

**North American Numbering Council
Meeting Minutes
October 16-17, 2001 (Final)**

I. Time and Place of Meeting. The North American Numbering Council held a meeting commencing at 8:30 a.m., at the Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W., TW-C305, Washington, D. C.

II. List of Attendees.

Voting Council Members:

- | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Robert Atkinson | Columbia University |
| 2. Teresa Gaugler | ALTS |
| 3. Ed Gould | AT&T |
| 4. Randy Sanders | BellSouth |
| 5. Michael Altschul | CTIA |
| 6. Maureen Flood | CompTel |
| 7. Switzon Wigfall | NARUC |
| 8. Hon. Thomas Dunleavy | NARUC |
| 9. Peter Pescosolido | NARUC |
| 10. Jody O'Marra | NARUC |
| 11. Dan Kearney | NARUC |
| 12. Philip McClelland | NASUCA |
| 13. James B. Goldstein | Nextel |
| 14. Ray Strassburger | Nortel Networks |
| 15. John Rose | OPASTCO |
| 16. C. Courtney Jackson | OUR |
| 17. Harold Salters | PCIA |
| 18. Deborah Bell | SBC Communications, Inc. |
| 19. Hoke Knox | Sprint |
| 20. Gerry Rosenblatt | TIA |
| 21. Chuck Eppert | Verizon |
| 22. Anna Miller | VoiceStream |
| 23. Peter Guggina | WorldCom |

Special Members (Non-voting):

- | | |
|-----------------|-------|
| John Manning | NANPA |
| Jean-Paul Emard | ATIS |

Commission Employees:

Cheryl Callahan, Designated Federal Officer (DFO)
Sanford Williams, Alternate DFO

Diane Harmon, Acting Chief, Network Services Division
Patrick Forster, Policy Division (PD), Wireless Telecommunications Bureau
Joseph Levin, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau

III. Estimate of Public Attendance. Approximately 36 members of the public attended the meeting as observers.

IV. Documents Introduced.

- (1) Agenda
- (2) Schedule of NANC Meeting Dates for 2001/2002
- (3) Public Notice Announcing GSA Approval of Renewal of NANC Charter Through October 4, 2003
- (4) NANPA Report to the NANC
- (5) NANPA Oversight Working Group Status Report to the NANC
- (6) Memo from Robert Atkinson to Code Holders, State Regulators and Other Interested Parties in Re: NANC Seeks Public Input on Performance of the NANPA
- (7) NANPA 2001 Annual Performance Feedback Survey
- (8) NANPA Technical Requirements Document
- (9) Corrections/changes to the NANPA Technical Requirements Document
- (10) NANP Expansion/Numbering Optimization IMG
- (11) NANP Expansion/Number Optimization Summary of Basic Descriptions
- (12) INC Report to the NANC
- (13) LNPA Working Group Status Report to the NANC
- (14) Wireless Number Portability Subcommittee Pooling Task Force Report
- (15) Wireless Number Portability Operations Status Report to the NANC
- (16) North American Portability Management (NAPM), LLC September 2001 Report to the NANC
- (17) NANPA Fund Performance Status Report & Funds Projection

V. Summary of the Meeting.

Opening Remarks. Chairman Atkinson expressed hope that everyone arrived home safely from the September 11 NANC meeting and that we would never have to experience an event such as that again. He announced that beginning in January 2002, NANC meetings will be held bimonthly. Cheryl Callahan, DFO, announced that the NANC Charter has been renewed through October 4, 2003. She emphasized that the Common Carrier Bureau has been looking into ways to increase the efficiency of the NANC. Ms. Callahan further advised that in an effort to keep the size of the group contained so that the operations will continue to run efficiently, the Bureau intends to reduce the size of the NANC through attrition as members step down. Chairman Atkinson noted that the new Charter includes the NANC's responsibility to provide guidance to NANPA and the Pooling Administrator as directed by the Commission. Cheryl Callahan noted that the process for selecting the various contractors and the process of providing advice and guidance to the Commission

has changed. She stated that to the extent that there will be extensive NANC involvement in the day-to-day operation as to how the Pooling Administrator or the NANPA does its job, in the next contract, that direction will primarily come from the Commission.

At the request of Chairman Atkinson, David Lockwood, President of Telecomm 555, Inc., expanded on comments that he made at the July 2001 NANC meeting. Mr. Lockwood spoke as the representative of 555 assignees. He discussed the history of the 555 NXX. As numbering experts perceived the coming exhaust of NANP numbering resources, various committees reviewed the existing types of numbers and assignment processes, including one for the 555 NXX. The 555 NXX resource involves the 10,000 telephone numbers from 555-0000 to 555-9999. The NXX has been reserved in every geographic NPA in the NANP. The 555 NXX committee designed 555 NXX telephone numbers for 7-digit dialing throughout the NANP, from anywhere to anywhere. The FCC exempted national 555 numbers from mandatory 10-digit dialing in FCC Order 99-243. Mr. Lockwood commented on statements made by Nortel in regards to 555 numbers. Mr. Lockwood stated that 555 numbers were first assigned in July of 1994. Mr. Lockwood said 555 assignees deserve treatment similar to assignees of 877 and 866 toll free numbers. Nortel said that 555 line number advocates want someone else to pay the bills. Mr. Lockwood said 555 assignees want to pay tens of millions of dollar in access charges to LECs. With regards to the INC issue on the reclamation of 555 numbers, Mr. Lockwood claimed that the real issue is not reclamation but the adequate ability to implement. Mr. Lockwood closed by requesting that the NANC direct carriers to provide translation of both 7 and 10 digit dialed 555 numbers to terminate as directed by the number assignee by January 1, 2002. He suggested the appropriate charges should be the same as access rates for toll free services.

A. North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA) Report to the NANC. John Manning, NANPA, provided the report to the Council.

Central Office Code Assignment Activity Report. Mr. Manning reported that beginning from January 2001 through September 2001, NANPA is averaging 927 codes per month. The average drops to 410 codes per month factoring in the return of codes. He further reported that for the same time period in the year 2000 the average codes per month was 1,353. After factoring in the return of codes, the net code assignment rate averaged 1,073 codes per month. Mr. Manning reported that effective in August 2001, NANPA has eliminated the suspension column, because those codes receive some other form of dispensation (i.e., assigned, denied).

NPA Inventory Report. Mr. Manning reported that there are 675 assignable codes of which 363 are currently assigned. He gave a breakdown of the number of assigned codes that are in service, both for geographic and non-geographic. There are 54 that are still awaiting implementation. Mr. Manning reported that of the 675 assignable codes, 312 are currently unassigned. Of the 312 unassigned codes, 48 are easily recognizable codes. Mr. Manning reported that since January 1, 2001, NANPA has assigned 19 NPAs. Twenty NPAs have actually gone into service. All of the in-service NPAs that have been put in since the beginning of the year have been for geographic purposes.

2001 NANP Exhaust Projection. Mr. Manning previously reported on its NANP exhaust projection in detail at the September meeting, but noted a couple of items that are based upon conversation both at the NANC and the NENO working group. He reported that additional information has been added for NANC's consideration. Mr. Manning reported that the base model using 11,600 annual CO Code demand, resulted in a NANP exhaust date of 2025. NANPA ran several sensitivity analyses. One of the assumptions was changed so that any NPA that had at least one rate center in the top 100 MSAs would also implement pooling throughout the area code. This resulted in an additional 55 NPAs. That sensitivity resulted in a NANP exhaust date of 2027. Mr. Manning indicated that on the previous report, the analysis was run on the assumption that at least one rate center had to be in the top 100 MSA. The same sensitivity analysis was run on the base model assumptions where there was 50% or more of the rate centers in the top 100 MSAs. Mr. Manning reviewed the breakdown of what the impact is on the base model using 11,600 yearly CO code demand. Mr. Manning summarized the results of the sensitivity analysis run with various yearly CO code demand where pooling is implemented in those NPAs with 50% or more of their rate centers in the top 100 MSAs and where pooling is implemented in those NPAs with at least one rate center in a top 100 MSA.

