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**Welcome:**

Kelly Walsh, as Chair of the CSCN, welcomed the attendees.

David Comrie, as CSCN Secretary, reviewed the list of participants.

**Action Items**

None.

**Discussion**

Kelly Walsh noted that this is a thousand-block pooling kick-off meeting. There is a tight timeline for implementation for the industry. There are a number of items that are in the conclusion of Telecom Regulatory Policy CRTC 2024-26. He noted that he created a spreadsheet identifying the directions in the conclusions and listed the ones that appear to be CSCN related to another sheet. He noted that another related item that occurred during the CSCN 128 agenda call is direction to the CNA to add an attestation to the CO Code Part 1 form. Participants were asked to review the attestations internally as there was a concern about some of the wording.

Ed Antecol gave a presentation on thousand-block pooling.

Suresh Khare noted that in Canada there are no Rate Centres. Canada uses the term Exchange Area. Kelly Walsh noted that the two terms are effectively synonymous in Canada as Canada must work with Exchange Areas in the Canadian tariffs which are associated with Rate Centres in BIRRDS.

Allyson Blevins noted that in the US, if you are the CO Code holder, you can use default routing for your thousand-blocks from that code but other carriers will require their own LRN.

Karen Robinson asked when a telco is requesting a 1k block from whichever rate centre it is, if they have an LRN for that rate centre, can they continue to use their LRN instead of making a new LRN for the new block. Ed Antecol noted that that is correct.

Leo Santoro asked if in the larger metro areas, can you ask for a full block or do you need to request individual blocks? Ed Antecol noted that it depends. Carriers will have to look at the available blocks and may need to request replenishment blocks but a Carrier can request multiple thousand blocks in a single application.

Leo Santoro asked about the situation where you have a customer requirement for a complete NXX. Ed Antecol noted that you can do that in the US system but the Canadian system has not been defined yet.

Allyson Blevins asked if Ed has a slide about the NRUF forecasting tools in the US. Ed noted he doesn’t have one in the presentation but noted that in the US, there’s a broader definition of “service provider” which includes resellers. Ed Antecol noted that in the Decision, we will have to look at how forecasting will be done.

Allyson Blevins noted that in the US the NRUF has to match what you are requesting on your pooling tab. Ed Antecol responded that it will require a new level of thousand-block pooling forecasting.

Phil Gauvin asked about the donation of 1K blocks with contamination. What happens with the customers on those blocks. Ed Antecol noted that no customers lose their numbers. Carriers getting the contaminated block have the obligation to make sure they do not assign those customers’ numbers to another customer.

Jean Michel Dupuis asked, if a carrier goes into a new area, are they required to request a new NPA-NXX? Ed Antecol noted that they will be required to get an initial NPA-NXX but they can specify how many of their blocks they want to use. If they want to keep more than one block, they will need to provide a more detailed forecast.

Leo Santoro asked if you are only allowed 1 LRN per POI. Ed Antecol noted that that is correct. You need to order a new CO Code to establish another LRN. For conservation purposes, if you already have an LRN for a rate centre, then you are not entitled to another one, as far as his understanding goes. But we might want to consider how we want to handle the situation in Canada.

Karen Robinson asked about the comment “SP is allowed to use Intra-SP Ports to share thousands-blocks across their multiple switches in a Rate Centre” and noted that you can’t share them across rate centres. Ed Antecol noted that you can’t do it across rate centres. It has to be on switches within the same rate centre like in Toronto which is a single Rate Centre where some Carriers have multiple switches.

Karen Robinson noted that a SP can have multiple POIs on the same switch. If you have a different POI CLLI on a different Switch, then what will happen?

Karen Robinson asked if Ed Antecol has a flow chart handy. He noted that he does not have one. Allyson Blevins noted that she can get a flow chart for Karen Robinson.

Suresh Khare asked if there will be 2 different forecasts being submitted. Ed Antecol noted that assuming CSCN decides we want 2 forecasts, there will be a time period where these forecasts will be required. Ed Antecol noted that he would not expect a 1k block forecast by January but he doesn’t know.

Suresh Khare asked if that 1k block forecast would require companies to report a negative demand if they have more blocks than they need. Ed Antecol noted that in the US, carriers are required to assess their inventory and return any unneeded blocks every 6 months.

Jennifer Mack asked if number requests would require sequential number blocks or can you request specific non-sequential blocks. Ed Antecol noted that you can specify which blocks you want and they do not have to be requested in a sequential order.

Jean Michel Dupuis asked if it comes to contaminated blocks, if we have native numbers that do not carry an LRN, how will those be identified. Ed Antecol noted that that is something that will have to be determined by the BPWG.

Bob Bruce asked, if you’re going to contribute a contaminated block back, wouldn’t you do a service impact form? Ed Antecol noted that you do a Part 1A to return a block. Ed Antecol noted that the obligation is on the person receiving the contaminated block to check the NPAC and make sure that they do not assign the numbers that are already assigned.

Allyson Blevins noted when you donate or disconnect a block, one of the first questions that is asked is how many TNs are assigned from the block. NANPA confirms with their own report from the NPAC.

Leo Santoro asked if any consideration has been given to non-portable numbering resources in portable markets. Ed Antecol noted that there are references to non-portable standards and what to do about it in the ATIS standard. Allyson Blevins noted that you would need to take the full CO Code which would be non-portable, not built in the NPAC and would be marked as non-portable in BIRRDS.

Diane Dolan asked if you donate a contaminated block and do the intraport, do disconnected numbers snap back to the block holder or the CO Code holder? Allyson Blevins noted that they go back to the block holder via snapback reports to the NPAC.

Ed Antecol noted that the purpose of the presentation was to highlight the different areas of impact. Everywhere in the Decision where it says “CISC shall”, every CISC working group should review it and determine if it impacts their group.

Kelly Walsh thanked Allyson Blevins for participating.

Allyson Blevins noted that there is currently a new system being implemented in the US that is different from the systems that Ed displayed in his presentation.

Kelly Walsh thanked Ed Antecol for providing a 1k pooling primer for the Canadian industry. Canada has some choice about how this is implemented.

Kelly Walsh noted that he previously said he would provide a project schedule but he has instead created an Excel sheet with the tasks he has identified in the conclusions of the Policy.

Kelly Walsh noted that there was direction in the Policy to add an attestation to the CO Code Part 1 form but there was 1 item in the attestation that was particularly contentious when considered by the CSCN. Kelly Walsh asked if anyone had taken the proposed changes to the Part 1 to be reviewed internally. There were no respondents.

Kelly Walsh presented Policy paragraph 86 which described the required changes to the Part 1 form.

Ed Antecol noted that it takes 66 days to activate a new CO Code so it would be very problematic to have to wait until you are completely exhausted before you request new numbers.

Fiona Clegg noted that some possible language is “the carrier does not have sufficient unused numbering resources from previous assignments that can be used instead”. Ed Antecol noted that a Carrier’s months to exhaust forecast should take their assignment rate into consideration.

Kelly Walsh noted that the CNA would like to be in a position by 6 March 2024 where they can decline any Part 1 forms that do not have the attestation section completed.

Karen Robinson asked if we want to add wording that Carriers do not have any Reserved and Held numbers to the Part 1 form? A Carrier might choose to reserve numbers in a code as part of a block for a potential customer. If you have 50% of your numbers in reserved or held status, do you qualify for a new CO Code with this attestation.

Kelly Walsh noted that the attestations apply to both initial codes and growth codes and no appendix B is submitted with an initial code.

Phil Gauvin suggested that the group stop trying to draft the changes by committee.

Action Item: Phil Gauvin will draft a proposal for 1.4.c **(Completed)**

Action Item: David Comrie will send the version of the Part 1 form that the committee was working on today to Phil Gauvin. **(Completed)**

Ed Antecol noted that he is willing to sponsor the guideline TIF but does not believe the timeline is possible.

Phil Gauvin noted that the standards for implementing this are missing and it does not make sense to create guidelines before we have the standards. Ed Antecol suggested that rather than “standards” the thing that is lacking is “Canadian processes”. BPWG, CLNPC agreements, is there going to be a block forecast added? Is it going to be by Rate Centre and Exchange Area? Whether it’s going to be in an automated system and by when?

Phil Gauvin asked if Ed Antecol would be able to put something together to list the requirements for Canadian processes? Ed Antecol noted that he doesn’t think he could do it on his own.

Kelly Walsh noted that there is a meeting scheduled for tomorrow at 1pm with a vision of trying to sort out the requirements for Canadian processes, then maybe if people can think about those and the subsequent associated guidelines, we can start working from there.

**Summary of Agreements Reached**

None

**Summary of Action Items**

1. Phil Gauvin will draft a proposal for 1.4.c **(Completed)**
2. David Comrie will send the version of the Part 1 form that the committee was working on today to Phil Gauvin. **(Completed)**

**Attachments**



Thousands-block pooling presentation – Ed Antecol



Telecom Regulatory Policy CRTC 2024-26



Thousands-Block Pooling Task Breakdown for CSCN – Kelly Walsh



CNCO224A – CNA contribution – Proposed changes to CO Code Part 1 (incl. in-meeting changes)