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# Executive Summary

The FCC and the North American Numbering Council (NANC) charged the Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG) with compiling and delivering an annual performance report of the Pooling Administrator (PA). The PA’s annual performance assessment is based upon:

* 2013 Performance Feedback Survey for PA and RNA (Routing Number Administrator)
* Written comments and reports
* Annual Operational Review
* NOWG observations and monthly interactions with the PA

The PA’s rating for the 2013 performance year was determined by the NOWG to be **More Than Met**. This rating is defined below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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 |

The 2013 survey results revealed a consistent level of satisfaction that respondents attributed tothe responsiveness and expertise exhibited by the PA and RNA personnel throughout 2013.

In 2013, the PA continued to consistently perform its required responsibilities. Highlights included:

* The PA successfully completed a Very Old Overdue Part 4 Project resolving all 188 overdue Part 4s.
* The PA processed 137,375 Part 3s, which was the highest amount of applications processed annually since the start of national pooling.
* The RNA continued to work with service providers on reconciling identified data discrepancies.

# Section 1.0 Performance Review Methodology

The annual PA Performance Evaluation is a summary of significant events that were accomplished during the 2013 performance year.  In addition to the annual performance review survey process, the NOWG’s interactions with the PA included the following:

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

The Routing Number Administrator (RNA) was established under the PA’s contract with the FCC.  Separate performance surveys for the PA and RNA were conducted because the PA and RNA systems and users are different. The quantitative results of the PA and RNA surveys are shown separately in this report, but the results were combined when determining the overall PA rating.  The following explains the 2013 PA Performance Review Methodology used by the NOWG in weighting the combined quantitative survey responses:

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 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 |

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

# Section 2.0 PA Reports

* 1. **PA Annual Report**

The annual report prepared by the PA is a requirement in the Pooling Administrator Technical Requirements document. The status of pooling and Pooling Administration should be reported in the annual report. Part of the NOWG’s annual performance review process is to review the annual report. At a minimum, the annual report is required to contain the following information:

* Brief description of the PA
* Highlights/significant milestones reached during the previous year
* Identification of existing and potential pooling areas
* Aggregated total, by pool, of the service providers participating in the pooled area
* Forecast results, as well as a review of forecasts vs. actual past block activations
* System and performance metrics
* Status of required transferable property
* Industry issue identification/feedback
* Volume of reports produced aggregated by regulatory agency, NANC, NANPA, and service providers
* Additional informational offerings

The PA provided the NOWG with an opportunity to review the draft copy of the 2013 Annual Report. During the on-site operational review in Concord, California in April 2014, the PA staff reviewed the 2013 highlights which were also included in the annual report.

Overall, the annual report provides a comprehensive snapshot of pooling and the PA for 2013. The PA 2013 Annual Report was filed with the FCC and is posted for general availability on the PA’s website at [www.nationalpooling.com](http://www.nationalpooling.com/).

* 1. **PA NANC Report**

The PA reported its monthly numbering activities to the NANC and the NOWG. Additionally, the PA made presentations at three NANC meetings in 2013 (the December 2013 meeting was cancelled due to weather). The PA reported the status of thousands-block pooling administration, p-ANI activities, and events affecting the performance of the PA, which included the following:

* Volume of pooling assignments, donations and applications processed
* Codes opened to replenish pools and establish Location Routing Numbers (LRNs)
* Pools with less than six months inventory vs. forecasts
* Summaries of monthly reports to the FCC
* Number of blocks reclaimed
* Percent availability of PAS and RNAS
* Status and implementation of change orders
* Updates to PAS
* Updates to the PA website
* p-ANI summary
* Results of the 2013 Pooling Administration Survey
  1. **NOWG Monthly Reports**

Throughout 2013, the NOWG and PA followed a standing agenda during the scheduled monthly calls. The PA provided monthly performance reports that were reviewed during the monthly calls with the NOWG. The quality and content of these reports provided the NOWG with valuable insight into the operations of the PA. Some of the standing agenda topics include:

* Application Processing
* Rate Center Pooling Status
* p-ANI
* Customer Focus

See Appendix A for 2013 PA / NOWG Standing Agenda

# Section 3.0 Customer Focus / Issues Log

**Customer Focus**

In 2013, at the monthly NOWG/PA meetings, the PA provided a report on customer focus items that they executed to help service providers and regulators. Customer focus items cover both contractual and non-contractual initiatives related to customer service.

There were 172 customer focus items from January 2013 through December 2013. Customer focus items included, but were not limited to, the following:

* Provided assistance to service providers on block donations
* Provided time-saving and special reports for both service providers and regulators
* Provided education and assistance on p-ANI resources
* Provided service provider and regulator training

**PA/NOWG Issues Tracking Log**

The tracking log is used to document ongoing issues. The log, which includes metrics on the create date, issue name, summary and status, keeps the NOWG informed until issues are brought to resolution/closure.

There were no new issues added to this log in 2013.

See Appendix B for 2013 PA / NOWG Issues Tracking Log

# Section 4.0 2013 PA Performance Survey Results

**4.1 PA Survey Ratings – Quantitative Analysis\***

The PA 2013 Performance Surveys were completed by a total of 99 respondents:

65 Industry & Other Respondents

34 State Regulatory Commission Respondents

The results are as follows:

* Pooling Administrator (Section A)
* There were 4 questions in this section to which respondents provided the following aggregated response ratings:
  + 126 as Exceeded
  + 99 as More than Met
  + 34 as Met
  + 1 as Sometimes Met
  + 3 as Not Met
* Pooling Administration System (PAS) (Section B)
* There were 3 questions in this section to which respondents provided the following aggregated response ratings:
  + 120 as Exceeded
  + 101 as More than Met
  + 48 as Met
  + 1 as Sometimes Met
  + 0 as Not Met
* PA Website (Section C)
* There was 2 questions in this section to which respondents provided the following aggregated response ratings:
  + 70 as Exceeded
  + 72 as More than Met
  + 43 as Met
  + 6 as Sometimes Met
  + 0 as Not Met
* Miscellaneous Pooling Administration (PA) Functions (Section D)
* There were 4 questions in this section to which respondents provided the following aggregated response ratings:
  + 117 as Exceeded
  + 111 as More than Met
  + 61 as Met
  + 3 as Sometimes Met
  + 2 as Not Met
* Overall Assessment of Pooling Administrator (PA) (Section E)
* There was 1 question in this section to which respondents provided the following aggregated response ratings:
  + 46 as Exceeded
  + 44 as More than Met
  + 6 as Met
  + 1 as Sometimes Met
  + 0 as Not Met

\* The aggregated results do not include “N/A” responses.

See Appendix C for 2013 PA Survey Metrics and Bar Charts, and Appendix D for 2013 PA Survey Cover Letter and Performance Survey

* 1. **PA Survey Written Comments**

The survey allowed respondents the opportunity to provide detailed written comments regarding their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the PA’s performance in 2013. The majority of comments were positive, with only a few containing suggestions for areas of improvement. The NOWG reviewed all comments to determine if there was a common theme substantiated by multiple respondents.

The following is a summary of written comments that were provided by survey respondents:

* Outstanding praise for the PA staff was a consistent theme throughout the survey:
* Prompt, courteous, knowledgeable
* Willing to help, friendly, professional
* Provides excellent guidance and assistance
* Patient with answering questions
* Comments suggesting improvements were mostly isolated. Comments pertained to:
* Administrative and managerial suggestions
* Technical/system and process issues

The NOWG concluded that the written comments were not indicative of any consistent performance issues, and in many cases provided significant praise for individual PA staffers. Samples of the written comments received are provided below:

“Always professional, knowledgeable and helpful at every encounter.”

“PA's are awesome! Always helpful!!”

“The reps were always willing to help when I had problems or answer any questions I had.”

“They always help with any issue and give me the orientation that I need to complete the requests.”

“PA provided prompt, thorough and friendly explanation of the reclamation process when inquiries were made regarding the process.”

“The Pooling Administrator personnel are outstanding. A well trained and congenial lot, they are always helpful.”