NRUF Reporting. Mr. Manning provided a chart that detailed the first round of the NRUF reporting as of September 15, 2000 and the NRUF reporting one year later as of August 1, 2001. He reported that as of October 13, 2000, NANPA had received over 3000 502 forms. As of September 5, 2001, NANPA had received 3275 502 forms. Mr. Manning noted that there has not been much change in terms of the quantity of 502 forms that NANPA has received. Mr. Manning reported that in September 2000, 350 forms were accepted without any errors. As of August 2001, 2734 forms were accepted without any errors. He noted that this is a significant improvement in terms of the submission error rate. Mr. Manning reported that in September 2000 over 1700 forms were accepted but contained errors. As of August 2001, 408 forms were accepted but contained errors. He noted that this is also a significant improvement in the overall performance of the submissions being completed. Mr. Manning reported that in September 2000, over 750 forms contained errors that resulted in the submission being rejected. In August of 2001, NANPA rejected 133 forms which contained errors. He noted the majority of those forms were from entities that were submitting 500 and 900 data. Mr. Manning reported that one year ago, beginning in the August 1 submission cycle, NANPA would only contact service providers when there was a problem with their submission. NANPA has now instituted a process in which it will send e-mail notifications to service providers regardless of whether there are errors or not that the forms have been accepted into the system. NANPA will also be contacting service providers whose submissions contain anomalous data (i.e., missing utilization data). Mr. Manning reported that as of September 2000 NANPA has been providing states access to NRUF data.

Unavailable Code Project Update. Mr. Manning reported that in September 2001, NANPA posted a listing of NPA NXXs and had focused on the area codes that were in the most need of NXXs. There were approximately 22 NPAs with approximately 160 NXXs that had been posted. Mr. Manning provided a list of additional NPA NXXs that

NANPA has reviewed and believes are currently unavailable for assignment that potentially can be made available for assignment. He reported that NANPA is currently contacting the industry and state regulators to review the list to determine if there are any reasons why the codes identified cannot be made available for assignment. Mr. Manning advised that once that process has been completed, if no concern has been raised for a particular code, that code will become available for assignment. He noted that responses have been received on 27 NPA NXXs that need to remain unassignable. The remainder of the codes will eventually be made available for assignment.

NANPA Response to 2000 Evaluation. Mr. Manning reviewed with the Council the following items: (1) NANPA's 2000 accomplishments, (2) primary areas for performance improvement based upon the information gathered during the evaluation process, and (3) potential improvements or enhancements to the NANPA evaluation process. Mr. Manning reported that NANPA has reviewed the NOWG evaluation in detail, including the presentation and the evaluation report. He advised that based upon this material, combined with the information gathered during NANPA's meeting with the NOWG in late May, NANPA has developed a performance improvement plan (PIP). Mr. Manning further advised that NANPA has already implemented process changes to address many of the items included in the PIP and intend to work cooperatively with the NOWG to address all of the other issues.

Chairman Atkinson stated that his reaction to the whole NANPA evaluation process is that the process is in place because it is required or has been done historically. He questioned whether it is producing useful results. Rose Travers, USTA, questioned whether the number of surveys in question would have mattered if this had been an outstanding report on NANPA's performance. Ms. Travers stated that she had heard, informally, through the industry that when they give feedback to an individual code administrator on their performance, they are concerned about repercussions. Peter Guggina, Worldcom, recommends an evaluation process. He stated that it would be much more effective if it is done in a similar fashion to employee evaluations where objectives are set in the beginning of the report period. Mr. Guggina suggested that the objectives should be broken into two parts, such as specific objectives and general responsibilities. Chairman Atkinson questioned whether the NANC owes the FCC a formal report regarding NeuStar's performance and if so, the due date of the report. Cheryl Callahan, DFO, responded that she does not know whether there is a specific date set for these performance evaluations, but that the NANC is to provide to the Commission, an annual performance evaluation of NANPA. Chairman Atkinson advised that the process should begin immediately. Norman Epstein, NOWG, stated that although the quantity of responses is not very large, the NOWG felt that it represents a very high percentage of the work that the NANPA does. He explained that companies have a right to have their comments heard and considered. He further explained that the NOWG tried to represent what they saw in writing, both in the positive and negative. Mr. Epstein stated that the survey that NANPA gives out throughout the year has an impact on the NOWG survey. Chairman Atkinson questioned how different is NeuStar's internal survey versus the NOWG survey. John Manning responded that NeuStar survey is more specific to a particular activity that has taken place. Randy Sanders, BellSouth,

questioned whether there is a formal complaint process that NANPA seeks feedback from that requires NANPA to respond to. Mr. Manning responded that there is a formal complaint process in place.

