North American Numbering Council
Meeting Transcript
September 17, 2014 (Final)

I. Time and Place of Meeting. The North American Numbering Council (NANC) held a meeting commencing at 10:00 a.m., at the Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W., Room TW-C305, Washington, D. C. 20554.

II. List of Attendees.

Voting Council Members:

1.	Hon. Chairman Kane	NANC Chairman (NARUC – DC)
2.	Henry G. Hultquist/Mark Lancaster	AT&T Inc.
3.	Greg Rogers	Bandwidth.com, Inc.
4.	Mary Retka	CenturyLink
5.	Valerie R. Cardwell	Comcast Corporation
6.	Karen Reidy	CompTel
7.	David Greenhaus	800 Response Information Services, LLC
8.	Scott Seab	Level 3 Communications, LLC
9.	Hon. Paul Kjellander/Carolee Hall	NARUC, Idaho
10.	Kalun Lee	NARUC, Massachusetts
11.	Hon. Lynn Slaby	NARUC, Ohio
12.	Jerome Candelaria	NCTA
13.	Stephen F. Pastorkovich	NTCA - The Rural Broadband Assn.
14.	Gina Perini	SMS/800, Inc.
15.	Rosemary Emmer	Sprint
16.	Michele K. Thomas	T-Mobile USA
17.	Thomas Soroka, Jr.	USTA
18.	Kevin Green	Verizon
19.	Brendan Kasper	Vonage Holdings Corp. (Vonage)
20.	Tiki Gaugler	XO Communications

Special Members (Non-voting):

John Manning	NANPA
Amy Putnam	PA
Faith Marcotte	Welch & Company
Jean-Paul Emard	ATIS

Commission Employees:

Marilyn Jones, Designated Federal Officer (DFO)
Ann Stevens, Deputy Chief, Competition Policy Division
Michelle Sclater, Competition Policy Division

Carmell Weathers, Competition Policy Division

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

IV. Documents Introduced.

(1)   Agenda
(2)   NANC Meeting Transcript – June 17, 2014
(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)   North American Numbering Plan Billing and Collection (NANP B&C) 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)   Local Number Portability Administration Working Group (LNPA WG) Status Report to the NANC
(10)   LNPA Working Group Report
(11)   Status of the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) activities
(12)   Future of Numbering (FoN) Working Group Report to the NANC
(13)   Report of the Internet Protocol Issue Management Group (IMG)

V. Table of Contents.

VI. Summary of the Meeting

CHAIRMAN KANE: This meeting of the North American Numbering Council is, for the record, September 17, 2014 and we are meeting in the hearing room of the Federal Communications Commission in Washington, D.C. It is 10:05 AM. First, I'm going to ask, as I normally do, to go around the room and introduce yourselves and then I will go to the folks on the phone. But I'm going to, not introduce but welcome back -- the person to my right is Marilyn Jones, back from her service to our country, back safe and sound, the designated federal officer. We're glad to have you back.

Marilyn Jones: Thank you, Chairman Kane. It's great to be back and I will also like to take this opportunity to thank Sanford Williams for filling in for me while I was away. Thank you, Sanford. You did a great job.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay. Let me go around the room.

3

MARY RETKA: Mary Retka from CenturyLink.

VALERIE CARDWELL: Valerie Cardwell, Comcast.

KAREN REIDY: Karen Reidy, CompTel.

STEPHEN PASTORKOVICH: Steve Pastorkovich, NTCA.

ROSEMARY EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel.

MICHELE THOMAS: Michele Thomas, T-Mobile.

KEVIN GREEN: Kevin Green, Verizon.

MARILYN JONES: Marilyn Jones, FCC.

CHAIRMAN KANE: And CHAIRMAN KANE, NARUC. Now, people on
the phone, and we still have a lot of people on the phone
because we have a lot of empty seats here in person. So if you
would start and introduce yourself on the phone but remind you
also to then send an email to Carmell so that we have recorded
your name spelled right, et cetera, who is on the phone. Is the
bridge open? Is there anyone on the phone?

LINDA HYMAN: Linda Hyman from Neustar Pooling.

TOM SOROKA: Tom Soroka, USTelecom.

LYNN SLABY: Commissioner Lynn Slaby, Ohio.

CAROLEE HALL: Carolee Hall, Idaho PUC staff.

PAUL KJELLANDER: Paul Kjellander, Idaho PUC.

REBECCA BEATON: Rebecca Beaton, Washington State PUC
staff.

GINA PERINI: Gina Perini, SMS/800.

ERIK CHUSS: Erik Chuss, DSMI/Ericsson.

4

BONNIE JOHNSON: Bonnie Johnson, Minnesota Department of Commerce.

MARK LANCASTER: Mark Lancaster, AT&T.

KALUN LEE: Colin Lee, Massachusetts staff.

GREG ROGERS: Greg Rogers, with Bandwidth.com. I'm sorry. [Cross-talking]

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay. The two of you were talking at once so if you could say it again.

JOANNE LEUNG: I am Joanne Leung, California PUC.

GREG ROGERS: And Greg Rogers with Bandwidth is on the phone.

SCOTT SEAB: Hi, Greg. Scott Seab with Level 3.

Male Voice: [Indiscernible]

Female Voice: Could those on the phone, please mute your number, your phone. I can't hear. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay. Thank you, all the people on the phone.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND RECENT NEWS

Announcements and recent news, I'm looking at the agenda. It will be the first item. We do have a new member of NANC, just been confirmed a new NARUC representative and that is Commissioner Karen Charles Peterson of Massachusetts Telecommunications Commission. I think Kalun Lee is on the phone. I can say he's the alternate sitting in for Karen.

5

KALUN LEE: Indeed, I am.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Okay and we welcome her. I know we've had a resignation in one of the NASUCA representatives because of a change in job and we'd look forward to where there are other vacancies getting those filled and getting our full complement. Okay.

APPROVAL OF MEETING TRANSCRIPT

The next item on the agenda is the approval of the transcript from the June 17, 2014 meeting that was sent out. It's on the website for everyone to look at. Were there any additions, corrections or questions about the transcript? Anyone on the phone and if you're on the phone, remember to unmute yourself if you're going to say something and then identify yourself too. All right, then I will take it as unanimous consent that the transcript is approved as presented.

REPORT OF THE NORTH AMERICAN NUMBERING PLAN ADMINISTRATOR (NANPA)

The first of the reports that we have is the report from the NANPA, the North American Numbering Plan Administrator. Let me go back. We will label the agenda as item number 1. The transcript is item number 2. And now, we are at item number 3, for the record, the report of the North American Numbering Plan Administrator.

John Manning: Good morning everybody. This is John Manning, director of the North American Numbering Plan Administration Group. My report this morning will focus on two primary areas. First of all, as an update on the status of the various resources that NANPA administers and second of all, we'll talk a little bit about relief planning activities that are currently underway in the numbering plan. Also, I have a few other items just to touch upon briefly. So on page 2, starting first with area codes, since our last meeting, we did assign one area code. The NPA 743 was assigned in relief of NPA 336 in North Carolina that occurred on August the 15th.

In 2014, there had been five area codes that went into service: the Kentucky 364; the NPA 725 in Nevada; the 346 in Texas; and just at the end of August, the 959 in Connecticut - all geographic area codes that went into service. Back in March of this year, we have one non-geographic area code, the 577 to go into service. There is just one area code with a future 2014 in service date that's up in Canada. The 782 will overlay the 902 area code which is scheduled for November 30th of this year.

With regard to central office code activity, the chart on the middle of page 2 provides you a readout of where we are from January through August 31st of this year talking about the quantity of assignments, returns, denials, and net assignments compared with the previous four years the same time period. In

terms of assignments, you'll see that approximately 1,900 codes have been assigned to date in 2014 which is in line with the previous four years. Quantity of denials are slightly less as well as all the returns. Net assignments for this year, approximately 1,760 codes, again, somewhat in line with the previous years and we're projecting that by the end of this year we will see assignments in roughly 2,800 to possibly 2,900 codes this year, slightly higher than the previous year but still in line with the previous four years.

With regard to the other resources that we administer, first of all, Feature Group B Carrier Identification Codes, no assignments of these codes so far this year and one code has been returned or reclaimed. As of the August 31st, there's 263 Feature Group B CICs that's assigned. Feature Group D Carrier Identification Codes, we've assigned 16 of these codes to date. A total of 40 Feature Group D CICs have been returned or reclaimed and at the end of August, we had 2,000 Feature Group D assignments leaving over 7,700 Feature Group D CICs available for assignments.

On page 3, the 5XX NPA, since the beginning of 2014, we've assigned 449 codes and over that same time period, one code has been returned or reclaimed and as of the end of August 3,447 codes are assigned leaving 507 codes available for assignment out of the 5XX NPA resource.

For 900 NPA, no assignments this year, four codes have been recovered and as of the end of August, there are 56 codes assigned, 39 codes have been reserved and 697 codes available for assignment.

The 555 line number resource, there have been no assignments and no returns or reclamation but the 800-855 resource which is used for hearing-impaired services, one number has been recovered in 2014.

With regard to the 456 area code used for international inbound services, one 456-NXX code was returned to NANPA in 2014. There are three 456-NXX codes assigned to date. And there's been no activity in terms of assignments or reclamations regarding vertical service codes, Automatic Number Identification or ANI information digit pairs or the N11 code resource.

Any questions on NANPA resource update?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Questions? Questions on the phone?

John Manning. Okay.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay. Thank you.

John Manning: Page 4, turn your attention to Area Code Relief Planning and the first item here is Indiana 812. Just in a summary, back in July of 2013, the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission approved an all services overlay and the new 930 area code was set to cover the same geographic territory as the

9

existing 812. Permissive 10-digit dialing started in March of this year with mandatory dialing scheduled to begin on September the 6th with an effective date of the 930 area code of October the 6th.

However, on August the 6th, the Indiana Commission issued an order extending the permissive dialing period for the 812 NPA until further notice from the commission. The commission stated there were concerns regarding the ability of certain businesses that service the medical and law enforcement industry to switch to mandatory 10-digit dialing by the due date of September 6, 2014. As a result of that order, the commission held a technical conference on September the 3rd. They discussed the need for this delay and have tentatively set a new date for mandatory 10-digit dialing on February 7th, 2015. So there will be a slight delay in the implementation of the 930 area code.

Tennessee 615, since our last meeting, they initiated permissive 10-digit dialing which started on July 26, 2014. In California 415, they've also initiated 1-plus 10-digit dialing on a permissive basis beginning August 16, 2014. Both of the area codes will be relieved in the March timeframe within service date of March 28th and March 21 respectively.

In Ohio 740, again, also an overlay, permissive 10-digit dialing with a schedule to begin on September the 20th which is

just a few days from today with the 10-digit mandatory dialing

starting on March 21st and the in-service date of April of 2015.

South Carolina 843, since our last meeting, there has been

no changes with regard to this activity. They still have

permissive dialing schedule to begin in March of next year with

mandatory dialing in September of 2015 and an end service date

of October 19, 2015.

Florida 305, now Florida back in June, we notified the

Florida Commission that the exhaust of the remaining prefixes

for the NPA 305 over the Keys rate center was projected to

exhaust within the next 18 months. In July, this matter was

reviewed by the Public Service Commission and on July 18th, the

PSC ordered mandating or issued an order mandating 10-digit

dialing to begin April 18, 2015 in the Keys rate center, which

to note, permissive 10-digit dialing was already in place. So

the extension of the 786 area code over the Florida Keys rate

center shall be implemented on June 1, 2015.

In Indiana, we conducted a relief planning meeting for the

317 area code which covers Indianapolis. The industry reached

agreement to recommend an overlay and then to file a petition on

behalf of the industry with the commission on July 10, 2014 with

that recommendation.

In North Carolina, the 336 area code, on August the 13,

2014, the North Carolina Utility Commission approved an all

11

services overlay of the 336. The 743 area code was assigned and will serve the same geographic territory as the existing 336. We conducted an NPA implementation meeting on September 4th and expect to file an implementation plan shortly.

That's all the relief planning activities. I'll pause here if there are any questions.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions? Questions on the phone? Thank you, John.

John Manning. Okay. Make note there are two other items. We will be publishing our third quarter NANPA newsletter in the first few days of October, just a few short weeks. And also we are currently working on our October 2014 NPA and NANPA exhaust projections which we will make available by the end of October and appropriate notice will be sent to the industry when they are posted to the website.

Finally, as I normally include the last few pages is a chart showing all area codes projected to exhaust in the next 36 months and gives you a readout on where those particular relief planning activities stand at this time.

