SGA Ad-Hoc
ENUM
CONTRIBUTION

TITLE: Views on various issues

DATE: March 28, 2001

SOURCE:

Telcordia Technologies, Inc.
Verisign

ABSTRACT: This contribution provides views on some of the issues raised at the first SGA Ad-Hoc ENUM meeting

---

NOTICE:

This document is offered to the SGA Ad-Hoc on ENUM as a basis for discussion and is not a binding proposal on Telcordia Technologies, Inc and Verisign. Telcordia Technologies, Inc. and Verisign specifically reserve the right to amend or withdraw the statements contained herein.

Introduction

At the first SGA Ad-Hoc on ENUM several issues were raised and it was requested that companies provide views for each of the issues. The following contribution provides views on some of these issues.

Discussion

Issue: Should the US participate in a common global approach with the implementation of ENUM in the US (e.g., E164.arpa)?

- If not, what are the other options?
- Will the US populate some of its NANP resources into E164.arpa? Are there any anti-trust issues?
- Should the US industry work at developing implementation procedures for other zones, e.g., .com

View: It is recognized that multiple, competitive ENUM DNS zones may be implemented and deployed in the marketplace, but it is our view that this SGA Ad Hoc should focus on developing procedures for a common designated ENUM DNS zone which currently is e164.arpa. However, it is recognized that events may alter this designation but regardless of that outcome, this SGA Ad-Hoc should focus on a global designated zone, e.g., E164.foo.

In addition, it is our view that if this SGA Ad-Hoc, or whatever form it takes, continues to meet as an open industry forum and collectively reach consensus on the issues. Resolving issues in an open industry forum should negate some of the anti-trust concerns.

Issue: Is there an ongoing role for ITU bodies in the manner in which the US implements ENUM?

View: No. There was agreement in the ITU-T that the only concern is to ensure that each Member State has authorized the inclusion of its Country Code within the globally designated ENUM DNS zone. The ITU-T has further stated that the administration of the designated ENUM DNS zone corresponding to an E.164 geographic code, i.e., Country Code 1, is a national matter and is, therefore, administered by the ITU Member State(s) to which the country code is assigned.

Issue: What are the implications for other countries in the NANP?

View: Other countries in the North American Numbering Plan may be interested in the implementation and deployment of ENUM. In addition the agreements reached in this group will have implications for other countries in the NANP and therefore it would be beneficial to extend the participation and invite all interested parties. It is

understood that in order to widen the participation to other countries that a different forum may be required.

Issue: Should there be competitive Tier One Registries?

- If so, how many?
- Joint Collaborative effort?
- What is the selection process?
- Sole industry responsibility or what amount of Regulatory involvement?

View: We believe that there should be a tiered provisioning architecture in the designated ENUM DNS zone, and that within that architecture, competition at the tier one registry level is provided. In our previous presentation we suggested that the model to follow is similar to the NPAC model. However, we do not have a firm view on the exact number of tier one registries or a preferred model on how to divide the NANP.

Issues: Would there be a need for additional NANP assignments to ENUM? And What are the effects of ENUM on NANP utilization?

View: In the current context of ENUM, it is our view that subscribers should use their existing assigned NANP numbers, e.g., wireline, wireless, fax, etc., and to avoid any impact on NANP numbers.

Summary

The discussion of these issues and the eventual consensus agreements will help provide a framework for the continued work on the implementation and deployment of ENUM in the US.