

1. **Process Improvement Plan (PIP) Review**
 - New Development Activities
 - Review Existing PIP Status Report
 - Highlights of Monthly Quality Assurance Group Findings/Corrective Action Plans
 - Current NANPA initiated Survey/Comments Findings
 - Areas Under Consideration for PIP Treatment

2. **NANPA Complaints**
 - New Complaints Received
 - Status of Existing Complaints

3. **CO Code Administration**
 - New Development Activities
 - Metrics/Benchmarks

4. **Code Administration System (CAS)**
 - New Development Activities
 - Metrics/Benchmarks
 - Client Usage/Difficulties Reported/Observed
 - Areas Under Consideration for System Improvement

5. **Numbering Resource Utilization/Forecasting (NRUF) System**
 - New Development Activities
 - Metrics/Benchmarks
 - Client Usage/Difficulties Reported/Observed
 - Areas Under Consideration for Improvement
 - Inconsistent/Anomalous Data Reporting
 - NRUF Status of OCN Report (Missing Utilization Data?)
 - Error Detection/Resolution Activities

6. **NPA Relief Planning**
 - New Development Activities
 - Metrics/Benchmarks
 - Status of Current NPA Relief Activities (Jeopardy etc.)
 - Status of NPA Exhaust Date Changes
 - Regulatory Impacts

7. **NANP Administration Process/Procedures**
 - New Development Activities
 - Metrics/Benchmarks
 - Summary of INC Contributions
 - NANPA Areas of Concern – Guidelines/Requirements
 - WEB Developments/New Features
 - Other NANP Resource Developments/New Features

8. **Number Conservation Activities/Special Projects**
 - New Development Activities
 - Metrics/Benchmarks
 - Reclamation Activities
 - Status of Special Projects
 - Unassignable Codes
 - Large Volume Code Returns
 - Code Returns with Ported Numbers
 - Other
 - Regulatory Impacts

9. **Action Item Review**

NANPA 2003 Performance Improvement Plan
Updated April 26, 2004

Code Administration System (CAS)	
<p>1. Survey CAS users; interpret results; determine path forward.</p> <p>a. Finalize survey</p> <p>b. Distribute survey</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed – 4/30/03 • Completed – 5/2/03
<p>2. Analysis and recommendations available (2Q03)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis presented at July03 NOWG meeting. Suggested CAS improvements are being considered for or incorporated into the new NANP Administration System (NAS). • Proposed NAS User Group issues provided to NOWG on 8/11/03.

Code Administration	
<p>1. Develop and implement measurement on anomalies included on the reclamation list sent to regulators (2Q03)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed 6/03
<p>2. Provide code administrator training (ongoing)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Code expedites – completed 2/03 • OCN changes – completed 3/03 • NRUF – completed 3/03 • Code return process – completed 4/03 • Splits and Overlays – completed 5/30 • Splits and Overlay Changes and returns – completed 6/03 • Review Changes to COCAG 8/03 • COCAG training 3/04

Data Integrity	
<p>1. Develop and implement proposal to further reduce CAS/LEAG/NRUF discrepancies (3Q03)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal submitted to the NOWG 5/30/03 • Revised proposal submitted 7/17/03 (OCN changes to be completed by end of Aug03; code status changes to be initiated in 7/03 with a subsequent list published in 8/03, 9/03 and 10/03.
<p>2. Develop and implement education plan to remind SPs to update CAS when changing OCN data in LERG (3Q03)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Email reminder distributed 7/03 and 12/03. Subsequent reminders to be distributed throughout the year. • NANPA introduced new issue and contribution at 7/29/03 INC meeting to modify COCAG and TBPAG to include reminder to update CAS when change OCN data in LERG.
<p>3. Monitor and provide regular reports on quantity of discrepancies and outcome of efforts to address them (ongoing)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total discrepancies reduced to 2,093 as of 2/1/04; a 72.1% reduction since the beginning of the project (8/02). • 160 OCN discrepancies were identified to one carrier, occurring during CY 2003; the carrier has been requested to submit Part 1s for these. • Not all corrections have been entered into the System as yet.

