

October 2, 2014

**VIA ECFS**

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

**Re: Notice of Ex Parte, Telephone Number Portability, et al.  
CC Docket No. 95-116; WC Docket No. 09-109**

Dear Ms. Dortch:

I am writing on behalf of the North American Portability Management LLC ("NAPM LLC") to correct a misquotation by Neustar, Inc. ("Neustar") in its Notice of Ex Parte filed on September 23, 2014 (the "Neustar Ex Parte"). Specifically, Neustar omitted a key word when quoting the reply comments of the NAPM LLC, and relied upon the misquotation to support its argument. The misquotation distorts the statement by the NAPM LLC and inaccurately gives the impression that the NAPM LLC's reply comments provide support for Neustar's claims.

In support of its claim that the NANC Recommendation was deficient, Neustar misquoted the NAPM LLC as stating that "the lack of formal analysis does not indicate that there was any deficiency in the analysis underlying the NANC recommendation."<sup>1</sup> In reality, the NAPM LLC stated that "the lack of formal analysis *notes* does not indicate that there was any deficiency in the analysis underlying the NANC Recommendation."<sup>2</sup> Neustar's omission of this single word materially changes the NAPM LLC's statement, which merely addressed whether meeting discussions were documented. Yet Neustar's distortion of the statement suggests that the NAPM LLC concedes that no formal analysis of the submitted bids was performed. That is incorrect.

As the NAPM LLC has explained, in addition to the collective analysis performed during numerous meetings, each member company of the NAPM LLC's Future of the NPAC Advisory Committee ("FoNPAC") undertook its own review of each vendor proposal, weighing the submitted materials (including the vendor interviews) against the specific RFP criteria and carefully considering the potential impacts and risks associated with each proposal.<sup>3</sup> These member companies individually spent considerable time over several months to complete this analysis. The FoNPAC met as a committee numerous times over several months to discuss relevant issues,<sup>4</sup> including, but not limited to, the

<sup>1</sup> Neustar Notice of Ex Parte at 9-10, misquoting the NAPM LLC's Reply Comments at 4.

<sup>2</sup> NAPM LLC Reply Comments at 4 (emphasis added).

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* at 3-4.

<sup>4</sup> For a more in-depth discussion of the relevant timelines, see Future of NPAC, A Subcommittee of the NAPM LLC, Local Number Portability Administration Request for Proposal Evaluation Summary and Selection Report, at 7-8 (Jan. 22, 2014); Report of the North American Portability Management LLC In Response to the Wireline Competition Bureau Letter, dated February 11, 2014, at 37-63 (Mar. 20, 2014).

technical qualifications of the vendors, transition costs, and the potential benefits and risks associated with each bidder's proposal.<sup>5</sup>

Neustar argues, in essence, that no other party is qualified to serve as the Local Number Portability Administrator ("LNPA"), and that transitioning the services away from Neustar allegedly would be too risky and too expensive to justify any potential cost savings.<sup>6</sup> Neustar also claims that, despite universal industry support for the NANC Recommendation, the recommendation necessarily is deficient because it does not endorse continued reliance on Neustar as the LNPA. However, as discussed above, the NANC Recommendation reflects the result of this thorough individual and collective analysis, and Neustar's push for production of "formal analysis notes" – which do not exist – by the NAPM LLC is a non-substantive distraction created by the losing bidder.

Pursuant to Section 1.1206(b) of the Commission's rules, a copy of this letter is being filed via ECFS for inclusion in the public record for the above-referenced proceeding. Please contact the undersigned if you have any questions or need additional information.

Respectfully submitted,



Todd D. Daubert  
Counsel for the NAPM LLC

<sup>5</sup> See, e.g., LNPA Selection Working Group ("SWG") Report to NANC on LNPA Vendor Selection Recommendation of the Future of the NPAC Subcommittee ("FoNPAC") at 5 (Feb. 26, 2014) (explaining that "the SWG conducted due diligence in requesting detailed information and explanations from the FoNPAC regarding various critical issues, including qualifications of the Vendors, anticipated costs savings, and transition costs and risks, all with the goal of ensuring that the SWG fulfilled the role delegated to it by the NANC. . . After abundant discussion and careful consideration of the FoNPAC Report and issues discussed above, the SWG concurs with the conclusions of the FoNPAC Report.").

<sup>6</sup> See generally, e.g., Neustar Ex Parte.