Extensive discussion continued on how the NANC is going to improve the NANPA evaluation process for next year and the process in which the NANC formally reports to the FCC on the NANPA Response to 2000 Evaluation Report.

Mr. Guggina suggested that the NANC should focus on the issue of neutrality since NANPA was rated less than acceptable in that area. Ms. Travers reported that there were two types of neutrality that the NOWG looked at. One was treatment of individual carriers, and the other was whether the parent company NeuStar leveraged the role as NANPA into other government contracts or other contracts. She stated that there was concern on the part of industry that other potential vendors would be precluded from a process that they wanted to see open, fair competitive bidding. Ms. Travers further stated that the questions were rather complex. Chuck Eppert, Verizon, agreed that the questions are too complex. Chairman Atkinson inquired as to what the NANC is going to report to the FCC. Mr. Eppert suggested that the NANC report that NANPA met their requirements, that survey results indicated that some areas warrant improvement, and that the NANC will continue working with NANPA to accomplish such improvements. Chairman Atkinson suggested that attachments to the letter should include the NOWG report, the NeuStar response, and a couple of paragraphs highlighting anything that the NANC would like to draw specifically to the FCC's attention.

After extensive discussion, a consensus was reached by the NANC that Chairman Atkinson would draft a letter to the FCC, e-mail the draft to the NANC members in a few days, and send the final letter to the FCC in two weeks.

B. NANPA Oversight Working Group (NOWG) Status Report to the NANC.

Rose Travers, USTA, presented the report to the Council. Ms. Travers reported that major revisions were made to the survey for the 2001 NANPA Performance Review. She stated that the NOWG has a proposed report outlined as to when the report will go out, when respondents will send them in, and when the NOWG will do their final deliverable on this particular item. Ms. Travers noted that the format was significantly revised. She reported that for the 2001 Performance Report, the NOWG expects to deliver the following: (1) Executive Summary, (2) Statistical aggregation by survey question, (3) Comments aggregated by survey section, (4) NOWG Operational Review, which involves a site visit to NANPA's facilities, usually on the West Coast and the East Coast, and (5) Final Results and the Process Improvement Plan. Ms. Travers stated that the NOWG will seek NANC approval for their outline on how they intend to deliver the next report plus the changed performance feedback survey. She reviewed the 2001 Performance Review schedule. Ms. Travers reported that the due date of the survey is January 15, 2002 and should be returned to Pat Caldwell or Karen Mulberry. She noted the different web sites where electronic copies of the Performance Feedback Survey may be obtained. Ms. Travers reviewed the definitions included in the Performance Feedback Survey and the survey return instructions. She advised that the survey has been

simplified to three overall sections: CO Code Administration, NPA Relief Planning, and an Overall Assessment of NANPA. Chairman Atkinson suggested that comments should proceed “not met” on the Performance Feedback Survey. Rose Travers stated that the NOWG could investigate if a “not met” is received. Switzon Wigfall, NARUC, suggested that it would be helpful to NeuStar if the response section of the survey would indicate whether responses are being provided from respondents who may represent a cross section of industry or just the typical ten thousand block code holder.

Chairman Atkinson proposed that NeuStar provide input on the Performance Feedback Survey questions to the NOWG, the NOWG will have a conference call or e-mail correspondence, and at the beginning of November, the NOWG circulate to the Council members a revised survey, and Council members provide e-mail feedback to the NOWG.

Technical Requirements Document. Rose Travers commented that the NOWG had some issues with some of the language in the document where it was thought to be a policy question and better referred to the NANC for resolution. Consensus was reached by the NANC to replace the bullets with numbers or letters, expand the table of contents, and approve the entire Technical Requirements Document with the exceptions of Ed Gould’s, AT&T, comments, Greg Pattenaude’s, NARUC, comments, and the paragraphs in document number #9. Extensive discussion ensued to reach consensus on the comments by Mr. Gould, Mr. Pattenaude, and the paragraphs in document #9. Deborah Bell, SBC, expressed concern regarding the consistency in the document on requests for approval dates. She noted that in the INC guidelines, there is no provision for the industry having included a request for approval dates. Ms. Bell indicated that her preference would be to stay with the 90 days. She suggested that there needs to be a caveat in the final analysis to give direction. Anna Miller, VoiceStream, commented that it is always good to have timeframes. She questioned whether there are timeframes within the relief planning guidelines that address this issue. Mr. Guggina stated that he sees merit in listing the timeframes. Ms. Travers explained that when the language was drafted, the NOWG was trying to be cognizant of the FCC requirement on NPA relief. She further explained that NPA relief had to be approved in a timeframe so that no carriers would be denied codes and, that is why the NOWG tried to limit the scope and impose a timeframe.

After extensive discussion regarding approval dates, consensus was reached by the NANC to accept Mr. Pattenaude’s suggestions with minor changes.

C. Presentation by National Thousands-Block Pooling Administrator (PA).

Amy Putnam, NeuStar reported that the Pooling Administrator is approximately 120 days into the contract. She further reported that the proposed national rollout has been delivered to the FCC. The national rollout should be released within the week. Ms. Putnam reported that the Telecordia states have all transitioned from Telecordia to the NeuStar state platform. She noted that the PA has provided to the FCC all documents that have been required up to this point in a timely fashion. Ms. Putnam reported that all other tasks required by the contract are moving along as anticipated.

D. NANP Expansion/Numbering Optimization IMG. Ed Gould, AT&T presented the report to the Council. Mr. Gould reported that the basic descriptions have been agreed upon for all number optimization measures. He also reported that there was an agreement by conference call of the NENO to eliminate Charging for Numbers from consideration. Mr. Gould pointed out that Administrative Measures, which is a new item, has been added. He reported that the NENO is trying to agree on the methodology to identify what the value is in terms of expansion of the numbering plan. The NENO has agreed on 10-Digit Dialing. Mr. Gould reported that the NENO plans to evaluate what Rate Center Consolidation can do for a reduction in the number of codes that would be required going forward. Most of the analysis of this is being done by NANPA. The NENO is looking at the impact and cost for the public as well as for the industry. Mr. Gould reviewed the meeting schedule of the NENO.

E. Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report. Norman Epstein, INC Moderator, presented the report to the Council. Mr. Epstein reviewed the upcoming INC meetings. He reported the INC has finished documenting procedures for NANPA, the PA, and Service Providers to follow when codes with ported out TNs are returned or abandoned. Mr. Epstein noted that these procedures, contained in separate appendices, support the interim FCC direction that was provided to NANPA and the PA. He reported on issues discussed at the LNPA workshop. Mr. Epstein stated that some calling plans (e.g., Extended Area Service) have different boundaries than rate centers. Some states define rate districts within rate centers as wireline call rating mechanisms. Calling party call rating for all customers is impacted by these two points. Different districts/plans are served by distinct NXXs. INC recommends that states with different districts/plans should require separate pools within the same rate center. Mr. Epstein stated that numbering resources for distinct districts/plans may need to be considered separately for code and block acquisition. He indicated that the INC would like to seek guidance from the NANC on this issue. Ms. Callahan stated that the FCC is aware of this situation and has been in contact with some of the staff at the state commissions on this issue. She further stated that the NRO Order speaks to number assignments in this context to some extent. She stated that she is not sure how much from a policy perspective that the NANC needs to begin work on this issue. Chairman Atkinson questioned whether the FCC has a decision coming up that will address this issue. Ms. Callahan responded that there is a plan to address the safety valve issue in the next Numbering Resource Optimization Order, and that this issue was raised in that context.