**NANPA 2003 Performance Improvement Plan
Updated April 26, 2004**

	<p>Priorities surrounding NAS have precluded this activity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NANPA will continue to pursue avenues of correcting discrepancies to the extent possible. • Corrections now will require submissions from carriers as situations present themselves.
--	---

NANPA Web Site	
<p>1. Add functionality to the web site (ongoing)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restructured the city to area code translator. Now works well for cities/towns with population greater than 20,000. • Added new report to list area codes requiring ten digit local dialing (5/23/03) • Provided clarification on exceptions to dialing plans. • Some area codes contains no cities/towns with population greater than 20,000. Added some smaller towns in these cases to insure that the search does not come up blank. • New website introduced with NAS deployment on February 9, 2004.

NPA Relief Planning	
<p>1. Provide specific web link to take the recipient more directly to the document referred to in the notification in order to make it easier to find documents related to a DDS notification (2Q03)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed 5/30/03. A link was created directing users to the DDS download page. This link is now referenced in all DDS notifications. When selected by the user, this new link makes it easier and quicker to find new relief planning documents. A DDS notice was distributed announcing this new feature and users were encouraged to bookmark the new URL in their browser.
<p>2. Provide explanation for how NANPA selects NPA codes for relief areas and post on NANPA website (3Q03)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The process begins when NRUF predicts that an NPA (or overlay complex) will exhaust within the next 20 years. At that time, the relief planners and code administrators reserve an available general purpose NPA code that will eventually serve as a relief code. In selecting the relief code, NANPA considers the following: 1) the code should be significantly different from NPA codes already in use in the local area, 2) the code should not be in use as a central office code, 3) the code should not be already reserved for any other purpose and 4) only one code is reserved for each exhausting NPA/overlay complex. When a code has been selected, it is marked as unavailable to prevent downstream assignment as a central office code. By convention, the identity of the reserved code is kept confidential until a relief plan is approved
<p>3. In the annual facilitation refresher course provided to relief planners, include ways to improve the verbal participation of small</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed during the annual facilitation refresher training session for NPA Relief Planners held on June 18, 2003. At the training session, ways to improve participation were brainstormed, e.g., asking those who have not spoken to

NANPA 2003 Performance Improvement Plan

Updated April 26, 2004

companies in the industry meetings (2Q03)	provide their viewpoints, or asking attendees who have not expressed an opinion to do so. These ideas are now being used in conference calls to improve participation.
---	--

NRUF	
1. Provide service provider training on NRUF forms and processes (2Q03)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service provider NRUF training conducted June 12 and June 20, 2003. Over 200 participants.
2. Provide refresher training state commissions on the state NRUF databases and customized reports contained within these databases (4Q03)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refresher training took place on 9/29/03.
3. Send missing utilization notifications to service providers within 45 days of submission (on-going)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed - NRUF group sent 100% of missing utilization notifications to service providers prior to sending service provider data to the FCC and state commissions (2/03) • Completed – NRUF group sent 100% of missing utilization notifications to service providers for the February 1, 2004 prior to sending service provider data to the FCC and state commissions

General	
1. Take leadership on numbering issues that affect administration. (ongoing)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiated effort to identify grandfathered NXX codes to assist in preparations for wireless number portability. List of grandfathered NXX codes posted to NANPA website on August 29, 2003 and updated October 15, 2003. • Issue 408: Switchless Reseller ACNA Requirement for CICs – Issue in final closure. • Submitted INC Issue 409: Recorded Announcement Period in INC Guidelines and associated contributions to include recorded announcement period in the NPA Relief Planning and Notification Guidelines and the Central Office Code Assignment Guidelines. Issue in final closure. • Submitted INC Issue 420: Data Integrity of Number Assignment Records, per NOWG suggestion, to clarify SP requirement to send Part 1 to NANPA when making information changes. Issue in Initial Closure. • Submitted INC Issue 424: Delete Appendix G from the COCAG, (MTE – 1000 Block Level) since form is not used. Issue in Final Closure. • Submitted INC Issue 425 – Remove References from Issue 195 – Issue in final closure. • Submitted INC Issue 428: INC Form changes to accommodate NAS (NANP Administration System)

**NANPA 2003 Performance Improvement Plan
Updated April 26, 2004**

<p>2. Distribute and explain FCC directives regarding number administration. (ongoing)</p> <p>3. Annual DDS tutorial session</p>	<p>development – Issue in final closure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinated effort between INC, LNPA WG, PA and NANPA to conduct industry survey on LRN requirements. Survey distributed 9/8/03 with due date of 9/26/03. • Conducted LRN Survey of industry to estimate potential impact on CO code resource if additional codes are needed for LRN purposes. Final survey results reported at 11/5/03 NANC meeting. • Submitted INC Issue 432: Selection of Specific Geographic NPA Relief Codes, per NOWG suggestion. • Developed and posted to the NANPA website a “safety valve” job aid (5/03). • Obtained confirmation for the FCC that the Switch ID and Tandem Homing ID information were to remain on the CO Code forms. Information conveyed to the INC. • Identified and obtained direction from the FCC to modify certain information on various NANP resource application forms to better adapt them to use in a mechanized system. These changes were introduced to INC and approved. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conducted annual DDS tutorial session on 7/21/03 for 28 industry and regulatory participants.
--	--

Other NANPA Initiatives (not evaluation driven)	
<p>1. Code Administration Tips (CATS) (on-going). This tool assists clients in applying for CO codes</p> <p>2. Development of Senior Code Administrator M&Ps (ongoing)</p> <p>3. AOCN Audit</p> <p>4. Introduction of the NANP Administration System (NAS)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updates posted on the NANPA website 2/19/03, 3/6/03, 4/22/03, 5/14/03 and 8/15/03. • CATS revised in February 2004 to reflect introduction of NAS. • Completed splits and overlays, jeopardies, audits, NPA exhaust and Code Admin Exploder List submission. In process of completing manual. • Financial audit of the AOCN Enterprise Service was completed and report provided to the FCC on 8/20/03. Audit covered 2001 and 2002. • Introduced NAS (CO code and other resource administration, NNS) on February 9, 2004.

**NANP ADMINISTRATOR
2003 Annual Performance Feedback Survey**

INFORMATION PAGE

PURPOSE: The North American Numbering Council (NANC) seeks aggregated input from your organization as to the yearly performance of the North American Numbering Plan Administration (NANPA) services. Responses to the questions contained in this survey are intended to provide information relative to your satisfaction with the performance of the NANPA.

Please note that this survey requests input on the performance of NANPA, not the Thousand Block Pooling Administrator. A separate survey will be distributed with regard to the Pooling Administrator's performance.

EVALUATION PERIOD: January 1, 2003 Through December 31, 2003

SUBMISSION DEADLINE: 5 PM Eastern Time, January 30, 2004

QUALIFICATION: Respondents are permitted to submit only one (aggregated) survey per functional entity, e.g., per service provider or per regulatory agency.

SURVEY DESCRIPTION:

Your numeric satisfaction ratings will be combined with all other survey responses for each of the questions in Sections A – E titled CO Code (NXX) Administration, NPA Relief Planning, Numbering Resource Utilization/ Forecast (NRUF), Other NANP Resources and Overall Assessment of the NANPA, respectively.

Your comments recorded by you in the box following each group of the satisfaction rating questions are strongly encouraged. Specific examples of your experiences with the NANPA will provide valuable information in determining if and where process improvements are needed.

SUBMITTING YOUR SURVEY: Return your completed survey **VIA EMAIL** to one of the contacts below. If facsimile is your only means for submitting your survey, please send it to 425-963-5445.

