The NANP (North American Numbering Plan) Turns 56

by Mark Cuccia

Date: Tue, 21 Oct 2003 21:09:57 CDT
From: Mark J Cuccia <mcuccia@tulane.edu>
Subject: The NANP is 56-Years-Old Wednesday, October 22

The NANP (North American Numbering Plan), as it was originally "finalized", and then built-upon, expanded, and developed, "as we have known it," does "officially" turn 56 this Wednesday, 22-October-2003.

AT&T issued a memo, authored by Harold L. Ryan, dated 22-October-1947, regarding the subject "Numbering Plan Area Arrangements -- Toll Area codes -- Letter to all General Traffic Managers -- attached Map and List of Codes."

I do *NOT* have a copy of that memo! I wish I did, though! :-)

But I do have reference to the date and title of the memo.

There were preliminary plans for a nationwide / continent-wide telephone numbering plan for Operator and later customer toll dialing, being drafted in the early to mid-1940s, one of them being where every toll (and tandem) switch in the US and Canada, some 2,600 of them (what an ironic number, twenty-six hundred for the approximate total number of toll switches in the US/Canada! If you know what I mean! :-), would be uniquely identified with an Operator Toll Dialing (OTD) code of the form 0XXXX, zero followed by four-more-digits. Operators were already using a limited form of regional OTD in some parts of the US and Canada, since the 1920s, using 0XX and 1XX SXS OTD codes, which customers weren't able to access (or at least were not supposed to be able to access). These codes *have* continued to this day for internal operator and network routing purposes, and are not supposed to be dialable by customers.

Anyhow, to have actual Nationwide Operator Toll Dialing, the use of individual 0XXXX codes for each toll center to reach specific *customers* would have been a bit "awkward" because of the large number of individual routing/area codes, as well as whenever there needed to be "re-homes" or growth.

By 1945, the basics of the plan used today were being developed, where there would be a 3-digit "Area Code" of the form N1X, a three-digit office code (based on the office-name and a digit), and the four-digit line-number. There is a map of the US (Canada was intended to be included but wasn't indicated on the map), which divided up the country into sixty numbering plan areas, some states having multiple area codes, some states having one area code, and there were some instances where two or three states would "share" the same area code. The map was published in articles on OTD which appeared in 1945 in Bell Labs Record and also Bell Telephone Magazine. I had posted information on these in previous issues of Telecom Digest (back in 1996 and 1997).

By 1946, the area code numbering was revamped to where Canada was specifically included. Also both N0X and N1X format codes would be included. There were 86 area codes for the US and Canada in this draft. States which were to have one and only one area code had N0X format codes. States which were to have more-than-one area code were

to have had N1X format codes. Also, all codes within those multiple code states were in a sequential range, i.e., NY State would have had 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, and also in a "linear progression/adjacency" across the state. Canada "as a whole" was to be treated as if it were a "single state" with multiple area codes, and would have had:

912, 913 Ontario
914, 915 Quebec
916 Maritime Provinces
917 Manitoba
918 Saskatchewan
919 Alberta
910 British Columbia

And while this might have "looked nice" in that there was a "block" of sequential area codes within multi-code states, and within Canada, the "growth" aspect would have been difficult (maybe impossible) to keep things in these "nice" ranges. To truly accommodate growth, the initial benefits of this particular numbering plan would have to be violated and even discarded completely. I had posted on this plan in 1996/97 issues as well.

But by October 1947, AT&T issued yet another numbering plan for area codes in the US/Canada for OTD and ultimate customer DDD. This is the plan that has mostly been built upon since then. And while I have posted the original "chart" of the NPA assignment layout in previous posts to TELECOM Digest, since this *IS* the plan that survived, and has its 56th anniversary this Wednesday, 22-October-2003, I'll go into the details of what was intended in October 1947, and how it developed since.

This plan carried over the N0X format for single area code states, and N1X format codes for multi-area code states. There were initially 86 area codes assigned (as in the previous 1946 proposal). But Canada was now treated as multi-province, where the provinces followed the same rules as the states in the US. Ontario and Quebec had (as of Oct. 1947) two area codes each, and were assigned N1X codes. The other provinces were assigned one area code each, and had N0X codes. The Maritime Provinces shared a single N0X code (902). This still "exists" to this day in the smaller form that Nova Scotia *AND* Prince Edward Island both share 902.

