North American Numbering Council
Meeting Transcript
May 17, 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	NANC Chairman (NARUC – DC)
2.	Hon. Geoffrey G. Why	NANC Co-Chairman (NARUC – MA)
3.	Mary Retka	CenturyLink
4.	Valerie Cardwell	Comcast Corporation
5.	Karen Reidy	CompTel
6.	Suzanne Howard	Cox Communications, Inc.
7.	Michael Altschul	CTIA – The Wireless Association
8.	David Greenhaus	800 Response Information Services
9.	Gregory Diamond	Level 3 Communications, LLC
10.	Joel Cheskis	NASUCA
11.	Jerome Candelaria	NCTA
12.	John McHugh	OPASTCO
13.	Rosemary Emmer	Sprint Nextel
14.	Anna Miller	T-Mobile USA, Inc.
15.	Thomas Soroka, Jr.	USTA
16.	Kevin Green	Verizon
17.	Brendan Kasper	Vonage
18.	Tiki Gaugler	XO Communications

Special Members (Non-voting):

John Manning	NANPA
Amy Putnam	PA
Faith Marcotte	Welch & Company

<u>Commission Employees:</u>

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
Heather Hendrickson, Competition Policy Division

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

IV. Documents Introduced.

(1)   Agenda
(1a)   Public Notice – Proposed NANPA Fund Size Estimate and Contribution Factor for July 2011 through June 2012
(1b)   Order – 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
(2)   NANC Meeting Transcript – March 9, 2011
(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
(5b)   2010 PA Performance Evaluation Report
(5c)   2010 NANPA Performance Evaluation Report
(6)   Billing and Collection Agent Report
(7)   Billing and Collection Working Group (B&C WG) Report to the NANC
(8)   North American Portability Management (NAPM) LLC Report to the NANC
(9)   Implementation of FCC Order on LNPA Selection Process
(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
(12a)   Letters in Response to White Paper on Toll Free Resources, Allocation, Assignment and Management
(12b)   White Paper on Toll Free Resources, Allocation, Assignment and Management – May 14, 2010

V. Table of Contents.

VI. Summary of the Meeting.

CHAIRMAN KANE: We will get started with the meeting. For the record

this is the stated meeting of the North American Numbering Council, and we are

meeting at the Federal Communications Commission at 445 12th Street S.W., in the

Commission Hearing Room, and it is 9:40 a.m. on Tuesday, May 17, 2011.

A couple of housekeeping things. When you go to speak, do a little pause right at the beginning so that the gentleman who is managing the microphones can switch your microphone on because all the microphones are off unless you're actually speaking. But, after I recognize you, just take a pause and allow him to switch it on.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND RECENT NEWS

Secondly, we do have some new material that was given out. I think the only new thing, and it really comes under Announcements and Recent News, that had not been circulated previously is that last evening the Bureau, the Wireline Competition Bureau, did issue an Order DA 11-883 in the matter of 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 which was Wireline Competition Docket 9109, and in Telephone Number Portability CC Docket, Common Carrier Docket Number 95116. And that was issued last night. I think it was emailed to everybody. It's short. I'm sure everybody hasn't had a chance really to read it and digest but we will get to that, but that is an announcement and you do have paper copies of that before.

And also last evening the Commission in Order Number DA 11-884 was released in Common Carrier Docket Number 92-237, proposed North American Number Plan Administration Fund size estimate and contribution factor for July

2011 through June 2012 for the coming fiscal year. And you have a press release or public notice rather on that also before you so we'll take those up as it comes.

Those are the Announcements and Recent News except to announce that as you know at the last NANC meeting, I did indicate that I was going to ask the Bureau to name Commissioner Jeff Why of the Massachusetts Telecommunications Commission to be the Co-Chair.

Traditionally there has been a Co-Chair and it has been brought to my attention that I needed to do that, and that has been approved and made official by the Bureau so welcome Jeff to his position there.

Okay, let's do a roll call to see who is here. For the record, I'm Betty Anne Kane, Chairman of the North American Numbering Council.

MR. WHY: Hello, my name is Jeff Why. I'm with actually it's the Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Cable.

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka, with CenturyLink.

MS. CARDWELL: Valerie Cardwell, Comcast.

MR. ALTSCHUL: Michael Altschul representing CTIA.

MR. GREENHAUS: David Greenhaus, Response Information Services.

MR. DIAMOND: Greg Diamond with Level 3.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Speak up.

MR. CHESKIS: Joel Cheskis, Pennsylvania Office Consumer Advocate on behalf of NASUCA.

MR. MCHUGH: John McHugh, OPASTCO.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel.

MS. MILLER: Anna Miller, T-Mobile.

MR. SOROKA: Tom Soroka, U.S. Telecom.

MR. KASPER: Brendan Kasper with Vonage.

MS. JONES: Marilyn Jones, FCC.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Do we have anyone on the phone? We do have a bridge open for members who could not be here in person. At the moment we do not have anybody on the phone. Okay, thank you.

There is a sign-in sheet that is being circulated for the official record.

APPROVAL OF MEETING TRANSCRIPT

Next item of business is the approval of the transcript of the March 9, 2011 meeting that was sent out by email. Are there any additions or corrections to that transcript? Hearing none I'll entertain a motion to approve the transcript as prepared.

MR. ALTSCHUL: I'll move.

MS. RETKA: Second.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Been moved and seconded. Identify yourself for the record when you do that.

MR. ALTSCHUL: Mike Altschul, CTIA.   I move to approve the transcript.

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka from CenturyLink, second.

CHAIRMAN KANE: It's been moved and seconded. All those in favor -

COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any opposition or abstention? It has been unanimously approved. Very good.

Our next item is a report of the North American Numbering Plan Administrator, better known as the NANPA. John Manning.

REPORT OF THE NORTH AMERICAN NUMBERING PLAN ADMINISTRATOR (NANPA)

The transcript will be entered into the record as Item 2. The Public Notice of the Fund Size Estimate and Contribution Factor will be entered in the record as Item 1A, and the Order in the LNPA Selection Process will be entered into the record as Item 1B. And this NANPA report now will be entered into the record as Item 3.

MR. MANNING: Thank you, Chairman. Good morning, everybody. My name is John Manning, Director with North American Numbering Plan Administration Group.

Beginning on page two of my report, it will give a summary of central office code activity since the beginning of 2011. The chart at the top of the page on the far right shows you that today or at least through the end of April of this year, we have assigned 880 codes, 327 denials, and 113 codes have been reclaimed.

When you take those figures and you annualize the quantity of assignments, it appears as if we'll be in the neighborhood of around 2600 assignments this year, which is basically on par with what we experienced in 2010.

I'll make note of one item here in terms of the quantity of returned codes.

You'll see we had 113 so far this year compared to roughly 100 last year, and again that trend seems to be that fewer and fewer codes will be actually returned for a variety of reasons which I've covered in the past.

In the middle of the page I talk a little bit about area code assignment activity. To date this year we have assigned no area codes. We've had three area codes go into service, one in Canada, the 249 area code, and two here in the States, the first being the 539 area code in Oklahoma and the 929 area code in New York.

Presently we know of one area code that will be coming into service later this year and that is the Sint Maarten 721 area code. They begin to plan permissive dialing of this area code at the end of September with mandatory dialing of the area code beginning in March of 2012.

With regard to area code relief planning, there are two area codes that we're looking for exhaust to occur within the next 12 months, the first of which is area code 919 down in North Carolina.

This particular area code has been in relief for quite some time. You have to go back to 2001 in which an overlay was agreed to by the Commission, the 984 to overlay the 919 area code but we haven't had need for that 984 for quite some time.

With the recent area code exhaust projections and the projected exhaust of the 919 occurring in the second quarter of 2012, NANPA initiated discussions with the Utilities Commission down there that resulted in them issuing an order just within the past couple of weeks to begin the implementation of the 984 to include the introduction of mandatory ten digit dialing. The industry will be meeting to put

together that plan in just a few short days.

The other area code I'll mention is in Maryland, the 410/443. This particular area code as well, our area code complex will also introduce a new area code, the 667. NANPA is to notify the Maryland Public Service Commission within ten months of exhaust of the current 410/443. We expect to be doing so in the next few months.

Under other relief activities, I've mentioned before the Nebraska 402. We're basically on watch in that particularly area code. When we reach the level of ten central office codes available in 402, we will see the beginning of the assignment of 531 NXX codes.

In Pennsylvania the 814, the Public Service Commission did order a split for the 814. In January of this year the PUC granted numerous petitions for reconsideration and they're beginning to start the process of gathering input from both service providers and the industry, again on the planned area code split, and those activities will be taking place over the next few months.

And in California 408, an area code overlay is planned and the implementation details with the filing of the application to the Commission, is planned for later this month.

One other area code, non-geographic area code, the 5YY resource, specifically 500, 533, and 544 NPA based upon current NRUF submitted utilization and forecast data combined with assignment activity over the last several months, NANPA is anticipating that we will see the exhaust of the current resource, the 5YY

resource, and we will have to see the introduction of the 566 area code sometime by the end of 2011.

Finally at the bottom of page three, make note that NANPA did publish the 2010 NANPA Annual Report at the end of March. We also put out our first quarter 2011 letter in the early part of April, and the NPA and NANP exhaust projections were posted to the NANPA website at the end of April.

The remaining few pages, there is a summary of relief planning activity for all those area codes projected to exhaust over the next 36 months.

That concludes my presentation. Are there any questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Are there any questions for John? Thank you very much.

MR. MANNING: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: I've been informed that there are people on the phone. We can't hear you. If there are people on the phone could you identify yourselves?

MR. CANDELARIA: Jerome Candelaria on behalf of NCTA.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you.

MS. HALL: Carolee Hall, Idaho Public Utilities Commission.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Very good.

MS. HYMANS: Linda Hymans, NeuStar Pooling.

CHAIRMAN KANE: I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.

MS. HYMANS: Linda Hymans, NeuStar pooling.

CHAIRMAN KANE: NeuStar Pooling, thank you.

MR. HEPBURN: Christopher Hepburn, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Very good.

MS. BEATON: Rebecca Beaton, Washington Commission staff.

MR LAGO: Larry Lago, Oklahoma Commission staff.

MR. MCDONALD: Guy McDonald, Kansas Commission staff.

MS. O'DONNELL: Beth O'Donnell, Cox Communications.

MS. MOREHOUSE: Katie Morehouse, California Public Utilities Commission.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Very good, thank you all. Since you can't sign in, we have a sign-in sheet, and we want to be sure the transcript gets the spelling of everyone's name and title right, if you could just send an email to Deborah Blue indicating that you were on the call then we can be sure you're recorded correctly in the transcript. Thank you very much for participating.

Next item would be Item 4 on our agenda, report of the National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator and that is going to be presented by Amy Putman. And we will enter this report into the record as Item 4.

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

MS. PUTNAM: As always, pooling is fine.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And everyone into the pool or out of the pool.

(LAUGHTER)

MS. PUTNAM: The first slide shows the Pooling Administration activity summary data. As you can see for the last three months, February, March, and April, we have continued high numbers with respect to part threes. Many of those are driven by the number of change requests to existing blocks. If you see the one, two, three, fourth line down in the chart, the number of change requests have been high for the past few months.

I would note that from January to April 2010, (unintelligible) we processed 30,404 Part 3s. From January to April 2011, we processed 43,507, approximately 13,000 more in the first four months.

The next couple of pages are the PA summary data sorted by type. On page four we have the summary of rate center information changes. We had a couple of months, three months there with a lot of activity. January, we had the Indiana and Arkansas implementations and after those we're kind of back down to a dull roar with respect to rate center information changes.

Next page shows a reclamation summary. We have been kind of high on a number of blocks with overdue part fours on the list the past few months. We have states that are granting extensions and that is the reason that the numbers are high. So the numbers may be high but the part fours are legitimately on the list.

PAS was up 100 percent of the time and we have other polling related activities. All of our contractual reporting requirements were met.

With respect to delegated authority petitions, there are currently no petitions

for additional delegated authority pending.

And on May 5th, the Mississippi Public Service Commission implemented the additional mandatory pooling in 662 NPA. That is the last implementation related to the May 2010 FCC delegated authority order and the chart showing that is on the top of the next page.

We had no changes with respect to the interim Routing Number Authority Administration. With respect to permanent pANI, I am aware of that the FCC staff is working on the change order and we have been working with the INC and with ESIF.

I attended the ESIF meeting at the ATIS meeting of committees in Indianapolis May 3rd to 5th, and there was a joint meeting between the ESIF-ECDR subcommittee and the INC-NARP subcommittee to address questions from INC relating to issues arising out of the change order, and I think we reached an amicable solution between the two committees.

The NOWG, we had a More Than Met at our read-out which we are very, very pleased about. I am sure that that will be part of the NOWG report.

We have no new change orders.

And on page ten we have other PA activities. The first one is a Pooling Administration staff change. This is a really big deal for us. We are not used to change, but we did have an employee retire after 11 years at NeuStar.

Dora Wirth had been the Pooling Administrator for a number of states and effective May 9th, John Auerbach, who actually when we first interviewed John

many years ago, Florence Webber was in charge of the Concord office, and she called me up and told me about this person she wanted to hire, and I said do you really want to hire someone whose last name is Auerbach?

(LAUGHTER)

But John has been with us for a number of years now, and he was promoted from the customer service rep help desk to the Pooling Administration position. And we've hired Evelyn Freeman. She has joined the pooling team as the new customer service representative.

Evelyn was formerly the administrative assistant in the Concord office and in that position which we no longer have, Evelyn proved herself to be very organized, a self-starter, and interested in learning and in those days she did do some back up processing. So, we are confident that Evelyn will be a wonderful addition to our pooling team.

The very old overdue Part 4s reconciliation process, a long time ago we started with the (unintelligible) January 1, 2007 overdue part fours, then we got approval to go with the 2008. This past year we went the 2009. We now have eight very old overdue Part 4s. We do not feel that there is anything that we can do at this point with regard to them, and we are considering this project closed.

The next one I've called the NPAC Scrub, the never ending NPAC Scrub, but we are actually moving closer in this one too. We are down from the original 9,949 blocks to 66 and, we are hoping that soon I will be reporting that we considered this project closed.

And that is our report for today. Thank you. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Are there any questions? Any questions from anyone on the phone? Okay, well, thank you for that good work. Did that take any action by the NANC to actually close those?

MS. PUTNAM: No, those are projects that we initiated internally.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Very good. Thank you. Okay, Item 5, the report of the Numbering Oversight Working Group, and that will be presented by Gwen Vaughn.

REPORT OF THE NUMBERING OVERSIGHT WORKING GROUP (NOWG)

MS. ZAHN: Good morning. My name is Gwen Zahn. I work for Verizon Wireless. I'm a Co-Chair on the NOWG along with Natalie McNamer from T-Mobile and Laura Dalton from Verizon Communications.

We're going to be covering approximately five things in the presentation today. The two main items will be the 2010 PA Performance Report and also the 2010 NANPA performance report.

If you'll turn to slide number three, you'll see a summary of the number of respondents to the 2010 PA survey. We noticed that this year the respondent level was slightly down from 2009 for the PA. This was our first year of doing an online survey. We converted from the paper surveys from previous years to an online format, and we don't yet know if that contributed to the drop in responses and the total number of respondents but, we will be doing an analysis to see if that might

have been a contributing factor.

However if you look back over the previous years, 2008 and earlier, you'll see the respondent level for 2010 were in line with what had been received in 2008 and earlier.

Slide number four has information on the PA Annual Performance Assessment and the elements that go into determining the performance ratings.

If you come with me to slide number five, and as Amy noted, the ratings of the 2010 performance year for the PA was determined by consensus for the NOWG to be More Than Met. The More Than Met rating is described in detail at the bottom of slide number five.

Slide numbers six, seven, and eight contain aggregated data from the 2010 Performance Feedback Survey, and if you turn to slide number nine and ten, these two slides pertain to comments received from the surveys.

Slide number nine talks about the outstanding praise for the PA. The respondents noted that the PA respond quickly to questions, they are always very pleasant to work with, and extremely helpful. They provide a high level of expertise and professionalism and, they're informative and eager to assist.

In slide number ten we pulled out two comments from the survey, and we requested that the PA maybe look at monitoring the help desk backup support and training of the PA's to improve accuracy of their response, and to increase their understanding of the Pooling Administration process.

Overall though and with the review of the comments, we concluded there was

nothing in the report indicative of any consistent performance issues of note on slide number 11.

And then slide number 12, we list four points we'd like the PA to focus on with regards to possible improvement or enhancements.

Bullet number one is internal training processes. Bullet number two is the NPAC Scrub that Amy hopes to soon mark as complete. Bullet number three is the ongoing review of the website, and bullet number four is to work with the NOWG on the monthly reports they provide to us for our monthly meetings with the administrator.

The NOWG requests the NANC approve the report and transmit it to the FCC if approved. This is the draft performance report to which I'm referring.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you.

MS. ZAHN: We've got a little bit more.
Did you want to ask for approval now or at the end?

CHAIRMAN KANE: No, if you have more to say about the report then we'll wait.

MS. ZAHN: Okay. We're going to transition now actually into the NANPA report. So slide number 13 looks very similar to the PA slide on the previous page but it is the aggregated survey respondent data for the NANPA.

We found the trend actually increased for respondents for the NANPA which may or may not have been attributed to the online survey tool. Again we'll be doing an analysis to see if we can figure out what might have contributed to the uptake in

respondents. We thought that was very positive and favorable. We got more feedback from the NANPA than we did in 2009.

Slide number 14 as with the PA, lists the elements that go into determining the overall rating for the 2010 year.

And if you turn to slide number 15, the NANPA rating for the 2010 performance year was determined by consensus to be More Than Met and that description is at the bottom of slide number 15.

Slides 16, 17, 18, and 19 as with the PA contain aggregated data from the 2010 Performance Feedback Survey.

If you turn to slide 20, slides 20, 21, and 22 contain information on the comments received in the Performance Feedback Survey. There was significant praise for the NANPA. Commenters regularly responded that they are competent, courteous, and customer focused as well as personable, professional, efficient, and helpful.

Slide number 23, these are the bullets, there are four in total. The NOWG recommends the following suggestions be implemented for continued improvement.

The first one is monitoring of change order 18 and issues related to the NDR or Notation Discrepancy Report and the UMR, Utilization Missing Report.

The second bullet is to continue to review the NANPA website. Third is implementing training videos posted to the NANPA website in lieu of live training so people interested in training, its a la carte, you can go in when you want to and download it and review it many times as you need so you can understand the

website. And the fourth bullet is, consider using live meetings for area code release planning meetings.

As with the PA report, for this NANPA Performance Report, the NOWG requests the NANC approval of the report and the NANC Chair to transmit to the FCC. And this is the report which I'm referencing.

Slide number 24 has the two outstanding PA change orders. Amy made reference to change order 19 which was the pANI change order which the FCC is currently working. Change order 20 is proposed enhancements of the PAS proposed by various regulator and service provider entities.

Slide 25 is a list of the NOWG participating companies. On the left hand side you'll see Earth Link business. That used to be One Communications. We'll be changing that name in the performance reports as well.

And slide 26 is the list of remaining meetings for the 2011 calendar year. And that concludes my presentation.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much. So we actually have three documents before us and, I'm going to clarify that for the record. 5A is your report with the slides, and then we will number as 5B the draft of PA 2010 PA Performance Evaluation Report, and as 5C, the draft 2010 NANPA Performance Evaluation Report.

First of all are there any questions on either the report or the recommendations? Anybody on the phone with a question?

MALE SPEAKER: Who was it that was presenting that report?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Oh, presenting that report, Gwen Zahn from Verizon Wireless.

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Now your recommendation is for the action items from NANC. First of all, for approval of the 2010 PA Performance Evaluation Report, and again that's document 5B, for submission to the FCC. I'll entertain a motion to approve that report.

MS. MILLER: Anna Miller, T-Mobile, make a motion to approve the PA Performance Evaluation Report.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Second? Don't be shy.

(LAUGHTER)

MS. HOWARD: Cox seconds.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Cox seconds the report. All in favor say aye.

COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any objections, any abstentions? Very good. That will be done, submit that to the FCC. I will do that.

And the 2010 NANPA Performance Evaluation Report. Move to approve that?

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka from CenturyLink will move to approve the NANPA evaluation.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. I need a second.

MS. EMMER: Sprint Nextel will second.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Rosemary has second it. All those in favor say aye.

COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any objections, any abstentions? Very good. The record will show unanimous also. Thank you very much for the report, get those done.

All right, moving right along. Item six, the report of the North American Numbering Plan Billing and Collection Agent and there you are. State your name again for the record.

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

MS. MARCOTTE: Faith Marcotte from Welch LLC.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you, Faith.

MS. MARCOTTE: Good morning. So we'll first look at page one of the report. It shows the financial position of the Fund at April 30th. There's $1.8 million in the bank, about $200,000 in accounts receivable, and about $250,000 in accrued liabilities and that leaves the Fund balance at $1.663 million. The accrued liabilities are listed there which is just really one month for the suppliers, the vendors.

I've noted there the proposed contribution factor and budget was submitted to the FCC, and they have now listed it for public approval or public notice. So the due date for sending out the invoices is June 12th, so since they listed it so quickly we'll have no problem meeting that deadline.

Page two of the report is forecast of the Fund balance. We forecasted up to the end of June which is the funding year and we're projecting $1 million, $87,000. What was projected originally was $500,000 with a contingency so we are $587,000 surplus.

In the bottom right hand corner is a box outlining the differences and the bulk that $587,000 is the $700,000 of carry audits that are not going to be done, and then there's a lot of other in the notes as you can.

Page three of the report is a forecast of the Fund out to June 2012, and its projecting now $593,000, a surplus in a year from now which is a long way to project but originally that should have been $750,000 of the contingency allowance that was projected in the budget.

The difference between $750,000 and the $593,000 is made up of the bad debts that are part of the contingency, and another $70,000 approximately is the difference between when we projected the Fund back in February, to what we're now projecting the Fund balance will be so we're left with now a projection of $593,000 for the Fund in a year from now.

Page four is the forecast of the liabilities to be paid over the next six months.

And page five is our deliverables. The processes are going as normal, sent out the invoices on April 12th. We are processing the payments as they come in. Before we send out any refunds we check the red light report and hold on to those until they're cleared by the FCC.

And our contract, there's an interim extra extension keeping it to July 31st.

And we're gradually cleaning up (unintelligible) the receivables. And that's it. Are there any questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions? Any questions from the phone?

On that bad debt, is that increasing with the state of the economy (unintelligible) or has it been fairly steady?

MS. MARCOTTE: It's fairly steady. A lot of that sometimes is just companies that have gone out of business, and we can't find anymore.

CHAIRMAN KANE: We experience that at the state level also, disappear. Okay very good. No action for us on this one. We'll note it for the record.

I will note in the public notice that you referenced on the contribution factor which was issued on May 16th, that it indicates that the Commission takes no action regarding the proposed fiscal year 2011 Fund size estimate and contribution factor within the 14 day period following release of this public notice. The Fund size estimate and contribution factor will be deemed approved and so that would be on May 30th that it would be deemed approved.

Okay very good. It says next we'll do a break but we've only been going for about a half hour so we're not going to need a break.

And this is Item 7, Rosemary's here already, the report of the Billing and Collection Working Group. Rosemary Emmer.

REPORT OF THE BILLING AND COLLECTION WORKING GROUP

MS. EMMER: I chair this committee with Tim Decker of Verizon.

The B&C Working Group is responsible for overseeing the performance of

the functional requirements provided by the B&C Agent. We review the performance monthly, and we oversee the budget.

We are currently monitoring the Billing and Collection and the deliverables, and as Faith just went over, the budget and contribution factor for this year.

The only really new news that we have is that we had a Co-Chair election. The positions were for two positions for a term of two years. Tim Decker and myself were nominated and, we accepted. There were no other nominations. Therefore, we're asking the NANC to approve that Tim and I would continue our roles for the next two years.

The meeting schedule is listed on page nine. Our meetings are public. If anyone would like to join feel free to email Tim or myself and we'd be happy to put you on the -- I'll give you the bridge and put the meetings on your calendar. We welcome new members. We're always having a membership drive. That concludes the report.

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

There is an action item which is for the NANC to approve the election of Tim Decker and Rosemary Emmer to continue in their role as Co-Chairs of the Billing and Collection Working Group for a period of two more years. Is there any objection to that? Then I say by unanimous consent that that is approved by the NANC.

Thank you very much. We appreciate your work. Thank you for all the time

you put in on these things.

MS. EMMER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: All right, Item eight, the report of the North American Portability Management LLC.

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

MR. CLAY: Good morning, NANC. My name is Mel Clay. I am the Co-Chair of the NAPM LLC. I share that duty with Tim Decker from Verizon Communications.

Our report is just a one page report. It has two items on it. Item one, new member recruitment. New member recruitment continues to be a high priority at the NAPM LLC.

Recently several companies have approached us and inquired about membership. We have sent the interested companies the membership packages and we now await a reply from them. When we get the replies we will report who the companies are.

In January of 2009, the LNPA Working Group submitted requirements for 22 change orders for NPAC enhancements for the NAPM LLC and requested that they be considered for a SOW with the NPAC Administrator NeuStar. The release package was presented to NeuStar and SOW 73 was approved in September of 2009.

Due to work prioritization, mainly the one day porting interval work that had to be done, this SOW was scheduled for implementation this year in 2011.

The seven regions have now been implemented. They started implementation for this SOW in March and it was completed a week ago on the 8th. So that has now been completed. And that's all we have to report today.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you. And the implementation went smoothly?

MR. CLAY: Yes, it did.

CHAIRMAN KANE: No problems?

MR. CLAY: No problems whatsoever.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Are there any questions for Mel? Thank you very much for your report.

MR. CLAY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And then our next item following right along is the implementation of FCC order on the LNPA selection process.

IMPLEMENTATION OF FCC ORDER ON LNPA SELECTION PROCESS

CHAIRMAN KANE: As I indicated at the beginning, you all got an email I believe last night. Some of the folks on the phone who are not on the Council had not received it, but it is now on the FCC website.

The Bureau did yesterday do their order and basically, I don't know if you had a chance to look at it, but as you know this was put out for comment by the Commission, by the Bureau in March.

There were some comments that were submitted on the process and the order discusses, the Bureau, the submission of those comments. Most of the comments

were accepted. They were minor changes to the process and so basically the process was approved pretty much as had been submitted.

And I want to thank everyone who worked on this. It's been a long process. We're going to be back on track and back on schedule now. I want to thank the NAPM, thank everyone who did comments. Thank the Commission, particularly thank the Bureau. We wanted to be very sure we got it out by today's meeting so that we could have a look at it.

They said they adopted the NANC NAPM proposal for the LNPA selection process with a few modifications. Most of these were clarifications on the final authority of the FCC to make the decision, that the decision, the final selection was not being delegated to the NANC or to the NAPM, that Commission approval will occur through Commission action or through the Bureau acting on delegated authority.

That the NANC has the authority to recommend to the FCC, the Bureau must approve the request, the proposal, the request for information, the technical requirements document, and that as far as the Selection Working Group that we will be setting up, their work will be complete once the FCC has done the final approval of the vendors, but the NANC may establish a working group to address contact implementation if we choose to do that.

They are deferring to the NANC to establish the composition of the Selection Working Group membership and Chairs and make clear that the Selection Working Group is going to review and approve all procurement documents submitted by the

FoN PAC which includes the authority to modify draft procurement documents.

And finally on the issue of consensus which we've been through before, that if the NANC does not achieve consensus approval, the Chair will inform the Commission and they'll defer to the Chair to decide when and how it's notified and the Commission, which means I'm going to knock your heads together until we get consensus, until we have consensus of the Commission.

And finally that the Commission will determine the management structure for the LNPA contract at a later date, clarifying that the Commission does not need now to designate the NAPM as the entity to manage the new contracts when we get to that point.

So we have that for your information. As I said, I'm delighted that it was out. And I want to say where we ought to go from here so we can get back, get on track. We know there's been a lot of work.

Are there any questions about the order itself? Okay, what I want to do to move this forward is I'm going to ask, as you know, Jeff Why is our Co-Chair. Jeff has the luxury of (unintelligible) being a Commissioner. In a Commission the only focus is on telecommunication.

And I'm going to ask Jeff to take the lead in putting together the next steps and getting the Selection Working Group together, getting them for a meeting, getting it composed, and getting a timeline in place and setting up a schedule.

So what I'd like to do is first of all, to know that the Selection Working Group should be balanced. It's open to anyone whether you're a member of the

NANC, or staff, or an alternate to a member, or a staff to a member. The only condition is that members of the working group will have to sign the non-disclosure agreement to be sure that all of the conflicts and potential in the non-disclosure agreement -- let me leave it at that.

So I'm going to ask anyone who wants to be on the Selection Working Group, and I know you have to go back and take a look and read this and probably figure out with your general counsel whatever, about the non-disclosure issue, to let me know, well actually to email Jeff by the end of next week.

This is voluntary so if you would like to be on the Selection Working Group if you would send an email to Jeff, that would be by the 27th of May, it's about ten days from now. Jeff, your email address?

MR. WHY: I will email everyone.

CHAIRMAN KANE: You'll email everybody, yes. We'll send an email out.

MR. WHY: My email address is fairly long.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, Massachusetts is a state that --

MR. WHY: Knowing my name is not helping (unintelligible).

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay. And then what I would propose when we have that list together of the volunteers because the order does say the NANC is to approve the Selection Working Group, and we don't have another meeting until September, I propose that we do that by email.

We'll send it out by email and if anybody objects to anyone who is proposed for the working group or if there's the right balance, you can email back. We will take an email vote to establish the Selection Working Group.

Then we'll set a meeting. Jeff will see if we can have a meeting, the first meeting of the working group, setting up a schedule and electing Chairs. There will be three Chairs that will be elected by the working group and hopefully that can be done by the middle of June.

And then also I want to ask the NAPM to prepare a non-disclosure agreement. We don't have such a document that exists, and I'd like to ask the NAPM if they would with their counsel prepare an appropriate non-disclosure agreement for us to look at and then implement that, and I'll send that around again for approval, for any questions about it.

So that hopefully will get the working group together. We'll get a timeline together. We'll get the proper forms signed and the work can start by the middle of June, and then there will be a timeline to get us there.

Now are there any questions about that? Rosemary, you had your card up first.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. So I haven't had a chance to read the order yet. I just looked at it while they were giving their presentation but I haven't even read through it yet therefore no one else has probably really read through it either since we just got it.

I'm a little hesitant to jump right in to so much SWG work so quickly when I

haven't even read it yet. I'm hesitating a little bit. Of course Sprint will want to participate in whatever we decide to do.

I'm also concerned about the timeline that you just put together. I think the procedure that you discussed is right on but I think the timeline is a little too soon seeing as though we have travel -- the LLC members haven't had a chance to even meet to talk about this yet because we haven't had a chance to look at it yet.

So you know, I would like to see the SWG process or the procedure timeline pushed back a little bit because the SWG doesn't really have any work to do until the LLC or the FoN PAC actually gives them something to talk about.

So I would like to ask, I mean we have travel coming up next week and then many of us are on vacation for a couple of weeks after that, and I think we have a meeting in June or we have a meeting next week with the LLC, and then a conference call after that, and then another meeting in July I think in Denver.

So it might be more appropriate for the SWG work to really begin or that process to begin maybe even after the July meeting. We don't have any time built into the next meeting next week. We only have two days or a day and a half or something so I would like to perhaps at least discuss it.

I'm just thinking off the top of my head now but procedurally to give us all kind of time to decide what we're going to do with this, to at least give us and LLC time to read it, comprehend it, and then think about what our next steps are going to be so that we have something to give to the SWG so the SWG has some work to do. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. I'm trying to balance that and I appreciate that. You're meeting next week you said?

MS. EMMER: We have a meeting next week and we have a meeting in July.

CHAIRMAN KANE: In July, okay. I'm trying to balance that concern with the fact that we are behind the schedule that had originally been first set up by the NAPM and conscious of that deadline we've got out there in 2015, and so trying to balance that.

The important work initially, you're absolutely right, there's nothing for the SWG to do substantively until they get dates from the LLC but the work would be setting up who's going to be on the SWG which is voluntary, getting those non-disclosure agreements signed, and setting a schedule. But I hear what you're saying, and let me hear the rest of the discussion.

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka from Century Link. I second some of Rosemary's concerns but I really kind of want to lay it out practically, is that the NANC had asked the FoN PAC who was working on this diligently to step back while we worked through out NANC process.

There hasn't been anything until we got this order here this morning to say that the FoN PAC needed to get geared up again and so travel arrangements and meeting arrangements haven't been done and I think that's what Rosemary was referring to, and to ramp that back up.

And we I think at the NAPM LLC have talked about in other meetings that putting it on hold will mean we have to have the time to ramp that back up and that

time is necessary to help get the SWG work, that Commissioner Why will be with us, to get that back to them.

So I think that it's very important to think about tactically the steps in sequence in order to get ready for handing off things to the SWG.

But I do agree with you and I think it's worthwhile to get some structure around the SWG itself. It's just that I know many of us will want to make sure we have the right person nominated and sometimes that takes leadership approval within a corporation because of travel et cetera so we're going to need to make sure that happens.

CHAIRMAN KANE: What would you suggest would be a longer timeframe, an adequate timeframe for just getting the volunteers, getting the nominations back to us and then obviously we would send it out to everybody? Do you need 30 days within your companies for people to decide?

MS. RETKA: Thirty days, that might work. I need to think about that a little bit. Can we over maybe a break talk about that, make a couple of calls?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Sure, okay. I mean obviously in terms of the SWG actually meeting and doing anything substantive other than approving the timeline which can be done by phone, you need something from the FoN PAC to have a substantive meeting.

FEMALE SPEAKER:(Unintelligible) my question regarding the NDA, were they certain when that will be released because commitment cannot be made until that's reviewed by inside counsel and who will be the drafting party?

CHAIRMAN KANE: I'm going to ask the NAPM to do that, to do a draft because unless there is someone else who wants to volunteer, I think they have the expertise on that, having been through that where there isn't a standard FCC one that we could pull off the shelf and use but I could ask them to draft it and then we'd have to review it and approve it. So you're (unintelligible) for the corporate side then, you should see the NDA before somebody is nominated and approved by their company to do that.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay. And I have not talked to the NAPM about drafting the NDA. Is there somebody here who can speak for them on that?

FEMALE SPEAKER: There's a lot of them behind you.

(LAUGHTER)

CHARIMAN KANE: This is something that we did discuss at some length as we were putting together the joint proposal that did go to the FCC.

MALE SPEAKER: The non-disclosure agreement that will be put together by our attorney. Todd Daubert will be the author of the non-disclosure agreement. We've already talked to Todd to have him start to do that. When we met with --

CHAIRMAN KANE: Back in January.

MALE SPEAKER: John (Unintelligible) a month ago we had talked about that so this will be ready pretty quickly for your review.

I'm not a member of the NANC so I can't actually do it but I would suggest that giving the names for the SWG from the companies should take place sometime

probably in middle June. That gives us time to have our meeting next week, go back to our companies and have the companies review who they would want to be on here.

So I would think that middle June -- we have a conference call meeting in June so by the time we get ready to have that conference call meeting, and I'm afraid I don't know the date off the top of --

FEMALE SPEAKER: June 22nd.

CHAIRMAN KANE: June 22nd.

MALE SPEAKER: June 22nd, so we would be ready to have the names from the companies that, you know, like AT&T would be ready to have that before that June 22nd meeting, so sometime around June 15th or so.

CHAIRMAN KANE: June 17th is 30 days from now.

MALE SPEAKER: Okay, that would work.

CHAIRMAN KANE: But remember they could be state members, other members on this, as well as the broad range, obviously not just the NAPM members although they would be an important part of it.

And in terms of the non-disclosure, do you have some sense of when we could have that to circulate? I know you don't want to put your attorney --

MALE SPEAKER: No, I don't want to put Todd on the spot, but I think we could probably have that for you by the end of our meeting next week.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, so by the end of next week you could get that to Jeff.

MALE SPEAKER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: We will see that it gets out to everybody and review it. This is just a draft non-disclosure agreement, which obviously people need to know what terms and the conditions there are going to be before anybody is considering serving if we get that done, because that's going to be an important consideration. Rosemary.

MS. EMMER: This is Rosemary Emmer with Sprint Nextel. So the non-disclosure agreement will be out next Saturday or the decision as to when the non-disclosure is going to be --

MALE SPEAKER: Todd Daubert will draft a non-disclosure agreement for consideration. Todd has said that he could have that done by the end of our meeting next week.

MS. EMMER: Okay, but he'll have that done but then we have to look at it once he has it done and we have to take it back to our internal counsel before we send it to the NANC, right, so we're not going to be able to -- I know for sure I can't get my internal counsel to look at something within one day. That's going to be a little hard.

I mean none of these decisions, I just want to point out too for the SWG, are going to make any difference to the end of 2015. What's going to make a difference there is what the FoN PAC is going to do, right, so I mean at this juncture, this early stage, this isn't about delaying anything, this is just about trying to work out the logistics and make this thing right.

And I actually kind of feel like we probably ought to put out heads together between now and the next meeting or in the next couple of months or something and write all these things down, get it all typed up because now there's the other question with the NDA.

Let's just say we get the NDA out for the NANC in the next two weeks and is it a draft or how does that procedure -- it would be nice to be able to iron out all of these and look at it and make sure that we're doing these steps the right way like Suzanne just mentioned, you know, we couldn't move to the decision as to who is going to be on the committee until we get the NDA type of thing (unintelligible). I just feel like we might be rushing things a little bit.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And the NDA will be a NANC document at the end. I just ask that -- because we had talked about it for the NAPM to draft it and the (unintelligible).

Okay, well, let's do this. Go ahead, Mary, sorry.

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka from Century Link. I do think we can begin to put structure around this but again I also raise the question, the NDA that Todd is developing is a NDA amongst the NANC members, a NANC NDA? Is the FCC going to be a part of that NDA, because I think there are some things in the order that indicate there needs to be NDA language around this.

And my concern is that let's say we go back with our attorneys and we have some issues, are we to talk to Todd if the attorneys need to talk to another attorney about that? Do they talk to the Chairman? I'm not clear on some of that structure so

maybe you could fill in the blanks.

And I apologize, Anna. I think I jumped ahead of you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Anna.

MS. MILLER: Anna Miller at T-Mobile. I think as this conversation goes on I'm becoming more confused and I guess I was asking, I wanted clarification because you said we'll work on next steps and the timeline, and I became confused in listening to this what timeline we're talking about.

So is it the timeline to set up the LNPA Selection Working Group, is that the timeline that we're talking about? And it sounds like based upon this conversation that one of the first things we need to do is identify what the process is, what the steps -- maybe that's next steps. What's the process, what are the steps to setting up the Selection Working Group and developing the NDA?

Again if the NAPM LLC drafts it and if it has to have approval, then to submit that draft, who would it be submitted to for approval? Would it be a member of the Selection Working Group or the FCC?

So I think we really need to identify what the process is going to be for setting this up and I guess maybe that's what the next steps are, is the process, and then again to clarify what we're talking about is trying to develop the timeline around that process to get this sub-working group going, or is that inclusive then of once again I guess taking the FoN PAC off hold and having them begin -- so that means begin their work again.

I think we need to understand that process before they even gear up and then

try to fit that process into their timeline if you will.

So are we talking about the timeline or -- it sounds like we need the process and the next steps for the Selection Working Group, and then what we're trying to discuss here is the timeline for setting that up?

CHAIRMAN KANE: I had proposed a timeline for setting up the working group but I'm hearing actually that the timeline I suggested was too aggressive, that there are other things due.

Then when the working group is put together one of their tasks will be first of all electing Chairs and then setting up a timeline for the whole rest of the project. So there are different things that need to be approved by the working group that then need to go in some cases to the FCC for approval.

There was a timeline that the NAPM had been set up originally, which is now not the timeline so there are steps in the process, get stuff from the FoN PAC, get it to the Selection Working Group, get it to the FCC if it's something that needs to go to the FCC, et cetera. That's what I'm talking about a timeline with that end date of 2015, they'll begin those things that need to be done but the initial would be setting up the working group.

We've been meeting for about an hour. Let's take a break. We'll come back and see where we are with at least going ahead with getting the working group and getting the message to FoN PAC that (unintelligible) FoN PAC to start working again. We'll recess for about ten minutes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: It's 11:00 a.m. We were on item nine on the

implementation of the FCC order. Let me say, I know you all have had a chance to talk about it. I'm going to take all of your input and advice under advisement and Jeff and I will send out in the next week a proposed schedule for setting up the steps that need to be done to set up the Selection Working Group and I'll send that out by email. And I hear what everyone is saying.

In the meantime the FoN PAC can get started again, ramp back up, and the NAPM will be working on the non-disclosure agreement and the conflict of interest. If you look at the actual order in our proposal there are two documents actually, a non-disclosure agreement and a conflict of interest kind of statement or checklist.

So let's move on then if there are no further questions on that to the report of the Local Number Portability Administration Working Group which is Item 10 on your agenda. And this document will be put in the record as Document 10.

REPORT OF THE LOCAL NUMBER PORTABILITY (LNPA) WORKING GROUP

MR. SACRA: Thank you, Chairman Kane. Good morning, everyone. My name is Gary Sacra. I'm with Verizon. I'm one of the Chairs of the LNPA Working Group. Our other two chairs, Paula Jordan with T-Mobile and Linda Peterman with Earth Link, are also both in attendance.

So the three items I'll be reporting on today, the first one is the FCC 09-41 order and FCC 10-85 order implementation. Just a brief status of that.

The second item is the NPAC Release 3.4 status, and the third and last is the LNPA Working Group's Best Practice on porting projects which I reported out on at

the March 9th meeting.

First item, FCC 09-41 implementation, the working group is continuing to monitor the implementation, gathering feedback from service providers in attendance at the working group meetings and on the conference calls.

I'm still happy to report that the one day porting process is working as designed. There has been no, well, from a process standpoint, no breakdown at all in the process.

As I reported at the March 9th meeting, we're continuing to develop and validate a list of NPAC service provider IDs and how the profiles are set for each service provider on whether or not they're supporting the new medium timers that are required for one day porting.

We have identified a number of providers and it's still a moving target because some providers are still coming on board with setting their profile in the NPAC in support of those timers.

So as I said it's still somewhat of a moving target but with (unintelligible) we are aware of some providers that we believe should be supporting the new timers for one day porting but are not yet supporting them.

So that is what we're doing, in the process of doing in the working group is putting together a list of those providers that we believe should be in compliance and supporting the new timers but are not yet doing so and we will report out once we validate that list.

I believe the next step is to perhaps discuss with Chairman Kane and perhaps

some of the folks at the FCC on how best to address that list because it is proprietary data, there's NPAC data involved. That it is proprietary data so we just need to make sure that it's kept confidential and yet also the issue is addressed as well so that's something we'll be talking about in the future, very near term.

And again the working group will continue to monitor the one day porting process and the implementation as we move forward.

Any questions on that item?

Okay, NPAC Release 3.4, as Mr. Clay accurately reported, it has been loaded in all of the seven NPAC regional databases. It was loaded successfully. No issues identified during the loading so it was tested and loaded successfully.

Release 3.4 as we reported out on previously, contains a number of operational and performance enhancements to the NPAC and the interfaces. Questions?

The last item in the report, if you recall back at the March 9th meeting, we presented a Best Practice that was approved in the working group on what has been dubbed porting projects.

Just real briefly to recap, since the inception of Local Number Portability back in 1997, most of the service providers at least that I'm aware of have a maximum number of telephone numbers for which they can support the standard one day FOC, Firm Order Confirmation, and a three day porting interval above those thresholds, in some cases they're called projects, and the FOC return date and the porting interval is typically negotiated between the two providers involved because

there's just so many telephone numbers.

In order to insure that the customer's service is maintained and the porting process is transparent to the customer, sufficient time needs to take place in order to do all the necessary translation work and systems work in order to affect the port.

Well, there's never been a standard threshold for what is a non-simple port versus what becomes a project so what we've done in the working group over time is we developed a recommended Best Practice that sets the minimum threshold for what can be considered by the old service provider in a port to be a project.

So above that threshold the old provider can consider that a project and work with the new provider to within certain perimeters provide the FOC and set the due date for the port.

So in the process one of the other items that the working group is taking on at this point is we're going through all of the Best Practices that have been developed over the years and we're updating them in some cases, making them more current with activity in both the porting world and the regulatory environment, and in some cases we're deleting outdated and obsolete Best Practices.

And in that process what we've done is we've taken a couple of the older Best Practices and incorporated them into the new Best Practice that I presented at the March meeting for porting projects.

So we haven't changed any of the recommended thresholds that I presented and received endorsement from the NANC at the March meeting.

What we have done with that Best Practice 67 is just incorporate the new

simple port intervals into that Best Practice so all the intervals for simple, non-simple, and projects are now contained in the one approved Best Practice from the working group and that Best Practice 67 is actually appended to the report as Appendix A.

As you can see, it starts off in the related issue section with some descriptive text on the simple port, the non-simple port, and the project port, and the main portion or the main text in the Best Practice is the table on page four.

As you can see for a simple port, quantity of (unintelligible) the numbers on the port request is one. The FOC return consistent with FCC 09-41 and 10-85 is a four hour FOC return for a simple port when the requested due date is one or two days.

For a simple port and what we call a simple extended due date, still one TN on the local service request, but if it's three days or above the request by the new service provider, then the FOC is due within 24 hours and the total port interval is four days.

Now the third and fourth column in that table is what I presented to you at the March 9th meeting and nothing in that has changed. For a non-simple port, what the approved Best Practice and what we received endorsement from the NANC at the March 9th meeting was for 1 to 50 telephone numbers, the FOC is due back within 24 hours, and the port interval is three days for a total of four business days.

In a project, the old provider can consider a port request to be a project for 51 and above telephone numbers on the port request. As you can see, there are some

notes that apply to these specifically for the project note five, that sets the perimeters for the negotiation between the old and the new service provider, and again this is recapping what we went through at the March 9th meeting.

If you move to note five, and again this is the perimeters set around a negotiation, but the FOC is due back within 72 hours on a project if the old provider considers this to be a project based on the number of telephone numbers, and the project completion interval or the due date will no longer then 15 business days upon receipt of the LSR from the new provider unless a longer interval is requested by the new provider, or if it's negotiated by the old provider and agreed to by the new provider.

So again this is just recapping what we went over at the March 9th meeting. The working group requested that the NANC endorse the approved Best Practice. We received that endorsement but then we were also directed the working group was directed, to come back at this meeting with a recommendation for changes to the NANC LNP provisioning flows that support this approved Best Practice.

So before I move to that, are there any questions on the Best Practice itself?

Again just in summary, it has been revised since March 9th only to add the simple port requirements, both FOC and porting interval. The non-simple thresholds and the project thresholds are exactly the same as what was presented at the March 9th meeting.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Are there any questions? Okay, go ahead.

MR. SACRA: Okay, and lastly now as we move to page six, Appendix B,

there were two figures in the LNP provisioning flows that the working group believes require some revisions, some additions in support of Best Practice 67.

The first one is in figure one, step six and this is the customer service record request. That's also part of Best Practice 67 that we discussed at the March 9th meeting.

But there are also thresholds in addition to the FOC interval and the porting interval. There are also thresholds for which a customer service record can be returned upon request within 24 hours above which then the intervals require a little longer time in order to get all the customer service record together because of the number of telephone numbers and lines of data on that record.

So what the working group reached consensus on there is that for a quantity of telephone numbers on the customer service record request between 1 and 50, the customer service record is due back within 24 hours, between 51 and 200 telephone numbers on the customer service record, the return time is 48 hours, and above 200 telephone numbers on the customer service record, the return time is 72 hours. Again, this is the very same part of the Best Practice that was reviewed and endorsed at the March 9th meeting.

So what we have done simply is to extract that table from the Best Practice with the applicable notes and incorporate that into the figure one, step six that discusses the return and requirements for requesting a customer service record. And you'll see that text is in red so anything in red there on that page is the addition based on the approved Best Practice 67. Questions before we move on? Suzanne.

SUZANNE HOWARD: Cox Communications, Inc. FCC on complex for tracing of complex port but it only pinpoints certain items in a complex port as far as you, and I had an email dialogue about something the other day regarding the information service that was being deemed by a carrier as complex port.

So this LNPA is not getting in the minutia of that right, it's only the intervals and the numbers, the number of ports being requested.

MR. SACRA: That's absolutely correct. This is actually I guess what I would say is the working group's input to the formal request petition for clarification on I guess non-simple ports versus projects.

Just briefly, historically in the development of the requirements for 09-41 and one day porting, there was an attempt made to touch on the very thing that you addressed Suzanne, and that is, what does multiple service is on the line mean, what are complex services on the line, exactly what does that mean.

That was one area where there was no apparent consensus at all. The providers were kind of all over the map as to what they felt they could support in terms of the one day port when there were some complex services on the line versus other providers that felt that they could, so we chose to I guess leave it as is I guess if you will.

So we didn't touch on things such as -- or specifically, like I know there are some issues with voice mail on the line and things of that nature with some providers considering them to be complex services but at this time we haven't touched on that.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Okay. This is a huge issue for a lot of us carriers so I

know you know.

MR. SACRA: I agree. I'm fully aware.

FEMALE SPEAKER: I'm preaching to the choir here but it's work that needs to be ironed out so the porting can -- and the customer cannot impact it. Thanks.

MR. SACRA: You're quite welcome. Okay, if there are no questions on figure one, just moving to page seven, the other figure in the NANC provisioning flows with figure five, step 13, and this is the return of the firm order, the confirmation to the new network service provider, and again this is in the non-simple flow.

So there are already requirements addressed in the simple flow so the only thing required in the working group's view based on Best Practice 67 was the addition in the non-simple flow of the portion of the table that dealt with the quantity of PNs 1 to 50, and than greater than 50.

So you can see we extracted that portion of the table, inserted it into figure five, step 13. And on page eight the applicable notes, the main one of which is note four here that sets the perimeters around the negotiation between the 15 business days when the due date shall be no longer than for a port that's deemed a project by the old provider.

And again, the purpose of setting this threshold or proposing setting these standard thresholds for projects again providers are all over the map in the industry. Some providers have a threshold as few as two telephone numbers where they

consider it to be a project and therefore not applicable to the standard non-simple four business day due date.

So this is an attempt to at least set a minimum threshold for when providers can deem a port request to be a project and sort of standardize and level the playing field if you will for when a non-simple port can be considered a project. This by no means is meant, and we have words to that effect in the Best Practice, it's by no means should be considered an encouragement on the part of providers that have higher thresholds to lower their threshold.

Obviously that would cost time and money for them to do that in their systems and we feel that providers that have more liberal thresholds for non-simple ports should maintain those thresholds for the benefit of the industry, but this is an attempt and it was a consensus driven process in reaching a proposed standard threshold for when a non-simple port can be consider a project.

So the working group would like to again respectfully request that the NANC I guess re-endorse Best Practice 67, also endorse the proposed changes to the NANC LNP provisioning flows, and then if that endorsement is reached or gained, then forward this to the FCC Wireline Competition Bureau Chief hopefully and take advantage of what I believe is a streamlined process for "tweaking the porting process" in the industry. Questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Are we prepared to take action on the recommendation? Okay, and again the recommendation then before us is that we again endorse the approved Best Practice 67 and the recommendation of the LNPA

Working Group of the supporting changes to the NANC LNP provisioning flows and forward it to the FCC Wireline Competition Bureau with a request that it be adopted. Is there any objection to that request? Consider it then unanimous approval of your request. Thank you very much.

MR. SACRA: Thank you very much. That concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much. Item 11 on our agenda is the status of the Industry Numbering Committee, the INC activities. This document, their report ATIS, will be entered in the record as Document 11.

You don't have it? It's in color, blue. We do not have a copy of it? I know it was emailed out because I have a copy in my notebook. Who doesn't have one? Everybody, okay. So let's get those out to everyone then. Does everybody have one now? Okay, thank you.

STATUS OF THE INDUSTRY NUMBERING COMMITTEE (INC) ACTIVITIES

MS. CRANDALL: My name is Dana Crandall. I'm with Verizon Wireless. I'm the INC Vice Chair along with Natalie McNamer from T-Mobile who is the INC Chair and unfortunately couldn't be with us today because she is not feeling well so you're stuck with me to do the report today. So forgive me if I'm a little bit rusty at this.

If you turn to slide two, this is just a read-out of our recent activity. We have actually had two virtual subcommittee meetings and one to face-to-face meeting since the last NANC report. We're going to meet again in June in Overland Park,

Kansas, and that will be a face-to-face meeting and anyone who would like to attend can find our calendar information on the ATIS website and we've provided the link here.

If you go slide to three, I want to report on issue 709 from the NARP subcommittee. We touched on this at the last NANC meeting. Back in December the FCC had provided some clarification to the PA regarding certain issues and assumptions associated with the pending change order for the pANI administration.

As Amy touched on during her report, INC met with ESIF earlier this month and discussed some of those clarifying points to better understand what needs to be changed in the guidelines and INC is working to make the guidelines conform to what the FCC clarified in its letter.

The next slide is number four and this is from the RAM subcommittee. This is from a NANC action item from the December NANC meeting. Chris Hepburn from the Pennsylvania PUC Commission staff had asked the NANC to address a multi OCN issue and we got an action item to work on that with him.

We touched on this at the last meeting so some of this will be a little bit repetitive but to address those concerns and to assist some of the state commission staffers in trying to understand the OCN relationship, there's multiple OCNs within a particular state, INC is going to add the parent company OCN to the part three form for the CO code guidelines and Pooling guidelines.

And then that will allow the NANPA and the PA to add the parent company OCN and the parent company OCN name to several different reports, the Part 1, Part

1A, and Part 3 reports that the administrators provide to the states when the states request them.

Those actions because they are form changes will result in NANPA and PA change orders so NOWG and FCC can look forward to getting those shortly.

The second part of that is that we added some text to the CO Code Guidelines and Pooling Guidelines to give states some guidance.

If they're aware that a particular applicant no longer has their jurisdictional certification or license in that particular area, revoked, then the state commissioner or the FCC can send some written direction to the NANPA or the PA along with some supporting documentation to ask the administrator to deny that applicant's application.

And then the converse of that, provide the direction to the NANPA and the PA to deny those applications when they get that information from the state or the FCC.

Next slide is slide number five. This is in response to some concerns raised at the last March meeting that Chairman Kane had brought to our attention during the INC presentation.

One of those concerns was the state commission staff wants companies with both ILEC and CLEC affiliates that have resources in the same rate center and have multiple OCNs in the same rate centers, to share blocks and codes across those multiple OCNs rather then applying for resources on an OCN basis.

So INC took a look at this and recognized that there are some regulatory,

legal, and technical barriers that prevent some companies from sharing resources, those companies that have the ILEC and CLEC affiliates in the same rate center.

Some of those reasons are that the ILECs have non-discrimination requirements. There's significant work involved to modify provisioning systems and other operational support systems to accommodate the sharing of those resources.

Also there's separate networks that exist and need to be maintained because there's different regulations associated with ILECs and CLECs. And then there are also various reporting implications when combining those resources within multiple networks.

We also wanted to point out that the FCC rules require that those providers apply for resources on a per OCN basis and INC's work under the previous issue that we just discussed, 710, may alleviate some of the concerns as well.

Then on slide six, was a second concern that was raised at the last meeting and this was about the seven calendar day application processing timeframe that NANPA and the PA follow.

Some state commission staff believe that that timeframe is too short to give them time to actually review the applications so staff had suggested that INC either extend that seven day timeframe or perhaps consider state furloughs days or state holidays in that timeframe.

We had reached out to Rebecca Beaton at the Washington Commission staff and got some more clarification on this and she was good enough to provide us some written information to work from, and did a really good job of providing some

suggestions for INC to work from so INC leadership will bring an issue to the next meeting to formally work through those suggestions.

And then we have what I call the usual slides at the end. We have issue 534, it's the only issue that's in initial pending right now that's awaiting the approval of change order 19, the pANI change order.

The next slide is slide eight. We have five issues that are in initial closure right now. I'm not going to go through them in detail here but if anybody is interested in knowing more about them certainly feel free to ask me some questions.

And then the next slide is the one issue that has gone to final closure since the last NANC meeting and that's issue 706.

And then the last slide is a listing of all the web pages from the INC website and where to find information. And that's it.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much, Dana. Just a clarification on your slide seven, Issue 534 you said was awaiting approval. That's at the FCC, that's not before us awaiting approval?

MS. CRANDALL: Correct.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay. Questions? Yes, Joel.

MR. CHESKIS: Thank you. Good morning. Joel Cheskis for NASUCA. On Slide five, this first concern where you indicated there's regulatory, legal, and technical barriers, what happened with that at this point? Is that something where we just tell the states no or are those barriers that could be overcome?

MS. CRANDALL: That's a good question and I'm not sure how to answer

that.

MR. CHESKIS: I'm sorry, then maybe it's not for you to answer. Maybe it's for the Chairman or someone else to answer.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Obviously the answer to that would depend on the nature of the barrier. For example, if there's an FCC regulation that requires that service providers apply for resources on an OCN basis, a solution is to change the regulation if the regulation is the barrier, or the others seem to be technical barriers.

So it would depend on what the barrier was I would say, as to what the process was for making the change if the change was considered important enough to make the change.

MR. CHESKIS: I guess what I'm suggesting is that maybe, you know, it seems a good suggestion it seems like to me, from the states that came forward with what seems to be a reasonable solution, and just because an initial determination has been made that there are some barriers doesn't mean that necessarily maybe it shouldn't be continued to be pursued.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, and also note here, and you might want to say more about this Dana, that work under issue 710 may alleviate some of the state concerns because it is giving additional information. So as you continue to work with the states, if you bring us back a report or some suggestions on to what extent have the changes or will the changes in 710 alleviate these concerns.

MS. CRANDALL: Okay. I'll just point out, because those have change orders associated with them the implementation is not going to be immediate so it

may be some time before we have a chance to assess that.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Right, at least where there are proposed changes that are awaiting approval as change orders, a review of those states that were concerned about this would likely take care of the problem or address a part of the problem. Anything else, Joel?

MR. CHESKIS: No, thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you. We will not let this drop. Thank you very much. Any other questions on that report? Thank you.

Number 12, the Future of Numbering Working Group.

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

MR. NEWMAN: Adam Newman, Telcordia Technology. I am one of the three Co-Chairs for the Future of Numbering Working Group along with Don Gray from Nebraska and Jim Castagna from Verizon.

You should have in front of you two items for the Future of Numbering Working Group. One is our presentation and another is a packet of letters that were submitted in response to the White Paper.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And I will mark your report as Item 12 and the packet of letters as Item 12A.

MR. NEWMAN: And just as an FYI, in addition, any email transmitting the report and the letters, I did provide a link to the previously reviewed toll free White Paper that I'll be talking about today.

I do have some copies of that. I didn't make 50 copies of it since we had previously reviewed it so anybody who wants a hard copy of that White Paper which we'll talk about in general terms today, I have some copies available.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, and if you'll give me a copy and give Deborah a copy we'll enter it as 12B and then it will be available electronically as part of the record.

MR. NEWMAN: I have copies for said purpose.

Okay, so slide two, the summary of activity since our last report. We've had two Future of Numbering conference calls on April 6th and May 4th. During those conference calls we reviewed our issue matrix and determined a path forward for each issue. I will review that issue matrix itself towards the end of my presentation.

We reviewed a number of industry letters submitted on the toll free resources allocation assignment and management White Paper that had been submitted to and provided by Chairman Kane's staff to the leadership of the FoN, in particular there was a letter from Custom Toll Free that was received on February 28th and a letter from 800 Response received on March 7th.

In addition, on slide three, you'll see that we also reviewed a number of letters on the White Paper that were addressed to Chairman Kane and we had courtesy copies forwarded to us by a NANC member David Greenhaus who had gotten copies but we didn't get those copies transmitted to us by the Chairman, and they were ATL Communications, ZipDX.com. We have no transmittal data on the letter itself, 1300 Australia and phones names with transmittal date.

We took it upon ourselves to not just review the two letters that were formally transmitted to us but to review all of the letters that were transmitted.

It seems to us to be the right thing to do especially since the letters themselves, if you'll remember we were seeking comment on this final draft White Paper for further action, and none of the letters that are in the packet that's provided suggested any changes to the White Paper itself. So there were literally no findings on the White Paper itself, and that's actually the first bullet on slide four.

And because there were no suggested changes to the White Paper, we recommend publishing the White Paper to the website as final, with any additional corrections or updates that the NANC itself decides that we need to make. Clearly we need to update the date of the letter from May 2010 to current when we finalize it but that's really the only substantive change on the White Paper that in our view needs to be made.

So from my perspective and from the FoN's perspective, we can either finalize that based on we've received no additional input -- NANC members did have a chance to get back to us, but if there are changes either around the table or post, we can certainly take those into consideration before publishing the White Paper as final. I don't know if you want to address that now or at the end of the report.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Why don't you finish your report and then we'll do the action item.

MR. NEWMAN: So that's the end of the FoN consensus on the White

Paper in terms of we suggest publishing it and then if there is no further direction with regard to the issue that produced the White Paper which is FTN005, we see it as likely that there will probably be consensus to close the issue with publication of the White Paper at a subsequent FoN meeting.

I don't know which FoN meeting that is but at a subsequent -- and we just wanted to alert the members that if we don't get further direction either at this meeting on based on publication of the White Paper from the NANC, I think it will close.

Slide five is our issues matrix. We do have four open issues, five numbers. The new and future services issue, we have a current consensus to keep that issue open for discussion and monitor ITU-T future numbering activities. ITU-T study group to have a taskforce on the Future of Numbering which a couple of our members, who also attend the study group to keep us up to date on it so that we can sort of figure out what the rest of the world is thinking in these regards. We found it useful.

FTN 002, Telematics and the use of NANP numbers, again we have consensus to keep this issue open and monitor developments at INC and ITU with regard to machine to machine communications. There is some remaining concern by some FoN members of the impact on NANP exhaust of machine to machine communications.

Issue 004, geographic issues impacting numbering policy decisions. There is an open action item for the issue Champion to make sure that they want to continue

pursuing it.

We have monitored a European Commission paper and IT that have been submitted to the ITU-T in this area so we're monitoring what's going on in other jurisdictions with regard to the geographic issues of numbers and this issue incorporates a quite old NANC action item to the FoN from a former member of the NANC from the OUR of Jamaica where we incorporated into this issue, the impact of the use of NANP numbers outside of NANP jurisdictional areas.

So that is included in this issue just as a reminder that we were asked to take a look at that as part of this issue by the NANC, if you made me guess, three or four years ago now. I would actually have to go look up when that was first submitted.

And then 005 is the one we already discussed with the White Paper. That's the Commons versus Marketplace model for toll free numbers.

Our future activities are to determine the next issue to engage based on working group consensus and contributions since we're contribution driven and/or NANC assignment.

If the NANC feels like there's one of these issues or some other issues that they really want us to focus on we would of course be glad to otherwise we will work as the consensus of the group has us work.

And we generally meet the first Wednesday of every month. If anybody would like call in information or to be added to the FoN mailing list please free to e-mail myself or one of the other Co-Chairs. And that's the extent of our report.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much. Are there questions about

the report? Okay, we have in the report or actually from the FoN, a request for action which would be to publish the White Paper to the website with any correction update from NANC members.

So let me ask first of all, are there any corrections or updates at this time from any NANC members to the White Paper? Yes.

MR. GREENHAUS: (Off microphone, unintelligible) report that was submitted I believe in terms of the letters that were submitted.

MR. NEWMAN: You're right, sorry.

MR. GREENHAUS: There's an additional letter that's in part of the packet dated February 1, 2011, from Jonathan (Unintelligible) CEO of (Unintelligible), so just to note that that is sent as an additional letter that wasn't in the report itself but it's in the package.

MR. NEWMAN: Sorry about that.

MR. GREENHAUS: And then I just also would like to recognize the enormous amount of time and effort that the Future of Numbering group members put in to producing the White Paper and would like to suggest that NANC approve the White Paper and transmit it through the NANC Chair to the FCC.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, I'll take that as a motion to approve it to the FCC and also ask that it be up on the website. Is that included in your motion? Is there a second? Anyone second that motion?

MALE SPEAKER: Second.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. You had a question.

FEMALE SPEAKER: No, I think you answered it. I was just wondering whether it was going to be on the website or sent to the FCC and it sounds like you're going to do both.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Put on the NANC website and send it to the FCC.

And I know Don Gray, who no longer attends our meetings as the alternate from Nebraska because Commissioner Ann Boyle has moved on to another FCC taskforce or group council, but I want to thank him for his work too. And he's still involved in the Future of Numbering, right

MR. NEWMAN: Which we are very grateful for, yes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And grateful to the Nebraska Public Utility Commission for continuing to support him doing that work.

MR. NEWMAN: You know, as David raised his card I realized that I actually skipped over fairly (unintelligible) interesting -- a little bit on slide four and I'm sorry about that.

While the letters did not identify any changes to the White Paper itself, the letters did identify potential changes to current policy and rules for consideration.

So for example, adopting the marketplace model for the toll free resources, the White Paper itself laid out potential solutions. The White Paper as we've discussed in the past clearly does not take any stance in that regard and the FoN was not going to come to consensus with it.

I did want to note that those letters did again apply some potential changes to current policy so that the Council realized what was in the letters themselves, so

although they did not impact the White Paper itself in any way, I thought it would be remiss not to actually mention that bullet that's in the report.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And those suggested changes or suggestions that there might need to be changes, will the FoN be looking at those suggestions and bring them to NANC or will there be another process on that?

MR. NEWMAN: I'll let Mary to speak to that.

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka from CenturyLink. I think it's important to note that those are advocacy positions that somewhat relate to the TSYS item that was ruled on, on February 24th and I'm not certain that that would be appropriate for the FoN to take on nor would it be appropriate to send those on with a White Paper since there was nothing in the letters to change the White Paper. I think those were sent to the Chairperson for the review of the White Paper but they really didn't change anything on it.

CHAIRMAN KANE: They didn't change the White Paper. Yes, we had asked that the White Paper be widely circulated so that there could be input but the motion that's before us is to send the White Paper to the FCC and to publish the White Paper on our website. David? As I said the letters are in the record of the NANC meeting.

MR. GREENHAUS: Okay, so they're accessible to FCC if someone would like to read them.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes. Certainly, they are public documents and they also will be in the record of this meeting because they've been given an item

number. They will be available.

Okay, so we have the motion before us to publish the White Paper to the website, the NANC website, and to submit it to the FCC for their information. Is there any objection to that recommendation? Then I will consider it unanimously approved. Thank you very much.

MR. NEWMAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: That brings us to the end of our items. Thank you very much. Summary of action items, let me go back over that, if I've taken my notes right.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

Action items, we have two action items in the report of the Numbering Oversight Working Group. We had an action item from the report of Billing and Collection Working Group, an action item from the report of the Local Number Portability Administration, and an action item which we just approved from the Future of Numbering Working Group. And all those action items were approved. All the recommendation requests from the various groups have been approved.

Public comments and participation, do we have anyone? I'm sorry, yes.

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka from CenturyLink. I apologize, but we also have the action item for the email that you're going to send on the Selection Working Group, the NPA, et cetera.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, that is what we are going to do, we are going to send out the proposed schedule for getting the working group up and working and

established.

So there was no public comment. Any other business before us?

Our next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, September 15th, and there's a lot of work that's going to go on between now and then, in the next three months. Most of the work of the NANC gets done in all those working groups that meet regularly and individually in between, and we all appreciate all of that work and committee work that goes on. And I know there will be a lot of work being done on the selection process too between now and the September meeting. Thank you all.

There being no further business we are adjourned at 11:47 a.m. Thank you.

(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:

_____