situations. Natalie Billingsley, NASUCA, noted that in California, NPAs are in jeopardy within weeks after they are opened and that it is carrier demand that drives jeopardy. Using the projected life of an NPA will not give one a more accurate forecast. Ms. O'Donnell suggested that forecasting could be checked by looking at utilization, and asked what mechanisms would trigger enforcement. Chairman Hasselwander responded that the NANC had discussed the issue, and believes that rules and sanctions are necessary, but had no more specifics.

Carl Hansen, Omnipoint, added that multiple requests from states for utilization information will be disruptive and will create confusion and unnecessary expense, raising the question of whether a consistent process is more desirable. Paul Hart, USTA, noted that enforcement issues should be separate from the model and conditions in place to ensure that NANPA gets the data; otherwise, none of this will work. Chairman Hasselwander reminded the Council that the NANC COCUS report and recommendation is due by June 30, 1999. NANC will have to handle enforcement issues. Jo Gallagher added that the overarching assumptions in the draft report will assist in answering a lot of enforcement questions. Brian Baldwin stated that he thought the WG's charge was to recommend a replacement tool not to deal with enforcement, auditing, etc. Dan Hochvert stated that enforcement should not be punitive and that, because utilization data is auditable, some of the concerns about enforcement should not exist. He added that honest mistakes will be made. Service providers' requests should demonstrate a need for the numbering resource. Utilization data should be auditable; data will come in and will be manipulated electronically. Chairman Hasselwander noted that NANC, in the past, has concluded that if a service provider fails to provide a forecast submission, then it should not receive codes. There is a difference between falsifying utilization data versus honest mistakes. Dave Rolka added that the best practices should be rolled into the Hybrid model. A forecasting tool projects future numbering resource requirements; but what is needed in a jeopardy situation is utilization data. Brian Baldwin clarified that the AT&T Minimalist model uses utilization as a key driver for forecasting and in turn jeopardy -- the utilization component is needed.

Chairman Hasselwander added that for forecasting, historical data is important as well as individual data from carriers. There was some discussion about the value of reporting multiple categories of information that may not be used. Brian Baldwin clarified that the Hybrid model says carriers should be ready to provide details, but questioned the utility of collecting data that may not be used. In response to a concern regarding who would be required to report data in an NPA, it was reiterated that NANC

reached closure on this issue in November 1998. NANC further concluded it would recommend to the FCC that the reporting requirement should be a rule, and that states should have access to NANPA data for a stated purpose; however, there should be sanctions for violation of confidentiality & denial of future access to data.

There was concern raised regarding interpretation of the December 1998 action item on number status in the reporting. Reporting on reserved numbers may be a significant part of the problem. Ron Connors noted that LINUS requires reporting in several buckets, *i. e.*, numbers in-service; aging; reserved; available for assignment and unavailable for assignment. Brian Baldwin added that reporting on reserved numbers tells nothing regarding compliance with the reserved number guidelines. Trent Boaldin, OPASTCO, agreed, noting that the focus and purpose of COCUS is to forecast when NPAs are going to exhaust; audits should address number categories.

Chairman Hasselwander posed the question of whether the data points should be limited to several categories vs. keeping it simple. Ron Connors suggested data could be collected for multiple purposes & then decide later if collection on all eight data points are not necessary.

Discussion continued on what data points should be collected. Ed Gould reminded the Council of the price to collect it All. @ Cost requests for each of the models have been sent to NANPA. In reality, carriers are not keeping track of numbers in the categories listed in the INC guidelines. Data should be available for audit purposes and that requires carrier to modify their systems in order to comply with an audit. Dan Hochvert noted that companies maintain data for record keeping & will accumulate data so that NANPA could have access to this information. An audit should be conducted when the data received by NANPA appears Aout of whack. @

Reporting on all categories was supported by MCI Worldcom, Nextlink, and ALTS; limited categories -- available, unavailable (reserved in-service) was supported by all other companies. Brian Baldwin added that Omnipoint, ALTS, MCI WorldCom and Nextlink would like to go beyond the Hybrid categories. It is important that all points of view should be made known to the NANC at the next meeting and between now and then electronically.

Beth O'Donnell will provide draft updates on the report to the Chairman for circulation to the full NANC in advance of the June meeting. The WG will meet on June 10-11 to finalize the report and recommendation. Additionally, edits to the Hybrid model will include changes to ensure consistency with the April 1999 CO Code Guidelines. With regard to the question whether NANPA should

require for consistency data at the 1K level from an NPA where not all carriers are pooling -- the WG has not had any strong advocates for reporting at the 1K level in a situation where carriers are not participating in pooling. Chairman Hasselwander asked whether there was a need for discussion on enforcement, stating that the NANPA could withhold codes if the FCC says it can. Beth O'Donnell indicated that enforcement was another issue to be addressed in the report.

There was discussion of frequency of reporting utilization data and forecasting data. Carl Hansen suggested that NANPA should tell the industry what it needs to get the job done. Ron Connors recommended reporting both at the same time; however, the same frequency is not needed for NPAs that are far from jeopardy. Chairman Hasselwander proposed that, subject to further discovery on cost vs. benefit, a sliding scale makes sense and that NANPA should not ask for data as frequently in NPAs that are not in jeopardy.

F. Cost Recovery Working Group Report. Co-Chair Anne La Lena, MCI WorldCom, reported that the CR WG had no issues to update the NANC on at this meeting.

NBANC Report. NBANC Chair Vincent Majkowski, NARUC, provided the report to the Council on the fund status and significant NBANC activities. The current fund balance is \$2.1 million; projected receivables total \$2.2 million, with payments to LM to date total \$713K, with remaining payments totaling \$3.566 million. Payments to NECA total \$42K to date with remaining payments totaling \$214K. Board expenses are \$4,569; this includes member reimbursement of \$3,690 and meeting expenses of \$878. Payments to an external auditor in year one and year two are \$22K for each.

The Dominican Republic contribution of \$17.8K has been paid. For the 1999 Funding Process, the Bahamas, British Virgin Islands, and Trinidad Tobago remitted payments in April. Alfred Oyog, Cable & Wireless, has agreed to coordinate and assist with NBANC collections from the remaining 13 countries. As of May 5, 1999, 3,695 forms have been received; reporting gross revenues now total \$232 billion, with net revenues totaling \$188 billion.

G. NANPA Oversight Working Group Report. Co-Chair, Pat Caldwell, Bell South, provided the update to the Council. The WG held two conference calls and one face-to-face meeting to address the performance issues noted in the annual NANPA performance review and recommendation. As requested, NANPA provided a first cut on the a performance improvement plan. The WG has established a meeting schedule to monitor and support NANPA efforts on the plan; NANPA will report on their comprehensive improvement plan at the June NANC meeting. The next WG meeting conference call is scheduled for June 4th, and the next face-to-

face meeting will be held in Washington, DC, on June 23-24, 1999. A complete schedule of remaining meetings for 1999 is listed in the handout.

H. Lockheed Martin CIS Letter dated May 21, 1999, Re: Audits.

Chairman Hasselwander summarized the May 21, 1999 correspondence from Jeff Ganek, stating LM's position that CO code audits are outside the scope of the LM NANPA bid. This NANPA requirement is outlined in the CO Code Guidelines published in April 1999.

Dan Hochvert commented that the former CO Code Guidelines appendix did not specify the entity to conduct the audit, and that perhaps the NANC dispute resolution process should be used in this situation. It is a question of who pays for the audit, not who performs the audit. Carl Hansen questioned how NANPA arrived at this position in light of the discussions about and cooperation offered on the trial audits to the SG back in November 1998. The trial audits were suggested and agreed to with no mention of being outside the scope of NANPA's responsibilities. What prompted this response? Ron Conners responded that NANPA tried to incorporate the audits into its work and went on to explain that CO Code audits were not included in the bid. Ron Binz expressed his concern that the NANC SG had spent considerable time discussing this issue only to find that NANPA had apparently changed its position on whether audits were within the scope of work.

Discussion continued on how to go forward with a plan of action for addressing this issue. Chairman Hasselwander suggested that a position paper be developed by a small group (from the original group that worked on the Requirements Document) to examine the issue. He added that a dispute resolution process is not needed now. NANC needs to conduct a rigorous assessment of the situation before a determination can be made. It was agreed that an IMG will be used to evaluate the CO code audit function and responsibilities under the Requirements Document. The team will consist of the following volunteers: Jo Gallagher, Jim Castagna, Norm Epstein, Karen Mulberry, Shawn Murphy. The IMG will organize, evaluate, and prepare a concise position in a written statement. The group will report back at June meeting with an interim report and recommendation of when a final report can be made. Karen Mulberry stated that the team could make a recommendation and draw some conclusions for presentation at the June meeting.

I. T1S1 N-1 Network Query Procedure. Chairman Hasselwander noted the N-1 structure is part of the FCC's *Second Report and Order* released in August 1997, and was included in the LNPA WG report and recommendation to the NANC prior to the May 1, 1997 recommendation to the FCC.

Peter Guggina provided the report on this issue. T1S1.6

requirements, adopted in December 1998, preclude originating LEC LNP queries for IXC calls, consistent with the **Second Report & Order**. It was noted that in August 1998, SBC's letter ballot comment requested deleting the requirement that if an IXC is used for the call, the LNP query will be done by an originating LEC. In April 1999, Telcordia Technologies presented a contribution to T1S1.6 proposing to modify LNP requirements to allow a LEC originating switch to perform LNP queries for IXC calls. It is not clear what the intent and scope of the proposed modification for originating LEC query (OLQ) is at this time. The handout provides further information on why IXCs perform queries for IXC calls. With respect to the Telcordia contribution, a detailed network capability description is needed. In response, Adam Newman, Telcordia, confirmed that their contribution was subsequently rejected by T1S1.6. Chairman Hasselwander invited Telcordia to provide a presentation at the June NANC meeting to explain the scope and intent their proposed modification. To that end, Chairman Hasselwander will send a letter to T1S1, acknowledging the existence of this issue, and request that the forum not proceed on this matter until after the June NANC meeting. He also noted that the issue would be worked at a more detailed level then forwarded to the LNPA WG.

May 26, 1999

J. Approval of Meeting Minutes. The April 21-22, 1999 NANC meeting minutes were approved as written.

K. NANPA 1999 COCUS and NPA Exhaust Analysis. John Manning, LM, provided the presentation to Council. As part of its NANP management responsibilities, NANPA must forecast the availability of NANP numbering resources and ensure the continued viability of the NANP. The COCUS report is designed to predict area code exhaust and thereby estimate overall NANP exhaust. The survey was distributed in January 1999 with responses due by February 10, 1999, and requested the following: service provider identification; number of CO codes assigned by NPA as of January 1, 1999; a yearly forecast for codes for 1999 through 2003; and telephone number utilization data.

The overall NPA average response rate was 60%. This figure represents 74% of all CO codes assigned as of 1/1/99. However, it was noted that input was not received from some entities who are requesters of large amounts of NXXs codes. Additionally, it was noted that many responses did not include TN utilization data and therefore the reliability of the utilization data received should be treated as highly suspect.

The analysis considered the following inputs: historical CO code assignment data by segment (CMRS, ILEC, CLEC and Paging) for the last two years; the number of service providers and expansion of footprint over the same time period, particularly important with CLEC and CMRS; 1999 survey responses; recent NPA relief activity;

and CO code rationing. Some other data points considered were the code assignments as of April 1, 1999; the total number of codes available for assignment; the number of rate centers per NPA; rationing amounts; and other data such as when was the last relief and whether it was a split versus an overlay.

LM also provided a 1999 COCUS and NPA Exhaust Projection report sorted three ways: (1) showing NPA exhaust by year and by quarter with a comparison to the 1998 COCUS; (2) numerically by NPA; and (3) by state. The report does include the Caribbean and Canadian projections. Area codes exhausting in 1999 were not included because they are already undergoing relief.

In response to a question as to whether there was any difference between rural and urban NPAs, NANPA did not evaluate. Ed Gould cautioned that projections should always be adjusted by comparison to the LERG. However, growth cannot be predicted solely by the LERG; carrier projections are required to project growth. In response to questions concerning follow up with non-compliant service providers, LM stated that it made attempts at collection and, as a result, did receive some late filed surveys.

In response to a question as to whether NANPA looked at state certifications to determine the expected number of new entrants, John Manning indicated there was some collaboration with state commissions -- LM looked at some state web sites, but did not seek specific input from all states. The forecasting method in 1999 is very different from 1998. Therefore, looking at the deltas may not be helpful because some states are consistently moving in one direction or the other -- it is like comparing apples to oranges. Some states have experienced more new entrants than others. Trent Boaldin noted that subjectivity makes sense in this report and NANPA should stay tuned to trends in the market place that effect the projections. Dan Hochvert questioned whether NANPA had since received requests for resources from entities that did not provide forecasts. No code requests have been denied.

The results of the 1999 survey and analysis gives support to the exhaust projection of the year 2008 to 2009. Council members suggested an update every six months based on historical CO Code assignment data, and a model that runs a comparison between historical assignment data and LERG data on a continuous basis for each NPA. John Manning indicated that LM is getting more data on an ongoing basis from its CO Code administrators. The LERG also identifies the rate centers within each NPA. A soft copy of the report presented will be made available on the NANPA.com web site.

Tony Pupek queried whether the poor rate of return of the surveys was a result of a problem with the NANPA's data base of service providers and code holders. John Manning responded that a

greater, more accurate data base of providers will be available for use for the next COCUS. LM intends to update its data base with LERG information or from other sources until they have a good solid listing of the code holders. Tom McGarry, LM, added that the current COCUS is voluntary. LM will identify carriers who did not respond, but there is no authority for sanctions at this time. NANC requested a breakdown by industry segment of carriers who did not respond to the 1999 COCUS.

Future Collaboration with NANPA Exhaust. Chairman Hasselwander stated that NANC wants to be updated by NANPA going forward as it accumulates real world data that alters the exhaust projection.

GTE contribution. Norm Epstein, GTE, presented GTE's comments regarding the forecasted exhaust survey presented by NANPA. It is GTE's position that the NANPA survey was flawed and misleading, and GTE urges the FCC and the NANC not to act on the results until an acceptable survey is conducted which is more realistic from an industry perspective. He further recommended that the NANC assign a continuation of the study to an existing industry committee, the INC Expansion Workshop, which was mentioned as a possible candidate.

Vince Majkowski did not support GTE's recommendation, and stated that the issue should not be given to the INC. Chairman Hasselwander stated that NANP exhaust study is a NANPA responsibility, and it should not be adopted by NANC as it is a NANPA study, nor should it be assigned elsewhere. INC is free to do its own study if they choose to do so.

Ed Gould concurred, stating that a baseline exhaust study is part of the NANPA contract. NANC and the industry should confine its efforts to support one answer that gives an exhaust date range. It is very difficult to evaluate the effect of competition; but it may need to be projected. Chairman Hasselwander raised the question of whether NANC would want to go beyond the base model and 1K pooling model to have other optimization methods modeled. There was strong support for modeling for rate center consolidation.

Chairman Hasselwander added that NANC would like updated data. There was little support for GTE's suggestion of moving this to another forum. The NPRM will set tasks, and direct further action with regard to whether NANC should look at other optimization methods. Carl Hansen suggested that only NANPA or the Exhaust Team involved should perform any further modeling, and involve the NRO. Ed Gould suggested NANC postpone further guidance on this matter until the NPRM is released. Brian Baldwin agreed that it would be premature to assign work to NRO until after NPRM is released. Chairman Hasselwander stated that the NRO is assigned to COCUS until June and reserved TNs in July. There is support for more information for rate center

consolidation; the NPRM will assist the NANC in making informed judgments on next steps. The Council agreed to come back to this issue after reading the NPRM and to continue its discussion in June or July.

L. Steering Group (SG) Report. Chairman Hasselwander reported on two topics of discussion by the SG on May 25, 1999. Tony Pupek reviewed USTA's contribution to the SG regarding optimization methods for the states to use going forward. The paper principally supports rate center consolidation where appropriate; encourages states to work cooperatively with the NANPA regarding confirmation of carrier certification; supports reclamation by the NANPA and believes that the NANPA should be authorized by the FCC to sanction carriers for non-compliance with industry guidelines requiring periodic reporting of forecast and utilization data.

Peter Guggina reported that LM is looking at finding efficiencies in an effort to reduce the cost of its initial bid on 1K pooling administration. During the May 13-14 meeting between the IMG and LM, another list of questions for clarifications was developed in order to break down some of the components of the 1K pooling. On June 7th, the parties will meet again and hope to conclude negotiations at that time. Additionally, the IMG created a small subgroup, led by Shawn Murphy, to look at INC guidelines in an effort to reduce requirements that would then reduce the overall cost. The IMG will work with the Cost Recovery Working Group, and NANC has agreed to use a revenue-based NANPA model for cost recovery purposes. The IMG's target is to have a final decision and recommendation in June for the NANC's review.

M Other Business. Chairman Hasselwander will not be available to chair the June 22-23, 1999. Co-Chair Ron Binz will chair the meeting.

V. Action Items and Decisions Reached.

1. Local Number Portability Administration Working Group (LNPA WG). NANC will address the final wireline wireless integration report at the July meeting.
2. Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report. On the issue of 500/900 number portability, the straw recommendation, with minor revisions, was accepted. Chairman Hasselwander will send a cover letter attaching the modified version to the initial document (handout 7(a) dated 5/25/99), as the revised NANC's response to the FCC, pursuant to CC Docket 95-116, FCC 98-275, Order (rel. Oct. 20, 1998), paragraph 30.
3. Numbering Resource Optimization (NRO) Working Group Report. Proceed with estimation of cost of reporting using categories provided. (No greater granularity - TNs Aunavailable@). Those disagreeing should share their positions with NANC members

electronically before the next meeting. Positions may be discussed at the June meeting. Accepted INC conclusions (*see* INC Issue 134) on reporting of data for non-LNP capable carriers, and as outlined in the INC Thousand Block Pooling Administration Guidelines, INC 99-0127-023, January 27, 1999, at section 6.0 Forecast and Utilization Reporting Process, which states, in pertinent part, **A**In areas where pooling has been or is planned to be implemented, SPs that meet any one of the following criteria are not required to report CO Code utilization and forecast data at the thousand block level to the Pooling Administrator (PA): (1) Exempt from local number portability and/or (2) Operate in a non-pooling area and/or (3) Operate in a pooling area but, utilize a switch technically incapable of pooling. However, these SPs are expected to provide such data to the PA in a reasonable amount of time, 6 to 9 months, prior to when they are required to participate in number pooling. Expect final recommendation for review one week prior to June NANC meeting.

The NRO WG will continue to work on the COCUS replacement through June, and then work on the **A**reserved@number definition before working on other tasks.

4. Audit Issue. NANC agreed to form an IMG to advise NANC as to a position regarding LM's obligation to provide CO code audits as a requirement of the fixed price bid. The IMG participants are: Karen Mulberry; Jo Gallagher; Jim Castagna; Norm Epstein, and Shawn Murphy. The IMG will provide a recommendation to the NANC for consideration within 30 days,
5. N-1 Query Issue. NANC will determine whether this is a policy issue. By letter, NANC will advise T1S1 of NANC interest in this issue and will ask for a briefing at the June NANC meeting. Chairman Hasselwander will prepare a letter to T1S1.6 stating the NANC's desire to understand the Telcordia contribution and asking T1S1.6 not to proceed on this matter until after the June NANC briefing.
6. 1999 COCUS. NANPA will provide additional clarification and data relating to the 1999 COCUS results, *e.g.*, current data points for jeopardies in California; explanation for large deltas shown between 1998 and 1999 COCUS reports; clarification of NA's; number of service providers contained in NANPA's data base and percentage of code holders that represents, breakdown by industry segment of respondents to the 1999 COCUS, and number of service providers not providing data that subsequently received numbering resources.
7. NANPA Exhaust Model. NANC will continue to discuss and examine a course of action relative to NANP exhaust and the effect of **A**other@optimization methods on exhaust at the June or July NANC meeting. Subsequent discussions will include recognition that there was significant support for pursuing the effects of rate center consolidation.
8. Steering Group Report. The Pooling Administration IMG will make a decision on its recommendation prior to the June NANC meeting for input to the Steering Group and the

NANC.