

**North American Numbering Council
Meeting Transcript
March 29, 2012 (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. Cyd Anglin | 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/Matthew Gerst | CTIA – The Wireless Association |
| 9. David Greenhaus | 800 Response Information Services |
| 10. Hon. Swati Dandekar/Michael Balch | NARUC – Iowa |
| 11. Hon. Ward Loyd | NARUC - Kansas |
| 12. Hon. Sara Kyle | NARUC – Tennessee |
| 13. Wayne Jortner | NASUCA |
| 14. Thomas Dixon | NASUCA |
| 15. Jerome Candelaria/Betty Sanders | NCTA |
| 16. John McHugh | OPASTCO |
| 17. Rosemary Emmer/Scott Freiermuth | Sprint Nextel |
| 18. Brian Lynott | TeleSmart Networks, Inc. |
| 19. Anna Miller/Natalie McNamer | T-Mobile USA, Inc. |
| 20. Thomas Soroka, Jr. | USTA |
| 21. Kevin Green/Ann Berkowitz | Verizon |
| 22. Brendan Kasper | Vonage |

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
- (2) NANC Meeting Transcript – December 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
- (10a) Passcodes for Non-Simple Ports
- (11) Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report to the NANC
- (12) Future of Numbering (FoN) Working Group Report to the NANC

V. Table of Contents.

1. Announcements and Recent News	6
2. Approval of Meeting Transcript from December 15, 2011	7
3. Report of the North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA)	8
4. Report of the National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator (PA)	20
5. Report of the Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG)	27
6. Report from the North American Numbering Plan Billing and Collection (NANP B&C) Agent	31
7. Report of the Billing and Collection Working Group (B&C WG)	38
8. North American Portability Management (NAPM) LLC Report	43
9. Implementation of FCC Order on LNPA Selection Process	44
10. Report of the Local Number Portability Administration Working Group (LNPA WG)	45
11. NASUCA Issue on Non-Simple Porting Passcodes	47
12. Status of the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) activities	57
13. Report of the Future of Numbering Working Group (FoN WG)	60
14. Summary of Action Items	63
15. Public Comments and Participation (five minutes per speaker)	63
16. Other Business	63

VI. Summary of the Meeting.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Good morning. I will call to order the meeting of the North American Numbering Council. For the record, I am Betty Ann Kane, Chairman of the

Council. It is Thursday, March 29, 2012. We are convening at 9:40 a.m. in the Hearing Room of the Federal Communications Commission at 445 12th Street, S.W., in Washington D.C. First we will do the roll call. Introduce yourself, starting to my left with my co-chairman.

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

MS. ANGLIN: Cyd Anglin, AT&T.

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka, CenturyLink.

MS. CARDWELL: Valerie Cardwell, Comcast.

MS. REIDY: Karen Reidy, CompTel.

MS. HOWARD: Suzanne Howard, Cox Communication.

MR. ALTSCHUL: Mike Altschul, CTIA.

MR. GREENHAUS: David Greenhaus with 800 Response.

MS. DANDEKAR: Swati Dandekar, Iowa Utilities Board.

MR. BALCH: Mike Balch, Iowa Utilities Board staff.

MR. LOYD: Ward Loyd, Utilities Operation Commission.

MR. CANDELARIA: Jerome Candelaria, NCTA.

MR. MCHUGH: John McHugh, OPASTCO.

MR. FREIERMUTH: Scott Freiermuth with Sprint Nextel and Rosemary Emmer is sitting in as well today.

MS. MILLER: Anna Miller, T-Mobile.

MR. SOROKA: Tom Soroka, US Telecom Association.

MR. GREEN: Kevin Green, Verizon.

MR. KASPER: Brendan Kasper, Vonage.

MS. JONES: Marilyn Jones, FCC.

CHAIRMAN KANE: We have today 14 members who are on the bridge. You'll notice we have a quite a few empty seats around the table. I'm going to ask them to introduce themselves, and I'm also going to remind the folks on the bridge to keep your phone on mute unless you're speaking just so we don't get any background noise, and also to speak up and be sure if you have any questions or say something, you know, to speak up so we can hear you, and I can recognize you. So we can start with who is on the bridge.

MR. SWEENEY: Richard Sweeney, Maine Public Advocate for NASUCA.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Sorry, I just heard a beep there. Could you say that again?

MS. FORSHEE: Yes, Shaunna Forshee with Sprint.

MS. HYMANS: Linda Hymans with NeuStar Pooling.

MR. LYNOTT: Brian Lynott, TeleSmart

CHAIRMAN KANE: And there was a second person there who I didn't hear.

MS. O'DONNELL: Beth O'Donnell with Cox Communications.

MR. SHORTLEY: Michael Shortley, Level 3.

MS. HALL: Carolee Hall, Idaho staff.

MS. BEATON: Rebecca Beaton, Washington State Commission staff.

MR. LANCASTER: Mark Lancaster, AT&T.

MR. DIXON: Good morning, this is Tom Dixon with NASUCA, and I'm also with the Colorado Office of Consumer Counsel.

MS. HUSTEAD: Paula Hustead, Windstream Communications, also a member of the NOWG.

MR. HEPBURN: Christopher Hepburn, Pennsylvania Public Utility, also a member of the NOWG.

MS. KYLE: Commissioner Kane, this is Sara Kyle. My phone may have been on mute.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you, Sara. Anyone else?

MR. CARPENTER: This is Jay Carpenter, 1 800 American Free Trade Association.

MR. HUTTON: John Hutton, Tennessee staff.

MS. FRIERSON: Good morning, this Shirley Frierson, Tennessee staff as well.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Is that it? Okay, thank you. I'm going to also ask all the people on the bridge, although we did hear you and it got recorded, if you would please email to Deborah Blue your exact name and your affiliation. And that is deborah.blue@fcc.gov just so we have it correct for the record.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND RECENT NEWS

Announcements. I want to announce and welcome three new members who are here. I'm not sure if the fourth one is, but first of all the Honorable Swati Dandekar who introduced herself, who is a board member from the Iowa Utilities Board who was appointed in January as a NARUC representative. Welcome, Swati. And then her alternate, Michael Balch who is a Utility Specialist with the Iowa Utilities Board, who was also appointed in January. And Scott Freiermuth who is Counsel for Government Affairs for Sprint Nextel, who was also

appointed in January. And then the fourth new member is a new alternate member, Betty Sanders who is Director of Regulatory Affairs for Charter Communications, and she is on behalf of the National Cable and Telecommunications Association. Is she here or on the bridge? No, okay. Thank you very much.

APPROVAL OF MEETING TRANSCRIPT

The next item of business is approval of the transcript from the December 15, 2011 meeting. That was sent out to everyone. Are there any additions or corrections to that transcript? If not I'll entertain a motion to approved the transcript as submitted. Mr. Freiermuth.

MR. FREIERMUTH: The transcript was just received last night, and I'm not sure if everybody has had an opportunity to review that so I'm not sure that there is consensus at this point.

MR. FREIERMUTH: My apologies.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay and we'll be sure that everyone is on the list and that's why I want to be sure I have everybody's email address. But certainly after reading it a second time if anyone sees anything that needs to be corrected, we can always correct that at the next meeting.

Are there any objections to the transcript then? I will declare by unanimous consent the transcript is approved as sent subject always to further check.

Now some of our reports are going to be done by folks who are on the phone so it's going to take a little logistics here. I guess because the meeting was changed at the request of

the Commission who needed this room last week when it was our regular planned time, some folks were not able to be here but I've got the report of the North American Numbering Plan Administrator.

The agenda we will enter into the record as Document 1. The minutes which we've just approved, the transcript of the December 15th meeting is Document 2, and we will number as Document 3 the report of the North American Numbering Plan Administrator. John Manning is here.

Let me just remind people, and particularly again the people on the phone, before you speak if you would identify yourself again for the record and for the transcript. John.

REPORT OF THE NORTH AMERICAN NUMBERING PLAN

ADMINISTRATOR (NANPA)

MR. MANNING: Thank you. Good morning, everybody. We'll begin on page two of my report called 2011 Central Office Code Activity.

My report here provides a status of all the resources that we administer and the status of activity that took place over the past year of 2011, and we will walk through each of those resources and of course if you have any questions please let me know.

Looking at the assignment of central office codes in 2011, we assigned 2,889 central office codes and a total 616 codes were returned or disconnected.

The table here gives you a snapshot of data beginning in 2005 running through 2011, so you can get an idea of our total assignments, applications, changes, denials, et cetera in terms of the quantities processed.

Just a few items of note, when you look at the total CO code assignments in 2011, it increased approximately 100 codes over 2010. With the exception of 2009, we're generally running in the neighborhood of around 2,900 to maybe as many as 3,200 codes over the past four or five years.

Net assignments were nearly 2,400 codes and that had been previously reported. One of the primary reasons we see a change in there is the 616 codes that were disconnected and this is due primarily to a single service provider that returned well over 200 central office codes. Still that figure is slightly higher when you discount that particular item compared to 2010.

And finally one item not on the chart here but I make reference to is the quantity of applications or assignment requests that came directly to NANPA versus via the Pooling Administrator. We're getting 92 percent of our applications for the assignment of a central office code via an application made to the Pooling Administrator and passed through to NANPA, so the other eight percent were those that came directly to NANPA.

The bottom part of this page provides you references to various reports that are on the website dealing with central office code assignments availability. There are numerous reports that you can take a look at the history over time in terms of the quantities of assignments as well as returns and it also gives you a good snapshot over years, year over year of what's been happening with a particular area code in terms of CO code activity.

On page three I provide you a little snapshot looking at both states and areas codes when it comes to CO code assignment activity. The first chart there is the net code assignments, net being the total assignments less the number of returned codes for 2011.

Looking at area codes first, you can see that New York 718/347 and 929 leads the way again and this has been the top area code complex five of the last six years.

Then we follow immediately by Maryland, which has two area code complexes, the 410/443 and the 301/240, came in second in terms of the number of codes assigned, and then as you work through you can see Texas there with its two area code complexes, and then the following area codes; D.C., Colorado, et cetera, et cetera.

The second chart on this page gives you the top five states in terms of net assignments. Not surprisingly New York is number one, and has been number one for quite some time. Texas is in there at the top number two spot, Florida, Illinois, and then Maryland as the fifth state in terms of quantity of net assignments.

I do make note here that California, which used to be one of those states that was always in the list and towards the top of list, moved off the list for the first time since 2008. I will leave it up to you as to whether that's good or bad.

(LAUGHTER)

So any questions were regard to CO code assignment activity?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions on the phone? We have a question here.

MR. CANDELARIA: Jerome Candelaria. I'm just looking for any other correlation you might have on the demands in the top five states and where that demand comes from. I assume most of these demands are through pooling?

MR. MANNING: Yes, it would be primarily through pooling since 92 percent of these applications as I remarked earlier are coming through the Pooling Administrator. That's not to say that some of these assignments are not directly through NANPA and that they are

not pooled resources, but the vast majority are through the PA.

MR. CANDELARIA: So what we're not seeing is a particular technology or company coming into any of these places.

MR. MANNING: Well, I don't think we can conclude that. I mean if you wanted to go take a look at the State of Maryland for example, we've been very, very interested in 410/443 because you'll see later on we just introduced a 667 area code and you took a look at their assignment history over the past few months just prior to this activity, you can go on our website, see who is getting those codes and those are codes that are being assigned to entities in pooling rate centers so there is a demand out there.

Now as part of our process we don't ask what are you using them for, we just want to make sure you're meeting the required guidelines and FCC directives but you can see that there may be certain carriers that are very, very active in certain areas and that's not to say that they're driving exhausts, it's just they may be active in certain areas.

I would encourage you if you want to see that, is to go right to our website and you can download the information and see when those assignments were made.

MR. CANDELARIA: Thanks.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Any other questions?

MR. MANNING: On page four we'll look at area code activity. The information you're seeing here you've seen before. There haven't been any changes since the last time I reported on this information. At the top you see the number of area codes that are in service, 358 of which 345 are geographic area codes.

We had four area codes go in service in 2011, one in Canada, Oklahoma, New York,

and in September we had Sint Maarten join NANP. We had three area codes assigned in 2011. You can see the listing there, all three in Canada, and we had five area codes moved from the assigned status to reserve status.

Again, all of those were in California as a result of activity by the CPUC, California Public Utilities Commission, to take action on specific area codes, and dismissing relief plans that had been out there for many, many years, allowing us to go ahead and move forward and not only remove them out of jeopardy but to take those areas codes and move them back into the reserve status.

On the bottom of page four we talk area code relief planning activity. Compared with recent history there's been a lot of activity going on. First of which are those area codes that are projected to exhaust in the next 12 months, the first of which is the NPA in North Carolina, the 919 area code, the implementation of the overlay 984 area code is coming up here in the next few weeks. Mandatory ten digit dialing takes place this weekend, March 31st. The effective date of this new 984 area code will be April 30, 2012.

In California 408, the CPUC approved an all services overlay. One plus ten digit permissive dialing is scheduled to begin next month, April 21st, and mandatory one plus ten digit dialing starting in October of 2012, with an effective date of the new 669 area code being November 20, 2012.

Mentioning some other relief activities, one I just spoke about is the Maryland 410/443. It was just this past weekend that the new 667 was introduced.

Kentucky 270, we conducted an area code relief planning meeting on February 23rd. The industry reached consensus to recommend an all services overlay to the Kentucky Public

Service Commission and we will be filing that within the next few days.

Nevada, 702, we will be conducting a relief planning meeting with regard to this area code next month on April 26th, and NPA 702 is projected to exhaust in the 2Q15. Just for those who don't know, 702 is the area code for Las Vegas.

And finally an item that's been on our list for quite some time, it's Nebraska 402, where we have a trigger in there to begin assignments out of the new 531 area code once we get down to ten codes in the 402 NPA.

Also in late February, February 27th, NANPA issued revised exhaust projections for the Arkansas 870 and the Pennsylvania 814 area codes. The 870 NPA exhaust projection was moved from 2Q15 to 4Q20. That's due to a fairly large return of central office codes in that area code.

The Arkansas Public Service Commission has ordered an overlay of the 870 NPA back in December of 2009, and permissive seven and ten digit dialing is scheduled to start on or about October 20th of this year.

And the industry will be meeting in April to review the latest information, specifically this exhaust forecast, and develop a plan to present to the PSC and that plan will be what they want to do in terms of moving forward with this implementation.

In 814 in Pennsylvania, the exhaust projection was moved from first quarter 2016 to second quarter 2018, and it's reflecting a decrease in the code demand. In December of 2010, the Pennsylvania PUC had ordered a split for the relief of the 814 area code. In January of 2011 the PUC granted numerous petitions for reconsideration pending the review of those merits.

So with this information the Pennsylvania PUC has the latest exhaust forecast and then they can decide what particular approach they want to take with regard to 814 relief implementation.

Just a little background, the third area code deals with Tennessee 615. In January of 2011, a relief petition was filed with the Tennessee Regulatory Authority recommending an all services overlay of the 615 area code, and again for some geographic significance, this is the Nashville area.

In October of 2011, the 615 area code exhaust projection was modified from 3Q15 to 3Q16, and as a result of that just a few months ago, on February 29th, the TRA issued a notice requesting comments as to whether the 615 NPA petition should be dismissed seeing the new published exhaust timeframe of 3Q16, and comments were due on that issue March 19th.

On March 9th, NANPA revised the exhaust projection of the 615 area code to 2Q15. NANPA then submitted comments to the TRA that officially conveyed this new exhaust projection and proposed that the 615 NPA relief petition not be dismissed. In essence if they dismissed the petition we're right back in there doing relief planning again and as of this morning I've heard no further action from the TRA on this item.

That's it for area code relief activity. I'll pause now if there are any questions.

CHAIRMAN KANE: John, I just have a question. All of the recent ones have been overlays. Has any state that you recall, say in the last three or four years actually implemented a split?

MR. MANNING: The last split I recall was in New Mexico, 505/575, and then I'd have to go back to --

MALE SPEAKER: There's a quiz here.

(LAUGHTER)

MR. MANNING: There's a quiz here -- 909, 951, I think it's 909. It's out in California, 951. And Kentucky, 270, at one point in time prior to it being dismissed by the PSC was going to be split but since they dismissed that petition we've started that process over again. That's the best of my recollection so if somebody else has a better recollection, please speak.

Okay, page six, the other resources that NANPA administers, we'll start with Feature Group B, as in BRAVO, Carrier Identification Codes or CICs. Very simply in 2011, we assigned four Feature Group B CICs. One CIC was returned and you can see we have at the end of 2011, 275 Feature Group B CICs are assigned in total. Not a lot of activity with this particular resource.

Feature Group D, DAVID, Carrier Identification Codes, much more activity with these. NANPA assigned 59 codes in 2011, some at a rate a little less than five codes per month. U.S. Canadian switchless resellers who are eligible to receive CICs received ten of these assignments and at the end of this last year, 7,739 Feature Group D CICs remained available for assignment. We also had 36 Feature Group D CICs returned or reclaimed in 2011.

I give you some totals here in terms of the number assigned and the number available. We note as we've done previously that the current assignment process states that you can only get two CICs per entity. We don't see a problem with exhaust for this resource assuming that the limit of two CICs per entity remains in effect.

Page seven, one of our very active resources is the 5YY area code. This consists of 500, 533, and the 544 NPAs. During 2011 NANPA assigned 757 new 5YY NXX codes. That's an assignment rate, an average rate of 63 codes per month.

At the end of 2011 a total of 2,312 5YY NXX codes were assigned. We did have 50 codes returned, reclaimed in 2011, so that gave us 61 codes available for assignment at the end of the year. That figure now is down to 30 with assignment activity that has taken over the first quarter of 2012.

CHARIMAN KANE: What are those used for?

MR. MANNING: The current definition for 5YY is for personal communication services and the service definition is along the lines of services where you either have personal mobility, terminal mobility with some type of service profile management. And that's the service definition that we use in looking at these applications.

Now the second half of this equation is that the Industry Numbering Committee is currently looking at the 5YY guidelines in detail, not only for what they're used for but also how they're assigned in the processes and I'm sure when the INC presentation comes forward they'll be able to give you a little more detail on that.

Of note here is that in July of this year the Industry Numbering Committee, based upon the forecast that we were seeing for 5YY resources, set aside an additional 22 NPA codes to the four already reserved for 5YY. The four already reserved are 522, 566, 577, and 588 so that gives us a total of 26 area codes set aside, ready to go for 5YY services.

I just mentioned we have 35 YY codes available right now. The expectation was that we would have exhausted all of them by the end of this quarter. Yes, we have a few days left

but we expect we'll be in 566 here in the next few weeks.

On the 900 side, quite the opposite. No new 900 assignments in 2011. We had 23 codes returned and you can see here there are 100 codes assigned, 39 reserved for Canadian use, and 653 codes available.

On page eight the 555 line numbers, we had no new assignments of 555 line numbers in 2011, 47 555 line numbers were reclaimed during that timeframe, and I give you the total number of assignments with regard to that resource.

The last one I'll make note of is on the 800-855 resource. We did assign seven 800-855 line number assignments in 2011. These assignments for the purpose of accessing services on the PSTN intended for the deaf, hard of hearing, or speech impaired.

There were no assignments and no returns, anything dealing with the 456 area code, vertical service codes, and the automatic number identification or ANII digit pairs.

Any questions on the status of those NANP resources?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions from anyone on the phone?

MR. MANNING: Okay, I'm on page nine of the report. NANPA change orders, there are two outstanding NANPA change orders. Both of these change orders were approved by the FCC in December of 2011, one dealing with the addition of the parent company OCN on some different forms and reports that would be produced, and change order 22 is adding some information to our assignment data that's available on the website to indicate whether or not a particular code is a pooled code.

These particular change orders are targeted for implementation in the second half of 2012. Because of the nature of the change orders it requires coordination with the Pooling

Administrator so that the changes made in the NANP Administration System are made coincident with the changes in the Pooling Administration System. That's where we stand on those outstanding change orders.

Finally I'll make some notes here under other NANP and NANPA news. Just reminding NANC again as we've done in previous years, assisting the NOWG with posting of the 2011 NANPA annual survey that the NOWG puts together on behalf of the NANC. All that information was published on our website. Notices were sent out in coordination with the NOWG to encourage participation in the survey.

The 2011 NANPA annual report which I know everybody is eagerly awaiting will be available tomorrow. We will be posting it to our website and a notice will be sent out when it's there.

The 2011 NANPA operational review session will take place next week with the NOWG. Part of that activity is an extensive overview of activities that took place in 2011, and as I've done previously, beginning on page ten of this report is titled 2011 NANPA Highlights.

I strongly encourage you to review that document because it breaks down on the different areas dealing with NANP administration whether it's the resources we administer, the system that we maintain on behalf of the FCC, and a variety of other activities that took place in 2011, they are summarized in that document.

After you get done reading the 2011 NANPA annual report you will be eagerly be awaiting the first quarter 2012 NANPA newsletter which will come out in the first week of April 2012.

And then at the end of next month we will be publishing the 2012 April version of the NPA and NANP exhaust projections, and we are in the process as we speak now, of reaching out to individual states and informing them of any changes in the exhaust projection of the respective area codes.

Like I said, beginning on page ten there is a highlights document. I do not intend to go through that however I do like to reference one item here in the highlights that typically we do not cover with the NANC. It's dealing on the NRUF side. This data is reviewed on a monthly basis with the NOWG so they're very much aware of the volumes when it comes to NRUF submissions.

Just a quick background, carriers provide utilization forecast information to NANPA on a semi-annual basis. The utilization information is as of June 30th and December 31st of each year, and the requirement is to provide that information by February 1 for the first NRUF cycle and August 1 for the second NRUF cycle.

The table on the top of page 14 gives you an idea of the quantity of submissions that we get on an annual basis containing NRUF data.

This data can be submitted either via an Excel spreadsheet, it can be submitted online via the NANP Administration System, it can be submitted via FTP, and it can be submitted via CD, a compact disc.

A variety of ways in which NANPA will collect this information, but that's the volume over the last four or five years, the quantity of submissions that we get, and again we just not only get them with that deadline, we will get updates throughout the year.

So that is data that you typically do not see here at NANC that I wanted to highlight to

you because that's one of the largest processing activities that NANPA has to take place on a month by month basis and certainly is busiest during the months of July and January.

Finally on the last few pages of the report beginning on page 21, the status of area codes exhausting within 36 months. This item is typically included with our presentation. It gives you a breakdown of all of those area codes that have activity going on, or are projected to exhaust in the next three years and what activity is going on with regard to that.

That concludes my presentation. Are there any questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions from the phone? Okay, thank you very much.

MR. MANNING: Thank you.

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

CHAIRMAN KANE: The next item, and we'll mark the document as Item 4, is the report to the North American Numbering Council of the National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator.

MS. PUTNAM: Good morning. Pooling is fine however I noticed that the date on my report is not fine. This is the report for 2012 not 2011.

CHAIRMAN KANE: We'll correct that.

MS. PUTNAM: I noticed that just this morning.

All right, the information on page two of the report is the data that summarizes the pooling administration activity for the last 12 months. We have a rolling 12 month information package here.

I would note that as of the end of December, we had a record number of part threes for

a year. In the December report I said we were heading in that direction. Well, we did it. We processed 132,429 part threes in 2011, and that was 29 percent over 2010.

The lower chart shows the summary data for the part threes and a part three is an indicator of the workload of the pooling administrators because every time they handle a request for whatever reason, they issue a part three to the carrier.

Page three breaks out the summary data by type and shows the number of central office codes that we opened in the past 12 months.

Page four is the summary of the rate center information changes on our website when the designation of the rate center changes, perhaps a second carrier comes in or a request from a service provider or a state to change an excluded rate center to an optional rate center.

If there is a supplemental implementation meeting there are often rate center changes that are made in conjunction with the supplemental implementation meeting as well.

The next page, the reclamation summary, doesn't really reflect the amount of work that's done in reclamation because we send notices to all the jurisdictions every month and then our pooling administration specialist who works on reclamation interacts with states and with carriers who are coming in with late part fours or extensions. So even though the number of blocks reclaimed is a small number, there's a lot of work that goes into that every month.

The next chart shows the system performance and with the exception of the nine minutes back in September, our system was up and running the whole time so we far exceeded the contract requirement for system up time.

On page seven is other pooling related activities. The chart there shows all the contractual reporting requirements, breaks it out by monthly, quarterly,

semi-annual, and annual reports. We have had no contract modifications since the last meeting.

There is currently one petition for delegated authority pending before the FCC from Montana and that is not out for comment yet. We report on the delegated authority petitions at the request of the NANC.

Page eight, pANI administration as of February 29th. We've been a little busy. We are up and running. Since the last meeting we opened the RNAs, the Routing Number Administration System for user registrations and then we went live.

On the list of activities there, numbers one through seven were notices that we sent out through all of those distribution lists notifying the industry of various things that were happening, were about to happen, needed to be done.

We discovered that people may or may not read those notices. We got a phone call from someone who called up and said who are you and what are you doing, and we explained and said, you know, we sent notices out through all these distribution lists, aren't you on any of them? And he said well, yeah, but I don't have time to read that stuff. Like, okay, here we are.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Who will remain anonymous?

(LAUGHTER)

MS. PUTNAM: Numbers eight through 12 there, the activities that are related to those are all team effort items. Although Florence Webber is our Director for pANI, and she does have a pANI administrator working with her, all the people in the pooling group other than the pooling administrators have responsibilities with respect to pANI as well that

are related to their pooling responsibilities.

So Wayne Louie created the website. We had a conference call with the 911 Board and Linda Hyman our regulatory person was involved in that.

We have our data quality and control team working on the data with Florence and the data is in serious need of being worked on.

And we had development work, systems testing, a lot of testing, and the people who test for pooling also test for pANI so it is definitely a group effort but it has been a huge amount of work for Florence Webber.

We participated in the regular monthly meetings of the NOWG. We put out the annual NANC survey to the website on January 3rd, and we prepared a presentation for and participated in our annual performance review in the Concord, California office on March 7th to 8th.

Change orders; we haven't submitted any change orders since the last NANC meeting. We have a chart showing the status of various change orders. Our change orders 21 and 22 are linked to the NANPA change orders 21 and 22 and we will follow NANPA schedule on those.

We had advised industry that we couldn't get to change order 20 until we finished development and work on change order 29, the pANI administration change order, and so we are beginning work now on change order 20.

We completed our annual report and we will be posting that to the website on Friday.

And we had a few highlights that I will mention. I'm not going to read the whole highlights document. I'll note again we had a record high number of part threes last year.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Excuse me, Commissioner Dandekar, you have a question?

COMMISSIONER DANDEKAR: (Off microphone). Yes, it's just a comment.

That should be also in 2012, right, (unintelligible)?

MS. PUTNAM: What should be 2012?

COMMISSIONER DANDEKAR: (Off microphone), you are saying you completed that and should that be 2012?

MS. PUTNAM: No, no, it's the annual report for the year 2011.

COMMISSIONER DANDEKAR: (Off microphone). 2011, for the whole -- okay.

Thanks.

MS. PUTNAM: And the highlights are all for events that occurred in 2011.

COMMISSIONER DANDEKAR: (Off microphone, unintelligible) just wanted to mention.

MS. PUTNAM: No problem. As I also indicated PAS was available for use 99.998 percent of the time in 2011 and that exceeded the contract performance metric of 99.9.

We produced all of the requested ad hoc reports in less than one business day although we're allowed up to three business days to get them out.

pANI administration was a huge group task in 2011, and we had the completion of the NPAC scrub which was a collective sigh of relief for us in pooling.

And we continued the seeking donations project that we started in May of 2010, where when a rate center goes from excluded to optional we ask the carrier that is in it if they can donate blocks so we don't have to open a new code for someone else coming.

And we posted two new training videos. The training videos have been very popular

and we will continue to work on them when there are change orders or when there is occasion to have another one.

And that's it. Any other questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions? Rosemary.

MS. EMMER: This is Rosemary Emmer with Sprint Nextel.

I don't have a question. I have a comment which is what I pretty much say every year about this but I think it's really important.

I attended the PA office review last month and once again its Sprint's opinion that the PA has gone way over and above. I've mentioned the NANPA being, or we have all mentioned the NANPA being a well-oiled machine for many years now and I think that perhaps the PA, I dare to say, perhaps the PA is there as well, if not have been there.

I wanted to point out the system availability at 99.9 percent and every year it's very commendable to me and I'm sure to all of us that -- I wish more companies could hit that goal and have a great number.

The yearly operational reviews give you an entire years worth of numbering at a glance in one day.

And just to repeat, the NANPA is next week in Sterling and there is a bridge so I highly recommend the NANC members attend these. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you, Rosemary. I think we all join in, in appreciation for all of the work. I'm thinking of the person who called up was I assume an industry person to say who are you, and what do you do.

Probably most industry people know but certainly the general public probably has no

idea both of the NANPA and the PA, how much goes on behind the scenes so that when they pick up the phone, not only their local phone company works but all the connections work, all the numbers work and everything else. So thank you.

All right, I just want to remind the people on the phone be sure to keep yourself on mute. I think we're hearing some background noise. And also I heard a couple of beeps. Is there anyone who has joined the phone bridge since we took the roll at the beginning?

MS. BOWYER: Yes, this is Michelle Bowyer at Windstream.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you, Michelle, and I'll remind you if you would also email your name and affiliation to Deborah Blue so we have it correct for the record. It's deborah.blue@fcc.gov.

MS. BOWYER: Yes, I sent it to her a few minutes ago but thank you.

MR. DECKER: This is Tim Decker and I've joined the bridge as well.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you, Tim.

MR. GRAY: Don Gray, Nebraska Public Service Commission.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Anyone else? Thank you.

All right, we'll move on to Item 5 and mark it number 5 for the transcript, which is the report of the Numbering Oversight Working Group, the NOWG.

REPORT OF THE NUMBERING OVERSIGHT WORKING GROUP
(NOWG)

MS. DALTON: Good morning, I'm Laura Dalton from Verizon Communications and I'm one of the co-chairs of the Numbering Oversight Working Group, which is the NOWG, along with Natalie McNamer from T-Mobile and Gwen Zahn from Verizon Wireless.

Slide two lists the contents our report. The main topics that I'll be discussing on the following slides are the NANPA and the PA performance evaluation process, NANPA and PA change orders, the NOWG's review of the annual reports of the NANPA and the PA, and the PA's TRD.

I will also be discussing an action item from the December NANC meeting. And finally I'm going to relay the NOWG's plan to evaluate a proposal pertaining to the NANPA and the PA contract.

MS. DALTON: So, if you'll turn to slide three. Slide three discusses the first step in the NOWG's performance evaluation process and that's the industry surveys.

The NOWG conducts an annual industry survey to obtain information regarding the performance of the NANPA and the PA. The industry surveys are the main source of industry input on the administrator's performance. Both the comments received and the quantitative results weigh into the NOWG's evaluation.

This year's surveys which were for the 2011 performance year, were deployed on January 3rd, and were opened for a six week period for responses to be submitted online.

Slide three shows the number of entities that completed the surveys. It shows the

survey respondents divided into two categories, industry and other respondents, and regulator respondents.

We received a slightly lower response rate than last year but overall we were pleased with the amount of responses received and we're grateful to everyone who took the time to complete the surveys.

The survey results will be provided in detail in the performance evaluation reports that will be presented to the NANC at the June NANC meeting.

The annual survey is just one aspect of the performance evaluation process. Slide four outlines some of the other NOWG activities that go into the preparation of the NANPA and PA performance reports.

As the timeline of activity shows, March through May is a very busy time of year for the NOWG. During this time we review the survey data and analyze the results. We attend the operational reviews that are conducted by the PA and the NANPA. We then draft the performance reports and our approach is to try to directly involve as many NOWG participants as possible by asking for people to volunteer to draft a section or two of the reports.

These first draft sections are then compiled into a draft document. We then hold several meetings as a group to thoroughly review and revise the drafts so the performance report preparation is truly a collective effort of the NOWG participants.

After we agree upon the ratings for the NANPA and the PA, we complete the reports and meet with the staff from FCC's Wireline Competition Bureau to present our preliminary reports to them and this year the NOWG/FCC meeting is scheduled for May 15th.

At the June NANC meeting we plan to present the performance reports to the NANC for approval.

Turning to the next slide, the charts on slides five and six show the NANPA and PA change order activity and these change orders were already mentioned by John and Amy. Throughout the year whenever the NANPA and PA submit a change order proposal to the FCC, the NOWG reviews the change order and prepares a summary and recommendation.

Since the last NANC meeting in December, there were no new change orders submitted by either the NANPA or the PA but change order 21 and 22 are still currently outstanding for both the NANPA and the PA because they are awaiting implementation and the implementation dates for these change orders as shown on the charts are still to be determined but they are targeted for the second half of 2012.

Slide seven discusses another area that the NOWG spent time working on and that's a review of the 2011 annual reports of the NANPA and the PA and review and update of the Pooling Administrator's technical requirements document which is the PATRD.

Slide eight discusses another topic that the NOWG was involved with earlier this year. At the December NANC meeting the NOWG was directed to work with the NANPA to respond to State Commission staff's request to review potential impacts of the universal service inter-carrier compensation reform order on numbering resources.

NANPA provided the NOWG with a NANP exhaust analysis to explain the basis and assumptions upon which the anticipated exhaust date of the NANP is calculated.

The NOWG held numerous conference calls and provided a response which included the NANPA deliverable to the NANC on January 27, 2012.

Slide nine discusses another issue that was recently raised at the NOWG. The NOWG plans to evaluate the benefits and risks of consolidating the NANPA and PA administrative contracts into one contract.

When this idea was raised the NOWG agreed that this issue warrants further evaluation. The NOWG plans to share the results of our evaluation with the NANC at the June NANC meeting.

Slide ten shows a list of NOWG participating companies and I'd like to point out you may have heard on the phone that we have a new NOWG participant. Chris Hepburn from the Pennsylvania Public Utilities Commission has joined our group.

Then slide 11 shows the NOWG's upcoming meeting schedule for our regular monthly meetings with the NANPA and the PA. We also hold NOWG only calls immediately following the calls with the administrators to discuss their monthly activity among ourselves.

In addition to the monthly calls mentioned here, we have other NOWG meetings throughout the month for the various issues that we're involved with such as the ones that I've mentioned earlier.

And the last slide, slide 12, shows contact information for the NOWG co-chairs.

That concludes my report. Thank you.

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

MR. CANDELARIA: Jerome Candelaria, NCTA. I'm curious if you could say what prompted the NOWG to evaluate merging the two entities, the two contracts.

MS. DALTON: Right. As you may be aware, the NANPA solicitation was just issued recently so their contract term had expired and they were working on their options

for extending the contract.

Also the PA contract is completed in August of this year so we were thinking the timing may work out with the two contracts becoming due, that maybe there's a time to look to putting this into one contract for certain efficiencies that may exist.

Now at this point, a NOWG member raised the issue, and a few people had felt also well, let's look into it. But it's really in its infancy. We have not sat down yet and really outlined all of the pros and cons. We plan to look at it and just do a type of feasibility analysis but we did want to make the NANC aware of our intention to undertake this and evaluate it.

We may come back to you in June and say, you know, we decided that the benefits don't outweigh the risks or the costs or something, but we just thought it was worth looking into so we're going to spend some time doing that following our busy time with the performance evaluation report. So we didn't have a chance to do that yet for this NANC meeting.

MR. CANDELARIA: Thanks.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Any questions from the phone? Thank you, Laura.

All right, moving right along to agenda Document 6, which is the Billing and Collection Agent report.

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

MS. MARCOTTE: Good morning, I'm Faith Marcotte from Welch LLP, and we are the Billing and Collection Agent.

There are two parts to our report this time. It's the regular financial report and then the report on the budget and contribution factor for the next funding year.

So I'll start with the financial report and on page one it's the statement of financial position of the Fund. At the end of February we had \$2 million in the bank, \$200,000 of receivables, and the payables were \$417,000 and those were just the monthly amounts owed to the vendors so that left the Fund with a balance of \$1,837,000. That's at the end of February.

Page two shows a projection of what we expect the Fund to be by the end of this funding year, which is the end of June 2012. On the total column is what we're projecting. We're projecting a Fund balance of \$956,000.

When we did the budget we had set aside a contingency provision of \$750,000 so we have a difference of about \$200,000. The bulk of that is explained. On the bottom right hand corner are the variances but the main item is the carrier audits that we set aside \$300,000 to do carrier audits but those were not done so that's \$300,000 of the \$200,000 and so going in the other direction are some smaller amounts, just differences to what we had estimated was going to happen in the budget.

Page four of the report shows what we expect to expend in the next six months and right now it's just based on what the contracts -- and what we anticipate at this time.

Page five shows our deliverables. These are the items we do on a regular basis, sending out the invoices and processing payments, answering any questions on our help desk.

Our contract expires, the extension is to the end of July and there has not been an RFP issued yet.

The receivables, a new process is being set up where we're getting everything, all the

receivables back from the FCC and the U.S. Treasury. We're going to be working with them to do receivables in the future. That process is just starting now.

So that's the regular financial report. Are there any questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Questions?

MS. MARCOTTE: Okay, so now we'll go to the second part of this and it starts again on page one and this is the budget for the next year. Page three is the actual numbers of the budget if you want to turn to that page.

We start out with NANPA administration and the total of that budget is \$1,632,000, budgeted item is \$1,632,000 and right now that is just based on the previous contract with some amounts for travel and maintenance costs but that may all change depending on what happens with that contract, RFP that has just been issued.

The Canada and the Caribbean will contribute \$94,900 of that so left for the U.S. carriers to handle is \$1,537,000. The Thousands Block Pooling contract, what it is now is \$2,179,000 on an annual basis.

pANI administration, there was an amount leftover from the original change order and then we have estimated a continuing amount so that total will be \$214,000 as an estimate for this year.

We have again put in the \$300,000 for carrier audits at the request of the FCC. The amount for the Billing Collection Agent is based on our monthly amount that was extended to the end of July, but again we're not sure where that will end up.

The Data Collection Agent that is based on estimate from USAQ as to what they expect the cost to be for the next year. Annual operations audit \$40,000 is based on the

amounts that we have been paying Ernst and Young for that audit in the past years. And then we have estimated the amounts for bank charges, bad debts, interest, and the fees collected for the late filing of Form 499A by the carriers.

So that puts us in a total projected disbursement of \$4,592,000. We have again put in a \$750,000 contingency provision due to three contracts not settled at this point. We thought the \$750,000 was a good provision to allow for any changes in those contracts. That leaves us with a total funding amount we need of \$5,342,000.

If you look on the right hand column that is the previous year's budget and the factor last year was .000022.

And on the next page we gave three funding options to the Billing and Collection Agent Working Group. So the first option talks about using the total surplus that we are anticipating, the \$952,000. That leaves us with a contribution factor of .000021.

Option two would be using half of the surplus which would lead us to a contribution factor of 233, and option three would be not using the surplus which would result in a contribution factor of 256. All of this is based on an estimate of revenue which we don't have yet. We were saying the revenue will be flat from 2010 to 2011, and again that's just an estimate.

So we will be getting the revenue figures from USAC at the end of April, so should there be a change from that number we will adjust the contribution factor for that.

Are there any questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions? Yes.

MR. GREENHAUS: David Greenhaus, 800 Response. I see the different options

here. By not using the surplus to have essentially the same affect as increasing the contingency, the \$750,000 contingency to a higher number?

MS. MARCOTTE: It would, yes. It would be the \$750,000 plus the \$952,000 would now be in the surplus.

MR. GREENHAUS: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any other questions?

MS. ANGLIN: Just a follow-up on that surplus discussion. This is Cyd Anglin from AT&T. So the decision to use the surplus versus expand the contingency would be based on and decided by who?

MS. MARCOTTE: You will decide, the Working Group. Rosemary is going to be speaking to that and you will be making the decision.

MS. ANGLIN: Okay, excellent. Okay, good deal, thank you.

MS. RETKA: This is Mary Retka from CenturyLink. I wanted to ask about the action item from the December 15th meeting.

I know, Chairman Kane, you were going to raise with the FCC the concern over the timeframe of the contract being such and I continue to have the concern that you're looking at a timeframe when the contract extension will end, that we would just have produced billing and parties would have to pay.

Should the contract change hands, it could be very confusing for all of us in the industry who have to pay those bills, to get the bill to the right party and be credited appropriately, and for the accounting to be handled correctly and that's the fund that pays the NANPA and the Pooling Administrators so I think we all share a strong concern for that

timing.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, thank you, Mary. You've anticipated the next thing I was going to do because I did send that inquiry to the Commission as to where this contract for Billing Collection Agent as well as to others are, and Marilyn, could you give us an update on that right now?

MS. JONES: This is Marilyn Jones from the FCC. I spoke with Sanford William. He is the Competition Policy Division's Special Counsel for Numbering Administration and I also spoke with Gary Remondino. He is the contract technical rep for all of the numbering contracts.

And the information I received from them, well, the B&C contract expires July 31st. There's some personnel changes going on in our contracting office but we plan to have that put out on a GSA schedule within the next 30 days and so that contract should be awarded before expiration of July.

And then if a new vendor gets it there's a 90 day, from what I understand, a 90 day transition period so the old vendor would be available for 90 days to transition a new vendor so there shouldn't be any issues with the billing because the old vendor would still be available.

CHAIRMAN KANE: So Marilyn, for the record, there would be 30 days from today or 30 days from when you talked to Sanford?

MS. JONES: Yes, I just talked to Sanford yesterday so within 30 days --

CHAIRMAN KANE: So by the end of April.

MS. JONES: End of April, yes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: End of April, okay. And the other two contracts?

MS. JONES: The NANPA contract expires on July 8th. That contract has been put out for solicitation on FedBizOpps. It was put out on March 20th. We expect proposals in by April 20th, and we expect to have contracts awarded before expiration on July 8th.

And the contracting officer for that contract is Gary Klaff, K-L-A-F-F. He can be contacted. He is with FCC. He awards our contracts or that particular contract. He can be reached at 202-418-1407.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. And the third one is the Pooling Administrator.

MS. JONES: The pooling administration contract, that contract expires August 14th. We're working with the NOWG to get a TRD and once we get a TRD available that would be put out for comment, and once we get comments and get that refined, that TRD will go to the contracting office and the contracting office will put that one out for solicitation also.

CHAIRMAN KANE: So we might expect that to be done, at least put out before the June meeting?

MS. JONES: Yes, yes. We expect to have something from the NOWG in terms of a TRD within the next couple of weeks, mid-April, and so we could put it out for comment and the comment period would probably be at least a couple of weeks. So yes, before the June meeting we should know some more about the PA contract.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you for that update.

All right, and then following right along, we have the Billing and Collection Working Group. Rosemary.

REPORT OF THE BILLING AND COLLECTION WORKING GROUP

MS. EMMER: Thank you, Chairman Kane. Rosemary Emmer with Sprint Nextel, and I co-chair the Billing and Collection Working group with Tim Decker of Verizon who is on the bridge today, nice and early, San Diego time. Thank you, Tim.

The Billing and Collection Working Group is responsible for overseeing the performance of the functional requirements provided by the B&C Agent, Welch LLP.

We investigate and review the performance of the Agent. We submit of course the reports to the NANC at each NANC meeting regarding their performance with respect to those functional requirements. We also help to identify the financial impacts of the initiatives, and activities, and change orders that might be included in the budget.

We've been in the Billing Collection busy season over the last several months so our report is a little bit longer than usual.

We are currently monitoring the monthly billing and collections. We are monitoring the evaluations of the deliverables every month. We helped with the budget and contribution factor with Welch LLC for July 2012 to 2013 year and we completed their vendor performance evaluation for 2012, or last year.

So if you'll move to page five, the 2012 and 2013 budget has been completed borrowing any huge changes from USAC or any huge changes anywhere over the next month or so. We should know about that pretty soon I think, the USAC numbers.

In any event the project costs for the NANP fund for next year is approximately \$5.4 million and as Faith has gone over, the carriers would contribute approximately \$4.3 million and the international participants would contribute in the neighborhood of approximately

\$95,000.

On page six of my report it lists out the contribution factor options that Faith has gone over in detail for us.

And on the next page, page seven, I'm going to read the first paragraph for the record. "The B&C Working Group has long held the practice as stewards of the factor from a fiscal perspective on behalf of the industry and in concern for the continued availability and best management of the numbering resources, to carefully control the impact of factor changes in seeking the optimal solution for the 2012/13 budget with the least impact to industry participants budgets and run rates, and with careful management of the fiscal needs for covering the numbering administrator contractual funding requirements. We have looked at the three scenarios and after careful review and full consideration we see the first scenario as meeting all of those requirements."

The first scenario uses up the entire anticipated fund surplus. It provides the least impact to the carriers or the participants budgets, and it's close to last years factor and it leaves the \$750,000 in the contingency for a rainy day, or as Faith mentioned if the contracts come in at prices perhaps different than we have today or change orders, for example the pANI.

So I've been told by I think the NOWG and the INC sort of in passing at this point that there will be change orders that are coming around, probably hit this budget and so the contingency factor was up a little bit from last year and we took all of these things into consideration when we chose option one.

Page four of this deck shows the last ten or 11 years of the budget and the contingency factor for your perusal.

And I'm going to ask the NANC Chairman when I'm done; we have three action items for the NANC. So are there any questions on this particular piece right now, the contribution factor and budget for me?

Okay, so we're going to move on to page eight then. The B&C Working Group completed the 2011 performance review for the vendor, Welch LLP. The rating schematic is the same as it has been for the last few years and that is they could receive a Met or a Not Met.

The B&C Working Group evaluates their monthly performance on our monthly conference calls and Welch provides a full blown overview every month of the NANP and deliverables from the previous month.

We consider, review, and analyze many factors when as an industry we reach consensus on a rating and on page nine it lists the factors that we use.

I'm happy to announce that the Welch rating for 2011 was a Met. Their performance met the requirements in order to be considered successful. Their performance was competent and reliable. Their decisions and recommendations were within our required expectations and on behalf of the B&C Working Group formally I would like to thank Welch LLP including Garth, Faith, and Heather for a job well done.

Are there any questions on the performance evaluation?

So with that on page 11, we would respectfully ask the NANC Chairman to call the questions to approve the three action items for the NANC to move forward to the FCC.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much. We'll take these up separately.

The first item is to approve the Billing and Collection Agent 2011 performance evaluation as submitted by the Billing and Collection Working Group and that is the one as

Rosemary indicated that indicates that Welch LLP met all the requirements, that they were competent and reliable, and that their decisions and recommendations were within requirements and expectations.

Is there any objection to approving this performance evaluation? I will say by unanimous consent that is approved.

The second item is to approve the July 2012/June 2013 budget which is the budget of \$5.4 million approximately as submitted. Any discussion on that recommendation? Any objections? I will say by unanimous consent that is also approved.

The third action item based on that budget is to approve the July 2012/June 2013 contribution factor which is .000021 which is the option that uses up the surplus or includes the surplus in the revenue for the budget. Is there any discussion on that recommendation? Is there any objection to that recommendation? I declare that by unanimous consent that recommendation is also approved and we will forward all three of those recommendations to the Commission.

MS. EMMER: Thank you. And you may recall in previous years if something does change within the next month which it has in the past at times, I think maybe one or two years out of the last well, ten or so, if that is the case we, the B&C Working Group would be sending the updated consensus and all the numbers and all that to the NANC Chairman and we would be asking, or she would be asking for consensus via e-mail unless we had to have a conference call, an emergency conference call. So please be looking for that over the next month just in case.

If you are starting to get things from Chairman Kane it could be that and it could be

important. If we don't get this consensus, this NANC consensus to the FCC by, I don't know, the beginning of June or something, then we can't give it to them for public notice and then we can't get the bills out in time. So anyway, thank you.

If you go to page 12, it lists our 2012 meeting schedule. On page 13, this is our membership page. You'll notice who we currently have on our membership. I mention to you all at every meeting how much we love to have more support. Unfortunately we have decreased in our membership over the last year by two carriers so I think I'll beg and plead at this point with the NANC members.

(LAUGHTER)

We only meet monthly and the busy season is over so it's kind of easy between now and the end of the year. We're just really monitoring the budget and the contribution factor bills that are coming in and receivables and we aren't in the busy season again until the end of December, and the busy season even still is not terrible.

So if you would like to join the B&C Working Group, you notice there's one, two, three, four, there's only five carriers now. If you'd like to join, Tim Decker and my email is on the last page, page 14, and we would appreciate hearing from you and we will send you the bridge information and a calendar invite for your calendar. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you, Rosemary. All right Item 8 and Document 8 is the report of the NAPM LLC.

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

MR. DECKER: Good morning, this is Tim Decker, co-chair of NAPM LLC. I co-chair along with Mel Clay. And our report is very short again today. We apologize for not being able to be there in person. When they changed the date we were unable to change our date for the meeting.

First up on the report is the NAPM LLC subcommittee FoNPAC, submitted outlines of the RFP, the TRD, and the qualification documents to the SWG in January by the date that was required by the timeline.

A meeting was attended by the SWG and the FoNPAC in early February to review and approve the outlines which was done.

The next bullet is the FoNPAC is continuing to meet regularly which we are all this week, to develop details for the RFP, the TRD, and the qualification documents to be submitted to the SWG by the required date of July 6, 2012, and the FoNPAC will continue to work towards the on time completion of all its milestones and tasks outlined in the timeline.

And that concludes my report. It's very short today.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you, Tim. Are there any questions on this report?
Thank you.

MR. DECKER: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Item 9 is the report of the NANC Selection Working Group.

REPORT OF THE LNPA SELECTION WORKING GROUP (SWG)

MS. BERKOWITZ: Good morning, I'm Ann Berkowitz with Verizon, and I along with Commissioner Why and Tiki Gaugler am a tri-chair of the SWG and my report is pretty short as well.

The SWG met with the FoNPAC in February to receive the high level outline of the RFP and the technical requirements document. The SWG reviewed that and provided some comments to the FoNPAC.

The SWG is also continuing its investigation for opportunities to expand the publication of the RFP when it is eventually published to insure that we get as many participants in the process as possible.

On page five we have some target dates for upcoming activities. Our next activity and probably most significant is in July. This summer in 2012, we are going to meet to review and approve the RFP and the technical requirement documents as well as the vendor qualification survey.

We anticipate the release of the RFP, TRD, and vendor qualification survey in September 2012, following FCC approval.

And that's pretty much it. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions? Okay, thank you. Thank the group for its work and for keeping on time.

Item 10 on the agenda is the work of the LNPA Working Group.

REPORT OF THE LOCAL NUMBER PORTABILITY (LNPA) WORKING GROUP

MR. SACRA: Chairman Kane, this is Gary Sacra, co-chair of the LNPA Working Group. As Tim said, we're in the FoNPAC meeting this week so I will be giving the report remotely as well. I have in the room here with me Paula Jordan, one of the other co-chairs of the Working Group as well.

Three items to briefly report out on in the Working Group's report. As we've been notifying the NANC over the past few meetings we are still in the process of updating the 70 or so Best Practices that have been developed over the years in the Working Group.

We're insuring that they are still applicable in today's porting environment based on the industry's practices and regulatory requirements.

Once we've reached consensus on a final document we will then determine what our planned next steps are for the overall Best Practices document itself and we will keep the NANC informed.

We do have all the current state of the Best Practices up on the LNP Working Group's website if anybody would like to visit that website and take a look at them.

The next item is a planned load test for 25,000 transactions in an hour. One of the recent NPAC releases that was installed in all seven regions requires support of up to 25,000 NPAC transactions in an hour so we're planning a load test for Wednesday, April 18th, between 5:00 a.m. and 6:00 a.m. Eastern time where NeuStar is going to kick off a number of projects that service providers had planned.

They're mainly modifies of existing transactions so these are actual NPAC

transactions that will be activated and the plan is to do 25,000 in an hour just to make sure that all the downstream local systems, all the service providers can support the current throughput requirements.

So we will provide a read out after the load test has taken place to inform the NANC of how the service providers processed all those transactions.

And the last item, the Working Group is also updating the vendor interoperability test plan and the service provider turn up and regression test plans. These have been in place since the start of porting back in the late '90s.

We are making the vendor interoperability plan more in tune with the actual porting process itself rather than -- currently vendors; they test with an NPAC simulator. We're revising the test plan to make it more like the type of test that the service providers run when they do their turn up and regression test plan.

So we're going through all of the test suites and in both test plans determining which will be done by the vendors, which will be done by the service providers, you know, when the new software is turned over to them from their vendors and make both test plans more like the actual porting process and production is today.

And that's the end of our report. I'll certainly entertain any questions.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions on this report?

MR. SACRA: Chairman Kane, I know there was an item underneath the Working Group's report on the agenda, a question about the use of pass codes in non-simple ports. I don't know if you wanted to address that now.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, thank you. We do have that on the agenda sort of as a

sub-issue under number ten. I'm going to mark your report as 10, and then the next document under that tab on the agenda has pass codes for non-simple ports and I'm going to mark that 10-A. And I'm going to ask the NASUCA representatives, Colorado, if you would want to address this.

NASUCA ISSUE ON NON-SIMPLE PORTING PASSCODES

MR. DIXON: Yes, good morning. This is Tom Dixon, I'm with the Colorado Office of Consumer Council, and I am a member of the NANC on behalf of NASUCA.

One of our NASUCA offices sent an inquiry to the FCC, specifically to Emmitt Carlton regarding a carrier's requirement for a competitor to use a carrier initiated passcode in order to complete a non-simple port.

And just for clarification, a non-simple port would indicate a port that involves unbundled network elements. It could be for an account with multiple lines, it could include complex switch translations, and it might include a reseller. And I use those terms from the definition of a simple port found in the Commission's Rule 52.36 in Title 47.

In May of 2010, the FCC issued an order, FCC 10-85, where it addressed the issue of the use of pass codes and specifically discussed the issue as it related to simple ports. When our NASUCA representative contacted the FCC the question that was raised was whether or not that order and the rule applied to non-simple ports. The NASUCA representative received a call back from Melissa Kirkel who's an attorney with the Wireline Bureau and she indicated that based on her interpretation of the rule and the order, that the pass code obligation or elimination of the use of pass codes was not clearly attached to non-simple ports and only applied to simple ports.

She suggested that it may be appropriate to specifically extend the regulation prohibiting the use of carrier initiated pass codes to non-simple ports.

When this issue was raised I contacted the Local Number Portability Administrative Working Group and ultimately spoke with Mr. Sacra who just discussed these issues in general.

Mr. Sacra advised me at that time it was his opinion based on what the NANC had done with respect to the order that was issued in May of 2010, that indeed the pass code elimination or prohibition for carrier initiated pass codes did apply to non-simple ports and his rationale was based on the fact that the order in May of 2010, specifically adopted the provisioning flow charts that were implemented by the NANC and I've attached that to my material.

I've attached three things. First, the actual order that is dated May of 2010. Secondly I've attached an excerpt from the provisioning codes that is about a 70 page document, but there's only one page that is specifically relevant and I used the introductory pages that lead to that. And the inter-service provider -- LNP operations flows on page five of those flows is a step number six.

This specifically states that only passwords and pins requested and assigned by an end user may be utilized as an end user validation field for an incoming LSR. The affect of that is to say you would not have carrier initiated pass codes used.

Mr. Sacra advised me that this step precedes a determination as to whether the port is simple or non-simple.

He also cited me to paragraph 18 of the order FCC 10-85 which describes the rationale

for prohibiting the use of carrier initiated pass codes, pointing out that it delays the process, that they adopted the recommended provisioning flows, that is the FCC adopted the recommended provisioning flows in support of the porting process and required the industry to specifically adhere to those codes.

And under that basis Mr. Sacra said it was his opinion and it was the intention of the LNPA Working Group that indeed the prohibition against using pass codes, carrier initiated passcodes for non-simple ports, it was intended that that would apply and indeed that would be within the steps within the provisioning flows.

So to make a long story short, the issue that's been raised is whether or not Section 47CFR-52.36, the rule addressing this issue, applies to non-simple ports. The order and the rule, that is the 1085 order issued by the FCC and the rule specifically describe and discuss simple ports. There is no reference to non-simple ports in either the decision or in the rule that I can find.

And so the issue that we've raised or that's been raised by our member is whether or not carrier initiated pass codes are appropriate for non-simple ports and if so whether we should seek clarification from the FCC stating that rule 52.36 is also applicable to non-simple ports as well as simple ports.

And I think that summarizes the issue.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much and we do have a couple questions. Before I go to the questions can you give a background as to what led to one of the NASUCA offices sending an inquiry to the FCC?

MR. DIXON: Yes, it was brought up out of Iowa and it involved carriers. And I

didn't want to bring up names. I've tried to be anonymous in this regard but the carrier that was requiring a carrier initiated pass code for a non-simple port had required this of a competitor and the issue was then brought up through our Iowa NASUCA representative to Emmitt Carlton and then responded to by Melissa Kirkel in July of 2011. I can give the details but I think that really is where it all came from.

CHAIRMAN KANE: That's all right. No, I think they were the consumer complaint or a consumer advocate's concern?

MR. DIXON: Well, I don't know specifically who initiated the complaint, whether it was a carrier or whether it was consumer. My sense was it was a carrier but as I said the consumer advocate is who brought it to my attention.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you, thank you very much. We've got some questions. Mary.

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka from CenturyLink. I may be one of the only non-attorneys sitting at the table so I will defer to the attorneys at the table but I believe procedurally -- I'm somewhat surprised that when the contact was made to the FCC there wasn't a request for someone to file a petition for clarification because I've been in the industry for 38 years and I believe that that's the normal process when you have a question like this.

And Tom was that considered? I know you mentioned it a little bit in your dialogue.

MR. DIXON: No, as I said, when this was brought to my -- actually this was brought to my attention the day before our December meeting and rather than bring it up at that meeting I felt it was not appropriate to just drop it on the NANC with very little notice.

Well, we've been researching it but at this point to my knowledge there's been no petition for clarification sought. In fact when I received this issue I sent it out as I said to Mr. Sacra and also to Chairman Kane to determine what action would be appropriate and that's why it's before the Council now. But to my knowledge there's been no petition for clarification filed by anyone that I'm aware of and none has been brought to my attention.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Yes.

MS. HOWARD: Suzanne Howard, Cox Communications. Based on a little research we did in addition to paragraph 18, we think the FCC has already clarified this in paragraph 24 and I'll read in part.

"As in the past the provisioning flows the NANC recommends today address the processes for both simple and non-simple ports. We agree the NANC recommended provisioning flows should address both simple and non-simple ports as it would impracticable to address one without the other." So I think it's explicit so I wanted to provide that information for the Council.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Rosemary.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer with Sprint Nextel. I'm just (unintelligible) and I have a story. There was a company that I worked for --

MALE SPEAKER: Excuse me, Madam Chairman, I cannot hear whoever is speaking.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay. It's Rosemary Emmer. Go ahead, Rosemary.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer with Sprint Nextel, and I have a story about this particular issue so I was interested in it when it came out.

So many years ago, I did not work for the same company that I work for now, and the company that I work for now did not share what I'm going to tell you as far as the same policy.

But when Wireless Number Portability was rolling out it was rolling out during this wonderful time, I think during the Thanksgiving holiday week and I think that was the busy season for wireless and I remember losing sleep for a long time and I'm sure many people in San Diego right now are also smiling.

In any event, we were really nervous for years prior to this as to what was going to happen. I mean we worked and worked on the wireless, the WICIS. We worked on the requirements. We worked on getting the carriers, you know, all working together electronically and we tested but it was kind of back in the day like -- it went from 1999 to 2000 when we went through that. You really weren't sure. There was a lot of nervousness about what would happen.

So the company I worked for at the time thought that it would be a good idea to have an opt in password provision similar to this. There was an affiliated company with my company that was not my company that decided on an opt out. So the opt out means that that company sent a note I guess in the carrier bill insert, I don't know, whatever, to all their customers that said here's your pass code. If you want to port you need this pass code to port.

So when wireless number portability rolled out all, those customers who decided they wanted to port in that company couldn't, they were all stopped. So that was problem.

But that wasn't my company. My company decided we would however we did it, ask the customers maybe in a bill insert to call us or whatever and give us their password if they

wanted one and this is how we rolled our wireless number portability. And I don't recall that it was secret but this is what we thought was the right thing to do.

And then maybe a year or so later, maybe not even that long, I mean during the time we had in the WICIS or in the requirements we had a pass code actually or a reject code like an 8-P or something that would come back that would say it was rejected as a result of a password and so there were actually reports that people could get to see how this was happening.

In any event, carriers were I guess feeling like this was perhaps non-competitive in some way and maybe it was.

So what had happened was this came into industry a long time ago and we talked about it and we argued about it, and we argued a lot about it, and for those folks in San Diego it's something we still talk about today. It was a tough situation. It was a tough issue.

And my company decided after industry consensus, after it went everywhere it needed to go, my company decided to dismantle this whole process that we had that we thought was fair and in good faith, but at the end of the day because industry decided years later that this wasn't a good idea, we dismantled it and it cost a lot more to dismantle than it cost to put it in place to begin with.

So this was a big project and it took a long time. So my point in telling you this story is if it isn't already obvious enough, that this isn't something that we should be doing. Now perhaps whoever is doing this in the industry doesn't know this history. Well, they can now read it on the transcripts.

(LAUGHTER)

But perhaps they don't know, you know, and perhaps they can look up the old meeting notes or they certainly --they're more than willing to call me and I can tell them how to dismantle this. And we went through a lot of pain and agony and cost to do this. And I think from a Sprint position, I think it's innately obvious.

I think Gary wrote, or somehow, maybe in the issue that came out, Gary was mentioned stating that the LNPA Working Group had looked at this and gave what the intent was sort of in writing and then last month I understand they talked about it again at the LNPA Working Group, or that it was brought up again there.

MR. SACRA: That's correct, Rosemary.

MS. EMMER: I think the actual issue statement says that they're looking to see if the NANC has decided if this is -- or whether the use of carrier initiated pass codes is prohibited or not prohibited.

I'm not sure that NANC can actually determine whether something is prohibited or not but I think giving all of this information, the write-up, the attachments that the gentleman that sent this in put forth, Suzanne with her research coming up with some new thoughts after re-researching this again for like the umpteenth time, I think it would be very appropriate at this point if the NANC could instead of -- I don't think we could say that it's prohibited but if certainly we could maybe bring something forward too as the Advisory Committee to the FCC and advise the FCC that hey, this is what's going on and this how we all feel about it and perhaps they would decide to rule and make it maybe a little bit more clear if they feel like they need to or not. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you, Rosemary. Yes.

MS. HOWARD: Suzanne Howard, Cox. So it would be more of a restatement.

MS. MILLER: Anna Miller at T-Mobile.

I think based upon the information, non-simple ports and the discussions that have gone on at the LNP Working Group, from an industry perspective that the intent was not to require carrier initiated passwords, to not make that a requirement.

It was end user passwords, not carrier initiated passwords before you could process a port request because essentially that would delay the port and actually create another barrier to porting.

I'm trying to recall, when we implemented one day porting and the LNP Working Group went through and updated the NANC flows to reflect that and that was reviewed at the NANC and approved and forwarded to the FCC.

Because those flows do state that a carrier generated password is not required to process a port request. If that doesn't give the intent of what should be happening in processing a port request, if it's not explicitly stated in a rule, at least that to me shows the intent and that was an intent that was by consensus of the industry, reviewed by the NANC, and forwarded to the FCC and I'm not sure if there was any reference in terms of implementation plan and the approval of the NANC flows but to me, I don't know if it's an explicit rule but it certainly designates the intent of the industry. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Yes, I think if I could summarize where I think we are, thank you all for the discussion and Rosemary for the history, but I think the record is pretty clear that the recommendation of the NANC was that the pass code fields is optional unless it's an end user generated pass code.

I recall all of that discussion we had here and that our intention of the NANC as included in the provisioning flows is that it applies to simple and non-simple ports.

I think the issue that we face is that when the FCC in its rules in 52.36, put that in for only simple ports and so there may be some either a conflict or an un-clarity about that.

I mean anybody can file for a petition for clarification but I would agree it would be useful that we point out to the FCC what the intention of NANC was, particularly if there's been an FCC attorney who looked at that regulation and said oh, it just applies to simple ports, that it was our intention that it applied to all ports and that if the FCC in taking a second look at it, sees that maybe they need to clarify.

If there's consensus from the group I can send that communication to the FCC, which does not rule out the ability of Iowa or anybody else to file their own petition for clarification, but I'm not suggesting we do something quite that formal. Yes, Mary.

MS. RETKA: Mary Retka, CenturyLink. I would suggest that we include in that the reference to paragraph 24 that Suzanne brought up.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, thank you. The order in the paragraph is quite clear and yet the regulation, the rule that came out only picks up part of that so it's really more an omission or maybe it needs clarification, but I think we are on record being very clear and the FCC is in paragraph 24, that the provisioning flows apply to all ports.

I will circulate that communication before it's sent for everybody to take a look at it. Thank you, and thank you for bringing the issue to our attention so we can move forward with clarifying it.

MR. DIXON: Thank you very much. This is Tom Dixon. I appreciate the

conversation and the help. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you, Tom. Now we'll move on to Item 11 which is the Industry Numbering Committee, the INC report.

STATUS OF THE INDUSTRY NUMBERING COMMITTEE (INC)

ACTIVITIES

MS. CRANDALL: Good morning, I'm Dana Crandall with Verizon Wireless. I'm the INC Vice-Chair and Natalie McNamer with T-Mobile is the INC Chair. She couldn't be here today so you get to hear from me today.

We'll start on page two. This is the recent activity from a meeting perspective. We've held one face-to-face meeting since the last NANC report in December and our next meeting is the week of April 16th in Bellevue, Washington. And anybody that might want to attend an INC meeting can find all our meeting information on the ATIS website and we've provided the link here.

On page three I'd like to talk about issue 497. The number is going to sound low and old and it's been around for awhile, but because of some recent activity we thought it was worth mentioning in the report today.

The FCC had issued a public notice in December asking for a refresh of the record on numerous petitions for a limited waiver of a particular part of Section 52.15 in the Commission's rules to allow VOIP providers direct access to numbering resources from the NANPA and the PA.

Those of you that were here in 2005 recall at the NANC's request in 2005 -- the

NANC had put together a report and recommendation on essentially what it would take to allow VoIP providers, what the access requirements might be for those providers, what it would take to allow them to get resources directly. INC took the report and crafted the relevant changes in its documents so that if and when or if the FCC changed its rules so that VOIP providers could get direct access to resources, INC was ready to go.

In June of 2008, we tabled the issue pending action from the FCC and just wanted to take this opportunity now that if the FCC adopts new numbering rules regarding VOIP provider access that we'll un-table the issue and probably rework the guidelines and the work that we've done because there have been lots of iterations of those guidelines since then and we would need to look at them with fresh eyes.

Any questions on that one?

Okay, we move to page four, issue 715. This issue was accepted to evaluate and revise the current procedures for retrieving a block from the pool when a service provider had either donated the block in error or returned the block in error.

There had been no documented process in the pooling guidelines for service providers to retrieve an over contaminated block that had been returned in error but there was a process that was outlined in the Pooling Administration System User Guide.

When the block return could not be cancelled in PAS, for example if the request had already been processed by the Pooling Administrator and the block is sitting in the pool, the service provider could use the state waiver button in PAS to process the application to retrieve the over contaminated block.

INC agreed to add a new button in PAS if you will, an over contaminated block

exception button, so that service providers could retrieve over contaminated blocks that had been returned in error when the return couldn't be cancelled.

The new button insures that block applicants are not certifying that they received a state waiver when they really haven't when retrieving those over contaminated blocks. This makes sure that over contaminated blocks aren't sitting the pool.

The slide says that the issue is now in initial closure and will generate a PA change order. That's technically true but we received an objection to the resolution of the issue and a contribution so the issue should go to initial pending and INC will review the contribution at its April meeting and resolve that so that it will likely go to initial closure again in April.

Any questions on that?

MS. CARDWELL: Hi, this is Valerie Cardwell with Comcast. Not to get into details but can you just share with us what the issue was of the carrier, whoever objected to it, just so that we have a sense of where this might be headed or is it just something for clarification?

MS. CRANDALL: It was actually the Pooling Administrator that objected.

(LAUGHTER)

MS. CARDWELL: Oh, okay.

MS. CRANDALL: And it's related to -- it doesn't really have so much to do with the intent of this particular issue but some of the language that INC crafted.

We put a **shall** instead of a **should** and the Pooling Administrator in my own opinion recognized rightly that making that a **shall** instead of a **should** may create additional work for the service provider and for the PA because if the service provider doesn't provide something

particular written in the remarks section on the application, then the PA would have to deny it. It's kind of a side something that's being worked along under this issue.

MS. CARDWELL: Thank you.

MS. CRANDALL: Any other questions? Okay, the next slide was just our one issue that's in initial closure that we just talked about.

Slide six is the two issues that we have in initial pending. John, Amy, and Laura have now commented on these two issues. They were due to NANPA and PA change orders that have been approved by the FCC and are just awaiting implementation which we're expecting sometime in the second half of 2012.

Slide seven is the issues that have gone to final closure since the last NANC meeting.

And slide eight is what I call the usual slide that has all the relevant INC web pages on it for anyone that wants to look at INC documentation.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much. Any other questions on this report?

Thank you.

And our last document is the Future of Numbering Working Group.

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

MR. GRAY: Good morning, Chairman and members of NANC. Don Gray from Nebraska.

Like the others, the co-chairs are spread across the land today so we're going to do it telephonically.

Hopefully you all have a copy of our report. And the first page, the usual.

On the second page you will see that we've had two meetings since our last report to

you, a conference call on January 4th and a call on March 7th. At the end we'll indicate when the future calls are and how you can get on the list if you'd like to.

On page three, in December the FoN Working Group reported to you on some machine-to-machine, M2M efforts that were ongoing both in the international and the local areas here and the kind of activity that they were estimating that that was going to be.

We then presented the NANC with a request that the FoN Working Group be allowed to monitor and review those activities by the various organizations and at that time you folks wanted to address the request at this meeting and have further discussions on that.

So page four is where we've kind of updated the information that we currently have in which there are 29 NPAs currently assigned for non-geographic surfaces such as machine-to-machine. Mr. Manning indicated where that is and having opened the new codes and that things are progressing about the way they see.

And what the FoN is suggesting is since there are multiple parties that are involved in this perhaps a role that the FoN could play would be to obtain periodic updates from the various groups that are involved in this activity, pull together reports for you, and kind of be the focal point for reporting on this.

And our activities and issues are on page five. Things are pretty much static there as we've working primarily on other previous activities that we've finished up.

And our calls are scheduled for the first Wednesday of each month from noon to 1:00 p.m. Eastern and if you'd like to send an e-mail to Adam Newman at Telcordia his email is there and we'll be glad to get you on our distribution list and invite everyone to participate in the calls.

And with that Madam Chairman, that is it for today.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, thank you, Don, and I'll mark your report for the record as Item 12.

We have a question at the end of the table.

MR. MCHUGH: John McHugh, OPASTCO. Don, just to bring you and the rest of the Council up to speed, at yesterday's FCC Technical Advisory Council there were six working groups assigned for activities in 2012, and amongst the activities assigned to three of the working groups were in fact the Future of Numbering as the PSDN transitions to an IP world.

The second one was the transitioning of the existing databases that we use and where they are going to reside in the future. And the third issue was specifically on the impact of M2M on the numbering resources and the new IP base services.

So I'd like to offer myself as your liaison seeing I serve on the TAC and two of the committees involved between the NANC and the TAC to make sure we're not sending different messages to the FCC.

COMMISSIONER KANE: Thank you. I accept that offer and perhaps you can provide us with reports too, regular reports, just oral updates what's going on so we're not duplicating work but we're working with the same information and particularly on the machine-to-machine issue.

I see from Don's report that based on at least the historical exhaustion rate, that the remaining NPA should last about 20 years. We've seen acceleration though so most of us probably won't be on the NANC in 20 years but it's certainly a trend to keep abreast of. So

thank you for that offer.

Any other questions or comments on this report? Okay, thank you very much, Don.

MR. GRAY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And that concludes our reports. Back to the agenda, and I might summarize, a summary of the action items that we've taken.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

We did approve the three recommendations from the Billing and Collection Working Group for sending to the FCC, and we will be sending a communication to the FCC restating the intention of the NANC that the password issue applies to both simple and non-simple ports, and indicating that if there is some omission in the regulations they might want to consider addressing that.

PUBLIC COMMENTS AND PARTICIPATION

CHAIRMAN KANE: Are there any public comments?

OTHER BUSINESS

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, is there any other business?

Then I'll announce that our next meeting will be on June 7th. Now we had a request at the last meeting that we start our meetings at 10:00 a.m. instead of 9:30 a.m. to allow some folks who fly in, that they could fly in, in the morning rather than having to come in the night before. And I think that got overlooked but we will start the June 7th meeting at 10:00 a.m. and, we should probably still be able to finish before lunchtime.

Thank you very much. And there being no further business the meeting is adjourned.

(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:
