**11 June 2024**

**Day One**

**Minutes from CSCN 129 Opening Session**

**In-person/Conference Call**

**Hosted by Videotron**

**In-Person:** David Comrie - COMsolve Inc. (CNA)

Kelly T. Walsh - COMsolve Inc. (CNA)

Natalie Ann Lessard - COMsolve Inc. (CNA)

Glenn Pilley - CNAC

Ed Antecol - COMsolve Inc.

Ofir Smadja - COMsolve Inc.

Karen Robinson - KROB Numbering Solutions

Melanie Cardin - Quebecor

Gabriel Picard Mandeville - Quebecor

Michael Studniberg - Rogers

Martin Laroche - TELUS

Jean-Sebastien Tremblay - Videotron

Marc Berruyer - Videotron

**Conference Bridge:** Fiona Clegg - COMsolve Inc. (CNA)

Stephen Walsh - COMsolve Inc. (CNA)

John Nakamura - 10X People / INC Co-Chair

Jeanne Bell - Allstream/Zayo

Joey-Lynn Abdulkader - Bell Canada

Wanda Mali - Bell Canada

Leo Santoro - Bell Mobility

Anamika Bharti - Cogeco

Alexander Pittman - CRTC staff

Étienne Robelin - CRTC staff

Sarah Reilly - Distributel

Tara Farquhar - NANPA

Jennifer Mack - Rogers

Tammy Wilson - SaskTel

Allyson Blevins - Sinch / INC Co-Chair

Diane Dolan - Teksavvy

John MacKenzie - TELUS

Olena Bilozerska - TELUS

James Sewell - Westman Communications

**TIF 119 (Report of inclusion of unused numbers from previously assigned CO Codes in pool)**

Kelly Walsh asked if there was any objection to reviewing CNCO243D despite having less than 5 business days to review the contribution.

Agreement was reached to review CNCO243D.

Diane Dolan presented CNCO243D.



CNCO243D - Teksavvy contribution - TIF 119 - Draft report for TIF 119 (incl. in-meeting changes)

Ed Antecol noted that whether or not Aging numbers need to be included in the contamination number depends on how the process is built. If companies can only donate blocks once there are no longer any numbers being aged, then those numbers wouldn’t be counted in the contamination level since there would not be any aging numbers in a donated block.

Ed Antecol noted that if a carrier uses a manual process for their inventory management system, the higher the contamination level and the more intra-service provider ports required, the more work it is.

John MacKenzie asked if anyone knew why the US was changing to 15% contamination? John Nakamura noted that he may remember instances in California where the availability of numbers was tight and so this was to make more blocks available for pooling but he does not remember a conversation about why they chose to implement it nationwide.

Karen Robinson noted that carriers may want the ability to get a list of the contaminated numbers in the block, not just the level of contamination. If a carrier has a customer that wants a vanity number from a specific block, it might be advantageous to have the capability to check what numbers are unavailable.

John MacKenzie noted that he still does not feel he has seen sufficient evidence that rolling out donated blocks from previously assigned CO Codes at the same time as thousands-block pooling is rolled out for new CO Codes is necessary.

Marie-Christine Hudon asked why it shouldn’t be mandatory for carriers to return unused thousands-blocks with the implementation of thousands-block pooling. Ed Antecol noted that he does not want to delay the rollout of thousands-block pooling just because some carrier doesn’t have their numbering inventory management system ready for thousands-block pooling. However, he does want it noted that carriers will not be able to get new numbers in an Exchange Area where TBP is available if they have not updated their system to be able to accept thousands-blocks.

Kelly Walsh noted that the CNA tried to conduct a third-party user survey recently and did not get a lot of usable data as there seemed to be different interpretations of how to complete the data.

Jennifer Mack asked what happens to a number that was previously included in the contamination tally, but then the number is cancelled and returned. Where does the number return to? Ed Antecol noted that if that block is sitting in the pool, the NPAC will send a notification to the CO Code holder that the number is available. That CO Code holder has to know that they can’t take that number unless they are the block holder. When a carrier gets a block, they can use a tool such as PortPS to verify the numbers in the contaminated list. If the NPAC notes that the number is from an assigned block, the cancelled number will snapback to the block holder and the block holder will receive a notification.

Jeanne Bell noted that NPAC does not send a notification to the provider but rather that carrires do their own query. Ed Antecol noted that he believes in the US, they do get notifications. John Nakamura noted that in both the US and Canada, the NPAC does have donor disconnect notifications. In the US, the Code owner gets the donor disconnect notification unless there is a different block owner.

Jeanne Bell noted that someone within the service provider needs to monitor those notifications. John Nakamura noted that it shouldn’t be a person monitoring those notifications.

Jeanne Bell noted that her company chose not to put in the automation to monitor the snapback notifications so they have to monitor it manually. Some companies will have to have someone monitoring those notifications. Ed Antecol noted that in addition, once TBP is implemented, they will have to receive training as the process will be slightly different.

Ed Antecol noted that the PA’s tool showing contamination level will not reflect any number cancellations after the block was donated. So when you get the block, you will know the maximum level of contamination for that block but it could be less if there are any cancellations before you get the block. Once you get the block, it will be the service provider’s responsibility to assess the contaminated numbers.

Anamika Bharti asked about aging numbers in blocks to be donated to the pool. Ed Antecol noted that the current process being proposed is that carriers only donate numbers when there are no numbers being aged in the block. If a customer cancels a number and then wants it back and the block is still in protected status by the block holder and has not been donated to the pool, the carrier can reassign that number. If the reassigned number does not push the level of contamination over the threshold, then the block can be donated to the pool once there are no more numbers being aged.

Ed Antecol noted that it will not be the CNA’s responsibility to order an audit but the CNA will be in a position to identify when a carrier has poor utilization and can request an explanation and, if the CNA does not feel the justification is appropriate or clear, the CNA can note the concern to CRTC staff.

Diane Dolan noted that in previous discussions, addressing the one-and-done approach for IoT, the group had noted that addressing it is not really exclusive to thousands block pooling.

Ed Antecol noted that there have been multiple changes to the Neustar FRS that have been directed by the FCC that go beyond the version approved by the CLNPC. It may be of value for Canada to adopt some of those changes.

Kelly Walsh noted that we can’t currently say what CLNPC has agreed to.

Action Item: Diane Dolan will invite Chantale Neapole to participate in the next TIF 119 meeting. **(Completed)**

Ed Antecol noted that in Canada, under the 2017 FRS, mass porting notifications are sent via email and do you want to have a person sitting and trying to accurately forward up to 10,000 emails to the right carrier.

Fiona Clegg noted that in her opinion, there will be several new fields required in the new GTT spreadsheet.

Natalie Lessard noted that she is aware that some of the smaller carriers are definitely monitoring these proceedings but they do not have the manpower to participate in them.

Karen Robinson noted that today there are service providers that are using geographic numbers for non-geographic purposes. Ed Antecol noted that in the Part 1 form for Geographic codes, there is an attestation that you are not using geographic numbers.

Martin Laroche noted that an IoT service that might need a geographic number is private wireless numbers where they might move the physical location of the number.

Glenn Pilley noted that he still thinks that some companies might be going into more and more rural areas to get whole CO Codes.

Etienne Robelin noted that the mention of “smaller carriers” in the regulatory policy was really meant to consider if there’s anything anyone can think of that might impact smaller carriers when implementing thousands-block pooling.

Diane Dolan proposed holding a TIF 119 meeting during the week of 24 June 2024.

A tentative meeting for TIF 119 was scheduled for 20 June 2024 from 11:00-13:00 ET.

Action Item: Diane Dolan will confer with Chantale Neapole about her availability on 20 June 2024 from 11:00 – 13:00 ET. **(Completed)**

Action Item: David Comrie, with confirmation from Diane Dolan, will send out a meeting invitation for TIF 119 for 20 June 2024 from 11:00 – 13:00 ET. **(Completed)**

Action Item: Ed Antecol will produce a contribution on facilitated LRNs for TIF 118.

**Summary of Agreements Reached**

Agreement was reached to review CNCO243D.

**Summary of Action Items**

1. Diane Dolan will invite Chantale Neapole to participate in the next TIF 119 meeting. **(Completed)**
2. Diane Dolan will confer with Chantale Neapole about her availability on 20 June 2024 from 11:00 – 13:00 ET. **(Completed)**
3. David Comrie, with confirmation from Diane Dolan, will send out a meeting invitation for TIF 119 for 20 June 2024 from 11:00 – 13:00 ET. **(Completed)**
4. Ed Antecol will produce a contribution on facilitated LRNs for TIF 118. **(Ongoing)**

**Attachments**

The following item is attached during the relevant discussion section:

* CNCO243D - Teksavvy contribution - TIF 119 - Draft report for TIF 119 (incl. in-meeting changes)