To: Block Holders, State Regulators and Other Interested Parties

FROM: Betty Ann Kane - Chairman, North American Numbering Council (NANC)

DATE: January 2, 2014

RE: NANC Seeks Public Input on the 2013 Performance of the

Pooling Administrator (PA)

RESPONSE DUE BY: January 31, 2014

The NANC seeks your input on the performance of the PA during calendar year 2013. The Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG) has developed the PA Survey and has posted it online at [http://www.surveygizmo.com/s3/1449650/2013-PA-Performance-Survey](http://www.surveygizmo.com/s3/1449650/2013-PA-Performance-Survey%20) . For your convenience, the survey can be completed and submitted online. The method of manually completing the survey form and emailing it to the NOWG is also still available. The NOWG will analyze the surveys submitted and use your input to evaluate the PA’s performance for 2013. Respondents are encouraged to provide written comments with specific examples. Please note this is the only direct mechanism available to you by the NANC to provide input before it prepares its final evaluation of PA’s 2013 performance.

The evaluation report will be reviewed with the PA, the FCC and made available to the public upon its approval by the NANC. It will reflect only aggregated responses from service providers and state regulators. Every survey response properly submitted will be reviewed by the NOWG and provided only to the FCC, the NANC Chair, and the PA. Other parties requesting to view specific individual responses must receive permission from the FCC.

The final report of the 2013 PA Performance Evaluation will be posted on [www.nanc-chair.org](http://www.nanc-chair.org).

Please note that respondents are asked to submit only one (aggregated) survey per entity (e.g., company, agency, etc.). If multiple surveys for an entity are received, the NOWG will consolidate the responses so that one response per entity is counted.

The NANC would like to remind you that membership in NANC Working Groups such as the NOWG is open to all interested parties. If you are interested in participating on the NOWG or to learn more about the NOWG, please contact one of the NOWG Co-Chairs:

Laura Dalton - [laura.r.dalton@verizon.com](mailto:laura.r.dalton@verizon.com)  
Karen Riepenkroger - [karen.s.riepenkroger@sprint.com](mailto:karen.s.riepenkroger@sprint.com)

Thank you for your participation in this important process.

**INFORMATION PAGE**

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

***Please note that this survey requests input on the performance of the Pooling Administrator (PA), and not the Routing Number Administrator (RNA) or the North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA)***

**EVALUATION PERIOD**: January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2013

**SUBMISSION DEADLINE**: 5 PM ET, January 31, 2014

**QUALIFICATION**: Respondents are asked to submit only one (aggregated) survey per functional entity, e.g., per service provider or per regulatory agency. If multiple surveys for an entity are received, the Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG) will consolidate the responses so that one response per entity is counted.

**SUBMITTING YOUR SURVEY:** If you are not submitting your survey via the online tool, return your completed survey via email to the NOWG contacts listed below. Ensure the name of your organization and your last name is appended to the end of the file name, e.g., “**2013\_PA\_Survey – Telco Jones.doc**.”

**SURVEY DESCRIPTION**:

Your numeric satisfaction ratings will be combined with all other survey responses for each of the questions in Sections A through E. Your commentsrecorded in the box following each group of the satisfaction rating questions are strongly encouraged. Specific examples of your experiences with the PA will provide valuable information concerning current processes that are working well and in determining if and where process improvements are needed.

**FURTHER INFORMATION**: Direct all inquiries to the following NOWG contacts:

Ms. Laura Dalton Ms. Karen Riepenkroger

Verizon Communications Sprint

914-741-7018 913-315-8546

laura.r.dalton@verizon.com karen.s.riepenkroger@sprint.com

**SURVEY DOWNLOAD SITES**: A copy of this blank survey is also available for downloading from the following websites: [www.nationalpooling.com](http://www.nationalpooling.com) or [www.nanc-chair.org](http://www.nanc-chair.org).

**SURVEY RESULTS:** Overall survey results will be incorporated into the *PA 2013 Performance*

*Evaluation Report* andwill be posted at [www.nanc-chair.org](http://www.nanc-chair.org).

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

**Full Name of Entity/Company/Agency: Date:**

**Type of Entity/Company/Agency (please check one): \_\_\_\_\_ Industry or Other \_\_\_\_\_ State Regulatory Commission**

**First & Last Name of Contact:**

**Mailing Address w/ Zip:**

**Telephone Number: E-mail Address:**

The following chart defines the Satisfaction Ratings that are to be used by you on the survey form to indicate your satisfaction with the PA’s performance for the evaluation period of January 1, 2013 – December 31, 2013:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Satisfaction Rating | Used when the PA... |
| **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 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section A – Pooling Administrator**  ***If you did not interact with Pooling Administration in 2013, proceed to Section B.*** | **Exceeded** | More than Met | Met | SometimesMet | NotMet | N/A |
| 1. PA accurately processed thousands-block applications and donations within seven calendar days. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. PA provided help in understanding the thousands-block application process, including explanation of industry guidelines and FCC rules, and assistance in the use of the Pooling Administration System (PAS) to submit block applications. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. PA provided accurate and courteous service within one business day when responding to calls and inquiries pertaining to the assignment of thousands-blocks and the block reclamation process. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **State Commissions Only**: PA effectively managed the thousands-block reclamation process and coordinated with state regulators to reclaim abandoned resources. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

***Section A - Comments on Pooling Administrator. Note any comments regarding your interaction with the Pooling Administrator(s) including any experiences, positive or negative, and describe the situation and the outcome.***

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section B – Pooling Administration System (PAS)**  ***If you did not use PAS in 2013, proceed to Section C.*** | **Exceeded** | **More than Met** | **Met** | **Sometimes Met** | **Not Met** | **N/A** |
| 1. PAS users were informed on planned PAS maintenance and availability and changes to system features and functions. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. PAS data (for example, NPA, rate center, blocks assigned/available) was accessible and accurate. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. PAS provided users the ability to effectively request numbering resources, make donations, input forecasts, and access existing reports and previously submitted data. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

***Section B –*** ***Comments on PAS.*** ***Note any*** c***omments and suggested improvements for the PAS including any experiences, positive or negative, and describe the situation and the outcome.***

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section C - PA Website**  ***If you did not use the PA website in 2013, proceed to Section D.*** | **Exceeded** | **More than Met** | **Met** | **Sometimes Met** | **Not**  **Met** | **N/A** |
| 1. The PA website (www.nationalpooling.com) was accessible and easy to navigate. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The PA website provided up-to-date information and included all the tools needed to locate information on the site. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

***Section C - Comments on PA Website. Note any comments and suggested improvements for the PA Website, including any experiences, positive or negative, and describe the situation and the outcome.***

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section D– Miscellaneous Pooling Administration (PA) Functions**  ***If you did not use any of the Miscellaneous PA Functions in 2013, proceed to Section E.*** | **Exceeded** | **More than Met** | **Met** | **Sometimes Met** | **Not**  **Met** | **N/A** |
| 1. PA representative(s) provided customer service and assistance when needed (for example, Help Desk support) and responded to inquiries in a timely manner. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. PA representative(s) effectively participated in and contributed to the resolution of industry pooling related issues at industry forums. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The pooling training videos available on the PA website are helpful to me. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. PA “Quarterly Pooling Tip” provided useful information. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

***Section D– Comments on Miscellaneous Pooling Administration (PA) Functions. Note any comments on miscellaneous PA functions including any experiences, positive or negative, and describe the situation and the outcome.***

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section E – Overall Assessment of the PA**  **Indicate level of satisfaction for your interaction with PA.** | **Exceeded** | **More than Met** | **Met** | **Sometimes Met** | **Not**  **Met** | **N/A** |
| 1. Based upon your experiences in the 2013 performance year, how would you rate PA’s overall service? (Please refer to the rating definitions on Page 2.) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

***Section E – Comments on Overall Assessment of the PA. Note any comments to explain your overall assessment of the PA including any experiences you may have had, positive or negative, and describe the situation and the outcome. If you have comments that you feel did not belong in any other sections of this survey, please list them below.***

|  |
| --- |
|  |