North American Numbering Council
Meeting Transcript
November 30, 2006 (Final)

I. Time and Place of Meeting. The North American Numbering Council (NANC) held a meeting commencing at 9:30 a.m., at the Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W., TW-C305, Washington, D. C.

II. List of Attendees.

Voting Council Members:

1.	Thomas M. Koutsky	Chairman
2.	Henry G. Hultquist	AT&T
3.	Debra Jordan	BellSouth
4.	Karen Reidy	CompTel
5.	Beth O'Donnell	Cox Communications, Inc.
6.	Michael Altschul	CTIA
7.	Dena Hunter	Level 3 Communications, LLC
8.	Hon. Jack Goldberg	NARUC – Connecticut
9.	Hon. Curtis Stamp	NARUC – Iowa
10.	Don Gray	NARUC – Nebraska
11.	Hon. Philip B. Jones	NARUC – Washington
12.	William L. Vallée	NASUCA
13.	Jerome Candelaria	NCTA
14.	John McHugh	OPASTCO
15.	C. Courtney Jackson	OUR - Jamaica
16.	Mary Retka	Qwest
17.	Rosemary Emmer	Sprint Nextel
18.	Anna Miller	T-Mobile USA, Inc.
19.	Thomas Soroka, Jr.	USTA
20.	Philip Harrington	Verizon
21.	Martin Hakim Din	Vonage Holdings Corp.

Special Members (Non-voting):

John Manning	NANPA
Jean-Paul Emard	ATIS
Amy Putnam	PA

Commission Employees:

Marilyn Jones, DFO
Deborah Blue, Assistant to the DFO
Ann Stevens, Associate Chief, Competition Policy Division

III. Estimate of Public Attendance. Approximately 35 members of the public attended the meeting as observers.

IV. Documents Introduced.

(1)   Agenda
(2)   Charter for the North American Number Council
(3)   North American Numbering Plan Administration (NANPA) Report to the NANC
(4)   National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator Report
(5)   North American Portability Management (NAPM) LLC Report to the NANC
(6)   Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report to the NANC
(7)   Timeline for pANI Administration Permanent Solution Recommendation
(8)   pANI IMG Report to the NANC
(9)   NANC Recommendations for Permanent pANI Administration
(10)   Billing and Collection Agent Report to the NANC
(11)   Billing and Collection Working Group (B&C WG) Report to the NANC
(12)   Local Number Portability Administration (LNPA) Working Group Mission Statement
(13)   LNPA Working Group Status Report to the NANC
(14)   LNPA WG Position on Porting of Telephone Numbers Used by VoIP Service Providers
(15)   LNPA WG Report to the NANC – PIM 32 and PIM 50
(16)   Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG) Report
(17)   NANC Seeks Public Input on the 2006 Performance of the NANPA
(18)   NANC Seeks Public Input on the 2006 Performance of the PA
(19)   Future of Numbering (FoN) Working Group Report to the NANC
(20)   List of NANC Accomplishments (January 2002 – November 30, 2006)

V.   Summary of the Meeting.

NORTH AMERICAN NUMBERING COUNCIL

MEETING

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 2006

(START OF AUDIOTAPE 1, SIDE A)

MR. KOUTSKY: Good morning. I'd like to call us to order, particularly because we have Commissioner Tate here who has only a few minutes.

For those of you I haven't met, I'm Tom Koutsky. I'm excited about my first meeting here, but let me introduce Commissioner Tate who does have to run to a call. I appreciate everyone coming out on a foggy yet 70 degree November day.

Commissioner Tate.

COMMISSIONER TATE: Thank you. Since arriving at the Commission I always try to take compliments for the weather because I feel like I brought it up from the south.

Anyway, you know, I really just wanted to come down today, one, to introduce myself because many of you I know and have known as a state commissioner, but many of you I haven't had the chance to meet yet.

And so I just wanted to come down so you would have a face with the name, and to especially thank you, not just for today, but for your ongoing public service because this is really important.

And then obviously it's great to look out and see my state colleagues who are here, including the co-chairman and Curt, and I think Phil is getting in from Washington at some point, and Bob and Geoff.

And this is fun for me because I kind of get to blend my old life at the Tennessee Commission with my new life here.

And of course I'm so thrilled about Tom now in his new role because Tom and I have had a long relationship and have relied heavily on the Phoenix Center and lots of their papers over the years at the state level.

And it's a good thing that I was paying attention because now I'm up here actually voting on a lot of those issues, not just learning about them.

And of course Bob Atkinson for his service for the past five years as chairman.

Anyway one of the things -- you all will find this funny. I was actually thinking about you all when I was at home at the grocery store and I don't know how many of you all have those little cards at your grocery stores that give you a discount.

So if you don't have your card they say put in your phone number. After I put in 12 phone numbers, I just looked at the lady and said could I just borrow somebody's card? This is obviously not going to work.

And so when you start thinking about Americans having that many numbers, you start realizing that we really do need to think about, you know, important issues surrounding numbers.

Numbers continue to be one of the issues that we also talk about when we're talking about universal service because it just happens to be a really simple and understandable way to think about some of the issues around contributions and universal service.

So thank you all so much. I'm giving a speech later about convergence, and there are just so many issues that are going on and that you all play such a role in because numbers are truly the foundation of our entire system, no matter what platform they're on.

So again, I just want to thank you all for your service, for being here today, and for really trying to keep us on track. And I hope you have a very productive day and I might buzz back later if I can. And thank you again Tom, for inviting me.

MR. KOUTSKY: Thank you and you're always welcome to buzz down whenever you choose to.

COMMISSIONER TATE: Thank you.

MR. KOUTSKY: I know you have a busy schedule and thanks for your time.

COMMISSIONER TATE: Sure, thank you all.

Announcements and Recent News:

MR. KOUTSKY: Well once again, good morning to everyone.

I just want to have a few opening remarks. This is my first NANC meeting.

I want to make sure that we keep on schedule. In fact the most important thing I think about today is that we have a bit of a NANC backlog in one sense and I'm going to ask people to understand that particularly in the morning, I'm probably going to do a very tough job of trying to make sure that we stick to the times that we have talked about in part.

And it's not because I want to cut off debate in the morning, it's because I want to have the time in the afternoon to cut off the debate in the afternoon.

So, you know, there are a lot of issues that might have been pent up over time and I just want to just kind of keep us on track.

I have gotten a couple of questions from people about future meeting dates and that is something we're definitely going to talk about in the afternoon. So rest assured we will get to that point.

I do want to talk about really two things before we start with the official agenda of the day. First of all, I asked Debbie to put out in kind of the initial stack -- you all got this huge stack of paper here.

But in the initial stack, which is probably now way at the very, very, very bottom, there should be a copy of the current NANC charter and this is the charter that was entered into by the Commission.

You know a couple of years ago or maybe last year -- that's effective to September of 2007. And I put this out here because I want to make sure that we always kind of are aware of it. When I first took this position, this is the first document I read. Maybe Debbie, if we just want to make it number one in the record.

I'm not going to go over it but I do want everyone to kind of understand that when we have discussions about things, I'm going to be myself referring to the charter, which is the reason we're here.

You know, we are chartered as a federal advisory commission. You know, this charter was filed with the United States Congress and so this is what I really regard as our baseline and our benchmark.

So I'm going to refer to it maybe more then you'd care for me to but I just want everyone to kind of be aware of it. I'm not going to spend any time on it but I think that it's important for us to kind -- if we ever get into a discussion or we're trying to think about what exactly should we move, this is going to be the benchmark and the baseline that I'm going to work off of.

And I'm looking forward to working with you. I also want to thank in advance all of the people that spent countless hours preparing their presentations.

One thing I've learned literally in the first week in NANC is that NANC is more then just the 15 or so people around the table, it's probably actually a community of at least 100 people who volunteer, literally volunteer their time.

Sometimes their employers let them, sometimes they do it after hours, and sometimes they do it in addition to carrying a full load of work.

I think we all need to understand that when the presenters come up here they've put a lot of time and effort into this work on the working group level, and so I think they're deserving of our thanks, our praise, and our respect.

And so I just want to make sure that we all understand that a lot of hard work has gone into putting this meeting together, that I wouldn't be able to do it without these people.

We have a couple new members and new alternates that I do want to recognize. I'm new to all of you so I won't introduce myself, but we did have a few new members that were announced in the last few weeks or so.

I just want to go around in case they haven't introduced themselves. Hank Hultquist, from AT&T, who is a long time industry veteran. I think a lot of you know him. Karen Reidy is the new CompTel alternate who was going to be here but I don't think she is. But I've worked with both Karen and Hank for several years on a lot of things.

Commissioner Jones, who I think is still circling somewhere above the Washington Metropolitan airspace on his way in. I understand he was taking a red eye from Seattle so when he does get in he is certainly deserving of some attention.

Kathy Hagans from the Ohio Consumer Council I believe was also named. We have a new alternate for Sprint Nextel, which is Susan Tiffany, who is a long time person and working group member that I think most of you know intimately well. She is now the Sprint Nextel alternate.

And Phil Harrington for Verizon was also just named to the Council as well. So I want to introduce those folks.

Let's see, the first item is usually approval of minutes but my understanding is that that was done already by e-mail in the summer, so the minutes from I believe the March meeting were approved by e-mail in June. So the record should reflect that already today.

So I think we will try to open up immediately with the discussion with the NANPA, the North American Numbering Plan Administrator.

One other procedural note, for people that want to have questions, I would suggest that we almost follow the neighbor protocol, which is kind of like tipping your little card up. That way you don't have to sit there with your hands up all the time, and then I don't have to actually be in the position of rewarding somebody who feels like holding their hand up for very long.

So that also will serve as a reminder to me that somebody at some point in time might have had a question, and also the speaker. So I think that's the easiest way.

The members of the public are here as well. There will be public time for discussion towards the end of the day but if you have a real pressing, burning need that somebody at the table isn't already articulating, you know, you can certainly, I don't want to say jump in, but you can certainly make your presence known.

So first of all I think we'll start off with John from NeuStar.

A.   North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA) Report to the

NANC. John Manning NANPA, presented the report to the NANC.

MR. MANNING: All right, thank you, Chairman. Good morning everybody.

Do you want to put a document number on this?

MR. KOUTSKY: Sure. I'm not really in order myself.

MS. JONES: Okay, we might have to renumber some stuff because normally we

have the agenda as the first item, and then maybe we can do number two, the charter, and

John's report number three.

MR. MANNING: So this will be document three.

MR. KOUTSKY: Okay, let's make the meeting agenda item number one, the

charter item number two, and the NANPA report number three.

MS. JONES: Okay, and also a reminder for presenters, if you can raise your

hand and say your name for the record.

MR. KOUTSKY: And anybody who has a question as well.

MR. MANNING: Good morning, everybody. John Manning with NeuStar's

NANPA organization.

This morning I'm going to cover with you the typical type of report you're used

to seeing at these meetings. A few other items in there of course that we're going to

address specifically.

We'll talk a little bit about CO code activity, and as we're getting towards the end

of the year, I can give you a better look-see as to what we're going to be looking at for

year end totals.

Talk about area code relief planning, a lot of activity in that area. It's primarily with projects that have been underway for some time but for whatever reason were delayed, what have you. We'll be covering those as well.

Late October we published the NPA and NANP exhaust projections. I'll briefly review those with you and talk a little bit about some other activities that are underway, and talk about some change orders that have both been approved as well as some change orders that are pending.

And the final item here that I'll touch briefly on and then turn it over to the Chairman is the issue concerning unused NANC travel fund.

The second page of my report gives you the October status report for the quantity of central office codes and other activities regarding individual states. This particular report is a report that you see each time I do the NANC meeting. This is also available on the website.

Let me just pause here real briefly and remind the NANC members that even though we did not have meetings for the middle months of this year, NANPA did put together its report as well as other working groups and groups within NANC, and those reports, those that I have received, are posted on the NANC Chair website under the date where there was going to be a meeting but that meeting did not occur.

So if you have questions about some previous reports, maybe the best thing to do is to see me offline unless there's some issue in here that we need to re-visit during my presentation.

Let me talk to you concerning page three about central office code assignments in 2006. From January 1, 2006 through the end of October 2006, we've assigned over 3,400 central office codes. You can see in the chart there, a month-by-month basis. You

can also see the quantity of denials and the quantity of disconnects or codes that have been returned over the first ten months.

Just to let you know since we're at the end of the month, for November we're looking in the neighborhood of around 270 to 280 codes assigned in the month of November, which is kind of typical. Due to the holiday season we do typically see a drop off on the quantity of assignments.

Looking at those figures, and the next chart right below that table, you can get a flavor as to what we're expecting to assign for 2006. Somewhere in the neighborhood of around 4,100 central office codes, 1,300 to 1,400 denials, and a little less then 700 disconnects for the year. And in that chart I give you a comparison how 2006 compares to 2004 and 2005.

Now one of the obvious things that you see here is, in 2004 and 2005, average of about 3,200 codes, 2006, we're over the 4,000 mark. So we definitely are seeing -- at least beginning to see somewhat of a trend in terms of the quantity of assignments going up.

As to whether that trend will continue is yet to be seen but in fact we have finally it appears looked at the bottom of the assignment quantities and are beginning to track somewhat upward.

Any questions of CO code assignments? Beth.

MS. O'DONNELL: Net assignments?

MR. MANNING: Yes, those are total assignments. If you want to get the net assignments, take the 4,100 minus the 685 and that will give you where we are now.

MS. O'DONNELL: Thank you.

MR. MANNING: Sure.

Okay, with that, let me go over to the NPA relief planning portion. I remind the NANC members at the back of my report is a matrix that summarizes all of the area code relief planning activities or the status of NPAs exhausting within 36 months. It gives you a brief synopsis of those area codes that we have identified, that will be exhausting over the next three years.

I just want to highlight two area codes that we're looking at in the next 12 months. One of those is Illinois 630, a lot activity in this particular area code. There is a planned area code overlay with the NPA 331.

The industry has been working as late as yesterday in putting together some final procedures with regard to the few remaining codes that are available in that area code and there are steps in place to be taken by the NANPA with the Illinois Commerce Commission so that when the 331 is introduced everybody knows when it's coming on board, when we can start assignment, and when codes out of 331 can become effective.

Just a note on there, at the end of October we had seven codes remaining. We now have five codes remaining so this one is very, very close to seeing the new area code.

The other area code is West Virginia, area code 304. Back in September, the West Virginia PUC issued an order that required some mandatory pooling in all optional pooling rate centers. I know that activity is underway and the pooling administrator is working with that state but we still are looking at potential exhaust within the next 12 months in the 304 area code.

Just for your information, approximately 37 codes are available in that area code.

Some other relief activities; Illinois happens to be a very busy state. We have two other area codes in there, 217 and 815. Each of these have implementation plans that

have been put together and are waiting to be filed. Both of these are going to be overlays. The industry is looking at the appropriate timing to introduce these plans and to go ahead and get the area codes introduced sometime in the 2007 timeframe.

Area code 505 in New Mexico forecast an exhaust in 2009. This particular area code, the Commission just recently agreed to do an area code split. The new area code will be 575 and the first implementation meeting will be next week where they will begin the process of planning the new area code in New Mexico.

Two California area codes, 714 and 760, you can see here that we have started some work in those. In 714, we had an industry meeting in early October and there are public meetings planned by the California PUC in January. And 760, again an early October planning meeting there as well, and CPUC is also planning some meetings in February/March for 2007 for the 760 area code.

So these two are kind of running in parallel with one another.

And finally in Oregon, 503/971 concentrated overlay. In October we filed with the Oregon PUC, a plan for expanding the 503/971 overlay to include the remaining 14 coastal rate centers in 503, and the Oregon PUC approved that plan on November 21 and of course we'll putting together the appropriate plans to make that happen in the near future.

Any specific questions on area code relief activity?

Okay, two items I wanted to make the NANC aware of. Both of these items by the way are items that have already been or will be introduced to the Industry Numbering Committee here in the next week or so.

The first one is that NANPA did receive a request from Kinsdale Mobile for an area code they're calling a charity NPA.

Now before I go through this explanation, you will see a lot of quotes here. The reason I'm using quotes is I'm using the explanation that has been provided by the entity that's requesting the area code.

There are a number of questions outstanding. The Industry Numbering Committee at the last meeting had come up with a variety of questions that have gone back to the originator of this particular request and I expect that they will be receiving some responses shortly.

But in my words, the way it was explained to me, is this area code would be used by entities who wish somehow, someway to contribute to charitable organizations each time a call is made to it.

So that if you had a number out of this area code, a call was made to you, somehow, someway a portion of the cost of that call would be donated, a penny or two pennies, three cents, to the charity organization, and that the individual making that call would understand that that particular activity was going to take place.

That's my simple understanding and we'll wait for the originator here to provide further understanding of what they're requesting when they address the questions for the INC.

MR. KOUTSKY: John, could you just state when that request was made?

MR. MANNING: That request was made I believe -- I have to check the timeframe, sometime in the September timeframe because we introduced it into the October INC meeting.

MR. KOUTSKY: September 2006.

MR. MANNING: Yes, this is very, very recent.

MR. KOUTSKY: Okay, understood.

MR. MANNING: And INC has had one meeting to accept the issue, which is per the industry guidelines and to develop the questions that they've sent on to the applicant.

The second issue deals with 500 area code exhaust. In September of 2006, we provided a status report of all NANP resources including the 500 resource. And at that time we were looking at service provider forecasts. Historical information, it indicated it exhausted this particular area code within the neighborhood of around six years.

Now as of November 16th of this year, there's 575 of these codes are assigned or are un-assignable, and we have 225 codes remaining, are available for assignment.

Some recent activity on the assignment side as well as some forecasts that we just received for 500 resource indicates that we're going to need nearly 100 if not a little more than 100 of these codes each year over the next three, four, to five years. Well simple math tells you, you only have 225 available; we could potentially be exhausting this 500 resource within the next two years.

As a result of this, NANPA is going to be introducing an issue to the Industry Numbering Committee and in that issue we're opening up the whole issue of what does the industry want to do with regard to relief of the 500 area code.

We should note that the industry some time ago reserved set aside area codes in relief of the 500 resource, particularly 522, 533, 544 all the way up to 588. So the industry at least in terms of this resource, have set aside some resources to relieve the 500 code.

However it is the Industry Numbering Committee that has to review the current status of the resource and then make a determination if another area code is going to be

assigned, and/or any other activities or actions will be taken with regard to the 500 exhaust.

Any questions on the NPA request or 500 results?

Okay, page five, I begin the review of the October 2006 area code and NANP exhaust projections. Let me keep this fairly brief. The methodology that NANPA has been using to do both area code and NANP exhaust projections did not change for the October 2006 forecast period. Thus I have outlined for you assumptions and other methodology that you have seen or many of you have seen in the past.

The projections were posted to the NANPA website in late October and a notice sent out to the industry. In addition to that with regard to the NANP exhaust projection in particular, you should note that we're not forecasting exhaust of the NANP until sometime after 2036, out beyond 30 years.

The projection itself is based on an annual CO code assignment rate of 6,500 codes, which is more then what we've experienced in 2006, in previous years, so you can see that that particular projection even at a higher rate than we're experiencing today, still puts us out beyond the 2036 timeframe.

Any questions on the NPA and NANP exhaust projections?

Super, okay. I'm going to proceed to page eight of the presentation.

I'm letting you know, a friendly reminder, this is November 30th. On December 1 we will be sending out a notice to all the industry, it's time to NRUF again and the cycle time again, the deadline this time as has been previous cycles, is February 1, 2007.

You'll be reporting utilization as of December 31, 2006, and the forecast period will be 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011. The whole process has not changed for quite some time in terms of the submission methods and the like and we will be sending the

16

notification as I just said out to the industry tomorrow reminding them of the requirement.

Along those lines, we are putting together and have already announced that NANPA will be hosting two refresher training sessions on NRUF itself. Those sessions are December 12th and December 14th.

We're focused primarily on the online NRUF submission method but in that process we speak to the fact that what you had to do to fill that form out, and we've already had a fairly good response rate already with folks registering to take that refresher training.

Any questions on NRUF? Don.

MR. GRAY: Don Gray, Nebraska. John, if the demand is sufficient would you expand that training window and add more opportunities?

MR. MANNING: Certainly.

MR. GRAY: Okay.

MR. MANNING: Let me cover the NANPA change orders. There are two change orders, change order number six and change order number seven that have already been approved by the FCC.

Change order six deals with the ability to modify the NANP Administration System, NAS, so that a carrier who has opted into pooling in a voluntary pooling rate center will not make the mistake of coming directly to the NANPA to request numbering resources. When you opt into pooling you have to go through the pooling administrator.

So what we will be doing in the NAS is putting in the logic so that if a carrier has either been assigned blocks, has donated blocks, or put in a forecast for blocks in an optional pooling rate center, if they do submit an application via NAS to NANPA for a

17

central office code, we will deny that application and send them to the pooling administrator.

The other change order, change order number seven, was modifying some text that is seen on the part one of 900 NXX application form.

Both change order six and seven have been approved and we look to deploy the new capabilities December 15th, in just a couple of weeks.

Two new change orders, change order number eight and change order nine, were just submitted right before the holiday.

Change order number eight deals with a function that the Industry Numbering Committee has asked NANPA to perform and that is whenever a service provider submits an application to change the rate center associated with a particular NXX, that NANPA requests from the NPAC an ad hoc report to determine and identify if there are any active or pending ports on that particular code.

If there are any active or pending ports, NANPA would deny the request. If there were none, then NANPA would proceed accordingly for the guidelines in responding to that request.

Change order number nine, deals again with an INC issue where --

MR. KOUTSKY: Did you have a question on number eight?

MR. MANNING: I'm sorry, change order eight.

FEMALE SPEAKER: (Off microphone). Change order eight, whose responsibility is that now?

MR. MANNING: Presently the industry guidelines require the service provider when filling out the application to certify on any rate center change that there

are no active or pending ports. So the responsibility presently resides with the service provider.

FEMALE SPEAKER:How often does it happen that they don't?

MR. MANNING:	Well I don't have a figure to tell you how many instances that occurred. I think what we have heard, at least from my knowledge, is not necessarily the service provider that initiated the change but we heard from the service provider that has ports out of that code.

When that change does occur it causes them significant problems. There may be some service providers here in the room that might be able to give you a little more instances as to how often that happens but when it does happen I know it's very disruptive to them.

FEMALE SPEAKER:Do you have any kind of ballpark, once a week, every day?

MR. MANNING:	Are you referring to the quantity of rate center changes that we get or the quantity of times that this --

FEMALE SPEAKER:Those changes that have problems.

MR. MANNING:	No, I don't have a specific figure.

FEMALE SPEAKER:Okay, do you get NPAC reports for any other reason?

MR. MANNING:	Yes, we get NPAC reports whenever there is a return code. Per the guidelines Appendix C, we're required to request an NPAC ah hoc report to see if there is active or pending reports on that disconnected code, and based upon that information we will initiate a process to either find a new code holder, or in the event that there are none, then we'll go ahead and process the disconnect.

FEMALE SPEAKER:Are these reports specific only to the code or do you have a larger range of information on porting numbers?

MR. MANNING: No, the report itself is defined by -- it's an ad hoc report from the NPAC that has defined specifically what we can get. And what we provide to them is area code and prefix on the particular code and they respond back with the information about the porting.

FEMALE SPEAKER: So it's a singe code at a time?

MR. MANNING: No, no, it's a single code but based upon what we're dealing with, we may submit a couple codes or whatever is available to us. We do not want to hang on to those for a significant amount of time because these are requests coming in, so typically we will ask for that report usually twice a week if we have those type of requests.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Would you be able to include this in that report?

MR. MANNING: We would plan to do just that.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Okay, thank you.

MR. KOUTSKY: We did have one quick question.

MR. NEWMAN: Adam Newman, Industry Numbering Committee vice chair.

Just as an FYI, the Industry Numbering Committee did correspond with the NANP LLC to seek permission for NANPA to obtain this report before putting the issue into final closure. So we did have permission from the LLC for an input to get this data as a FYI.

MR. MANNING: Thank you. Rosemary.

MS. EMMER: (Off microphone). Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. I just wanted to state for the record that the NOWG is currently looking at these change orders. The decision hasn't been made yet but there was a call this past week about them.

MR. KOUTSKY:　　　I'm sorry, Rosemary, when you said these change orders, which change orders are you referring to?

MS. EMMER:　Eight and nine.

MR. KOUTSKY:　　　Eight and nine, okay.

MR. MANNING:　　　I just want to briefly cover change order number nine. This is again a response to an INC issue 522 where they're going to permit service providers who have requested and received through the PA, a central office code that is a non-pooled dedicated code, and by that it's not a pooled code but it's dedicated to a specific customer, that when the service provider puts that code into service, the service provider can return the part four, that's confirmation of in service, directly to the NANPA rather then having to send it to the pooling administrator.

Presently today per the guidelines, any application coming through the PA, if you requested the resource through the PA, then you would respond with your part four confirmation of service through the PA and that would filter down as appropriate to the NANPA.

This particular change order slightly changes that process for the specific codes that are non-pooled and are dedicated to a particular customer.

So that NANPA would receive that part four, and the change order we have proposed in that would allow the system when we do get one of those types of part fours, to notify the pooling administrator that such a part four has been submitted so that they do not initiate any appropriate action due to the fact that they did not receive the part four themselves.

The last item, page nine, deals with unused NANC travel fund. I have provided you a brief history of this particular fund. You can have it here for yourself as to when it

was established, amounts, who has contributed, who has actually received disbursements, and the most recent activity on it. I'm going to turn it over to the chairman with regard to this particular item.

MR. KOUTSKY: Yes, I asked John to include this because I couldn't find a really good home otherwise. And this is a fund that NeuStar is essentially maintaining in a bank account so it seemed appropriate there.

This is an artifact. I've spoken with several of you about this already. There were proposals on the table back in the first part of the year with regard to what to do with this fund.

Essentially I think the best use for this fund is to turn it into the general fund or the general NANPA fund. These are contributions from industry. This was put into place at a time when there was a significant number of NANC activity meetings. It hasn't been used in five years. We're paying a monthly fee on it so the only person benefiting from this fund today is Bank of America.

And since then, all appointments to NANC have been clear that parties are responsible for their own travel expenses, so personally I just think that the best use of these funds, and since they came from industry, is to put them to the general benefit of the public which is to put them into the general NANPA fund, which seems the most logical place for it.

So if we don't have any objections to that I would like to kind of end this artifact if at all possible, and ask John to do that. Are there ay questions? Yes, Don.

MR. GRAY: Don Gray, Nebraska. Do the rules and regulations covering this fund allow it to be returned to the general fund? Are we going to encounter any obstacles there?

MR. KOUTSKY: I don't believe so. My understanding is these were written from industry members to NeuStar and so I think that would be -- just so you know, we're talking about $4,000.

MR. GRAY: Commissioner Boyle and I talked about this before I came and she highly would support that move, and the less time we spend on discussing it the better she felt.

MR. KOUTSKY: Exactly. And I want people to know, I'm sensitive to peoples concerns about travel, especially for the public interest members, but I just think this is the best way of addressing this issue at this point in time. Yes.

MS. BEATON: Rebecca Beaton on behalf of Commissioner Jones, Washington. Are there any outstanding state requests for these funds?

MR. KOUTSKY: No, the fund actually hasn't been used in five years so like I said, Bank of America has the pending request. Yes.

MR. GOLDBERG: (Off microphone) Jack Goldberg, co-chairman. There's actually a request by California alternate to use the fund, which brought this issue up about six or eight months ago and that's why we were going to have a discussion about it and we never did until now.

MR. KOUTSKY: Yeah, I think to make it clear, there was a request but not in essence an expense report filed that's outstanding I think is the way I was interpreting your question.

Anything else? Okay, we'll move on. Thanks a lot, John. Appreciate your comprehensive report.

MR. MANNING: Thank you.

B.   Presentation by the National Thousands-Block Pooling Administrator (PA).

Amy Putnam, NeuStar, presented the report to the NANC.

MR. KOUTSKY: Now we have the Thousands Block Pooling Administrator report, which is Amy Putman, also with NeuStar. Which documents do you want to be labeled in what order? I have several from you.

MS. PUTNAM: You should have two. One is entitled The Report of the National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator and what is at least technically, an attachment to that, is the Change Order 41 Summary Report.

MR. KOUTSKY: Okay, so that is the power point presentation and it will be item number four, is that correct? Yes. And if you say it's attached to it then it's attached to it. Rosemary had a question.

MS. EMMER: (Off microphone). I just wanted to say for the record that the B&C Working Group and Welch will work with NANPA to incorporate those funds for where they need to go. Thank you.

MR. KOUTSKY: Okay, thank you. And also while we're all sorting through paper here, I'd also like to recognize that Commissioner Phil Jones from Washington has landed and has now made it to the table. So welcome Commissioner. We saved all the really important stuff for when you were here. Okay, Amy.

MS. PUTNAM: Okay, thank you. And even though it's been a while since we have gathered, I want to tell you pooling is still fine.

(LAUGHTER)

Turning to the Power Point presentation, that's the report of the National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator on page two, we have the running total of the

pooling administration activity data for the last 12 months and as you can see, we have had two of our heaviest months since we last met, in June and August of 2006.

We're looking at running about 10,000 for the part threes processed for November. That's the third column. And we were a little heavy on red light rule denials in September and October. There was a carrier that we worked with that was on the red light list and is now off.

Page three shows the pooling administration activity; again these are running totals so these totals are from November 2005 through October of 2006.

Four part three summary data, and then we sorted it by the number of part threes issued for the various activities of the pooling administrator.

For the new people, these are items that we routinely report on at the NANC meetings.

And again on slide four, those are the CO codes that we have opened for the three purposes for which we open CO codes, for carriers that need LRNs, for carriers that ask for whole codes for dedicated customers, or for pool replenishment.

And the rate centers changed from M*to M are those rate centers that were excluded from pooling because there was a single service provider in them and a second service provider moved into the rate center.

On slide five we have the status of our change orders. We had three change orders submitted since our last report to the NANC.

Change order 46, which was approved, relates to NANPA's change order number six and that is the report that we will be providing to the NANPA to tell them what service providers are participating in optional rate centers.

That change order was submitted out of the normal time that we would submit a change order because of a discrepancy between the pooling administration and NANPA contracts.

Normally we would not submit a change order until an issue goes into final closure in INC but Nanpa submits an initial closure and it wouldn't have gone into final closure with a pending change order. And it was kind of a catch 22 situation and the FCC asked us to submit our change order and we did. And as you can see, that change order was approved.

The other change order submitted related to INC issue 516, changes to the part four form and the IRNA, the PNE administration change order, which is still pending.

Additionally we have the approved change order 46 and we also have change orders that remain pending that were still in pending status when we last met.

INC issue 44 which relates to contaminated or pristine assigned block returns where INC made a modification to the rules requesting that when a carrier returns a block to the pool, the carriers indicate whether or not the block its returning is contaminated or still pristine.

And the second one is change order 45. As the NOWG had suggested some time ago, we aggregate suggestions from service providers and this particular change order related to suggestions that service providers made during the 2004 NOWG survey.

Turning to page six, pooling administration, the past performance, we have had no down time in the past several months.

Page seven, other PA activities; pool replenishment. Now this continues to be an issue of concern because our pool replenishment is dependent on carrier cooperation.

Since we can't order codes on our own we need carriers to order them so that we can replenish pools.

And the NOWG has been working this issue. The INC has also worked this issue. And it remains active but at the October meeting of the INC, the INC indicated that they recognized the PA is doing everything possible to replenish pools. We have regular notification to carriers and outreach to ask carriers to assist us in pool replenishment at this time.

Charge order 41 is the change order that the attachment relates to and that was the NPAC scrub. And that change order has been floating around in various iterations for several years and ultimately resulted in change order 41, which allowed us to obtain reports from the NPAC to ascertain whether the information about the blocks in the NPAC matched the information about blocks in the PAS system, whether the blocks were contaminated or pristine in both systems, and in addition the degree of contamination.

To begin the project we looked at almost 190,000 blocks that were available in PAS and we provided those to the NPAC. The NPAC also ran reports, and when the reports came back 5.68 percent of the blocks that were entered in both systems showed discrepancies so we had to research the discrepancies on all of those blocks.

In addition, there were 506 blocks that appeared to be over ten percent contaminated. We did the research. We worked with carriers. Some of those blocks had been donated, assigned, returned to the pool, reassigned, returned to the pool.

There were issues with carriers about what would happen to them, particularly if they were over-contaminated and we could no longer keep them in the pool and we had to assign them to a carrier.

It was a lot of work but the bottom line was we resolved the issues, and one, two, three, four, the fifth paragraph there in the change order summary report indicates what happened.

And with respect to the 506 blocks that appeared to be over ten percent contaminated, about half of them were removed from the pool because we were able to give them to carriers, and the other half it turned out that they were in fact not over-contaminated and they were able to stay in the pool and we corrected their status in PAS.

We also indicated some of the explanations from carriers as to why there were discrepancies in the information in the two databases.

It took us five months to complete this process and we at this point will be governed by the language in the change order recommendation that a year after the reconciliation has been completed, the NOWG and the PA will seek input from industry as to any increase or decrease in the frequency in which service providers are encountering problems that they were encountering because of this very issue, and at that point if there is no need identified in industry we won't have to do it again.

On the other hand if industry indicates that there is still a need to do it we may have to do another scrub.

MR. KOUTSKY: I just want to make sure everyone has the document, the attachment that you're talking about. If you could show it to people.

MS. PUTNAM: I put it at every place.

MR. KOUTSKY: It's got NeuStar letterhead. That's the change she's talking about. That is officially going to be regarded as part of document number four. It's another document but it's called an attachment, so just make sure everyone has that. Beth.

MS. O'DONNELL: Beth O'Donnell, Cox Communications. Amy, I should probably know this but if I did I forgot. When you apply for a code for full replenishment --

(END OF SIDE A, **START OF SIDE B)**

MS. O'DONNELL: -- Faster then SP would?

MS. PUTNAM: No.

MS. O'DONNELL: Thank you. Actually Beth, remember it's the SP that's applying through us.

MS. O'DONNELL: Okay, that makes sense.

MS. PUTNAM: Okay, if there are no other questions, at this point we'll continue on page seven, our contract extension.

The FCC has extended our contract and they issued a second extension for three months plus two additional one month extensions, exercisable by the FCC, bringing us potentially to income tax day. I'm sure they didn't think of it that way but when I saw it I thought oh, there it is.

And the RFP for the new contract was released on November 17th.

We have an update on the delegated authority petitions. As you know the FCC issued an order in November, or as you may know, delegating authority to various states to implement pooling.

Ohio, which is the first one on here, issued an order on the 28th, and we received it yesterday and we are in the process of reviewing it to schedule the supplemental implementation meeting with respect to that order.

And we've listed the other states, going into page eight of the presentation, that have authority and also we have an update on the implementation of the February 24th order, also delegation order.

Nebraska, Michigan, and West Virginia have subsequently issued orders to implement pooling, and Oklahoma and Missouri are working on their proposals.

MR. KOUTSKY: Question from (Unintelligible).

MALE SPEAKER: I noticed in the report on code activity, Iowa is extraordinarily busy, and I wanted to ask if you could add anything from a pooling perspective concerning that state.

MS. PUTNAM: No, I can't. That may be a question for NANPA. Much of Iowa -- no, I'll just stop there. I'm sorry, I can't.

MR. KOUTSKY: Does Commissioner Stamp from Iowa wish to --

COMMISSIONER STAMP: (Off microphone). (Unintelligible) the extraordinary activity as best we can tell is from a company by the name of Web Point. We've raised this issue a couple of times. They are come to find out, a company that's actually owned by 13 of our rural carriers.

The business model is basically to sign people up for free voice mail boxes and fax services with the hope that five to seven percent of those upgrade to a premium service.

The impact in Iowa is that they think they need 5 million numbers in their inventory to successfully implement this model so they are rapidly getting numbers out of Iowa to the impact that from the March to September exhaust projection, some of our codes moved up by as much as ten years. So it's an issue.

I was actually upstairs yesterday pushing the delegated authority issue to try to see if we can move some things to slow down kind of the stem of things, but they're only at about a 1.5 million of the 5 million number that they think they need out of Iowa.

MR. KOUTSKY:　　　Okay, thanks.

MS. PUTNAM:　　　Okay, next on page nine, we have the status of the interim routing number authority administration.

The web base system that we put together was made available on November 6th. We have the information there on how to access the system. At this point we have had three registrations approved, one denied, and no applications. That was as of an hour ago.

And as I indicated, the RFP issued for the new pooling administration contract on November 17th.

Anybody have any questions?

MS. PUTNAM:　　　Thank you very much.

MR. KOUTSKY:　　　Thank you, Amy.

I just want to remind people that when they ask questions, they just identify themselves for the record, for the transcript. That will make it easier on the person transcribing.

C.　　North American Portability Management LLC (NAPM LLC) Report. Mel Clay, Co-Chair, presented the report to the NANC.

Okay, the report of the North American Numbering Portability Management, Mel, I believe. And this is a one page document, right, Mel?

MR. CLAY: Yes, it is a one page document. Good morning. My name is Mel Clay. I'm the co-chair for the North American Portability Management LLC. And with me to my right is Tim Decker. He is the other co-chair.

There's a one page document or one page that I sent out. I put it on each of your spots.

And if you went to the NANC website and pulled this document you may see a typo. My friend typo visited my computer and he changed the numbers from one, two, three, and four to one, two, four, and five. So I apologize for that but the document that I handed out is correct.

Since we were last here, the NAPM LLC has had some leadership changes. We had one of the co-chair spots vacated and in July of 2006, we had an interim election and replaced that co-chair with Tim Decker who is sitting next to me here.

This week we had our annual meeting and at our annual meeting each year we have elections. And we had our elections for the upcoming year and I'm pleased to announce that Tim Decker now is the co-chair for a two year term, for the next two years. And we elected a secretary for the next year and the secretary is from AT&T. Her name is Cyd McInerney.

Since we were last here, Neustar Gateway evaluation process audits have taken place. These are quarterly audits where the NAPM audits seven key elements of NeuStar service and for the last year, NeuStar has passed that audit without any failures.

If there were failures and the criteria were not met, that would result in a billing transaction rate reduction, but for the past year there have been no rate reductions and the service has been good.

We also once a year sit down and we usually work with the Canadians and we benchmark some area in NeuStar. And the last benchmark we did was a benchmark of their billing process.

We looked at their billing process from beginning to end and benchmarked it against several other companies and NeuStar was able to come out with a score of about 4.4 out of 5 for their billing efforts.

And since we were last here, we sat down with NeuStar and negotiated price points and new contract points. In March of this year, we decided unanimously that we needed to lower the price of our billing transactions. The volumes were increasing and had increased unexpectedly to a point that we felt that the price was causing the industry some problem.

So we sent NeuStar a letter and asked that we open up negotiations to look at the pricing and reduce the price point. NeuStar agreed to meet with us and negotiate this price point and we went into about six months of intense negotiations.

In September we reached agreement and we signed a contract with NeuStar that reduced the price. It not only reduced the price, it had three other terms in it and let me just kind of go over what those terms were.

First of all let's talk about the price. The price under the old contract was $1.08 at the high end and $.93 at the low end. The price that we were able to negotiate with NeuStar was a price based on volume that at the high end is $.95 and at the low end is $.75. The price for 2007 is a fixed price so it's not based on volume, and the 2007 price will be $.91.

The contract was extended 48 months and that was done in conjunction with the previous contract negotiations that had taken place. It was extended 48 months and it's not an exclusive contract. The contract goes to June of 2015.

Language was put in the contract that would adjust the price upward if we were to go back before 2011, which was the end of the old contract and ask to renegotiate price again. It also will adjust price upward if we were to seek, and when I say we, it's the NAPM LLC, if we were to seek another vendor between now and 2011.

The price adjustments would be 9 cents for 2007 and 2008, and after 2008, it would cap at $.95. So wherever we are on the price matrix according to volume, the adjustment in price upward would never go past $.95.

We felt that that was a fair thing to do. If we were to go out and seek another vendor or want to change the price points in this contract before 2011, and we negotiated something that would never go higher then the existing contract, this would always be lower then the existing contract, even if we chose to go out and invoke those price adjustments.

And the other item that we put in there was language that would allow NANC 400, which are four IP elements to be billed as billable transactions if they were ever approved. Right now those four items are with the FCC and the FCC has to approve releasing them. They would have to be approved at the LNPA working group and they would also have to be approved at the NAPM LLC.

If all those approvals took place and those four elements were approved, we've guaranteed NeuStar that they would be billed as billable transactions. Those are the four elements of the contract.

We feel that we've negotiated a contract that will allow the service providers in the industry to receive substantial savings over the cost that they use today or they have today for pooling and porting and we feel that we formed a contract that has value to the industry, and we followed all of our procedures, our operating agreement to make sure that we did things the right way.

I'm open to any questions.

MR. KOUTSKY: Thanks. I'll actually exercise my prerogative and ask a question about the last item you talked about, the NANC 400.

You had talked about that essentially those items would be billed but its contingent upon approval by -- of NANC, of the recommendation 400 by the FCC. It was also the NAPM LLC --

MR. CLAY: And the LNPA working group.

MR. KOUTSKY: The LNPA working group of NANC?

MR. CLAY: Yes.

MR. KOUTSKY: Okay. So that would require an additional step in addition what NANC has already done? I'm just trying to understand whether you would regard that as already having been approved or not approved.

MR. CLAY: No, I don't believe it is approved and I will let some of the LNPA working group folks answer it.

MR. KOUTSKY: Sure.

FEMALE SPEAKER:(Off microphone). (Unintelligible) the normal process is, first of all change orders are brought in to the LNPA working group and discussed and if there's a consensus at the LNPA working group for the change order -- so the first level

there is bring in a change order, the industry discusses it, there's consensus that they want to support this change order, that's the first step.

Then based upon those change orders, those periodic releases or upgrades to the NPAC, and those changes or recommendations then get forwarded to the LLC where they look at statements of work that include pricing of what the change order would require, and there they're prioritized in terms of cost benefit, and consensus is reached as to what would be included in the change order.

So for 400, it's my understanding, am I correct, it never reached consensus at the LNPA working group? Or they did reach consensus. So it did reach consensus at the LNPA working group but then an issue was brought into the FCC so it was pulled off the table for consideration.

MR. KOUTSKY: Yes, so my question is, and then we'll get to you, my question is, there is an expectation built into the contract that there would be subsequent work by the LNPA working group, correct?

MR. CLAY: No, that's not built into the contract. That's the normal procedure. The only thing that's built into the contract is the pricing that would allow those elements if approved by all parties that need to approve --

MR. KOUTSKY: Oh, the contract says more general language? I'm not asking for the specifics of the contract I'm just trying to make sure that we all, everyone, the public record reflects what steps are expected.

MR. CLAY: Okay. The steps or the normal steps would be right now, my understanding would be that the FCC would have to release that change order for approval. It then would go to the LNPA working group. The LNPA working group would then go through and make sure that it meets their approval and make a

recommendation to the NAPM LLC. And then we at the NAPM LLC would either approve or disapprove, and if we approved the billing would be a billable transaction or a modified.

MR. KOUTSKY: Okay, thanks for clarifying the process. I think Beth has --

MS. O'DONNELL: Beth O'Donnell for Cox Communications. You're probably going to hear this from me a couple times today, Mr. Chairman.

The FCC specifically told the NANC to hold that change order in abeyance so I'm bothered by any work that's being done on that change order or the substance of that change order before the FCC takes any kind of action.

Under the NANC aegis, I mean the NPAC LLC reports into the NANC. There would be other things on the agenda today that this happens to. It seems to me inappropriate that NANC groups are working on something that the FCC said not to. That's all, thank you.

MS. KOUTSKY: Okay, thanks. Anna.

MS. MILLER: Anna Miller, T-Mobile. Let me clarify. What we tried to describe to you as background is I guess the business as usual process.

In this instance the FCC did issue an abeyance so Industry is not working as Mel mentioned until that abeyance is lifted.

Then I would think that the industry would not be working on -- there's no reason to work on consensus to include it because the FCC has the authority to put it in abeyance and they've done that. So I think it's off the table. No work is being done, right?

MR. KOUTSKY: We're drifting into the LNPA report, but Beth, one more time.

MS. O'DONNELL: I will not disagree that work per se on change order 400 hasn't been done but the substance of change order 400 -- and in fact NAPM did work on getting 400 accommodated.

They can go back and get an amendment. Oh, no, I guess they can't get an amendment to include 400 items because that would raise the price of the contract but this -- 400 may be sitting over here, but the substance of that is whether or not what goes into the NPAC can be changed.

That's the issue that's out there. Not 400 specifically. It's whether stuff that goes into the NPAC can be changed.

So, you know, anybody can sit there and say we're not working on 400, but you're working on issues around 400, that take parts of 400. Thank you.

MR. KOUTSKY: Implicit in that was actually an interesting question; was what would trigger the price increase? Would the addition of fields or codes to the NPAC trigger a price increase?

MR. CLAY: No, it would not. The things that would trigger the price increase would be if the NAPM LLC or any of its members acting on behalf of the NAPM LLC were to go to NeuStar and request additional negotiations to reduce the price again.

Also if the members or the LLC were to seek a second vendor or another vendor to provide NPAC services then that would also trigger a price increase.

MS. O'DONNELL: My point was merely that had they not worked on 400 and they had to go back and add it, the price would have gone up so perhaps that was a prudent step to add even though I think it's inappropriate to have that even mentioned in any group that's under the NANC aegis.

MR. KOUTSKY: Jerome.

MALE SPEAKER: (Off microphone) -- Began your discussion by saying this is not an exclusive contract and exclusivity is of great concern to some NCTA members. And help me understand how this is not exclusive.

First of all in NeuStar's AK filing, the amendment, amended agreement is posted so it is now in public domain.

MR. CLAY: Yes.

MALE SPEAKER: This upward event triggering charge adjustment strikes me as a bit of a poison pill does it not, that if the NAP was to go out and solicit a request for proposal or request for information, the price goes up by 9 cents, correct?

MR. CLAY: Yes.

MALE SPEAKER: And how does that no retain exclusivity?

MR. CLAY: I'll try to answer that for you. If we had done nothing, if we had left the contract as it is today, we have the right to go out and seek a second vendor or seek another vendor. We still have that right. We can go out and we can seek another vendor.

What we negotiated with NeuStar is a price reduction that will give the industry considerable savings. If we were to choose to go out and seek another vendor, we've just put into the contract, we'll give you back some of those savings, and we will not be giving back all of it because the price will never go back to what it is today under the old contract.

But we have not given up the right to go out and seek another vendor. We've only put into the contract that the savings that NeuStar has negotiated with us would be refunded if we chose to do that.

So in my opinion it would be cost benefit analysis that would have to take place if we choose to go out and seek another vendor, and we have the right to do that and we could put another vendor. This only allows NeuStar to be a vendor until 2015. It does not say that they are the only vendor.

MALE SPEAKER: But still we're penalized even with elements that as Beth pointed out, aren't fully reconciled at NANC like IP elements. If you were to go out with a request for information --

MR. CLAY: That would not trigger the upward points.

MALE SPEAKER: You know you're taking a look at the AK filing; it was my impression that that does fall under the definition of a customer modification events.

MR. CLAY: The customer modification events would be if we were to choose to go back, and I don't have the contract in front of me but my memory says that if we were to choose to go back and renegotiate price, or if we were to seek another vendor, those are the things that would trigger those modifications.

MR. KOUTSKY: Rosemary.

MS. EMMER:Rosemary Emmer, Sprint and Nextel. I just want to see if I can try to say something about linking the confusion that there may be here with this.

This was about compromise at the LLC and all of the NAPM LLC operating agreement rules were followed and a super majority, 75 percent of the members supported the amendment.

Each representative on the LLC is an agent to their companies and in the collective view of the membership, the industry would have realized more savings through 2011 if NeuStar were willing to negotiate a lower price. That would be the case if the industry had chosen a longer term RFP route.

That said if the industry did not reach satisfactory agreement with NeuStar, the membership was prepared to issue an RFP.

So I wanted to make sure that we clarified that. And also to say the upward pricing triggers as a term can't be looked at in isolation from other terms of the contract. This was a very long negotiation. There were a lot of things on either side of the table, a lot of balancing on both sides. It was quite extensive. Thank you.

The industry has also reviewed alternative non-solicited proposals from vendors as well, and the bottom line is right now the price is going down, the service is going up. The vendor response has been excellent, especially to all of our industry concerns over the last six months. Does that help?

MALE SPEAKER: (Off microphone). It does, but also underscored, the other side of that is what I think can be called exclusivity continues. For example, now it's going -- the contract length is nine years now. Historically what have these been negotiated at?

MS. EMMER: Well historically I know of at least two times prior to this contract extension, there were contract extensions based on agreements reached in 2000, that extended it four years, and in 2003, that extended it for four years.

And know that the price triggers as Mel was indicating earlier, should the LLC choose to accept a new vendor as part of the NPAC it would only go through the 2011 year. So although the contract was extended to 2015, it would only go through 2011.

MR. KOUTSKY: Is that a reiteration?

MS. O'DONNELL: It's a different point.

MR. KOUTSKY: Okay.

MS. O'DONNELL: Beth O'Donnell, Cox Communications. When the LLCs were set up, the seven regions all put their contracts out for bid and there were two vendors.

Now that can't happen in one region without triggering price increase for the entire country, which there are still seven separate contracts, there's this fiction that there's still seven separate contracts but what any region does affects the entire country now and that wasn't true.

The second point about -- this has been renegotiated twice and contracts have been extended, but on both of those occasions there was no penalty for asking for another price cut or in this case -- this was two years ago we renegotiated, and what's to say we can't renegotiate -- well we can't renegotiate in two years unless we want to take a 9 cent hike, and what -- I was just trying to do the math.

In 2008, the price is 95 cents plus 9 cents takes that up to $1.04 for the rest of the contract. It goes up to $1.04 until 2015 so that seems to me to be significantly more then we're paying now. Thank you.

MR. NEWMAN: Adam Newman, Telcordia Technologies. Just one quick question. Rosemary's point triggered a question with regard to unsolicited proposals. So would an unsolicited proposal either being received or considered, automatically trigger that price increase I guess is my question?

MR. CLAY: No, it would not. We are still open and we still are with open arms ready to receive any unsolicited proposals. What would trigger the upward price adjustment is if your proposal was one that we thought was one that we could not refuse and we chose to accept it.

MR, KOUTSKY: Thank you very much. Just as a way to try to wrap this up

if at all possible, as Jerome said, the contract is available publicly. We may want to

consider making that a document in this. I'll think about that at a certain point in time

since we were referencing it specifically.

Absent further questions on this topic, I'd like to thank Mel and Tim for coming

by.

We were supposed to break 12 minutes ago. If we want to just take a very quick

five minute break for folks. I really want to keep this on because we're to discuss the

PANI issue not quite immediately after the break, and I want to make sure that we give

that full attention. So please be back at 11:03 a.m. if at all possible. Thanks

(BREAK)

MR. KOUTSKY: Okay. Yeah, 11:03 a.m. was probably a bad idea to tell you

all that. Well, we're reasonably on schedule.

D.   Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report. Adam Newman, INC Vice

Chair presented the report to the NANC.

The next is a very quick report from INC. And this is a Power Point presentation.

We actually didn't officially number the last one, which was the NAPM. Its

number five, (unintelligible) agenda item number five. We're going to stick with that

streak. So the INC report is document number six.

MR. NEWMAN: Adam Newman. I work for Telcordia Technologies and

one of my hats is to be the ATIS Industry Numbering Committee vice chairman or

chairperson.

And I do apologize. You had a change in this presentation relatively at the last

minute where one slide in the earlier version included a slide that's no longer in the

revised stack because we had a contribution to that issue which put it into initial pending status so it got pulled for further work, and I'll talk about that in the initial pending slot.

Our first slide gives an overview of the INC meetings. Our last meeting was in October in Denver. Our next meeting is next week here in Washington, D.C. at the ATIS headquarters and details on all the future meetings can be found at the linked website.

Our first slide is from our central office code NXX subcommittee with regard to issue 496. It updates the COCAG for information changes for rate centers. We discussed this briefly during the earlier report because it's in initial pending due to a change order.

We did agree to modify the text in the COCAG, the central office code assignment guidelines, to require NANPA to request the ad hoc report from NPAC when a service provider submits an application to change the rate center.

As I mentioned earlier, at INCs request, the NANPA LLC approved NANPA receiving this data prior to the closure of this issue so if a service provider submits a request for change of a rate center, 10NXX and NANPA finds ported or pending ported telephone numbers, NANPA will deny that rate center change request.

This issue is in initial pending, pending the results of the NANPA change order. It does prevent service effecting issues for those ported customers if the rate center changes while they're porting. Any questions?

Next slide is also from our CO/NXX subcommittee. It's with regard to the permanent pANI guidelines.

In anticipation of the NANC sending us a request after this meeting, the INC begun organizing itself to develop the permanent Pseudo ANI guidelines. We have internally agreed to work this issue within the CO/NXX subcommittee.

We also agreed that all of the work on the issue to develop the pANI guidelines would be done via virtual meetings so that both ATIS INC members and ATIS emergency services interconnection forum ESIF members would be able to participate fully in development of the guidelines. NENA, the National Emergency Number Association is a member of ESIF so we will have ESIF as well as NENA participation in the development of the pANI guidelines.

We had our first organizational virtual meeting on November 13th to set up something of a work plan. We were asked, which I think you'll hear in the pANI report as part of the pANI IMG, to give a timeline for when INC thought it could get its work done. I think you see that timeline in the pANI report, right? Yes, all right, so I won't get into it here.

That all depends of course on us getting the recommendation from the NANC to begin this work next week at INC.

Any questions about the pANI permanent guidelines work?

If you have an old packet your next slide will be issue 506 which is the initial pending because we had a new contribution in it. If you have a new packet your next slide should be issue 507 if I can go to the new packet.

Issue 507 is from our Local Number Portability Administration Subcommittee, LNPA. It's an update to the LRN assignment practices. We updated the LRN assignment practices to provide AOCNs, Administrative Operating Company Number.

It's a company that does input into the system that provides the LERG, the Telcordia LERG routing guide. So the guidelines were updated, practices. Sorry, I forgot we have those names, practices. To provide direction on how information gets in there.

What it comes down to is the old practice said LRNs

will be published in the LERG period. They didn't say LRNs will be put into BIRRDS

for publication in the LERG within a certain number of days of assignment of an LRN by

service provider.

So the guidelines got updated for that. Some other minor updates got made and

this issue was kicked off because of discussions between the common interest group on

rating and routing, which is Telcordia LERG users group, BERG users group, and the

LNPA working group which added a best practice with regard to publishing LRNs in the

LERG. Any questions on issued 507?

Issue 407. This is an issue that has been an initial pending for a long time now.

It's treatment of dedicated codes for single customers in a pooling environment. We

decided to include this in our presentation to the NANC because the chairman had asked

all of the working groups and INC as a reportee into NANC -- decided to participate in

the activity of what outstanding issues do you have that the NANC should be reminded of

given that it hasn't met in a number of months.

So issue 407 was developed to give service providers the option of requesting an

NXX code directly from NANPA in a pooling area where that code was dedicated to a

single customer.

NANC in May in 2004, created an IMG and in the end it agreed on the benefits to

issue 407. In February of '05, the previous chairman, Chairman Atkinson, sent a letter to

FCC recommending that the FCC move forward on approving this issue.

And there was an action item at the January '06 meeting for the chairman to

follow-up with the FCC as to the status of approval for issue 407. So given that

outstanding action item hadn't been answered, we thought we'd bring it back up here.

MR. KOUTSKY: And if I could just make a very quick comment. I've made a couple oral inquiries about this issue to the FCC, and why don't we talk directly with INC about it at their meeting next week.

One question I personally had about it was just trying to put my hands around either the quantification in some way of this -- in essence, the scope of this issue, how often does it come up, you know, do we anticipate it coming up more in the future, things like that. Those are basic questions that I have that I intend to take directly to the INC.

But and I also want to hear from other members of the NANC as to what impact this is having on their business or on the public not to have this issue resolved.

I don't know if people have any thoughts on that. If you don't have them now since I just sprung it on you, feel free to e-mail them to me and I'll make that part of my efforts to track this one down too.

MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Chair, if I might suggest, INC would probably be willing to accept an action item to come back with a list of some impacts, issue 407 impacts on its member companies if the NANC would like. I just volunteered us for an action item. Somebody is probably going to beat me up.

MR. KOUTSKY: Yes, if anybody is always willing to volunteer to do something we will accept the volunteer graciously.

MR. NEWMAN: I think my LNPA co-chair just through something at me. No? We're okay.

MR. KOUTSKY: I don't intend it to be a specific quantification, just more of a general indication of scope of the issue.

MR. NEWMAN: The next slide is from our VoIP subcommittee issue 510.

INC opened issue 510, Internet based relay services and inner-operability in response to a

NANC action item which is quoted in the bullet.

The Industry Numbering Committee was to take the lead in developing a

technical response/recommendation regarding the Internet based relay service, VRS,

inner-operability issue raised during the NANC meeting.

So the INC has opened issue 510 and assigned it to its VoIP subcommittee, and

the VoIP subcommittee has been working hard and has agreed to the following work plan

that you see presented before you.

Developing VRS number acquisition scenarios, basically how do VRS users and

providers get telephone numbers and list the characteristics. That activity is in progress.

The subcommittee is expecting to receive a contribution from a contribution

development team that has been working on this issue and meeting with weekly calls.

Two, developing database models viable for matching an inbound VRS number to

an IP routing instructions. So what type of database should be used to allow inner-

operability between this IP based service and the telephone number.

One option that I think was talked about briefly in an earlier report and you'll hear

about it a little bit later in the LNPA working group report, is the possibility of housing

such IP data in NPAC.

Another option that's being looked at is ENUM based solution, and a third option

that's being looked at by the contribution development team is a direct DNS domain

named system routing option.

So the INC hopes to get a contribution from its team and examine all of the

options and make a technical recommendation as to what the best option would be.

And then identify guidelines and industry groups for any changes that result from the recommendation. The first two are in progress, the third one is pending the recommendation.

MR. KOUTSKY: I think we have a question from the back.

MS. O'DONNELL: Beth O'Donnell, Cox Communications. I don't know why I'm so talkative today.

Do you have contributions on all the Internet based relay surveys, the VRS options? Do you have contributions against all of them?

MR. NEWMAN: The INC, the actual VoIP subcommittee of the INC has not received those contributions at this time.

There is a team of individuals working to produce such contributions for our next meeting at INC so that there are draft contributions that are being circulated among those individual team members but the INC itself had not received those contributions.

MS. O'DONNELL: That's a process thing, the INC hasn't received it? Members of INC are working on it?

MR. NEWMAN: Right, we can't achieve consensus on something until an actual contributions gets submitted to the actual committee or subcommittee in this case.

MS. O'DONNELL: Thank you.

MR. NEWMAN: INC issue 532, John Manning in his NANPA report talked about the Kinsdale Mobile INC application for an easily recognizable code, also known as an ERK. The INC NPA allocation plan and assignment guidelines call for the submission of such an issue and a review according to certain criteria before assignment of an easily recognizable code.

So as a result of the information included in that application as provided by NANPA, the INC has listed the criteria and asked a number of questions of Kinsdale Mobile so that it can then consider whether the request is in accordance with the NPA allocation plan and assignment guidelines.

We are waiting to hear back from the gentleman from Kinsdale Mobile and he has been invited to attend our meeting of the NPA subcommittee next week.

Any questions?

We have a number of issues that are in initial pending, mostly due to NANPA or PA change orders. Issue 407 I talked about on a separate slide. Issue 454, adjusting criteria that service provider must meet to obtain a --

(END OF AUDIOTAPE 1, SIDE B)

*   *   *   *   *

(START OF AUDIOTAPE 2, SIDE A)

MR. NEWMAN: -- NANPA change order, and actually that NANPA change order has been approved and I think we'll find out about that and discuss implementation at the next INC meeting.

On issue 486, contaminated or pristine assigned block returns is pending a PA change order 44. If you don't want me to read these, I'm delighted not to. Let me know.

Issue 496, this is to update the COCAG for information changes for rate center. Changes, that's pending a NANPA change order.

Issue 504, block assignments created or activated in the NPAC. That's actually pending a change at the NPAC and we're working with the LNPA working group to reissue the guidelines when the NPAC change is updated.

Issue 513 is actually in final closure and shouldn't be on the slide. We apologize. Don would probably be concerned if it was still in initial pending.

Issue 516, update the Thousands Block Pooling assignment guidelines part four form. It's pending PA change order 47.

Issue 517, denying an NXX assignment, 10SP (unintelligible) interpooling is actually I have recorded here, subject to two change orders. NANPA change order number 6 and PA change order number 46, both of which have been approved and INC will discuss implementation at its meeting next week.

Issue 522, revision to procedures for submitting the part four form for dedicated non-pool codes is pending NANPA change order number 9.

And then issues 523, pool blocks pending verification of LERG assigning responsibilities, and issue 527, blocks with effective dates earlier then the NXX activation date.

We've been informed by the PA that they will be submitting change orders for those two issues so those issues have been moved from final closure into initial pending.

Your last substantive slide, are the INC issues that were put in the final closure at its last meeting. Assignment of 700 NXX as a geographic NPA and XX. Issue 507 actually was put into initial pending wasn't it? No this is final closure, sorry. We just had a separate slide on it, so I reviewed that one earlier.

Revisions to Appendix C, Section 4.0 of the central office code assignment guidelines. This issue adjusts the guidelines so that a service provider who is returning an NXX voluntarily can't continue to have TNs in that NXX just to avoid the FOG routing responsibilities.

Issue 524 revisions to section 4.5 in Appendix D, three of the central office code assignment guidelines synchronizes the timeline for what's really being done today and provides a little more detail.

And INC issue 531 just adds some agreements reached to our internal operating procedures.

The last page is the INC web pages. I have been asked to remind NANC members that if they aren't INC members, even though they aren't INC members NANC members still have access to any non-public INC documentation and all you have to do is request either that access from leadership or ATIS administration, the ATIS director, Jean-Paul Emard, or our committee administrator, Margo Zeidner who are both here to day. Thank you.

MR. KOUTSKY: Thank you. And I do want to express my appreciation for INC on the pANI issue where we were tasked with coming up with a timeline in 30 days and we said jump and they did, and they were essential to us coming up with the timeline for their components of it and they did that without question. So I appreciate Jean-Paul and Adam's work on that.

And Don, take as much time as you need for pANI. Now this is the report of the newly reconstituted pANI IMG. Don Gray from Nebraska.

MR. GRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I apologize. We didn't get a hard copy of the timeline which we had all developed and as was mentioned, was reviewed with ATIS INC to determine could they support it and how would they support it, and jump I think is an understatement. They really came through.

They worked with ESIF and the other organizations that would have to be involved, the other subcommittees and came back with a timeline and let me just verbalize it for you.

Assuming that you approve our recommended permanent guidelines, December 1st through March 2nd, ATIS INC and its subgroups would begin the process of working up formalized guidelines based upon the recommendations.

An estimated initial closure date of March 9th, and then 331 would be the approval by NANC of those recommended guidelines and go into final closure on April 1st.

So that's the basic timeline that's been laid out on this process. If anyone has any questions on that we can try to field them.

MR. KOUTSKY: This was the timeline I circulated via e-mail and I think it was approved without objection. And so I think what I will do is I'll enter that document into the formal record here. Absent hearing any further objections to a letter already sent, I'll consider that approved by the full NANC. Seeing none, continue.

MR. GRAY: Let me start with our report itself, the Power Point Presentation. Is that going to be what, seven, or is it going to be eight if you use the guidelines?

MR, KOUTSKY: I will make the timeline seven. This is going to be weird but we'll just call it number eight.

MR. GRAY: All right. First of all I'd like to thank the other co-chairs of the pANI IMG group and also all the participants.

It was a great group of people. We had a lot of give and take, a lot of discussion, a lot of good issues got brought to the calls that we had and I think we've produced a good document in a very short timeframe there that addresses those.

Basically on page two of the presentations, our recommendations for a permanent pANI administration is that they use the guiding principles and the policy framework that will be in our permanent guideline, that this report augments the interim guidelines that were sent to ATIS INC on September 5th, for them to start to working on things and looking at that, and that the pANI IMG recommends that the NANC approve and forward this policy framework, the guiding principles and the recommendation to the FCC.

On the next page, some of the policy highlights that we came up with is that all of the pANI codes should be shared amongst eligible users on a technology neutral basis, and we felt that was a very key item that we needed to keep the focus on.

Eligible user, the definition of that, a lot of discussion there. Let me just summarize in saying that when we originally drafted the interim pANI guidelines, we were working towards providing guidelines that would allow voice over IP carriers to obtain routing resources to comply with the FCC's requirement.

So in those interim guidelines, we tried to get a definition that would allow voice over IP carriers access to numbers that per part 52, they didn't have access to. Rosemary.

MS. EMMER: Thank you. Rosemary Emmer with Sprint Nextel.

Along those lines of eligible users, I was wondering if you could tell me what a potential process would be to get wireless carriers to be able to use this process as well.

MR. GRAY: Good question since it is my understanding that because of the way the interims went through using specifically the terminology that was used in

those, that the interim RNA can only assign pANIs to a voice over IP carrier, and as Amy indicated this morning, only three have applied for that, registered for that process.

I guess Mr. Chairman, the question would then come, should an IMG come back and make a recommendation to a change or should we in passing comment on our permanent guidelines, recommend that a portion of this permanent guideline be given to the interim to implement immediately while INC is working on other guidelines?

MR. KOUTSKY: It's certainly a question worthy of study. From my standpoint it would be asking yet again to have some kind of interim activity tender taken, which I think -- frankly I think our efforts are best served at trying to get a permanent administration put in place as quickly as possible. That's my own personal view.

If people want to explore it in the context of the IMG, that's fine. I just want us to make sure that we keep our eye on the goal here, which is a permanent administration which would be -- because the definition of eligible user would include mobile user. It's really a question as to what are you accessing I think rather than who is entitled to access it.

So I just want to make sure that what we do doesn't get in the way of actually completing the final permanent administration. Anna.

MS. MILLER: Anna Miller with T-Mobile. I agree with you in terms of the need to have permanent guidelines.

When this became an emergency with the mandate for what to provide 911 in September of 2005, I guess a lot of us were in the mode of interim guidelines to help them out by November. Now we're at November of 2006, a year later, and we're just beginning to implement our interim guidelines.

So from a wireless perspective we need access to these resources in the interest of number conservation. And in my mind it's analogous to -- I say tomato, you say tomato because the purpose of these numbering resources are the same even though they have slightly different names, ESRKs for, you know, voice over IP service providers. I said the wrong thing, QK for voice over IP, RK for CMS wireless providers.

It's analogous in my mind, when we did number portability if you were a GSM carrier you could route on an MZ, if you were a CDMA carrier, you had to create this new resource called the NEM, which was essentially we came to a generic name for tomato/tomato as mobile station identifier.

So I guess the long story short is , I think given the timeframes, that it would be good policy to allow CMS carriers access to this resource.

I think when the industry starts working on the transition plan to the permanent, it will be an easier transition plan if wireless has access to that resource a year later as opposed to tow years later, now as opposed to a further delay.

And if there was agreement that that is appropriate, would it be possible in whatever correspondence the NANC forwards as part of its recommendation to the FCC, to state that clarification given the timeframe?

MR. KOUTSKY: And just to clarify, I would like the IMG to look at the question about ESQKs versus ESRKs in terms of what are the substantive differences between the two.

And I have the view, which was articulated by the FCC in their September 8th letter that a national solution or national permanent administration is in the public interest and so I think that any steps that we recommend that take us that direction I think are important.

I just want to reiterate that. I don't want us to get necessarily distracted by fixing an interim solution when we could be working on a permanent solution. I'm not assuming there would be distraction. I'm just pointing out that I wouldn't want to do anything that jeopardizes the implementation of the national permanent solution that is in the public interest in my view.

But certainly I mean if the pANI IMG wants to pick up the issue of the differences or the functional differences between ESQK and an ESRK with regard to the assignment by the IRNA -- I can't believe I just did that. That would be more than welcome to have that.

I would also want to make one point though that is about one of the points of the FCCs letter is that even though they appointed an interim administrator, it did not divest firms that were already engaging in the assignments of pANIs or their equivalents from being able to do so.

So I know several carriers who come at telephone companies and other providers had been in the process of assigning this type of resource, and the FCC letter specifically said that they may continue to do so.

And so to a certain extent, the interim solution did not supplant the already interim solutions that providers had already obtained for themselves. So that might also be an explanation as to why we have not seen a large amount of demand.

MR. GRAY: Let me take my co-chair hat off for just a minute since I've been involved in this since the beginning on this.

I think what may have happened as we were going along, and both Rosemary and Anna alluded to it, is that our interim guidelines were focused on addressing an issue

specifically for voice over IP providers and I think that's why the particular terminology was used as opposed to a more generic term pANI.

Going forward I see two possible situations that I think the IMG is going to have to come back and address, and I'll get an e-mail out tonight to call a meeting so we can start working this issue because I think it's important in that in our recommendation we're also indicating that ATIS INC and the interim routing number authority use experience from the interim routing number process in the development of the permanent guidelines.

Well if you've only got three folks that are asking for or registered to get numbers, your experience base is going to very low and we're not going to get a lot of good real world experience built into the process before.

The second point would be for the wireless carriers, that means they're going to continue to dip into their dialable number base to supply pANIs in most cases, so it's going to cause even more transition situations down line.

So I think this is something that the IMG ought to take up very quickly and get back with a recommendation.

MR. KOUTSKY: Okay, excellent. Thank you.

MR. GRAY: Co-chair hat back on. Because of that whole issue we did have some discussion on what an eligible user was and in our original interim definition we tried to lay forth a ground work that would allow a non-certificated entity access to the resources.

The FCC very clearly indicated in their letter of September 8th, establishing an interim RNA, that that was not acceptable and to stick with the current rules and

regulations and so we have since modified our interim, the permanent guidelines to reflect that specific statement there.

So basically you're permitted under applicable law, whether that be FCC or individual state authority to have access to resources.

You have an OCN, you have a valued company identification number issued by NENA, and that you are certificated, or not certificated but you have the technical and functional capability to move traffic on the tandem going to serve a (unintelligible). And those are basically our user requirements there.

On the next page, on page four, the administrator should also be responsible for the assignment of NPA 211, 511, resources on grow forward basis. They should project manage the transition from 211, 511 resources that voluntary administrators have been issuing to the permanent pANI administrator and that they should then support the transition from datable resources to 211, 511 resources as those entities desire to make that transition.

On page five, some additional policy recommendations there, that the pANI administrator should be responsible for developing the management tools for correlating pANI consumption, deployment, and forecasting.

Recipients of pANIs are responsible for providing forecasts and documenting the utilization of the numbers they've been assigned. Under these pANIs just like any resource, should be returned or if necessary a reclamation process should be started and that the North American Numbering Plan administrator is responsible for taking that an input form the permanent pANI administrator to use in NPA and NANPA exhaust forecasting.

Then on page six we started there developing general principles that we felt that the guidelines should embody, that pANIs are used for routing of emergency calls and that all participants in this need to follow a first do no harm principle. So think very carefully before you write rules and regulations, policies and guidelines and cast them in concrete. Wait a minute, is this going to work and are we going to cause any upset to the existing system?

That pANIs are shared numbering resources and they do require management by a third party. They are non-dialable but will use the standard 10 digit format.

The administration and assignment of them will comply with all of the mandated and required resources assignment and optimization requirements. That the cost for pANI administrator should be borne by all eligible users on a competitively mutual basis.

And on page seven, are basic recommendations that the NANC approve the guidelines, the principles, and the recommendations that we have offered in the document presented.

That ATIS INC to the best of its ability should incorporate the information in this document and in the information contained in the interim guidelines of 2005, into the permanent guidelines, and that ATIS INC should incorporate any lessons learned by the interim RNA or any changes that may occur to existing rules and regulations into the permanent guidelines, and that the pANI IMG will remain in place to advise as necessary until ATIS INC has the permanent guidelines and final closure and they are posted to the web for utilization.

And again I'd like to thank everybody that's participated in this process. I think we've turned out a very good piece of work in a very short timeframe with some very concentrated and productive meetings.

MR. KOUTSKY: I just want to make clear that the actual recommendations will be document number nine. They're dated today not coincidentally.

And just my personal appreciation to Don Gray and to Natalie McNamer of T-Mobile, and also to Martin Hakim Din who's at the table, and Bill Schaughnessy of Bell-South, and everybody that participated in putting these together. This was a tremendous amount of work to be done in a very short period of time so I express my personal appreciation for that.

Do we have any questions or thoughts? We have two action items. One is the actual consideration and adoption of the recommendations, which is document number nine. Are there any statements or objections? Seeing none we'll consider that approved.

And the second action item is recommendation that I forward these to the ATIS Industry Numbering Committee for further action and development of the final pANI guidelines, which I intend to do as soon as possible. Seeing no objection, consider those two action items approved.

And again, thank you Don for hauling the most paper here, the longest distance.

(LAUGHTER)

E.   Billing and Collection Agent (B&C Agent) Report. Faith Marcotte, Welch and Company, LLP, presented the report to the NANC.

Okay, we have a few minutes. I guess we have one more item, which is the report of the Billing and Collection Agent.

MS. MARCOTT: I'm Faith Marcotte from Welch and Company, and we're the Billing and Collection Agent.

To start on page one, which shows the financial position of the fund, we have about $5 million in the bank, which earned about 4.78 percent in the month of October.

Obviously that's an annual rate. And we have a bit in receivables and a lot in accrued liabilities, the bulk of which is to NeuStar proving (unintelligible).

Right now the fund stands at $4 million. What we're aiming for is to have just a million, the contingency amount by the end of the funding year, which is June '07.

So if we look on page two, we see a projection of the fund. If you look in the total column which is about two thirds of the way across the page, you can see that we're projecting the fund to be $1.4 million when we were looking for a million, which is the contingency amount.

There is a column called differences between the forecasted amount and what we had budgeted and that's the $454,000.

We have a little bit of extra in revenue, most of that was due to late filing fees for the filing of the form 499-A that we charge to the carriers who were late, but the bulk of it was really for pooling. They did not end up billing the full amount or haven't yet billed the full amount based on the contract for last year, which is what we base the budget on.

So there's a large difference there and the bulk -- between those items we had $454,000 surplus we're expecting this year. That's as of this time anyways.

And then the next columns are the projection up through to October '07, so we're just giving a full year projection of where we expect the fund to be.

And page three is the accrued liabilities. This just shows you what we're expected to pay out over the next six months. Does anyone have any questions?

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer with Sprint Nextel. And Faith, this isn't a question. I just wanted to thank you, and Heather Garth, and Welch and Company for your diligence and accountability in the absence of the NANC meetings. You haven't skipped a beat and we really appreciate it.

MR. KOUTSKY: I reiterate that. Anything further?

Excellent, well thanks a lot, Faith. I appreciate your coming here.

How about that, we've reached lunch five minutes early. Don't ever say I never got you out for lunch. Okay, I guess we will pick up promptly at one o'clock, so I'm going to say we're going to pick up at 12:55 p.m. And if people don't know where to eat around here feel free to ask me, but there's a lovely courtyard.

(BREAK)

F. **Billing and Collection Working Group (B&C WG).** Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel, presented the report to the NANC.

MR. KOUTSKY: Okay, we have a quorum. I hope everybody enjoyed lunch. We're only five minutes off, that's not too bad.

It's the Billing and Collection Working Group report fresh off the Billing and Collection Agent report earlier today. Rosemary.

MS. EMMER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel delivering the B&C Working Group report.

And when I heard Mel Clay, with the co-chair of the LLC, say he had a visit from typo, I wish I had a visit too but I didn't have a visit. I have to tell you that the first page of my report stills says draft. It's really final. My fault. I will resubmit that for the record tomorrow.

Just wanted to let you know that Jim Castagna with Verizon and I co-chair this group. We were asked to put together a little something about the B&C Working Group other then just things we've been doing lately, talk a little bit about the mission scope, responsibilities and things.

The NANC's Billing and Collection Agent Oversight Working Group is responsible for overseeing the performance of the functional requirements provided by NANP, billing and collection agent basically.

We're responsible for participating in the development of the budget, the contribution factor, payment computation. We monitor the billing collection and distribution of funds, and we review the completeness of the NANC reports and the quarterly reports that Welch and Company sends us.

We are also tasked to perform an annual performance evaluation as well, although we haven't had one yet.

The next two pages list the activities that we manage in order to meet our mission and objectives, and I'm not going to read those off but they're there for you.

As far as the budget and contribution factor, on May 1st the contribution factor of .00021, it was filed and the FCC acted expeditiously in approving the contribution factor which we appreciated, and as a result Welch was able to meet their targeted billing date of June 15th.

Current activity; there's two actions for the NANC today. We continue to hold our bimonthly meetings with B&C agent and as soon as we get the NANC schedule for next year we will put together our schedule for next year. We usually meet a week or two before the NANC meets for our standing agenda calls with Welch.

We are preparing to initiate our first annual performance review of Welch and Company for third quarter '05 to second quarter '06, and also we're going to be asking the NANC if we can have our co-chair elections. So basically these two things are subject to NANC blessing and we'd like to begin both of those projects ASAP.

As far as the co-chair elections, I want everybody to make sure that they're paying lots of attention. There are two new co-chair spots available in the industry under the B&C working group.

Nominations, provided we get NANC blessing, are going to be accepted for both my co-chair role and Jim Castagna's co-chair role. Basically they'll be a one year role and a two year role.

Jim Castagna is as most of you are aware already, co-chairing other committees and definitely won't be putting his name back in the hat. I will put my name back in the hat for the one year term to be a transition person if you will, with the person who will be the two year term if the group so decides.

That said, people can still put in their name for the one year position and I'll be glad to just transfer my knowledge on to someone else and be a member of the group but not co-chair.

So basically we're proposing the nominations be accepted from November 30th to December 6th, sent to Jim or myself, and a member of our team, Tim Decker of the B&C Working Group has agreed to be the person to handle the voting and so you would send your votes from September 7th through the 11th.

The announcements will take place on our next call, which is December 12th, and if anyone is interested in joining that call, please feel free to let me know at this meeting and I'll give you the information or you can e-mail Jim or myself at any time.

The B&C Working Group membership is on the next slide so you can see who attends these meetings and like I said, our next meeting is December 12th.

Are there any questions for the B&C Working Group?

MR. KOUTSKY: Actually I do, and this is a point, this is on the election schedule which -- first of all anybody that volunteers to be a co-chair I think is deserving of commendation. I just wanted to make clear that the presentations as carriers to vote via e-mail, and I would propose to modify that to say NANC members would vote. I think that was just unintentional.

MS. EMMER: Yes, sure.

MR. KOUTSKY: So clearly any of the public interest or our trade groups, you know, if people want to participate we'll make that more than open.

Do we have any further discussion about this election process? You know, this is essentially going to be self-starting.

I do have a question, what if you don't get very many votes, have you guys thought about -- I want to make sure that the selection process does go through some kind of industry consensus. My concern about doing it via voting is you may only get three votes. Has there been further discussion as to that.

MS. EMMER: We haven't discussed that. I've been through lots and lots of co-chair elections under the NANC and I haven't been in a situation where there was confusion over it yet.

MR. KOUTSKY: That's not happening?

MS. EMMER: Although with this group we don't have a large body of participation, so with a group that is as small as this one certainly there could be issues.

MR. KOUTSKY: Maybe we'll just cross that bridge --

MS. EMMER: Maybe just cross that bridge when --

MR. KOUTSKY: Okay.

MS. O'DONNELL: Beth O'Donnell for Cox Communications. To the extent that not enough votes are received, NANC approves the selection so there is a measure of industry consensus at the NANC. We could say we don't like our deputy chairman.

(LAUGHTER)

MS. EMMER: But you wouldn't say that.

MS. O'DONNELL: Not to you.

(LAUGHTER)

MALE SPEAKER: That sounds like a consensus to me.

MR. KOUTSKY: Well it depends on what you're seeking consensus on.

And I think I'll just take that under advisement that this will essentially be that type of -- there will be this further step involved.

But just in terms of making sure that there was -- my concern is whether there's broad enough participation given the compressed time schedule of the selection process, but I also recognize that, that if people want to become co-chairs that we have an open process for helping those people take on that responsibility.

Any other thoughts on this idea?

Okay, seeing no other thoughts, I think Rosemary you may proceed with that. You had another action item. What's that?

MS. EMMER: The other one was the yearly performance evaluation. Just basically want just a quick blessing that it's okay to begin that process, and we don't have a timeline associated with that yet but I don't think it will take us all that long.

MR, KOUTSKY: I see no objection. By no objection, you're clear to go ahead with that as well.

MS. EMMER: Thank you.

MR. KOUTSKY: Also I would just want to note that the Billing and Collection Working Group is also going to be working on aspects of the pANI administration recovery mechanism and that I'm grateful for them to pick that up as well as a new action item.

I think this is document 11, is that right? This is document 11.

G.   **Local Number Portability Administration Working Group (LNPA WG).**
Paula Jordan, T-Mobile, USA, Inc., presented the report to the NANC.

MS. EMMER: Just want to let you know for the record that Sue Tiffany with Sprint Nextel is going to be representing Sprint Nextel at the NANC table for the LNPA Working Group.

MR. KOUTSKY: Okay, which happens to be next.

MS. JORDAN: Hello everyone. I'm Paula Jordan with T-Mobile and I'm one of the co-chairs of the LNPA Working Group along with Gary Sacra who you'd normally see here. Gary's on vacation, so my turn.

I passed out a one pager that basically describes the functions of the LNPA Working Group. I don't know if you want me to go through it.

MR. KOUTSKY: I don't unless people have questions. This is this little thing. I guess we'll call this document number 12, and I appreciate you putting this out.

MS. JORDAN: No problem.

MR. KOUTSKY: For the benefit of our newer members, including me.

MS. JORDAN: Okay, the LNPA Working Group met in November, the 14th, 15th and the 16th of November. The things I'm going to cover today, we're going

to cover the LNPA Working Group architecture planning team, the wireless testing subcommittee, the LNPA NANC flows, provision flows for LNP.

There has been a video relay service change order that was submitted and we're going to review PIM 32 and 50. And then attached to the report, let's lead with LNPA Working Group report, there's the PIMs there and there's a status report on those. And we usually don't go through those (unintelligible) unless you have questions on it.

We have a conference call scheduled for December the 6th, and our next face to face is January the 9th through the 11th in Jackson, Mississippi hosted by Cingular.

Okay, the LNPA Architecture Planning team was restarted. We held our first meeting on the morning of the 16th. The discussion basically centered around end to end, through put requirements to meet the demands of large port transactions.

There's been some issues with some of the carriers trying to do large port transactions and we're trying to figure out how large those transaction should be. And some of those transactions are caused by network configurations, load balancing of their network and so on.

So they're going to take a look at that and see what that number should be and then they're going to develop a test scenario and they're going to do the testing to see how many of those ports we can do in an hour or whatever. So that's what they're working on right now.

MR. KOUTSKY: And just to clarify, that first meeting was you said the 16th?

MS. JORDAN: Yeah, of November.

MR. KOUTSKY: Of November, okay.

MS. JORDAN: They meet Thursday morning after the two day LNPA Working Group meeting. Any other questions.?

Okay the wireless testing subcommittee, we've restarted that because there is a new WICIS release coming out, 3.1 and 4.0. We have two new co-chairs for that. One of them is Teresa Patton from Cingular and the other co-chair is Mohamed Samater from T-Mobile. They will be heading that up.

That team will be developing the test plan for WICIS 3.1 and 4.0 and they will also be establishing the test timeframes, the scheduling for the (unintelligible) testing, monitoring the testing to determine problems and and/or issues, and the resolutions. Any questions on that?

Okay, the next thing this is the NANC flows. We reopened the NANC flows and they were reopened due to -- there have been some NPAC releases and we needed to update the flows to reflect those changes so we've done that.

Once we complete those additions we will bring them to the NANC and the FCC for approval. And as far as I know the NANC provision flows for LNP that were sent to the NANC in January of 2003, have not yet been approved so we are updating unapproved flows, but we'll get another round to approve those with additional changes.

Okay the other thing is that LNP Working Group is waiting guidance and ruling from the FCC before addressing VoIP providers in the NANC flows.

Attached you will find a position paper on VoIP porting obligations submitted to the NANC in March 2005, and included in the NANC working group's number -- and we've also included it in the best practices document from the LNPA Working Group.

A similar position paper was reflected in the NANC future number of working groups VoIP report submitted to the FCC in August of 2005. The VoIP information is attached to your documents that I passed out and it's also embedded in this document, in the report.

MALE SPEAKER: (Off microphone). (Unintelligible) of AT&T. I'm wondering why this document approaches the question of voice over IP porting as the voice over IP providers porting obligation since voice over IP providers generally don't have the LRNs, don't interface with the NPAC, and really are not physically capable of porting a number.

To me the way to frame this is, the porting obligation of entities that are providing numbers to VoIP providers, and the appropriate flow here in my mind at least is that these entities that are providing these services have to be able to provide ports upon request of an end user.

And this issue has been very well dealt with in the toll free environment in the past where there's this difference between who want entities customers and who the other entities customer is.

And I think it's pretty clear that if you're a LEC and you have a voice over IP provider who is your end user but they have a different end user, and that end user wants to port the number, you have to port the number. So it's not an obligation of a VoIP, it's an obligation of whoever the person whose LRN is associated with that telephone number is.

MR. KOUTSKY: Martin had a follow-up.

MALE SPEAKER: (Off microphone) for just a follow-up. Martin Hakim Din with Vonage.