FURTHER INFORMATION: Direct all inquiries to either of the following Numbering Administration Oversight Working Group (NOWG) contacts:

Mr. Jim Castagna
Verizon Communications
Phone: 212-395-5379
james.t.castagna@verizon.com

Ms. Karen Mulberry
MCI
Phone: 972-729-7914
karen.mulberry@mci.com

SURVEY DOWNLOAD SITES: A copy of this blank survey is also available for downloading from the following web sites:

www.nanpa.com or www.nanc-chair.org

SURVEY RESULTS: Overall results of the NANPA 2003 Performance Survey will be posted at www.nanpa.com upon completion.

**NANP ADMINISTRATOR
2003 Annual Performance Feedback Survey**

All responses to this survey, including names and comments, are considered public information.

*****Your input will not be reviewed unless the following contact information is provided.*****

Full Name of Entity/Company/Agency:	Date:
First & Last Name of Contact:	
Mailing Address w/Zip:	
Telephone Number:	E-mail Address:

Please respond to the following questions indicating your level of satisfaction by entering a single mark to indicate your satisfaction rating level based upon the following scale: **Exceeded; More than Met; Met; Sometimes Met; Not Met; N/A**. Refer to satisfaction rating chart below for specific details related to each rating category. **You are strongly encouraged to provide written comments for all ratings and specifically when giving a rating of "Sometimes Met" or "Not Met."**

The following chart defines the Satisfaction Ratings that are to be used by you to indicate your satisfaction with the NANPA's performance on the survey form for the evaluation period of January 1, 2003 – December 31, 2003:

Satisfaction Rating	Used when the NANPA...
EXCEEDED	Exceeded performance requirements consistently. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceeded performance even in the most difficult and complex situation • Taking on responsibility for extra or unique tasks. • Decisions and recommendations were always sound and exceeded requirements in less structured, non-routine areas of responsibilities.
MORE THAN MET	Met and often went beyond performance requirements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided more than what was required to be successful in all aspects of administration. • Performance was more than competent and reliable. • Decisions and recommendations were sound in routine areas, and were sound in the less structured, non-routine areas.
MET	Met performance requirements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No improvement is needed in order to be considered successful in all aspects of administration. • Performance was competent and reliable. • Decisions and recommendations were sound in routine areas.
SOMETIMES MET	Did not consistently meet one or more performance requirement(s). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did not consistently perform tasks and/or commitments completely, correctly or on time. • Performance is below reasonable expectations. • Improvement is desired in certain areas.
NOT MET	Did not meet performance requirements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative tasks and objectives were not met. • Performance was unreliable and commitments were not met. • Decisions and recommendations were not sound. There is a need to demonstrate immediate improvement in performance in the areas where deficiencies were noted.
N/A	Not Applicable or Did Not Observe

Survey Respondent Comments

Section A - CO (NXX) Administration	
Service Provider	Comment
AT&T Wireless Service	Since the implementation of Pooling, we rarely work with the NANPA any more. However they are generally Efficient, knowledgeable, available, and accurate. CAS has been a great tool to use and we look forward to NAS. Since it will now finally include many of the tools we have needed for the last 4 years.
The Bayou Telephone Company	My business is very stable and I therefore have no growth or need for new codes.
Qwest	Regarding Section A and related to questions: A2 - While NANPA addressed process issues, we were not always satisfied with NANPA's interpretation and management of the application process. A3 - NANPA made an initial NXX assignment that created a code conflict. The assignment was subsequently changed. A4 - In several instances NANPA did not return inquiries left on the NANPA code administrator's VM. A5 - We have had some disagreement with NANPA's understanding of governing regulations. A9 - Overall, CAS functionality is far superior to that of PAS. A11 - CAS does not allow changes to applications, which was a known problem. NANPA was reluctant to make any system modifications to correct this problem because of re-bidding for the new contract. We believe NANPA's action was non-responsive, as the problem was known prior to the re-bidding period and had existed for quite some time. A13 - NANPA did not use RCC update information (either from LERG data of from SP notification memos) in all cases to make the necessary CAS data changes. This caused data discrepancies between CAS and LERG data, which NANPA then had to address.
Armstrong Telephone Co. - ND	We have just never used the CAS system to input our information. We have complied simply by inputting our information directly through the Form 502.
DUNKIRK AND FREDONIA TELEPHONE CO, CASSADAGA TELEPHONE CORP, DFT LOCAL SERVICE	I have not had the need to work with the NANPA this year.
Sprint Local	252/959 was not added to the Telcordia BIRRDs database with the 919/252. We contacted NANPA and never received a response.
Rural Telephone Company	Did not use CAS in 2003.
Concord Telephone Co./CTC Exchange Services, Inc.	The only complaint I have is with number pooling, I am not getting my phone calls and emails returned.
CGI (dba Communigroup of Jackson	NANPA Code administrator, Genevieve Paulino, very professional and helpful
Duo County	I did not apply for any code changes in 03.

