

September 16, 2002

Re: Docket No. 01-05-18, DPUC Intent to Conduct a Voluntary Unassigned Number Porting (UNP) Trial

The tenth in a series of technical meetings concerning Docket 01-05-18 was held September 12, 2002, by conference call.

Participants:

Peter Pescosolido, DPUC
Greg Hunter, Sprint
Rich Skarzynski, SBC SNET
Ed Miller, SBC SNET
Paul LaGattuta, AT&T
Beth O'Donnell, Cox
Gene Johnston, Neustar
Barry Bishop, Neustar
Bill Higgins, Verizon

Karen Mulberry, WorldCom
Hoke Knox, Sprint
Pat Gendernalik, SBC SNET
Cassie Yang, SBC SNET
Brent Struthers, Neustar
Rob Howley, Cox
Shannon Collins, Neustar
Eileen Huggard, Verizon
Michelle Thomas, T-Mobile

The major focus of this call was questions/comments raised by Brent Struthers after his recent meeting with the Neustar Pooling Administrator (PA) folks. Specifically:

1. *If we must request NPAC reports on numbers ported within a block, who will pay for this service? Today PA does not have authority to request NPAC reports. These reports would be to determine which TN's are contaminated.*
2. *Should wording be added to the guidelines to account for instances in which all tens blocks are contaminated and PA must assign two blocks to meet sequential number requirement? For example, a SP requests 1 block and needs 10 TN's, the blocks that are available are contaminated, therefore we have to assign 2 blocks that would equal 10 TN's.*

Since Neustar will be identifying pristine tens number blocks at the beginning of the trial, it was agreed that NPAC reports would not be necessary. It was also agreed that the Connecticut Guidelines would be revised at Section 5.2.d to reflect that the administrator would allocate the tens-blocks sequentially from pristine blocks. Therefore, Brent's questions Nos. 1 and 2 were suspended.

3. *Note that tens blocks will not be ported as pooled type. This will affect snap-back.*

Barry emphasized that when numbers used as part of the trial are deleted from the NPAC, they will snap back to the original code holder (as is the case when numbers are ported rather than pooled).

Additionally, Shannon sought to clarify that the receiving carrier would be responsible for porting the numbers immediately rather than when they are assigned to the end user. It was agreed by the group that the guidelines would be revised to reflect this clarification (Section 2.8) and on the "Tens Block Part 3."

4. *How are carrier's going to handle default routing on numbers assigned to them as part of a ten's block?*

It was agreed that normal routing procedures would apply.

Regarding Brent's proposed changes to the guidelines:

2.4 ...prepared by the Connecticut Industry and the Connecticut Industry...

This proposed revision to Section 2.4 was accepted by the group.

6.2.3 INC is changing the 28 day timeframe to 33 days. Should the UNP guidelines be changed to match or would a shorter time frame work for this trial?

It was agreed that a new section, Section 2.9 would be added to the Assumptions and Constraints section of the Connecticut Guidelines that would indicate changes to the INC Guidelines would be reviewed for potential changes to the Modified UNP Guidelines where applicable.

6.1.3(a) ...resources for the rate center will exhaust...

6.3.2 ...placed in service within 6 months of the effective date of the tens block.

These changes were also accepted by the group. Additionally, "for applications for initial resources within the rate center," was added to the end of Section 2.5.f of the Connecticut Guidelines.

On September 16, 2002, these minutes were distributed to the industry group for comments and/or corrections. Cassie Yang-Cobb (SBC-SNET) questioned the above proposed changes. Specifically, Cassie indicated that Section 6.3.2 of the NeuStar doc still reflected 60 days. Notes from the SBC-SNET team show industry agreement for both 60 days and 6 months so we're not sure what's correct.

In light of this outstanding question, Michele Thomas (T-Mobile) proposed the following revision to the guidelines:

6.3.2 A tens-block assigned to a SP should be placed in service by the applicable activation deadline, that is, six months after the original effective date returned on the Part 3. Confirmation that the tens-block has been placed in service is mandatory by submitting the Part 4 form to the Administrator. If the SP identified that they will not meet the deadline, due to circumstance beyond their control, the SP may request an extension. If the Administrator does not receive the Part 4 – Confirmation of the tens-block in service, the Administrator will start the reclamation process within 60 calendar days of the expiration of the applicable activation deadline.

NOTE: Section 6.1(c) Criteria for Tens-Block Number Allocation states..... “the applicant must be able to provide documented proof that they are or will be capable of providing service within 60 days of the numbering resource activation date” (Footnote FCC 00-104, § 52.15 (i)(6)).

Therefore, based on the proposed language there should be no modification to 6.3.2 to reference facilities readiness as it is in Section 6.1(c)

These changes were accepted by the group and this outstanding issue was closed.

Barry raised the question concerning the provision of forecasts to the Pooling Administrator and how the PA would account for number blocks without formal forecasts. It was noted that since Neustar would be identifying pristine blocks (one block for each rate center participating in the trial), formal forecasting would be avoided. It was also agreed that should actual demand exceed the supply on a rate center basis, that conference calls would be convened by the group to resolve the issue.

A question concerning how the costs associated with the Connecticut trial would be recovered (as well as an additional Neustar staff person being assigned to assist in the administration of the trial) was raised. Neustar indicated that the FCC did not fully approve their change order request for the M-UNP trial. Although the FCC approved the commencement of the trial, the FCC did not

approve the additional Pooling Administrator resource requested. Therefore, Neustar reported that there will be no additional cost to the industry for this resource. Neustar hired a new pooling administrator separate from this change order request on Sept. 15 who will also be responsible for the M-UNP trial.

Finally, a working schedule was established as follows:

Revised guidelines issued by Gene on September 13, 2002;
Comments concerning the revised guidelines to Gene by September 20, 2002;
Next UNP Working Group teleconference call is scheduled for October 1, 2002, at 10:00 a.m. EST. Neustar will provide the conference bridge. Proposed agenda items to be discussed will include the final guidelines, attachments, possible face-to-face meeting, proposed start date and DPUC letter to the FCC; and any other business.

The Conference Call Meeting Adjourned at 11:40 a.m.