North American Numbering Council
Meeting Transcript
June 30, 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.	Hon. Chairman Kane	NANC Chairman (NARUC – DC)
2.	Mark Lancaster	AT&T Inc.
3.	Greg Rogers	Bandwidth.com, Inc.
4.	Mary Retka	CenturyLink
5.	Valerie R. Cardwell	Comcast Corporation
6.	Courtney Neville	Competitive Carriers Association
7.	Beth Carnes/Sandra Jones	Cox Communications
8.	Benjamin Aron	CTIA
9.	Christopher Shipley	INCOMPAS
10.	Cary Hinton	NARUC, DC
11.	Hon. Paul Kjellander	NARUC, Idaho
12.	Michael Scott	NARUC, Massachusetts
13.	Hon. Crystal Rhoades	NARUC, Nebraska
14.	Jerome Candelaria	NCTA
15.	Brian Ford	NTCA
16.	Richard Shockey	SIP Forum
17.	Rosemary Leist	Sprint
18.	Michele Thomas	T-Mobile
19.	Thomas Soroka, Jr.	USTA
20.	Ann Berkowitz	Verizon
21.	Brendan Kasper	Vonage
22.	Dawn Lawrence	XO Communications

Special Members (Non-voting):
John Manning	NANPA
Amy Putnam	PA
Jackie Voss	ATIS

Commission Employees:

Marilyn Jones, Designated Federal Officer (DFO)
Kris Monteith, Wireline Competition Bureau
Ann Stevens, Competition Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau

Sanford Williams, Competition Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau
Carmell Weathers, Competition Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau

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

IV. Documents Introduced.

(1)   Agenda
(2)   Matthew DelNero Letter Responding to the NANC NNP Recommendation
(3)   NANC Meeting Transcript – June 30, 2016
(4)   North American Numbering Plan Administration (NANPA) Report to the NANC
(5)   National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator (PA) Report to the NANC
(6)   Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG) Report
(7)   Report of the Toll Free Number Administrator (TFNA)
(8)   North American Numbering Plan Billing and Collection (NANP B&C) Agent Report
(9)   Billing and Collection Working Group (B&C WG) Report to the NANC
(10)   North American Portability Management (NAPM LLC) Report to the NANC
(11)   LNPA Transition Oversight Manager (TOM)
(12)   Local Number Portability Administration Working Group (LNPA WG)
(13)   Future of Numbering (FoN) Working Group Report to the NANC
(14)   Report of the Internet Protocol Issue Management Group (IMG)
(15)   Status of the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) activities

V. Table of Contents.

VI. Summary of the Meeting

Betty Ann Kane: Good morning. I'm going to call to order the quarterly meeting of the North American Numbering Council. For the record, today is Thursday, June 30, 2016. We are meeting in the hearing room of the Federal Communications Commission headquarters at 445 12th Street Southwest in Washington, D.C. I'm Betty Ann Kane, the chairman of the North American Numbering Council.

Agenda

You have before you an agenda. So the first item on the agenda I guess would be are there any changes or additions to the agenda. Marilyn, is this the agenda we're going to follow? I'm not aware of any changes or additions to the agenda.

Marilyn Jones: Yes, there are no changes to the agenda.

Betty Ann Kane: Great. Thank you. So then we we'll start with welcome. First of all, I want to do the roll call, and we also send around always the paper for people to sign. Can the people on the bridge hear me okay, anyone?

Female/Male Voices: Yes.

Betty Ann Kane: Good. I'm going to ask the people in the room here first to say their name and who they are representing, and then I will ask the folks on the bridge one at a time to say who they are and who they're representing in. And I remind the people on the bridge, please, also if you would send in an email to Carmell Weathers so that we have your name spelled properly. It's not always possible to hear exactly who you are. First, let's start to my left with the Bandwidth.

Greg Rogers: Greg Rogers with Bandwidth.

Betty Ann Kane: And remember, when you pull the microphones, the microphones aren't on until you start to speak. There's a gentleman in the booth there who turns it on, and so there's no button or anything. You just pause so you can get heard.

Mary Retka: This is Mary Retka from CenturyLink.

Valerie Cardwell: Valerie Cardwell, Comcast.

Courtney Neville: Courtney Neville with Competitive Carriers Association.

4

Benjamin Aron: Ben Aron, CTIA.

Christopher Shipley: Christopher Shipley with INCOMPAS.

Paul Kjellander: Paul Kjellander, Idaho.

Michael Scott: Michael Scott with Massachusetts.

Crystal Rhoades: Crystal Rhoades, Nebraska.

Jerome Candelaria: Jerome Candelaria, NCTA.

Brian Ford: Brian Ford with NTCA, The Rural Broadband Association.

Richard Shockey: Rich Shockey, SIP Forum.

Rosemary Leist: Rosemary Leist, Sprint.

Ann Berkowitz: Ann Berkowitz, Verizon.

Brendan Kasper: Brendan Kasper, Vonage.

Dawn Lawrence: Dawn Lawrence, XO Communications.

Marilyn Jones: Marilyn Jones, FCC.

Betty Ann Kane: And let's start with the folks on the bridge.

Bridget Alexander: Bridget Alexander, JSI.

Lynn Slaby: Commissioner Lynn Slaby from Ohio.

Laura Dalton: Laura Dalton, Verizon and also co-chair of the NOWG.

Carolee Hall: Carolee Hall, Idaho, PUC staff.

Linda Hymans: Linda Hymans, Neustar Pooling.

Peter Jahn: Pete Jahn, Wisconsin staff.

Helen Mickiewicz: Helen Mickiewicz in California from NASUCA.

Wayne Jortner: Wayne Jortner in Vermont from NASUCA.

Mark Lancaster: Mark Lancaster, AT&T.

Michele Thomas: Michele Thomas, T-Mobile.

Jennifer Penn: Jennifer Penn, T-Mobile.

Ashley Brodzinksi: Ashley Brodzinksi, Bandwidth.

Kim Hua: Kim Hua, CPUC.

Announcements and News

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you very much. Thank you. In terms of welcome announcement, we have some new members since our March meeting. Betty Sanders who is representing Charter Communication; Courtney Neville, with Competitive Carriers Associations; Beth Kearns and Sandra Jones from Cox Communications; Christopher Shipley from INCOMPAS; Brian Ford and Michael Riddile, NTCA - The Rural Broadband Association; and Lisa Youngers from XO Communications. We welcome them all to participating in the NANC.

So, Marilyn, do you have any announcements. And particularly, I'd ask if you could give us an update on where we are with the working groups' appointments and with the proposed new contract for the LNPA.

Marilyn Jones: Sure. This is Marilyn, FCC. For the working group appointments, the status, we've gotten in all the

nominations. Chair Kane has looked at those and approved them.
We passed them along to the bureau; we've gotten bureau
approval. We're at the level now where Carmell is coordinating
with OGC to vet all approved nominees. Timeline, that's going
to take a couple of weeks. So we plan to have those announced
by mid- to late July.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. I want to add, to everyone,
thank you for getting your nominations in. I want to
particularly encourage my state colleagues, if you would
nominate someone from your commission to be on the NANC working
groups. Not on the NANC itself, but on the working group. We
know Carolee Hall has been very, very active and consistent
member of the Future on Numbering Working Group. And we know
there are state staff that does participate in the working
groups, but we'd like to get those names in so they could be
officially appointed and count in terms of voting at the working
groups. And any other places, Marilyn, where we might have some
need for additional members of the working groups and diversity
on them, I encourage that.

Mary Retka: Mary Retka from CenturyLink. I'd like to
thank you all for getting things through the NANC and the
Wireline Competition Bureau, and ask potentially for the FCC to
urge the OGC to complete that work expeditiously because we do
have some organizations where, for example, LNPA Working Group

where they have a retirement of a tri-chair and voting will need to be taking place for a new replacement so that we can conduct business in the appropriate manner. So if you can encourage quick work at the OGC, and I know that may be an oxymoron, I'd appreciate it.

Betty Ann Kane: With apologies to all the lawyers in the room.

Mary Retka: Yes. I'm not a lawyer.

Betty Ann Kane: Yes, actually. Thank you, Mary. That was a message that I had conveyed also. We had talked about this yesterday on the working groups, thank you. On the recommendation for a contract that actually the NANC made over two years ago, can you give us any status/update on that?

Marilyn Jones: Sure. The FCC approval order for the LNPA contract, that is now on circulation on the 8th floor. We are working with the commissioner's office to get that voted as soon as possible.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you. And then I would like to share with you, as you know - and I want to thank the members again and the working groups - we did meet the commission's deadline.

We did send in a report on nationwide number portability recommendations and I have received a response, a nice letter from Matt DelNero, which I wanted to share with you. I just

received it yesterday. So we'll circulate that, put it out on our site.

But he said, "Dear Chair Kane, I would like to again thank you and the members of the NANC for the report on nationwide number portability sent to me on May 16, 2016 in response to my November 16, 2015 letter. We appreciate the work of the NANC and its Numbering Oversight working group, Future of Numbering Working Group, and Local Number Portability Administration Working Group in addressing the seven issues identified in my letter and setting forth specific recommendations to the commission on how to proceed. The NANC report is under review, and we will be in touch soon with respect to next steps. In the interim, should any new developments occur that you believe could inform our thinking, I would be grateful if you could bring them to our attention. Again, thank you for you leadership on this issue and to the NANC members for their timely and thorough work on this important issue. Best wishes, Matt DelNero, Chief of the Wireline Competition Bureau."

So that's our thanks from the commission, and definitely thanks from me for all of you for all of your work. On that regard, so we will hopefully by our September meeting have some update and some path forward next steps.

Just to let you all know that at the NARUC meeting, which is taking place in Nashville next month, the telecommunications

9

committee is doing an education panel for the commissioners about nationwide number portability. I think a number of NANC members or representatives from NANC companies will be participating in this. It's a new issue to a lot of commissioners. It's a new issue to a lot of people in general. So we wanted to get something out there so people could start thinking about it particularly from the state and the regulatory point of view.

And I will go back so we'll have our minutes properly. The agenda will be item number 1 in our meeting minutes, and this letter from the Wireline Competition Bureau will be document number 2 in the documents in the meeting. Are there any other announcements, Marilyn? I don't have anything else.

Marilyn Jones: No. I don't have any more announcements.

Approval of Transcript

Betty Ann Kane: Very good. Then the next item on our agenda is approval of the transcript. It was sent out to you. Are there any additions, corrections, comments on the transcript from our March meeting? There being none, I will deem that accepted. And we will now move ahead to our reports from our working groups and other committees. Let me just say also I'm going to have to leave at 11:00. I have been summoned to our city council, our legislator. We have a union contract with our employees that's up for approval and I need to testify on it.

But then, Cary, my alternate will take over in chairing the meeting. But I do have to leave in the middle. Again, I want to thank everybody for participating and all your good work. I will see you at the September meeting.

North American Numbering Plan Administration (NANPA) Report

So, the NANPA, John Manning.

John Manning: Good morning, everybody. My name is John Manning, director of the North American Numbering Plan Administration. My report this morning consists of an overview of the assignment activity in the first half of 2016 for both area codes and their associated prefixes. I will provide a review of area code related activity that's underway, and also give you an update on some outstanding change orders that NANPA has.

For central office code activity, looking at the first five months of 2016, I have a chart here showing the quantity of assignments, denials, returns for that time period in 2016 compared to the same time period for 2012 through 2015. Just a couple of quick observations, January through May of 2016 assignments are nearly identical to what we experienced in the same timeframe in 2015. The quantity of returns is slightly higher than in the past two years, but nothing out of the ordinary. And when we annualize the 2016 assignments, they're

projected to be in the neighborhood between 3,700 and 3,800 codes, which is in line with what we experienced in 2015.

Regarding area code assignment activity, we have not assigned any area codes in the first half of 2016. Four area codes have gone into service - one in Ohio, one in North Carolina and two in Canada. For the second half of 2016, we have two area codes scheduled to come online, the first being 934 to overlay of the 631 area code in New York. That's scheduled for next month. And also the 463 area code overlay of the 317 area code in Indiana. That will take place in October.

Turning now to area code related planning activities I've already covered the New York 631 and the Indiana 317 activity on page 3 of the report. The New York 315, this project has been out there since July of 2016. We have initiated permissive 10-digit dialing starting in March of this year. Mandatory 10-digit dialing will be in February of 2017 with an in-service date for the new 680 area code in March. Area code 332, also in New York, will overlay the New York 212, 646, 917 overlay. That will be effective in June of next year.

A new project here that just started up in May although it's been out there for quite some time, we recently had an industry decision, as well as a state commission action with regard to area codes in the western portion of Washington. Specifically, what will happen is that the 360 area code is

exhausting and we're going to overlay the 564 area code.

Permissive dialing, 10-digit dialing, will start in January of next year. Mandatory dialing in July and the in-service date for the 564 will be in August of next year. Along with that, the 206, 353, and 425 area codes – again, the western part of Washington - will also be implementing 10-digit dialing at the same time as we move forward with the overlay project for the 360 area code.

And finally, also on the scheduled Idaho 208 mentioned in previous meetings, they will begin permissive 10-digit dialing in November; mandatory dialing in August of 2017 with an in-service date of September of 2017. Now the remaining activity here are area codes that currently have relief planning underway, but there's no scheduled relief plan in place yet. For New York, 518 in April of this year, we conducted a relief planning meeting. NANPA filed a petition on behalf of the industry to the New York Public Service Commission recommending an all services overlay of the 518 area code.

The next five relief activities are all in California. Area code 323, this is a boundary elimination between area code 323 and 213. This matter has been far and along in the process that we're now awaiting a decision or hear within the next few weeks; if not, within the next month with regard to this proposed relief plan. California 805 and California 916 both

13

have proposed recommended overlays. Public meetings are going to be conducted in August of this year. For California 619, we started this project in January. Again, this is similar to the area code 323 or 213 activity where we're proposing boundary elimination between area code 619 and 858. There are going to be local public and jurisdictional meetings taking place on this proposal in October of this year.

Finally, for California, area code 510, we just conducted a relief planning meeting on that area code on June the 20th. The industry is recommending an all services overlay, and the next step will be the scheduling of the public and local jurisdiction meetings to review that proposed action.

In Texas, 210, this is a single rate center area code. We have a petition filed for an overlay in this particular situation. Public hearings were conducted in May, and we are expecting that the commission will approve this proposed relief plan at their July 20, 2016 commission hearing.

And finally, two relief activities in Pennsylvania, 717, we have filed a petition on behalf of the industry for an overlay, and public meeting here have yet to be scheduled. Just released is there are going to be some public hearings on this scheduled for August of this year.

And finally, 215, 267, we just conducted a relief planning meeting this week. The draft petition will be filed for an

overlay to this overlay complex. We expect to file that petition within the next couple of weeks.

And finally, with regard to area code, the new 5XX NPA code, we announced in April that we are expecting to need the next 5XX nongeographic NPA to supplement the 500, 533, et cetera NPAs in the second half of this year. We're still expecting that to occur. And the next area code that will be used for the 5XX series is the 522 area code.

Real briefly on the NANPA change orders. There are three change orders covering change order number 2. That's the moratorium on 555 line number assignments. NANPA has completed its outreach program with regard to all of the 555 line number assignees, and we also have presented a proposal to the Industry Numbering Committee concerning the future of the 555 line number resource. The INC report will provide you more details about the contents of that proposal and what their agreements are with regard to that action plan.

NANPA change order number 3. This is updates to the NAS NRUF, both the form and the process. This change order has been on hold for a while as NRUF Form 502 goes to a renewal process. They're still working through that process. Expectations are some time in latter part of July-August timeframe that renewal will occur, and then we'll move forward with the implementation

of that change order sometime in the late September or early October timeframe.

And NANPA change order 4 which are a number of changes to system reports, forms, et cetera. That particular change order was approved some time ago, and these changes were implemented in the NANPA Administration System in April of this year.

Finally, on the last page or second to the last page of my report, just a brief reminder on an activity that's already taking place since our last meeting. We published the 2015 NANPA annual report in March. We published the April of 2016 NPA and NANPA 5XX NPA exhaust projections in mid-April. And as a reminder, beginning tomorrow, July 1st, is the next round of our semiannual NRUF reporting that is scheduled to complete. Submissions are to be submitted to NANPA no later than August 1st, 2016.

And the last page is the NPA's exhausting over the 36 months. I will not go through that, but the chart is outlining those activities. And that's my report. Are there any questions?

Betty Ann Kane: You've certainly been busy.

John Manning: Yes, indeed.

Betty Ann Kane: Are there any questions, any questions from the folks on the phone? Okay. Well, thank you, John.

John Manning: Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: I'll mark that as Document Number 3.

National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator (PA) Report

And now we will hear from the Pooling administrator, Amy Putnam.

Marilyn Jones: That's Document 4. Three is the transcript.

Betty Ann Kane: Yes. I'm sorry. Three is the transcript. This is Document Number 4. Thank you, Marilyn.

Amy Putnam: This is Amy Putnam, director of Pooling. Pooling is fine. I'm going to go pretty fast through the charts. The first chart, the PA activity summary data, I would just note that for this year, at the end of May our total applications part 3 as processed was 53,327. We're down about 11,000 from 2015. We're about equal to where we were in 2013 and 2014, so we may not have another banner year. In terms of applications processed, we don't have any control over that. But we also don't know what is going to happen with the VoIP service providers. Time will tell.

The rest of the charts are pretty routine going through until reclamation. Oh, the system performance. Just to make a note, we do a rolling 12-month summary for all of these charts. So you've been seeing the June 2015 and July 2015 unscheduled downtime for PAS for 12 months now. That will be falling off

17

the chart for the next meeting, so you can say goodbye to it. With respect to RNAS performance, same thing, we had a July 2015 service disruption. And when that falls off, we plan to be back to 100 percent for every month in that column.

Other pooling related activities. On June 7th, the FCC exercised option year 3 on our contract for the year July 2016 through July 2017, which is the contract end date. We have complied with all of our contract reporting requirements for the contract. For p-ANI administration, we're still reconciling existing data discrepancies. And we have annual reports on file for 75 unique NENA ID/OCN combinations.

For the NOWG involvement, we participated in the regular monthly meetings, and in April of this year we had our annual review in the Concord office. The read out on our 2015 performance was on June 7th here in D.C. We met our contract requirements. We're on a pass/fail system now and we passed. I'm sure that Karen Riepenkroger will have more to say about that. We are currently working on responses to the suggestions that the NOWG made in their report to us.

Change orders. I've been reporting on change order number 1 for a while. That was a proposal to move RNAS and the PAS into the cloud, but there was a gap in time. After we rolled RNAS out, we needed a burn-in time to make sure everything was all right before we moved PAS. I am pleased to announce that PAS

was successfully moved to the cloud AWS on Saturday, June 11th. We had requested six hours of scheduled downtime. We used 4 hours and 44 minutes. And because we had moved RNAS in February, that change order is now complete.

Change order number 2 addressed various changes that the INC had made to forms associated with the guidelines, and some of those were related to the VoIP order. That was also implemented that weekend, on Saturday, June 11th. So that change order is now complete.

Change order number 3, which addressed pooling related requirements for transition was submitted to the FCC on March 7th, and on April 26th the NOWG recommended that the change order not be approved. That change order number 3 is still pending at the FCC. Last Friday, we submitted change order 3A related specifically to the API specifications as requested by the TOM. That is also pending at the FCC.

Other pooling activities, also on June 11th we upgraded PAS to https for greater security, and we continue to work on the VoIP order. There have been eight applications for national authorization filed with the FCC so far. Vonage authority was granted in March. Mix Net authority was granted in June. MetTel is out for comment, and TEL NEXX is out for comment.

We continue to educate the VoIP providers on application processing requirements, proper supporting documentation, and

19

the 30-day notice to the states. As a courtesy, to save one service provider time and to prevent the need for them to submit new notification letters to the states, we sent emails to 20 states with supplemental information to the 30-day notice requirements and we have posted an information sheet on our website. We had posted it earlier for the interconnected VoIP service providers explaining to them the initial processes for how to obtain numbers directly from us with links to things like the FCC order, the INC guidelines, the discussion of what the documentation must look like, the 30-day notices to the states, the facilities readiness documentation so that they have access to that and can download that and get that information.

We also have training videos online that are universal in that the difference between the VoIP service providers obtaining numbers and the regular service providers is primarily in the documentation, the 30-day notices, and anything in the FCC order. Once that is accomplished and that information is contained in the notice that we have posted on the website, then how they get numbers from us is exactly the same as any other service provider going into PAS and applying for numbers. And those videos are also online.

We've been sending regular updates to the state commissions whenever new applications or filings are made with respect to the VoIP service providers. We've given them information about

the website that you can go to, to find that information. And
because we were aware that some states were going to develop
their own 30-day notice, we proactively contacted all the state
commissions' staff to collect information on whether they're
using the INC 30-day notification template or they're creating
their own. We're keeping track of that and advising the service
providers on that. And we've provided you with some website
links in here in case you're bored and you want to check them
out some time.

    Also, moving on from the VoIP order to the top 100 MSAs, on
May 19th the Census Bureau provided the 2015 population
estimates for cities and towns. When that occurs, we go in and
we check that and compare the populations of the counties that
are affected with the top 100 MSAs lists that we have, which has
more than a hundred - I think we're up to about 130 - to find
out if we have to add anybody to the top 100 list. Because the
FCC has already said back very early on once a rate center is in
pooling because it is in the top 100 MSA, no matter what happens
to the MSA, that rate center will stay in pooling.

    So we've had some MSAs that have split over the years and
one part or another with them has fallen off the top 100 list,
but the rate center stayed in pooling. We did add a new MSA
this year. The Durham-Chapel Hill, North Carolina MSA was
added. And we've made a couple of status designation changes to

rate centers that are in that MSA. The changes won't affect

service providers since pooling was already implemented in all

those areas, and we notified the North Carolina's commission

staff about the changes. And that's it. Does anybody have

questions?

Betty Ann Kane: Rosemary.

Rosemary Emmer: Rosemary Emmer with Sprint. Please convey

it to the folks back home. Congratulations on the successful

move into the cloud.

Amy Putnam: Thank you. I will.

Betty Ann Kane: Any other questions or comments from any

one on the phone? Okay. Thank you.

Amy Putnam: Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: It's good to know that the VoIP stuff is

going smoothly and going regularly. So that will be Document

Number 5, your report.

Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG)Report

Now we have the report on the NOWG. That's Karen, I think.

You've got a couple of reports, do you?

Karen Riepenkroger: Yes. This is the longer report for

the year, so this is our big report. My name is Karen

Riepenkroger, I co-chair the NOWG, along with Laura Dalton of

Verizon.

22

On slide 2, we're going to cover an overview of the 2015 performance reports and surveys for the NANPA NPA. We'll review the 2015 NANPA performance report, the 2015 PA performance reports. We have a slide on the NANPA and the PA change orders. We have a slide on our meeting schedule, and then we have a list of the NOWG participating companies.

On slide 3, the NOWG based the assessment of the NANPA NPA on four different criteria. The 2015 performance feedback surveys, monthly reports, annual operational reviews and then the NOWG observations and interactions with the NANPA NPA throughout the year.

On slide 4, the NOWG does conduct three annual performance surveys. We do one for the NANPA, one for the PA, and a separate one for the RNA. In each survey there is a single survey question per function and a comment section at the end of each of the surveys. The rating categories that we used are met or not met. There is also an N/A category should the survey respondent not have any interaction with the NANPA, the PA, or the RNA in the year.

On slide 5 we have the definition of each rating category. For met, the performance was competent and reliable. Decisions and recommendations were within requirements. Not met was performance was unreliable, and commitments were not met, and

23

On slide 2, we're going to cover an overview of the 2015 performance reports and surveys for the NANPA NPA. We'll review the 2015 NANPA performance report, the 2015 PA performance reports. We have a slide on the NANPA and the PA change orders. We have a slide on our meeting schedule, and then we have a list of the NOWG participating companies.

On slide 3, the NOWG based the assessment of the NANPA NPA on four different criteria. The 2015 performance feedback surveys, monthly reports, annual operational reviews and then the NOWG observations and interactions with the NANPA NPA throughout the year.

On slide 4, the NOWG does conduct three annual performance surveys. We do one for the NANPA, one for the PA, and a separate one for the RNA. In each survey there is a single survey question per function and a comment section at the end of each of the surveys. The rating categories that we used are met or not met. There is also an N/A category should the survey respondent not have any interaction with the NANPA, the PA, or the RNA in the year.

On slide 5 we have the definition of each rating category. For met, the performance was competent and reliable. Decisions and recommendations were within requirements. Not met was performance was unreliable, and commitments were not met, and

decisions and recommendations were inconsistent with
requirements.

On slide 6, we will now get in to the NANPA survey. In
this first slide is a list of the number of respondents. We
have the whole history back to 1998, but for 2015 the survey was
consistent. With the total from 2014, it was up for industry
and others and down a little bit for regulators.

On slide 7, this chart, we've done this a little bit
differently this year. We've made a chart for the survey
results. And this chart reflects the aggregated responses,
response ratings by section. There were some that provided not
met, but there was only one that provided any comments in there.
I just wanted to note that. The information has been passed on
to the NANPA for their follow up with those specific companies.

Slide 8 is the NANPA survey results. It's the summary of
the written comments of the survey respondents. As in the past
years, there was significant praise for the NANPA staff, and it
was just a consistent theme throughout the whole survey. And
they praised not only the NANPA as a whole, but they praised
individual staff members – the appreciation for the service that
they are providing. Some of the adjectives and praises that
were used are listed here and on this slide - like dedicated and
knowledgeable, they were responsive, always ready to help, and
they show expertise and professionalism.

On slide 9, the comment suggesting improvements were mostly isolated and they were not indicative of any consistent performance issues for the NANPA. Suggested improvements pertained to the NANPA website and online NRUF reporting.

On slide 10, the NOWG observations. After we've gone through all of the survey responses and the NOWG concluded that the quantitative results and comments indicated a high level of satisfaction experienced by those who interacted with the NANPA throughout 2015. The NANPA did actively participate in industry forums, and they addressed any issues brought to their attention. They also promptly addressed any suggestions that the NOWG made to them. And as in previous years, the NANPA has consistently and effectively demonstrated their expertise as a custodian of numbering resources in all areas where they are involved.

On the next slide, on slide 11, the NANPA performed significant work. They helped service providers resolve discrepancies. They worked with regulators to recover or transfer abandoned codes. In 2015 the NANPA initiated a significant project to reclaim 555 line numbers not in service. They updated internal desk M&Ps. They conducted ongoing code administrator training, including the procedures and process applications for the interconnected VoIP providers. They also implemented several NAS and website enhancements, and as always

25

they provided industry leadership and support in multiple NPA planning activities.

On slide 12, the NANPA's rating for the 2015 performance year was determined by consensus of the NOWG to be met. And I know in the past we have asked for a consensus on approving this, but we're going to do it further down in the presentation and do the NANPA and the PA at the same time this year.

On slide 13, NOWG suggestions, as always we always have a few suggestions for the NANPA. For this year, this is pretty much a standard one that we have every year, we want them to just continually proactively look for ways to improve processes and educate customers and improve system functionality. We also made this suggestion to make information on the NANPA website easier to locate by reviewing its design and enhancing the website search function. We are asking them to review the existing NRUF training videos for possible upgrades to support training for new VoIP providers and overall NRUF refresher training for service providers with a focus on the submission of NRUF forms online. We also suggested that they consider offering a webinar NRUF training. And the last suggestion was to add verbiage to the "Getting Started with CIC Assignments" document, and that is on the NANPA website. We want them to convey the message that OCNs and CICs are not interchangeable,

and CICs are not contained in the LERG. Are there any questions about the NANPA performance report?

Betty Ann Kane: Questions on the phone? Thank you.

Karen Riepenkroger: Okay. Let's move on to the PA. So from the PA survey, we have the survey respondents online on slide 14. And again, it's back to 2003. So if you want to look at the entire history. For 2015, the number of surveys received from industry and others was slightly down, and regulators was up by one.

On slide 15, it's a very similar chart. The following chart reflects the aggregated response ratings by section. There was only one not met on this one, and this one has been given to the PA. They can contact the respondent. And it was related to user guides.

On slide 16, the written comments provided by the survey respondents – again, as with the NANPA. For the PA, there was just significant praise for the PA staff. It's been a constant theme for the past few years. It included praise for individual staff members and appreciation for the quality of service that they provided. Some of the adjectives and phrases that were used and they were used by multiple respondents was prompt, knowledgeable, courteous, professional, informative, and supportive.

On page 17, on the comments suggesting improvements, they were mostly isolated and were not indicative of any consistent performance issues for the PA. Suggested improvements were related to additional past enhancements.

On slide 18, we're going to go now to the RNA survey respondents because as you know the RNA is rolled up into the PA performance report. So for this slide, on the chart of respondents, again it goes back to the beginning which started in 2012. For 2015 they were down slightly from industry and others, and up from one on the regulators for 2015.

On slide 19, on the survey results, the chart on the aggregated responses, there was only one not met, and that one not met did not have any comment on it so we have no idea what the issue was.

On slide 20, the written comments provided by survey respondents. Again, the praise for the RNA staff was very appreciative for the quality of service. And then, some of the adjectives and phrases that were provided was timely, great service, exceptional, they were responsive, always available to assist, and consistently goes above and beyond.

On slide 21, the RNA survey respondents did not provide any comments suggesting improvements indicating no consistent performance issues for the RNA in 2015.

On slide 22, the NOWG observations. After thoroughly reviewing the PA and RNA survey responses, we concluded that the quantitative results and written comments indicated a high level of satisfaction experienced by those that interacted with the PA and the RNA throughout 2015. The PA and RNA did actively participate in industry forums, and they also quickly addressed issues brought to their attention. The PA does continue to demonstrate their ability to handle the large volume of block applications while simultaneously completing special projects throughout the year.

On the highlights on slide 23, as Amy had mentioned, the PA processed the highest quantity of part 3 since the start of pooling. In January of 2015, they rolled out the new PAS with minimal issues. They did create three new training videos which included two for service providers and regulatory users regarding the enhancements implemented in the new PAS. They did perform significant work in preparing for interconnected VoIP providers when they obtained resources directly, including they updated the guidelines and forms, as well as the associated processes.

On slide 24, the PA's rating for the 2015 performance year was determined by consensus at the NOWG - to be met. Again, the descriptions are back on the earlier slide for met.

On slide 25, NOWG suggestions. We suggested that they continue internal training sessions with their personnel to ensure consistency in understanding the processes when responding to service providers and regulators. We are asking them in 2015 to create a Program Improvement Plan, a PIP document that will capture and track performance improvements suggested by the NOWG. This document will be reviewed during the monthly joint meetings between the PA and the NOWG.

The other suggestion is to create training videos for p-ANI applicants such as a video similar to the PA's *New to Pooling Quick Start* video or *How to Locate FCC License Information*. We just want them to look at what videos that would assist p-ANI applicants and assignees as needed. Then we want them to continue to provide high quality of service that they currently do to the industry. Are there any questions on the PA and RNA performance reports?

Rosemary Leist: This is Rosemary Leist with Sprint. I just wanted to say that the NOWG spends an exorbitant amount of time on this, preparing these performance evaluations each year, although a more streamlined process now versus what they were in the past. I just wanted to make note of our thanks to the co-chairs and to the team for that. The PA and the NANPA continue to provide an excellent product, and they're both considered to

be well-oiled machines by many of us in the industry and I just wanted to thank them as well.

Karen Riepenkroger: Thank you very much. I also want to thank all of the NOWG members for their contributions, and supports, and reviews of all of the activities that are associated with preparing these, the survey results and the annual reports. So it's very much appreciated by Laura Dalton and I.

Betty Ann Kane: I think that fully echoed the appreciation of the entire membership here. Particularly, as you say, as we get new companies and new members/new participants coming in, that emphasis on training, on doing video, et cetera, so that people know smoothly and right away what to do.

Karen Riepenkroger: So the next slide, 26, we would like to request the NANC approval of the NANPA and PA performance report, and then request that the NANC chair transmit those to the FCC. Once they are approved, we will remove the draft watermark. I'll send them to you and then ask that you forward them on.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you very much, Karen. You've had that recommendation. So just strictly for the record, what we have is what I marked as Document 6 which is your summary, your slides. But also, then we have the actual report on the NANPA and on the PA. I'm going to mark those as 6A and 6B so they

stay together, the full reports there. I will ask, is there any discussion of the request that we approve these evaluation reports before I transmit them to the commission? Any one on the phone? Okay. Then I will take that as unanimous consent.

Karen Riepenkroger: Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: And thank you. While we're talking about the issue, I also want to thank all the members and the committee chairs and the working group co-chairs, et cetera, for sending in your reports and your information for these meetings electronically, getting it to Carmell, getting it in a week ahead of time in most cases so that we can get it out to people. I see lots of people using their laptops here now, so we don't have those piles of papers. I've got mine in a notebook, but we'll get it here. My office desktop is not that portable.

Karen Riepenkroger: I'm almost done.

Betty Ann Kane: I know you're not done, but I wanted to take care of that recommendation and get those documents properly marked. Okay, let's finish. You've got a few more pages, yes.

Karen Riepenkroger: I promise I'm almost done, really.

Betty Ann Kane: That's fine. That was good and important stuff.

Karen Riepenkroger: So slide 27 are the NANPA change orders. I know that John Manning reviewed these, so I don't

know that there is any additional information that we can provide other than the NOWG does review these and make our recommendations to the FCC.

On slide 28, we have the PA change orders. As you know, Amy did review them. I did want to note that on the 3A revised change order that was just filed on June 22nd, NOWG did review that last week and we recommended to approve and sent it to the FCC on 06/24 of last week. And I want to thank the NOWG members for meeting. We met at the last minute to get this approved. We knew it was an important change order.

Then on slide 29 is just a list of our upcoming meetings. And slide 30 is if you have any questions about the NOWG, you're welcome to contact the co-chairs. We have our email addresses there. Last slide, number 31, is a list of our participating companies for the NOWG. Are there any questions on the presentation?

Betty Ann Kane: Yes, Jerome.

Jerome Fitch Candelaria: Just to highlight that there's a lot of lofty terms used to describe the performance of the administrator here. I wanted to personally name Joe Cocke who is the relief planner in California dealing with five area codes now. He approaches each one as though it's fresh, just as important as every other one. I mentioned this because it would be easy to phone in something that's been done over in time. So

I just want to underscore that these descriptors are, from my personal experience, quite accurate.

Karen Riepenkroger: Thank you very much. We interact with them every month. We, as service providers, interact with them. It's a true statement. It is exactly how they perform, both of them.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you, Jerome.

Karen Riepenkroger: Thank you.

Betty Ann Kane: Thank you, Karen.

Report of the Toll Free Number Administrator (TFNA)

And then we'll move on to the report of the Toll-Free Number [sic] Administrator, the TFNA. Thank you, Gina. Your report will be Document Number 7, for the record.

Gina Perini: Good morning. I'm Gina Perini, president and CEO of SOMOS. We are the Toll-Free Neutral Administrator. We are going to go over the toll-free number utilization trends and exhaust. We're going to talk about a limited 800 NPA release we just completed, and I'm also going to do some follow up from the last meeting. There was a couple of good questions and I wanted to give some follow up on that, and some work done from the last meeting.

So we have the first. I will say the second slide is our toll-free pool exhaust. This shows overall as of the end of May where we are, and we're about at 86.4 percent exhaust. It's

34

been edging up. The next slide shows you overall the toll-free

number utilization and reservation trends. They are continuing

to increase. As we've said in the past, we watched that

exhaust. There's a process we go through. We are planning to

open 833, which is the next NPA, in April of 2017.

We like to dive in a little bit and look at what exactly is

happening in the NPA, so the next two slides give you a little

bit of the flavor of what's happening. So clearly the two NPAs

that are still predominantly in play that have numbers available

are 855 and 844. Slide 4 shows you that 855 has about 76

percent utilization, and 844 has about 50 percent.

If you look at the next slide though, you get a little bit

of a different perspective on it, which shows all of the NPAs as

they reach towards exhaust. As you can see, most of the NPAs

besides 855 and 844, are pretty much at exhaust. But we see 855

which is, I don't know if people have colored slides, but it's a

lighter line which is the one in the middle and then 844 which

is the darker one at the bottom. We see a little bit of a

different perspective in that while 855 is at 76 percent

exhaust, it sort of plateaued. There hasn't been a lot of

utilization over the last year really.

But we see 844 is very sharply increasing. So while it's

at 50 percent exhaust, it is getting the most number utilization

and reservations over the other NPA. Interesting, we're

continuing to monitor that. We don't see reason to believe that's going to change because, as you can see, it's still moving upward quite quickly. Again, that was slide 5. So, again just looking at the NPAs watching them, we're continuing to believe that 833 will be opened in April of next year. Any questions on that? Okay.

We just did a limited allocation release of actually 800 numbers. To give you a little background on that, we had about 96,000 numbers that were released back into the spare pool. They go through an aging process, and it sits in our help desk. These numbers are --

Betty Ann Kane: Sounds like good wine. Release it --

Gina Perini: Oh. And these 800 numbers are very good wine, yes. Well, they are very like good wine, 800 numbers are highly sought after. As many people can just imagine in the marketplace, just seeing them, they are very sought after. So when these numbers become available, they are often highly sought after as I said. So as we release them, we're always mindful of making sure that all of the users of toll-free numbers, all of our RespOrg, are actually going to have a little tutorial that Rosemary asked for in a few minutes. But we have responsible organizations, what we call RespOrg, and they are the ones that reserve these numbers. We want it as open

36

utilization as possible, as many people able to participate in the process of getting these 800 numbers.

So we went through a process with the FCC where we asked for a waiver of our usual first come-first serve, and we're going to talk about that in a minute. But essentially that means when you try to get a toll-free number, the first one in to get it, gets it. In this scenario, we wanted to create a little bit more of a neutral egalitarian open market for these 800 numbers. Because the last time that we had had utilization, our predecessors had utilization in 2008 where they released 800 numbers, we had a situation where 70 percent of the numbers were obtained by two RespOrgs.

So it's not a very open market. We wanted to create a more neutral environment. So we asked for the ability to do a limited allocation where every day each RespOrg could get a hundred numbers over a very short period of time, five days. So we create the opportunity for more people to participate, and that is exactly what happened. Essentially, we had this between June 20th and 25th.

I gave you some updates based on the three days we had as of last week, but essentially the end result was that 142 entities participated which is over 30 percent of all the active RespOrgs that we have; 48,000 of those numbers were obtained over those five days. When we closed the allocation in 20

minutes, the other 47,000 were picked up. But I will say out of those 20 minutes, no RespOrg reserved more than 6 percent of those numbers. So we really feel like this has been a successful ability for us to release very valuable numbers in a way that pretty much the RespOrgs that wanted to participate could and could also obtain some of these numbers.

Betty Ann Kane: I'll take back my wine analogy, and say it's more like when they announced the concert [indiscernible] dotcom, and limits the number you could take and you got to get on the phone right away. That's very good. Thank you.

Gina Perini: You're welcome. So that just completed, as I said, last week. All the numbers were reserved and we're pleased with that result, and thank the FCC for their help in allowing us to get the waiver for the first come-first serve to do it.

Now I want to do a little bit of a follow up from the last meeting. There are two pieces. One is a little tutorial, and Rosemary brought this up at the last meeting. I thought it was very good. Just how do you reserve toll-free numbers? It's a little bit different than how you do at other types of numbers. So we're going to do that.

One thing I do want to note first is we talked about toll-free texting last time. We talked about texting toll-free numbers. We did have a conference call with the Future of

Numbering Group, and they're going to report out on that

conversation. But I want to let you know that we have that

discussion and we thought it was very good, talking about some

of the issues that were discussed at the last meeting.

But let's do a quick primer on how do you reserve a toll-

free number. There's not going to be a quiz. Some people in

the room know how to do this, but it's a little bit different.

So just as a basis, who can reserve toll-free numbers? Well, as

I was just discussing there are these entities called

Responsible Organizations. They go through a certification

process with us to become these RespOrgs, that's our short for

them. They are agents for toll-free number subscribers. That

could be themselves if they are the end-users, or they could do

it for others. They are not all carriers. In fact, majority of

our RespOrgs are not carriers. They're just telephone service

providers, and we have about 450 of them. They range from

entities that have literally handfuls of toll-free numbers, very

few for limited purposes, to millions of toll-free numbers. So

we have a very wide diverse range of service providers that will

come in and reserve toll-free numbers.

So how do you reserve toll-free numbers? It's as simple as

you become a RespOrg, you go into our system, and you search the

system for a toll-free number that you're looking for or several

toll-free numbers that you might be looking for, and then we

reserve them first come-first serve immediately. You get the
number. If it's available, you reserve that number and then put
in your routing information and any other information into the
record. So it's very much an immediate process which is why we
had the process that we just discussed with the 800 allocation,
because it is so quick and you can reserve number so quickly.
That's essentially the core of how you do it just in a nutshell.

    We have a lot of information on our website. It's
somos.com, S-o-m-o-s. A lot of tutorials, a lot of information
about how you become a RespOrg, there's also some information
about toll-free texting, which I know we've discussed before.
And we're going to be having webinars, including one in July,
for RespOrgs and others about how that process works. So I
encourage you to do that. Of course you can always contact me,
my information is on the back of the presentation, at any time
and we can answer any specific questions.

    Betty Ann Kane: Thank you very much.

    Gina Perini: You're welcome.

    Betty Ann Kane: I am now going to go and appear before the
council. So I wish you all a good summer. Hope you all get
some time off, some vacation. I'm going on vacation tomorrow.
Our next meeting is September 15, so we will see you then. I'm
going to turn it over to Cary to handle and call up the next
presentation. Thank you.

David Greenhaus: I have a question on Gina's presentation.

Cary Hinton: I'm sorry. Someone is on the line. You have a question?

David Greenhaus: Yes. This is David Greenhaus from 800 Response. I just have one or two questions on Gina's recent presentation.

Cary Hinton: Sure, go ahead. Gina's coming back up to the table.

David Greenhaus: I'm just wondering. I don't know if others may have the same question in their mind, but I'm wondering how it came about that - I think the number was 96,000 800 - numbers were getting somewhere available to release, obviously, not assigned to specific service subscribers, and how that came about, just any thoughts about that. And also I was a little intrigued with the YouTube [sounds like] reports. Actually, the report that I received, it looks like the quantity of numbers in use decreased. And maybe my dates are wrong, because this was a June 25th date. The actual quantity numbers in use decreased by 77,000 numbers during the process of releasing the 800 numbers. So it looks like RespOrgs took advantage of these available 800 numbers and at the same time dumped a bunch of other numbers into the pool.

David Greenhaus: So those are my two questions. I just thought maybe others might be thinking, you know, have the same question.

Gina Perini: Hi, David. That's actually a very good question. Actually, both those questions relate to one another, so that's perfect. How did the numbers get available for release? There was an entity that didn't pay its bills to us and eventually, through our long process, they were suspended and those numbers were returned back. So the numbers had been sort of sitting in limbo for actually over six months during our process too, and so that's how we got them. They were with the company, and then eventually that company was suspended and they were brought back into the spare pool.

David Greenhaus: So would you consider those numbers as either warehoused or hoarded indefinitely?

Gina Perini: I have no idea actually. We don't know the usage that they had in these numbers before.

David Greenhaus: Okay.

Gina Perini: The second part actually is related because what happened is they weren't just 800 numbers that this entity had. There were just 96,000 of these 800 numbers which they were also numbers from many other NPAs that this entity came back as proposal [sounds like] at the same time we released all these numbers back into circulation or availability. So that's

why you saw an increase in numbers in the spare pool which changed regularizations [sounds like] last week.

David Greenhaus: Interesting. I hadn't looked at it that way. But thank you, Gina.

Gina Perini: Oh, you're welcome.

David Greenhaus: That helps.

Gina Perini: Thank you.

Cary Hinton: Any more questions for Gina before she leaves the table again? All right, again, for the record, this is Cary Hinton. I'm alternate for Chairman Betty Ann Kane.

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

So we now go to the next presentation by Garth Steele regarding the Billing and Collection Agent Report.

Garth Steele: Good morning everyone. It's Garth Steele. I'm a partner with Welch, LLP. We act as the Billing and Collection Agent for the fund.

There are two components to the report today. The first one is to give you a status update as to where the fund is at as of today, and where we project it to be as of the fund's fiscal year which is September 30th. Then second part of the presentation is to look at the development of the contribution

43

factor and the budget which drives the contribution factor for the coming fiscal year.

So starting on page 1 of the report, we've got the statement of financial position of the fund as of May 31st. You will see that at that point in time we had $2.3 million in the bank. We had $200,000 of receivables for a total asset of $2.5 million. We had liabilities that we had to pay at the end of May of about $479,000, so that left us with a fund balance of $2.1 million.

Flipping to the next page, page 2, this breaks down the revenue and expenditures by month for the current year. And you will recall that we are in a 15-month funding period this year. The fund balance is switched it's yearend, from the end of May to the end of September this year, so we funded 15 months' worth of operations during the last collection period.

The first 11 columns on page 2 are actual figures for each of the months up to the end of May, and the next four columns are the budgeted revenue and expenditures for the remaining four months in the current funding year. You'll note if you look in the total column, the third column from the right, that we expect to end this budget year at the end of September with a surplus of $889,000. Compare that to the second column from the right, which is the original budget, we had budgeted for a $500,000 surplus being the contingency amount that was built

44

into the fund. So we expect to end up with about $380,000 more than we budgeted for.

There is a block of information in the bottom right corner of page 2 that shows where the variances are and revenues and expense lines as to why we expect to have a higher surplus than we budgeted for. The main variance, as you'll note, is that the carrier audits were budgeted for an amount of $375,000. There were no carrier audits or at this point it looks like there will be no carrier audits conducted in this budget cycle; therefore, we have that money going into our surplus. So we expect to end the year, at the end of September, with a surplus of $889,000.

Flipping the page to page 3, page 3 summarizes the anticipated expenses over the next six months. You will note that the expenses are very consistent because most of the expenses are contracted with various suppliers under fixed payments each month.

Page 4 of the report talks about various status things that we'd like to update you on. It's all good news in there. I'll draw your attention to the bottom block of information called the budget timeline, and this leads into the second part of my presentation. And that is, that we've been working with the B&C Working Group to develop the final budget for the coming fiscal year which will run from October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017.

We are today presenting to you the final budget and the contribution factor for your input with the goal of providing this budget and contribution factor to the FCC. We're filing that with the FCC next Tuesday so that it will be approved hopefully in time for us to send our invoices to you all for payment with payment due on October 12th. So that's the timeline there.

Maybe we'll just take a break there and ask if there are any questions on the status of the fund up to date before we look at the development of the contribution factor for the coming year. All right, hearing no questions then we can turn on to page 5 and 5 provides a narrative summary of the development of the budget. We provide tables on the following page, page 6, and our assumptions on page 7 that have led us to this point.

We have a budget period coming up that runs from October 2016 to September 2017. Total expenditures that we have projected are $6.8 million. That includes the same contingency provision we had last year of $500,000. When we do an analysis of the carrier revenue and that type of thing, we come up with a contribution factor.

In the second paragraph of information on page 5, we talk about, again, the fact that we have $6.8 million in budgeted costs, $141,000 of those costs is funded by Canada and the

Caribbean countries, which leaves a remainder of $6.6 million to be borne by U.S. carriers. There are two ways that those costs can be covered, one would be through contributions this year, and one would be by applying the surplus that we have coming into this year to help reduce the costs that you need to fund. The contribution factor has been determined on the assumption that we will use the entire anticipated fund surplus of $899,000, so that would reduce the amount that U.S. carriers need to pay down to $5.7 million.

We looked at the preliminary revenue figures for the coming year, your contribution eligible revenues that you have contribute to the fund. We project the revenues to be $157 billion. You'll see on a slide later on that that's down about 8 percent from the year before, so that results in contribution factor of 0.0000368. It's a very small contribution factor, but very similar to the contribution factor from the year before. I'll show you that in a minute.

We looked at a couple of alternatives as well, perhaps increasing the contingency allowance up from $500,000 to $750,000 or $1 million which would have increased the contribution factor slightly. But we've decided to stick with the recommendation of having a contingency of only $500,000 - the same as in the prior years.

So if you turn the page over, for those of you who are
accountants or like to look at numbers, you can see the exact
numbers and how the costs break down on page 6 between the
various components that we need to fund. We start off with the
NANP Administration costs which are the costs that Canada and
the Caribbean contribute to. So we show the contributions for
Canada and the Caribbean coming off of that to give us a net
NANP Administration cost of $2.2 million. We add in the
thousand Block Pooling Administration and various audits and
administrative expenses to come up with a total projected
disbursements to be funded by U.S. carriers at $6.1 million. We
add in our contingency that we want to build into the budget to
get a total to be funded this year or total expenses to be
funded by U.S. carriers at $6.6 million. We subtract our
projected surplus that we expect to be there in September of
$899,000. That means the actual amount we have to raise in cash
this year from U.S. carriers is $5.7 million.

The second column provides the similar figures for the
current year's budget. Keep in mind that the current year's
budget is a 15-month budget, so it makes sense that this year's
budget is lower than last year's because we're only collecting
for 12 months and not for 15. The contribution factor on that
basis should have been a lot lower, but because the contribution

48

eligible revenues have also dropped, the contribution factor is not able to drop as much as you might have expected.

Page 7 outlines various assumptions that we've made in arriving at the costs that were included in the budget. Page 8 provides a summary of the contribution eligible revenue and the history of that revenue over the years. Of course, it continues to drop. As I mentioned earlier, we expect an 8 percent drop this year as compared to the prior year. So that's a high level tour through how we have come up with the proposed contribution factor of 0.0000368 for the current year as compared to the factor for the prior year which was 0.0000387.

Cary Hinton: Any questions for Garth? No questions. All right, we move along. At this point, I assume we have a consensus on transmitting this recommendation for the new contribution factor. Okay, Mary, thank you, I didn't want to jump ahead. Thanks, Mary. All right, we'll mark this, again, as Exhibit Number 8.

Female Voice: I just want to give this [indiscernible].

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

Cary Hinton: Nice sense of humor. We'll go to the next report then since we're jumping ahead, the B&C Working Group. Mary Retka. Thank you.

Mary Retka: Good morning. I'm Mary Retka from CenturyLink. I'm co-chair along with Rosemary Leist from Sprint

49

of the Billing Collection Working Group. Thank you, Garth, for that nice review that leads into what we're going to ask the NANC to look at for the factor for this year.

On page 2 of the report you'll see that it covers the mission of the Billing and Collection Working Group, which is responsible primarily for overseeing the work that is done by the Billing and Collection Agent and to submit reports to the NANC in regards to the agent's performance with respect to the functional requirements of the contract. And then our other work, which is another primary area, is to determine the financial impacts and feasibility and appropriateness of the initiatives and activities that need to be included in the budget. That results in us providing the factor that we submit and we will be submitting today for the fiscal year.

If you look on page 3, we're going to just talk quickly about the monthly oversight, the monthly evaluation of the deliverables, and the B&C Agent contract.

On page 4, you will see that, as Garth had in his report but didn't really touch on, the contract expired October 1, 2009. As we talked about in the last NANC meeting, there is an expectation that that is going to be recast. We actually thought it would be done in a quicker timeframe. But as a result of not having that done, an extension was done through

December 31, 2016. I don't know, Marilyn, is there anything you want to say on that?

Cary Hinton: Please, Marilyn.

Marilyn Jones: This is Marilyn from FCC. I have an update on the B&C contract. We plan to issue an RFP in August of this year, and an award in October of this year.

Mary Retka: We'll watch for that date. Thank you.

Cary Hinton: Yeah, we want to make sure we have that on the record. Hopefully, we won't have to hear about a revised timeline come our next meeting. Thank you.

Mary Retka: Thank you. Why don't we move to page 5? This is where we are going to talk about our budgeting contribution factor. As Garth emphasized, this budget contribution factor is for 12 months. It will begin in October. And the previous one that we came to you with was for 15 months, and the reason was we needed to align this budget and the factor with the federal fiscal year. We were out of alignment before, so we extended by three months. That allowed our work to align with getting the appropriate information about the carrier revenues from the other resources we used. That way, we aren't rushing at the last minute and asking you to do a range of numbers until we can see what the revenue information is. But this year we were able to get that and work in a more reasonable timeframe in alignment with the federal fiscal year.

So the budget that we're going to look at for this year will cover from October for 12 months. It provides the subsidization for the funding requirement by using up all of the surplus fund balance. It also assumes forecasted costs that are based on input we've had from the FCC, including information on the items that need to be forecast. So based on the current state and the forecasted items, the balance to be funded by U.S. carriers is $6,674,972. With the international amount, which is $141,334, it comes to $6,816,306. If things remain on track, the anticipated surplus at the time of our budget at the end of June - so last month - was $889,849. And we do understand that the net U.S. carrier contribution requirement will be $5,775,123. The budget will include $500,000 contingency fund. On the revenue base, the preliminary number that we received from Garth's work was $157 billion. So the contribution factor is 0.0000368.

For all of you to understand the work that we do in the B&C Working Group, we try very hard to keep the contribution factor from having large swings. As you all know, parties tend to build their basis of their budget on their previous year's budgets. And it would be inappropriate to see a large swing if that can be avoided. We try to keep it at around the same amount so that the budgets that you all have for your companies can align year-to-year. So this one will be in alignment with

52

the past few years and you can see that on the chart on page 6. This covers the budgets as far back as we've been tracking them.

Are there any questions on the factor, any discussion? Hearing none, then we would like to ask that the NANC approve the factor and the NANC chair then submit that to the FCC.

Cary Hinton: Great. Now that we've presented it properly, I apologize for my error in violating Robert Rules of Order or whatever. Hearing no objections, we'll take that as a consensus item and Chairman Kane will transmit it to the FCC promptly. Thank you, Mary.

Mary Retka: Thanks, Cary. Our last page just has the list of those who are part of the B&C Working Group.

Cary Hinton: Very good. This report will be marked as exhibit 9 for the record. Are there any questions from those that are on the conference link? No? Very good. All right. Moving on.

North American Portability Management (NAMP LLC) Report

We're scheduled for a break after Mary's report, but in the interest of getting everybody out of here so they can have a reasonable lunchtime, let's keep going and we'll bring up Tim Kagele to talk about the NAPM.

Tim Kagele: Good morning, ladies and gentleman. My name is Tim Kagele. I'm with Comcast. I represent the NAPM LLC as a co-chair. I share that responsibility with my colleague at

Verizon, Tim Decker. And I think everybody is familiar with the role of the NAPM, and that is as contract administrator over the LNPA.

So first up on the report is statements of work. For the last period no new statements of work have been introduced or received by the NAPM. In terms of general updates, the NAPM is always interested in new member recruitment. Consistent with that the NAPM is very pleased to welcome, now that the Time Warner Cable and Charter merger has been consummated, Charter Communications who will assume Time Warner Cable's remaining membership.

In terms of membership as well, as I mentioned, we're always interested in new recruits. And at the last NANC meeting, we had a pretty substantive discussion about the NAPM reviewing its dues and membership structure. We've taken that to heart and we have gone back and we've had that review. After that review, the NAPM has determined that its membership structure and dues are appropriate in supporting both single entity members as well as industry associations. So for those that might be interested, our contact information is listed in the appendix. We'll certainly welcome having any conversations with you that are interested.

In terms of the FoNPAC report, there's been no new updates. So let me just take a quick pause there before I move into LNPA

transition-related activities. Any questions? Okay.

Cary Hinton: Actually I would like to ask a question as a follow up.

Tim Kagele: Go ahead, Cary.

Cary Hinton: Could you refresh our memories about who the current NAPM members are? You've noted Time Warner Cable, because of the merger with Charter, is one less member. So who are the other existing members?

Tim Kagele: I think typically in the past, Cary, we really haven't gone into that level of detail. But from a member company perspective, we are represented across the board by large service providers, small service providers, and medium service providers.

Cary Hinton: So is there a proprietary issue there about disclosing the membership?

Tim Kagele: I don't think there's any proprietary -- I'll just name them. AT&T, Verizon, Comcast, CenturyLink, Charter Communications, XO Communications, Sprint, T-Mobile, and I think -- is that everybody? Bandwidth. I'm sorry, Greg. My apologies, sir. I believe that is everybody, Cary.

Cary Hinton: Let me follow up with that. In your discussion here, you mentioned about encouraging companies to join, as well as both apparently formal trade associations and ad hoc trade associations. Have you had any inquiries from any

of those entities? And if so, has the issue about the amount of the fee been an impediment to any of those entities? The membership fee, has that been an impediment for any of those entities from joining the NAPM?

Tim Kagele: So far no. We've made the offer on the NAPM's operating contract allows for membership of trade associations. We've made the outreach to trade associations in the past and very recently, and we've received no formal response to that. So, as you know, one of the things that makes the NAPM dues structure appropriate for trade associations is they're free to choose how they want to split the cost of that membership so it makes it affordable basically for almost everybody. But, so far, we've not had any direct interest expressed back from those entities that we've made the outreach to.

Cary Hinton: Is that true also for ad hoc groups, the formal trade associations that for example are represented here?

Tim Kagele: Yes, sir.

Cary Hinton: All right. Thank you.

Tim Kagele: Okay. Let's talk a little bit about LNPA transition-related activities. I'm not going to go into great detail on these as the TOM will be up next and they'll probably elaborate on much of this. But in accordance with the Transition Outreach and Education Plan framework that was published, the TOM has now conducted LNPA transition outreach

webcast meetings for April, May, and June, as well as had onsite

presence at the recent NENA conference, and I believe also

recently at the Incompas event. I think that was held in May.

The next item is the transition. The NAPM LLC has been

working close with the TOM, incumbent and selected LNPAs, and we

successfully deployed the Enhanced Bulk Data Download or EBDD

file that we've been talking about for the last I think couple

of reports. That happened on June 2nd and June 3rd. And as you

know, those files are used to seed the selected LNPA's new NPAC

for testing. This represents a very critical milestone

completed in the transition process, so I just want to express

my thanks on behalf of NAPM to the vendors, as well as to the

TOM and our transition team for making that such a success in

the process.

The next item, the NAPM continues to file monthly LPNA

transition status reports with the FCC on the last day of each

month. I believe today is the 30th, so we'll be filing the June

report. This process began in July of last year. Before I move

on to page 2, are there any questions? Okay.

Since the last NANC update, the NAPM LLC has filed various

ex parte letters and held meetings with the FCC to urge swift

approval of the master services agreement between Telcordia,

d/b/a iconectiv and the NAPM LLC also known as the master

services agreement. In addition to those, the NAPM LLC has

filed an updated and redacted version of the MSA. And I just want to take a moment to thank my industry colleagues, as well as the various associations that have been helping to support those ex partes. It's been helpful.

In terms of MSA approval, I think we have shared in the past that the NAPM continues to be concerned that delay is not attributing to managing specific transition-related risks. We'll continue to cost the industry voice service providers and the American public approximately $1 million for each day of delay. In addition to that, continued delay also extends the transition management cost for the TOM and Neustar transition teams which are included as part of voice service provider monthly NPAC allocable charges. Any questions so far?

Cary Hinton: Yeah. Let me follow up on that --

Tim Kagele: Yes, sir.

Cary Hinton: -- in case anybody else doesn't have any questions. As you know, the issue regarding security has been raised at least publically in the press, as well as in some of the ex parte filings. Earlier this week the FBI filed a letter on behalf of themselves as well as several other federal agencies indicating that they believe the security issues have been resolved. Is that accurate? And secondly are there any other issues that are still unresolved that would delay or prevent the FCC from approving the MSA contract?

58

Tim Kagele: To answer your first question, Cary, yes, that is accurate. And to answer your second question, to my knowledge there are no other impediments that would bar approval by the FCC of the newer contract.

Cary Hinton: Anybody else have any questions? Well, let me just state again for the information of the NANC membership, Chairman Kane is very concerned about the delays by the FCC in approving this contract. Certainly we're well aware the FCC and specifically the commissioners have many other items that they are also addressing, but suffice it to say that we believe that this is an important issue that deserves their immediate attention. Chairman Kane intends to communicate that perspective to Chairman Wheeler, as well as the other commissioners. Thus, hopefully in the next couple of days she will be sending a letter to that effect to the chairman as well as to the rest of the members of the commission. And of course that will be circulated to the NANC membership. Thank you. Go ahead, Tim.

Tim Kagele: So the next couple of items, the NAPM LLC has continued to meet weekly with the FCC and the TOM to provide transition status, as well as apprise the FCC of any issues or concerns that are pertinent to the transition.

And the last item on my report is after the MSA is approved by the FCC and executed by the parties, the previously provided

transition-related dates can be updated and shared with all of the interested stakeholders. I know that that's on top of everybody's mind related to the transition.

So that concludes my report. I'll be happy to take any questions. And just as a reminder, the NAPM LLC meets monthly. A portion of those meetings are open at each month. Our contact information is listed in the appendix, and additional information is listed on the NAPM LLC's website. Questions?

Cary Hinton: Anybody have any questions? Mary?

Mary Retka: Mary Retka from CenturyLink. This is really for Cary. I would hope in the information that Chairman Kane plans to send to the FCC in regards to the need to not delay in approving the MSA, that she also includes some information about the large amount of work that went on in this group and in the sub-working groups to get to this point – and that has been going on for quite some time - and the need that we all have for some closure on that. Thank you.

Cary Hinton: Absolutely. I appreciate that suggestion. I'll make sure to include that reference in the letter that clearly will present. Any other questions? Seeing no other questions, I will ask yet another question. Tim, we've had some communications, the Chairman and I have had some communications regarding concerns about the transition dates. With the delay in approval of the MSA, it appears that it is shall we say

squeezing some of the transition elements. Is there a possibility that we are now at the point or near the point where the effective date for the end of the transition will have to be pushed? Or how is that going to be addressed? Again, the concerns that we've been hearing is that as one looks at that transition time schedule, the latter elements are becoming shorter. Months and months are being cut off of those. These are really some concerns that may be problematic.

Tim Kagele: I think it's fair to say, Cary, that there is significant pressure on the timeline. I know the TOM will speak more to this in its report. But as we continue to experience delay in approving the agreement, the parties have been working together to continue to review the timeline in detail. And where it's prudent, where certain segments of the timeline can be evaluated and assessed in a way that doesn't push the endpoint out, that work is being done and has been done. I think we are at a point where there is no wiggle room left in the schedule, and continued delays really do put pressure on the endpoint.

Cary Hinton: And again just to refresh everybody's memory, particularly for the new members that haven't been involved in this process for the last say about two, three years that we're going through this -- it's longer than that, yes, I know. I try to overlook how much more of my life I've spent on this. What

is the current target date for completing the transition?

Tim Kagele: I think I prefer to have the TOM address that, Cary, in its report.

Cary Hinton: Okay. All right.

Tim Kagele: Based on previous information that was shared with the industry and stakeholders in the various webcast, we were targeting a third quarter 2017 objective. I believe that was consistent with what was previously communicated, but I think the TOM will have a better update on that.

Cary Hinton: Okay. Thank you very much.

Tim Kagele: Sure. Any other questions?

Cary Hinton: Ann?

Ann Berkowitz: Yeah. Ann from Verizon. Cary, just to kind of follow up on this – and maybe the TOM will speak to this. I mean we can speculate about dates, but until we have that MSA approved by the FCC and executed – it's speculation.

Cary Hinton: Okay, that's fair enough.

Ann Berkowitz: I highly encourage the chairwoman to reach out to the commissioners. I know the industry has been in, the [indiscernible] has been in. We need this thing voted.

Cary Hinton: Very good. Any other comments, questions? Anybody on the conference link have any questions? All right. I put everybody to sleep there.

Tim Kagele: Okay. Thank you.

LNPA Transition Oversight Manager (TOM)

Cary Hinton: Thank you, Tim. And this will be marked as Exhibit 10, which now brings us to Greg Chiasson with the TOM - actually with PricewaterhouseCoopers, which is the TOM.

Greg Chiasson: Yeah. The TOM, yes.

Cary Hinton: Thanks, Greg.

Greg Chiasson: Good morning, 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, and I'm here representing the LNPA Transition Oversight Manager or TOM.

I'd like to give you a brief update on the status of the LNPA transition, our accomplishments to-date, and our planned next steps. Broadly speaking, the scope of the TOM's responsibilities cover overseeing the transition in accordance with the Transition Oversight Plan or TOP; conducting the program management of the LNPA transition; monitoring, assessing and recording on the progress of the transition; and implementing a communications plan to inform all LNPA transition stakeholders. Since my last update in March, we've been working with the NAPM, Neustar, iconectiv and other stakeholders to prepare for the LNPA transition. There are a number of areas that I'll highlight today.

First, several efforts have been underway to ensure the new

NPAC works as intended. The functional requirements

specification or FRS that defines the NPAC system has been

extensively reviewed in a collaborative effort between

iconectiv, Neustar, the TOM, the NAPM and industry

representatives. Ensuring that the functional requirements

specification is clear and fully documented, reduces risk in the

development process and is key to enabling a smooth transition

of services.

Additionally, the industry test cases, which are used to

verify that the new system adheres to the FRS, are being

reviewed and validated by the architecture planning team within

the LNPA Working Group. Validating the test cases before

development is a leading IT practice and provides an agreed

standard that will support determination of readiness for

industry testing and the eventual acceptance of the final

system.

The second area that I'll highlight is one that Tim

mentioned, and that's data exchange. Since our last NANC

report, we confirmed the successful delivery of NPAC customer

data files from Neustar to iconectiv on March 31st, April 30th,

and June 2nd. These files contain information about the current

authorized NPAC users and form the basis for iconectiv's

outreach and onboarding efforts. The data is being exchanged

monthly so that new NPAC customers are identified and can be

contacted.

In April the TOM capped a multi-month effort to define a file format specification for the exchange of the data in the NPAC database. We refer to this file as the Enhanced Bulk Data Download, or EBDD, specification. It defines the content and format - that's to say the field types, sizes, allowed values, et cetera - of the file that will be used to exchange the NPAC data between the incumbent and the incoming LNPA.

On June 2nd the TOM confirmed the successful delivery of the initial regional and LEAP data transfers between Neustar and iconectiv. The delivery included NPAC data for the Southeast region, the Midwest testbed data, and select NPAC historical data for all regions. This event was notable because it was the first time NPAC data was exchanged between the incumbent and the incoming LNPA. The transfer was conducted to validate the EBDD specification, to support development, and to inform migration planning. These transfers include extracting, transforming, transferring, loading, and analyzing the NPAC data.

The test transfers, which are the first of many, are giving iconectiv developers a jumpstart in tuning databases and building familiarity with the data that will need to be migrated for production. Overall the test transfers of data have gone very well. Hundreds of millions of records have been transferred and successfully loaded with only a few clarifying

questions falling out of the process. Integrating real data early in the development cycle is very beneficial, and I'm pleased I can share the success with you today.

In addition, the TOM has continued to work on various other aspects of the transition including the development and definition of how operational activities will be divided between Neustar and iconectiv while Neustar is operating certain regions and iconectiv operating others – what we call parallel operations. Most notably for this group, the TOM has requested that the change order for pooling administration be split into two parts with the first part focused on definition of the API specification. The API definition is the most immediately required effort as it links to iconectiv's development activity, and the expectation is that the limited first portion of the change order will have a more rapid approval path.

The last area I'd highlight is outreach. Transition outreach is a major focus for the TOM. As I mentioned in our last report, the Transition Outreach and Education Plan or TOEP has been developed. The TOEP provides a means for stakeholders interested in the LNPA process to receive transition information and to provide their input and feedback. The TOEP encompasses multiple channels including the napmllc.org website, webcasts, communications industry and public safety conferences, and events like today's NANC meeting.

Since our last NANC report, the TOM has conducted three in-person events to gather stakeholder feedback on the LNPA transition. On April 11th and 12th, TOM representatives were present adjacent to the Incompas trade show in National Harbor, Maryland. This provided the opportunity to meet with representatives from the broad swath of the telecommunications industry, as well as other interested parties.

On May 4th the TOM was present immediately following the LNPA Working Group meeting in Miami, Florida. This permitted us to meet with representatives from the service providers, service bureaus, and providers of telecom-related services that participate in the Local Number Portability forum. We met with these industry representatives to answer their questions and gather their perspectives about the LNPA transition.

On June 13th and 14th the TOM was present adjacent to the National Emergency Numbering Association or NENA conference in Indianapolis, Indiana. This was our first public safety conference and is part of ensuring outreach to all transition stakeholders. In addition to our in-person events, we have continued our regular webcast series focused on the LNPA transition. The webcast series is the centerpiece of the TOEP as it allows frequent interaction with stakeholders without requiring travel or other costs. The webcast continue to be well-attended events. Across the six webcasts held so far,

we've had 1,072 unique participants with an average of 385 participants per webcast.

Users are asked to categorize themselves when registering. From this, we know that small and large service providers and providers of telecom-related services consistently comprise the greatest number of participants. Together these categories represent almost two-thirds of all participants. Small service providers are the single largest participant group and have averaged 27 percent of the webcast audience. Since the last NANC meeting we have conducted webcasts on April 20th, May 25th, and June 21st.

The topics covered in these webcasts included overviewing transition outreach plans and providing a view into the high level transition timing, discussing optional and required testing and the testing process with iconectiv, and thoroughly reviewing the onboarding process which is the first transition activity which will touch most stakeholders, so NPAC users know what to expect. We've also used the sessions to cover answers to common LNPA transition questions and reviewed expected transition cost and impacts. The webcasts are also a platform to publicize in-person events and other TOEP communication channels.

These webcasts permit us to gather and answer live questions from the participants and conduct real-time polling

during the webcast. To date we received more than 300 webcast

questions and comments from transition stakeholders. These

interactions have provided valuable insights into the questions

and the concerns of the more than 1,000 participants that have

attended these free online events. As I mentioned in our last

NANC report, one action we had taken based on this input was to

increase the number of in-person events.

In May, we used a polling question to check in with

stakeholders on the frequency of TOEP events. The vast majority

of respondents were satisfied with the frequency of events. In

fact, only 2.5 percent felt there was a need for more

opportunities to interact with the TOM. From the questions we

received through the webcasts and other channels, we've

developed a list of frequently asked questions which we post on

the LNPA section of the napmllc.org website. To-date there are

45 questions and answers spanning all aspects of the transition

available in this resource. Additionally, as a result of

stakeholder feedback, we maintain a list of questions from those

that have authorized their publication, and we post those

questions along with our responses on the NAPM website as well.

Finally, replays of the TOEP webcasts and other information

relevant to the LNPA transition are posted on this website.

It's a great resource for those that wish to stay apprised of

developments in the LNPA transition. As the TOM has reported in

the TOEP events and in the monthly reports, a key challenge in the transition today has been that timing is dependent on the completion of contracts. As of today the NAPM, the FCC and other stakeholders are still working through the iconectiv MSA approval process. This is significant as the MSA is on the critical path for some activities, like datacenter construction, and we won't have final dates until it's complete.

With the extension of MSA approval, the TOM is continuing to monitor plans for transition activities especially the absolute time allowed as well as the timing of these activities relative to holiday and other busy periods. At this point, I'd say that it's likely that the Q3 2017 final acceptance timing we shared in April will be revised. This preliminary indicative transition timing was based on a number of assumptions, including assumptions around MSA approval timing. As we progress into the summer, some of those assumptions no longer hold which may result in changes in the preliminary schedule.

The TOM has received some requests to release a duration-based schedule beginning with MSA approval as Day One. I'd like to touch on this, as in regards to forecasting MSA impact, it's not quite as simple as a proportional change rippling through the work plan. We've heard stakeholder concerns around planning Q4 activities due to resource bandwidth, higher volumes, blackout periods, and other constraints. Some activities can be

re-sequenced to avoid these periods. While, for other tasks,

there are stronger dependencies which limit flexibility.

Additionally, some activities can be accelerated by deploying

more iconectiv resources while others cannot.

As a side note, as I discussed in the TOEP webcasts, this

was the basis for the shorter test periods in the April

preliminary schedule – more iconectiv test engineers and test

resources to allow more stakeholders to test in parallel.

However, this can only scale so far. There are minimum times

independent of the resources applied. All these need to be

brought together. And until the MSA is approved and start dates

for key activities like datacenter construction are known, we

won't be able to best fit together all the moving pieces to

orchestrate a transition which is well-tested, orderly, and as

timely as appropriate.

I'd like to emphasize this point. Once we have clarity on

frontend approvals, the TOM will work with iconectiv, Neustar,

the FCC, NAPM, industry and other stakeholders to define an

optimum transition schedule based on all the factors involved.

We'll bring that proposed schedule to this group and other

stakeholders through the TOEP channels to get your feedback.

Beyond finalizing project plans, once contracts are

complete, the TOM will continue to manage the LNPA transition

and continue to communicate with transition stakeholders through

TOEP events. Specific near-term events I'd like to make sure you're aware of include on July 13th an in-person TOEP session following the LNPA Working Group Meeting in Durham, North Carolina; and on July 20th the next TOEP webcast.

I look forward to the opportunity to meet with all of you at one of these events, but also encourage you to submit questions or comments directly to the TOM through the comments feature that's listed on the left-hand side of the LNPA transition tab on the NAPM website. Thank you for your time and attention today.

Cary Hinton: Let me open it up to comments from the group? Jerome.

Jerome Candelaria: Yeah, NCTA. Concerning the upcoming TOM outreach and education events, are the ones held at associations - for example the upcoming CTIA - open to all transition stakeholders or are they intended to be industry-specific?

Greg Chiasson: They're open to all, anyone who wants to take part. There's no conference registration required. In fact, looking at the events held so far, we've had a range of people stop by to speak with the TOM - ranging from different service providers, to vendors, to financial analysts, and investors.

Cary Hinton: Any other questions from NANC members? Okay.

72

At this point, I'll open it up to those on the conference link. Any questions? Silence. That gives me my opportunity. Let me make a request here rather than asking a question. You indicated it appears likely that the transition schedule will need to be revised, and that you intend to bring the new transition schedule to the NANC for the feedback. Hopefully everybody has it on their calendar the next NANC meeting is scheduled for September 15th.

If - and I realize it's rather precognitive - you complete the revisions to the transition, can you send that to the chairman so that she can distribute it to the NANC membership and obtain feedback in advance of the September 15th NANC meeting? And if it turns out that the FCC continues to drag its feet - my words not the chairman's - but continues to for whatever reason delay action on the MSA and that ends up pushing us so that that's not feasible or reasonable, then certainly we would look forward to your presentation of that revised transition schedule at the next NANC meeting. But our interest, the chairman's interest is expediting this, maybe an oxymoron given what we've gone through the last several years, but at least try to move this forward as expeditiously as possible. Is that reasonable?

Greg Chiasson: We can certainly do that, yes.

Local Number Portability Administration Working Group (LNPA WG)

73

Cary Hinton: Thank you. All right. I'll mark the TOM report as Exhibit 11. We can now move on to the LNPA Working Group report, and I believe Paula is going to be presenting that.

Paula Campagnoli: Good afternoon everybody. My name is Paula Campagnoli. I'm one of the chairs of the LNPA Working Group, along with Dawn Lawrence. I'm here to also report that Ron Steen, who was also tri-chair of the LNPA Working Group, has retired as of this week. So we will be looking for a replacement for him, and nominations will be taken for that open position. Hopefully, when we meet on July 12th and 13th, we'll either be able to vote then or we'll vote at the September meeting.

So what we're going to present today from the LNPA Working Group is best practice 4 clarification; the transition from PSTN to IP; Nationwide Number Portability; and the LNPA transition.

The first of best practice 4 clarification, this was a request from the NANC at a previous meeting that the LNPA Working Group review best practice 4 to assure that the VoIP and the IP provider systems are included. Currently the subcommittee that was developed at the LNPA Working Group to work on this issue has developed a Problem Issues Management - PIM it's called - which was approved and accepted to work. The PIM is now PIM 87.

Bright House Networks along with Charter and others on the subcommittee are taking the action item to revise PIM 87, and that will incorporate possible resolutions to handle call routing of ported and pooled telephone numbers when you're trying to transport traffic over the extended area service. The updated PIM 87 will be presented at the July 12th and 13th LNPA Working Group meeting, and reports as to the findings and the progress of the subcommittee will continue to be presented at the NANC. Any questions? Okay.

LNPA transition. Mary Retka continues to provide updates on the ATIS Testbed Landscape Team. It is focusing on service provider testing together during the IP transition. And thank you, Mary, for continuing to do that. The Testbed Focus Group has continued to meet every other week. The work currently continues to focus on the fine-tuning of the test cases, and their continued work in soliciting members for participating in the testing. Several companies have signed the ATIS NDA for participation in the testing, and others are expected to do as well. The PSTN to IP transition effects on LNP will continue to be as an agenda item for the LNPA Working Group. Any questions on that?

Nationwide Number Portability. Martin Dolly, he's the chair of the ATIS Packet Technologies and Systems Committee, PTSC, joined our LNPA Working Group meeting in May. Martin

stated that a letter ballot at the ATIS PTSC would take place on May 18, 2016 on their Document 68R4. The letter ballot approval process was initiated at the May 18, 2016 PTSC Meeting. The FoN received a copy of the letter and the document that was developed by the PTSC, and in turn the FoN sent a copy of the report and the letter to the LNPA chairs.

We have distributed that document to our members at the LNPA Working Group for them to be prepared to review and discuss this document at the July 12th and 13th LNPA Working Group meeting. The document has various recommended -- or have different solutions for Nationwide Number Portability, and we're going to look at those documents and those options as to what effect - if any - they have on number portability and then we would report that information back through the FoN to the PTSC. Any questions on that?

Cary Hinton: Yes. Let me follow up on that. I'm not seeing other questions. The chairman and I have received communications from the FCC staff regarding their interest in this ATIS report. So as the LNPA Working Group reviews the ATIS report, is it your intent to inform the NANC membership whether you believe that the ATIS report justifies any type of supplement or revision to the National Number Portability report that the NANC has already submitted to the FCC? Or that there's any new information or anything of significance from the ATIS

report that the LNPA Working Group believes justifies submittal of either the ATIS report or ATIS report in association with comments from the LNPA Working Group?

Paula Campagnoli: What will happen is we'll look at the documentation and the options that they have put into this document. There are certain different solutions that they recommended or that they've looked at and we're going to look at it at the LNPA Working Group from a number portability perspective to see if it makes any changes in the porting process that's in place today. We will take that information and we will not only pass it back to the FoN who sent it to us but we will also present it here at the NANC so that the NANC has an idea of what we have found. I don't know that any changes will need to be made to the porting process. But if there is, we will document that and we will present it here at the NANC.

Cary Hinton: So we'll look forward to that at the next meeting then.

Paula Campagnoli: Yes.

Cary Hinton: Very good. Thank you. I was just going to ask if there were any other questions at this point. All right. Go ahead with the rest of your report.

Paula Campagnoli: So the next thing is the LNPA transition. Pursuant to the NANC chair's request that the LNPA

Working Group is discussing possible areas where the LNPA

Working Group would be involved in the LNPA transition. As you

know, we have been looking at the test cases that will be used

for testing from the service provider's perspective into the

system and so on and so forth. So there's a subgroup that's

taking care of this at the LNPA Working Group, and the subgroup

is called the Architectural Planning Team. There are two chairs

on that – Teresa Patton from AT&T and John Malyar from

iconectiv.

So far they've been having meetings every so often, quite

often, as a matter of fact. But the latest meetings they had

were a face-to-face meeting on May 4, 2016 and a conference call

on June 8, 2016. Additional APT meetings will be scheduled.

There's a meeting scheduled at the end of the LNPA Working Group

in July.

The current status is as follows - 112 issues have been

closed, one test case that has newly identified issues, 18

issues pending document only changes, and there's nine open test

cases that still need review before final disposition. The APT

will continue to report their progress to the LNPA Working

Group, and we will report it back here to the NANC.

Any questions? The next face-to-face meeting for the LNPA

Working Group is July 12th and 13th in Durham-Raleigh, North

Carolina, and it's hosted by Bandwidth.

Cary Hinton: I'm not seeing any questions from the membership. Are there any questions from anybody that's still on the conference link? Okay. Hopefully our link is still working. But we'll move on. Thank you, Paula. Again, this will now be marked as Exhibit Number 12.

Future of Numbering (FoN) Working Group Report

We're moving on. This brings us to the FoN Working Group, and Dawn will be making the presentation.

Dawn Lawrence: Good afternoon. First, our role is to explore changes in the environment, including new and future technologies, the impact of the marketplace and/or regulatory changes, and innovations on telephone numbering. Back last year the NANC sent a letter to the FoN and asked us to answer four questions. We answered those four questions and provided a final report to the NANC on April 15th. You can find the report on the NANC chair webpage. Since then, as Paula indicated, the ATIS Packet Technology and Systems Committee - the PTSC - has completed an initial analysis on possible solutions for nationwide number portability. They provided the FoN Working Group in April or May, I think in May, and it's attached to our presentation here.

The report considered five different approaches for implementing nationwide number portability, or NNP, but makes no recommendations on a specific approach at this time. The report

79

identified key impacts of each proposal, and no step further

analysis is warranted before making a decision on any specific

approach. Again, we're working in conjunction with the LNPA

Working Group on this. So everything we do, we're communicating

back and forth between the two working groups.

Cary Hinton: Let me just follow up on that, if I might.

Paula indicated the LNPA Working Group is going to take a look

at that draft report and try to make some judgment as to whether

there needs to be any changes in the porting process, which is

of course only really one portion of the whole NNP shall we say

proposal. Is the FoN also going to be evaluating that draft

report and, thus, making any type of comments or report back to

the NANC on it?

Dawn Lawrence: Well, we reviewed it and have not made any

drafts or have not decided for our comment yet on it. If that's

something that the NANC chair wants us to do, we can certainly

take that.

Cary Hinton: Well, let me put it maybe in a narrower

context. As I indicated to Paula, to the extent that there's

anything in that draft report from ATIS - or I assume that they

will eventually have the final report if all you received was a

draft - but be that as it may, if something is in that report

that you think significantly changes or should change either the

substance of the report that the NANC submitted to the FCC or

should supplement what we previously submitted, I think that would be useful for the NANC membership to know.

Dawn Lawrence: Okay. We'll take a look at that and we'll definitely respond back to you.

Cary Hinton: All right. Thank you very much.

Dawn Lawrence: No problem. At the last NANC meeting in March Gina brought forth -- well, during her discussion, a couple of issues were brought forth about the 800 number administration. And Cary Hinton asked us to advice the NANC on whether further investigation is needed regarding those toll-free texting by unregistered toll-free number holders.

On May 11th Gina Perini from Somos gave a presentation to the FoN Working Group, and again that is attached to our presentation. In a nutshell, CTIA has documented guidelines for managing texting interoperability among service providers for wireless, wireline, and toll-free numbers. Somos has its TSS Registry in place to provide a central registry of text-enabled toll-free numbers. Messaging providers are not required to follow CTIA guidelines because it's not mandated.

And so the FoN Working Group has reached consensus that the FoN Working Group cannot provide any additional assistance at this time. Some FoN members suggested that it is possible that regulations may be required to resolve the concerns of toll-free testing by unregistered toll-free number holders. That may mean

mandating the TSS Registry, whatever the FCC decides to do. Nationwide ten-digit dialing continues to be an open issue for future meetings.

That is the end of the report. We have all of the FoN attendees listed on page 5, and on page 6 is our next scheduled quarterly conference call which is August 3rd. Any questions?

Cary Hinton: All right. No questions from NANC members. Anybody on the conference link with questions? Maybe they've all gone to lunch.

Female Voice: We're here, Cary. We're still here.

Cary Hinton: Okay. Very good. Thank you.

Female Voice: Yes, we're still here. We're just listening.

Cary Hinton: All right. Thank you very much. That makes me feel so much better. Thank you, Dawn.

Dawn Lawrence: You're welcome.

Cary Hinton: This we mark as Exhibit Number 13.

Report of the Internet Protocol Issue Management Group (IMG)

Moving on to the next report, the Internet Protocol Issue Management Group, fondly known as the IP IMG. Gina is back.

Gina Perini: Hello again NANC members. I'm representing one of the three tri-chairs. I'm one of the three tri-chairs for the IP IMG. My other tri-chairs are Valerie Cardwell from

Comcast, as well as Betty Sanders from Charter who's our new tri-chair who replaced Ann Berkowitz from Verizon. And we'd like to thank Ann for her service as a tri-chair for the IP IMG. Thank you very much. We miss you already.

So we haven't reported recently. This is our first report in a few cycles, and so I'm going to give a little bit of an update. I put the mission statement as one of the appendices, so we can check that out as well. It's a listing of all of the member companies that participate in the IP IMG. We have gone to a bimonthly conference call schedule. I have the next conference call on the last page. For those who haven't participated yet, please feel free to reach out to any of the tri-chairs and we can give you more information about the call and bridge. We welcome more participation.

We have moved to a bimonthly reporting because we were finding that we weren't getting a lot of monthly reporting, and we were waiting for folks to finish their meetings and get their pieces of information together. So we do that now every two months, and it really actually depends on our reports.

So, in the materials is a very large tracking document, and that was sent out with our presentation. I encourage you all to look at this tracking document. Essentially we have liaisons from pretty much most of the groups that are working on any kind of IP transition-related work, and we have the updates from

those groups listed. It goes back over 12 months because we wanted to kind of show progression. It's hard to read it when you print it out. It's easier to read on a device.

But one of the things we did want to note is that the participation has been a little bit light. We've been getting less updates, so we're hoping that we can get more engagement going forward. We have some that report every time, and I commend Mary and her updates particularly on the ATIS TOPS Council Testbeds because that's very important work. So we appreciate that. Segar [phonetic] also is regular on their updates. But we think this is a really important forum where folks can come together and look holistically what's going on in the discussions for IP transition. So again, we welcome folks' participation. Our next meeting is in July, July 14th.

Then, as I noted, we have a new tri-chair, Betty Sanders from Charter. And that's really the update we have right now. As an IMG, as an Issue Management Group, we just really manage and look at the issues. We don't actually do voting or reporting on any of the actual issues.

Cary Hinton: Any questions from NANC members? Anybody on the conference link with a question? Don't leave yet, I have a question. I have to admit that I did not find the tracking report in the documents that were sent to me by Carmell. I don't know if this was one of those icons that was buried in the

PowerPoint or if it was actually a separate document, but since
I didn't --

Gina Perini: It was separate document, so maybe it didn't
actually end up -- so that's something that I should double
check on. We can make sure that that comes out. It's an Excel
Spreadsheet, and I will make sure that that goes out to the
NANC.

Cary Hinton: I don't know if I'm the only one that didn't
receive that then, but --

Gina Perini: It was submitted with the report. It might
not have actually went all the way.

Cary Hinton: Did everybody get a copy of it?

Mary Retka: Mary Retka from CenturyLink. Why wouldn't we
just have that uploaded to the NANC chair website?

Gina Perini: We could do that easily.

Cary Hinton: Well, yes. Right.

Mary Retka: Then we wouldn't have to worry if we didn't
have it.

Cary Hinton: We'll just do it that way. But let me ask a
question since I haven't seen it. Do you also track what the
FCC's Technology Advisory group is also doing on IP transition?
And I know that they've done quite a bit in the past. I'm not
sure if they've been doing anything on this issue recently.

Gina Perini: We do have this FCC CTO, and others are

invited. They've received our materials. We don't actually get a report in from the FCC on those activities. If think I know what you're talking about, I'm not sure there's been a lot of activity in the last year on that. But I think it's moved into other groups.

Cary Hinton: All right. Very good. We'll just touch base on that.

Valerie Cardwell: Valerie Cardwell, Comcast. Cary, are you talking specifically about the TAC itself?

Cary Hinton: Right.

Valerie Cardwell: So currently, as Gina mentioned, the way that we operate is it's all voluntary and whoever chooses to be the spokesperson for a particular topic. So as it relates to the TAC itself, I'm not aware of the folks that we're currently getting insight on information from. They may be participants from the TAC. However, the way that they're reporting it is not from the TAC specifically as a council identified. We do, for example, have like this. This is really done based on the NANC subcommittee.

Cary Hinton: Right. I understand that, yeah.

Valerie Cardwell: So the TAC is not to my knowledge an official NANC.

Cary Hinton: No, it's not. It's a parallel advisory group.

Valerie Cardwell: Right. So that's why we don't have the TAC specifically identified as a group participating, but that doesn't prevent any of our current members from sharing what may go on in the TAC. But honestly, we don't track that organization or that committee as a group providing input. Does that answer your question?

Cary Hinton: Yeah, I guess so. And maybe this is just an observation on my part. I know that many of you or at least some of the companies here, whether it be yourself or someone else from your company, that are also members of the TAC. To the extent that TAC is delving into IP transition that potentially impacts what we're doing, then perhaps we should at least know about it. Maybe it's a matter of coordination. If it's reasonable for Chairman Kane to reach out to the chairman of the TAC, maybe that would be a way to get it kick-started.

Valerie Cardwell: Yes. Cary, I think that's a great suggestion. We'll definitely take it back to the next IP IMG and have a discussion about it. But I do think that it would be very helpful if that is the request of the NANC, to now engage the TAC not only just in our discussion but as an overall. That's kind of what I'm hearing. It probably would be appropriate for Chairman Kane to maybe make that outreach.

Cary Hinton: Well, let me ask for your assistance then in perhaps helping her and me as to how to phrase such a request

and what specifically you think would be helpful to receive from them relative to tracking on your report. We don't even have to wait until the next meeting for you to communicate that to us at some point in time.

Gina Perini: Sure. Absolutely. We can help you.

Valerie Cardwell: So the tri-chairs will regroup and will get back to you like in the next two or three weeks.

Cary Hinton: That would be fine. That would be fine.

Valerie Cardwell: Great. Thank you.

Status of the Industry Numbering Committee (INC)

Carl Hinton: All right. Thank you. We'll mark this as Exhibit 14. And turning the agenda page for those of you that are double-sighted, and we'll move on to the INC report from Connie Hartmann.

Connie Hartmann: I think it's afternoon now. Good afternoon. I'm Connie Hartmann from iconectiv, one of the co-chairs of the INC, along with Dyan Adams of Verizon. Today I will be covering INC issues 788 and 816 specifically, as well as status of those issues in initial or final closure.

Slide 3 is our typical report about what the INC is and where to find information on membership. Since the last NANC, INC has held two virtual meetings in March and June and one face-to-face in May. As you heard from John Manning, at the

last INC meeting, we reviewed a NANPA proposal and readout of their outreach on 555 line numbers. So there are quite a few slides on this topic. I know the NANC has been receiving updates on this topic from both the NANPA and the INC for quite some time now, so many of you are familiar with this topic.

So a little bit of background. On slide 5, the resource began assignments back in 1994. The purpose of the 555 line numbers was to provide an alternative resource for information providers and potential nationwide use of the seven-digit resource. There is a 555 Technical Service Interconnection Agreement document that is part of the ATIS NGIIF documentation.

On to slide 6. By 2000 70 percent of the resource was assigned. NANPA had only received in-service confirmation for less than 100 of those assigned numbers, 80 of them identifying a carrier that subsequently went out of business. NANPA was not aware of any instances where a line number was dialable from the PSTN.

As we mentioned, NANPA performed its outreach under issue 788. The outreach revealed that many of the assignees were not aware of the guideline requirement to place the numbers in service or that industry guidelines even existed. The outreach resulted in a return or reclamation of nearly 8,000 of those number assignments.

On slide 7. We have an update of the status of the 555

line numbers. As of May 6th, 9,726 numbers are not assigned; 116 numbers were in dispute, multiple applicants requested the same 555 line number during the open enrollment; 56 numbers with no part 3 in-service certification are yet declined to be returned. There's one assigned number with a part 3 in-service certification. We'll note later that that is related to Directory Assistance service. There's one national grandfathered Directory Assistance assignment, and there are 100 numbers used by the entertainment and advertising industry as fictitious nonworking numbers. And you see the range there on the slide.

On slide 8 there's a little bit about the resource. 555 line numbers are a public resource and administrative assignment does not imply ownership of the resource by the entity performing the administrative function, nor does it imply ownership by the entity to which it is assigned. The assignees of the remaining 56 line numbers have refused to return the numbers for various reasons. Some have noted they paid for or own the number, or still intend to put the numbers into service. The vast majority of 555 line number assignments are to individuals and not to service providers. One 555 line number, as I stated earlier, is being used for directory assistance-related service.

On slide 9. The intended use for 555 numbers included the

provisioning of information services, but may include a broad

range of existing and future services as well. However, after

22 years, with only one number currently in service, INC

determined that the purpose for which this resource was intended

has been accommodated by other information/communications

technologies.

On slide 10. At the last INC meeting we reached consensus

on the following toward the resolution of issue 788. INC will

sunset the 555 NXX Assignment Guidelines, and the future of a

555 resource will be determined if a need for the resource is

identified and agreed to by the INC. The sunsetting of the

guidelines will be effective after completion of a reference

document at which time this decision will be formally conveyed

to the FCC.

On slide 11. The reference document is intended to include

a history of the 555 number resource, a listing of the

nonworking 555 line numbers used for the entertainment and

advertising industries, identification of the 555 line number

that is currently in service, and any grandfathered 555 line

numbers that are still in use and were originally identified in

the appendix of the ATIS NGIIF document. INC will notify the

NGIIF of the sunset of the 555 NXX Assignment Guidelines so that

they can determine the next steps for the NGIIF Technical

Service Interconnection Agreement document.

Slide 12. INC agreed that NANPA will perform the following items. This will be a part of the resolution of issue 788 as well. Modify NAS to remove the ability for a NAS-registered user to access the 555 application and in-service certification forms, as well as the Search 555 Forms function. NANPA itself will retain the capability to access those functions. Remove the 555 line number assignment report from the NANPA website and update the 555 line number resource description to reflect the sunset of the guidelines and the availability of the reference document. Publish a NANPA Planning Letter announcing the sunset of the 555 NXX Assignment Guidelines and the 555 resource.

Before I go on to the next issue, any questions on issue 788?

Cary Hinton: I'm going to take the prerogative of the acting chair position to ask a very basic question. Who in the entertainment and advertising industry uses the 555 resource? For what purpose? And then secondly, if that is going to be sunsetted, would there be some other numbering resource that will be utilized or available to the entertainment and advertising industry?

Connie Hartmann: The reason they're used today, if you see a TV show or a movie that typically quotes somebody's telephone number, you'll hear them quote an NPA 555 and a number within that reserved range. The intent is, with the sunset of the

guidelines, that same range of numbers will still be reserved. So it will not change. We will know in our reference document that they are being reserved for their use for it today.

Mary Retka: Mary Retka from CenturyLink. But to clarify, Cary, when you see that in a movie, the idea is you don't want anybody to call a number and reach some end-user or some service. So they aren't working at all.

Cary Hinton: Right. I certainly have read about the stories of unsuspecting grandmothers getting calls thinking that someone is calling, someone from a TV show or what-have-you, yeah. Thank you for the clarification.

Mary Retka: You're welcome.

Connie Hartmann: So the next INC issue I will report on is 816. Update of the p-ANI administration guidelines to document unavailable p-ANIs. In 2015 NENA's i3 Architecture Working Group asked the RNA to set aside 50 p-ANIs in each NPA for use in the Next Generation 911 Legacy Selective Router Gateway. The RNA received an emailed approval from the FCC to do so. So the RNA has set aside the noted range in each NPA with an exception for the 281, 405, 806, 870, and 903 NPAs. In those five NPAs there's a different range because the first range was not available, which is set aside for these purposes. The RNA will set aside the 211-9950 through 211-9999 range in each new NPA added to RNAS going forward.

93

The p-ANI Administration Guidelines were updated to document the specific ranges set aside and why, direct the RNA not to assign p-ANIs if applicants request p-ANIs within these ranges, add an unavailable status for p-ANIs set aside for these purposes, direct the RNA to set aside the range in new NPAs when they are added to RNAS.

And then in the next slide, we have one issue in initial closure - issue 818, which is updating two sections of TBPAG and two sections of the COCAG regarding supporting documentation required under FCC 15-70. That was really just to add some clarification to the documents. In final closure, we have issues 811, 812, 813, 815, and 816.

On the last slide we have a list of relevant INC webpages for your convenience. Any questions?

Cary Hinton: Any questions from anybody on the conference link? Thank you very much, Connie.

Connie Hartmann: Thank you, Cary.

Cary Hinton: This will be identified as Exhibit Number 15 on the record. I believe that takes care of the last of our formal reports.

Summary of Action Items

The next item on the agenda is Summary of Action Items. I have one action item -- actually two. One action item of course is the NANC chair will transmit the NANPA and PA evaluation

reports to the FCC based on the concurrence of the NANC. And then secondly as I indicated previously the NANC chair's intent to send a letter to Chairman Wheeler as well as the other individual commissioners asking them to give priority to acting upon the MSA contract. Mary, do you have a comment?

Mary Retka: Mary Retka from CenturyLink. I think there are two more action items, Cary. The first one was to provide the letter from Matt DelNero on NNP to all of the NANC. And then the last one was the approval of the B&C Working Group factor.

Cary Hinton: Oh, yes. I stand corrected. Actually the email from Matt -- Carmell, did you see that copy of that email that you can circulate to the NANC membership?

Carmell Weathers: It's already --

Cary Hinton: Very good. So Carmell has an action item. Thank you. Did I miss anything else? Very good. There's something else to keep me busy. We are now in the phase for public comments. We have a microphone over here if anybody from the audience would like to make a comment or ask questions. My good friend, Jim Falvey, come right up here. We want you to make a stand over at the big mic.

James Falvey: Oh.

Cary Hinton: No, no, no. Go right ahead. Go right ahead. Make yourself comfortable.

95

James Falvey: Okay. Thanks. I appreciate that. So I'm here on behalf of the LNP Alliance. I just have a few comments and questions on some of the earlier presentations. With respect to the NAPM dues, it's easy to remember who the members of the NAPM are. It's the three RBACs [phonetic], the two largest cable companies, the two largest non-RBAC affiliated wireless companies. And then Level 3 he skipped. There's an additional member in addition to Bandwidth that was not mentioned.

Cary Hinton: XO.

James Falvey: No. It's 11 with XO.

Female Voice: No, there's none. It's nine.

James Falvey: Oh, okay. It's nine, and he only listed eight. I thought the additional was Level 3. In any event, all very large companies. The bottom line is that we still consider there to be a problem with the NAPM composition. The outreach to trade associations suggests that it's too expensive for trade associations to join, both in terms of the cost of joining but also the resources to follow the meetings and so on. So we still believe strongly that there needs to be a reconstitution of the NAPM if they're going to continue to play the role that they're playing.

In terms of the delays on the MSA approval, there wasn't any discussion of the iconectiv contribution to those delays.

96

We all know that there were foreign nationals involved in writing the code. I don't think anyone would have known about that if there wasn't a whistleblower to bring that to the public's attention. The recoding began in March. So get to this point and say, okay, now you need to hurry up and approve it I think is a little bit off.

In addition, in terms of just getting the MSA out there for approval, it was filed in early April but entirely confidential. It was re-filed with portions of it made public in late April. There are still significant sections that we've been asking to be made public, like the user agreement. Just to use that as an example, the model is that consultants and attorneys, third-party outside consultants and attorneys will review on behalf of the companies. I can't recommend to any of the 20-plus companies that I represent that they sign the user agreement as is, and we think that NANC should be concerned about that. FISPA, which represents hundreds and hundreds of small companies, has also weighed-in for further review.

So this idea that we need to rush to get it approved I think is problematic from our perspective. It's almost like it's an aging process more than a review process because it's been sitting. We've made very specific suggestions after reading a fairly voluminous document, and we've got no feedback on our edits from NAPM or from the TOM or from the commission.

So it shouldn't just be aged, it should be reviewed. The purpose of the review process was something that NASUCA pushed for initially. There's no consumer representation here that I'm aware of. We have the state commissions, but I don't hear them speaking up on behalf of consumers.

NASUCA wanted an independent non-industry review of the document, and we're not seeing that happen. We're disappointed that the NANC is pressing for speedy approval. I hope that in Chairman Kane's letter that she'll raise some issues that should be addressed during this review process. Again, we've had no feedback on recommended MSA revisions. We've asked for the commission to put a stake in the ground to ensure that the LNPA continues to be a neutral and independent administrator. We're very concerned from some of the things we're seeing in the ATIS report and from previous iconectiv whitepapers that the LNPA could become an anachronism as other third-party clearing houses supersede the relevance of the NPAC. So it's very important for Chairman Kane in our view to emphasize that the NPAC must remain a neutral independent database.

I should say the necessary database for call routing and for call porting is critical to competition. We'd like to see a commitment to incorporate the IP transition. We've had CenturyLink, for example. Not to pick on CenturyLink, but you're the only company that had spoken out and said this

plainly suggests that the IP transition from a numbering

database perspective will not start until after the LNPA

transition which would push that IP transition down the road by

several years.

The IP transition is worth billions of dollars. I think

Tim gave a number of a million dollars a day, that's only $365

million. There is an enormous amount of unnecessary trunking,

unnecessary interfaces, and small carriers are paying billions

and billions of cost because the IP transition has stagnated

because of the LNPA transition. So we'd like to see a

commitment to incorporate the IP transition. And we hope that,

again, Chairman Kane will address some of those issues.

The one other question that I have, and maybe the TOM can

answer this. We haven't really been involved in the Neustar

appeal, but I'm wondering if there's a tipping point at some

point as the LNPA transition progresses and if the TOM or anyone

has given any thought to what the cost will be if the D.C.

Circuit says that the contract was not awarded properly. I know

there's a lot of hard work that's gone into this process from

people around the table, and so I don't know whether it was

awarded properly. I'm not the D.C. Circuit. But there's a team

of attorneys that Neustar has hired. I'm just wondering if

anyone's given a thought to the timing of that decision and how

that works into the timelines that the TOM has developed.

Cary Hinton: This is perhaps a little bit atypical, but I'd like to call Tim and Greg back to the table. I think it's important for the NANC to perhaps hear a response from the NAPM and from the TOM to some of the issues that Jim has raised on behalf of the LNP Alliance. I think those are obviously significant issues that the NANC needs to be apprised of. We have a mic over here. You're okay there, Tim?

Tim Kagele: Sure.

Cary Hinton: Who wants to go first, guys? What if Greg goes first? Tim keeps looking over here. We'll let Greg go first. That's why you get paid the big bucks.

Greg Chiasson: I think the question was around the TOM's involvement in the Neustar litigation. We've not been involved in that process.

James Falvey: Okay. Let me see if I can put a finer point on the question. Oh.

Cary Hinton: Okay, I got you. All right. I have been advised that because the matter is under review by the commission and because of ex parte limitations regarding communications being heard either by FCC staff or perhaps leaking to someone on the 8th floor in some fashion, that we have to limit the discussion of this at this point in time.

James Falvey: That's fine. I think the issue that I raised needs to be discussed somewhere in terms of the cost

impact. So I don't know. I totally defer to Sanford [phonetic] and to you Cary that this is not the place, but I think we should figure out a place to talk about that.

Cary Hinton: I appreciate your comments.

James Falvey: One last question for the LNPA Working Group. We requested it become a voting member, the LNPA Working Group. And I don't know if this is a question for Marilyn. There's some work that's continuing forward obviously and we have Dave Malfara who monitors the LNPA Working Group as a nonvoting member, but I'm just wondering what that timing might be in terms of decisions on the voting members.

Marilyn Jones: The timing for that is mid to late July.

James Falvey: Thank you. I appreciate it.

Cary Hinton: Perhaps Tim at least could respond to the comments that were made by Jim regarding the NAPM membership and such, it's kind of separate from the LNPA contract issues.

Tim Kagele: Well, as I mentioned, I think the NAPM has undergone a pretty extensive review of its membership structure and we have deemed it is currently appropriate for single member entities, as well as trade associations. Our operating agreement allows for trade associations to be a member provided that 50 percent of their membership does actual number porting. So certainly I think LNP Alliance fits into that category. Jim and I personally had this conversation in the past privately and

101

publicly.

In terms of Jim's question about the reconstitution of the NAPM, I really can't speak to that matter. The NAPM currently operates under delegated authority by the FCC, and that is where our jurisdiction lies at this point. Until that changes, the NAPM LLC will continue to move forward and administer the contracts for the LNP to the very best of its ability on behalf of the entire industry.

Cary Hinton: Okay, Tim. Is there any of the other NANC members have any comments or questions?

Public Comments and Participation

Let's go ahead then on opening it up back to the audiences. John has a comment.

John Manning: Nothing to do with that topic. John Manning with NANPA. There's an item I wanted to follow up on with regard to our last meeting. There was an update provided on the 555 resource, and a Mr. Richard Bartel came to the table during the public segment. He made some comments about issues about 555, and specifically stated something about enacting the NANC dispute resolution process. I was wondering if today has there been any follow up from Mr. Bartel either to the NANC chair, to the FCC, or anybody on the NANC with regard to his concerns and what he wanted to have the NANC do with regard to the dispute resolution process.

102

Cary Hinton: Speaking on behalf of the chair, we have not been in receipt of any communication - email, voice, written - from Mr. Bartel since the last NANC meeting. I'm not aware of the FCC having received any communication. Marilyn, did anything come in?

Marilyn Jones: No, the FCC has not received anything.

John Manning: Is it a safe assumption, a major assumption that absent any action by Mr. Bartel on this matter, there's nothing here that the NANC is looking to do with regard to the matter that he brought up during his portion of the presentation back in March?

Cary Hinton: On behalf of the chair, I'll just take the position that unless there's a member of the NANC that wants to pursue this, I would say that, no, we're not going to undertake anything in this area at this point in time.

John Manning: Thank you.

Cary Hinton: Would that be corrected by any member of the NANC? All right. Hearing silence, I assume everybody agrees with me. Any other public comments? Oh, she fooled me. She was getting up. I thought she was walking directly towards the microphone. Anybody on the conference link have any comments that they'd like to make at this point in time?

Helen Mickiewicz: This is Helen Mickiewicz from California. The last speaker made some references to positions

that NASUCA had advocated, and then NASUCA has been silent. All I wanted to say is that I came in to this process late. I've been a delegate for NASUCA for the last three meetings, and missed the first one so I don't know how to respond to the criticism. I just want to say that I can't respond to the criticism. I don't want it left unaddressed, but I don't have any answer.

Cary Hinton: Fair enough, Helen. Jim Falvey is coming back, Helen.

James Falvey: I'm sorry. This will be the last thing. I'm on a diet so I don't mind missing lunch, but everybody else here is ready to get to lunch.

Cary Hinton: I thought that's an explanation why you're so cranky.

James Falvey: That may also be connected with that. But that wouldn't explain the last 53 years of crankiness.

Cary Hinton: Touché.

James Falvey: So what I'd said about NASUCA is that several years ago NASUCA indicated that there needed to be a pro-consumer review of the MSA that was discrete, distinct from the industry negotiated agreement. All I was saying was that we support NASUCA in ensuring that there is an independent commission review of the MSA, and that the MSA shouldn't just be rubberstamped by the commission. So I just want to make it

clear that there is absolutely no criticism of NASUCA, and the commission sided to NASUCA in creating the process where the commission would have final review. So I was simply saying that we agree that there needs to be an independent review in the manner that NASUCA advocated a couple of years ago. I hope that helps.

Helen M. Mickiewicz: Yeah. This is Helen again. That's fine. Thank you for that clarification.

Cary Hinton: Thank you, Helen. Thank you, Jim. Anything else for the good of the cause? All right. At this point, I just like to remind people once again, next meeting, September 15th. Same place. Same bat channel. The meeting is adjourned. Thank you all for coming to Washington when we actually have good weather for a change.

[End of file]

[End of transcript]