As growth came about in the 1950s, this N0X vs. N1X "rule" for single code vs. multi-code states/provinces was abolished, first when the states with only ONE area code (N0X) were split in 1953 (the additional code was still of the N1N format), and next when both single-code states (N0X) and multi-code states (N1N) were split and new N0X format codes were assigned as additional codes in 1954.

Also in the Oct. 1947 initial assignments was that shorter/quicker dial "pulls" or "spins", or fewer dial PULSES, for an N0X *OR* an N1X code (EACH FORMAT TAKEN SEPARATELY, as N0X and N1X had specific different assignments as mentioned above), were assigned to higher incoming volume locations.

212 for NYCity
213 for Los Angeles
214 for Dallas
312 for Chicago
216 for Cleveland
313 for Detroit
314 for St. Louis
412 for Pittsburgh
414 for Milwaukee
415 for San Francisco
etc.

and in the N0X states/DC:
201 for NJ
202 for DC
203 for CT
301 for MD
302 for DE
401 for RI

Even though RI, MD, DE might not have had a lot of incoming calls, they were still along the eastern seaboard of highly populated surrounding territory, and had more incoming calls than other single-area-code states elsewhere in the US.

There is one anomaly in the above, and I think it was an error in printing that became embedded:

413 (4+3 is seven pulses) became western MA (Springfield/etc)
617 (6+7 is thirteen pulses) became eastern MA (Boston/etc)

More pulses for inbound to Boston than the seven pulses for inbound to Springfield and the more rural western MA area.

There were *NEVER* any "special" DDD tests involving Springfield that have ever been documented, despite what some people claim as the "reason" that Springfield had a shorter/quicker "pull/spin", or "lower" (fewer pulses) area code than Boston. If this was true, documentation to it would have shown up by now and eventually posted to the Digest/Archives "in perpetuity." But that has never seemed to happen.

Even if there were some special DDD tests involving Springfield, it would have been sometime in the 1950s or 60s, WELL AFTER 1947. The 413 vs. 617 assignments re Springfield vs. Boston were "embedded" on the paper assignments as of 22-October-1947.

(Springfield MA *DID* become an AT&T IOC (International Operator Center), a city of gateway overseas operators, but that was in the mid-1970s, LONG after the Oct. 1947 plan was "finalized.")

N0X Form (States/Provinces with only ONE code assigned)
(40 codes assigned):

201 NJ 301 MD 401 RI 501 AR 601 MS 701 ND 801 UT 901 TN
202 DC 302 DE 402 NE 502 KY 602 AZ 702 NV 802 VT 902 mrtm.prv.
203 CT 303 CO 403 AB 503 OR 603 NH 703 VA 803 SC
204 MB 304 WV 404 GA 504 LA 604 BC 704 NC
205 AL 305 FL 405 OK 505 NM 605 SD
206 WA 306 SK 406 MT
207 ME 307 WY
208 ID

(902 originally for all of the Maritime Provinces: NB, NS, PEI, NF/LB)

N1N Form (States/Provinces with several codes assigned)
(46 codes assigned):

212 NY 312 IL 412 PA 512 TX 612 MN 712 IA 812 IN ------
213 CA 313 MI 413 MA 513 OH 613 ON 713 TX ------ 913 KS
214 TX 314 MO 414 WI 514 PQ 614 OH ------ 814 PA 914 NY
215 PA 315 NY 415 CA 515 IA ------ 715 WI 815 IL 915 TX
216 OH 316 KS 416 ON ------ 616 MI 716 NY 816 MO 916 CA
217 IL 317 IN ------ 517 MI 617 MA 717 PA
218 MN ------ 418 PQ 518 NY 618 IL
------ 319 IA 419 OH

Linc Madison has some of this information at his website:

http://www.LincMad.com/table1947.html
(the above chart/table)

http://www.LincMad.com/map1947.html
(a map of the 22-Oct-1947 assignments)

Note that in the October 1947 finalized original plan, there are no area codes assigned of the forms N09, N00, N11, nor N10. The N11 format has been used (initially only in Panel and #1XB areas, later many SXS areas also began to use N11, and eventually all central office areas used N11 codes regardless of equipment type) as "short" 3-digit codes for special services (211 for the Long Distance Operator, 411 for Information or Directory, 611 for Repair Service, 811 for the Business Office, and later on 911 for Emergencies, and other assignments/reservations over more recent years).

The N09 format codes weren't assigned until some ten years later, in 1957. The N10 format codes were first assigned for TWX (Teletypewriter Exchange Service) in Summer 1962, but when TWX service was completely taken over by Western Union (in the United States) on WU's own switch network (separate from the Bell System telephone DDD network) circa 1981, those N10 format codes were now "vacant" and re-assigned starting in the early 1990s. The N00 format codes were first used starting in the mid-1960s, and always for *special* non-geographic services, the first being 800 Toll-Free "Inward-WATS."

In addition to the Springfield/413 vs. Boston/617 question, there is yet ANOTHER "old wives' tale" which keeps getting repeated, but which is simply *NOT* true, and that is that c.o. codes/names/letters/exchanges assigned in one area code were NOT (initially) assigned "at all" in "any" adjacent area code.

That presumption is *NOT* true one bit!

Central Office code assignments were *already* occurring *LONG* before the area code format was even dreamed of. The only thing that telco *tried* to do for "communities of interest" along state-lines, was/is not to assign "duplicate" c.o. codes in adjacent states ALONG THAT LINE, IN THE LOCAL or EAS calling area, so as to TRY to permit 7-digit (2L-5N) dialing within that community of interest along the NPA or state line. But that wasn't always possible, such as in NYCity and northeastern NJ.

In the NYCity Metro area and northeastern NJ area, Panel and #1XB (and later #5XB) switching was used. Step (SXS) was *NOT* used at all in this metro area. There was no "routing" need for any 112+ or 1+ type CAMA/DDD access code for toll in this area. If c.o. codes between 212 NYCity and at least the northeastern NJ portion of NJ's 201, then such calls, usually "multi-message-unit" (not "strictly" toll, although from the consumer's perspective these per-minute charges were indeed toll), "could" have been dialed as "just" 7-digits (2L-5N). However, during the later 1940s and throughout the 1950s, such calls between 201 (northeastern) NJ and 212 NYC were *NOT* dialed as 2L-5N (7-d) but rather (in each direction) as 11+ 2L-5N. There *WERE INDEED* "duplicate" c.o. code assignments between the two states/NPAs in this lower Hudson River NYCity/NJ Metro area. Such duplicate code assignments most likely existed long before the idea of area codes was ever thought of. By 1960, the use of "11+" in each direction for such northeast-NJ <=> NYCity calls was abolished, replaced with use of the actual destination 3-digit NPA codes, i.e., 201+7d for calls from NYCity to northeastern NJ, and 212+7d for calls from NJ to NYCity.

Anyhow, the 1950s era was quite a period of NPA assignments in the US and Canada. A great deal of this was postwar growth and a stronger economy. Some of it was the expansion of Operator Toll Dialing as well as Customer originated DDD, especially with the installation of automation for switching and routing calls (new XB Tandems, 4A/4M XB toll machines, and 5XB machines, as well as AMA/CAMA billing equipment).

In November 1951, the towns of Englewood and Teaneck NJ, were the first where *customers* could actually *DIAL* toll calls to distant cities, even clear across the country, although at this time, only to a few limited metro areas. But it *was* a first. The customers in these two towns actually used *real* area codes plus 2L-5N to dial such calls in most cases. One of the exceptions was for calls to the San Francisco/Oakland Bay area. The "official" area code list indicated only 415 for central California. But there were the two sides of the Bay, and different toll machines on each side of the Bay.

For the Englewood NJ Customer Long Distance Dialing trials, calls to Oakland (and east Bay metro area points) were reached with NPA 415. However, calls to San Francisco (and west Bay and north-of-the-Golden Gate points that were dialable) were reached with a different 318 area code. I think that Operators dialed 415 for the entire region. I think that some of this may have had to do with the number of digits that could be analyzed and translated up-front in the #5XB machines in Englewood and Teaneck NJ. I think that for discrete routing to Oakland toll vs. San Francisco toll, the machines couldn't translate all six-digits of the NPA-NNX code, but only three-digits of "just" the NPA code. Thus the use of 318 indicated San Francisco "up-front" while the use of 415 indicated Oakland "up-front."

This didn't seem to matter for Operators, because they keyed into a 4A XB toll machine, which was probably able to analyze/translate the full six-digits of the 415+NNX code, and thus be able to route directly to Oakland vs. San Francisco on those six digits 415+NNX.

By the time full six-digit translation was extended to customer-originated DDD calls, the use of 318 vs. 415 for San Francisco vs. Oakland was no longer needed, thus 318 was fully reclaimed for this use, with 415 being the only code for all calls to the Bay area. In 1957, 318 was assigned to the split of Louisiana's (only) area code 504.

During the 1950s, many PBXes became automated and to the point where individual "extensions" began to have "real" dialable 7-digit (ten-digit) "public" telephone numbers. Every hotel or hospital room, or office desk, etc. had a unique public/dialable telephone number. Mobile (IMTS) and paging was becoming available and popular, to where the mobile devices also had dialable "POTS" (NANP) telephone numbers. Manual service was becoming automated and getting dialable c.o. codes in many rural areas, and even in cities where manual service still existed. There were possibly the beginnings of tele-fax, as well as dial-up data connections over the regular DDD or local-dial telephone network.

The US possessions of Alaska and Hawaii were about to become states, and in 1957 were assigned area codes. Even the Caribbean area (both the US possessions of Puerto Rico and the US Virgin Islands, as well as the Dominican Republic, the "British" West Indies, and possibly even other parts of the French and Dutch Caribbean and maybe even pre-Castro Cuba ... was assigned an Area Code (809) in 1958. However, it wouldn't be until the mid/late 1960s and into the 1970s (and even later) when all of these non-CONUS points could begin to be *directly dialed* by customers in the US and Canada, without the need for operator intervention (at least for non-coin-station-sent-paid calls).

With the exception of the *temporary* use of 318 for calling to San Francisco (from Englewood/Teaneck NJ in the customer toll dialing trials starting Nov. 1951), there were *THIRTY-FOUR* new area codes assigned and activated for the US, Canada, Caribbean, between 1948 and 1962.

I seem to think that around 1960, it was planned to extend Alberta's 403 area code to include (Canadian National's) Yukon and southern/western Northwest Territories. Customer *dial* service with NPA 403 to the YT/NWT didn't begin until around 1972 though. New telephone service in the eastern/Arctic NWT began in the 1960s/70s, provided by Bell Canada. Eventually, NPA 819 (one of the three NPA codes for Quebec) was "extended" to include this part of the NWT, circa Fall 1975.

In 1962/63, the northwest border towns of Mexico were (temporarily) incorporated into the NANP/DDD network, many of these communities actually received their *dial tone* from a Bell telco (or Contel of the West) in the United States, or else if they provided their own dial tone, their toll homings were on an AT&T (or BOC -- Pacific Tel or Mountain States Tel) toll switch in the US. This was the (temporary) use of Area Code 903 for (the northwest border towns of) Mexico. AT&T and/or Pacific Telephone also had a financial interest in Telefonica Fronteriza. Telefonos de Mexico was *NOT* the telco in these northwestern Mexican border towns!

In 1980, there were changes where the Mexican Government took over the telephone service in these towns and put them into Telefonos de Noroeste, which was made a subsidiary of the Mexican Government's TelMex. Eventually, the "homings" or dial tone for these towns was provided by *MEXICO*, and these towns were being re-numbered to conform with Mexico (+52) dialing/numbering, under Mexico's 6NXX city codes in other TelMex parts of northwest Mexico. 903 was reclaimed, and instead, 70-6 was assigned, the '6' being the third digit of the NANP area code, but also the first digit of the Mexican "national/domestic" telephone number in that overall part of Mexico.

By 1970, AT&T assigned 90-5 for future customer use to dial Mexico City and surrounding communities. The +52 Mexican city-code for Mexico City was '5', and surrounding communities had city codes of the 59X form. The '5' in 90-5 did the same "double duty" that the '6' in 70-6 would do starting ten years later.

The use of 70-6 and 90-5 for reaching *limited* parts of Mexico from the US and Canada was eliminated in Feb. 1991, since most US/Canadian customers had the capability of 011+/01+ International/Overseas access. With the exception of the northwestern 903 Mexican border towns in the 1960s/70s, and to a lesser extent in the 1980s, Mexico was *NOT* part of the NANP (+1), but has been its *OWN* ITU-assigned country-code +52.

As for the POTS area codes of the US and Canada itself, there were those *thirty-four* new area codes assigned between 1948 and 1962. By the mid-1950s, AT&T was becoming concerned at the "rate" of new area codes being assigned and activated. There were several telco planning meetings that took place in the second half of the decade, and it was ultimately decided to go from 2L-5N (exchange name/letters) over to strictly 7-d ANC (All Number Calling). This would allow potential use of NN0 codes for c.o. codes (the third-digit '0' in c.o. codes was "discouraged" during the "exchange name" days because of confusion with the letter 'O' on the numeral '6', but there were still some NN0

codes with an exchange name with letters on the 'NN' first two digits, especially in the Los Angeles metro area back in the 1920s/30s!), as well as "POTS" use of 55X, 57X, 95X and 97X c.o. codes, which were mostly unused during the EXchange NAme days, because of difficulty in coming up with two letters to form a real use-able/pronounce-able/ easy-to-spell word/name from the letters J/K/L on the 5, P/R/S on the 7, W/X/Y on the 9. Those codes were mostly used for internal telco test purposes in the EXchange NAme days, and even today are still commonly used for special telco purposes, or special functions, although there are now POTS c.o. codes as well of the 55X, 57X, 95X, 97X formats.

"ANC" was also going to allow expansion to N0X/N1X format *CENTRAL OFFICE* codes, expected for Los Angeles (NPA 213) by the early 1970s (which did take effect as scheduled), and for New York City (NPA 212) by the mid-1970s (and took effect around 1981). It would also allow NNX format NPA codes to be introduced, anticipated by 1995-2000, and eventually took effect in Jan. 1995, more-or-less on schedule.

But with better control over number resources, after the splits of 1962, and except for special code assignments of the 1960s/70s, there were only TWO more "POTS" NPA splits for the remainder of the 1960s, and throughout the 1970s ...

In 1965, 305 in eastern/northern Florida split, with 904 for the panhandle and other parts of north-central and northeastern Florida.

In 1973, 703 in Virginia (its only NPA code as of 1947) was split, with 804 for southeastern Virginia.

It wasn't until almost ten-years-later, when 714 CA split off 619 (effective Nov. 1982), and 713 TX split off 409 (effective March 1983).

The breakup of the Bell System officially took effect on 01-January-1984. In 1984, there were two area code splits, even with N0X/N1X format c.o. codes, both 213 Los Angeles and 212 New York City needed to split. 213 split off 818 for the northern part of the city/metro area ... and 212 split off 718 for Brooklyn/Queens/Staten Island, with Manhattan (and initially) Bronx retaining 212. (Bronx was transferred from 212 to 718 during 1992/93).

There were a few more area codes splits in the late 1980s, three in 1988 (303/719 CO in March, 305/407 FL in April, 617/508 MA in July), and one in 1989 when Chicago, which had already gone to N0X/N1X c.o. codes, eventually needed to split, the city itself retaining 312, with the suburbs splitting off to 708.

The 1990-94 timeframe had thirteen new NPA codes, but even that wasn't a huge number. However, for "POTS" format area codes, it "exhausted" the supply of "traditional" style codes. But it was planned that 1995 would probably be the year that new format NNX codes, for a generalized overall NXX format, would begin to be used.

In the early 1990s timeframe, there was the first "overlay" area code, 917 overlaying all of NYC (both 212 and 718), initially for new

wireless services, but ultimately for landline service as well. Actually, the original 1991 Bellcore ILs for the 917 overlay to 212/718 *did* indicate that the ultimate intent was for 917 to be "all/full" services and not "just" wireless.

There were still several "special function" area codes assigned throughout the 1970s/80s/early 90s, such as 700, 710, the swap of 610 for 600 in Canada, 456, 500, etc. but these were just for special purposes and not geographic/POTS service.

The 1995-2001 timeframe saw an *EXPLOSION* in the number of new area codes assigned and activated, now that the NANP was using new NNX format area codes (generalized NXX for "all" codes), for a NANP ten-digit number format of NXX-NXX-xxxx. Some of it was because of more cellular service, some because of emerging and/or *potential* CLECs.

The 809 Caribbean/Bermuda area broke off 18 new area codes for a total of 19 codes (including 809 retained by (only) the Dominican Republic). This took effect in a staggered implementation, from 1995-99.

In Fall 1997, the Yukon and Northwest Territories (and future Nunavut Territory politically/jurisdictionally splitting off from NWT) in northern Canada, which had been "sharing" from *two* area codes assigned to lower provinces (403 in Alberta for YT and southern/western NWT; 819 as one of three codes in Quebec for eastern/Arctic NWT), now split off into its own new SINGLE area code of 867.

Two U.S. territories or possessions in the Pacific, Guam (+671) and the Northern Mariana Islands/ Saipan/etc. (+670) became incorporated into the NANP in Summer 1997. The numerics of their (three-digit) ITU assigned Country Code was migrated to their *AREA* (NPA) code within +1/NANP.

There were two more overlays, which from the beginning were full service overlays, in 1997. Maryland's two area codes were each overlaid.

1997 was the fiftieth anniversary of the NANP "as we have known it as it has evolved/developed", but 1997 was also the year that saw the *MOST* number of new area codes activated in a single calendar year, a total of 43 new codes!

When divestiture happened, effective 1984, the overall administration of the NANP and assignment of area codes was transferred from AT&T over to the new Bellcore organization, which was spun out of the old AT&T/Bell System. The name of this administering organization within Bellcore was first called the "Numbering and Dialing Plan Group", but was later changed to NANPA, the North American Numbering Plan *Administration".

Bellcore was owned 1/7th each by each of the seven regional Bell holding corporations which were carved out of the old Bell System. When competition in the local telco arena was becoming more

and more apparent (actually even in the later 1980s, there was competition in cellular, between a BOC wireless subsidiary against a competitive Radio Common Carrier), there appeared to be a "conflict of interest" with Bellcore also being the NANPA. There was also more regulatory oversight over the numbering plan as well. And there was the 1996 Telecom Act.

It was decided that Bellcore would divest itself of the NANPA functions, to be turned over to a non-governmental impartial third-party entity. There were several hearings and such over at least five years' time, and by 1998, Lockheed-Martin took over the NANPA functions from Bellcore. Also, Bellcore was about to be sold by the regional Bell holding corporations over to a new owner, SAIC, and the name of Bellcore was changed to Telcordia in 1999.

Also, Lockheed-Martin announced at the end of 1998, just less than a year of handling the NANPA, that it wanted "out" of numbering. A year later, in late 1999, just before 2000, a new entity named "Neustar" took over the NANPA functions.

When the NANPA became separate from Bellcore, even local c.o. code assignments (in the US) were transferred from the BOCs over to (LM) NANPA. In Canada, the incumbent local telcos turned over local c.o. code administration over to SAIC-held "CNA" (Canadian Numbering Administration) beginning in 1998.

Starting in 1998 were a few more overlays, and there have been overlays ever since. This prevents the need for a "two stage" holding of c.o. codes in existence during an "overlap" period under both the old and new area codes for the permissive dial period. And existing customers do NOT have to change the area code part of their already existing ten-digit telephone number. The US, Canada, and even Puerto Rico (US territory) in the Caribbean have had some overlays.

With the explosion of area code assignments, there was concern about the possible premature exhaust of the NANP ten-digit format "itself" (supply of assignable area codes). There was supposed to be the evolution of "portability" for those who were changing from one local telco to another in a competitive environment, where they could KEEP the same number, and there was also the concept of assigning blocks of assignable numbers in blocks of 1,000 instead of 10,000. This began to happen more and more by 2000, and with OTHER factors involved as well, has actually caused a SIGNIFICANT DOWNTURN in the number of new area codes! :)

There were only eight new area codes in calendar year 2002, last year.

This year, 2003, there are only THREE new area codes, all co-incidentally within the Republic of Texas.

The only "known" new area code for 2004 is 684 for the US Pacific territory of American Samoa, in where it migrates from +684 to +1-684, similar to Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands/Saipan in 1997. Permissive/Parallel dialing for American Samoa's new situation is expected to begin in October 2004, a year from now.

(The country of Guyana, +592, did make a request to join the NANP, back in 1999/2000, this is a "British" or former British location on the northern coast of South America, with a community-of-interest with the "British" Caribbean/West Indies; I personally don't think that allowing +592 Guyana or even +501 Belize, into the NANP, would have caused premature exhaust, but the FCC and the CRTC both gave Guyana "thumbs down" at this time on becoming part of the NANP).

Many states have actually called off area code implementation or even relief planning. California has been able to hold off any new area codes since Summer 1999. Some planned area code overlays in Canada keep getting pushed further and further into the future (but with planned specific future dates).

I have recently posted to TELECOM Digest some articles on the currently viewed situation of future area codes, in more detail.

It actually does seem to look more and more like the 1980s (or even 1960s/70s) regarding new area codes, as there are FAR fewer new codes assigned/activated each year than in the past years of the late 1990s thru 2001.

There is a lot more I could say here on the history and current/future development of the NANP and the DDD network. Much of it has already been said over and over by me *AND* others who are all well known.

So I will close here, but remember that Wednesday 22-October-2003, could be said to be the 56th Anniversary of the NANP "as we have known it" and "as it has actually developed and evolved," since the first "known" memo identifying the original 86 area codes that "took" was issued by AT&T some 56 years ago, on 22-October-1947.

Mark J. Cuccia
mcuccia (at) tulane (dot) edu
New Orleans LA USA
+1 504 UNiversity 5-5954 (WORK)
+1 504 CHestnut 1-2497 (HOME/voicmail)