**2 May 2024**

**TIF 118 (Update CSCN-Administered Guidelines for Thousands-Block Pooling)**

**CSCN Conference Call**

**Participants:** David Comrie - COMsolve Inc. (CNA)

Fiona Clegg - COMsolve Inc. (CNA)

Kelly T. Walsh - COMsolve Inc. (CNA)

Natalie Ann Lessard - COMsolve Inc. (CNA)

John Nakamura - 10X People / INC Co-Chair

Jeanne Bell - Allstream/Zayo

Joey-Lynn Abdulkader - Bell Canada

Marie-Christine Hudon - Bell Canada

Leo Santoro - Bell Mobility

Bill Barsley - CNAC

Glenn Pilley - CNAC

Anamika Bharti - Cogeco

Ed Antecol - COMsolve Inc.

Ofir Smadja - COMsolve Inc.

Étienne Robelin - CRTC staff

Kim Brown - Eastlink

Michael Adesina - Freedom Mobile

Muhammad Uppal - Freedom Mobile

Karen Robinson - KROB Solutions

Suresh Khare - Interested Party

Jonathan Holmes - ITPA

Tara Farquhar - NANPA

Marcel Champagne - Neustar

Austin He - Primus Tel

Darryl Evans - Quadro Communications

Jennifer Mack - Rogers

Michael Studniberg - Rogers

Tammy Wilson - SaskTel

Graham LeGeyt - Rogers

Allyson Blevins - Sinch / INC Co-Chair

Diane Dolan - Teksavvy

John MacKenzie - TELUS

Marlo Gelito - TELUS

Olena Bilozerska - TELUS

Jean-Sebastien Tremblay - Videotron

**Welcome:**

Kelly Walsh, as CSCN Chair, welcomed the attendees.

David Comrie reviewed the list of attendees.

**Discussion:**

Ed Antecol noted that when you do an LNP dip, a 10-digit number is returned back to you as well as the type of port and the LRN. If the individual number hasn’t been ported but is part of a pooled block, you will be returned the type, response and the pool NPA-NXX-X. So make sure you are able to handle that type of response. If the TN is native to that service provider, no LRN will be returned.

Jennifer Mack asked if there could be a checklist with a listing of what to expect with an LNP dip once TBP has been implemented. Ed Antecol noted that post-TBP, if a number belongs to a block holder who is not the native CO Code Holder, you will get an LRN but if the number is native to the CO Code Holder, it will not return an LRN. Companies will be getting a different type of message from the LSMS than they are used to.

Leo Santoro asked if this is any different from when bulk ports are done? Ed Antecol noted that he is not 100% sure. Ed Antecol noted that it might not be different from how bulk ports are currently handled. Marcel Champagne noted that bulk porting is just regular porting so there is no such thing as a “Pooled” type so it is different.

Graham Le Geyt said that it is not an LSMS that responds because an LSMS is not allowed to communicate directly with a carrier element. Ed Antecol noted that it is the response from wherever a carrier does its LNP dip.

Graham Le Geyt asked if Ed Antecol could provide an example of the response. Ed Antecol noted that he will try to grab a snapshot of an LNP Dip response if it’s not deemed confidential.

Action Item: Ed Antecol will provide an example, if it is deemed non-confidential, of additional data required in a thousand-block pooling environment to support an LNP Dip where the number is non-ported and part of a thousands-block.

**Post meeting note**: see contribution CNCO242A (available at https://crtc.gc.ca/cisc/eng/cisf3ft.htm), for clarification of the confusion by use of the reference to LNP Dips as opposed to upstream messaging between i) NPAC and LSMS, as well as ii) LSMS and local data store used by a Carrier’s Service Control Point (SCP).

Ed Antecol presented CNCO236B.

Tara Farquhar noted that INC is looking to change the time of aging a service block from 45 to 30 days. Allyson Blevins noted that that is regarding the blocks. They cannot comment on the time of aging individual numbers. So the aging of TNs and the aging of Blocks is different.

Allyson Blevins noted that in the US, if a carrier had a significant number of TNs that pushes the contamination over 10%, then a carrier would not donate the block. Allyson Blevins noted that in the US, a block does not get disconnected until the aging period for the TNs is cleared.

Allyson Blevins noted that the 45 days is the normal timeframe for aging TNs but allows that service providers can go higher than 45 but that is a business rule.

Karen Robinson noted that typically carrier services allow for 2 or 3 billing cycles before a disconnected customer’s number is returned to the pool. Once a thousand block has the potential to be returned, she would call it locked down, meaning once all numbers complete that 90 day cycle, the numbers are scrubbed and the block can be returned to the pool. As much as our efforts and objectives are to reclaim as many numbers as possible, we also should be conscious that different carriers will have different business requirements and these guidelines should not affect these carriers’ ability to do business.

Ed Antecol noted that in the TBCOCAG, it references a minimum and maximum for aging TNs before the blocks can be returned to the pool. We should also come up with a minimum and maximum and the timelines we come up with should make sure that numbers don’t get prematurely assigned. We need to have our own minimum and maximum defined.

Karen Robinson noted that each service provider should have the flexibility to determine between 45 and 90 days for their aging period. Ed Antecol noted that he has highlighted the 45 and 90 days in his contribution because that is the default in the US but we need to determine the Canadian values.

Graham Le Geyt noted that he is not prepared to provide an answer today on the desired aging period and will have to take it internally.

Action Item: Participants are asked to investigate internally the desired aging period for residential telephone numbers in a thousands-block pooling environment.

Leo Santoro noted that he supports Karen’s comments that most carriers have a 90 day aging period in their platform. Ed Antecol noted that he is okay with the time interval being 90 days but the process needs to be built around that period.

Graham Le Geyt asked what the impetus was for having a specific step for disconnecting test numbers. Ed Antecol noted that carriers may not realize that test numbers are administrative numbers and may not realize that they need to be disconnected. The TBCOCAG tells you to remove your test numbers out of any blocks you are returning.

Karen Robinson asked if a service provider has a customer that wants to reactivate a number, can that service provider request that specific number from the returned block without requesting the whole block? Ed Antecol noted that there would be problems with that.

Jeanne Bell noted that when we initially start this, there will be a lot of blocks donated back. There are going to be numbers that will fail to get ported just due to human error. Everybody needs to be prepared to address this type of situation at the onset.

Allyson Blevins noted that she cannot think of a carrier in the US that has not made a mistake like a failed intra-port. It’s going to happen a lot at first so it’s probably good to have a standard process in place to address these.

Action Item: CSCN Secretary will post a C version of the CNCO236B. **(Completed)**

Action Item: All participants should take this document internally and provide subsequent contributions.

Fiona Clegg noted that there are 3 types of test numbers so what kind of test number is being referenced in item 6. Ed Antecol noted that it’s meant to be all of them as they are tying up resources in the block.

Kelly Walsh asked if there were any objections to discussing CNCO240A today as it had not been posted for the minimum 5 business days. There were no objections.

Agreement was reached to review CNCO240A.

Ed Antecol presented CNCO240A.

Tara Farquhar noted that in the new system in the US, there will only be 1 form that is similar to Appendix 2 but it will be used for both a code and a block.

Tara Farquhar noted that in the US, excluded numbers is primarily meant to be the quantity of numbers activated in the last 90 days and there is no subtraction for special phone numbers.

Fiona Clegg noted that at the moment the Canadian industry does not do a percentage utilization on the forms that come in for CO Code requests.

Graham Le Geyt noted that point number 3 of the contributions [“If the carrier/reseller is a recipient of Intermediate Numbers, should they be required to obtain an OCN so that they can participate in CNA forecasting processes and report utilization of received numbers? (there are no barriers to resellers obtaining reseller class OCNs)]” is straying into the realm of policy because it would be requiring resellers to get an OCN where previously they did not need one. Ed Antecol noted that it can be changed but the point is that if a forecast needs to be submitted, the CNA needs a way to track it.

Fiona Clegg noted that last year the CNA was asked to try and figure out how many numbers were going to resellers/wholesalers and it did not work very well. If resellers were to get their own OCN, then the CNA would be able to keep track of what is in their inventory. Graham Le Geyt noted that if he was a reseller, he would not get an OCN if it was not required.

Karen Robinson noted that her contribution speaks directly to one of the questions Ed Antecol asked.

Action Item: David Comrie will send a TIF 118 meeting invite for 8 May 2024 from 12:00 – 14:00 ET. **(Completed)**

Ed Antecol asked if Carriers could get feedback on how to report back on intermediate numbers and, should intermediate carriers be required to provide number utilization reports.

Action Item: Carriers are asked to review internally about how to report back on intermediate numbers and, if intermediate carriers should be required to provide number utilization reports.

Fiona Clegg asked to have it noted that Karen Robinson’s contribution did not get reviewed today and should be discussed first on the next call.

**Summary of Agreements Reached:**

1. Agreement was reached to review CNCO240A.

**Summary of Action Items:**

1. Ed Antecol will provide an example, if it is deemed non-confidential, of additional data required in a thousand-block pooling environment to support an LNP Dip where the number is non-ported and part a thousands-block. **(Completed)**
2. Participants are asked to investigate internally the desired aging period for residential telephone numbers in a thousands-block pooling environment. **(Ongoing)**
3. CSCN Secretary will post a C version of the CNCO236B. **(Completed)**
4. David Comrie will send a TIF 118 meeting invite for 8 May 2024 from 12:00 – 14:00 ET. **(Completed)**
5. Carriers are asked to review internally about how to report back on intermediate numbers and, if intermediate carriers should be required to provide number utilization reports. **(Ongoing)**

**Attachments:**

****

CNCO236B – COMsolve contribution – TBP block return checklist (incl. in-meeting changes)



CNCO240A – COMsolve contribution – Paragraph 51 questions