First of all the obligation for porting a number is on the person that actually owns the number, the entity that actually owns the number. Certainly in our case if we're not a certificated carrier or have a waiver -- and the only one that I'm aware that has it is SBCIS.

71

MALE SPEAKER: (Off microphone). And in that case the waiver or the (unintelligible). I think there's no gap.

MALE SPEAKER: Exactly, so I don't see where the gap is either.

MALE SPEAKER: The problem is an impractical problem of making sure that the entities that are providing service to voice over IP providers don't refuse to port on the phony claim that the customer is not the appropriate customer. Because again in the toll free environment, that issue has been put to rest.

MALE SPEAKER: We can speak from experience that our Select carrier partners that we work with do not confirm with us on porting numbers out. They port them out per the requirements that are on them.

FEMALE SPEAKER: We agree, that all the LNPA committee agrees with everything you've said but what we found though in fact when we're porting is that not all of the voice over IP carriers agree.

And where we've found problems porting numbers from voice over IP carriers is when the number wasn't -- the ported number who has been ported to them, but they will sometimes, some voice (unintelligible) will refuse initially and sometimes it goes into long drawn out thing, refuse to port number that wasn't ported to them in first place, it was one that they provided to their customer initially.

MALE SPEAKER: I think the entire number porting process has that problem.

MALE SPEAKER: (Off microphone). Since the voice over IP provider doesn't have any interface with the NPAC and can't change -- the routing instructions for that telephone number don't say route to this voice over IP provider , they say route to the LRN of this LEC, isn't the problem, the LEC, that they're the one that's not porting the number?

FEMALE SPEAKER: And we'll get into some of this when we get into reseller porting because in fact the voice over IP carrier becomes sort of like a reseller and what you're saying, the way it should work, is we agree with that. We completely agree it's just that it's not happening in all case.

MALE SPEAKER: We have an obligation of the voice over IP provider to port I think misstates the issue because --

MS. JORDAN: But here's the issue.

MALE SPEAKER: The obligation to port is whoever has the number associated with their LRN.

MS. JORDAN: And that's true with the exception of if the VoIP provider or the reseller and like Sue said, we'll talk about that later, if the VoIP provider has instructed their network service provider not to approve those ports until they get to see the port request or the LSR, the network service provider has no choice but to --

MALE SPEAKER: (Off microphone) (Unintelligible) the carrier that I'm familiar with in which that can happen, is where the VoIP provider who is actually listed as the customer of record of the number, asserts that ability as the customer of record because the number is assigned to them and then they go and they resell it to somebody else.

But even in those instances I still don't know how the current regulations could be circumvented, how a carrier could circumvent those because they receive a port request, they have to release the number.

MALE SPEAKER: I think again that issue has been dealt with in toll free. We've faced that issue before where the ultimate end user is not the one who's listed as the customer of record, and the FCC has always made it clear that it's the ultimate end

73

user that has the right to port their number and the customer of record cannot prevent the port from taking place so --

MS. JORDAN: And as Sue says, the LNPA working group does not disagree with anything you're saying but the fact of the matter is it's happening.

MALE SPEAKER: Well all I'm saying is I think we should frame it not as that there's an obligation of a VoIP provider to port a number because what does that mean for a VoIP provider to port the number?

MALE SPEAKER: That's not what this says.

MALE SPEAKER: There's an obligation on the part of all service providers not to prevent end users from porting their numbers. So if the VoIP provider is doing things that prevent an end user from porting their number, that might be something that they have an obligation not to do, but the obligation to port is on the entity that actually has control of the number.

MR. KOUTSKY: If I can jump in, it strikes me more of almost an enforcement issue. Ultimately an enforcement issue and maybe less of a process issue.

MALE SPEAKER: I will say that I think that it might be worthwhile to work out processes to make sure that the handoffs are smooth in the circumstances --

(END OF SIDE A, START OF SIDE B)

MALE SPEAKER: -- If the LEC that has the number says wait a minute, that's not the name I have on my customer record. I mean from a process standpoint, it might be worth figuring out what's the best process to deal with that situation.

MR. KOUTSKY: Anna.

MS. MILLER: Anna Miller, T-Mobile. I'm glad to hear this conversation because it's a perfect segue to PIM 32.

And I agree with what AT&T, Vonage, and Sprint have been saying and that is that there is an obligation that is the end user's privilege if you will, to change service providers and keep their telephone number, but we have a situation where depending on their relationship with their network service provider, basically if you don't have direct access to a NANP resource you don't have direct access to the NPAC, and therefore you're dependent on a network service provider to activate a port request.

And so I think that in order to fulfill the intent of number portability, which was to make it easy for customers and easy for consumers to change service providers and remove that barrier, the telephone number, that there needs to be processes to enable that to happen.

And I think it would be good for NANC to clarify that and direct the industry to make sure that those processes exist so that the intent of number portability can be fulfilled.

And in coming back to your question, when I read this I think maybe the issue is -- it says here VoIP service providers along with wire line and wireless service providers have the obligation.

So in essence it is a joint obligation and maybe there could be some improvement in wording here, that there is an obligation and if you are a service provider that doesn't have direct access to the NPAC then you have to work through a wireless or wire line service provider or your network service provider to do that.

So I guess when you look at obligation, is it pointing to the VoIP carrier, is it pointing to the network service provider of a service provider, right?

MALE SPEAKER: Well I assume since there was this idea that they had to wait for the FCC to weigh in, that there was an idea that it was the obligation of VoIP

provider because obviously there's no question about the obligation of the network service provider. There's no need to wait for the FCC for that.

MR. KOUTSKY: Martin.

MALE SPEAKER: I would just suggest that if the wording is around a principle, let's write the wording around a principle which is we think that end users of phone numbers should be able to keep their numbers. I don't think anybody argues with that.

I think this is kind misleading in that I'm not sure that you can even put an obligation on a VoIP provider. I don't know how I could make level three or somebody that I work with agree to one of my customers porting requests. The obligation is on them to do it once they receive a properly formatted port request, correct?

MS. JORDAN: We do all of our ports on behalf of Vonage. If anyone ever asks us to port their numbers we do so. We're the ones doing the porting. So we've never refused to port or anything like that. We've always done it.

MALE SPEAKER: I don't know what the rest of the industry does but I mean I know what I do.

MR. KOUTSKY: Exactly, I mean we have the people around the table here are fully participating in the system. It's a question of people not around the table. Susan, you had something?

MS. TIFFANY: This bleeds into as Paul just said, the PIM 32 and the reseller issue. When as level three does, they get a port request and as the network provider they go ahead and facilitate that. There's no problem.

What we have found and this is not specific to the VoIP issues, it's the reseller issue, is that different network providers have different arrangements with what they

view as their customers and their customer in that case is the reseller, and some of the network providers require that their customer gives them permission to share customer information, end user customer information.

So when they get the request coming in then will send a message back, they'll get the LSR and they'll send a message back, it's not our number. And they don't tell you it's a reseller or they don't tell you who the reseller is.

And if their customer end user is not an informed end user, sometimes that's difficult information to get for the new porting carrier.

Again it's not all carriers, it's some carriers, and in that case as we get to PIM 32, you'll find that it's affecting -- some customers give up on the port because the new carriers, let's say it's Sprint and Nextel can't get the information they need to get the customer information, the CSR, to populate the LSR correctly so that the network providers can process the port. So we're stopped before we ever get to populate an LSR.

MR. KOUTSKY: Just to be clear. I want to make sure that we keep talking about the VoIP question that Hank I think originally rose. I mean we'll get to PIM 32.

I do understand the analogy, potentially analogous, but in one sense I think if I could try to get a feel for how this discussion started -- was the general characterization. I think this goes to the working group position paper, which admittedly is more than a year old, talks about porting of telephone numbers used by VoIP service providers.

Are you suggesting that this might be something that might want to be reworked by the working group to maybe reflect more accurately the network relationships?

MALE SPEAKER: (Off microphone). Hank (Unintelligible), AT&T. I think so. I mean I think it would be useful to describe the situation, you know, say there are circumstances where a VoIP service provider form the numbering perspective appears to

be the end user of a telephone number, but there is another end user who's the real end user and that end user has a right to port their number and the LEC that controls that number has an obligation to port the number.

And if there's a need to develop sort of a best practice process for making sure that there's a template that people can adhere to then that might be a good job to do, but I think we shouldn't say that we need to wait for the FCC to clarify any of this because this is in my mind anyway perfectly clear under the existing number portability requirements.

MS. JORDAN: This is Paula Jordan. Let me explain to you what the situation is it's conferring. We, wireless, wire lines send a port request across to the old network service provider because that's what the process is.

They have been instructed by their reseller VoIP provider that the request is to come to them, so then we as the new network service provider deal directly with the VoIP provider and in some situations, not all but in some situations, they have refused to port because their understanding is that they don't have to port. So that is actually happening. And I know that they're supposed. You know, we know that and we agree with everything that's being said but --

MALE SPEAKER: I guess I would say no network provider can, you know, escape their duty to port by saying go talk to that other entity and they can't by contract modify their duty.

MR. KOUTSKY: And that would be the type of thing that could be in a best practices matrix. And I would like to recognize Phil Jones.

MS. JORDAN: We have that in our best practices.

MR. KOUTSKY: Commissioner Jones, and then I'll get to you.

COMMISSIONER Jones: I fear wading into this fight a little bit but let me state a couple of things. One, I just want to reflect that I don't think VoIP companies own numbers. I've heard something like the word own here, and let the record reflect that the VoIP companies are assigned numbers from the resources administered by NeuStar.

The second thing, I've actually gone back in and read the last paragraph of what we're actually supposed to be forwarding on and it just basically says, "VoIP service providers along with wireless and wire line service providers have the obligation to port a telephone number to any other service provider when the consumer requests and the port is within FCC mandates.

Porting of telephone numbers used by VoIP service providers should follow the industry porting guidelines in the NANC inter-service provider LNP operation flows".

Is there any disagreement with that? I mean is that what we're being asked to do?

MS. JORDAN: Yes, you're being asked -- we've already got it in our best practices document and we're asking for support and endorsement from the FCC and the NANC for that statement, for that paragraph.

COMMISSIONER JONES: I think that's reasonable to do, Mr. Chairman. I think these other issues could be complimented and further discussed at the working group level but I don't see any problem with forwarding this language on.

MR. KOUTSKY: Okay. Anna.

MS. MILLER: Anna Miller, T-Mobile. I agree with what was just said and I actually wanted to maybe kill two birds with one stone in looking at this language.

I mean the LNP working group said that they would like NANC to provider guidance and a statement of clarification. And I think that if we not only can we totally

agree -- I think agree with this paragraph, maybe we could make the paragraph more generic, not only to handle the VoIP specific situation but also the PIM 32 reseller, or MVNO, or whatever situation by maybe editing this a little bit and just saying that service providers along with their network service providers have the obligation to port a telephone number with any other service provider when the customers requests and the port is within the FCC mandates.

And then in the next sentence just strike the restriction used by VoIP service providers and just say that porting of telephone numbers should follow the guidelines and the LNP operation flows with the understanding to your point that what we mean by service provider here is an entity that provide services using a NAP resource, and that way we don't have to get into a lot of semantics about who owns the number versus is assigned the number.

MR, KOUTSKY: Martin.

MALE SPEAKER: Yes, just on your point, I think I do object to this wording only in the sense that -- and it's the wording, and I think the suggestion is that we send it back to the working group to tighten up the wording to get at what we're really specifically talking about here, which I think and as I hear is, the underlying LEC carrier has an obligation to the ultimate end user of the number, to port that number upon request.

My concern from a VoIP provider standpoint is that I don't know if I can fulfill an obligation to port my customer's number away if I'm not the owner of the number. I certainly can't make level three or any of my carrier partners hoard a number away for one of my customers. They have to receive a properly formatted request.

So I think the suggestion at the table here is let's get the wording to be a little bit more up to date, I mean this was written in 2005, to reflect exactly what we're getting at which as I understand the consensus, or the consensus among a number of people in the room, is that the LEC carrier of record has an obligation to the end user.

So if a customer, you know, a citizen of the state of the Washington wants to keep their phone number and go to a different service provider they can.

MR. KOUTSKY: Hank was next.

MALE SPEAKER: I mean I think that's right. I think we could say that all service providers have an obligation to port numbers, that VoIP providers have an obligation not to prevent customers from porting their numbers, and the entity that actually has control of the number has an affirmative obligation to port it.

MALE SPEAKER: Everything except for the small phrase in there about specifying a particular carrier because everyone has the responsibility to port the numbers out if the customer is requesting it period.

MS. JORDAN: As far as the network service provider is concerned, in some cases the end user is the VoIP provider. But it's not the VoIP provider that's porting, it's one of their customers.

So if there's an agreement between the network service provider and the VoIP provider that the network service provider is to send the port request to the VoIP provider, I mean that's an agreement between those two parties.

MALE SPEAKER: But I mean wouldn't that be an enforcement action? I mean that seems like a violation of the rules.

MR. KOUTSKY: Yes, and this kind of actually -- and Don I know it, but my initial thought on this was that in addition to sending the working group back, we may

also want to do a little bit of exploration as to what the current rules would require that don't necessarily -- I mean in one sense do you need to have a best practices which says comply with the rules a little bit complicated. Don.

MR. GRAY: Don Gray, Nebraska. I agree with Anna's comment with the one modification here.

If you were to put customer service providers at the start and then drop the last sentence from the paragraph and don't point at a particular type of service providers, then you've got customer service providers, network service providers, you're supposed to do it per the rules period, end of qualification discussion or anything else. Anecdotally in Nebraska, most of the porting issues that get brought to us are usually when somebody is porting out of an original port because nobody knows who the damn number is being serviced by, and so we go looking for -- you know, trying to help the consumer find out what they should tell the people they're asking to port to, because many times they're in the process, it appears there are customers, I won't call them CSRs because they're really not, they're down a level, network desk people who simply look at it and say oh, that's not ours, and when it's a second port -- and so there's part of the issue to that I think comes up here.

MR. KOUTSKY: Rosemary, very quickly.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer with Sprint Nextel. I just have a very brief statement, and that is if this committee is thinking about sending this particular language issue back to a working group it would be extremely helpful if those that are objecting to this were actually involved in that particular committee or have someone that is, that isn't saying something different at the meeting then they're saying here at the table today because we certainly wouldn't want to get back here at the next NANC meeting and not

be able to gain consensus on an issue that we've already looked at now for seven, eight, however months. Thank you.

MR. KOUTSKY: Duly noted. Are there any other comments on this? Part of the question on this is that I'm not entirely sure what the request is to have the NANC approve, given that we talked about this 2005 language and possibly modifying it in some way.

So I do think there does seem to be the general feeling in the room, I'm not sure it's consensus, but the general feeling in the room is that I think the working group should go back and look at this from this particular perspective that Hank and Martin have brought up in terms of understanding the existing legal obligations that might be applied to the underlying network service provider and the extent to which -- do we need to recommend a new process or a change to a process, understanding that that network service provider may already be legally obligated to comply with the law.

Have I missed any further clarification on that? In one sense we are -- and I do appreciate this, we are working with a bit of an artifact. We are working with a 2005 document and so I don't mean to take away from any of the work that the working group has done. I just think that from that standpoint we might understand this issue a little bit more a couple years into it.

Does that generally take into account what we were talking about here, Mr. Jones, or anyone else's comments?

MS. MILLER: Anna Miller, T-Mobile. Just to paraphrase for my own clarification.

MR. KOUTSKY: SURE.

83

MS. MILLER: So what we're saying is here, is that NANC agrees that there is an obligation and that we want the working group to look at how best the industry should from I think you said, from a process standpoint, make sure that there's a process there to fulfill that obligation.

MR, KOUTSKY: And understand that there may not necessarily be the need to change a process flow given that the network service provider might already be obligated.

I mean this is more of a -- the first part when you said NANC believes that, I mean I really to a certain extent say that's what we should be looking at as to whether or not that is the case, it that makes sense. Probably doesn't.

MS. JORDAN: I need to ask a question of Anna.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Go ahead.

MS. JORDAN: So what you're saying is, if a provider is getting their numbers from a wire line network provider, a wireless network provider, that they don't have the right to say I want to approve my own port request for my end users? I mean I need to understand if that's what we're saying because I never remember reading --

MR. KOUTSKY: I'm not sure anyone said that, yeah.

MS. JORDAN: Who would agree to?

MALE SPEAKER: I don't know too many carriers that would agree to do that because they'd be afraid of their obligation -- not being able to approve their porting obligations.

MALE SPEAKER: I think what we're saying is that whatever processes they use can't impair the ability of the end user to port their number.

So whatever processes they've worked out in their arrangements have to insure that when the entity requesting the port submits the request to the entity that has control of the number, that the requests gets processed. So whatever they do behind the scenes, as long as it doesn't impair the ability of the end user to port the number is fine by me.

MS. JORDAN: And that is why the LNPA Working Group -- we already have this paragraph in our best practices document. We agree with what you'll all saying 100 percent, and what we were hoping for was that this wording would get endorsed by the FCC and NANC.

MALE SPEAKER: I think we just hung up on the fact that the wording says that the VoIP provider has an obligation to port. The whole document has this discussion sort of trying to frame up a justification for putting a porting obligation on the VoIP provider and I think what we're saying is we don't need to worry about whether the VoIP provider has an obligation to port. The network provider has an obligation to port, the VoIP provider has an obligation not to prevent people from porting.

MR. KOUTSKY: I think to characterize, I don't think there's significant disagreement as to what the ultimate goal -- I think it's just the way it's phrased and Anna had talked about even changing the paragraph further, and I think from that standpoint that is even more reason to kind of look at this again at a working group stage because, you know, Hank has some questions about the use of some of the phrases and Martin as well. Don.

MR. GRAY: Don Gray, Nebraska. To Paula's question, maybe when you get back and have your further discussion, there may be some verbiage in there that where you have the unique situation of the service provider, the customer service provider not being the one in control of the numbers, can indicate that they can request to

be informed of a port request but cannot delay beyond the industry accepted port window or whatever, something like that. Then you've got that out, they've still got the obligation all the way around and you go.

MS. JORDAN: I think that's very good. I think that's what we were trying to say. Thank you.

MR. KOUTSKY: Okay, do we have further on this? I want to make sure that you all feel that you understand what we're asking you to do.

MS. JORDAN: Yes, I've got it.

MR. KOUTSKY: Okay.

MS. JORDAN: The next one is the video relay service. At the September LNPA Working Group meeting we were requested by a company called Hands on Communication, which is an advocate for the VRS users, to come and do a presentation on an issue that they have with inner-operability for their customers.

And according to the hearing impaired, the VRS users require VRS providers inner-operability for (unintelligible) communication with other VRS users and the ability to be reached by both hearing impaired and non-hearing impaired callers via unique geographic 10 digit number assigned to them.

Hands on Communication and the VRS users submitted a NPAC change order request to the LNPA Working Group. That change order was accepted, and let me first clarify, it was accepted by the LNPA Working Group to work the issue, to work the requirements.

That does not mean that it has been accepted or agreed upon adding it to the next release. So we're just working, going through the requirements to see if there is a way

that we can resolve this, and anything that we work or come to consensus on as far as requirements, again not anything to do with actually putting it in the NPAC.

We're just developing the requirements, that we will share that information with the INC because we are well aware that the INC has been requested by the NANC and the FCC to work that issue.

So we will share all of our information with the INC, and basically we're trying to do this so should the NPAC be the chosen database, that we're ready to process the request for them.

Questions?

MR. KOUTSKY: Beth.

MS. O'DONNELL: Beth O'Donnell, Cox Communications. Mr. Chairman, my comments related to what I said earlier, this change order, I've read it, would put URI information into the NPAC, which is what change order 400 did. It's the same issue.

And I would again say I don't think it's appropriate at any stage to be spending NANC resources on something that the FCC specifically said hold in abeyance. I know that there are processes you have to go through but you're spending time on something that I think is off the table, totally off the table.

MR. KOUTSKY: Thank you. If I could ask, how much time is being -- I mean are you waiting for INC to do something before moving on this?

MS. JORDAN: No, we're doing the requirements work that's required for a change order when it's accepted. This is a normal process for us. There's many change orders that we've done the requirements for and they've been sitting there for years and never did get accepted and implemented in the NPAC.

So we're jut trying to be proactive, to get this ready should the INC decide, or the INC, the NANC, the FCC decide that the NPAC is where this data should go. It's just a normal process for us to work these types of requirements.

MS. O'DONNELL: That may be the case that it's a normal process but this isn't a normal topic. This is something that was -- we have a direction on. The FCC has this issue in front of it. It hasn't ruled.

The other items that don't get accepted into the NPAC for whatever reason, don't change the substance of the NPAC, what the NPAC purpose and use -- and what the database holds. This one does.

And I think that at a minimum, at a very minimum, you should wait to see what INC comes up with. Beyond that I even
if INC decides this is the way to go, it goes nowhere because the FCC hasn't said this information can go in there. That's all.

MR. KOUTSKY: Anna.

MS. MILLER: Anna Miller with T-Mobile. When the INC reported on this, they indicated that they were looking at three options as potential solutions. One was an NPAC option, one was an ENUM option, one was a DNS option.

And so in my mind all three of those options could utilize an IP address and I think it's premature to say we can't consider anything that considers the NPAC or that considers an IP address, certainly since any of these solutions would probably involve an IP address.

So I guess I disagree with Cox's comments and I think that we should give the industry an opportunity to explore these options and then define what the requirements

are and then decide whether -- you know whatever option is made, maybe if it's an

ENUM option.

I mean you can't do ENUM, you're not going to translate a telephone number and an IP address unless you have IP addresses. If you're not going to do DSS, DNS, unless you're going to translate into an IP address.

So I think we should give the industry an opportunity to evaluate this, come up with their recommendations and then decide what should or shouldn't be done, what should or shouldn't be considered.

MR. KOUTSKY: I was a little bit confused a bit on the end. When you were saying the industry to consider, were you talking about the INC to consider?

MS. MILLER:Right. Let the industry as INC, let the industry --

MR. KOUTSKY: Then I guess how is that really different then what Beth was talking about?

MS. O'DONNELL: Yeah, the industry will get to review it at the INC. The INC while it's gracious enough to come and talk to NANC, isn't under our umbrella and I wasn't talking about solutions using IP addresses, I was talking about the NPAC database specifically.

I'm not talking about anything else except that the umbrella of NANC should not be considering things that go into the NPAC database, specifically this because this is before the FCC. It's been there for a year and a half. If there was any kind of urgency about it, the FCC may have acted. They may not. They may never.

So INC is a different animal and they are looking at a variety of things and the

LNPA Working Group is only looking at one. I realize it was a change order. It's

only looking at one and I think the subject matter is off the table for NANC.

MR. KOUTSKY: What other thoughts do we have? Susan.

MS. TIFFANY: Is Cox saying then that they want NPAC taken off of the suggested solutions for this because it might require an IP address?

MS. O'DONNELL: No, I'm saying the LNPA Working Group shouldn't be working on it. INC can work on it. The LNPA Working Group shouldn't be working on it. INC is a totally independent body. If INC comes up with that being the solution, you still have to go through the LNPA Working Group, through NANC, and through the FCC.

But they may not come up with that being the solution and we get back to the same exact point. If that winds up being a solution in this body, we get back to the same exact point and the same exact arguments we had last year about change order 400 that we don't need to have. That's off the table.

MS. TIFFANY: Well that's why I asked you the question because it sounds like you're saying that if they chose the NPAC and it will require an IP address, that you would say that's not appropriate.

MS. O'DONNELL: Yes, I would say that's not appropriate but only when it comes here. I don't have the right to say what INC works on and doesn't work on, what solution they come up with. They may say all four are great and then it comes to a different point, but the LNPA Working Group should not be working on it. The FCC said take it off the table.

MR. KOUTSKY: I guess I kind of wish we could have INC report again as to their timetable. I mean actually I'm more curious as to what extent -- basically the time table the consideration of these options and where you see it falling in.

MR. NEWMAN: Adam Newman, Industry Numbering Committee Vice Chair. As I said, this is INC issue 510. INC under current action item for the NANC was to review and make a technical recommendation for the inner-operability of VRS services.

We have a VoIP subcommittee meeting this week at which we hope to get contributions both on the database solution and the number administration question for VRS services.

Now I cannot predict the outcome of any consensus or lack of consensus in INC on this issue. That said, INC will review and attempt to achieve consensus on a technical recommendation for database solution.

We hope to do that in time for -- well we hope to do that by the end of January, maybe at our early -- we have a meeting at the end of January, early February.

That said, it depends on our ability to develop a consensus around some of these issues as to what the best solution would be and since we do have a team of people as individual companies working on developing this contribution including these scenarios -- but those contributions have not yet been submitted to the subcommittee for us to attempt to achieve consensus on it.

I'm pretty much guessing at this point as to one, whether we're going to have a contribution next week and two, how that consensus discussion might be.

So we might be able to have a recommendation by the end of January, early February. It's our hope to have a consensus recommendation on this now.

INC will review whatever technical solutions are contributed to it including the NPAC based solution, and as I said we expect, because I've seen the draft contributions, the ENUM base solution and the directed DNS solution.

There may be others that are yet to come and we will work on those and hope to come to consensus on a technical recommendation.

That said, INC would not work on the implementing change orders necessary at LNPA Working Group should that be a consensus recommendation that's then approved, all right, and frankly even though I am also an LNPA Working Group member and I'm the liaison between the LNPA Working Group and the Industry Numbering Committee, I purposefully stayed out of the discussion as to whether the LNPA Working Group as a member, we should spend our time on developing requirements for a change order that may never get approved or recommended. I think that's really the issue here, right?

MS. JORDAN: But that's the case with any change order. I mean any change order that's --

MS. O'DONNELL: But this one's different. It really is different or we wouldn't be fighting about it.

MR. KOUTSKY: I think Jerome was first, sorry.

MR. CANDELARIA: Jerome Candelaria, NCTA. The LNPA Working Group has gone in one particular direction when we know there may be other solutions after INC has worked this issue. Don't we have the luxury of time though? There are no pending change orders or no reason why the LNPA Working Group has to fashion this now is there?

MS. JORDAN: No, except that we were requested and the LNPA Working Group agreed, reached consensus, to accept this change order and when we accept a charge order to work it, we work the requirements.

I mean we were asked by the submitting parties at VRS people to look at this as a change order. They wrote a change order, they sent it into us, we reviewed it and it was accepted by the LNPA Working Group to work only to develop the requirements.

Like I said it's not accepted to actually implement -- I mean that's got to go through all the normal processes, which is a very long and drawn out process for any change order.

MR. KOUTSKY: Rosemary.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. Very quickly, I just want to remind everyone at the NANC that the INC is more of a private type of situation where you have to be a member, you have to pay to be a member.

The LNPA Working Group is more of an open working group that has probably double the amount of people that go on it. Just because it's a public anyone can come.

The amount of work that the LNPA Working Group does for this body, for the NANC body every year is extremely significant and because of that we have so many technical people there, some are the same as Adam was alluding to, but a lot of them are very different and I think that as an industry body, if you really look at the fact that this is, you know, VRS, this isn't just like a vendor coming in and asking us to do something for them.

This is an important issue to have two groups under the (unintelligible) not under the NANC but two industry groups working on something that potentially could be, you know, for a common goal I think is fabulous and I definitely don't think from a Sprint and Nextel point of view that we need to stop working on something.

MS. O'DONNELL: Two comments. The one is from a process perspective, just because the LNPA Working Group accepted something, the NANC still

has the oversight role. Of all the working groups as to what they work on and what they don't work on.

And secondly if INC goes this way, in a coupe of months there is an opportunity to work on the work order then. It isn't time sensitive. The release for the NPAC isn't due anytime soon. They just had their release so it isn't time sensitive. I think you can take it off the table at least for a couple months until you know that it's real.

MR. KOUTSKY: Well Martin hasn't spoken on this and then we need to move on.

MR. HAKIM DIN: Martin Hakim Din with Vonage. Just to put this issue in a broader context, I mean I certainly understand your point but about two weeks ago the FCC in this room had an E911 disability access summit and I think that there were a lot of people in the room there that day that would claim that this is an urgent issue that requires immediate attention.

And I certainly was at this meeting when the video relay service folks came in and asked for help and this group accepted the request to find ways to help them and I understand, but I still think that we shouldn't just discard the entire issue.

There's got to be some kind of way that we can figure out a way to engage this issue because I know that this is of concern of the FCC. I know they're very concerned about disabled users having access to 911 and this is directly related to that, and that was the point that I wanted to make.

MR. KOUTSKY: We have one minute seriously because I really want us to move on because we do have other things as well.

MR. MADDOX: Thank you. Mike Maddox with (Unintelligible) Communications. I just wanted to make a point of clarification on the second bullet item

where it indicates that Hands on Communication is an advocate for VRS users. They're in fact a vendor and a provider of video relay service and not an advocate group.

MS. JORDAN:		Okay, they told us they were an advocate group. I'm sorry.

MR. KOUTSKY:		That's a useful clarification. I appreciate it for the record. Anna, and then the other gentleman.

MS. MILLER:	Anna Miller with T-Mobile, and I would just like to know if anyone on the NANC besides Cox objects to the LNPA Working Group moving forward with their change order process.

MS. O'DONNELL:		That's a question for the Chairman to call.

MS. MILLER:	Okay, I'm asking can we --

MR. KOUTSKY:		I'm trying to move on if people would stop talking.

(LAUGHTER)

MR. KOUTSKY:		But with the exception of people who haven't spoken yet. Go ahead.

MR. MAZONI:		Tom Mazoni, Telcordia Technologies. I think it all comes down to it's very nice that different technology organizations in the industry have come to consensus but no industry organization whether it be NANC, ATIS, of whatever, has the right to on its own decide to change the policies that sit at the FCC or Congress.

And right now this is a substantial issue on whether IP and IP services are (unintelligible) or not, and I agree with Cox that it has substantial changes to the type of information that is put into the NPAC, which is basically a charter for porting numbers only, not VoIP routing impairing.

MR. KOUTSKY: You know, the way I'm going to approach this is NANC exists for a reason. We exist because we're a public interest body. We're a federal advisory committee. We have certain responsibilities and certain obligations.

I don't want NANC to be a group that turns away people who might have legitimate requests. I do think that's part of the public obligation that we owe to them.

So I don't think the idea of -- I don't want to be getting in the position of saying that if somebody comes in with a legitimate request, regardless of who they happen to be or who they're affiliated with, I think that was an important clarification, that we give it a fair hearing and a fair opportunity to be listened to.

At the same time there is almost an Aristotelian notion as to can you have two different consensus of the industry. Can you have an INC consensus, which is different than the NANC consensus? I mean, you know, classical scholars would probably say no, that the consensus would have to be the same.

But to a certain extent I mean as NANC works on this question, I do think -- or as the working group works on this question, which I think they should continue to do since it was a valid request, they do need to be aware that there is the significant possibility that one of three other options may be selected as the consensus and that it may not be an NPAC issue.

So I think that becomes a prioritization issue. I don't want to tell people how they should spend their time and their days. It they want to work Sundays on this one that's okay, but just understand that you know when push come to shove and if INC decides that we would prefer to have an ENUM or DNS solution to this issue, that all of a sudden the work on NPAC may need to change.

So I don't want to say that we're not going to address this issue but in dealing with it I want people or I want the working group to understand that this is not necessarily going to be the answer and they should act appropriately.

MS. JORDAN: We do understand that completely.

MR. KOUTSKY: I appreciate that. Okay, next item.

MS. JORDAN: PIM 32 and PIM 50 report I think was sent to you originally earlier this year or May of 2006, right?

Basically this deals with resellers, porting of reseller numbers, and also what we call Customer Service Record Too Large.

There is a report attached that was developed by the LNPA Working Group. Actually a couple of our members did a lot of work on it. One of them was Sue Tiffany.

What we're talking about is resellers. There are certain times when you send a port request to the network service provider, and so you fill out the LSR or you try to fill out the LSR but before you do that you have to get a customer service record.

You put the directory number in and the customer service record comes back and says number not available or number not in our system. When you get that kind of response you don't know if you typed the number in wrong, you don't know if it belonged to somebody else, so you start doing some research.

And in another instance you'll send a number in and the carrier may come back and say this is not our number, it's a reseller number.

Resellers don't have numbers as you all know assigned to them directly so that means the numbers listed in the LERG were under the network service provider so then you've got to start hunting to see who the reseller is.

Some of these ports have taken up to as long as six months to get completed and as the reports says, you know, sometimes the customer gets the disgusted and cancels the port, sometimes they take a new number. Basically what it boils down to is you're inconveniencing the customer.

This doesn't apply to all service providers. A lot of service providers take the port request and it completes in normal time but there are some service providers who don't give you the information or just tell you that it's a reseller. That's the PIM-32 issue.

The PIM-50 issue is a CSR Too Large and that means when you send -- there's certain ways to ask for a CSR, customer service record. There's a certain message that you put in when you're only asking for one directory because if a customer has more then one number, like say they have a 100 numbers, for some service providers if you just put that directory number -- Sue, am I saying this wrong?

MS. TIFFANY: (Off microphone). (Unintelligible) without directory.

MS. JORDAN: Okay. So you're asking for a specific (unintelligible) without the directory, then you're supposed to get back just the information for that directory number.

Not all service providers follow that and that information or those guidelines that indicated that if you put it in there's a directory number without direct -- or TM without directories, that' you're just supposed to get back that number is part of the OBF guidelines.

Not all carriers follow that so what you get back is instead of getting just the information on that directory number, you get in the mail, you get boxes, and boxes of a printout. And sometimes it's ten boxes, sometimes it's five and it's not for a few days.

So we have two issues here. One is on a CSR Too Large we can't determine the information for the directory number so we can't process the port. And the other one is a reseller issue where in some cases we know its a reseller but we don't know who it is. In another case we don't even know its reseller.

So we're looking for guidance from the NANC because at the LNPA Working Group we were not able to reach --

MR. KOUTSKY: Just so people know, I think you've attached the two PIMs. I guess we're regarding all these documents as document 13 even though -- well, let's forget that.

Just for clarification we'll have the thing called status report that's stapled together, that will be document 13. Document 14 is this web service provider thing, it's called LNPA Working Group position on porting a local telephone number used by VoIP service providers. That's document 14. And then the LNPA Working Group report to NANC, PIM 32 and 50 will be document 15.

Okay, document 15, I had a question actually about some of the statistics in here and where they came from. I know the baseline number was from the NRUF but how can you find out that 35 percent of rejects were due to reseller issues and also what is a reseller issue as defined? Yes.

MS. TIFFANY: Sue Tiffany, Sprint Nextel. I was with the team that gathered the information.

The percentages that are used here are -- the wireless carriers work together to come up with the percentages and that's why you see a range. And we worked to refine this but the range and the average came from the wireless carriers meeting together and providing -- sharing with each other how it was affecting their fallouts.

So Verizon wireless may say 35 percent where Sprint Nextel may say 45 percent, so we came up with -- we took that composite range and then did an average.

MR. KOUTSKY: Did you pick a month, a time period for this data?

MS. TIFFANY: We were looking over the first half of this -- the statistics that were in here were from the FCC report from 2005, but the averages, the percentages we used were from the first half of this year.

MR. KOUTSKY: I mean when we start throwing numbers around I think we do need to have a little more information about who is in the numbers, like what carriers are in the numbers. Was it a --

MS. TIFFANY: It was T-Mobile, Cingular --

(END OF AUDIOTAPE 2, SIDE B)

*   *   *   *   *

(START OF AUDIOTAPE 3, SIDE A)

MS. TIFFANY: -- Do the majority of the wireless ports.

MR. KOUTSKY: T-Mobile, Singular, Sprint and Nextel and --

MS. TIFFANY: And Verizon wireless.

MR. KOUTSKY: I was speaking directly for PIM 32 but that was also for PIM 50 as well?

MS. TIFFANY: Exactly the same.

MR. KOUTSKY: With the same data review basically?

MS. TIFFANY: Yes.

MR. KOUTSKY: Was that done under the auspices of the working group or was that done separately?

MS. TIFFANY: No, it was under the working group.

MS. JORDAN: It was a subcommittee, a team of LNPA Working Group representatives which included wireless and wire line.

MS. TIFFANY: Yeah, putting together the report.

MR. KOUTSKY: That answers my questions.

MS. TIFFANY: One of the reason we went to the numbers here is because when you look at inner-mobile porting, overall inner-mobile porting which is wire line, wireless, is a small percentage but when you pair that down and say who is being affected by that small percentage, the numbers were -- you know, when your affecting around 4,000 customers total between the two, a month, and this is nationwide.

MR. KOUTSKY: Just as a point, the use of data I think is an important tool and I think you have to be encouraged. I just think that when we use it we just need to be clear about what the universes were so people can double check that. But I'm glad an effort was made on this. That was my only question about the document but I don't know what people think.

MS. TIFFANY: May I continue?

MR. KOUTSKY: If you have something else.

MS. TIFFANY: Yes, I wanted to kind of add to something that the AT&T representative stated on process.

When you look at the reseller issue, what they're asking for recommendation for is that resellers not be allowed, which is I think the point you were making on process (unintelligible), resellers not be allowed to tell the network provider not to share their information, which is what is happening in some cases.

On the CSR Too Large, there is already a guideline, the (unintelligible) guideline that says that if you use a specific code that is only asking for the TN, that is what the

provider is supposed to receive, but as Paul pointed out in many cases, they're ignoring the guidelines and if you ask for one TN you're going to get whole count no matter what you ask for.

MR. KOUTSKY: Okay, let's try to pick them one at a time. Hank.

MALE SPEAKER: (Off microphone) Hank Hultquist, AT&T, I think what I was really saying was, whatever arrangements the reseller or the voice over IP provider or whoever it has, has with the entity that controls the number in NPAC, that those arrangements can't be a barrier to the completion of the port.

So if they have some arrangement that says if someone requests support of this number please notify me and do such and such, that's fine, as long it doesn't create a barrier to the port.

I don't think we need to be so specific as to say they can't have all kinds of things in their contracts. Just whatever they have in their contracts can't be a barrier to porting.

MR. KOUTSKY: Anna.

MS. MILLER: Anna Miller with T-Mobile. I agree with what AT&T said and I know for T-Mobile specifically, and it's my understanding that for the wireless industry in general, that when we are provisioning our network for services for resellers and DNOs, that our contracts have sections on number portability to fulfill but the portability of obligation.

So I think we just need to make it clear that that's the way it should work and that there is a process to enable that to work.

So I think with the comments that we are discussing, the comments that we went through on the previous request with regard to VoIP, that in going back to the working group and making it clear what the obligation is per the FCC and per the NANC, that will

102

address PIM 32 as well if we do it in a generic sense like you said in terms of customer service provider, and make sure that the obligation is clear and that there is a process to not hinder the port or unreasonably delay the port. So I think that takes care of 32.

With regard to PIM 50, I would like the NANC to maybe reiterate and endorse the OBF guidelines -- OCN guidelines so that we just get the information to port, the telephone number we're trying to port and that we don't get box loads of customer service data on a whole slew of telephone numbers.

MR. KOUTSKY: Do we have other thoughts? I mean I understood that 32 was one that consensus hadn't been able to be achieved in the working group and I think we have an understanding that there's going to be at least some kind of reworking on that document.

I wasn't sure what the dispute on PIM 50 was though. I mean I think before moving on I'd like to at least have an understanding as to why consensus wasn't achieved below, or maybe it has been.

MS. JORDAN: Because the LSOG guidelines that state how you're supposed to implement or how you're supposed to translate for the (unintelligible), just get the directory number is a guideline so there's no enforcement to make them follow those guidelines.

So some carriers may choose to follow those guidelines, and when you put the TN in with no directory then you get back just the information on one directory.

But some carriers have not implemented that so when you put the information in and if it's a number that's in a large group of numbers for a particular customer, they're going to send you everything.

MR. KOUTSKY: So you're saying because it's absent NANC action it's just an LSOG guideline.

MS. JORDAN: Right.

MR. KOATSKY: And with NANC action it's?

MS. JORDAN: Hopefully it will make them follow the LSOG guidelines. That's what we're hoping.

MR. KOUTSKY: Further moral persuasion.

MS. JORDAN: Yes.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Paula does that go into the best practices though?

MS. JODRAN: Yes, we would put in the best practices.

FEMALE SPEAKER: (Off microphone). (Unintelligible) discussion.

MR. KOUTSKY: And I guess the question again was how -- you noted that you were unable to achieve consensus on this point yet I don't see anyone objecting. So I just really want to clarify on this.

MS. JORDAN: Well here's my understanding of what goes on because I've not been to a LSOG meeting. But my understanding is that they agreed -- the people that go to the LSOG agree, but when they go back to their company they don't implement exactly as the LSOG says. They choose to go different direction.

I mean it's the same thing with the validation field. I mean some of the validation fields are optional, some are required, but you can actually implement it any way you want.

MR. KOUTSKY: Oh, yeah, and I realize that.

MS. JORDAN: And I think when you come here you have the same situation. I mean probably everybody here agrees but what happens when you go back to

104

your company and you start looking at what it's going to cost or whatever, and maybe you decide not to implement it that way.

MR. KOUTSKY: What happens in the working group stays in the working group.

We have a public comment. Step over to the microphone, sir.

MALE SPEAKER: Hi, I'm Jeff (Unintelligible) I'm with Embarq.

And actually I don't know if we have a dog in this fight or not honestly, so just right up front say that, but this brings to mind some other issues that have come up in the past.

I think an intermodal-portability for very small carriers who never implemented portability in the first place -- and you mentioned cost and I guess just as an industry member we saw the numbers that were involved. They're not huge.

If the cost is really big then maybe we need to live with it as an industry, as a matter of public policy under cost benefit analysis.

So I guess I'm hoping that maybe that's information that would also come in as I said before, in any recommendations were taken.

FEMALE SPEAKER: When you look at these numbers, these are a month.

MALE SPEAKER: I didn't say there were small numbers. We don't know what the other side of the equation is, right, so if in fact it costs a million dollars, I'm just picking a number out of the air, or two million dollars for some carrier to comply with giving you a specific instead of the boxes, then maybe it's not worth it, maybe we should take the boxes, right? This is a simple cost benefit point.

MR. KOUTSKY: I think Susan was first.

MS. TIFFANY: He is exactly right. The reason we could not come to

consensus in the LNPA Working Group is that this would require system changes for

some carriers to their Legacy systems and they were concerned about the expense, the

cost.

MR. KOUTSKY: And was that cost explored?

MS. JORDAN: We don't discuss cost at the LNPA Working Group.

MS. TIFFANY: Right, this particular issue has been through several

iterations. I mean I could go into great detail about meeting with individual carriers, on,

and on, and on.

As she said, we don't talk costs specifically but the carriers who process is

causing those impediments. Their concern was the expense of changing their Legacy

systems.

MS. JORDAN: PIM 32 was brought to the LNPA Working Group on

2/27/04 and PIM 50 was brought to the LNPA Working Group on January 17, 2005.

MR. KOUTSKY: Anna, quickly.

MS. MILLER: Anna Miller, T-Mobile. I just have one final comment. Congress

and the FCC implemented numbering portability to remove a barrier, to make it easy for

customers and consumers to change service providers and keep their telephone number.

If you want to talk about cost, the industry spent billions of dollars implementing

that capability and through the LNPA Working Group we go through process

improvement to try to fulfill the goal of making it easy for consumers to change service

providers so in my mind we have the obligation not to hinder the porting process.

This hinders the porting process, and we've all spent a lot of money implementing

this and I know how many millions of dollars it cost T-Mobile to support this every year.

So I'm for moving forward with best practices that support the goal of member portability.

MR. KOUTSKY: Okay, one more.

MALE SPEAKER: Well sort of on that point, the point is not perfection and we need to get as good as we can get within the range of affordability.

And the court of appeals actually said we're not going to have perfect intermodal portability because in some rural areas we don't have number portability at all.

That's according to the rules and that's why intermodal portability was actually blocked under another statute of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

The point is the basic cost and benefit analysis still applies. We don't need to get perfection if it's too costly and I would hope that NANC would take that into account before it started trying to force companies to do things that maybe aren't in the public interest.

MR. KOUTSKY: Okay, I think we're done on this one. I mean we've already -- Anna, unless you just have a debating point or --

MS. MILLER: No, I guess my only comment to that is carriers always have the option of filing for waivers and obtaining waivers and they have, so I don't know if that's what the gentleman's referring to or not.

MR. KOUTSKY: Well I think he's referring to the fact that number portability doesn't apply to everyone, to every carrier under the law.

MS. MILLER: And I agree with that.

MR. KOUTSKY: And so to a certain extent I think the best practices do need to accommodate or to at least recognize that fact and that we don't hold people out as not

complying with the law or not complying with best practices when they're actually in full compliance with the law.

I believe we had actually talked about the resolution of PIM 32 in terms of having that go back in the context of VoIP, right? We were talking about doing that generally so in one sense we're sending that one back.

In 50 the CSR Too Large errors, does strike me as a little different. I'm not sure. I still don't really understand why consensus wasn't achieved on 50 honestly.

FEMALE SPEAKER: (Off microphone). (Unintelligible)

MR. KOUTSKY: Okay, does anybody else have any further discussion on this? Sure, go ahead, Al.

MALE SPEAKER: (Off microphone). (Unintelligible) 4,000 intermodal ports that fail per month. Are those failures which are because of incorrect data, too much data, that when corrected and resubmitted go through successfully, or are they just going to fail every time you put them in?

MS. JORDAN: Some fail once on the CSR -- I mean it really depends on -- I mean sometimes they fail once. I mean I've had some that it's taken me six months to get done.

So, you know, it depends on -- you have to do a lot of research on the reseller to find out who the reseller is. Once you get that information, generally you can fill out the request so that it will go through.

On the CSR Too Large you have to wait for the box to come in with all of the information and sometimes like I said it's been as many as 20 boxes.

MALE SPEAKER: But once you have the boxes --

FEMALE SPEAKER: Paul, if you look at the second figure, which says -- and it depends on which one you're looking at, but the 17,044, times 45 percent, that's the number that fall out. The bottom line figures are the numbers that fail and that the customer either gave up or took a new number.

MS. JORDAN: So it never went through.

MR. KOUTSKY: I want one further question on PIM 50. In terms of seeking guidance from NANC to proceed, what would be the next step from the working group? I mean you're asking us for guidance. What guidance are you requesting specifically? You may need to be more specific then that.

MS. JORDAN: Well basically I mean you've given us the answer for 32 and I think what some of the -- and I'll look to see to make sure I'm saying this right, I think what some of the carriers were looking for as what process or what do we need to do to get -- we're looking for you to tell us resolve that issue.

I mean do we enforce -- do we state that they follow the (unintelligible) guidelines because we at the LNAP Working Group have not been able to enforce that.

MR, KOUTSKY: Okay, that's the only request, as to whether NANC thinks that the LSOG guidelines should be followed. Is that the only guidance?

MS. JORDAN: Unless someone else in the room has a different solution.

MR. KOUTSKY: Are there any objections to that? Okay, without saying any objections to that, the guidance on 50 is follow the LSOG guidelines, and 32 and the VoIP thing are what they were.

All right, you're done.

MS. JORDAN: Okay. Thank you. If you have any questions on the PIMs just let me know. I'll be here for a while.

MR. KOUTSKY: Okay, thank you. I appreciate you taking the time. Luckily we have the time.

Do we want to do NOWG? We can do that relatively quickly.

H.   Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG) Report. Natalie McNamer, T-Mobile, presented the report to the NANC.

MS. MCNAMER: This should be quick because most of the presentation was covered in other committees. I'm Natalie McNamer with T-Mobile. I am a co-chair with the Numbering Oversight Working Group along with Rosemary Emmer and Karen Riepenkroger both of Sprint Nextel.

Today we're going to cover our NOWG members, the mission and responsibilities, NANPA and PA 2006 performance surveys, change orders, NOWG co-chair elections, and the NOWG meeting schedule.

On page three we list out the current active members of the NOWG for your reference. Page four goes over the NOWG's mission and responsibilities.

The NOWG oversees the NANPA and PA to insure compliance with the technical requirements, industry guidelines, FCC and state regulatory directives.

We prepare two annual performance reports, one for the PA and one for the NANPA based on the results compiled from the annual performance surveys that we send out to the industry and to the states, annual operation reviews that we conduct each year and NOWG observations from monthly meetings that we have with each of the administrators.

The NOWG received various directives assigned by the NANC for analysis and recommendation and we report back to the NANC on those items. We review and

prepare a recommendation to the FCC for all the change orders submitted by the NANPA and the PA.

On the next page, the 2005 NANPA and the PA performance reports were distributed and approved via e-mail by the NANC in June, and we submitted the final reports to the FCC on June 23rd.

Page six, the 2006 performance evaluations. The NOWG reviewed the performance surveys from last year and made quite a few modifications and did some streamlining to the surveys.

We distributed the draft surveys to the NANPA an PA for comments. Now we are submitting the surveys to the NANC for comments and approval. We are hoping to receive the approval on the surveys back by December 15th and those would go out in the beginning of January and are sent to the NX exploder list from the NANPA and the PA, and they're put on the NANC chair website with a cover letter that's signed by the chairman.

Page seven, we just went through our proposed schedule. In the beginning of January we would send the surveys out with a due date of February 28th. Usually each year we end up extending the deadline based on the number of surveys that are received, so hopefully this year we won't have to do that but I did want to note that we would probably extend it a little bit.

In March we usually do the NANPA operational review in Sterling, Virginia. In April we would go to the PA offices in Concord for their operations reviews. Also the NOWG meets for two and a half days in Denver in April to actually compile all of the information for the reports.

In May we plan on meeting with the FCC, the NANPA, and the PA in Washington, D.C. to review the preliminary results, and then in June we plan on presenting the final performance reports to the NANC.

MR. KOUTSKY: Before you move on. Beth.

MS. O'DONNELL: Beth O'Donnell, Cox Communications. In what I'm sure is no reflection how

T-Mobile feels about me, you left Cox off of the NOWG membership list.

(**LAUGHTER)**

MS. MCNAMER: I didn't put this together but you reviewed this.

MS. O'DONNELL: I know. I saw Communications and I thought oh, there it is. You can see unintelligible).

MALE SPEAEKR: We will resubmit document 16.

MALE SPEAKER: It's because you never speak up.

Ms. MCNAMER: We will resubmit this for Debbie to --

MR. KOUTSKY: That's fine.   And this is actually document 16, Debbie? Okay.

MS. MCNAMER: Now I'm just going to quickly go through the change orders. As you've heard about them by the PA and NANPA and INC already today, the first change order we've reviewed is change order number six, which was in response to INC issue 517, which is NANPA to deny the NXX assignments to a service provider that has opted in the pooling in the voluntary rate center. NOWG reviewed and submitted its recommendation for approval to the FCC on July 20th.

Change order number seven was submitted to the FCC on 9-25 by the NANPA and that is for the 900 NXX assignment guideline changes. The NOWG submitted their recommendation for approval to the FCC on October 3rd.

PA change order 46, the change order was received on September 15th. This is the change order that goes along with the NANPA change order number six for the NANPA to deny requests for NXX assignments in pooling rate centers that the carrier has opted in the pooling. It was recommended for approval and it was sent to the FCC on September 21st.

PA change order 47 was submitted by the PA on 10-10. This is for INC issue 516 to add additional fields to the part four form to make it more consistent with the NANPA part four form. The NOWG recommended this be approved and that was sent to the FCC on October 17th.

PA change order 48 was submitted on 10-13. This was in response to the FCC letter regarding the pANI administration and the letter was dated September 8th. The NOWG recommended this be approved and that was sent to the FCC on October 23rd.

Slide 13 has to do with the NOWG co-chair positions for 2007. Two of the three co-chairs positions were up for reelection for starting in January. Rosemary Emmer was a one year term and Karen Riepenkroger is just finishing a two year term.

The NOWG reached consensus to continue to have the three co-chairs and have all positions be two year positions. Nominations were accepted. Paula Hustead with Windstream was nominated for one of the positions and Karen Riepenkroger was nominated to continue her current role as a co-chair. Rosemary Emmer decided not to throw her hat in again. No other nominations were presented so Paula and Karen were named to the respective roles by acclamation in September, to begin in January.

The NOWG would also like to thank Rosemary Emmer for all of her hard work and dedication to the group that she has shown as co-chair in the last few years. It's all greatly appreciated.

Last slide is just a meeting schedule.

MS. KOUTSKY: And I'll reiterate that Rosemary will not have retired from oversight issues. She'll just be on the sidelines for a little bit. But no, her efforts are greatly appreciated. Don.

MR. GRAY: Don Gray, Nebraska. Question for you Natalie, back on charge order 46, am I reading this correctly that if a company had multiple OCNs and one of the OCNs had never opted into or used a block, they could come in for a full code, where the other part of the company with an OCN that had been pooled would be required to continue in a pooling capability?

MS. MCNAMER: Usually a company would only have one OCN in a rate center so I'll refer that to the INC. Are they still here? Okay, John Manning's here.

(LAUGHTER)

MR. MANNING: John Manning with NANPA. To respond to your question, everything is driven off of the OCN -- and that's how we're getting the information from the pool administrator based upon OCN.

MALE SPEAKER: (Off microphone) (Unintelligible) a merger and acquisition company might have more then one OCN.

MR. KOUTSKY: Okay, now we have to talk about the survey?

MS. MCNAMER: Yes. The NOWG has listed that there's three action items for the NANC. We did the first one, which was the submission of the 2005 performance reports.

MR. KOUTSKY: Yes.

MS. MCNAMER: The second one is -- I don't know if you want to approve them today or if you want to allow --

MR. KOUTSKY: Well, I want just kind of show it to people. Since we just got it today I don't think we can really approve it.

But the document is called 2000 Block Holders from the -- we'll call this document 17 in the record. This is basically the draft survey that we're going to force everybody to fill out. But I want people to look at that survey. Are there significant changes from prior surveys at all?

MS. MCNAMER: Yes. I mean we reduced the number in some cases of questions and we've changed some of the questions.

MR. KOUTSKY: Okay, so I'll alert people of the fact that it's not the same old survey necessarily. If people could look at it, we do obviously need to get this out in order to get the process out. I'm going to ask people to get feedback to me by December 15th and I would cc Natalie and the other NOWG co-chairs on feedback. Yes, Rosemary. Don't cc Rosemary, she's no longer a co-chair.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. Thank you, Chairman.

(LAUGHTER)

I like to hear that actually. Anyway I just want everyone to know that when you're looking at it, on the first page the satisfaction rating, how we actually rate the PA and NANPA, we are not changing those at all.

So if you don't like our language or whatever, we can take it into consideration for next year but we definitely don't want to change any of that. If you remember, we

changed a little bit or tweaked it last year and we don't want to have to tweak that from year to year. Thank you.

MR. KOUTSKY: Okay. So people have input on pages one to two and four to eight. That would be great. But please take a look at it and I'd like responses by December 15th. I'll send out probably a couple of tickler e-mails to the list, as many e-mails as I have. I'll probably ask Debbie to do it as well.

And then if we don't have any really significant substantive objections to the way these are drafted or can't achieve you know redrafting by then, you know, I'll just deem them approved on the 15th and then get the NOWG in the process of distributing them if that's okay with everybody. Thanks.

MS. MCNAMER: I'm not sure what the protocol is. Does the NANC have to approve the new co-chairs or is it just --

MR. KOUTSKY: Technically yes, probably, but are there any objections on the co-chair selections? I can't imagine. Okay, congratulations new co-chairs. Congratulations, Rosemary.

MS. EMMER: Thank you.

(LAUGHTER)

MR. KOUTSKY: See we always get back on track. Yes.

SPEAKER: (Off microphone.) (Unintelligible).

MR. KOUTSKY: We're about to take a break. Can I clarify that with you? I had the Thousands-Block Folders, the draft survey, as 17. Oh, you're right. I had marked (unintelligible). I'm sorry. So the pooling is 17 and the NANPA is -- Rosemary.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. I'm sorry, Debbie. I take full responsibility for the fact that I was hoping no one would notice that one of the survey

cover letters isn't particularly correct. Didn't realize it, gave it to my admin, she had it copied, didn't think about, didn't look at it. I'll make sure you get the right one, number one.

Number two, well when you open these up on (unintelligible), one survey cover letter is green and one survey cover letter is red, but when we copied them I forgot and so we didn't put them in color and so they look exactly alike. You have to actually look to see if it's NANPA or PA on the top. It's quite confusing. Thank you.

MR. KOUTSKY: That said we'll make NANPA number 17 and PA number 18.

We were going to do the FoN group. We're 15 minutes behind. Without objection I think we just take a break and have FoN do it then. Is that all right with the FoN presenters? Okay, we're coming back at 2:50 p.m., which means you can come back at three o'clock.

(BREAK)

I.   Future of Numbering Working Group (FoN WG). Jim Castagna, Verizon presented the report to the NANC.

MR. KOUTSKY: Okay. The Future of Numbering Working Group. Jim.

MR. CASTAGNA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Jim Castagna with Verizon, and I share the position of co-chair with John Cummings from Vonage and Don Gray from Nebraska Public Service Commission.

Today's report is going to be as brief as possible since essentially what we have is just an overview of what our progress is on our Future of Numbering report as well as some of the work that we intend to begin in the following months.

So on slide two, which is on page one, actually is a report summary. We have the project tracking matrix, a revised mission scope for your review, a description of FoN participation, meeting progress and activities, a summary and a meeting schedule.

So if we move over to slide three on page one, you can see that we've tackled some other challenging studies. In 2005 we looked at the change orders 399 and 400, and also the VoIP number assignment criteria.

So we are pretty much a group that's up to speed with technology, and over the past few months we've really taken some great strides, which I'll explain in a second.

We go to slide four, our mission and scope was slightly modified and we're asking the NANC at this meeting to endorse this modification.

In slide four we have some bold italic text that says in cooperation with other industry forums, committees as appropriate. Just to recognize that we do and expect to continue to work with other groups to pursue our goals and objectives. So if anyone has any questions about that modification maybe you could ask them now.

Okay, thank you.

MR. KOUTSKY: Wait, we do have a question.

MR. CASTAGNA: I'm sorry.

MR. JACKSON: Courtney Jackson from the Office of Utilities Regulation in Jamaica. Perhaps it's too early in the course of your covering of your presentation but I was specifically interested in the ENUM trials and the different working groups that are involved in the implementation. I was wondering if you had a plan to practically be involved in the ENUM trials.

MR. CASTAGNA: Well we don't have any plans to participate or be involved in the ENUM trials although there is an opportunity to discuss ENUM technology and its

potential impact on a number of resources or use of NANP resources, and as a matter of fact I believe that's one of our study categories, which I'll cover later on.

MR. JACKSON: Thank you.

MR. CASTAGNA: Thank you for that question. Regarding FoN participation on slide five, we met every two to three weeks. Typically we had 24 to 28 participants and on November 8th we had 26 participants and essentially that was the group of individuals that contributed to creating a profile, which is I believe on slide six.

As you can see there are some companies that listed themselves as being in several industry segments. We had four regulators, a vendor, several wire line, wireless, and VoIP providers as well as a cable company and also some administrators and associations.

You can see we had representation from four associations so the draw on these monthly, actually bimonthly meetings is very high and participation I expect will continue at that level.

It seems as though since the mission scope is pretty broad at this point, that there is a lot of interest in discussing issues and identifying items that require further analysis or attention by this working group in the NANC.

To that extent we've prepared a report outline early on, and in slide seven you can see section one is, Understand the Potential Futures.

Those are what we refer to as study categories. The first is nomadic mobile society, the second is new future services, the third, device capabilities and use, the fourth is regulation, fifth is allocation alternatives, and sixth is TN related database routing needs and that's probably where we would pursue discussion on e-mail, and DNS, and other types of IP database solutions if I could use that term.

If we go to slide eight, we could see that the second and third portion of our report would address envisioning the future and recommendations, and that's where we would actually identify the benefits of any potential changes to the allocation and administration of TNs as a result of our work in section one, and also we would identify who's warranting further monitoring and study or analysis.

And section three would be where we would address transitioning to the preferred future, maybe timelines, changes to standards and practices would be identified, and maybe some suggested changes to state regulations would be identified as well. So that was our baseline report outline.

So the first objective was to start on section one and we recognize that if you look at slide nine, that there are new uses of TNs with some new services that have become recently available that would likely significantly impact the NANP.

So we decided to first focus on new and future services, which is study category two shown in bold on slide nine.

Now if you turn the page, what we did do in investigating new and future services was we also looked into some of the other future of numbering reports that were developed and prepared by our friends in Europe.

So during that review we became more aware of situations being experienced in other areas of the world and we became also more familiar with the habits and the influences that technology and new services may have on telephone numbering resources.

So the next three slides describe some of those things that we identified when reviewing that information. The first slide of those three, slide ten, identifies some end user habits and influences.

For example, mobile numbers are stored more often then fixed numbers which are remembered, and you could associate that with your own mobile phone where you store numbers in there and you might have a name associated with it so the telephone number becomes more of a secondary address where the name becomes more of your primary identifier for reaching someone.

What a TN tells us about the destination, I mean, you know, today the locality, if you're looking for a potential supplier you might look at the area code or the NXX to see how close that supplier would be. You might also use the telephone number to identify the time of day.

So there are other things about end user habits and influences, including the fact that a fixed device may be more of a communal phone where as a mobile nomadic device is more of a personal phone.

So those are the end user habits and influences we became aware of and there are also other aspects of technology and services that became known to us, including new addressing schemes, and the options for those schemes, and the influences those schemes may have on the end consumption.

For example, you could have an IP address represented by a phone number so that needless to say you wouldn't necessarily need to know an IP address to communicate with someone via IP because the phone number could be used to identify an IP address. You could use a domain names or phrases and have them mapped to IP addresses.

So it could be SRV which is like an e-mail address that could actually be used to reach somebody even though, you know, you don't use their phone number to reach them. The phone number could be part of that addressing or routing scheme depending upon, you know, if you use it in the database.

ENUM, you know, could store a litany of addresses that depending upon in a multitude of services, depending upon how or what you were trying to do, would be able to route your call to the proper device even by dialing just one phone number.

So there are private naming addressing schemes like Skype and MySpace names and all of these things became very familiar to the Future of the Numbering Working Group so that we could really understand what the new environment is because you have to understand what the new environment is to really understand what the future may hold.

As far as technology as enablers or influences, you know, one of the more impressive things that we've investigated was next generation network development such as ENUM and IMS. We haven't pursued ENUM as much as IMS but we did have the benefit of a presentation by Telcordia Technologies IMS which was very helpful, and as a matter of fact it's up on the website under the FoN working group stack of documents.

So we really did pursue both end user services and technology in terms of the future of numbering so I feel pretty comfortable that this group is up-skilled in that respect.

One of the things that the FoN is interested in doing is going to a new study category, primarily regulation. If you look at slide 13 during our discussion of new and future services we kind of covered items one through three, although I am sure there are areas in items one and three that we have yet to cover if we looked at those study categories separately.

But there is this strong interest in going to study category number four, which is regulation, so if we turn the page to slide 14, it reflects the preliminary discussion that we had on regulation and essentially those four bullets describe some of those preliminary discussions.

User perceptions and the current use of TNs relative to existing regulation; potential impacts on the contemporary use of TNs and users, the relationship to the delivery of new services technology and competition, and other models for the allocation of numbering resources, example given, comments versus property rights model.

So these areas with respect to regulation are of interest to the Future of Numbering Working Group, and what we're proposing in slide 15 is basically a summary of the purpose of this report -- is to ask NANC to endorse and update the updated version of the mission and scope, and also to recognize that the Future of Numbering Working Group.

It intends to summarize its findings with respect to its research on the new and future services study category and also develop a work plan for the remaining areas of study.

The only other slide in the presentation I believe is our meeting schedule and it's an open meeting of course and everybody's welcome to join. And we're going to meet next December 13th, and the time escapes me but I'm thinking about two o'clock. I'm not sure. Does anybody remember? 11:30 a.m.? Thank you.

MR. KOUTSKY: Question over here.

MALE SPEAKER: (Off microphone). (Unintelligible) from the OUR in Jamaica. On your slide 14, particularly as it relates to regulation, there was an issue that I think has been for the NANC for some time and it has to do with the cross border use of numbering resources.

For example, you have numbers that have been allocated within the United States that find their way to various countries all over the world and I think this is a very (unintelligible) to regulate your issue that needs to get some focus.

It will impact this cross border numbering resources migration you might say on international settlements and the significant amounts of monies that are involved in the whole international settlement regime are of great importance in many countries, particularly where you have the incoming traffic in a multiple of the domestic outgoing traffic, and involves a significant amount foreign (unintelligible) for some small (unintelligible) particularly.

So I think this is something that we should give some importance, an agenda of issues to address. Thank you.

MR. CASTAGNA: I will add it as a discussion item. Thank you.

MR. KOUTSKY: That's a legitimate point. Do we have other questions? Commissioner Jones?

COMMISSIONER JONES: Jim, I just have one question. Your last bullet under regulation, when you say other models for the allocation of numbering resources, I think I made the point today to my friends in the VoIP industry that they don't own the numbers, it's not a property right, it's a --

(END OF SIDE A, START OF SIDE B)

COMMISSIONER JONES: -- Under certain terms and conditions, which I would think is more of a commons model. What are you thinking of? What's a property rights model and what sorts of things will you be looking at there, and what other reference cases are you looking at?

MR. CASTAGNA: I believe probably it would be best if I recognize that we do have a contribution that has yet to be distributed.

And I spoke to the contributor and I suggested that we wait until after this week because there is a flurry of reports and travel to the NANC meeting and people not seeing

e-mail so -- but we do have a contribution from Moni Country Afta, J. Carpenter, and it talks about the scenario where telephone numbers become not a commons but that the assignee of the number has property rights of that number, that there could be a market that would provide benefits to NANP number resource optimization or to the economy.

And I did skim through the contribution so I don't think I could represent what the purpose or the benefits are of those different models at this point, but I just wanted to identify that there is a contribution and I think that's probably the paper we need to read to really understand what is meant by that particular bullet.

MR. KOUTSKY: And I would just point out, that would be the type of thing that you would kind of include in this work plan?

MR. CASTAGNA: Yes. The important thing is that the mission and scope is rather broad. If you notice on the tracking matrix we really don't have a due date for our report.

And one of the things we need to do in developing our work plan is to kind of reassess what areas require or warrant analysis and try to get some focus on those particular areas based upon the needs of the NANC, based upon the needs of the NANP, and based upon the interest or the potential interest of particular items brought to the Future Numbering Working Group by its participants.

So one of the things we want to try to do now that we're up-skilled on technology, and services, and the environment is try to get some focus on particular areas that we believe warrant further analysis and report. So any direction from the NANC would be helpful.

MR. KOUTSKY: Don.

MR. GRAY: Don Gray, Nebraska. I just want to reinforce what Jim is saying there.

One of the concerns as a member of the FoN and as one of the co-chairs of the FoN that we've shared amongst each other is we've been in existence for a couple years, three years, doing what we're doing right now and the question might be asked where's your tangible results, what have you done?

And that's why we had the first slide in there saying oh, did you remember the Department of Navy request, ding, ding, ding, ding. We've been doing those and that kind of interrupted our future of numbering.

But as we looked at that again we felt perhaps what we need to do is take the report outline that Jim and others put together and say okay, let's try to put a book stop on this and say all right, here's technology as we understand it today, here's a report.

Next issue, how does this technology impact numbering resources utilization, expenditure, exhaust? Book mark that in a report and then based upon these two factors, here's recommendations that we think we ought to pursue, studies of changes enhancements, whatever regulations, and submit that as a report then to NANC to get direction, that yeah we probably should look at this area in more detail, go forth and examine in more detail and bring us back another report.

MR. KOUTSKY: And I guess I'd just like to point out, the serial aspect to this I think is particularly attractive because one step leads to the other.

And I know I had made a statement that we can talk about the term regulation broadly but it doesn't really mean much as a word in this context because I think of it more in terms of the current allocation regime or accessing regime I think is a better way of thinking about it as opposed to the particular rules, or regulations, or policies.

126

I think it's just more along the lines as to what extent is the current methodologies interfacing with the way these new technologies are operating and providing services, and customer are utilizing those new technologies in a way that might not have been foreseen at the time the existing processes were put in place.

And so I ask that you guys come back and be a little more specific about the work plan in terms of when you say regulation, be more specific about saying -- again like the point that was raised about cross border use of numbering. I think that's a very particular and interesting point and it's a specific point. It's one that we can think of and put our hands around and deal with these questions serially.

Does anybody have other thoughts on the particular ideas like Courtney had about what to include in this type of work plan?

MR. CASTAGNA: Of course you could reach the co-chairs via e-mail if you have any suggestions and we will discuss and entertain them during our next several meetings.

MR. KOUTSKY: All right we will check that off. Thanks a lot, Jim.

MR. CASTAGNA: You're welcome.

MR. KOUTSKY: We don't have any special presentations today.

J.   List of NANC Accomplishments. The NANC members reviewed the List of NANC Accomplishments.

K.   Public Participation. None

Let's see, update list of NANC accomplishments. Debbie, do you have --

FEMALE SPEAKER: Off microphone. (Unintelligible).

MR. KOUTSKY: So if people have anything to add to it, e-mail us and we'll make sure it gets put in the record.

Well the last document I didn't give it, so document 19 is the NANC FoN, Future of Numbering Working Group. So this would be 20.

L.   Summary of Action Items.

Okay, summary of action items. I only have a few unless people have others. The one action item, the most recent actually is again the completion of the surveys. If people can get their feedback back to us on the surveys, both the PA and the NANPA surveys, and I will be sending those things out.

I have an action item myself on INC issue 407, but also INC was going to at least try to provide some kind of higher level, I won't say quantification but just an idea about it. I will find out the status about that. We will either do that through -- try that orally or through a letter possibly.

Another action item for myself was to make sure that the pANI timeline gets put into the document request.

The pANI IMG is going to be exploring ESQKs versus ESRKs with respect to both the permanent and the interim administration of pANI resources. And I think that's something that's probably better done sooner rather than later so I'll just kind of point that out.

Let me characterize this correctly. This was the LNP discussion we had about PIM 32, and also I guess this is called the position paper on VoIP service provider porting which I think the decision there was to have the LNPA Working Group go back and at least try to re-look at this paragraph in the VoIP service provider document to see if that can also accommodate number 32 as well.

We've gotten limited guidance on PIM 50 with regard to LSOG applicability. That's not really an action item so much but I guess it allows them to continue to act.

What else did we have? The people are invited to participate in the election of the Billing and Collection Working group co-chairs. So that's something -- I want to remind people to make sure we get sufficient participation on that. I think that's it in terms of specific action items. Yes, did I miss some?

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka from Qwest. I think the other one was getting back the feedback too by December 15th on the letter for the PA survey.

MR. KOUTSKY: Yes, exactly. I tried to mention that first, but please get feedback on the surveys, both of them, both surveys to me in the next two weeks and don't cc Rosemary on those. Did you miss an action for yourself?

MALE SPEAKER: Well I think it was actually for you, which was to forward the pANI recommendations to the Industry Numbering Committee for us to develop final guidelines.

MR. KOUTSKY: Good point. Yes, I will forward the pANI recommendations to INC for their consideration with dispatch.

Okay, this is perhaps a little bit out of order. I might have redone this. Now we're supposed to be doing public comments and participation before new business.

So we do have people in the public. If people have ideas, or thoughts, or new business, this is now your opportunity. We try to limit it to five minutes if at all possible so if anybody in the public has anything that we haven't addressed before we go on to our own new business. Anyone?

Okay, new business or other business. I know we had a couple. So Rebecca, I think she had one.

MS. BEATON: Rebecca Beaton, Washington State Commission. I had an action item to INC and that was to implement a guideline change for the COCAG and TBPAG to address the resource request by one company under multiple OCNs.

There is nothing in the NAPA or PA, or actually the NAPA or the PA don't have authority to deny such requests for a company that comes in asking for resources under multiple OCNs under one main company is what I'm looking at.

MR. KOUTSKY: Okay. Who else is familiar with this? I'm trying to figure out a good (unintelligible) for it.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Would that be a study under one of the work groups or --

MR. KOUTSKY: That's what I'm trying to find out, maybe if we can elaborate a little bit further on it maybe -- Rosemary seemed to have an idea.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer from Sprint Nextel. I just confused. Were you saying that that was an action item and you didn't know where it was going to go, or was this something that you were just bringing in. I just don't understand, I'm sorry.

MS. BEATON: I would like this addressed either by a work group to a recommendation to INC to address the guidelines or to incorporate a new line item in the guidelines. I'm not sure of the process. It may need to be studied by one of the work groups and I'm not sure which work group it would go to.

MS. EMMER: Did you already go to the INC and ask them to look at it or ask a carrier to take it into the INC?

MS. BEATON: No, I have not.

MS. EMMER: And are both of those documents that you're talking about underneath I guess at least ATIS or underneath INC?

MS. BEATON: Yes.

MS. EMMER: Both are underneath INC?

MS. BEATON: Yes.

MALE SPEAKER: Off microphone). (Unintelligible).

MS. BEATON: To restate the issue.

MR. KOUTSKY: Yes, that would be good.

MS. BEATON: There are multiple OCNs under a single company name
and the states are seeing requests for multiple OCNs and multiple rate centers under one
company. This is an issue that -- NAPA and the PA do not have the right to deny
resource requests so I would like to see a work group or an INC issue addressed to -- am I
making sense here?

MS. EMMER: Are the OCNs in the same rate center under one company, is that
what you're saying?

MS. BEATON: Yes.

MS. EMMER: I guess for discussion purposes it would be best to talk about it at
the INC as opposed to -- I mean it is kind of policy versus numbering but I think it would
probably get to a technical extent that discussion, so it would probably be best to bring
that to the INC. I don't know if it would be a NANC request but a carrier could -- or you
could bring it.

MR. KOUTSKY: Yeah, I guess the question is, is that INC is a carrier group,
not necessarily a group that includes public interest participation. No offense to INC but
I just think INC has a different membership composition that's all.

MR. NEWMAN: Adam Newman, ATIS Industry Numbering Committee
Vice Chair, INC. There are a couple of options to have the concern addressed and one is

for an individual in coordination with an INC member to submit an issue to request the change. So for example could work with a service provider or another INC member to bring in the issue.

Another option would be for NANC to reach consensus on a recommendation, all right, and ask INC to try to accommodate that recommendation into its guidelines via an action item to INC and INC would do it that way. I think those are the two primary ways it could be done. What was that, Martin?

MALE SPEAKER: Well the action item, you're right, I would say if they do go the action item route they could then send an e-mail, which we treat as an incoming correspondence from a committee perspective.

So those I think are the two main options. I mean I do think there are technical issues that need to be overcome, how to identify a parent company, OCN companies that may be differently named for one.

MR. KOUTSKY: And a question for the floor, if we were to keep this in NANC at first, my understanding is I don't think there's any particular existing working group that would necessarily have particular expertise in this area so we'd be talking a =bout creating an IMG, is that correct? I see nods. I mean it could be under NOWG but I think that's a bit of a stretch.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Not under NOWG.

MR. KOUTSKY: A very big stretch. Myself I think -- again I go back to what I said before, NANC exists for a reason. NANC exists because it has the public interest participation in it and I think that people shouldn't have to convince a carrier first before they get paid attention to.

So I think what we could Rebecca afterwards, maybe if you could figure out a way to put this request down in writing or something, into a letter, and then I think I will pick up and you basically have volunteered to be part of an IMG you realize. I think that's probably the best way of handling it unless there are objections. Anna.

MS. MILLER: Anna Miller, T-Mobile. I guess I just heard from two ways to handle it at INC and I don't know it seems to me that that would be a better starting point than an IMG, then creating an IMG.

MR. KOUTSKY: I just don't think that somebody should have to convince a carrier to support them before we start looking at the issue.

MR. WALLEY: Mike Walley with Qwest. I'll volunteer to work with Rebecca to identify this as -- and turn it into a statement that we can take into INC so that the INC can assess both the policy and the technical aspects of it, and then bring the policy portion back to the NANC maybe either as a recommendation or in the form of a question and then work the technical issue at INC. And I'll be glad to assist you in formulating that if you'd like and helping you get that taken in to the INC.

MR. KOUTSKY: Commissioner Jones had a question, or is that just for Washington in general?

COMMISSIONER JONES: No, I was trying to sing along with a tune.

(LAUGHTER)

MS. BEATON: That was for me. I'm quite willing to -- it appears that Qwest has volunteered to take it up at the INC and then at that point we would bring it back to NANC, and I'm quite willing to head that endeavor up to bring it back to NANC, the policy portion of that.

MR. KOUTSKY: Okay, it's your request so it's your decision. I just wanted to make sure that this door is open.

MS. BEATON: Thank you.

MR. KOUTSKY: Do we have others? I actually do have one item I'd like to talk about a little bit. But I want to go last. Jerome, you had something or --

MALE SPEAKER: (Off microphone). (Unintelligible) fundamentally it brings us to NANC with a policy question, perhaps the FCC, with whether it's appropriate -- whether there are circumstances where it is appropriate for a company to operate with two OCNs.

In other words, I assume INC won't assume that this is not something that's allowed, and then to go forward and try addressing it from that position.

MR. KOUTSKY: Okay, understood. Hearing no others, there's one thing that literally just kind of came across my desk a couple of days ago that I wanted to utilize more, because no working groups had a chance to look at it.

One of the functions of NANC is kind of ongoing neutrality responsibilities that we have. And this actually wasn't included in the NOWG reports but I refer matters to the NOWG which are notices of certain investments into NeuStar and also NeuStar business activities.

And I'm only talking about this because we're having a meeting now, but I received a notice two days about the acquisition of a company called Follow APT by NeuStar, which is a mobile SMS service company that's overseas.

I'm kind of using this as an example of the type of work that I think is important to us under the rules, that we do have an obligation to at least think about the impact on neutrality as a result of these types of transaction.

I don't want to prejudge anything about what this transaction is. I am referring it to the NOWG and I have copies of the notice that was provided.

I refer all of these to the NOWG but this one is the first one in terms of an acquisition, and again I have no reason to think that there's anything not above board with regard to this but I just want to alert members to that, and if they any questions in particular about it, that I do have information about it and then maybe in the next meeting or two, you know, we might have further information based on that.

I'm bringing this up. I've gotten a few questions and inquiries from people. I know this kind of popped up and so I'm just going to -- rather then putting someone on the spot I'll put myself on the spot and say I'm just going to refer to the NOWG.

MS. MILLER: Anna Miller, T-Mobile. I don't know, I guess this is too new for anyone to make any conclusions but to the extent that it's a complicated neutrality review, at one time the NANC did have a legal group, a legal committee that looked at legal type issues.

I don't know if it's in that realm but maybe -- I guess what I'm wondering, at some point if what we're talking about is a corporate structure and, you know, the neutrality requirement of FCC orders and what legally the organization looks like or doesn't look like, we might need to I guess reenact a legal group to review things and give us advice

MR. KOUTSKY: Understood, that we might need to supplement if necessary. Yes.

MS. O'DONNELL: Beth O'Donnell, Cox Communications. I agree 1000 percent and I would hope -- I know I will get outside counsel to review it, and I

think that routinely other members of the NOWG have a legal review. And if it gets beyond that, if two companies for example don't agree, guess what, it comes here.

MR. KOUTSKY: Yeah, and I would also point out that there are quarterly neutrality audits and I think that that part of this process would be as to whether or not that would be sufficient.

This is very basic in terms of -- we just need even more basic information before we even start to run off and start thinking about this, but I just wanted to point that to people that that's I believe one of the core functions of NANC.

We have several new members here and I want to point that out as something that just crossed my desk.

Any other thoughts? Any questions, feel free to e-mail me.

M.   Other Business.

The last item is meetings for next time. I know everyone wants to know about this. -- It's been like the number one topic of discussion. We are going to have meetings next year.

(LAUGHTER)

I wanted to open up to discussion as to the frequency of meetings before circulating a specific meeting schedule, which I know a lot other things are depending on NANC to set their own schedules.

I did want to kind of throw open the discussion as to whether -- the current schedule is to -- or the tradition has been every other month or six meetings a year.

I've been looking at possibly just doing either quarterly meetings or maybe having quarterly plus one, which would be five meetings. And the five meetings would

be three kind of in the front half of the year and then two in the back half of the year. As we get into summer and the holidays I think there's a little bit less quantity of work based on what I've been able to tell.

But I'm not prejudging this. I want people to tell me what they think is sufficient in terms of the work flow and the work pattern, and from there I think we will come up with the best schedule we can do based on this meeting. Rosemary.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. Thank you, Chairman. This is a great subject to talk about today.

I would propose that we would have meetings in the beginning of the year, January to June, every other month, specifically because two of the working groups that I co-chair or did, that's when the main, the bulk or meat of the group -- you know, that's when we're the busiest.

We could have the surveys, we do the contribution factor, and without being held accountable every other month, and being able to ask NANC questions, and to just know that we can come here and hold ourselves accountable, I think it's just very important.

So I would suggest -- I don't think we particularly need a meeting in January because it's November 30th, but February, April, June, something like that, maybe take -- if you only wanted to have four or five meetings, maybe take the summer off and then come back September, October, you know, whatever.

The end year, it's not that it isn't important to meet, but the end of the year at least from my point of view with the NOWG and with B&C Working Group, the beginning of the year is much more important.

The other thing is, something I've noticed today is when we're not -- something I didn't realize until today was when we're not consistently meeting, we who go to some of

137

these other working groups might not necessarily be paying as much attention to what's going on in the meetings because we don't have a NANC meeting coming up.

So I've noticed even today that there are things that came up and I was like of gosh, yeah, I remember when they were talking about that and I wasn't paying attention as much as maybe I would have otherwise if I was going to be held accountable to talk about it here. So that's my two cents. Thank you.

MR. KOUTSKY: Mary.

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka from Qwest. I agree with Rosemary, and we especially have to remember that because of the timeframe for the work that (unintelligible) on Billing and Collection, you have a factor that you have to set that will impact all of us in our billing, so that timeframe really needs to be part of the thought of when we meet.

MR. KOUTSKY: So from you're standpoint, it's important to get some of those things resolved in the first part of the year?

MS. RETKA: Right.

MR. KOUTSKY: A particular date, like Rosemary said by June?

MS. RETKA: Generally you'll need a meeting -- I think Rosemary said April and I think that will be right after the Billing and Collection would have worked to set some of the options for the factor in March, and then in May they have to file it so that April timeframe would be a good one to make sure you keep on the list.

MR. KOUTSKY: Okay. Other thoughts on this? Beth.

MS. O'DONNELL: This is just a question. While we weren't having meetings we still send in reports?

MR. KOATSKY: Yes.

MS. O'DONNELL: Would we do that six times a year or would we change that to monthly, five times a year?

MR. KOUTSKY: No, we would change it to -- well there are monthly reports, but I would say no, we would change to five times a year or four times year. And the other thought would be conference call too.

FEMALE SPEAKER: With the exception of course of those that are required like the Welch report.

MR. KOUTSKY: Yes, that's what I meant. There are some things that are required under the contract which -- what are people's thoughts on conference calls?

FEMALE SPEAKER: I don't pay attention.

MR. KOUTSKY: Yeah, that's kind of my --

(LAUGHTER)

I mean you can do it in a pinch I guess if you really have an emergency --

FEMALE SPEAKER: Yeah, if it's an hour I can pay attention but --

(LAUGHTER)

MR. KOUTSKY: So it would be for a very specific purpose basically if we needed to get something done. I don't disagree. Are there other thoughts? Commissioner Jones.

COMMISSIONER JONES: This is Commissioner Jones from Washington UTC. I think four times would be okay but based on what I've observed today there's a lot of work going on in the working groups and I think -- I defer to all your collective judgment, and if you need to front end the work to the early part of the year I think that makes a lot of sense to do three meetings up through June and maybe one in the fall, or two.

Conference calls, I mean in (unintelligible) we do a lot of conferences calls. It's doable but I think you need a routine there, Mr. Chairman. It needs to be kind of habit like in the telecom committee of New York we have them usually every Friday so it gets on your schedule. If it's irregular I don't think you'll get very good attendance.

MR. KOUTSKY: And if it's regular too, you also know there's another one coming up relatively soon as well, so you can miss one and still not miss something. Other thoughts?

I'm just going to add this to my action items, which is to come up with a list. I'm going to take this advice, this is helpful, and we'll do what we can with -- we have obviously the meeting room issue in terms of finding the commission meeting room in terms of that, at least coming up with a schedule for the next few meetings.

Okay, is that everything? Any other new business? Mr. Gray.

MR. GRAY: Don Gray of Nebraska. Just one other thought that I had to learn and maybe you won't have to learn it the hard way, is that obviously Debbie, de-conflicting the FCC schedule but you also have ATIS and other groups that meet at certain times and it can be convenient for them all to be, so we'd leave it in your capable hands to de-conflict all the schedules and come up with the five dates for us.

MALE SPEAKER: Good Luck.

MR. KOUTSKY: Well, say good luck to Debbie.

(LAUGHTER)

No we'll do our best. And I understand we're doing this late. We got a little bit of late start on it so we'll do our best to work around it. Mary.

MS. RETKA: Just what would be helpful to all of us is if you could make that known fairly soon so that if we have to be here in January we know we'll be here in

January, and if you're going to cancel it if you could let us know enough in advance so we haven't made travel plans.

MR. KOUTSKY: Oh, yeah, I intend to have this wrapped up in the next two weeks, certainly by the holidays so people know what at least their travel schedule should be for the first quarter of 2007. But then again we do have to check with the commission meeting room. You know, we do utilize their resources so we have to be mindful of that.

Is that it? If there's no further business I will adjourn the meeting. Thank you everyone.

(END OF AUDIOTAPE 3, SIDE B)

<div align="center">*   *   *   *   *</div>