North American Numbering Council
Meeting Transcript
June 20, 2013 (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.	Hank Hultquist	AT&T Inc.
4.	Greg Rogers	Bandwidth.com, Inc.
5.	Mary Retka	CenturyLink
6.	Valerie R. Cardwell	Comcast Corporation
7.	Mary Albert	CompTel
8.	Matt Gerst	CTIA
9.	David Greenhaus	800 Response Information Services
10.	Gregory T. Diamond	Level 3 Communications, LLC
11.	Hon. Paul Kjellander/Carolee Hall	NARUC – Idaho
12.	Hon. Swati Dandekar/Michael Balch	NARUC - Iowa
13.	Wayne Jortner	NASUCA
14.	Tom Dixon	NASUCA
15.	Jerome Candelaria	NCTA
16.	John McHugh	NTCA - The Rural Broadband Assn.
17.	JT Ambrosi	SMS/800, Inc.
18.	Rosemary Emmer	Sprint Nextel
19.	Michelle Thomas	T-Mobile USA, Inc.
20.	Thomas Soroka, Jr.	USTA
21.	Kevin Green	Verizon
22.	Brendan Kasper	Vonage
23.	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)
Ann Stevens, Deputy Chief, Competition Policy Division
Sanford Williams, Competition Policy Division
Carmell Weathers, Competition Policy Division

III. Estimate of Public Attendance. Approximately 20 members of the public attended the meeting as observers.

IV. Documents Introduced.

(1)   Agenda
(2)   NANC Meeting Transcript – February 21, 2013
(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
(5a)   Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG) 2012 NANPA Performance Evaluation Report
(5b)   Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG) 2012 PA Performance Evaluation Report
(6)   Billing and Collection Agent Report
(7)   Billing and Collection Working Group (B&C WG) Report to the NANC
(7a)   B&C WG Contingency Plan
(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.

VI. Summary of the Meeting

CHAIRMAN KANE: For the record it is Thursday, June 20, 2013, and we are starting at 10:06 a.m. in the meeting room at the Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W.

We are going to start with the roll call. I am Betty Ann Kane, the Chairman of the North American Numbering Council. We will go around this way. I think there is also a sign-in sheet that's going around and we will also ask if there are any people on the phone. We will open the phone bridge.

COMMISSIONER WHY: Hi, my name Jeff Why. I'm the Co-Chair and I'm with the Massachusetts Commission.

MR. HULTQUIST: Hank Hultquist, with AT&T.

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka, Century Link.

MS. CARDWELL: Valerie Cardwell, Comcast.

MS. ALBERT: I'm Mary Albert, CompTel.

CHAIRMAN KANE: I'll call the roll for the folks on the phone in just a minute. I just want to remind people in the room there is a man back there who turns your microphone on so wait a couple of seconds before you speak to be sure it's on. Go ahead.

MR. GERST: Matt Gerst, CTIA.

MS. HALL: Carolee Hall, Idaho staff.

MR CANDELARIA: Jerome Candelaria, NCTA.

MR. MCHUGH: John McHugh, NTCA.

MR. AMBROSI: John Ambrosi, SMS-800.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint-Nextel.

MR. GREEN: Kevin Green, Verizon.

MR. KASPER: Brendan Kasper, Vonage.

MS. JONES: Marilyn Jones, FCC.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Now folks on the phone, one at a time.

MS. JORDAN CAMPAGNOLI: My name is Paula Jordan Campagnoli

with T-Mobile and I'm representing the LNPA Working Group today.

MR. SOROKA: Tom Soroka, US Telecom.

MS. DANDEKAR: Swati Dandekar and Mike Balch from Iowa

Commission.

MR. STEEN: Ron Steen, AT&T.

MS. PETERMAN: Linda Peterman, Earth Link Business.

MS. THOMAS: Michelle Thomas, T-Mobile.

MS. HYMANS: Linda Hymans, NeuStar Pooling.

MS. BEATON: Rebecca Beaton, Washington State Commission staff.

MR. KJELLANDER: Paul Kjellander, Idaho.

MR. DIAMOND: This Greg Diamond with Level 3 Communications.

MR. ROGERS: Greg Rogers with Bandwith.

MS. ADDINGTON: Sue Addington, Sprint-Nextel.

MR. HEPBURN: Christopher Hepburn, Pennsylvania Public Utility

Commission.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you, Chris

MS. BAKKE: Kathy Bakke, Wisconsin Public Service Commission.

MR. JORTNER: Wayne Jortner, Maine Public Advocate representing

NASUCA.

MR. DIXON: Tom Dixon from the Colorado Commission also representing

NASUCA.

MR. GREENHAUS: David Greenhaus 800 Response.

MS. SCARVARIA: Melissa Scarvaria Ohio Commission staff.

MR. CARPENTER: Jay Carpenter 1-800 AFTA.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you. A lot of people on the phone. I'm going to ask you also if you would e-mail to Carmell Weathers the fact that you are on the phone just so that we get that. It's being recorded but it is better to have it in writing for the minutes of the meeting. So that's carmell.weathers@fcc.gov. Thank you.

ANNOUCEMENTS AND RECENT NEWS

The next thing on the agenda are announcements and recent news. I don't have any announcements. Marilyn, do you have any announcements from the FCC?

MS. JONES: No, I do not.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay. I will note because it's not on the agenda that the FCC did approve a pilot program for VOIP providers having to do with access to numbers and I did ask actually that we have a briefing on that at this meeting because it is an open issue still. I believe the answer I got back was that FCC staff would not be able at this time to give that briefing but we can still work on it and get something before us perhaps at the September meeting.

APPROVAL OF MEETING TRANSCRIPT

CHAIRMAN KANE: All right, no announcements or recent news. I will next move to the approval of the transcript. The transcript of the February 21, 2013

meeting was sent out to everybody. Are there any additions, corrections, or questions about the transcript? Anybody on the phone? All right, then I will take by unanimous consent we will approve the transcript of the February 21, 2013 meeting.

REPORT OF THE NORTH AMERICAN NUMBERING PLAN ADMINISTRATOR (NANPA)

CHAIRMAN KANE: Now we will move to the reports and the first report is the report of the North American Numbering Plan Administrator. John Manning.

MR. MANNING: Good morning, everybody. You have a copy of my presentation before you. We will review the CO code assignment activity for the first five months of this year, talk about area code assignments and some relief planning activity, give you a brief update on our NANP administration system technical refresh, and just a brief update on our one outstanding NANPA change order.

Beginning on page two of my report, the chart at the top of the report outlines essential office code assignment activity for the first five months of 2013 and compares it with the previous four years in terms of total assignments, denials, returns, reclamations, et cetera.

You will notice first that the assignments for the first five months of this year are roughly 1,300 codes. That's up slightly compared to the previous four years in terms of overall assignment rate. I have also listed on here the quantity of assignments for each of the first five months.

You will also note that the quantity of returns, reclamations, are down compared to 2011 and 2012. This is due primarily to the fact that we had a fairly large quantity of returns both in 2011 and 2012 by two different service providers. And finally when you take the first five months of 2013 and you annualize that, we are looking at approximately 3,100 codes assigned this year, slightly higher than the previous years.

Now the question one might have is do we have any idea what might be contributing to this slight increase in overall assignments and you recognize that when NANPA gets an application for a CO code we do not know what that code is for so we can't tell you specifics about what that code will be used for.

But typically the types of things that we would see that might generate some type of increased demand would be expanding services by service providers whatever those services may be. Service providers might be expanding their service areas, or you might potentially be seeing new players coming into the market.

Although I do not have specific data to tell you which one of those that is really driving this slight increase, I will say that we can see through public resources that there is some expansion of service areas by some service providers that is impacting overall CO code demand, whether that will continue or not we'll have to wait and see.

I will note though in looking at the NRUF, the number resource utilization forecast data that was submitted by service providers for the current NRUF cycle

which was done back in February, we did see an increase in overall forecasted demand from an aggregate perspective all across the U.S. so this may be just the activity itself is an indication of what was projected is actually that we're seeing that in terms of actual assignments.

Any questions on the CO code assignment demand?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions on the phone?

MR. MANNING: Okay, looking at NPA activity we've only assigned one area code so far this year and that was down in Texas, the 346 for the overlay complex 281, 713, 832, which is in the Houston Texas area.

We've had four area codes go into service, all of them up in Canada. I have them listed here on the report. And we have two area codes that are scheduled to go in service for the second part of 2013, that would be in Texas, 512 overlay with the 737 area code which is scheduled to go in service at the beginning of next month, and the Pennsylvania 272 to overlay the 570 which is scheduled for October 21st.

Page three of the report addresses the status of relief planning activities. The first two activities I note here I just mentioned previously, the 512 where they are having the overlay of the 737 area code. Mandatory ten digit dialing just started at the beginning of this month and the in service date is July 1st. And in the Pennsylvania 570 as I just mentioned, the mandatory ten digit dialing will begin in September with an in service date of October 21, 2013.

The other area code I would mention is Kentucky's 270 which is going to

have an overlay with the 364 area code. Ten digit permissive dialing is scheduled to begin this summer, August 3, 2013. Mandatory dialing will start in the first part of February 1, 2014, with an in service date of March 3, 2014.

You will see from the next page and a half, there are a number of activities underway. We had previously mentioned the 702 being overlaid with the 725 in the Las Vegas area of Nevada. You will see there that permissive dialing is scheduled to begin also on August 3rd, ten digit dialing will begin May 3, 2014, and the effective date of the new NPA will be in June of 2014.

I have already just previously mentioned the overlay that is going to be happening in the Texas 713, 281, 832 because this is already in overlay and we're adding another area code. The new effective date for the 346 NPA will be July 1, 2014.

In California we just recently filed a petition with the California Public Utilities Commission and recommended an all services overlay of the 415 area code which is the San Francisco area.

In Indiana 812 we filed a petition to the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission back in August and recommended an all services overlay and the Commission has been conducting numerous educational sessions and field hearings over the past several months. They had an evidentiary hearing that just took place this week and we are expecting we will see some type of decision on this particular activity in the coming months.

Area code 843 in South Carolina, we conducted a really planning meeting in March. The industry is recommending an overlay and we filed that petition May 31st of this year.

Two area codes in Ohio, the first one is 740. We issued a revised exhaust projection in 740 back in March. The new exhaust date was the second quarter of 2015. On May 1st we conducted a relief planning meeting and the industry will be recommending an overlay and we anticipate filing the petition on behalf of the industry in the next few weeks.

Ohio 440, and like 740 NPA we revised the exhaust projection of the 440 and the new exhaust projection was second quarter 2014. As a result of that NANPA declared jeopardy and that's essentially meaning that the supply of CO codes does not appear to be ample enough to meet the timeframe that will be necessary to implement an overlay and with regard to that we conducted a relief planning meeting for 440 on May 1st and the industry is recommending an overlay.

On May 10th the NANPA revised the exhaust projection for 440 based upon a reduction in forecasted code demand and we rescinded that jeopardy. The new exhaust date is now first quarter of 2018, and based upon this information the industry decided to delay the filing of the relief petition and identified specific triggers that will be used to determine the appropriate timeframe to revisit this particular matter.

And then finally in North Carolina 336, we visited the North Carolina

Utilities Commission to give them an update on area code 336. A relief plan for this particular area code was filed many, many years ago. It was just simply never acted upon.

We will be updating the lives of the alternatives included in that petition so that the Commission has the most recent data to use in coming up with their final determination as to what relief alternative they wish to implement.

Any questions on area code relief planning or any of the material I just covered with regard to area codes?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions? Questions on the phone? I have one question, John. On 440, what area is that?

MR. MANNING: That's Ohio.

CHAIRMAN KANE: I know but where?

MR. MANNING: It's just outside surrounding the Cleveland area.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Cleveland area, okay. That's a big change from an exhaust projection of second quarter 2014 and now first quarter of 2018, I mean that's almost a four year difference. Any reason the data was so off or striking new information received? Usually it gets revised a couple of years or a year, one way or other.

MR. MANNING: Well, I will say this. We had seen significant demand in terms of actual assignments in 440 for the past 12 to 18 months which was consistent with the forecast that we were looking at.

When the attention was focused on the need to begin to implement area code relief planning I think -- service providers will typically go back and take a look at what their forecasting to insure that what we're looking that's driving us to make the decisions and move forward with relief planning is indeed appropriate and that those forecasts are still good if you will.

I think in this particular instance you can probably say that once that focus was put on 440 with the relief starting up and the jeopardy, those events took place and as a result some modifications were made to the forecast, the result being that that forecast and projection of 2014 could move out to 2018.

The good news is it did get the industry together. We did put together a plan and we have it ready to go. We may have done it in advance sooner then what would have typically been expected but at least in this particular instance we were able to work it with 740 NPA. We got both of them done and we will be ready to go when that date does come and we need to file that petition.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you.

MR. MANNING: At the middle of page four I wanted to give you an update on our NANP administration system technical refresh. I have noted in previous reports to the NANC that with the new contract awarded to Neustar back in July of 2012, we were doing some updates and enhancements and refresh of the NANP administration system.

Well, in April, just a few months ago we completed that refresh. We added

new web application, and database servers were deployed as well as a refresh of the

software application platform, and deployment of this new platform and this

software took place the weekend of April 26th to 28th, 2013.

Now the majority of the functionality with regard to the NANP

administration system did not change with the refresh but there were some

enhancements primarily in the area of the number resource utilization and

forecasting, NRUF portion or functionality in the system.

For example, at the bottom of page four I note NAS is modified to permit

service providers to search for NRUF data in all states and all NPAs Previously

service providers were limited in their searches to a particular state when running

certain NRUF reports.

So that was a function that we had heard over the years that many carriers

would like to have. It gives them a better opportunity to be able to see the data as

well as manage what they have put into the system.

With this change the NRUF reports are now downloadable in Excel 2007 as

well as 2003. The big deal there is because the 2007 allows you to download a lot

more data. Previously you were kind of limited to the amount of data so with the

ability to see and obtain a lot more data, we've given you the ability to download that

information.

And we are also with that added functionality limiting the amount of data you

can see in the system through the on screen viewable portion of the NRUF reports so

if you really need to see a lot of data you're going to have to download that information.

We've also added some keys such as help buttons throughout the form to help service providers who are completing their NRUF. Instead of having to refer specifically to a user guide that's available to them, they will be able to actually click on a button on the screen and get help for whatever particular aspect they're looking to complete on the form.

And finally we added to the form the ability for service providers to now via our dropdown menu, select a particular parent company OCN that they're going to put on their NRUF form. That's very, very important because the parent company OCN is used by a number of organizations to try and understand the relationship of entities that have multiple operating company members.

Previously service providers just kind of free formed that in an open text field and now they have the ability to select it from a dropdown menu that's driven from their profile in the system. That hopefully will improve the accuracy of the data as well as assisting service providers with completing the form.

And finally on the middle of page five I reference some additional reports that we made available. Some of these reports have already been there but we now make them on a daily basis rather then a monthly basis. Area code relief planning status activities report, a triggers report which is updated occasionally, not all that often but still it's now available on a daily basis.

We added a new report, in fact it's a report that I provide here to the NANC. It's the NPAs exhausting in the next 36 months which is actually attached to my report here and that's now a daily report made available to users.

And we've also updated our dialing plans report. It's converted to an online report, downloadable Excel 2007 and provides dialing plan information for all NPAs in service. Previously it was just those in the U.S. Now it's all NPAs whether they're in the U.S., Canada, Caribbean countries, et cetera. So that information is now available via the website.

Any questions on the NANP administration system technical refresh?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions on the phone? John, why didn't you go up to Microsoft 2010? Is that because people don't have it?

MR. MANNING: Yeah, that's an excellent question. We're always kind of dealing with the lowest common denominator when it comes to systems like this, recognizing that particularly the NANP administration system as well as NAS in general is used not only by service providers, state and federal regulators, but the general public will often go to that particular site and we're kind of always faced with the issue of how far can we advance in the latest releases off the shelf software. I mean one would argue that we should be having any downloadable word documents also in Word Perfect but the fact of the matter is we've got to begin --

CHAIRMAN KANE: But my husband still has Word Perfect.

MR. MANNING: That's not a knock on Word Perfect but we try to at

least transition and that's what we're trying to do here, particularly in the NRUF reports, why we retained a 2003 as well as 2007, understanding that the primary users of that information may not have 2007 or for that matter 2010, but understanding if you're in 2010 you're at least backward compatible and can get that information. But we are trying to start that transition moving forward.

With regard to the outstanding NANPA change order, this is the change order I've been reporting on for some time now. It's Change Irder #1, INC issue 692 and INC issue 702. We are looking to deploy that change order at the end of September or late third quarter 2013, that's the timeframe we're looking to do. That's a particular change order that will add additional functionality for those entities that are interested in applying for and receiving 5XX or 5YY NPA NXX resources.

And finally at the bottom we just make note that we did publish our 2013 NANPA annual report at the end of March. We have done our first quarter newsletter and our second quarter newsletter will be out in just a few short weeks.

And the NPA NANP exhaust projections were posted to the NANPA website at the end of April and included with these projections was an exhaust forecast for all assigned 5YY resources.

And finally I make note, this report is always included with the NANPA report, the NPA exhaust in 36 months. For those of you who have studied this in the past you'll note that the format is different. The format matches what's now on the website so that's why you're seeing a little bit different format here.

That concludes my presentation.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Questions?

MR. CANDELARIA: You mentioned the FCCs IP trial and I'm wondering if you plan to capture the CO assignment impact of that trial in any of your reports, either this one or any of those you listed, and that is separately breakdown what you view as an impact of the CO trial.

MR. MANNING: Well, in our read of the trial participants and their proposals, based upon what they've submitted, potentially there may be some CO codes assigned but they will be very, very limited. I think the vast majority will be looking at the thousands block level but yes, we will be able to keep track of that.

We need to keep track of that making sure that any CO assignments as a result of the trial are consistent with the proposals that are put together. And going forward we're happy to outline for the NANC any specific assignments because it will be treated just like any other assignments. Once they're made they will be publicly available on all of the reports on the NANPA website and we'll be happy to highlight that type of information going forward.

CHAIRMAN KANE: I'm going to back up. We have to itemize these or number them. We will number the transcript as Document 2, and the agenda being Document 1, and your report John as Item 3 for the record. Thank you.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL THOUSANDS BLOCK POOLING ADMINISTRATOR (PA)

CHAIRMAN KANE: We now have the report of the National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator. And this for the record will be Item 4.

MS. PUTNAM: I'm Amy Putnam. I'm the National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator and pooling is fine. P-ani is fine too. I'm not sure if I should start adding that.

All right, the first page of your document shows the pooling activity summary data, June 2012 through May 2013.
I would note that from January to May of 2013, we have an increase of 25 percent over the same period in 2012.

On that same page we have the p-ani summary data with nothing extraordinary. The Part Three summary data is on page three. That is 12 months. That is our rolling summary for 12 months.

Following page we have codes opened and what they were opened for during the last 12 months, LRNs, dedicated customers and pool replenishment, and the summary of the rate center information changes. There is something significant on that page in that in May we had 273 rate center changes and I will be talking about that a little farther along. That was because of Office of Management and Budget and the Census Bureau.

On page five we have the reclamation summary, again nothing out of the ordinary there.

The pooling administration system was up 100 percent of the time since the

last meeting. The routing number administration system had one instance of unscheduled unavailability on May 28th, but we were still well within our contract compliance.

Other pooling related activities, the solicitation for the pooling contract was posted to fedbizops on April 26th with a due date of May 28th. You'll be pleased to know I hope that we submitted a proposal and at this point the pooling contract has been extended to July 14th. We are hoping to hear on our proposal before that date.

We completed all of our contract reporting requirements. We did file our annual report at the end of March and that was posted to the website. With respect to regulatory, the FCC issued an order delegating authority to Montana pursuant to a request for delegated authority that Montana had filed in November of 2011.

We were promptly in touch with the Commission staff explaining the implementation process and the Commission issued a notice regarding the implementation with comments due July 3rd. At some point thereafter we anticipate receiving an order from Montana to proceed with that.

P-ani administration; as of May 31st, we're continuing to reconcile data. The three areas where we have data issues, the same p-ani range or part of a p-ani range is being reported by more then one carrier, we started out with 287 sets of overlaps affecting 14 carriers.

We worked with ESIF, ECDR, and INC on this to establish a process and they jointly worked out a process and pursuant to that, 272 sets of overlapping ranges

that were being reported by more then one carrier have been resolved either by providing the correct NPA, the correct range, ranges were returned, or ranges were swapped out for new ranges. Se we're left at this point with only 15 sets of overlaps and we've been working with the carriers and are waiting to hear back that those ranges have been resolved.

The second note there, no assignee reported on a p-ani range that the assigner reported as assigned. We started with 4,561 ranges in that category and roughly 90 percent of those have been resolved at this point.

Duplicate assignment issues will continue to be an ongoing issue for us because we don't always know about them until we assign a range that appears from all the data that we have to be available and we find out that perhaps it was loaded into the network as a convenience and then nobody was using it and nobody reported on it, and so on an ongoing basis we are cleaning up the duplicate assignment issues.

Through the annual report process we found ranges that carriers had failed to report on initially or had received right around transition and we have added those into our database. And we are again through assignments finding issues where a carrier overlooked reporting on an assignment and we're cleaning those up. So p-ani is cleaning up its database and we are pleased to report that we are moving right along on that.

We also are processing the p-ani annual report and semi-annual forecasts and we attended INC and ESIF meetings during the month of April.

For the NOWG we had our operational review in mid March in Concord, California. All of the pooling administration people gathered for that operational review. We are pleased to report that the NOWG has recommended that we receive a rating of exceeded expectations and we received that information during the readout on June 3rd, which was the same date that the FCC received it.

And we participated in our regular monthly meetings with the NOWG.

We submitted no change orders since the last NANC meeting. We continued to work internally on change order 24, changes to the FTP interface in PAS, doing testing on some of those as we speak.

Special project, I have reported several times on the very old overdue Part Four project which we have done. This is the fourth time that we have initiated that. This last time we started out with 606 blocks on the list and we are down to six and we're working with state commissions on the remaining six, so 600 of those have been cleaned up.

VoIP trial, on April 28th the FCC issued the order that contained the language that we're referring to as the VoIP trial. That portion of the order took effect immediately and we met with the FCC on May 1st to discuss process questions. Six companies had filed plans to participate in the trial. The FCC has subsequently issued orders on that and the VOIP trial is proceeding as we speak.

The MSA name changes that I referred to earlier, OMB published bulletin 1301 entitled Revised Definitions of MSAs et cetera, and then shortly thereafter the

Bureau of Census released its 2012 population estimates by county. We are

obligated to maintain a current list of rate centers that are in the top 100 MSAs and

so that was a process that we went through taking those two documents to review

them.

We took the new relationships between counties and MSAs that were in the

OMB document and compared them with existing relationships and found that

numbers of counties had moved.

We then had to compared the existing MSA numbers to the new names and

note the updates and since the census figures had also been updated we needed to

figure out how the census figures affected the counties that were in the MSAs to see

if the MSAs had moved into the top 100 range.

So a completely updated database with new data from OMB and the Census

Bureau had to be reconstructed from the old database to make sure that all the county

names were accurate between the databases and our rate center to county table.

I call that ours. It's really Bruce Armstrong's. Bruce is the driving force

whenever we have something like this and it is a project that falls to him. He is the

regional director for quality assurance and just does a fabulous job and I wanted to

give him a plug.

We then reconstructed all the new population totals by MSA, got a new top

100 figure, then figured out which rate centers had either changed MSAs or moved

into or out of a top 100 MSA based on the counties that had been moved in and out,

and analyzed what actually affected the service providers and what were simply name changes.

We sent a notification to the FCC, sent notifications to the carriers that were affected, and then we completed that project.

And after all of that I am utterly embarrassed to say that as usual I printed your reports out in black and white so all of the rate centers on those lists on yours that show that they moved from red M to black M on the original don't show that on yours. But you have the lists of the rate centers.

So that is what we have done since the last NANC meeting. Do you have any questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Rosemary.

MS. EMMER: This is Rosemary Emmer with Sprint- Nextel. The MSA project sounds like it was overwhelming difficulty and challenging and I too want to thank Bruce and the pooling administrator for tackling this project.

MS. PUTNAM: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Amy, how often does OMB and the Census Bureau do that, because I know they do population updates pretty regularly.

MS. PUTNAM: After the census they do it.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, after the ten year census but the interim ones that they do don't affect your process?

MS. PUTNAM:	Well, sometimes they do. OMB sometimes issues reports that affect names, or a few years ago they came out with a huge one where they divided some of the micro-politan statistical areas and renamed things. It's kind of random so we monitor that to make sure -- the census one is not random obviously, but we monitor OMB and make sure that there aren't any bulletins that affect us to make sure that we're on top of it.

CHAIRMAN KANE:	And you need to do this because the rate centers that are in the top 100 metropolitan areas, the carriers are required to pool under FCC orders, it's not just for information purposes but there's actually a regulatory reason for it.

MS. PUTNAM:	That's correct. Yes, there's actually a regulatory reason. Because we have the categories on our website that show what category they fall under, whether they're mandatory under national pooling, mandatory under state pooling, single service provider mandatory optional or excluded, we have to know where they all fall within the MSAs so that we know and are sure that we are giving the correct information to the carriers, the public, and the regulators.

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

MS. HOWARD:	Yes, this is Suzanne Howard, Cox Communications. I have questions regarding your meetings with FCC on the VOIP trial. I'm curious as to the questions you have and what were the results of the conversation.

MS. PUTNAM:	I'm going to Marilyn on this.

MS. JONES: Suzanne, this is Marilyn. Can I get back to you with a response to that because off the top of my head I don't remember the meetings. I would have to check my notes.

MS. HOWARD: Okay, that's fine. Thank you.

MS. JONES: Okay, thank you.

MS. PUTNAM: And I'm deferring because some of it is certainly public information, some of it may be proprietary and I just want to make sure that what we provide is appropriate.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And some of it you may have filed ex parti on maybe not, maybe it didn't fall into that category.

MS. PUTNAM: We were advised that it did not fall into that category.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay.

MR. HULTQUIST: Hank Hultquist, AT&T. Amy, on this process when the counties and consequentially the rate centers that are part of the top 100 MSAs change, if a rate center falls out of being in the top 100 MSAs, do people stop pooling then or is it only a one way thing that --

MS. PUTNAM: It's only one way, yes. At the very, very beginning of pooling we addressed that issue with the FCC and said what happens if, and it's pretty much once you're pooling, you're always pooling. Actually the top 100 MSAs, it's somewhere around 130 top 100 MSAs at this point because once you're in, you're in. Our net has very small holes.

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka from Century Link. Marilyn, I know you said you were going to share the answer to Suzanne's question with her but would you also share it with the rest of us perhaps through Chairman Kane and her distribution?

MS. JONES: Sure.

MS. RETKA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: As you can see from our series of questions, this is an area of interest and the whole trial impacts some different things.

Okay, thank you very much. Any other questions on the phone? Okay, thank you.

REPORT OF THE NUMBERING OVERSIGHT WORKING GROUP (NOWG)

CHAIRMAN KANE: All right, our next item is the report of the Numbering Oversight Working Group and that report will be entered as Item 5.

MS. RIEPENKROGER: Thank you, Chairman Kane. My name is Karen Riepenkroger, Sprint-Nextel, and I Co-Chair the NOWG along with Laura Dalton of Verizon Communications.

So today we're going to talk about the 2012 NANPA performance report.

CHAIRMAN KANE: On the phone, please be sure you're on mute. We're hearing some conversation from the room that you're in.

COMMISSIONER DANDEKAR: Hi, this is Commissioner Dandekar from Iowa. We cannot hear you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: You cannot hear, okay, thank you. Please speak up, Karen.

MS. RIEPENKROGER: Can you hear me now?

COMMISSIONER DANDEKAR: Yes, thank you so much.

MS. RIEPENKROGER: You're welcome. Okay, so today we're going to discuss the 2012 NANPA performance report, the 2012 PA performance report, NOWG leadership, outstanding PA change orders, outstanding NANPA change orders, and then we will have a slide on NOWG participating companies and future meeting schedules.

So on slide three we are going to talk about the 2012 NANPA performance report. And the NANPAs annual performance assessment is based upon the 2012 performance feedback survey, written comments and reports, annual operational review, and NOWG observations and interactions with the NANPA throughout the calendar year.

And on page four you'll see that for 2012 the NANPA rating was determined by consensus of the NOWG to be Exceeded, and then we've put in what the Exceeded rating is and it is provided excellent above performance requirements and exceeded expectations. Performance was well above requirements and decisions, and recommendations exceeded requirements and expectations.

On the next slide we have the survey respondents and the total number of respondents to the 2012 NANPA survey was down from 2011 and the chart reflects

the trend of respondents since the inception of the NOWG performance survey. So for 2012 we had 38 industry and other up from 37 in 2011, and the regulators was 17 which was down from 25 in 2011.

And again are there any questions?

Okay, moving on, the next four slides reflect the aggregated response rankings for each section of the performance survey so I'm not going to go through each one of these but while you are viewing these slides on the NANPA, you will notice that the NANPA received high ratings in each of the categories of the survey.

So for a summary of written comments that were provided by survey respondents, significant praise for NANPA staff was a consistent theme throughout the survey and in many cases the comments provided praise for individual staff members.

The following reoccurring adjectives were used by multiple respondents to describe their experiences in working with the NANPA staff, timely, responsive, professional, courteous, helpful, knowledgeable, and excellent, accurate, and dedicated.

On slide 11, all of the comments received from the annual survey were positive and none suggested any areas needing improvement, and after thoroughly reviewing the comments received the NOWG concluded that the written comments indicated a very high level of satisfaction experienced by those who interacted with the NANPA.

And on the next slide on observations, as in previous years, the 2012 survey results continued to reveal a high level of client satisfaction with the continued perseverance, professionalism, and expertise exhibited by NANPA personnel when performing their NANPA duties. The NANPA continued to consistently and effectively demonstrate their expertise as a custodian of numbering resources in all areas in which they were involved.

On the next slide, slide 13, the NOWG makes the following recommendations for NANPAs consideration. Continue to proactively search for ways to improve processes, educate customers, and enhance system functionality. Continue to develop and produce instructional and training videos to be posted on the NANPA website such as how to request a growth code.

And then on semi-annual CIC report filing, we recommend that they send out reminder notices similar to what they do when they send out the NRUF reminder notice.

So at this time the NOWG requests NANC approval of the report and request the NANC Chair to transmit it to the FCC.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Any questions? Questions on the phone? We have a request that the NANC approves the report and that I would then of course send it to the FCC, officially transmit it. Is there any objection to approving this report? I will take it then that we've got unanimous consent. The report is approved and I will transmit it to the FCC.

MS. RIEPENKROGER: Chairman Kane, we will send you a clean copy with the draft watermark removed removed from the performance report.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you.

MS. RIEPENKROGER: Okay, moving on to the 2012 PA performance report, again as with the NANPA, the PA annual performance assessment is based upon 2012 performance feedback surveys for the PA and RNA.

I just want to note here that we did two separate surveys. We sent one out one for the PA and then we sent a separate one out for the RNA because of the different audience that would receive the surveys.

We also had written comments and reports, annual operational review, and NOWG observations and interactions with the PA. And Amy stole my thunder, thank you Amy. The PA rating for the 2012 performance year was determined by consensus of the NOWG to be Exceeded. And I'm not going to read it again but it is the same criteria as I read for the NANPA.

And on the next page, slide 16, the number of respondents for the 2012 PA survey was up from 2011, with an increase in industry and other, and the regulator respondents remained the same as in 2011.

And again the chart that we have on the sheet reflects the trend of respondents since the inception of the PA performance survey and they had significantly more this year for industry and other, from 40 in 2011 to 68 respondents in 2012, and then the regulators stayed at 30 for both 2011 and 2012.

On the next three slides, I'm not going to go through them as I did for the NANPA, these are the aggregated responses by section and as you read through the detail you will notice that the PA received high ratings in again all of the sections of the survey.

For slide 20, the summary is the summary of written comments that were provided by survey respondents for the PA survey. Outstanding praise for the PA staff was a consistent theme throughout the survey, provides excellent support, assistance, and technical expertise, always prompt, helpful, and courteous, professional, friendly, and responsive, and willing to go the extra mile to provide top notch service to their customers.

On slide 21, the comments suggesting improvement were mostly isolated and the comments pertained to process clarification questions and suggestions for PAS and website enhancements.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Are there any questions on that report? Yes.

MR. GREEN: This is Kevin Green, Verizon. I was just curious how the score came out to be Exceeded when it looks like there is a lot more Mets then Exceeded. So how does that process work?

MS. RIEPENKROGER: The numbers that you're seeing here, those where it looked like there was more Mets then Exceeded, that's just one piece of the criteria that we use when we're evaluating the PA. So we've got the PA and we have the RNA and we combined them this year, and the PA as a whole overall did an

excellent job.

When they rolled out the RNA database this year and the whole RNA program it rolled out flawlessly. I mean to the industry it was seamless, you know, you didn't see a lot of errors and didn't see a lot of problems with the database.

They responded to inquiries that the NOWG had throughout the year, reports, anything that we asked them to do they provided immediately. They did the Part Four cleanup report, all of those things, all of those pieces tie in together so it's more then just the surveys that we send out. The surveys are just one piece of the criteria that we use to create the Exceeded rating.

MR. GREEN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Now the next report.

MS. RIEPENKROGER: For the RNA, for 2012, this was the first year for the RNA survey. It wasn't an entire year but we put out the survey, I think it was April when they rolled it out. Amy, I don't have the exact timeline.

And so for the year, we sent this out and we got only 11 responses back. This is the first year so next year we will have a rolling chart on this. So we had eight industry and other, and three regulators that responded this year to the RNA survey.

And again, for the next three slides these are the aggregated results from each section of the survey and I think as you can see the results for the surveys, that they were very highly rated in all of the different sections of the survey by the survey respondents.

And so if we move to slide 26, what we have following is a summary of written comments that were provided by survey respondents. Outstanding praise for the RNA staff was a consistent theme throughout the survey, efficient, organized, and helpful, polite and responsive.

Comments suggesting improvements were mostly isolated. Comments pertained to suggestions for RNAS and website enhancements, and the ability to upload or attach documents rather then sending an e-mail.

NOWG observations, the NOWG concluded that the written comments were not indicative of any consistent performance issues for the PA and RNA, and in many cases provided significant praise for individual PA and RNA staffers.

And on slide 29, NOWG suggestions, we make the following recommendations for the PA consideration. Continue to review internal training processes to insure that consistency in understanding the processes and responding to service providers is communicated to the PA and RNA personnel and ongoing review of the PA and RNA websites to insure accuracy and timeliness of data and continue to consider process or systems enhancements suggested by regulators and service providers.

The NOWG requests that the NANC approve the report and request the NANC Chair to transmit it to the FCC. Are there any questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions on the phone? Rosemary.

MS. EMMER: This is Rosemary Emmer with

Sprint-Nextel. I know it takes this team months and months of hard work to get to this point and the dedication of this team is very impressive. Thank you very much for all you do.

MS. RIEPENKROGER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay we have a request. You said the report. This is the PA and the RNA report together, it's one report?

MS. RIEPENKROGER: Yes, that is the correct statement.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay. As before, is there any objection to approving this report and transmitting it to the FCC? Then I will take unanimous consent that that is approved and thank you very much.

MS. RIEPENKROGER: And again, we will remove the watermark and draft watermark and send it you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Right, and send the final copy, very good. Thank you.

MS. RIEPENKROGER: The next slides will go really quick. The next one is the NANPA change order and that was covered by John Manning but we always include it in here because they report to us on the change orders as well.

And then on slide 32 are the outstanding PA change orders. We did include the one that was implemented on 4/15, change order 23, but Amy did review the change order 24.

I missed this slide, I'm sorry, can we take a step back to slide 30, I'm so

sorry.

NOWG leadership, the NOWG Tri-Chair position formerly held by Natalie NcNamer is now vacant and the current future workload was reviewed by the two other Tri-Chairs and on an interim basis, the vacant Tri-Chair position will not be filled. Are there any questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: You're just glutens for work.

(LAUGHTER)

MS RIEPENKROGER: And I do apologize for skipping over this.

Now to slide 33, NOWG participating companies, it's just a list of the companies that participate. Page 34 is the upcoming NOWG meeting schedule, and then 35 is just comments about the NOWG meetings. If you're interested in attending a meeting you can certainly contact either Laura Dalton or myself. So that concludes the presentation.

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

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you, Karen. Are there any final questions for Karen? Thank you very much, appreciate that.

Item 6 is the Billing and Collection Agent report. And we will mark this report for the record as Document 6.

MS. MARCOTTE: Good morning, I'm Faith Marcotte and this is the Billing and Collection Agent report.

If you turn to page one this shows a statement of financial position of the Fund at May 31st. There is $839,000 in the bank, receivables of $236,000 which leaves us with total assets of $1,076,000. The accrued liabilities are shown below and that's basically one month owed to the vendors so that left the Fund with a $683,000 balance at May 31st.

On the next page it projects that out to June 30th which is the end of the year, the funding year, and we're projecting the Fund balance at $392,000. As you can see in the budget column we excepted a $1.5 million as the contingency balance. The bottom right hand corner box explains the difference and as we discussed before the main difference was the NANPA Admin contract was awarded higher than what had been budgeted. That was $1,350,000, the difference, and that's offset mainly by the carrier audits for $300,000 that did not take place. So the bulk of the difference was about $50,000 and it notes otherwise.

And on page three we've projected out to the next funding year and we had projected a contingency balance of $1,250,000. We now suspect that will be closer to a $1,290,000 but we're very early in the process. That would be just differences from when we did our projection as to what we projected the Fund balance would be at the end of the year. That's the main difference at this point because we do the budget in February.

On page four we see the forecast liabilities for the next six months is basically what we expect to pay out over the next six months to various vendors.

And on page five we have our deliverables.

Everything is proceeding as normal. I send up the regular monthly invoices in May and answered any phone calls. The red light notices process is going well.

Our contract has been extended to the end of November at this point. And as far as the annual billing, we received approval from the FCC and sent out based on the contribution factor, the annual invoices in June or about a week ago and the due date for those invoices is July 12th. Are there any questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions? I see you're still on an interim contract.

MS. MARCOTTE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And the current contract expired October 1, 2009?

MS. MARCOTTE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: All right, I'll make an inquiry to the FCC and see where we are with that process. It's been extended to November 30th now.

MS. MARCOTTE: Yes.

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

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you very much. Item 7, the Billing and Collection Working Group. This report will be Document 7. Rosemary.

MS. EMMER: Thank you, Chairman Kane. Rosemary Emmer with Sprint-Nextel. I Chair the Billing and Collection Working Group along with Tim Decker of

Verizon.

The Billing and Collection Working Group is responsible for overseeing the performance of functional requirements provided by the agent and we review the performance of the agent monthly.

Our current activities, we are currently overseeing the monthly billing and collections and evaluating the deliverables.

We finalized a contingency plan in the event of an extenuating circumstance that might arise where our expenditures may exceed our proposed budget and I'll go over that in a few minutes. You also have a copy of that on your desk.

We also completed the performance evaluation of the B&C agent for last year and I'll go over that as well.

A contribution factor update, we'd like to thank the NANC for responding so quickly via e-mail last month I believe it was, to endorse the new contribution factor as we decided that we needed a little bit more money in our contingency fund and took it up to $125 million to account for any increases in the two pending contracts. So we'd like to thank the NANC for taking care of that so quickly. Page five shows the history of the contribution factor.

Page six, the Welch performance review. The B&C Working Group developed the evaluation consistent with the monthly deliverable matrix. The rating scheme that we used this year has been the same that we've used for the past many

years and this was a Met or Not Met performance.

We considered and analyzed a myriad of data components basically in communication with the B&C Working Group agent while compiling this overall evaluation. We used the monthly deliverables and we used team meeting materials. This is very similar to what you just heard the NOWG go over. We use a similar review process. We looked at the NANC reports, the monthly reports, customer service that we receive, co-chair interaction with the agent, that sort of thing.

And I'm pleased to report that the Welch rating this year was a MET so I'd like to thank you Faith and the folks back at home, Garth and Heather for an outstanding performance year. Thank you.

Now we'll move on to the contingency plan that you have a copy of. The purpose of this plan was to provide or address as I mentioned before any kind of contingent needs related to the responsibilities of the agent in the event where our annual funding is somehow less then what was billed.

So the scope enables us to insure that the forecast is sufficient, that we have predictable annual contribution factors for the carriers and member countries, and to insure the functional requirements are adhered to and compiled with.

We have listed a section of triggers in the report. For example on page ten, contractual changes to existing agreements outside the current terms, change orders which exceed the projected costs or remaining monthly expenditures available, and accounts payable factors such as slow payments or lack of payments.

On page 11, I'm just going to read the top portion for the record. So to date the FCC via the government procurement and contracting processes have aided in efforts to mitigate the need for the B&C Working Group to direct the agent to bill additional funding requirements to address any funding activity shortfalls, however we have defined a general timing requirement which is basically to meet with the agent as soon as possible, then the FCC and the NANC to work cooperatively and effectively in a timely manner to insure positive balances exist in all accounts. And once this is approved the agent will notify the billed parties and then make the NANC and the FCC aware. Are there any questions on the contingency plan that we've put forth?

CHAIRMAN KANE: This is a new plan, Rosemary?

MS. EMMER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And really putting into formal words some things that may have happened in the past but putting it into an actual plan.

MS. EMMER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you. Mary.

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka from Century Link. I want to just correct that they have not actually happened in the past.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Could have happened.

MS. RETKA: Right. We are not allowed per the order to run in the red so because of that and because of the conditions that we started to envision with this last

year, we determined that we need something to avoid that possibly happening and so

that's why -- so it never has happened that we've run into the red mainly because,

and that's what Rosemary recognized in her presentation, the assistance of the FCC

to help us avoid that.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you for that clarification.

MS. EMMER: So today we ask the NANC to approve the Billing and

Collection Agent 2012 performance evaluation and also to endorse our contingency

plan. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Questions on both of those requests for approval,

either of them? Rosemary, what we have here is just a slide. Is that the plan?

MS. EMMER: Oh, no, I'm sorry. The plan looks like this.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, the plan is there. Thank you. So we are going

to mark that Document as 7-A, that will be the actual plan.

MS. EMMER: And I know I mentioned this during the last NANC meeting

but I did want to recognize Mary Retka and Michelle Thomas for their dedication to

this document for they are the ones who basically created it and wrote it for the team.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. All right we have two

recommendations. We will take them separately. One to approve the evaluation, the

performance report on the Billing and Collection agent. Any objection? Hearing no

objection that is unanimously approved and we will transmit that to the FCC.

And secondly to approve the contingency plan presented by the Billing and Collection Working Group which is Document 7-A. Any objection to that recommendation? Then I will consider that also approved. And does that need to be filed with the FCC Rosemary, or just keep it --

MS. EMMER: I would imagine yes, it probably would.

CHAIRMAN KANE: We will have it in the record of today's meeting. It will be there.

MS. EMMER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much. Thank you for your work on that also, Mary.

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

CHAIRMAN KANE: Agenda Item 8 is the report of the North American Portability Management LLC and that will be Document 8.

MR. DECKER: Good morning, everyone. My name is Tim Decker with Verizon Communications. I Co-Chair the NAPM LLC along with Mel Clay from AT&T. Mel is unable to join us today. I'm saddened to report that Mel has been diagnosed with cancer. He is fighting a hard battle to beat it. I would ask that you all have Mel and his family in your thoughts and prayers during this difficult time.

So moving on to the report, it's very brief. We approved statement of work

87, which is the first one which allows the NPAC timers functionality run on

December 24th so that porting can continue for those companies that don't consider

the 24th a holiday.

We approved statement of work 89, which adds an optional XML interface

that can be used in place of the current CMIP interface. We also approved statement

of work 90, which adds an optional connection for access to the NPAC which allows

use of an Ethernet instead of a T1 connection.

So the next step is the FoNPAC report. We are currently under a non-

disclosure process and the FoNPAC is currently reviewing the RFP responses. And

that concludes my report.

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

And we will keep Mel in our thoughts and send him a note.

MR. DECKER: Thank you.

REORT OF THE LNPA SELECTION WORKING GROUP (SWG)

CHAIRMAN KANE: The next agenda item is the report of the LNPA

Selection Working Group and this is just an oral report. There is no document here.

MS. GAUGLER: Tiki Gaugler with XO Communications. I'm the Tri-

Chair of the SWG with Ann Berkowitz from Verizon and Commissioner Jeff Why

from the Massachusetts Commission.

So we do not have a written document, similarly we are under an NDA

process. We continue to collaborate and receive information from the FoNPAC as

they are doing their review. We held a meeting yesterday on the 19th, a joint

meeting with the SWG and the FoNPAC, and they will continue as they are

reviewing the RFP responses to evaluate those and provide feedback to the SWG.

That's our report.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And everything is on schedule for the record, pretty

much on schedule?

MS. GAUGLER: Everything is under an NDA and I'm going to defer to

others responding to that.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, I wasn't sure because we did have a timeline

that was anticipated.

MS. GAUGLER: The SWG would not be revising that.

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

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you very much. Agenda Item 10 is the

LNPA Working Group status report.

MS. JORDAN CAMPAGNOLI: Hi this is Paula Jordan Campagnoli and

I'm one of the Tri-Chairs of the LNPA Working Group and I'm sorry I'm not there

in person today but I had other commitments and I'm was not able to travel to the

meeting. Also on the bridge is Linda Peterman who is also one of the Tri-Chairs of

the LNPA Working Group along with Ron Stein. So they are both on the bridge in

case I say anything incorrectly.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Very good and we do have the written report before us.

MS. JORDAN CAMPAGNOLI: Yes, thank you. So today the LNPA Working Group will be reporting on the first port notification process change, the update of the LNPA Working Groups LNP Best Practice document, development of the new impact interfaces, and discuss our next meeting.

The first port notification process was changed. The LNPA reached a consensus to eliminate the five day interval imposed on the first activation of an SV or thousand block in the NPA-NXX.

So in other words when you establish a new NPA-NXX, the first time there is a port generated, an SV generated, it usually has to have a five day waiting period before we can activate that and so we've eliminated that five day waiting period but we still left in place the first port notification.

So when you open NPA-NXX and you activate a port in that NPA-NXX, the first port notification will still go out to all the carriers but the five day waiting period has been eliminated.

Any questions on that?

CHAIRMAN KANE: We have a question.

MS. CARDWELL: Valerie Cardwell from Comcast. Thank you for the update about the process change. Just wondering in terms of officially notifying the user community and things like that, just wondering if that has been done or will be

done and I just missed it.

MS. JORDAN CAMPAGNOLI: There was a notice sent out, it's a cross regional notice that was sent out by the NPAC on May 20th. It was Monday May 20th explaining the change with the first port notification.

MS. CARDWELL: Thank you.

MS. JORDAN CAMPAGNOLI: Any other questions on that? Okay, the next thing is the update on the LNPA Working Group Best Practices. We have completed the review and updated all the existing Best Practices to insure applicability to the current industry practice and regulatory requirements.

The LNPA Working Group did reach consensus on the final Best Practice document and we have also reviewed them for the ones that required the NANC and the FCC approval and those have all been done, either have been presented to the FCC and NANC and been approved, or in the process of being reviewed and approved. And so the LNPA Working Group will continue to keep NANC informed as we develop new Best Practices. Questions on that?

CHAIRMAN KANE: No questions here.

MS. JORDAN CAMPAGNOLI: Okay. The LNPA Working Group has completed their work on NANC change order 372, that was the change order that was developing the requirements for the SOA-to-NPAC and NPAC-to-LSMS interfaces utilizing the extensive markup language XML as a protocol. We finished that document.

There are still little things that we're correcting but basically we are done and we reached consensus at the LNPA Working Group to forward NANC 372 to the NAPM LLC for implementation and as Tim reported earlier they have accepted that and approved that change order so we look forward to getting this worked at sometime in the near future.

And that's the end of the LNPA Working Group report unless somebody has any questions.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions? Any questions on the phone? Okay, thank you very much. We will mark that as Document 10.

MS. JORDAN CAMPANOLI: Thank you.

STATUS OF THE INDUSTRY NUMBERING COMMITTEE (INC) ACTIVITIES

CHAIRMAN KANE: We will move on now to the Industry Numbering Committee, the INC report.

MS. ADAMS: My name is Dyan Adams. I work for Verizon Communications and I'm a newly elected INC Co-Chair along with Shaunna Forshee of Sprint.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Congratulations and welcome.

MS. ADAMS: Thank you. As you all are aware, the Industry Numbering Committee provides an open forum to address and resolve industry wide issues and associated planning administration allocation assignment and use of North American

Numbering Plan, NANP, numbering resources within the NANP area.

Since the previous NANC meeting we've had one face-to-face which was just this past week, June 17th through the 19th. Our next face-to-face will be held in Denver in August. And the usual information regarding membership is available on this slide.

We're reporting on one issue today, continuation from our last report to the NANC, issue 748: Assess Impacts on Numbering Resources and Numbering Administration with Transition from Public Switched Telephone Network to Internet Protocol.

We've had a quite a bit of activity on this issue since the last NANC meeting. At the INC April meeting we discussed a presentation given by Adam Newman of I-Connective entitled Address and Interconnection from the PSTN to an IP World. Essentially it was a high level overview of potential interconnection and number network address changes and potential questions for INC to consider regarding these topics.

We also discussed the ATIS PSTN transition focus group assessment and recommendations and focused on numbering of course, and the key discussion items there were rate center structure, expanded geography for numbering resources, and less than Thousands Block number allocation.

Also at our April meeting we discussed the technology transition numbering presentation by Henning Schulzrinne that you all saw at the last NANC. We

discussed items including our role in the PSTN to IP transition, decoupling geography from numbering, nationwide 10 digit dialing, rate center and LATA elimination, and again less than Thousands Block number allocation.

INC met virtually on May 10th to review the FCC 13-51 NPRM Order and NOI and discussed the direct access to numbers VoIP trial as you mentioned earlier and the trial's potential impact on our guidelines.

We have assembled the contribution development team and that CDT met twice so far, on May 21st and June 4th. We brainstormed possible PSTN transition impacts including items such as dialing patterns, rate center changes, local and long distance changes, porting, tariffs, and LATAs.

And just this past week INC drafted proposed comments to the technology transition policy task force seeking comments on potential trials for ATIS to potentially submit on its committee's behalf.

So in summary I would say that INC has spent a lot of time discussing the PSTN to IP transition and obviously the numbering impacts including the VoIP trials and INC believes it should be an integral part of the changes that are forthcoming.

The next slide is a list of the two issues in initial pending which we've heard from John and Karen about, issue 692 and issue 702, and as John stated at the end of the third quarter the changes should be implemented and we should be able to put those issues into final closure.

The next couple of slides are the list of issues in final closure that we usually

provide and then the closing slide is the same relevant INC web pages for your reference.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Any questions on this report or comments? Mary.

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka from Century Link. Madam Chair, it raises a question. I think that when we had the presentation at the last INC from Henning Schulzrinne, I would say probably very strongly interested parties around the table had some discussions since then, but it was interesting that we didn't as the NANC, have any assignments that were made as a result of that presentation.

I somewhat anticipated that the reason for the presentation was to have some work started on this although we really didn't discuss that at the last NANC and there wasn't any specific request made yet that I'm aware of. I mean there may have been something, or the FCC and the Chair may have spoken, so if you could maybe help clarify what the expectation is related to that presentation.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Not only that presentation but personally when the VOIP trial order came out, there was no referral, no issue, no asking from the FCC for NANC to have any role even in that or referring it to that.

And I have been trying to find out from the Commission because we are advisory to them, whether any of these issues are going to be officially referred to the NANC and our advice asked for, and the collective wisdom or at least views of the industry and the regulatory community being asked for.

And as I said at the beginning, I have asked if someone could come and talk about the VOIP trial and the role that they saw for us here and was told because the NOI is still out they couldn't do that, they had been advised not to do it.

I am in a quandary about this to tell you truth as Chairman because we are supposed to be advising the FCC. This is going to be major, major issue. We've got the Future of Numbering committee report coming up next and there are some vacancies there and I want to populate that committee more.

We've got some good work of the INC and other groups that are looking at the issue but we don't have any kind of assignment from the FCC to do anything, to advise them, to look at any issues.

And I am hearing, seeing some nods around the table that I think we need to do that and specifically ask what role they would like us to play and what role we would like to play in helping think through all the implications of this change that's coming. Mary.

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka from Century Link again. I appreciate that, thank you. I do believe we need to provide some direction because otherwise you will have overlapping efforts and you may find that the direction we're moving into may not be the expectation that Professor Schulzrinne had when he came in here and made the presentation.

So I think it's beneficial at an expedient time to get some information on what the expectations were and possibly Henning Schulzrinne had some expectations

as well so that may be a helpful point to touch base with as well.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Rosemary.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer Sprint-Nextel. By procedure, one of the things that we could do to bridge the gap in the meantime, we could begin an Issues Management Group, an IMG. By process under the NANC we can either have a working group or we can have an issues management group, IMG. So the IMG is specifically to perform a task and it has a beginning and an end. A working group is like an oversight committee or something where it just kind of goes on forever.

So as a idea we could form or begin the process of forming an IMG knowing that at some point information will come to us, who knows when it will come to us, maybe there won't be anything to do other then create the show of the IMG at some point, but that's just a suggestion. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And figuring that we've got the INC that wants to -- we have working groups already in place, the INC, we have the Future of Numbering, are the two particular existing groups.

I would think perhaps forming an issues group that would work with me to figure out between now and the September meeting how we would like to structure the NANC role.

And also that I could meet with the FCC, meet with the Chairman or the Acting Chairman or whatever the timing is, as well as a staff person and by the September meeting have a plan in place how we want to manage this, what we want

to ask the FCC, get some guidance from them, if they are going to assign any issues

to us or not, and how internally with either the existing working groups or

coordinating between the working groups -- I don't see a need for a new working

group since we've got two, the INC and the Future of Numbering that already have

been looking at these issues as well as several others obviously where it will impact.

But it's a cross cutting issue for NANC, for the industry, and for the states.

I was even thinking when Amy was doing her report about the OMB and the

census, the more we go to non-geographic numbers, what is the relationship there in

terms of who has to pool and who doesn't have to pool.

So I'm going to ask for some volunteers. Think about it, e-mail me in the

next ten days if you want to work on that. If you got thoughts on how we should be

involved in this and how we might structure it, let me know.

MR. HULTQUIST: Hank Hultquist, AT&T. I think that's a good idea. I

think we should be a little humble about how likely it could play out. I mean if you

look at the INC presentation and the issues that were identified that were discussed

in Professor Schulzrinne's presentation, and the issues that the INC discussed on this

contribution development team, there's a very broad of range of issues here and

without knowing which issue or issues the FCC may come to us with, it may be hard

to identify the people who are best situated to participate. So I mean I think at this

time it's kind of a holding pattern in some ways.

CHAIRMAN KANE: I think identifying the issues that we could possibly

be asked about or where we could possibly be helpful would be helpful too, just identifying those issues and then thinking through if we were asked how we would handle it process wise. Rosemary.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint-Nextel. Perhaps I could get with Mary as far as identifying issues. His presentation, the presentation that he gave, it would be very easy just to begin the process of going through that deck and picking out issues from that deck. I mean that be would I think a very good place to start but we can get together and provide something to you. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Mary.

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka from Century Link again. I understand what Hank is saying about we need to be humble however as you look at the deck and the issues that are involved in that and you look at the timeframe, the expectation of the deck's timeframe, then you have really four and a half years to do some things that are tremendously impacting in the industry from a numbering perspective.

And if you start to parse back that timeframe in order to be ready in the timeframe for the end of the transformation order, one would be very challenged if one were already underway in working through those.

So I think it's important that we recognize that there's a significant amount of work that needs to be done not just in terms of the ideas around how you might do it but actually being able to have those implemented and in place systems, and operations, and processes, and changes that require training for personnel. So I think

that's an important thing to keep in mind and it puts a bit of stress more on the need to begin that effort.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you.

MS. CARDWELL: Valerie Cardwell, Comcast. Just trying to understand the concept, and I thank you all for starting the dialogue. Is the concept that whether we call it issues management, that the whole NANC would be invited to participate depending on the issue, or is it a group of people that would volunteer to go deep on the issue and report back to the NANC? Just trying to get some clarification. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Rosemary.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint-Nextel. So I believe what I'm hearing Chairman Kane say is that initially right now she would be looking for more information about the group, and how to form the group, and what kind of issues we should, whatever.

So in between now and September I think her vision is to just kind of have a couple of people give her some thoughts so that she can decide how she would want to present this at the next meeting.

As far as by process procedurally, an IMG would be like a working group in that you would have co-chairs, you would elect co-chairs so you would have a formation, you'd have a group and you would specifically have that group under the NANC to talk about this VOIP to IP, whatever.

I mean we wouldn't be talking about the NANC working group stuff or anything else. So all issues would pertain specifically to that one topic and it would be a public meeting. Any NANC people could attend, anybody from the public could attend. So it's sort of like a working group but it's specifically going to deal with one issue so it has a beginning and an end and as soon as it's over it's over. It doesn't go on forever.

And recognizing that the INC and the FON are talking about these things it might seem like at first and it very well may be that we may not need it. It might be over thinking the whole thing.

But then again this is such a big topic and it's just such a huge topic that I think the Chairman by suggesting that folks think about how the procedure should work going forward and taking the next couple of months to consider it, and then giving her the ideas I think is a really good way, it's a really great path forward and that way in September we can kind of reconvene and see based on what she gets in how we should proceed.

But I definitely think based on seeing that report that the NANC needs to somehow be active and we should proactively let them know. Thank you.

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

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. I'll proceed with that so just let me know, give me your thoughts on that, and particularly also from the INC and from

out next group which is the Future of Numbering. So our last report is from the Future of Numbering Working Group.

MS. RETKA: I'm sure you all are wondering why I'm here.

(LAUGHTER)

I will thank you in advance for your patience. I am not one of the Tri-Chairs. I'm Mary Retka from CenturyLink and I'm on the FoN Working Group however I received an indication from Don Gray, the Nebraska Commission staff on Tuesday I think, that there have been some changes for folks involved in the Tri-Chair work.

First of all Adam Newman from iconectiv will be working for a different company, starting I believe next week, and will not be involved in the FoN effort going forward.

Then in addition to that, and I have to tell you I've known him for so many years and absolutely adore Don Gray, however he is going to retire, and is finally getting down to the point of working two days a week between now and the end of the year so he needs to step back.

And, so along with that, Jim Castagna has also indicated that he will no longer be a Tri-Chair for the FoN Working Group. So, someone needed to be here to give the report, so here I am.

And, as a result of that, the FoN Working Group in their June 26th meeting will discuss how they're going to work through the change in leadership going forward.

And just so you're aware, Adam did as one of his last things provided this report. I want to also thank Adam who I also have known for many, many years and really respect professionally and I'm very pleased for him with his new position and wish him well. And I appreciate that he did this report because I was involved also in the INC meeting so it would have been really difficult to do that for the meeting so I appreciate that.

If you'll turn to page two, FoN meets monthly and so we have had our March/April/May and June meetings. We also had a reason to hold a couple of interim conference calls that will be explained on the next slide.

We're looking at on slide three, the FCC 13-51 Order, NPRM and NOI. As a result of the presentation that was made at the last NANC meeting, and the Order, NPRM and NOI, it was determined that the FoN Working Group would need to hold a couple of interim meetings just to kind of talk about the issues that are raised in the order and then kind of determine what we needed to do moving forward.

However, it was determined that while we are best able to look at the NOI issues, we would focus on those but we are awaiting NANC action items related to PSTN to IP transition, kind of as we were just talking at the end of the INC report.

So, at this point in time while we've had those couple of meetings, in order to determine what needs to be done going forward, more direction is also appropriate.

There is an active issue open on page four, you'll see that. It's our AID number 007 and it was originally brought in by T-Mobile by Anna Miller so we will

work those issues depending on the outcome of the direction received from the

NANC.

On page five, you'll also see that we continue to track with the machine-to-machine demand. All of our other activities related to that will depend on what happens from standards, efforts that we're tracking from study group two. We have some folks on the FoN who give us a read out and actually I think that was Adam so we'll determine who will get -- when Adam is no longer working on that.

And, then on page six, you'll see our other active issues. These are the ones we're not actively working on, the new and future services. We just monitor the ITU efforts, and the telematics really was morphed into the machine-to-machine effort and the geographic issues. This is the one where we provided the white paper that was then sent to the FCC so that one is -- but, you know, continue to track and monitor.

And then on page seven you'll see the items that are either closed or were not accepted and we've reviewed these in past meetings so there's no sense to hold you here on that.

We do have scheduled calls the first Wednesday of each month from noon to 1:00 p.m. and our next meeting -- actually the July meeting, we're doing it on June 26th because July 3rd is right before the holiday so we moved it up for that one meeting.

And we really do welcome any new participants who are interested in the

FoN Working Group especially given that we're now going to need new leadership. We encourage anyone who's interested in that leadership position to step forward and then they can be the one here to make this presentation next time.

(LAUGHTER)

And the last page is just our mission and scope. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: You're next meeting is when?

MS. RETKA: June 26th in lieu of the July meeting.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And certainly we welcome volunteers for the working group and for the leadership of it. And a couple of people have contacted me so we are going to put that together. Thank you.

MS. RETKA: Great.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Question on the phone, yes.

MR. CARPENTER: This is Jay Carpenter 1-800 AFTA. And Mary, there was a slight correction in what you said that I'd like to note.

MS. RETKA: Oh, sure, I'm sorry.

MR. CARPENTER: When you were talking about the FTN 004 geographic issues, I believe I heard and I could be wrong, that you said that was one where the white paper was accepted, well, that was forwarded to the FCC. Well, that was not the white paper issue. We haven't produced a white paper on the geographic issues. The white paper was on the 005.

MS. RETKA: Yes, it was on the toll free issues. I'm sorry, because I saw

David's name there and I thought that was the one and I apologize for the error there.

MR. CARPENTER: No problem.

MS. RETKA: Thanks, Jay.

CHAIRMAN KANE: So geographic issue is pending, it says pending input, and it's not being actively worked.

MS. RETKA: Correct.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you. Any other questions, comments? I see also here of course that the PSTN to IP transition was accepted as a focus for the FON back almost a year ago September.

MS. RETKA: Right, that was brought in by T-Mobile by Anna Miller.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Right. This is something we'll look at in the next couple of months to figure it out because the FoN does have other issues before it too including machine-to-machine issue, as we look at how we're going to handle giving advice when asked on the transition.

All right, thank you very much. That will be Document 12 for the record.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

CHAIRMAN KANE: I think we have reached the end of the agenda. Summary of action items, I'll just summarize those for the record. We did approve the NANPA performance report and I will transmit that to the FCC. We approved the RNA and PA performance report and I'll transmit that to the FCC.

We also approved the Billing and Collection agent performance report, that

will go to FCC, and we approved the Billing and Collection contingency plan and informal action item.

I will accept and encourage advice from all of you over the next month of how we can organize and structure involvement in the PSTN transition issues as they affect numbering.

PUBLIC COMMENTS AND PARTICIPATION / OTHER BUSINESS

CHAIRMAN KANE: Do we have any public comment? Does anyone from the public wish to make any comments? Any other business?

Then it says we will adjourn no later then 2:00 p.m. and it is 11:50 a.m. So thank you all very much. Our next meeting is on September 18th. Thank you all. Have a good summer and I know you all will be very busy with all the working groups. The meeting is adjourned.

*   *   *   *   *

<u>CERTIFICATE OF AGENCY</u>

  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's, 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's furnished, to the best of our ability.

     _____

     CAROL J. SCHWARTZ

     PRESIDENT

     ON THIS DATE OF:

     _____