That concludes my presentation. Are there any questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions? Okay. Thank you, John.

John Manning: Thank you.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL THOUSANDS BLOCK POOLING ADMINISTRATOR (PA)

CHAIRMAN KANE: We turn to the next item on the agenda and
that is the report of the National Thousands-Block Pooling
Administrator and we will mark that report as item number 4.
Welcome. Good morning, Amy.

Amy Putnam: Good morning. I'm Amy Putnam, director of
Thousands-Block Pooling and pooling is fine. The first chart
that I have in the document is the Pooling Administration
summary data for the past 12 months. You'll notice that from
July to August, we had an increase and we encourage you keep up
the good work. Get those applications in. We like them. Most
of the increase from July and August had to do with a network
cleanup. You'll see a corresponding increase down in the fourth
line down number of change request to existing blocks between
those months but we don't care what the application says. Just
get it in. We like our numbers up.

The next chart is the p-ANI summary data. You'll see that
in March, we had a network cleanup but within the last few
months, we are moving steadily upward. That network cleanup in
March that you see in the total applications processed
corresponds to the fourth line down there in number of
modifications to existing p-ANIs that shows what caused that
spike. Other than that, as I said, we're moving steadily upward
in the number of new p-ANI assignments made and other than that,

13

we're doing fine with p-ANI, with other than that, we're doing fine.

Part 3 summary data on the next page and part 3 summary data sorted by type. As I generally say if you need to fall asleep some evening, browse through this.

The next chart shows the number of NXX codes opened in the past 12 months. Then we have the summary of rate center information changes. These are changes from X to O excluded to optional or from mandatory single service provider to optional, generally. And the reclamation summary, we noticed that the number of new blocks on the reclamation list is drifting downward very nicely down to 21 new blocks in August and we're down to a total of 277 blocks on the reclamation list.

The next couple of charts show the system performance for both the Pooling Administration system and the p-ANI administration system or the RNAS, the Routing Number Administration System. And then we get to other pooling related activities.

We submitted all of our contractual reporting requirement documents on time. With respect to p-ANI administration as of August 31st, we continued working on reconciling p-ANI data where the same p-ANI range is being reported by more than one carrier. We have one range left to be resolved and it let the network reflect two thumbs up, the transcript. The last update we had

14

was at the end of August and the entity involved said it should be resolved by the end of September. The PCEP [phonetic] continues to struggle to provide them time to test. As soon as they can test it, we can close this out and stop reporting on it.

The second thing we work on, on a regular basis and no assignee reported on a p-ANI range that the assignee reported this being assigned. We have 179 ranges still unresolved. We started with 4,561 so about 96 percent of the ranges have been resolved either by making the range available or by correcting the data to show it as assigned to the carrier.

The third item is duplicate assignment issues. We started reporting on this assuming that this was some sort of an other activity. In fact, the more p-ANIs we assigned the more duplicates we get. This has part turned out to be part of doing business, so this is going to come off of this section of the report for the future. Since the first of the year, we were notified of 61 assignments that we've made where the record was already loaded to another provider and we either exchanged it with a new range or the record was removed. It's a time consuming process involving going back and forth between the carriers involved and the network provider and is just more work than it appears to be but it's just part of doing business. We attended the ESIF meeting in July. We meet regularly with the

15

NOWG on a monthly basis. With respect to change orders, the only pending change order at this point, and I apologize, my allergies kicked in as soon as I got to the D.C. area.

CHAIRMAN KANE: We apologize for D.C.'s weather.

Amy Putnam: With respect to change orders, the only pending change order is what is left of change order 24 from the previous contract and that will roll out with the new system in January. We continue working on development and testing for the refresh of PAS and working on development and testing, and working on development and testing. I have a number of people who are going to be very, very glad when that is off their plates and they can get back to do doing their day jobs, just their day jobs.

In July, we did our annual MSA review. We do this every year when we determine that the new census estimates are available. This involves comparing the counties in the existing MSAs to the counties in the new list of MSAs to see if any counties have been moved. Then, we verify the population figures for each county and add them up for each MSA and resort the MSAs by population, comparing them with the previous MSA rankings. Again, something that's easy to explain but manual and time consuming.

This year, the composition of the top 100 MSAs didn't change. There were a number of rearrangements and placement on

16

the list, most of them minor. The biggest changes were the Worcester, Massachusetts-Connecticut Metropolitan Statistical Area dropped from 59th to 71st. The San Juan-Carolina-Caguas, Puerto Rico Metropolitan Statistical Area changed from 23rd to 34th. The largest increase was Provo-Orem, Utah which went from 98th to 95th, and I thank you. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions on the phone?

Kalun Lee: Yeah. Hi. This is Kalun Lee with Massachusetts. With regard to Worcester, could you help me understand the statistical change?

Amy Putnam: I would assume that it was a population issue. The piece of Connecticut that's in that MSA, I believe is Windham County, Connecticut and since the changes directly relate to population, there must have been -- people got sick of living in Worcester or --

Kalun Lee: No one would ever get sick of living in Worcester for the record, but thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN KANE: We'll blame it on Connecticut.

Amy Putnam: Maybe they got sick of living in Northern Connecticut.

Kalun Lee: Thank you very much.

Amy Putnam: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Just to clarify, Amy. These are relative speaking so that it may not be necessarily that a particular SMA lost population, but then another one gained.

Amy Putnam: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN KANE: It can also be -- it's a relative ranking.

Amy Putnam: That's a relative ranking, yes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Thank you very much. Any other questions? Okay. Thank you.

Amy Putnam: You're welcome.

REPORT OF THE NUMBERING OVERSIGHT WORKING GROUP (NOWG)

CHAIRMAN KANE: The item number 5 on our agenda, the report is from the Numbering Oversight Working Group, the NOWG. Thank you. We will label this report for the record as item, report number 5, document number 5.

Laura Dalton: Good morning.

Thomas Dixon: Excuse me. Chairman Kane.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes.

Thomas Dixon: A number of people have joined. I just wanted to advise my presence on the phone. This is Tom Dixon and I'm the representative on behalf of NASUCA. I've heard the tones indicating probably other people have signed in and I just wanted to note my attendance. Also, if I could beg your indulgence for a minute, I have sent a message to you and Carmell Weathers that I am no longer an employee of the Colorado

18

Office of Consumer Counsel and therefore can no longer be a representative for NASUCA. I have accepted a position as first assistant attorney general or a first assistant attorney general in the Colorado Office of the Attorney General and I just wanted to advise you that I will have to resign from the committee and would plan on probably dropping off the call shortly.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay, yes. Thank you, Tom, and I did mention at the beginning that we were losing one of the NASUCA representatives but thank you for sitting in and reporting back at least on today's meeting to NASUCA. We look forward to their nomination of a newbie. We thank you for your service over the years.

Thomas Dixon: Well, thank you and it's been a pleasure working with the committee and the committee members and being a participant and again, I appreciate you letting me make this comment at this time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Rosemary.

Rosemary Emmer: Hi. This is Rosemary Emmer with Sprint. I just wanted to thank you also and congratulations.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. And are there additional people who have joined the phone bridge since we did the roll call?

Brad Ramsay: Brad Ramsay's here.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Hello, Brad from NARUC. Very good. Anyone else? And we have in the room, also joining us --

19

Hank Hultquist: Late arrival, Hank Hultquist with AT&T.

CHAIRMAN KANE: With AT&T. Thank you.

Jerome Candelaria: Jerome Candelaria with NCTA.

Brendan Kasper: Brendan Kasper with Vonage.

David Greenhaus: I'm David Greenhaus with 800 Response.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes. Thank you very much. All right.
Now, let's move to item number 6 on the agenda which is the
report of the North American Numbering Plan Billing and
Collection Agent.

Laura Dalton: No, I didn't speak yet.

CHAIRMAN KANE: No. I'm sorry. We didn't you --

Laura Dalton: That's all right.

CHAIRMAN KANE: We're just moving along a little too fast.
Well, thank you. We'll go back and have the NOWG report. Thank
you.

Laura Dalton: Good morning. I'm Laura Dalton from
Verizon. I'm one of the co-chairs of the Numbering Oversight
Working Group which is the NOWG along with Karen Riepenkroger
from Sprint. Slide 2, lists the contents of our report. The
topics that I'll be discussing on the following slides are the
NOWG's proposed 2014 performance surveys for the NANPA, PA and
RNA. I'll discuss the proposed change to the performance
evaluation reports. The NOWG will request the NANC's
concurrence with our proposed changes. I will also briefly

mention the NANPA and PA change orders followed by the last couple of slides that show the NOWG participants and our upcoming meeting schedule.

Turning to slide 3, 2014 performance surveys. One of the NOWG's main functions in evaluating the performance of the NANPA and the PA involves conducting an annual survey to obtain industry wide feedback on the numbering administrators' performance. Each year, the NOWG reviews and updates the performance survey forms and questions. This year, the NOWG is proposing some major changes to streamline the surveys. The changes that we're proposing are not only to streamline the questions but also to simplify the ratings categories. These changes are reflected in the draft 2014 surveys that were distributed to the NANC members for review along with the documents for today's meeting. Specifically, we would like to change the survey ratings scale and corresponding ratings definitions to the following three categories: met, not met and not applicable. Additionally, we would like to shorten the surveys by reducing the number of questions to only one question per topic. Also, we would like to consolidate the written comment sections into one area at the end of the survey.

Slide 4, the feedback that we receive from the surveys factors into the NOWG's assessment of the NANPA and the PA and weighs into the annual ratings given to the administrators in

the performance evaluation reports. So if we change the rating

scale used in the surveys, the NOWG is proposing to also change

the rating scale that's used in the performance reports. So

rather than using the five-ratings categories that we used in

the past, performance reports which were exceeded more than met,

met, sometimes met, and not met, the NOWG is proposing to reduce

the number of categories of ratings in the performance reports

to either met or not met. Even though the ratings categories

would be reduced, the content of the performance reports and the

details provided by the NOWG about the work performed by the

NANPA and the PA would remain the same.

Turning to slide 5, since the NANPA and the PA would be

impacted by changes to the surveys and the performance report

ratings, we asked them what they thought of the proposed changes

and both were supportive. We also discussed this issue with the

FCC, and the FCC was not opposed to the concept of the NOWG

modifying the performance evaluation report ratings.

So now, I'll ask the NANC if there are any questions

regarding either the proposed 2014 surveys or the proposed

change to the ratings scales to be used in upcoming performance

evaluation reports.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay. So we have two proposals before us

asking for NANC's concurrence. Number one with the changes to

22

the surveys, and number two with the evaluation report ratings essentially to go to met and not met. All right. Mary.

Mary Retka: Mary Retka from CenturyLink. No questions. I just want to state that I think in changing to this format and this method of making the ratings met and not met that you'll get more survey participation and that's what we're really looking for so we get more feedback. Thank you.

Laura Dalton: Right. We're hoping that more people would be willing to respond when it doesn't take so much of their time.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay. Rosemary.

Rosemary Emmer: Rosemary Emmer with Sprint. The B&C Working Group started out the same way the NOWG has rated over time because we like consistency in the process here at the NANC. But over time we realized that the met, not met for the B&C Working Group was actually a better way to go for many, many, many different reasons. So I like the fact that it would be consistent again that we would again be consistent with our process so I support it. Thank you.

Kevin Green: Kevin Green, Verizon. I appreciate the work that went in to making these changes. I think the simplification would be helpful and I expect also that you will get a higher return rate, so we certainly appreciate that and we support it.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Okay. Any comments of the phone on the two proposals? I'm not hearing any opposition from anyone. We will conclude that a unanimous consent, we agreed with those two recommended changes. Thank you for your work on that.

Laura Dalton: Thank you. Okay. So just briefly moving on to slide 6, NANPA and PA change orders. Whenever the NANPA and the PA submit a change or a proposal to the FCC, the NOWG reviews the change order and prepares the summary and recommendation. Since the last NANC meeting, no new change orders were submitted by either the NANPA or the PA. All previously reported NANPA change orders have been implemented and as Amy had mentioned before, there's one PA change order that's currently outstanding, Change Order 24, to enhance the FTP interface with PAS. It was approved in 2012 but has not yet been fully implemented. The remaining FTP enhancements are targeted for completion in January 2015 with the roll out of the new enhanced PAS.

Slide 7 shows a list of NOWG participants. We currently have representatives from eight service providers in two state regulatory commissions who participated in the NOWG.

Slide 8 shows the NOWG's upcoming meetings schedule for our regularly scheduled meetings. The NOWG's monthly conference calls are held separately with the NANPA and the PA to review their activities and each month following our calls with the two

24

numbering administrators, we hold NOWG-only calls to discuss any issues that may require a followup.

And the last slide, slide 9, notes that in addition to the monthly conference calls, we schedule other NOWG-only calls when needed. This slide also shows the contact information for the co-chairs. If anyone's interested in joining the NOWG, please feel free to contact us. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much, Laura. Any questions on the report? Thank you for that report. Now, we will move to item number 6. The report of the North -- oh, I'm sorry. Yes. I'm sorry, Jerome. I did not see you.

Jerome Candelaria: Jerome Candelaria, NCTA.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes.

Jerome Candelaria: So you plan, you expect that this revised survey will be implemented in the next round?

Laura Dalton: Yes. We typically issue the surveys at the first business day of the New Year so January 2nd or 3rd. They're usually issued and it's one for the NANPA, one for the PA and one for the RNA. So we have different questions on each but each of them were made more concise so the questions are shorter and fewer questions but we feel that we're not losing anything in the process. We're still asking the same type of questions but just kind of getting to it in a more concise way.

Jerome Candelaria: Okay. Thanks for the time.

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

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you for that question. Okay. Now, the report of the North American Numbering Plan Billing and Collection Agent and this will be document number 6.

Garth Steele: Good morning. My name is Garth Steele, I'm a partner with Welch LLP and we're the billing and collection agent for the North American Numbering Plan Fund and it's my pleasure to take you through the financial update to the end of August. The first page of the report summarizes the assets and liabilities of the fund as at August the 31st. It's a very strong financial position with a total fund balance of $3.7 million represented primarily by cash in the bank of $3.8 million, accounts receivable of just under $400,000 at less accrued liabilities for amounts owing the suppliers for the month of August to $500,000. So, a fund balance at the end of August of $3.7 million.

The next page provides a summary of revenue and expenses over the course of the current funding year and this year runs from July 2014 to June 2015. The first two columns in the page represent actual results for the months of July and August and the remaining columns from September through June are projections or budgets for the remainder of the year. I'll focus on the two right hand columns being the total, a projected

26

balance as compared to our budget and if you look at the bottom

of those columns, you'll see that we're projecting as of today,

we're projecting a fund balance at the end of June of just over

a million dollars, a million and seventy-nine thousand dollars

and that compares to our original budget when we had projected

to have a million-dollar surplus which was our contingency fund

that we had built into the budgeting process. So we're very

close. Our projection at this point is that we would be very

close to budget but of course, we're only two months into the

year and the bulk of the year has yet to play out. There's a

box on the bottom right hand corner of that page that explains

the variants from budget with the primary difference being that

we were able to collect more than we had originally budgeted.

Of course, when we prepared the budget it's based on estimates

for telecom revenue and so on, so we're fairly close to the

budget on there but it looks like we might have a slightly

higher surplus than we desired but overall, things look to be

quite on track.

Flipping to the next page, you've asked us to provide a

list of upcoming expenditures for a rolling six-month period and

those are listed here for you. These were the same figures that

were presented in the cash flow projection on the previous page.

And on the back of the report is a deliverables report that goes

through a number of various key issues for us, with the only

change really from the prior report being the last item with respect to accounts receivable. We are now required to transfer outstanding receivables to treasury for collection after 120 days instead of the previous requirement of 180 days. However, it's our practice to be transferring those to treasury within 90 days of their due date. That concludes my report.

REPORT OF THE BILLING AND COLLECTION WORKING GROUP (B&C WG)

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much. Any questions on the report? And now, we'll have the Billing and Collection Working Group which will be document number 7.

Rosemary Emmer: Hi, everyone. Rosemary Emmer with Sprint. I'm one of the co-chairs for the Billing and Collection Working Group, along with Tim Decker with Verizon who is also here today. I like to thank Garth for coming to D.C. today and delivering the report to us. Please give Faith our regards.

The Billing and Collection Agent Oversight Working Group is responsible for overseeing the performance of the North American Numbering Plan agent. We identify and determine the financial impacts for the budget. Any kind of new activities that come in to the budget that needs to be included, we oversee those and make sure we have enough money to cover it, with that and within our contingency amount. Our current activities for the last couple of months, we've been overseeing the monthly billing and collections. We evaluate the deliverables every time we meet.

28

We are going to talk today a little bit about the B&C agent
contract and also the funding year billing cycle that we went
over during the last meeting, we're going to go over that again
today.

As far as the contract renewal on page 4, the B&C agent
contract expired October 1, 2009 and they received an extension
through 2014, and I don't believe there's been an update to
that. But I wanted to make sure that everyone was aware.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Rosemary, that's through December 31, 2014
until the end of the calendar year?

Rosemary Emmer: As I understand it. If you'll move to
page 6, the funding year. During the June 2014 NANC meeting, we
all discussed and we agreed to moving forward with the changes
to the current budget, allowing for our funding year to align
with the federal fiscal year. We need direction at this point
as to when and how to proceed because we need to transition
this, and in order to transition, we need the final approval
from the FCC or from the NANC or whatever the actual process is
going to be. We need the approval in January or by January
because we will be preparing the budget in order to budget for
15 months instead of for 12 months. This will be a big year for
us. We definitely are not sure exactly what the approval
process is at this point, but we definitely need that approval

in order to move forward with the agreement that we reached. So I bring that up today.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, Mary.

Mary Retka: Mary Retka from CenturyLink. As you can probably imagine, Chairman Kane, the parties that have to provide the input to Rosemary for us at the B&C Working Group to do that estimation of what our forecast is going to be also need to be prepared. So without some advance notice to them for them to be able to provide the projections to Rosemary, it becomes a little bit more challenging. It would be very helpful if perhaps the NANC chair could reach out to the FCC and get some formal approval so we could move forward on that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, we did take that action at our June meeting to agree that this was a good idea. And I will certainly get formal approval. The formal approval that's needed for the NANC has been accomplished. We've made that decision, whether a formal approval from the FCC - I'll turn to our federal officer as to -- that's been communicated because it's part of the record of what we did here. Is there any formal official approval needed from the FCC, and if so, from what level?

Marilyn Jones: This is Marilyn Jones, DFO. Sorry, Chairman Kane, I haven't been brought up to speed on this

particular issue. I'll get with Sanford and the contracting

folks and get back to you with a response.

CHAIRMAN KANE: If we could have that as soon as possible

so that that process can be put in place to notify all the

affected parties. They can get that done because we did approve

it in June. Rosemary, to start your budgeting -- your current

funding year ends in June, and I recall our discussion was we

have to do a 15-month budget. Instead of going from July 1st to

June 30th, we would be going July 1st to September 30th for --

Rosemary Emmer: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN KANE: We could do a nine-month budget or we could

do a 15-month budget. But our discussion was we'll do a 15-

month budget.

Rosemary Emmer: Yeah, we're comfortable with the 15-month

timeframe at least at this point.

CHAIRMAN KANE: To start from July 1, 2015 through

September 30, 2016 that would be the 15-month budget. And then

we'd start in October 1, 2016 with --

Rosemary Emmer: That sounds right, although September 1st

keeps popping into my head. But that sounds right in any event.

CHAIRMAN KANE: The federal fiscal year runs from October

1st to September 30th. And that was the decision at the last

meeting. We asked to conform it to the federal fiscal year. I

will follow up again with the commission, if there is any

approval needed. And if I can get an answer back quickly

whether or not it's approved and who needs to do it, and if the

FCC does need to take some official action. I'll try to get

that done as soon as possible.

Rosemary Emmer: Yes. We just thought now is the time to

ask that question since there is one more NANC meeting in

between now and January.

CHAIRMAN KANE: If you're going to do a billing in June and

figures in May, we need to know if that's going to be for 15

months.

Rosemary Emmer: If you'll jump to page 8, that lists our

current membership consisting of six carriers at this point.

Page 9 was our next meetings and also Tim and my email address,

if you have any questions about today or about the billing and

collection funding year, possible change or potential change.

Or if you want to join any of our upcoming meetings, we'll be

happy to provide the bridge number to you. If you'd like to

become a new member, we're also accepting new members at this

point. Thank you.

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

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you, Rosemary. Item number 8 is the

report of the North American Portability Management LLC, the

NAPM.

Tim Kagele: Good morning everybody. Tim Kagele with Comcast. I'm one of the co-chairs for the LLC. I share that role with Tim Decker, my colleague from Verizon. The NAPM LLC's role is the LNPA contract administrator. During the period, we had two new SOWs, statements of work, that were introduced. One was the seventh revision to SOW 24 which was requested by the LNPA working group and modified the end user testing certification requirements. That SOW was approved. The second SOW is revision 1 to SOW 88. That was requested by the LNPA to modify certain provisions of the master service agreement concerning the disclosure of LRN information associated with the TN by a user that is, to an entity, that is not a user with certain restrictions. That particular change is under review.

In terms of general updates, we've had one new member that has joined the LLC, that is Bandwidth Communications. We're very pleased with that. Our recruiting efforts, outreach efforts, continue. And in terms of the other general point, the contractually required neutrality audit by the LNPA, audit number 12 for 2013 is complete. There were no anomalies detected in that report. Then lastly, there's nothing new with the FoNPAC. The FoNPAC has not met, and the LNPA selection process remains as a confidential nondisclosure item. So I'll be happy to entertain any questions.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions on this report. Okay, thank you.

Tim Kagele: Thank you everybody.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Oh, I'm sorry. Over there. Yes?

Male Voice: Wait a minute, which report are we on?

CHAIRMAN KANE: We're on the NAPM.

Male Voice: Okay, no questions.

CHAIRMAN KANE: The report we just heard.

Male Voice: Got it.

Tim Kagele: You let me off easy, eh.

REPORT OF THE LOCAL NUMBER PORTABILITY ADMINISTRATION (LNPA) SELECTION WORKING GROUP (SWG)

CHAIRMAN KANE: Anticipating the next one which is item number 9, which is the report of the LNPA Selection Working Group. Now, we did not get any written report document on that ahead of time. Anyone could make that report. I'm assuming the report, if we had one -- yes, let me just for the record --

Valerie Cardwell: Valerie Cardwell from Comcast. Chairman Kane, it's my understanding that the -- is this selection working group tied to the --

 CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes.

Valerie Cardwell: I'm trying to remember but I believe we specifically submitted a request to be taken off the agenda

34

because we had finished our work. I think that was at the last

NANC meeting.

CHAIRMAN KANE: We thank you for your work. Since it just

showed up here again, I just want to note that that work is

done. The LNPA Selection Working Group has no other role in the

process, and it will not be -- at least nothing to report, it

will not be on the agenda anymore. The matter has been

transferred essentially to the FCC, and it's in their hands.

Thank you.

REPORT OF THE LOCAL NUMBER PORTABILITY ADMINISTRATION (LNPA) WORKING GROUP

Now, we do have the LNPA Working Group, which is item 10.

Paula Jordan Campagnoli: This is Paula Jordan Campagnoli.

I'm on the bridge, and I will be giving a report for the LNPA

Working Group. Can everybody hear me?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes, Paula. Thank you.

Paula Jordan Campagnoli: The first item that we were going

to talk about is the NANC 372 which was the -- we've developed

requirements for a new interface for the NPAC SMS. That work

has been completed. And currently, we have one vendor that

completed the testing of the XML interface and is also now in

production. Any questions on that?

CHAIRMAN KANE: No questions here.

35

Paula Jordan Campagnoli: Okay. The next item is the transition from PSTN to IP. At the July 8th and 9th 2014 LNPA Working Group meeting, we had presentations from iconectiv, Neustar and AT&T. These presentations were requested by the LNPA Working Group to aid us in understanding how IP networks work. There was a lot of interest in those presentations. We had representatives from state commissions, ATIS committees from the FoN and additional service providers joined our July meeting to hear the presentation. We had several people in person, and we also had people on the bridge. So we have a lot of interest in those presentations. They were very well-received and very helpful to the LNPA Working Group.

The LNPA Working Group continues to monitor. We continue to monitor activities regarding PSTN to IP transition and to discuss the potential impacts of the transition on number portability. We have also established an LNPA sub team. It was established to examine the non-geographic porting. And that transition from PSTN to IP will remain on the agenda for the LNPA Working Group until such time as consensus is reached regarding any recommendation from the group. Our next face-to-face meeting is November 4th and 5th in Atlanta. That concludes the report unless you have any questions.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Any questions? Any questions on the phone? Paula, let me ask you about your new LNPA, your sub team,

looking at non-geographic porting. Any timetable for coming up

with anything that they might be wanting to report to us?

Paula Jordan Campagnoli: Their reports will come through

the -- it will be included in the LNPA Working Group report.

But they're working on a report, and they're trying to get a

draft that will done by November, but that's not confirmed. It

could be later. But they are working on the report, and when

that report has some meat to it, we will include it in our LNPA

Working Group report.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Very good. Thank you very much.

Paula Jordan Campagnoli: I do have one item that I would

like to request.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes.

Paula Jordan Campagnoli: We have a couple of best

practices that are outstanding. I just wanted to bring, try to

see if I could get some status, not maybe today but in the

future. And it's best practice 67 and also best practice 70.

If we could try to get some status, not necessarily today but in

the future.

CHAIRMAN KANE: For the record, those best practices are

pending at the commission, correct?

Paula Jordan Campagnoli: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KANE: For the record, they have come through. We

have recommended them at the NANC and they are pending at the

commission. I did follow up. I will follow up again and see.
Our DFO who is back is making a list here. Yes, we will find
out and get a report. And for getting information, I will have
that sent out by email to everybody. We don't need to wait
until the December meeting to see where those are.

Paula Jordan Campagnoli: I appreciate that. Thank you.

STATUS OF THE INDUSTRY NUMBERING COMMITTEE (INC) ACTIVITIES

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you, Paula. Item number 11 is the
status of the Industry Numbering Committee, INC activities.

Shaunna Forshee: Good morning. This is Shaunna Forshee
with Sprint. I'm one of the co-chairs for the Industry
Numbering Committee, along with Dyan Adams. Our report today is
going to be information about INC, our meetings and membership,
and issue 748 and issue 762.

The Industry Numbering Committee provides an open forum to
address and resolve industry-wide issues associated with
planning, administration, allocation, assignment and use of the
North American Numbering Plan Numbering Resources within the
NANP area. Membership information is listed below at the
following websites. Since the previous NANC meeting, INC has
held one face-to-face meeting, on July 29th through 31st and inter
meetings on July 23rd and August 26th. INC is currently meeting
this week here in D.C.

I would like to also extend an invitation to state regulatory staff members to attend any of our INC meetings. And also, you may register at the ATIS website for INC documents for your review.

Issue 748 assesses impacts in Numbering Resources and Numbering Administration with the transition of the PSTN to IP. INC has drafted a response to the FCC regarding the impacts of a large scale rate center consolidation during the transition from the PSTN to IP. We've outlined positive and negative impacts of large scale rate center consolidation, documented impacts to carriers' networks and systems. Identified that regulatory changes would be necessary. And concluded that given the complexities related to the large scale rate center consolidations, it is premature to develop a plan for implementation. However, as carriers' networks, architecture and the market drives the need for such consolidations, the industry and regulators should work together collaboratively to develop a plan.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Let me ask you clarification there, Shaunna. You said you drafted a response. Has that response actually been sent?

Shaunna Forshee: Actually, we worked on that yesterday.

CHAIRMAN KANE: So it's still in draft form, it hasn't been submitted?

Shaunna Forshee: It is. We're hoping to have a cover letter finished this week during our meeting, and hopefully, it will be submitted shortly.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Very good. Thank you.

Shaunna Forshee: Issue 762. CO codes assigned and transferred only to providers who own switching facilities. When a central office code is assigned and the Part 1 has an invalid switching entity or point of interconnection, the CO code cannot be built in iconectiv's business integrated routing and rating database system. This can result in delays that affect other service providers with blocks from that code, more red blocks in the pool, and strand the numbers if there is no regulatory direction to reclaim the code. Thus, the INC has modified the guidelines to expand verification that switching ID or POI is valid for an NPA-NXX assignment, and it's built on the BIRRD's database.

The next slide is our issues in initial pending. These will be implemented with the PAS enhancements. And the next slide is issues in our final closure. Again, our relevant INC websites at the ATIS URL. Are there any questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: I'm sorry, can you identify yourself.

Karen Reidy: Karen Reidy with CompTel. I had a question on slide number 5 where you say identify the regulatory changes that would be necessary. Is there somewhere where you provide

that information? What regulatory changes you're thinking are necessary?

Shaunna Forshee: Part of that can be nationwide 10-digit dialing, state-wide 10-digit dialing, possibly thousand-block pooling. The tariffs would have to be modified for different LECs. So there definitely would be some regulatory involvement to start that process.

Tiki Gaugler: Tiki Gaugler with XO. I think we all understand that there probably would be, is there a place where that's published that list, that you identified those?

Shaunna Forshee: There were some documents that were filed with the NANC 2006 and we've also included that in our response here that we will be sending to Dr. Schulzrinne and Dr. Jordan in the next couple of days, so it will a public document.

Tiki Gaugler: Okay, thanks.

CHAIRMAN KANE: So that goes back, because I'd asked that when you finish drafting and make it final, and you file it with the appropriate folks at the FCC, if you could send me a copy, too, then we could send it out to everyone and everyone could see it. I'm assuming it was intended to be a public document.

Shaunna Forshee: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Very good. Thank you. Mary?

Mary Retka: Chairman Kane, Mary Retka from CenturyLink. I would just suggest to the chairman that since we've been working

on these efforts through INC and through the other committees at the direction of Dr. Schulzrinne, who's been replaced by Scott Jordan, that perhaps it would be good to have the chairman reach out to Scott Jordan to see if there's alignment with the direction we've gotten from Dr. Schulzrinne going forward, so that we ensure that we're appropriately following where the FCC wishes to direct us. Maybe a suggestion for a potential action item on your part.

CHAIRMAN KANE: That would be good, and I'm just thinking we'll also just invite him to come to our December meeting so we could hear directly from the new person.

Mary Retka: Thank you.

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

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you. Future of Numbering Working Group. This is document number 12.

Suzanne Addington: Good morning. I am Suzanne Addington. I'm one of the tri-chairs of the FoN working group, along with Carolee Hall from the Idaho PUC, as well as Mark Lancaster from AT&T. On page 2 is our mission and scope, and on page 3 is an overview of our recent activity. We do have a contribution open from AT&T regarding numbering testbed parameters. We've given the information that's not been available recently; it's been put on hold.

42

We have two subcommittees currently in progress. The first one is FTN4 for geographic issues. They are discussing the consumer perspective and service implications regarding the geography of telephone numbers and the decoupling or disassociation of those numbers from geography. They are creating a white paper to be shared with the FoN Working Group upon completion, and that's specifically to toll free.

Our second subcommittee is FTN8 for all IP addressing. It's a subcommittee created to define future identifiers and support of IP industry trends beyond the e.164 numbering plan. On page 4 is a list of our FoN membership. And on page 5 is our meeting schedule. We held three calls since our last NANC meeting. Our calls are regularly, the first Wednesday of the month, and our next call is scheduled for October 1st. If you have any interest in attending, it is an open membership. Our email address is all provided there, just feel free to reach out to any of us. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Questions? Thank you, Suzanne.

REPORT OF THE INTERNET PROTOCOL ISSUE MANAGEMENT GROUP (IMG)

Now, the report of the Internet Protocol Issue Management Group.

Valerie Cardwell: Good morning. My name is Valerie Cardwell from Comcast. I'm one of the tri-chairs of the IP IMG,

43

as we are known in abbreviated form. As some of you remember,
this is a new IMG that was formed out of the March 2014 meeting.
So we're still on the forming stage, so to speak, but we are
making progress. There are two documents that I'll be referring
to during this discussion.

Since our last NANC meeting, there were two conference
calls held by the IP IMG on July 10th and August 14th. One of the
things that we had to clarify was who were the representatives
from the different industry groups that would be providing the
updates? It was kind of unclear. People had volunteers. We
have lots of volunteers which was great. However, it was
recognized that some of the people who had not volunteered but
were members of the IMG were actually like chairs of some of
these industry groups. Therefore, we felt that it was important
to establish a protocol that said, if you're part of the IPIMG
and you're a chair of an industry group, then you're responsible
for providing the update. If we don't have a chair or someone
who's in an official position, so to speak, then anyone can
provide that. But we would have designated folks who were
assigned to provide the updates, just to put some clarity on who
was giving us updates from these different groups.

I do know that one of the questions that came out of the
last NANC meeting was what groups are we getting input from?
We'll take a look at that in a second. In addition to

44

identifying the who, we identified the what. What was our process for getting updates from folks? So basically, we meet the second Thursday of the month, and the second Monday of the month, we ask folks to send us their updates via email and then we compile them and share them out to review on the call. It's a process that seems to be working effectively.

The other thing that we did was, we all know that Mr. Schulzrinne has left the FCC and his official position as a CTO. And a lot of the issues that we were tracking originated out of several of his presentations. So we shifted our tracking document to make it more neutral and focus on the issues, and we'll talk about that in a second.

On page 3, what you will see are these various industry groups that we currently are receiving input from. It is an open committee so let me put the commercial out there now. If anybody here would like to participate, bring more ideas to the IPIMG, we welcome that. But these are the currently assigned folks from the different industry groups that were providing input and updates, as well as industry groups themselves.

As I've indicated before, we meet on the second Thursday of the month, from 11:00 to 12:00. Our emails are there should you decide you would like to participate. In the appendix, because again we are new, I didn't continue to keep our mission statement and scope and then also our membership. In case

you're wondering who we currently have on the team, there you have the list of the companies.

Lastly, what we did send out also is the IP transition tracking document. You will see that there are 15 distinct issues related to the transition to an all-IP network if you will.

CHAIRMAN KANE: Valerie, we'll mark that second document as 13-A.

Valerie Cardwell: Thank you, Chairman Kane. I'm not going to go through this, but I wanted to just point out that, again, since we're getting updates from the different industry groups, some of this stuff may be repetitive because the individual industry groups came and provided their updates. Our mission and our charge is to kind of collect all the issues that are going on in the various industry groups and try to keep them in one place. So most of the information that you see here, you will have seen on other documents. But again, we're trying to keep them focused by the issue in all the different groups. I will say, again, as a waiver, that it may not be complete or comprehensive. It's based on those that we know providing the input. Again, certainly, if you're aware of something going on, there's lots of forums going on overseas, internationally and things like that. This is really trying to be the kitchen sink

of capturing all the IP issues, transition to IP issues group for the world, so we're really open to a lot of input.

The only last thing I will say is that we do have specifically an item which is item 15, which is the testbed workshops. As you all know, that was originated out of an order by the FCC. And with the change of the CTO, we are very anxious to find out what is going to happen with the testbed workshop, specifically the scheduling of another one. Also, the minutes or the outcome from the first one. I know Mary Retka, I'd love to just acknowledge her efforts to try to keep this as a focused effort at the FCC, had reached out to Mr. Schulzrinne before he left to ask what about the minutes, and we still have not seen anything from that March session. So we are anxiously awaiting, again, the March meeting minutes, but also the scheduling of the second testbed workshop. Does anybody have any questions?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Thank you very much for your work. I think a lot has been accomplished in the short time in pooling together all of those. I don't know about taking on the world, probably taking on the United States will be enough, but you are correct, and we had mentioned before that there are a number of things going on internationally that it's important to track. I will again be following up both in person and in writing with Mr. Schulzrinne's replacement to see if we can get some answers

to where the commission intends to go and see also if he can come to our December meeting and give a report in person. All right, that ends our prepared agenda I should say.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

Summary of action items, we say we took an action to approve the change in the survey and in the evaluation terms for the billing and collection. I will follow up again with the FCC about changing the fiscal year and what kind of approval is needed, if any, from the FCC. We'll find out the status of the best practices on number 67 and number 70. And we will find out what is going to happen in terms of the work for the testbed, particularly for testbed number 2 and the minutes from the testbed with that conference that was held in March of 2014.

Mary Retka: Mary Retka from CenturyLink. Was there also a followup you intended with Marilyn on the B&C agency?

CHAIRMAN KANE: The B&C status of the contract again. Yes, and knowing that that expires in just a few more months, as to where we can go, when we can expect some action on that.

PUBLIC COMMENTS AND PARTICIPATION

Are there any public comments? Any member of the public who wish to make a comment?

OTHER BUSINESS

Any other business to come before the council? Though it says, we will adjourn no later than 2:00 PM. It is 11:16 AM.

Thank you again for participating, and I look forward to seeing you. Our next meeting is December 9th. Let me double check. I promise no snow. I don't know, the Farmer's Almanac says it's going to be -- yes.

Female Voice: Is it December 9th?

CHAIRMAN KANE: Yes. Tuesday, December 9th, 10:00 AM, here at the commission. That sets early in the season, so we'll make sure it's okay. Thank you, the meeting is adjourned.

[End of File]

[End of Transcript]