**20 June 2024**

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

**CSCN Conference Call**

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

Kelly T. Walsh - COMsolve Inc. (CNA)

Fiona Clegg – COMsolve Inc. (CNA) (last half of meeting)

Natalie Ann Lessard - COMsolve Inc. (CNA)

Stephen Walsh - COMsolve Inc. (CNA)

John Nakamura - 10X People / INC Co-Chair

Jeanne Bell - Allstream/Zayo

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.

Alexander Pittman - CRTC staff

Étienne Robelin - CRTC staff

Sarah Reilly - Distributel

Michael Adesina - Freedom Mobile

Karen Robinson - KROB Numbering Solutions

Tara Farquhar - NANPA

Marcel Champagne - Neustar/Transunion

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

Marc Berruyer - Videotron

Gabriel Picard Mandeville - Quebecor

James Sewell - Westman Communications

**Welcome:**

Kelly Walsh, as CSCN Chair, welcomed the attendees.

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

**Action Item Review:**

None.

**Discussion:**

Anamika Bharti presented CNCO252A.

Ed Antecol asked the INC Co-chairs if there is a similar requirement in the US for sequential thousands block assignment. Allyson Blevins noted that there is something in section 4.2 of the Administration of Telephone Numbers guideline about sequential numbering assignments.

Ed Antecol asked if every single number from a block needs to be assigned before opening a new block.

Tara Farquhar provided the following quote from Section 4.2 of Guidelines for the Administration of Telephone Numbers:

Sequential Number Assignment is an FCC mandate which requires all SPs to first assign all available telephone numbers within an opened thousands-block before opening another thousands-block, unless the available numbers in the opened thousands-block are not sufficient to meet a customer request. This requirement shall apply to SPs’ existing numbering resources as well as any new numbering resources obtained in the future.

It follows from this definition that, under this requirement, an SP that opens a uncontaminated thousands-block prior to utilizing in its entirety a previously-opened thousands-block should be prepared to demonstrate the following exceptions to the state commission: (1) a genuine request from a customer detailing the specific need for telephone numbers; (2) The SP’s inability to meet the specific customer request for telephone numbers from the available numbers within the service provider's opened thousands-blocks. The above exceptions do not apply to individual vanity number requests.

Upon a finding by a state commission that an SP inappropriately assigned telephone numbers from an uncontaminated thousands-block, the NANPA or the PA shall suspend assignment or allocation of any additional numbering resources to that SP in the applicable NPA until the SP demonstrates that it does not have sufficient numbering resources to meet a specific customer request.

Ed Antecol suggested that for Canadian purposes, it should not require 100% of numbers from a block be assigned from a previously opened block before opening a new block. Maybe it could be phrased as “substantially all”.

Anamika Bharti noted that Cogeco is also suggesting that companies begin the practice of exhausting blocks of 1000 before starting to assign from the next 1000, even when the carrier has been assigned a full CO Code, so that future 1000 blocks might be able to be donated without contamination.

Leo Santoro asked how requiring carriers to exhaust a thousand-block before opening a new one could be enforced?

Allyson Blevins noted that there are incentives to manage your resources effectively. If your blocks have been cherry picked and then a customer wants 500 sequential numbers which you don’t have. Now you have to justify why you need more numbers despite having a lot of numbers available for assignment.

Karen Robinson noted that in addition to opening 1K blocks sequentially, there would also be an advantage to assigning numbers sequentially as you would preserve consecutive blocks.

Ed Antecol asked Anamika Bharti if she could update her contribution to include a reference to the US section and to include specific recommendations. Anamika Bharti agreed.

Action Item: Anamika Bharti will update CNCO252A to include reference to Section 4.2 of Guidelines for the Administration of Telephone Numbers From ATIS-0300070 and include a specific recommendation.

Action Item: James Sewell will identify the recommendation for carriers to begin implementing sequential numbering and block assignments prior to the implementation of the thousands-block pooling.

The group began working on CNCO248F.

Karen Robinson asked, if an application is rejected by the CNA, how does that affect the Effective Date with the appeal to the CRTC/CRTC staff. Ed Antecol noted that there are minimum time periods for the CNA to process these applications. If the appeal goes to the CRTC, then it may require an expedite.

Kelly Walsh noted that the CNA is sensitive to the timing restrictions for applications by carriers. He reiterated that TSPs seem to favour the shortest possible Effective Date timeframe. He noted that TSPs should actually consider a longer lead time because if there are any issues with the application, the longer timeframe allows for more time to address the issues without impacting the desired Effective Date.

Karen Robinson noted that some companies are providing “warm numbers” which are pre-assigned to the SIM cards so that someone can walk into a store and leave with a working phone number.

Bill Barsley noted, when CNAC was approached regarding TBP, one of the considerations was the one-and-done philosophy. A whole bunch of numbers were assigned to their units in CDMA architecture. We probably don’t know what happened to these numbers. Were they recycled or have they disappeared. Maybe we can find a way to recycle these numbers so that there is a process for these.

Alex Pittman noted that it is preferred that recommendations are formatted in the following format:

The CSCN recommends that the CRTC direct X to Y by Z.

X= who the CRTC is directing to take action

Y= action to be done

Z = date or triggering condition to implement the recommendation

Action Item: David Comrie will post a modified CNCO248F as CNCO248G.

A meeting was scheduled for Friday, 21 June 2024 from 13:30 – 15:00.

Action Item: David Comrie will send out a meeting invite for Friday, 21 June 2024 from 13:30 – 15:00 ET.

Action Item: David Comrie will send out a meeting invite for Tuesday, 25 June 2024 from 10:00 - 13:00 ET.

**Summary of Agreements Reached:**

None.

**Summary of Action Items:**

1. Anamika Bharti will update CNCO252A to include reference to Section 4.2 of Guidelines for the Administration of Telephone Numbers From ATIS-0300070 and include a specific recommendation.
2. James Sewell will identify the recommendation for carriers to begin implementing sequential numbering and block assignments prior to the implementation of the thousands-block pooling.
3. David Comrie will send out a meeting invite for Friday, 21 June 2024 from 13:30 – 15:00 ET.
4. David Comrie will send out a meeting invite for Tuesday, 25 June 2024 from 10:00 - 13:00 ET.

**Attachments:**

****

CNCO252A - Cogeco contribution - TIF 118 - Sequential Numbering Assignment (incl. in-meeting changes)



CNCO248F - CSCN contribution - TIF 118 - Draft report for paragraph 51 from Telecom Regulatory Policy 2024-26 (incl. in-meeting changes)