STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER MICHAEL O’RIELLY
APPROVING IN PART AND CONCURRING IN PART

Re: Telcordia Technologies, Inc. Petition to Reform Amendment 57 and to Order a Competitive Bidding Process for Number Portability Administration, WC Docket No. 07-149, Petition of Telcordia Technologies, Inc. to Reform or Strike Amendment 70, to Institute Competitive Bidding for Number Portability Administration, and to End the NAPM LLC’s Interim Role in Number Portability Administration Contract Management, WC Docket No. 09-109, Telephone Number Portability, CC Docket No. 95-116.

Today, the Commission takes the next step in what has been a long process to select the Local Number Portability Administrator (LNPA). Like Chairman Wheeler, I was not at the Commission for most of it, and the work that has led to this stage has been conducted by Bureau staff and external numbering groups. Based on staff’s analysis of the record, assuming it is complete and accurate, and staff’s recommendation to the Commission, I concur on the process, but approve of the outcome.

I have concerns about the procedures used leading up to today’s decision, even though the outcome, based on the information available, seems to have merit. Admittedly, this entire venture is somewhat unique given that the statute assigns the Commission the role to “create or designate” numbering administrators, which some have interpreted to mean a procurement-like process. Personally, I cannot understand why the Commission didn’t just conduct a full-blown notice and comment proceeding in this instance, especially since over the last three-plus years there was certainly plenty of time.

In addition, a significant amount of information—more than was probably necessary or justifiable—has been cloaked behind protective orders.

Moreover, as I’ve said in other Commission items, we should endeavor to act on issues as quickly as possible, but it is also important to get things right. Here, more than three years after we started down this path, we find ourselves inexplicably running up against a deadline of sorts with important details still to-be-determined.

Nonetheless, assuming all of the information in the item is accurate, especially the analysis comparing the two proposals on the technical, managerial, and cost aspects, the outcome seems justified. Notably, Telcordia stated for the record: “On price, however, there was simply no contest.”1 Depending on the terms of the final contract, these savings will lower the cost for those contracting with the numbering administrator, and ultimately end users.

Given the importance of the transition to a new LNPA, I thank the Chairman for his willingness to accommodate my request for greater involvement by the full Commission going forward. The Commission will receive the North American Portability Management LLC (NAPM) transition oversight plan and status updates, and staff will report to the full Commission. This will help ensure that the transition proceeds as smoothly as possible and that any further concerns by carriers or other parties about the transition, contract terms, or associated costs receive sufficient attention.

Finally, it is critical that this process not impede or impinge on the IP transitions that are occurring every day in every market. For example, one party suggested that the contract should include ENUM or IP numbering, but I have significant concerns with such a step. While the LNPA must be cognizant of future technological and marketplace developments, we are not deciding at this time to bring ENUM within the LNP contract. Industry experts and standards groups, such as Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions (ATIS), have been hard at work for years to ensure that technical requirements are in place to support IP transitions, including for numbering. At times the Commission

1 Telcordia Comments at 11.
has let unfounded policy fears regarding new technologies and network transitions override industry-led technical and network engineering solutions. I will be vigilant in guarding against that here.