

**North American Numbering Council
Meeting Transcript
December 15, 2011 (Final)**

I. Time and Place of Meeting. The North American Numbering Council (NANC) held a meeting commencing at 9:30 a.m., at the Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W., TW-C305, Washington, D. C.

II. List of Attendees.

Voting Council Members:

- | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Hon. Betty Ann Kane | NANC Chairman (NARUC – DC) |
| 2. Hon. Geoffrey G. Why | NANC Co-Chairman (NARUC – MA) |
| 3. Hank Hultquist | AT&T Inc. |
| 4. Mary Retka | CenturyLink |
| 5. Valerie Cardwell | Comcast Corporation |
| 6. Karen Reidy | CompTel |
| 7. Suzanne Howard/Beth O'Donnell | Cox Communications, Inc. |
| 8. Michael Altschul | CTIA – The Wireless Association |
| 9. David Greenhaus | 800 Response Information Services |
| 10. Hon. Paul Kjellander | NARUC - Idaho |
| 11. Hon. Sara Kyle | NARUC – Tennessee |
| 12. Wayne Jortner | NASUCA |
| 13. Thomas Dixon | NASUCA |
| 14. Jerome Candelaria | NCTA |
| 15. John McHugh | OPASTCO |
| 16. Rosemary Emmer | Sprint Nextel |
| 17. Anna Miller/Natalie McNamer | T-Mobile USA, Inc. |
| 18. Thomas Soroka, Jr. | USTA |
| 19. Kevin Green | Verizon |
| 20. Brendan Kasper | Vonage |
| 21. Tiki Gaugler | XO Communications |

Special Members (Non-voting):

John Manning	NANPA
Amy Putnam	PA

Faith Marcotte
Jean-Paul Emard

Welch & Company
ATIS

Commission Employees:

Marilyn Jones, Designated Federal Officer (DFO)
Michelle Sclater, Alternate DFO
Deborah Blue, Special Assistant to the DFO
Ann Stevens, Deputy Chief, Competition Policy Division
Sanford Williams, Competition Policy Division
Gary Remondino, Competition Policy Division

III. Estimate of Public Attendance. Approximately 30 members of the public attended the meeting as observers.

IV. Documents Introduced.

- (1) Agenda
- (1A) NANC Meeting Dates for 2012
- (2) NANC Meeting Transcript – September 15, 2011
- (3) North American Numbering Plan Administration (NANPA) Report to the NANC
- (4) National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator (PA) Report to the NANC
- (5) Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG) Report
- (6) Billing and Collection Agent Report
- (7) Billing and Collection Working Group (B&C WG) Report to the NANC
- (8) North American Portability Management (NAPM) LLC Report to the NANC
- (9) Report of the LNPA Selection Working Group (SWG)
- (10) Local Number Portability Administration Working Group (LNPA WG) Status Report to the NANC
- (11) Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report to the NANC
- (12) Future of Numbering (FoN) Working Group Report to the NANC
- (13) State Commission Staff Numbering Concerns Related to the FCC’s Universal Service-Intercarrier Compensation Order and FNPRM

V. Table of Contents.

1. Announcements and Recent News	6
2. Approval of Meeting Transcript from September 15, 2011	8

3. Report of the North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA)	8
4. Report of the National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator (PA)	14
5. Report of the Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG)	18
6. Report from the North American Numbering Plan Billing and Collection (NANP B&C) Agent	21
7. Report of the Billing and Collection Working Group (B&C WG)	23
8. North American Portability Management (NAPM) LLC Report	25
9. Implementation of FCC Order on LNPA Selection Process	26
10. Report of the Local Number Portability Administration Working Group (LNPA WG)	31
11. Status of the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) activities	37
12. Report of the Future of Numbering Working Group (FoN WG)	40
13. State Commission Staff Numbering Concerns Related to the FCC's Universal Service-Intercarrier Compensation Order and FNPRM	45
14. Summary of Action Items	53
15. Public Comments and Participation (five minutes per speaker)	54
16. Other Business	58

VI. Summary of the Meeting.

CHAIRMAN KANE: If we could come to order. Good morning. Everyone can take their seats either at the table or in the audience. We will call to order the meeting of the North American Numbering Council.

For the record, today is Thursday, December 15, 2011. It is 9:37 a.m., and we are

meeting in the hearing room of the Federal Communications Commission at 445 12th Street, S.W., in Washington D.C.

I'm Betty Ann Kane, the Chairman of the NANC.

A couple of housekeeping items. Although this is a communications organization, let's have all the wireless devices on vibrate.

And also remember when you put your card up to be recognized to speak because this is being recorded and also because we have people on the phone who are listening I believe, the controller of the microphones needs to switch on your microphone before you speak, so don't speak right away, pause, count to ten and then speak.

I've got my cell phone on vibrate in my pocket because I'm waiting for my plumber to call. That's the only thing I would interrupt anything for.

Let us first go around and do the names again so that the person recording this and doing the transcript will know who is here. I'll start to my left with my co-chairman.

COMMISSIONER WHY: Jeff Why from Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Cable.

MR. HULTQUIST: Hank Hultquist with AT&T.

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka, CenturyLink.

MS. CARDWELL: Valerie Cardwell, Comcast.

MR. ALTSCHUL: Michael Altschul representing CTIA.

MR. GREENHAUS: David Greenhaus, 800 Response.

MS. HALL: Carolee Hall, Idaho staff.

MS. KYLE: Sara Kyle, Tennessee.

MR. MCHUGH: John McHugh, OPASTCO.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel.

MS. MCNAMER: Natalie McNamer, T-Mobile. Also Anna Miller with T-Mobile.

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

MR. GREEN: Kevin Green, Verizon.

MR. KASPER: Brendan Kasper, Vonage.

MS. GAUGLER: Tiki Gaugler, XO.

MS. JONES: Marilyn Jones, FCC.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And do we have anyone on the phones?

MR. CANDELARIA: Jerome Candelaria, NCTA.

MS. O'DONNELL: Beth O'Donnell for Cox Communications. Suzanne Howard
is on her way.

MR. KJELLANDER: Paul Kjellander, Idaho Commission.

Mr. GOYETTE: This is David Goyette from the New Hampshire Commission.

MS. BEATON: Rebecca Beaton with the Washington Commission staff.

MR. HEPBURN: Christopher Hepburn, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission.

MS. HYMAN: Linda Hyman, NeuStar Pooling.

MR. CARPENTER: Jay Carpenter, 1-800 AFTA.

FEMALE SPEAKER:(Unintelligible) Sprint Nextel.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Is that Wayne Jortner from Maine?

MR. JORTNER: Wayne Jortner from the Maine Public Advocate with
NASUCA.

MR. DIXON: And Tom Dixon from the Colorado Office of the Consumer Council on behalf of NASUCA also.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you, thank you very much.

You have before you the agenda. I want to add one item to the agenda after number 12. We have an issue from the State Commission staff that Carolee Hall from Idaho is going to bring forward. We'll add that. Are there any other additions to the agenda that anyone has? Okay, then we'll proceed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND RECENT NEWS

On announcements and recent news, a couple of things. First, Rosemary, I think you want to introduce someone or say something.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. I would just like to make an announcement to the NANC that Sue Tiffany with Sprint Nextel is retiring after a good long time with Sprint. She has been with industry for many, many, many years, as long as I can remember.

She's chaired several working groups, subcommittees under the NANC, under ATIS, the Wireless Committee. She's just given us an unbelievable amount of advice and she's done so much work for the industry, and I would like to thank Sue on the record.

I would also like to encourage everyone in the room to perhaps send her a note and thank her as well. Her last day will be sometime in mid January and Scott Freiermuth who is part of the Government Affairs Organization Council will likely be in the alternate position going forward. We're trying to work through the paperwork and that kind of thing now. So thank you very much, Sue Tiffany.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you, and we send her our best. I'll send a note from the NANC group to her and wish her best in retirement.

Brent, I think you want to introduce someone.

MR. STRUTHERS: I hadn't plan on doing this but Brent Struthers with NeuStar and with me today we have a freshman from the University of Dartmouth and you can even say your name into the record.

MS. DIPAULO: Hi, I'm Sophia DiPaulo. I'm a freshman at Dartmouth College.

MR. STRUTHERS: And so we are teaching her about telecommunications and telling her exactly why she wants to go into energy instead. Thank you.

(LAUGHTER)

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much. We like to encourage young people to learn about the wonderful world of numbering.

Another item in announcements, I just want to set the meeting dates for 2012. I had sent out earlier last month the proposed dates and asked for feedback.

What we heard back was that the first date that I proposed for our 2012 meeting which was March 15th doesn't work for a lot of people. There's some other event going on. The other dates were okay from the vast majority.

So we've checked with the FCC and March 22nd, the week after the 15th, the original date, works so without objection we'll look at March 22nd, June 7th, September 20th, and December 13th for our quarterly meetings for 2012. Those are all Thursdays. Okay, March 22nd, June 7th, September 20th, and December 13th and we can all plan ahead and

hope the FCC doesn't plan to have meetings on those days but so far it looked clear and that's a good time.

APPROVAL OF MEETING TRANSCRIPT

Next item is Item 2 on our agenda which is the approval of the transcript from the September 15th meeting. Has everyone had a chance to look at that? Are there any additions or corrections to the transcript? If not, I'll assume that by unanimous consent that transcript is approved.

REPORT OF THE NORTH AMERICAN NUMBERING PLAN

ADMINISTRATOR (NANPA)

Moving now to our reports, our first report is the report of the North American Numbering Plan Administrator or the NANPA and that is John Manning. We will put that into the minutes as Item 3.

And I should go back and say that the transcript will be Item 2 for these meeting minutes, and the dates, the scheduled meetings for 2012 will be Item 1.

MR. MANNING: Good morning, everybody. Again, my name is John Manning. I'm Director of the North American Numbering Plan Administration group.

Report this morning will review central office code as well as area code relief planning activities, update you a little bit about some of the change orders that we have pending, as well as some other NANPA news items.

Page two of the report gives you a review of CO code activity. Since the beginning of this year through November 30th, we've assigned 2,721 central office codes and 532 codes have been returned.

If you take those figures, you annualize them out. The chart on the top of that page indicates that for 2011 we're looking in the neighborhood of about 2,900 CO code assignments, approximately 975 denials, 557 returns, and net assignments in the neighborhood of around 2,300 to 2,400.

Making note of looking at these numbers compared to previous years, our 2011 total assignment numbers about the same as where we were last year and almost nearly identical for where we were back in 2008.

As far as returns, the quantity of returns is somewhat higher this year due to the fact that in May we had a single service provider. It was a paging entity that returned a fairly large sum of codes. If you were to factor those out of the numbers you would see that the quantity of returns, the reclamations is --

(Recording Interrupted)

MR. MANNING: -- Over what we experienced in 2010.

Any questions on the CO code numbers?

Okay, turning to relief planning, a couple of activities that have taken place since we last met. If you recall, back at the September NANC meeting, we were in the midst of beginning a process of looking at the Maryland 410/443 area code relief activity and since that meeting the industry has gotten together and developed an implementation plan for the new 667 area code which will be of course an overlay on top of 410/443. The effective date of that

new 667 area code will be March 24, 2012.

North Carolina 919, we are overlaying with the 984 area code. We have an effective date of the new 984 area code being on April 30, 2012. In October, October 1 specifically, they started the permissive dialing of seven and ten digit dialing with mandatory dialing at the end of March.

Finally, for the California 408 on October 20th, the California Public Utilities Commission approved an all services overlay relief for the 408 area code. Ten digit permissive dialing will begin on April 21, 2012, with mandatory dialing starting October 20, 2012, and the new 669 area code will be effective in November of next year.

Just some other relief activities to bring to your attention. September 30, 2011, I mentioned last time, Sint Maarten joined the NANP with the 721 area code. Mandatory dialing of that area code is not until September 30, of 2012.

In Pennsylvania the 717 area code, on December 1st the Pennsylvania Public Utilities Commission dismissed the relief petition that was filed by NANPA on behalf of the industry. They were citing that the new exhaust timeframe for the 717 area code is fourth quarter 2016. The original petition was filed back in 2009 when at that time the projected exhaust was third quarter of 2012.

Nebraska 402, this has been on my report for some time. This is the particular area code where they will start assignments out of the new area code 531 once the quantity of codes in the 402 area code reaches ten.

At the beginning of this month there were 31 available prefixes in the 402 so we can expect maybe over time, or about approximately one year or so we could see 531 prefixes

being assigned.

And finally on a non-geographic side, PCS NPA 544 has presently 61 codes available for assignment in that 5YY resource. Currently we have assigned 5YY NPAs of 500, 533, and 544. The next 5YY NPA will be the 566 NPA, and we expect those assignments to begin first quarter of next year.

Since we're at the end of 2011, I thought I would take a little look in terms of what we can expect in the first part of 2012. There are two activities that we look at.

In Texas first of all there is the Texas 512 NPA, projected to exhaust in second quarter of 2014. Relief planning was initiated on this particular area code back in 2000, but over time they've been able to delay the exhaust of the area code but at that particular time there was an agreement for concentrated overlay, meaning they were not going to overlay the entire 512 but a portion of the 512 in the Austin metropolitan area.

That plan was later suspended and NANPA has filed updated information with the Texas PUC and did that in January of 2010. The Texas PUC is currently looking at these alternatives and of course they are aware of the projected exhaust and will be making a decision sometime in the 2012 timeframe.

Also in Texas we have an overlay of 713/281/832. That NPA complex is projected to exhaust in first quarter 2015. There has been a petition on file for quite some time to do an additional overlay there. The Texas PUC has not had a need to act on that because the exhaust timeframe has continued to move out.

Two other relief activities, Kentucky 270 NPA --

(Recording Interrupted)

MR. MANNING: Projected exhaust first quarter 2015. We're going to expect to start NPA relief planning for that particular NPA in the first quarter of 2012. I have noted here that in December of 2010, a year ago, the Kentucky Public Service Commission vacated a previously ordered decision to implement a geographic split so they will have the opportunity again to take a look at that relief method.

And finally in Indiana 812, second quarter 2015 projected exhaust. The industry has been delaying the filing of the petition until certain benchmarks and milestones have been met.

The next time they'll look at whether or not they need to file that petition is after the April of 2012 NRUF is published and they want to look at it in terms of available quantities dropping to around 40 or less, the quantity of codes drops to 40 or less, and right now as of December 1, there were 50 codes available for assignment.

Page four, two other items I'll mention. Nevada, 702 NPA. For those of you who are familiar with Nevada that does include Las Vegas. That is projected to exhaust in second quarter 2015, and we expect to initiate relief planning in second quarter 2012.

And also on the horizon is area code 415 in California, the San Francisco area. Relief planning projected to start sometime in the third quarter of 2012.

That's a little look-see in terms of what we expect happening in 2012. Are there any questions on that?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Are there any questions from the folks on the phone?

MR. MANNING: The final two items I'll briefly cover. Number one, we have two change orders, NANPA change order 21 and NANPA change order 22.

At the last NANC meeting I reported that we had originally withdrawn our original NANPA change order 21 in order to examine some additional functionality that the NOWG, the Numbering Oversight Working Group asked us to examine. We did do that and in cooperation with them we were able to put together that added functionality, and we filed or resubmitted that change order on November 11 of this year.

Change order 22 is another change order that we had submitted at roughly the same time so those two were in the hopper with the FCC.

Now just yesterday NANPA did receive a contract modification from the FCC and that contract modification did a couple of things.

Number one, it extended our current contract which expires January 8, 2012, and they extended it an additional six months covering the period of January 9 through July 8, 2012.

The contract modification also approved NANPA change order 21 and NANPA change order 22. So that just happened within the last 24 to 48 hours.

Finally on other NANPA, NANPA news, say that real fast.

(LAUGHTER)

We did publish the October 2011 NPA and NANP exhaust projections. They were put out at the end of the month and notification was sent out to the industry as well as to the NANC.

And also over the past few weeks, NANPA has been conducting what we call NRUF refresher training, NRUF standing for Numbering Resource Utilization and Forecast reporting.

We've had three sessions where we have had service providers participate, and we had one

session dedicated to State Commissions, again, refreshing them on the capabilities of NRUF, the requirements, the system features and functionalities, and the various reporting capabilities within the system.

I'm happy to report that these sessions are quite popular. We had approximately 70 individuals from service providers participate representing approximately 60 companies and from a state perspective we had 20 individuals representing 16 states.

So it's good to see that both service providers and states do take the opportunity to refresh their memory on how the NAS - NANP Administration System - NRUF capabilities are available to them.

The final few pages are just again a summary of the status of the area codes exhausting in the next 36 months. It's there for your information.

That concludes my presentation. Are there any questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions for John? Okay, thank you very much.

MR. MANNING: All right, thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Good to hear that progress.

That's Item No. 3 for the meeting minutes.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL THOUSANDS-BLOCK POOLING ADMINISTRATOR (PA)

The next item on the agenda is the report of the National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator. Thank you, Amy.

MS. PUTNAM: Pooling is fine.

(LAUGHTER)

Actually pooling is quite fine. We are going to have a record year for Part 3's this year. In 2006 we had 127,965 Part 3's. That was our record before this year. At the end of November we already had 124,088 Part 3's.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Amy, could you refresh everyone's memory what a Part 3 is?

MS. PUTNAM: Every time we handle an application and do something with it we issue a Part 3 so it's the clearest evidence of the amount of work that goes into processing an application.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you.

MS. PUTNAM: I know that if you look at the Part 3 summary data down there it says 132,721 but if you recall, this is a running 12 month total so we have December of last year in that number so that's why it seems a little bit higher.

The charts on page three and page four are pretty self-evident.

On page five we have the reclamation summary. And pages five and six we have the pooling administration system performance. We're back on track with a 100 percent availability.

And moving to page seven, other pooling related activities... The first chart shows our contract reporting requirements.

With respect to contract modifications, it says that the FCC issued no contract modifications since the last meeting and that was correct until earlier this week when we received the contract modification approving change orders 21 and 22.

John mentioned that their change orders 21 and 22 were also approved, and I would

note that the timing of the implementation of those change orders will pretty much be dependent on NANPA because both systems have to be changed at the same time for those change orders.

With respect to delegated authority there is currently one petition for additional delegated authority pending before the FCC. Montana filed a petition on November 22nd for the 406 NPA.

And additional mandatory pooling in Mississippi 662 was implemented on September 5th.

P-ANI has been taking a lot of our time over the past few months, primarily continuing the reviewing, returning, revising, and processing the initial reports from the p-ANI users and assigners. That's actually 3-I sub 5 in that list of the things that we have there.

We would receive a report, review it for errors, omissions, and return it to the carriers for revision. The average number of returns per report is running at about four but we did have some that went into double digits.

We have loaded 89,000 assignee records to cross reference and verify them. Those are the records from the reports that finally came back in the right way.

And I'm actually pleased to say that of those 89,000 records only 600 ranges are overlapping or duplicative. Now this is just assignee records. We have not yet loaded the assignor records. We're waiting for one more assignor record and one that has been corrected, returned, and is waiting for the revision.

So with respect to assignee records alone, we have 600 ranges that are overlapping or duplicative and we'll be working with the carriers on those, then we'll add the assignor

records and cross reference, and that should also tell us whether all the --

(Recording Interrupted)

MS. PUTNAM: -- These have in fact given us records. So far as we know we have records from all assignees but we will find out.

We participated in our regular monthly meetings with the NOWG, and I also indicated with respect to that page, the correction on change orders 21 and 22 which have been approved.

The other activities that we've been involved in other than our regular day-to-day work from October 3rd through October 14 we made our internal annual performance survey available to our customers.

We got 107 surveys back, 24 of them were from state regulatory staff. This is down a little bit from 2010 but not a whole lot. There were 110 responses last year with 29 from state regulatory staff and our average overall score was 4.6 out of 5. We're very pleased with that.

We completed our annual disaster recovery testing during October. We failed the PAS environment over to the backup site and returned it, and we performed our annual database restoration testing and there was no impact on functionality during the tests. The system was available at all times.

We conducted a regulatory training earlier this week. We had 14 state staff attending and we reviewed the public and protective sides of PAS so that the regulatory staff can move around the web site comfortably.

On November 11th, we offered similar training to users just to make sure that there wasn't anything about the videos that people were dissatisfied with because as you know, we have a

number of training videos on the site. We had no takers on the user side for training so we can argue that the videos are doing a great job which I would prefer because the alternative is that you're not interested.

(LAUGHTER)

And that's it. Thank you very much. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions. Amy, just one thing on this process of looking at the overlapping or duplicative records. What is the implication of that, the reason for that?

MS. PUTNAM: That somebody reported something wrong or that somebody self-assigned something that someone else had. There are numerous possibilities but it shouldn't be so we will either correct them by making sure that what was reported was correct or if multiple carriers are using the same ranges, they'll have to work out between themselves who is going to move to another range.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you. And we will put your report into the record as Item 4.

REPORT OF THE NUMBERING OVERSIGHT WORKING GROUP

(NOWG)

And returning to the agenda, the next number is a report of the Numbering Oversight Working Group, the NOWG.

MS. ZAHN: Good morning. My name is Gwen Zahn. I work for Verizon Wireless. I'm a co-chair of the NOWG along with Laura Dalton from Verizon

Communications and Natalie McNamer from T-Mobile.

First up on the agenda are the 2011 NANPA and PA performance surveys. We have done some slight grooming on the surveys and have finalized them and would like to ask the NANC to approve the surveys for 2011, and I have them here along with the cover letters.

Our goal is to deploy the surveys electronically. Users can download them online or they can complete the survey in an online format as well. We're still working on finalizing the online format so we don't have URL yet for that, but we'll share that with the users once we deploy the surveys.

We'll present the drafts to the FCC in May and then the formal presentations at the June NANC meeting.

Next on the agenda are the outstanding NANPA and PA change orders. As both John and Amy noted, there's an update to this slide. We have change orders 21 and 22 which were listed as pending but recently were approved by the FCC.

The implementation dates have yet to be determined for the bulk of the outstanding change orders but again as Amy noted, 21 and 22 will likely have to be implemented simultaneously, and they'll work with the NANPA on getting that schedule finalized.

In September we had a nomination and an election for one of the co-chair positions. Natalie McNamer was elected and we would respectively ask the NANC concurrence on the election.

Slide number seven takes us to the list of participating companies, and then slides number eight and nine list the remaining meetings for 2011. We have one conference call with the administrators coming up on December 20th, and then nine covers the conference

calls up until mid-June.

Slide number ten has the contact information for the co-chairs. And that concludes my presentation.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much, Gwen. We have two action items coming out of your report. One is to approve the survey form for 2012. That's the first item. Do we have any discussion of that request? Is there any objection to approving that form? Okay, then we'll say by unanimous consent that form is approved.

The second item was to concur with the election of Natalie McNamer as one of your chairs. Is there any question about that? Any objection? I will say that there is unanimous consent to concur with that, and congratulations on your election.

MS. MCNAMER: Natalie McNamer, T-Mobile. As with last year, the survey process has been moved to an online system. That is thanks to Gwen because she has done all the work to put that online for us last year and this year, and she has worked with both the administrators for them to do testing on it to see if they could figure out a way to break what she's put together.

So it's taken a lot of work that the NOWG as a whole we're taking credit for but I want to personally thank Gwen for doing all that work because without her we would still be on paper for everything. So thank you, Gwen.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you on behalf of all of us. I think it's another example of, you know, that this is a volunteer organization essentially and all of the work that gets done by the members, by the company, the industry and the state commissioners and staff, is very much appreciated and often unseen.

We will enter your report as Item 5 for the minutes.

**REPORT OF THE NORTH AMERICAN NUMBERING PLAN BILLING AND
COLLECTION AGENT (NANP B&C AGENT)**

The next item on the agenda is the Billing and Collection Agent report for the period ending November 30, 2011.

MS. MARCOTTE: Good morning, Faith Marcotte, and we're the Billing and Collection Agent.

If you turn to page one of our report, it shows the financial position of the Fund as of November 30th. So there was \$2.6 million in the bank, receivables of \$214,000 and accrued liabilities of \$469,000 which are shown below. So the Fund is in good shape.

The next page, page two shows a projection of the Fund up through the end of the funding year which is June of 2012.

If you look in the budgeted column we were anticipating a \$750,000 surplus which was the contingency fund, and we're now in the total column projecting that will be \$664,000.

The box at the bottom right corner shows where the differences are in comparison from what we were anticipating to what we are now forecasting, and the differences offset each other and it's now about a difference of about \$90,000 overall.

Page four of the report shows a forecast of --

(Recording Interrupted)

MS. MARCOTTE: -- Fees that we expect to pay out over the next six months. And on page five is the deliverables and it's just a summary of what we do every month, distributing the invoices, processes the payments, answering any questions.

Our contract has now been extended another six months out to July 2012, and I believe an RFP is coming out soon.

And we are gradually clearing up all the old receivables with the help of the FCC and USAC which is the data collection agency and they're gradually going through USAC with the approval of the FCC to deactivate a lot of IDs, (unintelligible) IDs as these companies don't exist and they can't locate them. So we're gradually writing all those balances off.

Any questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions on this report? On your contract, it has just continued, been extended?

MS. MARCOTTE: We just heard last night that it's another six months.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Another six months.

MS. MARCOTTE: Above what was in this report.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, so beyond February 29th, six months beyond.

MS. MARCOTTE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, and you are expecting an RFP to come out?

MS. MARCOTTE: I think early in the new year.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Early in the new year, okay. Thank you. And just looking at your report here, if I have this right, the differences between what you projected, this is correct, for example bad debts not budgeted for, there's fewer bad debts?

MS. MARCOTTE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: People are paying more on time?

MS .MARCOTTE: It's certainly a number comparable to other years. It's not a high number.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Good, very good. Thank you. Any questions? We will put that into the minutes as Item 6, the Billing and Collection Agent report.

REPORT OF THE BILLING AND COLLECTION WORKING GROUP

The next item on the agenda is the report of the Billing and Collection Working Group. Rosemary.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. I chair this Working Group with Tim Decker, Verizon.

The Billing and Collection Working Group is responsible for overseeing the performance of the B&C Agent and we're responsible for pitching the budget and contribution factor to the NANC each year.

On page three we list our current activities. We have our monthly conference calls where we go over the deliverables and we will soon be putting together the yearly performance evaluation.

On page four we're talking about contract renewals. It sounds like the big buzz of the day is contract extensions and we were all reporting on it this time so the B&C Working Agent contract expired October 1, 2009. It's been under contract extensions ever since and we now just find out that it's also been extended another six months, which is fantastic.

Thank you.

I understand that as of this morning, this is one, page five, that the NANPA contract was also extended. The PA contract is due to expire April 14, 2012.

And just to note that with these three contracts under extension, it will be a little bit more difficult to prepare the budget for next year just because it's kind of an unknown as to exactly what the cost will be, but we will do the best we can.

The meeting schedule for 2012 was just put together and it's on page six.

And if you'll jump over to page ten it lists the current membership. We continually have a membership drive at the B&C Working Group and we would welcome new attendants so contact Tim or I, if you are interested in joining our meetings. And our emails are located on the last page of the report as is the next two meetings that you could put on your calendar.

Thanks.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you, Rosemary. Any questions on this report? Yes.

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka from CenturyLink. It sort of dawned on me as you were speaking and having just heard from Faith, that the extension goes to July, and July is normally the billing month and my question is and I don't know if Rosemary can answer or we may need to ask Faith, because July is the month the bills go out in, how well that will work if the contract goes to July. That timing is just kind of creepy.

MS. EMMER: Well, I think I'll just go on faith that we'll have a new contract or perhaps another extension or whatever by then because --

(Recording Interrupted)

MS. EMMER: -- Faith or I could answer that question but that's a good point.

CHAIRMAN KANE: It is a very good point to bring up because I think this is the third, she mentioned the third instance where there has been an extension.

I'm going to do an inquiry and ask the Commission because they are the actual ones who issue these contracts, if they could please give me and I'll report to everyone, the schedule and the plan for getting these contracts and RFPs out and getting more permanent contracts in place, which is not intended to say that there's any desire one way or the other to change who the people are doing the work but that we need the stability of having longer term contracts for a number of these important functions and I will send that inquiry to the appropriate division at the FCC.

MS. RETKA: Thank you, Chairman Kane. And as your dialoguing it, one thing to be thinking about is if parties receive a bill from a timeframe up to July and then the billing is supposed to be done in July, the transition if there is a different provider as well as if one provider sends out a bill but then it's going to be collected in a different system and how remittances are done, I mean it's extremely complex so anytime you get involved with billing and collections between two parties -- I just am concerned about that timeframe.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. I'll include that. Thank you very much, Rosemary. This will go into the record as Item 7.

REPORT OF THE NORTH AMERICAN PORTABILITY MANAGEMENT LLC
(NAPM LLC)

Moving right along, the next time is the NAPM LLC report to the NANC. Tim.

MR. DECKER: Good morning, everyone. My name is Tim Decker with

Verizon. I co-chair the NAPM LLC along with Mel Clay with AT&T.

My report is going to be very short today because most of what I'm covering will be covered in the next report that the Selection Working Group will be giving. The Selection Working Group met yesterday and finalized the timeline for now.

So number one on the report is the Statement of Work 85 was approved by the NAPM LLC to implement the NANC change order 446 in November.

NANC change order 446 modifies the NPAC to allow pending pool blocks to be created even when pending SVs exist within the Thousands Block for numbers that are not already associated with active SVs. So we approved that last month and that will be implemented.

Number two is the FoNPAC activities. Again, most of this will be covered by the SWG. The first item in the first bullet is the FoNPAC and the SWG continue to develop the LNP procurement timeline, and I'm not going to go into any depth on that because the SWG will be reporting on what happened yesterday.

The draft RFI was approved by the SWG and the FCC and was issued or made available in the ISASTA tool on October 13th and responses were due back November 23rd which we received and we received two responses. Again the SWG will be reporting out on that.

And just the last bullet, the FoNPAC will continue to work toward on time completion of milestones and tasks as we outlined in our timeline.

CHARIMAN KANE: Thank you, Tim. Are there any questions on this report? We will put it into the minutes as Item 8. Thank you.

REPORT OF THE LNPA SELECTION WORKING GROUP (SWG)

And next as referred to by Tim is the report of the LNPA Selection Working group, the SWG.

MS. GAUGLER: Actually I'm going to do it. If it's okay I'm going to stay in my seat here rather than following over there.

CHAIRMAN KANE: That's fine.

MS. GAUGLER: My name is Tiki Gaugler. I am the tri-chair of SWG with Commissioner Why and Ann Berkowitz from Verizon.

Slide two here just gives a summary of sort where we're going through with this. As was mentioned, we handled the RFI, the approval and release of the RFI. We received our summary of the responses of them. There was a request for additional information during that process by Telcordia which I will talk about, and then our upcoming activities is the final.

So as Tim --

(Recording Interrupted)

MS. GAUGLER: -- We reviewed and approved the draft RFI. When we met last at the NANC we had just received a copy of it and went through several weeks of giving feedback and back and forth with the FoNPAC, reviewing that, approved that on the 23rd and submitted it to the FCC for the FCC approval. It was then released on the 14th and responses were due and received on the 23rd.

During that process and within the RFI tool, the FoNPAC received some questions from Telcordia about requesting additional information and then after that time Telcordia sent

a letter to the SWG tri-chairs asking that additional information to be provided.

The information they were seeking was information that appeared to be internal to the current vendor. Some of the questions on the RFI were asking about software and hardware and some other processes, and Telcordia was seeking additional informational information about that in a response to that, as well as some more information about the timeline and how the RFP process would continue.

After receiving that letter we then received a letter from NeuStar basically opposing providing information that is confidential.

The SWG met on November 17th and then on the 18th we sent a letter back after discussion within the group basically saying that the SWG and the NAPM and the FoNPAC don't have any additional information,.

The information Telcordia was looking for was we consider confidential, internal to NeuStar, and more importantly that the information they requested wasn't necessary, that wasn't the information that the FoNPAC and SWG was looking for in response to the RFI, and that there was a significant amount of technical information that they had available to them publicly through the technical reference documents which were referenced in the RFI.

All of those letters have been publicly filed in the FCC dockets that are listed there and can be obtained there.

As I mentioned there were two parties that responded to the RFI and then one party filed comments with the FCC in response to the public notice.

Yesterday the SWG had a meeting where the FoNPAC came and presented those responses to SWG and I just note that the general tenure of responses back from the SWG was

just the need to make sure that this is forward looking and that when we're looking at a long term contract of this and the future of numbers that everything is forward looking, and that there needs to be flexibility for the next generation NPAC and that in light of that just trying to get the broadest response to the RFP when the RFP comes out next year and that it is widely publicized when that happens next year basically.

The next slide provides target dates for upcoming activities for the SWG and the RFP process. I say target because these may change, hopefully they will not but it is a bit fluid in terms of the work that is being done and the process that is going on based on conversations with the FCC and things that they would like to see done during the process as well.

But generally in February the SWG will hopefully review and approve an outline for the RFP and the TRD documents. The TRD is the technical reference documents that are going to go along with the RFP.

July of next year the SWG will be hopefully reviewing and approving the actual TRD and the vendor qualification survey. Vendors will need to qualify through this, just note that there is no neutrality issues prior to being selected as the vendor.

In September of next year we are hoping to release the TRD and the RFP. We have learned in discussions with the FCC the FoNPAC has is that the FCC intends to put it out for public comment prior to approval so that will be built in there as well.

The responses will be due in the November of 2012 timeline with the expectation that the SWG will review in the March/April timeframe of 2013 and bring it before the NANC in that time in order to approve the selection recommendation made by the FoNPAC.

Slide seven notes the membership of the SWG and slide eight notes the contact information. I will say we --

(Recording Interrupted)

MS. GAUGLER: -- And obviously upcoming meetings but have not established any specific dates at this time, working on things for the first quarter. Questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Questions? Yes.

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka from CenturyLink. I just wanted to emphasize, I know Tiki went kind of quickly through the dates and it may not be clear to everyone how tight a timeframe it is.

And while there's some expectation that some things may adjust slightly I think it's important to note that with that tight a timeframe and all the work that is ahead that we really need to avoid significant changes in that timeframe if at all possible.

MS. GAUGLER: Thank you, Mary. I meant to mention that as well, that there's a lot of work going on with the FoNPAC behind the scenes and that they need the time to make that happen so there's very little flex in the current schedule.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And again it's the schedule that the RFP will go out in September of 2012, and that March/April, about 15 months from now there would be a review and a recommendation for selection, review by the SWG and then by the NANC probably in our March/April NANC meeting. Yes, question.

MR. NEWMAN: Good morning, Adam Newman, Telcordia Technologies.

I just wanted to briefly clarify the information request Telcordia made. Telcordia did request information related to the questions that were posed by the RFI.

We did not specifically request information that we knew to be confidential and some of the information we requested had been provided to the LNPA Working Group in the past, some of it hadn't and we thought the more information we had to respond to the RFI, the better job we could do.

And when we were told that the information was confidential, confidential information is confidential and we do want to thank the SWG and the NANC for publishing the schedule. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. We will put your report into the record as Item 9.

I know that they just met yesterday so we all have paper copies of it here and I'll make sure that we make that available electronically so the folks who are on the phone and are not here also have a copy.

FEMALE SPEAKER: It was sent this morning.

CHAIRMAN KANE: It was sent this morning. Thank you very much.

Okay, it says we have a break. Time for a break or keep going? Keep going, all right.

REPORT OF THE LOCAL NUMBER PORTABILITY (LNPA) WORKING GROUP

Number 10 is the report of the Local Number Portability Administration, the LNPA Working Group and we have Gary.

MR. SACRA: Thank you, Chairman Kane. Good morning, everyone. I'm Gary Sacra with Verizon, one of the chairs of the LNPA Working Group. Our other two chairs are also in the room with us today, Paula Jordan with T-Mobile and Linda Peterman with Earth

Link Business.

I have before you I believe what is going to be the shortest report I've ever given.

(LAUGHTER)

An early present for the holidays perhaps.

The first item on the report is the update of the LNPA Working Group Local Number Portability Best Practices. As we've been reporting for the past couple of meetings the Working Group has delved into the roughly 70 Best Practices that have been developed over the years.

We're in the process of refreshing them. In some cases we've deleted a number of them that are no longer relevant to today's porting environment but certainly the ones that remain are being updated based on current Best Practices in the industry.

Our plan at some point in the near term is once we work out the logistics on how to package the remaining Best Practices up is to bring it to the NANC and review them.

The likelihood is it would be over a series of NANC meetings since there are so many Best Practices that certainly could take up an entire meeting discussing them. So once we finalize the review and the refreshing of the Best Practices we'll work out the logistics and bring them to you to review them with you as you see fit.

The next item on the report is a Lessons Learned document that we're in the process of finalizing for one day porting.

There were a number of areas where we felt we've learned some lessons in implementing that big project and that's in the area of planning and coordination, communication between the service providers. A big portion is the test planning and execution leading up to

implementing one day porting and then the actual implementation itself. So we'll be finalizing that document again in the short term. Our plan is to put it up on the new and improved LNPA Working Group's website.

That's another big project that's been going on behind the scenes. For those that are familiar with the NPAC website, NPAC.com, there is an LNP Working Group link.

We've completely revamped the Working Group's website, put a calendar function in there so you can simply click on a calendar date when a meeting took place and all the documentation associated with that meeting will pop up and be easily accessible, just a click or two away. That would be the agenda, the meeting minutes, the action items that resulted from the meeting and so forth.

So we're pretty excited about the new website and look forward to any feedback from anyone who has an opportunity to visit it.

The last item on the report is another item that was brought up previously. This is the service provider support of the medium timer.

For those that recall the discussions on implementing one day porting, the medium timer was a new timer that was implemented in the NPAC and it's required. It's a shorter timer in support of one day porting but for a provider to support one day porting they must also support the medium timer in their local systems that connect to the NPAC.

So we were asked to put together or to provide an approximation of the quantity of service provider IDs in the NPAC that have their profile set to false, meaning they do not support the medium timer in the NPAC which means then by virtue of their non-support of the medium timer they're not supporting one day porting.

We were very careful I guess in explaining at a previous NANC meeting our concerns about calling this a non-compliance list. That's simply not the case. There are legitimate reasons why a service provider ID in the NPAC may have their profile set to false for the medium timer. I've listed some of them here in the report.

The Working Group became aware that probably a large portion or a significant portion of the roughly 650 service provider IDs in the NPAC that have their profile set to false may be because they are in a lot of cases small rural carriers that just have not received a bona fide request to port yet.

Not having received a BFR to port means that they are not required to have their systems prepped and ready for support of local number portability for a period of months after receiving that first BFR.

So we were advised by some of the associations that support some of the smaller rural carriers that a lot of their clients simply have not received BFRs in their area and therefore are not required at this point to support porting much less one day porting.

Another reason is that a number of providers may only serve business customers, multi-TN or multi-line business customers therefore not required to do one day simple porting because all of their accounts are non-simple ports by virtue of the fact that they're a multi-line business accounts. Therefore they would legitimately have their profile set to false for the medium timer.

In some cases we found that the service provider IDs were inactive. The service provider may still have been in business but they just had one or more of their SPIDs just inactive and not being used for porting at that time but they were still in the NPAC.

Another reason is that the service provider ID is an LSMS or a local service management system only SPID. It's not a service order activation SPID that's used for receiving LSRs, therefore, that would not necessarily necessitate having the medium timer indicator profile set to true.

So those are legitimate reasons why providers may not have their profile set to true. So in response to the request what we've done simply is we've approximated roughly 650 service provider IDs in the NPAC out of roughly 2300 currently, or as of September 2011, have their service provider ID set to false.

Again, 650, that does not equate directly to the number of service providers because many service providers have multiple SPIDs in the NPAC. So the actual number of service providers out of that 650 is a number smaller than 650 that have their profile set to false even though the number of SPIDs in the NPAC are 650 that have set to false.

So our hopes are that that is an adequate response to the request that we had. Again, we've moved away from any inference that this is a non-compliance list. As I said they are all legitimate reasons for having the false setting.

Questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Questions? Yes.

MR. HULTQUIST: Hank Hultquist with AT&T. Gary, understanding that you guys aren't looking at this as a compliance issue and there are legitimate reasons, is your group aware of any cases where consumers desire to port their number and have been frustrated because this is set to false?

MR. SACRA: Nothing has been brought to the Working Group in terms of a

complaint that a specific provider is refusing to port on a one day basis.

What I do know is that when they do come across a provider that is not supporting one day porting they're working that out business to business with the providers in order to move that forward but no direct complaint has come to the Working Group about a provider that is absolutely refusing to port on a next day basis.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. But the Working Group isn't where one would normally report a complaint to is it?

MR. SACRA: That's true. Typically if it can't be worked out business to business then obviously then the next step would likely be to file a regulatory complaint with the appropriate regulatory body.

Now, that's not to say that issues aren't brought to the Working Group. But in terms of a provider just flat out refusing to port on a next day basis that is required to do so based on the FCC order, I'm not aware, and I look to my other co-chairs to refresh my sometimes faulty memory. But I'm not aware that any provider has been brought before the Working Group in that regard.

CHAIRMAN KANE: But a consumer complaint would go where?

MR. SACRA: Probably the State Commission.

CHAIRMAN KANE: The state, right. Put that to the state or to the FCC. Do you have a breakdown of the 650 between these various reasons?

MR. SACRA: No, we do not. That would be something that would require a massive amount of work. I mean one of the other reasons too, a number of providers have state waivers. That's something that would also require research as well. So that would

require a tremendous amount of research to determine that breakdown.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Any questions on this? Okay, we'll enter your report into the record as Item 10.

MR. SACRA: Okay, thank you. And I want to wish everyone happy holidays and a Happy a New Year. Thank you.

STATUS OF THE INDUSTRY NUMBERING COMMITTEE (INC)

ACTIVITIES

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. The next item on the agenda is the status of the Industry Numbering Committee or the INC activities. Natalie, thank you.

MS. MCNAMER: Hi, I'm Natalie McNamer with T-Mobile, the INC chair, and I do have a vice chair for INC which is Dana Crandall with Verizon Wireless. She is also here today and if I say something wrong because some of these are a little confusing she can always correct me.

We have a brief report this morning. On slide two we are reviewing that we just had a face-to-face meeting this week and there was another one since our last meeting. Our next meeting is not until next year on February 28. I actually checked the date just now because I knew we were meeting for two and half days but it's only February 28th to March 1st because it is a leap year so everyone is aware of that. I didn't know that until just now.

The substantive item that we wanted to cover today in slide three is INC issue 723. The INC had reviewed with you in the past an issue 710 which resulted change order 22 which you've heard was just approved by the FCC. Was it change order 22 or change order

21 -- but it has been approved by the FCC. This issue was a very large issue that was in response to some state commission concerns regarding their ability to deny service providers -

-

(Recording Interrupted)

MS. MCNAMER: -- Under revoked jurisdictions or licenses and we had called it the multi OCN issue. This issue had some items that went under the change order and then there were a lot of guideline changes to just put the direction into the guidelines for the states to provide the documentation to the NANP and the PA, letting them know that jurisdictional certification or licenses had been revoked so the NANP and the PA will no longer assign resources and it also puts in the guidelines, letting the service providers know that they will be denied resources when this occurs.

We did have a request from one of the State Commissions in Pennsylvania, staffers, that we move ahead and put the guideline changes in sooner rather than later so we separated the one issue 710 and created 723 which only has the guideline changes.

So we were able to put those into final closure and ready update the guidelines so the state commission staffers have something to point to when they're talking to service providers if they have any issues like this that come up.

Are there any questions on that slide?

Okay, the next item on slide four is non-geographic codes. We have two issues, INC issues 692 and 702. These are two issues regarding non-geographic numbers. Because the use of non-geographic numbers have increased so dramatically in recent years, the INC is going through and significantly revising the guidelines for and will be changing the name too

for the non-geographic resources.

Currently the title is like PCS 5YY numbering resources but it will be changing because we're not only using 5YY anymore and one of the major parts of these issues is changing the service description to more accurately reflect what these numbers are using today.

As we discussed a little bit at the last NANC meeting these numbers are being used more for machine type communications then for what you thought in the past of traditional personal communication services.

So there are many things that we are working on. We have taken quite a while working on this and there is significant more work to do on it but we wanted to bring the NANC up to date because we do know that other industry forums are looking at machine type communications also.

Any questions on that?

The next few slides are just issues we've placed into initial closure. We still have some issues in initial pending which looking at this, Issue 534, the development of the p-ANI guidelines we've placed into final closure already with the approval of the change order for that so that should not be on that slide.

And then all the issues we've currently put in final closure and all of our relevant INC web pages.

And that will conclude my report for today.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Any questions on this report on the subject?

Okay, thank you very much. This will be Item 11 in the minutes.

REPORT OF THE FUTURE OF NUMBERING WORKING GROUP (FoN WG)

Number 12 is the report of the Future of Numbering Working Group. Who is presenting that? Adam.

MR. NEWMAN: Good morning, Adam Newman, Telcordia Technologies, one of the three Future of Numbering co-chairs along with Don Gray of the Nebraska Commission staff and Jim Castagna from Verizon.

We've had two conference call meetings since our last report to the NANC on November 2nd and December 7.

The active issues are the same since our last report. We have four active issues, the New and Future Services, which is being kept open to monitor Future of Numbering activities, other industry forums, in particular the ITU-T Study Group Two as well as others.

Issue number 002, Telematics and the use of NANP numbers, like with 001, we have consensus to keep this issue open and monitor activities on machine to machine particularly at the ITU, and I'm going to have a little more on that on a slide coming up shortly. Issue 004, geographic issues --

(Recording Interrupted)

MR. NEWMAN: -- The NANP numbering policy decisions. This issue remains open pending some input from the Issue Champion as well as to monitor some of the European ITU reporting activities that have gone on in this area in the last year and a half or two years.

And finally Issue 005, the Commons versus Marketplace Model for Toll Free

Numbers. We did as you recall have a White Paper finally approved a couple of NANC meetings ago and the only open item on this other than looking to close the issue was that Madam Chairman was going to make sure that she forwarded the report to the FCC. So that's our only open item with five.

CHAIRMAN KANE: That has been done.

MR. NEWMAN: So at the last NANC meeting when I reviewed issues one and two, the NANC asked that the FoN, the Future of Numbering, go ahead and get an update on the activities at the ITU-T since it had met since we had last talked about it at the Future of Numbering on machine to machine.

So Gary Richenaker from NeuStar who also happens to be the chairman of the Numbering and Routing question at Study Group Two about ITU-T numbering was kind enough to give the Future of Numbering an update in that activity and that's summarized here in slide four.

The ITU-T does have a shared country code for international machine to machine uses. It's intended for country to country machine to machine uses.

The ITU does see their role as international versus domestic and therefore typically only accepts application for those resources that are multi-country in nature and have provided some examples of companies that are using codes within that mobile country code. And they do have to affirm every two years that they're still actively using the resource.

An update was also provided by one of the members on the GSM Association. GSMAs work on machine to machine. That group has been looking at machine to machine and has raised concerns that parallel the concerns of Study Group Two that by 2020 there could be 40 to 50 billion machine to machine devices worldwide with up to 50 percent of that in the

United States alone.

So that led the FoN to the last bullet point here which was the FoN wanted to consider presenting the NANC with a request for FoN to actively monitor and review the ongoing machine to machine activities by various organizations including those here in the U.S.

Having it sort of just a status of an issue, we thought it might be able to get lost, and we thought that maybe the NANC would want to specifically give us direction to monitor this activity on a going forward basis.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. So that's a request for the NANC to take that action?

MR. NEWMAN: It's a request for NANC to consider such.

And the last slide is just future activities... determine the next issue to engage based on contributions or consensus or NANC assignments vis-a-vis the last bullet point that we just reviewed.

We do meet the first Wednesday of each month at noon for about an hour and anybody can be added to the group

Email list. Just send me an email and I will be glad to add you. That's the end of our report. The last two slides are just our mission and scope.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much. Are there questions for the group on this report or any discussion of the request that the NANC consider asking the FoN to monitor and review the machine to machine activities by these various organizations? Yes, Hank.

MR. HULTQUIST: Hank Hultquist, AT&T. It seems like something we should put on an agenda for a meeting and talk about and give people time to sort of discuss it

internally before anything is decided.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Mary.

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka from CenturyLink. I think it's important for the NANC to continue to look at the activities of --

(Recording interrupted)

MS. RETKA: -- to machine given that it utilizes numbering resources and that Adam's statement of the projection that came from the GSM is critical to consider as well given that Tim raised some concerns regarding the use of resources such as 5YY numbers.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, and a question on that because I know it's the same issue in the ATIS report on the 5YY, that they're working on two issues to significantly revise the code to better reflect their use. Now is that a data gathering exercise or is there any overlap?

FEMALE SPEAKER: It's more of an operation.

MR. NEWMAN: So yes, and Natalie or Dana can jump in here as well from an INC perspective.

So the INC work is to revise the actual guidelines to assign the resource. The Future of Numbering Working Group is to review the use that's going on and its impact on numbering, both vis-a-vis the 5YY resource and the INC guidelines or any other resource that might be doing (unintelligible) and then to keep an eye on what's going on in other places for largely comparative purposes in my view.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Natalie.

MS. MCNAMER: (Off microphone). (Unintelligible) more on the changes we're

making to 5YY resources is more an interim plan until the larger international committees come up with a total future plan.

We just had a concern that for the long term solutions it would take a lot longer to get to that point and we didn't want to start running out geographic resources in that waiting process so ours is more of an interim solution and not a final solution. I just wanted to make that clear.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Thank you for clarifying that. Yes.

MS. MILLER: Anna Miller with T-Mobile. I think it's important for the NANC in terms of Future of Numbering to have information on what's going on from a global perspective.

This was raised by some of the European commissioners, was referred to ITU and transferred to some standards groups to look at this from a technical perspective, what are interim long term solutions. I think everybody is monitoring this just to see what is the level of demand, what is the level of consumption.

And so with this additional allocation of 5YY resources that relieves I think some of the tension for the United States.

Some of the European countries I think were anticipating exhaust in a short timeframe and have addressed that from various means but some of their numbering plans are mobile only in their -- and so it's a little bit different than it is in the United States.

So I think it's a good idea for us to monitor what's happening and just like we do forecasting for the NANP in that context, to look at what is the demand, is it accelerating, is it linear, and to look to these long term solutions if it looks like exhaust is in the next five to ten

years.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Based on that discussion here I will put this as an item for the March meeting, and we could flush out at that time if everyone's got suggestions, the scope of what we might want FoN to be following, what kinds of things they might want us to report on, and have an action item for the March meeting that would a more robust directive to the FoN.

Thank you very much for bringing this up. Those of us at state commissions, we also deal with whole smart grid issue and all of those issues which also use telecommunications resources, and there is a concern there, I think a very legitimate one, so thank you.

MR. NEWMAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, we will put your report into the record as Item 12.

**STATE COMMISSION STAFF NUMBERING CONCERNS RELATED TO THE
FCC'S UNIVERSAL SERVICE-INTERCARRIER COMPENSATION ORDER AND
FNPRM**

I indicated there was an additional item added to the agenda which is coming from some state commission staff. The state commission staffs do have a monthly call before each of the NANC meetings or actually a monthly call and calls before the NANC meetings and I'm going to call on -- my staff is handing out a written report but I'm going to call on Carolee Hall who is the alternate from Idaho, Commissioner Kjellander alternate to present this item. Carolee.

MS. HALL: Thank you, Commissioner. On November 18, 2011, the FCC released Universal Service Intercarrier Compensation Transformation Order and the FNPRM,

USF-ICC order, comprehensively restructuring the existing universal service fund and inter-carrier compensation system so that voice and broadband services are available to all Americans.

Section N of the USFICC order, pages 452 to 457, paragraphs 1315 to 1325, raises several important questions regarding points of interconnection, POI, beginning at paragraph 1316 and the network edge beginning at paragraph 1320 related to the implementation of a bill and keep pricing methodology.

As the USF-ICC order noted current rules require an ILAC to allow a requesting telecommunications carrier to interconnect at any technically feasible point. Over time this provision has been interpreted to mean that CLECs have the option to interconnect at a single POI per LATA.

The local routing number, LRN is assigned to uniquely identify a provider's switch or POI in each LATA. The creation of a new LRN usually means the assignment of a new central office code.

The establishment of multiple LRNs for each provider within a given LATA would create an increased demand for central office code assignments for reasons other than increased consumer demand for numbering resources.

If the current POI standards were to change, the multiple POIs in each LATA were eventually required to accommodate ICC issues, it would exacerbate the existing inefficiencies of the current numbering system dramatically impacting the rate of area code exhaust across the country and accelerating the anticipated exhaust of the North American Numbering Plan.

States reviewing the USF-ICC order are concerned with the potential expanded use of telephone numbering resources which would result in tens of thousands of stranded telephone numbers nationwide.

Therefore State Public Service Commission staff request that the North American Numbering Council direct NeuStar in its role as the North American Numbering Plan Administrator and Pooling Administrator to review the USF-ICC Transformation Order and the FNPRM document and report back all potential affects this order will have on the NANP including any changes to the anticipated exhaust date. A February 1st reporting date would accommodate state comment filing period timelines as prescribed by the FCC order. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you, Carolee. So you're asking that that report be back on February 1st.

MS. HALL: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Right. I do note just for the record that the FCC has set different comment and reply comment deadlines for specific sections of the FNPRM and this section that includes the issues that some of the state commission staff have raised has a comment deadline of February 24th and reply comments on March 30th, so that's why you're asking that request.

MS. HALL: Correct.

CHAIRMAN KANE: You're asking that the NANC direct NeuStar simply to review this and get that information back to the state commissions so the state commissions can decide what comments they might want to file on these.

MS. HALL: Yes, please. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay. Is there discussion of this request?

MR. HULTQUIST: Hank Hultquist, AT&T. I'm just wondering, you know, this is the first I've thought about this, what kind of guidance we would give NeuStar as to how they should interpret what the FCC may mean by network edge and whether or not they should assume that a network edge is the same thing as a POI or switch in terms of assignment of central office codes.

I'll just be honest. I don't know what the FCC means by that so I think NeuStar, if we're going to ask them to do something, we should make sure that we tell them what assumptions they should make.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, and actually if you read the further notice of proposal, we may ask some questions too, say what should it be, what shouldn't it be, would be useful. Did I hear someone on the phone?

MR. CANDELARIA: Yes, Madam Chair, Jerome Candelaria, NCTA.

I understand you said written materials were distributed on this and I just wanted to ask if possible they be distributed to the NP service list.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, we will. There was just a one page written request that actually just came yesterday --

(Recording Interrupted)

CHAIRMAN KANE: -- State commission staff and we will be sure to put that up electronically.

MR. CANDELARIA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Carolee did read it word for word and that's why she did because we knew that everybody -- but basically it is that the State Public Service Commissions staff request that NANC direct NeuStar in its role as North American Numbering Plan Administrator, Pooling Administrator, to review the USF-ICC Transformation Order and the FNPRM documents and report back by February 1st. That would be report back to whom, Carolee?

MS. HALL: The states.

CHAIRMAN KANE: To the states, the state commission staff, any potential effects the order might have on the NAPM including any changes to anticipate exhaust date. That's the request. Mary.

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka from CenturyLink. The question I would have is wouldn't NANC want to hear the report back and perhaps would do an interim call?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Sure, good idea.

MS. RETKA: Before it goes to the states so that we're certain that what we're asking for is delivered as well as the agreement amongst the NANC table of the results. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, I think that's a good suggestion that we would add a report because the original request was report back at the next NANC meeting but then we looked at the comment deadlines and that would not accommodate the February 24th, and we're going to meet on the 22nd, it's very close to the reply comment deadline.

So work with them to get a report back to the NANC that we'll share, that we'll have maybe a teleconference call on that and any questions, and then go to the states. Are there

other questions or discussion? Yes.

MR. ALTSCHUL: Mike Altschul, CTIA. Having just received the document and just beginning to think about it, one of the Lessons Learned for number utilization across different industry segments is that the wireless industry typically has the highest number utilization because we have the flexibility over multiple rate centers to assign numbers.

And while I'm not smart enough to know what kind of mitigation states can take through rate center consolidation or other efforts solely within their control to increase number utilization, perhaps we can expand this request to NeuStar.

We don't want them to have to lose nights and weekends, but they do have a lot of expertise and perhaps in their report they could also suggest some ideas and concepts that if there any deleterious effects how the states or FCC policy could mitigate those effects.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Yes.

MS. CARDWELL: Valerie Cardwell with Comcast. Just reiterating what Mary Retka raised. The other thing and maybe it's only because I've been here less than a year, I think the request to have NeuStar do the assessment and provide it back to this organization is appropriate. But, I'm just wondering or suggesting that perhaps as it relates to getting back to the state commissions that perhaps that would be something that NARUC could move forward because it seems like that might be a more appropriate forum to put obligations if you will on NeuStar.

So in other words, I think the request to have NeuStar do it and come back to us makes sense but I would also ask and suggest that those members of NARUC possibly do a similar or parallel request so that the information is jointly shared because I'm assuming NeuStar would

provide the same data but it just seems like that's a more appropriate way to get the information out as a suggestion.

CHAIRMAN KANE: That's possible I think, although given the timing if we get a report back to NANC from NeuStar, it will then become a public document and anyone can use it for whatever purpose they want to use it for. So we want to report back to NANC by February 1st.

At least general agreement of this, I think we will leave it a little bit up to NeuStar in terms of the scope, what they look at, so at least explain the assumptions you're making, etcetera. Mary, I think you've heard the discussion here.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Perhaps we need to invite them to the table to see if it is doable.

(LAUGHTER)

CHAIRMAN KANE: Let's make this as a request to NeuStar and if they come back and have any difficulty in doing it, directing them --

(Recording Interrupted)

MR. MANNING: John Manning with NeuStar representing NANPA. I have to admit this is the first time reading of this so I apologize. I'm not up to speed on it.

The things that come immediately to mind is without understanding the implications of all this, it would be at least in our opinion good to work with an organization that reports in the NANC rather than us just taking something and then coming back to the group.

Don't understand everything that's in here, having multiple organizations, service providers, states, whatever, help us interpret what is in here, and then work with them and

coming up with a set of assumptions or any challenges or roadblocks to doing what the NANC would like us to do in this very condensed short period of time.

That's a long-winded answer. The fact is it would be good to be able to work with an established group within the NANC to be able to flesh out these issues.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And you're suggesting that established group be?

MR. MANNING: Well, you know there's so many lovely groups here within the NANC.

(LAUGHTER)

You have the Future of Numbering Working Group, you have the NOWG. You might want to establish an IMG but with the tight timeframe here, you know, you want to get -

CHAIRMAN KANE: I don't want to establish a new group. Let's use our existing expertise, and I'm just looking for suggestions on which one.

MR. MANNING: I don't disagree with you on that.

CHAIRMAN KANE: The NOWG will take it, okay, and work with NeuStar on that. Is that agreed?

MR. JORTNER: This is Wayne Jortner. Just a quick suggestion. To the extent that the FCC order isn't clear, rather than have NeuStar make particular assumptions, perhaps they should make various assumptions and assign various ranges of number utilization associated with each potential assumption.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Right, that's a good suggestion given that a lot of the NPRM is questioned so if it's done this way, this might be the impact, if it's done another way that might be the impact, this is what it means. Is that what you're suggesting?

Okay, so we'll have NeuStar work with the NOWG. We will get the report back to NANC no later than February 1st, and we will schedule an electronic meeting in order to review that and then it will be information that anyone can use.

Okay, thank you, Carolee, very good. That was a good resolution on that. Yes, Rosemary.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer with Sprint Nextel. I just wanted to say that it's a little bit uncomfortable as the Sprint Nextel representative at the table to have something come in and not even have a chance to read it before we make decisions on giving and assigning action items to people outside of this group.

I understand there's a tight timeframe and perhaps this doesn't happen very often. I know I would not bring something to the NANC and expect that the NANC would make a decision that quickly.

So just perhaps going forward, just to note that we could get something in advance, have time to look at it and then have it on the agenda, that we would be making a decision, would be very, very helpful. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. I appreciate that given the timing on all of this, and we do try to do that almost all the time, so we're asking that the issue be looked at.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

Okay, summary of action items. We had an action item to ask now the NOWG and NeuStar to look at the issue and we're going to actually put that item from the state commission staff folks as Item 13, document number 13, Exhibit 13 I guess it should be

called. So that's our one action item.

We have two other action items to approve, the survey form the NOWG and to concur with the election of Natalie McNamer as one of the tri-chairs of that group. And I think that was all in terms of action items.

And we're going to add to the agenda of the March meeting, consideration of the issue of the machine to machine. Mary, did I miss something?

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka, CenturyLink. The one item that you were going to do was you're going to talk to the FCC regarding the Billing and Collection Agent contract timeframe. If you could add that to your --

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes. Well, actually all of the contracts that are on extension, I'm going to ask the FCC. Thank you.

MS. RETKA: Right, but in particular that one because of the timing of the billing.

CHAIRMAN KANE: That one because of the timing concern with the billing --

(Recording Interrupted)

CHAIRMAN KANE: -- There are several others I think we need to get a sense from the FCC of what the timing is for RFPs and permanent selection or longer term selection of each of those important outside contractors that the industry and the NANC depend on.

PUBLIC COMMENTS AND PARTICIPATION

Do we have any public comment? Any other business? Rosemary.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. Under new business and in an effort to go green, I'd like to ask the NANC if you really see any value in having these big thick transcripts printed out for us at each meeting. I know I read them on my computer

before the meeting so I can give any comments as to what needs to be upgraded if we make them final before we actually see this.

I'm sure it's a lot of administrative work to copy them and bring them down here and pass them out, and I'm sure it's expensive in some way for the copies. So anyway I would just like to perhaps ask that in lieu of copies we just look at it on our email.

CHAIRMAN KANE: That's a good suggestion, save some paper, save some time, save some staff time.

When I became Chairman of the Commission, actually when I became a commissioner I was amazed at the amount of paper that came everyday and everything that's filed is filed electronically with our Commission and I just said I don't want it. I'll read it and then if it's something really long or something when I want to excerpt I will print it out and gradually we've moved even our Commission that way.

Is there Internet access here?

FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: There is, Y5 here. Okay, so we might even consider bringing our laptops and looking at the documents online rather than having the paper ones here to anyone who wants them. Okay, yes, sir.

MR. EMARD: Jean-Paul Emard from ATIS. I oversee the Industry Numbering Committee and fortunately this week we were able to have a lot of people from the Industry Numbering Committee attending this meeting because it coincided with our week of meeting for the INC.

Having said that, we did not finalize our report to you until yesterday afternoon, so I

would understand that I would be requested to bring at least paper copies because of the timing issue but I would then take it to mean that we don't have to bring anyone any more of our copies going forward, or are we just talking about the transcript?

CHAIRMAN KANE: We were talking about the transcript of the minutes.

MR. EMARD: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Our meetings have been shorter recently but we have had some meetings when they have been very long and obviously nobody is going to sit here and read through the minutes at the meeting anyway so I think it's a good idea that we will just ask that the minutes be sent out ahead of time electronically and everybody review them and we don't need paper copies here. That's all.

Obviously the more you can get your reports in ahead of time and then Deborah can send them out electronically to everybody ahead of time, it will cut down on the need to have paper copies here but obviously some groups do meet -- and we're glad some many of you are here today from the INC.

All right, any other business before us? Yes, on the phone.

MR. HEPBURN: Chris Hepburn, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission.

Since my commission does not have anybody on the INC a lot of times we don't see any of that paperwork including the minutes until we get there if we end up coming to the INC. So not having paper copies at all -- maybe just cut down to a few so that people that are visiting, coming in that are not on the NANC, could have a copy.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Sure, I understand. We're really talking about the minutes and they do go up on the web site but yes, be sensitive to that.

MR. EMARD: Madam Chairman, this Jean-Paul Emard of ATIS.

I do want to remind all of the state commission individuals that they have the right of access to all of the INC materials. If you just kindly write to me I will make sure that you have access to those documents. So Chris, send me a request and I'll take care of you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay. Rosemary.

MS. EMMER: But just to be clear, especially since I bring a lot of the copies from the other subcommittees, we are still going to be bringing subcommittee reports in paper to this committee. This is only the meeting minutes we're talking about.

CHAIRMAN KANE: It's the meeting minutes we're talking about, right. Yes.

(Recording Interrupted)

MR. ALTSCHUL: Mike Altschul, CTIA. I wanted to endorse Rosemary's recommendation but ask the FCC designated federal official to check to make sure there is not some arcane requirement in the Federal Advisory Committee Act that would somehow require us to receive minutes in paper form.

(LAUGHTER)

It's hard to imagine. On the other hand the Federal Advisory Committee Act has been around a long time and one of its hallmarks is openness and transparency and it's worth checking.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes.

MS. JONES: This is Marilyn Jones, FCC. I will check but I'm pretty it doesn't require a transcript. It might require minute meetings but no transcript is required by the Advisory Committee Act.

OTHER BUSINESS

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Is there any other business to come before us? That being said, I'm going to wish everybody happy holidays and a very Happy New Year. And we will see you all in the New Year on March 22nd. We are adjourned at 11:16 a.m.

(Meeting Adjourned)

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF AGENCY

I, Carol J. Schwartz, President of Carol J. Thomas Stenotype Reporting Services, Inc., do hereby certify we were authorized to transcribe the submitted audio CD, and that thereafter these proceedings were transcribed under our supervision, and I further certify that the forgoing transcription contains a full, true and correct transcription of the audio CD furnished, to the best of our ability.

CAROL J. SCHWARTZ

PRESIDENT

ON THIS DATE OF:
