**16 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)

Natalie Ann Lessard - COMsolve Inc. (CNA)

Stephen Walsh - COMsolve Inc. (CNA)

Joey-Lynn Abdulkader - Bell Canada

Marie-Christine Hudon - Bell Canada

Wanda Mali - Bell Canada

Leo Santoro - Bell Mobility

Chantale Neapole - CLNPC

Rodger McNabb - CLNPC

Bill Barsley - CNAC

Glenn Pilley - CNAC

Anamika Bharti - Cogeco

Ed Antecol - COMsolve Inc.

Ofir Smadja - COMsolve Inc.

Étienne Robelin - CRTC staff

Michael Adesina - Freedom Mobile

Connie Hartman - iconectiv/TRA

Sarah Halko - iconectiv/TRA

Karen Robinson - KROB Numbering Solutions

Jonathan Holmes - ITPA

Tara Farquhar - NANPA

Marcel Champagne - Neustar/Transunion

Darryl Evans - Quadro Communications

Jennifer Mack - Rogers

Michael Studniberg - Rogers

Tammy Wilson - SaskTel

Allyson Blevins - Sinch / INC Co-Chair

Diane Dolan - Teksavvy

John MacKenzie - TELUS

Jean-Sebastien Tremblay - Videotron

Marc Berruyer - Videotron

James Sewell - Westman Communications

**Welcome:**

Fiona Clegg, as Acting CSCN Chair, welcomed the attendees.

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

**Action Item Review:**

1. Participants are asked to investigate internally the desired aging period for telephone numbers in a thousands-block pooling environment. **(Ongoing)**
2. 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)**
3. Chantale Neapole will be taking CNCO242A back to the CLNPC organization for review. **(Ongoing)**
4. Chantale Neapole will investigate if the GTT notification process will be impacted with the implementation of thousands-block pooling. **(Ongoing)**
5. Participants are asked to review the recommendations in CNCO241A internally and provide a response to CSCN. **(Ongoing)**
6. Fiona Clegg will look into whether or not companies that operate as a CLEC and a reseller will need two separate OCNs for submitting NRUFs and number utilization reports. **(Ongoing)**
7. Participants are asked to consider if there are any other things that can be done to improve number efficiency. **(Ongoing)**
8. Participants are asked to provide comments on the months-to-exhaust process. **(Ongoing)**

**Discussion:**

The following companies noted that their default aging time for telephone numbers is 90 days:

* Videotron
* Rogers
* Cogeco
* Bell Canada
* Freedom Mobile
* Teksavvy
* Bell Mobility

Ed Antecol noted that we need to identify a minimum and a maximum timeframe for aging. The minimum is crucial for how we design the timelines for Thousands-Block Pooling (TBP). Jennifer Mack noted that the aging period would be 60 days for Rogers for wireless.

Agreement was reached to have a minimum of 60 days and a maximum of 120 days for aging telephone numbers in a TBP environment.

Karen Robinson asked if this aging process is internal to the carrier. Ed Antecol responded that this aging process is internal to the carrier.

Chantale Neapole noted that CLNPC is looking into the GTT notification process. They have looked into testing. They are looking into who is responsible for SCP testing.

Karen Robinson presented CNCO238B.

Karen Robinson noted that she has been working in telecom number planning and capacity planning for 25 years and has observed various spikes at certain times of the year. If a blanket thousand block return policy is implemented when a carrier has to return all blocks that below 75% capacity, that may take a carrier’s inventory threshold below their risk tolerance.

Karen Robinson noted that the bigger Exchange Areas such as Toronto might need a 12 month inventory.

Karen Robinson noted that carriers using a 6 month inventory would be running lean.

Ed Antecol asked, if a thousands-block can be assigned in 33 days instead of the 66 days required for a new CO Code, would that alleviate some of the concerns about the 6-month versus 12-month inventory?

Karen Robinson asked, if a carrier needs 10 thousands-blocks, can they get it in 33 days? Ed Antecol noted that there are a lot of variables, but theoretically yes.

Leo Santoro noted that the primary focus on this question is to address medium to small size markets. With some of the very large metropolitan markets where wireless carriers in a period of high demand are going through a full NXX in a month and a half, we maybe have to look at exceptions for these larger markets.

Ed Antecol noted that in a larger market, you’re going to have a larger forecast which will allow you to keep more of your inventory.

Ed Antecol noted that in the US, the carriers are able to run on a 6-month inventory. Leo Santoro noted that in the US, a majority of markets are smaller than places like Toronto and Montreal.

Ed Antecol noted that we have to conserve numbering resources as much as possible. Leo Santoro noted that we do, but the flip side is that smaller exchange areas don’t benefit from TBP.

Fiona Clegg presented CNCO244A.

Fiona Clegg noted that based on the excerpt from NECA procedures, companies that become resellers would be required to get an OCN. Connie Hartman confirmed that that is accurate based on the NECA guidelines. The only exception that NECA shared was in the case of Voice over IP. So if you’re an ILEC or CLEC, and started sharing your numbers with a VoIP provider, you would not need to get a new OCN.

Diane Dolan noted that as a reseller today in Canada, resellers are not required to submit utilization reports so they do not need an OCN.

Ed Antecol noted that in his contribution, he is proposing an indirect way to report reseller use. If it’s decided that resellers are required to submit directly to the CNA, then it might also be decided that they need an OCN.

John MacKenzie asked, if a company has two types of service, it should have two OCNs? Fiona Clegg noted that that is correct.

Allyson Blevins noted that, she has multiple company codes: CLEC, Reseller, IPES, and wireless due to the types of services that the company offers.

Connie Hartman noted that OCNs are used in many other processes in the US – not just getting numbers – the OCNs are used in billing processes and other places that may be prompting the one OCN per line of business requirements by NECA.

Leo Santoro asked, are we going to define what a “reseller” is and what a “white label reseller” is? Ed Antecol noted that he is going to provide some proposed definitions.

Ed Antecol presented CNCO248A.

Karen Robinson noted that if a carrier has multiple POIs in an Exchange Area, they might need numbers at 1 POI which is exhausting. Ed Antecol responded that it’s probably not that valuable to have utilization at the POI level and probably more valuable to have it at the Exchange Area level.

Leo Santoro noted that if we are looking at 75% utilization without a timeframe qualifier, this won’t work. Ed Antecol noted that in the US it works with 75% utilization and a second test based on your forecast and you need to meet both criteria.

Karen Robinson noted that she would be happy to work with Leo Santoro on a contribution.

Anamika Bharti asked if the definition “Numbers that are not yet working and have a service order pending for more than five days shall not be classified as assigned numbers” is industry standard. Ed Antecol noted that he copied it from the TBCOCAG.

Leo Santoro asked if the forecasting here is for the NRUF and not the utilization. Ed Antecol agreed that it is for the NRUF. Ed Antecol noted that he just copied the process from the TBCOCAG which is based on doing forecasting every 6 months. If the industry wants to do 12 month forecasting, then he might suggest a 12 month inventory instead.

Jennifer Mack asked if the CNA would be responsible for requesting replenishment CO Code requests. Ed Antecol noted that the CNA cannot get CO Codes on its own but can encourage or incentivize carriers to get the replenishment CO Code to keep the pool stocked.

Jennifer Mack noted that for larger carriers in larger Exchange Areas a single thousands-block would not be sufficient during any of the spike periods. Ed Antecol noted that it would all come down to forecasts.

Karen Robinson asked, when a service provider is requesting a block, can they also request uncontaminated so that they have a sequential block of numbers? Ed Antecol noted that the CNA would have contamination information which would be provided when the service provider is applying for a block. Then there would be options from there.

Karen Robinson asked, if you have a service provider that wants to provide service for the first time in an area, they would need to apply for a CO Code. When they are applying, can they apply for a specific 1K block in that new CO Code. Ed Antecol noted that yes the service provider would get to choose the block(s) they want and the rest would be donated to the pool.

Fiona Clegg noted that Karen Robinson, Jennifer Mack and Leo Santoro will be coming in with a contribution that would be focusing on the 6-month inventory aspect of Ed Antecol’s contribution.

Marie-Christine noted that they will be reviewing CNCO248A and if they have any comments, Bell Canada will be coming in with a contribution.

The group returned to CNCO238B.

The next meeting was scheduled for 28 May 2024 from 10-12 ET.

Action Item: David Comrie will send out a meeting invite to the CSCN distribution list for a TIF 118 meeting on 28 May 2024 from 10-12ET. **(Completed)**

Ed Antecol asked participants to identify which parts of the proposal they agree with or don’t agree with so that we can start getting things into the report.

**Summary of Agreements Reached:**

1. Agreement was reached to have a minimum of 60 days and a maximum of 120 days for aging telephone numbers in a thousands-block pooling environment.

**Summary of Action Items:**

1. David Comrie will send out a meeting invite to the CSCN distribution list for a TIF 118 meeting on 28 May 2024 from 10-12ET. **(Completed)**

**Attachments:**

****

CNCO248A - COMsolve contribution - TIF 118 - Draft paragraph 51 report



CNCO244A - CNA contribution - TIF 118 - NECA company codes(



CNCO238B - KRob Solutions contribution - TIF 118 - Thousands Block Pooling Return Exceptions