

**North American Numbering Council
Meeting Transcript
Monday, December 16, 2019 (Final)**

I. Time and Place of Meeting. The North American Numbering Council Meeting (NANC) held a meeting commencing at 9:30 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. Jennifer K. McKee | NANC Chair (NCTA) |
| 2. Honorable R. Bruce Williamson | NANC Vice Chair (Maine PUC) |
| 3. Heather Barrows | 800 Response Information Services, LLC |
| 4. Brian Hurley | ACA Connects |
| 5. Susan Gately | Ad Hoc Telecommunications Users Cmte |
| 6. Jacqueline Wohlgemuth | ATIS |
| 7. George Guerra | AT&T |
| 8. Lisa Jill Freeman | Bandwidth.com |
| 9. Glenn A. Clepper | Charter Communications |
| 10. Timothy Kagele | Comcast Corporation |
| 11. Alexi Maltas | Competitive Carriers Association |
| 12. Matthew Gerst | CTIA |
| 13. Christopher L. Shipley | INCOMPAS |
| 14. Honorable Karen Charles Peterson | NARUC |
| 15. Barry Hobbins | NASUCA |
| 16. Brian Ford | NTCA |
| 17. Honorable Hayley Williamson | Nevada PUC |
| 18. Julie Oost | Peerless Network |
| 19. Richard Shockey | SIP Forum |
| 20. Shaunna Forshee | Sprint |
| 21. Paul Nejedlo | TDS Telecommunications |
| 22. David Casem | Telnyx |
| 23. Rebecca Murphy Thompson | Twilio Inc. |
| 24. Bridget Alexander White | USConnect |
| 25. Mike Saperstein | USTelecom |
| 26. Robert Morse | Verizon |
| 27. Darren Krebs | Vonage |
| 28. Robert McCausland | West Telecom Services |

Special Members (Non-voting):

- | | |
|-------------------|-----------|
| 1. Chris Drake | iconectiv |
| 2. Joel Bernstein | Somos |

Commission Employees:

Marilyn Jones, Designated Federal Officer (DFO)

Jordan Reth, Alternate DFO
 Carmell Weathers, Special Assistant to the DFO
 Kris Monteith, Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau (WCB)
 D'wana Terry, Associate Bureau Chief, WCB
 Daniel Kahn, Associate Bureau Chief, WCB
 Pam Arluk, Chief, Competition Policy Division (CPD), WCB
 Heather Hendrickson, Assistant Division Chief, CPD, WCB
 Edward Krachmer, Assistant Division Chief, CPD, WCB
 William Andrle, Attorney-Advisor, CPD, WCB
 Janice Gorin, Attorney-Advisor, CPD, WCB
 Michelle Sclater, Attorney-Advisor, CPD, WCB
 Celia Lewis, Attorney-Advisor, CPD, WCB
 Connor Ferraro, Attorney-Advisor, CPD, WCB
 Robert McConnell, Telecommunications Accessibility Specialist, Disability Rights Office,
 Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau (CGB)
 Karen Schroeder, Attorney-Advisor, CGB
 Michael Scott, Attorney-Advisor, CGB
 Myrva Charles, Contracting Officer Representative (COR), CPD, WCB
 Darlene Bidy, COR-Alt/Management Analyst, CPD, WCB

III. Estimate of Public Attendance. Approximately 10 members of the public attended the meeting as observers.

IV. Documents Introduced.

- (1) Agenda
- (2) North American Numbering Council Overview
- (3) NANC Contract Oversight Subcommittee Report
- (4) Summary: Interoperable Video Calling Working Group – Overview of Work to Date
- (5) NANC Referral Letter: Interoperable Video Calling
- (6) Summary: 833 Auction –Background and Status, WC Docket No. 17-192, CC Docket No. 95-155
- (7) NANC Referral Letter: Toll Free Number Modernization
- (8) Summary: Nationwide Number Portability Work at the Commission
- (9) NANC Referral Letter: Nationwide Number Portability
- (10) Overview of Call Authentication Trust Anchor Working Group
- (11) Secure Telephone Identity (STI) – Governance Authority (GA) NANC Report
- (12) 988- National Suicide Hotline Overview
- (13) North American Portability Management LLC (NAPM LLC) Report to NANC, December 16, 2019

V. Table of Contents.

1. Call to Order and Welcome	3
2. Opening Remarks	4
3. Introductions.....	8
4. Overview of the NANC.....	18

5. Overview of Numbering Administration Oversight.....	23
6. Overview of Interoperable Video Calling	31
7. Overview of Toll Free Number Modernization	43
8. Federal Advisory Committee Act and Records.....	46
9. Overview of Nationwide Number Portability	57
10. Overview of Call Authentication Trust Anchor.....	62
11. Discussion of the North American Portability Management LLC Report.....	66
12. Overview of the Implementation of the National Suicide Hotline Improvement Act of 2018, WC Docket No. 18-336, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking	69
13. Public Comments and Participation.....	74
14. Other Business	74

VI. Summary of the Meeting.

CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

Marilyn Jones: Welcome to the 2019 re-chartered NANC. We appreciate your attendance. We know how difficult it was at the last minute to get in in person and remotely.

I would like to start off the meeting by introducing our new chair, Jennifer McKee. Jennifer is with NCTA.

Jennifer McKee: Thanks, Marilyn. Thank you very much. I'm looking forward to meeting everyone and working with you all.

As Marilyn said, I'm with NCTA. I'm vice president and associate general counsel. Do I get to hit the gavel yet?

This is why I took the job, to do that. Okay. As I said, I'm associate general counsel and vice president. Before that I was at the FCC for a number of years. I was there 11 years,

eight in the Pricing Division and three in Telecommunications Access Policy Division.

Now, before we get too far along, I think we're supposed to introduce Kris. We have Kris this morning. I want to be respectful of her time. So Kris Monteith, chair of the Wireline Competition Bureau, is here to meet with us and start off our newly chartered NANC. So, Kris, thank you so much for coming down to meet with us this morning.

OPENING REMARKS

Kris Monteith: Good morning everyone. Thank you so much for being here on what is a rainy morning, rainy and sleety morning in December. In D.C. it doesn't get much better than that, right?

I'd like to begin by first thanking Chair McKee and Vice Chair Williamson for agreeing to serve and lead this august group. I also want to thank everyone who volunteered to serve on the NANC. I see many familiar faces, as well as some new ones. Your efforts in our view are an example of public service at its finest. We greatly appreciate all of your work and your time.

Second, I'd like to thank the FCC staff that endeavored greatly to make the prior NANC a success. Their work has this re-chartered NANC heading for similar outcome.

Third, I'd like to take a moment to thank Marilyn Jones, the returning DFO, designated federal officer; and, Jordan Reth,

the new alternate DFO, for agreeing to take on these important roles.

Lastly I'd like to thank Chairman Pai and his outstanding staff, including Nick Degani and Nirali Patel, for their vital leadership on these important numbering issues and for re-chartering the NANC to help us as we address the critical work before us.

As you may have heard me say in the past, numbering issues are hot. There are many on our plates and it's really fun in my humble view. I started my work at the Commission working on numbering issue some 20-odd years ago but it's really fun in my view. These are critical issues at a critical time. I'm excited that some of the most vital issues facing numbering at the moment will be considered by this talented group of experts. These issues include assisting the Commission with the consolidation and oversight of the FCC numbering contracts by the Numbering Administration Oversight Working Group, continuing the evaluation of how to facilitate the provision of interoperable video calling in order to allow service providers to voluntarily offer the capability to make or receive a video call between 10-digit telephone numbers, and further exploring the technical solutions necessary to implement nationwide number portability for U.S. consumers.

I want to add, and I just mentioned this to Jennifer and Commissioner Williamson, that the Wireline Competition Bureau stands ready to support the NANC however we can. You should

think and, indeed, we are your staff. So whatever you need, please do not hesitate to reach out to us. We are here to assist you in your work.

Lastly, I want to introduce and identify few WCB Commission staffers that, along with Marilyn and Jordan, have been supporting the NANC. First D'wana Terry, associate bureau chief in WCB. Please stand, D'wana. D'wana is overseeing the NANC for the Wireline Competition Bureau. Dan Kahn, also an associate bureau chief in WCB, is overseeing and taking a lead role on critical numbering issues. Second, Pam Arluk, chief at the Competition Policy Division. Pam's here. And Heather Hendrickson who I believe is on the phone. She's deputy chief for CPD. Third, our former alternate DFO, Michelle Sclater, for all of her work. Where's Michelle? Michelle is familiar face. Finally, all the CPD and WCB attorneys that have been supporting the DFO and ADFO in all their efforts.

Before I turn the meeting back to Chair McKee and Vice Chair Williamson, I want to just take a moment to recognize a significant loss that we all experienced in the numbering world recently. That was the sudden and sad passing of Jackie Flemming. I think Frank is here. Frank will say a few words in a minute too.

Jackie served on the NANC for many years. Her contributions were invaluable to the NANC. She was an incredible person who brightened the lives of everyone she met. Her dedication, her kindness, her service will be sorely missed. She really served

as an example to all of us. You couldn't help but have a smile on your face when you encounter Jackie. So I'll turn it over to Frank.

Frank: Thanks, Kris. I'll be brief. First let me just say congratulations to everybody that's been appointed to the NANC. I think the industry looks forward to the good work that you will do over the next charter.

As Kris mentioned, Jackie died very unexpectedly on Saturday evening of December 7th. It was only a couple of days after she and I had attended one of the many industry association holiday parties where Jackie could be found singing and dancing that night. That was the last time that I saw Jackie before receiving the sad news on Sunday morning.

Jackie had a brilliant 41-year career at AT&T. We were very lucky to have her for that much time. As you can imagine, in a corporation as large as AT&T, she did a number of jobs over the course of her career. She started as a management trainee working as a computer programmer and then held various positions in training, in wholesale, in marketing and finally made her way to Washington D.C. in the year 2000. So we were fortunate in the D.C. office to have her for 19 years. I hope you will keep her in your thoughts as we go forward in this holiday season. As things start to slow down a little bit, remember the people that you've worked with.

As Kris said, Jackie was a beloved member of the AT&T family. I think we will never forget her laughter. We grieve for her husband, Eric, as he tries to move forward with his life. So thank you for giving me the opportunity to say a few words about Jackie. I'm sure those of you that worked with her will miss her as much as we all do at the AT&T family. Thank you and best wishes.

Kris Monteith: Thank you very much, Frank. Just in closing, I just want to say we are so delighted that you are here today. We're delighted that you've agreed to serve for two years. We look forward to all of the interesting numbering issues that you'll have on your plate and we thank you so much for your service. Again please think of us as a resource and your staff. Whatever you need to help in your work, we're there to serve. So thank you so much. Have a successful meeting today and look forward to the next two years. Thank you.

INTRODUCTIONS

Jennifer McKee: Thank you. Thank you, Kris. As Kris mentioned, this is our vice chair, the Honorable Bruce Williamson of Maine. Would you like to say a few words to introduce yourself?

Bruce Williamson: Thank you. It's an honor being here. I look around the expertise at the table and, as I was commenting to Kris earlier, it's astounding to me the productivity of this group considering you're all volunteers. We're all volunteers. It's just very impressive.

So I'm Bruce Williamson. I have a telecom background starting out of graduate school with Southwestern Bell in St. Louis in the demand [sounds like] analysis and then moved into the corporate group where I was working on strategic planning and mergers and acquisitions. I left at the point where BellSouth was coming into the fold and AT&T, our second run at AT&T. I left that and I've been doing a lot of things since. But telecom was my heart and soul for many years. Thank you.

Jennifer McKee: Thank you very much, Bruce. Now if we could maybe go around and have all the members of the NANC just give a brief introduction of yourselves. Just so we can all get to know faces with the name cards, a little bit about yourself as brief as possible. As you see, we have a very full agenda today. And if you have any type of ethical disclaimers that you're required to state, if you can do that at this time too, that would be great.

Brian Hurley: Hello. My name is Brian Hurley. I'm vice president of Regulatory Affairs for ACA Connects, America's Communications Association. We're a trade association representing small and medium-sized communications providers. This is my first term on the NANC. I'm very pleased and honored to be appointed to this group. I look forward to working with everyone and learning from all of you as we go forward. So thank you.

Susan Gately: My name is Susan Gately. I am here on behalf of the Ad Hoc Telecommunications Users Committee, which is

Enterprise Customers for those of you who don't know who it is. I'm their economic consultant, independent consultant.

Alexi Maltas: Hi. I'm Alexi Maltas. I'm senior vice president and general counsel of Competitive Carriers Association. We're a wireless trade association representing carriers ranging from small rural carriers with 5,000 or fewer subscribers up to regional and nationwide carriers with millions of subscribers and vendors and service providers throughout the wireless ecosystem.

Matthew Gerst: Hi. I'm Matt Gerst. I'm the vice president of Regulatory Affairs at CTIA. We represent the wireless industry and many of the wireless providers who participate in the numbering system. I am a repeat offender on the NANC. I've been here many, many years and appreciate the opportunity to serve again. At the last NANC I was also co-chair of the Interoperable Video Calling Working Group where we put together a pretty robust report over a period of time. I look forward to continuing to work on that issue. I'm also on the Board of Directors for the Universal Service Administrative Company. And should any issues come up relative to USAC, I will be recused. Thank you.

Christopher Shipley: Good morning. I'm Christopher Shipley with INCOMPAS, the Internet and Competitive Networks Association. We represent traditional CLEC companies, but we also have a number of tech companies that have a lot of issues related to numbering that come before this board. So a lot of

our members are members of the NANC as well. I was an alternate a couple of cycles ago, so I'm happy to be back as our principal representative here. I'm excited to be back on the NANC again. Thank you.

Karen Charles Peterson: Karen Charles Peterson, commissioner from the Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Cable. I'm also the NARUC representative for the NANC. I chair the Telecom Committee for NARUC. Thank you.

Barry Hobbins: Good morning. I'm Barry Hobbins. I'm the public advocate for the state of Maine. I was honored to be asked by the National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates to represent them on NANC. This is my second term in the reconstituted charter. I'm very pleased and honored to be here. I'm very happy to see my Maine colleague, one of our commissioners serving as the vice chair, Bruce Williamson. I look forward to working with him in a different capacity. Thanks.

Brian Ford: I'm Brian Ford with NTCA, the Rural Broadband Association. We have about 850 small LECs in rural America in 45 states. This is my third term on the NANC although I think an NTCA staff member has been on since it was founded.

Julie Oost: Good morning. I'm Julie Oost with Peerless Network. I'm the vice president of Regulatory Affairs and Contracts there. This is my second term on the NANC.

Richard Shockey: I'm Rich Shockey. I'm chairman of the Board of the SIP Forum. This is my third term now on the NANC. For

those of you who do not know what the SIP Forum is, at least with our partners at ATIS, we are the people responsible for the STIR/SHAKEN Initiative which may possibly get passed by the Senate this week and signed by the president so the Commission can have all kinds of fun with robocalls.

Shaunna Forshee: I'm Shaunna Forshee with Sprint. This is my second alternate place on the NANC. I also work on the NAOWG. Thank you.

Paul Nejedlo: Paul Nejedlo, senior administrator at TDS Communications. This is my second term on the NANC.

David Casem: Hi everyone. David Casem here, co-founder and CEO of Telnyx. Second term on the NANC. An interconnected VoIP provider out of Chicago, have worked on nationwide number portability both at the general working group level as well as the technical subcommittee.

Rebecca Thompson: Hi everybody. Rebecca Thompson with Twilio. Twilio is a cloud communications provider. I served on the NANC in the previous life, but this is Twilio's first appointment to the NANC. We're grateful for the opportunity.

Bridget Alexander White: Good morning everyone. My name is Bridget Alexander White. I'm the staff director at USConnect. This is my second term serving on the NANC.

Mike Saperstein: Hi. Good morning. Mike Saperstein with USTelecom. This is my first full term on the NANC though I was pleased to pinch hit at the end of the last term filling in for

Diane as she transitioned away from USTelecom. I'm pleased to be here this year.

Rob Morse: Rob Morse from Verizon. I'm sitting in for our official rep, Dana Crandall. This will be Dana's second term on the NANC. I think, as most of you know, she's long served on many working groups over the years. If she surprises me and is able to dial in, then maybe she could say a bit more. But thank you.

Robert McCausland: Good morning everybody. I'm Bob McCausland, vice president at West Telecom Services. Soon to be known as Intrado Communications when we get our application to change our name filed within a few months. I'm part of the broader Intrado family of companies that include the 911-oriented company, conference calling company, notification services provider type companies - a multiple of them - and some others. I'm also co-chair of the Numbering Administration Oversight Working Group here.

Chris Drake: Chris Drake. I'm CTO at iconectiv. iconectiv is the local number portability administrator here and as of last week also the administrator for the iTRS, the solution for relay for the hard of hearing. I've been in telecom a long time. In fact, I've been in numbering since I started in telecom in 1986. My first line in software was a boat [sounds like] operator assist way back in the day we were just starting to modernize with the DMS at Nortel. So I'm pleased to be here

for my second term. I look forward to the good works we could do together.

Joel Bernstein: Joel Bernstein. I'm the alternate for SOMOS. I'm vice president of Regulatory and Public Policy. SOMOS runs the NANPA Pooling as well as the Toll Free Numbering Administration. And Ann Berkowitz, my colleague who I'm sitting in for, I believe is on the phone. So if you go to the phone, she'll be able to say a little more.

Marilyn Jones: This is Marilyn Jones, the NANC DFO. I want to try to catch some of the NANC members that are remote. So when I say your name or organization, if you're on the phone, please introduce yourself. Let's start with the 800response. Heather Barrows, are you on the phone?

Heather Barrows: Hi, Marilyn. Thank you. Yes, this is Heather Barrows. I'm the director of Operations for 800response. This is my first term on the NANC. You all may know David Greenhouse who previously served as the NANC rep representing 800response. So I look forward to working with everyone.

Marilyn Jones: Thank you, Heather. Jackie Wohlgemuth, ATIS. Are you on the phone?

Jackie Wohlgemuth: Yes, I am. Thank you, Marilyn. This is Jackie Wohlgemuth with ATIS. I am senior manager in Global Standards Development at ATIS. I work with several of our committees and forums including the Industry Numbering Committee.

Marilyn Jones: Great. Thank you, Jackie. George, AT&T. Are you on the phone?

George Guerra: Yes, Marilyn. Thank you. George Guerra, senior manager at AT&T handling state and federal numbering issues. This is my second appointment to the NANC as an alternate.

Marilyn Jones: Wonderful. Thank you, George. Greg or Lisa Jill, are you on the phone for Bandwidth?

Lisa Jill Freeman: This is Lisa Jill Freeman with Bandwidth. I'm vice president in the Office of the General Counsel and Regulatory Compliance Officer. I'm very pleased to serve as an alternate for Bandwidth.

Marilyn Jones: Thank you, Lisa. Betty or Glenn, are you on the phone for Charter?

Glenn Clepper: Hi. This is Glenn Clepper with Charter. I'm director of our Regulatory Group. I'm glad to return and represent Charter in the various NANC groups.

Marilyn Jones: Thank you, Glenn. Tim or Beth, are you on the phone for Comcast?

Timothy Kagele: Yeah. Good morning everybody. Tim Kagele, Comcast. Executive director on Carrier Relations. This is my second appointment to the NANC. I was on as a primary a couple of cycles ago. Full disclosure: I'm also a co-chair of the North American Portability Management LLC, and I also serve on the ATIS STI-GA Board of Directors. I'm very pleased to be back at the NANC and look forward to working with everybody.

Marilyn Jones: Thank you, Tim. This term we have two Commissioner Williamsons. Commission Williamson from Nevada, are you on the phone?

Hayley Williamson: Yes. Thank you. Good morning. This is Hayley Williamson, commissioner from Nevada.

Marilyn Jones: This is Commissioner Williamson's first time with the NANC. Vonage, Darren, are you on the phone?

Darren Krebs: Yes. Good morning, Marilyn. How are you?

Darren Krebs. I'm the senior director of Carrier Services at Vonage. I'm pleased to be back for my second term with the NANC. So thanks.

Marilyn Jones: Thanks everyone. I think that concludes the introduction of the NANC Members.

Just a little background about myself before we get into the FCC staff introduction. I've been working with numbering at the NANC. I've been involved in that capacity for a little over a decade first with the Network Service Division, later with the Telecommunications Access Policy Division, and now with the Competition Policy Division. I look forward to meeting all the new members and saying hello to all the returning ones. Thank you, all. Jordan?

Jordan Reth: Good morning. My name is Jordan Reth. I'm an attorney advisor with the Competition Policy Division in the Wireline Competition Bureau. I'm both new to the commission and new to numbering.

Marilyn Jones: Carmell, do you all have a mic up there?

CJ Ferraro: I think we can all speak louder.

Marilyn Jones: Okay. Thank you.

CJ Ferraro: Sure. I'll go first. I'm CJ Ferraro, also an attorney in WCB. I met a few of you before when I worked on a number of numbering issues. [Inaudible]

Marilyn Jones: CJ will be our liaison for the CATA Working Group. Thank you, CJ.

Benjamin Goodwin: Hi. I'm Jesse Goodwin. I'm in CPD and I'll be serving as a liaison for NFT [inaudible].

Carmell Weathers: Hi. I'm Carmell Weathers. [Inaudible]

Marilyn Jones: Also in the audience we have our liaison for the NAOWG, Karen Schroeder. She's with the Consumer and Government Affairs Bureau.

Karen Schroeder: Hello. I'm happy to be working with you.

Marilyn Jones: Thank you, Karen. Also from Consumer and Governmental Affairs, we have Michael Scott. He's liaison with our IVC Working Group. Good morning, Michael. And we should also have Robert McConnell. He's with our IVC Working Group as a liaison.

Robert McConnell: Good morning. I'm looking forward to working with you.

Marilyn Jones: And we also have Bill Andrle. Bill has a dual role. As a liaison, he's with the NAOWG, the COSC, and also with the IVC Working Group.

William Andrle: Good morning.

Marilyn Jones: Thank you, Bill. Did I miss anyone? Oh, Michelle Sclater. Michelle is still involved with the NANC in her capacity as the FCC liaison for the NAOWG. Thank you, Michelle. Okay.

Jennifer McKee: Thank you very much, Marilyn. And thank you, everyone, for the introduction. I look forward to working with all of you. This seems like a really great group. I know we've got a lot to do today so I will turn this back over to Marilyn and Jordan. They will give an overview of the process and a preview of what we have to look forward to.

OVERVIEW OF THE NANC

Marilyn Jones: Good morning again everyone. I'm Marilyn Jones, the designated federal officer for the North American Numbering Council. I wanted to start off with a short overview of the NANC before we get into additional overviews over some of the work product that we expect from the NANC.

As many of you know, the NANC is a Federal Advisory Committee as chartered under the Federal Advisory Committee Act. As such, when we compose the membership of the NANC, we have to be cognizant of how we balance out the expertise and the viewpoints that we would need to get our work done. Additional requirements under the Federal Advisory Committee Act will be addressed later, after my presentation, by Paula Siberthau of the FCC's Office of the General Counsel and Darice Gamble of the FCC's Office of Managing Director. Under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, we're given a two-year charter. The

charter for this term started September 16th. So two years from now it would expire, and that would be September 16, 2021. The NANC mission continues to be to recommend to the Commission ways to modernize administration of the North American Numbering Plan in order to ensure efficient impartial assignment and use of vital numbering resources in the changing modern world of communications. As authorized by the Federal Advisory Committee Act, the NANC is authorized to facilitate its work through informal subcommittees or other subgroups of the NANC. We normally call those groups working groups for the NANC.

Much of the work of the NANC is carried out through our working groups. The working groups, they're the body of folks that draft the reports. And those reports are brought to the NANC member as a whole for a vote. As such, the working groups are crucial and important to the success of the NANC.

NANC members. We ask that NANC members serve on at least one working group, you or someone from your member company. Each working groups also include other stakeholders. It's not entirely made up of NANC members. Process-wise, each working group develops a report through a deliberate process and working through collaboratively. Once the working groups adopt their report, the draft report would be made available to the full Committee and the FCC staff at least 30 days before the NANC will vote on that report. At the following NANC meeting,

the Committee then reviews, discusses, and debates the draft report.

For this charter, we've already received the draft report from the NAOWG regarding that reassigned number database. The TRD. We receive their report on the 13th, 30 days before the next meeting which would be January 13th, where the NANC will as a group review and discuss and vote on that draft report. The NANC at that time may make modifications that they would like to report before it votes on the draft report. If adopted by the majority of the NANC members, the report becomes an official recommendation of the Committee.

The Commission for this charter has approved five working groups. The NAOWG will be a permanent standard working group. The NAOWG is actually the Numbering Administration Oversight Working Group. They will oversee the performance of the Numbering Administration Contracts. The remaining working groups - the Interoperable Video Calling, Toll Free Number Modernization, Nationwide Number Portability, and Call Authentication Trust Anchor working groups - are all issue specific working groups and will lapse at the conclusion of their assigned work. Additional issue specific working groups may be formed as needs dictate. Later during the meeting we will have presentations to give an overview of the issue specific working groups. And the standing working group, the NAOWG will present its status later in the meeting.

Let's look at some of the leadership we have for the working groups. For our standard working group, the NAOWG, our co-chairs will be Robert McCausland and Betty Ann Sanders. Betty represents Charter and Robert represents West Telecom Services. The liaisons for these working groups will be Michelle Sclater, myself, Myrva Charles. She is the contract and officer representative in the Competition Policy Division for the Numbering Administration Contracts that the FCC is a party to. William Andrle and Karen Schroeder will also help out with liaison duties for the Numbering Administration Oversight Working Group.

Leadership of each working group will set the schedule for the working groups in terms of when and how often the group will meet and will have responsibilities for leading the meetings. The working group will meet by phone almost exclusively. It's typical for a working group to meet by phone weekly for roughly 60 minutes. These meetings can be longer, shorter, and more frequent or less frequent as needed.

Each working group will have an agency liaison and a FCC staff member. These liaisons will be there to assist the working group in completing its work in helping to gather information the working group may need to answer questions. For our issue specific working groups, the Call Authentication Trust Anchor Working Group our co-chairs remain Jacqueline Wohlgemuth from ATIS and Beth Choroser from Comcast. The FCC liaisons for this group will be Connor Ferraro and Annick Banoun. For the Toll

Free Number Administration Modernization Working Group, the co-chairs remained Susan Gately of Ad Hoc and we have a new co-chair, Julie Oost from Peerless Network. Welcome, Julie. The FCC liaisons for that group will be Jordan Reth, the ADFO, and Mason Shefa.

For the Interoperable Video Calling Working Group, the chair is David Bahar and the liaisons are William Andrle, Robert McConnell and Michael Scott. We also have a charge for the Interoperable Video Calling Working Group that we would present later. For the Nationwide Number Portability Working Group, the chair is Bridget Alexander White, USConnect. The FCC liaisons are Janice Gorin and Jesse Goodwin. Jesse will present an overview of the NNP later in the meeting and we will present a charge for the NNP at that time also.

That concludes the overview of the NANC and our working groups. If you have any questions or need to contact anyone, please reach out to me, Jordan, or Carmell initially and we will help guide you to the correct person. Our contact information is on the board. Thank you. Any questions?

Jennifer McKee: Thanks, Marilyn. I appreciate that. That was very helpful. I think next, we're going to hear from Paula Siberthau. Is that right? The Office of General Counsel to give us an overview of the federal advisory issue.

Female Voice: [Inaudible]

Jennifer McKee: Okay. We can do that, yes. We're running a little ahead of schedule, so that's nice. So we'll hear from

Paula in a little bit. I guess we'll move forward, if that's okay, to the overview with the working groups. So Mr.

McCausland, if you would like to give the report from the Numbering Administration Oversight Working Group --

Robert McCausland: Thank you, madam chair.

Jennifer McKee: -- that would be great.

OVERVIEW OF NUMBERING ADMINISTRATION OVERSIGHT

Robert McCausland: Phil Linse, where are you? Could Phil join me? Thank you. The Numbering Administration Oversight Working Group has been an extremely busy group over the past several years under the leadership of Carolee Hall - whom we missed - with the leadership also of Phil Linse, Rosemarie from T-Mobile and so many others. A very substantial effort has been put in to produce the technical requirements document, the TRD, which has been submitted to the NANC for its review prior to the January meeting. Phil will be discussing much of that. That's part of, by the way, the COSC, the Contract Oversight Subcommittee.

In addition, we're working on producing recommendations right now on the costing and pricing methodologies associated both with the provider side and also the caller side. In the order, there are two distinct sections, one pertains to the providers that will fund the Reassigned Numbers Database and the other pertains to the callers that will utilize the Reassigned Numbers Database. Those recommendations are due in January. We still have a lot of work to do on that. Thanks to Susan and

so many others on the team, we're making progress. We still have a lot of work to do. Phil?

Phil Linse: Thank you, Bob. So my name is Phil Linse with CenturyLink. I am with CenturyLink and I am the co-chair of the Contract Oversight Subcommittee which is a subcommittee of the NAOWG. I want to first thank Betty Sanders for being my co-chair for the last charter and I want to welcome Rosemarie Leist from T-Mobile as my new co-chair for this charter going forward. So, thank you, Rosemarie, for accepting that responsibility and I'm looking forward to working with you. Moving to the Contract Oversight Subcommittee activity, I wanted to kind of go through some of the activities that we've been involved with. I actually have my presentation. Thank you. Normally, for those that are kind of new to the NANC, I would just go through kind of our activity, what we do on a monthly basis typically. The first item there is the monthly review of the deliverables for the B&C agent. The B&C is the billing and collections agent. They're the entity that basically collects the funds from the service providers to compensate the vendor, the federally procured vendor for the North American Numbering Plan Administration, as well as the Pooling Administration.

From a review perspective, I just have one piece of information that I wanted to identify. The B&C agent has recently changed their banking vendor. For the service providers that are on the call and in the room, please verify with your number

administration groups that they have the correct banking entity. It is now the Bank of America. So when you see the bill or the invoice, you'll see Bank of America is the destination where you're supposed to basically remit funds. So just FYI, the old banker, BNY Mellon bank, that account was closed on December 2nd. So just FYI to folks, they'll still be able to handle things, but it will be streamlined if you verify with your companies that it's now the Bank of America account. So thank you for that.

And then the deliverables for the NANPA/PA, we have monthly meetings. We go through some of the criteria associated with the efforts and the requirements of their contract. We do that on a monthly basis. And then the Reassigned Numbers Database, we have kind of two efforts going or at least had going. We have completed the reassigned numbers, as Marilyn had indicated, the technical requirements portion of that. And then Bob from the NAOWG is proceeding with the cost and pricing structure aspect of that. The NANPA had a Change Order B, which was a no cost change order, did some changes around a 5-XX type code. If you have any questions about that, I can provide you more detail on that. And then we had in November, the NANPA/PA bridge contract extension, which I'll go into a little bit later.

So our area responsibility, again, I kind of explained that a little bit earlier. This gives you some of the detail around that for your reference. And then to the Reassigned Numbers

Database, again, on December 13th, we submitted or provided the technical requirements portion of that report to the FCC for distribution to the membership of this council for your review. And then I've got some additional kind of benchmarks that we've accomplished since the last NANC meeting. It's kind of self-explanatory there. Then there's the bold is kind of what we've done since the last meeting and then the stuff that's not in bold, that's stuff that's occurred prior to this last NANC meeting.

So the next page is the contract status. Again, this is pretty much self-explanatory. The main update is the NANPA and PA contracts. As of November, they have moved into a six-month extension with two, three-month potential extensions. That's going to be all dependent upon the Reassigned Numbers Database because that, in the order for the Reassigned Numbers Database, it combines that database and the cost associated with that with the NANPA/PA contract. It's anticipated to be awarded as one contract, so both the NANPA/PA and then also then the Reassigned Numbers Database.

That Reassigned Numbers Database, just to clarify on that a little bit, is that it's anticipated that it's initially going to be funded by service providers. So in order to stand up that Reassigned Numbers Database, that funding will come from service providers. And then once it's stood up and users begin to use it, then there'll be a cost recovery mechanism for that money to come back to the service providers. And then that's

going to make some changes to the efforts of the B&C agent that's going to be in charge of basically accounting for that funding and then that cost recovery.

So with that, I just wanted to provide you with the list of the companies and entities that are participating in the Contract Oversight Subcommittee effort. Just to clarify a little bit further, the Contract Oversight Subcommittee is mainly focused on those contracts and the oversight of the NANPA/PA. We have extended that in conjunction with the membership of the NAOWG to work on the RND, the Reassigned Numbers Database effort. Now that that's wrapping up, our focus is going to be more specifically on the NANPA/PA contracts. And then once the RND contract is awarded with the NANPA/PA, then we would oversee that as well.

Finally, I have a schedule put out for 2020. These are the meeting dates. We typically will meet for about an hour or actually two hours. We go over all three contracts, the B&C, the PA and the NANPA contracts. So that's a once a month type meeting for about two hours. The RND has been two-hour meetings twice a week since the beginning of March of 2019. So to give you kind of the magnitude of work that we have been doing, it's been a pretty extensive effort in addition to the monthly oversight meetings as well. So if there are no questions, thank you.

Robert McCausland: And I will add some final commentary. I think that, Phil, you understate some of the work effort. It's

been a really huge effort, very detail oriented. All one has to do is read through the recommended TRD document to begin to understand the magnitude of the work effort there. It's not stovepipe management per se. A lot of other members who are not necessarily part of the COSC or the NAOWG have assisted over time. I think that should continue. It's very much a team effort. A lot of expertise is required to produce something like that technical requirements document and a tremendous amount of effort on the part, I think, of every member of the COSC and some members of the NAOWG as well. So thank you for that.

Phil Linse: Thanks, Bob.

Jennifer McKee: Great. Thank you very much for the presentation. We really appreciate it. Question.

Matthew Gerst: Hi. Matt with CTIA. I also want to echo appreciation for the work of the NAOWG on this. As we were reviewing it over the weekend, it was a pretty significant effort clearly. I appreciate all of the input that went into it. One question I had in terms of the membership of the NAOWG that developed the technical requirements document, it seems like a big part of the success of the Reassigned Numbers Database is going to be the call originators who were actually going to use and tap into the database itself. Were there any members of the NAOWG that represented that particular community or is there some expectation to engage them at some point in the process to understand how they might use the database?

Robert McCausland: Phil, I'll start and then you can take it up.

Phil Linse: Okay, that's fair.

Robert McCausland: West Corporation, now switching its name over to Intrado Corporation, has a number of notification services providers, otherwise known in the order as callers and to the extent for voice messaging calls per year, almost 4.2 billion. So it's very, very large. An example was SchoolMessenger. It's a business unit. It's a company name - SchoolMessenger - that is owned by the parent company that owns West Telecom Services. They produced on behalf of consenting parents, calls and also text messages to the parents about school closings and that kind of thing. So that representation exists through me. And Susan, can you speak for a moment to Ad Hoc, please?

Susan Gately: Sure. I have just recently started participating in the NAOWG.

Robert McCausland: And who's already been a substantial contributor, I might add.

Susan Gately: Thank you. On this issue, the members of the Ad Hoc Committee, which are large enterprise customers, will either be hopefully using this database on their own or contracting with somebody else to interface with that. So I also am having an input to that.

Robert McCausland: And then in addition, with the Commission's assistance, we've been able to secure support from Pace [phonetic]. Phil, if you would?

Phil Linse: Yeah. So we've met with Pace [phonetic] and reviewed the TRD with Pace and they've actually provided some valuable concern. I don't know if I would even call them concerns, just some concepts from the user perspective which was very helpful as well.

Jennifer McKee: Any more questions? Yeah.

David Casem: David Casem from Telnix here. Just so I have an understanding, is it the case that disconnected numbers will be reported only once a month by telecommunications providers?

Phil Linse: Yeah, that's correct. Pursuant to the order on the 15th of the month is when service providers would be required to report their disconnected numbers and the dates associated with those disconnects into the database.

David Casem: The only automated way to do so would be the SFTP. Is that correct?

Phil Linse: Yes, I believe that's essentially. I think there might be some other interfaces that could be used by service providers, but that's the main one that I would expect to be used.

David Casem: Got it. Thank you.

Phil Linse: I guess a little bit to expand on that, there may be service providers out there that either may have very little activity, disconnect activity. They're very small service

providers that may not even experience disconnects throughout a month type of thing and then those may only have a couple or a handful, that kind of thing. There's a more streamlined list, you know, bulk type capabilities. So like a GUI-type interface.

David Casem: But there's no API?

Phil Linse: No, there is no API.

David Casem: Got it.

Jennifer McKee: Any other questions? We're good? Okay.

Thank you, again, very much for the presentation. I appreciate that. So we move on to the Interoperable Video Working Group, if that group is ready to do your presentation. Great.

OVERVIEW OF INTEROPERABLE VIDEO CALLING

Robert McConnell: Good morning. I'm making sure everyone can hear me from the microphone. All right, great. So we will start from the top down. I am Robert McConnell with the FCC's Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, specifically the Disability Rights Office, DRO. Michael.

Michael Scott: And I am Michael Scott. I am an attorney advisor with the Disability Rights Office of Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau.

Robert McConnell: Okay. So before we dive into this, you may be wondering how would the Disability Rights Office has any kind of in with regards to interoperable video calling, for those of you who are newer to the NANC, so I can back up a little bit. I'll tell you, more than 30 years ago now,

Congress passed the Americans with Disabilities Act. Title IV of the American's with Disabilities Act focuses on telecommunications. With that in mind, the FCC was tasked to oversee the implementation of a system to ensure that the telecommunications carriers and networks were accessible to people with disabilities in accordance with the ADA.

For better or worse, the FCC figured that they would take care of the interstate services by creating a contribution base to which various telecommunications carriers would contribute on an annual basis in accordance with the Form 499. And about ten years later, the FCC implemented video relay services, which is a form of telecommunications relay services allowing sign language users such as myself to access the telecommunications network via video by connecting with an interpreter on the other end of their video calls who would then engage in the voice call of the voice end of that call.

With that history in mind, the Disability Rights Office has, of course, become pretty well versed in overseeing programs like VRS particularly with regards to things like interoperability, portability of numbers and so forth. With all of that, we were asked by Marilyn and WCB to lend some of our expertise in this respect through the IVC Working Group's efforts ensuring that we've got the right resources on board to make this a success and make sure that we're able to mainstream interoperable video calling for everyone.

Considering all of the work that we have done in the past, I want to bring the analogy of curb cuts and ramps to your attention. It is the work that has been done to make things accessible that have provided ancillary benefit to everyone. So it's not just wheelchair users who are benefiting from using curb cuts and ramps, but it's also people pushing their baby strollers and pulling their wheeled suitcases up and down those ramps and those curb cuts. So the wheelchair users were the impetus for the mandates, but the end result was something that benefited everyone.

We're seeing a similar situation here. With that in mind, we're going to give you a summary of the work that's been done to date in the IVC, Interoperable Video Calling Working Group and the charge moving forward to achieve interoperable video calling. Michael?

Michael Scott: So initially, when the NANC first put forward this charge for the IVC Working Group, we had a couple of specific directives. The work of this directive came out of the final report that the working group put together. First, there were options for an analysis of any changes necessary in numbering or numbering administration to allow and encourage the deployment of telephone numbering-based interoperable video calling including any changes to the Commission rules, any changes - migrations or consolidations of existing numbering directories including the iTRS numbering directory. We sought recommendations and the development in technology standards or

operations required to promote the deployment of telephone number-based interoperable video calling including the incorporation of interoperable video calling in the implementation of NG9-1-1. And recommend next steps to the Commission and industry could take to promote interoperable video calling.

Robert McConnell: Okay. Looking at mainstream video calling services, I'm sure you can all think of a couple of examples of those services off the top of your heads, but typically these services operate inside their own silos and are not interoperable with one another. So that is something that we successfully achieved in the video relay service context wherein you have the iTRS numbering directory that Michael mentioned which lists all the 10-digit e-num addresses and is then queried by a user attempting to make a call. The query returns whether that number being called has an entry in that database, which would then correspond with connecting what is called a point-to-point call, a video-to-video call because both users in that situation are using video phones and presumably, use sign language. Without a corresponding find in that database, the number is being connected to the video relay service interpreter to interpret a call to a voice line. So there are both social and public safety benefits to interoperability. I looked again to VRS, but limiting users' registration to telephone numbers under VRS providers is not functionally equivalent and does not achieve the mandate for

the community of allowing for a single phone number for both voice, video and data calls, and text services with seamless integration with N11 call handling and routing.

The goal of IVC is, again, if we go back to the VRS use case and context, that everyone who has an IVC enabled device is capable of making or receiving a video call seamlessly regardless of their platform analogous to the same way that voice calls are made today.

Michael Scott: Okay. So in this initial report, the IVC Working Group where we've determined the need to put forward a very specific scope of what it would and wouldn't be working on. So it initially put forward that it was going to be looking at recommendations on addressing, signaling and media; and on the ability to make point-to-point video calls using ten-digit telephone numbers across video service boundaries; and the ability of video callers to discover which of their contacts are video capable regardless of which service they use, initiate and establish calls to users of another service and exchange audio and the video and communicate across services.

Robert McConnell: The IVC Working Group determined that the scope of its report would not include the following items. It would not include whether all devices that make calls must be or should be video capable. I don't think that the microphone here has any kind of video capability despite the fact that it can make a call through our connected system. It would not

include whether all devices should be able to use a telephone number, and whether all video conferencing services should use phone numbers, or whether multiparty video calling was screen sharing across services. So we will be considering kind of value added services.

Michael Scott: So the working group put forward two potential approaches, but it was unable to reach consensus as to which particular approach would be the best. Each approach has advantages and disadvantages, of course. The first approach was the database approach to use an existing or develop a new telephone numbering database that translates telephone numbers to the uniform resource identifiers among video service providers. And then the alternative was the platform approach which rely on existing network capabilities of IMS networks to signal video calling.

The platform approach built on existing Video over LTE, you know, ViLTE standards which provide a network path for operator interoperability, but does not support routing to signaling or media exchanges with Over the Top providers. That database approach allows for both Over the Top and carrier providers to route to each other's databases.

The working group had recommended further study on both of those approaches. Sorry, I was looking at an old slide and I read a little far.

So I'll finish this one up. So in sum, the working group requested an extension of its charter to develop a more specific recommendation to the NANC.

Robert McConnell: If you have any questions, you can reach out to Michael Scott, Bill Andrle or myself. We also have a significant resource in the room, a significant asset from the IVC Working Group in Matt Gerst with CTIA who was the coach here for the previous working group. I can say Matt did an outstanding job in providing expertise not only in the content but in facilitating the conversation of getting to the point of having a discreet set of recommendations. So I just want to publicly thank Matt Gerst for that and recognize his outstanding work there. Thank you, Matt.

Michael Scott: Yeah. We certainly look forward to working with all of you and we'll happily take some questions now.

Jennifer McKee: Questions?

Male Voice: Thank you, Madam Chair. I have one question. I raised the issue prior and there's still not consensus on the approaches. The question I had asked is whether there has been consideration regarding a commercial approach. The suggestion I had was consideration of something similar to what the Federal Trade Commission did in about 2012 and 2013 with the Robocall Challenge where the Commission itself generated input from commercial app developers, and some of those developed solutions. I'm wondering if there has been further consideration of that type of approach in this.

Robert McConnell: I cannot speak for the NANC or the IVC, but I do recall that effort by FTC. The charge by the FCC to the IVC Working Group at this point specifically focuses on two things. I would certainly probably defer to the DFO and ADFO to speak to more to the charges, but that I think is definitely something worth raising to the working group for consideration.

Male Voice: Thank you.

Michael Scott: Yeah. And then beyond that, the new charge to the working group will be presented later today.

Jennifer McKee: Any other questions? No? Okay. Do we have anybody on the phone? Any questions? No? Okay. Then I think our assistant DFO, Jordan, are you going to read the charges for us for the working group? Great. Thank you.

Jordan Reth: Thank you. The Wireline Competition Bureau would like to thank the North American Numbering Council and the Interoperable Video Calling Working Group for your work on the report on interoperable video calling. Your efforts are a good start toward creating the ability for providers voluntarily to offer the capability to make or receive a video call between ten-digit telephone numbers on an interoperable basis.

Interoperability has the promise to make video calling simpler and thus more popular and competitive which benefits all potential users. We are interested in continuing progress towards a framework for interoperable video calling and we appreciate the IVC Working Group's request for an extension of its work assignment so it can continue its work.

We are encouraged by the NANC's findings of two theoretical frameworks for using ten-digit telephone numbers, the database approach and the platform approach, and the NANC's recommendations for further study of numbering databases and various technical issues. Based on our review of the NANC's recommendations and other information, we request the NANC to develop more specific recommendations on how to implement the database approach. Specifically we direct the NANC to recommend a path toward implementing the database approach, including specifically providing recommendations as to whether it is preferable to use one or more existing numbering databases or to establish a new database. The performance and security measures that would need to be established for interoperable video calling to work effectively using any endpoint whether fixed, mobile, or interconnected voice, video over Internet Protocol, and how the databases should be funded and which parties should bear the costs.

We also direct the NANC to evaluate the technical and operational feasibility of interoperating with telecommunications relay services to ensure that persons with disabilities can connect directly to public safety answering point telecommunicators. We further direct the NANC to approve a written report on its findings on these issues and to transmit that report to the Wireline Competition Bureau by July 29, 2020. The IVC Working Group must submit the recommended

report to the full NANC no later than June 28, 2020 to allow for its consideration by all NANC members.

If you have questions about this referral, please contact Marilyn Jones, the NANC's designated federal officer, at 202-418-2357 or by email. Thank you again for your assistance in helping to make interoperable video conferencing available to all consumers.

Marilyn Jones: This is Marilyn, the DFO. I just want to let everyone know that we're in the process of giving copies of all the charges that will be read today to you all before the meeting ends.

Jennifer McKee: Great. Thank you very much. Thank you Jordan, and thank you Robert and Michael for the presentation.

Robert McConnell: Thank you.

Jennifer McKee: I think, Jordan, if you have the microphone, would you like to give us the overview now of the TFNM Working Group?

Jordan Reth: Sure.

Jennifer McKee: Thank you.

Jordan Reth: Again my name is Jordan Reth. I'm the alternate designated federal officer. I won't be giving an overview of the working group but more of an overview on the status of the upcoming 833 auction.

As some of you may or may not have heard, tomorrow, December 17th, is the day of the 833 auction and we're looking forward

to learning from the results. So what I thought we would do is we'd take a look and see how we arrived at this point.

On April 27, 2017 the Commission first announced the opening of the 833 toll-free code. The Wireline Competition Bureau directed each responsible organization to submit a single request for up to 2000 individual preferred 833 toll numbers. The bureau then directed SOMOS, the toll-free numbering administrator, to review all 833 number requests and identify mutually exclusive numbers - i.e. numbers requested by multiple resp orgs. SOMOS identified approximately 17,000 mutually exclusive numbers and these numbers were placed in unavailable status. The rest of the 833 code was assigned via a first-come/first-served basis when the 833 code was officially opened on June 3, 2017.

On September 28, 2017 the Commission issued a notice of proposed rulemaking seeking comment on a variety of means to modernize toll-free number assignments that are consistent with our statutory mandate under Section 251(e)(1) to make numbers available on an equitable basis. On December 17, 2017 the NANC received charges and on June 4, 2018 submitted its report and recommendations to the Commission.

On September 27, 2018 the Commission released a report and order providing for the following: Expansion of the existing first-come/first served toll-free number assignment rule in Section 52.111 to allow the Commission to assign toll-free numbers by auction on a first-come/first-served basis by an

alternative assignment methodology or by a combination of methodologies. Establishing a single round, sealed-bid Vickrey auction for the roughly 17,000 mutually exclusive numbers set aside in the 833 toll-free code. Under this type of auction, the highest bidder for a toll-free number wins and pays the second highest bid for that number.

The report and order also established SOMOS as the auctioneer for the 833 toll-free number auction. Required that net proceeds from the 833 toll-free number auction offset the costs of toll-free number administration for the benefit of all resps and subscribers. Establish a process by which certain toll-free numbers could be set aside without cost from the 833 toll-free number auction to promote health, safety, education and other public-interest goals. Revised the Commission's existing rules regarding hoarding, warehousing, and brokering of numbers to allow for a secondary market for toll-free numbers assigned at an auction. And, consistent with the NANC's recommendations, revised our toll-free numbering rules to modernize the language used.

On April 16, 2019 the bureau released a public notice inviting any interested government entity and non-profit health and safety organization to file a petition for an 833 toll-free number for public health and safety purposes. No petitions were submitted in response to that notice. On May 10, 2019 the Commission released a public notice seeking comment on proposed procedures for the 833 auction. On August 2, 2019 the

Commission released another public notice adopting auction procedures and establishing major dates and deadlines for the 833 auction.

Finally, I'll provide you a brief status of where we are with the 833 auction process so far. So the application period for the auction ran from October 7th to the 18th. After the application window, SOMOS began a review of applications with FCC oversight. On November 13th SOMOS released a status public notice informing bidders and the public which applications it considered complete and incomplete.

Applicants with incomplete applications were invited to resubmit correct applications during a re-submission window. On December 10th SOMOS then released a public notice informing bidders and the public of the full list of qualified bidders. Bidding will occur tomorrow, December 17th, and winning bidders will be announced sometime thereafter.

Jennifer McKee: Thank you for your time. Are there any questions? No questions? Then, Marilyn, you have charges for this working group that you could read for us?

OVERVIEW OF TOLL FREE NUMBER MODERNIZATION

Marilyn Jones: Yes. Thank you. This is Marilyn, the DFO. As you are aware, the Commission has established an auction of 17,638 unassigned toll-free numbers in the 833 toll-free code, the 833 auction. The commission decided the 833 auction would be conducted as a single round, sealed-bid Vickrey auction at which the amount paid by the winning bidder is determined by

the second highest bid. Applications to participate in the 833 auction were accepted from October 7th to October 18, 2019 and the single round of bidding will occur on December 17, 2019. The commission has directed the Wireline Competition Bureau to issue a report after completion of the 833 auction outlining the outcomes of the auction and lessons learned. We believe that the NANC is well suited to provide the perspective of participants in the 833 auction and potential future auction participants for use in the bureau's report. With that perspective as its lens we therefore direct the NANC via its Toll-Free Number Modernization Issues Working Group to address the following. There are four evaluations that the Commission would like the NANC to perform.

Number 1: Evaluate the utility for bidders of the single round, sealed-bid Vickrey auction design used in the 833 auction and suggest any alternate auction designs or aspect of the design that would be more useful for bidders in any future toll-free number auctions.

Number 2: Evaluate the education and outreach effort undertaken throughout the 833 auction process.

Number 3: Evaluate the application process that the 833 auction, specifically the auction application requirements and the decision to not require post-auction application, in view of the Commission's commitment to promote auction transparency and integrity and its goal of ensuring that the auction is simple and cost-effective.

Number 4: Evaluate the upfront payment mechanism in the 833 auction considering the Commission's goal of ensuring bidders in toll-free number auctions place sincere offers while maximizing auction participation. Recommend whether to modify the upfront payment mechanism or amount of the upfront payment required at any future toll-free number auctions.

We also direct the NANC to recommend improvements for any future toll-free number auctions that will promote the efficient and equitable assignment of toll-free numbers through competitive bidding.

We further direct the NANC to approve a written report on these findings, on these issues and to transmit their report to the Wireline Competition Bureau within six months of the release date of the bidding data from the 833 auction. The draft report must be sent to the NANC and to the bureau 30 days in advance of the date on which the NANC will vote on the working group's recommendations. If you have questions about this bureau, please contact me about this referral.

Jennifer McKee: Okay. Thank you, Marilyn.

Marilyn Jones: You're welcome.

Jennifer McKee: Now we have our representative from the General Counsel's office here, Paula Silverthau. You're already up. You want to speak to us about the Federal Advisory Committee Act and as to how it would affect stewardship, our work on the NANC?

Paula Silverthau: Yes. Here she is.

Jennifer McKee: Oh, great. We also have Darice Gamble from the Office of the Managing Director who's going to talk to us about record keeping.

FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT AND RECORDS

Paula Silverthau: Welcome. Now we have the boring part of the meeting, but it's important because my goal is to try and just make sure that the procedures that you follow are just very generally within the FACA guidelines so that everything that you do can be used. Some of you were former DFOs, have heard this little narrative before.

Generally the Federal Advisory Committee, which is in 5 U.S.C. Appendix 2, governs the operation of all of our advisory committees here unless otherwise exempted by statute. The guiding principles are openness in government, a diverse and balanced membership both on the full group and on the working groups, and public accountability. So you will find we have to notify everyone in advance. Statutorily we have to give notice of meetings 15 days in advance and it has to be published in the *Federal Register*.

Public attendance. People are allowed to or are welcome to come to all of the full committee meetings. Our working group meetings are typically held in closed door sessions. And we'll get to the working group meetings later, but they're considered to be distinct from the open meetings of the full committee. Documents are available typically in the information center. Darice will talk a little bit later about maintaining the

documents so that we have a full and complete record and so that Nora [phonetic] is not angry with us.

The committee chair and vice chair serve as the focal point for committee members. They'll help establish the working groups and they will work with our DFO Marilyn in conducting the meetings and suggesting meeting agendas. So if you have ideas for meeting agendas, you can let either Marilyn or Jennifer know.

The duties by GSA rules of the designated federal officer are to call the meetings, to approve the agendas so that no matter how great an idea is about getting it on the agenda, literally it has to be approved by the DFO. Either the DFO or liaisons will and are required to attend all full committee and working group meetings.

Let's see. I won't get into the record keeping now, but the DFO should and needs to be copied on all communications. So please do that, a little CC. It doesn't matter how trivial it is. It could be I'm not going to be at the meeting today.

Whatever. Every communication involving the working groups or the full committee needs to be copied to the DFO. I believe, if it's not set up already, at some point there will be in addition - at Nora's suggestion - a special mailbox. Have we set that up yet? Is that set up?

Marilyn Jones: Yes. We have at nanc@fcc.com.

Paula Silverthau: Okay. So Marilyn will send that out again just to make sure that when you're doing everything, please CC

the mailbox. Again this is to keep us on track and to keep Nora very happy.

Informal working groups. Okay. So the working groups need to be less than lukewarm so that they're never -- when the working groups meet, it's not going to be the same as the NANC meeting. So that's a limitation on the number of members that can be on the working groups. The goal is to gather information, to draft reports, to develop working plans, to discuss preliminary findings and to sort of argue things out among the working groups. But, and this is the important part because this is where there are some case law, the working groups can't function as the final say on any of it. As I've mentioned, there is case law on this.

Therefore, no matter how excellent - and usually they're very good, the working group reports are - when they come up there has to be time for all of you to read every working group report to be comfortable with it, to ask questions at the full committee meeting and debate it and then have a separate vote. So not only in practice isn't the working groups' recommendations very final word on something, but by law it cannot be the final word on something. Therefore, members of working groups can't speak for the full committee. Only the full committee can vote and speak for the full committee primarily though the chair or through your reports.

The other thing I'd mention is, and I don't think it comes up that much with this group but does occasionally, neither the

working groups nor the full committee should be conducting surveys. If there is something on which you feel that you need information from ten or more people and that you'd really like a very formal survey, please speak to Marilyn and Jennifer first. Because any survey that would be performed by an advisory committee or its working groups is like a survey by the Commission. Since you stand in that sense as something formed by the Commission; therefore, it's subjective to the Paperwork Reduction Act and the survey would need prior OMB approval. If you end up by mistake doing a survey and getting great information but it didn't go through the Paperwork Reduction Act process, then we can't use any information you have.

On that topic, to gather information, you can sometimes do it by just posting a very generalized notice on your website. Marilyn can work with you and others in the General Counsel's Office to formulate questions that are very open-ended as opposed to checking the box and requiring the same answer from everyone. Those, for the most part, would not be considered formal surveys. Sort of like when the agency posts an NOI and it's just investigating something. So you can. There is an outreach process. But please, if you want to do something like that, just work with Marilyn on it. We can formulate very general open-ended questions that would not trigger the Paperwork Reduction Act.

Ex parte rules. Typically we issue a notice that exempts your communications with decision makers, whether commissioners or bureau staff, from the ex parte rules. Marilyn, have we done that yet?

Marilyn Jones: Not yet.

Paula Silverthau: Okay. That will be done shortly so that you won't need to worry about conversations you have in your capacity as members of the NANC. But it's not like an individual tag on you personally. For example, if you represent a communications company and you're talking to a commissioner about the NANC recommendations, that would be exempt. But then if the conversation veers into my company or my association proposes a little tweak on what the NANC did, then that individual part of your communication would just be subject to the normal ex parte rules. But as long as you're wearing the NANC hat, you don't have to worry about filing anything.

And when we put up these exemption notices, we provide that before the Commission would rely on any communication made by any of you as NANC members. The commission would take care of posting an ex parte notice in the record so that people would have notice of it and it would cure any of those kinds of issues. If you have questions about that, just let me know later on and we can work through it.

The final point I would make is that occasionally, well, frequently we have differences of opinion between different

people on our working groups or in the full NANC. Once we had a situation in which a person who is like a vice chair of a working group published something in a communications journal giving their view on the issue - which happened to be the minority view for that working group - and they signed it John Smith, chairman of the FCC Working Group on whatever it was, which made the world think that that was the official view of the working group and the official view of that advisory committee.

Just a little note. It's fine if you want to express your individual views and do an op-ed or whatever you want to do, but please make sure to identify that opinion as the opinion of you individually as opposed to something that suggests inadvertently that it was the opinion of the full working group for the NANC. That tends to not happen with this group, but I just mentioned it because it's happened once before. And that's it. Does anyone have questions about any of that stuff? No? Yeah.

Rob: Hi. Thank you. On the surveys, I'm assuming that the restriction pertains to surveys of the public and not surveys within the say broader NANC. Is that correct?

Paula Silverthau: That's an interesting question. I would need to double check with our PRA people because it could be that if you even -- it sort of depends on how it's worded. So if you're asking for general opinions on something from members of the NANC, that's probably fine because it's probably not

even a survey. But if it were in the form of a questionnaire and you were sending it to people to get their organizational views, I'd be concerned it might trigger the PRA. I don't really know. I will track that. I will get an answer for you on that point.

Rob: Thank you.

Male Voice: May I ask a clarification. Rob, are you referring to something that's essentially polling the membership of NANC as opposed to a survey?

Rob: Yes. Polling the membership at the NANC really. To me, sometimes there's not a very clear distinction between an informal poll and a survey. I cannot think of an immediate example, a live example. But for instance, when we were working on the National Suicide Hotline Improvement Act, several times we discussed the potential need for more information possibly through surveys. And then at one point AIRS - the Alliance of Information Referral Systems, I think it is - had offered to perform a survey of its membership that was relevant to the recommendations potentially for the National Suicide Hotline Improvement Act N11 code issue.

That's the history and I'm confident we were fully within the bounds. But I can envision potentially other situations because we're dealing with issues that are so broad sometimes and we don't have all the answers. And information is so important to us in making our recommendations.

Paula Silverthau: Okay. I'll try to get some parameters on that. I'll run it by the PRA experts. But that's an important question for you to get your hands in. It might even end up with a phone call so that they could get more details from you about how that might arise here.

Rob: Thank you.

Paula Silverthau: Sure.

Jennifer McKee: Chris, do you have a question?

Chris Drake: Yeah. I have a question about the DFO on all correspondence must be approving all agendas and be in all meetings in the sense that from time to time there is a desire by a subset of a working group to -- perhaps they're the engineers or perhaps they're the lawyers but they're going to go do their own thing. The other half doesn't understand the language and wants them to just go do it and come back with the consensus. In that case of carving out to get a more deeper discussion and a consensus from a particular demographic, engineering or legal or otherwise, does that require the same level of DFOs attending that, DFOs approving the scope of the discussion on that, et cetera, et cetera?

Paula Silverthau: If it's an informal carve out. I mean this is the way I look at it. If it's an informal carve out, like you have ten people who are on the working group but you assign five people, it's everyone agrees, oh, these five people, they're great writers or they know the most about it. They're going to go sort of off informally and work on some sort of

draft or create a small document. I think that piece of it, those sort of informal less than the full working group, if it's sort of like spontaneous would not require the attendance of Marilyn at all of those meetings.

If it was a more formalized structure so that -- I know that the NANC is so large, that you had 20 people on the working group and that working group divided itself into very specific subgroups. They're going to meet and debate and sort of do a lot more than drafting. Then I'd say that's a more formal structure and we should hurry up and get some more liaisons to be able to be at those meetings.

Chris Drake: Thank you.

Jennifer McKee: Did you have a question there?

Matthew Gerst: Hi. Matt Gerst from CTIA. I have a question about collaboration tools. We use them in the working groups, particularly for the Interoperable Video Calling working group that we worked under the last NANC and I presume for the next one. There's a desire to have a tool in which the working group could collaborate in real time on documents. This is pretty standard practice in most organizations now. It's never been totally clear to me from a FACA perspective what the FCC's expectations are of those types of tools.

In addition to that, for this particular working group, it is a tool that needs to be accessible to people with disabilities. So the question then becomes are there an approved set of tools that the FCC has looked at and said, yes, these are the tools

that we would recommend that a working group use if they want to share and collaborate on documents. I think we found the answer by working with the Commission staff very helpfully. But it would be helpful I think from an administrator perspective if there was a list of pre-approved tools and resources that working groups could use that we knew met the Commission's expectations.

Paula Silverthau: Understood. I don't believe that there is a pre-approved list, but I was just on an email chain last week in which there was a reference to certain tools that were commonly used by the Commission and could be modified. So what I could do is work with Darice and those people and Marilyn. We could try to see what are the tools that are available within the FCC and also accessible to people with disabilities that we can offer. Or if you know in advance that there is a particular tool obviously that you'd like to use that's even better, then please just bring it to Marilyn. They'll sort of work with it from our perspective. Is that right? I don't think there's a list. I don't think there's a formal list.

Darice Gamble: Hello, good morning. My name is Darice Gamble. I'm here on behalf of OMD and PERM to talk about record keeping responsibilities as it pertains to FACA records specifically. The Federal Advisory Committee records are maintained in accordance with the General Record Schedule 6.2. It's got the actual schedules that outline the types of records that are to be kept. But, as Paula mentioned, as far as the National

Archives is concerned, they just want to make sure that the information is documented and accessible. They're permanent records, so eventually they get transferred to the National Archives. I work with Marilyn to make sure that happens. The schedule itself is media neutral, meaning that the retention period applies to all the records, all the information no matter what the format is - whether it's paper, whether it's audio/visual recordings or electronic.

Moving forward, the National Archives has implemented a deadline to go electronic. They will not be taking any paper records after December 31, 2022. All that means for you guys is that from a record keeping perspective, it's making sure that the DFO has a complete and accurate record of all documents of the committee's deliberations and decisions that were made. Again, just to reiterate, as long as you make sure that the DFO is copied or that the NANC mailbox is copied on all of the pertinent information, then you're in the clear. If you have any questions, let myself know or Marilyn.

Paula Silverthau: One other thing relating to it, again I don't think it comes up too much with this particular group, but if there are communications you have or documents you want to share that you feel are proprietary, privileged in any way, et cetera, please mark them as such and check the FCC rules on confidential information because we would need to -- otherwise, everything is open and available and could be subject to a FOIA request. So if you do have something you think is proprietary

to your organization or company, as I said, check the rules, mark it. In that way we can try to provide some FOIA protection. Also the archives will know be for that same purpose.

Darice Gamble: Yes. And just for clarification, OMD is the Office of the Managing Director and PERM is the Performance Evaluation and Records Management office. Toni McGowan is the agency records officer for the FCC.

Jennifer McKee: Thank you. Do you have any questions for Darice on the record keeping part of it? No? Seeing none, why don't we take a short break? We'll recess until about 11:30, and then we'll get started again. Thanks everybody.

[Break]**

OVERVIEW OF NATIONWIDE NUMBER PORTABILITY

Jennifer McKee: Okay, everybody, we'll get started again. We're doing a good job speeding along here, so let's keep things on track. Now we're going to have a presentation from one of the liaisons for the Nationwide Number Portability Working Group, Jesse Goodwin. He's going to provide us some overview of what's going on within the NNP Commission. Thanks, Jesse.

Jesse Goodwin: Hi everyone. I am a liaison, as said, for NNP. The following is just a summary of the work that has been done on NNP and a little bit of info about some of the different options had been looked at.

The NANC NNP Working Group has defined nationwide number portability as the ability of users of telecommunications services to retain existing telecommunications numbers without impairment of quality, reliability, or convenience when switching from one telecommunications carrier to another or when moving from one physical location to another.

In a charge letter dated July 3, 2018, the Commission directed the NANC to explore both Non-Geographic Local Routing Number - now Internet Protocol local routing number - and National Location Routing Number solutions for implementing NNP.

Currently a complete NNP does not exist. Local Number Portability architecture relies on the use of location routing numbers to identify a service provider's switch that serves the ported number. LRNs, however, are limited to a geographic area known as a local access and transport area restricting the ability of consumers to port a telephone number to a LATA other than their own.

In October 2017 the Commission released a notice of proposed rulemaking and notice of inquiry. The NOI sought comment on the best way to develop, deploy, and ensure NNP.

The commission sought NANC's recommendations on four models identified by ATIS. (1) Nationwide implementation of LRNs. (2) Non-geographic LRNs. (3) Commercial agreements. And (4) iconectiv's GR-2982 CORE specification.

The commission then issued a charge letter in December 2017 directing the NANC to determine which of the four models was

preferred. Specify in detail potential costs, benefits, and barriers to implementation. Identify consequences for routing, interconnection, or public safety. Recommend next steps to advance NNP and make any other recommendations necessary to achieve NNP.

In June 2018 the NNP released its report. In July 2018 the Commission issued a charge letter that narrowed down the options to Non-Geographic Local Routing Number and National Location Routing Number. The commission directed the NANC to: (1) Provide an analysis of the technical requirements for NGLRN. (2) Provide analysis of the technical requirements for adopting a National Location Routing Number. (3) Specify in detail the potential costs and benefits of the NLRN and NGLRN proposals. (4) Recommend next steps the Commission and industry should take.

In a report delivered on May 2019, the NANC evaluated how the two proposals stacked up but did not reach a consensus. The report compared the requirements and costs and benefits of each approach. The NANC could not reach a consensus in the timeframe provided and recommended that the impacts of interconnection, compensation, tariffs, and access charges be further investigated. A minority report recommended that NLRN is the only viable solution.

Internet Protocol Location Routing Numbers, aka The Non-Geographic Local Routing Number option, maintains current LNP architecture. However, a new process will be implemented using

IP-enabled switches or third party IP networks that act as gateways. IPLRN would not discriminate between wireless and wireline telephone numbers and may work for both. It has two main elements, one or more new non-geographic area codes, and administrative processes to provide service providers with their own unique IPLRNs specifically and uniquely for NNP; and VoIP nodes functioning as IP network entry points that host IPLRNs and provide interconnectivity to service providers that port NNP telephone numbers.

And the National Location Routing Number option. This model supports national number portability using the existing LRNs, permits telephone numbers to be ported beyond current LATA boundaries. The report noted that such an approach allows service providers without a nationwide footprint to serve customers who have left the rate center or LATA associated with their NPA NXX.

And here's our contact information. Again I'm Jesse Goodwin. The other liaison is Janice Gorin. So does anyone have any questions, comments?

Jennifer McKee: Some questions? Seeing none, Marilyn, do we have a charge letter for this working group?

Marilyn Jones: Yes, we do. This is Marilyn, the DFO. For the NNP Working Group, the Wireline would like to thank you with the NANC for your additional findings on the Nationwide Number Portability of May 13, 2019. The work of the NANC and the NNP Working Group continues to bring us closer to realizing the

promise of NNP. We're interested in further developing a solution for NNP and are encouraged by the progress made by the NANC as expressed in the report and seek for the NANC to continue its work.

Based on our review of the NANC's recommendation and other information, we request the NANC to develop more specific recommendations regarding what the NANC describes in the report as Internet Protocol Local Routing Number solutions.

Specifically we direct the NANC to analyze the likely effects of the IPLRN solution including, as to interconnection, carrier expenses relating to database DIP cost and the transport cost and consumer expectations regarding toll charges and state and federal tariffs for retail and wholesale services. Recommend a path forward to implement the IPLRN solution including specifically providing recommendations as to the necessary series of steps, including the estimated time each step would take, and implementing the IPLRN solution to the extent to which commercial solutions can serve as a substitute for IPLRN solution for smaller carriers including the cost of such solutions.

We also direct the NANC to determine whether the IPLRN solution should be modified in light of any development since the report was issued and the conclusions reached with regard to number one, and how to address the objections and concerns raised in the minority report accompanying the report. We further direct the NANC to provide a written report on its findings on these

issues and to transmit their report to the Wireline Competition Bureau by July 29, 2020. The NNP Working Group must submit its recommended report to the full NANC no later than June 28, 2020 to allow for its consideration by all NANC members. If you have questions about this referral, please contact me at your earliest convenience.

Jennifer McKee: Great. Thank you very much, Marilyn. Thanks, Jesse, for the presentation.

OVERVIEW OF CALL AUTHENTICATION TRUST ANCHOR

Jennifer McKee: Next up we have the Call Authentication Trust Anchor Working Group. We're going to have the liaison, CJ Ferraro, who is going to come in and give us a presentation on the work that's going on at the Commission.

CJ Ferraro: Thank you everyone. As the chair said, my name is CJ Ferraro. I'm one of the liaisons for the CATA Working Group, along with my colleague, Annick Banoun. I'm just going to give a brief overview of the work that's been done so far and what to expect going forward.

Some brief background that I think a lot of you are already familiar with. SHAKEN/STIR is an industry developed system to authenticate caller ID. It mitigates spoofing and illegal robocalling. As Rich said in his introduction, the SIP Forum had an identical role in creating it, so I certainly want to acknowledge his contribution. The acronyms themselves stand for the Secure Telephone Identity Revisited. Then SHAKEN is the Signature-based Handling of Asserted Information using

toKENS. Kind of a basic way to -- if you have to interact, it's that the SHAKEN procedures use the STIR protocols to allow communication service providers to attest to the legitimacy of that calling party's number.

Under the previous charter, the CATA Working Group did a lot. They prepared a report outlining the functional elements, selection process, and the characteristics for two of the governance components of the SHAKEN/STIR system in addition to outlining some milestones, metrics, and incentives for participation.

The full NANC approved this report and Chairman Pai accepted the NANC's recommendations. Since then, industry's been working to stand up the governance system. Today the governance system will be active and Brent Struthers from ATIS will give out a brief update on that after my presentation.

Before he comes up here, I do want to acknowledge the hard work that he in particular has done and ATIS on the Governance Authority. We talk to them regularly as they've been setting up this process and we know a lot of the hard work he does.

Some recent FCC action. In June of 2019 the Commission adopted a notice of proposed rulemaking that proposed requiring more service providers to implement SHAKEN/STIR and to implement the framework if major providers do not by the end of the year.

Chairman Pai is still evaluating the industry's progress and, while he has seen great process being made, he still would like more work to be done before the end of the year. At the

chairman's direction, the staff had begun work on an order to implement SHAKEN/STIR based on the NPRM if he decides it's needed.

The Commission is keeping a close eye on Congressional developments. As was noted earlier, the House passed the TRACED Act at the beginning of the month which has a significant portion of it on call authentication. So we're eagerly waiting to see any updates on that front.

As far as new charges go, the Commission is working to develop them. We know that CATA's work under the previous charter was instrumental to the system. So we want to make sure we're best taking advantage of the expertise and knowledge of the working group. Basically we just want to make sure we're asking the right questions, so those are still being worked on.

This is our contact information. I'm happy to take any questions. If there aren't any, I'll turn it over to Brent to give an update. Great. Thank you.

Jennifer McKee: Great. Thanks, CJ.

Brent Struthers: Good morning. Since this is a written transcript, I just want the transcript to show that I did not leave the house without forgetting my suit jacket today because I was in a rush. Thank you.

All right. Well, CJ kind of stole my thunder there. We did go live this morning at 8:00 AM. We have had service providers and CAs working to register already this morning. So far so good. We sent a press release out on this last week. I

actually brought a few copies. I put them on the back table. I know you all don't do paper anymore, but I just can't help that my dad use to run a lumber company.

Service providers can now register as of this morning. Like I said, we've got a few of them doing it. We've got two initial CAs, certificate authorities. Those are the authorities that will be approved to assign certificates to service providers. Those certificates are what the service providers will actually use to sign their calls to authenticate the caller ID. It's a digital certificate and it says, hey, I'm a service provider, I originated this call and this number has not been spoofed essentially.

So we've got two of those providers, Neustar and TransNexus. That will be up as soon as the carriers are registered and ready to request certificates. We've got a final STIR/SHAKEN implementation report coming out in January. I'll provide the NANC an update later on that. We'll make that available to the general industry.

Now that our Governance Authority has got a focus on what's next, what's next initially is outreach and education to generally the industry to make sure folks know that it's there and it's ready for them to register and implement.

Development of further STI-GA policies. Well, we're not done. There's a lot of issues that we've got the system turned up. But there's a lot of other issues that are going to come up including TDM implementation. What do we do with those? What

do we do with enterprises that might like certificates?

There's a lot of different policies that will be addressed by the GA board. Of course we follow the group, that's the IP-NNI Working Group. That's run by ATIS and joined by the SIP Forum. So we keep up on all that and make sure we're following the technical work they're doing. But the policies, we'll then follow up on that work.

Any questions? Oh, I'm sorry. I guess I should just show you the website. If you all need the link for the website, it's right there. Now, I will tell you that if you hit that link before, as a number of providers did after we announced this at SIPNOC, you might want to clear your Internet cache because it might take you to the wrong place or a non-functioning website. So the website's up and running. It's been used this morning. And that is it. I guess I'll just leave that up there.

Jennifer McKee: Great. Anybody have any questions? No?

Thank you very much. Next up.

**DISCUSSION OF THE NORTH AMERICAN
PORTABILITY MANAGEMENT LLC REPORT**

Jennifer McKee: So we have Tim Kagele who's on the phone, I think. Are you on the phone, Tim?

Tim Kagele: Yes, I am Madam Chair.

Jennifer McKee: Great. Okay. You're co-chair of the North American Portability Management LLC. If you would like to give us a little bit of an overview of the group's report.

Tim Kagele: Yes. Thank you very much. Good afternoon or good morning, ladies and gentlemen. As Madam Chair said, my name is Tim Kagele for Comcast. I am one of the co-chairs for the North American Portability Management LLC. I share that role with my colleague from AT&T, Teresa Patton. We're happy to present the following report on behalf of the NAPM.

For statements of work and amendments, the following SOWs or amendments have either been reviewed or approved.

Statement of Work 8 which modifies certain non-service impacting deliverable dates by the vendor was approved.

Statement of Work 24 which implements NANC Change Orders 472 - audit discrepancy report for CMIP mismatch attributes; NANC 528 - transition related GDMO/ASN.1/XSD updates to CMIP and updates certain features that were sunset by other change orders.

Lastly, NANC Change Order 543 which is vendor certification and regression test plan. That was approved.

Also under SOW 25, implements NANC Change Orders 403, 531, 533, 537, 538, 541, and 549. That was also approved.

Our Contract Implementation Committee or CIC as always in partnership with our vendor iconectiv, reviewed eight findings' reports for Providers of Telecommunications Related Services or PTRS users to validate the need for NPAC data access.

Then under general information, the annual election of officers took place at the NAPM's annual meeting in November. Tim Kagele was re-elected as co-chair for a two-year term. That term started in November. For treasurer, Joy McConnell-Couch

with CenturyLink was re-elected to a one-year term. And secretary, Laura Dalton with Verizon was re-elected to a one-year term.

Finally, the NAPM LLC did approve its 2020/2021 operating budget. Let me pause there and see if there are any questions. Jennifer McKee: None in the room that I'm seeing, Tim.

Thanks.

Tim Kagele: Okay. Great. Madam Chair, just a couple of facts for the group. General information. This is for the 11th month period for 2019, so January through November. The iconectiv NPAC performed over 273 million porting and pooling. Routing updates for individual telephone numbers in 2019, the NPAC currently maintains routing information for over 830 million telephone numbers which is an increase of 37 million telephone numbers in 2019. Year-to-date, the NPAC achieved greater than the contractually committed 99.99 production scheduled service availability.

This information was shared in a previous report, but this is just a reminder. The new iconectiv NPAC conducted its first annual customer survey and received a 4.08 out of 5 score. Overall the new NPAC is performing and continues to perform exceptionally well post-transition from the previous vendor. With that, I will close and happy to take any questions if there are.

Jennifer McKee: Great. Thank you very much, Tim. Does anybody have any questions on that report? No? Seeing none,

you answered all the questions anybody could think of, Tim.
Great job.

Tim Kagele: Great. Thank you. Next time I'll be there in person.

**OVERVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NATIONAL SUICIDE HOTLINE
IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2018, WC DOCKET NO. 18-336,
NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING**

Jennifer McKee: Moving along in our agenda then, we will hear from Celia Lewis and Michelle Sclater - the subject matter experts from the Wireline Competition Bureau - about implementation of the National Suicide Hotline Improvement Act of 2018 and the notice of proposed rulemaking that was just voted on by the Commission just last week. So Celia and Michelle.

Celia Lewis: Thanks. Good morning everyone. Let's start off. We're going to be discussing the implementation of the National Suicide Hotline Act of 2018 and the most recent NPRM. Some background. The rapid access to suicide prevention and mental health crisis intervention services has never been more critical for Americans. Since 2008, suicide has ranked as the tenth leading cause of death for all ages in the United States. Suicide rates are higher across various at-risk populations including veterans and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer - the LGBTQ communities. More than 20 veterans die by suicide every day. In between 2008 and 2016 there were more than 6,000 veteran suicides each year. LGBTQ youth

contemplates suicide at a rate almost three times higher than heterosexual youth, and more than 500,000 LGBTQ youth will attempt suicide this year.

Suicide rates are also higher in rural America. In 2017 the suicide rate for the most rural counties was 1.8 times the rate for the most urban counties in the country. The CDC also reports that suicide is the second most common cause of death among teenagers and young adults. In 2017 the rate of suicide by teenage girls hit a 40-year high. In between 1999 and 2014 the rate of suicide committed by girls ages 10 to 14 tripled. A recent study also found that self-reported suicide attempts among black teens increased by 73 percent between 1991 and 2017.

The federal government has already established a National Suicide Prevention Lifeline, 1-800-273-8255 or 1-800-273-TALK. In recognition of the need to improve access to that potentially life-saving resource, Congress passed the National Suicide Hotline Improvement Act of 2018. That statute tasked the Commission with examining and reporting on the technical feasibility of designating a shorter number, a simple easy to remember three-digit dialing code for a national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline.

Under its previous charter, the NANC studied three options for designating a three-digit code to be used for a national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline system.

(1) Expanding an existing N11 code. (2) Repurposing an existing N11 code. (3) Using a new non-N11 code.

The NANC report recommended expanding the 211 code beyond providing community services to include crisis and suicide prevention services. However, the NANC also recommended that if a single purpose code is preferred, a new three-digit dialing code - preferably 988 - could be deployed for the use of a national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline.

In its August 14, 2019 report to Congress, the FCC's Wireline Competition Bureau and Office of Economics and Analytics agreed with the NANC's recommendation of 988 as a single purpose new three-digit dialing code for a national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline. The report recommended that the Commission initiate a rulemaking to designate a three-digit dialing code for a national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline system, and that the Commission consider designating 988 as the dialing code.

I will pass it on to Michelle Sclater to talk about the notice of proposed rulemaking.

Michelle Sclater: Hello everyone. As was mentioned, Thursday we adopted a notice of proposed rulemaking. Consistent with our August 9, 2019 report, the notice of proposed rulemaking proposed to designate a three-digit dialing code for a national suicide and mental health crisis hotline. It also proposed to designate 988 as that three-digit dialing code that would

direct callers to the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline, and that within 18 months all telecommunications carriers and interconnected VoIP service providers transmit calls initiated by dialing 988 to the current toll-free access number for the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline.

Based on the findings and the reports that were filed with the Commission and the record compiled for the FCC staff report, the lifeline would be more effective in preventing suicides and providing crisis intervention if it were accessible via a simple easy to remember three-digit code.

So why 988? The notice proposes the following reasons for choosing 988 over an N11 code. First, it's a unique three-digit code that obviates the need to age an existing N11 code and should therefore reduce overall implementation timeline. The consumer education campaigns for a unique three-digit code would be simpler and likely more effective than those necessary for repurposing or expanding use of an existing N11 code.

A wholly and unique three-digit code would be less disruptive to existing users and service providers. In particular, several of the existing N11 codes discussed in the record are in heavy use. To expand or repurpose any of the N11 codes will require significant work and resources.

Also 988 is technically less complicated than other unique three-digit dialing codes. Because 988 is not currently assigned as a geographic area code, it would not suffer the same problems surrounding repurposing an existing code.

Timeline and routing. The notice proposes requiring that within 18 months all telecommunications carriers and interconnected VoIP providers implement 988 by transmitting calls initiated by dialing 988 to the current toll-free access number for the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline. The notice proposes to route calls to the current toll-free access number because, by using an existing infrastructure, we believe it's likely to be faster and more cost-effective than the alternatives of either setting up a new routing database or entering local translations as is used for 911 calls.

The notice seeks comment on how to address areas that both use seven-digit dialing and where 988 is in use as an NXX code. In such areas, a switch would need to distinguish between calls made to a suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline and the assigned 988 central office code. The notice seeks comment on several potential solutions including introducing a dialing delay after 988 is entered or mandating ten-digit dialing in those areas. The notice also seeks comment on issues pertaining to ubiquitous nationwide deployment of 988 and assesses the benefits and costs of designating and implementing 988.

So here's mine and Celia's contact information. We look forward to a robust record on this issue and it will be released soon. It has to be published in the *Federal Register* and then we'll have a 30-day comment period and another 30 days

for replies. So hopefully you can enjoy your Christmas break and then hit us hard in January. Thank you.

Jennifer McKee: Great. Thank you very much. Does anybody have any questions for Michelle and Celia on the presentation? No? Okay. Thank you. I appreciate it. I think coming around now are the charge letters' copies for everyone.

Male Voice: This is belated, but I have a question. In the main report on this, there is a Section 8 on cost-benefit analysis. The things that you're presenting there on your last slide are kind of qualitative reasons why 988 might be more effective without the cost part of it than other approaches. Was there actually any cost-benefit or not that tried to quantify the --

Celia Lewis: Yes. In our NPRM, there is a cost-benefit analysis in there. I'm sure people will chime in with their thoughts on how we did that and whether or not they think that is the correct way to do it.

Male Voice: Thank you.

Jennifer McKee: Okay. We have no other questions.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS AND PARTICIPATION/OTHER BUSINESS -
UPCOMING NANC MEETINGS**

Jennifer McKee: I think the next thing on our agenda is we will turn to any public comments or participation that we have from anyone. Would anyone like to address the council? No one? Don't be shy. Okay. I don't see anybody jumping up to address us.

So I guess we will talk about, I think Marilyn already mentioned the upcoming meeting dates. But just so everyone has them and can get them on their calendars for 2020, we'll have a scheduled conference call on January 13th at 2:00 PM. Then, after that, we'll have another one that will also be a conference call. That would be February 13th, one month later, also at 2:00 PM.

Adjourn

Jennifer McKee: I think that concludes our agenda for today. We've sped along. We can give you back some time and everyone can go out and enjoy the beautiful D.C. December day that we have out there. Thank you very much. I'd enjoy working with all of you going forward. Thanks.