**12 June 2024**

**Day Two**

**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

**Conference Bridge:** Stephen Walsh - COMsolve Inc. (CNA)

Fiona Clegg – COMsolve Inc. (CNA) (afternoon only)

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

Suresh Khare - Interested Party

Tara Farquhar - NANPA

Marcel Champagne - Neustar/Transunion

Jennifer Mack - Rogers

Tammy Wilson - SaskTel

Diane Dolan - Teksavvy

John MacKenzie - TELUS

Olena Bilozerska - TELUS

Marc Berruyer - Videotron

James Sewell - Westman Communications

**Response to CRTC regarding paragraph 51 of Telecom Regulatory Policy CRTC 2024-26**

Ed Antecol presented a months-to-exhaust spreadsheet.

Ed Antecol showed a Thousands-block Months-to-exhaust spreadsheet.

Ed Antecol noted that the TBP spreadsheet in the US includes the utilization.

The group began to work on CNCO248B.



CNCO248B - Rogers\Bell\KRob Solutions contribution - TIF 118 - Draft paragraph 51 report (incl. in-meeting changes)

Ed Antecol noted that recommendation 2 from CNCO248A which recommended a limitation on assigning numbering resources had been removed in CNCO248B and so he felt that an explanation for why the Canadian industry was not going to follow the US model should be included in the report.

Jennifer Mack noted that there was a justification in CNCO249A for why some Carriers wanted to remove the 75% utilization threshold.

Etienne Robelin asked if the concern about the 75% threshold is that it is too high? Leo Santoro noted that it’s the methodology as opposed to the threshold. The preference is to retain the current methodology of the Canadian Appendix B.

Jennifer Mack gave the example where if a carrier only has 1 block in an Exchange Area and already has 500 of those numbers assigned, that means they only have 500 numbers available for assignment which is below the 75% utilization threshold.

John Nakamura asked Tara Farquhar what she would do with that example if it came up in the US. Tara Farquhar noted that in the US they would need a state waiver but the resources received in the last 90 days are excluded from utilization. So if the initial block was less than 90 days old, then they could still request an additional block.

Ed Antecol noted that in his original proposal, carriers could ask for an exception from CRTC staff if they did not meet the utilization threshold.

Alexander Pittman noted that any deviation from the current process in the US should be thoroughly justified in the report.

Karen Robinson noted that when an NPA is in Jeopardy, carriers need to submit a request to the CRTC saying why they need a CO Code for every application in that NPA.

Karen Robinson noted that the 12 months to exhaust would primarily apply to the larger Exchange Areas.

Alex Pittman noted that excluding Admin Codes from Assigned Numbers would be consistent with the goal of the CRTC Regulatory Policy as it would incentivize carriers to maximize the efficiency of number assignments.

Étienne Robelin noted that obligations have been imposed on PSAPs indirectly by imposing requirements on the service providers to require information from the PSAPs. Could the CRTC take a similar approach with intermediate service providers?

John MacKenzie noted that if a wholesale customer doesn’t pay their bill for 6 months, the service provider can’t just cut them off so we probably can’t just cut a wholesaler off for not submitting a report.

Étienne Robelin noted that perhaps the submission of utilization by third parties to their service provider could be a mandatory condition of service.

John Nakamura noted that it’s probably not a “Can’t” but rather a “Won’t” for reporting intermediate numbers. These smaller carriers have to know who they have assigned numbers to, even if it’s just an Excel sheet.

Marie-Christine Hudon noted that Bell is okay with making the G-NRUF happen twice per year.

Ed Antecol asked if there were any objections to doing the NRUF reporting at the Exchange Area level.

Olena Bilozerska asked if the Exchange Area level of reporting would be implemented before the launch of TBP or at the same time. Ed Antecol noted that he would like to have Exchange Area level of reporting implemented before TBP so that the CNA can assess the effectiveness of conservation measures when comparing the numbers to those assigned/requested after the implementation of TBP.

Ed Antecol suggested that it might be possible to only do NPA-level reporting in NPAs where TBP is not expected to be implemented.

Karen Robinson noted that forecasting can be done at the Exchange level and then be consolidated at the NPA level.

Ed Antecol suggested that if a carrier does not want to do Exchange Area level forecasting, they can submit a request to the CRTC. He wants to have at least one iteration of utilization reporting before TBP is implemented.

Melanie Cardin asked what the utility is for including Aging numbers. Ed Antecol noted that Aging numbers should not be included as assigned. Melanie Cardin noted that some Carriers are aging numbers through NPAC via a disconnect. Some Carriers are doing nothing in NPAC until they have aged the numbers internally and then do the NPAC disconnect.

Ed Antecol noted that the primary goals of assessing Aging numbers is to make sure they are not included in Assigned.

Alex Pittman asked about the reason for using “require” as opposed to “condition of service” in the paragraph 51 report. Melanie Cardin noted that use of “condition of service” in this section is unnecessary as “condition of service” applies to the entire implementation of TBP.

John MacKenzie noted that he does not support requiring carriers to be responsible for getting information from the resellers. He wants the intermediate carriers to be responsible to the Commission for using their numbers efficiently. If wholesalers are not behaving appropriately, the punishment from the CRTC should be against the wholesaler.

The next TIF 119 meeting was scheduled for 10-12:30 ET on Tuesday, 18 June 2024.

Action Item: David Comrie will send out a meeting invitation for Paragraph 51 on Tuesday, 18 June 2024 from 10:00 – 12:30 ET. **(Completed)**

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

This item was skipped at this meeting due to time constraints.

**Summary of Agreements Reached**

None

**Summary of Action Items**

David Comrie will send out a meeting invitation for Paragraph 51 on Tuesday, 18 June 2024 from 10:00 – 12:30 ET. **(Completed)**

**Attachments**

The following item is attached during the relevant discussion:

* CNCO248B - Rogers\Bell\KRob Solutions contribution - TIF 118 - Draft paragraph 51 report (incl. in-meeting changes)