

**North American Numbering Council
Meeting Transcript
December 1, 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. Alea Christofferson | ATL Communications |
| 3. Mark Lancaster | AT&T Inc. |
| 4. Greg Rogers | Bandwidth.com, Inc. |
| 5. Mary Retka | CenturyLink |
| 6. Valerie R. Cardwell | Comcast Corporation |
| 7. Rebecca Thompson | Competitive Carriers Association |
| 8. Alan Hill | CompTel |
| 9. Jose Jimenez | Cox Communications |
| 10. Matthew Gerst | CTIA |
| 11. David Greenhaus | 800 Response Information Services, LLC |
| 12. Alan Hill | Incompass |
| 13. Paul Kjellander/Carolee Hall | NARUC, Idaho |
| 14. Hon. Karen Charles Peterson | NARUC, Massachusetts |
| 15. Hon. Crystal Rhoades/Cullin Robbins | NARUC, Nebraska |
| 16. Wayne Jortner | NASUCA |
| 17. Jerome Candelaria | NCTA |
| 18. Brian Ford | NTCA - The Rural Broadband Assn. |
| 19. Richard Shockey | SIP Forum |
| 20. Rosemary Emmer | Sprint |
| 21. Michele K. Thomas | T-Mobile USA |
| 22. Thomas Soroka, Jr. | USTA |
| 23. Ann Berkowitz | Verizon |

Special Members (Non-voting):

- | | |
|----------------|-----------------|
| John Manning | NANPA |
| Amy Putnam | PA |
| Faith Marcotte | Welch & Company |
| Jackie Voss | ATIS |

Commission Employees:

Marilyn Jones, Designated Federal Officer (DFO)

Ann Stevens, Deputy Chief, Competition Policy Division
Michelle Sclater, Competition Policy Division
Matthew S. DelNero, Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau
Carmell Weathers, Competition Policy Division

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

IV. Documents Introduced.

- (1) Agenda
- (2) NANC Meeting Transcript – September 30, 2015
- (3) North American Numbering Plan Administration (NANPA) Report to the NANC
- (4) National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator (PA) Report to the NANC
- (5) Report of the Toll Free Number Administrator (TFNA)
- (6) Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG) Report
- (7) North American Numbering Plan Billing and Collection (NANP B&C) Agent Report
- (8) Billing and Collection Working Group (B&C WG) Report to the NANC
- (9) North American Portability Management (NAPM LLC) Report to the NANC
- (10) Future of Numbering (FoN) Working Group Report to the NANC
- (11) Status of the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) activities
- (12) ATIS Report
- (13) Report of the Internet Protocol Issue Management Group (IMG)

V. Table of Contents.

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Announcements and Recent News | 6 |
| 2. Approval of Meeting Transcript | 9 |
| 3. Report of the North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA) | 10 |
| 4. Report of the National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator (PA) | 20 |
| 5. Report of the Toll Free Number Administrator (TFNA) | 28 |
| 6. Report of the Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG) | 39 |
| 7. Report of the North American Numbering Plan Billing and Collection Agent Report (NANP B&C) | 43 |
| 8. Report of the Billing and Collection Working Group (B&C WG) | 46 |
| 9. Report of the North American Portability Management (NAPM) LLC | 47 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 10. Report of the Local Number Portability Administration Working Group (LNPA WG) | 58 |
| 11. Report of the Future of Numbering (FoN) Working Group | 88 |
| 12. Status of the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Activities | 93 |
| 13. Status of the ATIS All-IP Transition Initiatives | 100 |
| 14. Summary of Action Items | 103 |
| 15. Public Comments and Participation | 129 |
| 16. Other Business | 136 |

VI. Summary of the Meeting

Betty Ann Kane: Good morning. Good morning, coming out on this rainy morning. I'm going to call to order the quarterly meeting of the North American Numbering Council. For the record, today is Tuesday December 1, 2015. We're meeting in the Federal Communications Commission's hearing room at 445-12th Street, South West. You have before you an agenda and there were a couple of changes on the agenda just in terms of who is making the presentations. When we get to those, I'll announce them, but I think we will start with going around for the record who is here. And then we have an unusually large number of people I've been informed on our phone bridge, about 35 people. This must be the meeting of the week for everyone to listen in on, although we have seen a trend over the last two meetings of

more people being on the phone bridge. So again, for the record, I'm Betty Ann Kane, chairman of the D.C. Public Service Commission but here in my capacity as chairman of NANC.

Greg Rogers: Greg Rogers for Bandwidth.

Betty Ann Kane: And let me remind you again for new people, the fellow in the booth there turns on the microphone when you're going to speak. So just wait a couple of seconds, like count to five and then speak. Go ahead.

Mary Retka: Mary Retka, CenturyLink.

Valerie Cardwell: Valerie Cardwell, Comcast.

Rebecca Thompson: Rebecca Thompson, Competitive Carriers Association.

Jose Jimenez: Jose Jimenez, Cox Communications.

Matthew Gerst: Matt Gerst with CTIA.

David Greenhaus: David Greenhaus, 800 Response Information Services.

Paul Kjellander: Paul Kjellander with the Idaho Commission.

Karen Charles Peterson: Karen Charles Peterson, Massachusetts.

Crystal Rhoades: Crystal Rhoades, Nebraska.

Jerome Candelaria: Jerome Candelaria, NCTA.

Brian Ford: Brian Ford, NTCA, the Rural Broadband Association.

Richard Shockey: Richard Shockey, SIP Forum.

Rosemary Emmer: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint.

Michele Thomas: Michele Thomas, T-Mobile.

Ann Berkowitz: Ann Berkowitz, Verizon.

Marilyn Jones: Marilyn Jones, FCC.

Matth DelNero: Matt DelNero, the FCC, Wireline Competition Bureau.

Betty Ann Kane: And I'm going to ask the people on the bridge, I know there are a lot of you, if you would identify yourselves. Try not to talk over each person. I'm also going to ask you if you would send an email to carmellweathers@fcc.gov indicating that you are on the bridge participating that way so that we have all the names, for the record, your name is spelled correctly, et cetera. Okay.

Annie Johnson: Annie Johnson [phonetic], Minnesota Department of Commerce.

Aelea Christofferson: Aelea Christofferson, ATL Communications.

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

Carolee Hall: Carolee Hall, Idaho PUC staff.

Rebecca Beaton: Rebecca Beaton, Washington State PUC staff.

Suzanne Addington: Suzanne Addington, Sprint and FoN Working Group co-chair.

Christopher Hepburn: Christopher Hepburn, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission.

Pete Young: Pete Young [phonetic], Wisconsin staff.

Cullin Robbins: Cullin Robbins, Nebraska PSC.

Helen Mickiewicz: Helen Mickiewicz, NASUCA, Office of Rate Payer Advocates at the California Public Utilities Commission.

Mark Lancaster: Mark Lancaster, AT&T.

Linda Hyman: Linda Hyman, Pooling Administration.

Alan Hill: Alan Hill, Incompass.

Cathy: Cathy [indiscernible], Charter.

Steve Pastorkovich: Steve Pastorkovich, NTCA, the Rural Broadband Association.

Cathy Capita: Cathy Capita, T-Mobile U.S.

Wayne Jortner: Wayne Jortner, Vermont Public Service Department with NASUCA.

Ron Steen: Ron Steen, AT&T and LNPA Working Group tri-chair.

Michael Scott: Michael Scott, Massachusetts DTC staff.

Gary Remondino: Gary Remondino, Wireline Competition Bureau.

Betty Ann Kane: Anybody else? Okay. Thank you very much.

Announcements and Recent News

Announcements and recent news, Marilyn, do you have anything to update us on?

Marilyn Jones: Just one short announcement about the upcoming NANC meetings for 2016. Carmell is working on those dates now and we should have you updated by the end of the week. She will send out an email out to all the NANC members.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. Thank you very much. Next, we are very pleased to have with us, Matt DelNero, who is the chief of the Wireline Competition Bureau, the primary part of the FCC that we advise for some remarks and welcome. Thank you for coming.

Matt DelNero: Thank you for having me, Chairman Kane. Thanks to you and to the rest of the NANC for venturing over here to the Portals Building. I'm impressed by the busy agenda that you have ahead of you today, I think about four hours of pretty intense work and, fortunately, you won't be distracted by the desire to go outside today, perfect day for a good NANC meeting.

My purpose in stopping by is really to express my thanks to all of you. And especially, I'd like to start with my thanks and the bureau's thanks to Chairman Kane who has served as chair for over six years. This is the beginning of her seventh year as chair, and for her efforts to lead the NANC in providing recommendations to the commission for the fair and efficient administration of numbering. I'd also like to acknowledge her policy advisor, Cary Hinton, who in addition to I know being her

right hand person at the D.C. Commission, also is invaluable in his work in helping Chairman Kane on advising us on numbering matters. And then, I thank each NANC member and alternates and those who worked on NANC's many working groups. I have learned in my six months or so in this position, as chief for the Wireline Bureau, just how important this advisory committee is to us in achieving our mission.

Really going back to your charter over 20 years ago, we greatly value your advice on the efficient and impartial administration of the North American Numbering Plan and on numbering issues in general, which continue to be very important and occupy a meaningful role in our agenda. Certainly, not an understatement to say that numbering today is as important as it was when the NANC was chartered 20 years ago. I know you devote many hours to this issue. We do appreciate it.

Looking ahead, I'm very pleased that the NANC has been rechartered for another two years. I expect it will be as today will be a busy day for you; these next two years will be very busy. The Wireline Bureau looks forward to working with you on issues as diverse as beyond going LNPA transition, which is critical to us; geographic considerations that arise from porting telephone numbers to and from interconnected VoIP providers; and, wireless nongeographic number portability, which we recently teed up for the NANC in the letter to Chairman Kane

a couple of weeks back. These issues are very important to the commission, to the chairman, and to the bureau, and have a real impact on the American public. We look forward to and value your input. Again, thank you and have a great meeting today.

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

Approval of Meeting Transcript

The next on our agenda is the approval of the transcript that was sent out electronically, the transcript from our last meeting in September. I sent out to everyone some time ago or recently, I should say. Are there any questions, additions, or corrections to that? Mary?

Mary Retka: Mary Retka, CenturyLink. I sent some corrections to Carmell on several pages. I know that I talked to her before the meeting and I know she had them, but I didn't get them in before she'd sent out the transcript. So I just updated especially some of the phonetic spelling items and some of the name items. So, hopefully, that can be a part of the transcript, for the record.

Betty Ann Kane: These are technical corrections and such. Thank you for doing that.

Jerome Candelaria: I have what I believe is a minor technical correction, and I can forward it or provide it right now.

Betty Ann Kane: Provide it for the record.

Jerome Candelaria: First line of the first paragraph on page 60. Rather than "we are now phased in," it should say "we are now phasing."

Betty Ann Kane: Phasing. Okay, thank you. It's always a challenge to get everybody's words down right, those of us who deal with transcripts all the time. So, with those corrections or modifications, any other concerns about the transcript, anyone on the phone? Considered it approved by unanimous consent as corrected.

Report of the North American Numbering Plan (NANPA)

Now, we have a lot of reports today. We have a very busy agenda and a couple of new items also. So let's start with the report of the North American Numbering Plan Administrator. John Manning, come up. Yes, thank you very much. The agenda will be Item 1, the transcript will be Item 2, and this report will be Item Number 3 for the record of the meeting.

John Manning: Good morning, everybody. Again, my name is John Manning, director of the North American Numbering Plan Administration group. This morning in my report, I'll give you an update on central office code assignment activity. I'll also update you on area code relief planning activities and update you on the two outstanding NANPA change orders, where we stand with both of those.

On page 2 of my report, at the very top, on CO code activity for January 1 through October 31st of this year, we've assigned a little over 3,100 codes. A total of 198 codes have been returned or reclaimed. If you look in at this on an analyzed perspective, we're looking to assign somewhere in the neighborhood of 3,700 to 3,800 codes this year, which is what we've basically been forecasting since about the middle of 2015. You'll see that the total assignments for 2015 will be higher than what we experienced in 2014. It got a little bit higher than what we've had the previous three or four years. Those assignments, as a result, we're also higher than in previous years and we're seeing the denials and returns reclamations are slightly lower compared to previous years. Just so you know, at the time of this meeting, we didn't have the November figures, but we will assign another 300 codes in November, and the expectations are, again, that will lead us to about 3,700 to 3,800 codes this year.

With regard to area code relief planning, several of these items I've touched on before in previous reports. Let me just go through them briefly. First of all, the 843, 845 overlays were implemented on October the 19th. That's down in South Carolina. Next up, starting really in 2016 is our Ohio 614, where we will have an overlay there. Effective date of that overlay will be February 27th of next year. Followed up in

April, we'll see an additional area code added to the Alberta, Canada, 403, 587, 780 overlay complex. Then in May, we'll see the 336 be overlaid with the 743. And then in June, again, back in Canada, we'll add an additional code to the overlay complex of 226 and 519.

On page 3, continuing this basically on a month-by-month basis. In July of 2016, we'll see the implementation of the 631 overlaid with the 934 NPA. And then October of 2016, the 317 in Indiana will be overlaid with this 463 area code, again, in October 17th of next year.

Finally, a project that's been out there for a while as well, in 2017, the 315 will be overlaid with the 680 area code. The effective date for that overlay is March 11, 2017.

Now, the remaining items here are kind of updates since our last meeting. New York 212, 646, on November the 19th, the New York Public Service Commission did approve the addition of a new area code to the 212, 646 overlay complex. The new area code will cover the same geographic area as a 212, 646. And we will be conducting an implementation meeting in the next few weeks to establish a time schedule for the new NPA. I'll pause here now. You noticed I'm saying new NPA and I haven't said specifically what the area code is. We coordinate with the State Public Service Commission so that they can put out a press release, and since this activity just took place right before the

Thanksgiving holidays, they have not put out their press release. So until they do so, we will kind of withhold that information, but you should expect to see what the new area code is shortly.

California, 323, if you recall, this is a unique situation where we're having a 213 and 323 area codes collectively serve the same geographic area, where today presently, they serve separate areas. Public meetings were conducted in September, and an application for relief was filed with the California PUC on November the 24th. The expectations are, they will act on that application, we'll get a decision, and then we can put together an implementation plan.

Texas, 210, October 6th, we filed a relief petition with the Public Utility Commission of Texas recommending an all services overlay. I probably said this before, but 210 is a unique area code. And the fact that it's an area code, it serves one rate center. So an overlay was really the only option here.

Two new projects that just started up as a result of some forecasting we did, some area code forecast changes that we made some time in September, the California 805. On October the 21st, we conducted a relief planning meeting since the exhaust forecast for this particular area code had been advanced and the industry will be recommending an overlay. On the following day,

NANPA conducted a relief planning meeting for the 916 area code. In addition, similar to 805, an overlay will be recommended. And Pennsylvania, 717, on the 23rd, NANPA filed a relief petition on behalf of the industry, recommended an all services overlay of the 717 area code. That was a very busy week for us here at NANPA. Idaho, 208, on November the 2nd, the Idaho Public Utilities Commission approved an all services overlay of the 208. We assigned the 986 area code to be that overlay code. And we will be conducting a relief planning meeting here in December to establish the schedule for implementation of the new NPA. I'll pause here for any questions on either the central office code activity or the area code relief activity plan for the next 12 months.

Betty Ann Kane: Jose?

Jose Jimenez: Jose Jimenez with Cox Communications. I could not help myself. I'm just curious, do we know what percentage of our country, either geographic or by population, is already covered by overlays?

John Manning: I don't have a percentage. I can come up with the number or the quantity of overlays that have been implemented within the U.S., as well as in Canada. But I don't have a percent to say X percent of the population that dwells within a particular overlay complex. I don't have that information, no.

Jose Jimenez: How many parts of the country are covered by a single area code anymore?

John Manning: Again, I can give you the quantities of states and the area codes that are single area codes. I don't have that right here in front of me. But if you desire, we can put that together. And if you need an answer right away, if you look at the annual report, the NANPA annual report, we list in there all the overlay complexes, all the single overlay, a single NPA as well, that information is there but I can certainly put something together if necessary.

Betty Ann Kane: I think the information is coming.

John Manning: Well, are they. Or I can bring this computer up. Now, I have to pause here because I can't understand what I'm reading here.

Jose Jimenez: I can take this offline.

John Manning: Okay.

Betty Ann Kane: It is an interesting question because we keep getting reports each quarterly meeting. It would be interesting if you're going to share the information that Brent just provided. But also maybe for our next meeting, we could get some maps and overlays that would visually show where there are a couple of states that are still single, Maine. I don't know what else.

John Manning: Montana, Wyoming, Rhode Island, Delaware, et cetera, et cetera, there's a number of them out there. What Brent - Brent Struthers is also with the NeuStar - has provided to me is some information that may have been shared at a previous meeting. I think it may have been at --

Male Voice: NARUC.

John Manning: NARUC, thank you. The 164 geographic area codes have 1 plus 10 or 10-digit dialing. So the majority of those, if not all, the vast majority are going to be overlays. The 203 geographic area codes have 7-digit dialing. Those would be your single NPAs. And of the 37 geographic area codes in Canada, all but four a part of an overlay complex.

Betty Ann Kane: So it's almost just about 50/50, yeah.

John Manning: Yeah.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay.

John Manning: It's getting close.

Jose Jimenez: Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: Any other questions? Yeah. You want to repeat the numbers? John, we've had a request to repeat those numbers, the numbers that have 10-digit and the ones that have 7-digit.

John Manning: [Indiscernible].

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. Sorry.

John Manning: I know the news anchor is about here. The 164 geographic area codes have 1 plus 10 or 10-digit dialing, 203 geographic area codes have 7-digit dialing. And of the 37 geographic area codes in Canada, all but four are a part of an overlay complex. And the information that just suddenly came into my ear indicated that we have provided a similar type of data at the industry numbering committee about a year ago and there's roughly around 40 percent of the geographic area covered by an overlay.

Jose Jimenez: Thank you.

John Manning: I didn't know I'd have all that information right here in the head, did you?

Betty Ann Kane: Very good.

John Manning: Amazing.

Betty Ann Kane: Any other questions? Okay. Continue with your report.

John Manning: Okay. Proceeding on to page 4, let me update you on the two NANPA change orders. The first change order is just a reminder. It's a moratorium on 555 line number assignments about line to you [sounds like] and here in the report, what's contained in the change order. But since the publication of our planning letter in July, NANPA has attempted to reach nearly 5,000 now. Actually, it's over 5,000 line number assignments. These are attempting to reach the assignees

of nearly 5,000 line number assignments. Approximately, 2,600 555 line numbers have been returned or reclaimed. Assignees of 43 line numbers have refused to return their assignments to NANPA, even though the numbers have never been placed in service. To date, no 555 line number assignee has informed NANPA of their 555 number is in service. And as we informed the INC earlier or just a few weeks ago, we're going to continue with our efforts to communicate to all assignees of the nearly 8,000 555 line numbers. And by that, that's phone, fax, email, phone calls, whatever we've had to try to reach out and communicate with these organizations or individuals. And upon completion of this outreach, which we hoped to have done in the first quarter of next year, we will submit to the INC a proposal as to what to do with the 555 line numbers resource.

NANPA change order 3, this is some updates to the NANPA administration system NAS-NRUF, Numbering Resource Utilization/Forecast updates, and then this particular change order we were suggesting some modifications to the Form 502, the form you use to submit utilization forecast data on a semiannual basis to NANPA. One of the items that we were proposing to include in this change order was the inclusion of an interconnected VoIP as a service provider type on the Form 502 so that those interconnected VoIP providers could be able to uniquely identify themselves as such. In follow up

conversations with the FCC, it's been determined that this modification is a change to the form, and as a result it must be approved by the Office of Management and Budget. Now, since the Form 502 is due for renewal in June of next year, we're expecting that along with this renewal, we'll also get approval of adding this particular item to the Form 502.

Now, that will impact the implementation of this change order. Number one, we have to actually make the system changes that are necessary to accept the modified Form 502. But because the form is being revised, we need to give carriers sufficient lead time to make whatever changes are necessary in their systems in order to be able to create or produce the Form 502 that is ultimately submitted to NANPA. So, the likelihood is that this change order, even if approved in the springtime of next year, most likely, it will not be implemented until after the NRUF cycle known as the August 1st, 2016 cycle, so that we give ample opportunity not only for the system changes but for the notifications that are required. That's an update on both the change order number 2 and change order 3. Are there any questions on those two change orders? Okay.

Betty Ann Kane: Anyone on the phone? Okay. All right.

John Manning: Just a final note on a couple of items here, we did produce the third quarter NANPA newsletter. It came out in early October. Our NAP, NPA, and 5XX Exhaust Projections

were published on the website and notification distributed at the end of October. Just this morning, we reminded all the carriers of the upcoming NRUF submission cycle that starts on January 1st and it concludes on February 1st.

The semiannual CIC reports covering the period of July 1 through December 31st, the second half of this year, they will need to be submitted to NANPA after January 1 but before February 1 of next year. And the last page is the report of NPA's exhaust in the next 36 months, just a quick summary of those area codes and current activity underway in terms of the relief of those NPAs. Finally, any additional questions or items? Very good.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you.

Report of the National Thousands Block Pooling

Administrator (PA)

Our next report will be on the Thousands-Block Pooling Administrator. This written report will be Item Number 4, for the record.

Amy Putnam: This is Amy Putnam of the National Pooling Administrator. Pooling is fine, I have to say that. If we look at the first chart of the many charts that we provide here, the first line of the first chart. We didn't have the traditional pre-holiday upturn in the fall this year. We are clearly drifting downward in the number of Part 3s process. In fact, in

November, we had about 7,300. But nevertheless, as of late November, we had processed approximately somewhere between 135,000 and 136,000 Part 3s for the year. And last year, which was a record year, we processed 139,000. So, we are headed to another record year for processing Part 3s. The remainder of the figures in that chart is well within range.

On the next chart, the p-ANI summary data, although October is kind of low, as a teaser for our next meeting in November, we had over 14,000 Part 3s for p-ANI. That was a data cleanup. We'll have the exact number by the next NANC meeting. Again, the other numbers on the p-ANI summary data chart are within range. The next chart, the PAS Part 3 summary data just summarizes all of the information in the previous chart. We have the Part 3 summary data sorted by type as well.

On page 4, looking at the NXX codes opened. The pool replenishment, of course, is much larger than the number of codes opened for LRNs or for dedicated customers, and the pool replenishment codes can be opened based on forecast in a rate center. We had 3,202 in the last 12 months.

The next page, the summary of the rate center information changes, these are the changes of rate center status, generally from excluded to optional and generally at the request of a carrier that wants to pool in a rate center. Again, these are within range. The next chart is our reclamation summary from

November 2014 through October 2015. We have to be authorized by a state to reclaim so the difference in the three columns. The first column there is the total number of blocks with overdue Part 4s. The second column is the new blocks on the list each month. And the third column is the number of blocks reclaimed. That's always much smaller than the other two numbers. That's because after the notices go out, people remember to file a request for extensions, or they remember to provide their Part 4s. The numbers get smaller, and then of course, we have to wait for authorization from the state to reclaim any numbers.

PAS performance in the last 12 months, since our last meeting, we had one unexpected service disruption that lasted 18 minutes when we had a routine firewall update that caused the connectivity issue. The servers had to be manually restarted. So we were down for 18 minutes. We had no customers indicate that they had any problem during that 18-minute period. We still have had less downtime this year than in 2014, and we are well within our SLAs. Our NAS did not have that problem, so we did not have that issue with our NAS in October.

Other pooling related activities, all of our contractually required reports were filed on time. And for p-ANI administration, we continue to work on reconciling data discrepancies since the data discrepancies continue to pop up. And we have attended the ESIF meetings and the advisory group

meetings. We participate in the regular monthly meetings with the NOWG and advise them on a variety of issues that they've requested to have on our regular agenda.

Since our last meeting, we have had some activity in the change order area. The VoIP order was published at the *Federal Register* on October 29th. It had been released back in June, but it was actually published in late October. Because of the uncertainty regarding the effect of the order on our operations, we filed a letter in lieu of change order on November 6th simply as a place holder because we have an obligation to file a change order within a limited period of time. We just wanted to let the FCC know that it's possible that when that FCC order is fully operational, it will sufficiently affect our processes that we may need the change order but we don't know that at this time.

We also submitted change order number 1 in this contract, which addresses our intent to move the RNAS and then PAS into the cloud using Amazon Web services, which is an approved FCC contractor for cloud services. We submitted that on November 10th. We chose to move RNAS first because it is less complex and has fewer users than PAS, and we provided the timeline with the change order to allow a burn-in period to make sure everything is working smoothly before we would undertake the PAS transition. Are there any questions?

Betty Ann Kane: Rosemary?

Rosemary Emmer: Rosemary Emmer with Sprint. I just wanted to thank the folks back home for fixing the unexpected service disruption so quickly.

Amy Putnam: Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: Jose?

Jose Jimenez: Jose Jimenez with Cox Communications. I would love to know a little bit more about your meetings with ESIF. And just in general, these are just regular updates on these activities or --?

Amy Putnam: Yes. When we became the interim Routing Number Administrator back in September of 2006 and began to address the issues of guidelines, which are INC guidelines actually for the administration of routing numbers, we recognized that there was a lot of brain power in ESIF regarding the 911 system that we should be using to our advantage, obviously, in developing a system that was going to affect the people at ESIF. So we engaged to attend the ESIF meetings and it is actually now part of our contract to attend those meetings. That's solely for the purpose of the interactions between the members of ESIF and the users of the Routing Number Administration System.

Jose Jimenez: So are you guys directly related to the work ESIF is doing on 911 IMS block form work and things like that?

Amy Putnam: No, no. There is a lot of work at ESIF that is not related to us. We are related to the extent that we administer the numbers that the 911 system users use for call addressing. The routing numbers are assigned to the 911 calls as soon as the 911 call is made either through wireless or through VoIP. The system automatically attaches a routing number to the call to send it to the correct PSAP so that if you call 911 from your wireless phone here, D.C. gets the 911 call.

Betty Ann Kane: We hope.

Amy Putnam: Not your home, so all of the issues related to the routing of those calls, the technical issues go to ESIF. We coordinated with ESIF and INC in some of the issues having to do with the guidelines to make sure that what we were saying in the guidelines was not going to be inconsistent with the practices of the industry in using those calls or in provisioning those numbers.

Jose Jimenez: Thank you. And then on a separate question, you mentioned that you are moving your RNAS and PAS?

Amy Putnam: The Routing Number Administration System, the 911, the p-ANI Administration. When the FCC appointed us, they named us the Routing Number Administration administrator.

Jose Jimenez: Any provider impact from moving these to Amazon cloud?

Amy Putnam: No.

Jose Jimenez: Okay. Thank you.

Amy Putnam: It will look the same to the providers.

Jose Jimenez: Thank you very much.

Amy Putnam: -- to the users.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. Amy, could you just tell us for the record who ESIF is and what it stands for?

Amy Putnam: The Emergency Services Interconnection Forum is what the acronym is. The people who are members of ESIF address a multitude of technical issues having to do with 911 routing calls, 911 calls in general. Actually, they are focused very significantly at the moment on ELOC, enabling the emergency services people to know exactly where the caller is in a high-rise or wherever the caller happens to be, to be consistent with FCC orders.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. That's a voluntary group, or --?

Amy Putnam: It's an ATIS group.

Betty Ann Kane: An ATIS group, okay. Thank you. It's best to be clear when we use those acronyms. I had a question, just looking at the numbers again, on your page six and I'll go back to John Manning's report too, where there was just no response.

Amy Putnam: Uh-oh. Brent, get your computer ready.

Betty Ann Kane: No. It's a different question. It's a question where you're asking people for information and you're

asking them to respond and you're not getting a response. We saw that with the 555 numbers too. I know you explained it here, we've got overdue blocks, a report that has to be done, new blocks that have an overdue report and none have been actually re-claimed yet. Do you have any enforcement authority there? Or what happens if nothing gets done?

Amy Putnam: We have no enforcement authority. We are all carrot and no stick. I have said that before. My team laughs at me.

What we can do is notify everybody. According to the FCC order, states had the opportunity to accept the obligation to review and authorize us to reclaim numbers, or if they chose not to, the FCC and Marilyn [sounds like] take that responsibility. So, we send the notice out to the states and to the FCC on the 10th of the month for the previous month, for any blocks for which we have not received a Part 4, within the six months that the carriers have to provide us with that, to tell us then that an end-user has been assigned a number in that block. After that, it is up to the state or to the FCC to direct us to reclaim those blocks.

There are potential issues with every reclamation because it may be that a carrier has, in fact, assigned numbers out of the block and just hasn't bothered to tell us, and/or has forgotten to tell us or there have been staff changes and things

have gotten lost in the shuffle. And if we were to go and reclaim a block, we would put end-users out of service, so there are a variety of protections there, to make sure that we're not doing anything to cause service disruptions. Some states have limited staffing for numbering and the staffing is focused on some other issues that have a higher priority than reclamation.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. So the enforcement's with the state or with the commission.

Amy Putnam: Yes.

Betty Ann Kane: And do these numbers eventually sort themselves out?

Amy Putnam: Yes.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. They eventually get done.

Amy Putnam: They eventually get done.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. Thank you very much. Are there any other questions?

Report of the Toll Free Number Administrator (TFNA)

The next report is of the toll-free number administrator. That will be Document Number 5 on the agenda. Who is doing that report?

Gina Perini: I am.

Betty Ann Kane: Oh. There you are, right behind me.

Okay, Gina. Thank you.

Gina Perini: You're very welcome. Good morning. So who am I and why am I here, right? We are a new reporting entity to the NANC. I thank Chairman Kane for having us. I used to sit next to Rosemary - I miss you, hello. I'm Gina Perini, the President and CEO of SOMOS, Inc. We were SMS/800, Inc. and now we are SOMOS, Inc. The name of our product, SMS/800, the system that administers toll-free number routing and reservation service, is still the name of the service, but the name of the company has changed to SOMOS. We, as I said, operate the SMS/800. We also work with the NAPM on managing the new area codes for toll-free.

I'm going to give you a little background on toll-free, just because we haven't had a report before. And you'll see in my report where we'll show you a little bit of information, about trending, about the use of toll-free numbers, just to sort of set that background for the NANC. We're also open. Our reporting is set on trending and giving you data, but we are open to any feedback about the report, any future reports that you'd like to see, new information or data. We're open to that as well.

So our first item on the report - it looks like some people have them, some people don't - is toll-free numbers in use. We went back from 1997 through to now. I'll just hold it up for those that don't have it in front of you. Essentially, this graph shows you the number trending from that period, 1997, through to now. You can see there's been a pretty significant increase in growth in toll-free numbers consistently over the years. Particularly in the last five years, there has been a significant growth in toll-free numbers. We'll go through where exactly we are on toll-free numbers, the types of where we are for actual subscription and exhaust numbers.

The next slide shows our total toll-free number pool exhaust. The real takeaway from this, which shows from the top of this graph - this is harder to read from farther away - from the top of this graph shows now, and it goes back through to a year ago. We're just showing you essentially where we are for our percentage of exhaust of total toll-free numbers. We have exactly 47,770,094 numbers available. Out of those numbers, 40,565,067 are in use. And we have roughly 7.2 million numbers in what we call our spare pool, so they're available for reservation.

Now if you take those numbers and you break it down by area code, we wanted to show you where we are for actual exhaust port per NPA. So for 800, we are 100 percent exhaust. That's not

surprising. When an 800 number becomes available, they tend to be picked up pretty quickly. David Greenhaus just gave me a knowing look, he knows how it goes. So, that has been in roughly 100 percent exhaust state, perpetually. For 888, we have a close-to-exhaust; we have a 98.6 percent exhaust. For 877, we are 97.5 percent. For 866, we are at 97.6 percent. For 855, we are at 94.8 percent. Our most recent code, which was opened two years ago, is the 844, which is at 40.2 percent, which has the most numbers available for reservation. So this gives you a sense of where we are for our numbers.

We have a scheduled new code opening of 833 in April of 2017. That's right now where it's expected to happen. Any questions on the initial exhaust numbers and our subscription numbers?

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

Gina Perini: Great. We had a question about the use of toll-free numbers. When we talk to the FCC about toll-free numbers, there're a lot of questions about, okay, clearly it's not about long distance anymore. Why are people using toll-free numbers? Really, this has to do with using these numbers. In many ways, our largest growth area is marketing and analytics. People are using these numbers for large-scale marketing campaigns. They're using them as a part of their branding

campaigns and their branding initiatives. They're also using them for new ways for businesses to communicate with their consumers, so we're finding some new growth areas, particularly around the use of toll-free numbers in texting and other multimedia communications. Again, it's a new area, but a growing area in toll-free numbers.

And finally, we just had a toll-free user's summit. We had the wonderful honor of having many people in this room involved. I'm thanking Greg at Bandwidth and Mary at CenturyLink for your involvement, as well as Randy Clark and Michelle Slater from the FCC who participated as well. We had over 150 attendees from the toll-free community, which represented over 53 companies. We addressed multiple issues across the toll-free industry, related to modernization of the platform, related to uses of toll-free numbers, related to some regulatory concerns and issues, related to really a full gamut of both consumer and customer issues to more technical issues. It was a really positive experience and we plan to do a summit for toll-free users every year, to be a forum for these kinds of discussions.

So that is my report to the NANC. I have my contact information on the last page of the report. Please reach out if you have any questions after the meeting or would like specific data to be reported to the NANC.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. Any questions? Jose?

Jose Jimenez: Jose Jimenez with Cox Communications. Later on in this meeting, we're going to have some discussions around national geographic number portability for regular numbers and also wireless. I seem to recall when Henie [phonetic] had his meeting about the API [sounds like] transition and numbering in this very room almost two years ago now. There was some discussion about how toll-free fits that. Is that something that would involve you, or is that a question of how toll-free fits on the non-geographic stuff something that I should direct someplace else?

Gina Perini: It's a part of our discussion generally, around the use of toll-free numbers.

Jose Jimenez: Okay.

Gina Perini: If I understand your question correctly, it's how does toll-free fit into that conversation and are we having that conversation? Are we involved in that conversation?

Jose Jimenez: Yes, yes.

Gina Perini: So I will say that I think toll-free does play a role in at least the conversation around, what does it mean to have a non-geographic number? Clearly, toll-free numbers really are non-geographic, so how does that relate to the larger discussion? I'm not sure around the other components of the non-geographic conversation, whether we relate directly, but we are involved in those conversations, and actually hope to

have more of our customers involved in that conversation because they're participating in a market where we they are in the use of non-geographic numbers.

Jose Jimenez: Thank you. I seem to recall that there are some toll-free numbers that are not national. I seem to recall that. Do I have that right? And what happens with those?

Gina Perini: So they might be regionally used, however they are not identified. I think out to the external, in an external way, if you're a consumer, you don't identify those as geographic. Is that what you're asking? There are some that technically apply to a specific area, but they're not -- that's more of a technical, internal way in which the database identifies it.

Jose Jimenez: So non-geographic numbers are unique? So, across the country, I couldn't have two toll-free numbers that are the same in two parts of the country?

Gina Perini: So that's a little bit different. That's shared use.

Jose Jimenez: Okay.

Gina Perini: Yes, you can have that, but that has to do with how you route that number and how the number is used by the subscriber.

Jose Jimenez: Okay.

Gina Perini: You might also be talking about, I think, some of the numbers are assigned to different regions, but that's [cross-talking].

Betty Ann Kane: Yeah. I think I'm just going to follow up on that because I may be out of date in my thinking or knowledge, but there was a time -- say an 800 number, say it was a business located in the district and it had an 800 number because it had, and you couldn't use the 800 number if you were in the district, that there was a geographic restriction. It can only be used out of state. Is that what you were talking about? I don't know if that's changed. That was way back with rotary dialing or something.

Gina Perini: Yeah. I don't believe that's an issue now. Yeah.

Betty Ann Kane: Yeah, that's not an issue, but there was a time when the 800 numbers first came in that they would say "not available in" and it would say what particular state it wasn't available in. But it's evolved, I guess. Okay. Yes.

David Greenhaus: This is David Greenhaus of 800 Response. The SMS/800 does allow you to block area codes, block areas of the country.

Betty Ann Kane: That the calls come in from.

David Greenhaus: Yeah, to literally accept calls from only whatever you choose, wherever you choose to have them selected

from. In terms of the interaction between local number portability and toll-free, I might suggest that you take a look at the toll-free white paper that was approved by the NANC and sent to the FCC about probably three meetings ago, I think, which pointed to some of the problems that are likely to occur or are occurring now and are likely to continue to be exasperated by the fact that, as local numbers become portable, the routing of toll-free numbers, which according to where the call was made, becomes much more difficult because historically, the numbers had been routed based on the area code in the exchange, because there was a tie between what that area code in the exchange was and with the geography of the originating location. As numbers become non-geographic in a sense and easily ported, we kind of lose the ability to do that and that has a significant impact on the industry.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you.

Richard Shockey: This is Rick Shockey from the SIP Forum. The question actually leads to the question I have, which is what is the plan the toll-free industry has on adapting the 800 number space to an all-IP transition, all-IP routing? Are there provisions within the system to permit this? I have not seen any documentation, white papers or otherwise, that really understands how the 800 industry is going to transition with the rest of the industry.

Gina Perini: Well, right now, the database as it exists isn't incompatible with an IP tradition, it's just not ideal for an IP transition. You can include in the routing fields IP termination. Now, many in the industry and many sitting in this table do route over an IP network. They just put in different routing information for that to be able to occur. What we are doing, I will say, as an industry and as a company, is a modernization of the platform so that it can accommodate that transition. It already has begun, actually, the process. The timeline on that really is a 24-month period, where we can develop and then transition into a modern platform that could be --

Richard Shockey: Have you documented exactly what the plan is for the rest of the industry to at least look at or just understand if nothing else?

Gina Perini: Well, there are a few things we're doing. One is our participation in the ATIS test-bed activities around how toll-free -- and we have a case study and we're doing that work as well. So there's some work there that is available to look at. We also, internally within the industry, have been discussing this. I think that would make sense to do, more of a public conversation about the modernization process and you'll be seeing more on that.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. Jose?

Jose Jimenez: Jose Jimenez with Cox, and I know that there are some issues with the bridge. I'm hoping that that will get resolved. I think it will be at least a good idea to consider the fact that there is at least one working group of this body that is working on IP transition issues or at least routing on nongeographic assignments. And if there is going to be a link between what we're doing for the regular numbers and what we may do for toll-free numbers, I think it would be a good idea to at least vet those issues within that working group.

One point of clarification again, as far as I recall, I do remember that toll-free out of the Future of Numbering working group I think it was an issue of the paper, to the best of my knowledge, subject to check, don't know that NANC took a formal approval of that. So, I just wanted to, on the record, I think it was just a paper submitted by the working group that this body did not, in one way or the other, bless it in any way.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. I was going to make that correction or clarification. We received the report. We accepted the report, and we sent it to the commission as something that might be of interest. But it was not a formal approval of the report, but it was a very useful report and useful information and useful perspectives.

David Greenhaus: I would say that the report didn't actually make any specific recommendations. It just kind of described what the problems were.

Betty Ann Kane: That's what we sent on to say that this is useful. Are there any other questions? Thank you very much.

The toll-free number administrator will be now a regular part of our NANC meetings. You've already had some questions on things that the group would like to maybe hear about in the future, particularly the ongoing work on the IP transition.

Gina Perini: Absolutely. Thank you very much.

Betty Ann Kane: You're welcome.

Report of the Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG)

We now have Item Number 6. Document Number 6 will be the report of the Numbering Oversight Working Group, and that is Karen Riepenkroger who's going to be doing that, presenting that report to us.

Karen Riepenkroger: Good morning, my name is Karen Riepenkroger from Sprint. I co-chair the NOWG working group along with Laura Dalton of Verizon Communications. Today, we'll have a slide on NOWG activities; the 2015 performance surveys; the NANPA and the PA change orders; our upcoming meeting schedule; and then, a list of our participating companies.

On slide 3 on the NOWG activities, the NOWG continues to hold monthly conference calls with the NANPA and the PA. And

then following the administrator calls, the NOWG holds an NOWG-only call. Throughout this year, we have been working on the 2015 performance evaluation process.

On slide 4, the NOWG has reviewed and we have updated the NANPA, the PA, and the RNA performance survey questions and the cover letters. There were no changes to the questions this year. The only changes that we made were to the years, so changing it from 2014 to 2015. And then on the cover letter, we put the date that it would be sent out as January 4, 2016, which is the first Monday after the New Year. The 2015 draft surveys and cover letters were sent out to the NANC for their review. The NOWG is now requesting that the NANC approve this surveys and cover letters.

Betty Ann Kane: We have a proposed action, which is approval of the survey and the cover letters. Is there any discussion on that request?

Jose Jimenez: Jose Jimenez with Cox. We do have a person who works on our behalf in the NWOG. Unfortunately, I didn't see this survey that we're being asked to approve today.

Karen Riepenkroger: The only thing that changed on the surveys was changing the date from 2014 to 2015. We changed no verbiage on the questions at all.

Jose Jimenez: Thank you.

Karen Riepenkroger: You're welcome.

Betty Ann Kane: And so that was approved last year by the [cross-talking].

Karen Riepenkroger: That is correct, did a major rewrite of it last year.

Betty Ann Kane: Any other questions? I understand we are having a problem with the bridge. Is that, Carmell, still a problem? They're still working on it. The people are hearing music, not us. Hopefully, that will get done as soon as possible.

All right, is there any objection to approving the survey which is the same as last years and the cover letter is the same as last year with only the date changed? Hearing none, I consider it approved by unanimous consent.

Karen Riepenkroger: Thank you very much. On slide 5 for the NANPA change orders, John Manning reviewed the NANPA change order, but I wanted to let you know that the NOWG does continue to monitor the NANPA's activities on the 555 line numbers. Also, on Change Order Number 3, the NOWG did send their recommendation to approve this change order to the FCC on September 28th. For the PA change order on Change Order 1 to move RNAS and PAS into the cloud, the NOWG also sent their recommendation to approve this change order to the FCC on November 18th.

In the next slide is a list of our upcoming meetings for December, January, and February. On slide 7, we just note that other meetings may be scheduled as needed beyond what has been identified in the list. And then if anybody has any questions, they're welcome to contact Laura Dalton or I at the email addresses provided on the slide. The last slide is just a list of the participating companies in the NOWG. Are there any questions?

Betty Ann Kane: Mary.

Mary Retka: Mary Retka from CenturyLink. On slide 5, you may want to fix your [cross-talking]

Karen Riepenkroger: I saw that. I just saw that, I was looking at it. Thank you. I didn't want to say anything, we will fix that.

Betty Ann Kane: Any other questions or suggestions? The change order that you sent to the FCC two months ago now, are there any updates? It says pending. Marilyn, do you have any status update on that?

Marilyn Jones: Sure. As John Manning reported during his report, that change order impacts the PRA collection, so we have to wait for OMB approval before we can approve that change order.

Betty Ann Kane: The OMB always gets its fingers in there, don't they? All right, any other questions? Thank you for the report.

Karen Riepenkroger: Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: Document 7 will be the report of the Billing and Collection agent.

Report of the North American Numbering Plan Billing and Collection Agent (NANP B&C)

Garth Steele: Good morning. It's Garth Steele. I'm a partner with Welch, LLP. We act as the Billing and Collection agent for the North American Numbering Plan Fund. We've got a report for you today that was prepared in November 9th. It covers activity up to the end of October 31st. On page 1 of the report is a statement of the financial position of the fund as of October 31st. You'll see that the fund balance at the end of October was just over \$4 million - \$4,064,000. That's comprised of cash in the bank of \$4.4 million; accounts receivable, net of allowance for doubtful accounts of \$129,000; less accrued liabilities for services provided by various suppliers in the month of October that remained unpaid at the end of October of \$530,000. That gives us a fund balance of \$4,064,000 at the end of October.

On page 2 of the report is a breakdown of the budget over the 15-month billing cycle. You'll remember that this is a

transition year from going from a June 30th funding yearend to a September 30th funding yearend. So the funding cycle that we're currently in covers 15 months from July of 2015 to September of 2016. The first four columns on the report are actual figures for the months of July, August, September, and October and the remaining 11 columns under the heading "Budget" are the budget or projected actual revenues and expenses to get us up to the end of September. You'll note, as I said on the previous page, our fund balance at the end of October was just over \$4 million. We expect that to drop on a fairly steady basis each month until we get to the end of September 2016, when we expect the fund balance of \$531,000. That fund balance at the end of September 2016 would be made up of a \$500,000 contingency and a \$31,000 surplus.

The actual budget that was approved for the funding period - the 15 months - is included in the second column from the right in this report. It was a budget for a \$500,000 surplus being the contingency. Therefore, we've got a \$31,000 variance from our projected actuals to the September '16 period of \$31,000. There's a block at the bottom of that page that explains the variances from actual to budget. Again, some things are up or down, but nothing major. It's just a \$31,000 positive variance anticipated from today's perspective for the September '16 period end.

On page 3 of the report is a list of upcoming expenditures. We've got all of our major contracts listed here with the amounts that are payable under those contracts over the next six months. There are no surprises here. All of these are amounts that were predicted in the budget.

Finally, on page 4 of the report is the deliverables report that highlights some of the activity over the past little while. One of the thing that's not on this report that happened since then was that all accounts receivable over 120 days old were sent to treasury for collection by them. We sent those to treasury on November 23rd.

With respect to staffing changes, I've been at this meeting before but the main person from Welch who's been coming to this meeting is Faith Marcotte. Faith is retiring from Welch at the end of this calendar year, so you're likely to see more of me. That's the highlight of the report from the Billing and Collection agent.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. Are there any questions? Thank you very much. I will anticipate the question will come up about the contract. We sent it out. I received an email indicating that the commission has appointed a new contracting officer or assigned a new contracting officer, Katie Ann Ferguson [phonetic], to be the contracting officer for the Billing and Collection contract. The first emails will be

issued soon. I've asked for and received an update on the actual proposed schedule. That proposed schedule is that the preparation of the solicitation will take place starting today and that the plan is to issue the solicitation on December 31st and to make an award on or before February 28th. We will look forward at our next quarterly meeting, hopefully for a completed process. Thank you. That's been an issue that we have been concerned about consistently for the last several many years.

All right, Rosemary?

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

Rosemary Emmer: Good morning. My name is Rosemary Emmer and I chair the Billing and Collection Working Group with Tim Decker of Verizon. We are currently overseeing the monthly billing and collections. We evaluate the deliverables of the B&C agent. On page 5, we list the current budget and contribution factor. On page 6, we list the 11-year history of the contribution factor. If you go to page 7, we list our membership - AT&T, Cox, Sprint, CenturyLink, Verizon, and T-Mobile. On the last page, it lists our meeting for December, December 15th on Tuesday and if you're interested in participating, our meetings are open and we'd love to have you. You can email Tim or myself. Our emails are listed on the last page. It's all we have this time. Thanks. Are there any questions?

Mary Retka: I'm Mary Retka, CenturyLink. I just wanted to mention for those on the phone who may not have seen the email that the contract for the billing and collection agent was extended to March 1st, which will coincide with what the chairman has said was going on for the solicitation. Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you, Mary. We will not have a gap. Are the people on the bridge back? Yes. Good. Are there any questions from the people on the bridge? Sorry about that technical glitch.

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

This report will be Document 8. Moving right along, the report of the NAPM.

Tim Kagele: Good morning everybody. 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 colleague from Verizon, Tim Decker. Just a quick reminder, the purpose of the NAPM LLC really is the administrative function for the LNPA from a contract and SOW perspective. Also a reminder, that there's a portion of each NAPM LLC meeting that's open to the general public. So the NAPM meets each month, the NAPM's contact information can be found on the back of the hard copy report that I handed out this morning.

In terms of statements of work for the last quarter, the NAPM has reviewed and approved two. The first one is amendment 99, which clarifies the handling of confidential information. The members voted to approve that no-cost amendment. The second amendment concerns number 101. This particular amendment implements the insertion of tracer data in the NPAC, pursuant to a request that was brought by LNPA Working Group to the NAPM LLC. The NAPM members also voted to approve that no-cost amendment. Are there any questions so far?

In terms of general information, the NAPM of course continually is recruiting new members. So I don't have anything new to share in terms of that recruitment effort, but we're certainly open to that. If you are interested in becoming a NAPM LLC member, please feel free to see Tim Decker or myself.

The other general piece of update information is officer elections. I was reelected as one of the co-chairs. For secretary, Paula Campagnoli with T-Mobile was also reelected. For treasurer, we have a new position, a new person, Suzanne Addington with Sprint. So we welcome Suzanne into that role for the NAPM LLC. It's a very important role for the LLC. For our recording secretary, also new in that position is Dawn Lawrence with XO Communications. I just wanted to take this moment to formally thank Laura Dalton with Verizon for her service to the

LLC as recording secretary. She's really done a terrific job. We miss her, but we welcome Dawn into that role. Questions?

Moving on, in terms of the phone PAC, there's no report for the phone PAC. It is a standing committee for the NAPM LLC that was initially put together to create the request for information, as well as the request for a proposal for the new LNPA. That continues to be in effect but there's no report.

In terms of LNPA transition, the TOM or the Transition Oversight Manager - I think as we reported last time - is going to be conducting its very first webcast, which is consistent with the transition outreach and education plan that's filed as part of the transition outreach plan that was directed by the FCC. That will occur on December 9th. That invitation was sent to a very diverse audience, which includes large and small carriers, all interested stakeholders including regulators. So please feel free to register for that. It will be an important conversation and the first of many that will take place.

The next item is that negotiations for the new master services agreement with iconectiv were concluded in all of the seven NPAC regions. The MSA was conditionally approved by the NAPM LLC members on October 26, 2015.

The last item that I have is NAPM LLC continues to file monthly status reports on the docket. That's consistent with the direction provided from the FCC. Those reports were filed

on the last day of every month. We encourage you to seek out those reports and review them to keep abreast of the latest. Let me pause there and see if there are any questions about the transition portion of the report.

Jose Jimenez: You know I have a question, right?

Tim Kagele: I'm ready for you, sir.

Jose Jimenez: Jose Jimenez with Cox Communications. One thing that was not listed in the report but happened last week was that the commission issued a public notice, I believe, approving the transition plan NAPM put in place. Is that correct?

Tim Kagele: That's correct.

Jose Jimenez: Part of that transition plan, I believe, included a statement about NAPM engaging NANC in the transition. NANC in June, I believe, recommended to the commission that the LNPA Working Group have some sort of role in representing NANC in that transition, but the public notice last week is silent on both the engagement of NANC and the LNPA Working Group role. So what happens now?

Tim Kagele: That's probably not in my wheelhouse to address. I don't know. Marilyn or Chairman Kane, do you have any comments on that?

Betty Ann Kane: The question is specific. That notice was, I believe, we circulated to everyone, the notice of the

acceptance of the transition plan by the commission, and then also the notice of the first outreach event - the webinar - on December 9th. Your question is, is the plan that was approved or accepted called for a role for the NANC?

Jose Jimenez: The plan was approved as submitted. It did specify that there will be engagement with NANC, no definition about what that engagement is. I am looking to understand what that will be going forward.

Betty Ann Kane: Marilyn, do you have any insights from the commission in terms of what their expectation is?

Marilyn Jones: This is Marilyn from the FCC. At this moment, I do not have any information regarding the engagement of the NANC. I will check with the bureau and then have Carmell send out that information as we work with Chairman Kane to figure that out.

Jose Jimenez: That will be great, because one of the reasons why I certainly advocated for the LNPA Working Group role in June was that it was a way for multiple stakeholders to engage. Now there is going to be this outreach effort through this webinar coming up in a few days. I don't know how that will work. I'm planning to sign on just to see what the dynamics are. But if you have potentially hundreds of people on a bridge listening, it is going to be potentially a challenge for those of us who have to interact with any administrator to

even voice concerns in that kind of a forum. I think a role definition about NANC engagement on the LNPA Working Group will be helpful.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you.

Ann Berkowitz: Ann Berkowitz, Verizon. Jose, I'm glad that you're going to be participating in the outreach. Tim, in this fair to say, we're still sort of in the early stages of the outreach and it may be yet to be determined what the NANC role will be as we go forward with the transition? I mean, you've just completed the contract negotiations. Certainly, outreach wants to go beyond NANC and its membership to all interested parties. But, I think there will be a role probably for the LNPA Working Group, but it's probably a little further down the line. It may be premature to know what it is today.

Jose Jimenez: I don't know that I'm looking for a certainty. But I certainly feel that this is a dialogue that needs to happen because the plan approved by the agency as crafted by NAPM called for engagement without defining what that was. And so we tried to provide a recommendation as to what that could be in June, but the public notice is silent, one way or the other, on the recommendation or what exactly this body will do.

Tim Kagele: Jose, your question is a fair one and I think it's a little early in the process. But what I would say

generally is this. With the FCC's issuance of the March order, they directed the NAPM to retain a third party transition oversight manager, which we have shared is PricewaterhouseCoopers. Their role is specific to facilitating in a neutral way the transition to the new vendor. So part of the transition outreach and education plan provides that forum for all interested stakeholders to voice their input and be heard as part of that process, and to bring that input back to the NAPM LLC for its consideration. I think that in addition to - and I can't speak for the LNPA Working Group, but they are a working group that's directly attached to the NANC or works under the NANC's direction - that there is a role for all of that. But the primary role and focus of managing the transition is really the TOM's responsibility.

Jose Jimenez: That makes sense to me. In the plan approved by the agency, the role of the TOM was clear. Even within that, there is this statement that the NANC will be engaged in some way, again, without defining what that was. I'm hoping that the commission can tell us down the line, hopefully. I hear that it's premature, but I do think that if we don't put it in place as soon as possible, whatever that role might be, even if it is to be another conduit for problems to be surfaced, if such a thing is the case, I don't know, If we wait too long into the process, then that role may not be that useful. I'm

hoping that in fact the commission can provide further input on that at some point in the near future.

Betty Ann Kane: You said the approval just came out about a week ago?

Jose Jimenez: Yes, right before the holiday.

Betty Ann Kane: We will certainly be looking at it. The NANC is on record, as you've mentioned from our June meeting, making suggestions and its views on what could be appropriate roles for engagement of the NANC. So we'll take a look at that recommendation in terms of what's been approved, and certainly I think by the March meeting, we should have it defined.
Commissioner Rhoades.

Crystal Rhoades: Crystal Rhoades from Nebraska Public Service Commission. I'm just wondering, is there an end date for this transition? Do we have a timeline established by which this must be completed?

Tim Kagele: No, we do not. What I can share is what was published as one of the exhibits, the non-confidential exhibits that is in the transition outreach proposal. There is a timeline that's in Exhibit 3b or 3a, if I'm not mistaken. But, if you string those date blocks together, it's about a two-year process. That process essentially started with the FCC's issuance of their order. That's not definite hard and fast.

The parties are still discussing that timeline, but that's what's been publicly communicated.

Betty Ann Kane: In that case, the end date would be somewhere around November 2017, about two years from now. Is that what you're saying? The order that was just issued, the order you're referencing to, is the start date for the two years?

Tim Kagele: The March order.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay, so that would be March of 2017. I guess that just leads to the next question. In your second bullet, the master services agreement conditionally approved by the NAPM LLC on October 26, what are the next steps that could be shared as to what happens now?

Tim Kagele: That's a great question, Chairman Kane. Thank you. In terms of next steps, the agreement was conditionally approved to allow for opportunities to review any feedback that the FCC might have. So the draft agreement has been provided to the FCC. They are reviewing that agreement. When we have their feedback, we will then consider that and be in position to take the next step, which will be either to incorporate the feedback or to request that the agreement be left as is.

Betty Ann Kane: And then it would be sent to the FCC for approval?

Tim Kagele: That is correct.

Betty Ann Kane: As revised?

Tim Kagele: Yes.

Richard Shockey: Richard Shockey, SIP Forum. I want to get this date issue at least clear in my own mind. The agreement does not preclude the transition being successfully completed earlier. Only that it should be done by November of 2017. If everything falls into place, it could be concluded earlier.

Tim Kagele: Let's be clear, yes, you're correct. There is nothing that would preclude the transition from being completed earlier. What I did not say intentionally was an end date has not been established - true. If you look at the publicly communicated exhibit that's in the transition outreach proposal, there is a block of time that represents approximately two years. One could loosely construe from that that the transition started upon the FCC's issuance of their March order authorizing the transition to a new vendor. That's what's in the public domain, but as I've mentioned, the parties are still discussing the actual time, the end date, or final acceptance date however you might want to characterize that. As soon as we have agreement on that, we will then make that public. That will become part of the TOM's outreach and education, just to make sure that all interested parties have that final acceptance date

and that they can then align their resources to work towards achieving that goal. Does that help?

Richard Shockey: Yes.

Tim Kagele: Thank you, sir.

Betty Ann Kane: Jose, you have one more question?

Jose Jimenez: Jose Jimenez with Cox. Tim, is there a time when the MSA will become more publicly available or at least those of us who signed the NDA, if it still applies, will be able to see it at some point down the future?

Tim Kagele: I really can't speak to that, Jose. Marilyn, do you have any comments on that? I hate to put you on the spot.

Betty Ann Kane: I think the question is that at some point after the MSA is final - at least from the NAPM's point of view that they submitted to the FCC for approval - will it become public or will it become public at some point later or do you know?

Marilyn Jones: I'm Marilyn from the FCC. I think at some point, it's going to be available under a protective order.

Jose Jimenez: I guess there has to be a degree of trust that the MSA's basic parameters will track what was part of the selection working group that NANC processed.

Tim Kagele: That's accurate, Jose. Let me say it differently. What I would say is that the information that is specified in the RFP, the MSA comports with.

Rosemary Emmer: This is Rosemary Emmer with Sprint. I just wanted to reiterate for everyone listening that the membership is open for the NAPM LLC. Thank you.

Jose Jimenez: I'll respond to that, because the membership isn't free. Therein lays the biggest difference between the role of the NANC and the LNPA Working Group and those companies and organizations that choose to pay the membership fee into the LLC.

Tim Kagele: Any other questions? Thank you very much.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you for the update. We'll look forward to continued update. Your report will be Document Number 9 in our record.

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

Now we will move on to the LNPA Working Group. Paula.

Paula Compagnoli: Yes, here I am.

Betty Ann Kane: Your report will be Document Number 10.

Paula Compagnoli: Hi, my name is Paula Jordan Compagnoli. I'm with T-Mobile and I'm one of the tri-chairs of the LNPA Working Group along with Ron Steen and Dawn Lawrence. Ron Steen is with AT&T and Dawn Lawrence is with XO. What our report is

going to cover today is the NANC-LNPA operation flow revisions. One of them has to do with the VoIP number portability capability. Also, we had a conflict capability when wireless short-timers are in use that we needed to put into the flows. We'll also talk about best practice for clarification; the transition from the PSTN to the IP; non-geographic number portability reporting; best practice 71, which is a new one; and, the LNPA transition.

First of all, the clarification on the VoIP number portability capabilities. As you remember, we were asked to review the NANC flow of narratives to determine if any change is needed to be made to accommodate the Voice over IP service providers. It was determined that the Class 1 Interconnected VOIP Provider definition should be revised. So we met via conference call on October 14th to develop and reach consensus on the new definition for Class 1 Interconnected VOIP Providers. That Class 1 Interconnected VOIP Provider definition has been added to the NANC flow narratives. A red line and clean version has been submitted to the NANC with this report. It was added, it was attached to the document when Carmell sent it out. I didn't print it. I didn't print the copies because there're 47 pages. I didn't think you want to be loading that back and forth, so I just attached it. The change that was made is a

definition for the Class 1. You can find that change on page 2 of 47, both on the red line and on the clear copy.

The LNPA Working Group recommends that the NANC approve and forward to the FCC the updated NANC flow of narratives for the definition for VOIP providers.

Betty Ann Kane: That recommendation, that request for approval is before us, is there any questions or discussions on that, anyone on the bridge? I conclude that there's unanimous consent to approve that and forward it.

Paula Compagnoli: The next issue is a conflict capability when wireless short-timers are used on a port request. The first thing which you need to understand is what we're talking about here is actually how it works. It has been working and is working today. What didn't happen is we didn't update the NANC flows, so we had to do that and that's basically all we did. We didn't make any physical changes or made internal changes to the process. We just needed to document it.

At the November 3rd and 4th, 2015 LNPA Working Group meeting, the group reached consensus to revise the applicable NANC-LNPA operations flows, replacing a port into conflict when wireless short-timers are used. There are different timers depending on what type of port you're doing. If you're doing a wireless-to-wireless port, it's a short timer. There's a medium timer for the one-day porting, and then there's a long timer if

you're doing intermodal porting, so there are different timers. This change only applies or this addition to the documentation only applies to the wireless timers. Currently, the NPAC behavior allows the port to be placed into conflict by the old service provider in the port up until the time when the port is activated if wireless short-timers are being used. This ability was requested by the wireless service providers in the LNPA Working Group a number of years ago. However, the NANC flows report for placing a port into conflict state that the port cannot be placed into conflict after the T2 timer expires. So there are two timers. There's a T1 and a T2 that applies to all three of them. There's a medium timer 1 and a medium timer 2, and the same thing for the long timers.

On November 3rd and 4th of the LNPA Working Group, the wireless service providers confirmed their desire to retain the current NPAC behavior. We revised the NANC flows for this behavior. They're included in the documents that were attached to the report. So the red line and the clean version that have been submitted to the NANC report. And you'll find those changes on page 17 of 47, so if you want to look at those.

We also had to make a change to figure 11. We made changes to figure 6 and figure 11. And so figure 6 is on page 17 of 47, and figure 11 is on page 30 of 47. And again, the LNPA recommends that the NANC approve and forward this to the FCC for

the updated NANC flow narratives. So we want to have this go up to the FCC just like we did the other one.

Betty Ann Kane: Right. So there would be two things to send to the FCC, correct?

Paula Campagnoli: Uh-huh. So do you want to -- ?

Betty Ann Kane: Yes. Is there any objection to this recommendation? We will consider that approved.

Paula Campagnoli: Thank you. The next item on our report is the Best Practice #4. If you remember, we had a discussion on Best Practice #4 at the last September meeting. And so in response to the NANC's request after we had our discussion and we came to an agreement, Chairman Betty Ann asked the LNPA Working Group to review Best Practice #4 to ensure that VoIP providers and IP provider systems are included. So the LNPA Working Group formed the subcommittee to work on this issue. Betty Sanders of Charter has volunteered to head up the subcommittee. The subcommittee has a conference call scheduled for December the 3rd of 2015 and they will report. Their findings and progress of this subcommittee will be reported at the LNPA Working Group meetings, and we will send those. We'll report back to the NANC at each NANC meeting. Any questions? Yes?

Jose Jimenez: Jose Jimenez with Cox Communications. Hi, Paula.

Paula Campagnoli: Hi.

Jose Jimenez: One question about this subcommittee. Is there a deadline, a timeline that the working group is expecting the subcommittee to adhere to?

Paula Campagnoli: No. Whatever time it takes them to come to an agreement. My experience has been they usually work through these very quickly, so we don't put timelines on them.

Jose Jimenez: Cox has agreed to participate in this subcommittee. Do you know who else is in there?

Paula Campagnoli: Not offhand. I think there's representatives from almost every participant we have at the LNPA Working Group.

Jose Jimenez: Thank you.

Paula Campagnoli: I have it back in the minutes, but yeah. And you did get an invite, right, to the conference call?

Jose Jimenez: Yes. And we have somebody in there.

Paula Campagnoli: All right. Good. Any other questions? Okay. The transition from PSTN to IP. Mary Retka, who has volunteered to give us this information and provide it to the LNPA Working Group, she provided an update on the ATIS Testbed Landscape Team. It's focusing on service providers testing together during the IP transition. Used cases including numbering, routing and provider-to-provider testing are what they're looking at. Mary will continue to keep the LNPA Working

Group informed, and the PSTN to IP transition effects on LNP continue to be an ongoing agenda item at the LNPA Working Group. Any questions on that?

Jose Jimenez: Jose Jimenez with Cox. In the next page, Paula, you have non-geographic number porting but with the focus on wireless. So I do not see non-geographic number portability for the rest of it, or wireline, in your report. Or am I missing it?

Paula Campagnoli: No, you're not. Because that's all we've been asked at this time. My understanding is that's all. I mean everything that I've seen, that's all I've received is that it's for wireless. You're talking about the next item on my report, the non-geographic number portability.

Jose Jimenez: For wireless? But I mean that item, that bullet, it focuses on wireless. So I'm curious. I thought the commission in the summer asked NANC to not only identify issues related to non-geographic number portability for wireline but also address those. I mean to come up with recommendations on how to address those issues. So you guys are not working that?

Paula Campagnoli: Not at this time. What happened was the information came to us at the LNPA Working Group after we already had our November meeting. That's when we were aware that there was additional work that was being asked of the NANC to be done. I, at that time, did not know because I thought --

and the contractor, Cary Hinton, got in contact with me and asked about this request and if we were going to talk about at the November meeting - which, like I said, we already had the November meeting so it was over and done.

With the LNPA Working Group, we were made aware of a letter from the FCC to the NANC chair on November 16, 2015 regarding nationwide wireless number portability. The LNPA Working Group will wait direction from the NANC as to what functions the LNPA Working Group is responsible in response to this letter. We're waiting to find out what we need to do, what they want us to do.

Jose Jimenez: Thank you for that. But my point, I suppose my initial point is this bullet and this ask relate specifically to wireless. I am curious. It sounds like you guys are not working the topic of wireline interconnected VoIP national portability.

Paula Campagnoli: We're not working on either one of them right now.

Jose Jimenez: On either one of them?

Paula Campagnoli: No, because we haven't gotten the information yet.

Betty Ann Kane: I think I could clarify that, because you're talking about two different things.

Jose Jimenez: Generally, it is what came to my mind.

Betty Ann Kane: You're talking about two different things.

Jose Jimenez: I just want to make sure that I don't --

Betty Ann Kane: Let me finish. We had a new referral that came on November 16th, and I'm going to bring that up under new business. We decide which working group we want to refer that to. That was the November 16th referral having to do with nationwide porting and the short term and longer term workarounds, if you will, that were worked out by CCA and CTIA. We did have some discussion and a report on that at our September meeting, but we're awaiting a specific referral from the commission as to what role they wanted NANC to deal with. And that has just come on November 16th, so I'm going to bring that up to new business.

But I believe you may be referring, Jose, back to the VoIP order that came out in June 22nd and that we did discuss at the September meeting. And in that order, which was actually published until October 29th in the Federal Register, but the directive to the NANC timeframe started with the release of the order and not on October 29th. It says, it's paragraph 103, "The commission declines to articulate specific geographic limits on ports between the interconnected VoIP provider; thus, obtained its numbers directly from the numbering administrators and the wireline or wireless carrier at this time." So that has to do just with VoIP. "Instead, the commission directs the North American Numbering Council 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, the commission directs the NANC to examine the rate center or geographic considerations implicated by porting directly to and from interconnected VoIP providers, including the implication of rate center consolidation, as well as the public safety considerations such as any public safety answering point and 911 issues that could arise."

The order directs the NANC to give the commission a report addressing these issues which includes options and recommendations no later than 180 days from the release date of the order, which, if you figure out, actually means December 22nd.

Jose Jimenez: So that's coming up.

Betty Ann Kane: So that's coming up. And there has not been a lot of work on that yet. My plan is to ask for an extension of that 180-day deadline. I know people are waiting for the order itself to be -- it was confusing because the order wasn't even published at that time of our last meeting. Although the text was there, it wasn't published until October 29th. But that 180-day directive went back to June 22nd to deal with it.

Jose Jimenez: So we have six months.

Betty Ann Kane: So we have a different six months referral timeframe on the one that just came on, essentially the small carriers, the non-nationwide carrier's portability, just not specifically VoIP. This is an interconnected VoIP issue. And the other is --

Paula Campagnoli: And we answered the --

Betty Ann Kane: We will be looking -- yeah, go ahead.

Paula Campagnoli: From the LNPA Working Group, we answered the interconnected VoIP because there was not -- the only thing we needed to change was the definition of what a Class 1 interconnected VoIP provider was. The rest of the flows and what they need to do to port, nothing changed. I mean we checked that piece of it.

Betty Ann Kane: So you are fulfilling that requirement and reporting to us. Do we have a written report from you as to this one thing that needs to be changed?

Paula Campagnoli: Yes.

Betty Ann Kane: And that is in?

Paula Campagnoli: It's in the report that I sent. It's the first item on the agenda.

Betty Ann Kane: Right. Review the NANC flow narratives.

Paula Campagnoli: Right.

Betty Ann Kane: And you are recommending that the NANC approve and forward to the FCC the updated NANC flow narratives.

Paula Campagnoli: Right.

Betty Ann Kane: So that is the LNPA's response to the NANC or recommendation to the NANC for any issues as identified in this FCC directive.

Paula Campagnoli: Right.

Jose Jimenez: Let me make sure that I understand what I just heard by repeating it back. I apologize.

Betty Ann Kane: Certainly.

Jose Jimenez: By addressing the Class 1 definition and the NANC porting flows in that report, the LNPA Working Group recommends that those are not only the issues that non-geographic portability create but the fixes for those issues?

Paula Campagnoli: No. This was strictly for VoIP providers. We are able to get their own numbers and now do their own porting. Because in the past, it was my understanding that in some cases they had to go through another service provider to be able to do that. Now, with this order and the ability to get their own numbers, they can port directly, which, well, they have been since we were doing the test. I mean that's why as far as the flows go for them to be able to port, nothing's change. Now this --

Jose Jimenez: The challenge is that the commission's request to the NANC was look at non-geographic -- the flows that I believe you guys fixed address if an interconnected VoIP

provider is porting services in a fixed location that is still connected to a certain geography. What the commission said in June was great, do that, which is great. The LNPA Working Group advances that ball [sounds like] by allowing a fixed interconnected VoIP provider to get numbers directly without having to go through a third-party intermediary. That order, however, does ask the NANC to go the next step and not only look at the issues that non-geographic portability raises or whatever recommendations that you have to address those issues. I haven't heard that we are working on that yet, or I'm not sure what that is.

Paula Campagnoli: Okay. As far as non-geographic porting, whether it would be wireless or wireline, as far as the LNPA Working Group understood, we hadn't been ordered to do that yet.

Jose Jimenez: Got it. So that remains in limbo.

Paula Campagnoli: Right.

Jose Jimenez: In those six months' tracks, whatever they begin remain in limbo for this body because we haven't asked anyone to work on those issues.

Betty Ann Kane: Let me just, Paula, walk you through this. We do have a recommendation here on addressing the Class 1 definition and revising the NANC flows. Now the request to NANC, the directive of the FCC was to examine and address any specific considerations for interconnected VoIP providers - not

non-geographic in general but just for interconnected VoIP providers - porting to and from wireline/wireless and other interconnected VoIP providers. And then, in particular, to examine any rate center or geographic considerations implicated by porting directly to and from interconnected VoIP providers. Does your recommendation on the flows address that issue? I'm just trying to isolate what's --

Paula Campagnoli: According to the VoIP providers that we had on the bridge and in the LNPA Working Group meetings, the only thing -- I mean they've been porting just like the wireline does or wireless, however they choose to handle their ports. They didn't cite us any different things that we had to change in the flows for them to be able to do what they've been doing -

Jose Jimenez: Until now.

Betty Ann Kane: For rate center and geographic considerations implicated by porting directly to and from interconnected VoIP. So your finding is that there's nothing additional that needs to be done.

Paula Campagnoli: That has to be done for them to complete that. For instance, from a wireless perspective, I can port a customer in from another carrier. I don't have any numbers in that particular rate center, but I can port a customer in. I mean, to me, that's non-geographic. You know what I'm saying?

Jose Jimenez: And certainly for some wireless.

Paula Campagnoli: Right.

Jose Jimenez: The reason that CCA and CTIA talk is that there are limitations for regional wireless providers to do this, from what I understand.

Betty Ann Kane: Yes, and that's a separate referral.

Jose Jimenez: That's a separate. But the non-geographic aspects of portability, I believe, need to be addressed not only for mobile but for terrestrial. The recommendation you guys bring before us today addresses the world of interconnected VoIP in the same way they have been doing portability until now through a third-party, and there's always been some connection to a geography. What the commission, I think, has asked us to do in the June order and now with the letter from a few weeks ago was to look at non-geographic for both.

Paula Campagnoli: I mean if we were supposed to look at non-geographic porting for VoIP providers, I misunderstood that.

Betty Ann Kane: And then the other issue was public safety and 911 issues. Did you identify any issues that would arise?

Paula Campagnoli: No.

Betty Ann Kane: So your report to the NANC is that addressing the Class 1 definition and the updated NANC flow narratives are all that is needed, as far as you know, to

address the rate center geographic and 911 considerations of direct.

Paula Campagnoli: Yes. I mean not the --

Jose Jimenez: Not the non-geographic.

Betty Ann Kane: Not the non-geographic, because it said geographic.

Paula Campagnoli: Porting as we do it today.

Betty Ann Kane: Yes. Thank you. So that is your recommendation. Richard, you were going to comment.

Richard Shockey: Yes. This is Rich Shockey with the SIP Forum. First of all, I'd like to thank my distinguished colleague from Cox for bringing up this particular issue. But from a point of clarification, Madam Chairman, I'm assuming that you are prepared to have a wide-ranging discussion about the chief's letter of November 16th as new business.

Betty Ann Kane: Yes.

Richard Shockey: This is what we're going to discuss?

Betty Ann Kane: Yes.

Richard Shockey: Point one. Point two, the problem that the LNPA Working Group had was two issues, which was, one, they were trying to redefine the structure by which the VoIP providers could do porting. This is essentially the extension of the Vonage [sounds like] order. That was an entirely separate issue from our mutual concern that a discussion of non-

geographic wireless porting for smaller service providers must - and I emphasize the word must - be combined with a long term view of wireline national geographic number portability and national 10-digit dialing at the same time which now has been clarified we are going to discuss as part of new business. Does that make sense?

Betty Ann Kane: Yeah. Thank you. So we do have the recommendation from the -- you finished your report, Paula?

Paula Campagnoli: No, I haven't.

Betty Ann Kane: Go ahead. Then we'll take break.

Paula Campagnoli: Okay. So in the non-geographic, we're ready to go to work whenever we're told what we need to do. I mean what's the subject, what do you want us to look at, and we're ready to go.

The LNPA transition, as you brought up, there are certain things that we do and certain things that we've not been asked to do. But one of the things that we were asked was pursuant to the NANC chair's request, the LNPA Working Group is discussing possible areas where the LNPA work could be involved in the LNPA transition. And so at the November meeting we were asked to reactivate the Architecture Planning Team, which is the APT, to review current test cases and any new test cases that may be needed for the LNPA transition. When we got this request, I got hold of the FCC and made sure that it was okay for us at the

LNPA Working Group to work on the test cases for the LNPA transition. I was given approval.

John Malyar of iconectiv will chair the APT. The APT has scheduled a conference call for December 9th, 2015, and the APT will report their progress at the LNPA Working Group meetings. I sent out an invitation to this meeting on December the 9th to the LNPA Working Group distribution list. Out of all the members that we have, I think I've gotten about four or five declines and everybody else is going to be there. So we're going to start working on the test cases.

Jose Jimenez: Jose Jimenez with Cox again. Thank you for that update. That's fantastic. One point of order or whatever, I would recommend that while Mr. Malyar -- how do you pronounce?

Paula Campagnoli: Malyar.

Jose Jimenez: Malyar. I'm sure he will be a fantastic chair. I thought iconectiv was connected to, in fact, the new administrator.

Paula Campagnoli: Yeah. They are the new administrator, but they're also a member of the LNPA Working Group. So they're going to lead the group, but it's all members of the LNPA Working Group.

Jose Jimenez: It might be good to think about finding a less connected chair, maybe. Just optics here. That's what I'm saying. It's just an optics thing. If you have somebody

running the test cases who is also going to be the new -- I don't know. That's just optics.

Paula Campagnoli: All right. I will take that up and make sure I present it. When we have the call on the 9th, I will ask if there's a neutral person that could do the chairing.

Betty Ann Kane: Rosemary?

Rosemary Emmer: Rosemary Emmer with Sprint. I've been on the record for, I don't know, since right after a couple of years after the NANC started saying that I wasn't a big fan of vendors being co-chairs. I don't know how many times I've said it, but I've said it an awful lot. But the fact of the matter is these people are nominated and voted in by consensus and so this is what happens, this is what our process is. It isn't necessarily a bad thing. I think in this particular case, this is a technical forum and this particular vendor is taking over at this point in time, so I don't personally think it's a bad idea at all.

John Malyar has been around for probably longer than I've been here. I'm not sure. It's been a long time. So I feel like he is probably more than capable of doing that job. But I just wanted to say that I think Paula could certainly bring it up at the LNPA Working Group, but I believe that that's already been decided and determined at the LNPA Working Group already. But, anyway, thanks.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you for that sensitivity to that.

Paula Campagnoli: So I will see if we can get a different chair of that team.

The last item I have is the Best Practice #71. This is a new best practice, and you did get a copy of the best practice with the report. Basically, what we're asking here is that in today's environment when we have a resell that's porting, they don't have any limits as far as what they can use for validation fields. And what happens is in some cases they validate on things that the new service provider or even the customer would know what they're supposed to put in there. So what we tried to do was set up some validation fields that they could use from a wireless perspective and we would like to have the wireless - and remember it's best practice, not an FCC order - to have them use the telephone number, the customer account number, the zip code, and the end user provided password or PIN as validation fields to help improve the porting process when you're dealing with reseller customers.

Betty Ann Kane: So you're making a recommendation to the NANC that we endorse this Best Practice #71 and send it to the FCC forum?

Paula Campagnoli: Yes.

Betty Ann Kane: Any discussion on that? Richard, do you have your -- sign-up first from the floor. Okay. Any

discussion on this recommendation, on Best Practice #71? Anyone on the phone? I take that as unanimous consent to accept it and to endorse it and send to FCC. Thank you, Paula. Thank you very much.

Paula Campagnoli: The last thing is the next meeting for the LNPA Working Group is January 5th and 6th in La Jolla, California hosted by iconectiv. And we all share in those meetings.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you.

Paula Campagnoli: Do you have a question for me?

Jose Jimenez: Yeah. Well, it's not a question. I think we need to go back. You had a recommendation that I don't think they got you formally on.

Paula Campagnoli: We did them all.

Betty Ann Kane: We did. We have voted on both of the recommendations - the updated NANC flow narratives as the response to the directive from the FCC in June, and then the Best Practices #71. There are new issues related to that that have come up with the new referral, and we're going to deal with that.

Jose Jimenez: I am concerned that we believe that the LNPA Working Group recommendations are fully addressed. I just don't believe that it does. I believe it partially addresses interconnected VoIP providers getting access to numbers, but

that directive also asked this body to look at non-geographic number portability and the LNPA Working Group hasn't gotten that directive so it doesn't do that. And I feel that if we're going to approve that, it should be with the proviso that the LNPA Working Group narrative partially addresses --

Betty Ann Kane: We'll continue to look at the issue. It says geographic considerations, not specifically non-geographic. I don't think the difference is technically there, and also rate center geographic, and 911.

Ann Berkowitz: Jose, I have to disagree with you. I actually do think this answers our problem. I think it saves you from having to ask for an extension actually. The whole non-geographic number portability in the nationwide wireless porting came up well after this June order came out, and it came up with a separate venue. It's a completely separate issue. While they do mention possibly somewhere in the order about geographically should we looked at what the specific directive for the NANC was - and you have the exact language, Chairman Kane - what other considerations or what other problems may arise with the existing system and how things operate today by implementing the VoIP direct access, and I believe that's what they came up with and they said it's just the one change.

Jose Jimenez: I just believe that that's incorrect. I mean the order says we are not going to put up any -- we are not

going to say, no, you cannot port non-geographic to interconnected VoIP providers. And in that same paragraph, it asks the commission to look at these issues. So it was an interesting --

Ann Berkowitz: And it lists out the very issues that they asked them to consider and to file a report on.

Jose Jimenez: I respectfully disagree. I think the commission wanted this body to take the next step, without prohibiting non-geographic portability, to go ahead and look at the issues that it will present and to come up with recommendations. That's what the June order did.

Paula Campagnoli: But that wasn't part of the specific request within 180 days to report back on.

Jose Jimenez: Yes, it was. But it's a black and white order and I guess we can all walk away with different -- it is unfortunate that I feel that we're not, in fact, carrying this forward because if our focus going forward is strictly on the wireless number portability, that's a huge issue too.

Paula Campagnoli: Well, it won't be. We'll discuss this via open point, but I was very involved with the nationwide wireless porting issue that came up in July. And while the directive was about wireless porting, our systems are integrated, so there's no way we can fulfill this recommendation without considering the wireline porting, and the impact, and

the changes. So that's going to be part of that discussion. But that, again, I believe is separate. We'll agree to disagree on where that stands, but I believe we have fulfilled our order here.

Jose Jimenez: At least from the Cox perspective, I do not believe we have.

Betty Ann Kane: Your objection is recorded. I'm going to say that the June directive specifically had to do with interconnected VoIP.

Jose Jimenez: Yes.

Betty Ann Kane: Period. So we will send that on. Thank you very much. I'm sorry, yes?

Jerome Candelaria: Jerome Candelaria, NCTA.

Betty Ann Kane: Yes, Jerome.

Jerome Candelaria: Revisiting the issue of consensus on the flows, the discussion concerning the scope, it actually pretty much occurred after the vote. So it raised in my mind the specific issue of whether we were articulate in that the issue of addressing the specific geographic limits were being addressed. It was in my sense that consensus was addressing the specs of how we are going to port these IP numbers around this.

Paula Campagnoli: The only thing with the definition of Class 1 interconnected VoIP, the processes that were used, that were there before we added that definition, we didn't change

anything in the flows and the transactions. They're the same transactions, the same flow process that we've been using for the last 18 -- 1998 was when we started porting, I think it was, and they're the same flows. They haven't changed and we didn't change them because of VoIP providers. We didn't need to according to the VoIP providers that were attending the meeting.

Jerome Candelaria: I understand. However, this concept raised in the order about non-declining to specify non-geographic and geographic portability seemed in my mind to be a separate issue.

Paula Campagnoli: Oh, okay. Yeah.

Jerome Candelaria: And that was made apparent until the following discussion. So if the consensus is saying that that issue was resolved as well, I agree that there's no consensus here. If it's as you described dealing with this practical aspect of meeting the flows, then --

Ron Steen: Yeah, that's been done.

Betty Ann Kane: Yes.

Paula Campagnoli: Yes.

Ron Steen: So if we could just start getting through --
[audio glitch]

Betty Sanders: This is Betty Sanders. Hi.

Betty Ann Kane: Yes. Thank you.

Betty Sanders: I know Jerome is speaking, but I can barely hear him. I don't know if you're in the mic or not, Jerome.

Betty Ann Kane: Can you move a little closer, Jerome?

Female Voice: Ron, try now.

Ron Steen: Yeah. When I get a chance, I'd like to make a comment.

Betty Ann Kane: All right.

Jerome Candelaria: I was just saying my view of what we determined was consensus didn't embrace this concept of non-geographic portability from the IP perspective, and I think Paula agreed that that was the case.

Paula Campagnoli: Exactly.

Betty Ann Kane: It's geographic considerations. We're not

--

Jose Jimenez: I do not understand. I mean --

Betty Ann Kane: Somebody on the phone want to comment?

Ron Steen: Yes, Chairman Kane. This is Ron Steen, one of the tri-chairs of the working group.

Betty Ann Kane: Yes.

Ron Steen: And I apologize for taking so long. I've been trying to get into the bridge, but I think somehow we were muted. I just wanted to make some comments in support of what Paula has been saying. Jose, I really think you're putting about three different issues together. First of all, as far as

the LNPA Working Group addressing non-geographic porting, we actually did a report at the end of last year that describes the issues that would have to be addressed to do non-geographic porting. I'd like to point to that, I'm sure it's available on the website. We can make sure that it's available for you to look at. It's not as if it hadn't been addressed.

This particular item that Paula was reporting on had to do with the wireless number portability, and she addressed just exactly what we had been asked to look at on that. And then the other issue of the VoIP porting and the changing of the flows, we studied that in-depth when we were asked to. I had a subcommittee to look at it and, first of all, VoIP has been -- it's not like anything has happened to deter I think is the word I'm looking for, deter them from porting as they have been porting for a long time. Now that they can get their own numbers, the VoIP providers can get their own numbers directly from the numbering administrator, we looked at it to see what changes are needed to be made. What we ended up with was a clarification of the definition of the port of the Class 1, 2, and 3 VoIP providers and that's what we've put in the flows. We've clarified a few places to make sure that that was taken care of.

And then as far as looking in the future for what would be done, naturally we will address that as we're requested to do

that. But I just wanted to say we've actually blended, in my opinion, several different issues together, and Paula was reporting on the latest thing we looked at which was the wireless nationwide number porting. So Paula, I hope that helps to clarify some of the things that you were talking about.

Paula Campagnoli: I am confused about one thing. Because wireless non-geographic porting, we haven't done any work on that yet.

Betty Ann Kane: No. And that was not the issue that was referred to you. It was interconnected. Now that interconnected VoIP can get their own numbers, are there any changes or implications for rate center geographic considerations? Are there any 911 or PSAP problems? And are there any porting problems that occur as a result of the change that occurred allowing VoIP providers to get their own numbers? That was the trigger. And are there any other changes? And your report to the NANC is that updating the flow narratives and the definitions addresses any issues that you saw that could arise simply as a result of interconnected VoIP providers getting their own numbers directly because that was the change, correct?

Paula Campagnoli: Yeah.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. There are a whole lot of other issues out there that we're going to deal with, but that

specific question was triggered by the fact that interconnected VoIP providers can now get it under the FCCs or to get their own numbers directly. And so simply as a result of that change, are there any things that need to be changed or recommendations that implicate rate centers geography or 911 or porting? And their recommendation to the NANC is that change in the flows and definitions addresses that question. There're a whole lot of other things that we're going to deal with in terms of the IP, et cetera, but --

Paula Campagnoli: The definition was the only thing in the flows that we had to change for the VoIPs. The only reason we made a change on the other, for the wireless capability for short-timers, that was something that we had put in to the impact a long time ago but we never changed the flow.

Betty Ann Kane: And that was not a result of the interconnected VoIP getting direct access?

Paula Campagnoli: No, it was not.

Betty Ann Kane: Are we clear now on what the LNPA Working Group was responding to and what they have made a recommendation on? I think we're clear on our acceptance of that recommendation on that narrow issue. Yes?

Jose Jimenez: Jose Jimenez with Cox again. I'm clear that the LNPA Working Group has a recommendation that would enable the NANC to tell the commission if you make this change in the

definition of certain NANC flows and the definition of what a carrier one is, that interconnected VoIP provider can get access to numbers directly.

Paula Campagnoli: And can port.

Jose Jimenez: And can port.

Betty Ann Kane: And can port. And does not cause problems with 911.

Jose Jimenez: But the challenge I have is that I believe that is all true so long as that portability is still connected to some geography and that number assignment is still connected to some geography. We have not addressed what would happen.

Paula Campagnoli: No.

Jose Jimenez: And I guess one difference of opinion is whether the commission in fact asked this body to look at those issues too. I believe that we had that task and we have not yet met it, but we have a difference of opinion there.

Second, I agree that the LNPA Working Group issued a report in March, a wonderful report that laid out the challenges that non-geographic portability for interconnected VoIP will pose. That is again only part of the assignment. We also need to come up with recommendations to address those challenges. We won't have that, and, therefore, I cannot support and I will not support a recommendation that from my perspective only has NANC meeting part of the ask from the commission. That's all.

Betty Ann Kane: So let the record reflect that it's not unanimous. Ann?

Ann Berkowitz: Yes. Also the report the LNPA Working Group did, which the NANC actually didn't see because of a snow day, that actually is what helps spawn the letter that the chairman sent to the wireless providers asking for a solution. Again, a separate issue. But they did point back to that. There was no reference to the VoIP.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. And that report is the future of numbering. People need a break.

Female Voice: Suzanne's on the phone.

Betty Ann Kane: Oh, Suzanne. Okay. Thank you.

Suzanne Voice: Can you hear me okay?

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

Betty Ann Kane: Your report will be document number 11. Go ahead.

Suzanne Addington: Yes. This is Suzanne Addington with Sprint, and I tri-chair the FoN Working Group with Carolee Hall from Idaho PUC and Dawn Lawrence from XO communications. On page 2 of the report provides our mission and our scope. That has not changed. Page 3 provides the status of our subcommittees that we've had in progress. The first one, the geographic routing of toll-free services FTN 4, that letter and the whitepaper was forwarded by the NANC to the FCC in July.

The group reached consensus to close this item. There's nothing more to do on the side. I mean we closed it in the October meeting.

FTN 8: All IP Addressing. It was a subcommittee created to define future identifiers in support of IP industry trends beyond the e.164 numbering plan. [Technical glitch 2:21:18-2:30:05]

Betty Ann Kane: We're back on the record. We have discovered the problem with the music, and it's not here in the FCC system. I hope the people on the bridge could hear this. Apparently, one of the bridge participants, when you put us on hold, if you're on the call and then you put it in on hold, your system plays music. That's what we're hearing even though you're maybe muted. So if you need to talk to somebody in your office or anything, put it on mute. Don't put it on hold. Thank you.

All right. We have two more reports, the INC and the ATIS report. And then we have, unless you're going to move other business up to those two reports -- I'm sorry, Suzanne. We were in the middle of the FoN report, or just at the beginning of the FoN report. So we'll have the FoN report, and then the INC and the ATIS report. Then I'm going to move -- this other business, move that up because there's a new business before we open to the public and summarize the action items.

Female Voice: Did you say you're going to listen to the FoN report?

Betty Ann Kane: Yes. She's on the phone. Suzanne?

Suzanne Addington: This is Suzanne. Can you hear me okay?

Betty Ann Kane: We could hear you fine.

Suzanne Addington: That's always good to hear. All right. I will start from page 3. I believe that's possibly where the music crept in, with the subcommittee updates. FTN 4, the geographic routing of toll-free services. The group reached consensus to close the item based on the previous activity of the NANC board and the cover letter and the whitepaper to the FCC in July.

FTN 8 for All IP Addressing. The All IP Addressing subcommittee was created to define future identifiers in support of IP industry trends beyond the e.164 numbering plan. They felt like until the NANC [audio glitch] is forecasted by the NANPA to occur within approximately 15 years, it wasn't necessary to further this discussion in the subcommittee so we reached consensus to close this subcommittee as well in the October meeting.

On page 4, the nationwide 10-digit dialing was agreed to be added as an open discussion item for future meetings. We

reached consensus to change our monthly meeting schedule in 2016 to a quarterly meeting schedule, and we provided the dates of our meetings for the entire year listed here. However, we also reached agreement that additional meetings would be scheduled if the need arises. So we still have that flexibility to add additional meetings as needed.

Page 5 is the FoN membership of those companies and states who attend our meetings. Page 6, our last conference call that was held on October 7th. We're currently scheduled to move to quarterly meetings in 2016, and our next meeting is February 10th. Our contact information is provided there if anyone needs to reach out to us.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. You mentioned that nationwide 10-digit dialing was going to be one of your future topics for discussion. Did I hear that correctly?

Suzanne Addington: It is. It's just an open discussion for anyone to bring any items up. It doesn't have a specific goal in mind.

Betty Ann Kane: Okay. So you're not working on it. You're just discussing it.

Suzanne Addington: Right.

Betty Ann Kane: Commissioner Kjellander.

Paul Kjellander: I understand, too, that -- I believe that Carolee Hall from Idaho is involved with your group. Is that correct?

Suzanne Addington: That is correct.

Paul Kjellander: Great. So as you look at the 10-digit dialing as well as other issues associated with some of the new technologies and have maybe a benefit, could you keep me in mind? There's a lot of interest in the states, as you are well aware, especially as you look at the IP protocols and to the extent that perhaps there may be the possibility of some resolutions down the road through the National Association Regulatory Utility Commissioners. Let us know if and when there is an appropriate time to pull the trigger on moving in that direction because certainly I don't want to get in the way of the work that you're doing. But I know that Carolee is aware of some of those efforts, and I'd appreciate any feedback you might be able to give me on if and when the appropriate time might be to move in that direction. Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you, Commissioner Kjellander.

Suzanne Addington: I'm sorry, who is that speaking? I didn't hear the first part?

Paul Kjellander: If you liked what I said, it's Commissioner Kjellander.

Betty Ann Kane: Idaho. Yeah, it is Commissioner Kjellander. There is an interest in a number of states, I mean at the national level, in the issue of nationwide 10-digit dialing. People know that you're looking at that. So your report was number 11. Are there any other questions on the Future of Numbering Working Group report?

Status of the Industry Numbering Committee Activities (INC)

Moving on to the next report, which is the INC, your report will be Document Number 12.

Dyan Adams: Good afternoon. My name is Dyan Adams from Verizon Communications. I am co-chair of the ATIS Industry Numbering Committee with Connie Hartmann from iconectiv. Today, I'll be providing a readout of INC's activities since the last NANC meeting, including the topic of the sale and brokering of non-toll-free numbers. I will also provide a summary on seven INC issues.

The ATIS INC provides an open forum to address some resolved industry-wide issues associated with planning, administration, allocation, assignment and use of NANP resources. On slide 2 we also included our membership URLs for your convenience. Since the previous NANC meeting, INC held two face-to-face meetings in September and November and two intra meetings in October and November.

Slide 5: At the last NANC meeting, INC was tasked with addressing the topic of the sale and brokering of non-toll-free TNs. We held two virtual meetings to discuss the topic and reviewed several sources of information, including the correspondents between the NANC Chair and the Wireline Competition Bureau, the *Washington Post* article that prompted the discussion, the websites of the companies referenced in the article, as well as existing commission rules and INC documents related to the topic. INC sent a response to the NANC chair on November 19th, and I'll give you a high level summary of our findings.

The two companies identified in the *Washington Post* article state on their websites they are providing account or call management services not specifically selling TNs. INC outlined three potential scenarios for how these two companies are obtaining numbers. INC is not aware of any FCC rules related to end-user transactions involving non-toll-free numbers comparable to existing restrictions on toll-free subscribers.

Some other points noted by INC are that its guidelines apply to service providers, not end-users. There are several FCC rules that appear to limit end-users' ability to engage in activities that adversely impact number resource optimization. Although some service providers' tariffs and/or agreements

indicate the end-user has no property rights to TNs, the ability to port TNs may give them the impression they have such rights.

INC's response also summarizes the following points: There are legitimate reasons for transferring numbers between private entities. Rules or policies that require service providers to second guess end-users' transfer request could adversely affect customers' legitimate needs. Service providers are not in a position to monitor if there is a sale or brokering transaction between parties associated with TN transfers. INC believes the FCC's Enforcement Bureau is the proper authority to address inappropriate transactions related to numbering resources. We provided the URL where you can find the specific response that was sent on November 19th. It's on ATIS' legal page.

Moving to slide 9. We have INC's work on Issue 497, which is related to interconnected Web providers' direct access to numbering resources. As a result of FCC Order 15-70, INC updated 13 of its guidelines with respect to the following areas - authorization, facility's readiness, VPC access to p-ANI, and CFR references and definitions including clarification of intermediate numbers. INC also drafted a template that iVoIP providers can use to provide their 30-day notice of intent to request resources and their regulatory and numbering contacts to the states. The NANPA and PA will be submitting change orders to update text on the forums in NAS and PAS; however, INC agreed

to place this issue into final closure with the understanding the systems will not be updated until the change orders have been implemented.

INC placed the following notation on the cover page of any guidelines containing updates not effective on November 30th. So the inset portion of the slide is what is on said guidelines. It says, note, these guidelines contain references to FCC Order 15-70 as noted in the Federal Register. I do believe we copy and pasted that. Once section 5215 G2 and G3 become effective, this note will be removed and all text in the guidelines will be effective.

Next we have slide 11, INC issue related to the IP transition which is Issue 748. INC continues to discuss a possible document on non-geographic number assignment. Based on initial discussions, a concern has been raised that if non-geographic number assignment and non-geographic number portability are implemented, they should be done simultaneously to avoid disparity and facilitated in a manner that does not disrupt or delay the LNPA transition.

Slide 12: We have an update on Issue 780 regarding 555 line number assignments and reclamation. I know John reported on that earlier in some detail. We recapped here what was reported in September, and I think the most notable change from our last readout is the updated information on the number of returns and

reclamations which we have on our slide as 2,576 but John stated earlier it's closer to 2,600 as this time. And as he indicated, NANPA will submit a proposal to INC concerning the 555 line number resource when their outreach efforts are complete.

Slide 13 is regarding issue 800 which resulted in updates to the 9YYNXX guidelines in regard to auditing reclamation and extension procedures so they are consistent with other INC guidelines. In summary, the updates included elimination of the administrator's ability to grant extensions to activate 9YYNXXs. INC added the ability for 9YYNXX code assignees to request extensions from the FCC, added an administrator responsibility to provide a reminder notification to assignees of the Part C duty which is the confirmation of in-service, revise the guidelines so that the FCC directs the administrator to reclaim 9YYNXX codes that are not activated within the required timeframe, and added an administrator responsibility to refer issues of non-compliance to a designated auditor or appropriate regulatory agency.

Moving on, Issue 801 is directly related to FCC Order 15-70 which permits VPC providers to receive p-ANI from the RNA when states do not otherwise certify VPC providers. INC updated the p-ANI guidelines to outline the appropriate documentation that VPC providers shall provide the RNA in those circumstances.

Slide 15. Issue 802 relates to code applicants using another service provider switch or points of interconnection. An assignment assumption in the CO code guidelines states that CO codes are assigned to entities for use at a switching entity or point of interconnection they own or control. The CO CAG was updated to allow an applicant to submit a CO code request with another service provider's switcher ploy [sounds like] when the applicant has a contractual arrangement to use that switcher ploy, and provides the appropriate supporting documentation which will be kept on file by the administrator for future applications using the same arrangement.

Slide 16. Issue 804 resulted in updates to the CO CAG to make block and CO code reservations consistent and to ensure efficient use of CO code resources. The guidelines were updated to limit code reservations to situations where a service provider has submitted a safety valve waiver to the appropriate regulatory authority and is awaiting the outcome of that request. The timeframe that a CO code can remain reserved was also shortened and a requirement was added for service providers to cancel reservations if they are no longer needed or if the associated safety valve waiver is denied.

Slide 17: Lift INC issues and initial closure, and slide 18 shows one issue and final closure, and our last slide includes relevant INC Web pages as we normally provide.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. You've been very busy. Are there questions about the report? If you could clarify on slide 6, on your conclusion, the last bullet point. Discuss the after-sale and brokering of non-toll-free telephone numbers between private entities. In your last bullet point, it says that you're not aware of any FCC rules related to end-user transactions involving non-toll-free telephone numbers analogous to the restrictions that are imposed on toll-free number subscribers. Are you saying that -- have you concluded that FCC doesn't need to do rules or simply that no rules exist?

Dyan Adams: That no rules exist.

Betty Ann Kane: And have you reached the point of making or concluding whether or not rules should be enacted?

Dyan Adams: No. I don't --

Betty Ann Kane: In other words, is there a gap? Or you're not at that point yet?

Dyan Adams: I'm not sure that INC is going to get to that point. We did the analysis based on what information was available to us and, honestly, short of one of us purchasing a number to see how it really works, we know that no rules technically exist that prohibits this behavior.

Betty Anne Kane: So the issue was still open as to whether or not this is a behavior that should be prohibited by rules.

Dyan Adams: I would say that's correct. INC feels that the FCC's Enforcement Bureau is the best place to make that determination. I don't believe that the group itself was planning on making a recommendation one way or the other.

Betty Ann Kane: But in order to enforce something, there would have to be a rule.

Dyan Adams: Correct.

Betty Ann Kane: Any other questions on this report? Thank you.

Dyan Adams: Thanks.

Status of the ATIS-IP Transition Initiatives

Betty Ann Kane: Next report is the ATIS report, and that will be Document Number 13.

Jackie Voss: Good morning. My name is Jackie Voss with the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions. I'm going to give you an overview today of ATIS All-IP Program. On slide 2, it lists the different areas that I'm going to mention in more detail in the following pages.

As a reminder, slide 3 represents that we're not only addressing the standards that support the transition to all-IP, which are represented in the horizontal bars, but, also, we're addressing the operational aspects as noted in the vertical columns.

Slide 4. As part of the primary transition program, ATIS is evaluating the basic set of services associated with the PSCN and addressing these services in a mix circuit switch, a packet switch environment, and in the future eventually on all packet switch environment.

On slide 5, you might remember at the prior meeting I mentioned that the PSRA, the Public Safety Related Applications Task Force was wrapping up with a report. That report has now been publicly released. The areas that it addresses are related to energy and utilities, alarm circuits to fire and police, transportation, and a broader set of emergency operations that are currently provisioned in the copper infrastructure. The document provides a high level of insight into the directional changes that could be enabled by the transition to all-IP.

Another work effort recently completed with the technical report to support RTT, which is real-time testing, is the ability to instantly communicate via text as it's typed. The teletypewriter TTY service can be provided over IP between operator's networks through the use of global text telephony capability which enables the simultaneous audio and/or video with text media stream. And as this work continues, we're engaging the consumer community in working on standardizing mobile devices to handle this type of communication.

Slide 7, another document was recently published that addresses enhanced calling name in the IP-based NGN. It describes a service that includes mandatory longer name field beyond the existing 15 characters and additional information about the caller. These service offerings address both calling and called parties that are in the IP-based NGN network and the name and related information that come from the database.

Earlier in the meeting, the Testbed Focus Group initiative was touched on. This effort is looking at testbeds to validate related solutions. They recently published a report on assessment and next steps which identifies ten use cases related to numbering, routing, provider-to-provider metadata and all-IP network. We had mentioned earlier that toll-free calling was one of those scenarios. The document provides an initial assessment and indication of interest by nine different focus group members to participate in one or more of the scenarios.

A more recent active topic that we're looking at is caller ID spoofing and robocall mitigation techniques. The ATIS Pocket Technology and Systems Committee is in the process of working on a technical report that reviews problems associated with originating party spoofing in IP networks and analyzes the various mitigation techniques. With this, ATIS and PTSC are working with a set forum on the development of a specification for an extensible canonical token that cryptographically

represent the originating call number and the provider that originated this call. This effort compliments the work being done in the IETester. The TOPS council is also developing use and test cases to support this effort, as well as ATIS' Next Generation Interconnection Interoperability Forum is developing a baseline document that discusses caller ID spoofing issues and methodologies to mitigate them.

And finally, as ATIS' North American partner, the 3GPP, we're working on a program that's examining enhanced prevention and detection of caller ID spoofing as it relates to IP multimedia subsystems. This concludes my report for today.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. You have also been busy. Questions?

Rebecca Thompson: Rebecca Thompson, CCA. Just looking at slide 6, have you all come to any conclusions on that, in particular with respect to the standardizing mobile device behavior with RTT, or is that still just in --?

Jackie Voss: That's a work in progress.

Betty Ann Kane: Any questions on the phone? Okay, thank you. Thank you very much. Those conclude our prepared reports. All our groups have been very busy.

Summary of Action Items

As was mentioned, I'm going new business now. On November 16th the commission referred to the NANC a new area of inquiry

and request for a report. I believe that was all shared. Everyone has the copy of that letter, but I want to also put it into the record. It grows out of the short term interim and recommended long term solutions that CCA and CTIA presented to the commission on enabling nationwide wireless number portability through technical modifications to the Location Routing Number system, the LRN, and to in particular the issue of non-nationwide carriers being able to participate in nationwide porting.

In that letter from CCA and CTIA to the commission, the CCA and CTIA also recommended, they had noted that the NANC should have a role and has expertise in this area. The Wireline Competition Bureau, in close consultation with the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, agrees experts within NANC should evaluate the important number portability issues and report to the commission on its evaluation and proposed solutions to nationwide wireless number portability. That's the focus of this nationwide, wireless number portability.

So the commission is directing the NANC to study the regulatory and consumer issues that may arise in connection with allowing a wireless telephone number to be associated with any location routing number, or LRN, and propose solutions to any identified issue. And there is a list of seven specific issues related to nationwide wireless porting that they're asking the

NANC to address - some of them are very broad - potential impacts to the life of the North American Numbering Plan; Numbering Resource Utilization and Forecasting Forum impacts; applicability and assessment of tolls, tariffs and taxes; the role of state regulatory commissions; costs, including cost recovery; conforming edits to relevant federal rules and how long the need for LRNs will continue to exist once VoIP interconnection is fully implemented, including an analysis of the role of LRNs for carriers to implement both TDM and voice-based interconnection during the voice interconnection transition.

They're asking the NANC to report its findings on these issues no later than six months from today. That would take us to about the middle of April, today being November 16th, the date of the letter; as well as asking for interim reports every 45 days to Marilyn as our DFO, and also directing the NANC to consider the short term interim and long term solutions that CCA and CTIA recommendations that ATIS evaluate and recommend actions to enable nationwide wireless number portability, and to engage the ATIS and the local number portability administrator in this effort as NANC deems appropriate.

And then finally, to the extent that the report will address 911 issues associated with nationwide porting of wireless telephone numbers, encouraging the NANC to consult with

the National Emergency Number Association - the NENA - and that wireless providers may wish to pursue near-time solution suggested by CCA and CTIA while the interim and long term solutions are under consideration by NANC. Also there's that reference to the North American Numbering Council local number portability, the LNPA whitepaper on non-geographic number portability from last February, asking and encouraging the NANC to build on that work that the LNPA has done and, finally, committing to make available the commission's technical experts to work with NANC on this important consumer and competition issue.

The issue before us is how we get this work done in six months with everything else on our plates, which working group or groups it would be appropriate to assign this to and to have a plan for coming up with at least an initial report back to the commission on these important issues. I know we've had some discussions on that. We have two. We have the LNPA, which has been cited, the LNPA Working Group. We have the Future of Numbering Working Group. We have the fact that the ATIS is working on some of these issues as well. I want to hear from you on how we fulfill this very important assignment. I think, Richard, you had your sign up first.

Richard Shockey: Thank you. Richard Shockey, SIP Forum, again. First of all I want to emphasize that I'm in complete

agreement with Jose Jimenez of Cox, that the issue that was raised in the November 16th letter simply cannot be addressed as wireless specific. Even though a short term solution may deal with the very appropriate issues that CCA and CTIA have come up with, it would be improper I think for us to focus specifically on that while not looking at essentially the longer term issue of wireline and wireless number portability and the ultimate need for ten-digit dialing to support that.

Of course, the letter from the 16th also related to a fairly extensive letter from Congress. I have not necessarily seen many letters where Greg Walden and NISU [phonetic] signed the same sheet of paper, rather unusual, and certainly Chairman Wheeler's response to CTIA's letter one way or the other. My recommendation is that it is clear that the expertise here has already done I would believe about 50 percent to 60 percent of the work. The whitepaper produced by the LNPA Working Group is excellent first start. I would certainly recommend that the LNPA Working Group build on the success that it has already demonstrated with this while agreeing at the same time to look at this on a much more holistic basis wireline as well as wireless.

Make sure that our colleagues from the PUC, by the way, have an appropriate input to this as well. Since if we are going to be talking about ten-digit dialing and national

geographic portability, what is the appropriate role of the states in the number allocation process. There has been a federal state partnership now for some time about this. I think that can be maintained, and it should be maintained and how all of this ultimately relates to the PST in transition.

We have seen in the PSTN transition several things going on here at the commission for quite some time. It was logical and appropriate that numbering would take its place alongside of USF and ICC reform, for instance, the ongoing issues of PSTN transition to 14 orders that we have seen coming down in weeks one way or the other. But if there is a time to finally address this issue once and for all and not do it in a piecemeal fashion, that time is right now. Again, I think the best first place to start is with the LNPA Working Group. I would certainly be willing to work with the LNPA Working Group personally in providing additional technical expertise on this. Let me just make that as an opening statement. You can throw your tomatoes now.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. Rosemary.

Rosemary Emmer: Rosemary Emmer with Sprint. I have an idea, that we give the potential impacts to the life of the NAP, and the Numbering Resource Utilization and Forecasting Forum impacts to the NOWG. I think we should give the tolls, tariffs and the state regulatory commission to the FoN - anything

regulatory-related - or perhaps what they could do would be to provide report that talks about the regulatory impacts. I don't know.

I'm not sure where to put cost. Because under the NANC we don't usually talk about cost, so I don't know where that belongs. Maybe we throw that into the FoN and see what happens with it. I don't know. Conforming edits to relevant federal rules, I'm not sure, maybe we throw that to the FoN too. The LNPA Working Group maybe takes how long the need for LRNs will continue to exist once a VoIP [sounds like] interconnection is fully implemented. And I won't read the rest.

So my thought process is maybe what we do is utilize what we already have. I mean we could just do an IMG and have everybody come to the IMG. But if we do it piecemeal, we could have NOWG. The LNPA Working Group could, as Richard said, look at their whitepaper that they made and maybe make that more robust or have a look and see what they could do to upgrade that. So basically we would be having the working groups that the NANC already has underneath their umbrella get to work on these bullet points. And maybe we get the IMG. I mean I haven't talked to anybody about this because I didn't read it until just now unfortunately.

Betty Ann Kane: I've done a lot of stuff were coming at us before the holidays. It was one reason I read it out loud today to refresh our memories.

Rosemary Emmer: Yeah. The co-chairs may not be too happy with me. Maybe what happens is the IMGs, since they're the folks who gather information, maybe the IMG has a meeting before the 45-day report is due. I don't know if it's the co-chairs or maybe the IMGs just have a meeting with everyone like they normally do. Who wants to attend can listen in. I don't know how that would work. But maybe the IMG is the one that actually puts together the report, the status report every 45 days to give to you or to give to the NANC for the actual consensus. I'm not sure how all that would work. But I guess initially I was thinking, oh, well, this would be a good opportunity for us to have another IMG which is interim and we could all put our heads together. And then I thought, why do that when we already have all these expertise underneath these different forums? But building that as to how do we get that into a report, I thought maybe that would be through the IMG that we already have. I don't know. But that's it. Thank you for listening.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. She basically says let's kind of break the work up among the existing working groups and have some overall coordinator role.

Ann Berkowitz: I'm just going to say I agree with Rosemary's idea of using the existing groups that we have. I would maybe throw a cost into LNPA Working Group because it's going to be the cost of changing the LRNs, the cost of impact there. It could be as simple as the co-chairs getting together after they've all met, and coming together with a joint report. I don't know that you need to add another working group into the mix. We have a short timeframe.

Rosemary Emmer: Rosemary Emmer with Sprint. I'm not sure how we address the cost issue, so we don't talk about cost as much as some of us would like to from time to time. I'm trying to think now through all these years what was the actual reason why we don't, and I don't - Mary knows - because I can't recall. So that's all. Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: Mary.

Mary Retka: Mary Retka from CenturyLink. First of all, I'd like to agree with what Richard Shockey said. We should look at it from both wireless and a wireline perspective. Because even if we tried only to look at it from a wireless perspective, because everyone has to route calls in the public switch to telephone network, you cannot restrict it simply to wireless. It really must be both wireless and wireline. Also, if you don't, you create a disparity.

I also believe that you need to look at non-geographic numbering administration assignment. Because if you don't do non-geographic number assignment at the same time you do non-geographic number portability, you bait an opportunity for more reasons for people to sell and barter numbers. I think that's very important to you, Madam Chairman, so I think we need to look at both. As Diane reported, INC has already got some things under consideration on that.

In terms of cost, the reason we generally stay away from cost is due to anti-trust concerns. So because those still exist, I think we must be very careful. I understand it's in the letter. However, I'm certain - Marilyn, I'm sure you know this - that there was that possible thought that we do need to stay away from that concern for those very reasons. I agree with the fact that we do need to think about where all of this goes, as Rosemary said, in a number of different groups. The way that we then take all of that input and put it together in one voice from the NANC may be a little bit more difficult and we need to probably think about that.

Betty Ann Kane: Jose.

Jose Jimenez: Jose Jimenez, Cox Communications, I appreciate Richard and Mary both bringing back the wireline national portability and national number assignment issues. I would also at least -- I mean I don't want to boil the ocean,

but we did talk earlier today about toll-free numbers as well and their connection to this whole transition, whether we need to look at them in conjunction with the six-month clock to address assignment and portability on non-geographic for regular numbers. I don't know. I'm open to hearing about that. That will be all, I think, if we tackle all three major areas. I like the division of labor that Rosemary put forward. I think dividing the labor makes sense as long as the chairs at least are making sure that they are coordinating behind the scenes so that there's no trampling across and we're efficient as opposed to working at the same issue in a couple of forums. But otherwise, I think it makes sense.

Richard Shockey: First of all, Mary, your point about looking at number administration at the same time, that was an excellent point and I completely agree with you. There are two other quick points that the letter points out that we have to be very, very cognizant of in our outreach, which is if we are going to national geographic portability for wireline numbers, the impacts on PSAPs and selective routers will be enormous. It is no question that that is going to be the elephant that sits in the room as we address these issues.

The second thing is I hope there is consensus among all the working groups that are going to address this problem. Our recommendation to the commission is to set a date specific,

namely by I think [indiscernible] March 4th, 2020 we're going to do this, because if we don't recommend a date specific, then it will drag on until we're all dead frankly. It's like the digital television transition. At some particular point in time, you just have to say it needs to get done by this particular date. The NANC is probably not constituted to recommend what that date is. But certainly if our work leads to NPRM, which would be inevitable, it is certainly necessary to set dates for implementation. Maybe an interim solution for non-national wireless carriers, they can do it by this date. But at some particular point in the future, we do it nationally and everything is put in place.

Betty Ann Kane: Jerome.

Jerome Candelaria: Jerome Candelaria, NCTA. I wanted to observe that the letter uses the term wireless. It doesn't define wireless and I think historically we understood that to be CMRS. But times are changing where we have IP-based wireless services maybe utilizing Wi-Fi and it begs the question whether the scope of what we're considering here needs to incorporate that. I would think at a minimum the scope of what the FoN thinks about should contemplate that scenario. I understand we were expected to have a product tier [sounds like]. We could open up these questions quite broadly. But I don't want to lose the fact that we're not only dealing with wireless to wireline,

but we're dealing with new flavors of wireless that also from a competitive perspective need to see the benefits of this kind of portability.

Then to reiterate the PSAP issue, we talked about cost. The whitepaper did an excellent job of highlighting those costs. One thing that was clear is PSAP cost can be significant. How we capture those seems to be out of the scope of these forums' expertise though.

Betty Ann Kane: Who hasn't spoken?

Male Voice: Rebecca, you go ahead.

Rebecca Thompson: Rebecca Thompson with CCA. First I just like to thank this organization for taking this issue up. We're glad you're tackling it. We know it's a heavy lift and so CCA really is thankful for that. I'm also glad I'm sitting here today so that I can understand this better.

But just a couple of points, the letter from the Wireline Competition Bureau chief was based on CTIA and CCA's letter, and we do mention CMRS in that letter. I understand your point about new technologies, but we did mention CMRS in that letter. To the point about a date, certainly we want a date certain when this can get done. But I don't know that you can bifurcate it because, as we've noticed here, the wireless and the wireline is sort of intertwined so I'm not sure you can bifurcated date.

And then lastly, the point about the cost, I think our intention was -- I mean you've raised a very good point about the anti-trust issues, and we want to be very sensitive about that. But I think there's a way to tackle that in an aggregated fashion. At least from our perspective, it was that we weren't trying, we wanted to be clear that we weren't trying to put the onus on one part of the industry over another because we know that the cost could be borne more by the wireline industry. So that was sort of the genesis of that, it was just to look at who's bearing these costs and why.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. And thank you, Rebecca, for bringing us back to the fact that the letter really grew out of a specific situation and a specific problem that was being addressed. I point out that with the letter, since wireless providers may wish to pursue a near-term solutions suggested by CCA and CTIA while their interim and long term solutions are under consideration by NANC, I think what I'm hearing - and I get to you in a minute - are two things.

Number one, that we all believe that there's a broader issue here, a much broader issue than simply wireless nationwide porting. And that is a concern that really need to be addressed together and studied together. My conclusion is that's not something we can do in six months and look at that broader issue, that that's going to be an ongoing work that we've been

asked. We have to be conscious of those. But we're being asked again by the commission for a specific review of interim and long term solutions that had been suggested by the industry, as well as some of the broader issues that are implicated in the wireless.

So I think as we're talking about dividing the work up among our various work groups, we probably also have to think about a kind of two or even three-tier approach where we want to zero in on the wireless issues that we've been asked to address within that six-month, making very clear that that can't be the answer. We have to look at other issues in conjunction with that. But we do need to come back with some things related to those particular solutions also in order to fulfill what we've been asked to do while making very clear that this is a very much broader issue. I think you're right. You can't solve it addressed simply as a wireless issue. That would be one of the conclusions, I think, we've already come to.

Ann Berkowitz: Ann Berkowitz from Verizon. I just want to make a clarification. This has kind of come up a couple of times. Non-geographic number porting is not happening anywhere today even with the nationwide wireless providers. The nationwide providers have a bigger presence and have work around, but we are not porting non-geographically. We are

porting geographically and letting the costumer roam. So it doesn't exist today and it is a problem for everybody.

Betty Ann Kane: CTIA is your issue. Let's hear from you.

Matthew Gerst: Thanks, I'm Matthew Gerst of CTIA. I want to echo what Rebecca said and thanking the council for taking up this issue and for having the FCC take up these issues.

Certainly, the industry as a whole believe this is an important issue. I did want to make a point of clarification on what exactly the FCC has tasked and asked the NANC to take a look at. Because going back to an earlier conversation, we are dealing with a number of issues related to the concept of how a number can be ported and where it can be ported to.

There is a macro issue with respect to non-geographic number porting which I think affects all wireless/wireline services as we discussed. And I think you pointed out that, to use a phrase that you used of boiling the ocean. This is a significant issue that we need to as a body tackle. But the CTIA/CCA letter looking at an intermediate step and asking the NANC and numbering experts to look at that intermediate step was whether you can associate a telephone number with a different LRN. That is, as I read the FCC's letter, what they're tasking the NANC with looking at that specific part of an intermediate step.

Because the letter says there are three steps here. There's a short term relief that could be gained through some sort of intermediary that the non-nationwide providers could enter into. There is potentially an intermediate step here, but we weren't sure whether it's actually feasible and we wanted the numbering experts within this body to take a look at it related to whether you can disassociate the LRN in order to port a number out of a geographic area. And then there's the longer term issue of non-geographic number portability which we believe needed to be addressed through the IP transition. That issue in particular is something certainly what the goal that this body needs to consider. But I wonder if we need to just narrow our focus a little bit in terms of the immediate six month period for what this body is supposed to be looking at in terms of what's being asked here.

Betty Ann Kane: Of the LRN issue.

Matthew Gerst: Of the LRN issue, which is whether this is technically feasible. If it's technically feasible, what impact will it have on these specific items? But I want to make sure. Maybe, Marilyn, if you could clarify or the FCC could clarify if that's what they're thinking or are they thinking of the larger macro issue of non-geographic number portability.

Richard Shockey: Richard Shockey again. I believe there are interim steps that will work. But the NANC has to make it

absolutely clear that an interim solution is interim. We cannot put the nation's wireline carriers at a significant competitive disadvantage once the consumer understands that you can literally go from Sprint to Verizon. As a national wireless carrier, we are still trying to preserve the wireline telephone infrastructure here.

The answer is, yes, we can do this. There is no tactical barrier to do it. It's only a question really of policy. The question is, are we going to get rid of LRNs? We will be dead before we get rid of LRNs, I can guarantee you that. But the commitment has to be made by the NANC and the commission that, as a truly competitive problem, what CCA and CTIA does was absolutely correct.

However, the longer term competitive issue has to be addressed at the same time in a somewhat linear fashion. We just cannot have an interim report that hints at disadvantaging America's wireline carriers, especially the incumbent wireline carriers who are still heavily dependent on TDM switches one way or the other. Cable operators are all SIP [sounds like]. They're all IP even now. They could implement this kind of a solution based on LRN. They could do it tomorrow much like wireless carriers do it. It's a question of, you know, we've all got to march down this road together. That's my point.

Matthew Gerst: Yeah. And just to clarify - Matt Gerst from CTIA - I'm not disagreeing with that. I mean you could look at this LRN issue and say it should be broader than just wireless in terms of looking at this as an intermediate step. But I think just trying to bring some focus to what we're tasking these different groups with looking at in such a short period of time, it is this specific question of the LRN and the overarching question of how you deal with the non-geographic number portability and the IP transition is maybe a longer term issue that this body needs to consider.

Richard Shockey: Well, Rich Shockey again. The longer term issue is there are certain things that the NANC can recommend, but there is no question that even on the recommendation that CCA and CTIA has made there's going to have to be an NPRM here. What we should be providing the commission is what are the questions that they need to ask to basically fill up the public record. Because the public record on NGLNP, the national ten-digit dialing, and the rest of the future of numbering issues is not very good at this particular point. Now that we have specific goals and objectives, this is the time that the Wireline Competition Bureau has to step up ultimately to do their part. NPRM is an appropriate place to answer a lot of these questions, especially from our friends from the PUCs.

They definitely are going to need to participate if we really are talking about the future of numbering.

Betty Anne Kane: Thank you. We need to wind this up because I need to make a decision on how we're going to respond to the specific request from the FCC, as well as be very conscious that it's a much broader issue than the specific question we've been asked to do, which is to look at the interim and the longer term solution that CCA and CTIA have suggested, and what are the issues related to that to get something back to that, as well as have a plan for looking at making it very clear that this is much broader issue here that also needs to be addressed. And the letter does mention the competition as well. It says it's an important competition and consumer issue. So we have Mary. I'm giving the last -- go ahead.

Mary Retka: Mary Retka from CenturyLink. I just think that we have to come back to ground zero right away here and make a very strong caveat on all the work that's being done here that we do not cause as a result of anything that we're doing any impact to the LNPA transition. I think that's very, very critical.

I agree with Richard that we need to start to look at when all of these needs to happen. I don't think it needs to be a date certain, but we all know that in the IP world we don't need to care about that relationship to geography. So there should

be a timeframe expectation as a part of that, but it needs to be very clear that it cannot in any way impact the LNPA transition. And I think it's important for us to make that caveat for everything we're doing on this upfront.

Betty Anne Kane: Thank you.

Mary Retka: I think the commission would agree with that.

Betty Anne Kane: I would assume so or hope so. We've had a proposal. Oh, Jose, okay, one last comment.

Jose Jimenez: Jose Jimenez from Cox. I'm going to encourage us that no matter what group takes this on, no matter how we approach it, that we approach it from if it is interim, if it is long term, it has to be across all services. I already believe that we missed the ask from the commission from the summer. If we once again take this letter and focus it only on wireless, then it's only creating and perpetuating the problem. Interconnectivity of the providers and that national portability is something we're going to have to wrestle with. If we're going to use the letter as an instrument, fine. Let's use that.

Betty Anne Kane: Thank you. Now, once before us, we've had a number of suggestions and really come back to dividing up the work between various working groups, or the alternative being to assign it to one working group to take the lead in consultation. Paula, did you want to speak to this?

Paula Campagnoli: Yes. This is Paula Campagnoli with T-Mobile. The LNPA Working Group, my suggestion is that we give the technical piece of this to the LNPA Working group because they're the ones that understand how the impact works, how the networks work and so on and so forth. And the back office systems, they know it end-to-end the people that participate.

The other thing is that I would also recommend that we look at all of it, not just wireless because if you go in and make changes to the wireless piece, you're going to affect the wireline piece somehow. So I just think it should be that we should do the technical at the LNPA Working Group, and we should look at it all. If we look at this first part with just the routing numbers or how we're doing it now, I mean we need to start from the beginning and go down and try to find a resolution that will work as time moves on.

Betty Anne Kane: I'm going to assign the technical aspects of it to the LNPA. There are also policy, which I would call policy applicability assessment of tolls, tariff and taxes; potential impacts [indiscernible] the North American Numbering Plan; numbering resource utilization forecasting forms; and the role of state regulatory commissions. Those sound to me like the future of numbering kinds of issues. Is there any disagreement on that?

Rosemary Emmer: Rosemary Emmer of Sprint. The potential impacts of the life of the NANP and the Numbering Resource Utilization and Forecasting Forum impacts I believe would be better served in the NOWG.

Betty Anne Kane: The NOWG, so the first two to NOWG. Applicability, tolls, tariffs, role of state commissions, costs to the extent that there is a cost impact to the future of numbering. And the last one, how long the need for LRNs will continue.

Rosemary Emmer: This is Rosemary with Sprint. While it's very important that each one of those groups take those bullets, there's going to be some work --

Betty Anne Kane: Coordination.

Rosemary Emmer: Right. So that's why --

Betty Anne Kane: I'll set up the process for the heads of each of those groups to report back, so we can do the 45 day report back to the FCC. That's for something every 30 days from the groups and their plan. I'm going to ask each of the groups for their plan to get the work done and get a report done, to get the 45-day reports, and see how it all goes together because we got to have that report to us by March. We haven't set a date yet for our March or April meeting, but it will have come to us by that meeting.

Rosemary Emmer: Rosemary Emmer with Sprint. So I'm trying to think of a scenario that could come up under one or two with the NOWG. So perhaps they talk about those bullets and something comes up that they need to talk to. You know, they need to punt to the LNPA working group because this might be, as Mary was suggesting, it could have something to do with the transition. So I'm wondering if we give the IMG a responsibility --

Betty Anne Kane: To be the coordinator.

Rosemary Emmer: -- to be the coordinator so that the co-chairs and whoever attends, whoever is on the IMG Distro [phonetic] but making sure that the co-chairs of each one of these groups are also on there. Because the NOWG may not realize that the LNPA Working Group needs to do any work or that there's any more technical pieces. Do you see what I mean? So before they report to you, maybe there should be that interim step just to make sure that everybody is working on the same page and all of the technical issues are being worked together. Thank you.

Betty Anne Kane: Thank you. Yes, final comment.

Female Voice: I was just going to say actually, Rosemary, I disagree - I don't know how Valerie and Gina feel about this - the IP IMG. I just think that adds another party to the mix. With a short timeframe, I think Chairman Kane can come up with the

new chairs can be all coordinated or just adding another layer of the administration.

Betty Anne Kane: Given the short time that we have and the meetings and all, can I ask --

Female Voice: Not that we're not happy to do the work, but it's just --

Betty Anne Kane: It's just tracking issues.

Female Voice: We're chasing down people for reports.

Rosemary Emmer: But how is it going to work then if there are things that happen in the NOWG that they don't even know that [cross-talking]

Betty Anne Kane: We could have a conference call on a regular basis that I'll set up between the co-chairs of each of the working groups to see what are they are working on, it could be emails back and forth, so we don't get duplication and we are sure that everything is covered. If there's something that comes up in one working group that implicates another, we can talk.

Jackie Voss: Jackie Voss with ATIS. I know in some of the original communications ATIS was mentioned as a technical resource.

Betty Anne Kane: Yes. And I hope you will be a technical resource to all of the working groups as needed.

Jackie Voss: I was going to say we've done some work in some of the areas. So certainly, if any outreach is needed, feel free to contact me and we can work that through our organization.

Betty Anne Kane: Good. It's a lot. And then we also need to look at maybe the commission's offering their technical resources. There may be technical issues that they can help staff.

Rebecca Thompson: Rebecca Thompson with CCA. Just what we keep coming back to is how much work this all is, so I don't have any particular thought on how you structure it other than to come back to the good clarification that Matt had. You might want to consider prioritizing these bullets because I think the interim step that CCA and CTIA had identified was this idea of associating a number with the different LRN. That's, in my opinion, reflected on that last bullet. So maybe you want to prioritize those.

Betty Anne Kane: Thank you. All right, I think we've reached the conclusion. I will summarize all this up and send it out, then we will get going and set up a schedule to get meetings, expertise, resources that can be responsive to the commission, as well as keeping the focus on the fact that this is a much bigger issue than just the specific issue that has been brought up.

Summary of action items, we have approved the survey and the cover letter to go out. We have approved a revision to flow narratives and to send that to FCC, and approved best practice number 71 and we'll send that to the FCC. And we have established a process for responding to the commission's request for the NANC to look at the CCA, CTIA, LRN wireless nationwide porting with a very strong understanding that this is not just a wireless issue and that the whole issue needs to be looked at across the board. Is there anyone from the public who -- oh, I'm sorry. Jose.

Jose Jimenez: Jose Jimenez from Cox. I do recall that in the discussion of the LNPA transition, Marilyn, you had offered that you go will go back and look at exactly the engagement of NANC and what that would look like. I just wanted to make sure that was captured too.

Betty Anne Kane: Yes. Thank you. The role of the NANC in the outreach and the transition.

Jose Jimenez: Yes.

Public Comments and Participation

Betty Anne Kane: Yes, very good. Members of the public, comments from the public, yes, sir.

Jim Falvey: So Jim Falvey with Eckert Seamans. I'm here on behalf of the LNP Alliance, which is a coalition of smaller carriers. I have a few comments on the discussion of the LNP

transition from earlier, and then a few questions for Mr. Kagele. I've talked to Tim and [indiscernible] was going to answer a few questions about the timing of implementation.

I just wanted to support Jose's comments from earlier about the role of the LNPA Working Group. We attended several or probably the last three or four LNPA Working Group meetings specifically for the purpose of hearing more about the LNPA transition. We're disappointed in that the topic wasn't really covered in any meaningful way. So there should be a role of the LNPA Working Group, as Jose mentioned, in the commission's order - it is a separate role from the transition oversight manager - to the extent that we have the TOM letter of engagement completed the iconectiv MSA.

Also, I think a month ago, the train seems to be leaving the station and we need to have an open forum for smaller carriers to not only have sort of a downstream reporting of what's going on but also an iterative process where we have an opportunity to provide feedback. I'm very happy to hear that the commission appears to be making the iconectiv MSA available under the NDA. We also support Jose's comments, and I believe this issue was put to bed, that the chair of the Architecture Subcommittee should be a neutral chair - with all due respect to the individual from iconectiv - and for that matter, iconectiv

is going to be playing a very central role. But we agree with Cox that they should not be chairing that subcommittee.

So we're looking forward to the call from the TOM in a couple of days and we hope to learn more. But for those of us who aren't part of NAPM, smaller carriers, folks who are on the inside may not even realize how little information has come out of the process and we think the LNPA Working Group would be a great place for more of that information exchange.

So I have a couple of questions. We have a November 2017 at least estimate as to when the process will be completed. Our smaller companies are doing budgets for 2016. One of the questions they have would be whether there will be costs and whether it's 3Q, 4Q 2016, what types of implementation costs and new interfaces are anticipated for the end of 2016. I don't know if the NAPM would be the right folks to speak to that, but we're curious about that timeline. I don't know if Tim maybe could speak to that. And I have two other quick questions.

Tim Kagele: Tim Kagele, NAPM LLC. Thanks for the question, Jim. It's a complicated answer. The easy answer is, yes, there will be budget impacts on all service providers. So let me break that down into how I believe this shapes up.

First, for 2016, you can expect all service providers to see transition-related charges in their monthly service provider bills as a SOW line item. I believe that the NAPM articulated

that in the last quarter NANC report, that those would be forthcoming and that those have been approved by the FCC to pass through. So service providers should have already seen transition-related expenses for the TOM, and we are currently discussing transition related charges with the incumbent provider - NeuStar. As soon as that is that is finalized, those will also be passed through as SOW line items. So from a 2016 budget planning purpose, yes, there are impacts and those impacts will be impressed upon all service providers that utilize the NPAC for number reporting.

Jim Falvey: I was here the last month. I'm familiar with the SOW and that it was approved, and those were past recharges. So what I'm talking about are the kind of budget items that will hit the bottom line, whether that be new systems, new interfaces, testing. Will it be testing 3Q, 4Q of 2016, so more focused on those types of company expenses that cannot be passed through?

Tim Kagele: That's a great question. So it depends on what configuration you have as a service provider and how you access the NPAC today. For example, if you are a service provider that utilizes the gooey [sounds like] portal, those service providers generally are not investing in any new hardware. So budget impacts at least in my opinion would be negligible. It's likely that service providers will utilize a

service bureau, and those service bureaus would then have some budgetary considerations for 2016 - probably mid-2016 I would say - to ensure that they have electronic capability into the NPAC.

If you are a larger service provider who does not utilize a service bureau, you likely have your own electronic connectivity by a SOA. So I will speak specifically for Comcast. We have a SOA. Comcast we'll make specific transition-related plans to invest in new electronic links and whatever hardware and or software might be required to facilitate a smooth and orderly transition. So my company is planning for those transition-related expenses in 2016.

Betty Anne Kane: Tim, are these the kinds of questions that will be addressed also in the webinar?

Jim Falvey: Yes, at another level of detail, I think so. I've got to echo again what Jose said, it's one hour. It's December 1. This is literally our first chance to ask questions for potentially hundreds of participants. I'm assuming that there will be a presentation for at least 15 minutes, half-an-hour or 45 minutes. So I certainly hope so. I know you're preparing. I hope there's communication with the service bureaus so that other companies can prepare. We need to understand when these things are going to take place and what our expenses are going to be. So testing, do you anticipate

testing in 3Q, 4Q? I'll ask you the last question also which is are you going to do a geographic rollout, and do you know yet where you're going to begin with the geographic rollout?

Tim Kagele: Yes. So in terms of testing, I think what service provider should anticipate is depending on - as I explained earlier - how you are configured as a service provider that access the NPAC, you should anticipate that there will be some resource requirement to help support testing. As you heard from the LNPA Working Group's tri-chair, the architecture committee is going to be reviewing the specific test cases. So depending on your specific scenario as a service provider, you would be looking at certain test cases that you would want to support as a company. So you should plan probably for late 2016 that there'll be some requirement for testing if you want to participate, strictly voluntarily.

And again, this is advanced information, in advance of the December the 9th meeting. December 9 is really intended for service providers to get acquainted with the process, all interested parties to get acquainted with the process. As more information is available with specific transition-related information, that will be provided as part of that TOM transition education and outreach process. So the frequency of those meetings would increase as we get closer to the actual transition date.

Let me just talk a little bit about the geographic rollout. There are currently seven NPAC regions. What we can share at this point is that a region, undetermined at this point, will be the initial region to be cut. That region will be cut and then it will be soaked. If the soak period works okay, the remaining six regions will then be determined in terms of order and timing. So the goal here is to ensure that any significant defects are borne out in the process during testing and that any production-related issues are surfaced during that initial region cut and soak. Does that help, Jim?

Jim Falvey: Very helpful. Do you know when, and how, and who will decide the initial region? That's my last question.

Tim Kagele: I can't answer that at this point not because I don't want to answer, but that is still in discussion. The NAPM's transition team working very closely with the vendor is deciding those matters at this point. As soon as that has been decided, we will then share that with the community at large.

Jim Falvey: So one closing comment. I know that we're towards the end of the meeting, but we haven't had a chance to discuss these issues in the LNPA Working Group or elsewhere. Those are the kinds of decisions that smaller carriers should be weighing in on. They should be weighing in upfront and not sort of, as I said, downstream where the information passed down this is how it will be. So we would like to have more of a say in

the process. I don't want to prejudge the December 9th meeting. We're looking forward to it. And if there's a whole series of meetings after that we may have our opportunity yet, but so far we have not.

Other Business

Betty Anne Kane: Thank you. We have other item that I want to bring up. This could be procedural. We don't have a date yet for the March meeting. Is that correct, Carmell? We're looking at one. We are very close on getting a date for the March meeting, probably mid- to second or third week in March. We'll get that schedule out just as soon as possible, hopefully within a few days.

But I did noticed this time, maybe because it's December, that you were busy. And this meeting was right after the Thanksgiving holiday. We are encouraging you to get your reports in early. Get the reports in electronically from each working group or anything else you want to bring up to Carmell a week ahead. She's got a standing order from me that as soon as it comes in, it gets sent out. It doesn't have to wait for me to say approved. My goal is for everybody to have everything they need electronically - either on your tablet, on your laptop, whatever you bring with you - before you start traveling to come to the NANC meeting and hopefully before, so you've got a few days before that to review it. I'm really going to ask,

first of all, the chairs to get their reports in a week before the scheduled NANC meeting and we'll have that out.

Secondly, if that happens, then we don't have to have the companies or the people who are volunteering on these various working groups, et cetera, bringing printed copies. We're really going to try in 2016 to go green, so get it in. I've got all mine here on my laptop. Bring it with you and try to do that here. It will be much easier. We have a trend of more and more people being on the phone, so they really have to also have the electronic copies of everything as soon as you could really make that work better.

I mean if you need to print it out at your own office and bring your copies with you, your own copies for your own use, that's an individual decision. But I'm going to try to relieve the volunteers on the working groups of having to bring lots of copies here. I can always ask the commission if they need to run something up. I'm sure you're probably trying to go more paperless here at the commission also, right? I just refused at our commission, I'm not letting anybody order at commission expense one of those calendars, those date books. We have people who still use these. I said no, we're not doing that. You could do everything on the computer. So that's kind of the mantra for 2016. We will get the dates out.

I thank everybody. This was a very long meeting. We're reverting. We'll try to do things a little faster next time. We have a lot of work that we have to do end of the year lined up today. I want to thank all of the working groups and all of the people for all the efforts that have been made in 2015. We're looking forward to a very busy 2016. I want to wish everyone a happy holidays and a happy new year. And you've got the last word.

Valerie Cardwell: Thank you. I'm Valerie Cardwell of Comcast. Thank you, Chairman Kane. And just really quickly, regarding the June order where the FCC requested that NANC do something from the June order and the order didn't come out until October 29th, my question - you said something about requesting an extension - can you just say something about that and then what are we supposed to do. Even if an extension is to be granted, how long, and then what should we still anticipate to do?

Betty Ann Kane: I think I said that before we got into the discussion of how much of what the LNPA Working Group had looked at. You know, whether it covered the whole response to it. I identified that the response that they said about, that they're recommending that we approve about the flows. The definition response to the narrow question that was asked, we respond to. But when I send that response to the commission, I'm going to

point out that there are larger issues involved that this responded to that. And if they would like some more advice, I think most of it is now going to get addressed in our response on November 16th on non-geographic, on the broader issue.

But I believe now that the specific question that was asked to respond to on June 22nd has been answered by the LNPA Working Group that what was needed was to update the flows and change the definition. That responds to that specific issue, it was unanimous agreement here, but that there are other issues that are implicated in that. If they want responses from us from those broader issues, we need more time to the extent that they're not going to be addressed by how we deal with the November 16th letter.

Valerie Cardwell: Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. And at 2:00 we are adjourned.

[End of file]

[End of transcript]