

**North American Numbering Council  
Meeting Transcript  
September 30, 2015 (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/Mark Lancaster | AT&T Inc.                              |
| 3. Greg Rogers                       | Bandwidth.com, Inc.                    |
| 4. Mary Retka                        | CenturyLink                            |
| 5. Valerie R. Cardwell               | Comcast Corporation                    |
| 6. C. Sean Spivey                    | Competitive Carriers Association       |
| 7. Alan Hill                         | CompTel                                |
| 8. Ida Bourne/Beth Carnes            | Cox Communications                     |
| 9. Matthew Gerst                     | CTIA                                   |
| 10. David Greenhaus                  | 800 Response Information Services, LLC |
| 11. Scott Seab                       | Level 3 Communications, LLC            |
| 12. Paul Kjellander/Carolee Hall     | NARUC, Idaho                           |
| 13. Hon. Karen Charles Peterson      | NARUC, Massachusetts                   |
| 14. Hon. Scott Rupp                  | NARUC, Missouri                        |
| 15. Cullen Robbins                   | NARUC, Nebraska                        |
| 16. Hon. Lynn Slaby                  | NARUC, Ohio                            |
| 17. Jerome Candelaria                | NCTA                                   |
| 18. Stephen F. Pastorkovich          | NTCA - The Rural Broadband Assn.       |
| 19. Richard Shockey                  | SIP Forum                              |
| 20. Joel Bernstein                   | SMS/800, Inc.                          |
| 21. Rosemary Emmer                   | Sprint                                 |
| 22. Michele K. Thomas                | T-Mobile USA                           |
| 23. Thomas Soroka, Jr.               | USTA                                   |
| 24. Ann Berkowitz                    | Verizon                                |
| 25. Brendan Kasper                   | Vonage Holdings Corp. (Vonage)         |
| 26. Tiki Gaugler/Dawn Lawrence       | 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  
Paula Silberthau, Office of the General Counsel  
Carmell Weathers, Competition Policy Division

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

**IV. Documents Introduced.**

- (1) Agenda
- (2) NANC Meeting Transcript – June 4, 2015
- (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
- (8) North American Portability Management (NAPM LLC) Report to the NANC
- (9) Future of Numbering (FoN) Working Group Report to the NANC
- (10) Status of the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) activities
- (11) ATIS Report
- (12) Report of the Internet Protocol Issue Management Group (IMG)

**V. Table of Contents.**

1. Announcements and Recent News	7
2. Approval of Meeting Transcript	9
3. Office of the General Counsel	11
4. Report of the North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA)	22
5. Report of the National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator (PA)	36
6. Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG) Report	41
7. Billing and Collection Agent Report	44
8. Billing and Collection Working Group (B&C WG) Report	47

9. North American Portability Management (NAPM) LLC Report	49
10. Local Number Portability Administration Working Group (LNPA WG) Status Report to the NANC	54
11. Future of Numbering (FoN) Working Group Report to the NANC	84
12. Status of the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Activities	96
13. Status of the ATIS All-IP Transition Initiatives	99
14. Report of the Internet Protocol Issue Management Groups	103
15. Summary of Action Items	114
16. Public Comments and Participation	115
17. Other Business	119

## **VI. Summary of the Meeting**

Betty Ann Kane: People would take their seats, please. Thank you. We're going to call to order the quarterly meeting of the North American Numbering Council. It is September 30th and it is about 10:06 AM. We are, for the record, in the Federal Communications Commission meeting room at 445 12th Street Southwest. I'm Betty Ann Kane, chairman of the commission. You have before you I think a revised and updated agenda. We've added a couple of things to it for late-breaking developments. And so you have the agenda. First, I'm going to ask everyone to introduce themselves.

Also to remind you, again, if you want to be recognized, I'm just going around, but for anything else put your tent card up and wait a couple of seconds so that the control booth personnel can switch on your microphone because the microphones are off when you're not the person who's been recognized to speak. And then I will go to the people on the phone who are on the phone bridge and ask them to introduce themselves, and remind the people on the phone too that if they have questions as we're going through the discussion to speak up. I'll try to remember to ask if there's anything, but don't be afraid just to speak up if you're on the phone. All right.

Male Voice: Betty Ann, on the phone, we can barely hear you.

Betty Ann Kane: On the phone, you can barely hear me?

Male Voice: Correct.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. I'm letting the --

Male Voice: Correct.

Betty Ann Kane: -- control people know. Is that better?

Male Voice: It is.

Betty Ann Kane: Good.

Male Voice: Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. I'll start on my left.

Henry Hultquist: Hank Hultquist, AT&T.

Mary Retka: Mary Retka, CenturyLink.

Valerie Cardwell: Valerie Cardwell, Comcast.

Alan Hill: Alan Hill, CompTel.

Matthew Gerst: Matt Gerst of the CTIA.

Carolee Hall: Carolee Hall, PUC staff.

Karen Charles Peterson: Karen Charles Peterson,  
Massachusetts.

Scott Rupp: Scott Rupp, Missouri Public Service  
Commission.

Cullen Robbins: Cullen Robbins, Nebraska Public Service  
Commission.

Jerome Candelaria: Jerome Candelaria, NCTA.

Steve Pastorkovich: Steve Pastorkovich, NTCA.

Rosemary Emmer: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint.

Michele Thomas: Michele Thomas, T-Mobile.

Ann Berkowitz: Ann Berkowitz, Verizon.

Brendan Kasper: Brendan Kasper, Vonage.

Marilyn Jones: Marilyn Jones, FCC.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. I'm reminding people to speak  
directly. I know we're sharing microphones, but try to speak  
directly into it. And on the phone, who do we have?

Ida Bourne: Ida Bourne with Cox Communications.

Joel Bernstein: Joel Bernstein, SMS/800.

Tom Soroka: Tom Soroka, USTelecom.

Paul Kjellander: Paul Kjellander, Idaho Commission.

Lynn Slaby: Commissioner Slaby, Ohio.

Linda Hyman: Linda Hyman, NeuStar Pooling.

Mark Lancaster: Mark Lancaster, AT&T.

Greg Rogers: Greg Rogers with Bandwidth.

Tiki Gaugler: Tiki Gaugler, XO.

Bonnie Johnson: Annie Johnson, Minnesota Department of  
Commerce.

Rebecca Beaton: Rebecca Beaton, Washington State  
Commission staff.

Dawn Lawrence: Dawn Lawrence, XO Communications.

David Greenhaus: David Greenhaus, 800 Response.

Christopher Hepburn: Christopher Hepburn, Pennsylvania  
Public Utility Commission.

Suzanne Addington: Suzanne Addington, Sprint.

Jay Carpenter: Jay Carpenter, PHONEWORD.

Richard Shockey: Richard Shockey, SIP Forum.

Michael Scott: Michael Scott, Massachusetts Telecom and  
Cable.

Scott Seab: Scott Seab, Level 3.

Ron Steen: Ron Steen, LNPA Working Group.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. Thank you. We have a very large  
complement on the phone, on the bridge this time. And we remind  
everyone --

Beth Collins: Hey, this is Beth Collins with Cox as well. I'm sorry, I was just waiting.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. Sorry to break in. Is there anybody else who hasn't identified themselves?

Joanne: Hi. I'm Joanne [phonetic], California.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. Thank you. I'm going to remind the people on the bridge, if you would also send an email to Carmell Weathers, that's with two L's, [carmell.weathers@fcc.gov](mailto:carmell.weathers@fcc.gov), so we have your name and affiliation correct for the record.

#### **Announcements and Recent News**

In terms of now any announcements, first of all as you all know, the FCC has approved the re-chartering of the North American Numbering Council. For two years, this has to be reviewed and redone every two years. So I want to thank the FCC for recognizing the work of NANC and continuing our work for another two years, and for all of the people who have volunteered and the companies that are supporting them and the organizations that are supporting them to continue their work. You all should have who asked to be reappointed, have received your official reappointment letters and the alternates as well.

We have a number of new members who I wanted to recognize or just indicate. Doug Davis, first of all, representing HyperCube Telecom, LLC and his alternate is Robert McCausland.

And we have Richard Shockey, SIP Forum. I don't see that he has an alternate. Rebecca Murphy Thompson who is a general counsel at Competitive Carriers Association, and her alternate is C. Sean Spivey for that. So I think we have a good complement of members for our work going forward.

In terms of other announcements, you may recall after our June meeting that we brought to the attention of the Wireline Competition Bureau, the FCC, the issue of hoarding of non-toll-free numbers and the brokering and selling of those numbers. I did receive just a few minutes ago, correspondence from Kris Monteith and from Matt DelNero, the chief of the Wireline Competition Bureau, thanking us for referring that issue to them and suggesting that the NANC look into this. They are accepting our suggestion and asking that the NANC provide the Wireline Competition Bureau with the results of our investigation into the brokering and sale to private entities of custom telephone numbers within six months of the date of this letter. And asked as part of our investigation that we focus in particular on how the specific entities that were -- remember, there was a particular *Washington Post* article on how they obtained their numbers and what's going on.

So it seems to me the appropriate group to send this to and to refer this to for a report back to the NANC would be the INC. So I'm going to refer this to the INC and ask them that at our



next meeting, at least, you'll be giving us a preliminary report, and then we'll try to meet the six months deadline.

Marilyn, do you have any announcements or news?

Marilyn Jones: No announcements or news, but I would like to take this opportunity to thank everyone for their efforts with getting the NANC remembered for the new membership. Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: Very good. Thank you, Marilyn.

### **Approval of the Meeting Transcript**

The next item on our agenda which we will -- well, the agenda will be item 1, for the record. The next item is the transcript from our June 4, 2015 meeting, which was provided electronically. Are there any additions, corrections, questions about the transcript? Rosemary?

Rosemary Emmer: Hi. This is Rosemary Emmer with Sprint. During this meeting, we had a very lengthy conversation about the geographic routing of toll-free services. On page 109, the person did an excellent job on this discussion, just by the way, this was a huge, very long discussion with lots of different acronyms. It was very, very good. I may have stated on page 109 at the very end of the paragraph that the reason why we didn't reach consensus to move this forward during the December meeting was because we were going to wait for the white paper, which is what this says, and perhaps I did say that. But that's

not correct. The reason I didn't just send this to the FCC prior is because this is more of an important change than just an administrative change.

So right now, it says we were going to wait for the white paper and that is incorrect because we had already gone over the white paper. And so what I would like to see is the transcript changed to delete the words "the white paper," 109 at the end of the paragraph and just say, "the next NANC to further discuss and create transmittal language." Period. So that's actually --

Betty Ann Kane: I'm not sure we can change the transcript because the transcript is a verbatim recording of what was said. But what we can do in the transcript of today's meeting, it will reflect what you have just said.

Rosemary Emmer: Okay.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay? So that will reflect it.

Rosemary Emmer: Yeah, because I'm not sure. It would be strange that I would have said the white paper, but I certainly could have said the white paper, because, you know, so -- all right.

Betty Ann Kane: Yeah. That's the nature of a transcript as opposed to say, minutes. The transcript does put down what people say. But the transcript from today's meeting will reflect your correction and clarification, okay?

Rosemary Emmer: Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you, Rosemary, and thank you for reading the transcript. At least up to page 109. Okay. Are there any other questions about the transcript? By unanimous consent, we consider it accepted. I'm sorry. We've had someone else join us, please just for the record.

Aelea Christofferson: Aelea Christofferson, ATL Communications.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. Yes?

Sean Spivey: Sorry. Good morning. Sean Spivey, Competitive Carriers Association.

Betty Ann Kane: Yes. Thank you. And I did announce before you're joining us. Thank you, Sean.

Heather Bambrough: Heather Bambrough from Welch, LLP.

Betty Ann Kane: Oh, on the phone. Thank you. Anybody else joined us on the phone? Now we have in your amended agenda or your updated agenda the next item which will be item 3. I don't know if there's a document but it will be item 3.

### **Office of the General Counsel**

But the next person to speak will be Paula Silberthau, who is from the FCC Office of the General Counsel and she's going to

give us a brief overview of the Federal Advisory Committee Act which we operate under and as I indicated, we were just reauthorized under. Paula?

Paula Silberthau: Thanks, Madam Chairman. Thanks for having me here. This will be extremely brief in part because most of you have been on the NANC for a while. But this is just an overall framework and a reminder of who you can talk to about problems that may arise or questions that may arise with process as you move along. The Federal Advisory Committee Act is found in 5 U.S.C. Appendix 2. And it, in a very generic manner, governs the operation of Federal Advisory Committees unless exempted by statute. The principles of FACA are ones that I'm sure you have heard of, which are openness in government, diversity and balance in membership, and public accountability, which, we would hope, would flow from having the openness and the balance and the diversity.

In terms of formal requirements, as you know, there has to be 15 days public notice, not just on our websites which is probably the most practical, but also in the *Federal Register*. We still have that requirement. In most cases, the meetings are open. However, as you, of all groups know that when there is confidential material with the approval of the general counsel and the FCC chair, meetings can be closed. This can be where you have national security matters, confidential matters,

foreign policy matters, things like that. But for the most part, the advisory committee meetings are open to the public and well announced. The documents that you distribute are put in a record. They were all available not just under FOIA but in a special advisory committee file that is maintained here. The role of the committee chair -- and do you have a vice chair or not?

Betty Ann Kane: We do not at the moment. We do need to have a vice chair, but that's quite -- it is coming soon.

Paula Silberthau: Well, the committee chair is extremely important because the chair, as you have seen, serves as the focal point for the committee members. You can communicate with her frequently about anything. Any questions you may have. She works with you to establish your taskforces and your working groups, and the chair conducts the meetings and suggests to the DFO the matters for the agenda. The DFO, Marilyn, has very significant duties and also should be your point person with questions that you may have about the working groups or about the committee meetings or complaints, questions, or whatever. Marilyn approves the agendas, will attend the meetings, could chair the meetings if the chair is not here, maintains the committee records, and is generally another source of communications with you.

Informal working groups. I know that you have four or five working groups and they work well. The one thing I would stress - and you've been doing this which is really good - is that when reports come up from your working groups, if it's a report that's going to be given to the agency in the form of advice, the report should be closely reviewed by all of you and fully debated, discussed at your full meetings. The reports of the working groups should not be rubber-stamps and should not be sent directly from the working group to the agency without going through the NANC. Because if it went directly by accident from the chair of the working group to the agency, then that working group would have sort of converted itself into being an advisory committee.

You know, just a reminder because this has happened sometimes where people think, oh, this is great, we're letting the agency or the bureau know exactly what we're doing. But it really all needs to be funneled through your chair and then DFO first because everyone needs to see it even if it might not be a particular subject or issue that is a burning desire to the entity you represent. But they're a consequence for doing that. Things can't be rubber-stamped. They really need to go through all of you.

One other little thing that's come up with one of our working groups, with one of our FACAs, a couple of years ago -

which was sort of unique but I think it could probably happen to any working group - some member was asked to give, or maybe it was one or two, give an opinion on a very hot issue that was before that person's working group. They were invited by a newspaper or they wanted to do a blog or something like that, and they wrote a very nice op-ed piece. The problem was that it was a highly contested issue. What the person did was to give that individual's viewpoint, which was fine except the person then signed it as in a way that made it look like it was the official viewpoint of the FACA and of the working group, because the person was very prominent in the working group. He was like the chair of the working group.

Betty Ann Kane: And this was a different advisory committee?

Paula Silberthau: This was a different advisory committee.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you.

Paula Silberthau: And there was no intent here of anyone doing anything wrong. They were asked for their opinion, they gave their opinion and they signed it, Tom Smith, head of the X advisory committee. So what happened was it was picked up, I think maybe in the trade press or just conversationally. People said, oh, that working group has decided X. And other people said, oh, the advisory committee has decided X, because people don't necessarily make those fine distinctions. So pretty soon,

this controversial issue - I don't know whether it was the majority of you or the minority of you - but it had not even been resolved by the full advisory committee. So everyone was talking about, well, this is wrong. We haven't voted on it. It was just sort of messy.

So this is not to squelch anyone's individual views, but if you're speaking on an issue and you also happen to be a member of an advisory committee or a working group. It's better to say so-and-so from CompTel or Comcast or whatever, and not create the appearance that whatever you're writing is on behalf of the NANC or the working group, unless it's a case where something has actually been voted already. If any of you want to say, we had that advisory group and we voted to do X, Y, and Z, in my opinion is that this was good or it was bad, that's okay because it's already been voted. But anyhow, just a little heads up on that because the person who did this ended up being embarrassed, so we tried to avoid that kind of thing.

But that's about it, and I would just say that the key thing is to leave time at the full meetings for debating and discussing and explaining the recommendations of the working groups and then you'll be fine.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you very much Paula for that sort of reorientation or orientation for new ones to the project group. And as you can see from our agenda, we have numerous reports



from all of our working groups sent to the full NANC. It's always been our practice, but thank you very much.

So you don't have a document, so we're going to move to the next item on the agenda which will be -- oh I'm sorry. Paula, we have a question. I'm sorry, we rushed ahead. Let me ask this. Rosemary has her card up too. I'm getting ahead of the game. Go ahead.

Ann Berkowitz: Hi, Paula. Ann Berkowitz from Verizon. Thank you very much, and I actually was part of the consumer advisory re-charter, so I've heard this stuff twice and it's wonderful. Just a question about the working groups. Do they also require the same sort of public notice and are they open to the public? I think that came up with the CAC meeting some.

Paula Silberthau: It did. Thank you. That's usually part of my little speech, and I was like too quickly. Working group meetings could either be open or closed. Because the working groups are not considered to be parent advisory committees, right, they are not subject to the *Federal Register* notice, or really any kind of notice other than what you think is reasonable and appropriate. So a lot of working groups just schedule things internally. The meetings are closed and they just sort of get down to business and have discussions, and it's closed and it's fine. If you want to, and I understand that's

the practice here, which is fine, it can be opened up to the public to attend.

The conversations should be primarily among the members of the working group, but if there is someone who is a member of the public and you want to open it up to comments or questions, or something like that afterwards, the Advisory Committee Act doesn't go into those details. So what GSA always tells me is that there's a lot of flexibility as long as it's fair. The fair part would be that if you are going to have an open, working group meeting - this is just my suggestion, it's not written in stone - but then subject to phone links and practicality that it would be open to everybody. That it would not be, okay, we have ten working group members and the only other people in the world we're going to be telling about it are these five people. So the typical advice is, it can be closed and that's fine, or it can be opened. But if it's open, try to make it truly open so that all interested people as opposed to the favored few can attend. That's sort of why you see all sorts of different practices it's because there are no rules other than trying to be fair.

Ann Berkowitz: That's very helpful. Thank you. Just one quick follow-up because this came up with the CAC. Is there a limitation on the actual number of members? Because I know, one of the working groups that came up with the CAC, we had too many

people volunteer for it because it was more than a quorum of the overall committee and some people had to step back. I mean people were still able to attend, but the official membership was limited.

Paula Silberthau: Yeah. A sort of best practice. Again, there are no hard and fast rules on this but the best practice is to try to leave it to less than a quorum of the membership, and then certainly even if it is a closed meeting, other members could attend and listen, and occasionally can participate if it's something that someone has serious expertise on or they just feel really hot about the issue. So sometimes you might go over the quorum number but we try to keep it under. Yeah.

Ann Berkowitz: Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: Rosemary.

Rosemary Emmer: This is Rosemarie Emmer with Sprint. The question came up in a subcommittee a couple of years ago about whether or not the subcommittee co-chair could put -- to create the actual subcommittee document that goes to the actual committee, not to the NANC, but two levels under that. To put their own deck, their own PowerPoint with their logo on it as the representation of that particular subcommittee. It never got escalated past that subcommittee because it didn't need to. But at the time, I didn't think that was appropriate just from sitting on the NANC so long and everything is pretty plain as a

general rule as far as subcommittee materials that we don't put our logos, and that kind of stuff.

We do put our company name on it if we're the co-chair but I didn't see anything in our operating manual or the principles and guidelines and document that I think came from the FCC. I didn't see it in there, and I looked at the FACA but I really didn't see a place where it says you couldn't do it but I didn't think that it was the right thing to do. But I have never been in a situation to ask the question since then, and it just was on my mind. So I thought I would ask you. Would it be appropriate or would it not? Are there rules associated or are there not rules associated? I know that people ought to probably just do it blank but could they if they were a representative of a subcommittee? Again, as a co-chair could they in fact do that? Thanks.

Paula Silberthau: Yeah. I think we have to look at it sort of in a case by case basis. I've never been asked that question before and I know, I know absolutely, there are no GSA rules on that and no particular FACA rules. I would think, again, it's sort of best practices as opposed to something that is illegal. But if something like that came up, my suggestion would be that before that's done that Marilyn, as the DFO, be alerted and we could talk to the person about it. I typically don't get involved in reading the substantive working group

reports, but the ones I have read have been sort of very generic blank pieces of paper, et cetera. So I think it's more a best practices thing, appearances thing. It's not the pure legal issue, but it's something we could work at. And so I would say if that happened another time or someone was concerned with something like that, whether it's a logo or the wording, or disputes, or whatever, please contact Marilyn, and she'll try to iron it out.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. Are there any questions from anyone on the phone? Thank you very much Paula.

Paula Silberthau: Just one other thing I forgot to mention. The other thing is that under the GSA rules, the best practice is for having the DFO sort of be aware of and approve the individual agendas for the different working group meetings. I would just request that there be some coordination before the meetings with Marilyn so that she is aware of the agenda. It helps us prepare and keep track of things and also there might be additional agenda items for a particular meeting that the chairwoman or the agency would like to have added. So as much as possible, just try to give advance notice and work with Marilyn and the chair on that. Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you very much.

**Report of the North American Numbering Plan Administrator**

**(NANPA)**

Now we will move to the report of the North American Numbering Plan administrator, John Manning, and this is for the record, the report which is on blank paper will be item 3 or document 3.

John Manning: Good morning everybody. This morning what I would like to cover on the NANPA report is an update on the NANC/NANP resources that NANPA is responsible for administering. I will give you an update on the various area code overlay planning activity that's underway and a couple of change orders that NANPA submitted and where we stand with regard to those change orders.

On page 2 of the report, in terms of area codes, since the beginning of 2015, there have been three newly assigned area codes, and since our last meeting in June, there's only one new one here. That would be New York 680 for the overlay of the 315 area code, and that was assigned in July of 2015. Six area codes have been placed in the service since the beginning of 2015 and new for this meeting would be the non-geographic 5XX-NPA 588. This NPA was placed in the service on September 9th. Planning letter 487 gives you some details about that and I will

also be talking a little bit more about this area code further along in the report.

For fourth quarter of 2015, we have one area code scheduled to go into service that is the 854 for the overlay of the 843 in South Carolina which is just a few weeks away. Concerning central office code activity, these figures are for January 1 through the end of August. Quantity of assignments for that time period is a little over 2,500 codes, and just a quick glance there you can see that's roughly 600 more than we assigned the same time period for 2014. The denial and returns are similar to previous years. Net assignments are nearly 2,400 codes compared to around 1,760 for the same period as last year. So you can see there is the trend for 2015 is going to be higher than in 2014. In fact, if you kind of annualize what we've been doing over the last eight months, we're looking at somewhere in the neighborhood of 3,700 to 3,800 codes assigned this year which is going to be roughly 300 to 400 more codes than we had last year.

Just to give you an idea, since we're at the end of September, September again will be a heavy month with over 330 codes assigned to date so that figure of 3,770 is certainly one in which we expect to achieve over the next several months. For carrier identification code, first off is Feature Group B. We have assigned no Feature Group B CICs in 2015, three have been

returned or reclaimed, and as of the end of August we had 260 Feature Group B CICs for a total or assigned in total.

Feature Group D, NANPA has assigned 14 of these CICs. Thirty-eight Feature Group D CICs have been returned or reclaimed as of the end of August, and you'll see there we have a little less than 2,000 Feature Group D CICs assigned and approximately 7,800 available for assignment. The 5XX-NPA since the beginning of 2015, 429 NXX codes have been assigned. Over that same time period, we've had 28 codes either returned or reclaimed. Now this is as of September 9. We had 3,970 5XX-NPA and NXX codes assigned, 776 codes are available for assignment, and again I'm going to talk a little bit more about this resource in a moment.

For the 900 area code, five new assignments so far this year in 2015. One code has been returned, and as of the end of August we had 60 codes assigned and well over 690 available for assignment. 555 line numbers, again, later on in my report I'm going to give a little more detail about this resource. We've had no assignments to date in 2015. As of the end of August, we had over 760 numbers have been returned or reclaimed. Updating that figure through the most recent data to the month of September that 760 figure goes up to over 1,100 numbers returned or reclaimed since the beginning of the year. For the 800-855, 456 NPA vertical service codes, ANI information digits and N11



codes, no activity with regard to those resources. I will pause there. Are there any questions on that status report of these resources?

Betty Ann Kane: Rosemary.

Rosemary Emmer: I'm Rosemary Emmer with Sprint. John, I was just wondering and you may have mentioned this and I may not have heard it, but what was the reason for the increase in the assignments? Is it state-based like is there one state that has a lot more assignments than others?

John Manning: Well, we're seeing a general trend all across the area covered by the NANP. If you could hold that question until I get towards the end of the presentation, I might be able to shed a little more light on that.

Looking at area code relief planning which begins on page 4, the first seven bullets on this page we've covered in detail. You can see the various relief activities. The very top one, of course I've mentioned is the South Carolina 843, 854 overlay. The thing you take note of beginning with Ohio, 614 all the way running through Indiana 317, is we've got new area codes coming into service in February, April, May, June, and July of next year. So we're basically rolling out a new area code every month for the first half of 2016, starting with New York 315. I've mentioned already, we made the assignment of the 680 area code. This is going to be an overlay of the 315.

Permissive 10-digit dialing will begin in March of 2016, mandatory 10-digit dialing in February of 2017 with the effective date of the 680 area code in March of 2017. Nothing new here, the New York 212, 646, back in March, we filed a relief plan on behalf of the industry to add an additional area code for this overlay complex up in New York, and on page 5, the California 323, just as a reminder, this is a boundary elimination between the 213 and 323 area codes. Since the last meeting, public meetings were conducted in September, and then we're expecting to file an application for relief by the end of this year for this situation.

New. The next three items are new. Idaho 208 in July 21, 2015. NANPA filed a petition on behalf of the industry recommending an all-services overlay for the 208 NPA. Texas 210, in August we conducted a relief planning meeting to review the draft petition recommending an overlay of the 210 area code. What's interesting about 210? 210 is a single rate center so the only option there really is an overlay. We expect to file that petition with the commission in early October.

Betty Ann Kane: John, where is that? What city?

John Manning: Texas, San Antonio. Finally, Pennsylvania 717. We've just had a relief planning meeting on September 15th. Consensus was to recommend an overlay, and we expect to

file a petition on behalf of the industry with the commission there in Pennsylvania by the end of 2015.

Let me just briefly with regard the new 5XX-NPA code, I mentioned September 9th. We've published planning letter 487 which announced that the supply of the 500, 533, 544, 566, and 577 area codes NXXs were exhausted and that's why we added the 588 NXX and 588 NPA. Just as a side note, the 577 area code lasted 18 months and the 566 area code lasted two years. So the trend on the 5XX area codes is trending up in terms of their quantity of time before a new one is needed.

Let me pause there with regard to any questions about area code relief planning.

Betty Ann Kane: John, could you refresh us, for the record, the use of the 5XX? That is the kind of things it's used for.

John Manning: Certainly, these are specifically geared for non-geographic services. There was a definition change about a year and a half, two years ago. It essentially says these are for anything that service providers who are authorized to receive these resources can use for non-geographic purposes.

At the last NANC meeting, we had given you an update of the NANPA Change Order 2, a moratorium on the 555 line number assignments and that was in early June. On June 15th, the FCC approved this change order. With the approval of this change

order, NANPA published planning letter 483 on June 19th. And in that planning letter, we notified and reminded 555 line number assignees that effective June 17th there was a moratorium on the assignment of 555 line numbers. We also reminded those line number holders that if they were not in service, that they were to return their numbers. And further, we went so far to remind the NANP resources are considered a public resource and are not owned by the assignees. This is important because if you'll recall the 555 line numbers are assigned in general individuals in the public. These are not assigned to service providers or other type of entities. They're basically assigned to an organization or individual that requested one of these resources over the past 20 years.

For those assignees who stated that their number was in service and thus dialable from the PSTN, we requested that the assignee provide NANPA specific information, including the date the resource was placed in service, the area code in which these calls to a 555 number could be successfully completed, and the service provider within which the 555 number was working. We also requested the assignee to provide us updated contact information. This was crucial in order for us to be able to reach out and communicate with these individuals. And responses were due no later than October 1, 2015.

Betty Ann Kane: Which is tomorrow?

John Manning: That's correct. Now just a quick update. Since publication of that planning letter - and I'm on top of page 6 - NANPA has attempted to reach, at the time I put this together, it was 2,500 assignments. We're now over 4,000. Meaning, we have sent either emails, faxes, FedExs, U.S. mail, phone calls - whatever way, shape, or form we could contact these individuals - to give us a status on their assignments. And we'd been able to reach out to nearly half of the assignments that had made of this resource.

To date since we started that process, we have not received any information from any 555 line holder that the number is actually in service. Just for follow up on this, our plan is to continue to reach out to a few more of these assignees and we're trying to go to those assignees that have multiple assignments, a bigger bang for the buck so to speak. Again, we tried to contact as many as we can. But we're expecting by the December timeframe, we'll be in a position to work with the INC since this is an open issue in the INC about outlining their plan forward with regard to this resource and getting, of course, their input and hopefully agreement. So that's the story of the 555 line number resource as of today.

Betty Ann Kane: We have a question here.

Aelea Christofferson: Aelea Christofferson, ATL Communications. My question is actually on the 5XX. When the

definition was changed a year-and-a-half ago - is that approximately right - did you see a marked increase in the numbers that were being assigned? In other words, is the new definition affecting how fast the numbers are being used?

John Manning: Immediately after the definition changed, and I would say for a good year, a year-and-a-half, no, we didn't see an impact. I think I can't attribute that definition change to the increase in demand now. But certainly, we are seeing more and more of these resources being assigned.

Aelea Christofferson: And do you have any way of knowing whether they're being assigned for uses that are substantially different than what they were being used for prior to that?

John Manning: No, I do not. The application does not go through that detail other than to certify that they're meeting the definition per the guidelines. So no, we don't have anything specifically in our possession that says, this is exactly what they're being used for.

Aelea Christofferson: Okay. Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: Any other questions? Any questions on the phone?

John Manning: Okay.

Betty Ann Kane: In terms of the 555 numbers, these are used for what purpose?

John Manning: The original intent of the 555 line number was the offering of information services.

Betty Ann Kane: Was that affected by the definition change for 5XX?

John Manning: No, no. 555 line numbers are totally different from 5XX-NPA. Just as a little history behind it, 555 line numbers were initially started, assigned back in 1994. A vast majority of those were assigned in the first few years after the resource was made available. And the concept was that you get assigned one of these numbers, you potentially would have a seven digit number available nationwide dependent upon what area code you opened it up in. That was the concept behind it. But as you can tell, not many of us are dialing 555 line numbers today.

Betty Ann Kane: So you're saying there are 4,000 of these numbers?

John Manning: Actually, there is approximately 8,000 of these numbers. We've been able to reach approximately half of those number assignments.

Betty Ann Kane: It's clear on your report, you said no line number assignee has informed NANPA that their 555 number is in service. Does that mean you just have heard nothing back from them or that they've gone back and said, no, it's not in service?

John Manning: We've heard a lot of things in our attempt to contact these service providers or these entities. To answer your question, no. Since we have published the planning letter and those individuals we've gone to, none of them have come back to tell us specifically they have a 555 line number in service in X area code. We've gotten parties that have voluntarily returned their resource. We have gotten parties that have told us they want to retain that resource even though it's not in service. We've had parties tell us that their ship has come in, that finally somebody is contacting them and is going to pay them a lot of money for their particular number. We have been told a history of how they've obtained these numbers with the promise that there was a treasure chest at the end of it. With NANPA contacting them, they thought that was going to be the case. And then there are parties who still think there's value in the number and they don't want to give it up because they actually paid somebody to get that number. So there's a history with this resource that we have learned over the past six months that we had heard about but heard directly from the assignees that we don't have with any other resource that we administer.

Betty Ann Kane: I think you heard at the beginning of the meeting that we have now had a request from the bureau that the INC, which I was assigned to the INC, discussed the brokering and sale to private entities of custom telephone numbers. And



in particular focusing on an article in the *Washington Post* on how they obtained those numbers. Are these two issues conjoined? Are they separate?

John Manning: They're separate.

Betty Ann Kane: They're separate issues. But the INC will be looking at both of them?

John Manning: Yes. This particular issue does have an INC issue already associated with it. We're just still in that process of gathering the information before we hopefully make an informed decision with this resource.

Betty Ann Kane: Very good. Thank you. Any other questions? Thank you, John.

John Manning: Page 6, there is another NANPA change order that was submitted on September 22nd. This change order proposes modifications to the NRUF reporting process in order to account for the FCC's report and order concerning direct access by interconnected voice over IP Internet protocol providers, as well as some other general updates to the NRUF reporting forms. And I've outlined them here in several bullets.

One of the primary things we want to be able to do in the NRUF process is for an interconnected VoIP who is now eligible to receive numbering resources directly from the administrator, to report their utilization as well as forecast, and to be able to uniquely identify themselves as an interconnected VoIP.

Today's form does not have such a category identified or service type on the form and we want to add that information to the form 502. Not only do we want to add it, we ought to also be able to report it on appropriate NRUF reports and databases that are provided to the FCC and the state that include all NRUF data. So this change order is to make those modifications in the NANPA administration system and its downstream reporting mechanisms.

It's also an opportunity for us to upgrade the form in terms of the Excel version that is currently accepted. We use an old .xls version. We want to move that to an .xlsx version or format as well as an .xlsm which merely allows the macros within the form itself to work. We want to eliminate some of the NRUF reports that are presently today available on XLS as well as XLSX. We just want to get rid of the XLS version of those reports. So this particular change order, which once approved, assuming it is approved, we would look to deploy sometime in the first half of next year prior to the August 1, 2016 NRUF cycle.

Betty Ann Kane: Any questions on this item?

John Manning: The remaining items here, we would have our newsletter that comes out. A quarterly newsletter will be coming out in the next couple of weeks. October is also the timeframe where we produce NPA individual area code, exhaust projections, NANP exhaust projections, also a projection of the

5XX-NPA resource. Along those lines and in response to an earlier question about the demand for CO codes, on September 18th, NANPA published revised exhaust projections over the following area codes: four of them in California - 323, 619, 805, and 916; and in Washington 360. It is those area codes in California we actually advanced the exhaust projections due to increased demand that we were seeing in those area codes.

So that is a direct result of this increase overall demand that I reported on earlier in my presentation. We are experiencing this all across the NANP, but in California in general. We have seen just as a quick study, nearly 19 percent of all CO codes assigned this year have gone into California. So California is very active and as a result we're seeing some exhaust activities. In fact, the 323 is already under relief planning but we're going to be starting the 805 and 916 next month, and with the 916 soon to follow. So we are seeing the impacts of these increased assignments at least in these particular situations. So I go back to your question, Rosemary, I don't know if I answered it or not but that's generally what we are seeing.

Rosemary Emmer: Thank you, John.

Betty Ann Kane: Any other questions on this report? Anyone on the phone? Okay. Thank you. I accept that report into the record.

## Report of the National Thousands Block Pooling

### Administrator (PA)

Moving on to the next report is from the Thousands Block Pooling Administrator and this will be document number 4. Amy.

Amy Putnam: I'm Amy Putnam. I'm the Thousands Block Pooling administrator and pooling is fine. Someone just hung up. All right. Looking at the first chart in the report of the pooling administrator, the activity summary data from September 2014 through August 2015, we processed only 8,068 part 3's in August. That's low. August is usually low because of vacations. But nevertheless, if we continue to process at a rate of 7,500 per month through December, we will break last year's record and last year was a record year. We are 27 percent higher than we were last year at the end of August. So we are continuing to be extremely busy with pooling.

The next chart, the p-ANI summary data, you can read the numbers. I don't need to read them for you. The next is - going back to pooling - the part 3 summary data that explains the areas in which the part 3's were provided to the carriers, and the part 3 summary data sorted by type.

The next chart on the next page, page 4, is the continuation of the summary data sorted by type. I know John was talking about the uptick. Obviously, since most of the requests for codes come through us, the codes come through us

for either LRNs for dedicated blocks or for pool replenishment. That particular breakout is on page 4. There has been a corresponding uptick in codes that we are passing through to NANPA. From our perspective, most of those seem to be for pool replenishment and we also are seeing them for machine-to-machine and automobile-related activities.

I've talked about pool replenishment a number of times in the past. As pooling ages is obviously supplies in the pools dwindle and the needs of the carriers increase, and so I would anticipate that we will continue to see an increase in pool replenishments. I certainly hope we do.

The next page, summary of rate center information changes. That's when we changed rate centers from excluded to optional, optional to mandatory, state mandatory. Any change in the characterization on the website, most of them driven by states when rate centers are changed from excluded to optional. That of course can be also with the request of the carrier who wants to start pooling in that rate center. Again, August was a slow month. A lot of people took vacations in August.

The next chart is the reclamation summary. The first column is the total number of blocks with overdue part 4's on our reclamation list. The middle column is the total number of new blocks that appeared in that month that were put on the reclamation list. We reclaimed one block in August. With

respect to system performance, we did have a period of unscheduled unavailability both for the pooling administration system and for the routing number administration system on July 31, 2015 and that was since our last meeting. We had a situation where the database hung. It was scheduled for an update and that update has occurred. So that's that.

Other pooling related activities. We are fully in compliance with all our contractual reporting requirements for p-ANI. We're continuing to work on reconciling existing data discrepancies. And by existing, I am including new ones that come to our attention frequently. We attended the ESIF meeting in July. For the NOWG, we participate regularly in the monthly meetings. We have no pending change orders at this time. A couple of special projects. Every year this new census estimates are available and we review the population estimates and make any appropriate changes on the database. This year when we've reviewed it, the same as last year, the composition of the top 100 MSAs did not change although there were rearrangements and placements. That happens every year.

The second one, the OMB Bulletin revising the delineations of the Metropolitan Statistical Areas, Micropolitan Statistical Areas, and combined statistical areas. There were some changes and we made them. That really isn't relevant to our tasks but

since we are the keeper of the top 100 MSAs list, we try to keep that as accurate as possible and we take pride in that.

And the other thing that has been taking some time is our reviewing the way the VoIP numbering order will affect us. We have been in contact with the FCC. We are working with the INC which is working on updating applicable parts of the industry guidelines. At the request of the FCC, we have had some interactions with SBCIS which is in a unique position with respect to the VoIP numbering order since it has been getting numbers in the past. Questions?

Betty Ann Kane: Yes.

Ann Berkowitz: Ann Berkowitz from Verizon and I'm sorry if at this moment I took a moment to step out for a health break. But in line with the question, the VoIP direct to access order asked the NANC to get back to them on something in 180 days. And I apologize for not having the report in front of me. And I don't know if that has been cared for or assigned to a working group.

Betty Ann Kane: I'd like to look into that. I had a follow up question on that same thing really from Marilyn because as you indicate in your report, Amy, the reported order which the FCC did release on June 22nd.

Female Voice: After our last meeting?

Betty Ann Kane: Yeah, after our last meeting. It is not as effective as you point out until 30 days after publication in the Federal Register. Has that order been published?

Female Voice: No, it has not.

Betty Ann Kane: It has not been published.

Female Voice: But I believe the task to the NANC - and I can look up the order, I'm sorry I didn't bring it with me - was 180 days from the release.

Betty Ann Kane: Not from the day of publication.

Female Voice: Not from publication. Since we're here, Barry is looking into that.

Betty Ann Kane: Yes. So June, July, August, September, October, November, December. Right before Christmas.

Mary Retka: This is Mary Retka from CenturyLink. Actually in INC we have actually looked closely at the date, and by December 19th the NANC portion is due back to the FCC. The order does state, and we had a readout from the ATIS attorney on this, that work would need to be began when the order came out and not waiting for the Federal Register posting.

Betty Ann Kane: And that work was?

Mary Retka: The NANC was to provide a report on, and I don't have the exact language in front of me, the impacts of the order for --

Betty Ann Kane: On numbering.



Mary Retka: Yes.

Betty Ann Kane: We'll discuss the effect. To the working group, I'm going to look at parts of that. Thank you. Any other questions on this? All right.

**Report of the Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG)**

I'm going to move to the report of the Numbering Oversight Working Group. This report will be Item Number 5.

Laura Dalton: Good morning.

Betty Ann Kane: Good morning.

Laura Dalton: I'm Laura Dalton from Verizon. I'm one of the co-chairs of the Numbering Oversight Working Group, which is called the NOWG along with Karen Riepenkroger from Sprint. Slide 2 on our report lists the contents of our report. The main topics that I'll be discussing on the following slides are the NOWG's monthly activities and the 2015 annual performance surveys for the Numbering Administrators. I'll briefly mention the NANPA and the PA change orders, followed by the NOWG's recent co-chair election. And finally, the last few slides contain a schedule of our upcoming meetings and a list of NOWG participating companies.

Turning to Slide 3: NOWG activities. The NOWG's primary role is to oversee the operations and review the performance of the two numbering administrators, the NANPA and the PA. Oversight of the PA includes monitoring the activities of the

RNA, which is the Routing Number Administrator. The NOWG's functions include holding separate monthly conference calls with the NANPA and the PA to review their activities. Following our monthly calls with the two numbering administrators, we hold NOWG-only calls to discuss any issues that may require a follow up. During our most recent monthly call, the NOWG began discussing the 2015 performance surveys. We're beginning to gear up for our annual performance evaluation process.

Turning to Slide 4, the NOWG has begun its review and update of the NANPA, PA, and RNA performance survey questions. Last year, survey forms were updated to reflect new dates and the survey questions were reviewed to see if any questions need to be changed or added. The draft survey forms were sent to the NANPA and the PA for their input. We don't anticipate any major changes this year since last year we had streamlined the survey questions and simplified the ratings' categories. By keeping the changes to a minimum this year, we can better compare the year over year responses. After we've completed our updates to the surveys, the NOWG will send the 2015 draft survey forms to the NANC for review, and we will request approval of the surveys at the December NANC meeting.

Moving on to Slide 5: NANPA and PA change orders. Whenever the NANPA and PA submit a change order proposal to the FCC, the NOWG reviews the change order and prepares a summary and

recommendation. Since the last NANC meeting, NANPA Change Order Number 2, which John Manning had mentioned, pertains to a moratorium on 555 line number assignments that was approved and implemented. NANPA also submitted one new change order, Change Order Number 3. And Change Order Number 3 is for NAS NRUF updates, and was submitted by NANPA to the FCC last week. The NOWG reviewed the change order and sent a recommendation for approval to the FCC this past Monday, September 28th. In this slide, it says pending because these slides were prepared prior to the submission of the change order recommendation. Regarding PA change orders, no new change orders were submitted by the PA, and all previously reported PA change orders have been implemented.

Turning to Slide 6: Co-chair position. NOWG co-chairs served two-year terms, and elections are held annually on a rotational basis. The term of one co-chair position is due to expire at the end of 2015. We had accepted nominations for co-chair for the 2016-2017 term. The election is currently in progress and the results will be announced at the December NANC meeting.

Slide 7 shows the NOWG's upcoming meeting schedule for our regularly scheduled monthly conference calls with the numbering administrators and for our NOWG-only calls. Slide 8 notes that in addition to the monthly conference calls, we schedule other

calls when needed. And this slide also shows the contact information for the co-chairs and where to find our meeting notes and information. The last slide, Slide 9, shows a list of NOWG participants. And that concludes our report. Are there any questions?

Betty Ann Kane: Any questions on the phone? Thank you very much. Thank you. That also went to the record.

**Report of the Billing and Collection Agent Report**

The next item on the agenda is the report of the North American Numbering Plan Billing and Collection Agent. She's on the phone. That's right. Heather?

Heather Bambrough: Yes. Hello. I apologize for not being able to attend the meeting today, but I will go forward with the report. On the first page, we have the statement of financial position. At the end of August there was a cash balance of approximately \$4.9 million. This is the result of most of the collections being received on the annual billing that was done on June 22nd. We have approximately \$276,000 in receivables. Again, the majority of it represents the monthly billers who pay their invoices on a monthly basis with a few others of these that are still outstanding. The accrued liabilities where we have a makeup below represents invoices that are for the August time period which were paid in September. Most of these

invoices are based on existing contracts that are in place. The fund balance at the end of August is \$4.682 million.

Going forward to the next page, the forecast statement of changes and fund balance. The main change here from previous reports is that we are now on a 15-month timeframe for this funding period due to changing the funding period from July to June to July to September 2016 so that going forward we can have an October to September funding period. There are no new changes on this report other than we do have anticipated fund balance at the end of September 2016 of \$551,000. This represents the \$500,000 contingency allowance and a small surplus of \$51,000. The costs are as expected for the budget with no large unexpected changes.

The following page is the forecast of liabilities and expenses that we expect to pay out over the next six months, and all these balances are per the contract. Nothing again is unexpected, and everything will be able to be covered by the fund.

The last page is the deliverables report. We have been sending out the invoices on a monthly basis, on August 12th, as we do every other month. Nothing has changed with our processing. We receive our payments from the log box at Mellon Bank and the information is downloaded on a daily basis and recorded daily as well. Statement of accounts are emailed and

mailed for balances greater than \$10. We have found that in emailing statement of accounts, we are getting a lot more response than just the mail. With regards to the FCC Red Light, it is updated pretty much on a daily basis unless no updates are required.

With our help desk, we received 272 calls in August. Most of these are related to the statements that we sent out at the end of July that reflected outstanding balances for invoices that were due on July 22nd. Many of the calls had to do with people requesting a change to their email billing address notifying us that their business was closed, or asking us what the invoices were, or how to make a payment.

Nothing has changed with regard to staffing other than, as you may noticed, today Faith Marcotte is retiring so she will not be attending anymore meetings in the future. It will be either myself or Garth Steele who will be attending the meetings. With regards to the contract renewal, we've received an extension that run until November 30, 2015. And with regards to accounts receivable, we did receive a \$131,000 from treasury for debts that they collected on our behalf. That is the end of my report. Are there any questions?

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. Any questions on the report?  
Mary?

Mary Retka: I think you probably know what I'm going to ask. In the transcript from our last meeting, I double checked this before once I had this report. And it appears that we were to have -- by the end of August we expected that the contract would be out, and we have now seen another extension to the end of November. So I just wanted to ask what we know of the status for finally putting out that in RFP.

Heather Bamrough: The only information, Mary, I have is that it's been extended to November 30th. I would check with our contracting office and see what the plans are, and I'll send out an email to the members.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. And it's probably time for me to send another letter on this issue. I think we'll just put a standing item on the agenda for every NANC meeting, which is the status of this. I can't remember how many times it's been extended. You know, it's not a good situation.

Any other questions? All right.

### **Report of the Billing and Collection Working Group (B&C WG)**

#### **Report**

Now we will move on to Item Number 7, which is the report of the Billing and Collection Working Group. Rosemary?

Rosemary Emmer: Thank you. Rosemary Emmer with Sprint. I thank you, Heather, for providing our report. And I chair the Billing and Collection Working Group along with Tim Decker with Verizon. We are responsible for overseeing the performance of the functional requirements provided by the B&C Agent. The B&C Working Group reviews the performance and we determine the financial impacts of initiatives and activities that might be included in the budget. We currently oversee monthly billing and collections, the monthly evaluation of deliverables. We're overseeing the contract extension, although our oversight doesn't seem to be making the date stick for a real contract.

In any event, well, we'll move to page 5. On page 5 and 6 we list the current and historical contribution factors. As you all know, we go through the contribution factor and budget stage earlier in the year so we don't have any work left to do with that from a B&C Working Group perspective. Page 8, it just lists our current membership, or page 7. Page 8 lists our conference calls from now until the end of the year, and mine and Tim's email addresses. Contact information shows on that page. So if anyone would like to join our conference calls in November and December, you're welcome to email us and we'll provide you the bridge information. We're always looking for new membership. Everyone is welcome. Are there any questions?



Betty Ann Kane: Any questions on the phone? Thank you, Rosemary.

Rosemary Emmer: Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: And that will be Document Number 7 in the record.

**Report of the North American Portability Management (NAPM)**

**LLC Report**

Item Number 8 on the agenda and Document Number 8 is the report of the North American Portability and Management LLC, the NAPM.

Tim Kagele: Good morning, Chairman Kane and distinguished members of the NANC. My name is Tim Kagele. I'm with Comcast. I'm one of the co-chairs of the NAPM LLC. I share that role with my Verizon colleague, Tim Decker. And just as a refresher, the NAPM is chartered with administering the activities of the Local Number Portability Administrator under the direction of the contract and under direction from FCC.

In terms of statements of work for the quarter, there were two new statements of work that were enacted. One was SOW 98 which implements billing as a new line item for the transition oversight manager that I'll speak about in the LNPA transition section of the report. That will be a shared industry expense, and that goes into effect via that SOW. Also SOW 99, or

Amendment 99 as we call it, clarifies the handling of confidential information as enumerated under the NAPM's operating agreement.

In terms of general, we have always been recruiting for new members. So if anybody is interested in becoming a NAPM LLC member, please feel free to reach out to myself or my colleague Tim Decker. We'll be happy to talk with you about the benefits of being a NAPM LLC member. In terms of the phone pack report, there is no report for the phone pack this quarter. Let me pause there and see if there are any questions with this piece of the report?

Betty Ann Kane: Any questions on the phone?

Tim Kagele: Hearing none, let me talk about the LNPA transition activity. So the first item that we'll talk about is in the FCC's order that was issued in March, there was direction in there to retain a transition oversight manager as a neutral third party to help oversee the transition process. So the NAPM initiated a robust RFP process, solicited a number of requests for respondents, and we're happy to report that PricewaterhouseCoopers was selected through that process. So the TOM, as we call it, is now on boarded, and they are fully immersed in the transition activities working very closely with the current LNPA vendor, as well as the selected LNPA vendor and

with the NAPM LLC's transition team. Any questions on that part? Okay.

Next up is the development of a Transition Oversight Plan also directed as part of the FCC's order from March. That plan was initially delivered in April and was amended in August. Part of that plan includes requirements for a Transition Outreach and Education Plan or TOEP. So that's another new acronym to get used to as we go through the LNPA transition process. So the TOEP was included as part of the amended Transition Oversight Plan. And for those that have been following the docket, that plan is out there and available. We've directed the TOM to begin the process of implementing the Transition Outreach Plan so you should be hearing more about that in an upcoming communications.

And then next up: Neustar and iconectiv are engaged in the transition planning work with oversight of the TOM, as well as the NAPM LLC's transition team. I'm happy to report that the process is very cooperative at this point. Any questions so far?

Betty Ann Kane: Yes. We have a question down here.

Steve: Can you give us any more details on the status of the TOEP? What kind of outreach we can be expecting and when our members, like the carriers that we represent, might be able to learn more about the transition?

Tim Kagele: Sure. I'm happy to Steve.

Steve: Thanks.

Tim Kagele: Thanks for the question. So the transition and education outreach plan will be a new form that is a standalone form. It will be open to any interested party that wants to follow the LNPA transition process; or is an impacted service provider, whether you're a small provider, medium provider, large provider, it's also open to law enforcement agencies, public service answer points. So any interested stakeholder. That is kind of the scope and breadth of the TOEP itself. As I mentioned, the TOM has been directed to implement the transition education and outreach proposal. We expect that within the next several weeks that process will start moving forward. The TOEP specifies monthly meetings to begin with. We do expect it as the transition cutover date. To get closer to cutover, that the frequencies of those meetings will increase. Did that help you Steve?

Steve: It does. Thank you.

Tim Kagele: Okay. Thank you. Are there any other questions at this point?

Betty Ann Kane: Any questions on the phone?

Tim Kagele: Okay. Hearing none, the next two items: Negotiations continue with iconectiv for a new master services agreement in all seven impact regions. The parties continue to

work very aggressively to reach closure on that agreement, and at this point I would say the process continues to move cooperatively.

The last item that I have to report on is the NAPM LLC's monthly transition status reports as requested by the FCC. Those reports began in July of this year. So two reports have been filed so far, and the next status report is due I believe today, September 30th. So those reports are filed in the docket, and this information can also be found on the public portion of NAPM LLC's website. On the flipside of your report is the contact information for the co-chairs, as well as the NAPM LLC's URL. So for those that are interested in following the LNPA process, basically all of the public information that has been filed can be found also on the NAPM LLC's website. Any questions?

Betty Ann Kane: The address for that website?

Tim Kagele: Let me turn to that. The address for that is <https://www.napmllc.org/pages/home.aspx>.

Betty Ann Kane: And we will email that out to everyone. We will also put it on the NANC website too. Good. Thank you.

Tim Kagele: Well, if there are no further questions, thank you very much.

Betty Ann Kane: We do have a question here from Steve.

Stephen Pastorkovich: Stephen Pastorkovich with NTCA.  
Will the master service agreement be a -- is that a confidential document or will it be public? Is something that we'll have access to?

Tim Kagele: It is a confidential document at this point. It is subject to the oversight and approval of the FCC.

Stephen Pastorkovich: Thank you very much.

Tim Kagele: Are there any further questions? Thank you very much.

**Report of the Local Number Portability Administration (LNPA WG)**

Betty Ann Kane: Moving on to Item Number 9, which is the LNPA Working Group.

Paula Campagnoli: My name is Paula Campagnoli. I'm one of the chairs of the LNPA Working Group, along with Ron Steen and Dawn Lawrence who are on the bridge. What I'm going to talk about today are the latest activities at the LNPA Working Group. First of all, we'll talk about the VoIP numbering portability order, Best Practice '04 clarification, transition from PSTN to IP, and the non-geographic number reporting, and the LNPA transition.

As far as the VoIP order is concerned, we reviewed that order at the September 2014 LNPA Working Group meeting. At the

time of the review we didn't see any changes, so we developed an action item for the service providers to review the document in detail and to try to determine if we have any changes to make to the NANC flows for the porting of VoIP providers. As of yesterday, we've only received one comment back; hence, basically we are waiting until -- they have until October 9th to respond to the action item. If we get changes that need to be made before October 9th, we will have a conference call set for October 14th to review those and get them implemented into the documents. Because the NANC flows will come back to the NANC to approve, and then they will go on to the FCC for approval. So the plan is if we have changes to make, they'd be made during October 14th meeting. Any questions on that?

Betty Ann Kane: Let me clarify. Because we had a discussion earlier about the specific directive in the VoIP order, the numbering order, for the NANC to report back. It's paragraph 60 which indicates that the commission, they wanted broad support in the record for industry involvement in addressing technical feasibility importing arrangements between interconnected VoIP providers and wireline or wireless carriers. We agreed the industry should be involved in addressing the issues. Accordingly, we direct the North America Numbering Council to examine and address any specific considerations for interconnected VoIP provider porting both to and from wireline

or wireless and other interconnected VoIP providers. In particular, direct the NANC to examine any rate center or geographic consideration implicated by porting directly to and from interconnected VoIP providers, including the implications of Rate Center Consolidation, as well as public safety considerations such as PSAP and 911 issues that could arise. We direct the NANC to give the commission a report addressing these issues which includes options and recommendations no longer than 180 days from the release date of this report and order.

My apologies. I was thinking 180 days from publication. And as Mary pointed out, that is December 19th. Now the work that the LNPA is doing now, is that going to cover and address these issues that are raised here?

Paula Campagnoli: It will cover the part of being able to port their numbers. At this time, we really don't see any issues because they're porting today with wireless/wireline and with each other. And that's the reason. But we wanted to make sure, and that's why we gave people extra time to be able to review the flows as they are today and come back if they felt that there were changes. Like I've said, we've gotten one report back. It doesn't seem to really involve a change, but we will discuss that on October 14. Whatever the outcome is of that meeting and if there are changes, we will send that to you as soon as it's done and not wait until the next NANC meeting.



Betty Ann Kane: Right. So the Rate Center Consolidation, public safety, PSAP and 911 issues?

Paula Campagnoli: Those will not be part of the LNPA Working Group.

Betty Ann Kane: But it is something that we were being asked to comment on also.

Paula Campagnoli: Yes.

Betty Ann Kane: But this is rate center geographic considerations implicated by porting directly to and from interconnected VoIP providers. But you're going to be looking at a part of this?

Paula Campagnoli: Right.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. Mary?

Mary Retka: I wanted to point out that the LNPA Working Group will look at the porting aspect of that. There's also some work underway in INC that will be discussed when the INC report is given today as a result of some of the other things that need to be addressed for this order. So there's more than just one working group that we are involved.

Betty Ann Kane: To support, you know. Thank you.

Paula Campagnoli: Any other questions on the VoIP order? The next item is the Best Practice '04. Basically what we did at this September 2015 LNPA Working Group meeting, we didn't make any changes to the existing document of Best Practice '04.

The only thing that we clarified was the term of the donor carrier or the donor provider. That was the only change that we made or clarification that we made. We didn't even change it. We just clarified who should be making the database to route the call forward in a EAS service area, and that is Extended Area Service.

I think what you have attached, there's a diagram that shows an example of EAS, and there is also a document that is labeled 0004 N-1 Carrier Methodology, and then there's another document. So about 11 pages. If you look at this first document, there are two paragraphs added to that. One of them starts Best Practice '04, and the next one starts on page 11. Those explain what we did at the LNPA Working Group. And then this document that's got 11 pages, it's the last bullet or the third bullet on page 11 that further explains who should be doing the DIP.

The reason that this came up at the LNPA Working Group meeting was because we have instances in EAS areas where DIPs are not being done, and what that means is that the calls are failing. We are getting customer complaints and so we felt it was necessary to clarify who the donor switch or the donor carrier was that should be doing the DIPs. That's the only thing that we added, was a clarification because Best Practice

'04 was worked on in 2004, and it was actually approved by the NANC at the January 2005 meeting and then sent on to the FCC.

Betty Ann Kane: So is this a clarification that needs to be sent on to the FCC?

Paula Campagnoli: If there is no objection from the NANC, I would say yes.

Jerome Candelaria: Jerome Candelaria, NCTA. I have a question and then a comment. The question is to make clear what you are capturing as the clarification is the working of this issue as it was done in 2004 and as approved by NANC in 2005. So there's no additional mandate, or requirement, or request to the FCC?

Paula Campagnoli: Right. It's just a clarification. Because, like I said, we're having issues with carriers and not service providers not doing DIPs, which means when the call comes to them, if they are not DIPping the call to find out what the routing LRN is, the calls are going nowhere. They're failing and so we're getting customer complaints. So we felt that it was necessary to maybe further explain who the donor service providers, who they are and when they should be doing the DIPs.

Jerome Candelaria: I would like to offer a comment as well then. Thank you for the background material. It gave us a picture of what was happening in 2004 and 2005 when, for

example, interexchange carriers were typically involved in IntraLATA calls.

We are now faced in an environment where the FCC has recently opened the door for VoIP providers to obtain resources directly. And in the VoIP world, of course the interexchange carrier isn't there. In fact, it's interesting to see your diagram where we talk about switches in tandems. That's something that is also absent in a VoIP environment. So I submit perhaps this issue is ripe to just take a fresh look at this, to whether Best Practice '04 remains the best practice. I understand there are forms looking into these fundamental question of what changes will be needed in light of this of introduction of VoIP, and perhaps this is one of them.

Paula Campagnoli: We reviewed it at the LNPA Working Group. We have members that had participated at the LNPA Working Group that are VoIP providers and I can tell you that when the question was raised if we have any objections, we had no objections to this clarification. But I'm not saying that we shouldn't look at it again. I mean it's whatever the will of the NANC.

Jerome Candelaria: Right. And in NCTA there are members who, when issues new like these come up, will or may very much have an interest. But where if it wasn't on the agenda before, they wouldn't be there. But they'll be there now.

Ron Steen: Paula, could I add to your comments?

Betty Ann Kane: Yes. Who's speaking please?

Ron Steen: This is Ron Steen, one of the LNPA Working Group tri-chairs.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. Go ahead.

Ron Steen: Sure. I just wanted to add based on the gentleman's comment just now, I really do think as we move into an IP network, that this will bear some looking at again because I think the capability to address this is probably there. But we're still in a world that has awfully a lot of the TDM. I mean that's still basically where we are, and this addresses that situation in that most ALECs in our box don't have the capability right now to route a call across the line of boundary. So this solution addresses how to keep their calls from failing. And I just wanted to mention that I do think, as we move in to an IP network, that this situation should improve and we should be able to deal with it. But that still bears some looking at.

Paula Campagnoli: We were asked to do this originally. What we were trying to allow this in the EAS, they should be able to make local calls. So by the way we responded to this was to have the A Block donor switch do the database DIP. The issue is if you have the DIP done in the ladder where the call originated, what we're going to pull out of the data is we're

going to be routing that call on a -- it will come across as a toll call versus a local call, which is what they are using the EAS for. So by having them do the DIP on the originating site of the call, it's no longer a local call and it now becomes a toll call. So that's why we had to set it up the way we did when we originally did it in 2004. Again, things are going to change so we may have to look at it again.

Valerie Cardwell: Valerie Cardwell, Comcast. I'd like to I guess reinforce what Jerome said in terms of the opportunity to really look at it. I understand a little bit about the issue. I'm seeing this for the first time. But just one clarifying question. I see this document looks like it was an output of some recent discussions in the LNPA Working Group. It mentions something about the yellow highlighting.

Paula Campagnoli: The only thing that pertains to what we did in September at the LNPA Working Group is the last page. There are three bullets, and it's the third bullet - that's the only thing that pertains to what we actually did at the LNPA Working Group meeting in September.

Valerie Cardwell: Thank you. Is the best practice, the way the best practice stands today in any of these documents?

Paula Campagnoli: Yes. The best practice on the LNPA Working Group computer, on the system --

Male Voice: The website.

Paula Campagnoli: -- is listed on the website for the LNPA Working Group.

Valerie Cardwell: I understand that. But is it in any of the documentation that I'm looking at here today?

Paula Campagnoli: You should have gotten the document. It's two pages.

Valerie Cardwell: This?

Paula Campagnoli: Yes.

Valerie Cardwell: The reason I'm asking --

Betty Ann Kane: I'm sorry, Valerie. Just for the record, let's identify the document that you're looking at. What is it called?

Valerie Cardwell: The document that I'm looking at is entitled 0004 N-1 Carrier Methodology Clarification. And the reason I'm a little confused - and I apologize, I'm just trying to put all the pieces together - is that this says it's from 2001 and modified 09/02/15. So you're saying that this is the current version of Best Practice '04?

Paula Campagnoli: Yes, Best Practice '04 with the changes and with the programs that we added.

Ron Steen: May I help you, Paula?

Paula Campagnoli: Yes.

Betty Ann Kane: Yes, you can help. Thank you. We can't focus with this because --

Ron Steen: The page --

Betty Ann Kane: Wait a minute. What we have before us, the version doesn't have red lining. It doesn't have yellow highlights. So we need you to point out whether this is the revised language or not and where the recommended clarification, the actual text of the recommended clarification is.

Ron Steen: Yes. So I think I can help with that. The one page that -- if you have what I believe you have, and I printed it in color. So at the bottom part there should be a change bar on the left part, on the left side. It starts Best Practice '04 in the attached 0004 LNPA Working Group, that is the new text.

Paula Campagnoli: Yes.

Ron Steen: But if you look up above that to the related issues, there's something there that says 0004 LNPA Working Group N-1 Interpretation v5. That's actually a link to an 11-page document that Paula was referring to, and that's got a number of scenarios. The last scenario - and I'm going for memory here, I believe it starts from the bottom of page 10 and is continued on page 11 - describes the current TDM situation with N-1 routing where you have an EAS situation that crosses a lot of boundary. But the words by the changed bar that you have is the only change we made to this best practice.



Betty Ann Kane: Well, we're coping with this that we don't have a version, a printed version that has the change bar, the actual change. Now there is a second --

Valerie Cardwell: I assumed they changed the color.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. Thank you. We'd be referring to this back anyway, but --

Valerie Cardwell: Well, thank you. My only addition was to suggest referring it back. But specifically, as I think Ron just so clearly articulate, this seems to be - as we know in 2004 where it was primarily TD and base world - that there probably does not need to be a consideration or review specifically as it relates to VoIP providers. So I would just ask any review, and then go back to the LNPA Working Group to the extent that it needs to have a specific call out or reference to VoIP providers. Because, again, our networks are very different that I'd like to just make that recommendation.

Betty Ann Kane: Yes.

Paula Campagnoli: So everybody sees that if you look at page 10 at the very bottom, it says Extended Area Service, that's where it refers to the EAS.

Betty Ann Kane: What is the new language that's being --

Paula Campagnoli: The new language is at the third bullet on page 11.

Female Voice: It's bold.

Betty Ann Kane: That's in bold, okay.

Paula Campagnoli: Yeah, because actually I made this at the last minute and I couldn't get them highlighted.

Betty Ann Kane: That's okay. So the new language is what's in bold.

Paula Campagnoli: Yes.

Betty Ann Kane: Everybody. So we take a look at that.

Ron Steen: And just as a comment, the way that the VoIP providers today route - although granted it's the numbers port that you can actually access from almost anywhere - it's sort of a near or a virtual non-geographic porting although it's not really because those numbers show up actually in right centers. As I see it with my quick analysis here, it doesn't really affect VoIP providers and routing today. But what will change - when we move totally into an IP network, this will all change. And I'm not an IP expert, but I do believe that this issue will go away.

Valerie Cardwell: Thank you. Just one last comment again going back to the relook as it relates to VoIP. In the VoIP world or maybe in the context of this, what is defined as a local tandem. I think that is critical to this issue. Thank you.

Ron Steen: Well, then in an IP network, that would be a different stance. Let me just back up and see if it's worth working at, but I'm not sure I see the issue at this moment.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. Thank you. Rosemary.

Rosemary Emmer: It seems to me that we have two separate issues going on here. The first issue is what we have in front of us that Paula just went over, which is a contribution that came into the LNPA Working Group in July. It was worked July and September. Everything was consensus. It was agreed too to add this language, or to clarify I should say, to clarify the language. That's in front of us to determine, and it's done. It's best practice and it's in front of us at this point in time to determine whether or not we are going to send this up to the FCC.

Then the second issue that I'm hearing is, hey, we might want to take a fresh brand new look at this actual best practice that maybe there are things. And now the LNPA Working Group just looked at it over a two-month period of time, I mean over two different meetings. But perhaps now there is a reason to have a relook at it. Procedurally, how that would work generally under our normal procedures is that whoever wants to talk about this best practice would simply bring the best practice up to the co-chairs to put on the agenda for the next meeting as a PIM [phonetic], and then the whole LNPA Working

Group would determine how they're going to handle that. So if we need to have a fresh brand new look, then maybe we could bring that in during the next meeting. But for today, it seems like our procedure today would be to take what's already been done in the LNPA Working Group and move forward with that. So anyway, I don't know if that clarifies things or not. But it seems like we were going down two different procedural paths. Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: Well, it's a little bit complicated because we have these referral and requirement from the commission to specifically look at the VoIP issue and the impact of the order on porting. That's going to be coming back to the NANC at our December meeting.

Henry Hultquist: Thank you, Chairman. Henry Hultquist, AT&T. The one thing I wanted to make sure that we all were clear on, and I heard it briefly referred to, is that the uncertainty that exists about this issue or has existed is currently harming consumers because calls are dropping. Is that a valid assumption?

Betty Ann Kane: Yes.

Henry Hultquist: I wanted to make sure everybody knew that the case here was that consumers were being harmed by the fact that there was either uncertainty or people who were not following this best practice.

Paula Campagnoli: Right, that is the case. And that was the reason for the clarification of the donor provider.

Betty Ann Kane: The other question. So what we have before us is a recommendation from the working group that the language on page 11 of the document that is referred to that is titled Local Number Portability Administration Working Group LNPAWG Interpretation of N-1 Carrier Architecture v5.0, and it's dated January 17th, 2005 and that is on the page 11 of that document -- is this new language or revised language?

Paula Campagnoli: This is new language that explains the clarification of the donor.

Betty Ann Kane: So there's no language in the current version that's being deleted. This is something that's being added.

Paula Campagnoli: Yes.

Betty Ann Kane: So the recommendation is that these three paragraphs be added to the current best practice as a clarification. That is the recommendation that is before us. We can act on that. We had discussed this and questions have been raised. We pointed out there is a consumer issue. This will be a recommendation to the FCC to add this as a best practice, correct?

Paula Campagnoli: Yes.

Betty Ann Kane: We've also had some concern raised that perhaps people haven't had enough time to look at it, that it's not ripe. And also the issue of the LNPA and together with the INC we'll be looking at and making broader recommendations to us concerning the whole issue of the impact of the VoIP order on a number of different issues related to number portability. Is this a specific VoIP issue?

Paula Campagnoli: No. This is a non-specific VoIP. This is just an issue that is trying to correct when customers are calling between LATA and you're in Extended Area Service.

Betty Ann Kane: All right. Further discussion on the -- and we have the recommendation from the LNPA Working Group which took it on, which had a couple of meetings, which got some input.

Paula Campagnoli: And we got approval at this.

Betty Ann Kane: At the end. So it was a recommendation that's saying --

Paula Campagnoli: No objections too, except in this --

Betty Ann Kane: From the members, those who participated and were notified, and the carriers who were consulted as to whether there was on this issue. And now we do have a unanimous recommendation from the working group that we recommend addition of these three paragraphs as a clarification to the existing Best Practice '04. Jerome?

Jerome Candelaria: For the reasons the chair just stated, that with this issue we've been asked for a relook by the FCC into VoIP-related issues, I'm not so clear as to whether there - - on this complaint we're talking about, the material doesn't go into any detail. So it's unclear to me whether this is, in fact, a VoIP issue. And all of those questions would benefit from a relook. If we're going to relook at this, it seems as though we would be a bit more efficient rather than send something to the FCC right now with a possible change. So at least give it a meeting to see if there are for the revisions we could offer.

Betty Ann Kane: Valerie.

Valerie Cardwell: I guess just to pick up on what Jerome was saying, the Comcast at this point does not support this revision being passed on to the FCC. I don't know if that's the right way to vote on the motion. Rosemary, please correct me. Because she always do. But at this point Comcast does not support that recommendation to have it passed on to the FCC to have it codified. Thank you.

Henry Hultquist: I guess I basically agree with the view Rosemary enunciated earlier, which is I don't think -- I mean looking at it now and based on what I've heard about the conversations in the INC, I don't think that the status of the existing best practice is really in doubt here. I think it's

understood. I think there are questions being raised about whether we should revisit and change that best practice. But since this does affect consumers, I think we should in fact make clear that this view of what the best practice is is what's set out in this document.

Betty Ann Kane: This is InterLATA issue and not necessarily a VoIP issue. I guess my question is on this best practice, when the LNPA does any further looking at the implications of the VoIP matter for affordability, is this current best practice even when the clarification is something that may need further change? Mary?

Mary Retka: I think Paula explained and I think Rosemary also. This was reviewed already in the LNPA Working Group to determine that it was just a clarification on that language. And I would also add to what Ann and Hank said given the consumer impact, that something needs to be addressed to the FCC in the PSTN part that Rosemary said is a separate piece from the VoIP look.

Betty Ann Kane: One more round. Okay, Jerome.

Jerome Candelaria: Yeah, we appreciate that consumers are being affected here. My understanding is this issue is actually before a regulatory agency dispute. This was before a regulatory agency so it's certainly not being ignored. It's being litigated. And what they have at their disposal is the



material that was provided to us, the history of Best Practice '04. So the issue is being addressed and considered. And these groups, I would think, would be charged with making sure best practice is in fact the best practice and we will offer suggestions as to make it current. But for now it will be pretty immature to adapt this.

Paula Campagnoli: We didn't change anything in the best practice as far as who's supposed to do the DIP. We didn't change that. All we did was clarify so it was understood by everybody who that carrier was supposed to be, who that service provider was supposed to be - And it's the A Block holder of the NPA-NXX that is supposed to be doing the DIPS. And that's all we clarify. We didn't involve the drawings or anything. So I'm a little bit confused as to why we wouldn't -- especially when at the LNPA Working Group we didn't have anybody that object us or who had objected to include this in the document. It's just a clarification.

Betty Ann Kane: Well, because that's the reason everything comes to the full NANC. We really appreciate the working group and the talk that goes into it and the opportunity people have to participate. I'm still trying to separate whether this is -- it's not a specific VoIP issue, and it speaks of tandems and switches and other things that don't implicate VoIP. It's a clarification of an existing practice, a best practice approved

by the commission. And I guess I have to ask Marilyn. If this is where to go to the FCC in the next few days after this group makes a recommendation, what is the process there and how long does it take since there is a consumer impact here?

Marilyn Jones: The process?

Betty Ann Kane: The process, yeah.

Marilyn Jones: The process to make this a rule that we can enforce?

Betty Ann Kane: This is a recommended clarification to a best practice. It's not a rule. It's a best practice, okay.

Marilyn Jones: In order for it to be enforceable at the FCC, it would have to be a [audio gap], and so we will have to initiate a rule.

Betty Ann Kane: So you initiate the rule-making and there would be then the normal public comment process, et cetera, on that.

Marilyn Jones: Right.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. We'll try to work by consensus.

Ron Steen: I'm sorry. Did you acknowledge me? I'm not sure.

Betty Ann Kane: No. Who is this?

Ron Steen: This is Ron Steen. I'd like to make a comment.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. Go ahead.

Ron Steen: I apologize for not being there in person. It's always tough to see what you guys are looking at compared to what I am. We didn't actually change anything on page 11, in the N-1 interpretation document.

Betty Ann Kane: Right. We clarified something was added. The recommendation was to add clarification.

Ron Steen: Well, no. Actually it's a little bit of a confusion point. There's an introductory page for Best Practice '04 that we put some notes on to clarify what we meant by donor carrier. The N-1 interpretation document itself was not changed. But the issue that we were addressing was the fact that not all service providers in their switches -- and this really is a TDM issue. Not all service providers in their switches provide the capability to do what I call a query of last resort or a donor query. If the call comes to them unqueried, they just don't do anything with it. They drop it.

Normally the originating switch makes the query to route the call. But in an InterLATA situation where the EAS calls go across the InterLATA, go across the LATA boundary, then the ALEC in our box switches - which is not capable I'll say at least in most cases and the ones I'm familiar with - are routing across the LATA boundary. So the resolution that we came up with back in 2004 and 2005 was that it go across the LATA boundary unqueried and the donor switch would make the query and route

the call. We all agree that that's inefficient, but it takes care of the customer.

So that's what we're trying to fix. I'm scratching my head about this and I don't really see -- I don't see the effects on VoIP, but it would be worthwhile I think for the Working Group as a committee to look at it and see whether I'm right or wrong. Again, when we get to an IP network, things will be done differently and this should not be a problem.

Paula Campagnoli: Ron, on page 11, there is a third bullet that was added just after the decision at the September LNPA Working Group meeting.

Ron Steen: Okay. Well, I think my printed copy doesn't point that out. But okay. Good.

Betty Ann Kane: Well, everyone here has this printed copy. And as I've said, before us is these paragraphs, one bullet with three paragraphs in bold to add this language. It is the language that has to do with switches, and TDMs, and that kind of thing.

Ron Steen: Okay. Thank you. And the main thing that we were addressing though was to try to keep those calls from failing.

Betty Ann Kane: I understand. We understand that. Thank you. And I think you were referring to this one-page summary too. We have it before us. We have a recommendation before us.

We try to work by consensus. This does not mean it has to be unanimous. But we have a recommendation to forward to the FCC, recommendation of the NANC now that Best Practice '04 v5.0 as of January 17th, 2005 be clarified by adding these three paragraphs that are in bold. And I'm going to call for a vote on that with one final word from Valerie, and that's it.

Valerie Cardwell: Thank you, Chairman. I just want to clear it for the record. Because I don't want coming across that Comcast does not care about customers that are having any service issues, number one. Number two, we all go through issues between companies and there are certain and well-defined litigation practices. There are ways that companies can work through issues that they deal. The fact that if this language is going to change the world so dramatically for customers and companies, it tells me and leads me to saying that it is a very serious issue. I'm feeling that the message is, hey, this is not a big deal, we just want to send this up and clarify. But at the same time we're hearing customers are losing service, this is a nightmare and we need to get this fixed immediately.

So again, for the record, Comcast is very concerned of our customers and wants to make sure issues are being addressed with customers and between carriers. We just want to make sure that this language clearly does address all areas and all types of

technologies, and quite honestly Comcast does not feel that it does for the record. Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. And I think it refers to tandems and things.

Valerie Cardwell: TDMs.

Betty Ann Kane: TDMs, yeah. All right. All those in favor of accepting the recommendation of the LNPA Working Group to request that the commission clarify Best Practice '04 by adding the three paragraphs that have been recommended, that are in bold in the document before you. All in favor?

Betty Ann Kane: And anybody on the phone who is a member of NANC, just say aye and please say it separately.

Male Voice: Also [indiscernible] here. Aye.

Benny Ann Kane: Anyone else. Ron? Did I hear you?

Ron Steen: I'm sorry. I'm not a member, Chairman.

Betty Ann Kane: Any other voting members of NANC who are on the phone. Okay. And all those oppose to the recommendation? Okay. And abstentions? Okay. So the vote is 14 in favor, 2 oppose, and 2 abstentions. So we will send that on to the FCC. So that takes care of that issue. Now, Paula, is there more on your report?

Paula Campagnoli: Yeah. Oh, I was going to ask are you asking us to look at this from a --

Betty Ann Kane: Well, what I'm asking is that the LNPA will look at the INC report. As I quoted before, from the report order of the commission in June, it asked specifically directed to the NANC to examine and address any specific considerations for interconnected VoIP provider porting both to and from wireline, wireless, and other interconnected VoIP providers. In particular, directing the NANC to examine any rate center or geographic considerations implicated by porting directly to and from interconnected VoIP providers including the implications of Rate Center Consolidation, as well as public safety considerations such as PSAP and 911 issues that could arise, and asking for a report back - which calculated now will be by December 19th - to the commission which would mean recommendations would go through the NANC from whichever working groups are going to be working on this at our December 1st meeting.

So what I'm asking, Paula, is that those of that list of things that the FCC is asking for that are appropriate for the LNPA Working Group to look at - that I know you said you had started that process already - I think, from what we're hearing today, that one look at a broader outreach particularly with the VoIP providers on those issues. And then if we can delineate which of those issues LNPA's going to be working on and making reports to us and which of the ones that INC is going to be

looking at and then if there are any that are not covered by either of those two working groups, how we're going to get those covered the most as we get the end actions. You know, that we get those reports back not just because there are going to be probably some complicated things there. If we could at least get an interim report back from the working groups sometime in November so that we have time before the December 1st meeting to consider and ask questions about those and be ready at the December 1st NANC meeting to discuss and decide what the report to the FCC is going to say.

Paula Campagnoli: We have a conference call scheduled for the 14th --

Betty Ann Kane: Of October?

Paula Campagnoli: -- of October to talk about the VoIP porting. And we also have a meeting the first part of November.

Betty Ann Kane: Very good.

Paula Campagnoli: So we'll be able to get your report. And we'll be looking at the porting issues.

Betty Ann Kane: The porting issues.

Paula Campagnoli: Yeah.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. But the implication of Rate Center Consolidation and safety, okay?

Henry Hultquist: I just want to make sure I understand the scope of what they're doing. I mean as I read it and think



about it, the question does the impact of the interconnected VoIP providers newly having access to numbers and being able to port numbers, it's not a question about impact and circumstances where you used to have a CLEC who has always had access to numbers. So it's a very specific new circumstance that you're looking at.

Betty Ann Kane: Right. Yes.

Paula Campagnoli: We already have VoIP providers that are already porting and we haven't had any issues, but who knows.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. Thank you. Mary?

Mary Retka: Madame Chairman, I want to get a little bit tactical here since I heard you say that we get that report in our December meeting.

Betty Ann Kane: Yes.

Mary Retka: And then NANC needs to provide the overall report. In other words, you're going to have multiple groups looking at things.

Betty Ann Kane: Yes.

Mary Retka: NANC would only have from there until the 19th for a full report from the NANC and for us to vote on it, and we don't have another meeting after that. So I think we need to think through a little bit more how we're going to tactically handle that.

Betty Ann Kane: More of the process, how we're going to do it or whether we're going to ask for an extension of time. But yes, that will start with the work of the working groups. But how we get that together in a form, that's why I want to get things in earlier. And that would be an actual report to the FCC, okay.

Jerome Candelaria: Two points. First on what NANC can expect in addition to VoIP considerations. I assume also any changes to BP form based on an evolved environment which is IP-related, but it's also related to missing IXZs [sounds like], et cetera. I would expect NANC would accept and the LNPA Working Group would accept those type of proposals as well.

Paula Campagnoli: Yes. The LNPA Working Group is open to anybody. I mean we don't -- it's not close. There's no charge for coming. There is always a bridge open for those that don't want to travel, but it's always open and we need it in order to look at this from an IP perspective and work perspective. We need members to have that capability to help us because not everybody understands everything, how a provider operates, so we really need their input. We need to encourage them to be at the meetings.

Male Voice: Thank you. My second question is to you Madame Chair and it's on the issue of what constitutes consensus. In this case, you had an entire industry segment

voting a certain manner. Has your reflection of what constitutes consensus taken that into consideration?

Betty Ann Kane: Yes. I understand [indiscernible]. I think the records seem to indicate that this was an issue for switched addendum and perhaps did not involve VoIP providers this specific clarification. The bigger issue of the impact of the VoIP order on porting, well, it had specifically, the FCC is asking for industry involvement in addressing the technical feasibility in porting arrangements between interconnected VoIP providers and wire-aligned wireless carriers. The consensus on that kind of issue is going to be to involve all of the industry segments.

Female Voice: We did have some VoIP providers at the September meeting?

Betty Ann Kane: Yeah.

Female Voice: And the rest of the --

Betty Ann Kane: Yes, the rest of your report. Thank you, Paula.

Paula Campagnoli: Very quickly, transition from PSTN to IP, Mary Retka - and thank you Mary for your report to us - stated that the ATIS test bed team has completed the baseline test cases and use cases and presented it to the ATIS NNI. One of the test cases involves numbering and could involve LNP.

Mary will keep us posted as to what's going on, so I appreciate that, Mary. Thank you.

Then, the PSTN to IP transition will be a continued agenda item on the LNPA Working Group. I've got the non-geographic number porting document that was issued in March from the LNPA Working Group. I just have it on here in case anybody had any questions or anybody needs a copy or if there's anything that's needed of this document. If you let us know, we will get the information to you.

Then, the LNP transition, we continue to look for ways that the LNPA Working Group can assist in the transition of the LNPA. As of our last meeting, we didn't have any other suggestions, so we didn't. But, we will ask again in November.

Our next face-to-face meeting is November 3rd and 4th, Seattle, Washington, hosted by T-Mobile, any questions?

Betty Ann Kane: And you have a conference call in October 14th.

Paula Campagnoli: Yes. That hasn't been sent out yet, but it will, the notice.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay, very good. Thank you.

**Report of the Future of Numbering (FoN) Working Group**

**Report to the NANC**

Item number 10, the Future of Numbering, Carolee, you're up.

Carolee Hall: [Indiscernible]

Betty Ann Kane: Oh, yes, I'm sorry, Carolee. Wait. We skipped one because I was looking at my old agenda. We do have another report which is report on Recommendations for Nationwide Wireless Number Porting. To give some background on this, I am going to ask Matthew Gerst, who is Director of Regulatory Affairs at CTIA, to come up. Back in the summer, Chairman Wheeler, in response to concerns that had been raised to the industry by consumers and actually in the Congress regarding the availability of number portability to wireless consumers nationwide, Chairman Wheeler asked the Competitive Carriers Association and CTIA to see if they could work together and look at this issue. And his office informed me that this was being done. It was not an intent to bypass the NANC, but was an opportunity to kick start getting the industry groups together to look at this issue of wireless carriers who are not national being able to have their customers access portability in the same way that customers of nationwide carriers could. That was July 27th. The Chairman of the Commission asked those two associations to get together, asked them to report back to him. They have reported back. You have a copy of their letter. It was made public on September 25th. The two associations did

brief me on it, and I asked that they come here and brief the NANC on what they have reported to the chairman of the FCC.

Matthew Gerst: Thank you, Chairman Kane. My name is Matt Gerst, I am Director of Regulatory Affairs at CTIA, obviously a member of NANC. Before I even address the unusual introduction of this letter into the NANC meeting, I did want to say thank you to the FCC for reappointing us to the NANC. And Mike Altschul, who is no longer participating in the NANC, I want to thank him for his long service to the NANC. I appreciate you all talking with him and congratulating him on his retirement. Then, I also welcome Ben Aron, who's with CTIA, who's here today as our alternate, so hopefully you all get a chance to meet him as well.

As Chairwoman Kane described, we did receive along with CCA, the Competitive Carrier Association, and the four national carriers received the letter from Chairman Wheeler in late July basically asking what seems to be a pretty simple question which is why is it that in some certain circumstances, consumers are unable to port their numbers to certain wireless providers? So, we took on an effort over a six-day period that the chairman required or asked us to respond to him within to work with CCA, to work with our nationwide and non-nationwide wireless providers to study the issue and see if we can come up with a response to the chairman. He also requested that we come up

with some sort of practical solutions to potentially enable that capability.

I think one of the things, the main things that we all came away with, which I think the members of the NANC fully agree with and support, is that portability has been a success for consumers. We all agree that it is a key tool for consumers to select the provider that best meets their needs. But, the challenge has been that, while consumers may believe they can port their number anywhere to any provider, the members of this committee are well aware that there are limitations on number porting due to the existing numbering system and the legacy wireline networks associated with their systems. I think we just had a brief discussion about it over the last half hour. So, the challenge for wireless carriers is how can they port in number from areas where they may not have a presence in the rate [sounds like] center where the number is located?

So, our letter comes up with three paths to evaluate this and take a look at this issue and resolve the issue. One is a near-term solution that is looking at existing business solutions that carriers can partner with potential providers who might have access to numbering resources within that particular rate center. And then try to port in a number and work with their potential subscriber through that approach, which is currently being used by interconnected VoIP providers today.

Another approach we think, in sort of an interim evaluation, is whether there might be able to be modifications to the current number portability system. In a second, I'll turn over to Sean, who can a little bit more in depth about what's in the letter related to that issue. But certainly, on any modification to the current number porting system, we think that the experts in this committee as well as at the ATIS, Inc. should have the opportunity to weigh in on that and make recommendations to the FCC if there were to be any modifications to the numbering system.

Then also, as we heard a few minutes ago, a lot of these issues we ultimately believe can be resolved in the IP transition, so looking forward to that approach to being the ultimate solution. We look forward to working with this committee. We look forward to working with you in your leadership on numbering issues and number portability specifically, and being supportive of efforts to make any modifications that might be necessary.

Sean, do you want to add anything?

Sean Spivey: Sure. Sean Spivey, Assistant General Counsel for Competitive Carriers Association. Thank you, Chairwoman Kane, for our new nomination to the NANC. We appreciate the opportunity to participate. As Matt said, yes, we received letter from Chairman Wheeler and we had an industry workday on



August 31st, which I see several people in the room attended and on the phone. It was well attended. I think we had over a hundred participants from all walks of the industry.

Related to the letter, we did identify this interim, short-term solution during the meeting involving commercial business relationships with providers who do have a network presence in a particular area where a provider would like to port in a number from. In terms of the interim solution, we actually built on the work that was done by the Non-geographic Number Portability Sub-Working Group of the NANC-LNPA Working Group. They identified two possible ways of getting at Non-geographic number portability. The first being reducing the number of rate centers or lattice throughout the country, that idea did not get a lot of traction during our workshop. But the second process that was identified in that March 2015 white paper, the allowing an LRN to be associated with any telephone number throughout the country, was something that we thought did merit further exploration.

In the letter that you all have in front of you, we asked Chairman Wheeler to ask the NANC to look at the regulatory and consumers issues associated with possibly allowing an LRN to be associated with any telephone number including specifically national impact connectivity, removal of the applicable impact added, impact some legacy equipment, changes to the

[indiscernible], and whether 10-digit dialing is necessary for handsets or other CPE among other issues. We also asked that the ATIS be asked to take a look at the technical issues associated with this approach and that both the NANC and the ATIS provide a report to the FCC for consideration within the year of when we submitted the letter, which was September 25th. We've also asked that both reports go out for public comment as there may be segments of the industry that don't participate in ATIS or NANC that would like an opportunity to review the recommendations and provide additional feedback.

Then, as Matt mentioned, taking a longer-term view also, asking that stakeholders in the transition towards all IP networks, make sure that any progress that is made as a result of the recommendations of ATIS or NANC are not a step back from as those networks transition.

Matthew Gerst: With that, we'd be happy to answer any questions, but also recognize you. We both spent a lot of time already talking about local number portability.

Richard Shockey: Madame Chairman, may I ask a question or make an observation? This is Rich Shockey, the Chairman of the SIP Forum.

Betty Ann Kane: Yes.

Richard Shockey: First of all, thank you for making this presentation. It's quite excellent. These are issues, by the

way, that those of us in the Voice-over-IP industry have been struggling with for quite some time. During the commission's last numbering rulemaking procedure, I certainly filed a number of comments along these lines. And I certainly would like to offer the two of you my assistance and support specifically on your third recommendation, which is the future of numbering committee, as I understand it, has been endlessly discussing the idea of national 10-digit dialing now for quite some time. The issue of national 10-digit dialing solves a lot of problems for the transition for the exhausted [sounds like] numbering resources as well as all-IP routing on a forward-looking basis. I would ask the two of you and the chairman to try and accelerate a recommendation to the FCC that a potentially proposed notice of rulemaking or we open up a larger inquiry into the future of national 10-digit dialing with an ultimate recommendation that we go to national 10-digit dialing by 2020 at the latest. And, shortly thereafter, enable national geographic number portability because this is a problem that is not going away. According to census data, seven to eight percent of the American population are still moving every single solitary year, so I think we should try and focus as much as possible on the end and not interim solutions.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you.

Matthew Gerst: If I can just make one response. Thank for your comments. I did want to make clear that the letter that we sent was directed to the chairman. Ultimately, it's going to be the chairman's decision or the FCC's decision whether they then refer it to the NANC. These are the things that we've identified that, if the NANC were going to take on these issues, these are the things that they might consider.

Betty Ann Kane: Yes, thank you for that clarification. This was just a few days ago that it was sent. The recommendation from the industry organization was - it says in the letter - that the ATIS look at a lot of the technical issues and that the NANC deliver report to the commission identifying - and you're listing - six or seven specific things. You're recommending that the chairman of the commission ask the NANC. That has not yet occurred. There'll be a turnaround time on that, but I can expect that we are going to be very busy over the next 18 months. Okay, thank you.

Female Voice: [Inaudible]

Betty Ann Kane: Yes, the ATIS. The ATIS were referenced in this letter. Go ahead.

Female voice: [Inaudible] and realize that there may be other forms or committees within ATIS that would be impacted and, as direction comes from the FCC or through NANC, ATIS does stand ready to assist.

Betty Ann Kane: Very good, thank you very much. This is just for information, to keep you up to date. We'll be sure it's sent out electronically also to members who are not here in person. Thank you very much for being here.

Steve, you had a question.

Stephen Pastorkovich: Thank you Madame Chairman. Stephen Pastorkovich, NTCA - The Rural Broadband Association. Some of you may not be aware, in addition to representing rural ILECs and CLECs, we also represent a number of rural wireless carriers that we kind of have a foot in each side of this. I want to commend the authors of the letter because it specifically emphasized that changes to both wireless and wireline procedures may be necessary, so I'm very grateful for that recognition.

One of the things I'd like to stress is that we still have a rural call completion crisis in this country. It's gotten a lot of attention from the commission, from the Hill. Some have made a bizarre claim that there is no crisis. But I just want to emphasize that as groups are looking at this, routing is very paramount because we want to make sure that any changes to procedures don't exacerbate and, if possible, help mitigate this problem. It's still a big consumer concern.

In the short-term, we've already talked a lot about LATAs today. But the third-party commercial arrangements that are mentioned, do appear to be technically feasible especially in

the short-term. However, there are a lot of rural carriers who don't have interconnection points. The large national carriers may have one or few areas where traffic is exchanged nationwide. But, in many rural areas, these kinds of arrangements don't exist because they're not economically viable. So, in those cases, there should either be exemptions or it should be clear that those wanting to establish these arrangements should be the ones bearing the cost. Otherwise, you'll have small rural carriers being required to shoulder the cost of these arrangements. They haven't been entered into because they're just too costly and it would have a negative impact for consumers.

So, our request is that the cost issues for small carriers - they operate differently, their finances are structured differently in both the landline and the wireless side - should be considered as the solutions are sought. Thank you very much.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. We'll keep that in mind if and when this is referred to the NANC. Thank you very much for that information.

Now, we will go the Future of Numbering. And yes, this letter is item 10, so the letter, the document, will be document 10 in the record. Okay, Carolee.

Carolee Hall: Hi, I'm Carolee Hall. I'm one of the Tri-Chairs of the Future of Numbering, the FoN. I serve with Dawn

Lawrence and Suzanne Addington. We had our conference call on July 1st. On the call, we had some discussions regarding the FTN for geographic issues. The subcommittee had created a white paper, "Geographic Routing for Toll-Free Services." It was shared with the NANC in December of 2014. Cover letter was submitted to the NANC and the June 4th meeting. The NANC agreed upon the wording of the cover letter and forwarded the letter and the white paper to the FCC in July, thank you, Commissioner. The item remains open on the FoN. We are scheduling for it to be closed on the October 7th meeting if there's no further action.

We also had the FTN-8: All-IP addressing; All-IP addressing subcommittee was created to define future identifiers in the support of IP industry beyond the E.164 numbering plan including M2M impacts. The subcommittee recommended it is not necessary to reconsider E.164 numbering policy until the NANP exhaust is forecasted by the NANPA to occur within approximately 15 years. According to the recommendation, the anticipated all-IP environment is very dynamic and the FoN will continue to monitor it. Oh, excuse me. The NANP exhaust was not currently anticipated until beyond 2045, so the FoN will continue to monitor the exhaust forecast in the future. If there's no further request from the NANC, we would propose that the FTN-8 be closed. The group continues to monitor nationwide 10-digit

dialing as it was agreed to be added as an open discussion item for future discussion. The next call is October 7th at 12:00 Eastern Time, all are welcome. Are there any questions?

Betty Ann Kane: Any questions? Steve, is your card up? Okay, any questions on the phone? Thank you. So, your recommendation that FTN-8 be closed, that recommendation is something that NANC needs to vote on or just accept that recommendation?

Carolee Hall: Yeah.

Betty Ann Kane: That's fine. No objection and that recommendation/request will be accepted that FTN-8 will be closed, very good, thank you.

Then, your report is item number 11.

### **Status of the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Activities**

And now we have the INC report.

Connie Hartmann: Thank you, Chairwoman Kane. I'm Connie Hartmann of iconectiv and I'm one of the co-chairs of the ATIS Industry Numbering Committee. Today, the INC will give our usual general information about the INC and also INC's activities associated with four issues as you see on slide two.

On slide three, we tell you a little bit about the INC. The Industry Numbering Committee provides an open forum to



address and resolve industry-wide issues associated with planning, administration, allocation, assignment and use of NANP numbering resources. You'll see information about the committee and how to become a member. There are some websites links there for you.

Slide four, since the last NANC meeting, the INC has held one face-to-face meeting July and two interim meetings in July and September, and the INC is meeting this week here in Washington D.C. as well.

The first issue to be reviewed is issue of 497. Previously, this issue was in tabled status, so I will give you a little bit of history on it. At NANC's request, in 2005, INC reviewed the NANC's report. VoIP service providers access requirements for NANP resource assignments and crafted changes to relevant sections within INC documents that may require modifications should the FCC issue an order addressing VoIP provider access to numbers. In June 2008, INC tabled this issue pending action by the FCC. INC moved this issue back to active status on July 10th of this year due to the release of FCC report order 1570, which you've heard much about today.

If you turn over to slide six, since we've moved this into active status the INC has identified several areas that may need changes in our guidelines. They include authorization for obtaining resources, intermediate numbers, facilities readiness,

VoIP positioning center access to p-ANIs, and CFR references and definitions. In total, the INC has identified approximately 12 sets of guidelines that will likely require updates. We have begun the review of those guidelines. We hope to complete our first full review of all 12 guidelines by the end of this week at our meeting this week.

Slide seven, INC issue 748, assess impact on numbering resources and numbering administration with transition from the PSTN to IP. Pursuant to the LNPA Working Group white paper on Non-geographic number portability, which noted that INC should address impacts to Non-geographic number assignment, numbering resource utilization forecast report impacts, and number management rules and standards. INC continues to discuss these issues. As Jackie mentioned, we did review the correspondence that was just shared from the CCA and the CTIA. As direction comes through ATIS, we will continue to take a look at that.

On slide eight, issue 788, related to 555 line number assignments. I think John Manning gave a very good readout of the activities that the NANPA is performing relative to these resources, so I will not go through those same statistics and numbers for you. As John did mention, when the NANPA completes their outreach - tomorrow is one of the deadlines for some of those responses - the INC will review and analyze the results of NANPA's findings. Then work with the NANPA to determine if any

INC guidelines should be updated and changed in accordance with that analysis.

Issue 798, add language to the p-ANI guidelines regarding documentation needed for non-exclusive nationwide FCC licenses. The RNA received the first instance of a non-exclusive 3750-3700 MHz radio service nationwide FCC license, as proof of certification and had asked the FCC for guidance. The FCC advised the RNA to request the 3650-3700 MHz service registration acceptance letter from the FCC to establish both the applicant has registered fixed sites and base stations, and the location of those sites. So, as a result of that, section 2.7 of the p-ANI guidelines was updated to direct p-ANI applicants to provide this additional documentation when using this type of FCC license.

Slide 10 just notes that that issue - 798 - has gone to final closure at the INC.

The last slide provides you relevant Web pages regarding the INC just for your reference.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. Any questions on this report? Okay, we will put that into the record. That will be document number 12.

Connie Hartmann: Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you, appreciate that.

## **Status of the ATIS All-IP Transition Initiatives**

And, the ATIS report, okay, Jackie.

Jackie Voss: Good morning. My name is Jackie Voss with ATIS. I'm going to provide a very brief update on some of the initiatives I've talked about previously related to ATIS' all-IP transition.

On slide 2, we list the major topics which you are very familiar to, I'm sure. They include the service transition, the work of the ATIS/SIP forum, IP-NNI joint task force, the Public Safety Related Applications Task Force, and the Testbed Landscape Team.

On slide 3, as a reminder, I'd like to note that our focus not only addresses standardization which is outlined in horizontal rows but also on the operational impacts of the transitioned IP. And then we're also addressing the cross-functional activities such as test beds and best practices, and doing outreach to various targeted industry groups as needed.

As part of the primary transition plan, ATIS is analyzing a basic set of services provided by the PSTN and addressing the technical issues to support these services in a mixed switch packet switch environment and eventually then in all packet switch environment.

The ATIS and SIP Forum IP-NNI Task Force is an important element of the LIP Program. The combined membership between

ATIS and the SIP Forum affords an expanded industry perspective. As a reminder earlier this year, I talked about phase one being completed with the publication of two documents, one being on routing and the other being on the protocol. And then based on these initial deliverables, phase two is now underway.

On slide 6, we talked about the various areas that are being addressed in the second phase, which are the point-point video, anti-spoofing caller ID validation mechanisms, white paper on VoIP security, and then also the effort that's going on between the SIP Forum and the test beds landscape team to support their effort and collaborate in that area.

On slide 7, the Public Safety Related Applications Task Force. I had mentioned that ATIS was in the process of wrapping up this initiative. The task force originally had been established to address the infrastructure related to public safety. It examined multiple applications that would be impacted by the transition. As a result of the effort, there were several takeaways which are listed on page 8: that available solutions can be provisioned over a broad range of IP-based media including wireless, microwave, coax, and fiber; that IP-based solutions offer generally a higher degree of inherent diversity. Many of the solutions have been already deployed by the industry. The opportunity exists for more horizontal integration of public safety applications. And then some of the

roadmap solutions are not designed to replicate the copper characteristics or emulate TDM services. In this, the public safety sector is looking to provide the same or better level of reliability in services and applications.

I also mentioned last time that the RFI had been published. That's still available on our website. A communications plan was being implemented to ensure that the findings were shared with the key stakeholders, and that there is public education, as well as education of the public safety industry manufacturers and service providers. In the near term, ATIS is going to be releasing a roadmap of IP-enabled solutions that will advance the transition of public safety applications to all IP media, products, and services. While the migration is well underway, the roadmap will take a broad view of the current public safety recommendations and identify current and future solutions available across the industry. It also provides an overview of the new capabilities that can be implemented to speed and streamline the adoption of all IP within technologies essential to saving lives and property.

As you'll see, that almost concludes my presentation if you're following through the slides. I did take the information that I've had previously on the test bed landscape team and provide that. The work on phase one has been completed. There is a proposal that will be put before the ATIS Technology and

Operations Council next week regarding the phase two activity. So should that information be accepted at the TOPS Council, I'll be able to report out on that in December. Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. Any questions on this report? Thanks, Jackie, then we'll put that on the record as document 13.

### **Report of the Internet Protocol Issue Management Groups**

And our final report is from the Internet Protocol Issue Management Group, Valerie.

Valerie Cardwell: Thanks Chairman Kane. I'm Valerie Cardwell of Comcast. I'm here representing the IP-IMG which is also chaired by Ann Berkowitz of Verizon and Gina Perini of SMS/800. We did send out a document. It's not meant to be an eye chart but in the interest of trying to save paper, it does have very small text and I do apologize. However, it was e-mailed out. Just to clarify, the purpose of this group or the mission of this group, I should say, is to try to keep track of all of the different initiatives going on across all the different industry bodies, many of which have already given

reports here of the issues that need to be addressed to get into an all IP network.

It is just a group or forum that tries to track and discuss and keep track of things that are going on in different committees. It does not make necessarily decisions or policy implications. So it is open for anyone and everyone, and the more the merrier. That's how we learn about the different initiatives going on across the different areas. Our next meeting, we do meet bi-monthly. Our next meeting is on November 12th at 11:00 AM. I'd be happy to send out any of the detailed information. So feel free though to take a look at what we've sent out here.

Again, we should just recap all of the different initiatives going on. The foundation of this, just to get some context because we do have some new members here, the format of this is based on the items that were originally identified in a presentation by the former CTO of the FCC, Henning Schulzrinne. He gave a presentation and outlined very specific areas that would need to be addressed to get to an all IP network. Thanks to the leadership of Rosemary Emmer and of course, Mary Retka. I can't thank her enough. They sat down and kind of went through that presentation and broke it up into different areas. That's kind of been the foundation of how we've been approaching



this issue. So we are, again, open for any more input and ideas and suggestions in membership at any time. Thank you.

Betty Anne Kane: Thank you. Thank you, Valerie. The specific issues that the commission in the June 27th order identified that they want the NANC to comment on. Would you take a look in this whether you're tracking all of those and who's doing work on those?

Valerie Cardwell: Sure. Will do. Yes.

Betty Anne Kane: We don't want to duplicate anything. Thank you.

Valerie Cardwell: Thank you.

Betty Anne Kane: Rosemary.

Rosemary Emmer: Rosemary Emmer with Sprint. I'm not sure if this is something that should maybe fall under the IMG or maybe this is just my problem and it shouldn't go anywhere. I don't know, but I'm bringing this up because I have this question. Maybe there's someone on the bridge that can help me.

In the June 4th NANC meeting, one of the presentation topics that Henning Schulzrinne discussed was his student's prototype. It was on page 7 of the transcript. I'm kind of paraphrasing what he said and I hope that I get it right. He said it was an exploratory activity where a customer would log in with a previously approved pseudo-OCN. It sounded like in three regions - the Northwest, South, and Northern. Anyway,

they were working with three servers. He said that numbers locked in the system so only one entity could access it at any given time. He said it was going to simulate a PIN-based porting model. So the customer would get a PIN, and when the gaining provider was ready to accept the customer, they would use the PIN to make the OCN change. That was the basics of what he was talking about.

Someone passed to me an email. I think it was from the modern distro, from Henning that says that he suspects legacy databases would continue to exist as interfaces, making it like a super database, largely invisible to those carriers who further remains as is. I'm unclear as to what kind of super database it is and is it tied to this prototype that he was talking about. Is anything tied to this prototype? I've asked several people. I'm very interested in the prototype and where that might be going. I don't understand if that's supposed to be an interface someday that -- I mean, has it grown since June? Has it not? I don't know where to have these kind of discussions from an industry perspective. I did ask at the Olympia working group because that's one of the groups that I attend from time to time, and no one really knew. Is there something in the IMG?

First of all, is there any interest in talking about this kind of thing? Should we ask the modern or the ITF - I don't

know what it's called - IETF to start providing information to the NANC through the IMG or should we do like when Henning came the last time and gave us the presentation in person? Should they come here? I don't really know what the process should be, but I still have this question. There has been some time and I don't know where it can be tracked. That's it. Thank you.

Betty Anne Kane: Mary.

Richard Shockey: Madame Chairman, this is Rick Shockey again from the SIP Forum. I can answer her questions.

Betty Anne Kane: Okay. I'd recognize Mary Retka first then I'll get back to you. Go ahead, Mary.

Richard Shockey: Okay.

Mary Retka: Thank you. I'm Mary Retka from CenturyLink. I agree with Rosemary. I do believe I recall from our previous discussion that Dr. Schulzrinne was planning to keep us up to date on the work of IETF as it relates to this issue, and specifically the modern group. I know Richard knows the ins and outs of IETF much better than I, so my expectation was that he would perhaps be invited to our meetings on an ongoing basis. I would hope that maybe we could get back to that so that we could be sure we're staying in sync with what's going on there.

Betty Anne Kane: Yes, a good point. Yes, go ahead on the phone.

Richard Shockey: Madame Chairman. Oh yes. I can give you a relative --

Betty Anne Kane: I'm sorry. Identify yourself again for our transcriber.

Richard Shockey: This is Richard Shockey, the chairman of the SIP Forum. Can you hear me all right?

Betty Anne Kane: Yes, we can hear you fine.

Richard Shockey: I can give you a relative status on what progress or a lack of progress is currently being made in this area. As of this particular point, there was activities started in the Internet Engineering Task Force under the AGS or what's called the modern working group or for a modern numbering. That activity has been chartered. As of this date, there has been no activity or progress as to defining what a successor numbering database would look like or to either supplement and/or replace the impact or the work at this particular time. There are, shall we say, some disputes about what the scope of this particular work should ultimately look like. It is presumed that a successor database query response mechanism would parallel the PSTN transition and transition to all IP.

But there's really nothing to report at this particular time. The presumption is that the existing numbering database structures would remain in place for quite some time. We outlined a great deal of this effort in the joint SIP Forum-ATIS

in a report which remained available to the commission in our second document on IP routing. As for the actual methodology to track this activity, certainly ATIS and the SIP Forum can continue to update the NANC on this on an ongoing basis. We're well aware of what is being discussed or is not being discussed at this particular time. I can answer some other particular questions if any of the members have them at this time.

Betty Anne Kane: Mary.

Mary Retka: Mary Retka from CenturyLink. Thanks, Richard. I think what Rosemary was looking for was the relationship between the prototype that Dr. Schulzrinne did with his graduate students and where does that fit. Does that go in through IETF modern? Is that something he's expecting the industry to work on? Where does that fit?

Richard Shockey: The prototype is being developed in Columbia University. There may well actually be two or more prototypes in theory. I'm aware a major service provider is also looking at creating a laboratory environment to -- I don't want to name names at this particular point since it's extremely preliminary. The goals and requirements have yet to be defined one way or the other. It is anticipated that at least some limited ideas will be presented through the NNI task force at some particular point in time, and then moved through INC to the

NANC as development prevail. But it is very, very, very early at this time.

Betty Anne Kane: Thank you. One final with Rosemary. Go ahead, you still have it. So I think you got your answer that nothing's really happened yet. But I want to just pick up also as on Mary's suggestion that we don't know what's going on. I'm having Henning Schulzrinne to continue to report to us as to the activities that he's involved in. There are so many moving parts in this whole IP transition and the geographic numbering, et cetera, that the Issue Management Group needs to keep on track of all of that. I mean, there's so many things you are keeping track of as to what's going on there. Again, track everything unless we know what people are doing. Yes?

Rosemary Emmer: Rosemary Emmer with Sprint again. I need to take my own action item to figure out where is the SIP, the modern IETF, the NNI. They're not new acronyms as far as this meeting, but they're newer at least to me. We do have internal meetings where there's folks that attend some of these meetings where I'm hearing statuses here and there and what's going on. I think I would just need to take an action as many others maybe do to find out where do they fit? I don't know where the modern reports to, for instance. I don't know if that's an ATIS forum. I don't know if IETF is an ATIS forum or NNI. I don't know. So I guess, number one, there seems to be a lot of other groups out

there now with the inception of IP and others where we're talking about numbering-related or reporting-related issues.

When we started the IMG a while back, I thought that this - - because I felt the same chaos back then. I thought, well, we have the IMG that we formed. Everything will filter there. We'll have an idea. Well, now there's even so many more. The IMG is doing a great job tracking and having this information is great. So I appreciate Richard Shockey. Thanks for being on the bridge and I appreciate having the conversation. But going forward, it would be really nice if we could somehow tie this. Anything porting or number-related, tie it together in the same place. And so I don't know how to make that happen, but thank you for listening.

Richard Shockey: You're right to be confused. Frankly, even those of us who are the engineers are confused. This is actually nothing new. But in terms of reporting through the normal industry structures, whether it would be ATIS or the NANC itself, it's too early. It's too early because some very, very fundamental decisions need to be made about protocol. What does this super database look like? We have been discussing a more distributed environment that they would look very much like white spaces, for instance, that the FCC knows a great deal about. It would be distributed exactly what the carrier

response mechanism who would have access to read/write mechanisms, one or the other.

The impacts of these on service providers, because there's a tremendous investment right now in existing operational support and business support systems to deal with numbering hasn't been a draft at all and would be a significant financial impact to the industry as a whole and those considerations have not necessarily been addressed or a requirement put forward. That some of us in the industry do not understand. But we do have a complex problem here, which is the IP transition is going forward. All IP network-to-network interfaces are proceeding with all deliberate speed, I might add. This is potentially one solution to a larger issue maybe five years down the road, maybe ten. We don't know. We don't know at this particular point.

Betty Anne Kane: Thank you, Richard. I think I'm going to wind this up. We're all probably getting a little hungry. I think the issue was not what are the solutions going to be, what the protocols are going to be, but just we set up the Issue Management Group in really recognizing that there was going to be all of these different groups of people and other things working on different parts of it. We've just identified some additional things that we want to track, if we can. Then I will talk with Henning about it. He's the central person on some of



these. To try to get a regular report from him is part of our meetings. I still see two things left. Go ahead.

Ann Berkowitz: Ann from Verizon. I'll make this quick. I'll cue this up maybe for the next meeting. When we looked at the Information Management Group, it was sort of manage the different entities that are out there. It may be time to have a NANC group focusing on IP transition, whether it's an existing group or a new working group as we move to or assuming a nationwide number portability is going to come our way with the chairman of the next meeting, to really care for the numbering and work with the ATIS groups that are out there. We can discuss that maybe at the meeting, but it seems like this has come up a lot and there's a lot of group. We are the numbering authority. Maybe that belongs under the NANC and that will include all the various stakeholders that may not be part of ATIS or some of the groups.

Betty Anne Kane: We'll look at that, yeah, whether we need another group or just utilizing. But there are only so many of you all in terms of groups, et cetera. Now what I'm going to -- go ahead, Mary. Then I'll finish up.

Mary Retka: Mary Retka from CenturyLink. I just want to provide some clarification because some of us who've been involved in this for a long time, we got to go back to the where-did-we-begin. After the FCC workshop on the test bed idea

and the FCC's order that said within a year that would be determined, which has sort of languished. The then CTO, Dr. Schulzrinne, chose to work the issue in the IETF area. That's how you started out with the STIR proposal and the modern group that is now looking at that proposal. Many of us have been monitoring that e-mail string. So that's not an atmosphere of that's how IETF.

They are continuing that effort meanwhile because the SIP Forum - and Richard is involved with that - with ATIS has merged together to do the IP network-to-network interconnection piece, the IP-NNI. There's been a lot of carryover between the two groups because the same people are involved in both. And the IP-NNI has come out with the interconnection profile and done the routing piece of it, and now is looking further as Jackie reported into the other aspects of this. So there's an ATIS piece as well as the industry group of the IETF group, the engineers, as Richard mentioned. So those pieces. That's why it's so important for us to keep monitoring through Dr. Schulzrinne as to what his other efforts are, because I think when you look at things like the prototype, they were a bit outside the scope of IETF and outside the scope that we had anticipated from the workshop that was done way back in March of 2014. Chairman Kane.

Betty Anne Kane: Thank you. Yes, Valerie.

Valerie Cardwell: Just as a closing comment. I will take as an action item to reach out to these different other industry groups - IETF, MODERN - and see if we can engage them in the IMG activity to start informally trying to tap into and know what they're doing. Thank you.

Betty Anne Kane: Thank you. We appreciate that very much. And so your report will be document 14 for the transcript of the meeting.

### **Summary of Action Items**

The next item on the agenda, very, very briefly is just a summary of the action items. At the beginning, I referred to the issue of the hoarding and the brokering of non-toll free numbers to the INC to hopefully give us that interim report in December. And because the commission has asked for a report back in 180 days, I would look to schedule a full NANC consideration of the recommendations or what the INC will have looked at, at our February and March meeting whenever we set a date for that. And then we also did agree to refer a clarification of best practice to the FCC for the additional language to be added in.

### **Public Comments and Participation**

The other action item I'm going to do is ask the chairs of the working groups to take a look at the specific request from the FCC in paragraph 60 of the internet order or the June 22nd order. Just get back to me and identify which of those issues your group is working on so I could see if we've got any gaps. And then I'll be reaching out to the chairs and co-chairs of the working groups so that we get a schedule. We get a kind of tactical plan so that we're in a position to have some things before the NANC at our December 1st meeting. Is there any public comment? Yes. Identify yourself please.

James Falvey: I'm Jim Falvey with Eckert Seamans. I'm here on behalf of the LNPA Alliance. I was listening to Tim's report on the NAPM. It's really helpful in terms of some of the public outreach that's coming out. I wanted to understand better. I've seen references. You might be in the best position to answer these questions to an SOW between NAPM and the transition oversight manager. I've also seen a reference to a letter of engagement. You were talking a little bit about an MSA. I wasn't clear on whether that was the MSA that you're negotiating with iconectiv or that there are documents. So if you could maybe just walk through what's out there. And just as on the side, then I'll give the mic to you, the LNPA Alliance is very interested in making these documents publicly accessible.

The line item initiative to collect from all carriers to pay for the transition oversight manager is moving forward. So we'd like to know what's out there and then rather than bounce back and forth, we'd be interested in --

Betty Anne Kane: So your specific question is, is the scope of work and the agreement with the transitions manager a public document?

James Falvey: That's right. What are the various documents and do you expect anything in public?

Tim Kagele: Let me try to answer Jim's questions. This is Tim Kagele with the NAPM, LLC Comcast. We have a number of agreements. The first one is the engagement letter that Jim referred to for the transition oversight manager PWC. That is not a public agreement. So that is not available. We do not publish that agreement. But that agreement does bind the terms of the NAPM, LLC and PWC to provide the duties as described of the transition oversight as directed in the FCC's March order. So that agreement exists. It's complete and it is executed.

The MSA that Jim referred to is the Master Services Agreement between the NAPM, LLC and the selected LNPA - iconectiv. That agreement is in progress. It will cover all seven impact regions. As I said, that agreement is in progress. It is not yet concluded.

Currently, that is not a public agreement. When the negotiation of that agreement is concluded between the parties, there's a process that gets followed. Part of that process involves the NAPM member companies' approval of that agreement, as well as iconectiv's approval of that agreement. And then the approved agreement by the parties will then be forwarded to the FCC for their review and ultimate approval. So that's kind of the process of the Master Services Agreement.

Let's see, are there any other agreements that I didn't mention? Thanks, Jim, and good to see you by the way after so many years. The SOW that Jim mentions will be between the NAPM, LLC and the incumbent LNPA, Neustar. That SOW will address transition services. Those services are what would be deemed above and beyond normal business-as-usual activities for number porting. So that's different than the current MSA that the NAPM, LLC has with the incumbent LNPA. That will be a very specific subset of activities that are limited in scope. Jim, did that help?

James Falvey: Yes, very helpful.

Betty Anne Kane: Thank you. Thank you very much.

Tim Kagele: Any other questions on agreements while I'm up here?

Betty Anne Kane: No. Okay. Thank you.

Tim Kagele: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Chairman Kane.

Betty Anne Kane: Yeah, go ahead.

Erin Fitzgerald: Hi. My name is Erin Fitzgerald. I'm the assistant regulatory council for the Rural Wireless Association. And so I wanted to thank Shawn and Matt with CTIA for their discussion on the non-geographic porting issues. I also wanted to echo Steve's points about cost. And as this issue develops, depending on what the chairman decides to do as you folks take up this issue, we're concerned that any new rules or procedures, they do need to consider rural carriers' cost structures, and also the cost of any new commercial agreements in the interim solution really should be borne by those seeking the arrangements. So I want to echo Steve's point. Thank you all.

### **Other Business**

Betty Anne Kane: Thank you very much for your input. There being no further business, our next meeting is Tuesday, December 1st. I will be before that meeting, sending out a proposed schedule of our quarterly meetings for 2016. Again, I thank all of you for agreeing to continue to serve on the NANC. Welcome our new members. We will have, I think, quite a full agenda for December. We're a little over our usual. We've gotten down to two

hours this time. We might want to just plan a little bit for December that we might have a longer meeting. These reports coming in, we're going to be making recommendations, et cetera. Certainly, we have a very busy year ahead of us for 2016 with both the ongoing work and these new reports and recommendations that we're being tasked with and probably will be tasked with. Thank you all. The meeting is adjourned. It is 11:21 PM. 1:21, I'm sorry. 1:21 if I look at it. Yes, I wish it was 11:21. 1:21.

[End of file]

[End of transcript]