

1776 K STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20006
PHONE 202.719.7000
FAX 202.719.7049

www.wileyrein.com

November 17, 2015

Thomas J. Navin
202.719.7487
tnavin@wileyrein.com

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Room TW-A325
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: CC Docket No. 95-116; WC Docket Nos. 07-149 and 09-109

Dear Ms. Dortch,

On November 13, 2015, Scott Deutchman and Aaron Goldberger, of Neustar, Inc., Michael Krieger, of Krieger Consulting LLC, and I had separate meetings with Diane Cornell, Special Counsel to Chairman Wheeler and Ann Stevens, Deputy Division Chief of the Competition Policy Division of the Wireline Competition Bureau; Amy Bender, Legal Advisor to Commissioner O’Rielly; and Nicholas Degani, Legal Advisor to Commissioner Pai.

In each of the presentations, Neustar discussed its commitment to honoring its present and future contractual obligations in support of the transition to a new Local Number Portability Administrator (LNPA). Neustar’s discussion also focused on the issues highlighted in the attached letter to the North American Portability Management, LLC (NAPM), including Neustar’s observations regarding issues that may impede a smooth transition. Recognizing the NAPM and Telcordia’s apparent preference to sequentially address their contract requirements prior to addressing a transition services agreement with Neustar, we suggested that the specific transition requirements that will require Neustar resources in 2016 be shared with Neustar as soon as possible. Furthermore, Neustar emphasized the need for the FCC to ensure that the transition process is open and transparent to all parties.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas J. Navin

Enclosure

cc: Diane Cornell
Ann Stevens
Amy Bender
Nicholas Degani

ATTACHMENT



November 05, 2015

Mr. Tim Kagele
5800 S Quebec Street
Greenwood Village, CO 80111

Mr. Tim Decker
Verizon
600 Hidden Ridge
Irving, TX 75038

Dear Mr. Kagele and Mr. Decker,

As a follow-up to our meeting on Wednesday, October 28, 2015 (and the documents filed into the record by the NAPM on October 29, 2015), we wish to offer several observations regarding the transition process and its implications and potentially unrealistic expectations on Neustar in connection with the transition.

Neustar is committed to honoring its present and any future contractual obligations in fulfillment of the smoothest possible transition to a new Local Number Portability Administrator. We also have an obligation to set forth our understanding of issues that may impede a smooth transition and that may set unrealistic expectations of Neustar. It is in the spirit of attempting to get this process on track that we write to you.

On March 27, 2015, the FCC awarded the LNPA contract to iconectiv. On April 7, 2015, NAPM and Neustar entered into an agreement for, among other things, Neustar to start providing defined transition services covered by the agreement. That agreement also specified the related commercial terms. Since that time, Neustar has diligently supported numerous NAPM transition requests that required over six thousand hours of time from key personnel.

Since entering into the April agreement, Neustar expected a multi-party information exchange process involving Neustar, iconectiv, the Transition Oversight Manager and the NAPM that would allow each of us to understand transition roles and responsibilities, milestones with associated timing, dependencies, security requirements, test plans, entry and exit criteria, and the critical path. Unfortunately, we have not received a transition plan document that informs us of the critical details about these items.

We fully appreciate the complexity of the task facing the NAPM and understand that there are multiple ways to move forward. The current serial approach – completing a contract with iconectiv prior to negotiating the associated requirements and dependencies with Neustar – creates the risk that expectations regarding key deliverables, may be unrealistic and could undermine our ability to deliver the services or negotiate the terms.

We expect that the NAPM's proposed contract with iconectiv reflects obligations that likely depend upon assumptions regarding Neustar's obligations. Neustar has not seen that contract but it has received an outline of proposed obligations¹ for Neustar that lack sufficient detail. For example:

- In at least ten places, the document requires Neustar to meet a set timetable but without the specifics of the timetable being provided.

¹ "NEUSTAR TRANSITION SERVICES SOW – Draft 1 092515" sent by Dan Sciuillo on October 7, 2015


- The document calls for Neustar “to comply with the following milestone delivery schedule” and then states “Schedule to be provided.” Neustar cannot reasonably agree to such a provision in which the entirety of the details, both as to substance and timing, are to be provided at a later date.
- The document calls for Neustar to “comply with agreed upon roll back procedures and requirements” without providing any details about what those procedures and requirements might be. Additionally, there is no clarity about whether rollback is defined in the narrow sense of a failed migration attempt or in the broader sense of transitioning back to Neustar before any regional migration is attempted.

To the extent that the contract with iconectiv depends upon the fulfillment of specific obligations within defined time frames by Neustar, then all the stakeholders in this transition would benefit from Neustar’s participation in developing those metrics.

As we discussed in our October 28th meeting, Neustar is willing to support the NAPM in the development of additional requirements for transition and enter into a transition services SOW. NAPM’s requests, however, currently lack necessary technical and operational requirements and supporting detail upon which to build a solid foundation for a transition services SOW.

Neustar has and will continue to engage with the NAPM in developing the detailed operational and technical considerations, and will negotiate the necessary agreements to effectuate the new requirements. We are ready to start immediately, and look forward to engaging with the NAPM at its earliest opportunity.

Sincerely,



Richard Louis
Director, Neustar Transition Program Office