

**North American Numbering Council
Meeting Transcript
September 20, 2012 (Final)**

I. Time and Place of Meeting. The North American Numbering Council (NANC) held a meeting commencing at 10:00 a.m., at the Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W., Room TW-C305, Washington, D. C. 20554.

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. Beth O'Donnell | Cox Communications, Inc. |
| 9. David Greenhaus | 800 Response Information Services |
| 10. Michael J. Shortley, III | Level 3 Communications, LLC |
| 11. Hon. Paul Kjellander | NARUC - Idaho |
| 12. Hon. Swati Dandekar | NARUC – Iowa |
| 13. Wayne R. Jortner | NASUCA |
| 14. Thomas Dixon | NASUCA |
| 15. Jerome Candelaria/Betty Sanders | NCTA |
| 16. John McHugh | OPASTCO |
| 17. Rosemary Emmer | Sprint Nextel |
| 18. Michele K. Thomas | 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
Carmell Weathers, 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 – June 7, 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) Selection Working Group (SWG) Report
- (10) Local Number Portability Administration Working Group (LNPA WG) Status Report to the NANC
- (11) Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report to the NANC
- (12) Future of Numbering (FoN) Working Group Report to the NANC

V. Table of Contents.

1. Announcements and Recent News	4
2. Approval of Meeting Transcript from March 29, 2012	5
3. Report of the North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA)	5
4. Report of the National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator (PA)	15
5. Report of the Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG)	19

6. Report from the North American Numbering Plan Billing and Collection (NANP B&C) Agent	22
7. Report of the Billing and Collection Working Group (B&C WG)	27
8. North American Portability Management (NAPM) LLC Report	29
9. Implementation of FCC Order on LNPA Selection Process	30
10. Report of the Local Number Portability Administration Working Group (LNPA WG)	33
11. Status of the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) activities	41
12. Report of the Future of Numbering Working Group (FoN WG)	49
13. Summary of Action Items	55
14. Public Comments and Participation (five minutes per speaker)	54
15. Other Business	56

VI. Summary of the Meeting.

CHAIRMAN KANE: I think we will get started. Good morning. Everybody has gotten through the new security here. It slowed things down a little bit but that's where we are.

For the record, I am Betty Ann Kane, Chairman of the NANC. This is the regular quarterly meeting of the North American Numbering Council. It is Thursday, September 20, 2012, and it is 10:15 a.m. We are meeting in the hearing room of the Federal Communications Commission at 445 12th Street, S.W. in Washington D.C.

You have before you the agenda, but I will start first with the roll call for the transcript, who you are and who you represent. I'll start with Commissioner Why on my left.

COMMISSIONER WHY: Jeff Why, Massachusetts Commission.

CYD ANGLIN: AT&T.

MR. ROGERS: Greg Rogers on behalf of Bandwidth.com.

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka, CenturyLink.

MS. CARDWELL: Valerie Cardwell, Comcast.

MR. GREENHAUS: David Greenhaus, 800 Response.

MR. KJELLANDER: Paul Kjellander, the Idaho Commission.

COMMISSIONER DANDEKAR: Swati Dandekar, Iowa Commission.

MR. CANDELARIA: Jerome Candelaria on behalf of NCTA.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel.

MS. THOMAS: Michele Thomas, T-Mobile.

MR. GREEN: Kevin Green, Verizon.

MR. KASPER: Brendan Kasper, Vonage.

MS. GAUGLER: Tiki Gaugler, XO.

MS. JONES: Marilyn Jones, FCC.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND RECENT NEWS

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Announcements and recent news, Marilyn do you have any announcements or recent news?

MS. JONES: No announcements.

CHAIRMAN KANE: No announcements and no recent news, okay, very good.

We wanted to check to see if there is anyone on the phone participating over the phone bridge.

MR. DIXON: Hi, this is Tom Dixon on behalf of NASUCA.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you, Tom.

MR. SOROKA: Tom Soroka, US Telecom, USTA.

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

MS. DALTON: Laura Dalton for Verizon.

MS. JORDAN: Paula Jordan, T-Mobile.

MS. HYMAN: Linda Hyman, NeuStar Pooling.

MR. CARPENTER: I'm Jay Carpenter, 1-800 AFTA.

MR. MCHUGH: John McHugh, OPASTCO.

MR. SHORTLEY: Michael Shortley, Level 3.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Anyone else? Thank you. And folks on the phone please be sure to speak up if you have a question when I ask after each report.

APPROVAL OF MEETING TRANSCRIPT

The next item is approval of the transcript of the last meeting which was on June 7, 2012 that was sent out. Does anyone have any additions or corrections to that transcript? Does anyone have any objections to the transcript? Then I will assume by unanimous consent that the transcript is accepted.

REPORT OF THE NORTH AMERICAN NUMBERING PLAN

ADMINISTRATOR (NANPA)

The next item is the report of the North American Numbering Plan Administrator, the NANPA and that is John.

MR. MANNING: Good morning, everybody. My name is John Manning. I'm Director of the North American Numbering Plan Administration. Is there a document number you want to associate with my report?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, we will make this Document Number 3. The transcript is Document Number 2 and the agenda is Item Number 1. This will be Item Number 3 for the record.

MR. MANNING: Good morning, everybody. Starting on page two of my report, I am going to give you a breakdown status of the resources that NANPA is responsible for, starting first with NPA or area codes.

To date, through August of this year, we have not assigned any new area codes.

MR. MANNING: Four area codes have gone in service this year, and since our last meeting in June, the only new area code going into service was just this past weekend up in Quebec, Canada, area code 703, overlaid on existing area code in Canada.

For the remainder of this year we have two area codes scheduled to go in service, one being in Manitoba, Canada the 431 to overlay area code 204.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Excuse me a second, John. Did you say 703? That's Virginia.

MR. MANNING: Excuse me, yes. What did I just say?

CHAIRMAN KANE: You said 703.

MR. MANNING: I don't know, forgive me.

CHAIRMAN KANE: That's where you live.

MR. MANNING: Forgive me for that. I just recently became a grandfather so I can do that stuff.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Congratulations.

MR. MANNING: That's my excuse. I'm going to use that for the next 30 years.

(LAUGHTER)

MR. MANNING: Let me start again. Two area codes have a future 2012 in-service date. Area code 431 will overlay area code 204 up in Manitoba, Canada in the in service date of November 3rd of this year. And in California the 669 area code will overlay the 408 NPA and that's scheduled for November 20th of this year.

And one item that we make note of, we had one area code so far this year moved from assigned to reserve and that was the Pennsylvania 582 schedule to overlay the 814 area code. It has been set aside again for reserve for that particular NPA.

For the central office code activity, again through August of 2012, I show you January through August of this year compared to the previous three years, the same timeframe. Items to note; for 2012 there were approximately 160 codes less in 2012 than there were compared to 2010 and 2011.

Similar to what occurred in 2011, we had a single service provider return 175 codes in the first half of 2012, which has driven up the number of returns and reclamations for this year.

The annualized 2012 yearly assignments are approximately 2,600 which is what we're forecasting right now, which is a little less than what we experienced in the previous two

years.

For Carrier Identification Codes (CICs), Feature Group B codes, we've only assigned one this year and had three that were returned, and as of August 31st we have 273 total Feature Group B CICs assigned.

For Feature Group D, Carrier Identification Codes, we've assigned 31 of these. A total of 19 FG D CICs have been returned or reclaimed so far this year. We have 2,050 of them assigned in total. We have over 7,700 available for assignment.

With regard to 5YY NPA, since the beginning of this year we've assigned 215 codes out of that NPA. We've had eight codes reclaimed so far this year. A total of 2,500 NXX codes have been assigned to date. We have 638 NXX codes that are available for assignment.

The 900 area code, only one assignment so far this year and there have been no returns or reclamations.

With regard to the 555 line numbers, we have seen only one new assignment this year so far and 16 numbers have been reclaimed.

For the remaining resources, the 800 855, vertical service codes, the area code 456 used for international inbound service, automatic number identification digits and N11 codes, there have been no assignments this year.

Any questions with regard to the status of those particular resources?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions? Any questions on the phone? Thank you, John.

MR. MANNING: All right, turning our attention now to area code relief

planning, an update on three items here. Back in June we reported about the activity going on in California 408 area code. There is going to be an overlay put in, the relieving area code, the 669.

One plus 10-digit permissive dialing started back in April of this year. The mandatory 10-digit dialing, 1 plus ten-digit dialing will start in October with the effective date of the new area code being November 20, 2012.

Area code 570 in Pennsylvania, this is a particular area code that we are going to watch and when we are within three months of exhaust that is when the industry will move forward with establishing timeframes for the implementation of the area code overlay that occurred there with the 272 NPA.

(Recording Interrupted)

MR. MANNING: -- Last meeting in Texas 512. The Utilities Commission approved an all services overlay for relief of the 512. Ten digit permissive dialing will start on December 1st of this year, mandatory 10 digit dialing on June 1, 2013, with the effective date of the new 737 area code being July 1, 2013.

Other relief activities of note, in Nevada we are moving forward with the 702 activity. The industry reached agreement for an all services overlay and the Public Service Commission in Nevada has a hearing scheduled for next week to receive public input on that particular recommendation.

In Indiana 812 we recently filed a petition with the Indiana Commission on August 3rd recommending an all services overlay for the 812 area code.

Nebraska I keep on the list but we are still in a watch mode on Nebraska. I won't cover that. Nothing has really changed with regard to the 402.

Kentucky 270, just recently earlier this month we published a revised exhaust projection changing the exhaust projection from 3rd quarter 2014 to first quarter 2014. Relief planning has been initiated in 270 in February of this year and we filed a petition in April of this year.

The recommendation of the industry is an overlay and I am expecting that the Kentucky Commission will shortly be releasing information about moving forward with receiving public input on this particular proposed plan.

And finally, in California 415 we conducted a relief planning meeting earlier this month. We expect local jurisdiction and public meetings to be conducted by the CPUC, the California Public Utilities Commission and NANPA. These will take place prior to us filing any relief plan.

Any questions on area code relief planning?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions on the phone?

John, I have one. On the first one, in California 408, you've got mandatory 1 plus 10-digit. What's the difference between 1 plus 10 and just regular 10?

MR. MANNING: In California they have the requirement that if you're going to make a 10-digit call whether it's local or toll, it has to be 1 plus 10-digits. So if you're calling within the same area code, it's still 1 plus 10. Other jurisdictions may just require 10 digits be dialed on a local call.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And that was a state decision?

MR. MANNING: That was the state's decision in that regard, yes. And that's consistent across all of those situations in California.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you.

MR. MANNING: Just bringing you up to speed with regard to two outstanding NANPA change orders, change order 21, this is where we are adding the parent company operating company number, OCN, to various reports and forms available through the NANP Administration System.

This change order was approved back in December of 2011. It's been kind of put on hold as a result of recent activity with regard to the NANPA contract however we are now still targeting implementation of this change order at the end of October of this year.

Change order 22 where we are going to be adding a pooled code indicator on various NAS generated reports available on the NANPA website, this particular change order will be implemented at the same time as change order 21. Targeted implementation is late next month and just as a reminder, we are coordinating this activity with the Polling Administrator since both of these change orders require changes in the Pooling Administration System.

The final item I'm going to cover here is that since the last time we met there has been an award of the NANPA contract. NeuStar was awarded a new NANPA contract effective July 9, 2012, similar to the previous contract. It includes one base year and four option years.

And with that award of the contract we will making a number of updates and enhancements to the NANP Administration System and I emphasize here our approach will take advantage of

existing business rules and logic and algorithms presently used in the system while incorporating a number of technological improvements.

It's a two phase approach that we're taking to this activity. It started in July and will take place over the next nine months.

The first phase is with the implementation of what we call a DMZ, demilitarized zone.

(LAUGHTER)

And that's the technical term they use for it. And this is a security measure that we're putting in place in NAS just as an additional effort with regard to the system to improve and bring the system up to date with regard to industry standards if you will on system security.

This phase started in July and we just completed it this past week where we have deployed the DMZ in both the Charlotte location of NAS as well as the Sterling location of NAS. Neustar stated this would take 90 days in our proposal and we have completed it within the 90 days.

Phase two of the proposal concerns the upgrading of existing hardware components, network gear and software within the current NAS.

You understand that NAS was deployed in February of 2004. Now it has had some upgrades in terms of hardware and network gear but the system is roughly almost nine years old, so what we plan to do is a three prong approach with regard to updating the system.

First of all is the implementation of a new development environment which is using the same hardware that we eventually will deploy in the system itself that will be used for quality assurance and testing.

The second part of this phase will be the development of improved application

software that delivers required functionality. This includes the migration of all data to this enhanced platform.

And the final phase of this activity is the implementation of a refreshed production environment and deploying the refined software in this new environment. We are going to take advantage of some new technology such as the use of virtual servers in order to reduce the quantity of hardware components within the system while not impacting NAS performance.

Now the current NAS, this NAS that we have deployed today, complies with all the functional requirements for resource management utilization, forecasting, enhanced notification capabilities, and the reporting that is defined in the current technical requirements document.

We will continue to ensure that NAS fully complies with these requirements and we're going to add a few items to the system based on our experience over the past 12 plus years in terms of what might be of assistance when using the system.

I've outlined them in the bullet items on page six of my report, including some modifications to the online NRUF capability to make it simpler and easier for use as we've seen an up-tick in the number of users that are using the online NRUF for submission of their utilization and forecast data.

The introduction of some downloadable NRUF reports, these reports sometimes can be quite voluminous, so what we want to do is to be able to introduce the capability for users who have a significant quantity of data to download to be able to do so, and that allows us to use a variety of software including Excel and updating the capabilities there so that users can download that information.

We want to enhance some of our reclamation capabilities and we're going to be enhancing the system to use Web 2.0 capabilities which will allow us to do additional functionality when it comes to website, being able to download information, sort information, and filter information and the like.

So those are the items that are of particular interest. These activities will be taking place or are underway right now with the deployment of the enhanced NAS scheduled for early April 2013.

Finally, just some other items, we will be releasing our newsletter in the first week of October, as well as in the latter part of October we will be releasing our new NPA and NANP exhaust projections. When they are done the appropriate notification will be sent out to the industry.

A final note, the final few pages here are all the status of area codes exhausting in the next 36 months which is a typical item I include with my report.

Any questions on any of the items I covered here this morning?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions on the phone? Thank you, John.

MR. MANNING: All right. And her name is Virginia Kathryn Sheriff.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Congratulations again. And just for the record, that was 873 as the Quebec overlay.

MR. MANNING: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. For those who are on the bridge, you did identify yourselves orally but if you would again please email your name and affiliation to

Deborah so that we can have it spelled correctly et cetera in the transcript and in the record.

Thank you.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL THOUSANDS-BLOCK POOLING

ADMINISTRATOR (PA)

The next item will be the report of the National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator.

Amy, thank you. And this will be Item Number 4 for the record.

MS. PUTNAM: Pooling is fine. The first chart, Pooling Administration activity summary data, you will notice that we had a very busy month in August. There were no mass mods. Those were all block requests. And as of yesterday we were already over 10,000 for September. So September is going to be another busy month.

And you will also notice that the number of block assignments that we made was very high and that of course is consistent with the number of requests.

On the next chart on the bottom of the page, the pANI, it's really too soon to trend anything. We had a mass return in May but as time goes on we'll kind of see where those figures are taking us.

I would note that within the next couple of days we are going to be beginning to assign non-dialable pANI's in the U.S. Virgin Islands.

Next page, Part 3 summary data, we're a little bit lower than we were last year at this time, but we seem to be picking up speed as we're getting to years end so we shall see.

Next page, number of central office codes opened, interestingly last year in the

September report our total was 2,678 so we're only ten off.

Next page, reclamation summary, you will notice that there is a significant drop in the number of blocks with overdue Part 4s from last September, and last year we had 853 at this particular time in mid-September so we are always glad to see that figure drop.

Pooling Administration system performance, we were 100 percent since the last meeting, but we had one unscheduled down time in last June. We were down for 12 minutes and 3 seconds.

Our NAS performance, we've had no instances of unscheduled unavailability. All of our CDRLs were covered. We've reported and posted on time.

Since the last meeting we had a contract modification number 22 which extended our contract for six months and also approved change order 23.

On the regulatory side there is currently one petition for additional delegated authority pending before the FCC. Montana filed that in November of 2011.

PANI Administration, we're continuing to work on reconciling the data and continuing to work with ESIF.

We participated in the regular monthly meetings of the NOWG and provided them with our mid-year highlights.

We submitted a change order proposal on May 31st. I may have mentioned it at the June meeting, but it was not in our June report. Change order 23 allows carriers to select an over contaminated block exception radio button to retrieve an over contaminated block when MTE and utilization requirements aren't met. And this change order was approved by the FCC

on August 14th.

We implemented change order 20. On the last page we have an indication that change orders 21 and 22 which we are coordinating with NANPA, are scheduled for October 26th. At the time we wrote the report we --

(Recording Interrupted)

MS. PUTNAM: -- That was a good day. It turned out the resources were not available that day but it's still scheduled for the end of October.

We added three new training videos; June 7th, mass modifications, June 29th, an explanation of the changes in change order 20, and months to exhaust and utilization on August 6th, and we give you instructions on how to go immediately and view those videos.

We're glad to announce that pooling administrator Dora Wirth is back. She retired and then she decided she liked working for us better than being retired so she's back and, Dora was very pleased because it cut way down on the training.

Our annual performance survey was available July 2nd through July 20th. We received an average overall score of 4.7. We cut down the number of questions from 24 targeted questions to four general questions and our score went up so the next time we're thinking of either asking one question and going for a 4.8 or offering not to send a survey at all and have you just send in a 5.

(LAUGHTER)

The security plan, on July 24th we submitted an updated security plan to include the RNA functions. We proactively updated the plan.

Questions? Yes.

MR. CANDELARIA: Jerome Candelaria, NCTA. I had a question about your dramatic drop in overdue Part 4s from both new blocks and total blocks. What do you attribute that to? Is there greater enforcement? Is this something you see on an annual cycle?

MS. PUTNAM: This is directly attributable to greater enforcement.

MR. CANDELARIA: On the state level?

MS. PUTNAM: California, yes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions on the phone? Any other questions here? When you mentioned the switch going out for nine minutes, the pages aren't numbered but September 28th, that must have been last year, right?

MS. PUTNAM: Yes, that was last year. That was last September.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Last year, okay, nine minutes.

MS. PUTNAM: We have a rolling 12 month reporting.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Right. Where are you physically located?

MS. PUTNAM: We're physically located in Sterling, Virginia.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Virginia, right here.

MS. PUTNAM: And Charlotte, North Carolina. That's where our pickup system is.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay. I guess I just had a general question. I probably should have asked this since a number of us particularly at State Commissions have been going through issues with power outages with the storms and in some cases even had some 911 center

outages, whether there have been any issues? You've got back up power.

MS. PUTNAM: We have back up generators that are available at the Sterling site so that even if Sterling loses power we don't have to fail over to Charlotte because we have the back up generators and they will give us plenty of time to fail over if it looks as if it's going to be a lengthy power outage.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. All right, thank you for your report.

MS. PUTNAM: Thank you.

REPORT OF THE NUMBERING OVERSIGHT WORKING GROUP (NOWG)

CHAIRMAN KANE: We will move on to the next item which is the report of the Numbering Oversight Working Group. And this will be entered into the record as Item Number 5, Document Number 5.

MS. RIEPENKROGER: Thank you. My name is Karen Riepenkroger, and I am one of the Tri-Chairs of the NOWG along with Laura Dalton of Verizon Communications and Natalie McNamer of T-Mobile.

The second page on our slide is just a list of the contents of the slides that we have today. We're going to review the NANP and PA contract consolidation. We'll have the PA change orders, the NANPA change orders, the NANPA, PA, and RNA 2012 Surveys, and then we always attach a copy of the NOWG participating companies and a list of our upcoming meeting schedule.

So if we move to slide three, this is the NANPA and PA Administrator contract consolidation that was discussed at the last NANC meeting.

The NOWG has held three sessions since the May NANC meeting to discuss the consolidation of the NANPA and the PA Administrator contracts.

We focused our activities on identifying the benefits and risks associated with consolidating the contracts which have included service provider regulatory operational efficiencies and impacts, single user interface and that's the combining of the PAS and NAS system, and combining the guidelines. We are still working on this and I believe that we have the commitment to report our final findings at the December NANC meeting.

Are there any questions on this slide?

The next two slides are just the lists of the PA and then NANPA change orders, and I'm not going to go through them because I think you just listened to them from John and from Amy so it would just be a redundancy to do that.

So we can go ahead and move to slide six. As you know, the end of 2012 is rapidly approaching so we need to start focusing on the surveys that will be distributed in January of 2013.

So we're going to have three different surveys this year. We will have the NANP and the PA surveys as normal and then we will have a new survey that will be the RNA activities, and we made a separate survey because it's got a different target audience.

So the NOWG has been working with the RNA to develop the 2012 survey form. The first draft of the survey form has been completed and has been circulated to the NOWG members for review and comment and it is still under review at this time.

And then the 2011 NANPA and PA survey forms that we sent out in 2012 have been sent to

the NANPA and the PA respectively for their review and comments. We have received comments back from the PA and the NANPA and we are currently reviewing them and updating the forms and we will be resending them out for final confirmation before we make the updates to the survey forms.

Any questions?

And then the last several slides list all of the participating companies and a list of our upcoming meetings. Of course we've already held the September ones but it does list the October and November ones. And then if we have other meetings they'll be scheduled as needed beyond what we've identified on this list.

And that's all I have. Are there any questions on the report?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions on the phone? Thank you.

I just have a question. Maybe it's for Marilyn for the FCC. You mentioned the study of consolidating the NANPA and the PA. The NANPA contract was renewed, was reissued and redone Marilyn, in July, for one year with four year extensions.

MS. JONES: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: But I believe that Amy said that the Pooling Administrator contract is only extended for six months. When does that six months run out?

MS. PUTNAM: Valentine's Day.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Valentine's Day, thank you, Amy. So that's February. I should have asked it when Amy was up. Can you give us a status on that contract? You know, what's going on with it now? It's February so that would have been in August it was extended for

another six months. Is there any other process going on?

MS. JONES: Our goal now at the FCC is to have that contract solicited in the November/December timeframe.

CHAIRMAN KANE: To put out the RFP and solicitation in November/December.

MS. JONES: Yes, to put out the RFP.

CHAIRMAN KANE: At about the time we would be receiving the report on consolidation.

MS. JONES: Exactly, yes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you. So we can talk about that at the December meeting then when we see what the recommendation is because were the report to recommend consolidation, it could have an affect on going forward I guess with either of those.

Any other questions on that issue? Okay, thank you.

MS. RIEPENKROGER: Thank you.

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

CHAIRMAN KANE: All right, now we have the report of the North American Numbering Plan Billing and Collection, the B&C Agent, and that will be Item Number 6 for the record.

MS. MARCOTTE: Good morning, I'm Faith Marcotte from Welch LLP, and we're the Billing and Collection Agent.

If we turn to page one, we see the financial position of the Fund. Right now we have at the end of August, \$3.1 million in the bank, \$300,000 in receivables, and about \$540,000 owed to

the various vendors and that was really just for one month services, for the month of August.

Page two is a little bit more interesting. It's a projection of the Fund out to the end of June which is the funding year.

When we did the budget we had provided a contingency allowance of \$1.5 million. We now think we will be down to \$183,000 by the end of June, and in the bottom right hand corner is an explanation for the variance to budget of what we're now projecting compared to budget.

The main thing is that the NANP contract came in after we had done the budget which is why the contingency was made to \$1.5 million to allow for the changes that were anticipated there. So it's about a \$1.3 million more than we had budgeted.

These monthly payments are 276 right now until to the end of March, and then the drop down to 160 which is \$30,000 more than we were paying out last year per month. The 276 monthly amount was for equipment and the other adjustments being made as mentioned before. So after that it will be at 160 a month. So that's the main difference there. We are down to 183.

The only issue I guess is we have two more contracts that are just in an extension mode right now as we just discussed the pooling, and our contract extension expires December 31st so I'm not really sure what the impact of those contract renewals will have. We will have to see.

Are there any questions about that?

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka from CenturyLink. Faith, I think the important thing for us all to remember as we've discussed in the B&C calls is this fund can't run in the red per the FCC's order so, you know, we're going to need some very close indications on forecasts from all the parties that are involved as we move forward.

MS. MARCOTTE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Rosemary.

MS. EMMER: This is Rosemary Emmer with Sprint Nextel. I would just like to ask the industry members to be considerate of change orders that we might really want between now and next July because of the fact that we're running so low on the budget, especially the NOWG folks. So just be cautious and aware that this is happening. Certainly we don't want you to not submit change orders but be cautious and aware that there isn't a whole lot left in our fund. So thanks very much.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes. He's next and then I'll get you, Mary.

MR. GREENHAUS: David Greenhaus, 800 Response. I just noticed in the budget there is \$300,000 budgeted for carrier audits and my recollection is that in the past that budget item was in the budget but the carrier audits hadn't been expended and I'm just wondering if that's something you expect to be expended this year or will that ultimately be added back to the --

MS. MARCOTTE: Yes, we haven't had any indication of any audits taking place so it could well be that will be there for us if we need it as well so we may really be at 483, you could consider.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Mary.

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka from CenturyLink. We can never expect though that that money won't be used also David because it is something that is forecasted by the FCC. But I think the important thing for us all to remember is that the one way that this can avoid going into red is to re-bill but that does have additional costs that all the industry would pay for, and should the

audits be done and other things happen, we would watch carefully as an industry so that we avoid having to do that if we didn't need to, however that is always the option and then carriers would then have another bill to pay that likely isn't in their normal run rate.

CHAIRMAN KANE: So the NANPA contract coming in at almost \$1.3 million more than was budgeted, what's the implication of that not only on the bottom line but is that going to necessitate more collections?

MS. MARCOTTE: Well, the bills have already all been sent and it's all built in, what we've collected is all we're going to collect or it's all set up, so there's no additional billing anticipated at this time but we may have to. It looks like we're --

CHAIRMAN KANE: And the bills were sent before this contract was done or after?

MS. MARCOTTE: No, they were sent in June. It was all based on the contribution factor.

CHAIRMAN KANE: In June, that's what I thought. Marilyn, what is the status of this contract with the Billing and Collection Agent that runs out December 31st? Marilyn does prepare the answers to my questions.

MS. JONES: The B&C contract was extended to March 31, 2013.

CHAIRMAN KANE: It's extended another 90 days, okay, until March 31st.

MS. JONES: March 31st.

CHAIRMAN KANE: March 31st. And what is the plan for putting that out for solicitation?

MS. JONES: I think that's planned to go out after the Pooling Administration contract

because they are going to do it on a GSA schedule and so it's not going to require as much time for solicitation as the Pooling contract.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you. Maybe you can update us on that at the December meeting.

MS. MARCOTTE: So just to finish up, on page four are the anticipated payments over the next six months. And on page five is our deliverables report and everything is proceeding as normal.

I'd just like to mention that the new Red Light process is we are collecting a lot of old stuff now because it's much quicker going on to the Red Light report, and because companies are not receiving their funds and they are paying their old balances up.

Are there any questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Mary.

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka from CenturyLink. I just want to say thanks to Marilyn for putting out the public notice on the Red Light order. So thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: It has been effective. Thank you. Rosemary.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer with Sprint Nextel. I just wanted to make a note that the carrier audit for maybe the better part of a decade or so is at \$700,000, and the FCC in an effort to streamline our budget or to make our budget better, they decided that they would lower that to \$300,000 last year so we're not having money sit there for no reason.

So the FCC did really great with that last year but just since we were talking the carrier audits earlier, I thought I would mention that to everyone in case you missed it in our reporting

last year. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you for that update and reminder.

Our agenda says a break now. It is 11:20 a.m. but we're a little bit ahead so if it's all right we'll just keep going for a little longer before we take a break.

REPORT OF THE BILLING AND COLLECTION WORKING GROUP (B&C WG)

And Number 7 will be the Billing and Collection Working Group and the report will be Document Number 7 in the record.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel, and I chair the B&C Working Group with Tim Decker with Verizon.

We are responsible for overseeing the performance of the functional requirements provided by the North American Numbering Plan Billing and Collection Agent, Welch.

We are currently overseeing the monthly bills and collections and evaluating the deliverables on a monthly basis.

As mentioned earlier by Mary and Faith, we wanted to note that the FCC had issued the public notice on July 25th and thank you for issuing that, outlining the new Red Light rule process and that the process is working very, very well. So thank you.

And if you'll skip over to page six, our membership is a little smaller than we would like so I thought that I would share who usually joins our calls, our meetings, in case any of your favorite people have been mentioned and that way maybe perhaps it might sway you to join us.

So Mark Lancaster with AT&T, Beth O'Donnell with Cox, Karen Riepenkroger and

myself from Sprint, Mary Retka from CenturyLink, and Tim Decker from Verizon.

So on the next page is Tim's and my contact information and if you have any inclination at all to join one of our calls please let us know and we'll send you the bridge.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Are there any questions? Any questions from the phone?

Yes.

MS. SANDERS: This is Betty Sanders.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Did you have a question?

MS. SANDERS: No, I'm sorry. I was just clicking in. I apologize.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Oh, right, thank you. Let me ask you Betty, if you would identify for the record where you are from.

MS. SANDERS: Charter Communications.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Charter, okay. Is there anyone else who has joined on the phone bridge who was not there when I originally asked people to identify themselves?

MS. REIDY: Karen Reidy from CompTel.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you, Karen. Again let me remind the folks on the phone if you would send an email to Deborah Blue at the FCC so we have your name spelled correctly and your affiliation for the written transcript.

MS. REIDY: Sure.

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

CHAIRMAN KANE: Let's move on to Item Number 8 which is the NAPM LLC report.

MR. CLAY: Good morning, NANC. My name is Mel Clay. I chair the NAPM LLC. I share that responsibility with Tim Decker from Verizon.

You should have a one page report from the NAPM LLC in front of you and I guess that's going to be Report Number 8.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Eight, yes. It will be Document Number 8.

MR. CLAY: Statement of Work 24, revision six was approved by the NAPM LLC at the August 22, 2012 meeting. The revision reflects the decision by the LNPA Working Group to eliminate vendor interoperability testing with the impact simulator and replace it with vendor turn up testing with the impact test bid.

With the revision of both, system developers and SOA/LSMS users will each separately perform the complete set of required turn up test cases. The previous term continuing certification process has been replaced in the documents with the term continuing certification testing.

Second, I'd like to report FoNPAC activities for the impact procurement. The FoNPAC and the SWG reviewed and reached consensus on the RFP documentation which includes the RFP itself, vendor qualification survey, technical requirement documents, reference questionnaire, and a glossary of terms and abbreviation.

The documents were provided to the NANC Chair for distribution to the FCC. The FCC put the documents out for public comment on August 13th with the comments due back on September 13th. We have now received the comments and they are being I guess reviewed by the FCC.

The NAPM LLC and the FoNPAC will continue to work toward an on time completion of all the milestones and tasks as outlined on the procurement timeline.

Are there any questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions on the phone? Thank you very much Mel, for that update and it's good to know that things are progressing on schedule.

MR. CLAY: Thank you.

REPORT OF THE LNPA SELECTION WORKING GROUP (SWG)

CHAIRMAN KANE: We'll just keep going. So Agenda Item Number 9, and Document Number 9, the Report of the Selection Working Group. Tiki.

MS. GAUGLER: Tiki Gaugler with XO Communications. I Tri-Chair the SWG with Commissioner Jeff Why and Ann Berkowitz.

Mel sort of stole my thunder there, and he gave our report as well because we work together very closely.

Just to sort of back up to what the SWG's role is in this, it is obviously overseeing the FoNPAC's drafting et cetera of all of the five documents that Mel mentioned there. So the FoNPAC has done a terrific job in turning around those documents to SWG to provide us with a great deal of time to review those and we extend our thanks to them for doing so.

They distributed those to the SWG on June 29th. On July 12th the SWG had an in-person meeting where it was officially presented to the group and we had a significant discussion.

We had an all day meeting with SWG, with folks on the phone and in person, and then presented that back to the FON PAC and there was a bit of an exchange over some of the language but nothing significant.

There was approval on July 26th, consensus approval by the SWG and then it was presented to the NANC Chair who then presented it to the FCC as Mel mentioned on August 13th. The FCC put it out for public notice and there were some comments that were filed on September 13th.

At this time we are hoping, anticipating that the FCC will review those comments and provide their approval for those documents at which time as Mel mentioned all of those documents will be released for response by vendors.

The upcoming dates as mentioned on slide four, is that in November of this year responses will be due and then there will be review of those responses by the FoNPAC and oversight by the SWG, and a recommendation will be provided to the NANC and discussed some time in the early spring. I don't think the date for that meeting has been set yet.

And then on slide five is our list of membership. We actually have a fairly robust membership which is extremely beneficial in this process.

And then on the last page is the contact information for Jeff, Ann, and I, should you need to get in touch with any of us.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Very good, thank you.

MS. GAUGLER: Questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Questions on the phone?

Let me just say on behalf of all of us, I want to thank both the FoNPAC and the Selection Working Group for a tremendous amount of work. I know that there was some concern at the beginning of this process about time schedules and how much could be done but I'm just delighted and I join Commissioner Why in thanking everyone for all of the time and effort that has been put into this and it looks like we're going to get there. Thank you very much.

And I'm assuming that there's indication Marilyn, at the FCC, that internally it will get turned around and put out. I mean the FCC's plan is to put it out as Tiki said in time to get responses back in November.

MS. JONES: Yes, that is the plan.

CHAIRMAN KANE: That's the plan, okay. Thank you. I didn't want to put you on spot, but I mean everything so far has been on schedule so I'm sure if there is any impediment or any time delay, that you will let us know.

MS. JONES: Right. We have a couple Ex parte meetings scheduled. We have to do some more internal review, but we're trying to stick to the schedule.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much. Thank you all.

We only have a couple left so if it's all right we'll just keep going.

REPORT OF THE LOCAL NUMBER PORTABILITY (LNPA) WORKING GROUP

Item 10, is the report of the Local Number Portability Administration Working Group, and this will be Document Number 10. Gary Sacra.

MR. SACRA: Thank you, Chairman Kane. Good morning, everyone. My name is Gary Sacra. I'm with Verizon. I'm one of the Co-Chairs of the LNPA Working Group. The other two Co-Chairs are Paula Jordan with T-Mobile and Linda Peterman with EarthLink Business.

I have three items to report on in today's report, the first of which is one that I've been reporting on in the past few meetings. The Working Group is continuing to review and update the many LNP Best Practices that have been developed over the years and as I've reported, in some cases we're deleting some of the outdated Best Practices. In other cases we're updating and revising them to make them consistent with current industry Best Practices as well as regulatory mandates.

We've completed a first pass through the Best Practices documents. There are roughly 70 some Best Practices so we have completed a first pass. We've now started a second pass to make sure that the revisions that we've made to date, that the group is still satisfied with those revisions.

After that second pass is completed which will likely take place at the November face-to-face meeting, the plan is then for the LNPA Working Group participants to take back the revisions internally, discuss them with their respective companies, and then come to a

subsequent LNPA Working Group meeting with any further suggested revisions.

Once that phase is completed then our next step will be to determine what we will do with these Best Practices external to the Working Group and we will keep the NANC informed of the planned next steps.

Any questions?

Okay, the next item, I just wanted to give the NANC a heads up. The Working Group is developing technical requirements for new NPAC interfaces. This would be the interface between service providers, so service order activation systems as well as the NPAC to the local service management system and the service provider platform.

The protocol that's currently being used in the development of the technical requirements is Extensible Markup Language or XML. That is a current generation protocol that's used by many participants in the industry in many of their systems.

The plan is that once the new interfaces are developed, tested, and implemented that they'd be interfaceable, coexist with the current CMIP interfaces and they will be optional on the part of service providers to implement.

So those providers that choose to stay with the current CMIP interface and not move to the new interface can do so, and those providers that wish to migrate to the new interface once they are implemented will also be able to opt to do that as well.

Advantages of XML over the current CMIP interfaces, number one, there's more common development expertise and resources among industry developers and system vendors. XML offers less complex analysis and problem diagnosis and the tools that are required for

development and analysis are less expensive with a XML versus CMIP.

And XML does offer potential for some messaging efficiencies between the NPAC and the service provider (unintelligible) platforms. So as we continue the development of the technical requirements we will be reporting that to the NANC and keep you advised as to planned implementation dates once the requirements are developed and the new interfaces are tested.

Questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions on the phone?

MR. SACRA: The last item, the Working Group has reached consensus on some clarifications to the NANC LNP provisioning flows.

The first change involves figure 12 which is the cancel flow. This particular flow comes into play when the consumer has contacted a new service provider other than their current service provider and has indicated that they want to activate service with that new provider and port their existing telephone number to that new service provider, and then subsequent to that contact for whatever reason, the end user changes their mind and wishes to cancel the port.

So this is the flow that outlines the steps and the responsibilities on the part of the old provider in the port which is the provider, that the consumer was planning to leave, and the new provider in the port which is the provider that the consumer had contacted and made plans to port their telephone number.

So if you move over to page three and fortunately I don't have to go through every

one of these pages, just the ones that we're recommending changes to.

On page three for those that have a printout in color, there is a bullet item in step two of figure 12 that's highlighted in yellow and the text is in red and these are added steps that clarify what can take place if the end user contacts the old provider or the provider in this case that they had originally planned to leave, or if they contact the new provider in order to cancel the port.

Now the option for the end user to contact either provider has been an option that has existed since the very first version of the flows that were adopted back in 1997 by the FCC, and they remain in the flows in version four that were adopted by the FCC with the next day porting order.

So this clarification just simply adds some text around what could take place depending on whether the end user contacts the old provider or the new provider. In the case where they contact the old provider in the port, the old provider may opt to refer the end user to the new provider to cancel the port, the new provider being the one that they had planned to port to.

That is a current practice among some service providers in the industry. If they are contacted by the end user as the old provider, they do refer the end user to the new provider to cancel the port. So this just adds that clarification that the old provider does have the option of referring the end user to the new provider in order to initiate the cancellation.

In the case of the new provider, if they are contacted by the end user, either directly or upon referral by the old provider, the new provider is required to cancel the port at the request

of the end user. And again, these are existing practices among a number of service providers in the industry today.

Moving to page four in step seven, this added some text around the type of authorization that the old provider must obtain from the end user if they are going to continue with the port cancellation at the request of the end user. In essence it's the same type of authorization that the new provider must obtain in order to initiate a port request to port the number from the old provider.

It could either be in the form of a letter of authorization, a third party verification, et cetera, but it's the same type of authorization. The difference here is that the LOA to cancel the port that's obtained by the old provider from the end user must be dated on or after the date of the original authorization that was obtained by the new provider to initiate the port request.

And as is the case with the authorization that is obtained by the new provider to initiate the port request, and it states it in this step seven, the new provider cannot require physical evidence of authorization in order to accept the fact that the end user has requested the old provider to cancel the port request.

Questions so far?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Gary, is there a time limit for changing your mind? At what point does it become a new request?

MR. SACRA: Well, up until the point when the port is actually activated.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Up until the point when the port is activated, thank you.

MR. SACRA: Okay, and the last recommended change in the cancelled port flow is

step 11 and this is an added step and this outlines the notification process.

If the old provider at the request of the end user is going to continue with the cancellation then this step outlines the fact that they must notify the new provider and let them know of the cancellation. And there are two bullets in step 11. This is a new step that has been added to add that clarification and therefore there's a corresponding added step in the Power Point flow that accompanies this narrative. The two bullets in step 11 simply outline the notification steps that should be taken if it's a wireline old provider in this case in the cancellation, or if it's a wireless old provider.

Because there are different capabilities on issuing in jeopardy notices between a wireline and wireless provider, it was necessary to outline the different steps to be taken to notify the new provider on the cancellation depending on whether the old provider that's performing the cancellation is a wireline provider versus a wireless provider.

And that's the end of the recommended changes for the cancelled flow.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Question, yes, go ahead. Would you identify yourself?

MR. ROGERS: Greg Rogers with Bandwith.com. I have a question that has to do with the comment you made about the production of documentation of the new LOA that the old service provider obtains. I'm just curious, if you can explain why the decision was to not require the production of that documentation. It strikes me that you're going to wind up with this situation where, you know, you have two service providers claiming ownership of the port as it were and if neither one of them is necessarily required to produce the documentation, how does that get resolved?

MR. SACRA: We believe the way we've worded this is consistent with the requirements for verifiable authorization for the initial port request, and that is it has to be available in the event of a dispute and that a regulator is brought in to resolve that dispute. However, we believe we're consistent again with the rules for the initial authorization in that the old provider is not required to present to the new provider physical evidence that they have the LOA in order to -- the new provider is not required to provide the physical evidence in order to initiate the port request, they simply check off on the LSR that they have that verifiable authorization. So we believe we're remaining consistent with that concept in not requiring that the old providing provide physical evidence that they have the authorization in order to cancel the port request at the request of the end user.

MR. ROGERS: Okay, so there's a checked box that is the representation that they have the documentation, is essentially what -- okay, thank you.

MR. SACRA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any other questions?

MR. SACRA: Now the final recommended change is on a different flow and this one is not nearly as extensive. This is the disconnect process for a ported telephone number and again, this is the process that takes place when a customer who has an existing ported number disconnects their service with the current service provider, disconnect meaning that they're not porting their number to another provider, for example they're moving out of state and disconnecting their service with that provider. The Industry Numbering Committee, the INC, had contacted the Working Group because again since the initial version of these flows that

were adopted back in 1997, there was a statement in step seven of figure 14 that said that the maximum interval between disconnect date and effective release date is 18 months. The effective release date in NPAC speak is the date that the number is actually removed from the NPAC database and the downstream service provider local systems, and the number is snapped back to either the code holder in the case of a non-pooled number, or it's snapped back to the block holder in the case of a pool telephone number.

So the INC questioned the Working Group about that statement in figure 14 and it seemed inconsistent with current FCC rules on aging of disconnected TN's. Those rules simply state that the aging period for residential disconnected telephone numbers should be no more than 90 days and for business telephone numbers it should be no more than 365 days.

Well, this phrase did seem to be inconsistent with those FCC rules on TN aging of disconnected telephone numbers because it was allowing 18 months between the time that the customer disconnected their service and the point in time when the disconnecting service provider snapped the telephone number back to either the code holder or the block holder, which is the rule for disconnected telephone numbers.

So after some discussion within the Working Group, the Working Group agreed that there was an inconsistency so our recommendation is to remove that sentence entirely from figure 14 step seven.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions?

MR. SACRA: So if I could just revert you back to page two, that bullet says that the Working Group is respectfully requesting NANC endorsement of these recommended revisions

to both figure 12 and figure 14. And if you all reached consensus on endorsement, we would also request that they be forwarded to the FCC Wireline Competition Bureau with the recommendation and request that they be adopted as part of revised NANC LNP provision flows.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you, Gary. So the request is that we endorse these two revisions and forward them to the FCC. Are we ready to do that today? Have we had enough time to see this? I know it was sent out ahead of time and I know the industry has participated in this. Is there any objection to taking that up, that endorsement at today's meeting? Okay, is there any discussion of the request to endorse? Is there any objection to endorsing these two recommended changes and forwarding them to the FCC?

MR. CANDELARIA: Jerome Candelaria, NCTA. I don't want to stand in the way of this but as you've expressed there is some reluctance simply because we haven't seen this. But that being said you know, I'll go with the consensus of the group.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, I'm going to say we have consensus here that the NANC go on record as endorsing these two recommended revisions to figure 12 and figure 14 in the port cancellation disconnect flows, and that I will forward that consensus of the group to the FCC Wireline Bureau for their incorporation and recommend that they incorporate it into the flow.

MR. SACRA: Thank you, Chairman Kane.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much.

MR. SACRA: Thank you, everyone.

STATUS OF THE INDUSTRY NUMBERING COMMITTEE (INC) ACTIVITIES

CHAIRMAN KANE: We just have two other reports, Number 11, the INC, Industry Numbering Committee activities report.

MS. MCNAMER: Hi, thank you. My name is Natalie McNamer. I am the INC Chair and I work for T-Mobile along with my Vice-Chair Dana Crandall with Verizon Wireless who is in the audience.

Today's presentation is going to be pretty brief. We've had two face-to-face meetings since our last NANC report. Our next meeting will be in the beginning of October in Overland Park, Kansas, hosted by Sprint. Any future meetings if anyone is interested can be found on the ATIS website under INC in our calendar.

The first item in the report that we wanted to review with you are two issues, Issue 692 and 702 which we have discussed at the NANC before. These are the issues that were opened regarding the non-geographic.

In the beginning of the report I'll call them 5YY - NXX codes. By the end of the report with these issues, we've changed the name of them. So we'll start out with what the current name is.

Because the demand of the non-geographic numbers has increased substantially with their use and has evolved with technology, we completed our work on these two issues to revise the guidelines.

There were a lot of revisions. We pretty much rewrote the guidelines to mirror more of our current guidelines for the central office codes and the pooled blocks.

So one thing that we did is to do a clarification that the FCC has the authority to reclaim

these resources or grant any extensions in it, requirements that the service providers provide documentation to the NANPA to demonstrate their authorization to provide service when requesting an initial non-geographic code which is standard of what you would have to do within a rate center for any of the geographic numbers.

Currently there wasn't a utilization requirement in the guidelines for these numbers so we implemented that, the 75 percent to mirror geographic. There was always the six months, but we put it on here so you'd know that there is the six months to exhaust requirement as with the geographic numbers.

We also put in, this will help the NANC a lot too, is as we're looking at how much the utilization of these numbers is increasing, the NANPA will calculate and publish semi-annually the exhaust projections of the total non-geographic NPAs set aside for these non-geographic services so that we'll be able to look at the future of what M2M is doing within the United States.

We renamed the guidelines. They used to be 5YY-NXX Guidelines. Now it's the Non-geographic 5XX -NXX Code Assignment Guidelines. To make it easier I'm calling them non-geographic because it just seems to remember all the words is hard.

We're changing the name mostly because currently they're used in the easy recognizable codes which have the numbers that are the same. We're going to have to get away from using those because of just the quantity of numbers that are being used we'll run out of those soon and not have enough NPAs. We want to save those for something maybe in the future that we really want to use an easy recognizable code for.

So the new guidelines won't be able to be published until the implementation of the change order. When the B&C Agent and the B&C Working Group were talking earlier about the budget, one thing that everyone is going to keep in mind is that these two INC issues are a complete revamp of the guidelines and current system. The NANPA will be submitting a change order but, they

(Recording Interrupted)

have indicated it would be a high level of effort so once we see the change order we will know the cost amount. The INC has spent over a year and half working on this.

The NANPA is currently working on the change order because they're going to have completely change the system, so I think they have a couple more weeks before their change order is due to us.

And the INC doesn't get the change order. It goes to the NOWG but the NOWG makes sure they share it with the B&C Working Group right away.

MR. ROGERS: Natalie, I have a question.

MS. MCNAMER: Yes.

MR. ROGERS: Greg Rogers with Bandwidth. I'm curious about the documentation of authorization and how that is envisioned to work. I mean maybe it's already established but your comment about it being similar to showing that you can offer service in a rate center, the numbers are non-geographic in nature. What is it that is your authorization proof?

MS. MCNAMER: I think we put in the guidelines or we at least talked about it, like for a wireless provider, we would show our FCC license and then for a landline carrier, now I'm not a

landline carrier, it would be the certificate of public necessity or whatever the state authorizations are.

MR. ROGERS: Okay, but then you wouldn't have to go further to show an interconnection agreement in a particular rate center or anything like that?

MS. MCNAMER: No, and that will get to the next slide that talks a little bit about PSTN connection.

MR. ROGERS: Okay, so it's your license or your CPCN.

MS. MCNAMER: Yes.

MR. ROGERS: Okay, thanks.

MS. MCNAMER: Then the next item, slide four is the second part of the issue. We looked through the service description of the 5XX - NXX non-geographic resources, and we updated the service description to better reflect the use for machine type communications and applications.

The new service description is as follows. It says, "For the purpose of these assignment guidelines, the 5XX -NXX codes are to be used for applications which are non-geographic in nature. They're not assigned to rate centers, and they may or may not traverse the PSTN, but they do require an e.164 addressing scheme". I think that's the main portion of it. "The use of the NANP numbering resources to communicate with both fixed and mobile devices some of which may be unattended, this resource may be used for applications enabling machines which would include but not be limited to wireless devices and appliances, the ability to share information with back office control and database systems, and with people that use these.

Service is limited only by the terminal and network capabilities and restrictions imposed by the service provider.” It took us a long time to come up with that service description.

With the evolution of the PSTN in the use of these resources, we did go and put a note on the term assigned numbers in our glossary for this resource only, and the note states that in the current context of these non-geographic 5XX-NXX code assignment guidelines, working in the PSTN means using a NANP E.164 addressing scheme.

The reason why we put that in there is the regular definition of assigned number for all of our resources says that the numbers are working in the PSTN so we put that in there, and we are asking that NANC give us concurrence with the addition of the note to this assigned number definition, and request that the NANC notify the FCC of such action, that we’re doing this.

What we’re asking to do is similar to what we did with some changes that we made with the Service Members Civil Relief Act and that is we changed some of the definitions a little bit to comply with that and then kind of just notified the FCC and waited to see if, you know, they have an issue, like let us know.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Questions? And let me remind you, when people speak, I think some of the people on the phone are having difficulty hearing some of us, so please speak directly into the microphone. Mary.

MS. RETKA: This is Mary Retka from CenturyLink. And I just wanted to let the NANC know that Natalie very quickly brushed over the fact that this was a very significant effort for the INC, a year and half effort on the part of everybody working together on it.

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

So the recommendation for the INC is that the NANC endorse this note --

(Recording Interrupted)

CHAIRMAN KANE: -- Which the language -- which starts with the word note on slide four, to be added to the guidelines.

Now let me ask from a layman's point of view, there has been an issue about direct assignment of numbers to voice over Internet protocol. Is this related to that at all?

MS. MCNAMER: Not from my understanding it's not because these are not for voice. You can't carry voice over them so it doesn't seem to me that it would be connected to the VoIP providers at all. This is data type applications.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Anything else? Any other questions?

I know that you all have been working on this. You have had plenty of time and have done a lot of work and we appreciate that.

I know sometimes we look at the meetings. The meetings are short but there is so much work that goes on in the Working Groups and the conference calls and everything before we get to our quarterly NANC meetings.

Are we ready to move ahead at today's meeting with discussion or consideration of this recommendation request from the group? Is there any objection to moving ahead with it today? Is there any objection to endorsing the recommendation that this line, this sentence be added?

Then I will conclude that there is consensus and the NANC will go on record as endorsing this change or this clarification shall we say and I will communicate that to the FCC. Thank you.

MS. MCNAMER: And then the next issue we wanted to review with the NANC is Issue 726 which is clarification and identifying possible relief alternatives.

The INC reviewed the NPA Code Relief Planning and Notification Guidelines to ensure that the descriptions of the relief alternatives were still valid in the current environment. And we added some explanatory language around those relief plans for NPAs in which there is a high concentration of the assigned NXXs in one or two rate centers.

In these cases an overlay is the only relief alternative that complies with the guidelines. So a recent thing that we're seeing a lot of during relief planning meetings across the country is that none of the split options that the NANPA tries to put together comply with our guidelines and with practice, so we're putting it in the guidelines to make it clear that there are going to be some cases that it will only be an overlay.

INC added more detailed reasons also for discontinuing any practice of allowing seven digit dialing across NPA boundaries. Continuing the practice can shorten the forecasted lives in the NPA currently under relief planning as well as in adjacent NPAs. Two-way seven-digit dialing across NPAs might involve several rate centers and many NXX codes and multiple NPAs.

One big thing is that the relief planning model used by the NANPA cannot take into account these protected routes when projecting the lives of a new NPA because the model assumptions are based on the premise that all NXXs would be available for assignment in all rate centers.

So the high number of protected routes may impact the availability of NXX codes in specific rate centers, usually in the high demand rate centers, which directly impacts the exhaust timeframes of the NPA. As a result the NPA relief planning may not start in time to permit for

standard intervals for relief implementation.

So when they have these protected routes across the NPAs it's very hard to determine what new relief plans, how long the NPAs would last, so we made that more clear in the guidelines to assist with service providers and states in determining relief planning options.

Are there any questions on Issue 726?

Then the rest of the presentation, I'm on page six, are the issues that are currently in initial pending. Then we have the issues that have been placed into final closure since our last NANC meeting, and all of our web pages for your reference.

Are there any questions on anything from the presentation? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Any questions on the phone?

And our last report is Agenda Item Number 12 and Document Number 12, the report of the Future of Numbering Working Group.

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

MR. NEWMAN: Good morning, Adam Newman, Telcordia Technologies, one of the Co-Chairs of the FoN. My fellow Co-Chairs are Jim Castagna from Verizon and Don Gray from the Nebraska Public Service Commission.

Our first slide just lists our last call since the last meeting. We did take most of the summer off but we did have a meeting on September 5th after Labor Day. I mentioned in the last report that we would be looking at a couple of new issues and at that meeting we did review, discuss, edit, and accept two new issues, activity/issues.

We call them activity issue descriptions, aids, and then we give them numbers, FoN tracking

numbers 06. So usually I talk about FTNs because they're already accepted here but today we're talking about two new issues, so just to sort of explain that weird sort of set of acronyms that we use within the Working Group.

So the first one, which is FTN 006, is on M2M Demand. As you can see here, the project is to monitor machine-to-machine demand relevant to its impact on NANP resources.

We looked to receive and provide periodic updates on various standards committee technical reports and interim or long term recommendations for machine-to-machine addressing, and consider whether any industry guidelines or any other modifications need to be updated to accommodate M2M addressing solutions.

If you'll remember over our last couple of reports, we had generally discussed at FoN keeping an eye on M2M, looking at some of the work that was being done by the Industry Numbering Committee with regard to the 5XX, it's really hard for me not to say 5YY guidelines, that Natalie just reported to you on.

And we had also been studying what had been going on at GSMA from a standards perspective and ITU-T Study Group Two from a standards perspective.

So this issue looks to formalize that work and provide us with some activities. If you actually look on page four, there's a suggested plan of action and activities to monitor the demand and impact on NANP numbering resources, identifying standards, activities, focused on long term solutions for M2M, particularly those going on both within the U.S. possibly as part of the transition, or the new M2M committee that's going on at ATIS, or within the GSMA or ITU as well, assessing any impact of technical options that those committees come up with on

NANP resources and making any recommendations with regard to any changes to the way we're currently doing numbering and addressing for M2M resources. So that's our suggested plan of activities.

You'll note right below that there are the groups I mentioned that will be sort of looking at the work we're doing for input into our work as we work this issue. So that was the first issue that we had consensus on the call to accept with some modifications.

This is actually the issue statement as edited, pretty much cut and pasted into the slides. The issues will be posted on the website as well.

The second issue that we discussed and accepted was FTN 007, PSTN to IP transition. The project description here is to monitor regulatory and industry activities associated with the evolution of the PSTN to an IP based infrastructure and to address the impacts of that transition on numbering resources and numbering administration.

The plan of activities there is to monitor the regulatory and industry groups, to evaluate recommendations or mandates, address any modifications that are necessary to accommodate the transition, and to develop a plan to contribute as needed to the development of transition plans for numbering resources. And I actually threw the as needed upfront, as needed or per NANC directions.

So we're going to monitor the activities that are going on in other committees, whether it's the PSTN to IP transition focus group at ATIS, the PSTN to transition work that has been going at the FCC's TAC, and in other industry bodies as well, including the work being done at ITU-T Study Group Two.

And then if it looks like there is a place for us to contribute we'll either develop a plan to make such a contribution and present it to NANC for approval, or if things come the other way, for example if the TAC in the FCC makes a report to the FCC and then the FCC decides to direct NANC to essentially do some work on numbering and transition, this issue could be a vehicle for us to do that work as well.

Our last two slides, if there are no questions on the issue, are a reminder of our other open issues that we're not doing a whole lot of work on right now, 01 is new and future services, 02 is Telematics and the use of NANP numbers, and 04 is geographic issues impacting a number of policy decisions.

As I reported last time, what we thought would happen, we knew these two issues were going to come in and we were going to see how the work went in those two issues to see if any of those overlapped these issues and potentially led us to seek to either close or withdraw any of these issues, and if they don't then we may look to pick back up some of the work in these issues. Again it's based on the contributions of the members and as they get (unintelligible) it.

And the last slide is our closed or not accepted issues. There's nothing new on this slide since our last report.

Our final substantive slide is our scheduled calls. We meet the first Wednesday of every month, usually for an hour, sometimes two. Our next meeting is October 3rd and if you would like to be added to the FON mailing list, please send me an e-mail. My e-mail is there.

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

Adam, on slide four on the M2M Demand and monitoring that, what is your time schedule on that and will you be in a position to present a report of any of your findings or monitoring?

MR. NEWMAN: We don't have a schedule yet because this is a brand new issue. So keep in mind that as Natalie mentioned and as John reports consistently from NANPA, most of the machine-to-machine numbering that's being done in the U.S. today is on the 5XX NPA so it's not that all of the use of the 5XX is M2M per se, but much of it is so in some ways a proxy for that in the U.S. is the updates that we get from Mr. Manning from a 5XX exhaust update and planning.

Now it would not surprise me if the committee, the Working Group decides to look at other ways of measuring or analyzing some of the data from other sources as well.

I think that goes to sort of the second bullet in that slide which is measuring consumption of non-geographic resources but it remains to be seen as to what work we'll do beyond keeping an eye on the 5XX codes that (unintelligible) guidelines for NANP provides the reporting of usage for.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, so we would be able to get that information through the NANP reports.

MR. NEWMAN: Yes. And we do have NANPA participation on our calls.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Right. So you don't plan in the next six months or so, any particular report to the NANC?

MR. NEWMAN: Not that I know of. I mean you'll clearly get regular reports on the issues. I don't know yet if this will resolve in say a formal report on demand. I think we need

to see what the data is and see what the work develops on a going forward basis.

You know, maybe at the next meeting we'll have some more information and we'll be able to give you some information and then NANC can give us some more direction along these lines if they want something more formal.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENTS AND PARTICIPATION

MR. NEWMAN: I think you have somebody for a public comment.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, public comments are next.

MR. NEWMAN: Well, it's just for this report.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, go ahead.

MR. EMARD: My name is Jean Paul Emard. I'm with ATIS.

And I want to also make the NANC aware of the fact that ATIS along with six other organizations are looking at M2M numbering or M2M usage of numbers internationally. That organization is called One M2M, small --

(Recording Interrupted)

MR. EMARD:-- M2M, and that group will be also reporting into the ATIS M2M committee, the new one that we've just established about two months ago, and that group within ATIS plans to work very closely with INC because of the potential for numbering issues and how numbering will be affected et cetera.

So the liaison reports will be going into INC and then ATIS does participate on the FoN and, therefore, we will also make the FoN aware of those kinds of activities. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Do you have a timeline on that? I'm just looking for in the next 12 months whether we would be expecting or should be focusing -- I know you just started.

MR. EMARD: The One M2M committee, the international committee, meets periodically and that could be on a quarterly basis. It's international in scope and therefore there's a lot of international travel et cetera that's involved.

And relative to the M2M committee within ATIS, that works just like INC does, it works on issues and it works on contributions, and depending on what issues are in front of the committee, it will depend on what work is being done. And again, if there's something that deals with numbering we'll be bringing it back to INC and it will be either in the INC report or in the FoN report or in both.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you. Thank you, Adam. Any questions? All right, thank you.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

Summary of action items, just again for the record, I think we reached consensus on two issues. One in the cancellation and disconnect flow changes, clarifications, to endorse it and send that to the FCC, and in the non-geographic 5XX clarifications to send that to the FCC.

OTHER BUSINESS

Are there any additional members of the public who want to make any comments? Is there any other business before us? Rosemary?

MS. EMMER: So in continuing to be mindful of going green, you will recall that we decided not to have our meeting meetings copied anymore or paper copies.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes.

MS. EMMER: I noticed today that there is one document, it's only two pages, but it's the public notice for the meeting, and I think we already know about it if we're here. So I don't know if it's a federal process that you have to provide a paper copy. We didn't know about that for the meeting notes either so it had to be an action item that was taken back.

But I thought I would just mention that from a Sprint perspective I don't need that copy. We don't need that copy so if we would like to take an action to find out if we could not have that copy anymore that would be really great. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you for reminding us about that. I notice also we've got lots of electrical outlets here and so often when I come to meetings I have it all on my laptop, all the documents that have been sent out electronically. I know my staff puts them in a notebook.

So we're trying to cut back on paper but we want people to have what they need too so when it's sent out ahead of time it would be easier just to put it into one place on the laptop and look at it here electronically. But thank you.

Of course we're also trying to reduce the use of electricity in the District of Columbia. We have a sustainable energy utility whose goal is to reduce the use of electricity one percent, or energy I should say, all energy one percent on an annual basis.

Are there any other comments? I have one which I should have done at the beginning which is to announce that there are two new members for the NANC.

Michelle Thomas was managing Corporate Council and was appointed on September 6th as the primary NANC member on behalf of T-Mobile USA.

And Carolee Hall, who is a telecommunication analyst from the Idaho Public Utility Commission, has been appointed as an alternate on behalf of NARUC and that was effective August 23, 2012, and she is with us here today. Thank you, Carolee.

Our next meeting is on December 13th. It does start at 10:00 a.m. and I guess with that little line we had out there with the new security, keep that in mind coming through. We hope it will be a no snow day in December here. We'll get the agenda items out ahead of time. Yes.

MS. MCNAMER: This is Natalie McNamer. I'm one of the NOWG Tri-Chairs. The NOWG is working on our schedule for next year for the performance reports, and they had asked that we bring up to the NANC about next year's schedule for the NANC meetings.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, thank you very much. I will work with the FCC. We will get out a proposed schedule of our quarterly meetings for 2013, and get that out so everybody can comment on it and we can have that known within the next 30 days of so.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer with Sprint Nextel. I haven't put together the master schedule yet that I usually send to you guys. I'll try to get that done in the next couple of weeks so if you could kind wait until you get that like you usually do --

CHAIRMAN KANE: Certainly, we can use that input.

MS. EMMER: I haven't put it together so I'm not 100 percent sure but I think that most if not all of the groups have already decided on their schedule for next year so as soon as I get that together --

CHAIRMAN KANE: On their meeting schedules, and then we have the schedule for the RFP and the vendor to work into it, and we'll put that altogether and then look and see when we

can schedule our quarterly NANC meetings so that it coincides with when we're going to get reports, recommendations, or need to take action from the various Working Groups.

MS. EMMER: It's nice to see that everyone is so early this year. Usually I have plenty of time to put together a master and then think about sending it over and then, you know, it's another month or two before we'd even need to think about NANC meetings. So thank you everybody, that's great.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you, and hopefully that will help knowing when the FCC meetings are going to be also for the use of this room.

Okay, well, for the record it is 11:58 a.m. and we are adjourned. Thank you all very much for your participation.

(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:
