Attendees:

Syed Mubeen Saifullah – Neustar

Rosemary Emmer – Sprint
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Michael Doherty - Vonage
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Jay Carpenter – Phoneword

David Greenhaus

Penn Pfautz – ATT

Dana Crandall – Verizon

Michelle Thomas – T-Mobile

Suzanne Addington - Sprint

Carolee Hall – Idaho PUC

Dawn Lawrence – XO Communications

Mary Retka – Centurylink

Shannon Sevigny – Neustar

Jackie Voss – ATIS

Cullen Robbins – Nebraska Commission

Natalie McNamer – iconectiv

KT Burton - Cox

“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.

1. Applicability and assessment of tolls, tariffs, and taxes; (FON WG)
   1. AT&T - would like to understand the paradigm of how NGNP would work. There could be a model where not much would change; however, there may be another model where these all could change.
   2. Centurylink – if a party uses NGNP (state a/state b) would the applicability go with the new geography or the original carrier?
   3. T-Mobile – Wireless does not have tariffs. Taxes and fees are managed under sourcing process defined under federal law (who pays what, where) and subsequently adopted under similar state statutes (MTSA - Mobile Telecommunication Sourcing Act).Washington State Commission– carriers have pricelists and taxes filed in each state. This is a very broad question
   4. Discussion around what the assumptions are prior to moving forward with answering the NANC questions: 1) Assume when the consumer engages in NGNP 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) Assume that the LRN will change when the consumer’s interconnect point changes.
   5. AT&T there is a NANC IMG that was completed in 1998 that summarizes the Bellcore solution to NGNP. Penn will distribute the paper to the FoN
   6. iconectiv – The FoN WG is going to have to make some assumptions and document assumptions
   7. Vonage – they remit surcharges based on the physical address.
   8. David Greenhaus – questions whether the call origination should be the actual geographic location of the caller – as is provided for E-911 (where the taxes etc. would be incurred). It is understood this is a far more complex way of looking at this, but would provide far more accuracy and a new long term paradigm. Just wanted to hear thoughts. (iconectiv stated that since we don’t do it this way today, we shouldn’t make that recommendation)
   9. T-Mobile – suggests a sub-committee with a strong state presence and other members to catalog the various points. Each carrier may remit tolls, tariffs and taxes differently so those need to be listed also. Do different states have different rules (USF, 911 fees, state utility commissions, etc?)

NGNP Subcommittee

ACTION: Create a baseline document that catalogs various tolls, tariffs, taxes, and remittance by carrier segment

FoN WG Assumptions:

1) Assume when the consumer engages in NGNP 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) Assume that the LRN will change when the consumer’s interconnect point changes.

Members of Subcommittee:

* + - 1. Carolee Hall – Idaho Commission
      2. Michael Doherty – Vonage
      3. Rebeca B – WA state Commission
      4. Rosemary Emmer – Sprint
      5. Mary Retka – CenturyLink
      6. Michelle Thomas – T-Mobile

1. The role of state regulatory commissions; (FON WG)
   1. Carolee Hall – from a state perspective these are the things that come to mind right now.
      1. interconnection comes to mind,
      2. consumer complaints,
      3. Public safety/911 issues
         1. Collecting correct 911 location of the caller

States would have to work together to come up with resolution to these types of issues

iconectiv: Do all states accept complaints for portability issues or do some states refer the consumer issues to the FCC? Idaho – takes an active role in issues for intra-state ports issues. Inter-state they refer consumer to the FCC.

Neustar - There are some states that are not active at all with porting and about 70% of the state’s deal with intra-state issues themselves. Minnesota has overlapping LATA with Wisconsin. Jurisdiction determination have arisen. LNPA wg developed rules on who should do the dip in this instance (overlapping lata)

\*The FoN WG agreed that new Rules will have to be developed to address Inter-State porting consumer issues/ complaints.

-Jurisdiction issues

-Extended Area Services (EAS) calling regions

ACTION: Next call states should come prepared with a list of known issues that may occur and possible (high level) resolutions. We understand that the states have varying ways to resolve each issue. Service Providers should come to the next meeting prepared to discuss how they identify who gets what EAS messages (i.e.: is it based on rate center or is it physical location at that moment of call? Etc.)

1. Costs, including cost recovery;
   1. States have no clue…..the industry has always argued that their costs are proprietary
   2. Previously the FCC allowed for cost recovery in the order.
   3. Truth and Billing – allows for some cost recovery
   4. Some entities that include porting costs in their interconnection agreements, especially in rural areas

ACTION: Service Providers should review this item and come to the next meeting prepared to discuss.

### 1) Do the carriers want cost recovery?

2) What costs would be involved to roll out NGNP? (Switches, billing, network, removing rate centers, back office changes, removing LATA’s, level of effort etc.). (Cost benefit analysis, how many consumers fit this situation currently? Impact in the future? Is there a benefit to doing NGNP?)

3) Reach out to the other working groups to see if they have discussed any of these issues (NOWG, LNPA, ATIS, CCA, CTIA, and NARUC)

4) Conforming edits to relevant federal rules; (FON WG)

Next meeting:

Be prepared to discuss the NGNP subcommittee Action item

Begin work on the report due to the NANC on Feb 15, 2016.

* Additional conference calls to address the NANC’s action items.
  + January 22, 2016 12:00 – 2:00 PM EST
  + January 27, 2016 12:00 – 2:00 PM EST
  + February 3, 2016 12:00 – 2:00 PM EST