

**North American Numbering Council
Meeting Transcript
October 10, 2007 (Final)**

I. Time and Place of Meeting. The North American Numbering Council (NANC) held a meeting commencing at 9:00 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 Hultquist	AT&T
3. Beth O'Donnell	Cox Communications, Inc.
4. Lori McGarry	CTIA – The Wireless Association
5. Hon. Robert M. Clayton, III	NARUC – Missouri
6. Don Gray	NARUC - Nebraska
7. Rebecca Beaton	NARUC – Washington
8. Kathy L. Hagans	NASUCA
9. Jerome Candelaria	NCTA
10. Ray Strassburger	Nortel Networks
11. John McHugh	OPASTCO
12. C. Courtney Jackson	OUR
13. Mary Retka	Qwest
14. Rosemary Emmer	Sprint Nextel
15. Anna Miller	T-Mobile USA, Inc.
16. Philip Harrington	Verizon
17. Martin Hakim Din	Vonage Holdings Corp. (Vonage)

Special Members (Non-voting):

John Manning	NANPA
Amy Putnam	PA
Faith Marcotte	Welch & Company

Commission Employees:

Marilyn Jones, Designated Federal Officer (DFO)
Deborah Blue, Special Assistant to the DFO

Dana Shaffer, Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau
Marcus Maher, Associate Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau
Ann Stevens, Deputy Chief, Competition Policy Division

III. Estimate of Public Attendance. Approximately 20 members of the public attended the meeting as observers.

IV. Documents Introduced.

- (1) Agenda
- (2) NANC Meeting Transcript – April 17, 2007
- (3) North American Numbering Plan Administration (NANPA) Report to the NANC
- (4) Public Notice Announcing the Renewal of the NANC Charter Through September 27, 2009
- (5) National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator Report to the NANC
- (6) North American Portability Management (NAPM) LLC Report
- (7) NAPM LLC Membership Introduction
- (8) Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report to the NANC
- (9) Billing and Collection Agent Report
- (10) Billing and Collection Working Group (B&C WG) Report to the NANC
- (11) NANP Billing and Collection Agent Deliverable Evaluation Matrix
- (12) Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG) Report
- (13) Local Number Portability Administration (LNPA) Working Group Status Report to the NANC
- (14) Future of Numbering (FoN) Working Group Report to the NANC
- (15) List of NANC Accomplishments (January 2002 – October 10, 2007)

V. TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Announcements and Recent News	4
2.	Approval of Meeting Transcript from April 17, 2007	5
3.	Report of the North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA)	7
4.	Dana Shaffer, Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau	14
5.	Report of the National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator (PA)	26

6.	North American Portability Management (NAPM) LLC Report	33
7.	Status of the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) activities	40
8.	Report from the North American Numbering Plan Billing and Collection (NANP B&C) Agent	54
9.	Report of the Billing and Collection Working Group (B&C WG)	56
10.	Report of the Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG)	60
11.	Report of the Local Number Portability Administration (LNPA) Working Group	71
12.	Report of the Future of Numbering Working Group (FoN WG)	102
13.	Special Presentations	--
14.	Update List of the NANC Accomplishments	110
15.	Summary of Action Items	--
16.	Public Comments and Participation (five minutes per speaker)	--
17.	Other Business	--

VI. Summary of the Meeting.

TOM KOUTSKY: Okay, if people could start gathering. Only fifteen minutes late. That's not terrible.

If everybody could find their seats I'll call the meeting to order in about thirty seconds. A few documents are still being distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND RECENT NEWS

Good morning everybody. It's October 10, 2007 and this is the meeting of the North American Numbering Council. I would like to welcome you all here this morning on actually a very nice day in Washington, D.C., all things considered.

I'm glad everybody was able to navigate getting here and not being involved in too many cab accidents.

By way of introduction for those of you who I haven't met, I'm Tom Koutsky. I'm the Chairman of NANC with the Phoenix Center. Just a few points of order before moving along.

For members of the public, we have a public microphone over there. There will be time in the end of the meeting for public statements or public requests or inquiries, etc., but also during the course of discussion here, the fact that people are sitting at the table doesn't give them a better voice than you. People are welcome to stand up and make points as they see fit. I will do my best to recognize them. If I don't, it's purely my fault, and I will endeavor to take requests from the audience in the order that they are made.

For people at the tables, if they want to make a point, I think I pretty much speak for all the co-chairs. I don't think anybody really minds getting interrupted with a question during their presentation. Don't be shy. Feel free to – the only thing I request is rather than act like third graders, we use our little name

tags to kind of put them on the end and to use that as a signal instead of raising your hand and holding it there for hours on end.

APPROVAL OF MEETING TRANSCRIPT

With that I would just like to welcome you all once again to Washington, D.C. We have previously circulated the transcript of the last meeting, April 17, 2007. I think that went out in June or July. We have been using this in lieu of official minutes.

I would like to request that if folks have any suggestions or additions or changes to the transcript from the last meeting this is your opportunity to make those and get those on the record. Rosemary?

ROSEMARY EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. On my copy there was a blank page between 29 and 30 but I noticed on a couple of the copies on the table that I looked at there was no blank page so I don't know if –

TOM KOUTSKY: Okay. Did we lose any content?

ROSEMARY EMMER: No. There was just a blank page. The other thing was — maybe that was just in the Word document, I don't know.

TOM KOUTSKY: Okay, that can happen.

ROSEMARY EMMER: I had two other questions. One, on page 85, the third paragraph, the ninth word in, it should be “his” and not “this.”

TOM KOUTSKY: Okay.

ROSEMARY EMMER: I had a question about –

TOM KOUTSKY: I guess there's no objection to that, to make it grammatically correct.

ROSEMARY EMMER: With the audiotape, when the audiotape changed, I don't think this is something that would be a big deal to me, but I was reading the California, the VRS stuff, and the tape changed and there's stuff that's missing I think because I don't understand between the first sentence and the next one. It looks like when the tape —

TOM KOUTSKY: What page are you on?

ROSEMARY EMMER: I'm sorry, page 51.

TOM KOUTSKY: This is in the middle of Jay Keithley's presentation?

ROSEMARY EMMER: Yes.

TOM KOUTSKY: I'll note that. I actually make a — during the break I'll ask AV guys to try and give me a signal when they are going to change tapes so I can cut off the speaker. I think we are lucky in this case that it was done during Mr. Keithley's presentation because he left a Power Point behind of what he said. I don't think we actually missed any substance or debates or decisions as a result of that, but I will speak to them about that. That's a good note. I had picked that up but I did not think there was a loss of substance. I thought there was some overlap. I will double check that with them.

Are there any others? Okay, so I will consider these minutes adopted, or this transcript adopted and placed into the record.

From exhibit standpoint I think the agenda is the first exhibit, correct?
Okay, so the agenda is Exhibit 1 and the transcript is Exhibit 2.

In the normal course we will try to get the transcript out to NANC members, usually about eight weeks after the meeting or so. This is about the time for this and I think that's the best way of handling that process.

With that we will have the reports of the North American Numbering Plan Administrator.

This report to NANC will be Exhibit 3. The floor is yours.

**REPORT OF THE NORTH AMERICAN NUMBERING PLAN
ADMINISTRATOR (NANPA)**

JOHN MANNING: Good morning everyone. My name is John Manning. Before I get started in the presentation this morning I did post to the NANPA website back after the end of the first half of '07, some information and report that you are very familiar with because I wanted you to have the opportunity for NANC members and others to get a look see as to where things were with all of the resources at the end of the first half of '07. What I've done in this report is I've carried it on a little bit further to bring us up to at least August and cover a lot of the same material I covered in that report that was posted to the web site.

I will also be talking about some area code relief activities, some change order activities that we've been through, a few items on the NRUF and then covering a couple of other items one of which is our newsletter.

On page two I'm going to begin with area codes, talk about where we are with area codes. To date we have assigned three new area codes. One has been in Kentucky, the area code 364 in relief of the Kentucky NPA 270. We have also assigned two area codes up in Canada, 587 was assigned to relieve NPA 780 and 581 was assigned to relieve Canadian NPA 418.

Since the beginning of this year we have had three area codes go into service. Illinois 779 was implemented earlier this year, an overlay of the 815 area code. NPA 331 just went into service this past weekend. That's an overlay of the 630. That's also in Illinois.

Finally, over this past weekend as well NPA 575 in New Mexico, which is a split of the 505 area code in that state. So we have 372 assigned area codes to date, 335 are in service, 325 are geographic area codes, and 10 are the non-geographic codes.

Moving on to central office codes, January 1 through August 31, we've assigned almost 2,400 central office codes and a total of 480 have been returned. In the chart in the middle of the page I have taken the data from 2004, '05 and '06 and compared it to what we will potentially be looking like for the end of this year.

You will notice roughly around 3,500 - 3,600 central office codes projected for the end of this year, which is higher than '04 and '05, but lower than '06. So, you can see that we had an upward trend there and it appears as if in '07 we will see a slight downturn in the number C.O. code assignments.

Denials are roughly about the same as in '06 and disconnects are slightly higher, expected slightly higher in '07 compared to '06.

Moving along to Feature Group B-Carrier Identification Codes (CICs). We have not assigned any new Feature Group B CICs in 2007 and we have reclaimed 27 of those codes. In Feature Group D CICs we have assigned 60 since the beginning of this year, 13 of those were for switchless resellers and we have also, over the same time period reclaimed 95 Feature Group D CICs.

Looking at the area code 500, since the beginning of this year we have assigned 120 new 500 NXX codes. That's roughly an assignment rate of around 15 codes a month. We've reclaimed 3.

As I had previously reported to the NANC we are looking at exhaust of this area code sometime within the next year. The new area code that will supplement the 500 NPA is the 533 NPA. We are looking over the next 10 to 12 months to see the 533 area code come into service.

On the 900 side on page 3, we have assigned four 900 NXX codes. None have been reclaimed this year and you can see the total numbers that are assigned to that resource.

We have assigned two new 555 numbers this year. For the remaining NANP resources, ANI Information Digit Pairs, N11, 456 area code, Vertical Service Codes In the 800-855 there has been no new assignments this year.

Any questions on that update on NANP resources? Good. Moving along to area code relief planning.

Beginning on page 6 of my report is a detail of each of the area codes projected to exhaust over the next 36 months. I wanted to highlight a few of them here.

There are four area codes expected to exhaust in 12 months. California NPA 714. Back in September, last month, the CPUC approved an all services overlay of 714 with the new 657 area code, with permissive dialing beginning in February of next year and mandatory dialing in August of next year.

Area code 304 in West Virginia, we are still waiting for some type of decision from the Commission on that with regard to whether this is going to be a split or an overlay. We are in communication with the Commission there. They understand the situation. We are pending their final decision on what they would like to do.

In Oregon 503, the Public Utilities Commission in Oregon approved an industries overlay expansion plan. We are going to expand the 971 to include the 14 coastal areas currently covered under the 503 area code. There is a small portion of the 503 that is not overlaid by 971. In this relief alternative we are simply going to expand the 971 over top of those remaining areas that are only covered by the area code 503. Permissive dialing starts later this month and mandatory dialing in April of next year.

Finally in Kentucky. Kentucky has decided to implement an area code split for 270. NPA 364 will be the new area code, permissive dialing to start in July of next year. There are some activities going on with regard to supplemental

pooling and it won't be determined when the mandatory dialing of the new area code will come into play until they have those meetings within the state and they see the impact of what number pooling will be doing once its been implemented. So, a mandatory dialing date for the new area code won't be determined until they have had those meetings and they get an idea of what pooling is going do with regard the exhaust of that NPA.

I'm just going to touch briefly on some other area code relief activities. I will remark that we have a number of items going on, a number of area codes that we are looking at. It used to be a couple of years ago this portion of the report was fairly short but there's a lot of activity now underway. Some of the items I'm pointing out to you here.

California 818. We conducted an industry meeting in June to update the relief plans. There are some meetings going on later this month to get local jurisdictional input. We filed a relief application of 818 NPA overlay once the public meetings are concluded.

NPA 505, I've already mentioned. Utah 801. This is a situation where they had planned to implement an area code split. The Utah Public Service Commission vacated that order and decided to implement an overlay of 801 with the new 385 area code - permissive dialing starting in June of next year, mandatory dialing in March of '09.

In Wisconsin we've got two area codes, 715 and 920 that are projected to exhaust in similar time frames. The Public Service Commission has

been conducting public service public meetings. In September they did the 715 area code and starting next week we will be conducting the same meetings for 920 area code.

Any questions on the relief planning activities? Okay.

Area code and NANP exhaust projects. As we are required to do per our contract, we publish those twice a year. We intend to publish them by the end of this month both the area code and NANP exhaust projections and as soon as they are published, we will be notifying the NANC and sending out a notice to the industry via NANP notification system.

Finally, I want to briefly touch upon an area code request that was brought forward to the NANC back in November 2006. NANP had received a request for assignment of a “charity NPA” from an organization called Kinsale Mobile. According to the applicant the NPA was to be used to promote some use of charitable telecommunications services to the public. The request for that area code was forwarded to the Industry Numbering Committee and became issue 532. At the most recent INC meeting, INC meeting 95, which was last month, the INC reached consensus that NANPA should deny the application for this request. It was based upon INC’s examination of the application and whether or not the application met the criteria per the guidelines for the assignment of an easily recognizable code or ERC. NANPA has since notified the applicant that their application has been denied.

On page 5, I just want to touch on some NRUF activities. NANPA conducted NRUF refresher training for state regulatory representatives on September

25 and 26. We had 26 state representatives representing 17 different states participate in that training.

Also in mid-September NANPA distributed the state NRUF data bases to the states. Contained in the data base is also information available on the NANP administration system.

To bring you up-to-date on some change order activity. Change Order 11, that was a change order where we wanted to eliminate the use of an external server and associated software that generate reports that are sent out to the states on a daily, weekly and monthly basis. That change order was approved by the FCC in June and the implementation of that change order is complete.

Change Order 12 was the replacement of four servers currently used in NANC. Two of those servers were located in Sterling and two located in the Charlotte, North Carolina site. The FCC approved that change order in July and the implementation of the change order is complete.

Change Order 13 was INC issue 545, the removal of switch CLLI information from the NANPA website. This is a report that we have had on the web site. It contains a number of pieces of information about NPA NXX assignments. One of the data shown is the CLLI code associated with the NPA NXX assignment. This change order had NANPA remove that information from the public web site and place that same report, including the CLLI code information, on the NANC secure site. The FCC approved that change order in August and that change order has been implemented.

Finally, Change Order 14, a change order due to an INC issue 526. This change order requires NANPA to schedule the effective date of each approved return code or disconnect in Telcordia's BIRRDs, the Business Integrated Routing and Rating Data Base System. The FCC approved that change order in September and implementation is scheduled on or about November 1.

Finally, just a quick notification. Just last week we published the third quarter NANPA newsletter. It's available on our web site. A number of the pieces of information that I've discussed here this morning are also included in that newsletter.

That concludes my presentation. Are there any questions?

TOM KOUTSKY: Do you have any questions for John? No. Thanks for the comprehensive report. You said there will be more information available at the end of October with regard to the exhaust projections?

JOHN MANNING: Yes. That will be placed on the web site, downloadable PDF form and we will send a notice to the FCC via Debbie that that information is posted as well as a notification to the industry.

TOM KOUTSKY: Okay. I'll also circulate that to everyone. Good. Okay. Thank you John.

DANA SHAFFER, CHIEF, WIRELINE COMPETITION BUREAU

I'm going to adjust the schedule a little bit on the fly because we have Dana Schaffer who is the new Wireline Carrier Bureau Chief as of – the 30th, so, not

quite. Anyway, as you know that NANC under our charter reports to her. So, meet the boss.

Dana actually goes back in the industry a number of years, since I left Tennessee and we both share a common select lineage, she worked at Excel for years when I worked at COVAD. She was mostly at the state level and has been in Washington for two and a half years, almost two years coming over pretty much at the same time with the new appointments in the new administration. So, I will turn the floor over to her for a quick few minutes, just to introduce herself, and feel free to ask her questions.

DANA SHAFFER: Thanks Tom. We do go way back. I was in the C-link industry back when it was NEX-link. Does anybody remember the old NEX-link? Not the new NEX-link but the old NEX-link. It worked with the old AT&T, not the new AT&T but the old AT&T.

I come from a land of splits and people always ask me why Tennessee, Kentucky, why do you guys like splits so much. I say because we are old enough to remember picking up the phone and dialing four or five digits. I remember when we went from four digits dialing to five digit dialing and Mamaw thought the world was caving in. So, to go from seven to ten sometimes, as you guys know, in some of our states it's a painful process. That's why you see so many splits in Tennessee and Kentucky and maybe even Arkansas. In Georgia I understand that they've got the big metropolitan area of Atlanta and those people know how to dial ten digits. We are getting there.

All kidding aside I think sometimes you guys don't get thanked enough and as I walked in the meeting and heard, you know, area code 504, da-da-da, I think it's like being at a cocktail party and starting to talk regulatory law. Peoples eyes glass over and they go to the bar really quickly. I think that you guys suffer from kind of that same affliction, if you will, that what we work on unless you really know what we are doing doesn't sound all that exciting.

You have probably never been accused of doing really sexy work on the NANC, but those of us who have been in industry, those of us who now work for the public regulating industry, deregulating industry, which ever way you want to look at it, and certainly although they don't realize it, the average consumer is impacted every day by what you do.

I want to thank you. I know that it's really thankless work so I want to say thank you at least ten times while I'm here this morning. So, thank you, thank you, thank you, thank you, thank you, thank you, thank you, thank you, thank you because I know it's a lot of work and I know its sometimes thankless.

Tom is too kind. I really don't consider myself the boss of anything except maybe my husband and that's only on certain nights when he comes home in the mood to be bossed around. I work for a really incredible team.

I've got Marcus Maher here with me. Marcus is the person I was able to grab this morning, everybody is so busy. I work for an incredible team that Tom Navin put together in the Wireless Competition Bureau, and I consider myself very fortunate to work for them and they let me kind of be the coach a little bit.

The same thing with the NANC. I look forward to working with you and for you. Tom and I will work closely together. I made a mistake on Tom's last name. Since there are only ten Koutsy's in the whole United States. He's going to punish me forever for getting his last name wrong. Its not like its --. That's okay. I'll let you put a "C" in my name for a while. You can do that at the next thing I speak at.

I'm glad to just chat this morning, to answer any questions. One of the things that I believe in strongly, having come from rural Arkansas and then lived in – I know there is no metropolitan Arkansas before anybody does that joke. I know there's not, but, I like to say rural Arkansas because in Arkansas that means really rural, out where the road stops, the gravel stops, the dirt stops and then you get to my parents' house.

Having been in Tennessee for a number of years we just believe in open dialogue and I want to always be as open as I can. My door is always open. I may be hard to reach during the day but I promise that between the hours of 11:00 and 12:00 p.m. I'm pretty easy to catch and talk to. If not, I'm up till all hours. I'm on call twenty-four hours. Any time you ever need anything, any time you want to talk, any time Tom wants to bring anything to us, we're here and we are ready to work with you.

I guess with that said one thing, I don't know if Tom mentioned, but we have re-chartered NANC. That has taken place and those of you with any individual reappointment issues, I promise we are working on that. So, bear with us.

We will be getting those letters out. Anybody have anything you want to talk about, ask about, complain about?

Come on girls, I see you all over there. I see you over there talking, what's going on?

ANNA MILLER: Good morning. I'm Anna Miller and I represent T-Mobile on the NANC. I have been accused of sitting on this Committee for way too long. I appreciate your thanks and do share those sentiments. We do do a lot of work and because it is complicated, like you say I think that people's attentions quickly fade.

We did a lot of hard work this weekend on the 505 New Mexico split and the 630 overlay in Illinois went well so we are all happy this week.

Along those lines with the re-charter of the NANC I think it's a good opportunity and I discussed this briefly. One of the, I guess, the leftovers from previous NANC's is a concept called a steering committee or steering group. What I would like to do is maybe reactivate that group and maybe redefine it a little bit based upon the efforts that on in the NANC working groups which really get most of the work done with oversight of the NANPA and the Pooling Administrator and oversight of number portability on behalf of the industry which has been an area of continuous improvement over the years and kind of refocus on the steering committee where we can have dialogue with the FCC and the leadership of the NANC and the chairman to kind of set our scope for 2008 in terms of goals and

objectives. What is it that the FCC would like the NANC to focus on? That would help the efforts of the working groups.

DANA SHAFFER: Is that, and forgive me, I feel like I had a dream once and I woke up and – have you ever had a dream where you show up for the final. You’ve missed the whole class but you show up for the final and you’re in your pajamas.

At least I don’t have my pajamas on this morning, but you all forgive me, I feel like I’m showing up for the final. I’ve got a lot more studying to do. How long has it been since we, is that something, you say reactivate the steering group. Give me a little, when was the last time we had a steering group?

ANNA MILLER: Actually I found out that I’m listed there and I don’t remember when the last time was, but I just think with the re-charter its an opportunity to, as you say, I would really like to open the dialogue with the FCC and with the leadership of the NANC because I think doing that improves the work that we do and the focus on the group of, you know, we are the advisory committee. We would like to focus on what the FCC goals are and I think it will make us more effective and productive.

DANA SHAFFER: I appreciate that. I think it would be helpful if maybe you guys talked today and see if there is a general consensus on the steering group and who might constitute that steering group. It is always easier to take an idea if its at least half baked or fully baked than to say, well, we are interested in doing this. Someone would say, well, who will be on it? Is there a consensus among

the NANC? That might be something that you guys can talk about today and I certainly welcome those conversations.

Tom, honey, I'll meet any time you want to meet. We've got honey on the record. Okay, I'm just – my spouse -as Elizabeth Taylor said in Giant - knew what a horrible creature I was when he married me. So, I did not deceive him. I'm glad we could get that on the record and your wife will love me now. Anybody else?

TOM KOUTSKY: Any questions?

DANA SHAFFER: Well, you know, I should know all the answers but that's why I've got Marcus. Marcus knows all the answers.

TOM KOUTSKY: Jerome.

JEROME CANDELARIA – National Cable and Telecommunications Association. Thank you for meeting with us today. I also traveled from California and my fellow NANC members who are from California asked me to convey what is a general feeling there that it would be very helpful if there was regularly scheduled NANC meetings going forward.

Notice was very short for this particular meeting making it problematic for some of us to attend. Moreover, as an association representative, it becomes problematic reaching out to the association members to fully inform them on matters that appear before NANC without sufficient time to prepare.

So to the extent we could go back to some sort of regular meetings, it would certainly help in my industry's regard. Even if you cancel a meeting, even if

you schedule them and cancel, that is more workable than announcing them with very, very short notice.

DANA SHAFFER: I appreciate that. One thing that Tom and I have already talked about is having an on-going dialogue between the two of us to address logistical issues, and I would consider that a logistical issue, making sure that everyone feels and has an opportunity to be fully prepared for a meeting. I know you all had more notice than I did but I just had to walk from upstairs. We'll talk about that and see what we can do.

ROSEMARY EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. Again, thank you for coming and joining us today and for the kind words.

I just wanted to quickly say that possibly scheduling of the meetings in terms of the other industry groups and what they have already put together for a schedule of next year and that kind of thing could possibly be done under the steering committee that Anna was talking about earlier as a suggestion for one thing that could be on that agenda. Thank you.

DANA SHAFFER: Thank you and again, I mean, I'm not going to come in here and tell you I've got all the answers and everything is going to be perfect because I can't seem to pull that off even at home. We will talk about these things and be open about them. I'm not going to hide the ball from you.

It would help though to have, to see that you guys have those conversations within this group so that we have some sense of what you have consensus on and some sense of, I'm open to hear even if there is a small group of

people who have a concern. Certainly I'm not saying you have to have a consensus to bring it forward, but it helps me understand the level of the problem if you guys have had conversations and it's a consensus or if its just a concern shared by the folks who had to travel the farthest or, I mean, this is very helpful.

REBECCA BEATON: Hi, Rebecca Beaton, Washington State. I have two quick notes. One is that we do have some openings here at NANC and it would be very helpful if the FCC announced those and perhaps solicited from NARUC or the appropriate bodies that would fill those positions because they are often left open for quite a lengthy period. I think because we have new players and new entities and new commissioners coming in, they are not fully formed of the process to be named to this advisory committee.

DANA SHAFFER: To that point I think you said you had two. I'll come back to you. Don't assume that just because someone hasn't been named that, for example, NARUC hasn't been solicited. Don't make that assumption at all, but I hear you. I don't have any update for you.

At least do me the favor of, I won't make assumptions if you all don't make assumptions and don't assume that just because, for example, the NARUC representative hasn't been named that we haven't asked NARUC who they might like to have for that position.

That said, you had number two?

REBECCA BEATON: Yes. Tom, we've had some dialogue from our state with Tom Navin. I assume we will just move that dialogue to you, is that correct?

DANA SHAFFER: Absolutely. I came to the Commission working for Tom Navin. My only regret coming back to be bureau chief is that I don't get to work again for Tom Navin because I'm one of his biggest fans. I can say with confidence and like I told the team I work for, that everything Tom had going, conversations, hopefully we have continuity in terms of not only keeping that going with me the same you had with Tom, but the team doesn't change, everyone is still there.

No one walked out when I got announced. I was very grateful. It would have been scary had they, because they had worked with me before, and if they'd said, "okay I'm out of here." That would have probably been a little deflating to my ego. Yes, we should, if you do not see total continuity, then let me know. All of those things should still hopefully keep going without any hiccup at all.

REBECCA BEATON: Thank you.

DANA SHAFFER: You are welcome.

COURTNEY JACKSON: Again, I share the welcome and the appreciation for the opportunity to meet you and the kind words that you had to say. I am from Jamaica. We have tried to participate in the work of the NANC from the perspective of the wider Caribbean and I thought it would be a good thing to make a gentle reminder of the interest of the wider Caribbean within the North American

Numbering Plan area and to say that we do have some issues that we think that should be brought to the NANC and you will be hearing from us in the future.

Thank you.

DANA SHAFFER: I look forward to that and let me say that if I need to make a field trip, I understand those issues completely. You just let me know.

COURTNEY JACKSON: Thank you. You're welcome.

DANA SHAFFER: Thank you for letting me, I'm sorry to interrupt but thanks for letting me just pop in. Its only been official since the 30th so my schedule is still a little hectic. I don't see that changing anytime soon, but I'll try to do better next time to be here at the beginning of the meeting.

Maybe we can make dialogue at these meetings. Its also something that's ongoing, you know, semi-regular. If you guys can stand me, I'll be back. Thank you so much and thank you for the work you do.

I just cannot say that enough and I cannot tout your praises enough. I mean it. I'm not just saying that because I know it's a lot of work. It's a lot of thankless work. It's a lot of sometimes, not boring work, but sometimes I know reading through it, you know, okay, I'm back.

I look forward to the October information. I absolutely want to see that. I understand there should be some interesting data from some of the states. We will charge forward together. I know there are a number of issues. I know some of

you are probably sitting there thinking, well, we're not talking about this today.

We're not talking about that today.

There are a couple of things you are talking about that even if I'm not sitting down here, I'll either have someone down here or just know that we are aware of your issues. I hope to have people in and out of the meeting today to listen to the presentations on those issues and Tom has already briefed me on a couple of the issues you are going to be discussing in detail today.

So, please, please also don't assume if I'm not here personally, that I'm not interested in the issue and keeping up with the issue and having a dialogue with Tom because he was one of the first people to say, I need to get on your calendar. You guys have a great chairman here.

We all look forward to working with you and thank you for letting me interrupt this morning.

TOM KOUTSKY: You can interrupt anytime Ms. Schaeffer.

DANA SHAFFER: Schaeffer? So that's one.

TOM KOUTSKY: Yeah, we're done. We're even.

DANA SHAFFER: You are not going to tell them what
(undecipherable) I made on your last name are you?

TOM KOUTSKY: No, not at all. Okay. Thanks Dana. I do appreciate Dana coming by and she really is a very – as open and gregarious as she just appeared in real life.

Amy, I think is next. The report of the Pooling Administrator. Is
Amy –

Two things while she walks up here. First of all I want to enter the
new charter, the public notice in as Exhibit 4 because Dana just referenced that.

I forgot to mention this earlier, because we are operating on a
transcript here, when people speak they should state, in the first sentence they should
state their name. That just makes it easier for the transcriber. State your affiliation
as well, but your name is sufficient.

We should really try to make sure that we get a clean transcript so
kind of make sure that the microphone appears to work when you make a statement
so the transcript is as clean as possible. This last transcript was much cleaner than
the one prior. So it's learning by doing.

**REPORT OF THE NATIONAL THOUSANDS-BLOCK POOLING
ADMINISTRATOR (PA)**

Amy Putnam the Pooling Administrator.

AMY PUTNAM: I am very pleased to announce that pooling is
fine and will continue to be fine for five or six years.

TOM KOUTSKY: Okay. Thank you.

AMY PUTMAN: If you look at slide 2, slide 2 is the rolling
twelve month Part III workload data that we provide to the NANC by month for the
last twelve months. We were down a little in September but can't call it a trend until
it goes on for a while.

Page 3, you will recognize as well, the Part III summary data. I apologize for the lack of a page break there where it clearly is supposed to be. I'm going to blame Damian, my laptop is named Damian. Damian is very old and now that we have the new contract I'll be getting something that I hope won't be called Damian.

Rosemary did you –

ROSEMARY EMMER: Yes. This is Rosemary Emmer with Sprint Nextel. I just had a quick question on page 2. The denials for the red light rules. It looks like there was 74 in May. I don't know if I caught that at the last NANC meeting.

AMY PUTNAM: I believe there was a reporting period then and we find that either a reporting period or a payment period and we find that for a few days we have issues with the red light rule and that happens until people get caught up.

ROSEMARY EMMER: Okay. Thanks.

AMY PUTNAM: Page 4 has some information on it that, for example, the quantity of the rate area pool replenishment information. We provide this type of information monthly to the NOWG and thought we would just include this forecasting data in our report.

The number of rate center file changes, that 1,041, that's rate centers that have changed from excluded to optional or from optional to mandatory to state

mandatory or single service provider to mandatory. Those are the kinds of things that generate the rate center file changes.

Slide 5 I like to look at that. That is our system performance for the year. I love the long line of zeros on the right column.

Slide 6 is new but, slide 6 in particular, the other pooling related items of interest are not new but we thought we would give you a matrix on the delegated authority petitions and I have a hot off the press Alabama 216 Order. It apparently came out this morning. I haven't read it yet. I was actually trying to figure it out on the Blackberry when you called me up here.

TOM KOUTSKY: I actually I would like to say that I think this chart is really useful, and I would encourage you to keep it. I think to have in one spot – honestly, I think it also helps the FCC a little bit too to kind of keep track of these things. Now they should expect that, you know, there is a state order from Alabama. I think that's a good idea.

AMY PUTNAM: Okay. The Alabama pooling to begin no later than four months after the date of the Order which is no later than four months after today. We will be setting up a supplemental implementation meeting for Alabama 256 post haste with alacrity.

Page 7. I'm going to skip the first section on page 7 for the time being and move on to the quick and easy ones. The semi-annual report, we completed our NRUF submission prior to the August 22 deadline. There has been no change in the information with regard to the interim routing number authority, the

interim pANI (sic). I believe that there is still a petition pending before the FCC that's related to that denial, but that denial has been on the records for a long time. We are pretty much in a holding pattern there.

Change Order. All the change orders from the first contract have been completed and as of this date there have been no new change orders in the new contract.

Change Order 41, if you recall, was the third or fourth change order in a series regarding our attempts to clean up the data in PAS on contamination levels of blocks using the NPAC data.

Finally through Change Order 47, we did a one time clean up of the data. In that change order approval it was directed that one year after that snapshot was completed, that we would work with the NOWG and seek input from industry as to how things are going now. Are things better than they were before the snapshot clean up, or are things the same with an expectation of using whatever information we get from industry to make a determination about whether or not the data base needs to be cleaned up more regularly.

We are working with the NOWG right now. The letter has been drafted. We've gotten comments and are going to be getting back to them within a day or so about that. That letter should go out very shortly.

TOM KOUTSKY: Is this something you expect to become an additional order to modify maybe the NPAC contract? I'm just trying to figure it out.

AMY PUTNAM: Well, if the information from industry is that we are still getting a lot of blocks that are contaminated more than they should be or we are still getting blocks that are designated in your system as pristine, but in fact they are contaminated, then we will sit down with the NOWG and talk about what needs to be done about that.

Maybe we do need the regular report that we talked about initially. Doing it as a once a year snapshot clean up is very labor intensive. It would be much easier for us to be able to maintain the data base on a regular basis. If industry comes back and says everything is fine now and we are not having any problem, well, then we can just continue the way we are. That will depend.

All right. Now, one other thing. Today we will be sending out the Pooling Administrator's Internal Survey to Industry. We had done this once a year until the contract extension and we decided to reinvigorate that. People should be getting that today.

And, finally, NeuStar was re-selected as the National Pooling Administrator. The new contract became effective in mid-August. It has a base period of two years with an annual renewal for the next three years for a total of five years. We will continue to meet monthly with the NOWG as we did under the old contract. We will continue to provide excellent service as we did under the old contract.

