

**North American Numbering Council
Meeting Transcript
March 9, 2011 (Final)**

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

II. List of Attendees.

Voting Council Members:

1.	Hon. Betty Ann Kane	Chairman
2.	Jeffrey S. Lanning	CenturyLink
3.	Valerie Cardwell	Comcast Corporation
4.	Suzanne Howard	Cox Communications, Inc.
5.	Michael Altschul	CTIA – The Wireless Association
6.	David Greenhaus	800 Response Information Services
7.	Gregory Diamond	Level 3 Communications, LLC
8.	Hon. Anthony J. Palermino	NARUC – Connecticut
9.	Hon. Ward Loyd	NARUC - Kansas
10.	Hon. Geoffrey G. Why	NARUC – Massachusetts
11.	Hon. Robert M. Clayton, III	NARUC - Missouri
12.	Joel Cheskis	NASUCA
13.	Jerome Candelaria	NCTA
14.	John McHugh	OPASTCO
15.	Mary Retka	Qwest
16.	Rosemary Emmer	Sprint Nextel
17.	Anna Miller	T-Mobile USA, Inc.
18.	Thomas Soroka, Jr.	USTA
19.	Kevin Green	Verizon
20.	Brendan Kasper	Vonage
21.	Tiki Gaugler	XO Communications

Special Members (Non-voting):

John Manning	NANPA
Amy Putnam	PA
Faith Marcotte	Welch & Company
Jean-Paul Emard	ATIS

Commission Employees:

Marilyn Jones, Designated Federal Officer (DFO)
Deborah Blue, Special Assistant to the DFO
Ann Stevens, Deputy Chief, Competition Policy Division
Sanford Williams, Competition Policy Division
Gary Remondino, Competition Policy Division

III. Estimate of Public Attendance. Approximately 30 members of the public attended the meeting as observers.

IV. Documents Introduced.

- (1) Agenda
- (2) NANC Meeting Transcript – December 16, 2010
- (3) North American Numbering Plan Administration (NANPA) Report to the NANC
- (4) National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator (PA) Report to the NANC
- (5) Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG) Report
- (6) Billing and Collection Agent Report
- (7) Billing and Collection Working Group (B&C WG) Report to the NANC
- (8) NANC/NAPM LLC Consensus Proposal for Clarification of the FCC’s Rules Regarding the LNPA Selection Process
- (8a) Petition of Telcordia Technologies, Inc. to Reform or Strike Amendment 70, to Institute Competitive Bidding for Number Portability Administration and to End the NAPM LLC’s Interim Role in Number Portability Administration Contract
- (9) North American Portability Management (NAPM) LLC Report to the NANC
- (10) Local Number Portability Administration Working Group (LNPA WG) Status Report to the NANC
- (11) Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report to the NANC
- (12) Future of Numbering (FoN) Working Group Report to the NANC

V. Table of Contents.

1. Announcements and Recent News	4
2. Approval of Meeting Transcript from December 16, 2010	5

3. Report of the North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA)	6
4. Report of the National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator (PA)	13
5. Report of the Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG)	21
6. Report from the North American Numbering Plan Billing and Collection (NANP B&C) Agent	27
7. Report of the Billing and Collection Working Group (B&C WG)	31
8. Update on Process for Selecting LNP Database, Platform and Services Provider(s)	37
9. North American Portability Management (NAPM) LLC Report	46
10. Report of the Local Number Portability Administration Working Group (LNPA WG)	47
11. Status of the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) activities	63
12. Report of the Future of Numbering Working Group (FoN WG)	68
13. Summary of Action Items	--
14. Public Comments and Participation (five minutes per speaker)	--
15. Other Business	--

VI. Summary of the Meeting.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Good morning. I'm going to call to order the regular meeting of the North American Numbering Council. For the record it is 9:45 a.m. on Wednesday, March 9, 2011, and we are meeting in the hearing room of the Federal Communications Commission at 445 12th Street, S.W., in Washington, D.C. I'm Betty Ann Kane, Chairman, for the record.

There is a sign in sheet going around somewhere. Be sure to sign in so we have the official record of everyone who's here.

A couple of housekeeping matters. Again to remind you, when you do go to speak just give it a couple seconds pause so the gentleman who is controlling the microphones back in the booth there can activate your microphone. You don't need to push anything to put it on but if you start talking immediately we're not going to capture the first few golden words for the transcript.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND RECENT NEWS

I have a couple of announcements. First of all we want to welcome, and I think he is on the phone, our newest member of the North American Numbering Council and that is Commissioner Ward Loyd from the Kansas Corporation Commission, Public Utility Commission. Commissioner Loyd, are you on the phone? Not yet. We do have a bridge.

Commissioner Loyd is taking the place of our long time colleague Ann Boyle of the Nebraska Commission. Ann has moved on to the great Joint Board, the USF Joint Board and so she has resigned as a member of this Council. I want to thank Ann for all of her work.

And in addition, thank Don Gray of the Nebraska staff who has been a very long time alternate member and has participated actively, and has done terrific work also with the Future of Numbering Committee. I think Don is going to be on the phone today as part of the report from the Future of Numbering Committee.

So I want to thank Ann, and particularly Don for his work, and welcome

Commissioner Loyd.

I also want to welcome Valerie Cardwell, representing Comcast. Valerie is replacing Cindy Sheehan from Comcast, so welcome.

Are there any other new members, anyone who hasn't been here before?

Very good.

And I want to thank the Bureau also for moving quickly in naming and approving the recommendation from NARUC that Commissioner Loyd be the new member. So it's good to have as full a complement as we can.

Okay, the first item on our agenda is the agenda and for the record that will be document number one to put into the record.

Are there any additions or rearrangements for the agenda that anyone has? It was sent out ahead of time. Okay, then we'll accept that as the agenda for the meeting.

APPROVAL OF MEETING TRANSCRIPT

CHAIRMAN KANE: The next item which we'll document number two for the record is the approval of the transcript of our last meeting which was on December 16, 2010. Again, that was sent out electronically. Are there any additions or corrections to the transcript from the December 16th meeting? Okay, then by unanimous consent I'll accept the transcript as approved.

The third item on our agenda is the report of the North American Numbering Plan Administrator, the NANPA. Who will be presenting that to us? That will be John Manning, yes, there we go, thank you. And this will be entered into the record

as document number three.

REPORT OF THE NORTH AMERICAN NUMBERING PLAN

ADMINISTRATOR (NANPA)

MR. MANNING: Good morning, everybody. My report this morning appears to be quite lengthy, but I will not be going through everything. Some of the information is provided for your use, primarily the NANPA highlights for 2010, which are attached to the report, but we'll be going over a number of items dealing with what occurred over the past year with regard to the NANP resources that we administer.

So beginning on page two, CO code activity in 2010, for the year we assigned 2,795 Central Office Codes and a total of 310 codes were returned or reclaimed.

The chart at the top of the page takes a look at 2010 and compares it with the past six years so you can get an idea of what 2010 looks like compared to the previous years.

A couple of notes or observations I would impart to you. First of all you can see for the assignments in 2010, we came back up compared to 2009. The 2010 number is more in line with what we were experiencing say in 2008.

Net assignments, however, for 2010 second only in terms of the quantity to 2006, and that's due in part primarily to the fact that we are experiencing fewer returns in 2010, in fact if you look at that line you can see as a general trend now, beginning roughly 2007, 2008 through 2010 that we're going down in terms of the

quantity of return codes.

And that is not unexpected simply because with the continued implementation of Thousands-Block Number Pooling as well as Local Number Portability, when there is a code eligible to be returned and most likely there are blocks assigned to other entities or there's porting out of that particular code, which ultimately means that code is not returned but rather reassigned to an appropriate carrier.

The other comment I would make in terms of 2010, it's interesting to note that 90 percent of all requests for the assignment of a code that came to NANPA came via the Pooling Administrator. So you can see the vast quantity of assignments that we're making are coming via the Pooling Administrator which means they're in pooling rate centers and the like.

In the middle of page two, just for your information I give you a list of the various reports that we have available on the NANPA website that you may want to visit to give you some further breakdown with regard to the numbers in the charts.

On page three, again talking about central office code assignments, the top NPAs in states in terms of code assignments, and this is net assignments, that is the total assignments minus the returns, I give you a breakdown of those NPAs that had the most assignments.

Obviously here New York, 718/347, leads the way by a large majority in terms of total CO code assignments but after that beginning with Nevada, Texas, and those area codes listed there, you can see the quantities of codes net assignments

again for each of those particular NPAs that are listed there.

NPA 718/347 has been the top NPA four out of the past five years. Nevada 702 NPA last appeared in the top ten list in 2007. So, just some reference points for your information.

And I provide similar type information in terms of states, total states. Texas leads the way with nearly 300 assignments, followed by New York, California, and Florida. The interesting thing to note here is the drop off after Florida when we have nearly 200 codes and then the next state or the fifth state is Georgia at 88. And, there are a number of states right around that area as well.

In 2009, Pennsylvania was the top state in terms of net assignments with 201 and they are no longer on the chart.

Any questions about CO code assignments?

Turning our attention to area codes, on the top of page four I've given you a list of the breakdown of the areas codes in terms of those that are assigned. There are 391 area codes assigned of which 354 are in service. Of the 354, 341 are for geographic area codes, 13 are non-geographic, and 37 are waiting implementation. Again, this is as of the end of last year. And we had 200 area codes that are currently unassigned.

Eight area codes went into service in 2010, and you can see the breakdown of those. Of those eight, two of them were non-geographic area codes. The NPA 855 for toll free services in October and PCS NPA 544 in December of last year went into service.

We had seven area codes that were assigned. You again see the breakdown there, and the date I show you there is the date that we made the assignment.

And we had two area codes, one in California, and one in Kentucky that were assigned but due to activities within the Public Service Commissions and the dismissal of relief plans, those area codes at the direction of the Commission were removed from the assignment status and were moved to reserve.

With regard to those area codes exhausting in the next 36 months, again referenced at the end of this presentation you'll get a breakdown of all of those area codes.

Highlighting just a few, there's only one area code we expect to exhaust in the next 12 months. That is the area code 718/347 NPAs up in New York. They're basically putting everything in place as we speak with the customer education as well as the network preparation and we'll be seeing that area code be available in the next several weeks. That would be the 929 area code coming into service.

On page five, some of these you've seen before, 918. We just had to start a mandatory ten digit dialing of the implementation of their overlay NPA on March 5th. The in service date for the new area code, the 539 area code will be April 1.

In Nebraska we had mandatory ten digit dialing starting there on February 26th. If you'll recall this is the area code in which we will not make assignments out of the relieving area code, the 531, until the remaining level of NXX codes in the 402 reaches ten.

NPA 814, quite a bit of activity there. On December 17th, Pennsylvania

Public Utilities Commission ordered an NPA split. The new 582 would serve the northwestern portion of the existing 814 area code.

Then on January 13, 2011, the PUC granted some numerous petitions for reconsideration and on February 18, 2011, NANPA issued a revised 814 exhaust projection. The previous exhaust projection was first quarter of 2013. We moved that to the first quarter of 2015, and as a result the Public Utilities Commission in Pennsylvania is taking a look at what they want to do in terms of moving forward with the implementation of the new area code.

And finally in mentioning California 408 NPA, there are some public input meetings scheduled for next week where they are looking at either an overlay or a split in the 408 area code.

Any questions on the area code activity or the relief projects?

Okay, beginning on the bottom of page five, I give you a status report on all the other resources that NANPA administers. First of all you'll see Feature Group B, Carrier Identification Codes. The chart gives you the quantity of assignments beginning in 2001 through 2010, the number of resources that were returned or reclaimed during the same time period and the net yearly assignments. You will see there's very little activity with regard to Feature Group B, Bravo Carrier Identification Codes.

On page six we talk about Feature Group D, Delta Carrier Identification Codes. You can see in 2010, we made 54 assignments yet we were able to reclaim or have returned to us 61 codes and a net of negative seven CICs for 2010.

The 5YY resource, this is 500, 533, and 544 NPAs, quite a bit of activity in this particular resource. In 2010, we assigned over 700 NXX codes and no codes were returned or reclaimed.

Projections are that we're going to be needing quite a few area codes for this particular resource. Based on NRUF forecast data and assignment information we project the need for multiple 5YY-NXXs or 5YY area codes over the next several years.

Presently we had the 522, the 566, 577, and 588 queued up to relieve this area code and there's already an issue within the Industry Numbering Committee to talk about what additional area codes we may need for this resource once those four area codes are used.

On page seven we talk about the 900 NPA, eight assignments in 2010 and no returns, 555 line number assignments, 27 assignments in 2010.

And then on page eight, we talk about Vertical Service Codes. We had one assignment in 2010, the VSC *09, and I provide to you the definition of what that's used for. We had 33 assignments of 800-855 number assignments. So that you know, those numbers are used for the purpose of accessing PSTN, Public Switch Telephone Network intending for the deaf, hard of hearing, and speech impaired services.

There were no assignments of 456 area code NXXs or ANI, Automatic Number Identification digit pairs.

Any questions on those resources?

Bottom of page eight we talked about one change order, change order 20. This was an INC issue which we wanted to provide some clarification on the definition of “in service” and there were changes made to various Part 4 forms. There’s a confirmation of in service forms. This change order was approved by the FCC in late December and it was implemented in the middle of February in the NANP Administration System.

Page nine is just some other information. Our quarterly newsletter came out in January. We will be publishing the 2010 NANPA Annual Report at the end of this month.

We have been working with the NOWG with regard to the surveys that they use, the annual performance surveys, and we’re of assistance with them in putting out notifications about that survey as well as posting the link to that survey on our website. We have planned next month, April 5th and 6th to have our operational review session with the NOWG at our Sterling office.

As I mentioned at the start of my presentation, beginning on page ten, is the 2010 NANPA highlights document. This is a summary of various activities, measurements, quality performance items that we keep track of during the year. It’s a summary of what occurred during the year and these items that we will be covering in detail with the NOWG at our April 5th and 6th session. I provide it here for your information.

And finally beginning on page 19 is the status of area codes exhausting within the next 36 months, the chart that typically accompanies my presentation.

Any questions with regard to anything I've covered in this report? Question?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, and please for the transcript identify yourself.

MR. CHESKIS: Sure, thank you very much. Good morning, Joel Cheskis with the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate here on behalf of NASUCA.

Thank you for your report as always. My question is pertaining to the big picture, one number I didn't see here, a potential NANP exhaust date. If you had any updated information on when that might be?

MR. MANNING: At this time we will be publishing both the area code exhaust projections as well as the NANP exhaust projection at the end of the April.

The current exhaust projection takes us out beyond the next 30 years but at that particular time, the end of April, we'll be able to publish that information. I'm not expecting any changes with regard to the current projection but we do want to have the opportunity to take a look at that data before we make that official.

MR. CHESKIS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Are there any other questions on the report? Thank you very much.

Agenda item number four is the report of the National Thousands-Block Pooling Administrator. Amy?

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

MS. PUTNAM: I'm Amy Putnam, Director of the National Thousands-Block Pooling Administration and as always pooling is fine.

I did bring about 50 pages of stuff that I can read to you about our highlights for the year or you can wait until our Annual Report is posted later in the month.

As always we provided the Pooling Administration activity summary data for you in the first chart. These numbers are a rolling total for this particular meeting from March 2010 to February 2011. Any place where there is a blank or an NA such as number of blocks reclaimed, it's because we don't have that data this early in the month.

We had 11,572 Part 3s processed in February and our rolling total for the last 12 months was 105,637.

Slide three is more Part 3 summary data sorted by the type and the number of NXX codes opened. We opened 739 for LRNs, 132 for dedicated customers, and 1,932 for pool replenishment.

The summary of the rate center information changes for the last 12 months, the number was pretty high in January and as is indicated in footnote two that relates to additional delegated authority in Indiana and in Arkansas.

Those are changes from excluded to optional, from state mandatory to mandatory as is required by the appropriate state action.

We have no reclamation information again on the next page for February. 1,064 is the number of blocks with overdue part fours at the end of February. That is our accumulative total. The second column, total number of new blocks or the number of blocks that were new that month with overdue part 4s.

Most of the time those are resolved between the time the state is notified and

the time it would be appropriate for us to take an action which is why there's such a discrepancy between the first two columns numbers and the third column.

Pooling Administration system was up 100 percent of the time since the last meeting. We fulfilled all of our contractual reporting requirements for the period of March 2010 through February 2011.

As was requested sometime ago, we report in this report on the delegated authority petitions. There are currently no petitions for additional delegated authority pending before the FCC.

As of February 28th, we had approved 697 ESQK requests and denied 13. We had approved nine ESQK applications and denied six in our capacity as the Interim Routing Number Authority Administrator and with any luck by the next meeting or the one after that, we'll have dropped that off of this report.

We did submit the permanent pANI change order proposal, number 19 on January 27, 2011. That was a milestone for us.

And we're looking forward to our operational review in Concord, California next week. In addition to the pANI change order we submitted change order 20 on February 28th. That was related to user proposed enhancements from service providers and regulators.

Page nine shows the status of all of the change orders that we have submitted since the beginning of the contract and the change orders themselves are all posted on our website as documents after the FCC approves them so most of those are posted.

The very old overdue part 4 reconciliation process, we are down to nine unresolved very old blocks and with the NPAC scrub, we started out with 9,949 and we're down to 257 blocks still needing a new block holder and I suspect that that's not going to change much.

And after that starting on page 11, are the highlights in a nutshell of the Pooling Administration activities for 2010. They are more thoroughly explained or will be more thoroughly explained in our annual report.

Of note, we were up 99.996 percent of the time during 2010. We submitted eight change orders. The FCC approved ten. We implemented eight. We had 970 rate center information changes. We produced 918 reports, and the rest of the information you can read at your leisure.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much. To have those statistics, you know, the average consumer picks up the phone and it works and the numbers go through, and they change their phone and it goes through, and they have no idea of the amount of work and the detail work of all these reports, that goes through it, that is behind it, that the industry, particularly technical people as well are very involved in, so we really appreciate that and having that.

I had a question on page 11 on the contract. You said that it ended after August, and the FCC issued a contract for the option period. How long was that for?

MS. PUTNAM: That was for a year.

CHAIRMAN KANE: One year.

MS. PUTNAM: Yes, one year so next August assuming that all goes

well, they will issue another one year option period and then the following year our contract will be up.

CHAIRMAN KANE: The following year we have to put a bid again.

MS. PUTNAM: 2012, yes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: 2012, okay, thank you. Yes.

MR. CHESKIS: Good morning. Again, Joel Cheskis with the Pennsylvania Office Consumer Advocate for NASUCA.

Thank you also Amy, for your report. I'm wondering if there's ever been an analysis, some statistical report done demonstrating the impact on the life of an NPA of the implementation of mandatory pooling.

I know that there's a lot of data on the websites and there are indications as to how many quarters for example the life of the NPA has been extended after pooling has been implemented but it's a little bit hard to translate that into years or actual real time I guess.

MS. PUTNAM: Well, a lot of that information Joel can be found in our Quarterly Pooling Matrixes report which breaks things out by NPA, but as you say that may not be as thorough an analysis as you may be looking for but that's what our contract requires us to do. And so in that report which contains an extensive amount of information, we do analyze to a certain extent the impact of pooling on each NPA that has any pooling in it.

MR. CHESKIS: So again you're saying that there's nothing that you can say on a general basis as to the impact of pooling on all NPAs where pooling has

been implemented.

MS. PUTNAM: I can certainly say that pooling has extended the life of the NANP, and there have been individual NPAs, Brent Struthers who is sitting in the back there was aware of the extension of the life of the Chicago NPA, and I don't remember which one, 312, which extended years after the anticipated exhaust date because of the implementation of pooling. That was the first trial in the country or one of the first.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Are you suggesting Joel, that it would be useful to have some kind of analysis on a more global basis just to show the success of the Thousands-Block Pooling process?

MR. CHESKIS: I think that it might be helpful to know that. You know again, there's a lot of numbers that fly around here and there's a lot of reports and things that go on and it might be helpful to me, although I don't really want to create more work for people, but it might be helpful to know, just a simple question, you know, pooling has proven to extend the life of an area code by an average of X years.

I know that there is individual data on a (unintelligible) PA basis and there's been hundreds of area codes that are in pooling right now so I'm just wondering, and again I don't want to make more work for people but if there is one statistical analysis that shows yes, pooling has shown, or the facts are that pooling extends the life of area codes an average of X years.

MS. PUTNAM: If I may, the problem with making such a statement is that it fails to take into account any other extraneous circumstances that may have an

impact as well. I think as a factual matter I can say pooling based on information that we have and information that the NANPA has, before pooling was implemented in NPA X, it was scheduled to exhaust here, now it's scheduled to exhaust there.

And I would love to be able to say that that is 100 percent because of pooling but I can't because there are other factors that have to be taken into account with respect to mergers and acquisitions in the industry, that's one.

CHAIRMAN KANE: How long has the Thousands-Block Pooling been in effect?

MS. PUTNAM: We had our first national pooling implementation meeting actually three months ahead of schedule in January of 2002. The national rollout was scheduled to begin in March of 2002, and we were able to start early in D.C. I held the first meeting in your conference room.

CHAIRMAN KANE: It sounds like coming up in 2012 or the end of 2011, we will have a ten year history.

MS. PUTNAM: We should have a party.

CHAIRMAN KANE: It would be nice to have something. We could have it in my conference room, in our hearing room.

(LAUGHTER)

It has been a success and a great success story. Maybe we can find a graduate student or someone who wants to look at those numbers and do some kind of statistical analysis, recognizing the other things too, extraneous factors.

But it has been a success story and I think it would be maybe nice with an

anniversary coming up to think ahead on that, and thank you for bringing it up, to show that it has worked and what it has done.

MS. PUTNAM: We do have again, information on our website and in our annual report with relation to what we call NXXs saved, codes saved by pooling where we analyze the number of requests in a given NPA that can be filled by providing blocks rather than codes.

So it's not a one for one. It's an analysis that allows us to say, okay, we've had so many requests for blocks in this NPA and have therefore saved so many codes that did not have to be opened because we were able to fill them with blocks. We do have that information as well.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes.

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka from Qwest. I wanted to say that I do also agree that pooling is a success, and I appreciate the Chairman's statement that perhaps some graduate student or someone could do that study because rather than have a costly study done by our vendor, I think it's more appropriate to use the data that's already out there and anybody that wants to can get their favorite intern or graduate student going on that. Thank you.

MS. PUTNAM: So you were seeing the words change order over my head?

(LAUGHTER)

CHAIRMAN KANE: It would be a good introduction for someone to the real world of telecom. Okay, thank you very much. Appreciate it.

A follow-up, anybody who does have any suggestions, any university or anyone else who might want to dig into those numbers and do a nice little project or thesis on it, be happy to talk about that.

Okay, now moving on to number five, the report of the Numbering Oversight Working Group and we've got Laura.

REPORT OF THE NUMBERING OVERSIGHT WORKING GROUP

(NOWG)

MS. DALTON: Hi, I'm Laura Dalton, and I'm one of the Tri-Chairs of the Numbering Oversight Working Group, NOWG, along with Natalie McNamer from T-Mobile, and Gwen Zahn from Verizon Wireless. I'm from Verizon Communications.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And for the record this is document number five. Thank you.

MS. DALTON: Page two of the report the contents, I'll be discussing three main topics. The first is the NANPA and the PA Performance Surveys and the NOWG's performance evaluation process. The second main area is the PA and NANPA Change Orders, and the third is the NOWG's review of the PA and the NANPA Annual Reports.

On to page three, the 2010 NANPA and PA Performance Surveys. The NOWG implemented the use of an online survey tool for the first time this year and in addition to the surveys being submitted online, surveys that were submitted by e-mail and Word documents were also accepted.

The survey response period was from January 3, 2011 until February 15, 2011. The responses originally were due January 31, 2011, and then we extended the deadline for another two weeks to allow a month and half for the responses.

Two reminder notices were sent by each of the administrators and each reminder notice generated more responses to the survey.

Page four shows a preliminary count of the surveys received. For the NANPA survey, 27 regulatory entities responded and 46 service providers and other entities responded. And for the PA survey we received responses from 28 regulatory entities and 83 service providers and other entities.

And the reason I say these are preliminary counts, the totals are preliminary due to the consolidation of the responses that the NOWG does to meet the one survey per entity requirement so we're currently in the process of grooming the data that we received and multiple survey responses from one entity will be combined into one so that only one survey per entity is counted.

On page five the table provides a timeline of the NOWG activities for completing the NANPA and the PA annual performance reports and as you can see from the table the industry surveys that I just discussed are only one part of the evaluation process.

From February through May, the NOWG will be working on the consolidation and review of the NANPA and the PA survey data as well as the preparation of the performance evaluation reports.

We divide the performance evaluation report draft into sections and

individually we work on the drafts and then we have several meetings as a group to review each section of the performance report draft before it is finalized.

Next week we will be in Concord, California to meet with the PA for their operational review, and on April 5th and 6th the NOWG will be attending the NANPA offices for their operational review.

Then in May we plan to share the preliminary results of the performance reports with the FCC and with the NANPA and the PA.

And finally in May at the May NANC meeting, the NOWG plans to present the final performance reports on the NANPA and the PA.

On page six, throughout the year the NOWG reviews the change orders that are submitted by the NANPA and the PA and we prepare a summary and a recommendation for the FCC regarding the approval of the change orders.

And as you can see from this table on page six, there was a lot of activity on PA change orders since the December NANC meeting, and since it was already mentioned by Amy I won't go into any of them in detail but several change orders have been reviewed over the past few months.

Page seven, PA change order number 19 for the permanent routing number administrator is also known as the pANI change order and this is being mentioned separately here because it is greater in scope than any of the other change orders.

And as Amy had discussed earlier, this change order involves the development and the implementation of a completely new system, the routing number administration system, and it addresses staffing issues related to setting up

this new administrator.

So the pANI change order required additional NOWG consideration. We reviewed the change order against INC guidelines. The change order was also reviewed internally by the NOWG member companies and in certain cases involved the sharing of information and the coordination with our ESIF participants. Additional NOWG meetings were held to develop clarifying questions for the PA and to review their responses.

Then ultimately the NOWG prepared our summary and NOWG recommendation recommending that the FCC approve this change order.

Page eight shows the NANPA change order activity since the last NANC meeting in December and there was one change order as John Manning had mentioned and that was approved and implemented by NANPA.

Page nine discusses the administrators' annual reports. The NANPA and the PA provided their respective 2010 annual report drafts to the NOWG for review prior to publication. Individual NOWG members' comments, questions and suggestions were provided to the NANPA and feedback is currently being gathered on the PA's annual report and will be provided to the PA by the end of this week.

Page ten contains a list of NOWG participating companies and we have a lot of participants we're happy to say.

And page 11 shows the NOWG's upcoming meeting schedule for 2011. This year we have begun meeting on the same day with the NANPA and the PA for our monthly NOWG conference calls with the administrators. We're having back-to-

back calls with each administrator and then following the NANPA and the PA calls, we meet as the NOWG only to discuss the monthly activity.

And in addition to all the calls mentioned here, we have other NOWG meetings held through the month especially during this busy time of the year when we are working on our performance reports.

Page 12 shows the contact information for the Tri-Chairs, and we can be contacted with any questions or requests to participate in the NOWG. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much. Questions?

MR. GREEN: Kevin Green, Verizon. Laura, thanks for the report. I wanted to know, I know that the information on page four, the results are preliminary but has there been an up-tick in responses based on going online?

MS. DALTON: It's really too early to tell at this point. Being that they're preliminary we still have a lot of grooming of the data to do, and one of the issues, it's easier to control not getting duplicates from an entity when you do Word documents.

Now with the online submissions, it's much easier for people to just go in and respond but now we have the task and it is quite a big task, of trying to figure out which entities belong with one another and consolidating those.

So I don't believe there -- well, I really can't say at this point. I know as far as the regulators and the regulatory entities, we did reach out to get more participants.

About halfway along the process we had asked the NANPA and the PA,

Brent Struthers and Linda Hymans from the PA, to contact their regulatory contacts, and they had done that for us and just kind of nudged them along if they had not responded.

So we are pleased to say that we had gotten additional responses that way and I think that we covered the same regulators or pretty much so as we did last year.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And it still looks like just about half of the states and regulatory entities haven't responded.

MS. DALTON: Well, in some cases that states don't interact with the NANPA and the PA so I think we covered the ones who have the interaction.

CHAIRMAN KANE: (Off microphone). I was going to suggest if there are some states that should have responded that you haven't heard from, if you would give me the list I could perhaps contact the Chairman.

MS. DALTON: Thanks. We reached out to them already so I think we pretty much have covered that but thank you.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint-Nextel. Back in the day we used to have a contest between the states and the carriers to see who could submit more and the states always won, just so you know. I don't know if you want to hear about that.

But in any event, I know I mentioned this at the last meeting too, but the undertaking for putting a survey online is just incredibly huge and I see these e-mails, I can't follow it. It's crazy.

The amount of work that these folks are doing to put this online is so

remarkable that it's definitely worth repeating as many times as we possibly can and to give them a lot of thanks for it. I'm just so impressed so thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, any other questions? Thank you very much.

Okay, I know the agenda says we're going to take a break now but we've only been underway about 45 minutes so I think we'll keep going for a bit more and have a break a little bit later.

We're going to move on to item number six on the agenda, which is the report of the North American Number Plan Billing and Collection Agent. And we have a document and that document will be also entered as item number six in the agenda.

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

MS. MARCOTTE: Good morning, I'm Faith Marcotte from Welch LLP.

There are two parts to this report and the regular part is where I will start. On page one of the report we show the financial position of the Fund as of February 28th. So there's \$2 million in the bank, \$200,000 of receivables and about \$350,000 owing to vendors. That leaves the Fund at \$2 million at the end of February.

On page two we see a projection of the Fund up to the end of the funding year which is June 2011. We're projecting a surplus. If you look in the total column it will be a \$1,125,000, \$500,000 of which is the contingency allowance and so that leaves us with a surplus that we weren't anticipating of \$625,000.

In the bottom right hand corner you can see the makeup of that \$625,000 and

the bulk of it is that \$700,000 was allowed for carrier audits which did not occur so of the \$625,000, \$700,000 of it is accounted for there and the rest are just small numbers in and out.

The following page, page three is a projection of the next funding year. At this point it's a little bit premature to be examining the numbers since it is a far out projection at this point.

Page four is the forecast of the liabilities over the next six months, what we expect to be paying out, just so you get comfort that there's enough money to do this.

And page five is our deliverables report that we're sending out our invoices monthly, processing the payments, sending out statements for late accounts, sending any delinquent accounts to the FCC for collections, and handling any questions that the carriers have.

Our contract has been extended to July 31st, and I have been assured that an RFP is coming out shortly.

And the accounts receivables, we are clearing those up gradually over time. All the old accounts, some that we inherited that didn't have filer ID numbers and things, we're gradually clearing those all up with the help of the FCC.

Are there any questions about that report?

CHAIRMAN KANE: The 500 delinquent accounts, how large a problem is that? Are these little accounts, little amounts, or is it a big problem?

MS. MARCOTTE: Well, they go on to the Red Light Report so these carriers don't get any services so they're likely inactive.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Any other questions on this report?

Okay, thank you very much.

MS. MARCOTTE: So we'll move on to the budget and contribution factor for the coming year. The anticipated or projected disbursements, if you look on page three of the report they are listed there.

I'll just go over them. The NANPA admin contract as discussed, it's been extended to July 8, 2011, so we have projected that for the full next year based on the same numbers, and also included \$70,000 for maintenance contracts based on the history of the previous years.

Thousands-Block Pooling contract is in force throughout this funding year so we have had an amount to use for that based on the contract.

Permanent pANI which has been discussed a couple of times so that change order proposed is for \$1,040,906 which is to be paid out over the remainder of the pooling contract.

We already had accounted for \$200,000 of that. That leaves \$840,000 to account for, so we have spread that over the remainder of their term which is out to August 2012, so in this funding year we've put in \$747,000 to be included in this contract.

The carrier audits, we have reduced that number from 700,000 to 300,000 on the advice of the FCC.

Our contract we have just extended as to what we are being paid now, and extended that for the year.

The data collection agent gave us an estimate of their costs. We based the annual operations audit based on previous costs and then just estimated bank fees, and interest earned, and late filing fees as in previous years.

One change that has occurred is we have bumped the contingency allowance from \$500,000 to \$750,000 after discussions with the working group. That's for this year only and it will go back down to \$500,000 in the future years. That is because there are two contracts that are not set yet so we just want to have an extra cushion in case the contracts come in for a larger number than they were before.

The revenue number used in all of this, we have to do an estimate because we don't have that number yet. We won't have that until the end of April.

We have brought that number down from \$219 billion from 2009's revenue and we're anticipating 2010's revenue will be slightly lower. We've brought it down to \$210 billion. We will get the real revenue numbers at the end of April so should that number be significantly different to what we've estimated here we will adjust the factor accordingly.

So that leaves us with three options for factors to use. In the first option, we've got a cost of \$5,762,000 to cover with U.S. carriers. Our anticipated surplus is \$1,141,000 so in the first option we are suggesting the full surplus be used. That would give us a factor -- I'm only going to use the last three numbers, of 220.

Option two would be using half the surplus and carrying forward the other half of the surplus. That would give us a factor of 247.

Option three would be not to use the surplus and carry it all forward. That

would give us a factor of 274 and I believe the working group is going to give their recommendation following this.

Any questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much. Just again, a procedural question. You said your contract has been extended until July.

MS. MARCOTTE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Who does that contracting process, just for the record? Is that the FCC?

MS. MARCOTTE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: It's the FCC that does that.

MS. MARCOTTE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you for clearing up the record. Thank you. Any other questions? Thank you very much.

Now we will move on to the report of the Billing and Collection Working Group, and I think you're going to have a recommendation among those three options, Rosemary? Okay, thank you.

REPORT OF THE BILLING AND COLLECTION WORKING GROUP

MS. EMMER: Good morning, Rosemary Emmer with Sprint Nextel. I Chair this Working Group with Tim Decker as most of you know.

If you'll go straight to page 11 first really quick we're going to ask the NANC Chairman to facilitate consensus on three items today, and I just wanted you to know about it to keep it in mind as we go through this report.

First we're going to ask the NANC Chairman to ask the NANC to approve the performance evaluation that we have completed for Welch, to approve the 2011 to June 2012 budget, and approve the contribution factor that Faith just went over.

So with that, the B&C Working Group's responsibility is mainly to oversee the Billing and Collection agent. We determine financial impact and do the budget and the contribution factor each year.

It's the numbering busy season for those of you who don't know. The NOWG and the B&C Working Group are very busy at the very beginning of the year doing these performance evaluations and putting together all kinds of lovely information for you folks at the table and others.

We are currently monitoring the billing and collections as we do every month. As I mentioned, we have finished the deliverables and the evaluation. We have finished the budget to the extent that we can without some of the numbers as Faith mentioned and the contribution factor.

On page four we always list the history of the contribution factor, and you'll see on the far right hand side we have added the proposal for this year.

Regarding our budget, Faith went over all those numbers but on page five there's a high level recap of the budget.

Contribution factor as she mentioned, we chose the first scenario on page six that lists out the contribution factor options that we discussed. We came to consensus on the first factor, 220. It uses up all of the surplus and this was a no-brainer and it's consistent with all the previous years, well, not all but for the last

several years, we've used up all of the surplus. So it's consistent with what we've done previously.

Welch continues to provide excellent service as the B&C agent. We completed their performance evaluation as we have in the past. We used a Met, Not Met rating schematic and Welch rates a Met.

Page eight lists what the B&C Working Group considered as we reviewed and analyzed their work.

Page ten lists a few notes of interest regarding their evaluation. Last year the actual industry revenue reported on the 499-A forms was substantially lower than the estimated amount we had used earlier in the year to calculate the contribution factor.

You guys might recall the USAC revenue numbers came in shockingly low. The B&C agent had to react to this and they did a fantastic job reacting in a timely manner, minimizing all delays possible to get the NANC to approve this, therefore to get the public notice out to the FCC. So they did any amazing job.

They have redesigned some reports as requested by the Billing and Collection Working Group and they also provided an in-depth operational review for us that was done proactively and was very informative as it has been in the past.

If anyone would like to see that you're welcome to email me or Tim Decker and we'd be happy to send it to you.

Page 12 lists our 2011 meeting schedule that you guys can put on your calendars if you'd like to join us. Membership is open. We welcome new members.

The last page, page 14 has Tim Decker's and my contact information. If

you'd like the bridge number, feel free to contact us and we're happy to include you in our meetings.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you very much, Rosemary. We will TF on page 11. There are three action items that the group is asking for NANC consensus on.

First let me ask if there are any questions overall about the report?

Okay then let me move to the first action item on number 11 which is approving the Billing and Collection Agent 2010 performance evaluation as submitted by the Billing & Collection Working Group. As you heard they did an evaluation and found that the collection agent was doing an excellent job. Is there any disagreement or questions from the group about that recommendation, that evaluation?

All right, then I'll say by unanimous consensus that we would approve that evaluation and thank Welch for all their good work.

The second is to approve the proposed July 2011 to June 2012 budget and that as you see on page five is a budget with a cost of \$5,857,267 which includes a \$750,000 contingency fund. I guess that's the budget.

And we'll go on to the contribution, but that would in lump sum, require a contribution of \$5,762,323 for the U.S. carriers and the international participants which are the Canadians and the Caribbean countries would contribute the remaining \$94,944. Are there any questions or objections to that proposed budget? Joel.

MR. CHESKIS: Again, Joel Cheskis. I know I've exceeded my

allotment of questions already so I apologize for another one.

CHAIRMAN KANE: We expect a strong consumer voice, go ahead.

MR. CHESKIS: Thank you. I know this is more of a procedural question. Just in keeping with some of the themes we've been discussing lately, in terms of whether or not this group here has the authority to finally approve these budgets and contribution factors or if this is something where we're recommending to someone else like the FCC to approve the budget and the contribution factors.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Marilyn, can you answer that procedurally, or Rosemary?

MS. JONES: This is Marilyn Jones from the FCC. The Billing Working Group, they get an approval from the NANC, and the NANC will submit their recommendation to the FCC, and we put the information out on public notice.

MR. CHESKIS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: So what I'm asking for is consensus on making a recommendation to the FCC that this be the budget. Thank you, Marilyn. Thank you for getting that clarified, Joel. Is there any objection to recommending this as the budget? I will take that as unanimous consent that we will recommend a budget of \$5,857,267 including a \$750,000 contingency fund to the FCC. The FCC will put that out for comment.

And then finally this would be a recommendation also Marilyn?

MS. JONES: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, to recommend to the FCC that the July 2011 to

June 2012 contribution factor be the 220, contribution factor of 0.0000220 being the contribution factor for the year beginning July 2011. Is there any question or objection to making that recommendation to the FCC? Okay, then I will consider that that was also by unanimous consent.

I've heard some beeps on the phone, and I apologize. If there are any people listening in on the phone if you could identify yourselves.

COMMISSIONER LOYD: Madam Chair, this is Ward Loyd from the Kansas Corporation Commission.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you, Commissioner Loyd. I'm not sure you were on at the very beginning where I did announce your appointment and welcome you. We're glad that you can participate and I know due to the short notice that it is by phone. We hope you can be with us in person at our May meeting.

COMMISSIONER LOYD: I'll look forward to that and thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much. And I'll remind you that you are also able to name someone from your Commission as an alternate staff person, generally as your alternate who can also participate.

COMMISSIONER LOYD: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Is there anyone else on the phone? Okay, thank you very much. Thank you, Rosemary.

MS. JONES: Marilyn Jones, FCC. Welch on the 1st of May submits all this information to the FCC, and we usually try to get the PN out before the end of May. So, that's the timeframe I think we typically work with.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Let's see, the update on the process for selecting the LNP database platform and service providers. That will be the record item number eight. And who is giving us that report?

All right, let's take a quick break. There was an order that went out on that. People might want to take a few minutes to take a look at that. So we'll take a break for ten minutes and we'll come back at eleven o'clock.

(Short Break)

CHAIRMAN KANE: All right, we're going to resume. We're back on the record at 11:10 a.m. for the continuation of the meeting of the North American Numbering Council.

UPDATE ON PROCESS FOR SELECTING LNP DATABASE, PLATFORM AND SERVICES PROVIDER(S)

CHAIRMAN KANE: And we are on our agenda up to item number eight which is the update on the process for selecting the LNP database platform and service providers.

We have after that just a few more items, and I believe we will be able to finish before everybody's really hungry. So we should be able to get that done.

You've got two items before you on this agenda item number eight. First is the document that was sent out which is in your notebook or in your material originally as document number eight which is labeled the NANC NAPM LLC Consensus Proposal for Clarification of the FCC's Rules Regarding the LNP Selection Process.

And then I want to add a document that was just issued by the FCC last evening and label it document number 8-A and that is an Order and Request for Comment in Wireless Competition Bureau Docket 09-109 and CC Docket Number 95-116, and that Order and Request for Comment incorporates as an Attachment A, the document that we originally had as item eight.

As you know, the last couple of meetings we've been discussing how to move forward as expeditiously and appropriately as possible in a process which should culminate in the selection of a vendor or vendors to run the whole thing actually, the North American Portability Administrator, to select the new local Number Portability Administrator because that contract which has been in place does expire in a couple of years, and it is a long process to get a new vendor or vendors, or renew the current vendor in place.

And after the last meeting at the request of the FCC, I did meet with the NAPM and at the request of the FCC, we did put together document number eight which you have, which is the consensus proposal for clarification of the FCC's rules regarding the selection process.

And we had a couple of meetings, and I want to particularly thank Tim Decker, Gary, and Mel Clay as well as their attorney for I think a very good couple of productive meetings.

We started with a meeting and then we had a two page outline of a process that we agreed on, that the NAPM agreed on, and then it went to the NAPM at their meeting. It went to all of the attorneys at each of the member companies and it came

back not as a two page paper, but I believe as an eight page paper, but really flushing it out and having the proper sites to the process and to past process, et cetera. And then at the request of the FCC, we did submit that to the FCC.

I want to thank everyone else who had input to it particularly I think the state members and other companies, all of whom had some views on this. I think we've incorporated something we felt very comfortable recommending to the FCC that will allow the process to move forward and yet will have the appropriate kinds of safeguards, repetitiveness, transparency, et cetera.

The FCC has now issued an order which as I said was released yesterday, and in this order, some of you may have seen it by email last night, but let me just put a few of the highlights into the record.

The Wireline Competition Bureau is taking four actions or has taken four actions in furtherance of selection of the next local number portability administrator and then it describes what the LNPA does which is provide local number portability services under a contract with an industry consortium which is called the LNP contract.

So first of all the FCC has delegated authority to the North American Numbering Council working in consultation with the North American Portability Management LLC, the NAPM, to implement a process for selecting the next LNPA.

And then they explain later in the order that they had determined -- of course that the process they used the first time, the delegation, that was a one time process for that selection process so they have now delegated to the NANC working in

consultation with the NAPM, to implement the process for selecting the next LNPA.

Second, the Bureau was seeking comments on the specific process that the NANC and the NAPM shall use and in particular they are asking for comments on the proposal by the NANC Chair and the NAPM regarding their respective roles in the LNPA selection process and that's Attachment A to the order.

Finally following the comment period, the Bureau is going to set forth more details about the process, and then third they're directing the NANC to recommend to the FCC one or more independent non-governmental entities to serve as the next LNPA.

And fourth, they are outlining the Bureau's role in overseeing the LNP selection process that is at what point in this process things will need to go to the FCC for review or for approval, which things can go forward without going through that process.

So the proposal is out for comment but the other three things have been done. And again I want to thank everyone who has worked on this.

Now that proposal was sent out as soon as we had reached agreement or I had reached agreement working with the NAPM, and we sent it to the FCC. We also sent it out to all the members of the NANC Council I believe on February 22nd, and I did ask if anyone had any questions, any comments, any suggestions, or concerns that they try to get back to me so that we could incorporate and think about that even before it went out for comment to the public.

I did not hear back from anyone and so I hope that means that everyone first

of all read it, everyone appreciated all the work that went into it, and that there are no questions or concerns about it. But let me just see if there are any questions or just comments on what went out.

I also want to thank the FCC for once we got it there, for really moving quickly. It's been a goal of all us to get this process back on track and I want to thank the Bureau for really getting this order out.

We have a comment period through March 22nd replies, and comments by March 29th, which is a nice expeditious way to do it also.

Is there any discussion or comment on this before we want to make a suggestion of our next step?

Okay, what I would like to do is ask if the NANC would kind of officially recommend this process. Everybody's looked at it. I have not heard back from anyone on anything, concerns or suggestions for changes. It is out for comment obviously for the general public, but I would like to see if we could have a recommendation from the NANC to the FCC that this is the process to use in terms of the attachment A. Any discussion on that? Yes.

MR. CANDELARIA: Jerome Candelaria, NCTA. There are elements that I trust we'll have the opportunity to flush out, specifically the content of any non-disclosure agreement.

I appreciate that this group needs to balance a transparent process with the need to protect confidential information and the devil will be in the details of any non-disclosure agreement.

CHAIRMAN KANE: As you know from the process, once the FCC has gotten the comments in and the period is over, what the process we're recommending would call for would be that there would be set up of a working group that would work with the NAPM and that that working group would come up with the requests for information, the RFP, and the details such as the contents of things like disclosure agreements, meeting times, and most importantly a time table for that.

MR. CANDELARIA: Well, if that's the issue then we're going to have a chicken and the egg issue if the working group itself is the one to set up the non-disclosure agreement and you need to sign the non-disclosure agreement to be part of the working group.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Good question. I mean making recommendations doesn't prevent anybody from also filing comments and so suggestions on that I think would be very welcome during that comment period. Good point, thank you. Commissioner Clayton.

COMMISSIONER CLAYTON: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I'm not sure how procedurally you want to move forward with this.

I appreciate -- and I think I can speak on behalf of most of my colleagues, we've had a number of discussions, and I say current members of the NANC and some recently departing members of the NANC, we've had discussions about this and we support your efforts.

And I don't want to speak for everyone, but I think we are all consistent in

the view that we appreciate the leadership that you brought to the table on this issue. And I don't know if you're going to bring this up as a motion or how you want to proceed, but I will make that or second that motion. But I thank you for your time on this and we look forward to moving forward in a fair process.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. I will take that as a motion that the NANC recommend approval of this process. Any further discussion? I guess if it's a motion, we don't usually do motions. We'll need a second just for the record. Yes, sir, second. And your name for the record?

MR. PALERMINO: Tony Palermino from Connecticut. DPUC.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you, Commissioner Palermino. Thank you very much. All right, any further discussion? Yes, sir.

MALE SPEAKER: (Off microphone, unintelligible). I'm just trying to understand what it is we're recommending. I think (unintelligible) process that's out for comment. The FCC is seeking comment on this process that would give us the authority to select the LNPA. Is it proper for us to be commenting on that, or recommending or not recommending? I just want to make sure.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Let me back up. The FCC has already done the delegation by the order. The FCC has said that after the comment period they are going to fill in a little more details about where the FCC's role is going to be, but they have asked for comments simply on the rest of the process.

This comes from the NAPM and the NANC Chair. I would like to be able to forward to the FCC to say the full NANC having looked at it, is comfortable with

that part that is out for comment.

MALE SPEAKER: Okay, so that's what we're doing. I just wanted to make sure I understood what we're doing.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes.

FEMALE SPEAKER:(Off microphone). We're discussing process only, not scope so your proposal --

CHAIRMAN KANE: Scope of?

FEMALE SPEAKER:(Off microphone). What the RFI should and should not do.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Correct. The process contemplates that the working group working with the NAPM and the NAPM technical folks will get into all of that. Anything else?

All right, I will then take that as unanimous consent that we will inform the FCC. And again I want to thank everyone.

My intention would be once the formal comment period is over after March 29th, the FCC will do what it needs to do hopefully very quickly after that, and then I will ask for volunteers, let me ask you, for the working group.

And as you said, our process anticipates that the working group would consist of or eligibility comprised of, open to any individual who is a NANC member, a NANC alternate, or the technical staff of a NANC member company association or governmental entity, and who doesn't have a conflict of interest and signs a non-disclosure agreement.

So be thinking about if you want participate in the working group, the selection working group, if there are folks at your company or at your organization who you think might have some expertise or perspective, whether they're lawyers, or engineers, or computer people, or whatever, who might be part of that so that we can be ready to move forward, as well as be working on a proposed timeline for a suggestion.

Our next meeting is not yet scheduled. It's going to be sometime from the middle to the end of May. We're just going over some dates. We had looked at May 12th but the FCC is meeting on May 12th so it may be something that I'll be able to send out in early April by circulation for people to look at who wants to be on the working group and a proposed timeline.

And then the working group will need to meet once it's established. It does say the NANC will approve it. I really don't want to wait until a meeting at the end of May perhaps to actually establish the working group so if we can do that by circulation, I'm considering that. Then they'll be able to come back with a timeline et cetera before the end of May.

So be thinking about that so we can get going and get back and get this done, and we're going to build on all the good work that the NAPM and the NAPM subcommittee and FON PAC et cetera have done to date so we won't be starting all over again.

Very good, thank you. Thank everyone in that move forward.

Our next item report is the Local Number Portability Administration

Working Group and that is number ten. Did I skip number nine? Yes, I did. I'm looking ahead.

This is the report of the North American Portability Management, report of the NAPM about which we were just speaking, and this is just a one page document that will go into the record as document number nine. Thank you.

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

MR. DECKER: Thank you, Chairman Kane. I'm Tim Decker with the NAPM LLC. I Co-Chair it along with Mel Clay, right behind me over here.

I would like to do this report in reverse order. It's so long.

(LAUGHTER)

And basically all I want to say about item number two is I want to thank Chairman Kane for the hard work that her office did, and I also especially want to thank the NAPM LLC. It took a lot of hours, a lot of hard work, not only by the members but taking it back to Legal and everything else.

Then the other item, I'm going to take up a lot of your time today, we just had one thing to report and that is we have a new member and that new member is Bright House Networks. That brings us to ten members. That's all we have.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much. Any questions? Thank you.

Now we will move on to number ten which is the report of the Local Number Portability Working Group, the LNPA Working Group and that is Gary Sacra. Document number ten for the record.

REPORT OF THE LOCAL NUMBER PORTABILITY (LNPA) WORKING GROUP

MR. SACRA: Good morning, everyone. I'm Gary Sacra with Verizon, one of the Tri-Chairs of the LNPA Working Group. Our other two chairs are Paula Jordan with T-Mobile and Linda Peterman with One Communications.

First on the report is our regular readout of the one day porting implementation. Since our last meeting we have had another major milestone that we've reached. That was the February 2nd implementation of one day porting per FCC orders 0941 and 1085 of the smaller providers in the industry as defined as less than two percent of the nation's subscriber lines.

The working group is continuing to monitor the one day porting implementation through service provider feedback at our meetings and on our conference calls. As I said February 2nd was the most recent milestone with the implementation by smaller providers.

We have received some feedback in the working group by a number of providers that they believe some providers are not or may not be in compliance with the one porting order meaning that they're not accepting and honoring one day port requests.

The process itself is working fine as designed but what we've decided to do in the working group is to start tracking the profiles of service providers, their profiles in the NPAC that indicate whether or not they support the new medium timers that were implemented in order to support one day porting.

Any provider that utilizes the NPAC reporting has a profile in the NPAC that indicates what features, what services that they support, one of which is the new medium timers. So, providers are required to indicate that they support the medium timers when they've done the necessary development work in their local systems to support one day porting.

So we have identified a number of providers whose profiles indicate that they still do not support one day porting via the medium timers so what we're doing is we're gathering any known regulatory waivers, whether they be FCC waivers or state waivers, banging that against the list of the providers that have indicated that they do or do not support the new medium timer indicators.

Our goal is to scrub those lists. Certainly any provider that's received a regulatory waiver from porting would not be on any list identified as one that should be supporting one day porting.

Our goal is to put together as accurate a list as we possibly can and bring that to NANC, present it to the NANC at a future meeting for discussion and possible action.

That is still a work in progress in fact it's just getting off the ground. We're in the process now of starting to scrub all the various lists that we need to do to put together this single list identifying carriers that we believe should be supporting next day porting but are not.

And I'll pause for questions.

CHAIRMAN KANE: How big a problem is it?

MR. SACRA: Indications are that there are more than a handful, numerous providers that are not supporting the required medium timers in order to support next day porting and providers that have brought that information to the working group believe they should be supporting it.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, so you'll report to us at our May meeting.

MR. SACRA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Good.

MS. MILLER: Anna Miller with T-Mobile. Gary, so essentially this list is a list of carriers that are non-compliant with the implementation of one day porting for FCC 0941, is that correct?

MR. SACRA: That's correct.

MS. MILLER: Thank you.

MR. SACRA: That will be the end result of our effort that we've just kicked off, to put together such a list.

Okay, moving to page two, just a brief status of NANC change order 437. If you recall I've been reporting on that for the past number of meetings. That is Telcordia's proposal for a peered NPAC architecture in a region.

At our January meeting the working group finalized the report on the feasibility analysis that was undertaken starting in January of 2009. We finished up last year the feasibility analysis, developed a final report. That was finalized at the January meeting.

As I reported at a previous meeting, there were two position papers included

in the final report, and they centered on the question of operational feasibility. A number of providers were of the opinion that NANC 437 was not operationally feasible and they developed a position paper with their rationale for that position.

And then a number of other providers, they also believed that NANC 437 was operationally feasible and again they also developed a position paper supporting their position.

The question of technical feasibility, the 437 was deemed technically feasible. That is acknowledged in the final report along with the two position papers on operational feasibility.

The final report was distributed over the LNPA Working Group email distribution list as well as provided to Telcordia.

Questions?

Okay, the next item is NPAC Release 3.4. That's currently undergoing service provider testing as we speak. There's a number of change orders in NPAC Release 3.4 that will enhance the operational and performance capability of the NPAC as well as we are increasing the throughput requirements so that the expected higher volumes of porting and pooling and work that will need to take place through the NPAC will be supported by the amount of throughput both by the NPAC and the downstream local systems as well.

The regional rollout, we'll be rolling out one region initially and then in phases three additional regions and then the final three regions. That rollout is starting the end of this month and will continue through May until all seven regions

are loaded as well as the NPAC test bed.

Questions?

Okay, this final item, and what the working group would like to request of the NANC as has been our practice previously when we've brought approved Best Practices before the Council, we are requesting that the NANC endorse this particular Best Practice that I'll go through in a moment, as well as forward it to the FCC with a request that it be adopted as part of the process for approving I guess the new streamline process for tweaking the industry's porting process and getting that into the NANC LNP provisioning flows.

At our last meeting I reported out that the working group was attempting to reach consensus on a proposed Best Practice to identify and define what is a project.

Since porting was implemented back in 1997, every provider that I'm aware of at least has maximum thresholds for the number of telephone numbers on a port request for which they could support the standard four day porting interval.

And above those maximum thresholds which are specific on a provider by provider basis, there is no industry standard, but once those maximum thresholds based on the number of telephone numbers on the porting request was reached, above that point the port request was considered a project and the two providers involved, the old provider and the new provider would negotiate the due dates, not only for the firm order confirmation but also the porting interval itself.

So this Best Practice was an attempt to reach industry consensus on at a least common denominator if you will in order to reach a proposed industry standard on

what could be considered a project above which that threshold -- above which would be worked out between the two involved providers below which the standard porting interval for non-simple ports which is a 24 hour firm order confirmation return and three day porting interval would apply.

So I'm happy to report that the working group after a lot of work, a lot of back and forth, a lot of cooperation and compromise, has reached an approved and recommended Best Practice on what can be considered the minimum threshold for what can be considered a project, and that was reached at our January meeting, this past meeting.

So the proposed Best Practice itself is appended to the report and I'd just like to refer you to kind of the meat of the Best Practice and that's the two tables on page four of this report.

The first table is the return of the firm order confirmation and the porting interval itself, and what we've reached consensus on in the working group, and again this is for non-simple ports. These are not simple ports. Certainly there's no recommended change obviously to the next day porting process for simple ports. This applies only to non-simple ports and the threshold for what can be considered a project.

So what the working group is recommending is that if the local service request or the port request is for a port between one and 50 telephone numbers, and again the one would be for a non-simple port, not a simple port, but if it's between one and 50 telephone numbers, the firm order confirmation would be required to be

returned within 24 clock hours, that's consistent with current requirements for non-project type porting request, and the port installation interval would be three business days for a total interval of four business days which is the standard non-simple porting interval.

Greater than 50 telephone numbers on the port request, the firm order confirmation within certain perimeters would be negotiated by the involved service providers, and the porting interval itself would be negotiated within certain perimeters between the two involved service providers.

And the perimeters are spelled out in note five if I can refer you to that real quick, on the last page. Note five states that -- most projects by the way, large projects are in a lot of cases coordinated between the two service providers.

There's a lot of up front work that needs to take place. There's a lot of lead time into the start of the porting interval itself and most providers that deal in large numbers of telephone numbers on port requests are very familiar with the work that they have to undertake in order to get these projects kicked off.

So typically what would happen is that the requesting provider, the new provider in the port would request a project ID from the old provider and a completion date when the port could be completed.

So what we stated in note five here is that upon request the old provider will supply the project ID and the completion date or the port due date for port requests for above 50 telephone numbers.

They will provide that information within 72 clock hours upon request and

this information would be included on the local service request that's submitted by the new service provider to the old service provider to kick off the actual porting process.

So once the LSR is received by the old service provider, the firm order confirmation for these project type activities would be returned to the new provider within 72 clock hours and again that excludes weekends and holidays.

Then the project completion date interval which is the port due date would be no longer than 15 business days from receipt of the local service request unless it's requested by the end user, the customer themselves, or the new service provider, or if it's otherwise negotiated by the old service provider.

I guess the key threshold here is greater than 50 telephone numbers, we get into that activity, the two providers get together and decide the acceptable interval for the FOC within those perimeters and also the due date within those perimeters in order to insure that the end user service is maintained and that the porting process of these large type projects is transparent to the end user and their service is maintained.

I do want to add, and there's text in this Best Practice that if endorsed and approved will go into the Best Practice itself. This is by no means intended to encourage providers who currently have higher thresholds than what's recommended here to lower their thresholds in order to tighten up what they consider to be a project.

This proposed Best Practice is really meant only to require providers who currently have lower thresholds, and consider -- in some cases providers have told

other providers that they consider two TNs or greater to be a project and therefore the four day porting interval does not apply.

So this Best Practice is intended to require providers with very low thresholds for projects to raise their thresholds to these proposed industry standards.

I'll pause there before I go to the last table if there are any questions. Yes.

MR. DIAMOND: Greg Diamond for Level 3. Assuming this gets incorporated into the provisioning flow by the FCC and the parties can't negotiate intervals that's more than 50 TNs, and they can't negotiate intervals, is it the rule still that the current FCC rules would apply or is this intended to change the current rules if this gets incorporated?

MR. SACRA: I guess first I'll answer by saying this is a way of acknowledging and standardizing what is already industry practice and has been industry practice since the beginning of porting.

The perimeters in note five are intended to remove I guess the openness which was a concern on the part of a number of providers when we were discussing the Best Practice in the development of this Best Practice.

The fact that the FOC has to be returned within 72 clock hours for projects and the due date can be no longer than 15 business days unless requested by the new provider or successfully negotiated by the old provider, those perimeters would apply. So that would be the rule if adopted by the FCC that would be the perimeters that would have to be met in order to negotiate these projects.

MR. DIAMOND: But my question is, if you can't negotiate or if one of

the parties says no, we want more than 50 numbers to be provisioned in accordance with the current rule, is this going to change the current rule so that if somebody says I've got an order for more than 50 numbers, the old service provider says well, we have to now negotiate, and if we don't negotiate and we can't come up with an agreement, does the 243 and four days rule still apply? Is that still the default rule or can an old service provider say no we've got to negotiate. I don't have to comply with those rules?

MR. SACRA: This is intended to give the old provider the authority to honor or to confirm a port request based on the perimeters in note five.

So this does not give the old provider the authority to say we're not going to negotiate, that my current rules apply. This is intended to standardize not only the firm order of confirmation interval but the porting interval itself for these projects which as defined here would be anything greater than 50 telephone numbers.

So this would not give the old provider the authority to refuse to negotiate or to refuse to abide by these perimeters that are in note five.

So the intent would be that this becomes the rule for what the old provider has to comply with in terms of meeting a port request of 50 or greater telephone numbers or less than 50 telephone numbers.

MR. DIAMOND: All right, just so I understand, and if it gets incorporated in the provisioning, is there a new default rule, 72 hours and 15 business days, is that going to be the new rule if parties can't negotiate? I'm just trying to find out what happens if we can't reach agreement.

MR. SACRA: Right, if they don't reach agreement on anything other than the perimeters set forth in note five, than note five would apply for anything greater than 50 telephone numbers.

MR. DIAMOND: Anything greater, okay.

MR. SACRA: Anything less than the 24 hour and the three day applies.

MR. DIAMOND: All right, so if it gets incorporated into the provisioning flow, this really does change the current FCC rules for non-simple ports over 50 numbers.

MR. SACRA: If you believe the current FCC rule is everything is 24 hours and three days.

MR. DIAMOND: Right, right.

MR. SACRA: I don't believe there's universal agreement among service providers that that is the current rule.

MR. DIAMOND: Right, and there's actually --

MR. SACRA: In fact there's a request for clarification. A request has been submitted to the FCC.

MR. DIAMOND: Right, and Level Three is the only party that's submitted confidence and connection with that, surprised nobody else has. All right, thanks very much. That helps.

MR. SACRA: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Your question?

MALE SPEAKER: (Off microphone). (Unintelligible) there's not

consensus on that point at all, there's actually (unintelligible).

MS. MILLER: Anna Miller with T-Mobile. Gary, maybe just to help me clarify, I think what the FCC rules are focused on are simple one day ports and this Best Practice is an industry guideline, right, this is an industry guideline, it's not an FCC rule. It's an industry guideline that addresses what the timeframes are for non-simple ports.

So this guideline would say for non-simple ports if it's more than 50 lines you really shouldn't take more than 15 days unless the new service provider has a request to do that. Am I interpreting that correctly?

MR. SACRA: That's correct. You're absolutely right, Anna. This Best Practice will distinguish between -- and again, simple ports, we know the rules there. That is clear.

This Best Practice is intended to identify and define what is a non-simple port and, therefore, applicable to the 24 hour FOC and the three day porting interval, and then to distinguish between that and then what can be considered a project on the part of the old provider.

It's not to say that the old provider for 100 TNs couldn't comply with a 24 hour FOC on a three day porting interval but this is intended to set the minimum threshold for what the old provider could consider a project and, therefore, the 72 hour FOC could apply and the 15 business day interval could apply, unless otherwise successfully negotiated by the old provider or requested otherwise by the new provider or their incoming customer.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, no further discussion? So Gary, again what are you asking the NANC to do or recommending we do?

MR. SACRA: Before I answer that question I'd like to just touch on the last table here.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Sure.

MR. SACRA: We did reach consensus on recommended rules surrounding customer service records. Again, service providers in the industry are all over the map in terms of how quickly they'll return a customer service record upon request, the number of telephone numbers that require a longer interval.

So what the working group reached consensus on is that if the quantity of telephone numbers on the customer service record request is between 1 and 50 telephone numbers, that the CSR has to be returned to the requesting provider within 24 clock hours and again it's excluding weekends and holidays.

If it's between 51 and 200 telephone numbers on the customer service record request, it must be returned within 48 clock hours. Then any request above 200 telephone numbers on the request has to be returned within 72 clock hours.

One of the key factors in determining what were the acceptable return times certainly is when you get to the larger quantity of telephone numbers on a CSR request, you're getting into very complex accounts.

Many services, many features on each telephone number, that increases the size dramatically of the customer service record some of which -- and again some providers may not be able to return on an electronic basis so again in the interest of

reaching a compromise and then trying to find a least common denominator in coming up with requirements that the participating providers could live with, these are the recommended requirements for returning a customer service record.

Questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Questions? And again this is a Best Practice, not a recommendation for a rule change.

MR. SACRA: Well, what the working group is requesting is first off that the NANC endorse this proposed and recommended Best Practice, and then we're also requesting that should the NANC endorse this, to send it to the FCC with a request for adoption.

I believe it was part of FCC 1085 that instituted a streamlined process that I believe enables the Wireline Competition Bureau Chief to I guess for lack of a better word, to tweak the process based on recommendations that come from the NANC, and the working group would like to if possible and with the approval of the NANC, to take advantage of that process if the NANC should so endorse this Best Practice.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Mary?

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka from Qwest. I just wanted to comment that I think Gary, you intended to also say that the reason that it's important to have something in this Best Practice in the timeframe that we're at right now is to give consumers some assurance of what they can expect in terms of the timeframe that it will take in order to get their service changed over to their new provider. And I think that's the important issue.

Yes, Qwest does have an outstanding petition and both Qwest and Level 3 have filed on that, and I believe that that's still pending, and in this interim consumers do need some surety as to what kind of timeframe they're going to be able to expect for their ports.

MR. SACRA: That's an excellent point.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Anna?

MS. MILLER: Anna Miller with T-Mobile. Gary, if the NANC endorses this Best Practice then you said that there will be updates to the NANC provisioning flows so my question is, is it the LNP Working Group's intent then to update the NANC provisioning flows and provide those to the NANC for review and approval?

MR. SACRA: Yes.

MS. MILLER: And then those would be submitted to the FCC, and then I guess they would review it and determine whether or not that the official NANC flow should be updated?

MR. SACRA: That's correct, Anna. The first step first off should the NANC endorses the Best Practice, we will add the Best Practice itself to our working group document that contains all the Best Practices with a note saying that it was endorsed by the NANC at the March 9th meeting.

At that stage, again the Best Practice is just a guideline as Chairman Kane said. It does carry certainly additional weight if the NANC endorses the Best Practice we believe, but then the next step as you said Anna, we would go back to the working group. If the NANC endorses this we would modify the LNP

provisioning flows. It could take on the form of an additional flow itself. We'll have to decide that in the working group, but once we come up with that revision to the flows, we would then bring that back to NANC for review and discussion, and should the NANC then approve that, then we would forward that to FCC and request that it be adopted as part of the formal industry provisioning flows.

CHAIRMAN KANE: So to clarify, what you're asking for today is the NANC agreement on the Best Practice.

MR. SACRA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And there would be some later stages for it to become a recommendation from you. Okay, thank you very much. The recommendation is that the NANC endorse the two Best Practices that are on page four, right?

MR. SACRA: It's actually two tables within the same Best Practice.

CHAIRMAN KANE: With the same Best Practice, okay, having to do with the timing changes on Best Practice, whether there's under 50 or over 50 and in one case over 200. Is there any further discussion on this? Do I hear any disagreement to the proposition that the NANC endorse this as a Best Practice? Yes.

MR. DIAMOND: Thank you, Madam Chair. Greg Diamond again, on behalf of Level 3. What I don't want to do is interfere with the consensus at all. What I think I want to do if you don't mind is just abstain so that my perspective on this isn't construed as a waiver of any position we might be taking in the pending petition for reconsideration. That's all I want to say about it. Otherwise don't want

to interfere with consensus. Thanks so much.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Very good. Well, that will be noted in the record, in the transcript.

MR. DIAMOND: Thanks so much.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Hearing that, I would rule that we do have consensus on this as a Best Practice and then if you have any further steps you're going to recommend, we will take those up at later meetings. Thank you very much, Gary.

MR. SACRA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, that concludes item number ten. Number 11 is the Industry Numbering Committee otherwise known as the INC report. Natalie, are you doing that? Okay, good.

STATUS OF THE INDUSTRY NUMBERING COMMITTEE (INC)

ACTIVITIES

MS. MCNAMER: Good morning, almost good afternoon. My name is Natalie McNamer and I'm with T-Mobile. I'm the INC Chairperson of the ATIS Industry Numbering Committee. Dana Crandall with Verizon Wireless who is also here today is the INC Vice-Chair.

Our report today is pretty brief. On page two, we review for the NANC that since our last NANC meeting we've had one interim general session call and one face-to-face call. Our next scheduled face-to-face meeting is May 2nd through the 5th in Indianapolis, Indiana.

On page three we wanted to review with you that the RAM Subcommittee's issue 710 which is in reference to the NANC action item that the INC received at the December 17th NANC meeting relating to multi OCN issue that was brought up by the Pennsylvania PUC staffer.

Since the last NANC meeting the INC reviewed the action item at a general session meeting and INC leadership has also met with the Pennsylvania PUC staffers to better understand their concerns.

At our INC meeting last week we accepted issue 710 and began discussing it. To date, the INC has come up with some steps to help state commission staffers identify the relationships of multiple OCNs within a given state.

We're looking at having the NANPA add the parent company OCN from the part one on to their daily activity report and also for the Pooling Administrator to add the same information, the parent company OCN, on their daily Part 1A activity reports that go to the states.

Another item that we're looking at is to have the parent company OCN added to the part three reports that also go to the states on a daily basis.

The INC does recognize that this parent company OCN information may not fully address the PUC concerns in Pennsylvania so we are keeping the issue open for now to have some further work. We plan on meeting with them and the whole INC later in an interim meeting coming up in April.

The next item on page four is the NARP Subcommittee issue 709. This issue is to update the INC guidelines to include the clarifications that came from the FCC

in their letter in December to the Pooling Administrator for certain issues and assumptions that were being made. Since we have that letter we can now bring the guidelines up to speed with those clarifications.

And on page five we only have one issue that's remaining in initial pending right now which is 534 which is the development of the pANI guidelines so once that change order is implemented this will move into final.

And since our last NANC meeting we did place one issue into initial closure which is issue 706. Two issues have gone to final closure, issue 696 and issue 704.

And the last page of our document just shows the relevant INC web pages.
Any questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions on that? I did have two things from the states. Apparently the state commission staffs that do administer the numbering process have a phone call, a conference call once a month.

MS. MCNAMER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: At least prior to each of the NANC meetings. I think one of them you did address in your report which apparently Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, and California, Virginia, and Washington State report that one or more CLECS that affiliate with an ILEC have requested separate number blocks or codes in the same rate centers as the ILEC even though the ILEC already has unused number blocks or codes

And their concern is that this contributes to number exhaust in those rate centers and they've previously requested the INC to resolve the matter by directing

affiliated CLECS and ILECS to share number blocks or codes before requesting additional number blocks or codes.

And I know you've acknowledged this as a problem, and I guess the issue was about the timing, and what was the status of moving on that?

MS. MCNAMER: That particular ILEC and CLEC sharing, I don't know if that was actually brought to the INC's attention in that way.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay.

MS. MCNAMER: It was just carriers having multiple OCNs even within a state. The INC is having an interim call with the Pennsylvania staff and we made sure we scheduled it when they can participate because it is hard to hear on the phone when we're all in the room and they're not so we'll all be on the phone, and that's in April and hopefully after we have that interim call, and the next INC meeting is in May, that we would be able to find something that would help them.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Be able to give the status on that, good.

And the other one is an issue raised by the state commissions, maybe they have raised it and it hasn't yet been accepted as a new issue, and that is the seven day review time limit for state commissions to review and approve number block and code allocation requests.

It sounds technical but it's asking to define seven days which usually means seven calendar days or is it seven business days, and particularly since states to tell you the truth are now having furloughs, we even had a furlough in the District a couple of weeks ago, they are asking the INC to define the seven day review of state

government business days.

MS. MCNAMER: See that has not been brought to the INC.

CHAIRMAN KANE: I don't know if that's been brought to your attention but they asked me if I would put that on the record and maybe bring that to you to recognize, you know, whether it's seven calendar days excluding government days -- but it's state government business days.

But I know that there are some states now where they are going through furloughs every month in some cases and there are special state holidays and things like that so I just wanted to bring that to your attention for your next meeting.

MS. MCNAMER: Okay, and we'll contact, I don't who at the state coordinating group. I think that's what they call --

CHAIRMAN KANE: Rebecca Beaton from Washington State.

MS. MCNAMER: Rebecca Beaton, okay. I will give Rebecca a call and we'll make sure that INC will be able to look at that.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Very good. Speaking of which, I guess we're all glad we're here today because the Congress did pass a two week Continuing Resolution so the FCC, and the D.C. government are still in business until March 18th, otherwise we would have had to cancel the whole thing. We'll see what happens between now and March 18th. Thank you very much.

MS. MCNAMER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Item 12, the Future of Numbering. Don Gray, are you on the phone?

MR. NEWMAN: You have me here.

CHAIRMAN KANE: We've got you in person, very good. Thank you.

REPORT OF THE FUTURE OF NUMBERING WORKING GROUP (FoN WG)

MR. NEWMAN: Adam Newman, Telcordia Technologies. I'm one of the Co-Chairs of the Future of Numbering Working Group along with Don Gray from the Nebraska Public Service Commission and Jim Castagna from Verizon.

We do have hopes that Mr. Gray will be able to continue in his role as Co-Chair of Future of Numbering. It looks like at least for now he will, so we're excited by that.

Slide two, the first slide with content is a summary of the Future of Numbering Working Group's activities since our last report in December to the NANC.

We did provide a transmittal letter and a White Paper, Toll Free Resources Allocation Assignment and Management to NANC for distribution.

That letter and document were distributed to the NANC list with the cover letter which requested comment back to Chairman Kane and I have a placeholder bullet here for feedback received by Chairman Kane. So I don't know if you want to speak to what you've received.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, so far I've received two letters which I will circulate. One came from Custom Toll Free from the President of Custom Toll Free, a Michael Evans, and that was dated February 22nd. It came by real mail so it took a

bit to get there. And he has two pages of comments there. I will circulate that.

And I also got a letter dated March 3rd, from a David Greenhaus, Director of Regulatory Affairs from 800 Response, and he's a voting member of the FoN Working Group.

MR. NEWMAN: And he's right there.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, he's right here.

(LAUGHTER)

And I'll have these scanned and circulated to everyone. Refresh my memory when we set the deadline for wanting people --

MR. NEWMAN: So the theoretical deadline was the week before our previously scheduled NANC meeting so it has at least in theory expired by about a month.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes and both these letters came after that date.

MR. NEWMAN: So I think in reality we just wanted them here to be able to discuss at this meeting from at least a realistic procedural perspective. I don't know if we were expecting more. I don't know if you want to let David speak to what he sent.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Go ahead, David.

MR. GREENHAUS: David Greenhaus with 800 Response. My understanding is we did a fair amount of work distributing the White Paper for comment to quite a number of businesses and organizations. We also had an online survey that we asked people to take to give us a feeling for how they felt about the

various issues that are raised in the White Paper.

And I think you'll see that letter is a summary of the responses, but it was also my understanding that there were I would say at least eight or ten companies that were planning to write a letter in support of various areas that were covered by the White Paper.

So I guess number one I would ask if there would be a chance that we could extend the deadline for review and comment and perhaps include some time on the agenda at our next meeting for discussion.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, we can extend the deadline to the end of March and I'll go back and search to see that -- these were the ones that came directly to me, what else has come in.

We'll get that to your working group and you could then give us a report and any recommendations at the May meeting.

I did notice David of course, your letter is really a summary of what you got from the survey, survey responses, and then this was just an individual company commenting, but there may be floating out there somewhere that didn't come directly to me, some other responses and we'll put that together, get that done. I want to encourage anybody else to do it, get it in by the end of March.

I will get the material to you and you all can make a recommendation and get a report out a week or so before the meeting, and whatever action you are recommending that we take, if any, we can have on the agenda for the May meeting, okay?

MR. NEWMAN: That works. I can report on behalf of the Co-Chairs, at least for the Co-Chairs in sum, as of our meeting last week, we had not received separately a set of comments.

Mr. Greenhaus had shared what he had submitted to you with the working group, and we said we'd see what the NANC decided to have us as a working group do with that after this meeting. We didn't take action on it.

And as one of the Co-Chairs, I have not received anything further in the interim since our meeting last week, and I have not heard from Don or Jim, the other Co-Chairs that they've received anything. So my suspicion is that that is it unless something is hiding in email.

CHAIRMAN KANE: This is it. I'll do an extra search. I know a couple of times some of those did come to the Commission or a secretary inadvertently sort of docketed it as a D.C. Public Service Commission issue. We had to un-docket it because I mean that's what happens in everything that comes to me.

But we'll just do that extra search to be sure there's nothing out there that you need and then get it all to you and we'll look forward to it at the end of --

MR. NEWMAN: We will look at it at our next meeting in time for the May NANC meeting.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes. And I would join you in hoping that Don Gray who is a long term staff person at the Nebraska Commission will be able to continue working with you, because he does a valuable service and a lot of institutional memory is there.

MR. NEWMAN: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Does that conclude your report?

MR. NEWMAN: I have a couple more things to go through.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Oh, very good, okay.

MR. NEWMAN: Sorry.

CHAIRMAN KANE: That's all right.

MR. NEWMAN: I know I'm standing between us and lunch. It's now the afternoon.

We did have a conference call on February 2nd and March 2nd to review the status of all of the Future of Numbering issues and the matrix to determine a path forward with each issue. I provide you with that matrix in slide three.

The only new data on this slide from what we presented before are the next steps and I'm just going to briefly go through the next steps on each issue.

We have an open issue on new and future services, that's number one, and we have a consensus to keep open this issue for discussion and to monitor some of the activity that's going on, on the future of Numbering, particularly with regard for example to ITU-T, study group two, and what gets reported there as to other countries activity at the Future of Numbering.

We have several members that attend regularly the ITU-Ts study group two meetings on numbering, so our members want us to at least continue understanding what's being done in other countries in this regard, and help and inform our members with Future of Numbering here in the United States.

FTN-002, Telematics and use of NANP numbers - We had a discussion and consensus to keep open this issue and to monitor developments both at the ITU-T on machine to machine communications as well as the Industry Numbering Committee has some issues related to the PCS guidelines that have something to do with machine to machine communications.

So to the extent that machine to machine communications may or may not impact NANP exhaust and future uses, we're keeping this issue open for discussion and contribution on going forward basis.

Issue number four, geographic issues impacting numbering policy decisions, we're holding this open for input from the Issue Champion who brought it in to make sure they want to continue working it and how they want to continue working it. They've asked for an extension to the next meeting to do that.

We also reviewed some reports in this area from the European regulatory, the CEPT and the ITU on both geographic number portability and the geographic nature of telephone numbers themselves and are so far keeping this issue open again for monitoring purposes and to understand what's going on with regard to the geographic nature of telephone numbers.

This issue also incorporates another issue that was closed that was brought up by a former NANC member to the Future of Numbering to look at. That was the OUR of Jamaica, and they had requested and the NANC had sent on to the Future of Numbering, for us to also look at the use of NANP numbers outside of the NANP geography or outside of their intended NANP geography as part of this issue. So

that is still included in this issue. That remains open and we're still looking at sort of ongoing issues here.

And finally FTN-005 was the Commons versus Market Rights on toll free numbers. That's the White Paper we just discussed, and you have an update on that already.

Slide four, you know, it's just what we're going to do next and so finalize any reports or changes based on the feedback on the White Paper and then determine which of those other projects that I just discussed, we will concentrate on and work on a going forward basis, and/or any future NANC assignments.

So if the NANC tells us to work on one in particular or if something other comes up for assignment with regard to the Future of Numbering, certainly that's what we're here for.

And the last slide is just our meeting schedule. We generally meet the first Wednesday of the month.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you very much. Any questions on the rest of the report? Very good.

All right, we're up to now the summary of action items. For the record, the action items that we took to summarize, we did agree to a Best Practice as recommended and agreed to go on record as supporting the selection process that was put forward by the NAPM and the Chair for the selection of the next administrator.

Public comments and participation, is there anyone from the public who

wants to say something? All right. And other business, we're up to that. Yes.

MS. MILLER: Anna Miller – T-Mobile USA. Regarding the action items from the last NANC meeting - at the last NANC meeting we approved the NANPA and Pooling Administrator Performance Reviews, and I have not seen any transmittal letter reflecting that approval from the NANC to the FCC. So, I was wondering when we anticipate that happening.

And the same thing with regard to the Telcordia dispute. We had the dispute team findings and two recommendations that were discussed at the meeting, but I saw no transmittal letter forwarding that result to the FCC.

And I guess that's a segue to what the action items, the approvals that occurred today with regard to the Welch performance evaluation, the budget and the contribution factor, is it the intent then that those approvals, there will be a transmittal letter communicating those approvals to the FCC?

CHAIRMAN KANE: They will be transmitted. The first one you mentioned was the evaluation of the --

FEMALE SPEAKER: The NANPA and the Pooling Administrator. So I think per their contract there's an evaluation process.

CHAIRMAN KANE: That will be transmitted very, very shortly.

MS. MILLER: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And I've already informed the parties in the Telcordia case that it is coming very shortly.

And then the three that we did today, the Welch performance evaluation, the

budget and the contribution factor, yes, will all be going the FCC.

MS. MILLER: One more. Also at the last NANC meeting the NANC approved the Service Member Civil Relief Act and how the INC was going to handle it and they were transmit that also to the FCC.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes.

MR. CANDELARIA: Jerome Candelaria, NCTA. Just a quick request to subcommittees and working groups, when there's an item that we want to present to the full NANC for endorsement it's very valuable to receive it as far in advance as possible. I realize it's not always possible but trade associations have a lot of folks to get sign offs from and so it would be appreciated. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, we want to remind people of that, get it in, get it in electronically to Marilyn and then I can take a good look at it and try to turn around as soon as we get it, to turn it around and get it out electronically to people. I appreciate that.

The other business, we're still trying to set a date for our next meeting. The FCC keeps taking our dates. We know they're very busy.

So looking at May, how do you feel about Monday meetings? Does that not work for people having to fly in, Monday not good? Mondays are not good, okay.

So in terms of available dates and trying to want to avoid the Memorial Day weekend coming up also, and as I said May 12th which we had originally looked at is taken, I'm looking at Tuesday, May 17th.

Now I know one of the working groups, you have your conference call stuff

at one o'clock and two o'clock but does that work okay? Tuesday May 17th, okay that is clear. We're going to take that day right now, put our stamp on this room, Tuesday May 17th.

And then we did have dates in September and December. If you could look at those, they were Thursday, September 15th and Thursday, December 15th. As far as we know those are still available so put those dates on your calendar.

Just to go again, Tuesday, May 17th, Thursday September 15th, and Thursday, December 15th for our quarterly meetings.

And on the selection process once we get the final details within the FCC. I'll try to do that by circulation so that can get going in April before our next meeting.

Any other business before? Thank you very much for all your work in all the working groups and all the work that you do in between.

One other final announcement, I was reminded by the FCC about a month ago that -- go ahead, yes.

MS. TIFFANY: Sue Tiffany, Sprint Nextel. The September date, 9/15, is in the same week that the LNPA meeting is in so it may -- I'm looking for the LNPA Co-Chairs input on this.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Thursday will be tight.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thursday will be tight. Where do you meet?

FEMALE SPEAKER: September happens to be in Overland Park, Kansas. Sprint is hosting and its Tuesday and Wednesday.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Okay, Gary is saying that they'll work it out.

CHAIRMAN KANE: You'll work it out, okay. It's just getting this room because the FCC is so active.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Yeah, I know. I understand.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yeah, a little more flexible, so hopefully we can get those dates really locked in.

I was reminded by the FCC a month or so ago that I'm also to name a Co-Chair, that traditionally there has been a Co-Chair for the NANC, not only just to be here in case anything happens to the Chair but also just to sort of share the work. And I am recommending to the Bureau that Commissioner Why from the State of Massachusetts be the Co-Chair, and it was important for me to let you know that.

Any other business? We are adjourned. Thank you very much.

(Meeting Adjourned)

* * * * *

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 audio CD, 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 audio CD furnished, to the best of our ability.

CAROL J. SCHWARTZ

PRESIDENT

ON THIS DATE OF:
