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 *“As was discussed at the December 1st  meeting of the North American Numbering Council (NANC), the FCC requested the NANC, by letter to me dated November 16th, to “evaluate and recommend actions to enable nationwide number portability through technical modifications to the Location Routing Number (LRN) system used to route wireless- and wireline- originated calls to ported numbers.”  The FCC requested that the NANC provide Status Report updates on our progress in evaluating the identified issues at 45-day intervals, as well as at the NANC meetings, and to report our findings and proposed solutions to each identified issue no later than May 16, 2016.  The FCC requested the NANC address the specific issues identified below.*

**NANC meeting update**

* + The NANC Chair held a meeting with all of the co-chairs of the NANC committees tasked with responding to the issues/questions on February 8, 2016
		- All chairs of the NANC Working Groups met with the NANC chair to provide interim NNP reports
	+ The chair’s working groups agreed to the term Nationwide Number Portability (NNP); which will be synonymous with the NGNP term in the LNPA WG whitepaper
	+ The FoN WG will need to identify the definition of NNP for the final report to the NANC. Assumptions from all working groups were discussed and agreed to
	+ The LNPA WG and FoN WG are working together to complete the NNP tasked assigned by the NANC Chair

**NANC issue items:**

**Assumptions** agreed:

1) Assume when the consumer engages in NNP they physically move and their interconnect point is established in their new geography.

2) Assume that the consumer is now under the new district (porting to a different rate center or LATA within the same state) or new state laws/regulations.

3) NNP should be implemented up to and including crossing state lines (porting from CA to NY)

4) The use of LRNs will continue until such a time when a different technical solution is used.

It was agreed the above assumptions is a good place to start and can be edited and improved as discussions continue.

**Recommendation:**

The industry needs to define an agreed to technical solution before implementing NNP while working with ATIS. It is premature for the cost recovery piece to be answered until the technical solution is determined.

The tri-chairs have reached out to ATIS and the PTSC asking for a potential timeline to be included in a future report.

The tri-chairs have not heard back from the PTSC as of 2/23/2016. However, the PTSC is meeting at the same time that the FoN WG is meeting today.

NARUC met since the last FoN WG meeting. Carolee Hall gave an update. The NANC Chair gave an update and indicated that the FoN WG was doing a very good job of working on NNP.

1. **Applicability and assessment of tolls, tariffs, and taxes; (FON WG)**
* Update from subcommittee
	+ Carolee met with Michele and discussed the question from Chairman Kane: Question: A person takes their *wireless* TN and ports to a *wireline* company from NY to Wyoming. Chairman Kane wanted to know what the implication to the carriers would be. Answer: Ultimately, it would be dependent upon which carrier takes the number and then its rates, terms and conditions for the new location would apply. The rate of return becomes a company specific condition. (See Assumption 2)
1. **The role of state regulatory commissions; (FON WG)**
	* Update from states
	* Tariffs and Rulemaking

Each state has its own specific methodology for rule making and tariffing. With NNP these processes may require some changes to accommodate an interstate program and rules. (see the subcommittee paper, incorporate into final report)

* + Coordination among states for rules and common practices for NNP

Each state creates its rules based on formal proceedings. Any state rules that conflict with a federal rule will have to be changed. This concern will need close scrutiny at the Federal Communication Commission to ensure there is clarity for States, industry and consumers.

* + - With NNP there may be a need for nationwide 10-digit dialing, which will require States/Federal/Industry collaboration to educate and implement.
	+ Consumer Complaints

Some carriers do not provide service throughout the United States, therefore there is a concern surrounding NNP and consumer complaint resolution. Specifically, in an NNP port scenario, which state would adjudicate a consumer’s complaint should a portability problem arise? At the core of this concern is a jurisdictional question, as to whether NNP is local or interstate, which will need to be resolved.

* + Public Safety

It is crucial that all 911/NG911 and PSAPs can coordinate/collaborate their expertise to provide seamless emergency services for the public. Since many states do not have the authority to perform these tasks 911/NG911 becomes another issue that will need to be vetted at the local State and Federal levels.

Issue: Regulatory fees assessed on all SPs and End Users. If a customer is porting their number into a state the (out of state) area code must be able to be identified for all the new jurisdiction taxes, fees, e911etc.

Issues: Some states have limited or no authority at this time due to state statutes.

Recommended Solution:
Given that not all states are represented on the FON WG call, we believe that the FCC should put this out for comment and notice of proposed rulemaking to get the States input on jurisdiction and procedural rulings. \*The FCC has to determine jurisdiction and determine delegated authority.

The FoN WG continues to discuss this in more detail.

* **Service Providers** should also come to the next meeting prepared to discuss how carriers identify who gets EAS error messages and how to handle when LATA’s cross state boundaries (i.e.: is it based on rate center or is it physical location at that moment of call? Etc.)
	+ Further examination would have to occur based on any technical solution for NNP. Would impact LNPA WG Best Practice 004(BP 4 N-1 dip responsibility for routing calls to ported and pooled numbers)
	+ Was the FON going to send something back to the LNPA WG for advisement????
1. **Costs, including cost recovery;**

There was an action item from the Jan 12 call that Service Providers should review this item and come to the next meeting prepared to discuss the following items:

* What costs would be involved to roll out NNP?
	+ Updates/changes to:
		- Switches, billing and rating systems, back office systems changes, provisioning systems, updates to SPs networks, timing for implementation, customer education,
	+ Recommendation: A cost benefit analysis must be done to determine if NNP is beneficial to the consumers and SPs which outweigh the costs for implementation.
	+ Recommendation: The FCC should put this out for comment and notice of proposed rulemaking to get input from Service Provider’s on their costs for changes in internal support systems, back office systems (ie: billing and rating systems, provisioning systems) and networks based on the identified technical solution to implement NNP.
	+ Suggested Recommendation: The FCC should order nationwide 10-digit dialing (discuss on the next call).
	+ Suggested Recommendation: Nationwide Number Assignment needs to be evaluated on how it affects NNP.
	+ Conclusion: A solution cannot be thoroughly evaluated until a single technical solution has been identified (or recommended?) by the industry.
* Reach out to the other working groups to see if they have discussed any of these issues (NOWG, LNPA, ATIS, CCA, CTIA, and NARUC)
	+ ACTION: Penn/Tom bring back from PTSC regarding the LRN solution and/or alternative solution. The Fon WG Tri-chairs asked PTSC for a timeline.
1. **Conforming edits to relevant federal rules; (FON WG) – not reviewed.**
* Depends on what the solution is will determine if the rules have to change (process, tolls, taxes, technology etc…). We will put this off until a later date where we might be able to recognize changes to the rules.

**Next meeting:**

* Be prepared to discuss the FON WG/NNP Report for the next NANC meeting on March 24, 2016.
* Additional conference calls to address the NANC’s action items.
	+ March 9, 2016 12:00 – 2:00 PM EST