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**Welcome:**

Kelly Walsh, as CSCN Chair and RPC Chair, welcomed the attendees.

David Comrie reviewed the list of attendees.

**Action Items:**

No outstanding action items from previous meeting.

**Discussion:**

Ed Antecol noted that COMsolve currently fulfills the contract to operate as the Canadian Numbering Administrator.

Ed Antecol noted that the memorandum (CNCO231A), which was drafted by the CSCN Thousands-Block Pooling Questions Team, is meant to define at a high-level how thousands-block pooling will be implemented in Canada.

Ed Antecol presented CNCO231A – Draft NPAC Memorandum from March 26, 2024.

Allyson Blevins noted that in the US, when Service Providers (SPs) build a new CO Code in the NPAC, there is no LRN associated with the CO Code. The Carrier adds the SPID and the NPAC region.

Ed Antecol noted that a SPID is a resource managed by the NPAC operator.

Gerry Thompson asked if there is a note outlining a race condition where, if an SP submits a Part 1B requesting a block but there are no blocks available, do they have to submit a Part 1A? Ed Antecol noted that it had not been determined at that level yet.

Karen Robinson asked if the SP through SOA can create the block record themselves. Ed Antecol noted that technically they could but based on this memo, that’s not how the process is intended to operate.

Karen Robinson asked if all modifications had to go through the Part 1B. Marcel Champagne noted that prior to activation, it had to go through the 1B. After that it could be through the SOA.

Jennifer Mack asked about the difference between the Part 1A and the Part 1B. Ed Antecol noted that a Part 1 is for a full CO Code to refill the thousands block pool. Part 1A is for one or more thousands block units. A Part 1B is for the information that the SP wants to pass through to the NPAC.

Jennifer Mack noted that Part 1 form has a CLLI. Is a CLLI still required for the Part 1A? Ed Antecol noted that you still need a CLLI for the thousands block. When the CNA opens up a Block Control Record in BIRRDS, they will be required to enter a switching entity/POI CLLI.

Allyson Blevins noted that at INC, when you are opening a code for pool replenishment, there is a timeline requirement that the Part 1A cannot be processed before the code is built in the NPAC and that is why we have the seven day limit on building the code in NPAC and BIRRDS.

Allyson Blevins noted that once the Part 3 is issued, the blocks are built. The way it works in the US is you cannot build the CO Code in the NPAC until it is in BIRRDS.

Tara Farquhar noted that blocks cannot be assigned until the day after a CO Code is activated.

Anamika Bharti asked about the process for activating a contaminated block. Ed Antecol noted that contaminated blocks will be indicated in the PA database including the level of contamination. When you get the block you will have to run a report on the block to get a list of the ported out numbers and to make sure you don’t add ported numbers from the block into your inventory.

Karen Robinson noted that in the LERG, you can see some NXXs where the rate centre is portable but the NXX is not. Can the SPID of the block record remove the portability indicator so that a particular block is not portable. Tara Farquhar noted that if a code is in pooling, the whole code has to be portable. There is something where a non-pooled code can port individual blocks but in general, the whole code has to be portable.

Leo Santoro asked, under what scenario would the PA not have a pending activation? Once you apply for an initial code, you have to send it to the NPAC. Ed Antecol noted that if you get a new CO Code but you only need 5 of the blocks, you have 7 days to fill out the activation in BIRRDS. You then have another 5 blocks that have not been activated.

Tara Farquhar noted that the US is going away from 1A and 3A and just going to 1 and 3 because everything is being combined in the US. Ed Antecol noted that the memo is currently meant to align with the current ATIS spec. Tara Farquhar noted that the change to a single Part 1 and Part 3 will be happening on October 28, 2024, in conjunction with the new NAS coming online for general use.

John Nakamura noted that while technically Part 1A and 3A is the current process, the transition to Part 1 and 3 is a foregone conclusion. Ed Antecol noted that it is not currently decided if Canada will start with 2 separate systems or an integrated system by the launch date.

Allyson Blevins noted that in the US, Part 1B will still be used after October 28, 2024.

Gerry Thompson noted that the group should make notes of things that have not been decided or may change in the future to avoid having to build everything from the ground up more than once.

Ed Antecol noted that there is an effort in the US to reduce the number of days to assign a NXX from 66 days and there are ways to expedite requests.

Action Item: David Comrie will post the modified contribution as CNCO231B on the CNA website. **(Completed)**

Kelly Walsh noted that John Nakamura had some additional items he wanted to note about the differences in the US system.

Marcel Champagne (TransUnion) confirmed that the current NPAC release uses industry documentation (e.g., Functional Requirements Spec [FRS] R3.4.8e), as indicated on the [npac.com](http://npac.com) website.

John Nakamura noted the following:

Changes to the U.S. industry documentation since R3.4.8e:

1. R3.4.8f.  10 change orders, some are doc-only, others are behavior clarifications.  None apply to Thousands-Block Pooling (TBP).
2. R4.1, released on July 31, 2018.  Contained no changes but represents the baseline functionality associated with the iconectiv NPAC SMS implementation from which future changes will be made.  This is equivalent to NANC version 3.4.8f with all change bars accepted.  Please note that there was no NANC version 4.0 of the NPAC SMS documentation.
3. R4.1c, released on September 9, 2019.  Change Order NANC 525, contained some updates to the Mass Update Mass Porting (MUMP) feature, related to the MUMP spreadsheet that is used for submission, but no functional changes.
4. R5.0, released on October 25, 2020.  Change Orders NANC 453/535/538, related to deleting a Service Provider records, and verifying no TBP data exists.  Several deleted requirements related to system availability.
5. R5.1, released on February 6, 2022.  Change Order NANC 554, related to LSMS Query Recovery.  No TBP changes.
6. R5.1.1, released on February 8, 2023.  Change Order NANC 554, related to SV Download Reason.  No TBP changes.
7. R5.2, released on February 14, 2024.  Change Orders 561/562, related to deleting a Service Provider record, and verifying no NPA-NXX-X associated records exist.

Marcel Champagne asked if any of the changes since the last Canadian version would have impacted the Interoperable Interface Specification (IIS). John Nakamura noted that the IIS has not been changed.

Ed Antecol noted that today the NPAC sends notifications to both the SP and the PA. The Canadian implementation of the NPAC only sends it to PA who then converts it into an email and sends it to the SP. Have those requirements changed between the 3.4.8 and the current US version?

Action Item: Kelly Walsh will reach out to an iconectiv/NPAC representative for answers to questions regarding NPAC activation notification traffic as well as establishing dialogue with the current US NPAC operator. **(Ongoing)**

Ed Antecol noted that this memo does not deal with all the expedite flows.

Action Item: Allyson Blevins will provide information on expedites. **(Ongoing)**

**Summary of Agreements Reached:**

None.

**Summary of Action Items:**

David Comrie will post the modified contribution as CNCO231B on the CNA website. **(Completed)**

Kelly Walsh will reach out to an iconectiv/NPAC representative for answers to questions regarding NPAC activation notification traffic as well as establishing dialogue with the current US NPAC operator. **(Ongoing)**

Allyson Blevins will provide information on expedites. **(Ongoing)**

**Attachments:**

****

CNCO231A - TBP Question Team contribution - Draft Memorandum to CSCN regarding TBP implementation in NPAC (incl. in-meeting changes)