



To: FCC

Regarding: The awarding of the LNPA Contract

Topic: Serious concern over legal ramifications of decision favoring iconectiv

My name is Daniel Jones and I am a stakeholder in the LNPA contract process (as an affected party through my company being a shareholder in NeuStar). I am emailing you to express my concern about the events surrounding the NANC's apparent endorsement of Ericsson (through iconectiv) for assuming control of the LNPA contracts.

Putting aside the procedural errors that NeuStar has alleged, there is the concern of the legality of granting a party other than NeuStar rights to handle these contracts. The reason behind this is that Section 251(e)(1) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 states that whomever takes on these contracts must be "impartial". This means that they must be without bias and must be able to decide matters in an equitable and logical manner. Because of the strong ties Ericsson has with different players in the telecommunications industry (like Sprint), iconectiv cannot be considered impartial.

Proof of this can be seen in some of NeuStar's filings to you detailing Ericsson's industry ties. It's possible that you could argue that iconectiv doesn't have ties to its parent company when it comes to making decisions, but when you see the following statement from Ericsson's Q&A portion of their site, it's impossible to conclude that iconectiv is, in any way, impartial:

**Q: Will Telcordia be fully integrated or not?**

A: : Telcordia will long-term be fully integrated into Ericsson.

On iconectiv's website, the claim is made by the company that it is a wholly owned subsidiary of Ericsson known as Telcordia who is doing business under the name of iconectiv. Therefore, it is illogical to claim that the company is impartial because of the nature of its ties with Ericsson.

For this one reason alone, it does not matter what the NANC recommends, nor does it matter the differences in price between NeuStar's contract and iconectiv's contract. What does matter is that it would be in direct violation of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to grant the company even one of the LNPA's 7 contracts and would, almost certainly, open the FCC to both regulatory and legal scrutiny. Because of these problems, combined with the challenges associated with

switching vendors and the significant layoffs that could take place at NeuStar, I believe it would be in the best interests of the FCC, NeuStar, industry players like COMPTEL, and every customer who could be affected by a transition from one party to the other, if NeuStar retains its contract in full. For your review, I've included Section 251(e)(1) below:

“(e) NUMBERING ADMINISTRATION.—

“(1) COMMISSION AUTHORITY AND JURISDICTION.—The Commission shall create or designate one or more impartial entities to administer telecommunications numbering and to make such numbers available on an equitable basis. The Commission shall have exclusive jurisdiction over those portions of the North American Numbering Plan that pertain to the United States. Nothing in this paragraph shall preclude the Commission from delegating to State commissions or other entities all or any portion of such jurisdiction.

Sincerely,

Daniel L. Jones

Founder and CEO of Avaring Capital Advisors, LLC