**Attendance:**

AT&T provided “AT&T Connect” (<https://connect7.uc.att.com/attinc3/meet/?ExEventID=85570882>) to facilitate the FoN discussions on a going forward basis. The tri-chairs also hope to use this as a tool to accurately track attendance.

**FoN Contact List:**

The tri-chairs are in the process of updating a FoN contact list which includes each member’s name, company affiliation, e-mail address and telephone number.

**Future Meeting Times:**

No alternate meeting times were suggested so the FoN will continue to meet the first Wednesday of each month, from 11:00-1:00 CT.

**Review of Forms:**

Participants reviewed the FoN mission, scope, target audience, and draft project tracking report referenced in the NANC training binder at: <http://www.nanc-chair.org/docs/principles.html> (pages 17-18). Also reviewed the FoN Contribution Form and the numbering scheme (i.e. FTN). Suggestions include:

1. Add an “anticipated completion date” field to the form in order to establish a clear working timeline for the group.

1. Keep specific issues referenced separately from the broad general topic to help facilitate discussions and eventual closure on these smaller issues.
2. Continue using the current FoN Contribution Form to define the original issue and to track overall the status of the FTN. However, a secondary form could be developed to clearly identify additional contributions made by FoN members to develop the solution. This would allow the FoN to efficiently identify and track the work-in-progress for the NANC and to facilitate monthly discussions.

**Future Topics for the FoN to Consider:**

Reviewed a topic list of FCC IP Numbering and NPRM/NOI issues prepared by Mark Lancaster (see attachment 1), as well as the items suggested by other FoN members in advance of the meeting (referenced in no particular order below):

1. The separation of telephone numbers from geography. What extent is technically feasible? Will the separation allow interconnected VoIP providers and most traditional telephone service providers the ability to assign any available telephone number from anywhere in the country to any customer?
2. Should the FCC open new NPAs and create a unified, national numbering regime that would apply equally to all service providers using these nationally available numbers, regardless of the type of service being offered or location?
3. Should the FCC have authority over geographically unrestricted "national" area codes?
4. Should certain area codes, such as Manhattan’s 212, retain their geographic connection on a grandfathered basis only- maintaining State regulation?
5. Should number block assignments in the 100s be allowed as opposed to full NXXs or 1K blocks?
6. Should Individual Telephone Number (ITN) assignment practices be allowed?

Additional suggestion made to develop principles that would guide future FoN discussions and provide a framework for evaluating issues.

Additional suggestion to explore whether numbers will still be necessary once the PSTN is no longer in use. One member noted that the subject was interesting but too general. The scope of this suggested issue should be defined and submitted via a FoN Contribution Form for consideration.

**Follow-up Items**:

1. For those participants that called into the bridge without logging into AT&T Connect, please e-mail Kathy Bakke so the attendance list for the August meeting can be updated.
2. If you have not done so already, please send your contact information to Kathy Bakke at your earliest convenience.
3. The September agenda and modified contribution forms will be distributed to the group by Tuesday, September 3rd.
4. The modified forms and process will be discussed during the September 4th meeting.

**Next Meeting**:

**Date**: September 4, 2013

**Start Time**: 12:00 ET/11:00 CT/10:00 MT/9:00 PT

**Duration**: 1.5 hours

**Attachment 1**

Source: Mark Lancaster

**FCC IP Numbering NPRM and NOI Topic List**

| **Para** | **Comment** |
| --- | --- |
| 20 | Alternative Certification  |
| 21 | Service Areas Form 477 Nomadic vs. Fixed VoIP Certification  |
| 22 | Utilization  |
| 23 | Intermediate Numbers  |
| 26 | Pooling Area Number Assignment  |
| 27 | VoIP from Specified Rate Centers  |
| 28 | Local-only Routing to VoIP  |
| 29 | Facilities Readiness  |
| 30 | Traffic Exchange Agreement  |
| 31 | 30 Day Pre-filing  |
| 32 | Numbering Commitments  |
| 34 | State Oversight  |
| 35 | CLEC Migration  |
| 36-38 | Blanket Certification  |
| 39 | Red Light Rule  |
| 44 | Routing/Tracking IP Interconnection Agreement (IPA)  |
| 45 | Database Modifications NPAC Uses  |
| 46 | Database Transition  |
| 50-51 | Transition Traffic Compensation  |
| 52 | VoIP Interconnect  |
| 53-56 | VoIP Interconnection Agreements SIP Endpoints  |
| 61 | VoIP LNP Obligations  |
| 64 | VoIP Overlap Porting Facilities in the Rate Center Geographic Limits Port Through Numbering Partner  |
| 65 | Transitioning to Direct Access  |
| 66 | Numbering Cost Allocation  |
| 71-75 | Expansion to One-Way VoIP Geographic vs. Non-Geographic VoIP Potential Numbering Abuses  |
| 77-81 | p-ANI Numbering  |
| 120-124 | Transition to Non-Geographic NumberingTimeframe for Change  |
| 126 | Public Safety  |
| 127 | Disability Access  |