

**North American Numbering Council  
Meeting Transcript  
June 7, 2012 (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. Greg Rogers                        | Bandwidth.com, Inc.               |
| 5. Mary Retka                         | CenturyLink                       |
| 6. Valerie Cardwell                   | Comcast Corporation               |
| 7. Karen Reidy                        | CompTel                           |
| 8. Suzanne Howard                     | Cox Communications, Inc.          |
| 9. Matthew Gerst                      | CTIA – The Wireless Association   |
| 10. David Greenhaus                   | 800 Response Information Services |
| 11. Michael J. Shortley, III          | Level 3 Communications, LLC       |
| 12. Hon. Paul Kjellander              | NARUC - Idaho                     |
| 13. Hon. Swati Dandekar/Michael Balch | NARUC – Iowa                      |
| 14. Thomas Dixon                      | NASUCA                            |
| 15. Jerome Candelaria/Betty Sanders   | NCTA                              |
| 16. John McHugh                       | OPASTCO                           |
| 17. Scott Freiermuth                  | Sprint Nextel                     |
| 18. Anna Miller/Natalie McNamer       | T-Mobile USA, Inc.                |
| 19. Thomas Soroka, Jr.                | USTA                              |
| 20. Kevin Green/Ann Berkowitz         | Verizon                           |
| 21. Brendan Kasper                    | Vonage                            |
| 22. 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  
Marissa Johnson, Competition Policy Division  
Kiara Williams, Competition Policy Division  
Diego Ortega, Competition Policy Division

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

**IV. Documents Introduced.**

- (1) Agenda
- (2) NANC Meeting Transcript – March 29, 2012
- (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) Local Number Portability Administration Working Group (LNPA WG) Status Report to the NANC
- (10) Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report to the NANC
- (11) 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 March 29, 2012	6
3. Report of the North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA)	7
4. Report of the National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator (PA)	12

5. Report of the Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG)	14
6. Report from the North American Numbering Plan Billing and Collection (NANP B&C) Agent	26
7. Report of the Billing and Collection Working Group (B&C WG)	31
8. North American Portability Management (NAPM) LLC Report	33
9. Implementation of FCC Order on LNPA Selection Process	34
10. Report of the Local Number Portability Administration Working Group (LNPA WG)	35
11. Status of the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) activities	40
12. Report of the Future of Numbering Working Group (FoN WG)	44
13. Summary of Action Items	46
14. Public Comments and Participation (five minutes per speaker)	47
15. Other Business	47

**VI. Summary of the Meeting.**

CHAIRMAN KANE: Good morning. We will call to order the quarterly meeting of the North American Numbering Council.

It is just 10:00 a.m., and we are starting at our new starting time at the request of a number of members to make it easier to fly in the morning instead of the night before and also easier for those of us who forgot it was going to not start until 10:00 a.m. to actually be here on time. And, we will go at 10:00 a.m. from now on assuming in our future meetings that that works out for people so at least more people won't have to come in the night before although we are always happy to have you come to Washington the night before.

For the record, I am Betty Ann Kane, Chairman of the North American Numbering Council. We are meeting in the meeting room of the Federal Communications Commission at 445 12th Street, S.W. in Washington, D.C.

I want to recognize, we have three new members and alternates. Greg Rogers who is actually rejoining us is Deputy General Council of Bandwidth.com, and he was appointed in April as the primary NANC member from Bandwidth. So welcome back. Greg formerly was with us as a representative of Level 3.

And Greg's alternate, Mary Tuten, Vice President for Customer Experience for Bandwidth. Is Mary here? Okay, we welcome her.

Our third new member is Michael Shortley, who is Vice President for Legal for Level 3 LLC. Is Michael here? No, not yet.

And we do have the bridge open. So after I go around and ask for recognition of each of the members who are here, I will ask the people on the phone to also indicate they are here. And again, if you are on the phone, if you would also send an email to Deborah Blue so that we have that for the record and the name right, et cetera.

And also remember that when you do ask to be recognized, you're recognized to speak, take a quick pause so that the controller of the microphones can turn your microphone on and it will be recorded. They're not on all the time.

So to my left:

COMMISSIONER WHY: Jeff Why from Massachusetts Department of Telecom and Cable.

MS. ANGLIN: Cyd Anglin from AT&T.

MR. ROGERS: Greg Rogers with Bandwidth.com

MS. MCMANUS: Mary McManus, Comcast.

MR. REIDY: Karen Reidy, CompTel.

MS. HOWARD: Suzanne Howard, Cox Communications.

MR. GERST: Matt Gerst, CTIA.

MR. GREENHAUS: David Greenhaus, 800 Response.

MS. HALL: Carolee Hall, Idaho, PUC staff.

MR. CANDELARIA: Jerome Candelaria on behalf of NCTA.

MR. FREIERMUTH: Scott Freiermuth with Sprint Nextel Corporation.

MS. MILLER: Anna Miller, T-Mobile.

MR. GREEN: Kevin Green, Verizon.

MR. KASPER: Brendan Kasper, Vonage.

MS. JONES: Marilyn Jones, FCC.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Jeff, who is Co-Chair, I think, has a recognition to do.

COMMISSIONER WHY: Yes. It has come to our attention that Anna Miller from T-Mobile is retiring in June so congratulations Anna.

**(APPLAUSE)**

COMMISSIONER WHY: But very importantly Anna has provided valuable, service to the NANC. She has been on the NANC for 15 years, is that right, Anna?

MS. MILLER: (Off microphone, unintelligible).

COMMISSIONER WHY: And obviously you've worked on local number portability and you worked on pooling, so we just want to recognize your service to the NANC and to your work on behalf of all the wireless companies. So thank you Anna and happy retirement.

**(APPLAUSE)**

CHAIRMAN KANE: And wherever you go during your retirement you can take your number with you.

**(LAUGHTER)**

**ANNOUNCEMENTS AND RECENT NEWS**

Marilyn, do you have any recent news or announcements?

MS. JONES: No, I do not.

**APPROVAL OF MEETING TRANSCRIPT**

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you. Then our next item of business is approval of the transcript of the March 29, 2012 meeting. That transcript was sent out electronically. Are there any additions or corrections to that transcript? Are there any objections to approving the transcript? Then I'll determine by unanimous consent the transcript has been approved.

Let me go back. Is there anyone on the phone participating?

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

MR. DIXON: This is Tom Dixon, appearing on behalf of the NASUCA and the Colorado Office of Consumer Counsel.

MARY RETKA: Mary Retka from CenturyLink.

MR. SHORTLEY: Michael Shortley from Level 3.  
MS. PETERMAN: Linda Peterman, Earth Link Business.  
MR. HUTTON: This is John Hutton for Commissioner Sara Kyle.  
MS. SANDERS: Betty Sanders, NCTA.  
MS. HYMAN: Linda Hyman, NeuStar Pooling.  
MR. HEPBURN: Christopher Hepburn, Pennsylvania Public Utility

Commission.