“All of my interactions with the Pooling Administrator have been extremely positive. They have been very good to work with and I have absolutely no complaints. I think the PA is doing a great job.”

“Phone calls and/or emails were timely answered with accurate information, often volunteering additional steps on how to complete the project.”

“The process should be less complicated and more streamlined for block requests. The current process is very time consuming and creates a hardship for our small ILEC with limited resources/time for completion.”

“The PA continues to do an excellent job.”

“The PA is staffed with great folks providing an invaluable service.”

“Very satisfied with PA's overall performance.”

“As reported, all reps and help desk person all were very helpful and knowledgeable and could answer my questions and help resolve problems.”

“I’m still having trouble trying to request two blocks of numbers for wireless services we are scheduled to launch in March. When I spoke to [Name], she just told me to contact NPAC and did not answer any of my questions about the block request application. When I tried to contact NPAC, I did not get my issues resolved. I am waiting for a response to two requests for help. One request went to the pooling help desk, the other was an email asking for help from my newly assigned administrator.”

“Questions or information requests were answered in a friendly manner, On occassion the PA would initiate contact with information about trends or unusual numbers of blocks that may have been requested by a particular company, to keep the state regulators informed of activity, particularly in the case of wholesalers requesting a large number of codes for resale.”

See Appendix E for 2013 PA Survey Respondents and Appendix F for 2013 PA Survey Respondents’ Comments

# Section 5.0 Operational Review

The NOWG members met with the PA representatives in Concord, California on April 2 and 3, 2014, to conduct the annual on-site operational review.  During this review, the PA staff presented an overview and highlights of 2013 activities. The presentation included the Pooling Administration operations, Pooling Administration System (PAS), NANP resource trending, external relations and training, change orders, pooling quality assurance, and regulatory compliance.

Key highlights presented to the NOWG included:

* Pooling Contract:
  + Two contract extensions were issued in 2013.
  + New contract for the Pooling Administrator was awarded on July 12, 2013. This contract also included the Routing Number Administration (p-ANI).
  + Effective date for new contract was July 15, 2013. Contract is a one-year base period ending July 14, 2014 and three one-year option periods ending July 14, 2017.
* Total Applications Processed in 2013:
  + Issued 137,375 Part 3s – which was a record high
  + Assigned 47,326 thousands-blocks
  + Opened 2,611 NXX codes
  + Processed 100% of all applications within 7 calendar days or less
* Customer Support Desk received 1,958 calls and 100% were answered within one business day
* Issued quarterly pooling tips
* Reclaimed 67 blocks in 2013
* Performed mass modifications for 10 different service providers resulting in 27,274 blocks and 6,253 codes being updated in PAS
* Located block holders for 565 blocks and code holders for 303 codes
* Trouble Tickets:
  + Opened two new trouble tickets to correct PAS and email errors
  + Closed two new and one old trouble ticket to correct PAS and email errors
* Reporting:
  + The following reports were all submitted on time:
    - 698 reports for the FCC, states, NANC, NANPA, and service providers
    - 66 ad hoc reports, all of which were provided in less than one business day (contract allows three business days)
    - 131 Contract Data Requirements List (CDRL) reports
    - 54 additional contract required reports
* Industry Support:
  + Participated in 62 industry meetings
  + Submitted 13 new issues and 17 new contributions to INC
  + Provided pooling status reports to the NANPA for their meetings
  + Made 963 changes to rate center information (50% changed the pooling status designation from Excluded to Optional)
* Customer Focus
  + Quarterly and monthly tips
  + 4.6 out of 5 on the PA conducted annual survey
  + Reported on 159 significant PA and p-ANI customer focus items
  + No formal complaints
* Facilitated four state regulatory commission education sessions related to pooling issues
* Special Projects:
  + Completed the fourth Very Old Overdue Part 4 Project clean up
    - 188 overdue Part 4s were resolved
  + Performed a complex change in the MSA designations
  + Secured block donations for 58 of 66 rate centers (excluded to optional) – saving 58 NXX codes from being opened

See Appendix G for 2013 PA Operational Review Presentation and Appendix H for 2013 PA Highlights

# Section 6.0 Pooling Administration System (PAS)

The Pooling Administration System (PAS) was available 99.98% of the time in 2013. Even though the PA contract allows up to 24 hours of scheduled downtime in a 12 month interval, there were no instances of scheduled PAS unavailability in 2013. The system remained up during the four system builds needed to implement two change orders and two maintenance updates. The only unscheduled downtime for the year totaled one hour and 45 minutes out of a possible 8,760 total hours that PAS could have been available in 2013.

The PA implemented enhancements to PAS in 2013 to improve system functionality. Over the past few years, the PA kept track of approximately 130 enhancement suggestions that had been submitted to the PA by service providers, regulators, and PA personnel. In 2013, the PA studied the recommendations and developed the system requirements for new functionality that will be incorporated into future PAS upgrades.

Overall, the industry was satisfied with the performance of PAS. This is apparent in the following sample of comments received on the industry survey:

“PAS performed as expected during 2013.”

“When there was a planned maintenance we were notified not only when accessing the site but also as a member via email.”

“PAS is easy to navigate and fairly intuitive -- a bonus for those of us that don't log into it regularly or work in it every day.”

“... I know I can readily access data that is more current than that found in the NRUF data.”

The following is an enhancement suggestion regarding the system:

“I would prefer that PAS just deal with adding and deleting blocks and not need block modification information.”

# Section 7.0 Change Orders

There were no new change orders filed by the PA with the FCC in 2013. There were two change orders (Change Order 23 and 24) that were approved in 2012 with implementation scheduled for 2013 and beyond.

Status of these two change orders is as follows:

* INC Issue 715 – Update TBPAG for retrieving a block donated/returned in error (Change Order 23) implemented on April 6, 2013
* Enhancement of the FTP Interface with the Pooling Administration System (Change Order 24) was partially implemented on July 19, 2013. The remainder of this change order is scheduled to be implemented in January 2015 with the roll out of the new PAS

See Appendix I for 2013 PA Change Order Matrix Log

# Section 8.0 National Pooling Website

The website maintained by the PA provides number pooling information to service providers and regulatory agencies. In 2013, the PA continued to keep the information current on the website.

There were no new training videos in 2013. The current videos on the PA website continued to be viewed regularly. There were 330 views of these videos in 2013. The training videos can also be downloaded from the PA website.

Overall, the industry was satisfied with the website. This is apparent in the following sample of comments received on the surveys:

“Great website, tons of info.”

“The PA website met our expectations during 2013.”

“The PA website is well designed and always assessible; it's easy to find all the data and information we need for requesting resources.”

“easy to navigate”

While there were no suggested enhancements to the website there were the following comments about log-in issues and difficulty locating information:

“I have some login problems using internet explorer.”

“At times I have a hard time finding instructions and requirements for ordering blocks. I usually use my direct link to ATIS to get the information that I need b/c I am unable to find it within the PAS site.”

# Section 9.0 p-ANI (pseudo-Automatic Number Identification) / RNA (Routing Number Administrator)

The responsibility of Routing Number Administrator (RNA) for p-ANIs is still relatively new for the PA. The year 2013 was the first full year that the PA performed functions of the permanent RNA for administering p-ANIs.

The PA’s RNA functions in 2013 included, but were not limited to, the following:

* Processed 16,548 applications (Part 3s issued), with 100% of the applications processed on time
* Assigned 3,328 new p-ANI ranges
* Modified 2,227 p-ANI ranges
* Processed 10,774 returned p-ANI ranges
* Maintained the Routing Number Administration System (RNAS) and the p-ANI website, with 99.97% availability
* Continued to train RNAS users on the types of documentation required to assure that applicants were eligible to offer services in the areas in which they requested p-ANIs
* Continued to participate in meetings and work with the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) and Emergency Services Interconnection Forum (ESIF)
* Processed carriers’ Annual p-ANI Reports and semi-annual forecasts
* Completed and posted the 2013 p-ANI Activity and Projected Exhaust Report
* Issued p-ANI Tips of the Month to registered RNAS Users

As a consequence of the government shutdown, the RNA was able to work through issues related to the inability to check authorizations. Once the FCC website was available, the RNA processed all 157 suspended applications in one day.

In addition to the functions listed above, a major work effort for the RNA in 2013 was their continued work on reconciling p-ANI data. The RNA worked with service providers to reconcile data discrepancies in which duplicate assignments with the same p-ANI range or part of a p-ANI range were identified, and discrepancies between carriers in which no assignee was reported on a p-ANI range that the assignor reported as assigned.

Overall, the industry was satisfied with the PA’s RNA functions. This is apparent in the majority of responses received in both the quantitative sections and written comments sections of the NOWG’s RNA Survey. Following is a sample of comments received on the survey:

“I have been working on cleanup projects for multiple wireless carriers and part of the process has been to investigate and return a substantial amount of ESRK ranges to Neustar. [Names] have been amazing to work with during this process.”

“The RNA personnel are always quick to respond, and always professional and courteous. We've worked together with [Name] on the return of pANIs from VoIP Provisioning Centers (VPCs), and this process has worked great to ensure that the RNA's database and our 9-1-1 System Service Provider database agree.”

“Both [Names] are both knowlegeable and exceptional in supporting the iDEN shutdown. Their assistance allowed the 911 group to complete the project in 63 business days.”

“The RNA personnel are very helpful and my calls are answered immediately. Overall, the RNA function performs splendidly, particularly when considering that it's essentially only a 2-person operation. [Names] are efficient professionals, and valued by the industry.”

The survey also contained some comments suggesting RNAS enhancements, including the following:

“The RNA password reset process can be a little cumbersome at first for users that don't log into RNAS regularly. It would be helpful if there were an easier way to query ranges of pANIs without having to query a single pANI at a time or query the entire NPA-NXX. Perhaps this functionality can be a future enhancement in RNAS.”

“Tools within the website to sort data for issues or conflicts are not available. Assignments can have too many errors because the system only takes in data and does not validate accuracy for selective routers or ESNs based upon the PSAP.”

See Appendix J for 2012 RNA Survey Respondents and Appendix K for 2013 RNA Survey Respondents’ Comments

**Section 9.1 RNA Survey Ratings – Quantitative Analysis\***

The following quantitative results were included in the PA Performance Review Methodology for 2013.

The RNA 2013 Performance Survey was completed by a total of 9 respondents:

8 Industry and Other Respondents

1 State Regulatory Commission Respondent

The results are as follows:

* Routing Number Administrator (Section A)
* There were 3 questions in this section to which respondents provided the following aggregated response ratings:
  + 15 as Exceeded
  + 1 as More than Met
  + 6 as Met
  + 0 as Sometimes Met
  + 2 as Not Met
* Routing Number Administration System (RNAS) (Section B)
* There were 3 questions in this section to which respondents provided the following aggregated response ratings:
  + 10 as Exceeded
  + 8 as More than Met
  + 5 as Met
  + 0 as Sometimes Met
  + 3 as Not Met
* RNA Website (Section C)
* There were 2 questions in this section to which respondents provided the following aggregated response ratings:
  + 8 as Exceeded
  + 4 as More than Met
  + 5 as Met
  + 0 as Sometimes Met
  + 1 as Not Met
* Miscellaneous RNA Functions (Section D)
* There were 2 questions in this section to which respondents provided the following aggregated response ratings:
  + 3 as Exceeded
  + 7 as More than Met
  + 5 as Met
  + 0 as Sometimes Met
  + 2 as Not Met
* Overall Assessment of the RNA (Section E)
* There was 1 question in this section to which respondents provided the following aggregated response ratings:
  + 5 as Exceeded
  + 1 as More Than Met
  + 2 as Met
  + 0 as Sometimes Met
  + 1 as Not Met

\* The aggregated results do not include the “N/A” responses.

See Appendix L for 2013 RNA Survey Metrics and Bar Charts and Appendix M for 2013 RNA Survey Cover Letter and Performance Survey

# Section 10.0 VoIP Trial

On June 17, 2013 the FCC approved a six month VoIP trial. There were five companies that were authorized to participate in the trial.

As the VoIP trial participants did not have knowledge of PAS, the PA spent time with each participant assisting them with registering in PAS, NAS, and NPAC. The PA also provided guidance on the process for acquiring an OCN and selecting an AOCN.

The PA walked the participants through tools available in PAS which included training videos and the new service provider checklist.

In addition to providing assistance to the VoIP participants, the PA provided information to state regulators on the process and implementation of the VoIP trial.

There were 67 Part 3’s issued associated with the trial, and 17 LRNs and 5 individual blocks assigned. The PA’s assistance included 44 contacts with state regulators, and 82 contacts with the VoIP participants involved.

Throughout the VoIP trial, the PA provided ongoing support to the participants.

**10.1 VoIP Trial Participants Survey Ratings – Quantitative Analysis\***

The VoIP trial participants’ quantitative survey results are from the overall PA 2013 Performance Survey. Only four of the five VoIP trial participants participated in the PA Survey. (These results are also included in Section 4.0 overall PA survey quantitative results.)

The results are as follows:

* Pooling Administrator (Section A)
* There were 4 questions in this section to which respondents provided the following aggregated response ratings:
  + 11 as Exceeded
  + 1 as More than Met
  + 0 as Met
  + 0 as Sometimes Met
  + 0 as Not Met
* Pooling Administration System (PAS) (Section B)
* There were 3 questions in this section to which respondents provided the following aggregated response ratings:
  + 9 as Exceeded
  + 0 as More than Met
  + 3 as Met
  + 0 as Sometimes Met
  + 0 as Not Met
* PA Website (Section C)
* There was 2 questions in this section to which respondents provided the following aggregated response ratings:
  + 4 as Exceeded
  + 2 as More than Met
  + 2 as Met
  + 0 as Sometimes Met
  + 0 as Not Met
* Miscellaneous Pooling Administration (PA) Functions (Section D)
* There were 4 questions in this section to which respondents provided the following aggregated response ratings:
  + 7 as Exceeded
  + 4 as More than Met
  + 1 as Met
  + 0 as Sometimes Met
  + 0 as Not Met
* Overall Assessment of Pooling Administrator (PA) (Section E)
* There was 1 question in this section to which respondents provided the following aggregated response ratings:
  + 2 as Exceeded
  + 2 as More than Met
  + 0 as Met
  + 0 as Sometimes Met
  + 0 as Not Met

\* The aggregated results do not include “N/A” responses.

# Section 11.0 Conclusion and Recommendation

The NOWG based its 2013 PA Performance Evaluation Rating on PA and RNA documentation, information collected, and observations throughout the review period year. Although emphasis continues to be given to the numeric and written survey comments, survey respondents may not always be familiar with the activities of the PA and RNA that occur “behind the scenes.” For the overall 2013 performance evaluation rating, the NOWG considered PA activities that included interaction with the NOWG and the NANC, and active participation at INC and other industry forums.

The survey results revealed a high level of client satisfaction with the continued professionalism and expertise exhibited by the PA personnel when performing their PA and RNA duties. The PA continued to demonstrate their ability to handle the large volume of block applications, while simultaneously completing special projects.

The NOWG reviewed all aspects of the PA activities, as well as the feedback from service providers and regulators, and determined that the PA consistently performed very well in all areas of their responsibilities in 2013. As a result of the analysis, the NOWG gave the PA a “More than Met” rating for the 2013 performance year.

The NOWG makes the following recommendations for the PA’s consideration in 2014:

* Ongoing review of internal training processes with the PA and RNA personnel to ensure consistency in understanding the processes when responding to service providers and regulators.
* Consider adding an RNAS enhancement to make it easier to query ranges of p-ANIs.
* Modify the p-ANI Annual Report form to make the fields un-modifiable so as to reduce the input formatting re-work performed currently by the RNA.
* Provide a proposed list and associated feature explanation of the upcoming 2015 PAS enhancements that resulted from service provider and regulator suggestions.
* Create a PAS trouble ticket log to accompany the monthly reports provided to the NOWG.
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