

**North American Numbering Council
Meeting Transcript
June 17, 2014 (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. Mark Lancaster | AT&T Inc. |
| 3. Mary Retka | CenturyLink |
| 4. Mary McManus | Comcast Corporation |
| 5. Jose Jimenez/Beth O’Donnell | Cox Communications, Inc. |
| 6. Michael Altschul | CTIA |
| 7. David Greenhaus | 800 Response Information Services, LLC |
| 8. Scott Seab | Level 3 Communications, LLC |
| 9. Tom Dixon | NASUCA |
| 10. Carolee Hall | NARUC – Idaho |
| 11. Kulin Lee | NARUC - Massachusetts |
| 12. Lynn Slaby | NARUC – Ohio |
| 13. Jerome Candelaria | NCTA |
| 14. Stephen F. Pastorkovich | NTCA - The Rural Broadband Assn. |
| 15. Gina Perini | SMS/800, Inc. |
| 16. Rosemary Emmer | Sprint |
| 17. Thomas Soroka, Jr. | USTA |
| 18. Kevin Green | Verizon |
| 19. Brendan Kasper | Vonage Holdings Corp. (Vonage) |

Special Members (Non-voting):

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

Commission Employees:

Ann Stevens, Deputy Chief, Competition Policy Division
Sanford Williams, Assistant Chief, Competition Policy Division
Michelle Sclater, 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 – June 17, 2014
- (3) North American Numbering Plan Administration (NANPA) Report to the NANC
- (4) National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator (PA) Report to the NANC
- (5) Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG) Report
- (6) Billing and Collection Agent Report
- (7) Billing and Collection Working Group (B&C WG) Report to the NANC
- (8) North American Portability Management (NAPM) LLC Report to the NANC
- (9) Local Number Portability Administration Working Group (LNPA WG) Status Report to the NANC
- (10) LNPA Working Group Report
- (11) Status of the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) activities
- (12) Future of Numbering (FoN) Working Group Report to the NANC
- (13) Report of the Internet Protocol Issue Management Group (IMG)
- (14) Presentation by John Visclosky, FCC/WCB, Report on Direct Access Numbers Trial
- (15) Recommendations to the NANC

V. Table of Contents.

1. Announcements and Recent News	6
2. Approval of Meeting Transcript	8
3. Report of the North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA)	11
4. Report of the National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator (PA)	14
5. Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG) Report	16
6. Billing and Collection Agent Report	29
7. Billing and Collection Working Group (B&C WG) Report	31
8. North American Portability Management (NAPM) LLC Report	36
9. Local Number Portability Administration (LNPA) Selection Working Group (SWG)	36

10. LNPA Working Group Report	37
11. Status of the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Activities	39
12. Future of Numbering (FoN) Working Group Report to the NANC	47
13. Report of the Internet Protocol Issue Management Groups	49
14. Presentation by John Visclosky, FCC/WCB, Report on Direct Access Numbers Trial	50
15. Summary of Action Items	58
16. Public Comments and Participation	58
16. Other Business	59

VI. Summary of the Meeting

Betty Ann Kane: I don't have a gavel. I don't have anybody to say all rise, so let me start this hearing. But I do want to call to order today's quarterly meeting of the North American Numbering Council. For the record, it is 10:09 AM, and it is Tuesday, June 17, 2014. Of course, we are meeting in the hearing room of the Federal Communications Commission in Washington, D.C. First, I'm going to do our usual introductions. I'll ask everyone to go around the room and identify themselves. Then I'm going to ask the folks on the phone - if there are people on the phone bridge - to also identify themselves. And in addition, ask anyone who's on the phone to email in to Carmell your name so that we not only hear it, sometimes the recording doesn't always pick up clearly

what's on the phone, so that we have it for the minutes. So I'll start. I'm Betty Ann Kane. I'm Chairman of the NANC.

Kalun Lee: Kalun Lee. I'm representing Massachusetts.

Mark Lancaster: Mark Lancaster, AT&T.

Mary Retka: Mary Retka, CenturyLink.

Mary McManus: Mary McManus, Comcast.

Jose Jimenez: Jose Jimenez, Cox Communications.

Michael Altschul: Mike Altschul, CTIA.

Carolee Hall: Carolee Hall, Idaho PUC staff.

David Greenhaus: David Greenhaus, 800response.

Jerome Candelaria: Jerome Candelaria, NCTA.

Stephen Pastorkovich: Steve Pastorkovich, NTCA.

Gina Perini: Gina Perini, SMS/800, Inc.

Rosemary Emmer: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint.

Kevin Green: Kevin Green, Verizon.

Brendan Kasper: Brendan Kasper, Vonage.

Sanford Williams: Sanford Williams, acting and temporary DFO for NANC.

Betty Ann Kane: At long last.

Sanford Williams: Hopefully, Marilyn will be here for the next meeting. Not that I don't love you guys, but you know, I can't wait to have her back.

Betty Ann Kane: We will welcome her back, not that we will be sad to see you go when you've been a terrific help and

assistance all through some difficult issues. On the bridge, who is on the phone?

Paula Jordan Campagnoli: This is Paula Jordan Campagnoli. I'm on the bridge for the LNPA Working Group.

Thomas Dixon: Tom Dixon on behalf of NASUCA.

Rebecca Beaton: Rebecca Beaton, Washington State Commission staff. [Cross-talking]

Betty Ann Kane: I'm sorry, there were two people speaking at once.

Tom Soroka: Tom Soroka, USTelecom.

Female Voice: I'm sorry about that. I'm [indiscernible], California Public Utilities Commission.

Linda Hymans: Linda Hymans, NeuStar pooling.

Lynn Slaby: Lynn Slaby, commissioner, Ohio.

Betty Ann Kane: All right. Thank you.

Scott Seab: Scott Seab with Level 3.

Betty Ann Kane: Anyone else on the phone? Very good. Thank you. Has someone just joined? No, somebody left. Just to remind you again, before you go to speak, pause for a second so that the gentleman who's handling the microphones has time to turn your microphone on, once I recognized you, otherwise we don't get the first few words of what you're saying.

ANNOUNCEMENT AND RECENT NEWS

Announcements, first of all, Kalun Lee is here representing Massachusetts. He's been the alternate for our co-chair Telecom Commissioner Geoffrey Why. Geoffrey has succumbed to the lure of the private sector and he has taken a position with a law firm in Boston and Washington, so Kalun is filling that position temporarily. There has been a request to NARUC to do a permanent slot there for the other NARUC slot. So we want to thank Geoff for all his work, and particularly for his work in heading the work on the LNPA selection. I don't know if we wore him out, but we do wish him well in his new endeavor. He will be in Boston most of the time but I understand in Washington, maybe once or a couple of times a month.

Kalun Lee: That is correct. And since he's working for the private sector, he can treat you to lunch and dinner now.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. Someone we don't regulate. Secondly, let me say, speaking of the LNPA, as you all know, the commission has now released the recommendation from the NANC for public comment. Sanford, do you know the timing on that, the timeframe? We'll put that on the record. I know it was recent that it was released. We know it's been in *The Register*.

Sanford Williams: Right. Ken says that we're working to facilitate access as quickly as possible. And we hope to bring the process to closure very soon.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. I did just want to remind you, because I had asked this of Sanford yesterday. Those of us who signed the non-disclosure agreement, the NDA, even though now the recommendation has become public, I need to remind you that according to the general counsel of the FCC, an NDA is forever. So that those things that were learned that were viewed during that process remain confidential. Some of those things during the public comment period may become public, and to the extent that they're public and you need to comment on them in the public context the information that was made public through the public process is all right. Then I asked also about the Selection Working Group. The Selection Working Group, until the FCC makes a final selection that is upon final approval of vendors by the FCC, then the NANC will disband the Selection Working Group. So that's where we are. Are there any other announcements or recent news? Sanford, yes.

Sanford Williams: On Friday, as Mary Retka pointed out to me quite appropriately, Friday the 13th, we released the North American Numbering Plan contribution factor and fund size estimate. Fourteen days after it was released, which would be June 27th, it becomes effective if the FCC didn't take any action before then. So I released it on the 13th and hopefully we'll go forward with that. But thank you for all your hard work to the Billing and Collection Working Group and to Welch

for working on that. I know it's been an arduous process at times, but thank you.

APPROVAL OF THE MEETING TRANSCRIPT

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. The next item is actually the agenda. We'll have the agenda be item no. 1 in the minutes, document no. 1. The next time is approval of the transcript. The transcript was posted electronically. Do we have any additions or corrections or comments on the transcript? Mary?

Mary Retka: In the transcript, there was a discussion about a report from ATIS on IP-related work at ATIS, and I think it was an item that Jose had raised. I think Tiki was also involved in that discussion about not everyone is a full member or member of ATIS and could we have a report. Jean-Paul Emard was here for his last meeting and had committed to that. I didn't see anything on the agenda for when that would come up, unless that would come up under the public comments. And I know Jackie Voss is here today from ATIS and stepping into the NANC attendance for Jean-Paul. So that's kind of a question on where that would come up.

Betty Ann Kane: This is the report and the sharing of the information from ATIS?

Mary Retka: Of the ATIS information on what they're doing on the IP transition.

Betty Ann Kane: Do we have an answer on that from Jackie?
Identify yourself?

Jackie Voss: Hi. Jackie Voss with ATIS. I would be prepared to provide a report today. However, there was also some discussion that we would be reporting out to the new NANC-IMG. So if it's more appropriate, I could report through that and then they could subsequently report here.

Betty Ann Kane: If you're prepared to give a report today, even if it's an oral report, at least a kind of status report, that would be helpful. And I can put that under other business.

Jackie Voss: Okay. Thank you.

Tiki Gaugler: Tiki Gaugler with XO. It was my impression from what Jean-Paul said that there was going to be some sort of formal something. That this was actually a formal process they had or were putting into place. So I didn't understand it to be like they're just going to come and do a report here. I thought there will be a written document that was going to be provided. I don't know if I misunderstood that, but that's what I thought I heard.

Jackie Voss: I believe that he didn't indicate that there was going to be a newsletter publication on some periodic basis; however, that work is still under development.

Tiki Gaugler: Do you know when that went first?

Jackie Voss: I don't have a date on that.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. And we will put this down then under other business. And Cathy [sic], your last name is?

Jackie Voss: Jackie Voss, V-o-s-s.

Betty Ann Kane: Jackie Voss, I'm sorry.

Jackie Voss: And just for clarification, in the future, would this report be given here or would it be given through the IMG?

Betty Ann Kane: We'll have to take that under advisement, but then [cross-talking].

Jackie Voss: Okay. If you would get that to me, that would be helpful. Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: -- day-to-day and then decide what's the best way, so that we have the information but it goes through the proper channels. Thank you. Yes, Mary.

Mary Retka: Mary Retka from CenturyLink. As of our last meeting, in case folks didn't see it, we were able to get the slides from Dr. Schulzrinne that he had made for his last visit with us. They're now on the NANC Chair website, thanks to John Manning. I just would like to make sure everybody got the chance to see those since it's his readout on the testbed that we had not seen before. Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. The minutes on today will note that those are available. Any other additions, corrections on the transcript from last quarter's meeting? All right, then I

will take the absence of objections a unanimous consent that the transcript is approved. Now we go to our report. So the transcript will be Item 2 in the documents for today's meeting. Item No. 3 and documents that we'll mark as no. 3 is the NANPA report to the NANC. John, thank you.

REPORT OF THE NORTH AMERICAN NUMBERING PLAN ADMINISTRATOR

(NANPA)

John Manning: Good morning everybody. The NANPA report consists primarily of two items: an update on CO Code Assignments as well as area code relief activity. On page 2, the chart at the very top of the report outlines a quantity of code assignments, returns, denials, net assignments and overall, total yearly assignments from January to May of 2014. For comparison purposes, I provided the previous four years. You'll see from the assignment perspective, 2014 is lining up to be very similar to the past four years. We're slightly less in terms of the number of returns. Net assignments, again, is along the same lines as the previous four years. When you take the total assignments for the first five months of this year and annualize that figure, you'll see an annualized figure of roughly 2,700 codes this year which is right in line with the previous four years.

In terms of area code assignments, we've had three area codes go into service: two geographic, one non-geographic.

Kentucky 364 went into service in March, and then Nevada 725 overlay of 702 went into service in June, just earlier this month. The non-geographic area code 577, NANPA initiated the assignments out of that particular NPA in March of this year. Scheduled for the remaining part of this year, Texas 346 will join the overlay complex - this is the Houston area - on July 1st. The Connecticut 959 will overlay the 860 that will take place in August. Indiana 930 will overlay the 812 area code. That's in October of this year. Finally, in Canada, the Nova Scotia-Prince Edward Island overlay 782 over the 902 area code will take place in November.

Page 3, I give a status of area code relief planning activities. The first three items I've already briefly touched upon. Starting with Tennessee 615, the California 415 and the Ohio 740, these projects I've reported on previously. All of these area codes will be relieved in the first half of next year. The South Carolina 843 will also be an overlay, and that will take place in the second half of 2015. North Carolina 336 area code, there are going to be some public hearings scheduled for next week. The industry has recommended some time ago an overlay of the 336. So anticipating that after these hearings and public meeting that the commission will then be able to move forward with a decision on the recommendation and we'll begin the overall process implementing the new area code for 336.

On page 4, a new project that just started up here in the past few weeks, Indiana 317 which covers the Indianapolis area. We conducted a relief planning meeting last month. The industry is recommending an overlay, all services overlay of the 317. The industry will be meeting within the next few weeks to put together a petition that will be filed with the commission later on this summer. And finally, in Florida 305, if you understand Florida, there is the 305 area code which covers Miami and points south, including the Keys. And some time ago, the 786 area code overlaid to 305 with the exception of the Keys' rate center. From that point on, the 305 prefixes were only assigned in the Keys' rate center. What NANPA was charged with was to notify the Florida Public Service Commission when we were within 18 months to the exhaust of the remaining 305 prefixes. We provided that notification to the commission on June 3rd, and the commission will be proceeding forward with their plans with regard to what they want to do with the 305 in the Keys. The plan on the table right now is for the 786 to eventually overlay the Keys' rate center, and that particular situation, 786, would now overlay all of the current 305 area code.

Finally, just a couple of news items here. We have published the 2013 NANPA annual report which was published on March 28th. Our semi-annual exhaust projections for the NPAs, NANP, as well as the 5XX NPA were posted at the end of April.

And just a reminder, we start the NRUF reporting process. That's the Numbering Resource Utilization and Forecast Reporting. That begins on July 1st with all of the utilization data as of June 30th and forecast over the next four-and-a-half years. That's my presentation. The last portion of the report provides you a summary of the area codes exhausting in the next 36 months and just a brief synopsis of what is occurring with those area codes.

Betty Ann Kane: Are there any questions, any questions from anyone on the phone? Thank you, John. The next item, item no. 4 is the report of the National Thousands-Block Pooling Administrator. This is Amy. We will mark this as item no. 4 of the agenda for the minutes.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL THOUSANDS BLOCK POOLING ADMINISTRATOR

(PA)

Amy Putnam: Pooling is fine. Actually, this is going to be a fairly short presentation. It has the usual activity summary data on the first slide. We had a busy month in April. A variety of mods [sounds like], not any one carrier in particular, which kept our Concord office very busy. And going through the various tables of numbers here, again, something that I have in the past said, if you can't sleep, you can always read this report. We are drifting downward in the summary in the rate information changes at this point until such time as

there are anymore applications for delegated authority. It seems as if those are going to continue to drift down. The reclamation summary, if you recall earlier in the year, we did the old overdue part 4 activity again and caught up with that. So we're drifting down again, which is a good thing, on a number of blocks on the reclamation list.

With respect to the systems, you'll see both for PAS and for RNAS, we had some downtime in May. We had an unexpected server disruption and we were down for 38 minutes before we came up in Charlotte. We had two customer reports on inability to reach PAS during the period that we were down, and we opened trouble tickets for both of those. We had no customer reports for RNAS. With respect to other pooling-related activities, all of our contract reporting requirements were met. P-ANI, we continue to reconcile data. Every time we think we're almost there we get another set of annual reports which keeps Florence busy and pulling out her hair.

We had the annual performance read out from the NOWG. And the pooling administrator got it more than met I am proud to announce, even though I'm stealing some of Karen's thunder, whoever is going to give the NOWG report. The only pending change order at this time is part of change order 24. We did part of it last year and determined that the remainder of it would be completed with the PAS rollout which is due in

mid-January 2015. Under special projects, that is something that's taking a lot of our time right now, and that is development and testing for the refresh of the PAS system. Are there any questions?

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you, Amy. Any questions on the phone? Thank you very much. Item No. 5 is the report of the Numbering Oversight Working Group.

NUMBERING OVERSIGHT WORKING GROUP (NOWG) REPORT

Karen Riepenkroger: My name is Karen Riepenkroger and I'm a co-chair of the NOWG along with Laura Dalton of Verizon Communications. Our report's a little longer today because we're doing the NANPA and the PA performance report. So we'll review the 2013 NANPA performance report. We'll then review the 2013 PA performance report. Then we'll finish up with the NANPA and PA change orders. We have a slide listing the NOWG participating companies, and then a slide on the future meeting schedules for the NOWG.

So on slide 3 we have the NANPA performance report and the NOWG based the 2013 NANPA performance on the 2013 performance feedback survey, written comments and reports, annual operational review that was held at the NANPA Sterling location, and NOWG observations and interactions with the NANPA throughout 2013.

On slide 4, we have a chart. This chart represents the number of survey respondents. It shows from the inception since 1998-2013. In 2013, there was a slight decrease in the respondents from industry and other and an increase in the regulator's responses. On slide 5 through slide 8, I am not going to go through these in detail. These are the aggregated response ratings for the questions in each section of the survey. The survey questions pertain to CONNX administration, NPA relief planning, NRUF, other NANP resources which includes the CIC, the 9YY, 5XX resources, NANP administration system, the NANPA website reports and industry activities, and one last question, overall assessment of the NANPA. I do want to note that the aggregated results reflected here do not include any of the NA responses.

Are there any questions so far? On slide 9, the NOWG noted that there was significant praise for the NANPA staff in the written comments that were provided by the survey respondents. Some of the adjectives that were used by the respondents to describe experiences working with the NANPA staff members included helpful, efficient and experienced. They were timely, professional and accurate, and they provided excellent and invaluable assistance.

On slide 10, they participated in the VoIP trial. So we separated out the VoIP trial. We made a separate slide here.

In the 2013 performance report that you have, we also have a section devoted to VoIP, and that is the section 9.0. NANPA did work directly with the five participants and assisted them with applying for the CO codes. The trial participants requested and received at least one CO code for assignment and an overall total of 16 code assignments were made for the trial. NANPA supported them in the following areas. They educated participants on their responsibilities as code holders, including assisting them with populating the industry routing databases. They reviewed their requirements that they would need for facility readiness, and they also helped them understand their NRUF responsibilities. The NANPA also provided information to the state regulators and the FCC on the process and the implementation of this VoIP trial. We did not do a separate survey for the VoIP trial, but what we did was we pulled out the VoIP trial participants' responses and reviewed them and noted that they provided positive feedback about the NANPA in their responses to the NANPA survey.

On slide 11, on our observations, from the survey responses, the NOWG has concluded that there was a high level of satisfaction by those who interacted with the NANPA. And as in previous years, the NANPA does continue to consistently and effectively demonstrate their expertise as custodian of the numbering resources in every area that they're involved in.

On slide 12 of the NANPA rating for the 2013 performance this year as determined by consensus of the NOWG is a more than met. We have also listed how this rating is defined. More than met means that that they met and often went beyond performance requirements, provided more than what was required to be successful, performance was more than competent and reliable and decisions and recommendations usually exceeded requirements and expectations.

On slide 13, we always have suggestions for the NANPA, and this slide reflects those suggestions. We have asked them to create a NAS trouble ticket log to accompany the monthly reports that are provided to the NOWG. We would like them to continually, proactively search for ways to improve processes, educate customers, and enhance system functionality. We also want them to continue to produce and develop instructional and training videos as needed and ongoing code administrator training to ensure that their code administrators understand and implement the process consistently. At this time, the NOWG requests the NANC's approval of the NANPA performance report. Once we receive that, we will remove the draft watermark and we will submit a clean copy to Chairman Kane for transmittal to the FCC.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you very much, Karen. Are there, first of all, any questions about the report or comments, and

any questions from anyone on the bridge? I think, speaking of the bride, I heard some beeps. I don't know if that means anyone new has joined or maybe someone dropped off. We have before us a request to approve the NANPA performance report. Is there any objection to that request? I'd say by unanimous consent then, the NANPA report from NOWG, the performance report is approved, and I will take the appropriate steps to transmit that to the FCC once I receive the non-draft copy. Thank you very much.

Karen Riepenkroger: All right. Moving on to slide 14, this is on the 2013 PA performance report. Again, the NOWG based the PA performance on the 2013 performance feedback surveys for the PA and the RNA. And as you recall, we do separate surveys, one for the PA and one for the RNA. But we do combine them and put them into one PA performance report. We also looked at written comments and reports, the annual operational review that was held at the PA offices in Concord, California and NOWG observations and interactions with the PA.

On slide 15, this is the chart that represents the PA respondents. This is only for the PA survey, not the RNA survey. As you can see, for 2013, the number of industry and other was slightly down, and the number of regulator respondents was slightly up for 2013.

On slide 16 through 19 are the summary of the PA survey results. This is the aggregated responses for each question. We asked the questions about the Pooling Administration System, the PA website, miscellaneous Pooling administration, PA functions, and the overall assessment of Pooling administrator. Again, we did not include the NA responses in the aggregated results.

On page 19, praise for the PA staff was a consistent theme in the written comments. They noted they were prompt and courteous and knowledgeable. They were willing to help. They were professional. They were friendly. They provided excellent guidance and assistance, and they were patient when responding and answering questions.

On slide 20, there were some suggested improvements provided. However, they did not point to any consistent performance issues. Comments pertain to administrative and managerial suggestions and technical system and process issues.

On slide 21, this is the RNA survey respondent's chart. This is the second year for the RNA survey. The number of respondents from the industry remained the same in 2013. However, the number of regulator respondents declined from three to one in 2013.

On slides 22 through 24 are the aggregated responses for each question. We asked the following questions in this survey.

We asked about routing number administrator, routing number administration system, RNA website, the miscellaneous RNA functions and the overall assessment of the RNA. Again, the NA responses were not a part of these aggregated totals.

On slide 25, in reviewing, the NOWG noted that praise for the RNA was a consistent theme which included comments like: amazing to work with, quick to respond, professional, courteous and knowledgeable.

On slide 26, the comments suggesting improvements were an RNAS enhancement for clearing p-ANI ranges and a website data sorting and validation tools. And we did conclude that the written comments were not indicative of any consistent performance issues with the RNA.

On slide 27, on the overall PA performance report, we did have a section for the VoIP trial and that section is 10.0. As with the NANPA, the PA provided ongoing support to the five trial participants including the following activities. They did assist the participants with registration and PAS. And they also assisted with some additional registration in NAS and the NPAC. They did provide guidance to the participants on the process for acquiring an OCN and for selecting an AOCN. And then AOCN is the one that inputs it into the industry routing databases. They walked the participants through tools available in PAS including the training videos and also the new service

provider checklist. The PA provided information to state regulators and the FCC on the process of the VoIP trial. For the VoIP trial, there were 67 Part 3s issued associated with the trial and 17 LRNs and five individual blocks assigned. As with the NANPA survey, we did pull out of the PA survey the five VoIP trial participants' responses and reviewed them in detail and noted that they did provide positive feedback about the PA and their responses to the PA survey.

Female Voice: Karen, can I stop you for a minute [cross-talking]? Could you ask people on the bridge to mute because it's really noisy on the bridge?

Betty Ann Kane: Yes. Thank you. Just to remind you, if you are on the bridge, to be sure that you are muted. Although, our microphones can pick you up, maybe we mute each person speaking here. The bridge is open so you need to do your own muting in your office or car, wherever you're participating from, and be sure that you are mute. The people on the bridge are picking up a lot of background noise. Thank you.

Karen Riepenkroger: On slide 28, we have our NOWG observations. And after reviewing the PA and RNA survey responses, the NOWG did conclude that the survey results revealed a high level of client satisfaction and a continued professionalism and expertise. The PA continued to demonstrate

their ability to handle large volume of block applications while simultaneously completing special projects.

On slide 29, as Amy has already mentioned, the rating for the PA for 2013 is a more than met. And I reviewed the more than met rating and what the criteria is earlier so I will not review that again.

On slide 30, again, we always have suggestions and we are making the following recommendations to the PA for their consideration. Ongoing review of internal training processes with the PA and RNA personnel to ensure that they are consistent in understanding the processes when responding to service providers and regulators. We would like them to consider adding an RNAS enhancement that makes it easier to query ranges of p-ANIs. And we also would like them to modify the p-ANI annual report form to make some of the fields unmodifiable, so as to reduce the input formatting rework that is currently performed by the RNA. We've also asked for a proposed list and associated feature explanation of the upcoming 2015 PAS enhancements that were a result of service provider and regulator suggestions. And we have asked the PA to create a PAS trouble ticket log that will accompany the monthly reports that they provide to the NOWG.

At this time, again, the NOWG would like to request NANC approval of the PA performance report. Again, if once approved,

we'll remove the draft watermark and forward to you a clean copy.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you very much. Are there any questions first of all on the report? Jose.

Jose Jimenez: Of course, I have a couple of questions. One is more education or maybe remembering, what is the relationship between number pooling and number portability?

Karen Riepenkroger: I'm sorry, I didn't understand.

Jose Jimenez: Is the number portability functionality employed in number pooling?

Karen Riepenkroger: No. The porting part is part of NPAC and the pooling part where they assigned the blocks is the PA.

Jose Jimenez: So the two, there is no intersection for --

Karen Riepenkroger: Well, they do. When you submit your paperwork for like you order a block and then you submit one of the forms, they send it over to the NPAC. So there is some interaction between the two.

Jose Jimenez: So given that the industry has recommended - although this isn't final - that the Number Portability Administration function be carried out by a party different from the current number pooling, I'm curious, have you guys talked about how that might affect the performance of Pooling Administration?

Karen Riepenkroger: I don't know that I can answer, if I'm qualified to answer that response. Maybe Amy is up there, maybe she can respond to that.

Betty Ann Kane: If you could identify yourself.

Amy Putnam: This is Amy Putnam, Director of Thousands-Block Pooling. Pooling is accomplished by porting the Thousands-Blocks using the LNP platform. So the Pooling Administrator does interact with the NPAC. We send the Part 1B for the NPAC for each block. So we would send the Part 1B to whoever was running the NPAC.

Jose Jimenez: So it will make no difference in the pooling function going forward potentially? I mean, the FCC needs to decide this, but that the function of Number Portability Administration would be changing?

Amy Putnam: In a perfect world, we would interact and any other entity who was running the NPAC would interact with us in the same fashion that the interaction occurs now.

Jose Jimenez: Maybe I'm just a pessimist, assume a less than perfect world, how do you prepare for that?

Amy Putnam: The pooling administrator will always do fine.

Jose Jimenez: Okay, thank you for that. The other thing, looking at this performance evaluations, probably later on, when we're talking new business, I would like to discuss a little bit about, again, maybe planning ahead or thinking ahead to the

potential change, if it happens, in Portability Administration. How does NANC have an inside into that process? There have been issues raised about that change being problematic for industry, and I think it will be a good discussion to have.

Betty Ann Kane: We will confer with DFOs since the FCC is in the middle of that process, what is appropriate to discuss and not discuss.

Sanford Williams: Right. At the moment we're in the middle of the process. It's not appropriate to discuss. There's a proceeding ongoing and things will be addressed in that proceeding. As things need to be addressed here, we'll definitely make the NANC aware of a need for that. But at the moment, the proceeding is ongoing so we can't waste there too much. If comments are made, they should be made in the context of the proceeding.

Jose Jimenez: Just so that I understand, we cannot really plan the what if? That would not be appropriate?

Sanford Williams: In terms of discussing it at the NANC meeting, anything dealing with the current proceeding, it should not be discussed.

Jose Jimenez: All right. Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: The individual companies in their other capacity obviously are free to comment to the public comment process on any of those issues. But as far as the NANC, while

that is still undecided, we think it's not appropriate. Thank you. Rosemary.

Rosemary Emmer: Rosemary Emmer with Sprint. I just thought that I would add, perhaps, add to the folks that each of these contracts are separate. There's a separate NPAC contract. There's a separate Pooling Administrator contract. There's a separate NANPA contract. Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: Presumably, the terms of the contracts will also spell out any kind of interaction and requirements, and they're separately evaluated. Thank you. Any other comments or questions? Anyone on the phone? We have a request then from the NOWG that the NANC approve the PA performance report, and then I will submit it to the commission. Is there any objection to that request? I will indicate that by unanimous consent the NANC has approved the PA performance report. We thank the NOWG for your work in doing the evaluation. Sanford.

Sanford Williams: I want to add one comment to Laura and to Karen especially and the rest of the committee, I worked with you guys relatively closely, especially close to the evaluation stage. I thank you for your hard work, your time, your diligence. Even pulling up the VoIP providers and the top participants and talking to them about their interaction with the NANPA and the PA and the quality of your work because it

really helps the commission, something that we can't do internally. So thank you for your hard work, your time and your effort is really appreciated. Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. Karen.

Karen Riepenkroger: I have just a couple of slides and then I promise I'm done. You can move on to somebody else besides me. So on slide 31, the change orders, there is no NANPA change orders outstanding at this time and as the change order 24, it was partially implemented in July of 2013. As Amy noted, the remainder will be implemented in January of 2015.

Slide 32 is just a list of the NOWG participating companies. Slide 33 lists our upcoming meetings. And the very last slide is we do have other meetings, sometimes periodically in-between the monthly meetings. If you have any questions about any meetings or conference call details, the NOWG co-chair's email addresses are located on this last slide. Please, feel free to contact us. Thank you very much.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you very much, Karen. All right, we were along item no. 6 and document no. 6 is the Billing and Collection Agent Report. Who's giving that report? There you are.

BILLING AND COLLECTION AGENT REPORT

Faith Marcotte: Good morning. I'm Faith Marcotte from Welch LLP and we are the billing and collection agent. We turn

to page 1 of our report. It shows the statement of financial position of the fund at May 31st. There was \$1,030,000 in the bank. We had \$240,000 of accounts receivable. And we owed the vendors \$494,000 for the services for the month of May, so that leaves the funding a balance of \$776,000 at the end of May. If you go to the next page, it shows a forecast of the fund. It's just for one month to the end of June. We are projecting that the fund will have \$369,000 at the end of June. At the bottom right-hand box, we had a contingency of the \$1,250,000 as we've talked about in the previous months. And we're now only projecting \$369,000 and the differences to the budget are listed on that box on the bottom right. The bulk of it being the pooling contract came in at more than had been budgeted. That was partially offset by the carrier audits that were not performed for \$300,000.

The next page shows the coming year and what we anticipate. It's a bit early because we haven't even sent out the invoices yet. Page 4 shows what we expect to spend over the next six months based on the contracts. And the final page is the deliverables. Everything is proceeding as normal. Nothing unusual is going on. As Sanford mentioned, the public notice went out on the 13th, which means that on the 27th we would be able to send out the invoices which is a Friday, so likely we will be sending that on the 30th. So the carriers, we normally

send them out on June 12th for payment received on July 12th. So now it's more likely it will be towards the end of July that we'll start receiving payments or that will be the due date for the payments. Are there any questions? Betty Ann Kane: Any questions? Any questions on the phone? Thank you. Item no. 7 is the Billing and Collection Working Group report. Rosemary?

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

Rosemary Emmer: Rosemary Emmer with Sprint Nextel for the Billing and Collection Working Group report. I chair this committee with Tim Decker with Verizon. The Billing and Collection Working Group is responsible for overseeing the performance of the functional requirements provided by the North American Numbering Plan Billing and Collection Agent, B&C agent, Welch. The B&C Working Group reviews the performance of the B&C agent, and we are responsible to oversee the B&C Working Group project. Today, we will cover the B&C agent contract, the funding year and NANC auction item.

Page 4, contract renewal, I just want to point out to everyone that the contract expired October 1, 2009, and Welch received an extension through 2014. So we're hoping to hear about an RFP [phonetic] going out or some kind of update on this at some point in the future.

Go to page 5. There's a list of the contribution factors here since 2005. We'd like to thank the FCC for getting the

public notice out for the contribution factor that we've talked about earlier. This way, we can move forward with billing by the end of the month possibly; unless, there's some kind of issues that come up with the public notice. Thank you for that.

Page 6, the funding year, as we mentioned at the last NANC meeting, this is new. We mentioned this. We were in the beginning stages of the process of planning this. Now, we're ready. We were discussing and we're ready to move the funding year to align with the federal fiscal year. September would be an ideal timeframe for our budget. Currently, the funding year ends in June. We will bill in June based on revenue figures received in May and we collect beginning in July. That's where we are. The Form 499-A is due in April. USAC requires time to collect the data in April and May, which doesn't give us much time to plan our budget. We're asking the NANC to codify our recommendation providing carriers or entities a one-year advanced notice in order to set the contribution at a higher percentage; thereby, enabling the transition of three to four months to support the outcome. We would bill a 15- to 16-month timeframe in a unique one-time cycle in order to get the budget to move from where we are today to September.

If you go to page 7, the billing and collection agent for us put together this slide that shows the carrier NPACs. You will see that of the roughly 6,000 carriers, well more than half

only pay \$25 a year and three quarter-ish pay less than \$1,000 and only five carriers pay more than \$100,000. We wanted to be able to clearly show and define the NPAC to the carriers with the other slide. Are there any questions so far? Okay. With that, on page 8, we're asking the NANC to approve our funding year change proposal.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. Any questions on that report, first of all on the recommendation or discussion of the recommendations? I see two things, to move the fiscal year, the billing year to October 1st to September 30th to conform with the federal budget year, and to authorize a local or transition year and a quarter that would start July 1, 2014 and run through September 30, 2015?

Rosemary Emmer: I believe so.

Betty Ann Kane: No. I'm sorry, with a year's notice. Let's get it clear. First recommendation is to move to the fiscal year to conform to the federal. You're recommending that that start on October 1, 2016. For the current billing cycle that will start next month, it will remain 12 months. Starting July 1, 2015, you would have a 15-month billing cycle, a transition year, if you will. And then on October 1, 2016 you go back to a 12-month billing. All right, everybody understands what the recommendation is, with notice, obviously, way ahead of

time to all the carriers that this change will be taking place.
Mary.

Mary Retka: Just to clarify, that would mean that really what we would be looking for, for that change would really impact carriers for the 2016 budget.

Betty Ann Kane: Yes. Depending on what the fiscal year was for a particular carrier, the change would occur during 2016. Yes. That's when they'd be paying the extra three months' worth, if you will, depending again on when their budget was. Any further comments, discussions, questions about this recommendation? It's certainly something we're familiar within government. The D.C. government used to be on the federal, and then it went to July 1st to June 30th. Then it went back to the federal, so we've been through a couple of transition quarters, if you will, there. Certainly, with enough notice and with the chart that you gave is showing the minor impact on a carrier that's paying \$25 a year to pay another - what - I can't do math in my head - \$6.25. For many carriers, it's not going to be a big deal. I think it's going to be with the bookkeeping. I will tell you for experience. Even after making the change, it's going to be a couple years where people have to catch up with it just because the way computer systems work and everything else, particularly with small carriers.

We do have that recommendation before us. Is there any objection to that recommendation? Now, Sanford helped me with this. This is a recommendation, the NANC will approve it. Does this need to go to the commission?

Sanford Williams: Isn't it that you would send the recommendation to the FCC? What we do with that, I'm not sure, other than the fact that I know that next year when see the information from the billing and collection agent, which is currently Welch, it would note that in transmission.

Betty Ann Kane: We are making a recommendation to the FCC that this be changed. We'd ask them. I might suggest we ask that they take it under consideration and make a decision fairly quickly so that the carriers do have the amount of time they need to plan ahead changing the systems, et cetera. All right, any objection to that? I'll consider that approved by unanimous consent also and send that off. Great. Thank you, Rosemary.

Rosemary Emmer: Yes. On page 9, we just list our membership and on page 10, list Tim Decker's and my email addresses in case you all have any questions about this. Our next meeting is on June 24th.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you very much.

Rosemary Emmer: Thank you.

NORTH AMERICAN PORTABILITY MANAGEMENT (NAPM) LLC REPORT

Betty Ann Kane: All right. No. 8 is the North American Portability Management and the NAPM, LLC.

Tim Kagele: Good morning, everybody. Tim Kagele with Comcast, I'm one of the co-chairs of NAPM, LLC. I share that role with my colleague, Tim Decker from Verizon. The NAPM is responsible for the LNPA Contract Administration, just as a general point.

Census reports, no new statements of work for NPAC enhancements have been presented to the NAPM. In terms of general updates, the NAPM has accepted the results of the third party vendor neutrality audit no. 11 which covers the period from January through December 2012. Nine out of ten NAPM members have renewed their capital call. Then, lastly, there really has been no activity under the FoN pack. That process remains subject to confidential nondisclosure process. I'll be happy to answer any questions.

Betty Ann Kane: Any questions, comments? Anyone on the phone? Thank you, Tim.

Tim Kagele: Okay, thank you.

LOCAL NUMBER PORTABILITY ADMINISTRATION SELECTION WORKING GROUP (LNPA SWG) REPORT

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you very much. Item no. 9 on the agenda is a report of the Local Number Portability

Administration Selection Working Group. We have no report from them. Item no. 10 is the LNPA Working Group. Paula, you're on the phone and you are going to give this?

LNPA WORKING GROUP REPORT

Paula Jordan Campagnoli: Yes, I am. I'm ready whenever you guys are.

Betty Ann Kane: We are ready now.

Paula Jordan Campagnoli: Okay. Can everybody hear me okay?

Betty Ann Kane: Yes. We can hear you fine here.

Paula Jordan Campagnoli: Also, on the bridge with me is my other co-chairs and Ron Steen with AT&T and Linda Peterman with EarthLink. That report for the LNPA Working Group for this NANC meeting will talk about the NANC 372 change order which is developing new NPAC interfaces and also the transition from PSTN to IP. As far as NANC 372 goes, we continue to refine some technical requirements for the newly implemented SOA to NPAC and NPAC to LSMS interfaces utilizing the Extensible Markup Language, XML, as a protocol. We have several SOA and LSMS vendors have inquired about implementation of the XML interface. We don't have anything firm yet or anybody that's actually doing any testing, but we have had several vendors request information on it. Probably in the future, we should have some vendors changing to the XML. Is there any question on NANC 372?

Betty Ann Kane: No questions here. Thank you.

Paula Jordan Campagnoli: Pardon?

Betty Ann Kane: I said there are no questions here. No.

Paula Jordan Campagnoli: Okay. Transition from PSTN to IP, as you all know, we've been working on it and looking at the PSTN to IP transition from how it would affect number portability. We continue to look at this. We are in the preliminary stages of this discussion surrounding this issue. It will remain on our agenda until we actually do the transition. At our last meeting, we did establish a sub-team to examine the requirements necessary for non-geographic porting and the elements that may need to be changed if we were to go to non-geographic porting. At our July meeting, we have several vendor presentations scheduled so that we can understand the functions and call processing in an IP network and the effects that it'll have on number portability. We're hoping that those presentations will help us. Right now, we have two vendors and a carrier that will be doing the presentation, so we're looking forward to that. That is the end of the LNPA Working Group report unless somebody has any questions.

Betty Ann Kane: Are there any questions? Okay, thank you very much, Paula.

Paula Jordan Campagnoli: Thank you.

STATUS OF THE INDUSTRY NUMBERING COMMITTEE (INC) ACTIVITIES

Betty Ann Kane: I'll mark that no. 10 for the record. Item 11 is the INC, the Industry Numbering Committee Report. Yes.

Dyan Adams: Good morning. Can you hear me?

Betty Ann Kane: Yes. We got you back on now.

Dyan Adams: My name is Dyan Adams. I work for Verizon Communications. I am a co-chair of the ATIS Industry Numbering Committee with Shaunna Forshee of Sprint. This morning, I will be providing some information about INC, meetings and membership information. I will provide the summary of three INC issues that we have worked on: 748, 775, and 778. The ATIS Industry Numbering Committee provides an open forum to address and resolve industry-wide issues associated with planning, administration, allocation, assignment, and use of North American numbering plan numbering resources within the NANP area. We also have general information about how to become a member. Slide 4 provides the details of our recent and upcoming meetings. Our next face meeting is in July in Denver.

Slide 5, since we last reported on issue 748, which is INC's issue related to the IP transition, INC filed an ex parte providing high-level functional requirements for the numbering testbed following the March 24th Numbering Workshop hosted by the FCC. During our May meeting, Henning Schulzrinne joined INC

briefly and confirmed that those high-level functional requirements would be useful. Also, during the week of the May INC meeting, which was ATIS's Annual Meeting of the Committees, INC participated in a joint meeting on the all-IP transition. At this meeting, Dr. Schulzrinne shared a presentation entitled "Technical Transition Update." That presentation from what I understand is available publicly on ATIS's Legal and Public Policy page.

Next slide, issue 775 is related to issue 740, which INC reported on at the last NANC meeting. Issue 740 allows a code holder that only has ported TNs and no blocks assigned to return a pooled code via the pooling administrator when there are other block holders. At INC's March meeting, the pooling administrator provided statistics that showed an increase in code returns. Asking service providers that only have ported TNs and no blocks assigned to become the new code holder resulted in extra work for the PA, few if any volunteers among those service providers and also a delay in the application's disposition. Issue 775 eliminates the step for the pooling administrator to ask service providers that only have ported TNs to become the code holder. Going forward, the pooling administrator will only contact block holders which will streamline the work for the PA and service providers alike as well as provide the outcome of the pooled code return requests

sooner. This issue is in final closure and the updated guidelines were published on Friday the 13th.

Slide 7, issue 778 will update the guidelines to support existing NANPA and PA processes and provide guidance to new entrants. Service providers require a NECA-assigned OCN in order to obtain numbering resources from the NANPA or the PA. The OCN must have a NECA company code category type that is allowed to receive numbering resources; however, these category types have never been clearly defined in INC guidelines. As a result, service providers with an incorrect company code category type have attempted to obtain resources. At times, service providers have changed the category type after receiving resources. INC will list the permissible company code category types in its guidelines to support existing NANPA and PA processes to deny requests for resources when an inappropriate category type is used. In addition, INC will formally ask NECA to update its website and documentation to help new entrants determine the appropriate company code category type. This issue is still active.

Slide 8 shows our issues currently in initial pending status. If I recall, they're all associated with PAS enhancements. Slide 9 lists our issues in final closure, 775, which I just reviewed and issue 777. The last slide is our usual relevant INC Web pages.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you very much, Dyan. Are there any questions on this report? Jose.

Jose Jimenez: Jose Jimenez with Cox Communication. Not a question about the report exactly. I could also ask this question, I suppose, when the IP IMG presents. Because some of the LNPA Working Group and your report referred to work on the IP transition, so is it going to be maybe the role of the IP IMG to make sure we're not all working on the same thing? How does that happen? Maybe that will be the IP IMG report. I could wait until that happens, but I'm just curious.

Betty Ann Kane: Your question is about coordination?

Jose Jimenez: Yeah, because I heard just about the same thing from you that I heard from the other reports.

Paula Jordan Campagnoli: Jose, this is Paula from the LNPA Working Group. At the LNPA Working Group, we're looking at IP transition from a portability standpoint and how it will affect number portability and what changes we may have to make or may not have to make. We don't know at this point as far as what we would have to do to be able to continue to do number portability when we go to IP transition. We're looking at it from that aspect. Whatever we come up with at the LNPA Working Group, will be coordinated in and discussed at the NANC and with other committees that are looking at it if need be. We're all

cognizant of the fact that we have to keep in touch with each other.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay, thank you, Paula. Comment here.

Gina Perini: Gina Perini, one of the tri-chairs of the IP IMG. We're going to be collecting that information and reviewing it and monitoring it, but we're not going to be saying who's overlapping. We're going to keep the conversations where they are as far as the initial discussions we've had. As the group continues to mature, we might have to think about how we report what people are doing, but there's no change what people are doing in their existing groups.

Jose Jimenez: Thank you. I hear that that is not exactly it. The role of the IP IMG is more of, I guess, making sure that you know where things are being worked without necessarily telling somebody, "Hey, you are duplicating the effort going on over here," right?

Gina Perini: That was my understanding. Again, we've only had two meetings so far. I think we have our mission and our scope. Those outline more of a monitoring process, not an overseeing process.

Jose Jimenez: Should you find a collision or should you find an area that doesn't have any coverage, right now, in either instance, all you do will be report?

Gina Perini: Correct.

Jose Jimenez: Okay, interesting. Should that be happening somewhere?

Gina Perini: Good question. It could be. I don't know.

Betty Ann Kane: Rosemary, did you have your card up?

Rosemary Emmer: I was just going to add that the IMG will be looking at their contributions. If there are numbering impacts that anyone sees that are not being addressed, like if anyone happens, to say, "Oh, gosh, well, this is affecting numbering. No one's brought it up within the team, within the group that's working on it or whatever," then I would expect that someone from the IMG would let these folks know as far as anything that might be missing from a numbering perspective. That's why the IMG was formed so they'll make sure that there wasn't something numbering that we were all missing. But, yeah, they're not going to be overseeing or telling the other groups, you know, how to do their jobs, just kind of looking for those numbering pieces.

Jose Jimenez: Well, I wasn't suggesting that the IMG would tell an ATIS or an LNPA Working Group how to do it. I was curious about if the IMG identify the same issue being worked into forums, whether the IMG would have a role to play in telling one of those, "Stop working on that." I hear that's not the vision. One of the things that I appreciated about the work that Mary and you did in kind of laying out where issues could

be worked was I thought that the high-level plan ensure that there will be as little duplication as possible. I think we still run that risk that there will be some duplication. I hope that either here in the quarterly meetings or in some of other forum if there is duplication of effort, which can be as inefficient as not working an issue that needs to be worked, that there is a way, a place where we can say, "Wait a second. We have a lot of brain cells over here, maybe too many, and there may be some other help over here."

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. Mary.

Mary Retka: I think the important thing is that, yes, we brought up at the formation of the IMG that we wanted to monitor, Jose, in particular for the issues that we were all working a lot of issues duplicatively in different groups. Obviously, when the IMG reads out to the NANC if we see something where we think there's some duplication, any of us can raise that as the IMG reads out what they've seen. If the IMG hasn't seen it, but we'd like to ask them to investigate, I think we can go back to the IMG with that information. I think you remember the IMG, SMI, and others. As Gina said, they're going to monitor the work. All of us that are involved can easily bring to that group or here at this table the questions that we have about duplication of efforts.

Betty Ann Kane: Tiki.

Tiki Gaugler: I was just going to note that the NANC is really the body that directs work. I mean, all of the working groups and the IMG all work at the pleasure and direction of the NANC, so this is the place. That's why the reporting is coming here. That was the goal. When we talked about it the last time about setting the IMG was to be able to track it. I don't think IMG has any role in actually making any direction of work but to bring it here for this would be the body that would make direction.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you, Tiki. All right, so we have that report. Are there any other questions on the report? Yes.

Stephen Pastorkovich: Steve Pastorkovich, NTCA. Maybe this is already exists in the SOA, and if I just missed it, I apologize. But maybe it would be possible just to start simple and get a list of who's doing what. Going through this report, I'm hearing a lot of things of, okay, this group is looking at a certain aspect of the IP transition; this group is looking at the numbering aspect, things like that. Frankly, I'm already a little lost. If there could just be a list of who's doing what, I could go back and report to my members. I have to go back to them and say, "Here's what's going on with the NANC." Basically, I tell them there are a whole lot of groups looking at this. If we could just start, maybe starting simple would be step one.

Betty Ann Kane: I can ask maybe the Issue Management Group to write their work and with their report could include just here are the issues, the parts of the IP transition, and this is the working group, the group that's looking at it. That would be obviously one of the reasons we set up the Issue Management Group to manage the issue so I appreciate that. It's clear just from this, this is the one issue that's gotten some discussion today, that the IP transition and all its aspects, whether it's on portability, whether it's on access to numbers, whether it's on all the technical things and the test trials, is really going to be an important issue over the next several years for us to keep track of and for everybody in industry to work on. Okay, thank you very much. We're now up to the Future of Numbering Working group. Carolee, if you want to be doing it right from there, that's fine.

FUTURE OF NUMBERING (FoN) WORKING GROUP REPORT

Carolee Hall: Thank you. Thank you, Commissioner Kane. I am the new chair of the Tri-Chairs.

Betty Ann Kane: Your name for the record.

Carolee Hall: Carolee Hall. I am a tri-chair with Mark Lancaster from AT&T and Suzanne Addington with Sprint. I am replacing Kathy Bakke from the Wisconsin PSC. She stepped down to take another position, a new job responsibility. The group would like to thank Kathy for all of her hard work on the FoN.

There were new contributions from AT&T that were discussed regarding numbering testbed parameters. The FoN agreed to hold these contributions until more information regarding the testbed is available. Some committee updates, geographic issue. FTN for the Geographic Numbering Subcommittee is discussing the consumer perspective and service implications regarding the geography of telephone numbers and the decoupling or disassociation of numbers from geography. The subcommittee is creating a white paper to be shared with the FoN Working Group upon completion. We've had conference calls on April 2nd, 28th, and June 11th. Our next call is scheduled for July 2nd. The contact information, if anybody's interested in joining the group, is on the back. The FoN meeting notes and documents are posted at the NANC Chair. The link is listed on the back there. Are there any questions?

Betty Ann Kane: Jose.

Jose Jimenez: Just curious, Carolee, what is the timeline for the white paper? It's a critical topic. I'm just curious.

Carolee Hall: It's soon. We just had a call. The update was they wanted to drill down on a few specific issues left, remaining. We're looking for it very soon.

Jose Jimenez: Maybe by the next NANC meeting? Maybe there will be [cross-talking].

Carolee Hall: Hopefully, yes. I think so.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. Any other questions or comments?
Thank you, Carolee.

Carolee Hall: Thank you.

REPORT OF THE INTERNET PROTOCOL ISSUE MANAGEMENT GROUP

Betty Ann Kane: Item no. 13 on our agenda is the Report of the Internet Protocol Issue Management Group. We have a report which will be document no. 13.

Gina Perini: Hello, this is Gina Perini from SMS/800. I'm one of the tri-chairs along with Ann Berkowitz of Verizon and Valerie Cardwell of Comcast. We've already have some good-spirited discussion about this new group. We have had two meetings thus far to kind of get us going. We had a meeting on May 15th and then again, on June 2nd. These were teleconferences. At these meetings, we elected our tri-chairs. We defined and approved our mission and scope, which is on the second page of our slide presentation. We identified an initial list of industry groups and activities to be monitored. That definitely addresses the comment earlier about getting a list together. We have our next meeting, it's a teleconference as well, on July 10th at 11:00 Eastern. The contact information for all three of the tri-chairs, all of us, is on the back page. Please reach out to any of us and we can get you more information, get you into the participant member list. Again, this is a new group. We are starting to figure out what we're

doing. Also, I think there's a lot of energy and excitement about this group and monitoring what we're doing.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay, thank you very much, Gina. Are there any questions? In light of the previous discussion, can we maybe expect at the September NANC meeting we might be able to get that kind of list of who's doing what at least preliminary?

Gina Perini: Yes.

Betty Ann Kane: Which groups are working on which issues, that'd be very helpful in the IP transition.

Gina Perini: Absolutely.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you very much.

Gina Perini: You're welcome.

PRESENTATION BY JOHN VISCLOSKY, FCC/WCB, REPORT ON DIRECT ACCESS

NUMBERS TRIAL

Betty Ann Kane: All right. The next item is a presentation by John Visclosky of the Wireline Competition Bureau, which is on Direct Access to Numbers Trial. Where is John here? We just had that handed out. That was not mailed out ahead of time, it was emailed out. Does everybody have that? Okay, thank you. Go ahead, John.

John Visclosky: You'll have to bear with me. I'm a little bit under the weather, so my voice is not as clear as it normally is. I'd like to just give you a quick idea of the

direct access trials that the commission conducted recently and what we learned as a result of it. I'm going to show that ultimately, we found that with only a few minor exceptions, the trials proceeded with a lot of success. They demonstrated that it is technically feasible for interconnected VoIP providers to obtain telephone numbers directly from the numbering administrators without causing porting or interconnection or billing and compensation issues.

On that first slide there you see on April 18th last year, we really see direct access, NPRM order, and NOI, which established the six-month technical trial to allow interconnected VoIP providers' direct access to numbers. Well, traditionally, they haven't had this ability. Instead, they've had to partner with a competitive LEC who will then obtain the numbers from the administrator before handing them over to the VoIP companies. The order allowed a select group of interconnected VoIP providers to gain direct access directly from the numbering administrators to telephone numbers.

As you see on the next slide, there were a few limits placed. The trial is only open to interconnected VoIP providers that had pending petitions for waiver of Section 5215 G2 of the commission's rules. All the providers, who were accepted into the trial, were granted a six-month time-limited waiver of that section of the rules and were also required to meet a number of

terms and conditions. They had to file monthly reports with the commission throughout the duration of the trial. They had to comply with our number utilization and optimization requirements. Moreover, they also had to comply with industry guidelines and practices. They had to provide the state commissions with specific contact information.

Now, as you can see on the next slide, at the end of the selection process, five companies participated in the trial: Vonage, SmartEdge, WilTel, IntelePeer, and Millicorp. Now, before these five companies could obtain the numbers from the numbering administrator for the trial, they were required to complete all the same steps that are traditionally required of carriers who request numbers. You could see on the next page there is a short timeline of the trial where we released the original NPRM order and NOI on April 13, 2013 and then where the Wireline Competition Bureau approved the proposals of the five companies that eventually participated in the trial that was on June 17th of last year. That was the official beginning of the trials. Thereafter, the five participants requested numbers from the NANPA. Then, the trial ended six months after it began on December 17th of last year. Then, about a month-and-a-half later, the Wireline Competition Bureau reported to the full commission giving it the results of the trial. You can see on the next slide, the chart, all told there were 97,000 numbers

that were requested and obtained from the numbering administrators. Sixty thousand of those went to WilTel; 30,000 to Millicorp. The remaining numbers were divided amongst the remaining three participants.

Just to give you a clear idea, the next slide shows the number of numbers requested and at which rate centers they were requested. As you can see Vonage, SmartEdge, and IntelePeer requested a relatively small amount of numbers and a fewer number of rate centers; whereas, WilTel and Millicorp, their numbers were spread amongst a slightly wider swathe of geography. Just for a better visual representation of that, we have the map of all the rate centers that were utilized in the trials. They're mostly centered around the Eastern seaboard as you can see, but a few out West in Dallas and Denver and Los Angeles.

Now, in the next slide, there were limits placed following the completion of the trial. For instance, the five participating companies were not allowed to obtain direct access to additional numbers following the end of the trial period late last year. While the participating companies are allowed to continue to assign the trial numbers that they obtained during the six-month trial, they may not port in a number for a new customer. They have to use a competitive LEC partner for that.

Now, just in terms of the results, they turned out to be very positive, we thought. Vonage and Level 3, as you can see here, Vonage placed just over a thousand numbers into service. Level 3 placed almost 3,000 in numbers into service. They each had tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands of porting requests. Vonage reported that it completed bulk ports without a problem. As you can see, 100 percent of port-ins and port-outs for both companies were successful with no routing failures or billing or compensation disputes reported in the monthly reports to the bureau.

Now, Millicorp was slightly slower than Vonage and WilTel in requesting and eventually obtaining numbers from the administrators. Well, by January 15th of this year actually, they were only able to place 40 numbers into service. But like the previous companies, they didn't report any problems or issues or billing or compensation disputes either. IntelePeer has begun operational testing with internal telephone numbers to assess call routing. Unfortunately, they were not able to place new numbers into service.

Now, the next slide, there were just a few issues that we highlighted in our report to the full commission. The first was interconnection issue. During the trial, a few of the participants did report that they were unable to reach agreement for traffic exchange in four of the rate centers that were used.

This wasn't due to any technical issues with porting numbers or anything like that. It was simply the result of the parties being unable to reach a contractual agreement. There were no other issues reported in the other rate centers that were at use in the trial. The second matter was noted by a few commenters basically thinking that the scope of the trial was too limited or should have been open to more companies.

In a report to the full commission, the Wireline Competition Bureau, we did find that if the trial had been longer or included a greater amount of numbers, then it's possible that it could've provided more information. However, that's really the case with any trial. By nature, trials have to be limited in time and scope. We thought that this one gave us a lot of great info that is really going to prove very useful going forward. In terms of VoIP interconnection, Vonage, in particular, gave us some good info that we found very helpful. They'd been able to exchange traffic with both AT&T and Verizon through an existing agreement that they had with Peerless. They noted that the trial actually facilitated their efforts to negotiate VoIP interconnection agreements with carriers and multiple system operators.

The last issue that we noted on the report is facility's readiness. Under the commission's rules, carriers have to demonstrate that they can place numbers into use before they can

actually obtain the numbers from the administrators. The trial participants were asked to comply with the same requirement. In the direct access order, we asked for comment, going forward, what sort of evidence VoIP companies could potentially provide in order to prove facility's readiness, and the commission's considering what centers of facility's readiness may or may not be appropriate.

The last slide, just our conclusions overall, we thought the trials proved to be extremely helpful. Again, we learned that it is technically feasible for interconnected VoIP providers to obtain telephone numbers directly from the numbering administrators. There were no routing failures or billing or compensation disputes reported. There were no technical problems reported to the commission involving number porting or VoIP interconnection. To the extent that porting or interconnection disputes did arise, the bureau believes that additional clarity and guidance can be given in rulemakings that are pending that should be able to adequately address those issues.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay, thank you very much. Are there any questions, comments on the report? I have one I want to start with, if you don't mind, just for clarification because as you indicated, the trial's over, the report's gone in. But on the slides near the end, we talked about the trial results. The

last two, IntelePeer and SmartEdge, you say, "Are completing, has begun the testing phase." Are things still going on or is it totally shut down?

John Visclosky: Things are still going on. They'd begun operational testing by, I believe, the time that the report was issued to the full commission in January of this year.

Betty Ann Kane: In terms of these ones where they hadn't finished but are still going on, how are they being looked at, monitored, you know, treated? Are there new lessons learned from that? I mean, at the end, you said there's no new numbers being ported in, no new customers. Will there be some follow-up looking at things that are ongoing, is what I'm saying. Thank you, Sanford.

Sanford Williams: I'm sure that they will report to us anything they find along the way. Any information received from them will be used in our decision-making process.

Betty Ann Kane: They being?

Sanford Williams: They being the companies.

Betty Ann Kane: The companies.

Sanford Williams: Right. We'll have dialogue with them at some point. It won't be just something that's totally halted. So we're still talking about things they'd learned, the things that have transpired since.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay, thank you. Jose.

Jose Jimenez: I was curious not about this direct number access. Is the FCC also looking into the future about the numbered assignments, ideas that were floated last year, something like single number assignment under a block? Is that something that the agency's looking at to or is that part of this, something different, part of their numbering trials? Do you happen to know?

Sanford Williams: I think in the numbering item that we had that Henning talked to us about, the numbering testbed, there are lots of ideas that were floated in NPRM, so people are free to comment on those ideas. Once they comment on them, we can react to them. [Indiscernible] has been mentioned by people in the past. I'm sure if it's brought up by commenters, we'll address those issues and ideas.

Jose Jimenez: Those may be addressed in some future order?

Sanford Williams: Well, depending on, you know, what we receive back as feedback.

Jose Jimenez: Okay.

Betty Ann Kane: I'm sorry, Sanford. You're indicating these are issues that are subject of a current NPRM?

Sanford Williams: Exactly.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS /PUBLIC COMMENTS AND PARTICIPATION

Betty Ann Kane: Are there any other questions on this report? Thank you. I hope you feel better. Okay. We did have

just the summary of action items. I note that we've had three action items we approved and we'll submit to the FCC. The performance evaluation of the NANPA, we approved, and we'll submit to the FCC the performance evaluation of the PA. We are recommending the change in the fiscal year and the transition year. The next item we had was public comments and public participation. Then, we have added under other business, Jackie Voss will talk about the testbed, the ATIS.

OTHER BUSINESS

Jackie Voss: [Speaks away from the microphone]

Betty Ann Kane: Great. If you could come, then come and sit up here. Let's pass these around, all IP transition initiatives. If you want to sit here, it would be easier to talk with papers than standing up. Let me just set the record. We do have a handout, "ATIS All IP Transition Initiatives." We will indicate that that will be, I believe, document no. 15. Thank you.

Jackie Voss: Hi, my name is Jackie Voss from ATIS. I'd like to report on the various activities related to the IP transition taking place within our organization. As noted in the presentation, the IP transition and the evolution of the network is a topic that impacts several of ATIS' work programs. ATIS' Packet Technology and Systems Committee, the PTSC, and the Industry Numbering Committee, INC, are addressing much of the

technical work. Obviously, Dyan reported on the INC work earlier, so I won't be reporting any of that out. Previous updates on ATIS' work related to their transition were reported last July under the Technology Transitions document and are available on the ATIS website under our Public Policy page. Additionally, forward-looking strategic work is being addressed by ATIS' Technology and Operations Council, also known as TOPS.

In December 2013, ATIS in the SIP Forum launched the IP-NNI Joint Task Force to address the following areas. From a protocol perspective, they are defining a reference architecture identifying the functional entities required for an IP-based interconnection. They're developing a specification for all protocols at the NNI. Specific to the topic of routing, they're defining the architecture for sharing the NNI interconnection data. This effort is not being done with the intent of identifying a single approach but rather, it is expected that multiple solutions will exist during the transition and an analysis being done to specify how the multiple solutions will work together.

Several key principals will continue to be supported under its transition. They are the universal connectivity to next generation broadband networks and services; the protection of consumers including safeguards against fraudulent, deceptive, and unfair business practices; uninterrupted seamless access to

public safety, national security, emergency preparedness responsive services, continued network reliability and robustness, and the facilitation of competition and innovation. This group is currently working on the initial readout regarding the progress of their routing framework and the IP, Internet Protocol, and the completion of the NNI profile is scheduled for the first quarter of next year.

Another one of ATIS' groups addressing the IP transition is the ATIS TOPS Council IP Services Interconnected Focus Group. This group is defining a strategy for developing an IP services interconnect specification appropriate for all service provider types, taking into consideration basic advance in future services. The specification will include forward-looking services such as HD voice, video, messaging, and data. These requirements are identified for a set of interconnection profiles built on existing standards to enable these services and to deliver a consistent user experience independent of the type of network. This effort is complementary to the ATIS/SIP Forum IP-NNI Task Force. Again, this focus group will help ensure interconnection and interoperability between all types of service providers for IP-based services. As you may know today, many standards addressing interoperability exist across several SDOs. A key step in this transition will be to identify which specification should be used as a basis for interconnection.

The focus group is currently analyzing several use cases for advanced voice and video services. This analysis is limited to the requirements and architecture which are stage 1 and stage 2. Any analysis related to stage 3 or the protocol work will take place within the PTSC.

Finally, our report on the IP transition of the Public Safety Related Applications Task Force, this group falls under the purview of our TOPS Council. This group was established to address the migration of the infrastructure associated with public safety. Some of the key areas they're looking at are the alarm circuits to fire and police departments, FAA circuits to towers and alarms, circuits that monitor railroad crossings, circuits for sensors of gas and power companies, meter and alarming circuits related to power grid, and circuits supporting underground communications. Obviously, given the nature of these items addressing these applications will be critical to the timely transition to the all-IP network. There are several key contributors to this work effort. It'll be important for the operators to identify specific circuit types and to prioritize the various applications, the manufacturers engaged to provide solutions to support the transition and contribute to the development of the roadmap. Then, finally, outreach to the industry and customers will be important in order to receive feedback on recommendations and best practices.

This task force has completed a preliminary review of the current environment and the challenges associated with the transition. Specifically, they've identified the public safety-related applications involve a diverse set of customers with unique requirements. In most cases, circuit records alone did not provide sufficient data on the underlying applications. Many existing customer requirements are based on the characteristics of the legacy copper network. Feedback with relevant industry groups and associations is necessary to develop transitional and future solutions. Ensuring of the findings and customer education will be essential.

The next step is the development of a report which will outline it and prioritize the key applications and issues impacting a transition, provide possible solutions and guidelines, and recommend a roadmap and timing to further address these areas. An effort is underway to collect data from relevant industry organizations. In turn, the task force will communicate its recommendations to the appropriate regulatory bodies and industry associations. This concludes my report today. On the last page, I provided an additional slide outlining the various regulatory activities where ATIS has been engaged. If you're interested, this information is also available on the ATIS website under the Public Policy section.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you very much, Jackie. Let me just say for the folks on the phone, this was just handed out today and the previous one also. I will see that we get electronic copies of those last two reports in particular, that were not sent out ahead of time, send out to everybody. We appreciate you doing this, Jackie. You know, we're focused on the numbering aspects of the IP transition. But it's very useful to have an overview of all of the pieces that are involved here, including those of us who are public utility commissioners, the electric and gas industry implications, too, in terms of the safety. There's just myriad ways in addition to numbering, but it's really useful to have what we do here with numbering kind of put in that larger context. Rosemary.

Rosemary Emmer: Jackie, thank you for this. Thank you for jumping right in and providing this to us real time today. Thank you. This is really helpful. I have two questions. One on page 7, what is an SDO?

Jackie Voss: Standards Development Organization.

Rosemary Emmer: Okay, cool. You had that right, Gina. I have to learn that one. That one's new. I have never heard of PSRATF. I heard you say it really fast. How do you say it?

Jackie Voss: We do spell it out.

Rosemary Emmer: I thought that had said something like SHRAT [sounds like] or something.

Jackie Voss: If I meant to, I didn't mean to.

Rosemary Emmer: Okay, very good. All right. Well, that's all I had. This is just great. Thank you.

Jackie Voss: Okay, thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: Yes.

Kevin Green: Kevin Green, Verizon. Jackie, for the Public Safety Task Force, is there an expected timeframe for delivery on that report?

Jackie Voss: Let's see. I don't have a specific date. I can get back to you on that. I would anticipate probably within, say, six to nine months, if I had to guess. Probably I shouldn't guess.

Kevin Green: Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: Tiki.

Tiki Gaugler: Thank you very much. This is great. This was, I think, what we're all kind of looking for in some ways, something right, and that we can look at it. Regarding the piece here on the NNI profile, you said scheduled for first quarter, 2015. I know there is discussion later about some of the appropriate regulatory body. Do you know at that point, you think this is going to go? This is a question for Sanford, too. Is that going to go to the TAC? Is that going to NANC here? I mean, we don't do interconnections up here. I'm just wondering

where that might land given that there are, as you said, multiple approaches, not a single approach. How is that?

Sanford Williams: To be honest, at the moment, I couldn't tell you.

Tiki Gaugler: Okay. We'll just keep an eye on that. I guess I'm more like is it going to be released in some public way or are you planning to file it at the FCC? How would those of us on the NANC interested in it see that?

Jackie Voss: I anticipate that there will be a report that's published.

Tiki Gaugler: Okay, and it will be public.

Jackie Voss: Yes.

Tiki Gaugler: Okay. That was sort of the crux of my question. Okay, great. Thank you. Betty Ann Kane: The other questions, well, we will certainly keep our eye on this. We do appreciate your putting together that report and giving it to us. All right, that brings us to the end of our agenda. Are there any other items of new business? Then I'll just announce our next meeting, I believe, it's the second week in September. I believe it is September 17th. Yes, thank you. Somebody's faster on their iPhone than I am. Yes. We will be on Thursday, September 17th, exactly three months from today. I wish everybody a good summer and I hope you get some vacation time in some place cooler than D.C. Safe travels on your way home.

Thank you all again for all of your work on this, and as I said, we will post any of the handouts that were just put out today. We'll send those out again so people do have them electronically. It's really good, I appreciate you all getting your reports in ahead of time so that Carmell has enough time to turn them around, get them out to everybody. You're not getting them when you're getting on the plane and you can, you know, make your copies. Rosemary doesn't have to lug all those boxes in here again. Okay. Thank you very much. The meeting is adjourned.

[End of file]