North American Numbering Council
Meeting Transcript
March 24, 2016 (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. | Cary Hinton | Policy Advisor (NARUC – DC) |
| 2. | Alea Christofferson | ATL Comunications |
| 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. | Matthew Gerst | CTIA |
| 9. | Doug Davis | HyperCube |
| 10. | Hon. Paul Kjellander/Carolee Hall | NARUC, Idaho |
| 11. | Hon. Karen Charles Peterson | NARUC, Massachusetts |
| 12. | Hon. Crystal Rhoades | NARUC, Nebraska |
| 13. | Betty Sanders | NCTA |
| 14. | Stephen F. Pastorkovich/Brian Ford | NTCA |
| 15. | Richard Shockey | SIP Forum |
| 16. | Rosemary Emmer | Sprint |
| 17. | Thomas Soroka, Jr. | USTA |
| 18. | Ann Berkowitz | Verizon |
| 19. | Brendan Kasper | Vonage |
| 20. | Dawn Lawrence | XO Communications |

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)
Paula Silberthau, Office of General Counsel
Michael Jacobs, Front Office Legal Advisor
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  – December 1, 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)     LNPA Transition Oversight Manager (TOM)
(9)     Local Number Portability Administration Working Group (LNPA WG)
(10)    Billing and Collection Working Group (B&C WG) Report to the NANC
(11)    North American Portability Management (NAPM LLC) Report to the NANC
(12)    Future of Numbering (FoN) Working Group Report to the NANC
(13)    Status of the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) acvtivities
(14)    ATIS Report
(15)    Report of the Internet Protocol Issue Management Group (IMG)

**V.  Table of Contents.**

## VI. Summary of the Meeting

**Cary Hinton:**  Good morning.  My name is Cary Hinton.  For those of you that don't know me, I'm policy advisor to the chairman, Betty Ann Kane with the D.C. Public Service Commission.  Unfortunately, Marilyn and I were just notified a few minutes ago that Chairman Kane is ill in bed and is unable to attend today's meeting.  As her alternate, I've been asked to substitute for her.  As most of the NANC members know, we have a vice chair position but it has been vacant since the departure Geoff Why from one of those M states - Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications.  Thus, it falls to me to try to run this meeting in her stead.  So Marilyn will assist me to make sure I don't stumble too much.  But I believe the first procedure is we'll go around the room so everybody can introduce themselves

and see who the new faces are, new members of the NANC.  Go ahead to the left.

Aelea Christofferson:  Aelea Christofferson, ATL Communications.

Mark Lancaster:  Mark Lancaster, AT&T.

Greg Rogers:  Greg Rogers with Bandwidth.

Mary Retka:  Mary Retka, CenturyLink.

Rebecca Thompson:  Rebecca Thompson, Competitive Carriers Association.

Matthew Gerst:  Matt Gerst with the CTIA.

Doug Davis:  I'm Doug Davis, HyperCube.

Paul Kjellander:  Paul Kjellander, Idaho Commission.

Karen Charles Peterson:  Karen Charles Peterson, Massachusetts.

Crystal Rhoades:  Crystal Rhoades, Nebraska.

Betty Sanders:  Betty Sanders, NCTA.

Stephen Pastorkovich:  Steve Pastorkovich, NTCA.

Richard Shockey:  Rich Shockey, SIP Forum.

Rosemary Emmer:  Rosemary Emmer, Sprint.

Ann Berkowitz:  Ann Berkowitz, Verizon.

Brendan Kasper:  Brendan Kasper, Vonage.

Dawn Lawrence:  Dawn Lawrence, XO.

Marilyn Jones:  Marilyn Jones, FCC.

## Announcements and Recent News

**Cary Hinton:** I want to take this opportunity to welcome Dylan to the NANC as a new member of the NANC. I think we've had you participated in several or at least one or two of our work groups, and we'd look forward to having your expertise join the NANC. Also, as part of the introductions, let me take this opportunity to ask Rosemary to introduce her esteemed guest that she has brought to this meeting.

Rosemary Emmer: Thank you very much. Rosemary Emmer with Sprint. I would like to introduce my intern, Heather Wiss [phonetic]. She's from Idaho. She's brilliant. She's interested in Numbering, which is really fun. As most of you know, I've had many interns over the years, and, well, they're not here. So I guess I either didn't do a good job or I wasn't interesting enough. But she seems to be very interested in it. I wanted to let everyone know that she's worked on the next draft of the training binder version 4. We haven't had a new version since 2013. She's just scrubbed it, done some work with it, asked lots of questions about it. I'm not sure where it will go, if anywhere, with all of the new rules and things that we have coming down. But I did want to say for the record that she's worked really hard on that and she's doing several of our working group meetings. Sometimes she announces herself as a member of the public. And that's caused some stirs I think

5

around town.  I guess that's not as normal.  But in any event, it's been really great to have her, and I wanted to let everyone who I haven't had a chance to introduce her to, yeah, today who she is and that hopefully we can keep her around for a while. Thank you.

**Cary Hinton:**  Thank you, Rosemary.  Let me point out to your guest that if she has any questions or complaints regarding our meeting, Paul Kjellander down in the corner is our Idaho Public Utility Commission representative and he'll be happy to answer any of the numbering issue questions that you have. Thank you, Paul.

Paul Kjellander:  Cary, we've already had that conversation, and I demonstrated I could count to ten and that was the extent of my knowledge.

**Cary Hinton:**  Well, thank you for informing us of that great accomplishment.  All seriousness aside, I'd like to ask if there's anybody that's on the conference call link, if they would introduce themselves.

Michele Thomas:  Good morning, Cary.  Michele Thomas with T-Mobile.

Paula Jordan Campagnoli:  And this is Paula Jordan Campagnoli, one of the chairs of the LNPA Working Group.

Valerie Cardwell:  Good morning, Cary.  This is Valerie Cardwell with Comcast.

**Cary Hinton:** Good morning.

Scott Seab: Scott Seab, Level 3.

David Greenhaus: This is David, 800 Response.

**Cary Hinton:** I'm sorry, could you repeat your name? I didn't understand that. It got a little garbled.

David Greenhaus: David Greenhaus with 800 Response.

**Cary Hinton:** Very good. Thank you, David.

David Greenhaus: Thank you.

**Cary Hinton:** Anybody else?

Cullin Robbins: Cullin Robbins, PSC.

Linda Hyman: Linda Hyman, Neustar Pooling.

Bonnie Johnson: Bonnie Johnson.

Karen Riepenkroger: This is Karen Riepenkroger, one of the NOWG co-chairs.

**Cary Hinton:** All right.

Bonnie Johnson: Bonnie --

**Cary Hinton:** We're going to have to back up a second here. I may interrupt you because I'm a little bit of a stickler of trying to understand names and since I'm deaf in one ear and can't hear the other. Let's back up. I believe with Cullin, was that correct?

Cullin Robbins: Yeah. Cullin Robbins of Nebraska Public Service Commission.

**Cary Hinton:** Very good. After that?

Mary Ann Kaplan:  This is Mary Ann Kaplan [phonetic] with the Ohio Commission.

**Cary Hinton**:  Very good.  Thank you.

Karen Riepenkroger:  And this is Karen Riepenkroger, one of the NOWG co-chairs.

**Cary Hinton**:  Thank you, Karen.

Linda Hyman:  Linda Hyman with Neustar Pooling.

**Cary Hinton**:  I'm sorry.  Who's with Neustar?

Linda Hyman:  Linda Hyman.

**Cary Hinton**:  Thank you, Linda.

Rebecca Beaton:  This is Rebecca Beaton with the Washington Commission Staff, that's Washington State.

**Cary Hinton**:  Good morning, Rebecca, for joining us so early there on the West Coast.

Rebecca Beaton:  You're welcome.

Bonnie Johnson:  This is Bonnie Johnson, Minnesota Department of Commerce.

**Cary Hinton**:  Good morning, Bonnie.

Bonnie Johnson:  Good morning.

Brad Ramsey:  Brad Ramsey's here from Network [phonetic].

Lisa Patton:  Lisa Patton from AT&T.

Suzanne Addington:  Suzanne Addington, FoN Working Group tri-chair.

Anne Dell:  Anne Dell [phonetic], CenturyLink.

8

David Reid:  David Al Reid, AT&T.

Susan Travis:  Susan Travis, Colorado PEC.

Ken Fouts:  Ken Fouts [phonetic], AT&T.

Michael Scott:  Michael Scott with the Massachusetts Commission.

**Cary Hinton**:  Anybody else?

Jonathan Turner:  Jonathan Turner, PwC.

**Cary Hinton**:  I'm sorry, who is that last one?

Jonathan Turner:  Jonathan Turner with PwC.

**Cary Hinton**:  Thank you.

Christopher Hepburn:  Christopher Hepburn, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission.

**Cary Hinton**:  Did someone else just join us?  We're doing the introductions?

Betty Ann Kane:  Yeah.  Hi, everyone.  This is Betty Ann Kane.  Thank you, Cary, for stepping in on such short notice. This time I get to experience the meeting via the bridge.  I'm going to be on mute.  I totally lost my voice as well.  So thank you all.

**Cary Hinton**:  Well, thank you, Chairman Kane.  We appreciate you taking the time and the effort in your condition to join us.  We all miss you.  Anybody else on the line?

Jerry Jean:  Jerry Jean.

9

**Cary Hinton:** And for those of you, I'm sure there must be at least one person in the room that doesn't know Jean. He's with the Nebraska Public Service Commission.

Jerry Jean: I'm with Nebraska Public Service Commission. Sorry.

**Cary Hinton:** That's all right, Jean. You know me, I'll have questions to ask.

Bridget Alexander: And this is Bridget Alexander with JSI.

**Cary Hinton:** Anybody else? Well, great. We have a good turnout on the conference link. I appreciate the FCC again setting that up for us.

## Approval of the Meeting Transcript

All right, first order of business is approval of the transcript from the last meeting. That's been circulated electronically. Does anybody have any corrections, revisions, additions, anything else? Okay. I'm seeing no tent cards up. And I will point out to the members that are here, the usual practices. If you want to speak, just put your tent card up like this and I will recognize you. Okay, all right. Seeing no questions regarding the transcript, I will assume that we have a consensus that it is appropriate. I will mark that as Exhibit 1 for our record. All right. Moving on to the first working group presentation. We have a report -- excuse me?

## **Introduction of FCC General Counsel Paula Silberthau**

Paula, you want to introduce yourself?

Paula Silberthau:  Sure.  I'm Paula Silberthau.  I work in the General Counsel's Office.  I do a lot of Federal Advisory Committee Act stuff.  And did you want to talk first about the appointment process?

Marilyn Jones:  Sure.

Paula Silberthau:  Okay.  So we're going to play tag team here.

Marilyn Jones:  Good morning.  This is Marilyn from the FCC.  On March 10th, I've sent out a letter indicating that the bureau had approved the working group chairs for the NANC.  I just want to go over those approvals now real quick.  For the billing and collection working group, Rosemary Emmer and Mary Retka were approved as co-chairs.  Mary is replacing Tim Decker from Verizon.  We would like to thank Tim for his leadership in the past.  For the Future Number Working Group, we approved Suzanne Addington, Carolee Hall, and Dawn Lawrence.  For the LNPA Working Group, Paula Jordan, Dawn Lawrence, and Ron Steen were approved.  For the Numbering Oversight Working Group, we approved Laura Dalton and Karen Riepenkroger.  For the Internet Protocol IMG, we approved Valerie Cardwell and Gina Perini.  Ann Berkowitz resigned, but we would've approved her if she was

nominated.  So thank you, Ann, for your past service.  We really
appreciate it.

Once we approved the working group chairs, we started on
the working group membership.  I sent that e-mail to the NANC
members seeking nominations and they have until the 31st of
March to submit those nominations.  Once I get those
nominations, I'll be working with the working group chairs to
get a recommendation to the NANC chair.  Once the NANC chair has
a review of those nominations -- once she approved the
nominations, we're going to submit that to the Wireline
Competition Bureau Chief for final approval.  The timeline,
we're looking at maybe end of April, we should have all the
working group members approved by that point.

Paula Silberthau:  Let me mention one thing that might be
helpful to you, folks.  This was the third point of my
presentation, but we're moving it up.  Maybe you know this
already but just to emphasize it, that the working group reps
for a particular company or an agency can be different than you
folks sitting here who are the members for the full committee.
So if you feel that, you know, there's a drain on your time or
maybe that you're not that interested in what the subject matter
is for a particular working group but that your agency or
company is, someone other than you can be appointed or requested
to be appointed to serve on the working group.  It doesn't have

to be the group here.  And maybe someone has more expertise or just really eager to work on a particular issue whereas you have broader concerns.  So if that happens, then just a little footnote that anyone who's new who hasn't gone through our very short ethics screening could be approved but would just have to -- you know, it could be someone different but they have to go through the screening process.  Okay.

I'm here because I wanted to mention that there are going to be some slight changes, not huge, in terms of the way the working groups will proceed process-wise going forward.  Now in the past, my understanding is that essentially, and this is a good thing, the working group meetings were announced in advance, and there might be a master mailing list for certain working groups, and there'd be a posting on the website of the fact that there'd be a call-in number and anyone who wanted to can participate.  In the discretion of the working group chair, that's fine, that's great if that's how you want to proceed. People can still talk as long as the calls, I guess, don't go on forever.  But the one change is that there will be a distinction between people who were appointed to service members of the working group and people who were just interested parties who were listening or even participating, talking, whatever, so that when it comes to a vote of what to do, only the people who are the working group members will be voting.

Now apparently in many of your working groups, you proceed pretty much by consensus anyway. Hopefully, that won't be a problem. If someone has an issue with a particular recommendation and it's a public meeting, that company or agency can certainly express their perspectives. This is not to drown out voices. But in terms of voting, the actual vote should be taken by the members of the working group, and you may ask why that is so. It's because the working groups, like the full FACA, need to be balanced. So it needs to be a balancing of interest and we're trying to comply with GSA guidelines, which is that you don't want voices drowned out and you want every sector's voice to be heard. And we can't really do that if we don't know who's on the call and if we don't create a balance in the membership by having specific appointments.

The reason for this change is to just make sure we comply with the General Services Administration guidelines on this. But as I said, it's not to drown out voices. People can still participate at meetings. And so I don't think you'll notice a huge change in the process except on the voting piece.

Yeah, the other thing I wanted to mention was, there'll be a certain limitation on the number of people appointed to the working groups because we want to make sure it's less than a quorum because we don't want the working group to be so large that it really becomes another parent committee meeting because

then it would require a different notice and federal registry notice, et cetera, et cetera.

**Cary Hinton:**  Paula, if I could jump in here for just a second.  When you refer to quorum, you are referring to a quorum of the NANC.

Paula Silberthau:  Yes.

**Cary Hinton:**  So that the membership of the working group would actually, by numbers, would be a smaller number than one-half of the numbers that are currently on the NANC.

Paula Silberthau:  Thank you.  That's right.  That's exactly right.  So I think that's about it.  I already mentioned that for the people who would be the appointed members to the working group, it doesn't have to be the same individuals who were here.

Oh, I'd also mention that we do have some FACAs where the working group members aren't even members of the parent FAC.  It looks like everyone under the sun is here.  But, for example, if you knew of a public agency or a company that you worked with, maybe a smaller company that didn't want to participate in the full NANC but that had expertise and serious interest in one of the issues being addressed by the working groups, those people could request to serve just on the working group, not in the full NANC.  So I just wanted to get that out there.  That's about it.  Does anyone have a question about this?

**Cary Hinton:**  Rosemary from Sprint.

Rosemary Emmer:  Hi.

Paula Silberthau:  Hi.

Rosemary Emmer:  It's Rosemary Emmer with Sprint.  In terms of voting, I'm trying to wrap my arms around voting versus consensus and the quorum thing.  So when we're co-chairs and when we need to make a decision on something, and normally we would say, are there any objections to moving this paper forward today, let's say, the only people now that can object are people that are actual members of the committee, and those people would be ultimately under the NANC umbrella.

Paula Silberthau: Correct.  They'd be appointed members, right, of the working group.  As I was saying, you could actually have someone appointed to a working group who isn't a full NANC member.  If someone requested that and we thought they would really be a great participant, that's fine.

**Cary Hinton:**  If I could offer one clarification.  Rosemary used the term "object."  Actually, anybody that is either attending or participating in a conference call link into a working group can raise comments and object in the course of their comments, but it's not a vote.  They can't vote no or vote yes.

Paula Silberthau:  Yeah, that's exactly right.

Rosemary Emmer:  Okay.

Paula Silberthau:  Again, as I said, it's not to drown out -- so you might say, okay, so what I hear is X, Y and Z, does anyone object?  Someone might say, well, I'm Paula Silberthau from OGC and I think that's a really bad idea.  That's my comment.  I'd like people to take that into account before they vote or whatever.

Rosemary Emmer:  Okay.  So we've never voted before.  We've always operated under consensus prior.  I think this is where I'm becoming a little bit confused.  So usually if we ask the question, are there any objections to moving this paper forward and there are objections and a company were to say I object, then we, the co-chairs, would look at that scenario and we would say, okay, there is a whole segment of the industry, like cable or whatever that's objecting.  So perhaps, as co-chairs, we wouldn't move that forward because that wouldn't be consensus under what we would normally have for our rules for consensus.  But what I'm hearing now is people can object by just saying this is how they feel about it but we're actually going to be voting now instead of reaching consensus.

So if we're going to be actually voting and we're going to say yes or no, then are we going to be keeping like a spreadsheet that's going to say here's all the members that we have in the room and we're going to start now, instead of asking, are there any objections to moving the paper forward?

17

Now we're going to be saying, we're ready to take a vote now.

So get the paper in front of us and say, Verizon, Sprint, AT&T,

T-Mobile, you know, yes or no, and then we hold that.  And then

if we're going to vote, are we voting, is it half-and-half, is

it super majority for a vote?  So I'm just trying to make sure

that I get it so that when we have our next meeting, we --

Paula Silberthau:  And I think there's lot of flexibility.

Like the many times I've called the GSA to ask, are there

specific procedures, they say whatever works best for the group.

You'd normally would take like a sort of roll call at the

beginning anyhow to see who's on the call, right, to see --

Rosemary Emmer:  Yes, we do that.

Paula Silberthau:  Okay.  So then you have like a list of

who's there.  I mean, we can talk about this offline.  But I

don't see any prohibition on saying can I move this forward or

are there any objections because if people have no objections,

you're fine.  You know what I mean?  It's not like people have

to go on record and you have to do it.  If someone objects, then

you probably have a couple of different alternatives.  They

might say, well, I'm such and such a company.  You know, I

really don't like that.  Then I think you go to sort of step

two, which is to take a vote if you want or try to work through

it and you could just try to come up with another alternative.

If we do it this way, does that work better for people?  You

18

know, you could do that.  Like 99 out of 100 people on the call want to do it in the way you proposed, you could also say, well, I think this is the probably the way we want to go forward. Let's just take a vote of voting members at this point.

Rosemary Emmer:  Okay.  So would we still have minority reports?  If let's say we asked the question, are there any objections to moving this paper forward today, and we have three companies that object out of 50 or 15, we'll just say 15, three out of 15.  So maybe it's close but they're not all in the same segment of the industry and the thing passes.  So we just decide as co-chairs that we feel that this thing passed whether we've moved it forward for a consensus or whether we're now going to be voting or however we do it.

Paula Silberthau:  Right.

Rosemary Emmer:  Now the three people that objected, are they still going to be able under our processes that we've had, are we still going to be able to say as co-chairs to them, look, you guys are more than welcome to work together to provide a minority report to the NANC where they're either singly writing the report or they all jointly get together and write a report, or is that no longer --

Paula Silberthau:  Oh, that's fine.

Rosemary Emmer:  That's fine, okay.

19

Paula Silberthau:  That's fine.  Yeah.  The goal is not to cut out the debate and the different opinions.  That's fine. Now if the three people who objected happened to not be working group members, they could still get together and do something but it wouldn't be like a minority working group report.  It would just be an NO communications, Vonage, and Verizon, XO Communications.  Thank you.  I knew that didn't sound right. And you know, getting together and putting together their individual reports.  Then when it moved forward to all of you here, you'd also have the additional comments.  That's absolutely fine.

Rosemary Emmer:  Okay.  What I'm going to do is just follow this up with Marilyn because I'm going to have other questions and then offline just to make sure that I totally get it because we kind of have like a mentor program with the co-chairs, whenever a new co-chair comes into play so we have very specific procedural that we've always followed as co-chair so that's always, always been the same.  And so I'll have some more questions and I'll take those up offline and then thank you.

Paula Silberthau:  Okay.  Sure.

**Cary Hinton**:  I suspect that Rosemary is now thinking about how much she has to rewrite that manual which she just discussed.  But be that as it may.  Mary?

Mary Retka:  Mary Retka from CenturyLink.  Thanks for the information that you provided, Marilyn and Paula.  That's helpful.  I think I heard you say that there are four parties who want to be participants in the working group.  There are two ways they can do that.  They can either go through the vetting process or they can participate as kind of a member of the public.  It may be that a party initially starts participating more as a listening kind of checking out the group member and then decides they want to be vetted to become a member.  And so a question about the vetting process is that once a year can someone do it anywhere along the way so that they could see if they can get a chance to be more of a voting member for a consensus.

Paula Silberthau:  It could be anywhere along the way as long as the slots are not filled up basically.  As long as you're still, as Cary explained, under the one less than a majority of the NANC membership number.

Mary Retka:  And do we know what that number is?

Paula Silberthau:  I don't know.  I haven't added it up.

Mary Retka:  But that could be provided to us, okay.

Paula Silberthau:  Yeah.

Mary Retka:  Thanks.

**Cary Hinton**:  Ann Berkowitz, please.

Ann Berkowitz:  Ann from Verizon.  Hi.  Thank you, Paula.
I serve on another FACA.  So this is not unfamiliar to me.  And
I just want to sort of keep things in perspective.  It's not
that complicated.  And also a reminder that the working groups,
and correct me if I'm wrong, are actually working groups for the
NANC.  that's where they're supposed to be doing sort of the
heavy dive, get the expertise that they don't have authorities.
The NANC actually has the authority.  So as you're voting and
talking, you can bring it up.  And if there's a disagreement
among the members, chances are they're mostly NANC members.  I
know you said you may have opportunities for non-NANC members to
join.  But that's a pretty rare occurrence, isn't it?  I would
imagine.

Paula Silberthau:  It is pretty rare, but it happens.

Ann Berkowitz:  They have to have expertise.  It happens.
You know, the majority report, minority report.  We have a
chance to vote anything down.  Anything that comes through has
to be voted through the NANC.  If I disagree with you on
something with one of the working groups, I'm going to fight for
it here.  So I think it's going to be fine.

Paula Silberthau:  Yeah.  And the other thing I'd mention
is that one of the problem areas of FACA that I'm always
reminding people about is that it's exactly what you're saying,
it's just a recommendation from the working group.  It can't be

22

rubberstamped here.  You guys would actually have a chance to look at it not two minutes before the meeting but a couple of days or a week or depending on how things flow.  Look it over, discuss it at the meeting.  If there seems something that's sort of goofy or contrary to a more current development, you can propose changes, et cetera.  So it'll go through a full review by the full NANC, and it has to.  Yeah.

**Cary Hinton**:  I don't see any other -- oh, yes, one more tent card down at that end.

Betty Sanders:  Betty Sanders with NCTA.  I want to understand the statement that you made.  I appreciate all the information.  This is very good for me.  In regards to if there's a NANC member that has selected another person to represent on that subcommittee working group, I understand that person needs to be vetted.  Is that right?  So what is that vetting process?  I'm not familiar with it.

Paula Silberthau:  I wish I knew the details, but our ethics group handles it.  Their doors are right next to mine, so I think I should get it by osmosis.  But they do a very, for those of you who have been through it, a very quick check to make sure there are no super huge conflicts of interest.  And also to make sure that the group that's appointing that member actually -- sometimes we get people saying I want to serve in the working group.  But the agency or company they represent

23

really doesn't want that person to do it, so we actually just check to make sure there's an email from someone, sort of high up the chain saying I'd like so and so to be my member.  It involves making sure that there's actual appointment by the full NANC member saying I want so and so to be on the working group.  And then a quick list, I think, of very general financial questions.

I don't know.  You guys have been through it.  But I don't think it's very cumbersome.  It's not like they're asking for a complete list of every stockholding or anything like that.  It's sort of more broad categories.  It's something like a five-minute conversation on the phone, I think.  Yeah.

**Cary Hinton:**  I think it's less than getting security clearance to go frankly through the metal detector there at the national airport.  Anyway, be that as it may.  Specifically, are there any NANC members or work group members that are on the conference link that has any questions?  I believe Paula, if you're still with us, I thought you might have a question.

Paula Jordan Campagnoli:  Yes.  Cary, I'm still with you.  And we have asked Paula to come onto the -- we have a LNPA Working Group conference call set for April 13th and we've asked her and Marilyn to come on the call and explain it further to our LNPA Working Group participants.  So that's going to be very helpful to us there.  I look forward to that.

**Cary Hinton:** Great.

Paula Silberthau: Okay. We'll be on it.

**Cary Hinton:** This gentleman I don't recognize, so I'll let him to introduce himself.

John Cummings: If I may, John Cummings, Time Warner Cable. For those current participants who have some expertise but are not represented by someone on this body, what would the process be for those potentially open spots that haven't been filled but where there is some expertise to lend to the discussion?

Paula Silberthau: Yeah. If you wanted to be appointed to the working group, you would just have someone in your company, whether it's you or someone up the chain, say you'd like to serve on the working group as a voting member and explain --

**Cary Hinton:** I've got to give a clarification there.

Paula Silberthau: Yeah.

**Cary Hinton:** I don't believe Time Warner has a member on the NANC.

John Cummings: Correct.

**Cary Hinton:** So what they need to go through his trade association. NCTA, for example, it does have a seat at the NANC.

Paula Silberthau: If you wanted an individual seat, you could request it. It doesn't have to go through the trade association and you could ask to be put on. What we would do at

that juncture is look at the balance on the committee.  So if your trade association was already serving and we'd have to look at how many people were going to be on a particular working group, if we felt that having Time Warner in addition to the trade association might tip the balance in some way, we might decide, no, that doesn't make sense.  But if we felt it would be fine in terms of the balance and there was space that would sort of be a decision for the policy people over at the bureau and in consultation with the chairman.

John Cummings:  Thank you.

**Cary Hinton:**  If I could give a clarification, I just want --

Paula Silberthau:  But you could send the request to Marilyn.  Yeah.

**Cary Hinton:**  So I just want to make sure we're clear about this.  It's not a prerequisite to be a voting member of a working group that you have someone from your company that is a member of the NANC.

Paula Silberthau:  Correct.

**Cary Hinton:**  Very good.  Any other questions?  All right. At this point, I'd like to particularly thank Paula and Marilyn and Sanford Williams, Anne Stevens, Chris Monteith and, of course, Matt DelNero for the numerous meetings and conference calls that Chairman Kane and I have had with them over the last

year to try to get this sorted out.  It may not appear so, but this is actually a much more reasonable process than what we originally were addressing when we started out in these conversations.  They've done, I think, an admirable job of trying to accommodate our process in our intent to be as open and as informative not only to the industry but to the public at large and particularly to have as much opportunity for a representation from stake commissions and consumer advocates in this process.  So again, thank you very much.

I would like also to take the liberty of identifying the letter that was referred to that was sent to Chairman Kane on March 10th by the FCC as Exhibit #2.  Okay.

**Report of the North American Numbering Plan (NANPA)**

If we could now, at this point, go to John Manning who will give us a report for the NANPA.

John Manning:  Good morning, everybody.  Just in case if you're sitting here at the table and you'd need a paper copy of the NANPA report, I have a couple of copies up here I'm happy to send around.  This morning, I'd like to take the opportunity to kind of review with my report a status of events, activities, assignments, et cetera, with regard to 2015 as well as bring you up to speed on some NANPA change orders that are currently underway.  And at the very back of this document, which is most of it is the 2015 NANPA Highlights document, which we make

available to you.  We'll not be going through it.  But it's a document we use as part of our overall operational presentation that we presented to the NOWG earlier this month.

So beginning on page 2, it has the summary of central office code assignment activity.  We assigned a little over 3,700 codes this year.  A total of 233 codes were returned or our returns were approved.  The table there on the middle of the page gives you a breakdown of the total assignments, total pros [sounds like], net assignments, et cetera, and the various measurements that we keep track of on a monthly basis.  Just a couple of items to note.  First of all, the total quantity of codes assigned in 2015 was higher than -- and it was the highest in the past seven years.  Last year or rather 2014, we had about 3,400 codes, 3,700 codes this year.  So we'll wait to see if that trend continues or not.

Important to note that 85 percent of the code assignments that we did were for pool replenishment, and that's consistent with what we saw in 2014.  With regard to returns, that's the lowest we've had over the last seven years.  And nearly, almost nearly all of our assignment request are coming in via pooling areas.  I've made a note towards the middle on the bottom of that page the various reports that are available on our website. If you want to know specifics about a particular area code,

assignments, et cetera, et cetera, you can visit those reports and they'll give you a breakdown of the information.

Page 3, just as an informational item, talking about the top area codes in states and code assignments in 2015. The top chart is for net assignments. The one remark I'll make here is the top four. So area codes, you see there are area code complexes were there in 2015 where some order the ones in 2014 are Texas 713, 281, 832, 346. The Houston area was on the top since 2012. So that's a very, very fast growing area. The others ones in Dallas, New York, and in Atlanta were also appearing on the top NPAs in 2014. The next chart breaks that down in terms of states, and you'll see California is number one with 628 total assignments. And then next to follow is Texas, Florida, New York, and Michigan. And those states, again, were there in 2014 as well.

Proceeding onto area code activity, in 2015, I basically covered this information in previous reports so I won't go line by line over it. Suffice to say that at the end of the 2015, we had 367 geographic area codes in service. We had 18 non-geographic area codes in service and we have 24 awaiting implementation, and just had 272 area codes that are currently unassigned. The six area codes assigned in 2015, I've covered that before. And beginning on page 4 you'll see the total area codes that were placed in service, a total of seven, two of

which were non-geographic area codes and the remaining were for geographic area code relief.

Addressing area code relief activity.  We've already had one area code going to service in Ohio, and that was the 614/380 overlay which became effective in late February.  The next four or five bullet items are area codes that we have covered in the past, two of them are in Canada.  We have North Carolina, 336; we have in New York, 631; and area code 317 in Indiana.  All have area codes that are going to go in to service in 2016.  Towards the bottom of the page, area code 315 is not new to the list.  I'm just going to note that on March 12 we entered into permissive 10-digit dialing in preparation for the implementation of the overlay of the 680 overtop to 315.

On page five, two relief projects: New York 212/646/917, we've assigned the area code 332 which will be added to that complex in June of 2017; and in California, the 323, we're going to be doing what we refer to as a NPA boundary elimination overlay where we're basically going to extend 213 over the top of the 323 and vice versa.  We've submitted that application back in November of last year and we're still awaiting approval from the commission.

The next four projects in Texas, two in California, and two in Pennsylvania are all projects where we have either gotten a recommendation and filed something with the state - i.e. in

30

Texas.  In California, a unique process there, but we're now

presently on the path of having public meetings about the

recommendation for overlays in those two area codes.  In

Pennsylvania as well, we filed a petition and expecting some

type of public meetings on that in the short term, ultimately

leading to a decision for 717.

Idaho is on track but with an area code overlay, the 986

area code overlay in the 208.  And finally, a new project that

just started at the beginning at this year, this is area code

619 in the San Diego area where we're actually recommending or

the industry is going to be recommending an NPA boundary

elimination there as well similar to what we did in the 323/213.

The 585 is just the northern part of San Diego 619, and we're

looking to take that particular area code and then eliminate the

boundary between that and the 619 ultimately creating a single

overlay complex for that particular geographic area.  We're

looking at public meetings, just local jurisdiction meetings in

that in the October timeframe.  I'll pause there.  Any questions

on the CO code or area code relief activity or anything in what

I've covered thus far?

Male Voice:  Boundary redefinition.  Can you compare that

to rate center consolidation and how those two things may or may

not be similar?

John Manning:  Well, honestly, I never thought of it that way.  Let's just take 858, for example.  The 858 was created out of the 916 back in June of 1999, and now here we are 17 years later and we've got plenty of prefixes in the 858 rather than introduce and use another assignment backing out the -- well, not backing out but moving the 858 back over the 916 and vice versa making it a one big territory.  I don't know if I would equate that similar to a rate center consolidation.  But in essence, what you're doing is you're allowing the use of two area codes that are currently in place introducing relief into one of the exhausting one without having to assign a new area code.  So, from that perspective, it certainly helps from an area code optimization perspective.

Well, I was just going to proceed on page six.  I'm going to run through briefly here the various resources that NANPA administers that we don't often talk about but are just as important.  Feature Group B, Bravo, Carrier Identification Code: this is the resource that we don't see much activity on, and you can see in 2015 we didn't assign any and we got three back. Feature Group D, as in Delta, Carrier Identification Code: we assigned 23 and got 42 back.  Continuing with what has been generally the practice that we assign X quantity but we're getting more back.  So 2015 was similar to the previous two years as it relates to Feature Group D kicks.

The 5XX NPA, this is the 500/533/544, et cetera.  In 2015 we assigned 658 codes, which is basically in line with what we did in 2014.  We did get a few back.  Just to bring you up to speed, year-to-date for 2016 we made 220 assignments of these resources.  We had 340 prefixes available.  So we're anticipating that the next new area code, the new non-geographic 5XX NPA, is going to be needed sometime in the second half of this year.  We're basically growing in area code a year when it comes to this resource.  For the 900 area code, we made five assignments in 2015 and one return.

And now back to 555.  I've been updating the NANC with regard to our efforts on the reclamation and examination of this resource in terms of finding out which resources are actually in use and those that are just sitting idly by.  We have made no assignments in 2015 and, if you recall, there was moratorium put in place in June of this past year as we went through our outreach effort.  As of the end of 2015 we had 2,600 assignments and we have been in the process of nearly recovering almost 5,000 555 line numbers.  Year-to-date, for 2016 we are now down to just 430 555 line number assignments, so we have recovered or had returned or reclaimed over 7,000 of these numbers.

We have reached out to the assignees of these 430 555 line numbers and we're awaiting their response.  As I've indicated at past NANC meetings, our next step with regard to this resource

33

and once we've completed this effort is to go to the Industry Numbering Committee with a proposal concerning the future of this resource. I will make note that today we've had 56 assignments where the assignee, and recognize an assignee may have more than one number, has refused to return the resource although indicating that the resource is not dialable and not in use. We will, of course, have to deal with that as we go forward. But in terms of the nearly 8,000 numbers, 56 is certainly a very, very low quantity of numbers that we're going to have to address.

With the remaining resources on my report, the 800-855, the 456-NXX vertical service codes, as well as the Automatic Number Identification digits on top of page nine, we made no assignments in 2015. I'll pause here with any questions with regard to the other resources that I just covered.

Okay. Let me just update you. There's currently three NANPA change orders I'll bring you up to speed on. The first you're familiar with, NANPA Change Order 2. That's the moratorium on 555 line number assignments. Of course, that's still in play. NANPA Change Order 3, this was the change order we put into place, we submitted in response to the FCC order on interconnected VoIP providers getting direct access to numbers. And as I've mentioned previously, there's activity underway to update the NRA Form 502 with renewal in June this year. Once

that takes place, we figure we'll be able to get it from where

it is to whether we're to proceed forward with this change order

or not.

NANPA Change Order 4 is new.  This was actually submitted

at the very beginning of this year.  This is, as you can see,

has a fairly long name. It's in response to two INC issues, INC

issue 497 and INC issue 797.  I will not read the names of those

issues but I've outlined here the changes that are resulting

from this issue, primarily their modifications necessary in the

NANPA administration system to update the various forms that

were changed or updated based upon these two INC issue

statements.  We're working forward right now to implement these

changes in the system with the appointment schedule for some

time in second quarter of this year.

On page ten, just a couple of items of note.  As we've done

previously, just make note that we assisted the NOWG with

posting the NANPA 2015 performance survey that they conduct

every year.  Our annual report is scheduled to be posted to our

website by the end of this month.  We've also come out with a

newsletter in January, the fourth quarter '15 newsletter.  We'll

have the first quarter '16 newsletter coming out in the next

couple of weeks.  We did conduct our annual NANPA operational

review session with the NOWG earlier this month, and as I

mentioned before, I've given you a copy of our highlights

document.  And finally, we are working right now on the April

2016 NPA with NANPA and the 5XX NPA Exhaust projections.  As the

case every year, they'll be available by the end of April.  That

concludes my report.  Are there any questions?

**Cary Hinton**:  Any questions on the conference call link?

Very good.

John Manning:  Thank you.

**Cary Hinton**:  Thank you, John.  We'll go ahead and mark

this for the record as Exhibit 3.  Come on up, Amy.  Don't be

bashful.

### Report of the National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator (PA)


Amy Putnam:  No one has ever accused me of that.  My name

is Amy Putnam.  I'm director of Thousands-Block Pooling, and

pooling is fine.  I also have a couple of extra copies of

reports if anybody needs one.  First chart we have is the

Pooling Activity Summary Data.  It's a rolling report.  Those

from March 2015 to February 2016 cover 12 months.  You'll note

that in January and February of this year, we've processed a

total of 19,245 applications.  We were a little ahead of this in

2015, about 4,000 ahead.  But as of March 22nd, we had processed

11,686 Part 3's for March.  So we'll catch up a little bit this

month.  We had one application that was not processed within

seven calendar days in February.  That was a system hiccup, and we checked it out and made sure it will not happen again.

The third line, and I'm not going to go through every chart this closely, the third line you'll note that the number of block assignments made is pretty significant for the month of February.  We are processing high numbers of applications and they are, a lot of them, requests for block assignments rather than changes or modifications.  So we're getting a large number of block assignments.  We're keeping busy.

For p-ANI [phonetic], it was a quiet couple of months. Nothing noteworthy there except that we did our job well.  The next chart is the part three summary data.  The next couple of charts re-sort the information from chart one into more detail. On page four we also have a chart for the number of NXX codes that have been opened for the past 12 months.  Pool replenishment codes, we had 2,972.  We noted that in 2013 we had a little over 2,000.  In 2014 we had 2,950.  In 2015 we had 3,188.  So we keep creeping up with the number of codes that we're opening for pool replenishment.

Rate center information changes, that's when the status of a rate center is changed generally from excluded to optional. Most of the rate centers in the country are pooling at this point, so we're slowing down with the number that are excluded and need to be opened to optional.

The next chart is our reclamation summary.  The total number of blocks reclaimed is always very small, but we have to send notices on all the blocks that are on the list to the state every month.  We only reclaim the ones that the state or the FCC authorizes us to.  Often, after we send out the notices, carriers file for extensions or they provide the part fours that they haven't provided before.  The part four is the INC form carrier files when they've assigned a number out of a block to an end user and it shows that the block is being used.

Performance.  We have been fine through the end of February.  We do have a little explanation of the downtimes that have occurred during the last 12 months, and those roll off as the month that we're involved with rolls off.  RNAS also has been 100 percent at the time for the last few months.

For other pooling-related activities, all our reports for the contract were posted on time and submitted on time.  For p-ANI, we continue working on reconciling existing data discrepancies.  The annual reports are coming in and that always gives us more work in that area.  We participated in the regular monthly meetings with the NOWG with respect to Change Order #1, which involved moving RNAS and PAS to the Cloud.  The RNAS-related portion of it was finished on time on February 20th.  We completed that with only 55 minutes of unavailability.  We had requested that from the FCC, and we had actually requested six

hours but we used 55 minutes.  RNAS is working well and we're pleased with that.

Regarding PAS, the preliminary work is on target for a late May move to the Cloud.  On December 29th, we submitted Change Order #2 which addresses a variety of changes in the INC guidelines.  With respect to INC issues 497 and 797, which John Manning mentioned, that change order was approved by the NOWG on January 11th and the FCC on February 3rd, and we are also looking at a second quarter completion.

On March 7th, the PA submitted Change Order #3 which was requested by the TOM and addresses Pooling-related requirements for the transition of the NPAC to the new LNPA iconectiv, including access to the Pooling Administration System through an API comparable to the existing API that resides within the Neustar Data Center.  It also addresses creation of a customer test environment, sets out a testing regimen, and the amount of support needed by personnel.  This proposal is presently under review by the NOWG.

Other Pooling activities.  With respect to the VoIP order which does allow VoIP service providers to get their numbering resources directly from the PA and the NANPA, the FCC issued a public notice on February 4th outlining the process that VoIP service providers can use to apply for national authorization to get their numbers.  In anticipation of having the new service

providers need guidance and assistance, we developed a quick
sheet, a how-to sheet that was posted to our website on February
18th.  That happened to be the day the FCC began taking
applications for the national authorization.  So far, only one
application has been put out for comment and we have received
very few inquiries.  That application will be deemed approved on
March 31st unless it is denied before that.  On February 9th, we
had a call with state regulators to educate them.  We focused on
the 30-day notice that carriers will have to give to the states.
That was attended by 26 states, up from 20 states.

Turning to the next, page 10, we are participating in the
testbed landscape team relating to the just-in-time and
individual telephone number issues.  Bruce Armstrong from my
team developed a proposal for a Pooling-related just-in-time IT
and testbed.  We presented the proposal in the normal course to
the ATIS TLT subgroup.  The group suggested that we share the
contribution with our numbering contacts and that the subgroup
participants share that with their numbering people for comments
and some questions.  We had a call with the NOWG and went
through it with them so that they would understand and could ask
us any questions on February 17.

With regard to our annual report, it is due at the end of
March.  We have already submitted it to the NOWG and gotten it

back with no comment, and we will be submitting that to the FCC at the end of March.

The next part of this document relates to our highlights for 2015. Although I'm not going to read all of it, I will note that we processed 145,828 Part three's in 2015. That was our highest annual total and the third year in a row that we've broken the previous record. That represents 4.8 percent more than the 2014 record. Both PAS and RNAS were available for more than the contract performance metric, so pooling is still fine. Questions?

**Cary Hinton:** Anybody from the conference link? Thank you. I'm sorry. Oh, Rosemary.

Rosemary Emmer: Rosemary Emmer with Sprint. So it's a record-breaking year. That's good. Please tell the folks back home that moving the RNAS to the Amazon Web in 55 minutes is remarkable. Thank you.

**Cary Hinton:** Anybody else? We'll go ahead and mark this as Exhibit #4. Thank you, Amy.

Amy Putnam: Thank you.

**Cary Hinton:** We've already had those to deal with. Looking at your agenda, we've already had the overview presented by Paula. So now we'll go to Gina on the Toll-Free Number Administration Working Group. Gina, are you on the conference link?

## Report of the Toll Free Number Administrator (TFNA)

Gina Perini:  I'm right here.

**Cary Hinton:**  Oh, you're right here.  I'm sorry, I didn't see you back there.

Gina Perini:  It's okay.

**Cary Hinton:**  I'm so used to you sitting here at the table.

Gina Perini:  Yeah, I'm not at the table anymore.

**Cary Hinton:**  Uh-oh.

Gina Perini:  Thank you for having me.  Hello everyone. I'm Gina Perini.  I am a part of SOMOS, which is the Toll-Free Neutral Administrator.  So our report is a little different than others, but I'll give you some good data which is always helpful.  Then we'd been adding a little education piece, so we're going to do some education on some uses of toll-free numbers because we have a lot of questions about that and we thought this was a good forum in which to do some of that.

The first graphic shows you the trending of toll-free numbers since 1997.  I think at the last meeting it was a surprise to some that the toll-free numbers trend has continued to increase over time and, as you can see, in 2015 we had a similar trend.  We were at about a 5 percent increase over the previous year.

The next graphic on the next page or the next chart shows you month-to-month since February of 2015 those increases and

42

changes, some increases and some changes month-to-month to give you a sense of some of the data around particularly numbers in use, what we have in our spare pool which means those that are available for use and available to be reserved, and then we have our percentage to exhaust out of the current NPAs. So as we come into February, we see we're at roughly 40 million numbers in use. We have about 7 million in the spare pool. We just came under about 7 million right now. We also have about an 85 percent to exhaust of the current pool.

As you can see, I just want to note we've had roughly between 83 and 85 percent exhaust thus far. We have had an interesting beginning of the year, about 200,000 net number reservations per month. So we're going to watch that. That's fairly normal, but we might see some increase. The numbers might increase on the exhaust side.

I will note, I want to give you a look at so what does that mean for each NPA, which is what we call our area codes? Where do they fall? What's available? This gives you a nice handy way to look at it based on the NPAs that are available right now. It's pretty clear to see from the lighter shaded components of this chart that really most of those numbers fall on 844 and 855. Any numbers that come available in the other NPAs tend to be snapped up fairly quickly in our system.

One thing that I was thinking about as I was getting ready to talk to you all is we have some interesting transaction information.  We have a lot of transactions in our system every day.  If that's something that the NANC would be interested in, I can come back with some interesting sort of analytics and data around what's going on in the system.  Because when I talk about snapping up, it's because there's a lot of activity in our system to folks looking for different numbers for their uses.  That's interesting.  We could do that.  I think we have a question.

**Cary Hinton**:  Oh.  I'm sorry, Rosemary.  I didn't see you.

Rosemary Emmer:  Rosemary with Sprint. I would just be really interested to know if an 800 number became available, how exactly does one get assigned that number?  So maybe for the next time, I don't know, but that's fascinating to me.

Gina Perini:  Absolutely.  We can walk through that.  There are different ways you can get that.  It's a first-come, first-served system.  So whoever gets it first, gets the number.  That's why we have a lot of transactions in our system.  I absolutely can do that; that would be very easy to do.  As noted, we have a tentative date for April 2017 to open the 833 NPA based on our current trending towards a percentage of exhaust.  We obviously do not go to full exhaust.  We have a

44

time period in which we can then prepare, and that was calculated. We go through a whole process to do that.

Last time we talked about the uses of toll-free, and many people had some really interesting questions after that session. One of the predominant questions was about toll-free texting as we are calling it. Essentially, it's using toll-free numbers, wireline numbers for texting and messaging. So we thought this is a good opportunity to give out more information about that. Here's some background. Ask questions as they come up, I'm happy to answer them.

I thought I would give you sort of a general timeline on where this came out of and where we were going or where we see this area going. In 2008, there started to be emerging uses of essentially wireline numbers for the use of messaging, and in particular toll-free was being used, these toll-free numbers. What happened was that the folks know messaging is not a regulated area. It's not regulated in the same way that we understand the process of using wireline numbers for voice. Obviously, we're here in this forum. We are the administrator for that, for voice. There's definite processes around how numbers are being used on the voice side.

In messaging, that doesn't exist in the same way. So there was a series of issues that came up as this area began to grow and emerge. CTIA stepped up in a lot of ways to really see what

was going on here, solve as an industry, really come together and figure out a good way to be able to see this area emerge and grow and be able to use these numbers with guidelines.  So the industry did that and through CTIA was able to put together a set of guidelines on how toll-free numbers and other wireline numbers are used for texting.  We then were asked to develop a solution to help deal with the numbering issues around how do you assign these numbers that are used in voice now in messaging.  Initially, it's texting and it'll move into multimedia messaging and other types of messaging.

So we did and we created a peer registry to the SMS/800 called the TSS Registry.  Tons of information on our website about this if you want to know.  Essentially, it's what we do for voice with the SMS/800, we do for texting.  It's how do you administer and use toll-free numbers in texting?  The reason why this is important is because, as many of you know, people use these numbers in their businesses.  They use them for various specific uses.  If they're using them in voice, they want to be able to use them in texting but we have to have the same subscriber on either side of that scenario.  We have to make sure there's consistency and integrity in the use of those numbers across media and across the networks.  So we came in to say we can serve in this role to be able to provide the authoritative registry for these numbers in this new use.  I'm

going to explain how that works in my next slide, sort of the
ducks and bunnies of how that works.

Essentially, our core mission and the core purpose of this
registry is to validate that these numbers are working.  That's
an important thing because if the numbers are not working in the
voice side, we do not want to have these numbers used in
texting.  As you can imagine, it could create a lack of
integrity or consistency across the use of numbers and different
networks.  We also notify what we call Res-Responsible- [sounds
like] organizations.  Most people don't know what those are so I
can explain them to you.  We call them RespOrgs for short, and
essentially they're the service providers for the subscribers to
be able to use toll-free numbers.

There are carriers and there are many non-carriers that do
this service.  There's a whole certification process that you go
through within the SMS/800 platform to be able to become a
responsible organization or RespOrg.  Essentially, these are the
controllers of those numbers for their subscribers, and then we
provide non-discriminatory neutral practices.  We're all
commerce.  We don't provide the services ourselves.  We provide
the registries that those numbers can be administered and,
again, we comply with the CTIA guidelines which were set by the
industry around how these numbers should be administered.

47

How does this work?  What does this mean?  How do these
numbers work in this new registry?  The next slide gives you
that understanding of it generally and how it works.  Just to
orient you, this middle sort of shaded area called the TSS
Registry, that's us, this platform we had set up.  I'm going to
explain how it interacts.  Essentially, that registry works very
similar to the SMS/800 but has some different components.  I
know not all of you are 100 percent familiar with the SMS/800 to
begin with, so I'll explain the components of that.

Our core processes here are enablement, meaning
administering the numbers themselves; having that routing data
in the database for those numbers; and then actually authorizing
that these numbers are appropriately being enabled.  So if you
look at the left-hand side, we have what we call service
registrars.  Those are the people that have signed up to say we
provide this service, we're going to enable numbers and we would
like to do so, and we want to be in your database, too, as the
controller of that number for texting.  So what we do is we take
that information and we ping our SMS/800.  We make sure the
numbers are working, that they're actually being used in the
voice side first.

Then we do a second thing, which there are these little
people down here on the left-hand corner.  Those are our
responsible organizations.  We then authorize that that is

48

appropriate, that they are authorizing that number to be used for texting.  So we do two verifications in that process and it's all automated.  This whole process is automated.  And then what we do is once that's appropriately vetted, it's in the database, all that information.  Then we push that out to what we call routing database providers.  Those are the folks that actually push it into the network, and then they push things into the network.  We're in the voice side, the call path. We're not in the message path.  We push that out to routing database providers who then move it into the networks and then the numbers are routed.

So this is another way in which toll-free numbers are being used.  Clearly, as the TFNA, we are as always focused on making sure the numbers are being used with integrity across these different ways.  I think this to me is also a good symbol or a good example for the NANC of how numbers are used in new networks and in new areas, and this to me is really the forefront of numbering in a lot of ways and in how they're used. We believe, in our role, we've been able to provide the solution to keep the integrity of toll-free in this new environment.

**Cary Hinton**:  Could you introduce yourself?

Richard Shokey:  Rich Shokey.  Do you have more information for us about what the 800 administrator's plan is for IP transition?

49

Gina Perini:  So when you say IP transition, do you mean our platform transition or in general about thinking --

Richard Shokey:  Both.  Obviously, how can the platform be used to interconnect voice and text messages over IP networks one way or the other, and also upgrading the information about responsible organizations to allow law enforcement and other people ways to properly track and trace where these transactions are going from?  Because the commission, the Federal Trade Commission, obviously have a huge problem with caller ID spoofing and malicious calls one way or the other.  The ability to use the underlying numbering databases for track and trace in a responsible manner is really at the top of the agenda on the 6th floor here from time to time.  But the whole IP transition, a lot of 800 transactions are based on time division multiplexing, and at least the 477 data that I see from the FCC would indicate we're about 35 percent all IP right now.  Since 800 transactions represent, the last time I looked, about 35 percent of all toll call, at least - correct me if I'm wrong here - if we're going down this PSTN transition, how the 800 database process is integrated with everything else that our competitive carriers are doing to transition as well.  They used to be integrated in some way, and I don't have any sense of where that is going.

Gina Perini:  Right.  We are internally and externally involved in sort of IP evolution, so we have our platform itself that has to evolve to be able to handle serving as the authoritative source for toll-free numbers on the voice side.  That's the SMS/800 evolution.  So that's more technological.  But we are involved and we have a test case that we are working on with various parties to talk about how toll-free can and will actually work out the mechanics of how toll-free will work on an IP network.  From our perspective, we're the administrators so we just have to make sure that the proper data is in the registry for that to exist, and that we are connected to the right, have the right fields and information and data in our registry to exist in the IP network.  So that is where our focus is on.

But all the other components of law enforcement, we're the administrator, we already have direct access.  The law enforcement has direct access, not directly to our system but they have direct access to us.  The whole law enforcement piece has been in place for many decades.  On the TSS Registry side, we have modeled that and mirrored that on how we set up the TSS registry.  So I'm not sure what you mean on the law enforcement side because we already have many protocols in place around for law enforcement.  I'm not quite sure how that will change

because we already have a pretty rigorous process in place for that.

Richard Shokey:  Well, given the distribution of the 800 numbers, we've seen in the past that some numbers are going through primary, secondary, tertiary, and in some places four layers of distribution one way or the other.  Actually being able to find a responsible organization that is responsible for that number is becoming increasingly difficult so that the registries themselves are, at least I have been told by responsible law enforcement authorities, are incomplete.  Though we're trying to combat spoofing and robocalls one way or the other, this is just providing another level of complications.

Gina Perini:  I hear you on what you're saying.  I think you might be using responsible organization.  I think you're using it in a more colloquial way, like who's responsible for that activity I think.  Because we have --

Richard Shokey:  Who owns number.  It's real simple.

Gina Perini:  Right.  So the subscriber information is what I would call.  I'm just trying to understand.

Richard Shokey:  Right, the subscriber information.

Gina Perini:  Yes, and that is true.  So in our system, if you think of a toll-free number, whether it be a responsible organization or a service registrar, we have that information and we do have that for law enforcement.  What they need to do

is then get further information from those entities that connect into us to get that further down the path.  I agree with you that there are multiple layers there.  We do our piece.  You can enable a number for texting, at least in our paradigm.  Or definitely in SMS/800, you cannot reserve that number without providing us that information.

So we have that first line of contact for law enforcement. At that point, they need to go further.  Now those other issues you're talking about could be something that, as a toll-free neutral administrator, we could focus on but I'm not sure if that's something that's even within our purview.  So I'm not quite sure.

**Cary Hinton:**  Thank you.  Anybody else?  Questions? Anybody on the conference link?  I'm sorry.  I didn't see you, Matt.

Matthew Gerst:  It's okay.  So Matt Gerst from CTIA.  I just wanted to thank Gina for her presentation.  We've obviously been mentioned a couple of times in your presentation.  I just wanted to emphasize that our role here obviously is ensuring the integrity of text messaging services.  Particularly to consumers in general, it's different than email, right?  It's personal. And so when you get a text message from a number that you aren't familiar with, whether it's a 10-digit number or a toll-free number, it's surprising to you.  And that is, to us, a good

thing because you expect that this is a secure communication capability. So our interest in coming up with guidelines here was in the interest of trying to maintain that even as we evolve the services, to make opportunities that Gina was talking about for businesses, and to reduce spam and unwanted communications and text messaging capabilities. So I just want to emphasize that, and thank you for your presentation.

Gina Perini: Absolutely.

Aelea Christofferson: Aelea Christofferson from ATL Communications. We know that the TSS Registry has not been made mandatory and that numbers are getting text-enabled by people who the numbers are not theirs. Is the FCC taking a stand, as far as you can see, as far as protecting those toll-free numbers?

Gina Perini: You're correct, Aelea, this is an industry solution. We've provided a solution for the industry around this, and the guidelines promulgated are industry solutions. There is no mandate per se and the FCC has not taken action. I mean there are many people who could speak for the FCC besides me, but I'm not sure it's that level. I mean I think this is an industry discussion and this is an industry solution. You bring up a good point. As was noted, this is not a regulated area per se. I think that the industry has a very good set of guidelines

that CTIA has put together, and I would hope the industry would follow that and come together on those.

Aelea Christofferson:  Yeah.  We have a lot of concern about it because, from our standpoint, as soon as you put a toll-free number on it, then it does become a regulatory issue because toll-free is so heavily regulated.  So whatever can be done to get the industry moving in the direction where we don't everyday have toll-free numbers that are text-enabled by people they don't belong to, we'd like to know what that would be.

Gina Perini:  A fair point.

Doug Davis:  This is the question I was going to bring up. My understanding is at the very moment today, the wireless carriers are routing the toll-free text messaging away from and into a non-neutral party, and there is no TSS registry today that has any relevance in those paths.  I mean there's nothing there.  You can't use a TSS Registry to register numbers properly.  You can't follow the CTIA guidelines because there's non-neutral third party in the middle of all this that's taking this traffic.  And my concern is what does this do to the integrity of the toll-free system?  Like Aelea just said, we see people text-enabling telephone numbers that they have no business to.  They have no authority to at all, but they've done it anyway because of this relationship.

Gina Perini:  Thanks, Doug.  Essentially, yes, this is a voluntary registry.

Doug Davis:  TSS is a voluntary registry.

Gina Perini:  Right.  Exactly, and because it's an industry solution.  So if those in the industry aren't participating and, you know, your statement about there are particularly certain players that are working around that, that is a problem.  I absolutely agree with you.  I guess the line in this issue is it's not a mandated service so we can't make people do it.  But as an industry, if the industry is going to set these guidelines, they should do it.  But I think you're right, that when there's an industry that's not following those guidelines, we're going to continue to have a problem with not having the authorizations.  But there are verifications that are in place to make sure these numbers are being used properly.

Richard Shokey:  Rich Shokey again.  To your point, I think the concern of some of us is that if there aren't proper guidelines in place, proper controls, authorizations, certification in some way, shape or form, we're going to see increased levels of robo-texting using 800 numbers.  That is going to make the spam problem that we have in email pale in consideration one way or the other.  And, of course, some of us are aware that Congress now wants to put texting basically under the same umbrella of the caller ID spoofing/robocall regime one

way or the other, so there is in fact a regulatory element to this.  There's at least a possibility, though slim, that Congress could actually do something this century.

But this is our concern, is that the guidelines that are being put together through this forum and CTIA and others need to be extremely cognizant of the problem that we're getting with.  Because even now in mobile numbers, mobile robocalls are starting to proliferate all over the place and there's not much we currently can do about it.  But if we are going to put new systems in place to enable something like 800 texting which is in fact a perfectly legitimate and excellent idea, that we start with a foundation of policies, procedures, and information within the databases, we're never going to prevent robocalls and robo-texting completely, but at least we can tamp it down to something that approaches at least a tolerable level.  That's my concern.

**Cary Hinton:**  Yeah.  I understood your question earlier with regards to the call flow and being able to reverse what we call in the operator space a slim upstream to find the originator, so either through you're spot on.  When it comes to the issue that I've got, it's we've spent a lot of time, I've spent personal time on those CTIAs - a wonderful set of guidelines that have been put together for this - but we have a

57

non-neutral third party entity in the middle of these flows right now that doesn't give a crap about that.

Doug Davis:  My point exactly, which is again if the congressional legislation that's being proposed by the House actually comes to fruition, then it will be in fact a regulatory issue that will be dealt with in this building sooner or later. But we've got to be able to understand how this works because this is a potentially valuable service.  It's a potentially profitable service for mobile operators.  But to see it degraded somehow because there's a lack of administrative control at some particular point in the system I think is right to your point.

Gina Perini:  I will say that we are trying to solve the piece that's the most important for toll-free, which is make sure these numbers are being used appropriately across these platforms and these networks.  I think CTIA has done -- that's what they're trying to do with the guidelines and the promulgation of those guidelines.  I know there's working groups working on all of the very similar things you were talking about.  I think in the end the industry has to form a line under those guidelines.

Is there a quasi-regulatory?  Are there regulatory components?  Are there existing regulations that can be applied here?  Those are all things that are being looked at right now. And I think at the NANC, the numbering concerns are significant.

If we look at that from are these numbers, which we have used

for so long in voice, are they now being used in a new way that

is diluting the value or in fact really not following any of the

numbering guidelines that are in place now?

**Cary Hinton**:  Mary.

Mary Retka:  Mary Retka from CenturyLink.  I just want to

point out pretty much all of us here at the table have people

who are involved already in the Message Mobile Malware Anti-

Abuse Working Group, and they've already produced best practices

and are working on this issue in a number of their subgroups.

So for those who aren't involved, you might want to get

involved.  It's sometimes referred to as MOG.

**Cary Hinton**:  Is that a subgroup of another organization?

I'm not familiar with it.

Mary Retka:  No.  It's an industry group.  Yeah, it's an

industry group of their own and they have a number of subgroups.

**Cary Hinton**:  Rich, did you have another comment?  Okay.

Very good, thanks.  Anybody else?

Gina Perini:  There's clearly lots to talk about.

David Greenhaus:  This is David Greenhaus.  I'm one of the

co-chairs of the SMS Number Administration Committee.  That is

the toll-free group.  I just want to go through a lot of the

concerns and comments that have been made by Gina and Richard

and others.  I think one important point is that with toll-free

numbers, as Gina described, through the SMS 800 you can determine who the RespOrg is which is the entity that controls the routing and any changes related to the toll-free number. But beyond the identification of the RespOrg, there's nowhere definitive that you could look to identify who the subscriber or a sense of the owner of the number is. The only way to find that out is to inquire the RespOrg who may not know because it may be there's a carrier involved. It may be resolved.

I mean someone mentioned that there could be many levels before you get down to the actual subscriber to that number. One of the things that the SNAC group is concerned about is the very real possibility that numbers could be text-enabled without the subscriber's knowledge or consent. I know that SOMOS has been working hard to set their system up in order to go to the RespOrg prior to text-enabling a number and how the RespOrg makes sure that the ultimate subscriber has consented to this number being text-enabled. Because if it's not the subscribers that's text-enabling their number, then you can get into a lot of problems in terms of one entity is using their number for voice services and another entity is stepping in and trying to use the number for other purposes - text, multimedia, whatever might be the service that they're trying to implement. To me that's a gray area, I mean then you're kind of stepping over the line.

The assignment of telephone numbers is regulated.  But if entities start using telephone numbers that have been assigned presuming to a regulated service and then they start using the same telephone numbers in an unregulated and in frankly unacceptable way, I think you're kind of in the gray area there.  And I think it's a kind of thing that should be given consideration whether it be by the NANC or the other groups that are looking into this.

**Cary Hinton**:  Rosemary?

Rosemary Emmer:  Rosemary Emmer with Sprint.  Just real quick.  This has been a really interesting conversation.  Thank you, Gina, for the presentation.  It's been a long time since we've had a conversation this robust about something so totally different than we normally talk about, so I've enjoyed it.  And I wanted to say that maybe we need to keep this kind of on our radar, like you who are presenting today, because maybe at some point in time we want to have discussions outside of the NANC group, like more discussions about this and the different topics that are being brought up that are numbering centric for IP going forward that we might want to consider at future meetings having these discussions offline.  So it's just from a procedural standpoint, that's what I was thinking of.  But thank you.

**Cary Hinton:** Doug? Oh, I'm sorry. All right. Ladies first.

Female Voice: I was just going to say for the people who are not really familiar with this issue, today you could take 800 flowers and aim it at your local florist. That's the outcome of the lack of requirement going through the TSS.

Doug Davis: I was about to say the exact same thing. This isn't a fantasy. These aren't things that people are theorizing about. This is happening today. We've already seen customer impact on it.

**Cary Hinton:** Let me just throw this question out here and take the prerogative of the chair, I guess, or being the NANC chair. Is this something that we want to formally request one of the working or maybe two of the working groups to investigate further? Is the NOWG or the FON, either of those two working groups appropriate to ask them to investigate further and report back to the NANC? I hear crickets. Thanks, Rich.

Richard Shockey: Short answer, yes.

**Cary Hinton:** Any opinions about which one or both?

Gina Perini: Maybe the future of numbering, yeah, I think that probably would be a natural fit. And I could picture the chairs on that.

Richard Shockey: Yeah, I would agree.

**Cary Hinton:** Well, I know we've got at least a couple of the co-chairs here. Carolee, you have an opinion since I'm looking right at you? Is that something that you think would be appropriate for your work group to take a look at? Oh, we also have Dawn here. I don't want to put Carolee on the spot. So we have at least the two co-chairs here, if they could opine.

Carolee Hall: I can't speak for the group.

**Cary Hinton:** Sure. Absolutely.

Carolee Hall: I think it would be something that we could take back under advisement. As you're aware, we have kind of a project going on right now that is really consuming a lot of our time.

**Cary Hinton:** I understand that.

Carolee Hall: So, with all respect, I will take this back to the group and maybe we can get back with you on that?

**Cary Hinton:** Is that appropriate, Dawn?

Dawn Lawrence: Yes. I'll just say obviously I'm available to the group. Maybe we could talk offline to give you more information, and obviously we'd be available to present and write materials. I don't think this has to happen right now. I know what you guys are working on. So yeah, it can happen when you're ready if you want to take it up.

**Cary Hinton:**  I bring that up because Chairman Kane and I always worry about the work groups not having enough to do. Thank you.  All right.  Thank you, Gina.

Gina Perini:  You're very welcome.

**Cary Hinton:**  I want to particularly thank you for your reference to ducks and bunnies.  That reminds me I still have an Easter basket to put together.

Gina Perini:  That's true.  That was the supplemental message there.  Thank you.

**Cary Hinton:**  All right.  Anyone else?  Before Laura starts, let me just mention that Gina's report will be marked as Exhibit #5 for the record.  Laura.

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

Laura Dalton:  Good morning.  I'm Laura Dalton from Verizon.  I'm one of the co-chairs of the Numbering Oversight Working Group, which is the NOWG, along with Karen Riepenkroger from Sprint.

Slide 2 of our report lists the contents and the topics that I'll be discussing on the following slides.  They are the 2015 Annual Performance surveys, the NANPA-NPA performance evaluation process, followed by a brief summary of the NANPA-NPA change orders.  I'll also discuss the NOWG's response to the NANC action items on nationwide number portability.  And

64

finally, the last few slides contain a schedule of our upcoming meetings and a list of the NOWG participating companies.

So turning to slide 3, 2015 performance surveys, annually the NOWG conducts three separate industry surveys to obtain information on the performance of the NANPA, PA, and RNA.  The surveys for the 2015 performance year were deployed on January 4th and were open online for a six-week period.  This slide shows a count of the number of entities that completed the three different surveys this year.  The survey respondents are classified into two categories: industry and other respondents, and regulator respondents.

The response rate this year was or the most part consistent with prior years, except for fewer responses received for the PA survey from the industry and other category of respondents. We're still analyzing the responses and we plan to look further into which entities responded last year to the PA survey and did not respond this year.  The detailed survey results will be provided in the performance evaluation reports that will be presented at the June NANC meeting.

So are there any questions regarding the surveys that we deployed this year?  Okay.  The survey is just one aspect of the NOWG's performance evaluation process.  If you turn to slide 4, this outlines some of the other activities that go into preparing the NANPA and the PA performance reports.  As the

timeline of activities on this slide shows, the first half of

the year is a busy time of year for the NOWG.  During this time,

we review the survey data and we analyze the results.  We attend

the operational reviews that are conducted by the NANPA and the

PA.  We also work individually on drafting the various sections

of the performance evaluation reports.  The sections are then

compiled into draft reports and we meet several times as a group

to thoroughly review and revise the drafts.

After we determine the ratings for the NANPA and the PA, we

complete their performance reports.  The NOWG then meets with

the staff from the FCC's Wireline Competition Bureau to present

our preliminary reports.  This year we will be meeting with the

FCC staff on June 7th in the morning, and later in the day the

NOWG will meet with the NANPA and the PA for a readout of our

preliminary reports.  We plan to present the performance reports

to the NANC for approval at the June NANC meeting.  Are there

any questions regarding the performance report process?

Moving on to slides 5 and 6, NANPA-NPA change orders.

Since John Manning and Amy Putnam have already reported on them,

I'll only briefly address them here.  Slide 5 shows the NANPA

change orders.  NANPA Change Order #2 for the moratorium on new

555 line number assignments has been approved and implemented,

but it's remaining on this slide as the NOWG continues to

monitor NANPA's activities in reclaiming this resource.

NANPA Change Order #3 proposed NAS changes pertaining to updating the NRUF form and the NRUF process as a result of VoIP providers obtaining direct access to numbering resources. The NOWG has recommended that this change order be approved, and it is still pending FCC approval.

NANPA Change Order #4 proposed updates to NAS to coincide with modifications made by INC to numbering resource forms contained in the numbering guidelines. The NOWG supported the proposed modifications and recommended approval of the change order. The FCC approved it and work is now being done by NANPA in preparing to implement the changes.

Slide 6 shows three PA change orders. PA Change Order #1 proposed moving RNAS and PAS into the Cloud, as Amy Putnam had mentioned. The NOWG recommended that this change order be approved and it was approved by the FCC. The RNAS portion was implemented in February, and PAS is targeted to be moved into the Cloud in May.

PA Change Order #2 proposed various changes to the forms contained in PAS to coincide with INC guideline changes, similar to NANPA's Change Order #4. The NOWG had recommended that this change order be approved and it was approved by the FCC. Implementation is targeted for the second quarter of 2016. The PA Change Order #3 is the most recent change order submitted to the NOWG, and it relates to the impact transition and proposes

67

changes to enable an automated interface between iconectiv's NPAC and the PAS through an API.  The NOWG is reviewing this change order now, and our recommendation as well as the FCC's action regarding this change order is currently pending.  Are there any questions regarding the information contained on the change order slides?

**Cary Hinton**:  Again, I'll take the prerogative of the chair of asking the question first.  The last change order, number three, you've mentioned that that's pending before the NOWG.  Do you expect that you'll have a recommendation before the next NANC meeting?

Laura Dalton:  The next?  I believe by the end of June, I think, the next NANC meeting is scheduled.

**Cary Hinton**:  Right.  Correct.

Laura Dalton:  We may.  This change order is requiring a little bit more background work for us, so I can't commit to that.  But I think that we will be on target to have some type of recommendation by then, or at least we'll be able to report on a little bit more detail on that change order.

**Cary Hinton**:  Very good.  Thank you.

Laura Dalton:  So then slides 7 through 9 address the NOWG's response to the action items that the NANC assigned to us on the issue of Nationwide Number Portability or NNP.  Two issues were referred to the NOWG.  The first issue was potential

impacts of NNP to the life of the NANP, and the second issue was

NRUF forum impacts.  Recognizing the subject matter expertise

that the NANPA and the ATIS INC have on these topics, the NOWG

requested input from them in assessing these issues.  NANPA

provided a detailed analysis to the NOWG, which is included with

our report.  The INC reviewed NANPA's input and responded that

they agreed with NANPA's assumptions and input related to both

issues.

Turning to slide 8.  In considering the feedback that we

received, the NOWG concluded the following in regard to the

first issue: potential impacts to the life of the NANP.

Assuming there are no changes to the assignment process for

central office codes and thousands-block, the implementation of

NNP is unlikely to have a significant positive or negative

impact to the life of the NANP.  However, if a new technical

routing solution is developed that requires service providers to

establish additional LRNs, then the assignment of additional

central office codes to facilitate those additional LRN needs

could negatively impact the lives of particular NPAS and the

overall life of the NANP.

Turning to slide 9.  Regarding the second issue, NRUF form

502, impacts to NRUF Form 502.  The NOWG concluded that assuming

there are no changes to the assignment process for central

office codes and thousands-block, and ported out numbers would

69

continue to be reported as assigned by the block holder or code holder on the NRUF Form 502, the implementation of an NP would have no impact on the NRUF Form 502.  The NOWG completed our study and our final report in response to the NANC action items on NNP and was provided to the NANC members in an email that was sent out on March 3rd, 2016.  NANPA's detailed input is attached to the NOWG's report as Exhibit 1.  So are there any questions on the NOWG's response regarding NNP?

Okay, no questions.  So just a few more slides to go. Turning to slide 10, that shows the NOWG's upcoming meeting schedule for our regularly scheduled monthly conference calls with the NANPA and the PA and for our NOWG-only calls.  Earlier this month, the NOWG attended the annual NANPA Operational Review that was held in Sterling, Virginia, and on April 20th to the 21st we will be attending the PA Operational Review in Concord, California.

Slide 11 notes that in addition to the monthly conference calls, we schedule other calls when needed especially during the time when we are preparing the performance reports and when we need to discuss special issues that come up.  This slide also shows the contact information for the co-chairs and where to find our meeting notes and information.  The last slide, slide 12, shows a list of NOWG participants.  And that concludes our report.  Does anyone have any questions?  Thank you.

**Cary Hinton:** Great. For the record, this will be Exhibit #6. I see by the clock on the wall that we're at high noon, which we had predicted or scheduled I should say for a break. I'm going to go ahead and invite you to take a break now for 15 minutes. But unlike past meetings, we're going to be very restrictive about keeping that 15 minutes since we're running behind schedule. I'm unfortunately not as good as Chairman Kane at keeping us on schedule. So see you back in 15 minutes. Thank you.

Okay, I'm tired of holding my breath. I'm just going to go ahead and start. Now, my phone is clicked to 12:50, very good. Thank you for all coming back. Most of you have come back. Those that haven't come back to the tables, they'll sneak in.

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

We'll now go to our next report by Garth Steele on behalf of the North American Numbering Plan Billing and Collection Agent. Thank you. Garth.

Garth Steele: Thank you. This is a report about the financial aspect of the cost associated with numbering administrations. What are the costs and how are they funded? This is a report up to the end of February 2016. Page 1 of the report provides the statement of financial position of the fund as of February 29th. It shows that we had assets of $3.5

million, most of that being cash in the bank. We had accrued liabilities at that point in time of $524,000. That leaves a fund balance at the end of February of $2.9 million. If we flip to page 2 — a fairly wide spreadsheet that gives details of the fund activity by month. The first few columns are actual results from July through to the end of February. The remaining columns are the budgeted activity from March through to the end of September.

This whole fund balance covers a period of 15 months this year. That's because we switched from a June 30th cutoff to a September 30th cutoff to match up with the FCC's yearend. This funding period covered 15 months instead of the usual 12. We're running this through to the end of September. If you look under the September column kind of down at the bottom, you'll see that we project the fund balance at that point in time to be $569,000. That compares to our budget where we had projected to have a contingency reserve of $500,000. So we're fairly close. We're going to have a bit more money in the bank than we had budgeted for. But that's all right. That will just be used to presumably reduce the cost of contributions in the coming year. That $69,000 difference between our original budget and our projected ending balance is explained in that box of numbers in the bottom right of page 2 if you want to look at that.

Page 3, the report just provides a breakdown over the next six months of all of the contracts that are in place and payments that are likely to be made under those contracts over the next six months. They were all budgeted for. There's nothing out of the ordinary there. The last page of the report, page 4, talks about various deliverables and so on. I think the most important piece for you, folks, would be look at the budget timeline at the bottom. What are we doing on a go-forward basis? We've noted there the dates of the meetings that we have at the Billing and Collection Working Group to come up with the contribution factor for the coming year. The hope is to have that contribution factor approved at the June NANC meeting and to be sending out invoices that would be due October 12th. That's a change in the due date for invoices.

Last year, they would have been due in July. Because of the 15-month switch, they're going to be due - if you're an annual payer - they're going to be due in October. That's the Billing and Collection Agent's report.

**Cary Hinton:** Any questions? All right, I'm not seeing anything. Anybody on the line have any questions? Very good, we'll mark this for the record as exhibit 7.

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

Okay, Mary, you now have the report by the Billing and Collection Working Group.

Mary Retka:  Thanks, Cary.  Good afternoon, everybody.  I'm Mary Retka from CenturyLink and with my esteemed colleague, Rosemary Emmer from Sprint.  We are the co-chairs for the Billing and Collection Working Group.  Again, thank you, Tim Decker, who previously had this slot, for all of your hard work over all the years.  As you can see on page 2, we have a mission statement related to overseeing the performance of the functional requirements provided by the North American Numbering Plan Billing and Collection Agent.  We provide you folks here at the table of the NANC with our reports.  We also every year work with the agent to set the factor and make sure that we include in that factor everything that is appropriate from a financial and feasibility perspective.

On page 3, we're just going to talk about our monthly billing and collection oversight, our monthly evaluation of deliverables in our billing and agent contract.  Let's start on page 4 with the contract renewal.  As everybody is aware, this has been a favorite issue of mine for a couple of years now.  Welch, as Garth Steele just reported, had received an extension of the contract through June 30th of 2016.  Probably, some of you looked at your transcript from the last meeting before you got here and noted that we kind of thought by now we would have a new selection.  But we don't so I don't know, Marilyn, if there's anything you want to comment on.

74

**Cary Hinton:** I'm going to hand this off to Marilyn since it's in her ballpark.

Marilyn Jones: This is Marilyn, FCC. We got a new contracting officer actually to work this contract. Part of the requirement she needed was to do a market study survey for cost [sounds like] so we had to do our RFI to get that information. I think we've completed that process. Now, the statement of work is at the OGC level for review. We should have something, a solicitation within the next quarter.

Mary Retka: Thank you, Marilyn.

Marilyn Jones: You're welcome.

Mary Retka: You're probably saying why didn't they have her be the co-chair? But thank you, I appreciate it.

Let's move to slide 5. Garth really walked us through all of this. But just as a reminder that we had for this particular round of budgeting and funding, we had a 15-month timeframe because we were aligning with the fiscal year for the government. That's why you're not going to see something as quick as you normally do from us on a proposed factor. We did actually have the contribution factor set at 0000387 to cover the time from July 15th through to September of 2016. Hopefully, when we meet in June, we will be ready to provide you with some information about the factor for then, the next fiscal

75

year that will start at the beginning of October and go for that fiscal year.  It won't be a 15-month timeframe the next time.

Then on slide 6, we give you the history of the contribution factors that we've had on an ongoing basis for the industry.  Our billing collection membership is made up of the folks shown on slide 7.  It's always good to have other members. I know that now that we have our new guidelines for vetting for membership, there may be some people who will have renewed interest in participating with us.  Our next meeting is going to be Tuesday, April 26th.  Garth has already told you that we'll start at that meeting to look at the requirements for the next fiscal year's factor.  Are there any questions?

**Cary Hinton:**  Not seeing any, I'm going to take the prerogative once again to ask questions.  I'm going to quiz Marilyn.  That is, you mentioned that the timeframe is that there will be a request for proposals, I guess, in the second quarter or next quarter.  To get to the point, in fact, the contract expires in June.  Is there automatic extension that would be granted or any mechanics that have to be taken by anyone to ensure that we still have Welch working on the job come July 1?

Marilyn Jones:  Usually, within that 30-day expiration, there would be an extension.  If it's going to be extended

again, it will probably be extended end of May, beginning of June.

**Cary Hinton:**  Okay.  How does that happen?

Marilyn Jones:  The contracting officer works with Welch.

**Cary Hinton:**  Okay, all right.  Thank you.

Marilyn Jones:  You're welcome.

**Cary Hinton:**  Okay.  We'll mark this report as --

Mary Retka:  Cary, did you want to ask on the phone?

**Cary Hinton:**  I'm sorry.  What?  Oh, yes.  Anybody on the phone have any questions, on the conference link?  Anybody?  Thank you.  All right, thank you very much, Mary.  We'll mark this for the record as exhibit 8.  Tim Kagele.


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

Tim Kagele:  Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.  My name is Tim Kagele.  I'm with Comcast.  I'm one of the co-chairs for the NAPM LLC.  I share that responsibility with my colleague, Tim Decker, from Verizon.  Heeding the advice of Chairman Kane from the last NANC meeting, we are going green.  Therefore, you will not have copies in the room of our report today.  However, hopefully, that is available on the NANC's website.  And you are all able to download that successfully.

For folks that may be new to the NANC process, let me just describe a little bit about what the NAPM LLC does.  It is the

contracting entity for number portability services with the current vendor, Neustar. Ultimately, we'll extend that to administrative contract oversight to iconectiv once the LNPA transition is complete. So I just wanted to make that little bit of administrative update for folks that may not be clear on what the NAPM LLC does.

In terms of our report this time, generally, we start with statements of work. Again, for those that might be new to the process, statements of work are enhancements to the NPAC that are generally requested by the industry through the NANC's LNPA Working Group. In this regard, no new statements of work have been voted on by the NAPM. However, I will mention that there is a draft SOW under development. I'll address that when I get into the LNPA transition because it is specific in that area.

Under general points, the NAPM co-chairs have had a conversation with a voice service provider in terms of new membership recruitment. I'll put my pitch out on behalf of the NAPM. If you are interested in being a NAPM LLC member, please don't hesitate to reach out to Tim or myself. We'll be happy to talk to you about the requirements and the cost associated with it. In terms of the FonPAC's report - there has been no committee activity. Therefore, there's no report this time. Before I move into the LNPA transition piece, let me just pause

and see if there are any questions so far about the report. Anybody on the bridge?  Okay, thank you.

In terms of the LNPA transition, first I just want to acknowledge that the transition oversight manager which is the neutral third party, the TOM as we call it, Greg Chiasson from PricewaterhouseCoopers will be here today to address the specifics of what the TOM is working on.  With that, some of what I share on behalf of the NAPM may be a repeat of what the TOM might cover.

But in terms of the outreach, something that the industry and interested parties are very interested around LNPA transition, we have what we call Transition Outreach and Education Plan.  Under that plan, we've conducted a couple of meetings in December last year, again in January, and again in March.  During the January meeting, we were very pleased to be able to share some high level transition timing for completion of the LNPA transition.  I know there were a lot of questions around that from NANC members last time.  There have been a lot of questions around from interested stakeholders about that. That was shared.  Hopefully, that's been appropriate guidance for folks.

In terms of the next transition bullet point, the NAPM continues to file monthly transition status reports in the docket.  Something new for this report, you will see attached is

79

an example of the February transition status report that was filed in the docket, so just as an example. In the appendix section of the NAPM's report, you will also find the web link where that report and other related LNPA transition information can be found.

In the next bullet point, we did make available to interested stakeholders, interested parties a summary of the transition oversight manager's engagement letter with the NAPM LLC available. Substantively, that engagement letter addresses I think everything an interested party would want to know. That was made available as information. An example of that letter is also available in the NAPM LLC's website, the public portion.

The next bullet point, and this goes back to the SOW that I mentioned at the beginning of the report, we have an SOW that will be called 103. That's under development between the transition team and Neustar that will address the specifics around the enhanced bulk data download which will be sort of the seed for the one regional database. That work is underway by the NAPM transition team as well as our transition team. I have a question there, I'm sorry. I have to turn my neck a little farther. Thanks, Mark.

Aelea Christofferson: Because some time, I don't know, long before my time, it was decided that TOM would report to your organization instead of directly to NANC. We've developed

a great concern for small or medium-sized companies.  I don't know how many.  I guess, NPAC would have to tell us.  Large numbers of companies that aren't going to have $34,000 to be members of the organization.  There's a lot of sorting through what gets to the industry and what doesn't.  You know, for instance, many of us are on the TOM calls.  But our questions are not answered on the TOM calls and never addressed afterwards.  I know that there is, well, maybe not enough people asked about that.  But I'm aware of many people are asking the same questions and they're ignored.  The contract has been out for five months or something.

Again, we're getting a summary of the contract instead of actually being able to address anything in the contract.  I understand if there's like national security or something, it could be kept private.  But I'm not sure why we get a summary instead of seeing the contract.  Many companies of my size and really even quite a bit larger are not getting information and have no way to be a part of the process.  Yet we're making business plans, both from the kind of mechanization things that we're building which may or may not be even relevant under the transition or going into areas of the industry without having any idea what our costs are going to be.  How do we get real industry input to this instead of what those TOM calls do which is not really industry-input?

Tim Kagele:  Well, I think first of all, the TOM has been invited today.  They will be presenting right after the NAPM LLC finishes its report.  I think some of those questions would be more appropriately directed to TOM.  In terms of questions being ignored during the TOM calls, I think probably Greg Chiasson can speak more directly to that.  My perception is that is not the case.  There simply is not information that can be shared at this point.  When that becomes available, there's no intent to withhold information certainly.

In terms of the contract, I think that's a good segue into the last bullet point that I have in that I'm very happy to report that the NAPM LLC has been working very closely with all the parties involved in this to close up the remaining open items in the contract.

That has been done successfully and that that contract is eminently to be scheduled for a vote by the NAPM LLC members.  Once that process is concluded, we'll move forward with the next step.  In terms of sharing anything beyond that, Marilyn, is there anything else we can really say about that?

Marilyn Jones:  This is Marilyn from the FCC.  I can say that once the negotiations are completed and the contract is formally submitted to the FCC, there will be an FCC review.  The contract will be placed in the record probably under some sort

of protective order or however ODC defines that, we put it in the record.

Aelea Christofferson:  The conversion schedule is kind of upon us.  That's one of the concerns.  That's 2017, which for things not like this seems like a long time away.  But for product introduction and things that we're building now from a technical sense, that's getting really close.  As much as we would like this to be concluded, I think we also need to voice that if we can't get the information until months from now, then the implementation schedule may become a real problem.

Tim Kagele:  Yeah.  We can certainly appreciate your concerns.  I would continue to voice those concerns through the Transition Education Outreach process.

Aelea Christofferson:  I can say for a fact, my questions don't get addressed.

Tim Kagele:  And again, I think this information is available.  In terms of the timeline, we'll be able to share that [cross-talking].

Aelea Christofferson:  Timeline, yes, that is available.

Tim Kagele:  We'll be able to share the milestone.  I think that the high level milestones have been shared at a very high level.  That was shared at the January meeting.  That should help with any internal planning that companies have going on.

Aelea Christofferson:  You're correct.  The milestones are being shared.  But that's not the detailed -- I mean the milestones without knowing what we need to be building to are just dates.

Tim Kagele:  Yeah.  One of the things as well, I'm assuming you've taken advantage of the FAQs that are on the NAPM's website.

Aelea Christofferson:  Yes, I had.

Tim Kagele:  Okay.  Those are not addressing your questions?

Aelea Christofferson:  Like you say, these are high level answers to questions where operationally, we need the detail to it.  The high level, "This is going to happen at this date.  This is what's going to happen," doesn't help at a company level.  The main concern of many of the small or medium-sized companies is that there's no way to participate in your organization.  I know what TOM is doing.  But the TOM is handled by your organization.

Tim Kagele:  Under the direction of the FCC pursuant to the order.

Aelea Christofferson:  Right.

Tim Kagele:  Yes.

Aelea Christofferson:  Because of the decision to go through your organization - like I said long before my time, I

have no idea how that decision was made - without $34,000, there's no real way to influence any of it.

Tim Kagele:  We probably should have an offline conversation, I guess, would be my view.  I would disagree that there hasn't been an opportunity to influence this process.  I would remind the NANC members that there was an RFI that was asked for several years ago.  There was an RFP process, a rather robust RFP process that went out.  We took very seriously the comments that came back through that process before the RFP was finalized.  I would disagree that there hasn't been an opportunity to participate in this process.

Aelea Christofferson:  Just to be clear, I'm not complaining about who was selected.  I just want to make sure that you realize that's not my intent.  It's the participation and how those details get worked out that trickle down to companies that don't really have a way to input.  Not input but influence on how they're decided.

Tim Kagele:  Sure.  I can appreciate.  I think the NAPM appreciates very much and is acutely aware that the flow of information may seem to be slow.  But we are following a very rigorous process to make sure that the transition is fully vetted out and that the information that is shared with the industry has been fully vetted and is accurate at the time that it is shared.

I'll just make one final point.  Going back to my membership pitch, it's my understanding that the NAPM's operating agreement does allow for certain associations provided they meet the requirements to become NAPM LLC members.  Perhaps, that would be a way for some of the smaller providers that would like to have a voice in this process could pool their resources and have a direct voice in the process.  I just make mention of that.  So happy to have an offline conversation with anybody that might fit into that category.  Thank you for the questions. I appreciate it.

**Cary Hinton:**  Any questions from people that are on the conference link, the bridge?

Tim Kagele:  I think we have one more question, Cary.

**Cary Hinton:**  I'm sorry.  I didn't see Doug's card up. Thank you.

Doug Davis:  I want to reiterate something Aelea had said. I think that she's feeling the tension as some of us are that the implementation schedule versus how fast we can develop systems and deploy and test them are starting to look a little compressed.  A lot of us are thinking these systems as, you know, years as opposed to months.  We're now down to about a year.  We're getting a lot of pressure internally about when's the details on some of these are going to be available so that we can start the development process for whatever can be there.

The concern, of course, is today we can port numbers. We do thousands every day just like most everybody in the situation does. But in order to implement to a new system, that's going to take a considerable amount of time. Now, even if the new system is substantially the same as the old system, we're starting to compress things. We all need to be aware that the faster you can flow technical information, interface, documents, all those kinds of things back out, the easier this is going to be as a transition.

Tim Kagele: We appreciate the point, Doug. I think we all share that.

Doug Davis: We do. It's just we're starting to see the clock.

Tim Kagele: We appreciate that. Any questions from the bridge? Thank you very much.

Female Voice: No. Sorry. Other than the volume sometimes goes in and out, so it's hard to hear some of the conversations.

Tim Kagele: Okay, thank you for that.

**Cary Hinton**: I'll try to make sure that people speak up into the mic, I guess. Any other questions or comments from the bridge? All right, we'll go ahead and mark this as exhibit 9 for the record.

### LNPA Transition Oversight Manager (TOM)

Now, we'll have Greg Chiasson from the TOM.

Greg Chiasson:  Good afternoon, Acting Chairman, distinguished members of the NANC.  Thank you for the opportunity to address you today.  My name is Greg Chiasson. I'm a partner with PricewaterhouseCoopers or PwC.  I'm here today representing the LNPA Transition Oversight Manager or TOM. I'd like to share a brief update on the status of the LNPA transition, our accomplishments to date and our planned next steps.

Let me start with a bit of background.  As we know in its March 2015 order, the FCC conditionally approved the selection of iconectiv as the Local Number Portability Administrator replacing common LNPA after the end of a transition period.  The order also directed the NAPM to select and engage a Transition Oversight Manager to oversee the transition.  To this end, the NAPM conducted a competitive RFP process, which resulted in the selection of PwC as the TOM and hence, my appearance before you today.

Broadly speaking, the scope of the TOM's responsibility covers overseeing the transition in accordance with the Transition Oversight Plan or the TOP; conducting the program management of the LNPA transition; monitoring, assessing and

reporting on the progress of the transition; and implementing a communications plan to inform all LNPA transition stakeholders.

Since August, we've been working with the NAPM, iconectiv, Neustar, and other stakeholders to plan for the transition. Initial efforts focused primarily on establishing the program framework and include activities such as establishing a regular program management cadence; defining a set of work streams to categorize program activities to enable effective program management; establishing a set of program milestones against which to measure progress; implementing project management tools; developing various policies to govern appropriate interactions between Neustar and iconectiv; and developing a Transition Outreach and Education Plan or TOEP to communicate with stakeholders.

In addition to the program framework, the TOM is also focused on a variety of operational planning efforts. For example, working with stakeholders on the definition of a specification of the format for impact data to be exchanged between Neustar and iconectiv. This is called the enhanced bulk data download or EBDD specification. Additionally, an initial schedule of the development in test transfers has been prepared.

Another example is the development and definition of how operational activities will be divided between Neustar and iconectiv while Neustar is operating certain regions and

iconectiv, others.  This is what we called parallel operations.

These parallel operations areas include change management,

helpdesk, ancillary services, new user evaluation and new user

acceptance, pooling administration, website migration, sped

[sounds like] migration and mass updates and mass ports, and

industry meetings and notifications.  Additional examples

include developing more detailed project checkpoints, which

support the program milestones and will enable visibility into

transition progress, and developing a process for the review and

acceptance of contractually required transition related

deliverables.

Transition outreach has also been a major focus for the

TOM.  As I've mentioned, the Transition Outreach and Education

Plan has been prepared.  The TOEP provides a means for

stakeholders interested in the LNPA transition to receive

information, and provide their input and feedback.  The TOEP

encompasses multiple channels including the napmllc.org website,

webcasts, surveys, communications, industry and public safety

conferences, and events such as today's NANC meeting.  In order

to publicize TOEP events, we've developed a mailing list based

on NPAC and LEAP user lists, industry mailing lists, contact

information for those that have filed comments on the transition

and other sources.  We have approximately 10,000 contacts in

this mailing list.  In addition, events are publicized via the

90

NAPM website, and the FCC has also been very helpful in noticing events.

The webcast series is the centerpiece of the TOEP as it allows frequent interaction with stakeholders without requiring travel or other costs. As Tim mentioned today, we have conducted three webcasts on December 9th, January 27th, and March 9th. His webcasts have averaged 479 participants. Users are asked to categorize themselves when registering. And from this, we know that large and small service providers and providers of telecom-related services consistently comprise the greatest number of participants. Together, these categories represent about two-thirds of all attendees.

If we look just at small service providers, this group has averaged 26 percent of the audience or about 125 participants per webcast. If you come at it from a slightly different direction, we know that users of the LTI or low tech or website interface are consistently the most commonly cited connection type among attendees, and this group accounts for more than one-third of all the participants in the webcast series. That gives you a little bit of flavor for the diverse audience we're getting via the webcast.

The webcast have included a variety of topics including overviewing transition outreach plans in providing a high level view into the transition timing, discussing optional and

required testing and the testing process with iconectiv, and thoroughly reviewing the onboarding process, which is really the first transition activity which will touch most stakeholders.

We've also used interactive polling questions to get feedback on a number of topics.  Over the three webcasts, we've asked eight polling questions.  Additionally, through a Q&A capability in the webcast, we've received more than 100 questions.  These have been answered during the webcast and have also been incorporated into the Frequently Asked Questions list. For the last questions where there have been questions where we don't have the information to immediately answer, those questions have been logged and we fully intend to bring them out and answer them at future TOEP events once the information is available.

The LNPA transition tab at the NAPM website is our central repository for transition materials.  Webcast presentations, minutes, and answers to polling questions, as well as additional documents like the FAQ are available on this website.  Beyond the webcast, significant in-person outreach is planned.  I think this is a good example of the responsiveness to stakeholder input that's been engineered into the TOEP.  Based on input the TOM received regarding the desire for more direct interaction, we significantly increased the number of planned events.

92

Similarly, we're also maintaining a public questions log on the website based on stakeholder requests.

In terms of communications conferences, we've identified three 2016 events to have an onsite TOM presence - the INCOMPAS Show in Washington D.C. in April, CTIA in early September, and the NTCA Fall Conference in Indianapolis in late September. On the public safety side, we've also identified three conferences for an onsite TOM presence - the NENA Conference in Indianapolis in June, the APCO Conference in Orlando in August, and the IACP Conference in San Diego in October. Through this set, we expect to cover a broad range of transition stakeholders and provide a number of calendar and location options in order to make it easy for stakeholders to meet with the TOM.

Beyond conferences, the TOM will also have a presence at a number of additional venues where we expect the concentration of transition stakeholders. The quarterly NANC meetings are one example of this. We're also planning some informal TOEP sessions following in-person LNPA Working Group meetings, for example, at the upcoming meeting in Florida in May. These sessions will not be directly associated with the working group meeting itself, but will take advantage of stakeholders colocation. And of course, we're going to continue the webcast series on a monthly basis. These events have been fairly popular, as I've said averaging almost 500 participants. We

expect this interest to grow as stakeholders become more directly involved in onboarding and testing activities.

As the TOM has reported in the TOEP events and in our monthly reports, a key challenge in the transition to date has been that timing is dependent on the completion of contracts and finalization requirements.  As Tim mentioned, this process is currently underway with the FCC, NAPM, and LNPA vendors.  Once the MSA with iconectiv is approved and executed, we expect the immediate position to update our guidance regarding the transition schedule and provide a more detailed view into the milestones.  That said, the information that was shared in the TOEP webcast remains current and that information was that data migration and go-live are planned for Q2 and Q3 in 2017.

So looking at next steps, beyond finalizing project plans once the contracts are complete, the TOM will continue to manage the LNPA transition and to continue to communicate with transition stakeholders in the TOEP events.  Specific near term events I could call your attention to include on April 11th and 12th, the INCOMPAS show in Washington.  This is the event formerly known as COMPTEL PLUS.  I'd like to be clear on the structure of these informal in-person events.  Since we've realized that only a subset of stakeholders will be able to attend, they are organized informally and provide a chance to share perspectives or ask questions.  We won't provide a formal

presentation, and the webcast will remain the primary outbound

communication channel.  I'd like to think about them as office

hours with the TOM.  It's a chance for us to get industry inputs

as opposed to more so from an outbound communication

perspective.

Then on April 20th, we'll have the next TOEP webcast.  So

the notices for that have been distributed and the registration

site is open.  And then on May 4th as I said, we'll have an

informal TOEP meeting following the LNPA Working Group session.

We look forward to the opportunity to meet with all of you at

one of these events.  We'd also encourage you to submit your

questions or comments directly to the TOM through the comments

feature on the LNPA transition tab on the NAPM website.  Thank

you for your time and attention today.

**Cary Hinton**:  Questions?

Aelea Christofferson:  Yes.

**Cary Hinton**:  Aelea.

Aelea Christofferson:  I guess I'm supposed to ask you this

question, but while I was thinking about it, maybe it's a

suggestion.  I'm talking about the webinars, webcast.  Maybe

what you could do is like the next day, list the questions that

weren't answered, and maybe tell us why because the way it comes

off now is you pick and choose which questions you wanted asked

and you ignore the other ones, which may not be true.  Maybe

there are reasonable explanations for why they weren't answered. But because the experience for those of us that are on the calls is we asked questions, nothing is said about the questions and nothing is ever heard about the questions again. It gives the appearance that you're looking at it and going, I think I'll answer a question from this company, but I'm going to ignore a question from this company, which you gave an explanation that's not what you're doing. But you have to find a way for the 98 of us who asked a question that didn't get answered to not feel like that's happening.

Greg Chiasson: Yeah. I understand that perspective. It's one we had heard not just from yourself but from others in the webcast series. We did make a change and also in the last webcast. So originally, we were looking at the questions at somewhat at the one-to-one communication with the TOM. And we know that not everyone wants their question publicized or attributed to them, but it was clear that some do. And so the capability we made available for is for anyone who's asking a question to ask for it to be publicized. And so we're taking that question and we're putting it up on the NAPM website with an answer. There'll be an answer maybe that we can't answer right now, but we'll be able to answer it in 30 days. So there is a 100 percent log. If you ask for your question to be publicized, we will put that up on the NAPM website.

96

Aelea Christofferson:  So that was available at the one last week?

Greg Chiasson:  It was.  In fact, we had about --

Aelea Christofferson:  I guess, I didn't figure out how to do that.

Greg Chiasson:  Yeah.  We had 44 percent of the questions people asked them to be publicized.  And so those are up and it's called the public questions list at the NAPM's website.

Aelea Christofferson:  Then excuse me, I'll go back and find out why I didn't figure out how to do that or maybe I didn't and didn't know it.

Greg Chiasson:  It's okay.  Well, we just rolled it out in the last webcast and I'll explain it again on the one in April.

Aelea Christofferson:  Okay, great.

Greg Chiasson:  We're definitely not taking and choosing questions.  Some we've been able to answer, other ones not quite yet.  I think as soon as these contracts are finalized, we'll have a lot more information to share, but there's not a picking and choosing going on.

Aelea Christofferson:  Okay.  Thank you.

Female Voice:  A little follow-up to that.  Do you answer the questions that have been asked not to be publicized as well?

Greg Chiasson:  Absolutely.  If we can answer the question during the webcast, we answer the question.  The only thing is

if you want your question publicized, then we'll put it up on the website. If you don't, we won't put it up on the website.

Female Voice: Okay. So like after the fact because we'd like to think you're answering all the questions even if you don't.

Greg Chiasson: Absolutely. I will say that even if a question is not asked to be publicized, but if we think it's a question of general interest, we'll take it in a non-attributed fashion and use it in the Frequently Asked Questions list.

Female Voice: And do you get any questions in advance of the meetings?

Greg Chiasson: We get questions through the NAPM's website. There's a feature there where you can submit comments or questions directly to the TOM.

**Cary Hinton:** I'm sorry. I don't remember your name, Steve from NTCA. I know that you're not Mike Romano. That's all I recall.

Stephen Pastorkovich: Thank you. Thank you very much.

**Cary Hinton:** But, Steve, you have a question or two.

Stephen Pastorkovich: Yes. Thank you very much. Steve Pastorkovich, NTCA. When you referenced office hours at these conferences, is that something that will be open to anyone interested? So you don't have to be a part of the conference to

-- so it will be separate from the conference just kind of
located nearby?

Greg Chiasson:  Yeah, absolutely.  Anyone who wants to take
part is welcome to do so.  In fact, at the INCOMPAS Show, it
ended up being fairly expensive to be actually at the conference
itself.  So in the interest of managing cost, the TOM is located
actually at a hotel immediately across from the conference.  And
so that's in the public notice for the event, but everyone is
welcome.  You don't have to be attending the conference.

Stephen Pastorkovich:  Okay.  Thank you.

**Cary Hinton**:  Are those locations noted on your website or
the NAPM's website?

Greg Chiasson:  They are.  They are.  We sent out a mailing
to the contact list we have publicizing this, and it's also up
in the NAPM's website.

**Cary Hinton**:  It seems like this is an opportunity for NTCA
and CTIA and USTA and others to perhaps invite the TOM to rent a
room at their conference hotel site.  In any case, I digress.  I
actually have a subset of question.  The NAPM has reported that
once again, there have been delays in the process of finalizing
a contract with iconectiv.  What impact do those continuing
delays have on meeting the scheduled targets for implementation
of the LNPA transition?  In other words and to be more specific,
is it pushing back any of the key dates?  What comes to my mind

of course are the beta trials that many have been talking about and looking forward to or fearing.

Greg Chiasson:  Yes.  As far as the overall transition schedule in the January webcast, we discussed a high level indicative timeframe for testing and go-live activities.  So far, that timeframe still holds.  At some point that would break, but I think in the timeframes hopefully we're looking at to finalize the contracts we'll be able to maintain those.  So that Q2, Q3 2017 timeframe for an eventual go-live is still the current working plan.

**Cary Hinton**:  Any questions from anybody on the bridge?  I don't see any tent cards up here.

Greg Chiasson:  Okay, great.  I'd just like to thank you.

**Cary Hinton**:  Thank you very much, Greg.  And we will mark this as exhibit 10 for the record.  At this point, I'm going to somewhat deviate from the agenda and I'm going to ask Marilyn to give us an update on the NANC's role in the LNPA transition process.  As most of you know, there was a letter that was sent to Chairman Kane on March 10th regarding the subject.  And just take it away Marilyn.

Marilyn Jones:  This is Marilyn, FCC.  On March 10th, I sent out a letter to the NANC meetings just to clarify the NANC's role that was set out in the Transition Outreach and Education Plan as released by the FCC.  It was two components to

that role.  The first component was the outreach component, and the lead on that is going to be the TOM as he just mentioned. Our role is basically to provide a forum for the TOM to come and participate as part of the NANC agenda.  The bigger role that the NANC is going to have involves the testing, the test use cases, and the LNPA Working Group is going to take the lead in that role.  The letter spells out some of the parameters that the LNPA Working Group should adhere to when they're exercising that lead.  I just wanted to mention that before Paula went in to her spiel because she may have mentioned more details about what the LNPA Working Group is going to be doing in that role.

**Cary Hinton:**  Can I ask for a clarification because -- well, you knew I wasn't going to let you off the hook that easy. The last paragraph of the letter to Chairman Kane refers to the NANC's LNPA Working Group may be involved in certain testing. Having spent many years working on legislation as well as in regulations as I do currently, there's a difference between may and shall or will.  So this is discretionary apparently on the part of whom?  The NAPM to decide whether the LNPA Working Group will be involved in the testing or is this --?

Marilyn Jones:  Where is that?

**Cary Hinton:**  I should have circled it.  There we go. Second line, may be involved in certain testing.

Marilyn Jones:  Oh, that was individual company members of the LNPA Working Group, not the working group.

**Cary Hinton**:  Okay.  So to be clear, the LNPA Working Group will be involved within the testing.

Marilyn Jones:  Absolutely.  And then in addition to that, some of the actual organizations or representatives may be involved on behalf of their organizations also.

**Cary Hinton**:  I just want to make sure that we have that on the record and that it's clear to everyone.  Thank you.  Any questions from NANC members or anybody on the bridge?

Paula Campagnoli:  This is Paula on the bridge.  When I get to my report, I may have some questions about the testing, so I'll wait until I get there.

**Cary Hinton**:  I'll make sure Marilyn doesn't leave the room.

Paula Campagnoli:  Thank you.

**Cary Hinton**:  Thank you.  Seeing no further questions.  I'd like to mark the letter to Chairman Kane as exhibit 11 to add to the record.  So again that's the March 10th letter to Chairman Kane sent by Marilyn.  Paula, I think it's your turn.

**Report of the Local Number Portability Administration**

**Working Group (LNPA WG)**

Paula Campagnoli:  Can everybody hear me on the bridge and in the room there?

**Cary Hinton:**  We can.  Thank you very much for speaking up.

Paula Campagnoli:  First of all, what we're going to cover today is the best practice 4 clarification, transition from PSTN to IP, the non-geographic number porting, and LNPA transition. And then also I'm just going to give you some information on a document that we've prepared at the LNPA Working Group, which is the guidelines for new service providers to start porting telephone numbers.

The first thing is the best practice 4.  The subcommittee who is working on that is headed up by Charter Communications. The subcommittee is currently in the process of developing a PIM or a Problem Issues Management to present at the LNPA Working Group that will incorporate possible solutions to handle call routing of ported and pooled telephone numbers in an extended area of service.  The report as to the findings and the progress of the said committee will be reported to the NANC.  They've been doing a lot of work and now they're getting ready to document.  We expect to have a PIM at the May 2016 meeting that will be held actually at May 3rd and 4th.  Any questions on best practice 4?

Transition from PSTN to IP.  Mary Retka continues -- and I appreciate your help on that, Mary, so I want to thank you very much for doing this.  She continues to provide updates on the ATIS Test Bed Landscape Team, and it's focusing on service provider testing together during the IP transition.  If completed, test cases will be presented, reviewed, and updated as required and used cases include numbering, routing, and provider-to-provider testing.  As I said, Mary continues to keep us updated with the LNPA Working Group, and also the PSTN to IP transition effects on LNP will continue to be on the agenda for the LNPA Working Group.

The non-geographic number porting as I had reported in the previous -- I guess it was December.  The LNP responded to the questions that were asked about the LRNs and how long they would be in use.  That was reported in December.  And also, the one additional thing that I wanted to let you guys know about is that the LNPA Working Group Non-Geographic Subcommittee that we have has joined forces with the FoN to determine what steps need to be taken to enable non-graphic number portability, so they're working together on that.  We felt that there was no reason for two separate groups to be working on it and it was better to do a joint effort.  That's what we've done and that's working out very well.  Any questions so far?

The LNPA transition pursuant to the chairman's request, the LNPA Working Group is discussing possible areas where the LNPA Working Group could be involved in the LNPA transition. The LNPA Architecture Planning Team, APT, which is co-chaired by John Malyar of iconectiv and Teresa Patton with AT&T, and they continue to review current test cases and develop any new test cases that may be needed for the LNPA transition. The APT has held face-to-face meetings on January 6th, March 2nd and conference calls on January 27th and February 11th and they held one yesterday.

The APT conference calls are scheduled for March 23rd, which was yesterday, and April 13th, there's another one that will be a full LNPA Working Group meeting, but the main topic will be the APT test scenarios. We're going to review them and hopefully start getting some approval on them.

The APT current status is 92 issues have been closed, 14 issues have been opened, 14 issues are awaiting document changes and the APT will continue to report their progress to the LNPA Working Group. We are working on the test cases. The LNPA Working Group is heavily involved in that end. Once the APT gets through with all of their work, the final will be presented to the LNPA Working Group and we will approve the work that is required for the LNPA transition. Any questions?

The last thing I wanted to talk about is this document that we prepared, which has to do with the service providers who have not yet started porting and they're just getting into it. Our group at the LNPA Working Group got together and I want to specially thank Bridget Alexander from JSI who've led that group, and they put together a document that basically informed the new service provider what they need to do to begin porting in the network. So the document is completed. It's posted on the impact.com. So if anybody is interested in receiving a copy of it, you can go to the impact.com website and it's listed under the LNPA Working Group documents. Any questions? Okay. Thank you everybody.

**Cary Hinton:** Just to be clear, no one else on the bridge of the conference link has any questions? We've got all tent cards down here, but I wanted to make sure we didn't overlook anybody. Okay. Thank you, Paula. I appreciate you giving the report. We will mark this as Exhibit 12.

Paula Campagnoli: Cary, did you say you have some people with questions or --?

**Cary Hinton:** No questions here, Paula. You're off the hook.

Paula Campagnoli: Good.

**<u>Report of the Future of Numbering Working Group (FoN WG)</u>**

**Cary Hinton**:  Next report is the Future of Numbering Working Group.  Dawn.

Dawn Lawrence:  Good afternoon.  First the status, nationwide ten-digit dialing continues to be an open portion for future meetings.  I believe we have a final report due to the NANC chair April 15th.  The group reached consensus to change the monthly meeting schedule in 2016 to quarterly meetings instead of monthly meetings.  We have the April 6th, August 3rd, and October 5th meeting dates.  We also agreed that we would have additional meetings if we needed to.  The nationwide ten-digit dialing, which we now call Nationwide Number Portability, NNP, we've met six times since January to discuss this based on a letter that the FCC sent to the NANC chair where we were asked to come up with a possible solution and answer four different questions: one, the applicability and assessment of tolls, tariffs, and taxes; two, the role of state regulatory commissions; three, costs including cost recovery; and four, conforming edits to relevant federal rules.

As the FON started discussions, it became very apparent that some assumptions needed to be defined.  So we came up with three different assumptions.  One is when a consumer engages in NNP, they physically move and their interconnect point is established in a new geography.  We assume that the consumers

now under the new district porting to a different rate center or LATA within the same state or to a new state and those laws and regulations would be in effect and that the NNP should be implemented up to and including crossing state lines. Example is porting number assigned in California to New York.

So the applicability and assessment of tolls, tariffs, and taxes. The FoN Working Group agreed to create a subcommittee to discuss and define this issue. Findings will be included in the final NNP report to the NANC. I won't get into all of the findings we have there.

The roles of state regulatory commissions, several state commission staff regularly attend the FoN Working Group meetings. Early on in the discussions, it was clear that each state has its own regulations and processes to managing portability within their state. The regulations and processes could vary differently from state to state. The FoN Working Group received input from the state commission staff participants and identified some aspects of NNP at the state and local levels. Some of the concerns expressed were consumer complaints in that some carriers do not provide service throughout the United States; therefore, there is a concern surrounding NNP and consumer complaint resolution specifically in an NNP port scenario, which state would adjudicate a customer's complaint should a portability problem arise. At the

core of this concern is a jurisdictional question as to whether

NNP is local or interstate, which will need to be resolved.

Coordination among states for rules and common practices

for NNP, each state creates its own rules based on formal

proceedings.  Any state rules that conflict with the federal

rule will have to be changed.  This concern will need close

scrutiny at the Federal Communications Commission to ensure that

there is clarity for all states, industry, and consumers.  Then

with NNP there may need to be a nationwide ten-digit dialing

which will require state/federal industry collaboration to

educate and implement.

Another role of the state regulatory commissions is the

public safety.  It is crucial that all 911 and PSAPs are

coordinated or collaborate their expertise to provide seamless

emergency services for the public.  Since many states do not

have the authority to perform this task, 911 becomes another

issue that will need to be vetted at the local, state, and

federal levels.

Then the tariffs and rule-making at the state.  Each state

has its own specific methodology for rule-making and tariffing.

With NNP, these processes may require some changes to

accommodate an interstate program and rules.

Then the third question was costs, including cost recovery.

This is why we joined forces with the LNPA Working Group,

because this kind of cross the boundaries between the FoN and the LNPA Working Group. The FoN agreed that without a technical solution for NNP defined and agreed to by the industry, it is a challenge to define issues and resolutions. The FoN Working Group tri-chairs reached out to ATIS and ATIS PTSC co-chairs to ask for assistance regarding a feasible technical solution to NNP. The PTSC agreed to start working on and analyzing different possible solutions for NNP and create a final recommendation. It is unclear for final recommendation will be defined and agreed upon before the final report is submitted in May. We reached out to the PTSC because they were the ones who defined the LRN many years ago. So we'll continue our collaborations with the ATIS PTSC to understand possible technical solutions.

The FoN Working Group has determined that all local and state rules may depend upon federal rule changes. The FoN Working Group will keep this issue open and continue to look for possible changes to the rules. We are working on the final report and we'll definitely have it finished and to the NANC Chair by April 15th.

Again, we have our next scheduled regular call is April 6th. Right now we do not have a call schedule for the NNP discussion to approve the final report, but I'm sure it will be able to be approved on April 6th, the meeting, the regular

110

meeting.  The tri-chairs discussed, Marilyn, that we'll reach

out to you to talk to the committee about the membership also.

And it might be something, I don't know if we can do it across

with the LNPA Working Group, invite everybody as a whole.  I

don't know if that's something we can do or not.  Any questions?

**Cary Hinton:**  Steve, I believe, was first.

Stephen Pastorkovich:  Thanks very much.  Steve

Pastorkovich, NTCA.  I just want to point out that we sent a

letter recently to Chairwoman Kane.  We identified approximately

eight scenarios where small carriers that may not have

interconnection or rather relationships with larger carriers may

have customers who port numbers, and then when those customers

either move or travel there are a lot of scenarios in which we

don't know exactly how the calls would be completed, how they

would be routed, who would pick up the transport costs, how the

implementation would work.

We appreciate that the working groups have been looking at

these issues.  We just wanted to spell out a few scenarios that

we thought of.  There are probably more and may well be more,

but it's very complicated especially when you're a small carrier

and don't have the scale and don't have the relationships with

many other carriers as the larger national carriers do.  So we

appreciate the working groups looking at these issues, but

didn't want to raise it to the whole NANC that these are

potential situations that we think could be problematic.  We

just want the larger NANC to be aware of them.  Thank you.

**Cary Hinton:**  Let me jump in here now just for the

information of NANC members and those that are on the bridge.

NTCA sent a letter to Chairman Kane dated March 16th.  It

appears that it was filed also in the FCC dockets.  Am I correct

about that, Steve?

Stephen Pastorkovich:  Yeah.

**Cary Hinton:**  Just for the information of everyone, it was

filed in Dockets 13-97, Docket 07-149, and Docket 09-109.  Those

were all the Wireline Competition WC Dockets, then in the CC

Docket 95-116, and finally in the GN Docket 13-5.  Subsequent to

the identification of Dawn's report as Exhibit Number 13, I'll

take the prerogative of identifying the NTCA communication with

Chairman Kane as Exhibit 14.  It had been distributed, I know,

to the co-chairs and tri-chairs of the working group that are

working on the NNP issues, but I don't believe it was

distributed to all the NANC members.  So hopefully we'll have

this at least posted on the NANC chairs' website as part of the

meeting materials.  All right, we'll go forward with the

questions of Rich right now.

Richard Shockey:  Rich Shockey again.  First of all, I want

to congratulate NTCA for an excellent letter.  I think it did

outline at least some of the problems that I've been able to

personally identify.  There are several other ones in terms of
rating on origination, as well as termination charges that are
best dealt with at the intercarrier compensation regime.  But my
real question is the singular largest concern I have on national
geographic portability is frankly public safety.  The potential
effect of this on the selective routers is potentially severe
and I'm wondering how we outreach to anyone or where the
appropriate outreach would be to try and get an evaluation of
what the impact on public safety and the selective routers would
be, in the landline selective routers.

Dawn Lawrence:  Well, I really can't answer that question.
I don't know, Carolee, if you can or not.  But one of the things
we are going to have in the final report is to suggest that the
FCC put out for comment to get those kinds of answers.

Richard Shockey:  Would it be helpful to talk to some of
our mutual friends at NEMA even now?  I don't know, maybe.

Mary Retka:  Richard, I might be able to help with that.

Dawn Lawrence:  Yes, Mary.  Please.

Mary Retka:  Richard, I think that perhaps the best way to
address this would be through some of the ATIS Committee work,
in particular the PTSC work and if necessary, ESIF as another
area to go to.  Because what you're really asking for in terms
of public safety network setups may be outside the purview of

the numbering people but more into the technical piece, so my suggestion would be PTSC and ESIF.

Richard Shockey:  Excellent suggestion.

**Cary Hinton**:  Go ahead, Matt.

Matthew Gerst:  Thanks.  This is Matt Gerst with CTA.  As one of the two entities I think responsible for the work being done here, I just want to say we greatly appreciate the work of the FoN and the other working groups are doing on this.  I certainly look forward to the final report.  I guess the question for the acting chair is the process for the report. Once it's delivered to the chair, does the NANC have an opportunity to review it or what happens once it's delivered to the chair?

**Cary Hinton**:  Well, thank you for teeing that up for me, Matt, because I actually have the schedule right in front of me that I wanted to outline for everyone since we do have some new members.  Next item on our schedule is on March 31st the NANC chair will be delivering, or submitting I should say, the next status report to the FCC as to our progress.  And essentially, everything you've been hearing today on this topic is what I'll be writing up in the report, as well as other information that we have gotten from the working groups.  April 11th is when the NANC chair will be holding her next monthly coordinating conference call.

114

As you may recall, at the last NANC meeting the chair committed to conduct monthly coordinating conference calls with all the working group co-chairs and tri-chairs. So that has been occurring. And so we have our next one scheduled for April 11th. April 15th, as has been noted by Dawn and others, is the deadline for the working groups to submit their reports to the NANC chair. Chairman Kane and I then have a week-and-a-half to put that into some type of cohesive edited draft final report. We expect on April 25th then to have it sent out to the NANC members. Carmell, I look forward to that. May 2nd, we will be targeting the edits and comments from the NANC members on that draft final report, for you to submit those to us by May 2nd, so the little red star there in your Outlook Calendar for that.

On May 9th, the NANC chair will, again with Carmell's assistance, will be distributing the final report to the NANC members with a request for hopefully a consensus vote for approval to be able to submit it to the FCC. We will hopefully be able to expedite that process such that we will have your responses by May 11th, another little red star there in your Outlook Calendar. And, finally, our target date as requested or directed by the FCC is to submit the final report six months after their request to the NANC chair, which will be May 16th. So that will be a big red star in your Outlook Calendar. Questions? Okay. Oh, I'm sorry, Mark, I didn't see your card.

Mark Lancaster:  Mark Lancaster, AT&T.  Cary, I just wanted to respond to Steve with regards to the scenarios that NTCA submitted.  [Indiscernible] at AT&T has provided a contribution to the PTSC that responds to each of the items in your scenarios, so we may need to get together just to share that with you.  That is probably going to be processed further, but it might provide some feedback for how those things could be handled.

**Cary Hinton**:  Mark, could I request that you send a copy of that to Chairman Kane?

Mark Lancaster:  Certainly.

**Cary Hinton**:  We'll make sure it's distributed to the other working group chairs.

Mark Lancaster:  I will.

**Cary Hinton**:  Thank you.  Any other questions, anybody on the bridge with questions on this topic?

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

All right, we'll go to the next and final report, this being from the INC.  Connie.

Connie Hartmann:  Thank you, Cary.  I'm Connie Hartmann from iconectiv, one of the co-chairs of the ATIS INC Committee.

If we start on slide 2, there's an overview of what I'll be covering today.  There is one typo on that list.  We will not be

116

covering issue 788 today.  Slide 3 gives you some backgrounds about the INC and where to find further information on membership and how the INC operates.  Slide 4, since the last NANC meeting, INC held one virtual meeting and one face-to-face meeting in January, as well as meeting this week here in Washington, D.C.

Slide 5, issue 497 you heard mentioned in both NANPA and the PA's reports on change orders.  This issue is identify changes to INC guidelines based on NANC's report and recommendation, VoIP service providers' access requirements for NANP resource assignments, and the FCC report in Order 1570.  We previously reported that we made several changes to many guideline documents.  That was placed into final closure initially with the note you see on this slide referencing the two paragraphs in the order that were not initially effective on November 30th.  However, those are now in effect so INC has removed that note from its guidelines.

Issue 748, assess impacts on numbering resources and numbering administration with transition from the PSTN to IP, INC is continuing to discuss the relationship between non-geographic number assignment and non-geographic number portability.  INC is analyzing the potential modal disparities that could occur if non-geographic number portability is

117

implemented without simultaneously implementing non-geographic number assignment.

On Slide 7, as you heard in the NOWG report given by Laura, INC did provide some input into the action items assigned to the NOWG. Those are covered in the first two bullet items. Laura covered that. I won't repeat them. The last bullet, because changes to the current LRN routing architecture could impact the life of the NANP, INC advised the NOWG that it will evaluate any recommendations for a new LRN routing scheme agreed to by the industry technical routing experts such as ATIS PTSC for impacts to the INC guidelines, specifically the LRN assignment practices.

Currently the INC does not have any issues on initial closure or initial pending. Since the last NANC, two issues went into final closure, issue 806, consider adding state and rate center criteria to letter supporting dedicated code requests, and issue 809, update COCAG Appendix D reservation timeline. On the next slide, you see the relevant INC webpages for references to everyone. INC will be meeting again in May this year. Any questions?

**Cary Hinton**: Anybody on the bridge with questions? All right, a noncontroversial topic. Thank you very much, Connie.

Connie Hartmann: Thank you.

**Cary Hinton**: Well, we're actually almost on schedule.

## Summary of Action

Next item is of course summary of action items.  I've already given you what Chairman Kane's schedule is for the NNP items.  And this, I've noted I look forward to emails on that topic in the near future.  We'll have to be completing that of course before our next meeting, so hopefully that'll go smoothly.  We've also of course given some tasks once again to Marilyn, so we hope to be hearing back on the billing and collection agent contract issues being resolved in the near future.

## Public Comments and Participation

At this point though, we turn it over to anybody from the public if you'd come to the microphone or either here or in the center of the room.  Mr. Falvey, I'm shocked.

Jim Falvey:  It's becoming a habit.  I have a few questions for the NAPM, and maybe the FCC or the TOM.  I don't know who might be best positioned to answer them.  I represent the LNP Alliance, Jim Falvey, with Eckert Seamans.  I share a lot of the concerns that Aelea raised earlier.  We heard that there are 26 percent of the folks on the TOM calls that are small carriers, and none of those are represented on the NAPM.  The smallest NAPM carrier is going to be Level3 before long.  It was XO I think, and XO is now going to be part of Verizon.  So we have this imbalance, this structural problem.

We've had some good back and forth with the commission and with the NAPM and some progress, but one suggestion I wanted to make upfront.  Tim mentioned this idea of pooling to become a member of the NAPM.  I've been on the board of a trade association in the past, and they had a tiered structure.  First of all, they had an equal number of small, medium, and large-sized carriers on the board.  That's the kind of representation that should be involved in the supervision of this LNPA transition process.  The way you do that is to have tiered membership dues.  I think the commission should seriously consider implementing -- I'm not sure about the legalities exactly of implementing this, but there should be a tiered structure and then none of these back and forth about why are we are watching this process from the outside would be going on.

Moving beyond that, I wanted to talk a little bit about the iconectiv agreement.  It was submitted by the NAPM in October to the commission.  Some six months ago, so the NAPM members have had that much time to review the contract.  Our companies and a number of the organizations around the room, whether it be NARUC or the state commissions or companies like Cox I believe that are not members of the NAPM NTCA companies, have not had any time to review that iconectiv agreement.  So I'm wondering how much time is everyone else going to have to review the iconectiv

agreement before it gets approved.  Maybe that's a question for Marilyn, if you know.

Marilyn Jones:  This is Marilyn, FCC.  I think I stated earlier as far as the MSA process, once the negotiations are completed and that agreement is submitted formally to the FCC, we will review it in consultation with OGC and public safety and Homeland Security.  And we will place that agreement on the record under protective order.

Jim Falvey:  How long in advance of the approval, if you know?

Marilyn Jones:  Of the approval from the commission?

[Cross-talking]

Jim Falvey:  Sorry.  So the question was from that time that it becomes available under a protective order, how long will we have to review it before it's approved by the commission?  Again, if you know.

Marilyn Jones:  I don't know an exact timeline.  But once we review the contract, place it on record; then, we're going to make a recommendation to the commission.  I'm not sure how long the commission's going to take to vote on the item, so I don't have a specific timeline for that is the answer.

**Cary Hinton**:  Just clearing up some of the information, and you could probably answer this as well as any one.  The contract was already submitted back in October, and it was their proposal

at the time.  My understanding is that there's been some sort of

back and forth and then another vote on the contract by the

NAPM, or what exactly has transpired since October?

Marilyn Jones:  I think the NAPM may be in a better

position to answer that.

Todd Daubert:  Thank you, Jim.

Jim Falvey:  Sure.

**Cary Hinton**:  Todd, could you identify yourself for the

record?

Todd Daubert:  Yes.  My name is Todd Daubert from Dentons,

and I serve as outside counsel to the NAPM LLC.

**Cary Hinton**:  Thank you.

Todd Daubert:  This process of negotiating the agreement

between NAPM and iconectiv, we had reached the tentative

agreement on a draft back in October and we've been consulting

with various different members of the FCC and iconectiv to

address a few open issues.  Those open issues are what have been

resolved at this point, and so we expect the approval vote for

the NAPM to be taken imminently.  We expect that if it is

approved after that vote, that it will be submitted to the FCC

formally.  And then what the FCC chooses to do with it, they'll

handle it from there of course.

The one other thing I wanted to suggest because I don't

know if the point has been clearly made enough, you talked about

this tiered membership.  As a practical matter, that already

exists.  It already exists for NAPM.  NAPM provides a framework

pursuant to which a trade association can become a member, and

so all the members of whatever the trade association is can pool

their costs and get more members.  It's under the trade

association's control over how many members it has so it can

split the cost however it likes and then become a full member.

So that tiered approach as a practical matter already exists.  I

just wanted to point that out to be clear, that the formal

process for doing that exists today.

I think that one of the things - just to add in what I hope

is helpful - is that once this contract is signed, the amount of

information that will be available for distribution or that will

exist or that will be created will be much greater.  So I think

that during this process where there's a perception that there's

not very much information being disseminated, I think that's

more a function of the phase in which we find ourselves right

now.  And then once we get through this phase, a lot more

information will be available for distribution.  And then one

final thing is the NAPM are in exactly the same boat as

everybody around this table, so the concerns that you're

expressing about timeline and information and details are

absolutely shared.  They feel it to the same extent that you're

expressing it, so you have a lot more in common than it may seem.

Aelea Christofferson:  Is it out of order to make a comment to his comment?

**Cary Hinton**:  Go right ahead, Aelea.  That's fine.

Aelea Christofferson:  We've heard a couple of times that the way to solve this is through trade associations.  The problem is the actual reality is the trade associations most of us belong to represent small and medium-sized carriers, but they also represent AT&T and Verizon and the large carriers.  So those trade associations can't go represent themselves on NAPM in a way that represents the small and medium-sized carriers.  The other trade associations that tend to have the small or medium-sized are usually state related and they don't have any money anyway.  So I've heard this explanation that this is the way to do it, but as one of those exact kind of companies you're talking about, we have no way to do this through a trade association.

Jim Falvey [??]:  Let me just provide further comment on that.  I was aware of a pooling suggestion, and that's not at all the result that we would like to see.  The way the trade association that I was involved with operated is that a third of the members were small, a third medium and a third large, and so there's balance.  What you're talking about is taking all of our

124

22 members and putting them all in one chair, and then having one chair to be overruled and outvoted by what is right now entirely very large companies, and so I really think we should do something different.

Todd Daubert: To be clear, (a), I'm not telling anybody what to do; (b) I'm not suggesting to anybody what they should do; but (c) what I am suggesting is that there may be a misunderstanding about the membership in NAPM. So the first important fact is that it's open to anybody. Anybody today - big, small, medium - is free to join if you meet the rules. But most people could meet the rules for membership, right?

The point was made that the fees may be too expensive for some of the smaller or medium carriers, so all I wanted to do was to point out that you could pool resources to join to solve that problem. It doesn't need to be one of the existing. I'm not saying that it has to be CTIA, NCTA, NTCA. I'm not saying it has to be one of the existing ones. It could be the LNP Alliance. So there's a lot more flexibility than I think people realize, and it's certainly not an effort by NAPM to tell people to go away. So I'm just trying to make sure that everybody understands that there are multiple paths to membership in direct voice.

In addition to the multiple paths to becoming a direct member, all of the input, every input that everybody has, it's

genuinely considered when any decisions are made by the NAPM LLC. And for anything that's important that people are discussing within NAPM, they typically get discussed with the FCC as well and informally through LNPA working groups and through other fora. So I don't want anybody to be mistaken that there's any ignoring of any issues. Again, I would stress that as an attorney who in the rest of my practice represents the competitive side of the industry including small and medium carriers, a lot of the members are closer to being in the same boat than you might imagine.

Jim Falvey: I'm just going to make one final comment, because then we could go on. But we're not all on the same boat until you extend. Two months ago Comcast sat here and said that they were writing code, and that's what Aelea wants to do. My members want to know what they're going to have to interface with. Other folks in the room have said we want to understand what the interfaces are. Comcast has information that nobody else has unless Tim misspoke and Comcast is not writing code. But that's what you said two months ago, Tim. So there's very heavy information imbalance however you might want to sugarcoat it.

**Cary Hinton**: Go head, Tim, since you called out.

Tim Kagele: To respond to that question. Jim, that's simply not accurate. What Comcast stated is that we were

working to develop our transition plans.  I think if you go back and check the record, that's what I said.  I didn't say we were writing code.  We were developing transition plans consistent with the information that we had available.

Jim Falvey:  I appreciate that.  I just think that Aelea is not, our members are not.  We don't know where to begin even now with the amount of information that's been put forward, and we'd like to -- all the reports that are being sent back and forth between the TOM and the NAPM, why aren't those public?  I mean, what's the secret here?  He listed all series of things that are available within the NAPM.  If there's no security interest or any other national security concern, put them on the website so it's not such a secret and then we will all have the same information.

Todd Daubert:  I think that what you will find - and I know it's difficult to hear - trust me, once this phase is over a lot more information will be made available.  One of the explicit goals for this transition was to ensure that the interfaces remain available from the previous interfaces to the new one. So while there are still details to be worked out, the manner in which companies interconnect with the LNPA today should largely be available - those passed - tomorrow and again more information is coming.  I think that this idea that there's a mountain of information about the details that's available to

127

NAPM members, it's not available to others is just not accurate.

I think that everybody feels the time pressure, and I think that

- hopefully - we're close.  And then I think that the concerns

will begin to be alleviated as this information becomes

available for distribution.  That's my hope.

Jim Falvey:  I just want to reiterate that we appreciate

the progress that has been made at all the TOM meetings and

trade association meetings.  There has been progress, and I

don't want to downplay that with my other comments.  Thank you.

**Cary Hinton**:  Thank you, Jim.  That's good to hear.  Let me

take the prerogative as the acting chair to remind Tim and Todd

and perhaps others that even before we begin the LNPA selection

process, Chairman Kane had concern about the role of the NAPM in

this process and the ability for small carriers, mid-sized

carriers, state regulators, consumer advocates to participate in

this process.  I think what Jim is raising is a similar issue,

analogous to what we had raised at the beginning of this

process.  I think on her behalf, I would suggest that perhaps

the NAPM which has consistently - to your credit - at every NANC

meeting mentioned that there's an opportunity for companies to

become members.  But maybe it's time for you to put on your

creative thinking cap to think about whether there's a new way

in which you can shall we say attract new members than what you

have done in the past.  I'm not saying what that method should

128

be, but at least give it some further thought rather than perhaps assuming that what you've done in the past will work in the future.  Thank you.

Are there any other members of the public -- oh, Michael. Yes.  While Michael's coming up here, for the record I neglected to mention that the ATIS report will be marked as Exhibit Number 15 for the record.  Thank you.  Michael.

Michael Calabrese:  I'll be very brief.  Michael Calabrese. I'm with the Open Technology Institute at New America.  We've been actively involved in the Local Number Portability proceedings at the FCC and in trying to give input.  We failed to be able to give input, but trying to give input to the LNP transition process.  We've had filings in this along with other members of our consumer advocacy coalition - Public Knowledge, Common Cause, Consumers Union.  We filed with the Competitive Carriers Association, replied [sounds like] comments, and have done a number of meetings with the LNPA alliance at the commission.  So I just wanted to just very briefly, for one thing, thank Carrie for the first time that I've heard the NANC mentioning the word consumer.  Consumers are stakeholders.  The commission has reiterated that recently.  So for that reason, after hearing this last exchange about small and medium carriers, I just wanted to say that we completely endorse what the representative from ATL -- Alvina, is that it, right?

129

Aelea Christofferson:  Aelea.

Michael Calabrese:  Oh, yeah.  Sorry, I don't know you.
But anyway, what she said earlier in the meeting about the lack
of transparency and the inability to have input into the LNPA
transition process, that's exactly been our experience - just
one way webinars, questions ignored, no face-to-face
interaction, no information.  And we also endorse everything
that Jim Falvey said.  From the perspective of the LNPA
alliance, it's very important that the small carriers have a
voice.  I would just add, too, that even if there may be some
means by which small competitive carriers can buy their way in
to this process, consumers cannot do that.

I don't think it's realistic to think that Common Cause and
Consumers Union and others that we work with are going to pool
their money to buy their way into your process.  So we have to
rely on the FCC.  I was heartened to hear from Marilyn that, as
we were told I think a couple months ago, the commission indeed
will put the LNPA contract on the record with an opportunity to
comment before the commission votes on approval.  We hope that
this is done.  Marilyn mentioned a protective order.  We hope
that that's done in such a manner that it is practical for
consumer groups to be able to review and have an opportunity and
time enough to comment because these are in effect implementing

ultimately policy issues once it gets locked in.  And it's really important too, I think, even for members of NANC.

I believe there are representatives here who answer back to organizations that aren't industry, right, like NAIRU [phonetic] or NASUCA.  Well, all those different state regulatory authorities and state consumer advocates, they need an opportunity to review this contract and have an opportunity to give input to the five commissioners before there's a vote.  So we'll really be looking closely at this and hopefully there will be at least at that level, at the public government level, a very transparent process.

**Cary Hinton:**  Thank you, Michael.  Is there anybody else attending that would like to make a comment, anybody on the bridge that would like to make a comment?

Valerie Cardwell:  Hi, Mr. Hinton.  I don't know if I should call chairperson in place of.  This is Valerie Cardwell from Comcast.

**Cary Hinton:**  Thank you, Valerie.

Valerie Cardwell:  I just like to make a comment because there was an accusation made about Comcast having advance knowledge.  I know Tim Kagele spoke to this, but I wanted to just add to the record and make it very clear that Comcast does not have any secret information that no one else has.  When Tim Kagele alluded or stated that we're making plans to sort of

transition, we're doing so much through [sounds like] any other regulatory potential decision and things like that. We're coming up with a plan A or plan B and we're just thinking ahead about how this may play out. I just want to add and again clearly state for the record that Comcast does not have any advance intelligence than any other member of NAPM or any other person participating in the process. Thank you.

**Cary Hinton:** Thank you for that clarification, Valerie. If you could introduce yourself.

Richard Bartel: My name is Richard Bartel. I haven't been to this meeting for quite a while. I was here when NANC first started, and that was years and years ago. I represent myself and a number of entities that had been assigned the 555 numbers that you've been hearing about in the INC report and so forth. We see some light at the end of the tunnel here if there's a possibility that these new interconnected IP carriers will be able to activate our 555 exchange numbers within their networks and qualify as an activation under the 555 assignment guidelines.

In order to queue this issue up because there doesn't seem to be a consensus as to whether or not this is the case, we filed today a request with NANC with your designated federal official on your staff a request for initial numbering dispute resolution from NANC under Part 52.11(c) of the Federal

Communications' regulations in order to have this organization or maybe a committee of this organization look at this and make a decision or recommendation to the commission as to about whether or not the 555 numbers can be activated within these IP networks.

I'd like to give some tribute. This has been going on for many years, these assignments, and we're facing current reclamation issues. I'd like to give some tribute to Bob Hirsch of AT&T, who's long been gone from here, who assisted in getting the interconnection arrangements done. We went through numerous ATIS groups to get final resolutions on numerous issues in order to get to a point where these numbers can be activated. Mr. Manning today as well has been very forthcoming in giving the information about what steps we may need to take in the future and, as well, we're exploring with iconectiv some other potential issues relating to the use of the LERG as a mechanism, and we also want to look at Local Number Portability as a mechanism.

But one of the things we really like to look at right now is whether these IP carriers can carry the 555 traffic and have it qualified as an activation for network purposes. I just wanted to inform you of the request for initial dispute resolution under Part 52 that was filed today.

133

**Cary Hinton**: Well, thank you for bringing that to our attention. We look forward to seeing it. Are there any other public comments, anybody on the bridge? And it's only slightly after 2:00. Oh, no. Ann. I thought I was going to get us out of here.

Ann Berkowitz: I just want to say, with all due respect to Chairman Kane, nice job.

**Cary Hinton**: Well, thank you. Thank you. And thank you everyone for traveling here. Hopefully, no one has to travel through an airport in the Midwest to get home. And if so, don't blame us about the weather. Thank you very much. And let me mention the next meeting is June 30th. We look forward to seeing you back in D.C. Thank you. We're done.

[End of file]

[End of transcript]