

**North American Numbering Council
Meeting Transcript
December 9, 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. Chairman Kane | NANC Chairman (NARUC – DC) |
| 2. Henry G. Hultquist | AT&T Inc. |
| 3. Greg Rogers | Bandwidth.com, Inc. |
| 4. Mary Retka | CenturyLink |
| 5. Valerie R. Cardwell | Comcast Corporation |
| 6. Karen Reidy | CompTel |
| 7. Ida Bourne | Cox Communications |
| 8. Matthew Gerst | CTIA |
| 9. David Greenhaus | 800 Response Information Services, LLC |
| 10. Scott Seab | Level 3 Communications, LLC |
| 11. Carolee Hall | NARUC, Idaho |
| 12. Hon. Karen Charles Peterson | NARUC, Massachusetts |
| 13. Wayne Jornter | NASUCA |
| 14. Jerome Candelaria | NCTA |
| 15. Stephen F. Pastorkovich | NTCA - The Rural Broadband Assn. |
| 16. Gina Perini | SMS/800, Inc. |
| 17. Rosemary Emmer | Sprint |
| 18. Michele K. Thomas | T-Mobile USA |
| 19. Thomas Soroka, Jr. | USTA |
| 20. Kevin Green | Verizon |
| 21. Brendan Kasper | Vonage Holdings Corp. (Vonage) |
| 22. Tiki Gaugler | XO Communications |

Special Members (Non-voting):

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

Commission Employees:

Marilyn Jones, Designated Federal Officer (DFO)

Ann Stevens, Deputy 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 – September 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) North American Numbering Plan Billing and Collection (NANP B&C) Agent Report
- (7) Billing and Collection Working Group (B&C WG) Report to the NANC
- (7A) Legal Report
- (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) Status of the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) activities
- (11) Future of Numbering (FoN) Working Group Report to the NANC
- (11A) Geographic Routing of Toll Free Services
- (11B) White Paper Summary
- (12) Report of the Internet Protocol Issue Management Group (IMG)
- (12A) ATIS Report

V. Table of Contents.

1. Announcements and Recent News	7
2. Approval of Meeting Transcript	8
3. Report of the North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA)	8
4. Report of the National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator (PA)	13
5. Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG) Report	17
6. Billing and Collection Agent Report	19
7. Billing and Collection Working Group (B&C WG) Report	23

8. North American Portability Management (NAPM) LLC Report	29
9. Local Number Portability Administration (LNPA) Selection Working Group (SWG)	32
10. Status of the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Activities	39
11. Future of Numbering (FoN) Working Group Report to the NANC	44
11A. Geographic Routing of Toll Free Services	
11B. White Paper Summary	
12. Report of the Internet Protocol Issue Management Groups	63
12A. ATIS Report	
14. Summary of Action Items	76
15. Public Comments and Participation	76
16. Other Business	76

VI. Summary of the Meeting

Betty Ann Kane: Good morning. I apologize for the slight delay. We don't regulate D.C. taxi cabs anymore at the Commission. But if we did, I would have been especially furious this morning when you pick up a cab at the Capitol and he has to use his GPS to try to find this. Anyway, rainy morning, but I'm glad everyone -- I can see so many people here in person. I know we have people on the phone also. Let me just say officially, this is the quarterly meeting of the North American Numbering Council. We are convening at 10:12 AM on Tuesday, December 9th in the hearing room at the Federal Communications Commission. Actually, let's do roll call first.

Henry Hultquist: Henry Hultquist, AT&T.

Mary Retka: Mary Retka, CenturyLink.

Valerie Cardwell: Valerie Cardwell, Comcast.

Matthew Gerst: Matt Gerst, CTIA.

David Greenhaus: David Greenhaus, 800 Response.

Carolee Hall: Carolee Hall, Idaho PUC staff.

Karen Charles Peterson: Karen Charles Peterson,
Commissioner, Mass. DTC representing NARUC Massachusetts.

Jerome Fitch Candelaria: Jerome Candelaria, NCTA.

Stephen Pastorkovich: Steve Pastorkovich, NTCA.

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

Thomas Soroka, Jr.: Tom Soroka, U.S. Telecom Association.

Kevin Green: Kevin Green, Verizon.

Brendan Kasper: Brendan Kasper, Vonage.

Marilyn Jones: Marilyn Jones, FCC.

Betty Ann Kane: I guess I got to say Betty Ann Kane,
Chairman of the NANC DC PSC. People on the phone.

Paula Jordan Campagnoli: We can't hear on the phone.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. We can hear you.

Paula Jordan Campagnoli: Okay. Most of the time, they
can. My name is Paula Campagnoli and I'm from the LNPA Working
Group. I'll be giving a report for the LNPA Working Group
today.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you, Paula.

Greg Rogers: Greg Rogers with Bandwidth.com.

Ron Steen: Ron Steen, AT&T and I'm also one of the LNPA co-chairs.

Dyan Adams: Dyan Adams. I'm representing INC. I'll be giving the presentation over the bridge today.

Karen Reidy: Karen Reidy with CompTel.

Male Voice: Marshall Andrew [phonetic], [indiscernible] Commission.

Laura Dalton: Laura Dalton, Verizon and one of the NOWG co-chairs.

Rebecca Beaton: Rebecca Beaton with the Washington State Commission staff.

Linda Hymans: Linda Hymans, Neustar Pooling.

Ida Bourne: Ida Bourne, Cox Communications.

Tiki Gaugler: Tiki Gaugler with XO Communications.

Mark Lancaster: Mark Lancaster, AT&T.

Michele Thomas: Michele Thomas, T-Mobile.

Rosemary Emmer: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint.

Christopher Hepburn: Christopher Hepburn, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission.

Wayne Jortner: Wayne Jortner from Maine representing NASUCA.

Dawn Lawrence: I'm Dawn Lawrence, XO Communications.

Betty Ann Kane: There were two together there, if you'd do that again.

Dawn Lawrence: I'm Dawn Lawrence, XO Communications.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. Anybody else on your mind? Go ahead.

Scott Seab: Scott Seab, Level 3.

Betty Ann Kane: I'm sorry. I didn't hear that, the last person.

Joanne Leung: I'm Joanne Leung, California Public Utilities Commission.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay, thank you.

Melissa Scarberry: Melissa Scarberry, Ohio Commission Staff.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay, thank you. Let me remind the people on the phone if you would also email in to Carmell, you know, so we know exactly your name, et cetera, who's on there that will help for the minutes. Very good. Okay. Now, can you all hear better now, those of you on the bridge?

Male Voice: Not really.

Female Voice: It's a little better but not much.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. Well, I'll remind the people here when we're speaking to speak right into the microphone. We are getting the technician to work on it.

Female Voice: That is much better actually.

Male Voice: Now, it's better.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND RECENT NEWS

Betty Ann Kane: Good, okay. The first item on the agenda is announcements and recent news. I want to welcome in person Commissioner Peterson from the Massachusetts Telecom Commission. Thank you for joining us. Marilyn, do you have any announcements?

Marilyn Jones: Just one brief announcement. We're working for the upcoming FY '15 NANC meeting dates with Chairman Kane's office and also with the commission staff so those should be out shortly. Do you want to announce the dates when it's at?

Betty Ann Kane: Yes. Let's announce the dates that were being looked at so that people can -- we'll email them out, too, but I'd like to make this final before the end of the year so we could put it out on our website, et cetera. Go ahead.

Marilyn Jones: Okay. The tentative dates so far are each quarter it's Wednesday, March 25th; Thursday, June 25th; Wednesday, September 16th; and Thursday, December 3rd.

Paula Jordan Campagnoli: I'm sorry. Marilyn, this is Paula. Could you do that again? March 25th, June 25th.

Marilyn Jones: September 16th and December 3rd.

Paula Jordan Campagnoli: Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. If you would look at those, if they conflict with any known major meetings, et cetera, let us know.

We will try to finalize it by the end of the year, okay? We'll email it out to everybody, too. Very good.

APPROVAL OF MEETING TRANSCRIPT

Next item, which we will have is document number 2 - we'll put that proposed schedule as document number 1 for the minutes - it's the approval of the transcript of the September 17, 2014 meeting that was sent out electronically. Are there any additions, corrections, comments on the transcript? Hearing none, we will accept that as approved.

REPORT OF THE NORTH AMERICAN NUMBERING PLAN ADMINISTRATOR

(NANPA)

The third item is the report of the North American Numbering Plan Administer, the NANPA. This will be John Manning. We will mark this as document number 3 for the minutes record.

John Manning: Good morning, everybody.

Betty Ann Kane: Good morning.

John Manning: The report this morning consists of the usual items and update on CO code activity, area code relief planning, and some other NANP or NANPA-related news. Beginning on page 2 of the presentation, from January through November this year, we've assigned a little over 3,100 central office codes and a total of 236 codes have been returned or reclaimed. If you look at that figure of 3,100 codes, you'll see for the

first time at least over the last four or five years, we topped the 3,000 mark. We're expecting if you annualize the quantity of codes assigned to the first 11 months of this year, we're looking around 3,400 codes assigned this year, net assignments being around 3,150 codes. The last time we actually hit this quantity of codes assigned in a year was back in 2007. It's been quite some time that we've broken the 3,000 mark albeit we have been fairly close for the past several years.

I'll make one remark about the assignments. We saw a significant amount of activity in September and October as well as November of this year. In my report, you'll see in September of 2014, we assigned a little over 400 codes. In October, we assigned the 504 codes and in November, just a little over 330 codes. It's a significant spike seen at the average quantity of codes assigned per month over the past year was in the neighborhood of approximately 250 to 260 codes. We did see a significant spike in those three months.

Looking or examining those quantity of assignments, the vast majority of those assignments were simply pool replenishments. Looking at December, although we only have a few days in December, it appears as if that spike is beginning to come back down again. We do not anticipate that quantity of codes assigned this month. Any questions with regard to CO code assignments?

Examining area code relief planning, the first item I'll make note of, we saw the introduction of a new area code in Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island in Canada. The 782 was overlaid on top of the 902 area code and that took place on November 30th.

The next four or five projects, I've already covered, but just in summary, we'll see that a number of area codes will be introduced in the first quarter of next year: the Indiana 812, the Tennessee 615; and the California is 415. We all see mandatory 10-digit or 1 plus 10-digit dialing introduced with the effective date of the new area code being in March. Ohio, 740 will see mandatory dialing implemented in March of next year with an implementation or in-service date of April 22, 2015.

Also, happening in March of next year, we'll begin permissive dialing for the overlay of the 843 area code with the new 854 NPA. Also, in April, we'll start mandatory dialing for the Keys' rate center, where the 786 area code will extend over the Keys, which presently is only served by the 305 NPA. Effective date for that implementation is June 1, 2015.

The only project we currently have underway right now is in the Indiana 317. That's the Indianapolis area. We conducted a relief planning meeting back in May. The industry did reach agreement to recommend an overlay. NANPA filed a petition on behalf of the industry in July. Public carrier [sounds like] have been underway for that particular area code and they should

be concluding here shortly. We expect that the commission will then be in a position to render some type of decision early next year.

The 336 area code is one that's going to be an overlay. Permissive dialing will begin in October of next year with mandatory dialing in April of 2016. That's going to be overlaid with the 743 area code. Finally, to make note of two items in Canada - Alberta, Canada is going to get another area code for their complex they have up there with the effective date of April of 2016. In Southwestern Ontario, Canada there will be an additional area code added to the 226/519 complex. That's going to be effective in June of 2016.

One final note on area code relief, I wanted to bring your attention to a piece [sounds like] of correspondence that NANPA received back in October. We typically will ask the SMS/800 Number Administration Committee to provide this an analysis and when they expect the toll-free resource to exhaust. In that October 8th letter, which you can find on the NANPA website, and I provided you the URL in the report, it indicated that the SNAC would recommend to the FCC to consider opening the 833 NPA on or about June 30th of 2017. The last area code implemented for toll-free was the 844 and that was in December 2013, just a year ago. Any questions with regard to area code relief planning on the toll-free resource?

Betty Ann Kane: Any questions on the phone? Anyone on the phone with a question? Okay. Thank you, John.

John Manning: Okay. My final note is just a couple of items. Most everybody here knows that we completed the area code as well as NANP exhaust projections and then also the five XX NPA exhaust projections at the end of October. They are posted on the NANPA website. Our newsletter that we publish every quarter, the next one will be coming out in early January 2015. Also, I'd like to remind everybody here that a course in Reform [sounds like] 502, the so-called tax form of numbering will be due on a Monday, February 2, 2015 with utilization as of December 31, 2014. Also, we are collecting semiannual CIC reports covering the second half of 2014. They will be due no later than the end of January 2015. That concludes my report.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. We have a question. Jerome.

Jerome Candelaria: Jerome Candelaria, NCTA. On the NANP exhaustings within next 36 months, have you seen any acceleration of any of these exhaust dates? I'm thinking of the first page of your report showing, you know, spike intakes from the pool that we haven't seen since 2007. Is this showing up as a greater demand for new area codes or is it simply part of the cycle of replenishing?

John Manning: At least in terms of the exhaust projections, we put it together in October naturally with some

adjustments. There wasn't any general trend in showing any type of movement either way in terms of exhaust projections. By that, I mean there weren't a significant quantity of area codes that were advancing exhausts or a significant quantity that were nearing exhaust that were being pushed out. All in all, we really didn't see much of an impact even with this spike that we saw here in terms of a major influence on those exhaust projections. Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: Any other questions? Thank you very much.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL THOUSANDS BLOCK POOLING ADMINISTRATOR

(PA)

Item number 4 is the report of the National Thousands-Block Pooling Administrator. Thank you. Amy. We will make this document number 4 for the minutes.

Amy Putnam: Pooling is fine. The first chart that you have in your handout is the Pooling Administration's activity summary data for the last 12 months. You will note in particular on the first line, total applications, total Part 3s processed, that July, August, September, October, November, we have been in the five digits, which is a good thing. As of Monday morning, we had processed 131,675 Part 3s this year. We had an all-time record of 137,375 last year. If we process 5,700 more Part 3s before December 31st, we will break last year's record. Last year was a record so please get those Part

3s in. We're going for another record. Please, my pooling administrators don't listen to that. All right.

We had other all-time highs this year. The 479 codes we opened in October constituted a monthly all-time high. John mentioned that we had had a lot of activity in September, October, and November. In November particularly, we had an all-time high on codes opened. We passed 776 Part 1s to NANPA in October. Again, that was also a monthly all-time high.

The rest of the information on those charts, as I frequently say, you can read some time when you're having trouble going to sleep. There is nothing of astounding import on any of those other than that they are actually being reported until we get to the other pooling-related activities, which is on page seven.

We were fully compliant with all of our contract reporting. P-ANI administration, we continued working on reconciling data. In my last report, I said that that was the last time I was going to have to report number 1, the same p-ANI range or part of a p-ANI range as being reported by more than one carrier. We thought that would be gone - we found more. Unfortunately, we are still doing reconciliations on those things.

We participated in the regular monthly meetings of the NOWG. In the monthly meetings to the NOWG, we give a couple of regular reports on forecasts on rate centers that have

forecasted demand but not enough resources to fill that demand. We have some very high forecasted demand in some states. Idaho 208, for example, the forecasted demand requires the opening of more codes than are currently available in the NPA. Nebraska 308, the forecast demand is 102 in X codes. Montana 406, forecasted demand is 78 codes and there are 83 codes available.

We, of course, cannot open a code. We need a service provider to open the code and so when there is a need, and we look for someone who satisfies month to exhaust and utilization to open codes. The reality is, the longer the pooling goes on, the more the pools are depleted. Forecasting being an art rather than a science, forecasting often shows an expectation rather than an actuality. But those forecasts are out there and are taken into account when NANPA is looking at its reports.

Change orders. The only pending change order is part of Change Order 24 from the previous contract, which as I have indicated, will be implemented with the rollout of the past system. We anticipate rolling the past system out on the weekend of January 10th. We have training sessions planned for January 6th for regulators and January 7th and 8th for service providers. We anticipate that the system will be available Monday, January 12th. We continue, as we said, to work on development and testing.

John mentioned the California overlay. We had an issue with that with our customers. We receive so many requests for new code assignments in the overlay, the new 628, that when people came in to replenish the pool with blocks that were usable now, we were unable to fulfill their requests. We proactively contacted the California Public Utility Commission staff about finding a solution. We work with them. On November 7th, they granted us an umbrella safety valve waiver to enable us to override the MTE in utilization rules if necessary in order to replenish the pool now with blocks that can be used now. That will continue until March 21st and that order will then no longer be valid. The INC has changed the INC guidelines so that this will not happen again.

Finally, we completed our annual disaster recovery failover exercise on November 24th. Every year, we have to do a disaster recovery test on both the system and on the Concord office. For the system, we fail over and run out of our secondary site for a few days. For the Concord office, we do things like fire drills and assuring that everyone knows how to operate from home. We require everyone to take their laptop home at night so that if during the night, there should be an earthquake and the office were to be unavailable in the morning, we can go on working from home assuming that everybody's home is okay. That is it for today. Any questions?

Betty Ann Kane: Any questions on the phone? We ask the same question that Jerome asked about the previous report. This kind of unprecedented level of activity and the records you're breaking, what does that indicate?

Amy Putnam: That we're doing a fantastic job.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. Industry trends-ready.

Amy Putnam: We can't answer that. Carriers ask us for more codes. It may be part of their business plan, part of new services they're offering, and of course, part, as I mentioned, is that the pools just are being depleted by a fact that they've been around for a long time.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. Thank you, Amy.

REPORT OF THE NUMBERING OVERSIGHTWORKING GROUP (NOWG)

Moving on to item number 5 on the agenda, which is the report of the Numbering Oversight Working Group, the NOWG, and we will mark this document as document number 5 for the minutes.

Karen Riepenkroger: Thank you. My name is Karen Riepenkroger and I co-chair the NOWG along with Laura Dalton of Verizon Communications. Today, we'll review the NANPA, PA, and RNA 2014 surveys, the PA, NANPA change orders, co-chair position for the NOWG. Then, we have a slide that lists the NOWG participating companies and our future meeting schedule.

On slide 3, when we distributed the presentation, we also distributed the NANPA, the PA, and the RNA performance survey

cover letters for your review. This is in addition to the survey forms that were approved by the NANC at the September meeting. Throughout the proposed timeline for the survey process, survey deployment will take place on January 2, 2015. All responses will be due on January 30, 2015. Then, we will present the performance reports at the June NANC meeting. At this time, the NOWG would like to request NANC's approval of the survey cover letters for the 2014 performance surveys.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. That survey cover letter was sent out?

Karen Riepenkroger: Yes, it was. It was distributed with the presentation to all of the NANC members.

Betty Ann Kane: Are there any questions or comments on the proposed survey cover letter? Is there any objection to the proposed survey cover letter? Anyone on the phone? We will consider it approved by unanimous consent.

Karen Riepenkroger: Thank you very much. The surveys will be posted up on the NANPA and the PA website. We'll be providing them to them later this month so that they will be there and ready on January 2nd.

The next slide is the change order slide. There are no outstanding NANPA change orders that the NOWG has reviewed. Then, Amy had mentioned Change Order 24 that will be implemented

with the new pass that is scheduled to be rolled out in January of 2015.