Survey Respondent Comments

Telephone Coop.	
Panhandle Telephone Cooperative, Inc.	We utilize CHR Solutions to handle all of our Code administration work.
NTS Communications, Inc.	Your due date intervals are seemingly long and I have received incorrect information from my Code Administrator in the past causing my due date interval to double my time frame. When I have customers waiting on numbers to be assigned, this is highly unsatisfactory.
Board of Water, Light & Sinking Fund dba Dalton Utilities	We are a low usage CLEC; and our AOCN, NECA, performs many of these tasks for us.
NetCarrier Telecom, Inc.	What is the difference between, CAS, NAS, & PAS? I primarily use PAS and will be using NAS in the future as needed.
Sprint Spectrum	CO Code (NXX) Administration almost always waits until the 10th business day to process applications. CO Code Administration does not always respond to emails and a phone call is required to get a response from them. They should be as responsive to emails as they are to phone calls. The CAS database has proven to be a very reliable database and its reports benefit our day to day business activities.
Verizon	Nancy Cowles has been efficient in responding to questions and problems. There was one incident that was an anomaly - An NXX was requested as the result of a waiver. NeuStar stated that the request was forwarded to NANPA. NANPA stated that they did not have it.
Colo Telephone Company	We are a small rural Telephone company, as such we have had no experience in dealing with the NANPA. We didn't have any addition or changes in our NPA NXX that would lead us to dealing with the administrator. Our only interaction is filling out surveys and annual reports.
Laurel Highland Telephone Company	Never had to do this as of yet.
SureWest Communications	I have not yet used CAS due to all of my cod request having to go to the Pooling Administrator.
Range Telephone Coop.	CAS process was done on are behave by GVNW
Public Utilities Commission	Comment
Washington Utilities & Trans. Commission	The reclamation group was slow to respond to requests to verify reclamation codes. Concerning Part III reports – A reason why an initial code was granted, or not granted, i.e., “requirement for LRN”, would be helpful. Monthly Usage Reports – it would be very useful to know what specific codes have been returned.
Public Service Commission of West Virginia	Being a state regulatory agency employee, I do not use CAS. My answers above reflect my experience with NANPA re provision of data/information and handling of inquiries.
CT Department of Public Utility Control	CT DPUC is a state regulatory agency. Therefore, some of the items above (understandably) do not apply. However, the Department notes the NANPA staff have always been responsive and helpful.
Oklahoma	As a regulator, most of the items above did not apply to us. On instances

Survey Respondent Comments

Corporation Commission	where I did interact with code administration, they were knowledgeable, reliable and courteous.
City of Lakeland	This must be one of the hardest data bases in the country to maintain and I applaud your efforts. Keep up the great work.
North Carolina Utilities Commission	As a regulator, several of the above activities do not represent operational issues for the Commission.
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio	Alisha Janowski who handles reclamation is always responsive to the PUCO's questions in a timely manner.
Georgia Public Service Commission	We recently (December 2003) assumed the duties and have not had experience or interaction with NANPA. Therefore, this year cannot offer input concerning NANPA's performance.
Section B – NPA Relief Planning	
Service Provider	Comment
AT&T Wireless Services	Since the NPA Relief activity has decreased dramatically, there is not much to say either way for the performance of the NANPA on this area of the business. Hopefully, they have decreased the staff working on NPA Relief Planning, and have passed the cost savings on to the carriers.
Qwest	Regarding Section B and related to questions B4, B6, and B7. As in previous years, NPA Relief Planner Joe Cocke demonstrated highly effective communication skills during industry calls. He was proactive in contacting the NE state commission staff for pending relief concerns, and updated relief options with current data at their request. Joe is extremely conscious about returning both calls and emails quickly. He operates with a sense of urgency, uses sound judgment, and is truly a SME in his field.
Choice One Communications	Please alternate the conference times so that they are not always at lunch time for the mountain time zone.
Laurel Highland Telephone Company	A lot of these issues I didn't deal with.
Verizon Wireless	Some relief projects have been postponed, or rescinded. It is hard to determine if this is being done with communication from the relief planner (question 7, or not). Would like to know exactly what kind of communication the relief planning is doing with initiated communications, other than updating the exhaust date. Sometimes we have had a need to get more assistance than what is on the website. Joe Cocke, in particular, has gone out of his way to get me the information that is needed. Facilitation of conference calls has improved in the last year, however it still is a few service providers that make all of the decisions. It would be good if there were some way further participation could be initiated by the relief planners.
Public Utility Commission	Comment
California Public Utilities Commission	No NEW relief planning in CA 2003, therefore N/A for questions 1-4.
New Jersey Board of Public Utilities	More than met often exceeded staff needs for timely and accurate information.
Washington Utilities & Trans. Commission	Joe Cocke has been very helpful in determining the best way to handle the possibility of removal of NPA 360 from jeopardy.
Florida Public	Although Florida did not conduct any area code relief proceedings in 2003,

Survey Respondent Comments

Services Commission	questions regarding area code exhaust dates and NXX code inquiries happened throughout the year. MR. Tom Foley answered all inquiries quickly and professionally.
Nebraska Public Service Commission	Joe Cocke was most helpful in updating the exhaust dates for the 402 area code in preparation for evaluating possible future actions by the PSC for number conservation in the 402 area code.
Michigan Public Service Commission	Michigan had limited NPA relief planning efforts in 2003, with our final plan becoming mandatory in February.
Oklahoma Corporation Commission	No NPA planning occurred in Oklahoma during 2003. The few times I spoke with NANPA concerning area code relief, they were knowledgeable, reliable and courteous.
North Carolina Utilities Commission	NANPA's response to all NPA planning projects has been courteous and timely.
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio	NANPA helped the PUCO in having unassignable codes for both the 614 and 740-NPAs returned. They provided us with timely information regarding the status of exhaust forecast updates and changes for the 614, 740, and 937 NPAs which allowed the PUCO to delay initiating a relief process for all of these NPAs.
Section C – Number Resource/Utilization Forecast	
Service Provider	Comment
AT&T Wireless Services	The staff who handle NRUF at NANPA are really great to work with and efficient and reply back in a very timely Manner. It is unfortunate that it took 4 years for the NANPA to work out a more efficient solution to submission.
Qwest	Regarding Section C: Beth Sprague responded quickly to special inquires and unique questions.
CGI (dba Communigroup of Jackson)	My experience with both the form and NANPA first line support in this area are not good. The form is confusing difficult to follow and complete correctly. First line support was not helpful. This took way too much time to complete and needs to be converted to a CAS format so that data can be submitted correctly the first time.
Level 3 Communications	Beth Sprague is very helpful and proactive about issues coming up.
Sprint Spectrum	NANPA has done an excellent job on NRUF.
Verizon Wireless	Anomalies still get queried on utilization when it is clear per the LERG the NPA/NXX is not our code. When a clarification of a rule is needed in the job aide, they resolve the problem in a timely manner and then they update the job aide to make issues clearer. NANPA is always working to make the job aide a better tool. Get all updates within 2 weeks of filing the NRUF. It takes considerably longer for anomalies, anomalies are received over a several month time period.
Public Utility Commission	Comment
California Public Utilities Commission	Appreciate new queries and reports in NRUF on non-reporting carriers.

Survey Respondent Comments

Washington Utilities & Trans. Commission	The state commission must be notified when new code holder information has been received by NANPA. There is no other way for us to know that new information is available, and thus make a decision whether to ask for an update or not.
CT Department of Public Utility Control	The NRUF report is extremely useful to state agencies. However, its sheer size makes it unwieldy. A handbook, which speaks to the nature of the report and provides tips and guidance on how state (regulatory) agencies can make use of it would be a useful tool.
Michigan Public Service Commission	The NRUF staff has been very helpful in resolving issues with incomplete NRUF data and providing MPSC staff with updates
Oklahoma Corporation Commission	A job well done.
North Carolina Utilities Commission	Although NCUC has not requested assistance of NANPA to execute independent NRUF analysis, the expectation is that the appropriate level of assistance would be readily available.
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio	NANPA provided the PUCO with customized NRUF reports that simplified our review of the data. Since we have few staff to review numbering data, this was very helpful to us.
Section D – Other NANP Resources	
Service Provider	Comment
AT&T Wireless Services	All we can say is that we are very glad that the 500/900/555 process is now included in the NAS system and we do not need to fax/e-mail requests in to Nancy Fears any longer. The forms and processes for obtaining 500/900/555 resources are very outdated and not very accurate – i.e., no MTE worksheet. The faxing of forms with signatures etc. to Nancy's 208 fax number really was unreliable throughout the year.
Qwest	No involvement in this area during 2003
Laurel Highland Telephone Company	I haven't had to do yet.
Verizon Wireless	With regards to the 500 numbers, Verizon Wireless has not had a lot of interaction with NANPA this year. On June 18, 2003, VZW returned fourteen 10K blocks of unused numbers to NANPA. The return order was immediately processed and we were notified on June 19 of the completed task. This was a one day turn around and very much exceeded the 10 business day expectation. The only other interaction regarding other NANPA resources was attaining information pertaining to 500 number Utilization requirements. The individuals from NANPA were very resourceful.

Survey Respondent Comments

Public Utility Commission	Comment
SAIC Canada	As the Canadian Numbering Administrator, our contact with NANPA over the past year has been with Nancy Fears and, to a small extent, with Beth Sprague for NRUF. All applications have been dealt with within the 10 day time frame and sometimes within one day.
North Carolina Utilities Commission	NCUC inquiries concerning numbering resource issues have been responded to in a very timely and informative manner. NCUC has on a few occasions requested numbering resource direction/guidance on the above resources, but not on any regularity.
Section E – Overall Assessment of the NANPA	
Service Provider	Comment
AT&T Wireless Services	NANPA is quick to point out their “contract” with the FCC yet they could do many things and still abide by the contract, or work to include provisions in the contract that allow for a more flexible system to meet the Service Provider’s needs instead of waiting for 4 years and an new contract to modify a very cumbersome process. The NANPA should refrain from blaming the FCC for these types of delays and inefficiencies and take responsibility for their half of the contract negotiations. I also would like Neustar and Telcordia to stop bashing each other publicly in front of the Service Providers. It detracts greatly from the overall process and makes both companies seem petty. Overall we appreciate the staff very much at the NANPA, and find the CAS system to be a very good tool, look forward to an even better NAS system, and would hope that the NANPA take responsibility for being more flexible and service-oriented to the SP’s in the future.
Qwest	Regarding Section E and related to questions: E1 and E2 - Not all users in our company found the NANPA web site easy to use. Depending on the user’s level and frequency of interaction with the web site, those with frequently access found the web site functionality satisfactory, but casual users could not find data easily and were not satisfied with the web site. E3, E4, E5, E7 and E9 - While NPA Planning and NRUF NANPA staff provided good customer service and were responsive, that was not always the case when dealing with Code Administration staff. At times CO staff did not return calls as expected, or at all. Likewise, we were not always confident in the NANPA Code Administration staff’s interpretation of regulatory orders and directives. At this point in time and after 5 years of operation, the entire NANPA organization should be operating at expected levels of customer service and expertise. This has not been the case during 2003 for our company. Accordingly, this negatively impacts our overall rating for NANPA.
CGI (dba Commuigroup)	Code Administration is great. The rest needs some improvement.

Survey Respondent Comments

of Jackson)	The web site is not as "useable" as it needs to be.
Wood County	Sent out notifications and updates prior to submission dates.
Sprint Spectrum	NANPA continues to improve in their role of providing services to the industry.
PBT Telecom	NANPA is very responsive for the most part. Some holdovers are much too rigid. The web site has improved the process greatly for informational purposes.
Iowa Telecom	I had very little contact with NANPA, but what I did have, it was very excellent assistance
Verizon Wireless	Would like to see the number of rate centers for each NPA on the NANPA web site. We have not had the contact with the NANPA this year, except for relief planning and NRUF that we have had in previous years. Our primary contact has been with the pooling administrator.
Public Utility Commission	Comment
California Public Utilities Commission	Pleased that NANPA will be providing regulators with electronic web access to carrier specific data.
Missouri Public Service Commission	Everyone at NANPA is always helpful with any questions I have. Thank you.
New Jersey Board of Public Utilities	More than met often exceeded staff needs for timely and accurate information.
Washington Utilities & Trans. Commission	The web site could be improved – it could be more intuitive. The NPA exhaust analysis is something I have great interest in, but always have difficulty finding. Slow response on Reclamation questions. No justification of usage forecasts used for exhaust estimates.
Florida Public Services Commission	NANPA staff are always ready to assist with any inquiries we have. They are courteous, prompt and professional with their responses, and a pleasure to work with.
Public Service Commission of West Virginia	I have worked with Brent Struthers, Wayne Milby, Linda Hymans and Amy Putnam on a number (no pun intended) of numbering matters. They have always been quite knowledgeable and helpful. They regularly go "above and beyond" and are very patient with answering my questions and going over things until I finally understand...and Brent is fun to joke with!
CT Department of Public Utility Control	Informational reports regarding possible reclamation lists still contain inaccuracies regarding the status of Part 4s. In one month sampled, virtually all service providers for whom NANPA reported a failure to activate numbers have been able to show those numbers were and had been, in fact, active.
Michigan Public Service Commission	The NANPA has assisted MPSC staff with several issues this year.
NY Dept of Public Services	Staff turnover and reassignment has lead to lack of knowledge of local conditions and regulations in some instances. Some problems with accuracy of reclamation data. NANPA is extremely responsive to questions, at all levels. Special reports keep in getting "dropped" – I have to call to get the info which has been promised monthly.
City of Lakeland	Thanks again.

Survey Respondent Comments

North Carolina Utilities Commission	As the market conditions continue to change, NANPA has overall maintained a neutral posture when working with NCUC. NANPA's assistance and responsiveness to NCUC's inquiries is very much appreciated. NANPA continues to upgrade its support systems to better serve the users of numbering resources and related information systems. The presentation by NANPA of timely training sessions, conference calls, trade update memos, etc., speak very well of the commitment being made to serve the telecommunications industry at large.
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio	NANPA's bi-monthly conference calls have proven to be helpful in updating the status of pending FCC decisions and informing us of actions and decisions of industry groups impacting numbering. NANPA also keeps us <i>informed</i> of how other states are resolving issues. If we have questions, NANPA has been quick to respond. Brent Struthers's personal visit to the PUCO provided staff, including those not intimately familiar with numbering issues, with an overall picture of what NANPA and the states are facing regarding numbering and other issues.