Mr. Epstein advised that the INC is continuing to work on the NANP Expansion Recommendation and expects to have a final report by the end of this year. The INC's objective is the expanded NANP format, which is a plan that adds two digits to the existing ten digit number. Mr. Epstein reported on the three ways in which the INC can transition to the recommended expansion plan.

F. Local Number Portability Administration (LNPA) Working Group Report. Gary Sacra, Verizon, presented the report to the Council. Mr. Sacra reported that the LNPA spent a portion of the October meeting reviewing the project plan for NPAC Point

Release 3.1. This Point Release is being developed to address the NPAC-SOA interface issues associated with NPAC Release 3.0. To date, only the Northeast Region is running on NPAC Release 3.0. Mr. Sacra reviewed the current planned rollout schedule for Point Release 3.1. He reported that the Statement of Work (SOW) 28 for NPAC Point Release 3.1 has been approved. NeuStar announced that they are changing the NPAC hardware configuration coincident with the implementation of Point Release 3.1. With the combination of 3.1 Change Orders and new NPAC hardware configuration, NeuStar estimates total throughput performance improvement will be 3-4 times that of Release 3.0. This is for both SOA and LSMS interfaces. Service provider systems must also support 3.1 Change Orders and faster throughput in order to achieve improved performance end-to-end. Mr. Sacra noted that the LNPA will address any longer term solution to this issue on a contribution basis, and that NeuStar will participate in any discussions. The PIM Report was reviewed with the Council.

Wireless Number Portability Operations (WNPO) Subcommittee Pooling Task Force Report. Anna Miller, Co-Chair, presented the report to the Council. Ms. Miller reported that this task force was opened to address how the wireless industry will catch up with the pooling establishment process for 1K Block Pooling. She reported that the task force agreed on its mission and scope. The Mission Statement is: Provide a forum for the identification discussion and resolution of issues affecting wireless implementation of all areas and associated area codes that will be participating in pooling by November 24, 2002. The task force has participation from wireless service providers, the Pooling Administrator (PA), and state regulators. Ms. Miller reported that it has been estimated that approximately 151 NPAs will be pooled by November 24, 2002. The PA reviewed their worst case estimate of wireless demand for August 2002 through August 2003. She reviewed the Work Plan of the task force. Linda Godfrey of Verizon Wireless stepped down as co-chair, and Anna Miller of VoiceStream Wireless was selected as her replacement.

Wireless Number Portability Operations Status Report to the NANC. James Grasser, Co-Chair, presented the report to the Council. Mr. Grasser reported that the WNPO met on Monday, October 8 and Tuesday, October 9. NeuStar provided an update on new entrant testing. NeuStar pointed out that service provider testing for Release 3.1 would begin in November, and, during this test period, resources for new entrant testing may not be available. Mr. Grasser reported that new business items were introduced and briefly discussed. Included were: NAPM LLC action items, conversion of Type 1 numbers, and extending the length of the WNPO meetings. Additional items that were not discussed were: order exchange between wireline and wireless service providers, over the air activation in a WNP environment, and NPAC's readiness for wireless number portability. An update from the Wireless Testing Sub-Committee (WTSC) was presented. The WTSC sent a letter to the WNPO expressing their concern that wireless service providers will not be ready to begin inter-carrier testing in October 2001. Mr. Grasser reported that in June 2001, the WNPO sent letters to a number of vendors requesting confirmation that they would be ready to support Phase 2 of LNP and the MIN/MDN separation by the time the wireless service providers would need to begin internal testing in preparation for inter-carrier testing. Due to the poor response to this

letter as well as the letter from the WTSC, the WNPO is requesting help of the NANC. Specifically, the WNPO is requesting that the NANC approve a follow-up vendor letter and request the FCC Common Carrier Bureau to send this letter to the vendors. In addition, the WNPO is seeking NANC approval of a second letter, which is a follow-up to a letter sent several weeks ago to those wireless service who are not participating at either WNPO or WTSC but have licenses to provide service in the top 100 MSAs as identified in the FCC's order for Local Number Portability. Based on responses to the first letter, the WNPO may request, at the November NANC meeting, that the NANC send this follow-up letter. Mr. Grasser reported that review of the current draft version of the Risk Assessment Document began. A conference call is scheduled for October 19, 2001 to complete the review. The next meeting of the WNPO will be held in Kansas City on November 12 and 13, 2001.

The following two issues were deferred until the afternoon session of the NANC meeting: (1) the question of whether the NANC should ask the FCC CCB to exert leverage on behalf of one industry segment on another industry segment, and (2) whether the NANC should advise the FCC of a potential risk to the inter-carrier testing schedule for wireless number portability and pooling because of the unavailability of information concerning the necessary hardware/software in a timely fashion.

Chairman Atkinson requested the WNPO Subcommittee to draft a letter that he could send to the FCC alerting them of a potential problem. The NANC will then try to reach a consensus by e-mail.

G. NAPM LLC Report. Michael O'Connor, Co-Chair, presented the report to the Council. Mr. O'Connor reported that on Monday, August 20, 2001 the NPAC data base failed. It was restarted and failed again on Tuesday, August 21, 2001. He reported that the NeuStar engineers determined there was a data base corruption that was creating these failures, and further restarts at that time would have been pointless. He reported on the root cause of the failure. Data bases were back up and running in the Northeast Region on Friday morning, August 24, 2001. Mr. O'Connor reported on Preventive "Cure" with regards to this problem. He stated that more backups are needed, and there needs to be procedures in place on how to deal with this.

H. NBANC Report. Maripat Brennan, NBANC, presented the report to the Council. Ms. Brennan reported that as of October 10, 2001, the fund balance in the NANPA fund is almost \$9.8 Million. Approximately \$6 Million has been collected. Approximately \$1.5 Million has been paid out in expenses. The Projected Receivables from October 2001 through June 2002, are \$4.5 Million of which payments by the U.S. carriers are approximately \$4.4 Million. Payment to NeuStar for NANPA and Co Code Administration for Year 4 is \$1.27 Million. The first year of the five year contract for 1K Block Pooling Administration will be approximately \$3.9 Million. Ms. Brennan reported that NBANC began to pay NeuStar for the 1K Block Pooling contract in September 2001. They were paid for two months' work for July and August for \$115,000. Mitre Corporation has been paid \$13.8 Thousand for consultation on pooling administration for July – October 2001. To date, no money has been paid out of the funds for the NANPA

Auditor and for COCUS Replacement. NECA has been paid \$69.3 Thousand for the operational work in support of NBANC. To date, the Board payments are approximately \$2,200. PricewaterhouseCoopers has been paid \$26.5 Thousand and has provided the FCC with a report on the operations of NBANC. Ms. Brennan reported that the 1st quarter 2001/2002 NBANC financial report was filed with the FCC today. Randy Sanders, BellSouth, questioned how late payments are handled. Ms. Brennan stated that the IRS figure of 9% is used if a carrier does not make their payment on time. It is multiplied times what they owe and is added to what they owe. It will continue to accrue even though a carrier does not receive a bill.

Action Items and Decisions Reached:

1. North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA) Report

The NANC Chairman will issue a letter to the effect that NANPA met the requirements, noting that there are some areas for improvement.

The letter, the 2000 Performance Evaluation, and NANPA's response will be forwarded to the FCC.

2. Presentation by the NANPA Oversight Working Group

NANPA and NOWG will meet to review the 2001 Survey

- NOWG will send electronic copy to the NANPA on October 17, 20001.
- November 1, 2001, NOWG will send revised 2001 Survey to NANC members.

NOWG will expand the Table of Contents of the NANPA Technical Requirements document, and replace bullets by letters or numerals, as appropriate.

3. The Wireless Number Portability Operations Working Group

WPNO will draft a letter for Chairman Atkinson to be addressed to Dorothy Attwood regarding the difficulties wireless carriers are experiencing in obtaining information from vendors for LNP testing.

4. Chairman Atkinson will check on whether there is a response from the FCC on the 555 letter previously sent by the NANC.