The old contract emphasized the National Rollout. That was really the focus of the old contract and that has been completed. This one emphasizes data

quality more than anything else and reporting issues. So, we reorganized the staff to make sure that we had people where we need them. Some people stayed the same. Some people got moved around.

Gary Zahn is still going to be the Regional Director for the Pooling Administration Service Center. Shannon will still be Regional Director for External Relations. Florence will still be doing pANI work as well as other pooling work. Linda Hymans will still be doing regulatory and compliance. Bruce Armstrong however, who used to be our Senior Data Analyst is now the Regional Director for Quality Assurance. Cecilia Louie who was one of the Pooling Implementation Managers, will be working for Bruce doing data quality and implementation. So Cecilia will be the point of contact for the supplemental implementation meetings. Those of you who are involved in those will be working with Cecilia. Jan Connally who is our Q.A. manager will also be working with Bruce. Kevin Gatchell is now our Senior Pooling Specialist.

Other than that you will be working with the same folks that have been helping you all along and I hope that they continue to do a job that pleases you and if not, please let me know.

TOM KOUTSKY: Rosemary.

ROSEMARY EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. A couple of things. First of all, congratulations on the contract rebid.

I continue to be impressed with your system availability. You just can't do better than 100% - usually that is a number to shoot for, rarely is it reached and achieved, especially year after year. Congratulations.

AMY PUTNAM: I just don't know how we are going to do that 110.

ROSEMARY EMMER: I don't know either but this is something that has been impressing me for a long time now. So, thanks for putting this slide in here. It just kind of reminds us that there are departments and folks or there is hope for – there is hope. So, very good.

I do have a question on page 3. There might be an obvious answer to this and I can always get with you off-line if I'm not going to be able to figure this out. On the first table under Suspended. When you look at the manual column of 1,326, and then you look at the PAS column of 3,076. It just seems to me like there is a whole lot more manuals expended than pass expended and like I said there's probably a good reason, an obvious reason for that but --. We can definitely talk about this later if we need to. There may be no, it may be me. There may not even be a correlation that matters there, but –

AMY PUTNAM: Yeah, why don't we get off-line and get a better feel for that. The 3,076 is the combination of pool replenishment dedicated in LRN blocks. I'm pretty sure that's what it adds up to. So, I'm not sure where the question is.

ROSEMARY EMMER: Okay, I'll send you an e-mail on that.

Thank you.

TOM KOUTSKY: I have a quick question. Amy, I cribbed. I saw you were reading off an Order Chart for that list of people. I was wondering, given the reorganization of the new contract I was wondering if that might be the type of thing you would consider posting?

AMY PUTNAM: The information is posted on the website.

TOM KOUTSKY: I just want to make sure you get it in the appropriate section of the minutes. We'll take care of that.

AMY PUTNAM: Okay, I can send it.

TOM KOUTSKY: Yeah, send it. I think its useful just to – given that there were – I don't want to say substantial changes but enough changes to warrant probably keeping –

AMY PUTNAM: Well, I'm sure Bruce thinks they are substantial.

TOM KOUTSKY: Anything else? Any other questions from the old and new Pooling Administrator? Okay, thanks a lot Amy.

We had a break scheduled here. I'm just going to cruise right through it because you all seem chipper.

We will bring Mel Clay in from the LLC to give his presentation.

**REPORT OF THE NORTH AMERICAN PORTABILITY MANAGEMENT
LLC (NAPM LLC)**

MEL CLAY: Good morning. My name is Mel Clay. I'm the co-chair of the NAPM LLC. The other co-chair is Tim Decker and Tim is somewhere in the audience. We have two documents that we brought with us to report today.

One is the report to the NANC. It's a two page Word document and also a Power Point deck that's titled the NAPM LLC Membership Introduction. So, those are the two items that you should have.

On the report the first thing that we are going to report is the results of the NAPM new member subcommittee. Earlier this year we formed a subcommittee and that subcommittee was established to develop ways to improve the process used for the recruitment of new members to the LLC.

The goals for the team are to review the qualifications to become a member if needed. Develop a communications package. Develop a web site for potential candidates to access and add three to five new members to the LLC during 2007-2008.

The results to date. We have looked at the qualifications and felt that there were no changes needed there. A communications package which is the Power Point deck that I handed out also has been developed. The communications package is being shared with industry groups such as the LNPA Working Group, the NPAC Cross Regional, CTIA, USTA and others.

We are sharing that package with you as kind of like, here's our advertisement and if you know of companies that would be interested in becoming a member, we would like for you to pass that on to them.

Development of the web site is in process and we anticipate that we will have that web site launched during the fourth quarter of this year. We have reserved the URL domains. It's the www.napmlc.com, as well as .biz, .net, .org, and .us. We are trying to make sure that if you put in napmlc. something, you are going to get to us.

Sprint Nextel, a member from Sprint Nextel is working to develop that web site, and we think we will have that launched within the next month or two.

There have been several companies that have contacted the LLC with an interest in membership, and everybody that has contacted either me or Tim Decker or our attorney has received a communications package detailing what it takes to become a member and all of the associated documents that go along with that.

To date there has been one company that has had repeated communications with us and I understand they are in the process of getting internal approval to become a member. Rumor has it that they have been approved, and they should be a member, I guess before the end of this year.

The industry segments that have shown interest are Cable and CLEC. Are any questions on that particular topic?

JEROME CANDELARIA: I have a question on page 2 of your promotional piece. It says that NAPM membership is currently made up of companies and then it listed wireless, wire line cable and I wanted to ask who the cable member was.

MEL CLAY: This document was made up before the cable company that was a member left and you are right, at this point in time there are no cable companies that are members.

TOM KOUTSKY: Rosemary and then –

ROSEMARY EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. I do want to qualify that comment however with the fact that there are members underneath the LLC members companies that are carriers that have a strong interest in the cable partnership.

TOM KOUTSKY: Okay. Beth.

BETH O'DONNELL: Beth O'Donnell for Cox Communications. I was going to say something like that that Rosemary just said. You don't have to answer this question if you feel it is inappropriate Mel, but I was wondering if you thought that the Telcordia petition is having a chilling effect on new members.

MEL CLAY: Beth, I really don't know how to answer that question so I prefer not to.

BETH O'CONNELL: Okay.

JEROME CANDELARIA: I wanted to pursue your comment that there are other members who may be, have the cable industry interest in mind – can you specify which member that would be? Who is not in fact a cable member itself?

ROSEMARY EMMER: Rosemary Emmer with Sprint Nextel. I just want to clarify the fact that even though there wasn't necessarily a company that falls under the cable category anymore under the LLC, there are carriers who, at this point in time, are partnering with cable companies.

So, there are carriers in other words, who are thinking about the cable industry in terms of coming up with company position as a result. I'm not saying there's a cable interest underneath the LLC specifically right now because there's not, but there are carriers that certainly have that interest in mind. I just wanted to mention that.

TOM KOUTSKY: Just one thing. I guess I'm just thinking about the record. Maybe Mel if you could just state the companies that are in the LLC today. Could I at least have a list?

MEL CLAY: All right. There are seven companies today. The companies are AT&T, Verizon, Qwest, Sprint Nextel, T-Mobile, Embark, and Frontier Citizens. At this point in time, there is not a cable membership however we do anticipate that there will be one very shortly.

Any other questions? All right. The number two topic on here is just kind of an FYI. The LNPA working group has recommended to the NAPM LLC that a separate statement of work document be developed by NeuStar for PIM51 and 61. The SOW requests have been provided to NeuStar from the LLC and details on PIM 51 and 61 will be provided today by the LNPA working group. If I tried to

answer the questions of 51 and 61 it would probably not be as detailed as you would get from the LNPA working group.

The number three item, again, it's an FYI item. Back in July the FCC Wireline Competition Bureau, Pricing and Policy Division, requested an informal meeting with the LLC to discuss LNP cost causer petition. The petition number RM11299 which is better known as the Bell South Cost Causer Petition. That is before the FCC. It is still evidently an item at the FCC.

Attending that were the co-chairs Tim and myself, one of the PE's from the LLC, and a member from Sprint Nextel. The FCC staff questioned us on how ports are identified and if there are any alternative ways of handling SV modifications.

An action item was assigned to the LNPA working group through the NANC chairman and that action item, again, not to try to deflect any questions, but the action item will be discussed as a part of the LNPA working group report today.

The last thing on here is that there was a data request from the Iowa Utilities Board. NeuStar informed us, the LLC, that the data request was received from the Iowa Utilities Board and that they had provided the NPAC data to the Iowa Utilities Board and what the Iowa Board plans to do with that data was to assist them in their third biennial telecommunications competition survey. So, just to let you know that NeuStar, as they provide data to anyone that's outside of the users, they have to inform the LLC and the LLC does review that. That's all I've got. I'm open for questions.

TOM KOUTSKY: Okay. Jerome.

JEROME CANDELLARIA: Jerome Candelaria, NCTA. A question about the FCC meeting on cost causer and I'll have the same question for the LNPA working group. This matter is a subject of FCC rule making, 11-2-99, I'm wondering if this will be put into the FCC record, into that rule making record.

MEL CLAY: What I was told at the meeting was this was an informal meeting just to gather data. It was not an ex parte or anything that would be put into the record and I would ask Marilyn if there is anything other than that.

MARILYN (JONES): Marilyn Jones, FCC. That is correct. It was not an ex parte. It will not be put into the record.

TOM KOUTSKY: I will just say preemptively, we have considered yet, but the work product of the LNPA working group put together, I will put that into the record of that rule making proceeding. Just as a matter of course I think it's important to get that information in provided we adopt it. So from that standpoint, that information will go in.

The other point is that this was a request from the Bureau that originally went to the LLC. The LLC essentially said it's probably better done through the LNPA working group and that was essentially how the process worked. I think the process worked, you know, probably as effectively as it could, given the specific nature of the request.

Yes.

BETH O'DONNELL: Beth O'Donnell, Cox Communications.
You are going to put, if we approve it, the LNPA working group report in the record of what?

TOM KOUTSKY: Oh, the rule making. RM11299.

BETH O'DONNELL: Okay. Thanks.

TOM KOUTSKY: Yes. So it's a public file.

MEL CLAY: Okay. If there are no more questions Chairman Koutsky, that's all I have.

TOM KOUTSKY: Okay. Thank you Mel. I'm like way behind on labeling the exhibits so, Amy Putnam's, the Pooling Report is Exhibit 5 and then we'll make the two page presentation that Mel gave Exhibit 6 and then the membership packet Exhibit 7.

Now we are on to the Industry Numbering Committee. Mr. Ken Havens. He has, this is from ATIS. It's a document that looks like this. It's rather lengthy, if we have enough time to get through it. This will be Exhibit 8.

INDUSTRY NUMBERING COMMITTEE (INC) REPORT FOR THE NANC

KEN HAVENS: Thank you Mr. Chairman. My name is Ken Havens. I'm the INC chair. The presentation that you have before you represents INC issues that INC thought that the NANC might have an interest in knowing more about, in particular the VRS issue and then we also have noted the particular issues that are in initial pending and issues have gone to final closure and issues that are also in initial closure.

On page 2, this represents the meeting that have taken place since the last NANC meeting, in particular the INC met last week which is in large part why you didn't get the deck until just yesterday. We met last week.

Also of interest you might note that we have taken or had eighteen interim meetings for the VRS or the VOIP subcommittee which is working the VRS issue and have a number of interim meetings scheduled in the coming months.

Slide 3, an issue that was worked in our CO/NXX Subcommittee, Issue 545, Removal of the Switch CLLI information from the NANPA web site. John Manning talked at length about that. I guess the one point that I would like to reemphasize is that that switch CLLI information will be available on the NANPA secured web site to authorize service providers and regulators that have a desire or a need to know that information. Any questions?

Slide 4, Issue 519 Pool Replenishment. At the request of the PA and the NOWG, the INC explored options to insure that the PA is able to maintain a sufficient quantity of blocks available for assignment to satisfy the anticipated demand while maintaining no more than a six month inventory.

This issue was brought to the INC by the Pooling Administrator because they were experiencing difficulty in having service providers opening codes in rate centers whose demand was below the recommended six month inventory. They were looking to find ways whereby they could encourage service providers to open codes to keep that pool replenished. Obviously there is a lot of effort that goes into opening a new code, the costs and the time associated with doing that. Its much

easier for a service provider to request blocks from an existing pool, so we are looking for ways to keep that replenished.

The INC explored a number of options. We discussed this issue for a number of INCs. We talked about possibly forcing service providers to open new codes but in the course of discussion we found that those were undesirable, trying to force SP's to do that. Ultimately what we decided was that we would agree that the PA's would ask service providers via a pop-up box to take a portion of requested blocks from existing resources and the remaining blocks from a code open for pool replenishment. This is intended to encourage service providers to share the burden of pool replacement, rather replenishment, and discourage a single SP from taking remaining blocks in a pool.

The point that I would like to emphasize here is that, again, we are not requiring service providers to open a code but we are encouraging them to do so. If, for example, they don't want to do that then they can take blocks from that pool. This issue will result in a change order. Any questions about this issue?

Slide 5 and a few subsequent pages after that talk about the INC's progress with regard to Issue 510 which is internet based relay services and inner operability or the VRS issue.

Slide 5 basically describes the genesis of the issue. The issue was brought to the NANC and these are taken from the transcripts from the January 2006 NANC meeting talking about the NANC action item and the desire to have functional equivalency with the hearing community.

This INC report will focus on both the number assignment paradigm and the number and routing data base which will be required to support this functionality.

On slide 6 this slide is intended to provide you an example both visual and in paragraph form of VRS services. Any questions at this point?

Slide 7. The INC's working proposal is to maintain interoperability and help achieve functional equivalency for VRS. The INC likely will propose that NANPA numbers be assigned to deaf and hard of hearing relay users. That a neutral third party administered central data base to support interoperability among relay providers by linking the relay user's NANP number to the necessary internet address and that the same approach be applied to internet based services. Question?

ANNA MILLER: Anna Miller with T-Mobile. Just a clarification for me. When you say third party neutral administered central data base, is that, I'm trying to understand it. Is that kind of like a registry, a registrar to support the routing for the VRS?

KEN HAVENS: Right. That would be where you translate the user's assigned number to a URL

ANNA MILLER: Okay.

KEN HAVENS: And subsequent IP address.

TOM KOUTSKY: I have a couple of questions. First of all I appreciate, you know the INC has done a tremendous amount of work on this. Meeting twice a week and things like that. So, want to note the appreciation that I

think everyone shares and also the FCC for the hard work they've been putting into this. It's a lot of work.

A couple of questions on this. First of all I want to kind of clarify at least my understanding that what INC is working on is a report that will then be referred to us the NANC essentially. We will then review that and pass on to the FCC essentially pursuant to their request. That's my understanding of the process. Is that correct?

KEN HAVENS: That is correct.

TOM KOUTSKY: And so this is a status update as to where they are, just so everyone knows this is what they are continuing to work on and we will get our bite of the apple.

Point four. I have a question when you say other internet based relay services. Two questions, related questions. What kind of internet based relay services are we thinking about? Well, maybe I'll just ask that question. What other examples are the subject of that?

KEN HAVENS: VRS's, IM. Mr. Chairman. In the event there are questions which I am unable to clarify, I've got my subcommittee chairman for the VOIP that may be –

TOM KOUTSKY: Certainly and you can, you know, if he wants to stand over there.

KEN HAVENS: This is Joe Hurlbert. He's the co-chair of the VOIP subcommittee at INC.

TOM KOUTSKY: Okay. Thanks Joe.

JOE HURLBERT: To address your question as to other types, we've learned through this process that there are other types of relay services that the deaf make use of besides the video relay service. Some are much more portable in a handheld and are text based relay service. We are trying to determine whether some of those fall in scope and will work under our proposal for VRS also and whether some will not. In some of them I guess already have some number assignment and basically it's a text based, kind of like a cell phone, I understand.

TOM KOUTSKY: So when you mean relay service you are specifically talking about the hearing impaired community.

JOE HURLBERT: It's all based on the hearing impaired community and when we are saying relay there's an interpreter in the middle that is doing the relay.

TOM KOUTSKY: Okay. That's answered the question. I want to make sure everyone understood what that point four was driving at. Continue.

KEN HAVENS: Okay. On slide 8, it describes number assignment options, assignment to VRS deaf or hard of hearing relay users. This essentially just describes the following options for number assignments.

The VRS service provider can obtain numbers from an existing voice service provider and in turn would assign those to VRS users. The VRS service provider could obtain numbers from a neutral third party and in turn assign to VRS users. VRS users could actually obtain numbers directly from the voice service

provider and arrange for the routing to chosen VRS provider for incoming calls. We have identified a number of options in which these numbers could be assigned to an end user. Question?

