**FoN Contact List Reminder:** Missing contact information should be sent to Kathy Bakke at: [kathleen.bakke@wisconsin.gov](mailto:kathleen.bakke@wisconsin.gov).

**Meeting Notes:** Some participants continued to have concern about the FTN 7B subcommittee meeting notes of December 16, 2013. On January 30, 2014, Jim Castagna, of Verizon, proposed changes to these subcommittee meeting notes and the corresponding January 15, 2014, FoN meeting notes (where the December 16, 2013, subcommittee meeting was first reported to the FoN). The FoN did not discuss the proposed changes to the December 16th meeting notes as Jim agreed to submit his contribution to the FTN 7B subcommittee to address his concerns.

With regard to the draft January 15, 2014, FoN meeting notes (where the FTN 7B subcommittee chair reported on their December 16, 2013 and January 10, 2014 meeting activities), Verizon distributed a proposal on February 3, 2014, to add additional content to the draft meeting notes, so that FoN participants would be aware of some aspects of the subcommittee activities identified in their meeting notes but not reported at the January 15, 2014 FoN meeting.  After much discussion, the FoN agreed to revise the January 15th meeting notes to include the following post-meeting reference:

**Post Meeting Notes:**

Although the following items were not discussed by the FoN on January 15, 2014, Verizon asked that the following clarifications be added to the final meeting notes regarding FTN 7B:

1. No proposals were presented by the FTN7B subcommittee to the FoN as a result of the FTN7B December 16, 2013 meeting.
2. The sub-committee determined more discussion is needed on the following items: which methods should be trialed, that a detailed synopsis of TN assignment under JIT is needed for clarity, and whether LRN assignment will/won’t work under the JIT and Less Than Thousand Block methods.
3. No proposals were presented by the FTN7B subcommittee to the FoN as a result of the FTN7B January 10, 2014 meeting.

The tri-chairs explained that they recently met with the subcommittee leaders to discuss the general concerns that have been raised. To clarify, the draft subcommittee meeting notes are first distributed to the subcommittee participants for review and comment. Once the meeting notes are finalized by the subcommittee, the meeting notes are forwarded to the tri-chairs and then distributed to the FoN. Any questions or concerns regarding subcommittee meeting notes should always be discussed with the subcommittee leader first.

Since the process of using subcommittees is somewhat new, the tri-chairs agreed that it would be beneficial to all FoN participants if we created guidelines to help define the general management of a subcommittee. Once a final draft has been completed it will be distributed to the entire FoN for review, feedback and approval.

The tri-chairs explained that the FoN meeting notes are intended to reflect the discussions that actually took place during a FoN call. To maintain accurate meeting notes, the FoN tri-chairs recommended that any on-going subcommittee activities that have *not* been discussed with the FoN will *not* be incorporated in the FoN meeting notes. No one on the call expressed concern regarding this recommendation. FoN members that are concerned about references in subcommittee meeting notes are strongly encouraged to contact the subcommittee leader in a timely manner for clarification. Concerns can also be addressed during the monthly subcommittee updates on the FoN calls.

**Updates on active FTNs:** The FTN issue champions provided brief updates on the subcommittee work that has taken place since the January 15th FoN call.

* **FTN 4**: Geographic Issues: (Mr. David Greenhaus). David explained that the FTN 4 subcommittee met twice last month, on January 9th and January 31st. He reviewed the subcommittee meeting notes with the FoN (these meeting notes will be distributed to the FoN). A brief overview of the topics discussed during those meetings follow:

On January 9th, the subcommittee discussed a variety of issues related to toll-free routing including: (1) information identifying the geographic origination of a call should be made available to toll-free providers as needed, (2) toll-free providers don’t have an established relationship to the callers of toll-free numbers and are unable to trace their movements or whereabouts over time, although the general location of the caller may be available when the call originates, (3) privacy concerns regarding the sharing of single-point, isolated instance geographic data are unfounded, while the need for such data is essential to carrying out the most basic of responsibilities of the common carrier – the accurate and timely completion of calls, and (4) once the toll-free call has ended there is generally no need to retain any originating location information.

David also reported that Penn Pfautz had presented AT&T’s contribution at the last PTSC meeting titled “Evolution of Toll Free - ENUM and the Locus of Service Processing.” David felt that AT&T’s proposal suggested that any geographic information needed by the toll-free industry (or others) can be purchased from companies on a competitive basis. However, he felt that the geographic information necessary for accurate call routing should continue to be provided in the meta-data of the call.

In response to this subcommittee meeting overview, Penn noted that a caller’s telephone number may no longer be a reliable indicator of their actual location. With this in mind, he raised several questions for consideration, including: (1) what is an acceptable proxy for location information? (2) What level of (location) detail is needed on a going forward basis? (3) Does this make economic sense? (4) What is the toll-free industry looking for in routing capabilities in an all IP-environment?

On January 31st, the subcommittee discussed consumer attachment to the geographic identity of telephone numbers. Since no specific data was available for review, Kathy Bakke shared an informal overview of the consumer feedback the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin received during the area code relief investigations for the 715 and 920 area codes. Some commercial customers in the 920 area code reported that it was difficult to change their area code during the 414/920 spilt but that over time their area code became less of a concern because their business materials tended to primarily web-based versus printed. On the other hand, the 715 area code is more rural in nature and the residents and RLECs alike in many rural communities continued to have strong ties to both the area code and rate center NXX. Kathy indicated that many consumers had stronger opinions about the possibility of 10-digit dialing than the geographic identity of their area code. Some subcommittee participants also felt that generational differences may contribute to some of the variance in consumer perspectives.

The subcommittee also discussed the possibility of conducting consumer surveys to quantify consumer attachment to the geography of their area code and telephone number and the importance of safeguarding numbering resources as we transition from today’s established standards to whatever standards will be in place at the end of the transition.

The next subcommittee meeting is February 21st from 12:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m. EST. Anyone interested in working on this subcommittee should contact David at: [dkgreenhaus@yahoo.com](mailto:dkgreenhaus@yahoo.com).

* **FTN 7A**: Routing Standards in an IP-Based Environment: (Natalie McNamer) Natalie was unable to attend today’s FoN meeting but she provided a brief update to the tri-chairs via e-mail. There have been no PTSC meetings since the last FoN call and she hopes to begin the FTN 7A subcommittee meetings later this month. Chris Drake also noted that iconectiv intends to submit new contributions to the PTSC in early February. Anyone interested in attending the FTN 7A subcommittee meetings should contact Natalie at: [nmcnamer@iconectiv.com](mailto:nmcnamer@iconectiv.com).
* **FTN 7B**: Less-than-Thousands-Block Pooling Number Assignment: (Bridget Alexander). The December 16, 2013 and January 10, 2014, draft subcommittee meeting notes were originally presented to the FoN during the January 15, 2014, meeting (via AT&T Connect). The subcommittee participants later reviewed and approved their draft meeting notes, which were then distributed to the FoN on January 29, 2014. Verizon was concerned about the report provided to the FoN on January 15th when compared to the December 16th and January 10th subcommittee meeting notes. While these concerns were not raised at the January 15th FoN meeting, Verizon subsequently proposed changes to both the subcommittee and FoN meeting notes. See above “Meeting Notes” section for discussion summary.

The subcommittee met again on January 22, 2014, and is in the process of finalizing those meeting notes. Bridget explained that the subcommittee discussed Sprint’s contribution regarding increased pooling donation contamination levels (from 10% to 50%, or anything higher than 10%) and Verizon’s contribution to establish an initial outline for a report to assist in organizing the characteristics and features of each proposal being reviewed by the subcommittee. The sub-committee agreed that a detailed synopsis of TN assignment under “JIT”, “Hundred Block Pooling”, “Less Than a Thousand Block Pooling” and “Twenty-five Percent Block Contamination” should be provided by the individual champion(s) by February 13th using Verizon’s proposed outline.

The FTN 7B subcommittee did not have any proposals for the FoN’s consideration at this time. The next subcommittee meeting will be on February 24, 2014. Anyone interested in working on this sub-committee should contact Bridget at: [balexander@jsitel.com](mailto:balexander@jsitel.com) or 301-459-7590.

**Miscellaneous Updates:**

* INC (Mark Lancaster): INC has been preparing for its upcoming meeting with Henning Schulzrinne. Mr. Schulzrinne will be discussing issues related to the recently proposed numbering testbed. Mark noted that some current FoN discussions may parallel some of the work being done at the INC.
* LNPA WG (Suzanne Addington): The LNPA WG has not met since the last FoN meeting. The next meeting is scheduled for early March.
* PTSC: (Chris Drake): There have been no PTSC meetings since the last FoN call. However, iconectiv intends to submit new contributions to the PTSC in early February.
* SCG (Kathy Bakke): There were no SCG meetings since the January FoN call.
* IP Transition Order: The FCC’s January 30, 2014, order regarding voluntary experiments to test the impact of technology transitions can be accessed at: <http://www.fcc.gov/document/fcc-oks-voluntary-experiments-testing-impact-technology-transitions-0>.

**New Contributions**:

* On February 5, 2014, AT&T submitted a new FoN contribution regarding “Numbering Testbed Parameters,”with the stated purpose of developing functional parameters that could be used in the numbering testbed proposed in FCC 14-5 (para 151-170) under WC Docket No. 13-97. The contribution was distributed to the FoN shortly before the February 5th call. AT&T noted that the information in its proposed contribution was taken from the FCC’s recent order and that there is value in identifying possible parameters and assumptions for the proposed testbed. Some participants felt Industry requirements should drive testbed requirements. Time did not allow for a detailed discussion of AT&T’s proposal so it will be discussed further on the next FoN call on March 12th.
* The FoN welcomes any suggestions that members have regarding new contributions. Contribution Forms are available for your convenience online at: <http://www.nanc-chair.org/docs/documents.html>. Forms can be submitted to the tri-chairs and will be distributed to the group for review.

**Documents:**  Three documents were distributed to the FoN with the February 5th meeting notes, including:

* AT&T Contribution regarding “Numbering Testbed Parameters”
* FTN 4 subcommittee meeting notes from January 9, 2014 (The January 31st notes will be distributed once they have been finalized by the subcommittee).
* The February FoN contact list

**Next Meeting**:

* **Date**: **March 12, 2014** (Please note the revised date)
* **Start Time**: **12:30 ET**/11:30 CT/10:30 MT/9:30 PT (Please note the revised start time)
* **Expected Duration**: 1.5 hours to 2 hours
* **AT&T Connect**: <https://connect7.uc.att.com/attinc3/meet/?ExEventID=85570882>
* **Bridge Information**: Call 888-388-6645 or 212-372-3682, passcode: 331915

**Participants**:

There were approximately 34 participants on the February 5th call, including:

| **Name** | **Company** |
| --- | --- |
| Beth O'Donnell | Cox Communications |
| Bonnie Johnson | Minnesota Department of Commerce |
| Bridget Alexander | John Staurulakis, Inc. (JSI) |
| Cathie Capita | T-Mobile |
| Chris Drake | iconectiv |
| Connie Hartman | iconectiv |
| Cullen Robbins | Nebraska Public Service Commission |
| David Greenhaus | 800 Response Information Services |
| Deborah Tucker | Verizon Wireless |
| Jan Doell | CenturyLink |
| Jason H Lee | Verizon |
| Jay Carpenter | PHONEWORD |
| Jim Castagna | Verizon |
| Jim Kaster | SMS/800, Inc. |
| Josh McConkie | Michigan Public Service Commission |
| Joyce Dingman | Wisconsin Public Service Commission |
| [Karen Riepenkroger](mailto:Karen.riepenkroger@sprint.com) | Sprint |
| Kathleen Bakke | Wisconsin Public Service Commission |
| Laura R Dalton | Verizon |
| Linda Lloyd | CHR Solutions |
| Margie Mersman | TCA, Telecom Consulting Associates |
| Mark Lancaster | AT&T |
| [Michele Thomas](mailto:michele.thomas@t-mobile.com) | T-Mobile |
| Paul LaGattuta | Neustar |
| Penn Pfautz | AT&T |
| Rich Kania | Maine Public Utilities Commission |
| Rosemary Emmer | Sprint |
| Shannon Sevigny | Neustar Pooling |
| Stephen Hayes | Oregon Public Utility Commission |
| Suzanne Addington | Sprint |
| Tiki Gaugler | XO Communications |
| Tim Kagele | Comcast |
| Tom Foley | Neustar |
| Tom McGarry | Neustar |