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# Executive Summary

The North American Numbering Plan Administrator’s (NANPA) annual performance assessment is based upon a compilation of performance feedback surveys, monthly standing agenda conference calls, the annual operational review, and observations/interactions between the NANPA and the Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG). The NANPA serves under a contract with the FCC. The NOWG has compiled this data into an annual performance report for the FCC and the North American Numbering Council (NANC).

NANPA’s rating for the 2012 performance year was determined by consensus of the NOWG to be **Exceeded**. This rating is defined below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| EXCEEDED | Exceeded performance requirement(s)   * Provided excellence above performance requirements and exceeded expectations * Performance was well above requirements * Decisions and recommendations exceeded requirements and expectations |

The Exceeded rating was given to the NANPA for its ongoing consistency in meeting or exceeding all of its requirements related to Code Administration, Other NANP Resources, NRUF, and NPA Relief Planning.

Throughout 2012, the NANPA personnel continued to exhibit their professionalism and expertise while performing NANPA duties.

In 2012, the NANPA consistently exceeded its required responsibilities. Highlights included:

# The NANPA continues to perform at a high level of efficiency in the administration of all NANP resources.

# The NANPA proactively resolved numerous code discrepancies, and conducted research on the viability of transferring codes to avoid opening new codes for LRN routing purposes.

# During Hurricane Sandy, the NANPA assisted service providers as needed to process expedited requests for resources necessary to restore service.

# Section 1.0 Performance Review Methodology

The annual NANPA Performance Evaluation is a summary of significant events that were accomplished during the 2012 performance year. In addition to the annual performance review survey process, the NOWG’s interactions with NANPA included the following:

* Monthly NOWG/NANPA status meetings
* Annual operational review
* Change Order review process
* NANPA NANC reports
* Interaction with the industry

The methodology used by the NOWG in weighting the quantitative responses from the surveys is as follows:

Each rating category was assigned a point value (Exceeded = 5, More Than Met = 4, Met = 3, Sometimes Met = 2, Not Met =1). The NOWG multiplied the corresponding point value by the number of responses in that category and then divided the results by the total number of respondents to the question.

The following chart provides the definition of each rating category:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Satisfaction Rating | Used when the NANPA... |
| EXCEEDED | Exceeded performance requirement(s)   * Provided excellence above performance requirements and exceeded expectations * Performance was well above requirements * Decisions and recommendations exceeded requirements and expectations |
| **MORE THAN**  **MET** | Met and often went beyond performance requirement(s)   * Provided more than what was required to be successful * Performance was more than competent and reliable * Decisions and recommendations usually exceeded requirements and expectations |
| **MET** | Met performance requirement(s)   * Met requirements in order to be considered successful * Performance was competent and reliable * Decisions and recommendations were within requirements and expectations |
| **Sometimes Met** | Sometimes met performance requirement(s)   * Was inconsistent in meeting performance requirements * Performance was sometimes competent and reliable * Decisions and recommendations were sometimes within requirements |
| **NOT MET** | Did not meet performance requirement(s)   * Administrative tasks and objectives were not within requirements in order to be considered successful * Performance was unreliable and commitments were not met * Decisions and recommendations were inconsistent with requirements |
| **N/A** | Did not observe activity or does not apply to service provider/regulator |

The NOWG will present the preliminary report to the FCC and the NANPA. The final report will be presented to the NANC for endorsement and then forwarded to the FCC.

# Section 2.0 NANPA Reports

In 2012, the NANPA reported its monthly numbering administration activities to the NANC and the NOWG.  The reports were consistently completed and delivered as required.  The NANPA provided monthly reports to the FCC and made presentations at the March, June, September, and December NANC meetings.

**2.1       Monthly Reports to the FCC**

As per Section 8.3, 8.4 and 8.5 of the NANPA Technical Requirements Document, the NANPA reported monthly to the FCC on activity in applications, assignments and denials for Central Office (CO) Codes. They also reported on other numbering resources, as well as the status of NPA relief activities.

**2.2       NANC Reports**

In 2012 the NANPA provided monthly reports to the NANC and made presentations at NANC meetings on a variety of subject matter, which included the following:

* Neustar’s award of a new NANP Administration contract
* 2011 versus 2012 CO Code and NPA Inventory Status, and a summary of CO Code Activity, including data showing that 95 percent of CO Codes assigned in 2012 went to thousand block numbering pools
* NPA and NANP Exhaust Forecasts and Status Report
* NANPA initiated relief planning activities in three NPAs in 2012: California 415, Indiana 812 and Texas 512
* Planning for the introduction of the 844 toll free NPA was initiated
* NRUF data collection
* New NAS functionality to improve efficiency for Service Providers
* NAS future functionality, including software and hardware improvements, and efficiency and security enhancements as part of the new contract
* Code Reclamations for other NANP resources, in particular; CICs and 555 NXX line numbers

**2.3       NOWG Reports**

The NOWG/NANPA followed a standing agenda during scheduled monthly conference calls.  The NANPA prepared monthly performance measurements and status reports for the NOWG that were reviewed in-depth during the monthly calls.  NANPA also reported on a range of activities and services performed for the industry and regulators.  The transparency, quality and content of these reports provided the NOWG with detailed information and valuable insight into the operations of the NANPA.

.

The NANPA reported on its training for service providers and state regulators on NAS and other numbering administration activities.

The NANPA responded to a request by state regulators for assistance in evaluating the impact of the PSTN-IP transition on numbering resources by providing a tool for estimating NPA exhaust.

The NANPA reported on a situation associated with deploying stronger security measures for NAS that affected seven providers, trouble tickets that affected single service providers, and minor items such as broken hotlinks.

See Appendix A for 2012 NANPA / NOWG Standing Agenda

**Section 3.0 Program Improvement Plan (PIP)**

The PIP is utilized for identifying and tracking performance improvements and improvements in the user experience. The NANPA developed an additional document for tracking and reporting performance activities at the monthly status meetings, called the Monthly Operational Report (MOR), to serve as a repository of various NANPA activities and events occurring throughout the year.

Highlights of the 2012 PIP included:

* Use of Online Meeting for NPA relief planning meetings and introduction of on-line meeting aids to assist in evaluation of relief alternatives
* Development of a month-by-month NRUF action checklist for service providers
* Introduction of training videos to supplement live training

See Appendix B for 2012 NANPA PIP Report

# Section 4.0 2012 Performance Survey Results

**4.1 Survey Ratings – Quantitative Analysis**

The NANPA 2012 Performance Surveys were completed by a total of 55 respondents. The respondents were comprised of 38 industry and other and 17 state regulators.

The results are as follows:

* CO Code (NXX) Administration (Section A)
* There were four questions in this section to which respondents provided the following aggregated response ratings:
  + - 65 as Exceeded
    - 53 as More than Met
    - 14 as Met
    - 2 as Sometimes Met
* NPA Relief Planning (Section B)
  + There were four questions in this section to which respondents provided the following aggregated response ratings:
    - 57 as Exceeded
    - 39 as More than Met
    - 21 as Met
* NRUF (Section C)
  + There were four questions in this section to which respondents provided the following aggregated response ratings:
    - 62 as Exceeded
    - 57 as More than Met
    - 22 as Met
    - 1 as Not Met
* Other NANP Resources (Section D)
  + There was one question in this section to which respondents provided the following aggregated response ratings:
    - 13 as Exceeded
    - 9 as More than Met
    - 8 as Met
* NANP Administration System (NAS) (Section E)
  + There were two questions in this section to which respondents provided the following aggregated response ratings:
    - 45 as Exceeded
    - 34 as More than Met
    - 19 as Met
* NANPA Website, Reports, and Industry Activities (Section F)
  + There were three questions in this section to which respondents provided the following aggregated response ratings:
    - 61 as Exceeded
    - 53 as More than Met
    - 31 as Met
    - 1 as Sometimes Met
    - 2 as Not Met
* Overall Assessment of the NANPA (Section G)
  + There was one question in this section to which respondents provided the following aggregated response ratings:
    - 28 as Exceeded
    - 18 as More than Met
    - 8 as Met
    - 1 as Sometimes Met

See Appendix C for 2012 NANPA Numerical Survey Results and Bar Charts and Appendix D for 2012 NANPA Survey Cover Letter and Performance Survey

**4.2 Written Comments**

The comment sections in the survey allowed respondents the opportunity to provide details regarding their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with NANPA’s performance in 2012. The NOWG reviewed all comments to determine if there was a common theme substantiated by multiple respondents.

Following is a summary of written comments that were provided by survey respondents.

Significant praise for the NANPA staff was a consistent theme throughout the survey. In many cases, the comments provided praise for individual staff members. The following adjectives and phrases were used by multiple respondents to describe their experiences in working with the NANPA staff:

* Timely, responsive, professional
* Courteous, helpful, and knowledgeable
* Excellent, accurate, dedicated
* Always willing to assist
* Provides clear and concise direction
* Goes above and beyond
* Invaluable source of information

None of the comments suggested any areas needing improvement. After thoroughly reviewing the comments received, the NOWG concluded that the written comments indicated a very high level of satisfaction experienced by those who interacted with the NANPA.

Samples of the written comments received are provided below:

“The NANPA Code Administrator team has provided and delivered outstanding service in 2012. They have exceeded all expectations to execute, deliver and respond to our company's needs for codes. They were courteous and respondent to call when necessary to provide further explanation to questions. Our company has a need to receive codes in a most efficient and timely manner to meet our network and customer demands. NANPA code administrator's made this happen in 2012.”

“My interactions with NANPA staff are always professional and expeditious. They consistently go above and beyond what's required in order to assist me with whatever I may need.”

“I have always had positive results when interacting with NANPA CO code administrators. They provide accurate and correct information, return calls asap in a professional, courteous and timely manner.”

“The Code Administrators are always helpful in any questions I might have regarding processes or direction of an issue.”

“Nanpa always carries out assignment process well withing allowable time frames.”

“It's difficult to think of what NANPA could have done better to support the Industry during 2012. Great job everyone!”

“The periodic conference calls to state commission numbering personnel are extremely helpful.”

“Throughout 2012, I've had the need to contact NANPA for many various issues from NRUF to NAS to code returns. Calls/emails have always been returned promptly, which I sincerely appreciate; and, staff has been exceedingly helpful in resolving any issues I had.”

“Great crew!”

“The team at NANPA continues to do an excellent job in all areas of the NANPA.”

See Appendix E for 2012 NANPA Survey Respondents and Appendix F for 2012 NANPA Survey Respondents’ Comments

# Section 5.0 Operational Review

The NOWG members met with NANPA representatives in Sterling, Virginia on April 16-17, 2013, to conduct the annual operational review of the NANPA. During the operational review, there were formal status presentations regarding:

* 2012 Overview
* Central Office Code Administration
* NPA Relief Planning
* Numbering Resource Utilization & Forecast (NRUF) Reporting
* Other NANP Resource Administration
* NANPA Reports
* NANPA Enterprise Services
* NANPA Forum Participation and Industry Liaison Activities

The NANPA presentation shared at this meeting can be found in Appendix G.

The following sections summarize highlights of specific areas within the NANPA operational review.

**5.1 Central Office Code Administration**

The NANPA presented the following 2012 highlights on code administration services:

* The NANPA staff processed 10,243 applications in 2012
* All applications were processed within the 7 calendar day requirement
* No central office code assignments resulted in a code conflict
* Due to the FCC’s Red Light Rule, 30 applications were denied
* Initiated reclamation on 12 codes for those states that have not exercised their delegated authority over reclamation
* Worked with 25 states on over 120 central office codes appearing on state delinquent lists in 2012, resulting in the reclamation of 9 codes
* Coordinated the recovery of 262 abandoned codes with regulators in 11 states and the FCC
* Worked with state regulators and service providers to identify potential recoverable NXXs in advance of relief planning in 3 NPAs
* Worked with 12 service providers to investigate 7-digit cross-NPA dialing arrangements to identify 22 protected routes that could be eliminated in NAS and ensure the maximum quantity of codes available for assignment in each rate center
* Voluntarily investigated and coordinated communication among state regulators and service providers on the possibility of transferring about 30 codes in 8 states to a new service provider to avoid opening new codes for LRN purposes
* At year end, there were only 4 NPAs in jeopardy: IL 217, FL 305, PA 570 and IL 618
* Developed and posted to the NANPA website a training video to assist service providers in requesting assignment of an initial code in a pooling rate center
* Resolved discrepancies on over 70 codes by proactively reminding service providers of the requirements to build new codes in industry databases, perform work necessary to transfer codes and return codes not in use

**5.2 NPA Relief Planning**

The NANPA presented the following 2012 highlights on NPA relief activities:

* Met all performance objectives on 33 tracked events
* Filed NPA relief petitions for KY 270, NV 702 and IN 812
* Conducted pre-Initial Planning Document (IPD) and relief planning conference calls for CA 415
* Conducted initial relief implementation conference calls for TX 512 and NV 702
* Rescinded jeopardy in MD 410/443 and CA 408
* Conducted conference call regarding the impact of 33 returned codes on the AR 870 relief implementation schedule, and filed an addendum to postpone the relief implementation with the state regulatory authority
* Shadowed 39 industry subcommittee meetings for relief implementation for CA 408, MD 410/443, TX 512 and NC 919
* Participated in 3 public input meetings or consumer sessions regarding NPA relief for TX 712 and NV 702, and supplied various scripts, maps and FAQs for regulator use at these meetings
* Conducted face-to-face meetings with state regulatory authorities to review number administration and NPA relief activities in OK, OH, MI and SC
* Advised state regulatory personnel on the status of 15 specific NPAs within their states
* Assisted state regulatory personnel in 15 states on various other numbering concerns
* Published 6 Planning Letters announcing new relief or changes to existing relief projects
* Distributed 81 NNS notifications of NPA relief planning activities
* Further enhanced NPA relief on-line meetings by providing to the industry a list of pros and cons identified in previous relief activities, dialing plans and draft implementation schedules, relevant excerpts from relief planning guidelines, and sending reminders of the meetings via NANP Notification System (NNS)

**5.3 Numbering Resource Utilization & Forecast (NRUF) Reporting**

The NANPA presented the following 2012 highlights on NRUF reporting:

* Processed 16,500 Form 502 submissions
* All 5 processing metrics were met at 100%
  + Form 502s processed and confirmation notifications sent, with any errors identified, within 7 calendar days
  + Missing utilization notices sent within 45 days
  + Anomalous notifications sent within 90 days
  + Phone calls/emails responded to within one business day
  + Job Aid updates completed 60 days prior to submission deadline
* Answered almost 1,700 NRUF inquiries and produced 83 reports for states
* Added a month-by-month NRUF preparation checklist to the NANPA website
* Instructed NRUF filers using email to start sending their non-geographic Form 502s to the same email addresses as those for geographic Form 502s
* Updated the NRUF on-line training guide, the NRUF job aid documents, and the NRUF FTP file format document and posted all to the NANPA website
* Produced and published NPA and NANP exhaust projections in April and October
* Issued 4 delta NRUF exhaust projections for PA 814, AR 870, TN 615 and KY 270
* Began producing and publishing a separate NPA exhaust projection for currently assigned and reserved non-geographic 5YY NPAs

**5.4 Other NANP Resource Administration**

The NANPA presented the following 2012 highlights on other NANP resource administration:

* There was 1 non-geographic NPA put into service
* There were 5 net assignments of FGB CICs
* There were 2 net assignments for FGD CICs
* There were 357 net assignments for 5YY-NXXs
* There was 1 net assignment for 9YY-NXXs
* There was one 555 line number assigned, and 93 reclaimed for a net of a negative 92 assigned
* There were no assignments of 800-855 line numbers, vertical service codes, N11 codes, ANI II digits or 456-NXXs

**5.5 NANPA Reports**

NANPA continued to supply accurate and timely data through the web-based public queries and reports on NPAs, area code relief planning, CO Codes, CICs and other resources. NANPA also provided more than 14,000 reports that were auto-generated daily, weekly or monthly (frequency as requested by the individual) to regulatory personnel in 29 states. NANPA continued to provide ad hoc reports as needed to support state and federal regulatory authorities, service providers, and NANPA functions such as NPA relief planning.

**5.6 NANP Administration System (NAS)**

NAS continues to support a variety of number administration functions, including Central Office Code Administration, Other Resources, NRUF, and NANP Notifications. Please see Section 6.0 for details.

**5.7 NANPA Enterprise Services**

As a required for Enterprise Services, the NANPA AOCN processed 6,119 Part 2 submissions in 2012 (a more than 40% increase over 2011), and completed all of those within five business days or less. In addition, all phone calls received by the AOCN were returned no later than the close of the next business day, indicating a high quality of service provided to 230 NANPA AOCN services customers. In addition to the AOCN Services, NANPA continued to stand ready to provide four other Enterprise Services, although none were requested in 2012. Those include the entry of paper submissions of resource applications, entry of paper NRUF submissions, NANPA testimony in state regulatory hearings, and customized reports.

**5.8 NANPA Industry Forum Participation and Industry Liaison Activities**

The NANPA provided monthly reports to the NANC membership and the NOWG, and made 4 presentations at NANC meetings. The NANPA also continued to manage and maintain the NANC Chair website. The NANPA actively participated at INC in 2012, submitting 7 new issues and 20 contributions. The NANPA also regularly attended the NANC’s FoN WG monthly meetings to ensure NANPA was available to provide input as needed on NANPA operational capabilities and processes. The NANPA published 4 quarterly newsletters throughout 2012 and its 2011 Annual Report in March 2012.

**5.9 Summary of the NANPA Operational Review**

Based on the information shared with the NOWG during the 2012 Operational Review, the NANPA not only maintained a high level of performance, but successfully managed new challenges and continued to proactively find ways to improve processes and customer satisfaction. The NANPA’s Operational Review presentation was very thorough in providing details of the NANPA activities in 2012. The NANPA staff effectively responded to NOWG inquiries during presentations, demonstrating their knowledge and seasoned expertise. NANPA received two complaint submissions in 2012 but neither was due to NANPA’s performance; both were issues that would have been more appropriately addressed by the complainant’s service provider.

See Appendix G for 2012 NANPA Operational Review Presentation and Appendix H for 2012 NANPA Highlights

# Section 6.0 NANP Administration System (NAS)

NAS is the primary tool used by Service Providers, Consultants, Regulators, and NANPA in the assignment of NANP resources and various administration aspects of the NANP. NAS provides an automated system for processing number resource applications, collecting resource utilization and forecast data, and issuing notifications to the industry on numbering matters.

NAS provided system functionality in the following areas to support the assignment and administration of NANP resources:

* NAS Central Office Code Administration
* Applying On-line for Other Numbering Resources
* NANP Notification System
* NAS NRUF
* NAS Reports
* NAS User Registration

During 2012, the NANPA provided excellent support and maintenance of NAS, exceeding the FCC requirement for NAS system availability of 99.9%.

With the award of the new contract in June 2012, NANPA began a major NAS upgrade of the system hardware components and the application software platform. The approach was to take advantage of business rules, logic and algorithms currently used in the existing system while incorporating a number of technological improvements. To accomplish this, a two-phased delivery process was initiated. During Phase 1, modifications to NAS hardware were implemented to create a secure Demilitarized Zone (DMZ), ensuring NAS conformed to industry best practices for system security. Phase 1, which started in July 2012, was completed in September 2012. Additional NAS upgrades for Phase 2 implementation began in the fourth quarter of 2012 and are planned to continue into 2013.

Additional enhancements to NAS were made in 2012 to implement Change Orders 21 and 22:

##### NANPA Change Order 21 was in response to INC Issue 710: NANC Action Item “Multi-OCN” Issue. With this change order, additional functionality was added to NAS to permit the user to select the Parent Company OCN from a drop-down menu that appears on the application and subsequent Part 1 and Part 3 reports provided to the states.

* NANPA Change Order 22 was in response to INC Issue 698 – Auto-Populate Total Numbering Resources on the TBPAG MTE Form. This change order modified NAS to include a “Pooled Code Indicator” on various NAS-generated reports available on the NANPA website.

Six NAS trouble tickets were opened in 2012, of which five tickets were closed and one ticket remained open at the end of 2012. The five tickets were resolved in less than one business day (four of which were opened and closed the same day).

The industry appeared to be satisfied with the operation of NAS in 2012 as seen in the survey comments. The 2012 Survey Comments relating to NAS included:

“Working at times with unexpected demands requires timely notifications for any down times or updates to the NAS systems and NANPA has delivered on both and I have not incurred any issues in these areas in 2012. The NAS-NANP Notification site is an excellent place for me to reference the many resources made availabile to support my numbering needs.”

“Communication from NANPA has been great. With the variety of planning activities, INC and NRUF issues that come up, communication about how to handle these issues is appreciates. The timely distribution of information needed to run our daily operations has been an excellent resource during 2012.”

“Adequate notices have always been received regarding any planned updates”

“The NAS communicated helpful information on numbering issues in a professional, timely and courteous manner.”

# Section 7.0 Change Orders

During 2012, NANPA implemented Change Orders 21 and 22. These two change orders were approved in December 2011 under the old NANPA contract but were implemented in November 2012 under the new NANPA contract.

##### NANPA Change Order 21 was in response to INC Issue 710: NANC Action Item “multi-OCN” Issue. This change order modified NAS to include the Parent Company OCN on the Part 3 form as well as to include Parent Company OCN and Parent Company Name on various NAS-generated reports.

##### NANPA Change Order 22 was in response to INC Issue 698 – Auto-Populate Total Numbering Resources on the TBPAG MTE Form. This change order modified NAS to include a “Pooled Code Indicator” on various NAS-generated reports available on the NANPA website.

NANPA Contract FCC12C0023 Change Order 1:

##### NANPA submitted this change order in September 2012 in response to INC Issue 692 (Update the 5YY Requirements for Resources) and INC Issue 702 (Update Service Description for Use of 5YY Resources). In addition to changing the purpose for Personal Communication Services (PCS) 5YY numbers, numerous modifications are required to the NANP Administration System that impact resource processing and reclamation, NRUF queries and reports and public website reports. Targeted implementation is mid-2013.

See Appendix I for 2012 NANPA Change Order Matrix Log

# Section 8.0 NANPA Website

The website maintained by the NANPA provides information relating to numbering resources and relief planning for use by service providers, regulatory agencies, and the general public. In 2012, several updates were made to the NANPA website:

* Posted documentation regarding the exhaust of toll free resources
* Posted NANPA’s first NAS training video, “How to Request an Initial Central Office Code in a Pooling Area”
* NAS User Guides were updated to include Change Order 21 and Change Order 22

Comments received regarding the NANPA website during the 2012 survey process provided positive feedback. These comments included the following:

“The website is a valuable resource to anyone involved in numbering management and conservation.”

“The NANPA website continues to be a source of valuable information…”

“The NANPA Website has easily accessible information…”

“Very useful in their tutorials and links.”

“Love the website and the improvements.”

# Section 9.0 Conclusion and Recommendation

The NOWG based its 2012 NANPA Performance Evaluation Rating on documentation, information collected, and observations throughout the review year. For the 2012 performance evaluation rating, the NOWG considered NANPA activities that included interaction with the NOWG and NANC, active participation at INC and other industry forums, and the NANPA’s ongoing consistency in addressing PIP suggestions, the resolution of issues brought to the NANPA’s attention, and suggestions made by the NOWG throughout the calendar year.

As in previous years, the 2012 survey results revealed a high level of client satisfaction with the continued perseverance, professionalism, and expertise exhibited by NANPA personnel when performing their NANPA duties. NANPA continued to consistently and effectively demonstrate their expertise as the custodian of numbering resources in all areas in which they were involved.

In reviewing the rating criteria for the NANPA, the NOWG reviewed all aspects of the NANPA activities, as well as the feedback from service providers and regulators, and determined that the NANPA consistently exceeded in all areas of their responsibilities in 2012. As a result of this analysis, the NOWG gave the NANPA an “Exceeded” rating.

The NOWG makes the following recommendations for NANPA’s consideration in 2013:

* Continue to proactively search for ways to improve processes, educate customers, and enhance system functionality.
* Continue to develop and produce instructional and training videos, such as; “How to Request a Growth Code” on the NANPA website.
* On semi-annual CIC report filing, send out a reminder notice similar to the NRUF reminder notice.
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