BETH O'DONNELL: Beth O'Donnell, Cox Communications. These three options play into your working, INC is likely to propose slide? Like, one of the options on page 8 is part of the proposal on page 7. Is that NANP numbers be assigned to deaf and hard of hearing relay users? The language isn't the same so I'm having a hard time figuring it out.

KEN HAVENS: Slide 7 tries to illustrate that we will use NANP numbers. We will be assigning NANP numbers.

BETH O'DONNELL: Oh, its not, the relay user isn't the important issues, it's the NAPM number that's the important issue, on page 7.

KEN HAVENS: Yes.

BETH O'DONNELL: Okay. Thanks.

KEN HAVENS: Okay. Slide 9. The INC is considering three major alternatives for implementing a central data base and the thought going into details one of them is the impact. You have the dynamic DNS and DNS with delegation to a VRS service provider. The INC report, the actual INC report will go into more depth and discussion of how these are being considered.

TOM KOUTSKY: With regard to this, to what extent will there be discussion about relative costs of each of the options?

KEN HAVENS: The INC is not delving into actual cost issues. Its out of the purview of INC to discuss actual costs.

TOM KOUTSKY: So, I'll point out that that will probably be something that will be part of our review is to weigh and measure the relative costs of these three options. It's essentially a cost benefit analysis. Anna.

ANNA MILLER: Anna Miller, T-Mobile. I guess in terms of evaluation I'm anxious to see what the INC report says and get more detail on these three alternatives. Depending on NANC review then if there is a determination that that type of information is important then maybe NANC needs to put together an IMG or group to look at that. I'm not sure. I guess I wanted to bring that up as maybe a possibility. I'm just waiting to get the INC report first to see if that really satisfies the information that's needed and how to address the concern or if more work needs to be done.

TOM KOUTSKY: I'm kind of in a similar situation. It kind of depends on what the report says. My anticipation today is that we will probably do some kind of IMG to – probably do an IMG to pull in the expertise because we have experts on both in FON and in the LNPA working group. This kind of crosses over a little bit of both. I don't want to pick one. I think we will probably end up doing it that way. IMGs also work, can work a lot faster because they are single topic.

What I encourage the INC report to do, I mean, you are a separate body but even if you do come up and make a statement about we think this is a preferred option I would like there to be in the report sufficient information about the

other options so that we can kind of take another step. I would even encourage to possibly not necessarily to get bogged down in picking one over the other. Maybe information gathering is a lot more useful.

KEN HAVENS: The INC report definitely goes into an analysis of the various options. I think you will find that section particularly useful in helping to come to some conclusion.

TOM KOUTSKY: Okay. I appreciate that. Beth was first and then Rebecca.

BETH O'DONNELL: I don't have anything. I just nodded.

TOM KOUTSKY: Oh, you just nodded. You've got your little card up.

That's fine. That's fine. Rebecca.

REBECCA BEATON: Rebecca Beaton, NARUC Washington (undecipherable). For clarification then the INC will make a recommendation, give the options to NANC, NANC will look at the cost at that point and then –

TOM KOUTSKY: We'll also review the recommendations. I've learned to appreciate that there are two platonic ideals of consensus. There is an INC consensus and there's a NANC consensus which don't necessarily have to be the same thing, but usually are. The process will be that they will come up with a recommendation and then a NANC group --. I think the one thing that we will value add on that is a type of, a general cost analysis. You will have information as to what

some people might think is the best way to do it, but there is also other considerations at play.

KEN HAVENS: I should point out that the INC will come to a recommendation provided we can gain consensus on a recommendation.

TOM KOUTSKY: Exactly.

KEN HAVENS: At the very least, we will try to distill it down into, you know, perhaps a couple of paths that you can go by and provide enough information to facilitate discussion and having a recommendation from the IMG.

TOM KOUTSKY: Exactly because a lot of these do cross over and aren't necessarily solely related to VRS in the end. That's the specific charge from the Bureau is to help them out on this VRS, actually the Bureaus, there are three Bureaus involved in this question. These do cross over into other areas and other subject matters when you start talking about the merits of the dynamic DNS data base versus ---. There are a few other considerations. If anyone is volunteering to chair an IMG, speak to me. You may want to start setting up on it.

INC has been doing a tremendous amount of work on this. I just think that what they put together is going to be very useful for us.

KEN HAVENS: Thank you Mr. Chairman. On slide 10, this provides the status of the INC report. You will note that currently we have over fifty pages which is comprised of seven sections and four appendices and over one hundred contributions have been submitted in preparation for this particular report.

We have a number of industries that have consistently participated in discussion and providing contributions and so I look forward to being able to present that report to you in the near future.

The slide goes on to talk about some of the hours that we have invested in that and that we have been and will continue to meet twice a week until the report is finalized.

Finally, on slide 11, some additional points of note. The INC believes that the use of the NAPM resource will facilitate the provision of the E911 service to relay users. INC recognizes that E911 is an issue of interest to the FCC and to the NANC and so we wanted to make sure that it was understood that our solution should dovetail nicely into that.

INC believes that a number and routing data base should be operated by a neutral third party with appropriate privacy and security considerations. Finally, the INC report does not address how or for which aspects of this service service providers will be reimbursed by the TRS fund. Obviously that is a policy issue and that will be decided here. Any questions?

TOM KOUTSKY: I will note it may not even be decided here. That's ultimately for the FCC.

ROSEMARY EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. I would like to personally thank the INC and Joe Hurlbert and the subcommittee membership for the unwavering support with this particular issue. Eighteen interim

meetings since the last report and thirteen interim meetings in October and November is more than impressive.

To follow Ms. Shaffer's lead, just thank you, thank you, thank you.

KEN HAVENS: That's the end of the VRS piece.

TOM KOUTSKY: One thing I would just, I'm not sure on the timing of the result of this report but I anticipate INC will forward it to me and then I will, as soon as I get it, it will circulate that to the full NANC and we'll probably --. Unless I hear anybody else saying, in the event we don't have a meeting between now and then, unless anyone objects, my initial inclination on this is to create an IMG. If anybody objects to that decision now would be a good time to let me know if they think its better in a working group. I personally think its better in an IMG because we can pull in people from both of the related working groups. Saying that, I will then act to try to establish that as soon as practicable.

KEN HAVENS: On that note the INC is again meeting, nose to the grindstone for as long as it takes. We discussed last week, you know, based upon that when we thought we might have this report and we anticipate, cannot of course guarantee, but we anticipate we would have something by the year end. That's the goal that we are driving toward.

These last three or four slides, slide 12 represents issues are in initial pending at the INC and what that really means is we have issue that have gone to final closure but we had received information which caused us to bring the issue back into a pending status or that we are waiting on information or action items from

another body. Normally I go through a number of these issues and tell you a little bit about those but there's a whole bunch of them and I'm not sure – if you have any particular questions, I'd be more than happy to answer them, but my suggestion would be that if you have questions about them you could get with me or this information is available on the ATIS website to provide more information.

There is probably one issue that I would like to perhaps note. That would be on page 14, just to follow up on something that Mr. Manning noted during the NANPA presentation.

Issue 532 the Kinsale Mobile application for an ERC. The only thing that I wanted to add to that was that the INC in hearing David Traynor who is the gentleman from Kinsale that made the presentation to the INC. He provided us some questions, rather information to questions that we had about his application, and we continually sought additional information to try to get more information. Ultimately it became apparent that he wasn't interested in it because he didn't answer our questions. So the point I wanted to make is that we exercised due diligence in hearing his request and waiting an appropriate length of time to ensure that we had provided all the information that he needed. That's the one point that I wanted to make on that.

Finally, that's pretty much the end of my presentation. Are there any questions or any issues that people would like me to talk about that I glossed over?

If not, then I would – this is my last NANC meeting as INC chair. A new INC chair will be elected at the December meeting. I just wanted to thank NANC and its members for allowing me to be up here for the last four years.

TOM KOUTSKY: Thank you Ken. You've done a tremendous job in putting a lot of things together for us especially in short order. That's much appreciated. The work is always done professionally and comprehensively. You've done well.

KEN HAVENS: Thank you.

TOM KOUTSKY: Don.

DON GRAY: Nebraska NARUC. I just wanted to personally and for Nebraska thank Ken also for his hard work and the diligence of INC. They have been a tremendous help over the last two to three years for Nebraska and some of the issues that we discovered in exploring into the world of thousands-block number pooling. You were a great help to us in implementing that and making necessary changes to guidelines to help facilitate that for states that were looking into that.

Thank you very much Ken, we appreciated that help and look forward to working with you in some other capacity down the road.

KEN HAVENS: I'm not going away. I'm just not chair anymore. Both the INC and I thank you, Don.

TOM KOUTSKY: Okay. The Report of the Billing and Collection Agent.

This report will be Exhibit 9. It's the one with all the numbers on it.

**REPORT OF THE NORTH AMERICAN NUMBERING PLAN BILLING
AND COLLECTION (NANP B&C) AGENT**

FAITH MARCOTTE: Good morning, I'm Faith Marcotte from Welch and Company, and we are the Billing and Collection Agent.

If you turn to the first page of the report it gives the statement of the financial position of the fund. Right now as of August 31st we had \$5,000,000.00 in the bank, \$300,000.00 of accounts receivable and about \$900,000.00 in accrued liabilities. There's a little bit of a make up of those accrued liabilities below. In the cash account we earned a rate of return of 4.79% in annual rate of return.

If you turn to page 2, there is a forecast of where we expect the fund to be by the end of the funding year, which is June 2008. If you look across the page there is a total column and a budget column. You can see there what we expect the fund to be at now versus what the budget was. Of course, our budget was for \$1,000,000.00 surplus and we are now projecting \$2,500,000.00 surplus.

The bottom right hand corner gives you a breakdown of the difference between the two, mainly it due to pooling. One of the bigger differences is for pANI. There was a Change Order 48 which originally was an amount of \$517,000.00 and it came in at \$87,000.00. There was a difference of \$400,000.00 there that we hadn't anticipated.

We had also projected that the pANI costs of \$225,000.00 for the coming year. That is now included in the pooling contract so its not a separate number on its own.

The major difference was the difference between what we had budgeted for pooling for the year versus what the new contract amounted to. We were budgeting based on an average of what the pooling costs were for the previous two years which amounted to \$3.2 Million which amounts to about \$256,000.00 a month and the new contract is \$189,000.00 a month. That's a difference of \$772,000.00.

There were two other amounts based on the difference between estimates and what the actual invoices turned out to be for pooling.

So we are about \$1.5 Million over what we had anticipated, again, mainly due because we didn't have the pooling contract in place at the time we were doing the budgeting.

Just to let you know, when we did the September report which we didn't have time to get approved by the working group and to this meeting in time, a couple of more invoices came through from NeuStar for previous year for merit bonus and a fixed fee which reduces the surplus by another \$300,000.00. So we are down to about \$2.2 Million in what we are anticipating as of now, as of September 30th. Are there any questions about the forecast and the budget?

FAITH MARCOTTE: (undecipherable) liabilities for the next six months, just so you can see what we are looking at over the next six months. Are there any questions?

TOM KOUTSKY: Seeing no questions. Nice job on this. I know last year was kind of difficult because we threw pANI into the mix and you had to

make some guesses. I appreciate the work that you did and I'm glad it turned out better than expected. Thank you.

Now the B&C working group. Rosemary is doing this. Her presentation will be Exhibit 10.

BILLING AND COLLECTION WORKING GROUP REPORT (B&C WORKING GROUP)

ROSEMARY EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. Good morning. Tim Decker with Verizon and I co-chair this working group.

The B&C working group is responsible for overseeing the performance of the Functional Requirements provided by the NANP Billing and Collection Agent, Welch and Company as you guys well know.

We review the performance of the NANP B&C Agent and submit reports to each NANC meeting informing the NANC of the performance with respect to the Functional Requirements. We have spent several months preparing Welch & Company's very first performance evaluation.

You will remember that the FCC contracted with Welch & Company for the B&C Agent responsibility in July of 2005 and our first evaluation reflects the period of time between July 2005 through December 2006.

We developed a rating schematic very similar to the NOWG's for consistency under the NANC. We developed an evaluation consistent with the monthly deliverables matrix that the B&C working group works on to evaluate the

vendor and we scheduled conference calls to gain consensus on the rating and the evaluation.

We used eight criteria in considering and analyzing Welch & Company, the monthly deliverables matrix score, the 2004 and 2005 team meeting materials, the FCC and NANC reports, the monthly reports that they generate, overall customer service, the cleanup of receivables, our own observations, co-chair interactions with Welch and, of course, the most important contribution factor in the budget related to communication and the printed material that we received from them regarding that subject.

Turn to the Deliverable Evaluation Matrix. It's in color.

TOM KOUTSKY: That's a separate document. It will be called Exhibit 11.

ROSEMARY EMMER: On page 2 you will see the rating legend, and it should be familiar to you as it is similar if not exactly like the NOWG's.

The next page reflects the high level of the deliverable document and the evaluation results are based on the deliverable matrix that the B&C working group keeps. You can kind of look down through there and see those scores.

The next couple of pages we outlined the comments that were included in the evaluation. I will highlight a few from the evaluation period from July through September of 2005, specifically regarding the reporting to the B&C working group and the NANC comment was "vendor was available and responsive

to the new billing and collections working group.” Also regarding the FCC red light notice during the same time frame they received a more than met very responsive within a very short time frame for the red light rule process.

The evaluation period between January and March regarding the contribution factor they rated a more than met and the comment was “preliminary options were provided timely and in an understandable manner.”

So, you can read through those comments. On the very last page is a matrix of the scoring. Do you have any questions on this document? After the meeting feel free to contact Tim or myself.

Now I am going back to the deck for the B&C working group on page 6. Welch & Company’s rating for the July 2005 through December 2006 performance year was a met. They met the requirements in order to be considered successful. The performance was competent and reliable. Decisions and recommendations were within requirements and expectations.

I do want to point out that no performance improvement plan was identified. We didn’t identify a single issue to put inside of a performance improvement plan.

The other thing that I wanted to mention to you all was we did not have an operational review since this is new. We are rating a new vendor. We just didn’t have an opportunity to receive that yet and so we did contact Welch & Company, and they agreed to work with the B&C working group at least on figuring out what maybe some of the criteria would be. They did agree to provide a yearly

operational review to the B&C working group for the 2007 time frame. I'm thinking that we would expect to have the 2007 evaluation to be finalized sometime maybe in the late Spring or early Summer.

We kept in the deck the NANP fund size and the contribution factor data. Initially we put some talking points in here regarding the budget details and why we have or are expecting to have more money than we originally indicated, but Faith has done a terrific job of going through all that so I won't repeat it.

We strongly encourage participation at the B&C working group. I know you are used to me saying this, but we aren't going to have a formal membership drive like the LLC has. I would just ask that if you are even remotely interested in learning more about the B&C working group and overseeing Welch & Company, we would be just thrilled to have more participation.

The last page of the deck has our future meetings and if you would like to have the bridge number for those meetings please feel free to e-mail Tim or myself or give us a call. Thank you.

TOM KOUTSKY: Thanks Rosemary. I do appreciate the work that you and Tim do on this. All these services do need to be paid for somehow so B&C is actually the core to both collect and remit the payments. I would encourage folks to participate in that and in essence do their time in terms of making sure that that process is continuing to go relatively smoothly or very smoothly frankly.

With that I think it's probably best that we break for lunch early right now. Since we skipped through the break. We do have a couple – NOWG I don't

want to rush that one unnecessarily on empty stomachs. We will try to meet here. Everyone try to gather a little bit before one so we can start promptly at right at 1:00.

For those not familiar, there are a couple of different cafeterias in the courtyard of the FCC which is on the courtyard level which you have to go up one floor from here and there is elevators across, just down the hallway.

So, I will see everyone a little bit before 1:00. Thank you.

TOM KOUTSKY: Okay, Let's all settle into our chairs and get our pencils and scorecards ready for the NOWG report. Karen, co-chair of NOWG will make the presentation. It's all yours.

REPORT OF THE NUMBERING OVERSIGHT WORKING GROUP

(NOWG)

KAREN RIEPENKROGER: This will be the NOWG report. My name is Karen Riepenkroger. I co-chair the NOWG along with Natalie McNamer of T-Mobile and Paula Husted of Windstream.

Today we will be reviewing the summary of the Pooling Administrator 2006 Performance Report and Survey results, the Summary of the NANPA 2006 Performance Report and Survey results. We have also provided attachments of the tracking document which is the NANPA 2006 Preliminary Performance Evaluation Report and the PA 2006 Preliminary Performance Evaluation Report. We will also touch base on the 2007 Survey Draft, the NANPA Change Orders, the NOWG Co-chair position and the meeting schedule.

On page 3, slide 3, for the PA for 2006 the number of respondents to the 2006 PA survey was down slightly from 2005 for the industry and there was a very small decrease in responses from regulators.

The following chart reflects the trend of respondents since the inception of the PA Performance Survey. As you can see for 2006 we had 55 industry and 23 regulators. Are there any questions?

The next slide is the PA Annual Performance Assessment is based upon four pieces of criteria. The 2006 Performance Feedback Survey, written comments and reports, the Annual Operational Review and NOWG Observations and Interactions with the PA.

For the 2006 PA Performance Report the PA's rating for the 2006 performance year was determined by the NOWG to be more than met. As you can see the rating is defined as to provides more than what was required to be successful, performance was more than competent and reliable, and decisions and recommendations usually exceeded requirements and expectations.

On the next three slides, I'm not going to go into a lot of detail on them. I will let you review them. It just goes by section and how many respondents and the cumulative results for each of those sections. If you have any questions, please feel free to get with me after the presentation. We can answer any questions that you may have.

If you can go to slide 9, a summary of the written comments that were provided by survey respondents. Significant praise for PA staff was a consistent

theme throughout the survey. Provides exceptional help and support, very responsive, knowledgeable and professional and staff is doing an excellent job, a pleasure to work with. That can echo from the NOWG members as well, they have been very responsive to everything that we have asked of them in 2006.

NOWG observations on the 2006 PA Performance Report on slide 10. The 2006 survey results reveal the high level of client satisfaction that commenters attributed to the PA's professionalism, customer service focus and expertise exhibited by the PA personnel throughout 2006.

Delegated authority for supplemental pooling has been sought by various state commissions and granted by the FCC and the PA has demonstrated that they can handle the increase of service providers that are now participating in pooling. They have done this without an increase in their staff.

On suggestions the NOWG recommends that the following improvements be considered for pro actively managed rate center inventories to ensure resources are available when needed, continue to explore ideas and processes for keeping pools replenished, continue customer focus, pass through capability from PAS to NAS and process improvement suggestions provided by service providers and our regulators in the survey comments. Are there any questions on the 2006 PA Performance Report?

TOM KOUTSKY: I have a question on the suggested improvements.

KAREN RIEPENKROGER: Yes.

TOM KOUTSKY: They seem like good ideas to me but how would they actually be implemented? What do you think would be the next step to getting those in place?

KAREN RIEPENKROGER: Well I know that under the new contract they will be implementing the interface between PAS and NAS and I know that the PA actually goes through the comments from the survey and they'll go through them and review them and analyze to see if they need to implement a change order to implement them into the PAS system and I know that they have done that in the PAS on previous surveys. They are actively working with the INC to identify ways to keep the pools replenished.

TOM KOUTSKY: Yes, Ken.

KEN HAVENS: You may recall that we talked about issue 519, pool replenishment and that the INC in conjunction with the PA explored a number of opportunities to try to get service providers to open NXXs in those rate centers where you didn't have enough inventory and basically all we decided that we could do was to encourage this PAS drop down screen that we talked about where it would suggest that a service provider open up a code.

Again, it's just purely encouragement because we concluded that we really couldn't require anyone to open up a code. It's purely voluntary, that half and half proposal where you might take half of the blocks in the pool and then perhaps you would agree to take the remaining blocks from the code that you would in turn try to open up or would open up.

TOM KOUTSKY: And that's been finalized, correct. That's being implemented right now.

KEN HAVENS: Its part of PAS or will be, same change order.

TOM KOUTSKY: Okay. So that change order will go through the process and then its approved and implemented and after several months we might be able to see if that's having an effect.

KEN HAVENS: Its certainly not a fail safe measure.

TOM KOUTSKY: Yeah, okay, all right.

KAREN RIEPENKROGER: One of the other things I do want to comment about is that the PA pro actively each month sends out e-mails to service providers that pools need to be replenished. So they are consistently each month sending out e-mails that say, you know, the pool needs to be replenished. Can you submit a part 1? So they are actively doing that each month.

TOM KOUTSKY: Okay. Thanks.

KAREN RIEPEN KROGER: Any other questions? Okay. I will move on to slide 12. 2006 NANPA Survey respondents. The number of respondents to the 2006 NANPA Survey was down significantly from 2005 for the industry and there was no increase in responses from regulators.

The following chart reflects that trend and as you can see we only had 15 from the industry and twenty-one from the regulators and as we discussed this at the NOWG we attribute that to, a lot of the companies go directly to the Pooling Administrator because to get their NPA and NXXs or their blocks also and so, they

don't even probably look at the NANPA to do the survey. In fact, I have had conversations that say, no I don't even deal with the NANPA and I said but you do in different aspects but they still look at it from just getting their numbering resources and not for the NRUF and for NPA relief. They are not looking at all of that. We attribute that to why the decrease in service provider participation.

NANPA's annual performance is based upon four pieces of criteria. It's the 2006 Performance Feedback Survey, written comments and reports, annual operational review, NOWG observations and interactions with the NANPA.

The NANPA's rating for the 2006 performance year was determined by the NOWG to be exceeded. The definitions for exceeded are: provided excellent above performance requirements and exceeded expectations, performance was well above requirements, decisions and recommendations exceeded requirements and expectations.

On the next three slides, again, I'm not going to review each of those because those are the cumulative results. If you do have any questions, please feel free to get with me after the meeting and I'll be glad to answer any questions you may have.

The following is a summary of written comments that were provided by survey respondents for the NANPA. Significant praise for NANPA's staff was a consistent theme throughout the survey. Helpful, cooperative and supportive, professional, prompt and courtesy, responsive, knowledgeable and demonstrates expertise, willing to go the extra mile to provide excellent customer service.

The only consistent comments for improvements pertain to the NANPA web site navigation. The written comments submitted at part of the survey did not reveal any consistent theme or concern about NANPA's performance.

NOWG observations. High level of satisfaction revealed NANPA focuses on customer satisfaction, significant praise for NANPA's staff was a consistent theme throughout the survey results, cooperation with the NANC, NOWG, the FCC and state regulators has been exceptional and displayed leadership initiative, outstanding professionalism and expertise. Pro-actively introduced new INC issues and contributions.

From the NOWG we truly enjoyed working with the NANPA throughout 2006 through this performance report and they responded to every question or need that we asked of them.

On slide 20, NOWG observations. NANPA seamlessly addressed the Code Administration personnel changes necessitated by the department of two of its three administrators and their work product remained at a high level of performance. The NANPA effectively managed all aspects and NPA relief activity in 2006 providing excellent service above and beyond performance requirements.

Throughout 2006 the NANPA personnel continued to consistently exhibit their professionalism and expertise while performing NANPA duties.

For suggestions, recommendations. The NOWG recommends that the following suggestions be implemented for continued improvement. Pass through capability from NAS to PAS. Continued efforts to improve NANPA web site search

engine. Enhancement to the NAS NRUF missing utilization report search capability.
Are there any questions on the NANPA report?

TOM KOUTSKY: Rebecca has one.

REBECCA BEATON: Rebecca Beaton, Washington. On the performance report recommendations, with the pass through capability from NAS to PAS, do you know if that's going to be in effect this year or next year?

KAREN RIPEN KROGER: I would probably defer that to John Manning for his response since I believe it will have to be a change order that will be issued. I think they are working in conjunction with the PA on this.

JOHN MANNING: John Manning, NANPA. Karen is correct. We are working right now with the PA to put together the requirements that are necessary for the interface. The plan is to submit a change order for NANPA this month with the idea that at the conclusion of the six month interval that the PA has for the system it will be able to introduce the interface between PAS and NAS at that time. So that would probably roughly be January, February of next year.

REBECCA BEATON: So, January, February of 2008.

JOHN MANNING: Yes.

REBECCA BEATON: Thank you very much.

KAREN RIEPENKROGER: Thank you John.

On slide 22. The NOWG, this is our time estimate for the 2006 Performance Report. To complete the various NANPA and PA 2006 Performance Report activities, the NOWG collectively and individually spent approximately 400

hours. These activities included operational reviews with the NANPA and PA review and aggregation of the survey data. Preparation of the performance report and review of the performance report with the FCC, NANPA and PA. Are there any questions?

On slide 23. 2007 NANPA and PA surveys. The NOWG is working on revising the surveys. Drafts have been forwarded to the vendors and the FCC for input, and the NOWG will be convening additional meetings to discuss these surveys.

On slide 24. NANPA changes order. I believe these have probably been reviewed so we will just do highlights. NANPA Change Order 11 proposed to eliminate the use of external server and associated software. The NOWG reviewed and recommended this Change Order be approved and the recommendation was provided to the FCC on May 25, 2007.

On slide 25, NANPA Change Order 12 proposed to replace all four of the servers currently in use for the NANPA administration system NAS. NOWG again reviewed and recommended that this Change Order be approved. This was submitted to the FCC on July 20, 2007.

On Change Order 13, which proposed to remove from the public NANPA web site the switch I.D. field from the Central Office Code utilized report and Central Office Code Assignment records, the NOWG again reviewed and recommended that this Change Order be approved and this recommendation was provided to the FCC on July 20, 2007.

NANPA Change Order 14 recommendation. Change Order 14 proposed that NANPA personnel enter a disconnect date of its Central Office Code on the ACD screen until Telcordia's BIRRDs data base prior to the SP or their agent/AOCN entering the disconnect date on the NXD. This will ensure that an NXX reported TNS is not disconnected without a thorough investigation and attempt to find a new LERG assignee. Again, the NOWG reviewed and recommended that this Change Order be approved and this was submitted to the FCC on September 20, 2007. Are there any questions on the Change Orders?

2008 NOWG Co-Chair Position. The two year term for co-chair position currently held by Natalie McNamer was up for re-election. Nominations were accepted. Natalie McNamer, T-Mobile was nominated to continue her current role for 2008 and 2009. No other nominations were presented. Natalie was named to her role by acclamation on October 1, 2007.

The last slide is the meeting schedule for the remainder of 2007. Are there any questions?

TOM KOUTSKY: I'd like to go back actually to the survey slides. This is just on timing for the next few months. You said you have listed input from the vendors and the FCC on the survey?

KAREN RIEPENKROGER: That is correct.

TOM KOUTSKY: I do plan on doing a circulated note to the NANC to try to get their input for a few weeks. Could you give me a sense of a time line on

KAREN RIEPENKROGER: Probably in the next thirty days. I would say thirty days.

TOM KOUTSKY: Okay. So sometime between now and early November the surveys will be circulated to NANC and then we'll probably take three weeks or so. When do you want to send those out for next year?

Okay. So we will try to have NANC input done by essentially Christmas. Okay.

KAREN RIEPENKROGER: That would be great. Thank you.

TOM KOUTSKY: Okay. So, everyone's aware of that, that time frame. I think the key is to get, to make sure that we at least, that we maintain the participation level in the industry. The regulators seem to have done a good job on this thing, but we could increase that to get the clarities (sic).

KAREN RIEPENKROGER: One of the things that we did notice is that every time the PA or the NANPA sent out a reminder we got significant numbers of surveys. It seems like every time that they sent out the reminder it jogged somebody's memory to send in the survey. So, I think maybe what we might want to do in looking at 2008 is to maybe have them increase the number of notifications that they send out. Its something we will discuss with the NANPA and the PA.

TOM KOUTSKY: Monthly for the first couple of months or something like that.

KAREN RIEPENKROGER: That's correct. Any other questions?

TOM KOUTSKY: I sent the performance reports out to everyone a few weeks ago, I guess. I hope everyone has had a chance to review them. Do anybody have any questions relating to those documents or these documents here? If not, we will consider them approved without objection. That's for both the NANPA and PA Performance Reports. Those will be posted on the web site at the end of the meeting or when we finalize this stuff next week. Anna has a question?

Also congratulations to Natalie. The new co-chair for another two years. Its important work and she does a great job on it. That I think –

KAREN RIEPENKROGER: Is that it? No more questions? Thank you very much.

TOM KOUTSKY: I think this is the major big presentation. We are going to call it number 12, Exhibit 12. Is that right?

Now the LNPA working group report. That's Gary, I believe.

**REPORT OF THE LOCAL NUMBER PORTABILITY ADMINISTRATION
WORKING GROUP (LNPA)**

GARY SACRA: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon everyone. I'm Gary Sacra, co-chair of the LNPA working group. My other co-chair is Paula Jordan of T-Mobile.

I believe everybody has a copy of the report.

TOM KOUTSKY: I think so, yes. I know I do. Its Exhibit 13.

GARY SACRA: Thank you Mr. Chairman. There are two components of the LNPA working group's report today. The first component is a

readout of the action items assigned to the NANC by the Pricing Policy Division staff of the Wireline Competition Bureau. Those action items relate to the former Bell South Petition RM-11299 and the subsequent Verizon ex parte related to proposals to shift the provider who pays the fee for certain impact billable transactions to the initiator of that transaction.

The second component of the report is the usual PIM summary that reflects the current remaining open PIMs and those that have been opened and closed since the last NANC meeting in April.

So to tee up the action item report. It is attached. Before I walk through that I just wanted to tee up as Chairman Koutsky and Mr. Clay stated earlier. Members of the NAPM LLC met with the Pricing Policy Division staff on July 26 to discuss the former Bell South petition and the Verizon ex parte. That was an informal meeting.

Chairman Koutsky was subsequently contacted by the Pricing Policy Division staff to assign or to request assignment of a number of action items to the LNPA working group related to a very specific focus of the July 26 meeting. That was to discuss modifications of existing NPAC ported and pooling records that occur as a result of being initiated by certain providers.

One of the components that's common to both the former Bell South petition and the Verizon ex parte is a proposal that modifies of existing ported and pooled records be paid for by the initiator of the transaction. Providers modify their existing ported and pooled records for a number of legitimate reasons, but the focus

of the July 26 meeting and the subsequent action items was the very specific type of modify. That is modification of what's called destination point codes in the NPAC ported and pooled subscription version records.

Destination point codes or DPCs as they are commonly referred to are nine digit Signaling System 7 (SS7) network addresses that are assigned to SS7 network elements such as switches, data bases such as LNP routing data bases, calling name data bases, Line Information Database (LIDB) data bases and also they are assigned to signal transfer points or STPs. STPs act as the traffic cops in the SS7 network for the routing of SS7 messages.

There are five services currently that potentially could contain DPC data in a ported or pooled number record. Those five services are: LIDB for alternate billing services; CNAM for calling name delivery service; Class features such as auto recall and auto call back or *68, *69. There is also DPC data for inter switch voice messaging for the messaging waiting indicator. The DPC data routes the necessary message in order to light up your light on your phone that indicates that you have a message waiting or to put stutter dial tone on your line also indicating that you have a message waiting. The fifth service is wireless short message service, text messaging. Some providers use the DPC data fields in the ported and pooled number records for the routing of the wireless short message text service.

I have a slide that I'll walk through a little bit just to kind of walk through using CNAM as an example to show how these messages are routed using

the DPC data fields. These messages are commonly referred to as TCAP messages or transaction capabilities messages. Those are the type of SS7 messages that these five services utilize in order to route these messages in support of the services, route them to their proper destination whether that be a switch, a data base such as LIDB or CNAM.

Typically the DPC data that in a ported or pooled number record and that DPC data is placed in their by the provider that either ports in the number or pools in the thousands block. Those DPC fields typically indicate or are assigned to what's called a gateway STP in that provider's network or the data base provider's network.

That DPC data is what the rest of the world uses in order to route these TCAP messages to the target SS7 network. Once it hits that gateway STP, then it's the recipient provider in their network, its their responsibility then to route that TCAP message according, whether to the appropriate switch for class services or the appropriate data base for LIDB.

What I would like to do is walk through the first three action items because those action items relate to the quantity of numbers assigned to various industry segments and how many of those numbers are either ported or pooled in the NPAC data bases. I would like to kind of walk through those three action items first, then I would like to shift everyone's attention to the Power Point slide to walk through the CNAM example. Then I will go back to action item four which relates

to whether or not there is any viable alternatives to doing the modified transactions on these DPC data fields.

JEROME CANDELARIA: I just have a question about the sequence of events. You described NAPM met with FCC staff initially, then they reached out to the chairman. Did the NAPM direct the FCC staff to Chairman Koutsky or can you give me –

GARY SACRA: Yes. In fact I was in attendance at the July 26 meeting. One of my responsibilities, I'm one of the LLC project executives. At the July 26 meeting –

JEROME CANDELARIA: So you were at both the NAPM meeting and you are the chair of the LNPA working group.

GARY SACRA: Co-chair of the working group. That's correct. I wear a number of hats. That's okay.

At the July 26 meeting there was discussion of the possibility of assigning to the working group a number of action items related to some of the questions that the Pricing Policy Division had on modified and use of the NPAC for modifies. We felt, the LLC felt that it was appropriate for any request to the LNPA working group in terms of action items and data requests should go through Chairman Koutsky in order to have that action assigned.

JEROME CANDELARIA: Were the same questions outlines in the LNPA working group handouts, the same questions that were presented to the NAPM?

GARY SACRA: Those questions actually weren't. Well, they were discussed in general. They were actually made specific and finalized on the August 29 conference call that Chairman Koutsky convened between the LNP working group co-chairs and the Pricing Policy Division staff members.

BETH O'DONNELL: Beth O'Donnell from Cox Communications. You may have said this and I missed it. I apologize for that. I was reading the paper. Can you tell me the genesis of the July 26 meeting? It is confusing. The paper says that Tom Koutsky was contacted by the Pricing Division but then you are talking about a NAPM meeting with the Pricing Division on July 26. Can you tell me what the genesis of the July 26 meeting was?

GARY SACRA: The NAPM LLC representatives which were both the co-chairs, myself as project executive and the Sprint Nextel representative of the LLC they attended the meeting at the request of the Pricing Policy Division staff in order to discuss some of the questions that they had that pertained to the Bell South petition and the Verizon ex parte.

BETH O'DONNELL: So the Pricing Policy Division initiated this meeting?

GARY SACRA: Yes.

BETH O'DONNELL: Okay. Thanks.

GARY SACRA: If I can shift your attention to actually the third page in the report, the LNPA working group report which is actually the second page of the action item report. It has a "2" down at the bottom right of the page.

Action Item 1 was a request for the assigned numbering resources by industry segment. Those segments being wire line ILEC, wire line CLEC and wireless providers. The staff requested the working group to identify the total quantity of numbers currently assigned to each of these segments.

There was a request initially to see if we could break out cable providers as a separate industry segment. Quite frankly every source, data source, that Paula Jordan, my fellow co-chair and myself identified, includes providers in with the CLEC quantities.

We talked with a number of the cable providers that participate on the working group we weren't able to identify a source that broke out those quantities separately. You will see there is a note here in Action Item 1 that states that cable provider numbering resources that are assigned to that segment are actually included in the wire line CLEC counts.

TOM KOUTSKY: I think Jerome was first.

JEROME CANDELARIA: We can ask the same thing. Cable obviously gets our attention here. I am wondering did staff as you to breakdown, make any other breakdowns? For example, cable provides service through both third parties and as a CLEC. Did they ask you to breakdown cable among those who are CLEC and those who are not?

GARY SACRA: No, they did not.

JEROME CANDELARIA: Did they ask you to breakdown among the top providers, for example, Vonage or any other provider of phone services who utilize the North American Numbering Plan?

GARY SACRA: No, they did not. The three segments that I have listed here, in addition to the cable providers were the four industry segments that were discussed.

TOM KOUTSKY: I was at the meeting. A quick observation. You know frankly the nature of the request was, if its practicable to have it, you know, that would be interesting data. I don't think it was specifically directed at the cable industry to say that we want to know exactly how many numbers they have. That would be an unfair interpretation. It was more or less what kind of data is there out there in terms of the users of the data base at a general, broad aggregate level. That was the question.

In essence, we were the ones that really broke it down, tried to break it down into crystalline specific questions. So, I don't want to run the risk of making too much about the specifics of the data request because I do think the information in the end is useful information.

BETH O'DONNELL: Beth O'Donnell, Cox Communications. You in essence just answered my question because cable companies per se aren't CLECs. Cable companies have affiliates who are CLECs so why it was singled out was an interesting –

TOM KOUTSKY: I wouldn't –

BETH O'DONNELL: It kind of caught our attention because it wasn't voice providers, it was cable providers. Cable CLEC affiliates also provide CLEC service in a variety of ways. We were wondering why we got singled out frankly.

TOM KOUTSKY: I don't think the phrase singled out is an appropriate phrase. That's all.

It was more of an informal, you know, who uses the data base and at what levels. If it's known, it's known and if it's not, it's not. That's all.

JEROME CANDELARIA: Although I must say Action Item 1, 2, and 3 in each case the FCC staff apparently specified they wanted cable specific information if possible.

TOM KOUTSKY: No. This is what I'm trying to correct you on. I don't mean to be short, but the articulation of the action items was what we did subsequent to the meeting in terms of trying to crystallize it so we could actually put some numbers to those things. I think using the term singling out or, even in this particular format, is unfair and inaccurate. That's all. These were requests as to who are users of the database and in what quantities basically. That's all.

JEROME CANDELARIA: Did you consider this an informal request by FCC staff? I ask the question because NAPM described the request from the FCC staff as informal and I'm wondering if the same –

GARY SACRA: The July 26 meeting I believe Mr. Clay was referring to the July 26 meeting when he said it was an informal meeting. I guess and I certainly can't speak for Chairman Koutsky, but speaking from the perspective

of the LNPA working group, we feel that the request for this data and the action items assigned to us, was an official request.

JEROME CANDELARIA: Was there any discussion whether this was an ex parte? We heard that. We had this discussion with NAPM and I'm wondering if there was any –

GARY SACRA: That meeting?

JEROME CANDELARIA: Actually the entire process of having the LNPA working group pursue this issue. Any discussion of this.

GARY SACRA: None that I had.

TOM KOUTSKY: Under the ex parte rules the FCC is able to ask, it only applies to presentations made with regard to the merits of an open rule making proceeding. This wasn't a presentation made. This was us receiving a request from them. We didn't actually make any presentation.

By definition the ex parte rule, presentation rules, don't apply. They will, in my opinion, and I don't, it really the only one that matters to a certain extent, because in essence ex parte is in the eye of the beholder. With regard to this submission, sending this in since it does go to the merits of rule making, this document will be an ex parte and will be in the public record as we discussed this morning, if we approve it.

I think you will find that's consistent with any legal interpretation. The FCC ex parte rule is that requests from the Commission are not presentations. From our standpoint I will refer everyone to the NANC charter which says that

NANC reports to the Wireline Competition Bureau and if the Wireline Bureau makes a data request to us, gosh darn it we are going to provide them that information.

GARY SACRA: I will add if there is any assurance to our friends in the cable industry, this report, in developing this report, there was quite a bit of participation. The working group members are made up of a number of the major cable companies. They fully participated in the development of the report.

I share Chairman Koutsky's opinion as well. Singling out I don't think really – I think the reason why cable, cable providers or the cable industry was at least initially discussed as a segment is just because they are a very important segment to our industry.

It wasn't anything other than just, perhaps an innocent discussion on if at all possible providing the quantities of numbers in the data base and the quantity of numbers that are assigned to cable providers if at all possible. Again, it wasn't possible for us to find that information.

TOM KOUTSKY: I also remember specifically saying that I'm not sure that will be possible given that they have different ways of providing phone services. So, that's all. Rosemary.

ROSEMARY EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel.

TOM KOUTSKY: I'm sorry. I think Mary was first.

MARY RETKA, QWEST: Just a clarification because I thought that earlier when you said you were going to file the response to the FCC publically I

didn't anticipate it would be filed in that Cost Docket, but I think you just said you would file it as an ex parte response versus just the NANC's normal report back to the FCC. Right?

TOM KOUTSKY: Yes.

MARY RETKA: And you are doing that voluntarily on our part?

TOM KOUTSKY: Doing if voluntarily, yes.

ROSEMARY EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint/Nextel. Just a quick point of clarification. When the FCC asked the LLC to attend the meeting to discuss some of these issues the charge from the LLC to the folks who attended the meeting was to ensure that they were representatives of the NAPM LLC and not a single carrier. So the folks that attended that meeting had a NAPM LLC hat on and not a specific carrier hat on and I just wanted to make that clear.

JEROME CANDELARIA: Appreciate it. One of the reasons I mentioned it. This, at least in my short memory, was somewhat of a typical process we follow to be presented first of all to the NAPM and then brought directly to a subcommittee without coming to NANC. It creates a situation where some of us are taken unawares.

TOM KOUTSKY: Your point on that is noted and I understand the view that you are articulating on this.

GARY SACRA: Again, just to walk through Action Item 1, the data source in this case was the NRUF data filed with NeuStar as of December 31,

2006 as reported in the August 2007 FCC Industry Analysis and Technology Division Report on Numbering Resource Utilization in the US.

As you can see wireline ILEC, roughly 600,000,000 numbers assigned. I might add that there is a table in that report. I referred to it in here. It's table 1 on page 14 for those that have access to that report.

The quantities used in this Action Item readout is the total column. The total categories is a summation of the assigned, intermediate, reserved, aging, administrative, and available categories.

So, for wireline ILECs in the total category there is roughly 600,000,000 numbers. Wireline CLECs, 312,000,000, and wireless carriers have assigned roughly 374,000,000.

Moving to Action Item 2 which gets into now the quantity of these numbers that are resident in the 7 NPAC regional data bases. Action Item 2 pertains to the quantity of ported numbers currently in the U.S. NPAC data bases as assigned to these three industry segments.

The source of this data is an August 2007 NPAC report that provided the quantity of numbers by services provider I.D. or operating company number. The NPAC actually, for the numbers that are stored, whether they are pooled or ported in the NPAC, they are associated as either a wireline number or a wireless number.

There was an additional step required for us to break down the wireline number into either ILEC or CLEC. That breakdown was provided in the Telcordia Local Exchange Routing Guide.

In the LERG there is an identification or categorization of operating company number as either an ILEC or as a CLEC or as a wireless. ILEC is not just the former regional Bell operating companies, there are many, many, many ILECs around the country.

So, the ILEC category is all inclusive in terms of incumbent local exchange carriers, which does also include the former regional Bell operating companies.

It was kind of a two step process in order to get to these numbers. The first process being the wireline wireless categorization in the NPAC of either ported or pooled number. The second stage was looking in the LERG to see how that particular SPID was classified.

In all seven regional NPAC data bases there is approximately 7.8 Million numbers that are associated with wireline ILECs, 71.2 Million wireline CLEC numbers ported in the seven regional data bases and, keep in mind this does not include pooled numbers yet.

For wireless around 93.5 Million numbers in the seven regional NPAC data bases. Again, these ported number include both inter provider ports and intra service provider ports as well.

Action Item 3 is the same process. In order to come up with these numbers, but this is the quantity of pooled numbers currently in the seven regional NPAC data bases. Wireline ILECs have roughly 4,000,000 pooled numbers in the seven data bases.

Wireline CLECs have approximately 67.7 Million pooled numbers in the data bases and wireless carriers have a little over 59 Million pooled numbers in the seven data bases for a total of about 130.8 Million numbers in all seven regional data bases.

Any questions? Again, that gives you a feel for the quantity of numbers assigned to these three particular industry segments, what portion of those numbers are resident in the NPAC data bases as of August of this year.

Before I go to Action Item 4 if I could just move you all just a little bit ahead in the report to the Power Point slide. I would like to very quickly walk through this just to get a level set on the use of Destination Point Codes and the routing of these SS7 TCAP messages in support of one particular service, in this case CNAM.

CNAM is Calling Name Delivery. For those end users that have subscribed to CNAM on the calling line I.D. box if an incoming call would typically display the calling party number as well as the calling party name. That utilizes SS7 of these routing TCAP messages and destination point code data in particular.

In step number 1 in the lower left, we have call party "A" and they have a ported number - 410-555-1234, a fictitious number. They go off hook and

they dial call Ed party “B” and for simplicity’s sake, because its not relevant to this particular call set up, call Ed party B does not have a ported number. Their telephone number is 410-555-6789. That’s the phone number the calling party dials. Call Ed party B does have CNAM service with their local service provider. After calling party A dials the number, the originating switch will.

To the originating carrier’s LNP data base to see if the number is ported or pooled. If it is ported or pooled, then we have to route on the location routing number rather than the dialed digits.

In step two in this case since the call party number is not ported, the dialed digits are returned from LNP data base one and step three, the call set up message is then routed in the SS7 signaling network over to the terminating providers signaling network or STP2. That signaling message, initial address message is now being routed on the dialed digits. There is not need to route on an LRN because the number is not ported or pooled.

STP2 receives that incoming call set up message and routes that to the terminating switch B that serves this called party B. That’s the continuation of step three.

Terminating switch B sees that called party B is a CNAM subscriber so terminating switch B has to launch a CNAM TCAP query in order to obtain the calling party name from the appropriate CNAM data base.

Step four you see the CNAM TCAP query being launched by terminating switch B. That message is being launched and routed based on the

calling party number or calling party A's number that is a ported number and that number is 410-555-1234. So, step four, that TCAP query hits STP2 which is the terminating provider's STP in their network.

This is where things have changed since LNP. Before LNP was implemented, these TCAP queries could be routed based on NPA and NX because an entire block of 10,000 numbers and an NX code was assigned to a specific carrier, assigned to a specific carrier's switch or a specific carrier's data base or a CNAM provider's data base. Prior to LNP, steps four and five weren't required, this lookup at the LNP data base two.

What would have happened prior to LNP is in step four, when that TCAP query hit STP2, that STP would have done a translation based on calling party A's NPA NXX and translated that to the appropriate DPC value of the CNAM data base provider's SS7 signaling network.

With the advent of LNP and subsequently in 2002 telephone number pooling, we now have to do a lookup based on ten digits. We can't route these message based solely on NPA NXX because NPA NXX's numbers within that code are spread out among multiple providers. They are spread out among multiple switches and they are spread out among multiple data bases such as LIDB and CNAM.

So, step four this TCAP query, STP2 recognizes calling party A's NPA NXX as a portable NXX code. In step four the continuation of that step it now

routes that TCAP query up to the terminating provider B's LNP data base in order to see if that calling party A's number is ported or pooled.

In step four that query now hits the LNP data base 2 and because calling party A's number is ported there is going to be a ten digit match in that data base. Associated with that ten digit ported number now is a DPC value for CNAM that was put in there by calling party A's provider when they ported in calling party A. There is a ten digit match found.

Step five returns the DPC value of calling party A's provider's CNAM data base. Step five is now going to route on the DPC value associated with STP3 which is the ingress or the incoming gateway STP associated with the CNAM data base provider that has calling party A's number and name in it.

That CNAM query now hits the appropriate data base and in step six the calling name is delivered back to STP2 in order for it to be routed over to terminating switch B for subsequent routing to the call ED party's calling line I.D. box.

The last step is the voice path is established between originating switch A and the call ED party served by terminating switch B. One of the reasons for modifying in this particular example of CNAM.

Let's say, if the originating switch A's, the service provider that had calling party A, if they elect to change their CNAM data base provider, they would then go in and do a modify of the CNAM DPC value in calling party A's ported record via the NPAC and change the DPC value for that particular service from the

old CNAM data base provider's gateway STP to whatever new CNAM data base provider they have elected to go with. They would put in that DPC value of the new provider's gateway STP and that would be broadcast down to all subtending providers in order for them to have in real time the actual DPC routing value that CNAM needs to rely on.

Any questions? Everybody's eyes are glazed over. I think my eyes are glazed over. Seriously, I wanted this to be as clear as possible because it is kind of important for Action Item 4 and the reason why Action Item 4 and the results and analysis that took place for Action Item 4.

TOM KOUTSKY: Its as clear as mud to me.

GARY SACRA: Okay. Action Item 4 was a request for the working group to determine whether or not there are any viable alternatives to doing the modified transactions of the DPC data for these five services that are currently in the NPAC ported and pooled number records. Again, those five services being CLASS, LIDB, CNAM, ISVN inter switch voice messaging, message waiting indicator and wireless short message service.

The only potential viable alternative that was offered up and discussed in the working group analysis was the possibility of doing a redirect of the TCAP message for these five services. I guess analogous to say like a call forwarding scenario in the SS7 network where there would not be a modify in the NPAC of any of the DPC data but in the SS7 network there would be sort of a call

forwarding, if you will, or a redirection of the TCAP message to the appropriate target SS7 network.

So, we looked at the five services kind of in blocks. The first block of services that we looked at was LIDB and CNAM. We blocked them together because the target DPC or the final destination for the TCAP message in support of both LIDB and CNAM is a data base, its not a switch, its not a wireless short message service center. We looked at LIDB and CNAM sort of together and we kind of walked through a redirecting scenario.

Using CNAM as an example what would have to take place for this redirection to work of CNAM would be in lieu of changing the DPC value when the provider elected to change their CM data base provider, in lieu of changing that DPC value, that would require the old CNAM data base provider to receive the incoming TCAP message, recognize that its not one of their customers, that number is no longer in the data base and then redirect that CNAM TCAP query to one of their competitors so that the lookup can take place in the appropriate data base.

Even though one CNAM data base provider said that that is technical feasible, the working group collectively did not view that as a viable alternative because certainly there is questionable incentive for a data base provider to reroute an incoming TCAP message for CNAM for example or LIDB to one of their competitors so that that lookup could take place for a number that's not in their data base.

Also, that rerouting scenario keeps the former data base provider's SS7 network in the routing path of the TCAP query. That has possible impacts then on the quality of service for affected customers. If there should be congestion in the former data base provider's SS7 network, that could have an impact on the new data base provider's ability to provide a service for a customer.

Provider systems and networks do rely on the real time update of these TCAP messages, the destination point code data, that forwarded by the NPAC and the LNP infrastructure. As numbers are ported and pooled, in real time immediately that DPC data is made available to all subtending providers and their systems. As these modifies take place, if data base providers are changed, those changes to the DPC value happen in real time and are broadcast to all subtending services providers simultaneously.

There is a real time need to have this data modified in NPAC and the LNP architecture does afford that. There is an administrative effort ongoing to maintain this rerouting infrastructure as the need takes place.

The conclusion for both LIDB and CNAM was that redirection of the incoming TCAP query was not deemed a viable alternative to going in and modifying the DPC values in the NPAC for both LIDB and CNAM. Questions?

PHIL HARRINGTON: Phil Harrington, Verizon. This may not be the appropriate question to ask you Gary but what would be the motivation for a service provider to change out of LIDB or CNAM data bases, for example?

I mean, could it be just that they get a better deal from another data base provider?

GARY SACRA: It could be a service thing.

PHIL HARRINGTON: But its pretty much the service provider's idea and they are doing it for something within that service provider's (undecipherable).

GARY SACRA: Right. Okay. The next one we looked at, kind of separately was wireless short message service. The reason we looked at that kind of separately is because its not, well, besides being a wireless service, not a wireline service, the DPC value identifies a short message service center, not like a LIDB data base or a CNAM data base or a wire line switch or a wireless switch like in the case of CLASS or inner voice message.

So, we looked at this particular service a little bit separately but, again, came up with the same conclusions for a number of the same reasons with LIDB and CNAM.

Again, questionable incentive to receive an incoming message for wireless short message text message and then realizing that its not an incoming message for one of your customers, then rerouting that out to another wireless short message center for completion of the delivery of the text message.

Again, keeping former networks in the routing path of these message could be a service affecting condition. For the same reasons we didn't feel that rerouting of these particular SS7 signaling messages for WSMSC was an appropriate

or viable alternative to actually going in if those providers choose to use those DPC values. It wasn't a viable alternative to actually going in the NPAC and changing those values.

The last two that we looked at kind of in conjunction with each other were CLASS and inner switch voice messaging, message waiting indicator, mainly because these two particular services, the final destination of the TCAP message in support of these services is a service provider's switch.

Again CLASS, the two main CLASS services that utilize these TCAP messages and the DPC values in the ported record are *68, *69. The TCAP message actually is launched towards the target switch and it checks the off hook, on hook status of the target number. If somebody has hit *69, that TCAP message is launched from the originating switch, routed through the SS7 network to the target switch. If that line is idle then there is a signal sent back to the calling party that its okay to now initiate a call to that calling party.

I think the way the service works then is the calling party gets like a brief ring. They pick up the phone and then it immediately redials the number that they *69ed.

Again ISVM message waiting indicator, the final destination for the TCAP message for that service is a switch so that the appropriate line can have stutter dial tone placed on it or the message waiting light can be lit on a phone.

Typically what a provider would put into the DPC value for these two services when they poured in a number or they pool in a number, is the ingress

gateway STP, the DPC value of their incoming gateway STP. That's what the advertise to the rest of the world saying that if you are going to send me a TCAP message for *69, or for ISVM, I want you to route that message to this incoming STP. I'll take it from there.

They broadcast the DPC value of their ingress STP gateway to the rest of the world. Now, if that provider chooses at some point, for whatever reason to change the incoming gateway STP that they want the rest of the world to route these messages to, then typically that provider would go in and modify the DPC value for these two features via the NPAC and all of their ported and pooled in number records.

Again, the very same reasons that we walked through for CNAM and LIDB, we didn't feel that because of the real time need to have these records modified and these DPC values modified, we didn't feel that rerouting of the incoming TCAP message in the SS7 network was a viable alternative in lieu of actually going in and doing the modify of the DPC values via the NPAC.

As you can see at the bottom of page 8, the overall conclusion for the entire Action Item 4 is, after analyzing and walking through the routing of these messages for all five services that utilize DPC values and the NPAC, the working group does not feel that rerouting the messages is a viable alternative to modifying the DPC value. We found no other viable alternative in addition to the one that we did walk through and look through and that was the rerouting. I open it up for questions.

TOM KOUTSKY: First of all, take a break for your voice. It is a very thorough job in a very short period of time and I do appreciate it.

PHIL HARRINGTON: Phil Harrington, Verizon. Is there any other drivers for modifies, for example?

GARY SACRA: Well, in addition to the DPC values, there are other, in addition to the one that we focused on in the meetings and in this action item report, providers do modifies, they can modify the LRN, location renumber. That is one of the fields that's available for modification. If a provider wants to move one of their ported numbers, their currently existing ported numbers or pooled numbers from one of their switches to another switch, they can do that because the record already exists.

Its not like an initial port where the record doesn't already exist. Because the record does already exist, either via being ported or pooled, in order to move it to another switch they can change the LRN and that would immediately change the routing to the new switch where the number is now served.

There is corrections too, to DPC values. That's another reason why providers may do a modify too, if they needed to make any correction to the DPC value.

PHIL HARRINGTON: So I guess that switch to switch is almost like a grooming activity. Do we have any idea what percentage of modifies might be a switch to switch or LIDB or –

GARY SACRA: No, I honestly don't know. There may be some data we could get from the NPAC but I don't know. I don't even know if we could do that in a provider's local system because of the history. That would require some history retention. Perhaps its available via the NPAC.

Any more questions?

TOM KOUTSKY: Any more questions, comments on the report?

Objections to the report?

The only edit I suggest is that –

ADAM NEWMAN: Adam Newman, Telcordia. I just have a couple of minor, picky little edits that I didn't catch because I was bouncing on the train.

GARY SACRA: Telcordia (undecipherable)?

ADAM NEWMAN: That's one of them and actually the TCAP spell out. I'm just going to send you an e-mail. They are just editorial. I have two minor changes.

GARY SACRA: I may have spelled out TCAP somewhere in here but if I didn't –

ADAM NEWMAN: You didn't have the application part.

GARY SACRA: Oh, okay, application part. You are absolutely right. Thank you Adam.

TOM KOUTSKY: My nit was to change the date from October 1 to, I guess today.

GARY SACRA: I was trying to get credit for having it in early.

TOM KOUTSKY: I appreciate that.

GARY SACRA: I'll change it to the 10th.

TOM KOUTSKY: Yeah, I guess so.

GARY SACRA: Since this is not considered filed because I'll talk to Adam and get his edits.

TOM KOUTSKY: Okay. With that proviso for those minor editorial, totally non-substantive edits, upon receipt of that I will send this off to the Bureau, in a few days hopefully. I think it's a solid piece of work.

I understand there were questions related to the genesis of the request but I do think that in the end the answers to the questions that were raised were done very professionally and done as objectively as possible.

I understand that this is a rule making where people have different sides. I do appreciate that. This is an example of a working group working.

GARY SACRA: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I would like to also just mention that Paula Jordan, my fellow co-chair who put a tremendous amount of work into this report as well as the rest of the LNP working group members individually, going back to the own SS7 signaling experts within their own companies and then collectively as a working group, there was a lot of participation, a lot of involvement in putting this report together. I want to recognize them as well.

TOM KOUTSKY: Okay. Thank you. You are free to move on.

GARY SACRA: The last part of the report is something I think everybody should be familiar with. That's the summary of the PIMS. Again, I don't

really feel a need unless others disagree to walk through this other than just mentioning some of the highlights.

Since the last NANC meeting in April we've closed eight PIMS, opened six new ones and some of the eight that have been closed have been placed in the LNP working group's number portability best practices document.

I will mention PIM 32 which has been discussed quite a bit here in the council. That related to difficulties in porting reseller numbers. We did come to a consensus that I believe I reported out on in either the February meeting or the April meeting that basically said it was the consensus of the working group that resellers should not instruct their underlying network providers to withhold customer service requests from requesting providers that wish to port in those numbers.

That is now in our best practices document. That best practices document is up on the LNP working group's web site www.npac.com so there is a lot of good information in there for those that wish to go to it.

I will also mention, because Mr. Clay, during the NAPM LLC report mentioned PIMS 51 and 61 and the fact that the LNP working group requested the LLC to submit a request for a statement of work to NeuStar. As Mr. Clay read out, that request was approved by the LLC. The statement of work request have gone to NeuStar.

PIM 51 is a request for a statement of work for a manual clean up of all seven regional NPAC data bases for NXX codes that have been opened by the

wrong provider. Currently there is no mechanized way to prevent the wrong provider from opening up a code to portability in the NPAC.

What happens in some cases subsequently numbers have actually ported in that code. It makes it difficult then, we have to basically do a SPID migration or delete, temporarily delete the ported numbers in order to get the code ownership to the proper service provider in the NPAC and deleting the ported records temporarily still is a service affecting condition while those numbers are ported.

We know there are still existing codes in the regional NPAC data bases that have been opened up by the wrong provider so this statement of work is a request for NeuStar to put a project together to do a manual clean up. Identify those codes that have been opened up inappropriately by a provider, identify the appropriate provider and get those codes reestablished to the rightful owner, if you will.

Again, this is just a request for a price to do that. The actual work has not been approved by the NANP LLC.

TOM KOUTSKY: I'm sorry. Do we have any indication as to when that – that sounds expensive to me. Do we have any indication as to when that might come back?

GARY SACRA: No, what's the typical turn around for requests? Within ninety days or –

TIM DECKER: Tim Decker, Verizon.

TOM KOUTSKY: Yes. Step closer to the mike.

TIM DECKER: Oh, I'm sorry. Typically we send the request to NeuStar for the statement of work. It depends on the turn around time for that. As soon as we get the statement of work back usually we will send it out to the members and vote on it probably the next scheduled meeting.

GARY SACRA: Was you question the turn around for receiving the statement of work?

TOM KOUTSKY: For receiving yes.

TIM DECKER: Turn around from Neustar?

TOM KOUTSKY: Well, I think its more specific to when the request was made to get them to put this together and when a response is expected, I guess.

TIM DECKER: Well, the request was made right after the September LLC meeting which was mid-September.

TOM KOUTSKY: Right. So last month, okay. I guess its up to them to –

TIM DECKER: I would have to defer that to NeuStar as far as when they are going to turn it around.

TOM KOUTSKY: All right. That's fine.

GARY SACRA: Just finally, PIM 61 which is a request for a statement of work to establish a virtual private network or VPN interface to the NPAC for what's called Low Tech Interface Users. There are a number of providers

that don't have mechanized systems and interfaces to the NPAC. What they use is what's called a low tech interface which is a dial up interface in order to interface with the NPAC to facilitate porting.

Quite some time ago the NPAC in Canada implemented an internet based VPN functionality for the low tech interface users. This was a request – PIM61 was a request by several low tech interface users in the U.S. to implement a VPN access for their use to the NPAC. So, PIM 61 is resulted now, again, a second statement of work request for NeuStar to develop pricing for establishing a VPN access to the NPAC in the U.S. as well.

That request went to NeuStar the same time that the other request went. That was mid-September.

I believe that's all I had for the PIM report unless there was any other questions or any other questions in general on the working group report.

TOM KOUTSKY: Any other questions, comments, thoughts?

GARY SACRA: I will make the changes to the Action Item Report and probably get that report to you before the end of the week.

TOM KOUTSKY: Okay. That sounds great. Thanks, Gary.
Thanks to Paula as well.

Now the Future Numbering with Don Gray. We are all very happy to see Don Gray here.

**REPORT OF THE FUTURE OF NUMBERING WORKING GROUP (F0N
WG)**

DON GRAY: Not as happy as I am to be here. Thank you. Good afternoon, Nebraska Public Service Commission, one of the tri-chairs for the future of numbering working group. Before I start I would just like to make a point of personal privilege if you will. I think that's the right term.

I just want to thank everybody in NANC and the various committees and the people in the industry for the overwhelming expressions of prayers and thoughts and cards and messages I've gotten. It has been truly humbling, I want to tell you.

My status. We can't say I'm cancer free because it hasn't been long enough, but the lobe that I had cancer in is gone. We nuked it with radiation and then removed it. So, that's out of the way.

A couple of lymph nodes were giving us an issue. We think its just irritation is why they are showing up now and right now the 27th of September I started a final chemotherapy regime to go in and get any of those little bad boys that are in the blood stream, the lymph system or in the bone marrow that we just can't see yet. So, I've got about four to six treatments of those, once very three weeks and then we watch and wait. So, its great being a survivor.

As I said on behalf of the other tri-chairs, Jim Castagna and Adam Newman and myself, we would like to bring you up to speed on the future of numbering working group. To give you a summary of what we've done since the

last report, an overview of our submissions, explain our tracking matrix and then what our future meeting schedules have been laid out as.

Future of Numbering group has met eleven times since our last report. We've accepted three new projects to review and we have been reviewing and working a significant number of contributions on the already accepted projects. I think the thing, especially for me, about the future of numbering that's so exciting is basically we've got carte blanche to look at just about anything we want to as long as it can somehow be tied to the numbering field and its in the future. That's gives us a pretty wide gamut to work with. We do see some things that at first glance, um, um, this is interesting.

Some of those that we have been seeing, the first three that we've accepted, one is the issue of telematics and the use of NANP numbering resources. When that was first brought to us it was a little more specific, pointed at On Star and their application, but in not too long a time frame, telematics as grown to encompass a lot more than a car calling for help or somebody saying, hey, you got an air bag deployment. Do you need help?

There are medical devices out there now that are in real time monitoring people's condition and automatically transmitting that information in to their physicians, making automatic adjustments to implanted defibrillators and other things like that. It all comes under the issue of telematics.

The primary concern, I think, that we are arriving at here is not that they are using numbering resources, but do those providers understand their

responsibilities as users of the numbering resources in terms of assignment, in terms of appropriate retirement, recycling of numbers and issues like that. I think that's probably where we will end up driving that particular issue to is ensuring there is proper notification and communication between the industry and those specific providers.

A very interesting one that we are looking at right now is looking at a property rights model for numbering resources. Whether it should be a commons based which is the term that we've kind of accepted in our discussion, which is what we have today. They are there for everybody to use as long as you meet certain requirements, or a market based approach in which case you would still have some requirements to have access to the numbers, but perhaps there are fees associated with those numbers that you would acquire.

We've had some very interesting discussions on that topic and several different ideas submitted on it. We've had a couple of recent discussions to perhaps narrow that focus a little more from the total numbering plan to perhaps looking initially at the toll free number environment. I think that may be where we are going to go. We'll know in our next couple of phone calls if we focus that a little more toward that instead of saying any number, anywhere, used by anybody. I think that's probably a pretty big elephant for all of us to take a bit out of and to be able to comprehend it right off the bat. We are going to try and focus that one on something that we can all grasp.

Geographic issues impacting numbering policy decisions. That one originally started out – I'm sorry that Courtney had to leave, but in his concern that he raised with us where there were providers primarily voice over IP providers that were obtaining resources from the Caribbean, using them outside of that geographic area and then using IP transport methods to deliver the traffic back to one of the original switches without indication that it was coming from outside the area and therefore sidestepping the access requirements and other regulatory fees that might have been appropriate.

As we looked at that and then looked at another geographic issue that was brought to us, which is as more and more people utilize a wireless device, outside of their, shall we say native area, or they are using a voice over IP enabled device which is not physically located to where the number assignment would typically be registered. The 800 number service providers as part of their services call redirection based upon the geographic location of the originating call, is causing an issue.

So as we started to look at that combined with Courtney's we realized that really the whole issue was the importance of geographic identifiable location for a phone number and what's that causing? We are going to have that under one issue, the geographic numbering and then break it down into at least these two sub-issues underneath for more analysis there.

Misuse of resources outside the NANP. That the one that Courtney recently brought to us. Some pending ones are network's apology and numbering

system impacts. What happens as you start to move the traffic around in different ways and when you see a particular number on your caller ID, it may not be from where or who from you thought it was originally, obviously issues that can impact a lot of different things and I think even down to the consumer level.

As my boss would say, Gene Hand, the little old grandma in white tennis shoes, when she gets to her caller ID and sees a number that she thinks is local and picks up and find out that she's got a telemarketer from someplace else that she would never have picked the phone up had she known that.

Interoperability and ENUM are issues that are on our radar screen that we are going to start to look at and do some research into. The Mobile Nomadic Society demands and the changing of numbering requirements. I think that's probably going to be one of the biggest ones that we will be looking into in the future from several issues.

The most basic being the fact that many people in today's society, they got their first wireless phone when mom and dad decided it was time they wanted them to have one before they went off to college and got one. They've still got that same number but they are living nowhere near where that number was assigned out of.

If I remember correctly, I could read the fine print in my contract. It said, X percentage of your calls must originate in your billing service area, yada, yada, yada. I don't know that that's really being enforced that much anymore. So, the whole nomadic issue of the wireless environment is one that, is it an issue, is it a

problem, it is something for the future? That we need to look at and we will investigation.

The other one is just probably the whole impact of geographic portability and how that could help or could hinder in the effective utilization of our numbering resources. Rate center consolidation sure frees up a lot of things and I know at least in Nebraska, if you look at our numbering situation, the 402 area code, you know, we've got 7 million and change numbers available in 402 but we've only got a 1.5 million people total with number, why do we have a problem? It goes back to the old rate center and 10,000 block code assignment originally and the fact that we can't move the numbers where we need them to be used. I think that will be another area that we will probably look into.

The committee came up with a couple of different tools that we used. This one here on page 5 is our activity project identification matrix or our AIM matrix which is what we use to track our numbers with.

Number one is new and future services. That's kind of an open bookmark that the tri-chairs are using to add information to look to see what else we want to go out there and examine.

Number two is the telematics and use of the NANP number and that was brought to us by Karen Norcross from the Michigan Public Service Commission. As I said, it originally started as On Star specific but now is focused at the total telematics implementation that technology is giving folks availability to.

Number three, J. Carpenter from 1-800-AFTA brought us the commons property rights model and that one has brought a lot of discussion, a lot of questions and a lot of knowledge being exchanged by everybody as we understand that.

Number four is geographic issues and numbering policies. We are keeping the one that David Greenhouse brought to us which is, how can a service provider direct his 800 call to the right physical location in an umbrella group or a corporate environment when they may not be able to accurately identify the physical location of that caller.

The last one without a number there, was the one from Courtney that the tri-chairs drafted and put into the system on his behalf. We've combined those together from that aspect.

Any question on the things that we have been looking at, how we have been looking at them or where we are headed?

TOM KOUTSKY: I would just like to make a statement. I encourage you guys to continue to look at this stuff. I think the questions on the geographic issues raised by Courtney originally, I think are actually going to become something that we are going to have to pay a lot more attention to perhaps over the next year or two, particularly in the Caribbean.

I know it's a rather significant issue that's growing as we speak. There are certain other applications in the United States so I would encourage you guys to continue to look at that one and place some focus on it.

DON GRAY: As far as meetings go, we have four meetings scheduled between now and December 5 and the schedule is there. If any of you would like to participate or just listen in, don't hesitate to send an e-mail to one of the tri-chairs. We will get you on the distribution list so that you know what's happening, when its happening.

We've been pretty good about sticking within our time frames and getting done with the calls on time. I thank everybody that participates in it. Again, we've got a great group of people, a great cross-section. A lot of great ideas get brought to the table.

Like all of the NANC IMGs and working groups, I'm continued to be impressed by how people put aside the particular hat they wear for their day-to-day job and look at these issues from a total perspective of how do we best address our numbering resources and make the best use of them. It a fun group to be with and I'm really happy to be here.

TOM KOUTSKY: Don, I know I speak for more than one to say that we are also more than impressed with you, as well. The measure of a man is where he stands in times of challenge and you've given us a great model. Its great to have you back and to have you here.

TOM GRAY: Thank you.

TOM KOUTSKY: Don's presentation is Exhibit 14.

TOM GRAY: Do I get credit for being early?

TOM KOUTSKY: You get extra credit for being early. I think we will move on to Update List of the NANC Accomplishments, Action Items.

UPDATE LIST OF NANC ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Basically the only action item I have from this one is to forward along the LNPA working group report. We will do that with dispatch, really just that portion of the report to the Bureau.

I'm going to kind of merge items number fifteen and sixteen, I guess. Public Participation and Comments. Anyone from the public is always free to talk whenever they want to anyway, but if people have other issues that they want to raise now is the time to raise it or questions that they might have. I'll also open it up to the floor of the rectangular table as well. Anna.

ANNA MILLER: Anna Miller with T-Mobile. I wanted to follow up on my earlier comment about giving our new, the renewal of the NANC charter revisiting the steering group concept activity. I was noticing on our new membership list that in addition to the NANC chair that there's only two of us that are still around from the original steering group and I can't remember the last time, the last activity associated with that.

I guess what I would like to do is consider reactivating the steering group with the intent of open communication between the FCC and the NANC. I think it would be beneficial for the NANC to focus on 2008 to meet with the FCC and identify what their goals are. What their expectations are. Given that we are

their advisory group, get their input on what kind of advice they want, what topics they are interested in.

A possible example of that is, we just completed the Pooling Administrator Contract and we have an upcoming NANPA contract and so, one thing that might be considered is does the FCC want NANC input on the technical requirements for NANPA similar to the information that was provided to them for the Pooling Administrator Contract.

One approach in terms of next steps might be to identify, first of all if the NANC things that this is a good concept that we should do given our charter and given an opportunity to have more communication with the FCC and FCC stakeholders, that we could identify volunteers to the steering group, maybe have those volunteers establish a mission and a meeting with the FCC stakeholders and develop some goals for 2008.

TOM KOUTSKY: I think that's a good idea. I think its definitely, I think the example you give of the NANPA technical requirements is clearly one that we could, in my opinion, should be trying to provide.

BETH O'DONNELL: Beth O'Donnell, Cox Communications. The NOWG has taken on the role of providing input to the Technical Requirements in the past. Does anybody see any reason why we wouldn't do that again?

TOM KOUTSKY: Oh, I would assume, the way I would interpret this is that this is really more to clarify, to have a path of communications with the FCC to get an indication as to perhaps when they might want to have these technical

requirements completed by. Also to really let them know that we are doing it. I think there is a genuine openness on the new bureau chief's part, Ms. Shaffer, to understand our process flows in these types of things to know when – to understand the process and I think that might be facilitated.

I don't propose that somebody else would do the technical requirements. I would assume that would still be done at the working group level.

NATALIE McNAMER: Natalie McNamer, T-Mobile, NOWG co-chair. Usually in the past from what I understand, is the FCC or the NANC would give the NOWG the charge to work on those documents and we are willing to work on them but we don't have any charge from anybody to do so. So we are in a holding pattern until we get that.

BETH O'DONNELL: It just sounded like the steering committee would do it and seems like it was down in the weeds for a steering committee.

I don't disagree in concept with the steering committee because I too was a member of the early one. I think earlier today in our discussion about the LNPA working group report, there is a level of discomfort on people getting information that other people aren't getting and by having a higher committee than the full body, that could lead to more discomfort.

As I recall, what ended up happening with the steering committee meetings is that everybody attended them anyway. Certain people sat at the table but everybody was in the room.

I just offer that as a perspective. I'm not saying do it or don't do it. I just, I think that excluding people from a flow of information with the FCC is not a good idea. This was a perfect example of that. Thank you.

TOM KOUTSKY: Okay.

ANNA MILLER: Anna Miller, T-Mobile. I just want to clarify that it would be my expectation if the FCC requested input on the NANPA TRD documents that the NOWG would do that again and I consider them a working group of the NANC. I wasn't trying to exclude them.

With regard to your comments of open communication with the NANC again, I think the role of the steering committee is to establish goals. Everything the steering group did was communicated and discussed at the NANC. It's just a way to help focus. Absent, I guess, having forty people in the room doing that. It's really kind of more of a goal setting, focus thing that can be discussed here. It's two-way communication. I would be, I guess, an interim process.

BETH O'DONNELL: I'm not saying don't do it. I'm just saying that people were talking to the FCC and things happened and we didn't know about it, the rest of the council didn't know about it. I think that's a real risk. That's all.

I'm not saying don't do it. I'm saying there's a real risk if there is a group of five people who are talking with the FCC and nobody else is. There's a risk that if I'm not on the steering committee, I'm just using this as an example, that I'm going to be asking you well, who said that and why? What did they mean by that? Why are they singling out cable?

TOM KOUTSKY: I see your point on that and actually see that the role of a steering committee would not be to have regular discussion. I mean it would not be a weekly or monthly. I'd see it at max semi-annually. I don't see it as an on-going or as something that happens all the time.

I think Rebecca was first. Then Don and then Martin. So, Rebecca.

REBECCA BEATON: I would echo some of Cox Communications' concerns based on dialogue with the FCC that the entire council did not have. Is an option rather than a steering committee, it appears there is a concern that we set an agenda meeting dates, priorities with the Commission, is there some way in which we can incorporate that in these meetings with the FCC, as an option? I would throw that on the table as a consideration.

TOM KOUTSKY: I guess if you are talking about just with logistics, possibly but I don't think that – I mean its going to be likely to have us sit at a meeting and come up with a meeting schedule for, you know, 2008-2009 in one of these contexts.

That's just my – that's potentially possible, I guess, but I'm not sure we would ever really get into the position of saying, okay, these are the four or five things that I think are perhaps a priority as opposed to something else. I'm not sure that that could possibly happen here.

That's an interesting point. I haven't really thought that much about it. Maybe I should think a little more before I keep speaking. Don.

DON GRAY: Don Gray, Nebraska Public Service

Commission. I hear the concerns but I'm having trouble putting them in context with what I thought a steering committee would be and would do. Not having been around when there was an active one, I'm making some assumptions here.

I'm assuming it would be a group of people that would represent the broad membership so that each of the elements would have some representation. That would be the group that would have discussions with the FCC and staff, not on thumbs up, thumbs down on issue, but on meeting schedules. Yes, we'll have one once every quarter, specific date to be decided by such and such. Yes, these are the reoccurring tasks that the FCC expects NANC to do every year on this schedule. These reviews, you know, so on.

As issues of the day come to light that would be an entity they could come to. We need information on such and such. Think about it. Come back and let us know if there is an existing working group, an IMG that is currently in session that could work on it. If a new IMG is needed, that recommendation would be made and through the chairman that activity would be passed down to that group and the communication would go as it should.

I guess that's what I thought I heard and would seem to me how one might work it.

TOM KOUTSKY: I think Martin was first.

MARTIN HAKIM DIN: I want to pick up on something Don said. I think we are making a lot of assumptions as to what this steering committee

would be and not having had any experience either when there was a steering committee, I'm not really quite sure.

My basic question is, what are we trying to steer? If it's the question of scheduling, communicating with the Commission about issues and things like that, well if they really want us to look into something, you know, they can send us an e-mail. They can send you an e-mail, right? That's not really that complicated. Do we really need a group to sit down with the Commission to figure out a meeting schedule?

If those are the two things that are, that we would be chartering the steering committee with, I don't see the reason for it because it think what you do ultimately is introduce some of the issues like you brought up. Just concerns that maybe there is not quite the information distribution that people would like. Not that that's what's going on, it just could be perceived that way.

TOM KOUTSKY: Yes, Rosemary.

ROSEMARY EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. I think we are all speculating on a concept that we haven't seen anything in writing on yet. My proposal would be that those folks who think that a steering committee might possibly improve communication somehow, or I don't even know what the right term is, if the steering committee would help the NANC in some way, shape or form, for whatever reason, maybe we'll put something in writing like a mission and a scope or some kind of just general one page – this is what the intent is. This is what it would look like and then maybe we would have something to talk about at the next

meeting. At least it would open up discussions on something we would have in writing that we could look at and we could argue. Thank you.

TOM KOUTSKY: Yes, that's a fair point. My initial thinking here is, I'd never actually even thought the steering committee would act as a screen or a filter in any way. That was never, you know, when the issue was first brought, the thought was first brought to me. I had never been thinking of it as a filter of information. That's not something I would like to see in a written proposal for such a committee.

I think Rosemary has a good idea. Maybe, Anna, if you want to write up a paragraph as to what you think a – who was here when they had a steering committee?

All right. You are all on it. That would be a question as to why it stopped operating.

MARY RETKA, QWEST: I think a lot of the reason that you don't see a steering committee at this point is just kind of at the discretion of whoever is the chair. The process seems to evolve differently from different chairs. I think that's mainly how it came to no longer be.

TOM KOUTSKY: Okay and just from my standpoint. When I do get inquiries from the Bureau, I kind of deal with them as I think appropriate. So, with regard to the LNPA thing I felt it was appropriate to send it to the LNPA working group where membership is open. That was my judgment. Perhaps I could have done that differently, certainly.

I don't think it was necessarily inappropriate to do it the way that I did, but I do understand what people are saying in terms of when you receive – especially in that situation because an unsolicited request from different staff than we normally deal with. I understand the point here.

So, Anna, if you want to pick up, I'm thinking four sentences maximum. If we can't say it in four sentences what its purpose is, then its hard. If you want to send that around. We could probably circulate that to other folks too and maybe receive input from the full NANC on the e-mail as to that thought, after you and I talk about it for a few times.

Maybe that's one way of kind of moving this ball further rather than just, creating a written document that we'll discuss at the next meeting which means we won't write it until a week before the next meeting.

ANNA MILLER: Anna Miller, T-Mobile. A couple of comments. First of all, the last item that Don described is the type of item that I think, once identified by the steering committee would, it would come here for discussion.

The second thing is, the whole idea is to open up communication between the NANC and the FCC so we have better direction from what the FCC is thinking and I sometimes think its better to sit down with your stakeholders and have a real time discussion, responses back and forth, as opposed to sending out e-mails.

It would certainly not be some kind of closed club or to make decisions on what the NANC works on or does not work on. It would be just exactly

the opposite. These are the things the FCC thinks is important and would like input on and bring that to NANC for discussion in terms of how to proceed.

TOM KOUTSKY: Okay. Other thoughts. Rebecca. That's the last thing you can say today.

REBECCA BEATON: Again, I was not here when there was a steering committee and a scoping document would be very helpful on whether we would participate or defer that.

I do have a question. We have a representative of the FCC here, the DFO and is it appropriate for that, for her to bring FCC issues to us for discussion as part of this?

TOM KOUTSKY: In the context of this meeting?

REBECCA BEATON: Yes.

TOM KOUTSKY: I would probably need to look again at the Federal Advisory Committee Act and that is the one reason I had a hesitation in my answer to your last question was because since we are chartered as an official Federal Advisory Committee, there are certain procedures that we need to follow in the context of sitting at this table here and actually making these recommendations.

I'm not entirely sure to what extent the Federal Government or the FCC is supposed to participate in that level. I just don't know the answer. So I would hesitate to say, unless Marilyn knows the answer herself.

MARILYN JONES, FCC: Well, it depends on, sometimes the Bureau (undecipherable) with other resources. (Undecipherable) I probably could

deal with them but I was not really involved in that aspect of the rule making so, its kind of hard to (undecipherable). I'm really not in a position to commit the Bureau.(VERY POOR TAPE QUALITY THROUGHOUT THIS SECTION).

TOM KOUTSKY: Yes, that's the question.

MARILYN RETKA: I think the whole Commission –

TOM KOUTSKY: Yes, so there is a filtering operation that happens over at the Commission as well and that's why I think it becomes hard to say can we resolve these at open NANC meetings. I'm not sure.

I think an open NANC meeting, is it going to be about NANC membership, us saying something collectively as a body, as opposed to us interacting with another body. Does that make sense kind of in a strange way?

In essence this body acts on certain things and sends it to the Commission. That is the role of this meeting.

Any other thoughts or questions on this point? I do pick up on some of the trepidation that some folks might have with regard to this and I think we will just try to work it through and try to figure out a best way to come up with a way of dealing with these, as Don said, these logistical and priority type questions.

Anything from the public? Anybody else has anything. Yes, Mary.

MARY RETKA, QWEST: When you were going through the action items, I caught another one I just thought you might want to document. That was, that when the NOWG has the new survey questions, you were going to send them out to the NANC members and you said you would want to have our responses

back by about Christmas. If we don't have another meeting between now and then, obviously you will want that on your action item list.

TOM KOUTSKY: Yes, okay. Thanks.

MARY RETKA: A second on that I'm not sure is really ripe at this time. When the INC was talking about their VRS efforts you indicated that you would want to set up an IMG. That was completed and since they think they are going to have it done by the end of the year, and I'm not sure when we are going to have another meeting, maybe that's another one to track with our action items as well.

TOM KOUTSKY: Thanks for reminding me of those. That's absolutely correct both of those things are action items that we'll probably be seeing in the next two months. Thank you.

With that, I think I will close this meeting. I appreciate everybody's attendance and their input and especially on the work that was done on a lot of the items that we talked about today. Thank you.

(END OF AUDIOTAPE 4, SIDE A)

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF AGENCY

I, Carol J. Schwartz, President of Carol J. Thomas Stenotype Reporting Services, Inc., do hereby certify we were authorized to transcribe the submitted cassette tapes, and that thereafter these proceedings were transcribed under our supervision, and I further certify that the forgoing transcription contains a full, true and correct transcription of the cassettes furnished, to the best of our ability.

CAROL J. SCHWARTZ

PRESIDENT

ON THIS DATE OF:
