

**North American Numbering Council  
Meeting Transcript  
September 15, 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. Cyd Anglin           | AT&T Inc.                         |
| 4. Mary Retka           | CenturyLink                       |
| 5. Valerie Cardwell     | Comcast Corporation               |
| 6. Suzanne Howard       | Cox Communications, Inc.          |
| 7. David Greenhaus      | 800 Response Information Services |
| 8. Gregory Diamond      | Level 3 Communications, LLC       |
| 9. Michael Balch        | NARUC – Iowa                      |
| 10. Guy McDonald        | NARUC – Kansas                    |
| 11. Hon. Sara Kyle      | NARUC – Tennessee                 |
| 12. Jerome Candelaria   | NCTA                              |
| 13. John McHugh         | OPASTCO                           |
| 14. Rosemary Emmer      | Sprint Nextel                     |
| 15. Natalie McNamer     | T-Mobile USA, Inc.                |
| 16. Thomas Soroka, Jr.  | USTA                              |
| 17. Kevin Green         | Verizon                           |
| 18. Brendan Kasper      | Vonage                            |
| 19. Tiki Gaugler        | XO Communications                 |

Special Members (Non-voting):

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

Commission Employees:

Marilyn Jones, Designated Federal Officer (DFO)  
Michelle Sclater, Alternate 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 40 members of the public attended the meeting as observers.

**IV. Documents Introduced.**

- (1) Agenda
- (2) NANC Meeting Transcript – May 17, 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
- (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) Report of the LNPA Selection Working Group (SWG)
- (10) Local Number Portability Administration Working Group (LNPA WG) Status Report to the NANC
- (11) Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report to the NANC
- (12) Future of Numbering (FoN) Working Group Report to the NANC

**V. Table of Contents.**

1. Announcements and Recent News	6
2. Approval of Meeting Transcript from May 17, 2011	8
3. Report of the North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA)	10
4. Report of the National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator (PA)	22

5. Report of the Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG)	30
6. Report from the North American Numbering Plan Billing and Collection (NANP B&C) Agent	35
7. Report of the Billing and Collection Working Group (B&C WG)	38
8. North American Portability Management (NAPM) LLC Report	39
9. Implementation of FCC Order on LNPA Selection Process	42
10. Report of the Local Number Portability Administration Working Group (LNPA WG)	45
11. Status of the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) activities	59
12. Report of the Future of Numbering Working Group (FoN WG)	68
13. Summary of Action Items	71
14. Public Comments and Participation (five minutes per speaker)	71
15. Other Business	--

**VI. Summary of the Meeting.**

CHAIRMAN KANE: -- Thursday, September 15th. We are meeting in the hearing room of the Federal Communications Commission at 445 12th Street, S.W. in Washington, D.C.

A couple of housekeeping matters, just to remind you again that when you want to speak, put your tent card up and then do two things when you're recognized please, again for the benefit both of the folks who are on the phone listening in and who can't see you and also for the recorder, wait a couple of seconds before you start speaking because the gentleman who runs the system has to punch on your microphone. The microphones are

dead until you're recognized. And then state your name clearly and who you are representing.

And for the record I'm Betty Ann Kane, the Chairman of the North American Numbering Council.

To my left is Commissioner Jeff Why from Massachusetts, Telecom Commission who is the Co-Chair.

And I'm going to ask first of all that we go around the room, and you identify yourselves. Again, wait so that your microphone can go on. And this is for the transcript and for the folks on the phone.

MS. ANGLIN: My name is Cyd Anglin from AT&T.

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka from CenturyLink.

MS. CARDWELL: Valerie Cardwell, Comcast.

MS. HOWARD: Suzanne Howard, Cox Communications.

MR. GREENHAUS: David Greenhaus, 800 Response.

MR. DIAMOND: Greg Diamond, Level 3.

COMMISSIONER KJELLANDER: Paul Kjellander from the Idaho Public Utilities Commission.

COMMISSIONER LOYD: Ward Loyd, Kansas Corporation Commission.

MS. KYLE: Sara Kyle, Tennessee Commission.

MR. CANDELARIA: Jerome Candelaria, NCTA.

MR. MCHUGH: John McHugh of OPASTCO.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel along with Sue Tiffany who will be sitting here in a little while from Sprint Nextel.

MS. MCNAMER: Natalie McNamer, T-Mobile.

MR. SOROKA: Tom Soroka, the United States Telecom Association.

MR. GREEN: Kevin Green, Verizon Communications.

MR. KASPER: Brendan Kasper, Vonage.

MS. JONES: Marilyn Jones, FCC, DFO.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you all very much. Do we have some folks on the phone?

MR. JORTNER: This is Wayne Jortner, National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates.

MR. DIXON: This is Tom Dixon. I am also with NASUCA.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Very good, anybody else?

MS. HYMANS: Linda Hymans with NeuStar Pooling.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you, Linda.

MS. FRIERSON: Hi, Shirley Frierson, Tennessee Regulatory Authority.

MS. BEATON: Rebecca Beaton, Washington Commission staff.

MS. PERRY: Rachel Perry, Georgia PSC.

MR. BALCH: Mike Balch with the Iowa Utilities Board.

MR. GOYA: This is David Goya from New Hampshire, the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you very much.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS AND RECENT NEWS**

Announcements; the first item on our agenda is Announcements and Recent News, and I think the first announcement I want to make is an announcement of some new members who have been appointed, some of whom are with us and some members who were recently appointed who are now with us for the first time.

First of all Guy McDonald who is the senior Telecom analyst of the Kansas Corporation Commission was appointed on May 19th as the alternate, the official alternate to the Honorable Ward Loyd of the Kansas Corporation Commission, and we are happy to have Commissioner Ward Loyd here himself in person.

Second I want to welcome the Honorable Sara Kyle who is the Director of the Tennessee Regulatory Authority who was just appointed in August as a primary member from NARUC. Welcome, Sara.

MS. KYLE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: I want to announce that Ms. Cyd Anglin, the Technical Director of Network Methods and Support for AT&T was appointed in August, and she is an alternate member. I'm happy to have you here.

The Honorable Elizabeth S. Jacobs who was Chairman of the Iowa Utilities Board who was also appointed in August. She is a primary member. Commissioner Jacobs, Chairman Jacobs, is not able to be with us this morning. She is hosting I understand a conference in Iowa at the request of her governor on energy policy.

But Michael Balch who is the Utility Specialist in the Iowa Utilities Board -- appointed in August 25th as the alternate to Commissioner Jacobs is with us on the phone.

We also have with us Commissioner Paul Kjellander who is President of the Idaho Public Utilities Board. Commissioner Kjellander has been nominated by NARUC. The paperwork hasn't gone through yet at the Commission to make it official so he won't be voting today, but we're delighted that he has come and he will sit with us and get up to speed. We're happy to have you here.

And then I think we have on the phone from NASUCA -- We do want to say goodbye to NASUCA representative Joel Cheskis from the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission. He has left that position with the Pennsylvania PUC and so was no longer a member, but we do have two NASUCA representatives on the phone.

And I want to ask the folks on the phone if you would also send in an email spelling your name and who you're with. Sometimes it's a little hard for the recorder to hear the name and the identity when you're speaking over the phone. So if you could just send it in for the record.

And Marilyn, who do they send that to?

MS. JONES: Debbie Blue, [deborah.blue@fcc.gov](mailto:deborah.blue@fcc.gov).

CHAIRMAN KANE: [deborah.blue@fcc.gov](mailto:deborah.blue@fcc.gov). And that's B-L-U-E. You've probably all gotten emails from her anyway and have her address bookmarked on your system. So if you would just send that in to her we'll be sure your name is spelled right in the transcript.

Marilyn, I think you have some other announcements.

MS. JONES: Yes, I have. This Marilyn Jones with the FCC. I have a couple of announcements. The first announcement is that the new charter for the NANC will be available on or around September 23rd. Deborah will send it out when it becomes available.

And also I wanted to announce that the Bureau is planning to release a public notice today regarding the LNP Best Practice 67. We want to see comments on that Best Practice. So that will be available today. Debbie will send it out also.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you. Do you know what the comment period will be, how long?

MS. JONES: I think it's going to be maybe 30 days after publication in the Federal Register.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Which could be a week or so from now.

MS. JONES: Yes.

MS. MCNAMER: Natalie McNamer with T-Mobile. Marilyn, did you say Best Practice 67?

MS. JONES: Yes.

### **APPROVAL OF MEETING TRANSCRIPT**

CHAIRMAN KANE: All right, the next item on our agenda is approval of the transcript of the last meeting which was on May 17, 2011. That was sent out electronically. We try not to print it out because it's so big.

Are there any additions, or corrections, or questions about the transcript? Then I will



entertain a motion to approve the transcript as presented. Commissioner Kyle has moved.

Do we have a second?

MS. EMMER: Second.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Rosemary Emmer seconds it. All in favor say aye.

COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And speaking for Rosemary, I had it on my list Rosemary, and I went over it. Rosemary has a guest that she would like to introduce.

MS. EMMER: Thank you. Chairman Kane. Rosemary Emmer with Sprint Nextel. I'd like to introduce to the NANC Council members, the FCC, and the folks in the room, a gal I've been mentoring. Her name is Kati Grigg. Kati if you'd please stand up, thank you. I'll spell her name for the record. It's K-A-T-I G-R-I-G-G.

She grew up in Damascus, Maryland. She graduated from Pennsylvania State University with a BA in International Politics and a BA in History in May of this year. So she's interested in learning more about the legislative process, in particular policy making.

She would probably stand to gain a lot more information from us personally than she will be listening to all of these acronyms that are new to her in the numbering world.

So if during our breaks and during lunch or whatever if you guys would kindly introduce yourselves to her and give her your business card, maybe tell her a little bit about what you do for a living, I'm sure she'd appreciate it. Thank you so much.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you, Rosemary. I remember a couple of meetings ago you had a whole group of young people to whom we had to explain all of the acronyms

and what we do.

MS. EMMER: I spend a good amount of time mentoring.

## **REPORT OF THE NORTH AMERICAN NUMBERING PLAN**

### **ADMINISTRATOR (NANPA)**

CHAIRMAN KANE: The next item is Item 3 on our agenda which is the report of the North American Numbering Plan Administrator, also known as the NANPA. John Manning.

And John we do have as I said several new members here and on the phone so it might be worthwhile taking a couple of sentences to explain sort of what your group does.

MR. MANNING: Certainly. Good morning, everybody. My name again is John Manning, Senior Director with the North American Numbering Plan Administrator.

Our primary function is the assignment and administration of the various resources that make up the North American Numbering Plan. That includes the area codes and the central office codes within those area codes. We also do a number of other resources such as carrier identification codes, 5YY resources and 900 resources.

We're also responsible for the area code relief planning. When an area code is projected to exhaust within the next 36 months, the NANPA begins the process of pulling together the industry and a plan that ultimately can be approved and implemented in the appropriate timeframes.

We are also involved with the collection of utilization and forecast information from carriers on a semiannual basis, allows us to take a look at how resources are being used and

just as important what the forecasts are for those resources.

So that's a primary rundown of what we do and of course a lot of the information you ever really need to know about NANPA is located on our website at [www.nanpa.com](http://www.nanpa.com).

That almost sounded rehearsed, like I've done that so many times. I swear that just rolled off just like that.

**(LAUGHTER)**

Okay, beginning on page two of my presentation, and I don't know if we number these or not, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, we will. This will go into the transcript as Item 3.

MR. MANNING: My presentation this morning will focus on the status of various resources, many of which I just mentioned, talk a little bit about the area code relief planning activities. I've got a couple change orders that we're in the process of reviewing, and just a few other minor items that I'll cover with the NANC.

Starting first with the resource update, begin with areas codes, and primarily this report will go from the beginning of this year to August 31st as a timeframe of primary reference.

We've actually assigned three new area codes in 2011. The report indicates that all three of those area codes were in Canada, one in Ontario, Canada, one for British Columbia, Canada, and one for Saskatchewan, Canada. And the dates of those assignments are included in the report.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Which reminds us, this is North American Numbering

Council, not just the U.S. one.

MR. MANNING: Exactly. We've had three area codes actually placed in service. These were done a number of months ago, one in Canada, one in Oklahoma, and one in New York.

We have one area code with a future in-service date here in 2011. That's the area code 721 in Sint Maarten. They will officially join the NANP on September 30th, just a few days from now. Mandatory dialing of the new 721 area code will begin a year from now, September 30, 2012.

And finally based upon some actions taken by the California Public Utilities Commission back in June, we had five area codes that were assigned to relief projects. Most of these relief projects were at least ten, maybe close to 12 years old.

The decision was made based upon the forecast of those involved area codes being out so far, to go ahead and dismiss those particular projects and have those area codes that were assigned, move them back to the reserve status. So you'll see the five area codes and the area codes that they're assigned to relieve as part of the report.

CHAIRMAN KANE: John, are those still reserved for California?

MR. MANNING: Yes, they're reserved for California and also reserved for the specific area code that they were assigned to relieve.

With regard to central office code activity, again, January through August of this year, the chart towards the bottom of the page, I give you January through August 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, comparing it to 2011.

Interesting, in the quantity of assignments so far this year, 1,889, nearly identical to where we were at the same time period for 2010.

I'll make note of the number of returns, reclamations of 469. That's significantly higher than what we experienced in the previous years and that was due primarily to a single service provider returning over 200 NXX codes in the May/June timeframe of this year. They were -- codes, no porting, so we were able to return them to the inventory.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Can you identify the carrier or is that confidential?

MR. MANNING: I don't think it's -- well, the second question is, I can't remember who the carrier was.

**(LAUGHTER)**

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay.

MR. MANNING: I'm just happy to get the resources back.

With regard to total year assignments, we're looking at approximately annualize figure of about 2,800 codes which is on line with where we were last year.

Next page beginning with Feature Group B Carrier Identification Codes, one assignment this year so far and one returned.

Feature Group D Carrier Identification Codes, we've had 46 assignments this year, eight of those were to switchless resellers, 330 CICs have been returned and we're nowhere near exhausting that particular resource.

CHAIRMAN KANE: John, would you explain for the new folks what Feature Group Carrier Codes are?

MR. MANNING: Sure. Feature Group B and Feature Group D Carrier Identification Codes are codes used for the ability to direct traffic to a particular carrier. Most common form is Feature Group D which is what used to be known as equal access where you actually identify on a prescription basis where a particular call is to be delivered regarding who is going to carry that call on a long distance basis.

So CICs are assigned to entities that carry basically long distance traffic. There are other uses of that particular resource, not as greatly used for the ability to identify traffic and appropriately route it.

COMMISSIONER KANE: Thank you.

MR. MANNING: 5YY resource really refers to the resources known today as 500 NPA, 533, and the 544 area code. They are assigned today per guidelines for personal communications services. These are services where you either have some type of terminal mobility, personal mobility, and some type of service profile management.

Since the beginning of 2011, we've assigned 423 5YY NPA NXX codes and over that same timeframe had 50 codes returned.

We have 395 available NXX codes in this resource and based upon recent assignment activity as well as the forecast we have on file as of the end of August, we are projecting that the 5YY resource and of course that includes all three of the area codes that I mentioned, will exhaust the end of this year, the beginning of next year and that the 566 NPA area code will be the next area code in which assignments will be made.

The 900 resource, this resource is really for paper call type services. This particular

resource, we've made no assignments of any 900 prefixes since the beginning of the year and two have been returned.

555 line numbers, these are intended for a provision of information services. We've had 14 assignments so far this year and 47 numbers have been returned.

And finally on the 800 855 toll free services for the hearing impaired we've made six assignments so far this year and no returns.

The remaining resources, the vertical service codes, the area code 456 for international inbound, automatic number identification digits, and the N11 codes, there's been no activity on that since the beginning of the year.

Page four, talking about area code relief activity. We've had a number of items taking place here in the near term, and I'll cover them for you.

First of all, North Carolina 919, this is a particular activity that started nearly ten years ago with an overlay of the 919 with a 984 NPA but due to numbering optimization measures, demand, et cetera, that project was delayed until recently where we had notified the North Carolina Utilities Commission of the need to go ahead and move forward with relief.

So on May 9th of this year the Commission ordered the telecommunication industry to submit a plan, an implementation plan for the new 984 area code. That plan was submitted in early June and approved in late June and ten digit permissive dialing begins October 1st of this year with mandatory dialing March 31, 2012. The effective date of the new 984 will be April 30, 2012.

In Maryland, 410/443, this is currently an overlay complex. Again we're talking about -- relief activity that was started in 2001 but had been delayed over the past ten years.

We recently informed the Maryland Public Service Commission of the need to go ahead and move forward with the additional overlay in this complex that would be the 667 area code. We've already started implementation planning with a meeting that is scheduled to take place next week.

We recently had to declare jeopardy in this particular situation because the timeframes needed to implement a new area code combined with the quantity of resources that had recently been assigned and the forecast led us to believe that we wanted to make sure that when the industry came together on the 21st of this month, they had maximum flexibility with regard to the implementation schedule that they wanted to put together.

So they will be addressing at that time not only the schedule for the new 667 implementation but also how they want to deal with the remaining codes in terms of rationing those available codes until such time as that new NPA is available.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And declaring jeopardy means?

MR. MANNING: Declaring jeopardy simply means we're in a situation where the supply of NXX codes available in the area codes does not appear to meet the demand that is expected over the timeframe we're dealing with.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you.

MR. MANNING: That's referred to as a jeopardy situation.

Moving on to California 408, we had initiated relief planning in this again some time



ago. It was back in December, however NANPA conducted a relief planning meeting with the industry because we saw where the forecast was and we needed to move forward with a relief plan.

The industry recommended an overlay and they were various public input meetings in March of this year. NANPA filed an application with the PUC in May and the Public Utilities Commission Administrative Law Judge, the ALJ has issued a draft decision on September 2nd of recommending the overlay.

Now subsequent to that, NANPA has recently revised the exhaust projection of the 408 NPA from first quarter 2013 to the third quarter of 2012. As a result of that change in the exhaust projection, the Utilities Commission in California directed NANPA to initiate the rationing process which is already in place to extend it to not only non-pooling carriers but also to pooling carriers.

So now in that particular area code the rationing process is that only two codes will be assigned per month regardless of whether you are a pooling or a non-polling carrier.

The proposal as we see it now is that the implementation of the new area code assuming that the ALJ recommendation is approved, would be in the fourth quarter of next year so that's how long we would have to deal with the rationing situation.

CHAIRMAN KANE: John, we have a question.

MR. CANDELARIA: Jerome Candelaria, NCTA. The industry and the Public Utilities Commission in California anticipated 13 months to relief and I'm wondering if there is any light you could shed on why the number was revised, the basis for jumping two

full quarters. Also is that in your view a dramatic change?

MR. MANNING: Well, first of all with regard to the exhaust projection, looking at the recent NRUF data that we've just obtained that was due on August 1st, combined with recent assignment activity, and that's looking at not only just the past few months but also over the past ten to 12 months, our view is that what we expected to happen in that area code, there was an increase in demand for central office codes.

With regard to that, it's our responsibility when we see that and we believe that the exhaust projection of a particular area code needs to be modified, that's why we go ahead and move forward with it and initiate that exhaust and publish that exhaust projection.

Also we were aware of the ALJ's proposal and we also know that we're presently in a comment cycle so we thought it's best to make this move sooner rather than later to give the industry the opportunity during that comment cycle if they choose to do so, to take a look at the current exhaust projection related to the proposed schedule that they're going to be looking at from the ALJ and the possibility that that schedule could be changed.

MR. CANDELARIA: Yes, thank you. It was very helpful, your timing.

MR. MANNING: So from that perspective we wanted to get this done sooner than later and was one of the reasons we were looking at that area code now rather than waiting until the later October timeframe when we publish the results.

With regard to other relief activities, in Pennsylvania 814, real quickly they have recommended-- a split but based upon comments from the industry the Public Service Commission granted reconsideration of various petitions there and since that timeframe the

Commission has been gathering input via various public hearings, many of which occurred over May and quite a few over the month of August.

Nebraska, 402, there's no change there. We're simply waiting for us to get the quantity of prefixes within the 402 to be approximately ten prefixes and that's when we'll start assignments out of the new 531 area code.

And the final bullet item there, I've already mentioned, Sint Maarten 721 becoming effective at the end of this month.

One item I want to make with regard to the area code relief planning, is just recently NANPA has initiated the use of the online meeting feature with our area code relief planning activities, an opportunity for participants not only to join us via a conference call but actually look at the documents we're reviewing, whether it's petitions, schedules, procedures, et cetera.

We just initiated this process with the first meeting being held in August, and we'll be moving forward and we'll be looking for some type of general feedback from those who participate as to whether or not they're finding that useful.

On page five, NANPA has submitted two change orders. NANPA Change Order 21 was in response to an INC Issue 710. This particular issue was really the ability to start presenting on various reports the addition of a parent company operating company number, which is assigned to a carrier that uniquely identifies that carrier as well as the parent company name on various reports that are generated out of the NANP Administration System, the system we use to administer the various resources within the NANP.

We submitted that change order. Based upon feedback and input from the Numbering Oversight Working Group about some additional functionality that may be used to offset some of the risks that we identified in that particular change order, NANPA withdrew that change order and we're currently doing an investigation as to what we can do to address some of the concerns that were voiced by the NOWG as well as spelled out in the change order. And the resubmission of this change order will occur after we've had some discussion with the NOWG about our proposals to address their concerns.

Change Order 22 was submitted at the same time as Change Order 21. It's in response to INC Issue 698, INC being the Industry Numbering Committee, that's the auto-population of the total numbering resources on some forms.

With regard to the change for NANPA, this change modifies NAS to include what's called a pooled code indicator on various NAS generated reports simply being able to tell you when you look at our various reports if an NPA-XX is either pooled or not, and that's what that change order is about. This change order is still pending approval with the FCC.

Final note here on other NANPA news, most of you may be aware but NeuStar was provided a bridge contract to continue to provide NANPA services covering the period of July 9, 2011 through January 8, 2012. The bridge contract consists of a base period of three months which is July 9, 2011 through October 8, 2011 in three one month options. The firm fixed price remained the same.

We published our second quarter newsletter on July 8th and the third quarter newsletter will be coming out in the first week of October.

The October 2011 NPA NANP exhaust projections will be available at the end of October and will be posted to the NANPA website and of course appropriate notification will be provided to the industry.

And the final note I make is with regard to some changes that we have implemented on the NANPA website. This is in response to some of the items identified during the 2010 NANPA operational review session with some changes, modifications, and enhancements we can make to the website.

What these changes were was the ability to provide single page access to various reports and other documentation that's available throughout the website. This included a new report section entitled Area Code Relief Planning and various activities and documents associated with that, as well as some updates to our NRUF and central office code report sections on the website.

And finally I make note, we added a new page under our area code maps and the maps now include maps for the U.S. You can go to the Canadian website and their Numbering Administrator to get the Canadian area code maps. We now have maps for the Caribbean nations that are part of the NANP for Bermuda as well as U.S. territories located in the Atlantic and Pacific.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Very good. John, on the NeuStar contract, is that out for bid, is there a process going on there of the three month extension?

MR. MANNING: There's currently no official solicitation out although we're anticipating we'll have something here in the near term.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you. Are there any further questions on this report? Thank you very much.

MR. MANNING: Thank you.

## **REPORT OF THE NATIONAL THOUSANDS-BLOCK POOLING**

### **ADMINISTRATOR (PA)**

CHAIRMAN KANE: All right, the next item on the agenda, Item 4, is the report of the National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator and that's Amy. This report will go into the record as Item 4.

MS. PUTNAM: Good morning. I am Amy Putnam. I'm the Director of the National Thousands Block Pooling Administration, and I would be remiss if I didn't say that pooling was fine.

**(LAUGHTER)**

Commissioners, I always start out that way. I hope I will always continue to start out that way.

**(LAUGHTER)**

CHAIRMAN KANE: Amy, we just had our annual meeting of Commissioners from the Mid-Atlantic states. It is called MACRIC and we had reception on Monday night up on the rooftop of the Donavan Hotel on 14th Street, which has a pool, and I tried to get everybody into the pool but they just didn't.

**(LAUGHTER)**

MS. PUTNAM: We have a very, very old slide from when we were doing the

state trials back in the late '90s that shows numbers jumping into a swimming pool.

**(LAUGHTER)**

The Thousands Block Pooling Administrator actually has two distinct functions at this time. Our primary function and the one that we have held since we were awarded the national contract in 2001, is the assignment of North American Numbering Plan resources in Thousands Blocks rather than in full codes and NANPA assigns them, and the FCC designed pooling in the hopes that it would extend the life of the North American Numbering Plan and I believe we have been successful in that endeavor.

The second function that the Pooling Administrator has been assigned by the FCC is more recent and that is the administration of pseudo-ANI and under that directive we must manage and assign non-dialable p-ANIs, that's Pseudo Automatic Number Identification, p-ANIs out of the 211 and 511 NXXs in each area code and these numbers are used to support routing of wireless and VOIP 911 calls.

And we have been operating as the interim routing number administrator for p-ANI and will go live in March of 2012 in our function as the permanent p-ANI administrator or the permanent RNA.

On page two of our slides, we have the rolling 12 month statistics of pooling administration activity. You noticed that in August of 2011, our numbers have gone up with respect to the number of total applications processed and that increase is primarily due to block modifications.

And if you look to the fourth line down where it says number of change requests to

existing blocks, that number is also increased and those two numbers are tied together.

Each time there is a NANC meeting, the Pooling Administrator produces the summary data, rolling data for the last 12 months.

The second chart there on page two is the summary data for part 3s. A part 3 is issued whenever we take an action with respect to an application for blocks so this shows the number of actions that we have taken in the past 12 months with respect to applications for blocks.

On page three we have the part 3 12 month summary data sorted by type so that you can see which actions we've taken with respect to the applications.

And it also shows the number --full codes that we have opened in the last year for location routing numbers for dedicated customers and for pool replenishment.

On page four we have the summary of rate center information changes. That reflects the change that we have made to the status of rate centers on our website. The rate centers are characterized as mandatory, optional, excluded, state mandatory, and periodically we have requests to make changes to those status designations.

In August we had a large number of changes from excluded to optional, 68 of those 76 were changes from excluded to optional, and eight were changed from mandatory with one service provider to mandatory which means the second service provider entered the rate center.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Amy, explain what excluded and optional means.

MS. PUTNAM: An excluded rate center is a rate center outside the top 100



MSAs where no carrier has chosen to pool.

An optional rate center is generally either a rate center where a carrier has chosen to pool in a rate center where it is not obligated to, or where a state has requested that we change the designation from excluded to optional to encourage carriers to pool in those rate centers. It is still not mandatory for a carrier to pool in an optional rate center.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And those are mostly in more rural and suburban areas.

MS. PUTNAM: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you.

MS. PUTNAM: On slide five we show the reclamation summary. That's the number of blocks with overdue part 4s that we have reclaimed. We cannot reclaim a block without the authorization from a state commission or the FCC and so although the last column, the total of number of blocks authorized to be reclaimed has a lot of zeros in it, that is not because we have not chosen to reclaim, but because we have not been authorized to reclaim by the appropriate authority.

And very often it's because the carriers that have overdue part 4s have a legitimate technical reason for the part four to not have been -- or for the block not to have been activated and they notify the states or the FCC and they receive an extension.

The next chart shows the instances of unscheduled, unavailability of the pooling administration system and that is one case in which we like to see a lot of zeros, and we are pleased to have a long list of zeros there.

On slide seven, other pooling related activities, the first chart shows all our

contractual reporting requirements and what we have done and what we are required to do. We are fully up-to-date on having all our reports being submitted on time and posted to the website as required.

We had three contract modifications since the last meeting. Contract mod 16 approved change order 19. That was the p-ANI change order. Contract mod 17 approved change order 20, and contract mod 18 exercised the FCC's option to extend our contract through the end of the current contract and that would be August 14, 2012.

On page eight, we often have a chart under regulatory that shows the status of delegated authority petitions and if there were any pending we would have a chart there at this time however there are currently no petitions pending for additional delegated authority.

The final step in the last petition was when additional mandatory pooling in 662 NPA was implemented on September 5th.

CHAIRMAN KANE: I'm particularly pleased to see this. I know when I became Chairman we had a handful that were pending and some had been pending for some time from the states and it's good to see that was all cleared up acted on. Thank you.

MS. PUTNAM: We have been very busy with p-ANI administration since change order 19 was approved. We have been working on getting the permanent p-ANI administration up and running -- we've sent notices to various industry members through as you can see as many distribution lists as we can find to make sure that everybody knows about this, requesting the information on p-ANI assignment from users of p-ANI and from assignors of p-ANI. And these are just non-dialables. We are not seeking information on

dialable p-ANIs.

We have also finalized our system requirements and begun the system development process. We are responding daily to questions concerning assignment information and the transition to the permanent p-ANI administration and we have begun development of the permanent p-ANI administration RNA website.

We regularly meet with the NOWG and provided the highlights of our performance for the first six months of 2001 on July 28th.

With respect to change orders, they are exactly the same as the ones that were addressed by John Manning with regard to the NANPA. We submitted the two change orders. We withdrew change order 21 and we will be discussing that further with the NOWG.

On table nine it shows the status of all current change orders and other PA activities. Effective September 6th, one of our Pooling Administrators, Ms. Diane Calhoun transferred to the position of p-ANI Administrator. She will be working closely with the Regional Director for p-ANI, Florence Webber, and they will work on permanent p-ANI administration. Ms. Calhoun will remain in the Concord office.

Other p-ANI responsibilities as we ramp up will be assumed by the corresponding pooling personnel. For example, Bruce Armstrong who is our Regional Director for Quality Assurance and Control is working already on that aspect of p-ANI. Tara Farquar who is our industry interface representative works already with the INC on p-ANI issues and will continue to do so.

The next one is a big yea. For two years we've been working on the NPAC scrub to clean out over-contaminated and otherwise problem blocks in the pooling administration system and we started out with 9949 problem blocks and I am pleased to say that as you see on the last line of page ten the number now is zero.

It was a huge amount of work but we are finished and this I hope will be the last time you will see anything about this in the NANC report. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: That's very, very good news. Thank you very, very much for that update.

On the p-ANI issue, you said it's just the non-dialable ones but it is VOIP and wireless and with the increase or the trend to more and more users going to VOIP or to wireless, do you see any future problems down the road in exhaustion of the codes that are assigned to that?

MS. PUTNAM: We have already approached the INC and requested that they make the 311 NXX available to us at the point at which 211 and 511 exhaust and there is a provision that whenever we see exhaust in the next year that we will go to the INC and request that they open another NXX for us.

Because we didn't have any data and we weren't sure about what the status of 211 and 511 were, we preemptively asked the INC to open up 311 in case we might need it and that would happen on a rate center by rate center basis.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you. Other questions? Rosemary.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. Amy, would you please take back

to the folks back home our thanks and gratitude for this scrub. I recall during the performance evaluation how much time and energy this was taking from a lot of people in your organization and it's just very, very, very appreciated and if you'd please let them know that from us.

MS. PUTNAM: I certainly will. We had lots of pruney fingers that are now returning to normal.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, thanks from all of us.

MS. PUTNAM: And Commissioner, with respect to the distinction between dialable and non-dialable, we had a lot of antidotal information from industry upon which we relied to make a determination that temporarily housing dialables in the system and building the system large enough to temporarily house dialables was not the most financially advantageous route to go since it is the goal of the industry to transfer from dialables to non-dialables as near future as the carriers deem fit.

And there is a provision out there I believe it's in the interim guidelines, that says that this is the goal of the industry and that we will work on an individual basis with carriers as they want to transfer their dialables to non-dialables so we can create a schedule that is mutually agreeable to both of us.

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

## **REPORT OF THE NUMBERING OVERSIGHT WORKING GROUP**

### **(NOWG)**

All right, Item 5 is the report of the Numbering Oversight Working Group, and we will put this into the record as Item 5.

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

And as the Numbering Oversight Working Group, just to explain, we oversee the activities of the two numbering administrators, the NANPA and the PA.

Slide two shows the contents of our report. I'll be discussing the major items that the NOWG has been spending time working on and have been meeting about over the past few months, and they are the online performance survey and enhancements to the process, the monthly report submitted to the NOWG by the numbering administrators, the NANPA and the PA change orders, and the Co-Chair position that was recently up for reelection.

On slide three the online survey, the NANPA and the PA annual performance surveys that are conducted by the NOWG are the main source of industry input on the administrator's performance.

They weigh heavily into the NOWG's evaluation reports and for the first time in 2011 the NOWG mechanized the survey process by use of an online survey tool and there was overwhelming agreement that the use of the online survey was a success, and it greatly improved the survey process.

However, being that it was our first time using the online survey tool we felt that we

should look back on our experience and see if there were any areas that needed enhancements or that maybe we could make better for next year.

So the NOWG had maintained a tracking log throughout 2011, throughout the survey process for issues that we felt needed to be revisited after the whole survey process had been completed.

And the tracking log contains such items as whether the NANC cover letter should be incorporated as part of the survey or as a separate document, such things as enhancements to the save and continue feature that allows a user to begin to fill out the survey and then go back later and complete it, and other things such as the ability of the survey respondents to e-mail themselves a copy of the submitted survey.

So that's just a few items that we have on our log but there are many others that we're discussing and the NOWG is holding conference calls to discuss the items on the log and to agree upon the suggested enhancements and the process improvements.

On slide four, we're discussing the other things that the NOWG has been meeting about and one of the items here is the monthly reporting requirements of the Numbering Administrators.

And during the pooling administrators 2010 Operational Review that was held last March, the PA had asked the NOWG if we would be willing to review and evaluate the current reports that the PA submits to the NOWG for our monthly calls and we accepted this as an action item and are currently holding meetings to review the PA's monthly reports.

The NOWG first needed to review the reporting requirements specified in the PA's

Technical Requirements Document since the TRD sets the perimeters on what needs to be covered on the monthly calls.

It really just gives a broad overview of the what items need to be covered and at this point in time we're really just meeting about the reports that the PA presents to us as the NOWG and we haven't really drawn any conclusions yet but at this point in time we are not really seeing any reports that we feel should be eliminated.

We are probably going to recommend the consolidation of certain reports or formatting changes to some of the reports but when we're done with our NOWG only discussions we do plan to meet with the PA and obtain their feedback and we're going to be open to their suggestions and consider the reports that they're giving to us and see if any can be eliminated.

And similar to the reports that the PA provides to us, the NOWG also receives monthly reports from the NANPA. The NOWG approached the NANPA and asked if we should review their reports as well but the NANPA felt that a review is not necessary at this time because all of the reports that they prepare for us are also prepared for other purposes so they didn't feel that it would be beneficial to eliminate any at this time.

If you'll turn to slides five and six, the tables on these pages show the NANPA and the PA change order activity that was discussed briefly earlier by John and Amy. Throughout the year whenever the NANPA and the PA submit a change order proposal to the FCC, the NOWG reviews the change order and prepares a summary and recommendation for the FCC.



Since the last NANC meeting the NANPA submitted two change orders that are shown on the table on slide five. Change order 21 regarding the multi OCN issue was withdrawn by the NANPA because they're reviewing an alternative solution that was proposed by the NOWG.

Change order 22 which is to add a new data field to the NANPA central office code utilized report which will identify if a code is pooled or non-pooled. The NOWG sent our summary and recommendation for this change order to the FCC last week.

Turning to slide six, this table shows the PA change order proposals that were submitted this year and similar to the NANPA change orders, the PA submitted change orders 21 and 22 last month. Also change order 21 regarding the multi OCN issue was withdrawn by the PA and the PA is reviewing the alternative solution that was proposed by the NOWG.

Change order 22 proposes the addition of a new report in the pooling administration system, PAS, and this report will benefit service providers and the state commission staff by allowing them to view total numbering resources. The NOWG sent our summary and recommendation for this change order to the FCC last week.

If you'll turn to slide seven, another topic addressed by the NOWG has been the annual Co-Chair election.

I'm sorry, there's a question.

MS. MCNAMER: Yes, Natalie McNamer T-Mobile. Laura, I'm sorry to bring this up because I should have caught it when I put this slide originally together but on slide

six under change order 20, the scheduled implementation date should be 3-19-2012 and it shows 2011 on the slide.

MS. DALTON: Okay, thank you, Natalie, good catch.

Okay, then speaking of Natalie, on slide seven the NOWG Co-Chair election has been a topic of discussion and the NOWG Co-Chairs serve two year terms. The elections are held annually on a rotational basis.

At the end of this year Natalie McNamer's term will be finished so the position that Natalie is currently holding was up for election. Nominations were accepted through the end of last week. Natalie was nominated to continue in her current role for the next two years. With no other nominations presented Natalie was reelected by acclamation.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Congratulations, Natalie.

MS. DALTON: On the next page slide eight shows a list of the NOWG participating companies and slide nine shows the NOWG's upcoming meeting schedule for our regularly scheduled meetings with the NANPA and the PA.

The NOWG also holds NOWG only calls immediately following the calls with the administrators to discuss their monthly activity that they had just reviewed with us.

And in addition to the calls mentioned here, we have other NOWG meetings throughout the month for special issues that come up such as the online survey meetings and the PA report meetings that I had mentioned earlier.

And the last slide is slide ten, shows contact information for the Co-Chairs, and we can be contacted with any questions or requests to participate in the NOWG. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Any questions on this report? I'd just like to comment on change order 22. Although you list of course the members of your participating companies in the NOWG, the state and the state commission staffs I know had some input on that also on change order 22, whether it was through your group or another group. That will be helpful to the states to have that additional information.

MS. DALTON: I believe the issue was first raised through the NANC, and we had gotten --

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, it was an issue that the states had brought to the NANC and we asked you to take a look at it so that each state will be able for its own state look at that information.

MS. DALTON: Right, I believe it came through the INC also and then we looked at that too.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. I'm glad that's moved along. Okay, thank you very much, Laura.

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

We'll take a couple more before break. Item 7 is the report of the Billing and Collection Agent and its number six on the agenda. I'm sorry, thank you, Jeff. That's why I have a Co-Chair. I'm looking at Item 6, the Billing and Collection Agent Report for the period ending August 31st.

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

are the Billing and Collection Agent.

The main purpose of the Billing and Collection Agent is to determine a budget for the coming year and then from there determine a contribution factor which NANC approves and, then we then use that information and the data information from USAC, and we bill the carriers, collect the money, and pay the vendors for their services and keep track of it all and then report to you, which I'm about to do.

Page one of the Fund shows the financial position of the Fund as of August 31st. We have about \$3 million in the bank, receivables of \$280,000. We owe the vendors \$400,000 which leaves the Fund in a position of \$3 million.

We just recently paid a change order to NANP administration, that was change order 18 and that was paid in August, approved by the FCC and paid in August.

Page two of the Fund shows the forecast for the upcoming year and what we're doing here is comparing what we are now projecting the Fund to be compared to the budget.

We're very close. If you look on the bottom right hand corner it shows we were expecting a surplus of \$750,000 which was the contingency and we're now projecting it to be \$724,000. There are a few ins and outs in the box there but we're very close to what our target -- we were planning.

Page four shows what we were expecting to pay over the next six months which is for the various vendors and how it should work out. The FCC is routinely approving the invoices. They are being paid every month.

And page five shows our deliverables. We are billing every month and processing

the payments and answering anybody's questions. This is a bit of busy time because the invoices just went out in June so a lot of people aren't sure who we are and why we're billing them but we sort through all those.

And we are collecting the receivables and working with the FCC to clear up the old receivables. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Very, good. Any questions? I notice there are no delinquent accounts.

MS. MARCOTTE: Well, none that have showed up this month.

CHAIRMAN KANE: That have showed up this month, right, for the red light site. Yes.

MR. CANDELARIA: Jerome Candelaria, NCTA. Can you elaborate on the bad debt expense appearing on page two?

MS. MARCOTTE: Yes, basically how that's determined is as the debts go old we do send them over to the FCC. So we provide an allowance, it's called a bad debt allowance or uncollectible accounts, and so every month we look at that account and as accounts go over 90 days they get provided for because we're now saying they may not be collectable.

We also get information from USAC that tells us that -- should never have been billed, so we put them into the allowance and we work through trying to get those written off with the approval of FCC. So it's just monthly we do this routine of determining which accounts are -- so they're generally accounts that should never have been billed, often.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you. Any other questions? We will put this

into the record as Item 6.

### **REPORT OF THE BILLING AND COLLECTION WORKING GROUP**

Now Item 7 is the Billing and Collection Working Group, and Rosemary is going to do that. And this report will go into the record as Item 7.

MS. EMMER: Thank you, Chairman Kane. Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. I chair the Billing and Collection Working Group along with Tim Decker of Verizon who is sitting behind me.

The Billing and Collection Agent Oversight Working Group is responsible for overseeing the performance of the functional requirements that are provided by the North American Numbering Plan Billing and Collection Agents, Faith Marcotte, Welch & Company, who just spoke to you. We review the performance of that agent every year, and we also oversee the contribution factor and the budget.

On page three we are currently looking at the monthly billing and collections. We are evaluating the deliverables. We are making sure or just overseeing the general budget and contribution factor for 2011 and 2012, and currently the agent has ongoing work with FCC and auditors for the annual U.S. government audit.

Page four shows the history of the contribution factor. For those folks that are newer, this is kind of interesting slide that we just try to keep in our decks for history sake.

Page five and page six, we talk about our budget for 2011 and 2012.

On page seven is our meeting schedule. Page eight is our current membership. Our membership is open. Of course we encourage new members. So for the new NANC

members, if you'd like to join our party, you're welcome to contact Tim and I, on page nine, our email addresses, and we'd be happy to add another meeting on your calendar if you'd like to join.

And to close I just wanted to point out just a quick note to you all. Welch's current contract expired October 1, 2009 and it's been extended several times, and their current contract ends in January with as I understand it, no further extensions allowed for that current contract.

So this is a really important function that they do and in order to make sure that the budget and the contribution factor is set appropriately going forward, we usually do that work in February. So just wanted to point that out just as a note.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you, Rosemary. And it's always good seeing these budgets. A good reminder that we're here at the FCC and it's a Federal Advisory Council and the states involved, but the vast bulk of this is paid for by the industry.

MS. EMMER: Correct.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you.

MS. EMMER: Thank you.

## **REPORT OF THE NORTH AMERICAN PORTABILITY MANAGEMENT LLC**

### **(NAPM LLC)**

CHAIRMAN KANE: We'll do one more item, and then take a short break, to hear from the North American Portability Management, the NAPM LLC. And this report will go into the report as Item 8.

MR. CLAY: Good morning, NANC. My name is Mel Clay. I'm with AT&T. I Co-Chair the NAPM LLC. I share the responsibility with Tim Decker from Verizon Communications.

The NAPM LLC is a Delaware Limited Liability Corporation. We're made up of ten member companies. The companies are AT&T, Brighthouse Network, Comcast, CenturyLink, Level 3, T-Mobile, Time Warner, Sprint Nextel, Verizon, and XO Communications.

Our responsibility is for the management of the current LNP Administration contract and the development and implementation of the NPAC procurement process with the NANC and FCC oversight due at the expiration of the current contract.

I wanted to report just a couple of things that we've been working on since the NANC meeting. SOW 78, revision one, at the request of the LNPA Working Group, the NAPM LLC approved a revision to SOW 78 that allows NeuStar to extend the Service Provider Medium Timer Implementation Profile report from its scheduled expiration date of August 1, 2011 for one year until August 1, 2012.

NeuStar is to maintain the Service Provider Medium Timer Implementation Profile report on its secure website and that supports the effort of the LNPA Working Group to develop a non-compliance list for FCC Order 09-41.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And Mel, if you'd refresh our memory, what FCC 09-41 entails.

MR. CLAY: That was one day porting.



CHAIRMAN KANE: One day porting, thank you.

MR. CLAY: Right. And this report shows which service providers are implementing or complying with that order.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And this is a confidential report? You said secure website.

MR. CLAY: That report is on NeuStar's secure website, and so I would assume it is confidential.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you.

MR. CLAY: The NAPM LLC and the FoNPAC activities since the last meeting, the FoNPAC was restarted in May of 2011 at the request of the FCC and the NANC.

The NAPM LLC developed and proposed nondisclosure agreements and conflict of interest statements, documents for the SWG members and submitted them to the NANC and the FCC for approval.

The NAPM LLC worked with Commissioner Why to insure that the approved NDA documents were executed and that the SWG members had the ability to meet and perform the functions outlined in FCC Order 09-109.

Several conference calls and face-to-face meetings have been scheduled for the remainder of the calendar year for the FoNPAC.

The following scheduled dates are, and these are fluid, these dates will change as the activities suggest that they do change, but right now there's a scheduled conference call for September 22nd, a face-to-face meeting on September 28th and 29th, another face-to-face meeting on October 25th, 26th, and 27th, a face-to-face meeting November 16th and 17th,

and a conference call meeting on December 6, 2011.

As I said, those are the scheduled meetings. These meetings are fluid. They will change as the activities dictate.

On the second page of the report some more activities. The LNPA procurement timeline was revised and submitted to the NANC, the SWG, and the FCC. There will be an SWG report given to the NANC today, and that timeline was worked on yesterday and approved.

A RFI public notice was developed and submitted to the FCC. That is still pending. The RFI draft was revised and submitted to Commissioner Why for submission to the SWG for approval with a copy to the FCC.

Again the SWG report that's coming up will explain what happened on that, we worked on that yesterday. And the FoNPAC will continue to work toward the on time completion of the milestones and tasks outlined in the procurement timeline.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much. Are there any questions about this report? Okay, thank you.

I think actually nobody feels a great need for a break at this moment. We've been going about an hour and ten minutes.

#### **REPORT OF THE LNPA SELECTION WORKING GROUP (SWG)**

Because it follows right on, I'm going to turn to Co-Chairman Why and ask for the report of the LNP Selection Working Group which follows right after Mel's report and which just occurred yesterday. And this would be Item 9 in your agenda. It was emailed

out last night as soon as the group finished its work, and I think you have printed copies of it here. Commissioner Why, it's all yours.

COMMISSIONER WHY: Good morning, again. My name is Jeff Why, Commissioner at the Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Cable.

As many of you know, pursuant to FCC order 09-109, the Selection Working Group was formed to oversee the selection process of the LNPA.

So indeed, yesterday was our first meeting. Fourteen members attended this first meeting. Chairman Kane as many of you may recall appointed me as one of the Co-Chairs of the SWG at our last meeting I believe, and the first order of business actually at our meeting yesterday was to select the other two Co-Chairs as the order had requested.

So by vote two Co-Chairs were named along with me, Tiki Gaugler from XO Communications and Ann Berkowitz from Verizon Communications are the other two Co-Chairs.

There were probably two major action items after the selection of the Co-Chairs that we needed to accomplish, one was reviewing the timeline that the FoNPAC had presented to us and the NAPM had given to us as well. We reviewed it, made no significant changes to the timeline. There were some small edits to the timeline, and I think we agreed on the timeline and the dates.

The second major action item we actually worked on was looking and reviewing the RFI. Again, pursuant to the order, that is one of the charges for the SWG was to review and approve the RFI. We spent the bulk of our time in the meeting going through that. We have

made revisions. We're going to submit those revisions back to Mel and his group, and they will send it to the FoNPAC.

The SWG will reconvene with the FoNPAC on the 22nd of this month via teleconference to discuss those changes and come to an agreement on the RFI and then send it to the NANC Chair to send to the FCC.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Jeff, if I could interrupt before you go further, and I should have done it at the beginning since we do have some new folks, could you in two or three sentences explain what the Selection Working Group is selecting, what it's all about. Most of us here have been through the last year with the new orders and all --

COMMISSIONER WHY: Right. The new LNPA, the new administrator for numbering. One sentence I think.

**(LAUGHTER)**

And so our next meeting is next week on the 22nd. Other meetings are going to occur contemporaneously probably the day before the NANC meetings that occur quarterly, in person, and then we will have teleconference meetings as needed pursuant to the timeline. And that's the end of our report. Anything else? Tiki?

MS. GAUGLER: I just wanted you to know, my name is misspelled on the first and the second page, it has an R at the end.

COMMISSIONER WHY: Okay, Gaugler, I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any other questions? And I apologize, if there is anyone on the phone who has questions of any of these reports when I say any questions, please speak

up. It seems to me you've all been emailed the information.

Thank you very much Commissioner Why. I'm happy that this working group has gotten off to a start, it has gotten organized, and as you can see in your report here, the charge to the group and the membership is listed. Very good. Thank you.

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

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, number 10. As we're talking about the LNPA, let's get their report which will be Item 10 on the agenda. Gary, are you going to do that? Okay, thank you.

MR. SACRA: Thank you, Chairman Kane. Good morning, everyone. I'm Gary Sacra with Verizon. I'm one of the Co-Chairs of the Local Number Portability Administration Working Group. Our other two Co-Chairs, Linda Peterman with Earth Link and Paula Jordan with T-Mobile are also in the room.

The two main charges of the LNPA Working Group are to oversee and recommend any revisions that are necessary to the industry's local number portability process and also to develop technical requirements for recommended changes and upgrades to the number portability administration center databases and its interfaces to the service provider's local number portability local systems.

I have two items to report on today. One is a major effort that's ongoing in the working group and that's an update of the LNPA Working Group's Best Practices. These Best Practices have been developed over the years since the implementation of number

portability in 1997.

We're in the process now of going through each Best Practice one by one, refreshing them where necessary, making sure that they are still applicable and relevant to today's industry porting practices and any regulatory requirements that have been ordered and mandated over the years.

In some cases we've actually deleted a number of Best Practices because they're no longer relevant to today's porting world.

Our plan is once the review and the update of the remaining Best Practices are completed and we've reached final consensus in the working group on an overall Best Practices document, we would like to bring the updated and revised Best Practices to the NANC and review them with you.

Perhaps it may take over a series of meetings. We'll see how many we have left when we've completed the update of the document but once we bring the final document containing all the Best Practices to you and review them with you, we'd like to ask for your endorsement and then forwarding them to the FCC for consideration for adoption, but, that will take place at a future meeting.

We've made a first pass through of the document of all the Best Practices. We've got a number of open action items that still have to be completed. And then each service provider is going to take the document back internally, review them with their companies back home, come back prepared to reach consensus on a final document.

And once we get it packaged in a format that we think would be most suitable for

presenting to the NANC, then we will arrange for a future meeting to review that with you.

And in the same line with Best Practices, the working group did reach consensus and approved a Best Practice related to customer service records.

A customer service record or a CSR is a record of a customer's telephone numbers, the services contained, their name, address, the account number, all of the working telephone numbers that are associated with the account, quite a bit of data.

CSRs are requested for a number of reasons. In the context of local number portability, in a lot of cases they are requested in order to obtain the customer's account number because the account number is one of the required fields on a simple port request which is used for one day porting.

The customer may not always have the account number available, may not know what their account number is, and they may not be in a position to obtain it quickly. And certainly their expectation when they contact a service provider either by phone or by walking into a kiosk, their expectation is that they would be able to initiate the porting process immediately.

Well, in some cases because there's no industry standard for what data is required when the new provider in a port requests a CSR from the old provider in order to obtain the necessary information, in order to accurately complete a local service request to initiate the port process, what is happening is because there's no standard, providers are pretty much all over the map as to what data fields and what information they require before they'll honor a CSR request.

One of the instances that was brought to the LNPA Working Group is that some providers are requiring the customer's account number in order to honor the CSR request when in fact that's the reason why the CSR request was initiated by the new provider in a port was to obtain their account number so it is resulting in sort of a Catch 22. They were requesting the CSR to obtain the account number, but they were required to provide the account number in order to get the CSR.

So this has resulted in some cases where the customer is becoming frustrated, walking away because they didn't have the account number available at the time, and didn't want to come back at a later time with the account number in order to initiate the porting process.

Also at the very least it has added delays to the porting process. In some cases when the expectation is a next day port it can actually add another day or perhaps even two days before the account number is obtained in order to get the CSR.

So the working group over the past few months has been working on a Best Practice in order to develop a recommendation for what data fields, what information would -- standard information would be required in order for the new provider in a port to submit a CSR request to the old provider in the port. And we just reached consensus on that recommendation this week at the working group meeting.

If I can direct you to go over actually to page two through four in the report, here is the actual Best Practice. A lot of the information in the front of that Best Practice is just information on what requirements have already been adopted in terms of customer service



record requests. These were adopted as part of FCC orders 09-41 and 10-85 which addressed next day porting.

But, if I could direct you to page three, this is the actual decision recommendation that was developed at this week's working group meeting.

The three pieces of information that we are recommending be required or the only three that can be required on a CSR request would be any working telephone number associated with the customer's account. Certainly that is information that the customer has readily available, they can provide that at the point of contact with the new service provider if they wish to move their service to and port their number to.

Then a positive indication that the new provider has obtained the proper authority which is a requirement not only for porting but also a requirement for requesting a customer service record as well, and then the date that that authority was obtained.

A lot of providers, many providers have found that that is very useful information especially when it comes to disputes over whether or not the new provider in the port request has obtained the proper authority from the end user or the customer.

So those are the three pieces of information that the working group believes should be required for a customer service record request.

Many providers in the industry today, those are the only pieces of information that they require on a CSR request, so we believe by moving to a standard set of requirements for a CSR request it will not only standardize the process but it will make a much more efficient and a streamlined process for the consumer as well.

So as we have been with a number of Best Practices we've been bringing and reviewing with the NANC, we would respectfully request that the NANC endorse this Best Practice and forward it to the FCC for consideration for adoption, and to direct the working group to incorporate this once adopted into the NANC LNP provisioning flows which is the overall industry's porting process that the service providers abide by. Questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, so this is a recommendation for action that we endorse this. This is our first action item today.

MR. SACRA: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Let me just start with a question. On number one, the recommendation that the telephone number be what the new service provider has to put into the customer service record request.

MR. SACRA: That would be any working telephone number.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any working telephone number. The basis of that is it's the old service provider who knows what the account number is and the customer may not always know what their account number is.

MR. SACRA: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And this is going to the current service provider.

MR. SACRA: Right. And then what would be returned would be all the necessary information.

CHAIRMAN KANE: The account number which is required by the order would come back from the old service provider.

MR. SACRA: Correct.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Are there any questions first of all or discussion on this recommendation that the NANC endorse this as a Best Practice, and we distinguish between Best Practices and actual rules and requirements but they do have some status when they are recommended to the FCC.

MR. SACRA: That's correct and this would be Best Practice 70.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Best Practice 70. Yes.

MS. CARDWELL: Valerie Cardwell with Comcast. Gary, can you just clarify a little bit on when you say a positive indication that the proper authority has been obtained, is it like a question you would say yes to?

MR. SACRA: It's a check off box basically.

MS. CARDWELL: Okay, and then when it says the date that the authority was obtained, is that like the date that the customer initially called in? What's that date?

MR. SACRA: Whether it was a letter of authorization or a third party verification, but it would be the date that that authority was obtained from the customer.

MS. CARDWELL: But just to clarify because this is becoming an issue with certain carriers, this is not intended in any way to make a requirement that the new service provider actually sends an LOA -- anything regarding that nature?

MR. SACRA: It's a very good question and we had a lengthy discussion about that this week. This by no means supersedes or is intended to supersede the current requirement where the actual physical authorization has to be presented to the old provider before they'll

honor either a CSR request or a local service request for porting.

That's not a requirement as you well know that it actually be physically presented before that process will kick off if it has to be obtained, and the only thing required not only on an LSR but also on a CSR request is that check off box just indicating that the authority has been obtained.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any other questions? Yes.

MS. HOWARD: Suzanne Howard, Cox Communications. Gary, on one, any working telephone number, is that only the numbers that are being ported or is it a requirement now that all numbers on the account be included in that?

MR. SACRA: In fact it's any working telephone number associated with the account. It doesn't even necessarily have to be eventually one of the numbers -- it could be a partial port that's being set up for example. It doesn't have to be one of the numbers that are being ported.

Obviously the LSR when that's submitted has to be only the numbers that are ported but in order to obtain the account information, in order to make this as easy on the consumer as possible, we're just suggesting that it just be any working telephone number associated with the account and then the LSR would have the specific numbers to be ported.

MS. HOWARD: Okay, wonderful. And also in the last four words, in case of a dispute, is that a dispute launched by the old carrier or the customer? I'm trying to figure out if somebody can use a dispute process to delay the port.

MR. SACRA: Well, in fact in my many years involved with portability I'm not

aware of too many disputes but it could be initiated by the old provider who for whatever reason is not satisfied that the new provider has obtained the authority. I guess it could be initiated by the end user themselves as well.

MS. HOWARD: I'm assuming if that becomes an abusive process you'll be reporting to --

MR. SACRA: Oh, absolutely. I'm not aware that has been an issue over the years.

MS. HOWARD: Good, fabulous.

MS. CARDWELL: Valeria Cardwell with Comcast. I have a follow-up question, Gary. It starts off by saying that, you know, there's no change that a CSR is not required, right, to be pulled.

MR. SACRA: Right.

MS. CARDWELL: So if a carrier doesn't pull the CSR, whether they do or not, when they submit the LSR there's no again indicator that they have to say that a CSR was obtained or that the customer did the LOA. So this is only addressing a carrier pulling the CSR for record purposes potentially to submit the LSR but there's no requirement to do so nor does the LSR require them to say you've pulled the CSR.

MR. SACRA: That's absolutely correct.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Just for my information, when this becomes a Best Practice, one, two, three, when it's all put together, given some of the questions that were raised here is there some explanatory material that goes with that that explains some of these things or do people have to look at the record of the discussion here?

MR. SACRA: We can certainly add what you feel is necessary. Right now this is the current --

CHAIRMAN KANE: Unless the industry doesn't feel its necessary, this becomes general knowledge.

MS. HOWARD: Suzanne Howard, Cox Communications. I don't want a delay for purposes of --

CHAIRMAN KANE: Right, of any additional information or explanation. Any further questions or discussion? This is another step in the implementation of one day porting to make it more consumer-friendly as well as making it work right.

Is there any objection to this recommendation that this be forwarded to the FCC as a Best Practice?

FEMALE SPEAKER:(Off microphone). Are you allowing objections outside the group (unintelligible)?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Am I allowing objections outside the group. We do provide for public comment but it's the members of the NANC. You know, the public comment is at the end.

So for the record it is the members of the NANC who do vote, but we will take any public comment at the end and that will be part of the record obviously that the FCC will also have available to them.

That being said I will determine that there is unanimous consent to forward this to the FCC as a Best Practice.

MR. SACRA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Speaking of local portability because I had asked Mel with his report, do we have any kind of report on how it's going?

MR. SACRA: The one day porting?

CHAIRMAN KANE: One day porting, particularly adding in the smaller carriers. It's been a while now since it became operational. Do we see any problems? Is it working well?

MR. SACRA: It's going so well that we've actually stopped talking.

**(LAUGHTER)**

No, we haven't stopped talking about it but it is going very well. The process is working fine, not only with the implementation with larger carriers but also with the smaller carriers back in February. The process is working.

We do have a sub-team in the working group that is working on a Lessons Learned document, and we will also be bringing that at a future meeting to the NANC.

The main purpose of that is just to guide us for future mandates future implementations that have major changes to the porting process that the one day porting order had. And again everything seems to be working fine at this point.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Very good. We spent a lot of time and a lot of people put a lot effort and a lot of thought into what the rules should be, what the requirements should be, and it's good to see that it does -- we will look forward to that Lessons Learned and that report. Marilyn.

MS. JONES: Marilyn Jones, FCC, DFO. I just wanted to mention that the Bureau has released the PN to seek comment on the LNPA Best Practice 67. And as you may recall that Best practice recommended a set of standard thresholds and intervals for non-simple ports and project ports and the project ports were ports that involved a large quantity of numbers.

They has been a varying definition about what those were and how to handle them so this Best Practice addressed that issue and we have put it out for comment and the comment period is 30 days after the Federal Register publication.

And I didn't have enough copies for all the NANC members. I will get copies during the break for the NANC members and the public members.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much. Any other questions? Yes, go ahead.

MS. HOWARD: One final question. Suzanne Howard, Cox Communications. Gary, I'm trying to remember, I thought there was going to be some kind of report to the NANC on compliance of 09-41.

MR. SACRA: Actually we did talk about that this week. What we agreed to this week was that because of the confidential nature of the data, in fact Mel Clay spoke to it earlier in his report of the NAPM LLC, the Medium Timer Indicator report that's up on the secured website, and for those that are not familiar with that, for the shortened porting interval for next day porting, it was necessary to develop a set of timers in the NPAC, shorter timers in order to meet the one day porting implementation.



So in order to support next day porting, a service provider has to change their local systems to support this shorter timer and so the Medium Timer Indicator if it's set to true on this list in the secured website, it's an indication that the provider has changed their systems and is complying with next day porting requests.

If it's set to false then they haven't changed their local systems or the assumption is they haven't changed their local systems to support next day porting.

Well, this is confidential data and the compliance report that we were developing was derived from that confidential data so we were I guess concerned number one, of I guess making public this confidential NPAC data.

Number two, we were also concerned that it's such a moving target that we were concerned about falsely labeling a provider as being non-compliant when in fact they were either in compliance and we just didn't have the most current data, or perhaps they weren't even required to be in compliance.

There are a number of service providers that connect to the NPAC that only have large business accounts so next day porting is not even applicable to them so there would be no need for them to change their local systems to support next day porting requests because all of their ports are non-simple ports and therefore not applicable to a next day port.

So we had a lot of concerns about sharing this list publicly. Certainly if there's a way of assuring that there's no repercussions for perhaps having a provider on that list that is labeled as non-compliant but in fact either is compliant or is not required to be compliant, then certainly that will alleviate one of our major concerns but the other concern simply is

it's just derived from confidential data that is not disclosed to the public.

So what we advise providers to do because all providers that are connected to the NPAC can have access to the secured website.

If they're an NPAC user, they can go on the NPAC, review that list, see the current state of what providers have set their MTI profile to, and then if they believe that provider should be compliant to a next day porting order and they're shown as not supporting it, then they can work one-on-one with that provider, or I guess file a regulatory complaint if they believe that provider should be compliant but is not.

So that's kind of where we left it at this week's working group meeting. Now certainly we're open to further discussion and suggestions or how to alleviate our concerns but most of the providers in the working group had that concern about sharing that publicly at this point in time.

CHAIRMAN KANE: I do hope that you will take a look at how you could give us some kind of report though.

I know we deal with this at State Commissions too where we have reporting requirements for compliance, consumer complaints, et cetera, and do find sometimes ways to do it with aggregate information without naming names and without being too specific.

But I think it would be good, particularly since next February it will be almost a year into the small carriers even, if we could get some kind of report, you know, number of complaints filed, number of carriers that seem to be compliant, some aggregate data at least or overview. I think it would be helpful.

MR. SACRA: Okay, I can take that back to the working group and we can certainly discuss that.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you. We only have a few items left but we've been here awhile. We're going to take about a ten minute break. Come back at 11:30 a.m. We should be able to finish by noontime. Thank you.

MR. SACRA: Thank you, everyone.

## **STATUS OF THE INDUSTRY NUMBERING COMMITTEE (INC)**

### **ACTIVITIES**

CHAIRMAN KANE: We're back on the record. It is 11:35 a.m., and we are up to Item 11 on the agenda which is the report from Industry Numbering Committee, otherwise known as the INC, and Natalie McNamer is here to do that report. Natalie.

MS. MCNAMER: Thank you, Chairman. My name is Natalie McNamer. I am the INC Chair along with my Vice-Chair which is Dana Crandall with Verizon Wireless.

The INC is the Industry Numbering Committee. It's an ATIS Committee that is responsible for writing the guidelines and updating the guidelines for numbering resources.

Since our last NANC meeting we've had one INC virtual meeting and two face-to-face meetings. Our next meeting will be in October in St. Louis. Details on our future meetings can be found on the INC website.

The first item we wanted to cover with you today is on slide number three. It's Subcommittee Issue 698, which is the auto-population for total numbering resources on the Thousands Block Pooling Assignment Guidelines Months-to-Exhaust Form.

This issue was accepted to address some state public commission staffers concerns regarding the validation of the information on total resources on the Months-to-Exhaust Form.

Today the validation must be performed manually if the state commission staffers would want to do that. There is no automated validation in the PAS system.

So the INC has reached consensus that it's going to create a new total numbering resources report that will be made available for viewing or downloading in the PAS system that will demonstrate and calculate the total numbering resources by state and PA rate center and rate center for each of the OCN and a past users profile.

This new report will be available to both the service providers, service provider consultants, and the state staffers which have authority to views their states information, and of course the FCC.

In addition to creating that new report, the NANPA on their external websites, will also add a field into their reports to show that there is a pool code indicator and that will be able to be updated if a code goes from pooled to non-pooled. So it can be looked at right on the external NANPA website.

This is what you had learned earlier on change order 22 for both the NANP and the PA that has been submitted to the FCC and is waiting for approval.

The next issue we wanted to review with you was Issue 714.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Before you proceed, may I ask Marilyn if you know kind of the status of that within the Commission? It was about a month ago it was sent up for

approval.

MS. JONES: This is Marilyn with the FCC. I know at the division level our technical representative person did approve that change order and it's now with OMD at the FCC level so a mod has to be created to modify those contracts.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, so it's moving up the chain.

MS. JONES: Yes, it's moving up the chain, one last step.

**(LAUGHTER)**

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much.

MS. MCNAMER: And the FCC in recent months has been really approving change orders very quickly. The NOWG submits the recommendation. And on these two change orders we waited a little bit before submitting our recommendation to the FCC because 21 and 22 was submitted at the same time so we held off on 22 while we were still talking about 21.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you.

MS. MCNAMER: The next item is at the March NANC meeting Chairman Kane you had let us know about some concerns that some of the states staffers had regarding the seven calendar application processing timeframes that was too short.

And so I had contacted some of the state staffers, and Dana Crandall and myself were able to create Issue 714 to address some of the concerns that the state staffers had.

There are three main concerns that we addressed under this issue that the states were recommending that we change the application processing timeframe from seven calendar

days to seven business days.

And the states requested that they be given authority to approve all block requests prior to -- by the NANPA or the PA, and that states may request application materials under FCC rules but they don't always get that information so that the states may request that NANPA or the PA deny the application. That's per FCC rules.

So INC has reviewed the issue, and we've placed it into initial closure. For the first item on the processing timeframe changes, we declined to change the application processing time for a few reasons, one reason being that extending that time extends the total quantity of days before a block or code becomes effective and it's not in the best interest of our consumers.

Carriers need access to numbering resources to be able to be competitive and it could increase the timeframe and delay our ability to actually serve customers.

Another reason was that the FCC has contracted with the NANP and the PA to approve and deny the service provider's applications for resources thus it's not necessary and it's contrary to the FCC's establishment of a national and neutral numbering administration to add in the other player for approval.

In FCC 00-429, paragraph 123 it actually describes the states limited role with regard to the numbering resources applications. And I put that on there for you so I don't need to read it. So for those reasons we are not going to extend the timeframe.

The next item is for them requesting and receiving the application materials. The INC made text changes to the COCAG and the TNPAG to establish a one business day

timeframe for the service providers to supply the states with the documentation that they're requesting.

Any questions on that one?

The next item was INC Issue 709 and its updates to the p-ANI guidelines and forms. As Amy had presented earlier, the Pooling Administrator is working on implementing the change order for p-ANI. That instruction came from a letter from the FCC that provided clarification to them regarding the p-ANI and that came in December of 2010.

So we've been working on getting the INC guidelines up-to-date with the FCC clarifications to avoid any conflicts when it's time to launch when it comes to March 19, 2012.

Another item we wanted to review is Issue 690 which was the update Toll Free Resource Exhaust Relief Planning Guidelines.

We reviewed those guidelines for updates. After communication with other ATIS committees and non-ATIS committees, we determined that it's SNAC which stands for the ATIS SMS 800 Number Administration Committee.

It's their responsibility to forecast and project exhaust of existing toll free resources, thus, the Toll Free Resource Exhaust Relief Planning Guidelines are no longer needed.

We do realize that adequate notification is necessary so we added text to the NPA Code Relief Planning and Notification Guidelines to outline NANPA's responsibilities regarding this industry notification.

On slide eight we have NARP Subcommittee Issue 703 which is Reservation of

Future PCS and NPA Codes beyond the 5YY Series.

As John Manning reported earlier today, we are running through the 5YY numbers pretty consistently, and we'll be implementing a new one towards the end of this year or early next year.

So the INC already had the 522, 577, and 588 and NPAs reserved, but we did go ahead and reserve additional NPA codes in the 52X, 53X, 54X, 55X, 56X, 57X, and 58X NPAs for future 5YY use for PCS with a total of 22 additional NPAs. So those are already reserved so that once we need them the NANPA can go through and get those implemented.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Natalie, can you give us some examples of the uses of PCS?

MS. MCNAMER: There's many reasons and the reason why it's going through now is a lot service providers now are using these type of resources for data applications and machine-to-machine type services so that we are not using geographic numbers in the states thus exhausting NPAs that customers are using for dialable numbers.

So the international committees are working on machine-to-machine type solutions but those are many years down the road so for the interim we -- and we're doing a lot of issues at the INC for the guidelines to bring them up to speed with the current uses that are being done today.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Yes.

MS. ANGLAND: This is Cyd Anglin from AT&T. I was thinking that the 5YY definition had been updated to be different than PCS.

MS. MCNAMER: We are working on that. That issue has not gone into final



closure. There are two issues that we're working on and one is ready to go into final closure but we want to put them into initial closure simultaneously thus having only one change order from the administrators to encompass all the major changes we're trying to do.

CHAIRMAN KANE: I'll just ask on the PCS because it has come again from a State Commission, we are dealing on the electrical side, with all of the SMART grid and the automation of the electrical distribution system.

And one of the issues there obviously, what it really is, is just putting communications on the electrical distribution system and there may be a great increase there in as you say machine-to-machine kinds of communications, some of which might go over a telephone network and that's an example of the increase in use in the 5YY.

MS. MCNAMER: Right, and that would be because that's what we're doing at the INC, is writing that we would recommend that these be used and not using, you know, a state, an actual geographic resource and area code.

So I mean relief planning is not fun I don't think for anybody, consumers, or carriers, or anybody, so it's just better for us all to not be using a resource that could exhaust and cause anybody to spend anymore money at a consumer level.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you.

MS MCNAMER: The next item we wanted cover is Issue 701 and it's add information to the guidelines regarding NPA implementation steps for a new NANP entrant. There are no steps currently in the guidelines that tell the new NANP entrant and service providers how to implement a new NPA once it's been assigned so there are tests that need

to be completed for this to happen.

The INC did add a new section to the guidelines to provide such guidance to the new NANP entrant and its service providers, and we also documented the necessary information required for the NANPA planning letter and the need for semi-annual forecast data so that the NANPA can project the exhaust of the NANP.

Then slide ten shows the issues that we are holding in initial pending. 534 will go to final closure once the p-ANI change order is implemented. The same for Issue 698, that's change order 22. Issue 710 is change order 21 that the NOWG is working on with the administrators.

The next slide, slide 11, shows issues in initial closure and then since our last NANC meeting slide 12 shows the issues that we've placed into final closure.

Then the last page of our presentation just shows the INC web pages for your reference. And that will conclude the INC's presentation unless there are any questions.

CHAIRMAN KANE: One more question. Just go back to your first two, the Subcommittee Issue 698 on the auto-population of the numbering resources which is making more information available, like it's automatically. And then relate that to Issue 714 where the states did ask for more time.

Is there some connection there in the sense that when 698 is implemented, states will have already some more up-to-date information so that it may help alleviate the time problem also and the review problem?

MS. MCNAMER: We believe it will because currently they have to go into PAS

and they can go into the NANPA web site. They have to coordinate between different reports to try to figure out what's going on and if they have a question then they come to the service provider, and then we try to figure out where they're getting their information.

So by everyone being able to see the same information especially if the state has a question, we know exactly what they're looking at and we can get them the answers they need quicker.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you. Are there any other questions on this? Yes.

MR. EMARD: Jean-Paul Emard - I'm the Director of Industry Forums for the Alliance Telecommunications Industry Solutions or ATIS, and INC is one of my responsibilities.

There is a training manual that we have prepared on behalf of the NANC membership, and this training manual has a number of sections within it. One of the sections we found which was written is incorrect, and I would like to ask that we be given permission to correct that and then be able to resubmit the information.

The incorrectness is something that -- there was an intent that is not stated and that intent needs to be put into the record. Thank you.

MS. MCNAMER: Jean-Paul is referring to the NANC Training Binder.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes.

MR. EMARD: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you. Rosemary.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. The NANC Training Binder hasn't been officially updated since 2006. We made some formatting changes to it when I had an intern a couple of years ago but Kati Grigg has agreed to help me, so nice of her, to kind of maybe even take the reformats, make them a little nicer, and I can work with the Co-Chairs again to make sure if they have any changes or upgrades to their sections.

So I'm happy to take that on again and also to add the SWG's information to this whenever they have that done. So if you'd like I can have a draft to the NANC by the next NANC meeting, if possible.

CHAIRMAN KANE: That would be terrific. Thank you. Incorporating the changes just mentioned we appreciate that. It will be a great learning experience for your intern, just learning the acronyms, et cetera. We appreciate that. It's a changing industry and obviously the training manual needs to be changed.

Do you have any questions on the INC report? Okay, thank you very much, Natalie.

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

And the last report on our agenda is one of my favorite groups, the Future of Numbering. Who is presenting that? Okay, thank you.

MR. NEWMAN: Good morning, I'm Adam Newman with Telcordia Technologies, and I am one of the Co-Chairs of the Future of Numbering Working Group, FoN, along with Don Gray of the Nebraska PSC, and Jim Castagna of Verizon.

I'm actually going to skip us quickly to slide six for the new members which is the mission and scope of the Future of Numbering Working Group just to give you a quick

background of what we do.

At the Future of Numbering Working Group we explore changes to the telecommunications environment including new and future technologies and the impact of either marketplace changes or regulatory changes and innovations on telephone numbering and identification. And the scope is outlined there as well and of course if you have any questions on that you should feel free to see me after the meeting.

We have had one meeting since the last NANC meeting. It was a conference call last week. Our monthly conference calls during the summer essentially got cancelled as we got to them because we had no new issues or contributions submitted for those conference calls so the week before or a few days before when we've had no contributions or issues we try to cancel the calls and give people back their time.

Slide three is our active issue slide. We have four active issues. Issue one on new and future services, that issue is being held open for discussions and to monitor any ITU-T or other activities on the Future of Numbering.

Issue 002, Telematics and the use of NANP numbers. As with Issue 001, we have a consensus to keep this open and monitor developments at INC as Natalie just spoke about, and the M-2-M information and discussions that have been going on at the ITU-T study group two meetings which is the Numbering and Addressing Study Group at ITU as well.

Issue 004, geographic issues impacting NANP numbering policy decisions. This is pending input from the Issue Champion, and we have also agreed to keep an eye on both the CEPT which the Centralized European Regulatory Body in the ITU because they've done a

report on this issue and we have also looked at that and are keeping our eyes on that activity as well.

And finally Issue 005, we discussed last meeting and did the final approval of the White Paper on the Commons versus Marketplace Model for Toll Free Numbers. That paper was approved on the 17th. There was an action item to publish that paper on the NANC website and for the NANC Chair to send that paper as an FYI to the FCC.

So I didn't know if that was done -- at the last meeting. I did send Madam Chairman and Mr. Co-Chairman the paper a couple of weeks ago, again to assist with completing that action item as needed.

CHAIRMAN KANE: I believe all the action items have been completed, but we'll double check on that particular one. Thank you.

MR. NEWMAN: Future activities on slide four, we will engage either any new issues or any of the open issues based on consensus of the working group, direction of the NANC, or contributions or issues submitted to the working group itself.

We generally meet the first Wednesday of every month. The next three of those meetings are listed here for anybody that would like to participate. The group is open to interested parties and if you would like to be added to the Future of Numbering e-mail address, just send me an email, and I'll be glad to do it. That is our report.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much. Any questions? You are looking at the machine-to-machine and the whole VoIP issue too.

MR. NEWMAN: So we are monitoring activity both here in the U.S. as

contributions come in and discussions at the International Telecommunications Union, ITU-T Study Group Two.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Very good, thank you. Any questions? This will go into the record as Item 12.

Okay, that concludes the formal reports from all of our working groups. Thank you all for all the work that takes place in between these meetings and the many phone calls, and conference calls, and in person meetings, et cetera.

### **SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS**

Summary of Action Items - Just for the record, we have taken one action item which is to recommend to the FCC adoption of Best Practice number 70 as recommended by the working group.

And also it wasn't an action item, but we have endorsed Rosemary's action to update the Training Manual which we will look forward to.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS AND PARTICIPATION**

Public Comments - any public comments? Members of the public? Yes, ma'am.

MS. BARSLIFE: Hi, my name is Melinda Barslife from Windstream Communications.

Earlier this week we attended the LNPA Working Group and expressed our objection to the Best Practice that was discussed today.

In particular we object to the conclusions that an OLSP should not be permitted to require an account number and more than a check in the box from the NLSP on CSR

requests.

We believe in those respects the Best Practice contradicts existing law and policy requiring carriers to safeguard sensitive customer data, in particular Section 222 of the Communications Act and the FCC's implementing rules obligate carriers to enact reasonable safeguards to protect proprietary data.

And a couple of years ago in the Number Portability Porting Interval order, the FCC stated a desire to have a balance between making porting easy for customers while at the same time safeguarding the privacy of customers and carrier information and insuring that customers are protected from unauthorized ports.

We don't feel that the Best Practice as stated strikes the appropriate balance and will likely be filing a Minority Report since I expect this will be approved by the group. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, thank you very much.

MR GREEN: Kevin Green, Verizon. Since the acquiring provider already has the authority from the customer to actually act as the customer's agent, it's not clear where the CPNI issue comes in.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. We've already approved it but obviously this opinion will be part of the record and will be also obviously known to the FCC on that issue.

Any other comments from the public?

Okay, the only other business is to announce that our next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, December 15th. There will be no snow.



**(LAUGHTER)**

And then at that meeting we will set the schedule for 2012 I think, which is very helpful to know that schedule ahead of time.

So there being no further business, it says we're going to adjourn no later than 5:00 p.m. and we've accomplished that. Thank you. Good job.

**(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:

---