On Slide 5, we have our co-chair position. Each one of the co-chairs has to serve a two-year term. We rotate this so they aren't both up at the same time and so in October of this year, the NOWG accepted nominations for one of the co-chair positions. I'm very pleased to announce that Laura Dalton of Verizon Communications was nominated and reelected by acclamation to continue in her role as a co-chair for 2015 and 2016.

On slide 6 is a list of the companies that participate. On slide 7, we have our meeting schedule for the remainder of December and January and February. I do want to point out that we will be holding our annual operational review with the NANPA at their Sterling location on February 24th and 25th. Then, the last slide is our email addresses in case anyone has any questions and also to note that we do hold inter-meetings as needed. Are there any questions?

Betty Ann Kane: Any questions? Thank you very much.

Karen Riepenkroger: Thank you.

BILLING AND COLLECTION AGENT REPORT

Betty Ann Kane: Item number 6 is the Billing and Collection Agent Report. We will mark this document as number 6 for the record.

Garth Steele: Good morning. My name is Garth Steele. I'm a partner with Welch LLP. We act as the billing and collection agent for the North American Numbering Plan Fund. Our report takes the format similar to what you've seen in the past. The first page of the report summarizes the statement of financial position of the fund as that to the most recent month then being November 30th. There is a fund balance of \$2.8 million as of that date comprised of just over three million in cash, 200,000 of receivables less accrued liabilities for services provided in November of 500,000 so fund balance of \$2.8 million at the end of November.

The next page provides an analysis of the current year. The current year runs from July 2014 to June 2015. The first five columns in the report present actual numbers to the end of November. The remaining seven columns from December through June provide the original budgeted numbers for the fiscal year to come up with the total combined actual budget to date. Then, we have presented for you our original budget in the second to the last column on the page. You'll see that we had originally projected a budget surplus of \$1 million for the year based on revenues of \$6.9 million and expenditures of \$6.2 million. Our tracking to date with five months of actual expenditures under our belt is very close to that. We now project a slightly higher budget surplus at the end of the year of about \$1,046,000

as compared to the original budget of \$1 million, so tracking very close to original budget. There's a box in the bottom right-hand corner of page 2 that provides a detailed breakdown as to where the variances are from the budget.

The next page presents the current and forecasted liabilities for the fund for the next six months. No surprises there. All of the expenditures are under fixed monthly contracts, and the amounts are the same each month with the exception of carrier audits which have been projected to be paid for in the month of February if those take place.

The final page of the report provides some narrative concerning the various deliverables that we have, and nothing really to note there except in the last block, we talk about a change to the timing of remittance of unpaid debts to treasury. We now remit those debts to treasury within 120 days of their due date according to treasury guidelines. That concludes my report.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. Any questions on this report?
Yes, Mary.

Mary Retka: Mary Retka from CenturyLink. One other change, I believe, is that you've received a contract for renewal up until February of 2015. Am I correct on that?

Garth Steele: Yes. It was extended for another couple of months to the end of February.

Betty Ann Kane: An extension, not a renewal, right?

Mary Retka: Yeah. I wanted to point it out. I think it's just an extension at this point in time. We've been waiting a long time on that contract.

Betty Ann Kane: Yes. Marilyn, can you give us any update on that contract? Because each of our meetings, we inquire about it and we know there gets to be an extension but not the actual solicitation or renewal.

Marilyn Jones: Yes. I spoke with the folks in our contracting office. The intent is to have a new solicitation out by the end of the year and therefore, an award before the end of the extended period of February 2015. So they're working it.

Betty Ann Kane: We would expect at our March meeting, we could get a report on a new contract?

Marilyn Jones: Yes. We expect that.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. Tell me the process on that just so we all understand. You put out a solicitation. Is there a certain amount of time? Is it normally 30 days to respond?

Marilyn Jones: Yes. I think this particular solicitation is going to be a GSA schedule solicitation. So within 30 days, they should be able to solicit and award a contract. That's my understanding of the process.

Betty Ann Kane: By GSA schedule, you mean the persons who respond to it would be people who've already been approved and are on the General Services Administration list of vetted and potential contractors?

Marilyn Jones: That's right.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. That shortens the process, doesn't it?

Marilyn Jones: Immensely, yes.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. We will look forward to an update on that at the March meeting. Thank you very much. I'm sorry. Any other questions on this? Thank you.

BILLING AND COLLECTION WORKING GROUP (B&C WG)

Item number 7 on our agenda this morning is the Billing and Collection Working Group. Rosemary, you're going to do that on the phone?

Rosemary Emmer: Yes, I am. Hi, it's Rosemary and missing seeing everyone today. Sorry that I wasn't there. There was just a sheet of ice this morning from West Virginia. I decided not to go there. For the Billing and Collection Working Group, I chair this with Tim Decker of Verizon. I apologize there are no copies because I was to go on. I was in charge of bringing the copies so I'll just quickly [cross-talking].

Betty Ann Kane: Excuse me. Rosemary, they were sent out electronically.

Rosemary Emmer: Yes.

Betty Ann Kane: No? I have one.

Rosemary Emmer: Very good. The Billing and Collection Working Group is responsible for overseeing the performance of the functional requirements provided by the B&C agent. We review the performance of the B&C agent. We identify financial impacts of activities that might be included, that might need to be included in the budget. Right now, our current activities, we are overseeing the monthly billing and collections. We also do monthly deliverables. We do an evaluation of the deliverables.

The B&C agent contract, I was going to talk about that, but we just did so I don't need to. I'm glad to hear that there's going to be an extension at least through 2015, February. That's good. This funding year, this was really seeing that as a significant importance. Okay.

For those of you on the line, this is on page 6. We want to address the funding year budget change. As you all, I'm sure, [audio glitch] and during those September 2014 NANC meetings, we discussed and we agreed to move forward with changing the current budget that allows this funding year to align with the federal fiscal year. We talked about that in both meetings.

We have not received an actual okay from the federal government like we haven't anything in writing or whatever. But after we've done a lot of research, we've talked to a lot of people. We've done a lot of research; we've done a lot of legal research. We believe that based on that, we have the requisite authority to move forward with changing the funding year. We've provided the justification documents to the NANC also.

So basically, the B&C agent already calculates - and I'm reading now from their project - they calculate, assess, bill, and collect payments for all Numbering Administration Functions, and distribute funds to the NANPA or the agent designed by the Common Carrier Bureau that performs functions related to the Numbering Administration on a monthly basis.

Contributions to support the Numbering Administration shall be the product of the contributors and user telecoms revenues which everyone's familiar with. Well, anyway, many of the carriers only pay \$25. I put a note into that, I think, on the page before that. I've also shared this in the June and in the September meetings showing everyone what the breakdown is as far as the percentage of carriers that pay a percentage of the fund. For instance, there are 3,800 carriers approximately that pay only \$25 annually, and there are five carriers that pay over \$100,000.

In any event, what we would like to do as we've talked about, as I said in June and September, is we would like to or we plan to bill in June 2015 and collect in July 2015 for a 15-month cycle. From there, we will begin billing each September in 2015 for October collection. As Garth pointed out earlier, we are looking at a little bit of a surplus right now for our budget in June, the 15-month, so hopefully that'll offset some of the costs for a little higher billing this year. Are there any questions on the funding year?

Betty Ann Kane: Any questions on the funding year? I don't know if everybody has the document. You have your report. I know it did go out electronically. It may have gone out while people were traveling and didn't have a chance to print it out. But there is attached with it a two-page piece posing the question: does the North American Numbering Council, through its billing and Collection Oversight Working Group, have authority to implement an adjustment of the annual contribution calendar so as to be consistent with the federal fiscal calendar? And as you point out, this was discussed at NANC meeting. We did take action and approved that.

I had sent an inquiry through Marilyn Jones asking, on behalf of the NANC, whether the FCC needs to take specific action regarding the use of the federal fiscal year calendar for the annual contribution calendar as was previously recommended

by the NANC and as discussed in the following email. We've forwarded some inquiries. If the answer is yes, what is the status of FCC action in this regard? The response I got was that Marilyn was unable to locate the recommendation regarding the use of the fiscal year. We did send her another copy of it that was in the minutes, and it was submitted.

Rosemary, you've gone through some -- so I'm looking at the Code of Federal Regulations and some sites here. Your conclusion is that no specific provision or section of an FCC rule provides details related to the use of a calendar or fiscal year for the annual assessment of an NANPA cause and note that it just refers to monthly billing.

Similarly, your review of the available FCC orders related to Numbering Administration also netted no specific provision or section that would preclude the B&C Working Group from independently implementing the NANC approved B&C Working Group recommendation to adjust the annual contribution calendar to be consistent with the federal fiscal calendar. I want to put that in the record. We'll put the whole document there in the record. We've not received any response other than your analysis. Is there any concern about what the group plans to do? Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Rosemary.

Rosemary Emmer: Okay, very good. We have included the 2015 draft meeting schedule. We're going to finalize that

schedule next week on our call. Our B&C Working Group membership consists of AT&T, Cox, Sprint, CenturyLink, Verizon, and T-Mobile. On the last page of our report, it shows our contact information, Tim and my contact information. Our next meeting, like I said, is next Tuesday. If anyone would like to join, feel free to reach out to us and thank you so much.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. Thank you, Rosemary. Thank you for all your work on this, the whole working group. Marilyn.

Marilyn Jones: Rosemary, this is Marilyn. I just wanted to point to everyone else so that normally, when we do the NANP contributions, we do get a report from the B&C agent. In a NANP report, it would be wise to put a description on what we're doing also because that report goes out for public comment. If anybody has an issue, that will be one last time for somebody to comment on it also. Rosemary, one last thing, if you have any last minute print, anything printed at the last minute, just give me or Carmell a call and we'll make sure it happens for you.

Rosemary Emmer: Thanks. Yes. Sorry about that. Thank you to Michelle Thomas. She did the lion share of work on our legal justification.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. We're going to put that two-page document starting with the word question into the record as document number 7-A. Be careful out there. All right.

REPORT OF THE NORTH AMERICAN PORTABILITY MANAGEMENT LLC

(NAPM LLC)

Item number 8 is the Report of the North American Portability Management, NAPM LLC.

Tim Kagele: Good morning, everybody. My name is Tim Kagele. I'm one of the co-chairs for the NAPM LLC. I share that role with my colleague, Tim Decker at Verizon. First up, we had a couple of statements of work that were approved in the last quarter, Statement of Work 89 Revision 1, which extends the timing of the test window and support of the XML conversion. That SOW was approved by members. SOW 88 Revision 1, which I shared last quarter, agreement has been reached with the LNPA and the NAPM and that SOW is pending NAPM approval in December.

In terms of general updates, I'm happy to report that Tim Decker with Verizon was reelected for a two-year term as NAPM LLC co-chair. Treasurer was also Tim Decker. Secretary for 2015 was Paula Jordan Campagnoli with T-Mobile. Recording Secretary for 2015 was Laura Dalton with Verizon.

Next item, members approved the one-time data download of LEAP elements in response to a request by the LNPA that was initiated by the U.S. Marshall's Office. The last item, the NAPM LLC and the LNPA are working out the logistics for the NAPM LLC project executives to observe a business continuity exercise. The date on that is to be determined, but it will be

probably occurring sometime in early 2015 is our best expectation. That concludes my report. Are there any questions?

Betty Ann Kane: Yes.

Thomas Soroka, Jr.: Thomas Soroka, U.S. Telecom Association. This is for the NANC chair and the NANC body in general. I'd like to request that the NANC make a formal request up to the FCC to give us a status or an update on our vendor selection recommendation that we've submitted over six months now. If we could get a formal request made up to the FCC, that would be great.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. Certainly, we'll do that. As the report notes, parts of it is still under the nondisclosure process, but yes, we will ask for that. Mary.

Mary Retka: This is Mary Retka from CenturyLink. I would like to also second the request that U.S. Telecom has made for that update on the selection. Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: Other questions? Yes.

Matthew Gerst: This is Matt Gerst, CTIA. I'd also like to echo the request. I think that there's a concern that, you know, we'd like to see the commission act very quickly on this so move that that would be included in the request.

Kevin Green: Kevin Green, Verizon. Verizon also concurs with the previous comments. We'd like to see it actively moved forward here. Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. I can see that as, let's be unanimous, a very widespread request. The working groups and the groups involved in that worked very hard to meet the schedule, to meet the timeline to get a recommendation there. We know that there's a process after it came from us to the FCC. But knowing where that is and expressing a desire to have it moved forward and have our work completed by the other body that has to do the final work because what we did was make a recommendation. I will certainly send that letter out just as soon as this meeting is over in the next few days. Okay. I did have a question. What did the U.S. Marshall want? What was that all about?

Tim Kagele: The U.S. Marshall's Office, if you recall, a couple of years ago, the FBI made a very similar request where they wanted -- there are four essential data elements that comprise the LEAP platform. Instead of retrieving those data elements on a kind of a limited basis, they wanted a one-time dump of that information so we agreed with the LNPA to support the request. Does that help?

Betty Ann Kane: A little bit, yes. Thank you. It was just for the elements, the structure of it.

Tim Kagele: The data itself.

Betty Ann Kane: The data.

Tim Kagele: Yeah. All right. If there are no other questions, that concludes my report.

Betty Ann Kane: Any questions on the phone?

Tim Kagele: Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. Thank you very much. Okay.

REPORT OF THE LOCAL NUMBER PORTABILITY ADMINISTRATION

(LNPA) WORKING GROUP

Item number 9 is the LNP Working Group Report and this will be document number 9. Paula, are you doing that on the phone? Who's doing that report? Paula, are you there?

Paula Jordan Campagnoli: Yeah, I'm sorry. I was on mute.

Betty Ann Kane: You're probably on mute. We're up to number 9, up to your report.

Paula Jordan Campagnoli: Okay, thank you. Sorry. What we're going to report on today for the LNPA Working Group is we had an election. We held an election this last quarter. We talked about the transition from PSTN to IP and non-geographic porting.

The first thing is the LNPA Working Group co-chair election. Linda Peterman is stepping down as co-chair of the LNPA Working Group effective December 31, 2014. This is due to a change in her job responsibility. Linda has served as a co-

chair for three years. The LNPA Working Group thanks Linda for her support and leadership throughout these three years and wishes her the best in her new assignment. Linda will be missed because she has a lot of experience when it comes to the LSR process and that is done at the OBF so we really will miss her.

Nominations and election to fill the vacancy of the co-chair position took place on November 4th and 5th 2014 LNPA Working Group meeting. The co-chair position vacated by Linda will be filled by Brenda Bloemke of Comcast.

The floor was also open to nominations for the co-chair positions currently held by Paula Jordan Campagnoli and Ron Steen. Due to the fact that no nominations were made, both Paula and Ron will remain as co-chairs of the LNPA Working Group for 2015. We do this every year to give an opportunity to others that might want to chair the LNPA Working Group so we always allow people to nominate and Ron and I to open our positions should somebody else want to co-chair. We didn't find any volunteers this year so it's Ron and I and Brenda for the next year.

Betty Ann Kane: We appreciate your willingness to do it.

Paula Jordan Campagnoli: The LNPA Working Group requests that the NANC approve the results of the election.

Betty Ann Kane: That's before us as a recommendation to approve the results of the election. Any comments, objections, anyone on the phone? They are approved.

Paula Jordan Campagnoli: Thank you. Okay. The next thing is the transition from PSTN to IP. By the way, I forgot to thank somebody. Mary Retka made copies of this and passed them out so I appreciate that, Mary. Thank you very much. PSTN to IP transition effects on LNP continue to be an ongoing agenda item for the LNPA Working Group. We did receive the ATIS/SIP NNI Joint Task Force IP Interconnection Routing Report document. We reviewed it to see what effects that would have on porting. The report presents multiple views of potential IP interconnection mechanisms based on aggregated PSTN constructs, interim solutions based on all-IP routing using a per-TN registry, and a consideration of hybrid approaches also across both mechanisms during the transition to all-IP.

The potential impacts of number portability process were discussed based on the options presented, and none were anticipated at this time. The LNPA Working Group will provide this feedback to the NNI which we did earlier this month. The LNPA Working Group will actively follow the work of the NNI Joint Task Force going forward so we're working with them as time goes on. But at this time, with the report that they gave

us, we did not see any issues with any of the options that they had presented. Any questions on that?

Betty Ann Kane: There are no questions.

Paula Jordan Campagnoli: Okay. The next item is the non-geographic porting. As you know, we have a subcommittee that continues to work on the development of a white paper discussing technical constraints, consumer and regulatory impacts; and a draft report is projected to be available at the first quarter of 2015. As soon as that report comes out, we will make sure that the NANC gets a copy.

Betty Ann Kane: Good. Maybe if it's first quarter, if we could have it -- I think we're projecting a March 25th meeting. It would be great if we could have it for that meeting.

Paula Jordan Campagnoli: Right. That's what we're working towards. Like I said, as soon as we get it, we'll present it at the LNPA Working Group. We will share it with the NANC. Our next face-to-face meeting is January 6th and 7th 2015. It's hosted by i-Connectiv in Scottsdale, Arizona. That's all for my report from the LNPA Working Group. Does anybody have any questions on any of the report?

Betty Ann Kane: Mary Retka.

Mary Retka: Mary Retka from CenturyLink. Chairman Kane, in our last NANC meeting, we had an action item on a couple of outstanding best practices. I made a note that you were going

to ask the FCC for an update on Best Practices 67 and 70. I haven't seen anything on that and I wondered if we have an update from the FCC on that.

Betty Ann Kane: I do. We did send that request. I do have something that I had just gotten - what was the date - December 8th.

Paula Jordan Campagnoli: Mary, I had it on my report here, the request. I also requested it, Chairman Kane, earlier this month.

Betty Ann Kane: Yes. We did send that request through Marilyn, through FCC. I do have a response for her which I will put in the record. My question was: what is the status of the FCC's approval of including the NANC recommended Best Practices Number 67 and 70 in the NANC LNP provisioning flow? The answer I received, I believe this was a December 8th email. This is from Marilyn Jones: "I spoke with the Commission personnel assigned to work on the NANC Best Practices 67 and 70 recommendation and was informed that the best practices will require a rulemaking action on the part of the commission and that the commission has initiation of such a rulemaking under consideration." I don't know if Marilyn would add anything to that, what that means initiation of a rulemaking under consideration.

Marilyn Jones: Those two particular best practices, basically, we're treating the recommendation as a petition for rulemaking. Best Practice 67 involves project port. Our rules right now don't address project port. We address non-simple and simple ports. For non-simple ports, we do not have a limitation on there. Best Practice 67 will put a limitation on those ports, so we need to address that in a rulemaking before we just change it.

Also, Best Practice 70 involved the CSR. Our rules do not address CSR at all. So we also need to address that in a rulemaking before we put those provision inflows [sounds like] into our rules because the provision inflows are incorporated by referencing to our rules so they're enforceable by the FCC. With those two particular best practices, we need to do a notice and comment period.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. Can you tell us this because you're talking about the initiation? You're considering initiating rulemaking. What's the process? Does that have to go to the commission meeting?

Marilyn Jones: Yes. It has to be done at the commission level. What we're just saying, this is pending. They haven't told us whether we're going to do the rulemaking or not so we are waiting on whether we can initiate the rulemaking or not.

Betty Ann Kane: That takes a vote of the commissioners to give you permission to initiate the rulemaking. Is that what you --? I just want it so that we're clear what the steps are.

Marilyn Jones: We need that from the commission -- the commission sets the priority for what we work on. In order to work on something, we need to have the commission's approval to work on it.

Betty Ann Kane: To work on it, and then the rulemaking would go to the commission for approval as a proposed rulemaking.

Marilyn Jones: No. Once we get permission to work on it as a rulemaking, then we would do a notice of proposed rulemaking and the process --

Betty Ann Kane: And put it out for comment, et cetera.

Marilyn Jones: Yes.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. Well, if you would keep us informed on --

Marilyn Jones: Absolutely.

Betty Ann Kane: -- the commission's consideration of initiating the rulemaking.

Marilyn Jones: Right.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. Thank you, Mary, for the question. I was going to bring it up at the end, but that's good. All right. Anything else on Paula's report?

Paula Jordan Campagnoli: Well, that's it. I was concerned because I thought we had had already a comment cycle on these two best practices that I must have been mixing them up with something, that was the other one. Okay. No. I don't have anything else. Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay, thank you. I'll follow up with that again.

STATUS OF THE INDUSTRY NUMBERING COMMITTEE (INC) ACTIVITIES

All right, item number 10 is the Report of the Industry Numbering Committee, the INC. We'll mark this document 10.

Dyan Adams: Good morning. It's Dyan Adams. Can you hear me okay?

Betty Ann Kane: Yes, Dyan. We can hear you.

Dyan Adams: Okay, great. Thank you. I'm sorry if I couldn't be there. We have some weather up here in Massachusetts also. Okay. I am Dyan Adams from Verizon Communications. I co-chair the ATIS Industry Numbering Committee with Shaunna Forshee from Sprint. I'd like to take a second to thank Jackie Voss and Alexandra Blasgen for printing and handing out the hard copies. They're in the room. Thank you very much. On slide 2 is our overview. On the next couple slides, you'll find our general information that we normally provide, as well as our meetings and membership info. And I'm going to share some information regarding INC's issues

today. Slide 3 is our usual slide regarding INC and how to become a member. Since our last NANC meeting, INC had one face-to-face meeting in November and a brief virtual meeting in October. We have another virtual meeting scheduled this month, and our next face-to-face meeting is January 27th through the 29th in Sterling, Virginia.

Slide 5 begins our issues. As most of you are aware, Issue 748 is INC's IP transition issue. Since our last activity report, we sent a response to the FCC regarding impacts of large-scale rate center consolidations during the transition from PSTN to IP in the form of a white paper. Shaunna reported on this item in September. If you'll recall, we also provided the white paper to the NANC chair and DFO. I believe it was distributed in November, maybe around the 18th or 19th. It is a public document and can also be found on ATIS' website under their public policy section.

At our last face-to-face meeting in November INC heard informational presentations about VoIP, IP and SIP interconnection, and caller ID spoofing. A couple of them were very similar if not exactly the same as what we shared with the LNPA working group a few months ago, and INC continues to discuss IP-related topics and work issues related to the transition under this Issue 748.

On the next slide, we've got Issue 783. This is the issue that Amy mentioned earlier in her report related to the example with the new 628 NPA in California. Previously, code assignments could be made up to six months in advance of a new NPA's effective date. Although blocks from those codes would replenish the pool, none of the blocks are useable until the effective date of the new NPA. So service providers needing blocks prior to the effective date of the new NPA are unable to obtain them because the criteria for pool replenishment cannot be met even though codes in the current NPA are still available. INC modified the guidelines to change the interval when codes can be requested from a new NPA from six months to 66 days prior to the effective date of the new NPA unless there are no available NXXs in the existing NPA.

INC believes changing this interval will ensure a supply of a thousands-blocks is maintained in an exhausting area code and will also ensure that a thousands-blocks from a new NPA not yet effective do not prevent replenishment of the pool with useable blocks. The closure of this particular issue was expedited to allow for the revision and publishing of planning letters to avoid the situation in current and upcoming area code relief projects.

Next slide, ATIS is holding a series of webinars to highlight the IP transition-related work of its committees. On

the 11th, Thursday of this week, they're hosting a webinar on the numbering impacts related to the IP transition. This webinar will cover INC's work related to the IP transition. More information including registration can be accessed via the ATIS homepage under news and events. Their first webinar in this series was entitled New Wireless Opportunities and I believe that was recorded and is available also under news and events from ATIS' homepage.

Slide number 8 just summarizes the issues we have in initial pending, and those are related to the PAS refresh scheduled for January. Slide 9 shows the Issue 783 is in final closure, and then our last slide is our normal relevant INC webpages.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. Questions? Mary.

Mary Retka: Mary Retka from CenturyLink. I just would direct this question as not one necessarily for Dyan, but perhaps as a follow-up to the last NANC meeting.

I believe that Issue 748's results from the INC were sent to both Dr. Schulzrinne, who still is on a retainer working on numbering issues for the FCC, and to the new CTO for the FCC Scott Jordan. When Dr. Schulzrinne was in the CTO role, we heard from him several times here at NANC and he gave us several items to work on. There had been a lot of questions I know in other industry meetings I've been on whether or not the new CTO

Scott Jordan's priorities for what he is expecting from NANC are aligned with those of Dr. Schulzrinne or if there are some different priorities. And I think at the last meeting we talked about the fact that we would want to invite Scott Jordan to join us at NANC and provide us with that insight as to his priorities for us, and I just would like to find out what the status is on that.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. You're anticipating all of my responses from Marilyn. We did forward that request and then repeated that request several times. And the response I got was that Marilyn Jones, as our designated federal officer, had invited Scott Jordan to the NANC December meeting but she had not gotten a response back from him regarding the invitation. This was as of yesterday. And she was going to continue to reach out to him to see if he will be available tomorrow or for future NANC meetings. I think this is an important thing. I know he's new on the job and he's got a lot of other things to do. But I will be personally following up and emphasizing that we really do need to have -- we are an advisory committee to the FCC and we need to know from the folks who are there what advice they want and what their priorities are if they are changing as we continue this very important work on the IP transition and other things. Thank you. Thank you for bringing that up. Any

other questions or comments on the report? Okay. Thank you very much.

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

Item number 11 is the report from the Future of Numbering Working Group. It will be document number 11.

Suzanne Addington: Good morning. My name is Suzanne Addington, and I tri-chair the FoN Working Group with Carolee Hall from the Idaho PUC and Mark Lancaster with AT&T. Page 2 is our mission and scope. It has not changed. And on page 3 our status. Mark Lancaster has chosen to step down at his role as tri-chair so we are undergoing elections and hope to have an announcement by December 19th. So we want to definitely thank Mark Lancaster for his time, energy, and his leadership of the FoN Working Group. He will be missed.

A contribution from AT&T for the numbering testbed parameters has been withdrawn due to the ATIS TOPS Council Testbed Initiative. We figured that it was an overlap so AT&T chose to withdraw that contribution, so that is closed. And as far as FTN 4, our geographic issue subcommittee update, the Geographic Numbering Subcommittee was discussing the consumer perspective and service applications regarding the geography of toll-free, call-routing and the decoupling or disassociation of numbers from geography. They have created a white paper, and

David Greenhaus is here prepared to provide a review. So everyone has been copied on the actual report itself, the geographic routing of toll-free services, and it's also sent out via email. And then I believe David also created some slides that he wanted to review at the end of the FoN Working Group.

And our last item, all IP addressing, we do have a subcommittee that was created to define future identifiers in support of IP industry trends beyond the E.164 numbering plan and they continue to meet on a regular basis.

Page 4 is our membership list of attendees, and page 5 is our meeting schedule and contact information. Our next meeting is scheduled for January 7th from noon to 1:30 if anybody would like to attend.

Betty Ann Kane: Any questions on this part of the report? Okay. Now you indicated David Greenhaus is here.

Suzanne Addington: Yes.

Betty Ann Kane: Yes. I'm going to mark this as document number 11a. It was sent out. You're passing it around, also geographic routing of toll-free services.

David Greenhaus: That's the actual white paper that was produced and approved by the Future Numbering Group. I'm also passing around just now a handful of slides as the summary of that white paper so that we can just give everybody an

opportunity that hasn't read the paper or will just like an overall summary. It's something we could read today.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. Let me pass those around.

David Greenhaus: Yeah, they were --

Betty Ann Kane: Wait a minute. Just a minute, David. I want to mark this as document 11b so we have it in the record. And since you're just passing it out, we'll be sure that we will send it out electronically too so that everyone has it as well as 11a. I'm not sure that went out ahead of time electronically. We'll send those both out. Go ahead.

David Greenhaus: Yeah. I believe they already were sent out.

Betty Ann Kane: They were sent out? Okay. Thank you. I'm being corrected. They were sent out. We'll put them in the record as 11a and 11b. Go ahead with the summary.

David Greenhaus: Thank you. So reviewing not the white paper itself but the summary, the Future of Numbering Working Group set up a subcommittee called FTN 4. We've met now for probably well over two years, at least a year-and-a-half if not two years. We're working this and revising the white paper, and we had quite a good participation on the group - the FTN 4 subcommittee - and I appreciate everyone that participated. We had at least 12 members in each of our meetings, and at some meetings quite a few more. I also want to just give a

particular thank you to Pam Faust [phonetic] of AT&T who became very active in some of the revising and wording of the white paper.

Reviewing this summary, we'll go to the second page - introduction. Routing calls based on the caller's location is an important aspect of many toll-free services where their call originates from a wireline, or wireless, or VoIP caller. Today the ongoing erosion in the geographic underpinnings of the North American Numbering Plan is gaining increased visibility and attention in the telecommunications industry. Taking together the de facto nomadic nature of mobile telephone service, the proliferation of mobile devices and their impact in determining an originating caller's location has compromised the toll-free carriers' ability to route and bill mobile and nomadic VoIP-originated calls on the basis of a telephone number. Telephone number area code exchanges historically have been the basis on which these calls have been routed. But due to both the nomadic nature of the hardware itself, as well as the number portability, we find that the telephone number is no longer an indication of where the caller is.

This white paper provides an overview of the toll-free location based routing, identifies specific roadblocks to accurately routing those calls in the current environment, and

offers up suggestions for overcoming those limitations within the context of these current rules and regulations.

So the next page, page 3, is an overview of some of the CPNI rules. One of the most significant issues that comes up in the conversation is our privacy issues. Because we're talking about a caller's location, there is a concern as to whether or not disclosing or using the caller's location is in some way a violation of CPNI or whether it fits well into the CPNI rules that currently exist. And I think kind of part of the conclusion is that we start to identify the CPNI issues and ask the commission first some clarification that, in fact, I think our conclusion essentially is that there should not be concerns beyond the existing rules but that you're having clarification of that would ease the business practices and interactions between originating service providers, toll-free providers, and also the subscribers to those numbers who are receiving the calls.

There was a declaratory ruling released June 27, 2013 Implementation of the Telecommunications Act 1996. Telecommunication carriers use some customer proprietary network information and other customer information. With that declaratory ruling, the commission in paragraph 8 did not adopt any new rules. So this declaratory ruling in fact did not provide any new rules, but rather clarified some of the existing

rules. In paragraph 33, we also reiterate that Section 222(c)(1) allows a telecommunications carrier to use, disclose, or permit access to the CPNI and its provisional telecommunication service from which such information is derived or services necessary to or used in provision of such telecommunication services.

Note that Section 222 of Title 47 states that the telecommunications carrier that receives or obtains proprietary information from another carrier for the purpose of providing any telecommunication service shall use such information only for such purpose and shall not use such information for its own marketing efforts. So essentially this is reiterating that the exchange of CPNI between carriers subject to the same rules is an accepted practice, but it's a practice for the purpose of providing telecommunication services by properly routing and rating calls and not for marketing applications.

The combination of these two provisions in the statute indicates that Congress contemplated the transfer of CPNI in the provision of telecommunication services, and specifically permitted it. Moreover, Section 222 clearly imposes upon carriers an obligation to use such information only for such purposes.

The next, page 4, addresses the issue of fuzzy location. And what we're looking at here is the fact that when a toll-free

carrier uses the customer's location in order to terminate the call whether it be to the correct closest store, whether it be to a service that provides answering services or fulfillment services - whatever it be - the information that's provided on that caller, number one, is normally as when we use the caller's cellphone number, we didn't know exactly where the caller was. We know where the caller generally was, and that's what we call fuzzy location.

But another important aspect to this is that the toll-free carrier has accessed only a single point, a single call, a single point in time for that caller. It's a very limited and distinct information about that caller, and you might compare that to a cellular carrier who knows where their callers are. They can track them from point to point and intercepts [sounds like] a huge amount of information on their callers, and their location, and their activity. We're talking about here toll-free callers. We're talking about a very specific point in time, one location. And as I'm saying here, the location can be rather indistinct as opposed to a specific location.

So for the most part, toll-free calls that are routed based on the caller's originating caller's location currently utilize the caller's telephone number which corresponds with the fuzzy location usually within miles of the caller's actual location. While fuzzy location data should be available to indicate the

location to which the caller is to be routed, that is different from transmitting actual current location. In determining the degree to which notice and consent requirements are warranted, consideration should be given to the granularity of the location information passed through to the toll-free subscriber.

The next page relates to what might be called notice and consent, which is also known as opt-in/opt-out. The opt-in/opt-out rules generally apply to service providers that are actually providing marketing services, sharing marketing information that want to do something more than just route the call. When that's the case, the opt-in/opt-out rules come in to play. It requires an interruption in the call. It requires asking the caller do you opt-in to allow your location information to be used or do you opt-out of it. Again, I think one of the conclusions to this white paper is that that kind of interruption to the call, that kind of customer inconvenience should not apply to simply getting the location of that customer routing their call because of the simple nature and what historically been the purpose of routing calls geographically.

As a rule, callers want their calls to complete quickly. They do not want to deal with time-consuming interactive voice response systems which are frequently viewed as annoyances. This is especially true when callers do not expect to encounter an automated interaction. In addition, the longer a caller is

on the call, the greater likelihood the caller will be disconnected because sometimes the opt-in/opt-out interaction has a significant time period associated with it which very likely can result in the caller just hanging up, which is obviously not what we want to see happen in a normal telecommunications interaction.

Thus, the imposition of opt-in or opt-out requirements would be detrimental to both the toll-free customers and the callers attempting to reach them or having at best a minuscule impact on the protection of a caller's privacy.

In conclusion, and again, the white paper itself is six or seven pages and it will provide a lot more detail than this summary so I recommend that people take a look at it. The conclusion here, where both the extent and frequency of access to protected information are limited, where the carrier is subject to the FCC strict CPNI regulations, as well as other obligations placed upon common carriers, there is no need or reason to impose an additional layer of protection. When a toll-free telecommunications provider requires geographic originating location for the limited purpose of correctly routing toll-free calls to its customers, and the location information passed on to the toll-free subscribers is of a general fuzzy nature, that information should be provided free of notice and consent obligations.

Increasing customer and device mobility should not compromise seamless and accurate toll-free geographic routing and mechanisms to provide accurate location-based routing, and toll-free calls should be developed with as minimal impacts on performance and added caller interaction as are consistent with the determination of caller privacy interests.

As I said, there was an FTN 4 subcommittee that developed the white paper, approved it, and sent it to the FoN which also reviewed it and ultimately approved the white paper to come to the NANC. What we are looking for are a couple of things. One is the visibility of the importance of this issue to the toll-free industry. Two is to clarify and seek clarification that the current CPNI regulations would not require any additional restrictions or impositions in order to continue to route calls by the originating geography. And thirdly is to kind of shine a light on the fact that as the phone number becomes less and less reliable as an indication of where the call is initiated as we transition to the IP environment, other technologies will need to take its place.

We feel from the toll-free industry that it's very important that this become a key part of the IP transition and that technologies and methods for sharing those technologies - there are some examples that have been given in the white paper

- that they become as available as the originating telephone number has been over decades.

So that's my presentation and if there are any questions, comments?

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. Thank you very much. And thank you to the FoN for bringing this issue to some visibility. I want to be sure I understand it, so I'm going to put it in layman's terms, okay? There are a lot of technical things here. If I'm understanding correctly what the toll-free industry is concerned about, we have a situation. Let's say we got a national appliance repair service and it's got a toll-free number, an 800 number you call looking at the yellow pages. They have physical locations in seven different regions in the country. So my washing machine breaks down. I call on my cellphone. And let's say I've got a 302 cellphone number because I used to live in Delaware, but I am now located in Nebraska. Now, when I call that 800 number - which is the national number - they want to route it to the service center that's closest to where I am. And what do they see now? Do they see my 302, that it's coming from a 302 number, or does it come through --?

David Greenhaus: Well, historically --

Betty Ann Kane: Go ahead. And I guess the question is and the CPNI and the opt-in and opt-out, the industry is concerned that because of this complication of the 302 number may not be

where I really am, but you have other ways of knowing where I am or where I'm calling from. You don't want people to have to say, yes, sometimes it shows up on my phone when I do it. If you put on your Wi-Fi, we'll know where you are better. And I always say no because I don't want them to know where I am.

But --

David Greenhaus: They have a fuzzy idea where you are.

Betty Ann Kane: A fuzzy idea where I am, that's right. But, you know, we could really tell you that. So you don't want people have to be asked would you really tell us where you really are and press 1, press 2, press 3 that sort of thing? Is that what we're dealing with here?

David Greenhaus: Yes, more or less. So the routing of the call is seamless and we can use a technology that will provide the information as to where you are. That's the important aspect to both, and that becomes a part of this whole IP transition.

Betty Ann Kane: And that you're also pointing out that whereas I'm calling from my cellphone, they might be able to actually geographically know where I am no matter what the number is that shows up. When we go to VoIP or other means of communication, there'd be no way of telling where the person is.

David Greenhaus: Oh no, there are ways.

Betty Ann Kane: Oh, there are ways. There are different ways, and those ways need to be considered and kind of worked in to what's ever done with IP transition so that those ways can be activated.

David Greenhaus: Right. And I think we've noticed that in terms of the originating carriers, those that originate those calls, for the most part what I've heard is, we're happy to do this. We're happy to pass this information on. There's a way to do it. We would just like to have a level of comfort that we can do this without --

Betty Ann Kane: That is legal.

David Greenhaus: Yeah.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. And so let me ask you. So first of all you said you want to bring this to visibility, and that's good, but you also said you wanted clarification of the CPNI rules and you cited it. So are you asking that NANC do anything? Are you going to be asking FCC to do the clarification? What?

David Greenhaus: We're certainly asking the NANC to approve the white paper as it's written and officially send it and provide it to the FCC.

Betty Ann Kane: Provide it to the FCC.

David Greenhaus: Yeah. And I think it says in the white paper what essentially we're asking for. I know there are

points where we have said we're seeking clarification or we would like clarification that the CPNI rules are adequate for what we're looking for. I know that this has been discussed. I'm one of the co-chairs of this, the SMS/800 Numbering Administration Committee, SNAC. We've discussed it. We've had some give and take with the FCC staff on that and where they've asked for some clarification. There's been some private -- I know of one private group of businesses that have taken this. So the issue is very, you know, they're very aware. The commission is very aware or the staff is very aware that this is an issue. There's another way to have it vetted by a different group, a larger group, and I think it would be very helpful.

Betty Ann Kane: So you're asking the NANC? You're requesting NANC to approve the white paper?

David Greenhaus: Yeah.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. I'm going to ask the group whether we're ready to do that or whether we need some more time to read the white paper, I know it's just come out, whether we want to defer the actual approval of it, and actually need to hear from folks on that. Yes.

Henry Hultquist: Hank Hultquist, AT&T. I'm not sure what the approval would be. I mean, I could see approving the transmission of the white paper, but the white paper is drafted in corporates, not just numbering things, but legal arguments

about Section 222. Certainly not without fairly extensive consultation with lawyers can I imagine we could approve those components of the white paper. So we can think about what we would be approving, what would be something we could approve without going down the lawyer rabbit hole.

Gina Perini: Gina Perini, SMS/800, Inc. So I think we could approve passing along the white paper. I think that would be a reasonable thing to do, to pass it on to the FCC. I would like to note, I want to give a lot of credit to David for championing this issue. I know personally I've got a pretty good number of calls from those who have used shared-use numbers which is the example you used, Chairman Kane. I've also had calls from people who run hotlines, needing to understand where people are, poison control hotlines and other things. This is important information in that if they need to know the information of where these people are located and cannot get the information from the person, that that can help them locate a person. So this has been a brewing issue so I think it would make sense. And I don't know if we -- maybe the lawyer had to need [sounds like] this one. Should I make a motion that we pass this paper along to the FCC for their consideration?

Betty Ann Kane: Go ahead, Jerome.

Jerome Fitch Candelaria: Jerome Candelaria, NCTA. Well, I'm reflecting on AT&T's comments, passing it along for their

consideration seems to lead us to the same concerns you had expressed. I confess I'm certainly looking forward to guidance from NCTA's membership on this and, well, I'm certainly aware of the hard and long work you've performed here. You know, if there's a way to temper passing it on and qualifying it without the mark that somehow it's NANC's work or approved by the full NANC, I'd feel far more comfortable with that.

Gina Perini: You can amend the motion and then we could qualify it or have a disclaimer that we're not espousing to the paper itself.

Jerome Fitch Candelaria: Well, I suppose the qualification would be for information purposes only and subject to further action by the NANC.

Henry Hultquist: Hank Hultquist, AT&T. Maybe it would be useful to have a cover letter drafted that would sort of lay out this report was prepared by this group. You know, it's based on a lot of consideration of these issues. We have not considered the validity of the legal arguments raised herein, but it certainly is an issue that I think - as was pointed out - people have heard concerns on. So I think if we had something before us that we could say we would approve that letter, that might be more productive. Because, otherwise, I think we're just going to be left with the uncertainly Jerome identifies of exactly what are we approving.

Betty Ann Kane: Yeah. That's why I ask the question. Let me point out, first of all, it's in the public record now. The report of this meeting, it will be in the minutes of this meeting. And I don't imagine that the commissioners and the whole staff read the transcript of every one of these meetings, but it is now a public document and it will be included.

Draft some -- and I'll send it around, a letter to the FCC just pointing out that this paper was presented and that we think it raises some, you know, as they consider the IP transition and as they consider other things, we just want to bring the existence of it to their attention. If people are comfortable with that, I'll send and circulate that before -- I think this will be an ongoing issue and just another one of the IP transition issues that we're going to have to keep an eye on. It has numbering implications, but it has a lot of other implications that are not related to numbering per se. But certainly they had the numbers, which is a very important part of it, how that all works is an important part of what the NANC gives advice on. Okay. Yes.

Valerie Cardwell: Valerie Cardwell, Comcast. Chairman Kane, we certainly support the effort. I'm just a little concerned in where's Rosemary Emmer when you need her with the guidelines and the rules. I want to make sure we don't go down a slippery slope, if you will, of setting this precedent for

white papers that come out of certain committees and things like that. So we certainly support the effort. We don't really have an objection. I just want to raise a concern about anything that even mimics that the NANC is endorsing something. But certainly if it comes directly from you, Chairman Kane, and you've read it and vetted it. But I just feel kind of reluctant at this point.

And certainly being on other committees, the industry committees, white papers are flying left and right we all know. Certainly those committees, I think, have the right to submit them and send them to any agency or any bureau that they like. So, again, I just want to raise that concern about putting our stamp on it when there really hasn't been a very strong review process.

Betty Ann Kane: Yeah. I certainly don't feel confident that we're ready and otherwise myself to put any particular stamp, but let me just take this under consideration and see. I mean, certainly the group is free to send it on and say that you've presented it to the NANC and the NANC has heard it. But this is what I raise, that I'm not comfortable yet that we want to say this is -- as with any white paper, we appreciate all the work in a lot of white papers that are done. And I'm going to try very hard again to get Scott Jordan here at the next meeting. And we do had set-up a process and Rosemary really

worked very hard where we monitor these issues related to IP transition, et cetera. And so let's take this under consideration. Okay. Thank you.

Rosemary Emmer: This is Rosemary for the queue.

Betty Ann Kane: There you are, Rosemary.

Rosemary Emmer: Sorry. I've been trying to talk. I just wanted to say thank you first of all to David for presenting this today, and I want to thank the working group under the FoN for working on this, and for all of those that were instrumental in writing the paper. It's very well written and it's easy to read. It's an interesting issue, and I think it's an important issue.

As far as procedurally, Chairman Kane, you're right on track. I couldn't hear everybody's argument either way, but to put a cover letter on it is fine. The whole purpose for us having these groups and subcommittees is, of course as we all know, is to write this white paper in order to get information or to communicate information as an advisory committee to the FCC. So if this is something that the NANC feels is important and has to send it to them with the cover letter stating all of the different things that Hank and others had mentioned, then that's a great idea. But they will have to have NANC consensus of course. And if there are folks that feel like they need a little more time, there's nothing at all wrong with waiting

until the next meeting and just ensuring that NANC consensus. So Chairman Kane, you're right on target. And I just thank you, David, for presenting this today. It's very interesting. Thanks again.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. Thank you, Rosemary. Well, now I think about it, it might be even more useful to look at the number of issues related to IP transition that we've been looking at and kind of do a -- particularly in my re-invitation to Scott Jordan to give him maybe a list of the number of different issues including this white paper and including other things. This is more of an informational. This is what we've been hearing. This is what we have been discussing. And this is why we need to continue to work with him on that.

Okay. Thank you.

REPORT OF THE INTERNET PROTOCOL ISSUE MANAGEMENT GROUP

(IMG)

Let's move on to the last of our reports, which is the report of the Internet Protocol Issue Management Group.

Gina Perini: I'm going to do it from here. Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. Thank you.

Gina Perini: Perfect timing. This is Gina Perini from SMS/800 Inc. On behalf of the IP IMG membership who are listed in our appendix, as well as my fellow tri-chairs - Valerie Cardwell of Comcast and Ann Berkowitz of Verizon - I'll be

providing the report. In the spirit of an IP transition, we have distributed those electronically so we don't have printed copies today. It might help you that it wasn't printed because some of our appendix has very tiny prints. You'll need to zoom. We have a tracking document that I'll talk about in a minute that will relate to some of the conversation that we just had around the various IP transition issues that are being worked across multiple committees and groups.

We have monthly calls. We've had two monthly calls since the last NANC meeting in September and October. In particular, we have an IP transition tracking document and that document is in the appendix. And what we do is originating out of the many questions/issues that have come up around the IP transition, we've itemized all of those issues and then have updates monthly from various industry groups. That is all put into this tracking document. You'll see the document is now a spreadsheet because we wanted to really truly track it across multiple months. So we plan to come back and we'll have updates for every quarterly NANC meeting so we can see those updates.

We do monthly calls and our next call is in January, and I'll mention that in a minute. But we have monthly updates, as well as the calls in which all of the updates are right out on the call. We invited Dr. Scott Jordan, the FCC chief technologist, to our calls and he graciously agreed to

participate. He'll be on our distribution list going forward and we'll receive materials, and we have invited him on those calls.

Our next meeting is on January 8th at 11:00. If you would like conference call confirmation, just contact one of the co-chairs or tri-chairs and we'll provide it to you. That is essentially it. I will note that in our appendix we have our mission and scope, as well as our list of all of our members and the IP transition tracking document - which really is the critical document that we provide and what we pull together each month.

Betty Ann Kane: Very good. Thank you.

Gina Perini: You're welcome.

Betty Ann Kane: Hank?

Henry Hultquist: Henry Hultquist, AT&T. I apologize. Maybe I should have raised this earlier during the LNP or the INC report. But it's related to IP transition so I'll raise it now. There were a couple of references in both the LNP report and the ATIS-INC report to the work of the ATIS Forum on different routing solutions. And the LNPA working group reported, made some reference to, you know, there not being an impact on portability from those different routing things that they're looking at.

And so the question I have is should we be making a broader analysis of impact on different, you know, whatever the path that's chosen by the people who are working on it, on the duties of any of the administrators - whether it's the NANPA administrator, or the Pooling Administrator, or the p-ANI administrator - on possible numbering resource optimization efforts in the future and maybe on sort of future service innovation? I mean it seems like if the industry is considering different approaches through routing, at least to me it seems like they could have different implications for either the duties of the administrators or a feature in our NRO activities. So it might be useful to have somebody look at that. Just as it appears, they looked at whether there was an impact on LNP.

Betty Ann Kane: Mary?

Mary Retka: Mary Retka from CenturyLink. Just as a follow up to what Hank said and also in our pile of reports on the table, this is one of the reasons that we had asked ATIS to read out on the ATIS work - for example, the SIP NNI group readout and other things. And it's not on the agenda this time. I don't think it was on last time either, but we should get it and add it on an ongoing basis. And I believe there's somebody here today to make a report for us on some of the things that Hank brought up. And then in addition, he broadened that to other things that are going on in the industry that other working

groups might be aware of. INC is following some of the work that's going on in the IETF steering committee. So there's a lot of moving parts and keeping them all together will be helpful. But I think one of the major things that would help us is to keep this ATIS IP transition initiative on the agenda on an ongoing basis.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. Thank you, and we will get to that. Are you suggesting also, Mary or maybe Hank - I'm looking at the IP transition tracking document - whether this should be another item, the impact of IP transition on the work of any of these administrators?

Henry Hultquist: Henry Hultquist, AT&T. I think it's important for the council to understand the potential puts-and-takes of the impact of things that are under discussion in the industry on our work and on the work of the entities we interact with. So I tend to think yes. And I hesitated to say it earlier but I would say it now, you know, in addition to thanking David for the hard work that went into that report, I think more generally in my personal opinion, there has not been a lot of focus on the overall impact of the IP transition not just on SMS/800 but on any of the call-related databases either how they'll transition, you know, what's their IP transition. I think that there's a lot here that needs to be done. I don't know how we translate that, but --

Betty Ann Kane: Yes.

Gina Perini: Gina Perini, SMS/800. I think that that would be a very important thing to track. I just don't know what committees are tracking them or doing that. I'm not sure if the work is being done to understand what the impacts are on the administrators. If there are committees doing that, then we could track it. But I don't know if there are.

Betty Ann Kane: Let's try to find out if anybody is, if the groups themselves are tracking it or looking at it. And if so, then we could get it on the tracking. And if not, maybe identify the gap in the things that are being considered. Okay. Good. Thank you.

All right, the ATIS report. Give me that. Come forward. We're going to add this as I guess 12a. It's part of this issue. This is document number 12a.

Jackie Voss: Good morning. My name is Jackie Voss with ATIS. In response to Hank's request, ATIS did send out the IP NNI report to some of the NANC working groups. But as you mentioned that, I think maybe we would be happy if you think it's appropriate to send such reports out at the NANC level rather than a working group level, if you think that would be helpful.

Betty Ann Kane: Yes.

Jackie Voss: We just don't like to spam everyone with too much email. So anyway, I'll take that away as an item for us to address in the future.

So I would like to report on the various activities related to the IP transition that are taking place within our organization. You'll see throughout the presentation that the IP transition and the evolution of the network is a topic that impacts several of our various work programs. I am going to pause. I apologize that the soft copy was not provided prior to the meeting for those that are on the phone, but I will follow up and provide that to Carmell after the meeting.

Betty Ann Kane: The electronic copy?

Jackie Voss: Right.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay.

Jackie Voss: Some of the areas that I'm going to touch on today related to our all-IP program are the service transition, the ATIS/SIP Forum IP-NNI Joint Task Force, the IP Services Interconnect Focus Group, Public Safety Related Applications Task Force, public safety and emergency services, numbering and routing, testbeds, reliability and robustness, and the back office integration.

Slide 3 is provided as it represents a view of the overall IP program both from a business and technology perspective. Slide 4 provides information on some of the transition work

being addressed by ATIS' Packet Technology and Systems Committee regarding services that have commonly been provided in the circuit switch PSTN environment. The PTSC is identifying the impacts that will take place during the transition and in the all-IP environment. The output of this effort will include detailed call flows; new ISUP/SIP and TCAP/IP interworking to support areas such as: toll-free calling, LIDB service, CNAM, operator-based services, and priority government services.

The last update I gave, I gave you an update or kind of laid out the plan on this joint task force. Late last year ATIS in the SIP Forum launched the IP-NNI Joint Task Force to address areas related to VoIP interconnection. They defined a referenced architecture with functional entities necessary for IP-based interconnection. They also defined the architecture for sharing NNI interconnection data. The effort was not done necessarily with the intent of identifying a single approach, but it rather identified multiple solutions that will exist during the transition.

We had put this document out to various groups in the industry for comment and asked for a December 1st reply date. The group is now reviewing and working through those comments and we expected in the first quarter that the two documents will be released when related to the Internet protocol and the other related to the routing.

Slide 6 talks about another one of ATIS groups addressing the IP transition, which is the ATIS TOPS Council IP Services Interconnect Focus Group. This group was complementary to the ATIS/SIP Forum which is defining strategy for developing an IP services interconnect specification appropriate for all service provider types taking into consideration basic, advanced, and future services.

As I mentioned before, the IP-NNI Task Force was looking at their work from a VoIP perspective, and this report goes beyond and is looking at things such as HD voice, video messaging, and data. Requirements were identified for a set of interconnection profiles to deliver a consistent user experience independent of the network type. Their document was published in September 2014 and it's available in the ATIS Document Store if you're interested in obtaining that document.

We also have a Public Safety Related Applications Task Force. They're reviewing the effects of the all-IP transition for safety related applications. I have a list of those. We're looking at alarm circuits to fire and police departments; FAA circuits for towers and alarms; circuits that monitor railroad crossings; circuits for sensors at gas and power companies; metering and alarming circuits related to the power grid; and circuits supporting underground communications. We have operators, manufacturers and industry associations represented,

and have also invited other key stakeholders that are also participating in this work effort.

The task force will take the findings from this collaborative work effort with the stakeholders to determine if and what prioritization of key applications is needed; identify whether there are common issues impacted by the all-IP transition across industries; evaluate existing and potential solutions toward the publication of guidelines; and identify the opportunity to educate customers. We're looking at a target completion date of first quarter 2015. And then once that's complete, the information will be shared with the relevant interest groups and regulatory bodies.

The ATIS Emergency Services Interconnection Forum, known as ESIF; and the Wireless Technology and Systems Committee, also known as WTSC, are addressing public safety and emergency services requirements in a number of areas. In particular, they are supporting FirstNet in developing the nationwide broadband network. Given that ATIS created the first text-to-911 standard, they're also looking to continue to expand this work as the technology evolves by enhancing to accommodate for multimedia. And they're creating a standard for mission critical push-to-talk voice interoperation between land mobile radio and LTE systems which is also critical to FirstNet.

The next slide, slide 10. In addition to the work programs that I've already mentioned, I wanted to note some of other areas that are being worked on. Slide 10 in particular talks about some of the INC works so I'm not going to provide this, but I just did go ahead and include it just to have a more complete deck of information.

So on slide 11, ATIS recently launched in November a testbed effort. I'd like to note that the leadership for this group is Mary Retka of CenturyLink and Chris Drake of iConnectiv, so I'd like to make note of that. We have noted that there are several different industry transition initiatives. They're calling for testbeds to validate solutions for migration to all-IP and understand that the testbeds may duplicate many functions. It could be inefficient to implement and maintain those various testbeds. The scope of this work effort is to evaluate the different activities related to testbeds and proposals to identify what common requirements there might be across them and determine if there would be value in combining separate activities into a common testbed to support those capabilities.

Slide 12, the ATIS Network Reliability and Steering Committee has a role regarding network reliability and resiliency in the industry. With the transition, there's a need to consider the impacts related to the data that is submitted to

the FCC's Network Outage Reporting System. The system recently was expanded to include reporting for VoIP outages and considerations being given to what metric should be considered for reporting IP outages in general.

Finally, I'd like to note that ATIS is partnering with the MEF to develop a standard for Ethernet ordering. Today IP interconnection agreements are completed on a customized bilateral basis, and ATIS is enhancing the ordering process used by the PSTN to include all-IP interconnections and services.

This concludes the report that I have for today on the recent activities that ATIS has engaged in to support the IP transition. I've included my contact information on the last slide. If you have any questions, I'd be happy to take those or you could reach out to me.

Betty Ann Kane: Wow, that's a lot. Very good. Thank you for that. And I agree, we'll keep an update from ATIS on the agenda now quarterly and then particularly zero in on the numbering implication of this. I know some of that is done by the INC, but there are other things that are going to come up. I think that's very, very important.

There's one particular question. I know you're looking at it in terms of obviously the FCC. But things such as the outage reporting for VoIP, I know this really doesn't have anything to do with numbering but just out of curiosity. A lot of states

have outage reporting requirements also. It would be interesting to know whether they are -- state commissions do for outage reporting, whether they are also catching up and it could be included now that VoIP outages, for example, are being reported to the FCC, whether those are also available to the states' commissions.

Jackie Voss: To my knowledge, the companies that report the outages do it directly with the FCC.

Betty Ann Kane: Right. But then states can sometimes access them and sometimes not.

Jackie Voss: Okay.

Betty Ann Kane: Yeah. But I'll follow up with you separately on that. Mary?

Mary Retka: Mary Retka from CenturyLink. Just a follow-on because Dr. Schulzrinne also came and talked to us about call spoofing and I know Jackie had to really scrunch everything into her report, but there is some work going on in call spoofing at PTSC and NGIIF as well. And we recently got the FCC's public notice on that with comments that are due I believe on the 24th.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. Thank you. Any other comments? I'm taking all of this going on with the transition, with IP, et cetera. And with that effort, if I get Scott Jordan to come to our next meeting, we may plan on it being a little bit longer so that we could have some time, do our routine bases, maybe then

take a break, and then spend a couple of hours maybe even for once going back to something after lunch where we could really focus in on -- kind of pull together and let him know and find out from him what's all of these IP and numbering implications of the IP transition. So I'll let you know. But you've got to keep that in mind when thinking about your schedule for the March meeting, that we might want to devote a little more time.

But I think we have reached the end of our time for this one.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

Just a quick summary of action - there are only two action items I have coming out of this, is that we approved the cover letter for the survey and that I will be asking FCC again for an update on the selection process for the LNPA and expressing our interest in seeing that or recommend some action to move forward.

PUBLIC COMMENTS AND PARTICIPATION AND OTHER BUSINESS

Are there any public comments? Any other business? Then we are adjourned. Thank you very much, and we'll see you in a couple of months. Have a good holiday to everyone and safe travels.

Male Voice: Thank you, you too.

[End of file]

[End of transcript]