MR. KJELLANDER: Paul Kjellander, Idaho Public Utilities Commission.

MR. CARPENTER: Jay Carpenter, 1-800 AFTA.

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

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, we have ten people on the phone. Very good, again remember to send in an email to Deborah Blue recording that you were here.

COMMISSIONER DANDEKAR: Swati Dandekar from Iowa Utilities Board.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Anyone else? Very good. We have approved the transcript.

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

### **ADMINISTRATOR (NANPA)**

The next item is the report of the North American Numbering Plan Administrator.

Who is providing that? Beth, yes, there you are.

We will label the agenda as Item 1, the transcript as Item 2 for the record, and this report will be Item 3 for the record.

MS. SPRAGUE: Thank you. My name is Beth Sprague from the North American Numbering Plan Administration, and I'll be covering the NANPA report today.

The first page, CO code activity for the last four months, you'll notice there is really nothing unusual. It's very much in line with assignments, denials, and returns for the past four years at this time so there's really nothing that jumps out at you on the CO code activity.

Going down to the NPA assignment activity, we had no new area codes assigned in 2012, but we have had three area codes that have been placed into service since the beginning of 2012.

The first one you see there is the area code 667. That's the overlay of the 410/443 in Maryland overlay. That went into service on March 24th. That's planning letter 427 on our NANPA website. That one was pretty easy because the mandatory ten digit dialing was already in place so that was a relatively short implementation timeline.

The next one down there you see in the NPA 566. This is still called the Personal Communication Service. It's a non-geographic area code. That went into service April 17, 2012. That's planning letter 436. So now that joins the other PCS codes, still called PCS 500, 533, 544 so now it will also be 566. So that was the non-geographic one.

And then the third one that went into service was NPA 984 in North Carolina, the overlay over 919. That went into service April 30, 2012, planning letter 422. That one had been suspended for a long time. The order was from 2001 but then it had been indefinitely suspended and then a new order came out in 2011 and it's now in service.

And there are also two area codes with future in service dates for this year. One is

NPA 873, an overlay over 819 in Quebec. The planned in service date is September 15, 2012, planning letter 425.

And the other one is area code 669, overlay of NPA 408 in California. The planned in-service date is November 20, 2012, that's planning letter 430. And this one, CO codes could be ordered in the 669 as of May 20th, so a few weeks ago but as long as the effective date is not prior to the in service date of November 20th. And there's also one area code that had been assigned and it's been moved to reserve status in April of 2012. That's the Pennsylvania area code 582 that was going to relieve 814. That area code was returned to reserve status on April 26th per the Pennsylvania PUC April 26th order.

Any questions so far?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Questions from the phones?

MS. SPRAGUE: Okay, going on, on the next page the status of those codes exhausting in the next 36 months and as usual, there is an attachment showing all the relief activities for those codes that are going to be exhausting.

The 408 which I just mentioned, that's going to go into service later on this year. Other NPA relief activities, the Kentucky 270. We conducted NPA relief planning meeting for 270. The industry reached consensus for an overlay and NANPA filed a petition on behalf of the industry on April 2nd.

For 814, we already covered that one. The decision to rescind or put the 584 back to reserve status has already been done.

Nevada 702, there was a relief planning conducted on April 26th for the 702. The

industry is recommending an all services overlay. The 702 is currently projected to exhaust in third quarter 2014. The petition was filed on behalf of the industry yesterday, June 6th. So we will be waiting for an order for that.

Texas 512, May 17th the Texas PUC conducted a public meeting. The PUC reviewed the all service overlay plan to introduce the new 737. So we're waiting for an order from the PUC so we can schedule a relief planning meeting. And the Texas PUC, I believe they're meeting today so hopefully an order will be coming soon on that.

And then also the Nebraska 402, Nebraska approved an all service overlay as a relief method for 402. The new 531 will cover the same area. Mandatory ten digit dialing started February 26th and per the PSC direction, will not assign codes from the new 531 until all the remaining 402 codes, or actually until the remaining 402 codes are at a level of ten codes. That's planning letter 410. As of now there are still 30 codes.

And one other thing in other NPA relief activities, the NANPA on behalf of the industry filed an addendum for Arkansas 870, and this is not on the readout, to suspend the 327 overlay. That planning letter suspending that overlay in Arkansas will be coming out on June 18th.

Just a few other things, other NANP and NANPA news, the 2011 NANP annual report was posted on our website on March 30th. The first quarter 2012 NANPA newsletter was also published and that's under publications on our website.

And the NANP exhaust projections as well as the NPA exhaust projections were posted to our website on April 26th and in these projections we've also included exhaustive 5YY

which will soon be called 5XX codes. We're going to be doing this going forward on a semi-annual basis. That was a suggestion of the INC, the Industry Numbering Committee.

Any questions on that?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Questions? Yes.

MR. CANDELARIA: (Off microphone, unintelligible) -- the basis of that request for a suspension in Arkansas? Did they give a reason?

MS. SPRAGUE: The industry got together. They had a trigger to meet and the forecast had moved I think almost five years, over five years. This was really the result of a return of a large amount of codes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Any other questions? Any questions from the phone?

Thank you, Beth.

CHAIRMAN KANE: While Beth was doing her report I heard some beeps on the phone. Has anyone new joined on the phone bridge who was not identified before?

MS. BEATON: This is Rebecca Beaton on Washington State Commission staff.

MS. JORDAN: This is Paula Jordan, T-Mobile, LNPA Working Group.

MS. MOREHOUSE: Katy Morehouse, California.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay and we've also been joined by XO Communications, Representative Tiki Gaugler, for the record. Thank you.

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

All right, our next item is the report of the Thousands Block Pooling Administrator.

We will mark this report as Item 4 for the record. Amy Putnam.

MS. PUTNAM: Good morning, pooling is fine. pANI on the other hand -- okay, on the first page we have the summary data for activity through April, our rolling 12 month cycle and you will note on the bottom, we're going to be reporting on pANI summary data as well and there was a big jump as expected from March to April when we moved from interim pANI to permanent pANI status, permanent routing number administrator status.

Second slide, the part three summary data for pooling is nothing out of the ordinary.

The third slide, the number of codes opened for LRN dedicated customer and pool replenishment and the summary of rate center changes, again nothing extraordinary there.

We had one block reclaimed in April and we were up 100 percent of the time both for pooling, the pooling administration system PAS, and the routing number administration system, RNAS which went live on March 19th.

In our other pooling related activities we submitted all of our reports in a timely manner. There were no contract modifications issued by the FCC since our last meeting.

There's currently one petition for additional delegated authority pending before the FCC. That's Montana, the 408 NPA which is the one that covers the whole state and that was filed in November.

pANI administration, as of April 30<sup>th</sup>, we divide into interim and permanent at this

point. We have the final totals there for the interim. With respect to the permanent we are continuing to analyze the data we've received from pANI assignees showing situations where either the same pANI range or part of a same range is being reported by more than one carrier and we are trying to resolve those.

We've notified the affected carriers and that particular situation is the subject of an INC issue. The INC and ESEF, ECDR met jointly at AMOC and had a very useful discussion on that issue and there is a joint contribution that is the pANI administrator and T-Mobile that will be submitted to INC to revise the guidelines to address that issue.

The other areas where we have data problems and we're working on them is where no assignee has reported on a pANI range that the assignor reported as assigned or where the data shows that the state that the PSAP is indicated for is not the same as the state that the NPA of the PSAP shows and we're working to resolve those issues as well.

And there are issues where there are duplicates assignment issues regarding pANI's that are loaded in routing databases, where the assignees, the people who are using the pANI's are indicating that they are not using those but when we go to assigned them the entity that is running the routing database says well, this is loaded in my database and then we have to go back and confirm that in fact the pANI is not assigned to anyone, then go back to the database and ask them to scrub that and make that available.

And we are working with all of the involved entities on those and getting those cleaned up because there were situations where frankly if we didn't get those unused

pANI's out of the routing databases we would have had to open another NXX. So

we're cleaning those things out, getting the data cleaned up, and moving forward.

With respect to the NOWG, we participated in the regular monthly meetings. We attended the readout of our performance for last year. The NOWG gave us a More Than Met.

The change orders; because this report goes through the end of April it indicates we haven't submitted any change orders since the last NANC meeting. We did submit one, change order 23 on May 31st, which will show up in our next NANC report. The subject of that was providing a new radio button for retrieving blocks that were returned to the PA in error.

Other PA activities, Pooling Administration activities, actually these were both. We completed the 2011 annual report and posted that to our website. We had system maintenance on both PAS and RNAS. We had no down time for RNAS. For PAS we had scheduled down time where we updated the pooling administration system database to the latest major release of Oracle and that did require some down time which we scheduled ahead of time.

And finally the PA TRD went out for comments since our last meeting and, we filed comments as did AT&T. And that's it.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you, Amy. Are there any questions? Thank you very much.

MS. PUTNAM: Thank you.

**REPORT OF THE NUMBERING OVERSIGHT WORKING GROUP  
(NOWG)**

CHAIRMAN KANE: The next item on the agenda is the report of the NOWG, the Numbering Oversight Working Group. We will enter this report in the record as Item 5.

MS. MCNAMER: Good morning. My name is Natalie McNamer. I'm a Tri-Chair of the NOWG along with Laura Dalton of Verizon Communications, and Gwen Zahn of Verizon Wireless.

Our report today on page two, our contents we're going to cover, will be the 2011 PA Performance Report along with the NANPA's Performance Report.

We've held a Tri-Chair election. We will briefly review the PA and the NANPA change orders along with a brief discussion on the NANPA and the PA contract consolidation project. And then we also show in our presentation the participating companies of the NOWG along with our meeting schedule.

On page three, we are showing you a summary of the survey respondents for the PA survey. I think we had a very good turnout this year. There were 40 industry and other participants and 30 regulators.

The NOWG worked with the PA to make sure that most of the states that they work with regularly did complete surveys so we think we have a really good assessment of them for this year.

On the next page, the PA summary is that the annual performance assessment that the NOWG did was based on the performance feedback survey, the written comments and reports, the annual operational review, and the NOWG observations and interactions with the PA throughout the year.

For 2011, the NOWG reached a consensus to rate the PA as More Than Met. On page five we show you that, and we go through the description of what More Than Met means. It

means that they met and more often went beyond the performance requirements, that they provided more than what is required to be successful, their performance was more than competent, reliable, and their decisions and recommendations exceeded the requirements and our expectations.

The next few pages I'm not going to go over in detail. For your reference it's just the actual sections of the performance report and the aggregated responses of what was received.

If we move over to page nine, the following are some written comments that were provided from the survey respondents, was outstanding praise for the PA staff was a consistent theme throughout the survey. They provide a high level of support, assistance, and guidance. They are always professional, informed, and courteous. They are responsive, helpful, and thorough, and they go above and beyond to satisfy their customers.

Suggestions for improvements were mostly isolated for the Pooling Administrator. The comments pertained to some inconsistencies among the PA representatives and accuracy and timeliness of information provided, and past limitations and suggestions for system improvement of the PAS system.

So the NOWG has concluded that the written comments are not indicative of any consistent performance issues and in most cases provided significant praise for the individual staff members.

On page 12, the NOWG, part of the performance reports, we provide recommendations for the administrator's consideration. So, we're asking if they would consider continuing to review their internal training processes to insure that the consistency and

understanding the processes in response to service providers is communicated to the PA personnel.

Ongoing review of their website, which they currently do, to insure accuracy and timeliness of data and to work with the NOWG on determining the feasibility of automating Telcordia BIRRDs entries of the BCD data screen elements which are the entries that the Pooling Administrator provides into the BIRRDs system for (unintelligible) output that service providers then would do their side of it.

So we're looking at seeing if it's feasible to automate that process instead of individual pooling administrators manually doing the data entry.

And at this point the NOWG -- we sent the actual performance reports out two weeks ago to the NANC distribution so, we did not bring copies because we didn't want to kill that many trees since we gave the two weeks notice so that we could request that the NANC approve the report today. If both reports are approved we'll place them in final status and forward to you Chairman for transmittal to the FCC.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you. First of all are there any questions on the report? And secondly, we do have a request for action which is to approve the report and then forward it to the Chair where I would transmit it officially to the FCC.

Is there any discussion on that action item? Anyone on the phone? Very good. I will take it there is unanimous consent that the NANC approves the report and that when I receive the final version, I will transmit it to the FCC. Thank you very much.

MS. MCNAMER: The next item on slide 13 basically I'm going to review the

same information but from the NANPA report.

For the NANPA for this year, they received 37 industry and other participant surveys and 25 state, which the good thing is we're getting close now between the NANP and the PA of actually getting almost the same amount of surveys.

It used to be that there was a vast discrepancy between -- we had a whole lot of people putting in surveys for the PA and not many for the NANPA so we're kind of closing that gap so that we're making sure we're getting all the right players on their surveys.

On page 14, again the performance assessment is based upon all the same items as the PA's. On page 15 the NANPA's rating for this year based on consensus of the NOWG is an Exceeded. The Exceeded rating means that they exceeded their performance requirements, that they provided excellence above their performance requirements and exceeded our expectations.

Their performance was well above requirements and their decisions and recommendations exceeded the requirements and expectations so we're very happy to be able to give them an Exceeded for the year.

The next few pages again are just the sections and how many responses were for each of the ratings so we can kind of breeze through that.

If you move over to page 20, we have the summary of written comments. There was significant praise for the NANPA staff. In many cases provided praise for the individual staff members. The following recurring adjectives were used by multiple respondents to describe their experiences in working with the NANPA staff, friendly, helpful, and knowledgeable, professional, prompt, and courteous and competent, diligent, and informative.

All the comments that we received and this is the first year since I've been doing this, that either survey, they came back with absolutely no negative comments or anything that needed improvement so I think that right there in itself shows the excellent job that the NANPA has done in the year.

So after thoroughly reviewing all the comments received, the NOWG checked it a few times to make sure that we couldn't see any negatives and there were none, so everything showed that there is a high level of satisfaction experienced with everybody who interacts with the NANPA.

The NOWG makes the following recommendations in the report for the NANPA consideration: for them to continue to proactively search for ways to improve processes, educate customers, and enhance system functionality, to work with the NOWG again as we've asked the PA, on automating the BIRRDs entries from the administrator perspective, and to implement training videos that will be posted to the NANPA website for NRUF, NAS website, and other training in lieu of live meetings. And at this time the NOWG requests the NANC approval of the report.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Are there any questions on this portion of the report?

And we have a request for action that we approve the report and send it to the Chair for transmission to the FCC. Are there any objections or discussion of that request? I will take it by unanimous consent that that report is approved and also, I will transmit it to the FCC once we receive the final version. Thank you.

MS. MCNAMER: On slide 24, I'd like to inform the NANC that Gwen Zahn of Verizon Wireless has accepted a new position within her company and has resigned from her position as a Tri-Chair of the NOWG.

We held an election and Karen Riepenkroger was our only nomination so she has been elected by acclamation to serve as a Tri-Chair with her term ending at the end of 2013. Gwen's term was supposed to expire at the end of December but, per the NANC Operating Procedures, all elections, the term should be a minimum of one year so, we're putting it out to December of 2013.

And the NOWG is requesting NANC's concurrence with that election.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any objection to that request to concur with that election?  
Yes, sir.

MR. GREEN: This is Kevin Green, Verizon. No objection, I just wanted to recognize Gwen's hard work on this committee. We appreciate it and we'll miss her.

CHAIRMAN KANE: I think there is unanimous consent to that and unanimous consent on attesting to the election for her replacement. Thank you.

MS. MCNAMER: And the last item on my presentation is the outstanding PA change orders which the Pooling Administrator has reviewed with you and also the outstanding NANPA change orders. Those will be able to be implemented, the NANPA ones, until after the contract award.

The last item is at the March meeting the NOWG reported to the NANC that we were going to begin a project to look at benefits and risks associated with consolidating the PA and NANPA contracts into one contract.

With all the work that we've been putting in on the performance reports the NOWG has not had time to review this and the NOWG is requesting that the NANC approve for us to proceed with an in-depth evaluation of some of the benefits and risks in the consolidation. Some of our members felt that it would be better to have official NANC approval for us to work on this.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you. Is there discussion of this issue? Yes.

MS. ANGLIN: Cyd Anglin. I would just like to concur that AT&T supports that investigation. We think it seems logical. It seems like a good idea. We filed comments to that effect as well, so this is just in consistency with that.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes.

MS. MCNAMER: (Unintelligible). .....vis-a-vis the fact that the contract is out for bid, both of them are, and given the timing I see this as having a chilling effect on those negotiations. They're (unintelligible) in house with the FCC and once you conclude the investigation what are you going to do with after because I'm assuming it would come after the contract. The first question was, right now the NANPA contract was put out for solicitation already. Those responses were due on April 30th so those have already been delivered and just waiting contract award.

The PA TRD has gone out but a solicitation has not at this time. I have discussed with FCC staff about the process that we would cover. You know, the NOWG asked me to contact them to see how they wanted to go about that and this was the process that they recommended, was putting it through the NANC. They didn't indicate any concerns with the current process. The current contracts are written as one year contracts with four yearly renewals

so I think at any time --

FEMALE SPEAKER: So at what point during that contract would this -- if you decided and the FCC approved the consolidation, where would it go?

MS. MCNAMER: Well, what we're doing is trying to come up with a recommendation if we see benefits, asking for the NANC's approval and asking the NANC to just submit a recommendation to the FCC and it would be in the FCC's hands at that point. I mean the FCC did indicate in FCC00-104 in paragraph 152 when they gave out --

FEMALE SPEAKER: A studied response, huh?

MS. MCNAMER: Yeah. No, I have a really good memory and somebody brought it up at our last meeting that the FCC at that time was making the PA's contract separate and going through a separate bidding process but that they would consider in the future -- they identified that there may be efficiencies to consolidating it.

FEMALE SPEAKER: On the phone. When there's an opportunity --

CHAIRMAN KANE: (Off microphone, unintelligible).

FEMALE SPEAKER: I guess I'm wondering if it's going to be a surprise to the submitting vendors at this point.

MS. MCNAMER: Of which?

FEMALE SPEAKER: Either contract if you're going to consolidate them.

MS. MCNAMER: It could be. I mean, it's been announced at the NANC that the NOWG would look at it in March and we're not really doing anything with it but making a recommendation to the FCC.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Okay, just as a side note, what you can consider is maybe a hypothesis on what it might be expected to be a benefit without talking with the vendors, that's kind of subjective. And second of all there would be costs on the carrier side to make this consolidation.

MS. MCNAMER: Which is something we would discussed if we would talk about carrier costs and that type of stuff. That's why we haven't made a recommendation until the NOWG would be working on this as a project and trying to go through the due diligence to determine if there are benefits and risks, with the benefits and risks.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Do you have an idea when this will be completed?

MS. MCNAMER: Some folks are thinking September. I was thinking more like December, that it wouldn't be that quickly.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Anna.

MS. MILLER: T-Mobile supports at least looking at this evaluation and looking at the pros and cons and it seems like there is some interest in the industry perspective from the FCC on this but as we just approved, the NOWG goes through a lot of work every year doing the performance evaluations, the surveys, the operational reviews, and from an administrative standpoint, an efficiency standpoint, it might be easier to do that for one entity as opposed to do it twice for two entities.

And also I think, you know, some of the concerns of what it might mean from an vendor impact, I guess the timing of all this is up to the FCC but potentially in the long term

rather than have two smaller contracts, if there is a larger contract there might be more interest and there might be more vendors interested in that prospect. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. And we have someone on the phone who wanted to ask a question or a comment.

MS. RETKA: Madam Chair, this is Mary Retka from CenturyLink. I just wanted to make sure and point out because I sat in on one of the NOWG calls and I think what we're really looking at is both the benefits and the risks as Natalie has represented, and I know that that's some concern that some others have brought up as well.

We want to look at both sides of this as well as we're looking at it from a provider perspective and I think there were some that were concerned as one might be with anything that would deal with vendors when the procurement is ongoing.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. All right, is there further discussion? Yes.

MR. FREIERMUTH: Good morning. This is Scott Freiermuth with Sprint Nextel. I don't think I'm going to break new ground here but I just wanted to say also that Sprint supports the investigation or an evaluation here.

You know, it seems like there could be some efficiencies gained. You know, we reserve the right of course to evaluate or view the evaluation and make a decision down the road but, I think it certainly makes sense to take a look at this. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you. Any further discussion or questions?

All right, as I'm hearing pretty much consent and some concerns about the timing and about the scope of it, as I understand it the one contract, all the bids are in, they're being

evaluated, and then the other one, the second contract has not yet been put out for bid?

MS. MCNAMER: No, the TRD was released for comment but I'm not sure exactly, the contract is up in August but I'm not sure with the NANPA's being out and the B&C agents, that the FCC would be able to put that out by -- I don't know if it will be out by the August timeframe.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Is the NOWG recommending then that there be a delay in putting out that second contract until this recommendation comes?

MS. MCNAMER: We haven't discussed making that request of the FCC. When I had discussed it with them they had thought that the timing is not a problem because I had thought that when the NANPA contract came out this would be a moot point but because of the way the contract is that a year down the road it could change. I don't know.

CHAIRMAN KANE: But the contract hasn't been put out yet or is in processing of being put out which runs out in August.

MS. MCNAMER: Right.

CHAIRMAN KANE: So something needs to be done by August.

MS. MCNAMER: Right, or if they're not putting out a full solicitation it might be as with the NANPA that there were extensions put on it.

CHAIRMAN KANE: An extension of the current contract ending it. Okay, and you said either September or December you would have a recommendation back?

MS. MCNAMER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: All right, let me suggest then that we get a progress report,

as I'm hearing not a lot of objection at least to going ahead and looking at it, a progress report on how you're doing on the investigation, the kinds of things you're looking at, no conclusions, at the September meeting.

It's probably with an aim for a final recommendation to us in December, and then working with the FCC on what they're going to do about the current contract that would normally have been put out in August.

MS. MCNAMER: Okay, perfect.

CHAIRMAN KANE: So that we don't have any disruptions or uncertainty, and sooner rather than later. Is that acceptable as a way forward? Okay, thank you. Thank you very much.

MS. MCNAMER: Thank you. And then the next few slides of the presentation are just a listing of the NOWG participating companies and our current NOWG meeting schedule. Since we put this together we have added a couple of meetings with regards to the contract consolidation project.

On the last page it has all of our contact information so if a company does decide that they normally do not participate in the NOWG but would like to, especially with the contract consolidation project, they can feel free to contact any of the Tri-Chairs and we'll make sure you get all the information on the meetings. And that's all for me.

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

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much. All right, Item 6 on the agenda, the

report of the Billing and Collection Agent. And this document will be document number 6.

MS. MARCOTTE: Good morning. It's Faith Marcotte. We're the Billing and Collection Agent.

I'm going to start with a couple items on the bottom of page one, just an update on the contribution factor.

At the last NANC meeting we approved a factor of .000021. After that we received revenue information which suggested that we should increase the factor and we did increase the factor to 217, which was approved by NANC by email.

And then subsequent to this the FCC recommended that our contingency allowance of \$750,000 might not be enough and they asked us to increase to a million and half. And that meant the factor increased to 254. And that was approved and we sent the contribution factor notice to the FCC and it has now been finally approved and the invoices will be going out shortly based on that 254 factor.

And the second paragraph deals with a procedural change to how delinquent debt is now going to be handled. In the past we've been sending our delinquent debt to the FCC for collection and at that point after 90 days it went on the Red light site. Now a legal demand notice will go out with the invoice. We're hoping to attach it right to the back of the invoice so carriers can't miss it and the affect of this is that the debt is now legally enforceable as a debt to the U.S. government on the date of the invoice.

So at that date if the invoice is not paid the carriers will be put on the red light site. So it's right at the 30 days, if it's not paid at that 30 days it will go on to the red light site, and we

will now be transferring our debt directly to Treasury and not to the FCC at all and probably within 90 to 120 days we'll be making that transfer.

Are there any questions?

All right, so now we'll get to the financial side of things. On that same page one at the top we're looking at what the financial position of the Fund is.

We have \$1.6 million in the bank, \$194,000 in accounts receivable, \$400,000 owing to vendors and the makeup of those vendors is just below there, the \$400,000. That's just for the current month.

Page two shows a forecast of the Fund to the June 12th funding year. We had projected \$750,000. If you'll look in the total column, we originally projected that and we're now looking at what we think will be a \$961,000 balance compared to the budget on the next column.

In the bottom right hand corner you can see the makeup of that difference so it's a \$211,000 difference. The bulk of that is the \$300,000 that was put aside for carrier audits that were not performed and then there are other items in and out to balance it to the difference of \$211,000.

And then on following page is a forecast for the following year and as you can see, now the contingency allowance, we've provided it to reach a \$1.5 million when we get to June 2013.

On page four it's a list of what we expect in liabilities over the next six months and it's basically the amounts owing to the vendors other than the one amount for the operations audit, Ernst and Young.

And then on page five it's just a list of our deliverables. These are the items we do every month and everything is proceeding as normal. Nothing new is happening there other than what I mentioned earlier about the red light report is changing the dates of that.

Does anyone have any questions?

MS. RETKA: On the phone.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes.

MS. RETKA: Madam Chair, this is Mary Retka from CenturyLink. I wanted to call attention to the change in the red light and the impact that that could have if there's also a change in contract and a difference in where amounts are to be made to.

In the past we've had some changes of bank locked boxes that have caused confusion for carriers. You know, I brought this up in the last couple of NANC meetings and have found that in the last NANC meeting where we said it was going to go out in April, the solicitation has not yet gone out, and I want to call that to the attention of the NANC because of especially this change in the red light and how that could impact carriers in getting things filed at the FCC should there be confusion if there's a change in agent.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. The red light change has gone into effect already?

MS. MARCOTTE: It's in process now, the change.

CHAIRMAN KANE: In process.

MS. MARCOTTE: Yes, it's just starting.

CHAIRMAN KANE: It sounds like a legitimate concern that if that process

changes and a different location as a result of the contract decision for where -- these are July 1st payments?

MS. MARCOTTE: July 12th.

CHAIRMAN KANE: July 12th they'd be due. And the invoices have not gone out?

MS. MARCOTTE: No, they were going out by June 12th.

CHAIRMAN KANE: By June 12<sup>th</sup>, which is Tuesday.

MS. RETKA: Right, tight timeframe.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes.

MS. RETKA: Perhaps Madam Chair, if Marilyn Jones is there maybe she wants to -

CHAIRMAN KANE: I wonder if -- asking her to speak to it or if there could be some delay in putting this new red light system into effect for another 30, 60 days because of the possibility that we don't know who will be selected for the contractor but the possibility there might be a new one.

I know just from government and trying to -- I'm the Chief Contracting Officer for our agency and I'll sign off on things but, you know, if it comes to the wrong person it can take several months for it to get straightened out when there's been a change, bills coming to us or things I sign that go out and so putting it up on that red light, you know, that's public. We want people to pay. We see there were no delinquents last month but given that there may a change, I'm wondering if we could see if there's a possibility of delay in implementation of the new red light system for a couple more months. Marilyn.

MS. JONES: This is Marilyn from the FCC. I'm not directly involved with the red light process but what we can do, if there's going to be a change in vendors, I can insure that a public notice goes out from my division indicating how the carriers should proceed in sending payments if there's new addresses or anything that changes with that process I can put out a public notice to that effect.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Perhaps if you could also take a message back to the folks at the FCC who are implementing the red light system that this concern has been raised.

MS. JONES: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much. All right, thank you for the report. Moving right along, we've got the Billing and Collection Working Group. This is Item 7 on the agenda and the report will be document number 7. Tim.

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

MR. DECKER: Good morning, everyone. I'm Tim Decker with Verizon Communications and I Co-Chair the Billing and Collection Working Group with Rosemary Emmer with Sprint Nextel. Rosemary is unable to join us today. She is recovering from recent surgery, and we all wish her a speedy recovery.

Okay, I'll zip through this because most of what I was going to cover has already been covered by Faith.

So the second page is just our mission statement and our areas of responsibility. And then the third page covers the concern about the red light rule change. It covers our activities, which we have oversight over the Billing and Collection Agent, and we do an evaluation of the

deliverables monthly.

The third page explains what the contribution factor is, and I was going to spend some time on the fifth page except Faith has already covered all of that so I really don't need to. It explains exactly what she just covered. She made my report very easy.

The sixth page you see just the history of the contribution factor back from the beginning in March of 2000.

Page seven is our meeting schedule for the rest of the year. And page eight is the members of the Billing and Collection Working Group and we always encourage new members and anybody that would like to join us can either contact Rosemary or myself.

And our next meeting is Tuesday, June 19th. Anybody have any questions?

MS. RETKA: On the phone.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes.

MS. RETKA: This is Mary Retka from CenturyLink again, and I just wanted to make sure that it was -- and I appreciate what Marilyn offered as far as like a public notice on the red light, especially because there are a lot of carriers that are small carriers that aren't at the table and there are also other carriers who may not have the same process and may not see something that's on the back side of the bill.

So I think it would be important to do as Marilyn as brought up here that perhaps we ought to have something that just calls that out.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, thank you for underlining that. Are there any questions on Tim's report? Okay, we'll put that in the record. I think you're going to do the next report

also?

MR. DECKER: Yes, ma'am.

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

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, go ahead. This is the NAPM LLC report.

MR. DECKER: Okay, thank you. Again, I'm Tim Decker with Verizon Communications, and I Co-Chair the North American Portability Management LLC with Mel Clay with AT&T.

As it's been lately, this is a very short report. We are pleased to announce a new member. Vonage has joined the NAPM LLC. With the addition of Vonage to the NAPM LLC all segments of the industry will be represented including the Wireline, Wireless, Cable, and VoIP. So we welcome Vonage to our team.

And then the next thing is the FoNPAC activities. The FoNPAC continues to work towards an on time completion of all milestones and tasks as outlined in the published procurement timeline. The RFP, TRD, and the Vendor Qualification documents are scheduled for delivery to the SWG by July 6, 2012.

This short paragraph really doesn't show all the hard work and hours that have been put in on this huge project that we had. The FoNPAC has been working diligently over the past months to get this out on time.

And that's all I have.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Any questions, comments? Thank you for all

your work.

MR. DECKER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: The next item is the report of the LNPA Selection Working Group.

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

COMMISSIONER WHY: This is Jeff Why from the Massachusetts Department of Telecom and Cable. We haven't had much activity between the last NANC meeting and this meeting but we are anticipating receiving the RFP from the FoNPAC and we're going to be meeting on July 12th. That will be a full day meeting, reviewing the RFP and hopefully approving it sometime thereafter. And I think that is it for our report.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, and there's no written report here so just an update.

COMMISSIONER WHY: No written report, just an update.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you very much. I know the FoNPAC has been doing a lot of work in between also.

COMMISSIONER WHY: Yes, yes, they have.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Where is your meeting on July 12th?

COMMISSIONER WHY: Here in Washington D.C., I believe at the Verizon offices.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you. Yes.

FEMALE SPEAKER:(Off microphone, unintelligible) this is a pretty big time crunch for the ability to review prior to the meeting, the delivery documents. I mean that's going

to be pretty extraordinary for non NAPM members, so I don't know if NAPM if at all possible could deliver it two weeks prior to the meeting. They are really hindered, at least Cox's time, to review prior to the meeting.

COMMISSIONER WHY: (Off microphone, unintelligible) I recognize the time crunch. I think we scheduled the meeting in order to sort of be expedient as possible.

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

CHAIRMAN KANE: The next item on the agenda, Item 10 is the LNPA Working Group report and this will be document number 9.

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

I have here our abbreviated summertime report so hopefully this will be very quick.

We have four items. The first one is what we have been reporting on in the past couple of meetings. The Working Group continues the process of updating the LNPA Working Group's Best Practices document.

There are over 70 Best Practices so we've nearly completed a first pass through the document. We still have a couple of outstanding action items that need to be completed before we can say we've made our first pass.

Once we've complete the review and the update of the Best Practices document and reached consensus on the final Best Practices, the Working Group will then determine what our

next steps will be and we'll keep the NANC informed as to what those next steps are.

The next item is the planned 25,000 transaction industry load test. As I reported at the last NANC meeting it was originally scheduled to take place on April 18th. The Working Group decided to postpone the industry load test until May 23rd in order to insure that we had sufficient transactions in order to achieve 25,000 transactions in an hour.

That is with one of the recent NPAC releases, 25,000 transactions in an hour is now the throughput requirement that the NPAC must be able to achieve.

So even though this report was written prior to the May 23rd industry test, that test did take place. It was very successful, in fact, it was actually more successful than the previous industry load test when it was tested at 15,000. The NPAC had no issues broadcasting the 25,000 transactions in an hour.

Four SPIDs or service provider IDs did fall behind in that hour. The range that they fell behind ranged from just two minutes falling behind. In one case one SPID was actually 48 minutes behind.

So in follow-up to the test, the NeuStar NPAC team is going to reach out to each of those four SPIDs individually and discuss their performance and, once we get a follow-up from those discussions, then we'll keep the NANC informed as to what steps will be taken in order to insure that all service providers are able to keep up with that industry load.

The next item is another item that we've been reporting on. The Working Group is also reviewing and updating both the vendor test plans and the service provider test plans. These test plans are designed to insure that all vendors and their platforms and the service providers and

their respective systems can interoperate with both the NPAC and each other.

These test scripts have been around since the very beginning. Back in 1996 they were developed and, they've been added to over time as we've added or made software changes to the NPAC but it was deemed necessary to take a complete and very detailed look at each of the tests and the test scripts to make sure they are both relevant and make sure that they capture all the necessary functionality that we need to insure interoperability.

So that's a pretty big project but we're biting off of it bits and pieces at a time but when we are completed we will report to the NANC upon completion of that review and update.

The last item is something that we have recently taken up in the Working Group. One of the NANC LNP provisioning flows deals with canceling a pending port at the request of the end user and a sub-team was formed in the Working Group to take a look at that flow.

There were a number of service providers that felt that they needed some clarification so the sub-team made some revisions to the cancel flow and presented those to the full Working Group and they were accepted.

We're in the process of finalizing those revisions to both the narrative and the actual pictorial of the flow itself.

The revisions include that the old service provider if contacted by the end user to cancel the port may opt to advise the end user that they need to contact the new service provider in the port to cancel the port. That is a practice of a number of service providers when they are the old service provider in the port.

In some cases the old service provider will cancel the port at the request of the end

user and that leads to a second clarification that was added to the flow, that if the old provider in the port at the request of the end user does move forward with canceling the port then they are required to obtain proper authorization to act as the end user's agent in canceling that pending port in both the NPAC and transmitting that cancel notification to the new service provider as well.

So our goal is to finish revision of the flow, that particular flow at the July Working Group meeting and at the next NANC meeting I would expect that we will be bringing that revised flow, presenting that to the NANC and we would be asking for the NANC endorsement of that revised flow at that time.

Questions? Yes.

MS. ANGLIN: This Cyd Anglin from AT&T. A question on the test plan revisions. Is that in preparation to be better positioned with the new contract? Is that what triggers that activity or is it just a revision on general principles?

MR. SACRA: The latter, actually the contract, had no basis for our decision to move forward with revising the test scripts. It was just a need. Because they had been in place for so long it was felt there was a need to take a look at them and revise them where necessary.

MS. ANGLIN: It seems like that it would nice for them to have been reviewed recently once we get to that next stage down the way so it's good fruit planning. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes.

MR. ROGERS: Greg Rogers from Bandwidth. I'm curious about the review date of the Best Practices and how that process works holistically. There are some Best Practices that have been developed and submitted and are being considered for adoption as rule is present

there, right, separate and apart?

MR. SACRA: Yes.

MR. ROGERS: So does it sort of occur in a somewhat piecemeal fashion or is it done more holistically? I mean are some of those that have been proposed still under review?

MR. SACRA: In fact that probably is going to be part of the discussion that we'll have to try to determine what our next steps are going to be.

You're absolutely right, there have been a number of Best Practices over time that have been brought to the NANC and have been endorsed by the NANC and forwarded to the FCC. In some cases the FCC has adopted some of the Best Practices.

I could only say that part of the discussion that will take place in terms of our next steps will be do we want to bring the entire Best Practices to the NANC and review them, will we be asking for endorsement of all the Best Practices.

I'm sure there's going to be varying opinions among the service providers in the Working Group as to what those next steps will be but those are some of the options that we'll be discussing at that time.

MR. ROGERS: Okay. So I mean to the extent that there have been individual Best Practices that have been submitted, is it possible that in the holistic review that those could be reviewed again or is that something that you hope to have put to bed and not do an additional review of?

MR. SACRA: In the cases of the Best Practices that have actually been adopted in various FCC orders, there's been no attempt to change in those particular Best Practices because

they are rule, they are the rule.

MR. ROGERS: Sure.

MR. SACRA: The main goal was to take a look at current industry practices and in a lot of cases we've deleted several Best Practices because they were no longer deemed relevant on current practices in the industry. So a number were deleted.

The ones that haven't been adopted and are currently still in practice today, a lot of those have been revised and updated based on current practices.

In terms of what we will be doing once each service provider takes the final document internally and comes back with any concerns or any further suggestive revisions, that will be the next step after we make our complete first pass but once consensus is reached in the Working Group on a final document then that's when we'll discuss what our next steps will be, and we will certainly at the very least keep the NANC informed as what those next steps are.

We may be bringing individual Best Practices to the NANC asking for endorsements. Another option is the full document but that's something we'll have to decide as a working group and reach consensus on.

MR. ROGERS: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Any other questions? Okay, thank you.

MR. SACRA: Thank you very much.

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

### **ACTIVITIES**

CHAIRMAN KANE: Item 11 on the agenda is the report of the Industry

Numbering Committee, the INC. Natalie, we will put your report as document number 10 for the record.

MS. MCNAMER: Hello again. I'm Natalie McNamer. I'm with T-Mobile and I'm the INC Chair along with Dana Crandall with Verizon Wireless, the INC Vice-Chair.

FEMALE SPEAKER: I can't hear you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: People on the phone are having trouble hearing.

MS. MCNAMER: Is this better?

FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes, thank you.

MS. MCNAMER: I'll start over. My name is Natalie McNamer. I'm the INC Chair. I work for T-Mobile. Dana Crandall of Verizon Wireless is the INC Vice-Chair.

We have a pretty brief report for the NANC today. We held one face-to-face meeting since the last NANC report and our next meeting is the week of June 25th in Sterling, Virginia.

On page three, we wanted to bring the NANC up to date on the two issues we are currently working on for the non-geographic 5YY NXX codes, INC issue 692 and 702. These are the issues that we are working on to significantly revise the code assignment guidelines for the non-geographic numbers including updating the service description for the resources to better reflect the use in machine type communications and applications.

So far we have reached consensus to tighten the requirements for service providers to be assigned growth codes by requiring the service providers to meet the 75 percent utilization before DSP is eligible for the growth resources and requiring the service providers to demonstrate

via monthly forecast that the existing resources will exhaust in six months.

Currently there is the six month threshold but the service providers don't have to outline their forecast on a monthly basis.

We wanted to inform the NANC that the growth of the M2M applications is expected to increase dramatically in the next several years and that it is anticipated that the exhaust of the 29 designated NXXs that we have reserved for 5YY will accelerate until a long term solution is developed by standards bodies but the INC will be monitoring the assignment rate of this resource closely to insure that the negative affects on the life of NANP are minimized.

Are there any questions on this slide?

The next issue we wanted to review with you, and Amy Putnam of the Pooling Administration brought this up earlier, is issue 731 for resolving the conflicts of duplicate or overlapping pANI ranges. The RNA has identified approximately 271 ranges that are reported in use by more then one service provider.

INC met with ESIF and came up with what the problem is and what it needs to be resolved. Currently we wanted to outline that duplicate assignments can result in the delay of emergency responses because 911 calls could be routed to the wrong PSAP. The 911 location information could be incorrect or PSAPs that can transfer calls from one PSAP to another, they can also transfer ALI location information and that could be incorrect when it's getting passed from one PSAP to another.

So this is a very important issue that the INC needs to work with the PA and ESIF in a resolution. So we have identified steps the service provider needs to correct the situation, and we

agreed on a process with the ESIF to resolve these and we're working to determine a timeframe for each of the steps involved.

AMI had also identified that a contribution has been submitted that will be reviewed at the next INC. Are there any questions on 731?

CHAIRMAN KANE: One question, the 270 ranges, what percentage of the total universe of ranges is that? I mean is it a big portion, is it a small proportion, to get an idea of the size of the problem.

MS. MCNAMER: One second, I'll have Amy answer.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you.

MS. PUTNAM: Okay, I was multi-tasking.

MS. MCNAMER: The two that we identified in our INC presentation that there's 270 pANI ranges, she is asking what percentage of the whole is that. Very small?

MS. PUTNAM: Maybe ten percent.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Ten percent, okay.

MS. PUTNAM: That's off the top of my head but it is not a huge but still it is significant if it's your call. One isn't a good thing.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you.

MS. MCNAMER: And the remaining document just shows our issues that are currently in initial pending and these are waiting change order implementation and issues that we've placed in final closure since the last INC meeting, and all of our relevant INC one pages. Thank you.

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

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Any other questions? Very good. And our last item is the Future of Numbering Working Group. This will be document number 11 for the record.

MR. NEWMAN: Good morning, thank you Madam Chairman. Adam Newman, Telcordia Technologies and now part of Erickson, for the Co-Chairs of the Future of Numbering Working Group, Don Gray with the Nebraska PSC and Jim Castagna from Verizon Communications.

We've had two conference calls, the April 4th conference call and the May 2nd conference call since our last report.

Our activity updates, pretty brief, one slide. We're continuing to have sort of an open discussion on numbering and addressing from machine-to-machine communications and transition to an IP based network and the potential NANP numbering resources. These have been pretty sort of open discussions so far at the Future of Numbering Working Group, and we do expect actually to start focusing those discussions a little bit as I'll talk about in a couple of bullets.

We also reviewed all of our open issues, our FTNs. There are three of them, FTN 1, the New and Future Services, FTN 2 which is our Telematics issue, and FTN 4, the geographic issues in NANP numbering. All of these remain open. None of them are being actively worked per se at this time.

We do expect a couple of new issues to be submitted at the next meeting which will be

in August that will sort of look to refocus these issues in light of the current situation and both of those issues actually you can see on the next slide, were submitted in '07 or '06 so they've been around for a long time.

And the suggestion was made that we get a couple of new issues to refocus our work in these areas for the current environment so that's what we're going to look to pursue at our August meeting.

They may supersede or result in the closure of any of these open issues. We'll see as it happens over the course of the next couple of meetings.

I've already sort of reviewed the active issues, which is slide four. The closed issue slide, we've moved an issue from active to closed since the last report. That's the FTN 005 which was the Commons versus Market Place model for toll free numbers.

We had done a White Paper on that that was approved and submitted, and we had consensus to close the issue with the final White Paper being approved and said that any new action by the FCC or legislation that might resolve in a change would just be a new issue should we have to undertake it. And that was our consensus with that issue.

Our next meeting will be in August. We meet the first Wednesday of every month. The first Wednesday of July happens to be the 4th. We decided not to meet and take July 4th off.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Slackers.

**(LAUGHTER)**

MR. NEWMAN: I may be working sadly but that's a different issue.

**(LAUGHTER)**

So we will not be meeting in July which means our next meeting is August 1st and our following meetings are September 5th and October 3rd.

If you would like to be added to our email list, we are always open, and we welcome new members. Please just send me an email, and I will add you.

That's our report, thank you very much. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much. All right, I think we've reached almost the end of our agenda in record time.

### **SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS**

The summary of action items which I'll do very quickly. We approved two reports from the NOWG and they will be transmitted to the FCC when I receive the final copies.

We concurred in the election of Karen Riepenkroger as a Tri-Chair of the NOWG.

We supported the NOWG going forward with an evaluation of the benefits and risks of a consolidation of the two contracts with a report on their progress at our September meeting.

And we supported the suggestion from Marilyn Jones to put up a notice that if there is a change in the vendor for the contributions to be sent with the bills that are going out on June 12th, that there be a notice on the website as well as relaying the concern about the timing of the new red light system, the acceleration of the posting of delinquencies to the system if there is a change.

I'm going to add also and suggest that if there is a change of vendor that there be an arrangement with the current vendor that should a company send their money, you know, their contribution to the old address that it be immediately, you know, just as quickly as possible

transferred right over and noticed.

Again, I was an administrator for awhile of our system in the District where the insurance companies had to send in every year an assessment and we changed addresses and three or four years later people were still sending it to the old address and the old person.

And hopefully carriers are maybe more astute than insurance companies but that is a transfer so you want to be sure if you could that if people do send it to the old address and I know how it just gets in the system and it's there automatically, that those things get transferred over right away so they are not considered delinquent just because they sent it to the old address.

And those are the action items that we are taking.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS AND PARTICIPATION**

CHAIRMAN KANE: Are there any public comments, comments from members of the public? Very good.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

MS. JONES: Madam Chair, I have an alibi from this morning's recent news. I've just been informed that our three interns -- the division has three new interns. They were at a staff meeting this morning so I couldn't introduce them but they are here now and I'd like to introduce them.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Oh, very good.

MS. JONES: We have Marissa Johnson. She's working with us. She's from the University of Colorado. We have Kiara Williams, Sanford Williams' daughter. She is working

with us. She is from the University of Virginia. And we also have the Diego Ortega. Diego is from Howard University Law School.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Excellent, excellent. Good to see you and welcome. I hope it's been instructive, all of this.

All right, our next meeting is on September 20th and again it will be at 10:00 a.m. Have a good summer and have good vacations. Get some rest and we'll see you all in a few months. Thank you. We are adjourned at 11:20 a.m.

(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:

---