

**North American Numbering Council
Meeting Transcript
Thursday, September 13, 2018 (Final)**

I. Time and Place of Meeting. The North American Numbering Council Meeting (NANC) held a meeting commencing at 9:30 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. Honorable Travis Kavulla | NANC Chairman (NARUC - MT) |
| 2. Diane Holland | USTelecom |
| 3. Jacquelyne Flemming | AT&T |
| 4. Jacqueline Wohlgemuth | ATIS |
| 5. Beth Choroser | Comcast Corporation |
| 6. Courtney Neville | Competitive Carriers Association |
| 7. Honorable Paul Kjellander | NARUC - ID |
| 8. Brian Ford | NTCA |
| 9. Julie Oost | Peerless Network |
| 10. Richard Shockey | SIP Forum |
| 11. Shaunna Forshee | Sprint |
| 12. Paul Nejedlo | TDS Telecommunications |
| 13. David Casem | Telnyx |
| 14. Bridget Alexander White | USConnect |
| 15. Darren Krebs | Vonage |
| 16. Robert McCausland | West Telecom Services |
| 17. Professor Henning Schulzrinne | |

Special Members (Non-voting):

- | | |
|-------------------|-----------|
| 1. Glenn Reynolds | iconectiv |
| 2. Ann Berkowitz | Somos |

Commission Employees:

Marilyn Jones, Designated Federal Officer (DFO)
Michelle Sclater, Alternate DFO
Carmell Weathers, Assistant to the DFO, CPD, WCB
Ann Stevens, Deputy Chief, Competition Policy Division (CPD), WCB
Myrva Charles, Contracting Officer Representative, CPD, WCB
Darlene Bidy, Management Analyst, CPD, WCB

III. Estimate of Public Attendance. Approximately 10 members of the public attended the meeting as observers.

IV. Documents Introduced.

- (1) Agenda
- (2) NANC Meeting Transcript – May 29, 2018
- (3) Letter to Honorable Kavulla re: FCC 18-88 and Draft TRD Report
- (4) Secure Telephone Identity – Governance Authority Report
- (5) North American Portability Management LLC Report
- (6) NANC Referral Letter: Nationwide Number Portability
- (7) NANC Referral Letter: Interoperable Video Calling Letter
- (8) Nationwide Suicide Hotline Improvement Act

V. Table of Contents.

- 1. Welcoming Remarks/ Announcements & Recent News/ Approval of Transcript2
- 2. Overview, Discussion, and Approval of the Numbering Administration Oversight (NAO) Working Group (WG) Recommendation for a Proposed Technical Requirements Document Combining the functions of the North American Numbering Plan Administrator and Pooling Administrator6
- 3. Discussion of the Secure Telephone Identity – Governance Authority.....14
- 4. Discussion of the North American Portability Management LLC (NAPM LLC)25
- 5. Overview and Discussion of Nationwide Number Portability (NNP) Issues WG Directive29
- 6. Overview and Discussion of Interoperable Video Calling (IVC) WG Directive.....35
- 7. Overview of the Nationwide Suicide Hotline Improvement Act39
- 8. Public Comments and Participation.....55

VI. Summary of the Meeting

Welcoming Remarks/Announcements & Recent News/

Approval of Transcript

Travis Kavulla: Well, let's, ladies and gentlemen, get this show on the road. This is the NANC's quarterly meeting.

The date is September 13th. Thank you all for joining us. Hopefully it will be a little more sedate meeting than our last NANC meeting. I don't see anything on the agenda that should cause a particularly animated discussion, I think.

I really don't have much in the way of welcoming remarks. You have the agenda and the materials that have been distributed beforehand. Chairman Pai is traveling, so he will not be joining us for his customary opening remarks. Our first order of business is to approve the transcript which I trust you all have taken a moment to look over. Does anyone have any changes to note? If not, would someone care to move the approval of the transcript?

Female Voice: So moved.

Travis Kavulla: Is there a second?

Male Voice: I second.

Travis Kavulla: Okay. As many as are in favor, please say aye for its approval.

Male/Female Voices: Aye.

Travis Kavulla: Any opposed?

Female Voices: Aye.

Travis Kavulla: Excellent. Thank you for the phone participation. We will mark that as unanimously approved and move into our first substantive agenda item, which is the overview discussion and approval of the Numbering Administration

Oversight Working Group recommendation for proposed technical requirements document combining the functions of the North American Numbering Plan Administrator and Pooling Administrator. Commissioner --

Marilyn Jones: Before we do that, Chair, there's a couple of announcements.

Travis Kavulla: I apologize, Marilyn. And I'm not going to read that agenda item again. So at the conclusion of your announcements, we'll just turn to Paul. Sorry, Marilyn. Go ahead.

Marilyn Jones: Okay. So just a couple of announcements. One is that Carmell is back in the fold. She just stepped away for a minute. She's working on something with the audio. So I just wanted to welcome her back.

Also, on behalf of T-Mobile, I wanted to announce that Paula Jordan Campagnoli is officially retiring after 45 years of service to the telecommunications industry. Paula retired from Pacific Bell, then she worked for AT&T. In the last 14 years she's worked for T-Mobile. In the last two decades you cannot have been part of the NANC without having known Paula Jordan Campagnoli. Paula had been an instrumental player in the numbering arena and, in particular, to the Local Number Portability Working Group where she chaired for over a decade.

Paula was not shy about who was in charge especially when it came to running meetings. She started the meetings on time, she ended on time, and she would not hesitate to call you out if you insist on excessive talking during the meetings. One thing for sure you learned early on never to put your phone on hold if you were on a conference bridge. Doing that in many cases causes the elevator music to disrupt the entire meeting. Once she found out who made that mortal sin, she would never let you live it down.

Paula ran a tight ship and we accomplished an enormous amount of work as a result of her leadership. She had a unique style of running meetings and it worked like a charm. The sheer volume of work at the LNP Working Group that she's produced over the years is reflective of Paula's work ethic. Paula brought to the table a special skillset and she had a strong sense of doing what is right for the industry especially in the early days of number portability when there was a lot of controversy. She was in part responsible for gathering the troops around the campfire to collaborate helping form the cohesive team function we still have today.

Paula always stepped up to do the unpopular work, like being the secretary of the NAPM LLC. When year after year no volunteers were in sight, Paula would take one for the team and sign up for yet another year of service. This work would often

bleed into her own personal time on nights and weekends, but getting the job done and getting it done right no matter what it took was her forte.

We've all benefitted from Paula's dedication and more importantly her acts of kindness that we have the pleasure of reflecting upon. She will be sorely missed and impossible to replace. You are invited to reach out to Paula to celebrate her amazing career and to wish her well as she starts a new chapter in her life. Please reach out to Michelle Thomas, or Rosemary Leist for Paula's contact information. Congratulations, Paula and best wishes on your retirement. Thank you.

Travis Kavulla: Thank you, Marilyn. All right. Commissioner Kjellander, my colleague from Idaho, we will go to you.

**Overview/Discussion/Approval of the Numbering
Administration Oversight Working Group Recommendation**

Paul Kjellander: Thank you very much. What was the topic again? Could you repeat that? The first thing that I want to do is first say thank you for the opportunity to be on the NANC. When I was convinced to join this from Carolee Hall, my staffer, she told me I get to create a new number. I was actually

looking for something between nine and ten and instead I got tasked with what I'm about to talk about.

So I desperately do want to say thank you to Carolee Hall upfront. She, along with a lot of other people - and I'll go ahead and get the thank yous out first - and I'm going to miss some folks but Karen Riepenkroger, Dana Crandall, and Phil Linse were heroes in this when this was tasked to the working group. It was a very, very tight timeline. Instead of grouching, they rolled up their sleeves and put in a tremendous amount of work. I was extraordinarily impressed that they met the deadlines and that everybody who was involved with this in terms of the edits and moving things forward were very, very positive, and got us to where we're at today. So I greatly appreciate their efforts.

The Contract Oversight Working Group completed its review and updates to the PA technical requirements document and the NANPA technical requirements document. Those two TRDs were forwarded to Marilyn Jones so that a bridge contract could be prepared for a new contractor which would be effective September 30th of this year. Work immediately began to combine the two TRDs, the technical requirement documents for the PA and the NANPA. The combined TRDs created a single unified set of functional and system interface requirements, which I don't get to say that phrase very often so I really feel excited about

saying that. Let me repeat that, a set of functional and system interface requirements for a new NANPA to fulfill.

This merging of the two TRDs were ordered by the FCC's Order 18-88 and it was issued July 19, 2018. So from July 19th to today the group that I mentioned was extraordinary in their willingness to move this forward and accomplish a tremendous volume of work. The review of the combined TRDs were completed by the Numbering Oversight Working Group and distributed to the NANC members on September 6th of this year. Today we're here to discuss the combined TRD with the NANC members and to recommend approval subject to any requested changes and editorial privileges.

With that said, I think Phil Linse is either on the phone or nearby. Phil is one of the heroes and champions. If you'd like to show him just how much you care about the hard work he did, I would recommend you not asking him a single question so that he can have an easy day today. Phil, thanks again.

Philip Linse: Thanks Paul. And I wanted to echo your appreciation to Dana and Karen Riepenkroger of Sprint, Dana of Verizon, for all the hard work. They did a tremendous amount of prework to get those technical requirements and documents put together with kind of the state that they are that exist today, as well as the whole effort of combining those two documents. I think the evidence of that, of our work is seen with the

Numbering Oversight Working Group's review of it and very minimal amount of changes or suggestions associated with that. So again I extend my appreciation to Karen and Dana.

In addition to that work, other work that we've done since the last NANC meeting has been kind of the traditional work that we've been doing since the existence of this group - which is the oversight of those contracts, review of the monthly reports of the vendors that provide information associated with those contracts: the B&C Working Group, as well as the NANPA and PA.

Then we also did our annual review for the NANPA and the PA. The reports are attached as was provided yesterday afternoon, and the survey as well. And then you'll see some summary of that in the presentation that we have attached to the agenda as well.

So I'd be happy to take any questions if you have them.
Travis Kavulla: Okay. Are there any questions for Paul or Phil?

David Casem: Hi. David from Telnyx. So one of the things that I noticed was there was no mechanized or API interface for service providers in the new specification. Given that we're sort of addressing a fix to or a combination, would now not be a good time to potentially create a modern interface that can be used by service providers who run low on inventory?

Travis Kavulla: Would you like to delegate that question to Phil, Paul?

Paul Kjellander: That would be my preference.

Philip Linse: Oh. Come on, Paul. No. Yeah, I appreciate the question. The effort was done on a fairly tight timeframe. We did add some enhancements in the document. I don't know if the finished product actually has those highlights in the document, of those enhancements. But we didn't receive any input associated with providing an API, and I'm not familiar if the API is necessarily conducive to the existing systems and interface with it at this time. So we'd have to explore that a little bit further if we need to.

Travis Kavulla: Is that satisfactory?

David Casem: Sure. So I guess the question is in its current draft, if we wanted to request an API, what would be the mechanism to do so?

Philip Linse: Yeah. This is Phil again. We can if through those editorial - we're requesting some editorial privileges upon approval by this council. So if there is some contribution you would like to provide as far as what that might look like as part of those TRDs and that's acceptable to this council, we can most definitely do that.

David Casem: Great.

Robert McCausland: Bob McCausland, West Telecom Services. I have some commentary. We at West did suggest some changes, enhancements. We didn't go quite as far as you're suggesting. The team was attempting to accommodate. Because of a limited timeline, it was recognized that some of the kinds of changes that we were suggesting probably wouldn't be accomplishable right now. But they did invite us at West to provide some additional suggestions for enhancements going forward and we committed to work with them to do that. So maybe we can talk later and we can coordinate. Thank you.

Travis Kavulla: Thank you. Any other comments or questions? Okay. If not -- yes, Commissioner Kjellander.

Paul Kjellander: Mr. Chairman, just as a reflection of what Phil offered up. Our drop dead date is September 24th which leaves us, if we approve this today, an opportunity for additional comments to show up between now and then. In speaking with Carolee and also hearing from Phil, they expect to see that. I would encourage you to put your comments to them so that they can make any adjustments that might be necessary. So again, thank you very much, Phil.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would move for approval of the combined TRD with the NANC and leave that, and subject to any requested changes or editorial privileges that might be forthcoming as a result of the comments that might be coming

within the next week. Again, a reminder that the drop dead date for completion is September 24th so those comments, which I'm sure you probably already have drafted, if you could get those to Phil and others as soon as possible. So that would be the recommended motion.

Travis Kavulla: Okay. Is there a second to the motion?

Male Voice: I second.

Travis Kavulla: Okay. It's been moved and seconded that the combined TRD be approved subject to editorial changes that might be made within the next nine days or so, eleven days. Is there any discussion of the motion? Diane?

Diane Holland: Just one. A suggestion. If you would like to maybe have a date certain to get edits in just to give you a little bit more certainty.

Paul Kjellander: For someone who is more calendar less challenged than I, would Thursday of next week be an appropriate day? Whatever date that is.

Diane Holland: That would be the 20th.

Paul Kjellander: The 20th?

Diane Holland: Yeah.

Paul Kjellander: It's a good round number. Okay.

Travis Kavulla: I don't see Phil showing any real reaction to that.

Philip Linse: Well, we've got a meeting next Tuesday. That might fit in well with -- we might be able to accommodate it at that point. But Thursday might be a better time, since we've had standing meetings on Thursdays for the combination, so we can be flexible. It would be nice to maybe get an initial review on Tuesday. Then we can maybe finalize things on Thursday.

Travis Kavulla: Other than the issue, David, Bob, you mentioned conferring. Does that sound okay to you? Okay. Does anyone else intend to submit anything as we're sitting here today? It would be nice to just get it on the record if you do have any notions. All right. Well, we'll have that one potential change in mind. It can be submitted no later than next Thursday. Any further discussion on the motion? All right. We'll call the question then. All in favor of the motion, please say aye.

Male/Female Voices: Aye.

Travis Kavulla: Thank you. Any opposed? All right. That motion carries unanimously.

Paul Kjellander: Mr. Chairman, I'm also instructed to reference that once approved, which I appreciate everyone's willingness to approve this, that it officially be filed on September 24, 2018 as required by FCC 18-88.

Travis Kavulla: Okay. We'll see that that's done. Anything else on that agenda item, Commissioner Kjellander, or does that take care of it? Excellent.

While we are once again well ahead of schedule, the schedule obviously brings us through 2:30 and it incorporates a lunch break as is our usual practice. I imagine we'll get through this agenda in such a way that allows us to adjourn before having to break for any lunch. We might have a break if we go on, just a bio break, but I don't anticipate actually taking a full lunch break.

We'll move on then to ATIS' presentation. This is a follow-up from the CATA Work Group's report, a discussion of the Secure Telephone Identity Governance Authority. And we're joined by Tom Goode.

**Discussion of the Secure Telephone Identity -
Governance Authority**

Thomas Goode: Great. Thank you very much. Good morning everyone. My name is Tom Goode. I'm general counsel with ATIS. We're here to provide an overview or update on the efforts to establish and set up the STI Governance Authority, the Secure Telephone Identity Governance Authority.

Travis Kavulla: Tom, just hold off while we get this projected.

Thomas Goode: It's only seven slides. So once we get this set, it will be quick.

Travis Kavulla: Marilyn, it's now up.

Marilyn Jones: Okay.

Travis Kavulla: All you have to do is get off your seat and -- okay, Tom, go ahead.

Thomas Goode: Terrific. So I'm providing an update on the industry's efforts to establish the STI-GA. As this group well knows, with the governance authority for the SHAKEN ecosystem, it will ensure the integrity and the security of the use of the identity certificates that are issued in compliance with the SHAKEN specification. The STI-GA, the governance authority is operating under the auspices of ATIS. It's managed by the industry board for the CATA Working Group report. It has begun its work on development of the request for proposals for the STI policy administrator.

So outside of ATIS, without ATIS, the industry met and agreed to set this up under the auspices of ATIS. This was on May 21st, soon after the NANC report had been provided. Then this initiated a fairly significant work program by the industry and by ATIS to get this up and running. There were many, many calls. It was a very challenging effort to get the NANC, the

report that we've provided, sort of operationalized and implemented. So there was a lot of discussions about the rights and responsibilities of individual stakeholders - what the board member, who the board is, the actions needed to set, to meet the deadlines. So a lot of discussions, many calls to establish the board.

I think it's important to note that the industry looked very closely at the CATA Working Group and attempted to sort of implement it as it was written. But there are places where the group decided that changes were needed. Some reminders, things like renaming the TAC into the technical committee so we don't get confused with the FCC's TAC. But others, smaller changes. Nothing I think is particularly hugely significant. But the industry tried very hard to implement the report but did make changes as the industry felt was necessary. So again nothing earth-shattering.

The STI-GA is being led by an industry board, as I mentioned. So the initial board - and this differs slightly from what was in the CATA work group. It's very close in the report. Currently we have 12 board members. They are actually currently, I think, at 11. We're going to 12, potentially 13. Here as you see - I won't read through the names - some of them were appointed by the stakeholder associations and there are

other at-large or founding members which are AT&T, Comcast, and Google.

So as I mentioned, we started in late May. Worked very hard throughout the summer. Instead of setting this up and having an official board meeting and then doing the work to establish operating procedures and other things, the industry I think correctly did the opposite. They worked on the operating procedures. They did a lot of work. Then once that was done, we officially launched the board meeting. So while it says August 29th, it seems late, honestly. The significant work had been done over the summer. So when we met on August 29th we were able to approve, the board, the operating procedures and make a lot of other decisions. I think we're still on track to meet the deadlines recommended in the CATA Working Group.

We also elected board leadership. Linda Vandeloop, AT&T, as chair. Vice chair Glenn Clepper from NCTA or Charter Communications. In addition to the technical committee which was referenced in the CATA Working Group board, the board also looked at other taskforces. Obviously one is going to focus on the RFP and solicit SMIs [phonetic] for that. That's already been established and has already begun work.

The corporate structure taskforce is looking at -- I think there was a decision that this group would like to move this into sort of its own corporate structure, and so this will be

examined. Right now it's operating as sort of an initiative of ATIS but with the knowledge that we would be transitioning this into something else. So a group will be looking at that.

There was also a discussion about how you would or could you. The industry, these industry stakeholders are contributing significantly to the development of this. But once the STI-PA comes up, we have a stable funding mechanism. The thought is there may be a way, and we should investigate if there is a way, for those that contributed the money upfront to somehow receive some kind of credit for that as we move forward. So it's still a little ambiguous about how that would happen and the limitations we may have on that, but it's thought that that would be something we should examine while we're developing this and while we're getting the STI-PA up. So in that way we could potentially have that as a part of the stable funding mechanism.

So with that, we're now focused heavily on almost exclusively on the RFP which is coming up in November. We began to work, the technical committee which was referenced to the TAC within the NANC report, the technical committee and the RFP taskforce is going to be jointly working together to develop that so we can get it out. We also have our own internal structure and schedule for how that will be delivered so we meet all of our deadlines and what we need to do by which deadline. So we've got a lot of work being done to make sure we're doing

the work fast and we're getting this up and running as quickly as we can.

They are also beginning to work. The other taskforces, the two as I mentioned, are also going to start. They have not started yet but will be starting in the near future. And then we're also considering other STI-GA board representatives. As mentioned, we have already a set number of them but there are other opportunities. Then, if there's more information, we set up a website so you should be able to get more information for that. And we'll be posting more. As we progress and get up and running, we'll be posting more and more to the website so there will be a public face to this.

Really that is it. Questions? I'd say compliments go to the left-hand column and negative comments go to the left-hand column. Just a thought.

Travis Kavulla: Okay. Any questions or comments for Tom? I guess I have one. If you just want to put a little bit more detail on the progress or the timelines going forward. So you're going to issue the RFP in November.

Thomas Goode: Yes.

Travis Kavulla: When are responses intended to be due? When do you anticipate the PA to be stood up? And most importantly, when then would you expect consumers to feel a kind of a retail effect of this work?

Thomas Goode: The last one is a tough one. I don't know if I can answer that one. Well, the responses are due per the CATA Working Group in three months. We have set up - and I honestly don't have them off the top of my head - we have set up the interim times for questions/answers, and that's what we've established. I believe the deadline for questions is December, but I don't remember the exact date. I apologize. The work has been done despite the fact that I can't remember.

Travis Kavulla: And then when would you expect a PA to actually be selected by the board?

Thomas Goode: Within the first year we're expecting to have that. Within 12 months of the establishment, we're going to be hopefully having the PA or establishing the PA. That will begin a little bit of a negotiation contract, negotiation time period. But selecting it should happen within the year.

Travis Kavulla: Within the year of?

Thomas Goode: Well, actually within the year of the NANC report. We can deliver. So midyear of -- I would say we looked at the May deadline, in May 2019.

Travis Kavulla: And not to really put you on the spot with that third question, but at the end of the day the rubber meets the road when calls actually start getting signed and verified and authenticated.

Thomas Goode: Yeah. And I really don't know. I mean that really depends. That's something I really can't say. I don't know exactly when that's going to happen.

Travis Kavulla: Rich.

Richard Shockey: I can answer that with a little bit of ease.

Travis Kavulla: Please.

Richard Shockey: It is a complicated problem to actually put all of these in place beyond the certificates. We do have several of those carriers who are going to deploy solutions by Q4 this year or early Q1 next year using cell site certificates. I don't want to necessarily name names but I think we all know who they are.

In terms of a general national system, we need to make sure that the vendor community who actually supply the kit to service providers are capable of actually using this. That process is underway. However, given the fact that this is the national phone system of the United States, there's going to be stringent testing involved first from the vendor community and then ultimately by the carriers themselves. Then there's a lot work of course through the ATIS testbed here in terms of a PO [phonetic] neutral forum to work out particular issues, one for the other, in a realistic view.

We also probably know that mobile operators will deploy this first because they have the most advanced voice communications gear, probably cable socket. And then the advanced landline operators after that. But realistically a true consumer impact will not occur before the fourth quarter of 2019. It just takes time.

Henning Schulzrinne: I'm Henning Schulzrinne. A follow-up question on timeline. Is the anticipation that the solicitation discussions with the CAs who do the actual work in some sense? And then if you ever wanted to issue cryptographic certificates to carriers beyond the self-signed one. That was just mentioned. Is there any notion of a timeline or parallelizing just like you did for the establishment? So we don't have this one year until we have a PA, and then another year until they select the CA, and then another year until they actually start issuing certificates, another year until people actually implement them. Then who knows what happens? By that time everybody will have given up on telephone service.

Thomas Goode: Well, we haven't discussed that issue. I don't think we expected there'd be a significant delay with the CA. I mean the big issue is getting the PA. Obviously that's a key complex and a difficult task. The CA should not be a challenge. We should get them up and running. It's a competitive market. It's not a single CA like the PA, so I

don't think. But we haven't discussed it. I could bring it back to the board and ask their views on it, but we haven't discussed setting up timelines or anything for this year at best.

Henning Schulzrinne: Because in some of the basic outlines I know the PA has to establish rules and all of that.

Thomas Goode: Exactly.

Henning Schulzrinne: But there's a lot of material, a lot of ATIS documents among other things, that outline at least to an extent that if I were operating a CA I would have at least kind of a notion of, yeah, that's in my ballpark or, no, this is something I don't want to get involved with. So in the interest of exactly addressing the consumer impact timing, the more parallelism as in maybe issuing our advice or just issuing an alert to the industry or speaking at the association of CAs is useful. And for our type of CAs, just making outreach to those entities so that they can essentially shorten -- the PA can shorten the deadline. That would be helpful to accelerate the process.

Thomas Goode: I'll bring that back to the board. I think it's a good comment.

Henning Schulzrinne: Thank you.

Travis Kavulla: Other discussion or questions? Sure.

Richard Shockey: Just one observation from the NANC. On behalf of ATIS and SIP Forum NNI Task Force, we have also generally anticipated that the cost to industry to deploy this is extremely minimal. It will be a rounding error for some of the companies around this table. So even though this process is relatively bureaucratic for obvious reasons, the long-term cost to industry should be not an issue whatsoever.

Travis Kavulla: Okay. Well, obviously the premise of the CATA Workgroup report was sort of endorsing an industry-led model with the intention that it be streamlined and expedient. Because we all know how regulators and consumer advocates' presence on these things can make it even more bureaucratic and slow things down occasionally. So the proof will be in the pudding in terms of timely deployment, I think.

Well, we'll keep this I think on the agenda maybe - if you're willing, too, Tom - for periodic updates at our quarterly meetings because I find this helpful.

Thomas Goode: That'd be great. We are actually planning this and also the outreach to the Consumer Advisory Council as well. Hopefully the standing agenda, I think, is for both.

Travis Kavulla: All right. Thank you very much for your report.

Thomas Goode: Sure. Thank you.

Travis Kavulla: We'll go then next to a discussion of the North American Portability Management LLC, the NAPM, report by Tim Kaegle. Welcome.

Discussion of the NAPM LLC Report

Timothy Kaegle: Thank you, Commissioner. Good morning everybody. My name is Tim Kaegle. I work for Comcast. I share my responsibility for the co-chair role with my colleague from AT&T, Teresa Patton. Teresa sends her regards. She could not be here due to weather-related travel which I think a number of us will experience.

Before I get into my report for the quarter, I think you'll find this one much less spirited than some of the past NAPM reports. But let me just throw out a couple of facts here that I think will be interesting to the group.

Since final acceptance date, May 25, 2018 when we converted the NPAC from Vendor A to Vendor B, iconectiv, we have processed over 55 million unique TNs through that new NPAC. That's a combination of new porting events and/or pooling events. So, a very sizable number. In addition to that, we've had now about four months of clean efficient operation of the new NPAC. So, great work to the vendor, great work by the industry to support the transition. I can't really echo that enough, at least from

the NAPM LLC's perspective. We couldn't have done this work so successfully without the industry's partnership, without the partnership of the FCC and certainly with our vendor. So thank you very much for that. I'll just cap it off with there have been very, very minimal customer-related issues associated with the transition. So, pretty much a seamless event.

With that said, let me get into sort of my normal report for the LLC. I think most of you are familiar by now with the new NANC here, that the North American Portability Management LLC serves at the pleasure of the FCC. We're in place to administer the master services agreement in all seven NPAC regions with the vendor iconectiv. That is the role of the Number Portability Management LLC.

In terms of statements of work and amendments with Neustar, the former vendor, we still have some ongoing obligation work that they will need to continue to comply with as we wrap up the terms of their terminated master services agreement. Specifically it is Change Order 6 that modifies the terms and conditions of Statement of Work 97 which, most of you may recall, was put into place specifically to deal with the transition. The latest amendment was approved by the NAPM LLC and we're moving forward with implementing those change provisions.

With respect to iconectiv, the NAPM has reviewed Statement of Work 16. It's hard to believe we've already had 16 statements of work from iconectiv. It seems like just a very short period of time. But that implements the requirements for NANC Change Order 527 which modifies the NPAC/SMS to send attributes in the AVC notifications associated with the SV modify request if the due date, old SP authorization, or medium timer indicator, is in the modify request regardless if those attributes are being modified on the SV. So that was approved.

iconectiv has also initiated an SOW to implement the requirements for NANC Change Order 522 which was approved by the NANC TOSC which modifies the numeric digits populated in the SSN field. Not to be confused with Social Security number. It's the subsystem number which is applied to the BDD files. That is currently under review and pending action by the NAPM.

In terms of the activities of the Contract Implementation Committee - and this is the committee that reviews all of the PTRS new user applications - in partnership with iconectiv, the CIC has reviewed five findings reports of providers of telecommunications-related services or PTRS users that are not service providers to validate the need for NPAC data access. The CIC also reviewed and approved recommended changes to the M&Ps for Service Level Requirements 5, 6, and 14.

The CIC is continuing to discuss the types of uses of NPAC data and whether or not the use of this data should be extended to entities that are interested in using that data to combat voice fraud. That is under review by the CIC and certainly by the NAPM and the vendor. I'll just caveat that remark that when the rules were originally established for PTRS users, that was done decades ago in the '90s, and certainly voice networks and the world has evolved since then. We think that that's an appropriate use of the CIC's time and of the NAPM's time to really review what are those requirements.

Before I go on, let me just pause and see if there are any questions so far. Okay.

In terms of general information, as you know, the NAPM has waived its requirement for what I'll call the initiation fee for new members for the last - probably about the last 12 months now. So the NAPM has again waived that initiation fee through the end of this year. We are very open to new members. So in the event that you are interested in becoming a NAPM LLC member, please don't hesitate to reach out to Teresa or I. Our contact information is listed on page two of the report. We'll be happy to speak with you in more detail about that.

With that, that concludes the NAPM's report. Let me just see if you have questions.

Travis Kavulla: Any questions for Tim?

Timothy Kaegle: Okay.

Travis Kavulla: You're off the hook.

Tim Kaegle: All right.

Travis Kavulla: Thank you.

Tim Kaegle: Thank you.

Travis Kavulla: Moving right along, we'll now turn to one of the first two latest referrals that we've received from the FCC. This is regarding further work on Nationwide Number Portability. It's an overview and discussion so far of that directive. We'll turn to the co-chairs of that working group who have graciously agreed to remain in that capacity in relation to this referral, Courtney and Rich. Who would like to lead?

Overview/Discussion of NNP Issues WG Directive

Courtney Neville: Thanks, Chair. Thanks, Rich. So yes, hopefully these will be more sedated reports than last time as well. Although it was fun last time, I will say.

As a follow-up to our June report that we had a lengthy discussion of the last time we were all gathered here, we received a directive from the NANC in July to provide a more thorough technical analysis of the NGLRN and NLRN solutions along with recommended next steps for the NANC and some more

detailed findings into the cost and benefits of those potential solutions. That being said, Rich and I then had some very helpful conversations with the NANC leadership and the Wireline Competition Bureau and FCC correspondents on the best ways to meet those objectives based on the current makeup of the working group.

As an outgrowth of those discussions, we decided that it would be best to create a technical subcommittee within the NNP Working Group. Thanks to Rich, he did much of the footwork there, and asked for volunteers. We received about 12 names from members who are currently on the NANC as well as the Working Group and a few individuals in their own capacity. From that, we then had another follow-up discussion and decided that, in terms of organization of the subcommittee, it would be helpful to have at least two sort of co-chairs that would mirror Rich and I. We are still working to recruit some leaders for that. Thank you to those of you who I know we've been bothering.

In terms of organization of the subcommittee, we've decided that it would be most productive for that subcommittee to operate as its own working group, create a report with the December 2018 interim report deadline in mind, then present it to the broader NNP Working Group. Then Rich and I would bring it to the NANC at the first quarter meeting of 2019.

So that's the update thus far. I'm happy to take questions. And thanks to everybody for your guidance so far again.

Henning Schulzrinne: Henning Schulzrinne. A quick question. Timeline for -- I put my hat in the ring for that one. I'm curious when the hats will be picked, for when is the starting date for that given December seems far away but as you can tell from the decorations in the stores that apparently, it isn't.

Courtney Neville: Yeah, that Halloween candy is creeping out. No. I understand that the December 28 deadline will come up fast. I want to reiterate that Rich and I are actually going to let the subcommittee determine their own sort of timelines and deadlines. But once we do have those co-chairs chosen, which is something that I think is being discussed internally amongst the representatives that have identified themselves, then things can get off the ground.

Richard Shockey: Mr. Chairman, I just want to add to that. Everything Courtney said is exactly the current state of play. Once we can isolate and identify technically competent co-chairs for this particular effort, Henning, I think we can begin almost immediately. That's really the sort of plan. We are not going to dither around with this one way or the other.

I think in terms of what Courtney and I have agreed would be the goals and objectives, it would be again not just the charge from the chief of Wireline Competition Bureau to technically evaluate both proposals but I think we also agreed to take a much stronger look at a proposal that you made which would be potentially partial deployment of national number portability among those service providers that were more technically capable of doing so.

I think one of the things that I believe we made a mistake on was we thought that this was an all or nothing proposition. I agree with you in your final conclusions on the sort of report and in the comments that one of the things that this technical subcommittee should look at is any potential barriers, regulatory or otherwise, to allow consenting service providers to go ahead and deploy without necessarily waiting for other carriers that are TDM, SSF, and Centric to convert their networks to all IP.

Travis Kavulla: Just not to put you on the spot, Marilyn, but I know the FCC, yourself, and the Wireline Bureau have looked at those names. Is there any impediment to them starting their work at this point?

Marilyn Jones: Yes. As a procedural matter, we want to get approval of those participants from the bureau and also from the chair and myself. So we're working on that. A couple of

them may need vetting by the Office of General Counsel. So we hope to have that completed within the next week or so here at the commission. Thank you.

Travis Kavulla: Mark those words, the next week or so. We'll send you an email when the week concludes. Yes.

Female Voice: A question on the membership. You have all the nominations that you -- are you still accepting names or you closed that off?

Richard Shockey: Well, we do have 12 names from the companies that are involved, including AT&T, by the way. I would prefer not to accept any more names, if at all possible. However, we were looking at recruiting the most technically competent individuals that understood the historical issues involving national portability. I mean never say never. You just don't know if someone again wants to volunteer. If he's willing to put the time and effort in, sure, we'll consider it. We'll pass the name along to Marilyn and the appropriate people.

Travis Kavulla: In the discussions that I've been involved in on this topic, it has emerged that if someone wants to make a technical presentation or even iteratively present to a working group or a technical subcommittee like this one, they're always welcome to do so even while not officially being a member. That's one. I don't want to characterize it as a workaround of

FACA, but it is one way to increase technical participation of people who may not have gone through the formal vetting process.

As you can see just looking through the referral letter, and this goes to I think Courtney and Rich's point, the referral in some respects is quite technical and then it round trips to a couple of policy items. So I would imagine it to be a largely technical report that also has some policy feedback loop that can be rounded into the first quarter final report. All of which is to say there's a work stream for the people who have been referred to as the technical subcommittee right now. And there's also, I think, enough work for the working group and the full NANC to do relative to these referrals as well before we make sure that it gets out the door by the usual onerous timelines that are associated with these referrals.

Any other discussion? I also appreciate the comment about finding a solution that doesn't burden TDM players. I mean I think this all or nothing proposition, we did put ourselves maybe into a box that we didn't need to.

Richard Shockey: Absolutely.

Travis Kavulla: All right. We'll move right along then - if I can steal another copy of the agenda from Marilyn since I've shuffled mine beneath some papers here - to the second referral that we've received lately from the FCC. That's an overview and discussion of interoperable video calling and the

progress really the FCC has been making in trying to establish a work group related to that endeavor.

Overview and Discussion of IVC WG Directive

Marilyn Jones: Good morning. This is Marilyn. I'll provide the overview for that working group. I'll be joined later by some liaisons from our CGB, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau.

Background-wise, on July 3rd the bureau released a public notice announcing the new issue-specific working group entitled Interoperable Video Calling. We sought nominations for participation in that working group through their PN. The stated mission in the PN of the IVC Working Group is to explore how to facilitate the provision of interoperable telephone number-based video calling allowing service providers to voluntarily offer to any customer the capability to make or receive a video call between ten-digit North American Plan Numbers.

In the notice, the commission welcomed participation by parties who are not NANC members but have interest in developing and integrating video calling for both hearing individuals and people with hearing and speech disabilities who may currently use different and otherwise incompatible equipment and services. Given that mission in the PN, the Wireline Competition Bureau

will reach out to the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau. They do a lot of work with direct video calling, and so we felt this was very related to what we were trying to do. So we involved them with the process.

In addition to the public notice which I sent to all the NANC members, we work with CGB. We also work with the FCC CTO Eric Burger. We work with folks in the Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau to recruit technical experts for this working group.

Like other issue-specific working groups, the IVC Working Group will lapse at the conclusion of its assigned work - the deadline for nominations, which is July 31st. At the bureau, at this point we're finalizing those nominees. We're looking at them. We are getting it approved through the bureau and the chairman's office. We're going through the vetting process so, as with the NNP Technical Subcommittee, we hope to be able to announce participants for that working group later within a week or so.

On the same day that we released the public notice announcing the working group, we also sent a letter to the NANC chair. In that, Chair, we noted that the commission is interested in exploring how to facilitate the provision of interoperable telephone number-based video calling which could allow the increased use of video calling for both hearing

individuals and people with hearing and speech disabilities using different and otherwise incompatible equipment and services.

We noted that the commission envisioned carriers and providers being able to voluntarily offer to any customer the capacity to make or receive a video call between ten-digit NANP numbers. Accordingly, the bureau letter directed the NANC through the new working group to focus on interoperable video calling issues to, among other things, provide options for any changes necessary in numbering or numbering administration to allow and encourage the deployment of number-based interoperable video calling.

In that letter to the NANC Chair, we set forth time and we expected a deliverable from the working group. We expected the working group to provide an interim report at the first 2019 meeting of the full NANC. Then a final report is due at the NANC second meeting which is normally in the second quarter.

Given that this issue is related to something that the commission is working on through the CGB, its Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, in addition to having a liaison from the Wireline Competition Bureau which would be Sherwin Siy - he's a liaison for a number of other committees also, working group - we also plan to use a couple of liaisons from CGB, Robert McConnell and Michael Scott. Michael is here with us

this morning to make any remarks that he has and to also answer any questions that you have. Thank you.

Travis Kavulla: Another bureau for us to afflict ourselves upon. Welcome.

Michael Scott: Thank you. As she said, my name is Michael Scott. I'm glad to be here. I'm sitting across at the neighborhood Massachusetts seat. You see, in my prior role with the Massachusetts Commission, I both assisted Commissioner Charles Peterson and prior to that Commissioner Why. I worked on this committee so I have some familiarity with this.

In CGB, my colleague Robert - who hopefully will be able to come down - and I both work primary on ensuring communication access for people with disabilities. We are excited that the commission decided to move forward with this initiative to bring video calling numbering to everyone. We have it in a small capacity with video relay service. We hope that our experience with that numbering database, video interoperability, and our standards implementations that we work on can be of assistance to everyone here. We really look forward to the outcome of this committee. And I'm happy to take any questions you might have that I can answer at this point.

Travis Kavulla: Any questions on this subject matter for Marilyn or Michael or, for that matter, comments on the referral as you've seen it? Okay. Marilyn, when can we expect that

working group to be seated? I realize I feel like I'm asking nothing but questions about when are things going to happen.

Marilyn Jones: Yeah. We're close to the finish line on that one. So I expect something within the next week or so.

Travis Kavulla: Okay. All right. Any other questions or comments around the table on this topic? All right. Thank you very much.

Marilyn Jones: Thank you, Michael.

Travis Kavulla: We turn now to an item that we have not discussed before in the NANC and that I was only sort of just really aware of. That is an overview of a recently passed piece of federal legislation called the Nationwide Suicide Hotline Improvement Act that Michelle will describe for us.

Overview of the Nationwide Suicide Hotline Improvement Act

Michelle Sclater: Good morning everyone.

Travis Kavulla: Good morning.

Michelle Sclater: The Nationwide Suicide Hotline Improvement Act was signed into law on August 14, 2018. The purpose of the act is to study and report on the feasibility of designating a three-digit dialing code to be used for national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline system by considering each of the current N11 designations. The act calls

for the FCC to consult with the NANC; the Department of Health and Human Services; Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administrations we refer to as SAMHSA; and, the Department of VA, of Veterans Affairs.

SAMHSA and VA are required to conduct studies and provide reports to the FCC within six months, which would be February 11, 2019. The FCC must then take that information, combine it with the information from its own study in consultation with the NANC, and produce a report within one year of the act's enactment which would be August 13, 2019.

The SAMHSA must report on the current and future suicide hotline systems. Specifically SAMHSA must analyze and report to the commission on the potential impact of designated N11 dialing code or other easily remembered three-digit dialing code. So crisis services and suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotlines, including the existing National Suicide Prevention Lifeline and Veterans Crisis Line. The report is also to include possible recommendations for improving the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline in general. The VA report must study and report on how well the current National Suicide Prevention Lifeline is working to address the needs of veterans.

So the FCC report, the commission in coordination with SAMHSA and the VA and NANC, must conduct a study that examines the feasibility of designating an N11 dialing code or other

three-digit code to be used for national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline system. It must also analyze the effectiveness of the current National Suicide Prevention Lifeline as of the date the study is initiated, including how well the lifeline is working to address the needs of the veterans. The FCC study must consider each of the current N11 dialing codes, including codes that are used for other purposes, and consider other three-digit dialing codes.

If the commission's report recommends that either a current N11 code or other three-digit dialing code should be used, the report must also then include the following. An outline of the logistics of designating such a dialing code, an estimate of the cost associated with designating such code, including the cost incurred by service providers and states and other localities. It must also provide recommendations for designating such a dialing code. It must provide a cost-benefit analysis comparing the use of recommended dialing code with the current National Suicide Prevention Lifeline in effect on the date that the report is submitted.

It must also make other recommendations as appropriate for improving the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline generally which may include the following - increased public education awareness, and improved infrastructure and operations.

I think today also we have in our audience is Joe Hurlbert [phonetic]. He's a senior fellow with the Department of Veterans Affairs and he will be working on this project also. We will also be working with SAMHSA. We will be reaching out to the NANC soon to request recommendations and following up with you so that we can work together and provide this report within a year.

Travis Kavulla: Great. I think Marilyn, this piece of legislation was distributed to people. But if not, it's HR 20 --

Michelle Sclater: I have copies of it. If anybody wants to see it, I'll put it on the table over there. And we did send it out in an email as well.

Travis Kavulla: Great. Thank you. It's HR 2345. Just to be clear about why we're having this discussion, the statutory provision does specifically call out the NANC as being a kind of consultative partner or having a consulting role to the FCC study that it's statutorily directed to undertake.

Joe, would you care to -- we'll go a little bit out of order and just invite you to give your public comment now about the role of your agency.

Joe Hurlbert: Thank you. I appreciate it.

Travis Kavulla: Introduce yourself.

Joe Hurlbert: Some of you may recognize me. I was a member of INC [phonetic] for eight years. I was a co-chair of the committee that responded to the request for information and for assigning phone numbers for the relay services for deaf and hearing impaired. So I've been familiar with NANC and I really look forward to working again in this forum.

Travis Kavulla: But your name and affiliation also, just for the record.

Joe Hurlbert: Okay. Joe Hurlbert or Joseph Hurlbert, and I work for the Veterans Administration. I'm a telecommunications specialist in OI&T. Okay. My comments today is how appropriate that we're addressing this during National Suicide Prevention Month. Today 123 people are going to commit suicide in the United States, 20 of them veterans. So it's a very significant problem in the United States.

You've all seen, with the media attention especially this month, the 10-digit phone number that is currently the number for National Suicide Prevention Lifeline. That feeds into the Veterans Crisis Line if you press 1. So you've all seen it in different articles and stuff, but how many of you would be able to remember that right now if you needed to dial it? Nobody.

So having an easily recognized code when you're in crisis, something you're going to remember, is going to have a significant impact on suicide prevention in the United States.

I have spoken with mental health professionals but I'm not one and so I won't address the impact, but that will be coming forth at some point very soon. So what if instead of that 10-digit number, if on the side of a bus, in a clinic, on TV, you saw 611, wouldn't that be a whole lot easier to remember?

So first of all let's talk a little bit about N11s in general. Because there's only eight of those now, they're considered a very scarce resource. In reality right now they're an exhausted resource. But two of the N11s, 411 and 611, are identified as being allowed for use but not assigned. When you go through some of the different orders that the FCC has issued, they acknowledge that it's one of the scarcest resources under the commission's jurisdiction. But in addition, they say that N11 codes that have not been assigned continue in use provided that such use can be discontinued on short notice.

So 611 and 411 seemed like the likely targets. All the others are in use and there you have valid uses. So why am I choosing 611? Why am I targeting 611? When originally conceived, the 611, there is Ma Bell. If you dialed 611 from your home, if you're having problems with your own phone and you couldn't dial it from home, you could go to your neighbor's house or you could go to the office and dial 611 and there's Ma Bell so you could talk about your service.

Today in my home I've got four different carriers. In trying to explain to my wife why she can't dial 611 from a phone that's not under that carrier that we're having problems with is just, you know. She's a PhD and she -- it still is not something you can easily describe.

As such, also public service announcements. There's public service announcements around all the other N11s. You don't see public service announcements for 611 or 411 - 411 for different reasons, but 611 is just too complex to try and do a public service announcement for. You can only dial it. If you dial 6 from your phone that you're having problems with and then you want to talk to them about that problem, they tell you to call back on an 800 number. At the end of the call, once you dial 611 from maybe another device in your home, at the end of the call it typically turns into a sales pitch. They start discussing your current service and what you can do to improve it which, since it is a scarce national resource, it really isn't supposed to be used for competitive advantage. You have to at least concede that when you're calling from the device that can only go to one carrier. That gives that carrier a competitive advantage.

So what the VA is proposing of course is that 611 be permanently assigned for suicide prevention, assigned to the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline under Health and Human

Services with the caveat of dial 1 or press 1 to transfer to the VA as it is today. So these are existing call centers, existing services, and we're just giving a new phone number. We would hope that the industry would partner with us and help us in this cause, help us save lives. We'd hope also that utility commissions would partner with us because you guys are critical as we go through this process. And it's your constituents that are going to be impacted as well.

So I have a -- I will touch briefly on 411. 411 is obviously information that's pretty much obsolete with the Internet. It seems like it could be a good target for repurposing. However, 411 is in the urban dictionary.

I got an email the other day internally to the VA. So the subject line was here's the 411 on blah-blah-blah. To repurpose that number, it would have to be vacated for a lengthy time before you could repurpose it. The education process would be monumental. I would suggest that the commission consider having 411 vacated so that eventually it can be repurposed, but it's not going to be on a short notice.

I guess that would be the end of my remarks. 611 will save lives. The response I had on a conference call was that it will be profound. We don't know what profound equates to, but they will give us some validation on that in the coming months.

Travis Kavulla: Okay. Thank you, Joe. Bob, do you have a comment or question?

Robert McCausland: I have. Mr. Chairman, I have several questions. This is Bob McCausland speaking from West Telecom Services. No one should interpret anything that I ask as anything other than me trying to educate myself. I'm not trying to suggest a position on behalf of West with respect to this.

I personally don't know what some of the other N11 codes are used for. I'm aware, for instance, I live in Austin, Texas. In Austin we have the National Domestic Violence Hotline Headquarters. It has some issues from time to time that, in fact, I communicate with the commission about. It seems like a good candidate for an N11 code as well potentially. And there certainly would be some other entities in the U.S. like these that would make good candidates. Can you tell us, other than the obvious 911, what the other codes are currently typically used for?

Joe Hurlbert: Okay. 211 is typically for community services. Full disclosure, my wife is on the board of directors for Michigan 211. So I know it fairly well. There are no standards that they have to adhere to. It's implemented locally by local funding, and it's inconsistent on service levels and reliability. Throughout the country there's hit and miss because it is implemented locally. Not all localities implement

it. And because it's locally funded, a county in Indiana just recently pulled the plug and shut it down.

311 is typically for municipal services. Often they define what that means. Often it overlaps 211. They do some community services as well. But it again is originally intended I believe to offload 911. And so it's only typically implemented in large metropolitan areas and not in rural areas. It's locally funded so the hit and miss again is to where it is and where it's not.

511 is used for highway, administration of highway information. It's something that I believe may be a candidate in the future because with the advent of the Internet on your cell phone and apps that are available, arguably it's something that will achieve obsolescence at some point because your phone will tell you what the highway conditions are before you could dial 511.

Then 611. And then 711 is used for relay services for deaf and hearing impaired. That one is probably a poster child for N11 from my perspective. The carriers that offer services under 711 are listed on the FCC web page. They are vetted and so you have a pretty good idea of their qualifications. 711 is, from my understanding, managed at a state level through the commissions or at least monitored by the commissions.

And then 811 is fairly new. N11s were designed in 1957. And 811, I believe it was about ten years ago, was implemented

for MISS DIG or utility underground services and is now on the side of most transformers across the country. It's very viable and in use.

Robert McCausland: Thank you. One final question, if I may.

Travis Kavulla: Of course.

Robert McCausland: Does it concern you that there may be some local uses of 611 right now that may result in additional calls to the number at least for a transition period until people get to understand that the --

Joe Hurlbert: That's part of my plea for the carriers, to support us in this. The implementation and planning time will take months. If they ahead of time start shutting down 611 services fairly soon, there will need to be a vacant number where they can give a notice of the 800 number to call their office. There will need to be a transition period where they have that number available or people dialing it.

But since it's not been advertised for years, the only place you see 611 is when you order a hotspot and it comes to your home to activate. Sometimes the carrier will tell you to dial 611 from your other phone to activate it. But 611 is not -- a lot of people don't even know 611 exist. Those who do apparently are frequent callers of it and so they don't have time to hit that message to dial the 800 number. Then too, just

like with implementing new area codes, the carriers can use billing notices to educate as to what, you know, stop using 611 or the new number is. So that can go up once [sounds like] and advance as well.

Robert McCausland: Thank you, Joe. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Travis Kavulla: All right. Any other questions?

Rosemary Leist: [Inaudible]

Travis Kavulla: I'm sorry. Is there a comment on the phone?

Rosemary Leist: Yes, this is Rosemary Leist with T-Mobile.

Travis Kavulla: Hi, Rosemary.

Rosemary Leist: Can you hear me?

Travis Kavulla: Yes, we can. Go ahead.

Rosemary Leist: Oh great. Okay. I just wanted to make folks aware that I worked closely with Joe Hurlbert for many years from the numbering arena back with Nextel and then with Sprint Nextel. He supported many whitepapers that the NANC has submitted to the FCC over the years. He's truly a valuable asset in the numbering world.

Joe and I had talked extensively several months ago about his current mission, and I support him a hundred percent. I hope the industry can partner with him on this mission. I honor

the work, Joe, that you are doing with this and I thank you for turning this passion into work. Thank you.

Travis Kavulla: Okay.

Joe Hurlbert: Thank you, Rosemary. Good to hear your voice.

Travis Kavulla: Yeah, nice to hear from you Rosemary. Hope you're doing well. Anyone else on the phone or around the table?

Female Voice: Just a quick question?

Travis Kavulla: Sure, Diane.

Diane Holland: The statute seems to also contemplate at least exploring and raising questions about other three-digit dialing codes. I guess my question is whether your work will also encompass that, especially you work with the FCC on the feasibility of something other than an N11.

Joe Hurlbert: Oh yes. I intend to be in attendance here for quite a while. I've started this project, the process of exploration and research, about three years ago - actually, three-and-a-half. This is my best effort right now, it's 611. There I'm willing to -- the VA is reluctant. It took quite a bit to get them to let me come to this forum. So anyway, it's been a passion of mine. I'd go with that. Initially I started off with what I thought was a good idea. Then after I heard the

mental health professionals, it became a passion. So that's where I'm at.

Ann Berkowitz: Hi. Ann Berkowitz from Somos. I think this is a wonderful thing you're doing. I know 800-273-TALK. It has done a lot. I assume that will still be in use.

Joe Hurlbert: Oh yes. It should not be --

Ann Berkowitz: Yeah, because that's been reserved. But I think the faster we can get people in crisis the three-digit, whether it's the 800 number or three-digit, all the better.

Joe Hurlbert: Yes. I would envision that 611 would just be forwarded.

Ann Berkowitz: Yeah. Anything we can do to help, give me a call.

Joe Hurlbert: Yeah.

Travis Kavulla: What's the call volume right now to the --

Joe Hurlbert: I don't have that data.

Travis Kavulla: Okay.

Joe Hurlbert: That would be the clinicians who need to do that.

Travis Kavulla: Do any other jurisdictions or countries have a simplified dialing system for suicide prevention that could be a kind of comparison of how a before and after effect would be utilized?

Joe Hurlbert: No. I should say, no, I'm not aware of any.

Henning Schulzrinne: Henning Schulzrinne. I'm not aware of any numeric comparison but I do know the EU in particular has established, because of the same scarcity of three-digit numbers, a set of nonemergency but widely known numbers. For example, for reporting missing children, I know there's one. In fact, there's similar type of services with the same idea. I believe suicide prevention is indeed one of those. So it probably would be helpful to look at some of the quasi [sounds like] European efforts in that.

I will make a remark, and this is one way. I think hindsight is better. It's not clear that, again, before you said for 511 and I suspect 811, that a short term consideration would seem like a good idea. Burning up an N11 code for 811 is a relatively limited used case, for example. With hindsight, probably it wasn't the smartest move. Given our needs for 511 for that matter, taking a slightly broader view at least within the committee as to what other options might be or what the tradeoffs might be for future assignment, I think that would be helpful so that we don't find ourselves in the same predicament again given that. This is pretty much the last number that's reasonably reusable based on your presentation.

Joe Hurlbert: Yes.

Travis Kavulla: 811 is the only one I dial, Henning.

Female Voice: Can I make a comment?

Travis Kavulla: Sure.

Female Voice: Ann Stevens [phonetic] [inaudible]. One thing I wanted to note especially for folks who might end up on this working group, which is that the statute also ask if an N11 is the appropriate mechanism for such a hotline as opposed to a toll-free number. I think I know that people don't recognize 273-TALK but there is a very recognizable toll-free number out there, 800-SUICIDE, that for whatever reason is not marketed the same way that the 273-TALK number is. So I think folks need to keep an open mind if they work on this issue and recognize that because the statute does require us to look at the alternatives to an N11 number.

Travis Kavulla: Michelle.

Michelle Sclater: This is Michelle Sclater. One other thing too is that there had been one or two petitions filed in the past asking to not repurpose exactly but to use 211. It's a community resource number and there was some talk a while back about possibly, when you called 211, you could hit 1 for suicide prevention. So that is also an option that was put forth to the commission a few years back.

Travis Kavulla: All right. Any other discussion? So our -- Michelle, are we supposed to tell you how we would like to be consulted or will you get back to us?

Michelle Sclater: I think we will get back to you.

Travis Kavulla: Okay. All right. Anything else? With that, thank you for being here, Joe, and presenting today. That concludes that item. Now we will go to public comment, a further public comment really if there is any.

Public Comments and Participation/Other Business

Travis Kavulla: Does anyone in the room wish to offer a public comment? Okay. If not, I do not believe under other business that we have a date established for our December meeting. Correct?

Marilyn Jones: Yes, we have a tentative date of December 4th.

Travis Kavulla: Okay. Well, there we go. Tentative it is. You should mark that in your calendars and we'll get you an agenda in advance to that meeting. Is there any other business that people need to raise before we adjourn this morning? Yes.

Julie Oost: Hi. I'm Julie Oost with Peerless Network and very new to the process, so this is going to be probably a very naïve question. I was a little concerned about the recent order that came out. Concern isn't the right word. I can't figure the right word right now. But the toll-free modernization order that came out. I'm trying to understand the process after hearing that for one of the groups the commission reached back

out to the group and said, hey, can you look at this issue one more time or give some more thought to this.

I didn't know if that didn't happen with the modernization for a particular reason. I think I'm just wondering if anyone had any comments about that order and how it was very different than what we had presented in the report, at least in my opinion. If someone could help me understand how we can help in that process to better address the commission's question. Because I felt like perhaps the report didn't, and that certainly wasn't the intent. So I would appreciate if anybody had any feedback. Kind of a shot in the dark but I thought I'd ask.

Travis Kavulla: I personally am not familiar with the order. But how soon we forget. I can't even recall the precise details of our report other than we didn't -- it seemed to disfavor some of the premises of the commission's questions to us so to the degree that an order was issued that might appear in variance to our report. I'm maybe not entirely surprised. But does anyone have any reaction to Julie's --?

Julie Oost: I know how to quiet a room.

Travis Kavulla: I know. It's very quiet here. Well, let me look into that. Maybe I can discuss that a little bit with you offline because it's certainly not fair to put Marilyn on the spot on behalf of the commissioner.

Julie Oost: That's true. It wasn't the intention, not the intension at all.

Travis Kavulla: Okay. All right. I will follow up on that, Julie. Any other generic comments or questions under other business that haven't appeared on the agenda today? Very well. Thank you all for being here. It's 11:01 AM. I'm happy to get you out very early. We are adjourned.

[End of file]

[End of transcript]