

# NENA Wireless E9-1-1 Overflow, Default and Diverse Routing Operational Standard



NENA Wireless E9-1-1 Overflow, Default and Diverse Routing Operational Standard  
Document 57-001  
November 18, 2004 Original

Prepared by:

National Emergency Number Association (NENA) Wireless E9-1-1 Overflow, Default and Diverse  
Routing Wireless Operations Working Group.

Published by NENA  
Printed in USA

**NENA**  
**Operational Standard/Model Recommendation**

**NOTICE**

This Operational Standard/Model Recommendation is published by the National Emergency Number Association (NENA) as an information source for the voluntary use of communication centers and is provided as an example only. It is not intended to be a complete operational directive.

NENA reserves the right to revise this for any reason including, but not limited to, conformity with criteria or standards promulgated by various regulatory agencies, utilization of advances in the state of operational techniques or services described herein.

It is possible that certain federal, state or local regulations may restrict or require modification of the recommendations contained in this document. Therefore, this document should not be the only source of information used. NENA members are advised to contact their legal counsel to ensure compatibility with local requirements.

By using this document, the user agrees that NENA will have no liability for any consequential, incidental, special, or punitive damages arising from use of the document.

NENA's Committees have developed this document. Recommendations for change to this document may be submitted to:

National Emergency Number Association  
1700 Diagonal Rd, Suite 500  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
202.466.4911  
or [commleadership@nena.org](mailto:commleadership@nena.org)

Acknowledgments:

This document has been developed by the National Emergency Number Association (NENA) Wireless E9-1-1 Overflow, Default and Diverse Routing Working Group.

The following individuals are recognized for their contributions in development of this document.

| <b>Members:</b>   | <b>Company/Agency</b>       |
|---|-----------------------------|
| Susan Sherwood<br>(NENA Wireless Operations co-chair)         | Sprint PCS                  |
| Norman H. Forshee, ENP<br>(NENA Wireless Operations co-chair) | St. Clair County, IL 9-1-1  |
| Ron Bloom, ENP<br>(Working Group co-chair)                    | GeoComm, Inc.               |
| Bill Janes, ENP<br>(Working Group co-chair)                   | Madison County, IL. 9-1-1   |
| Doug Miller, ENP  | Bureau County, IL. 9-1-1    |
| Marty Bausano   | GeoComm, Inc.               |
| Sandy Beitel  | Ogle County, IL 9-1-1       |
| Delman Catlett  | TCS                         |
| Topper Hightower  | Bell South                  |
| Rex Hollaway  | Hollaway and Associates     |
| Norton Lovold   | Bullberry Systems           |
| Selena MacArthur  | L.R. Kimball and Associates |
| Tolanda McKinney  | TelePacific Communications  |
| Gary Rhodenizer   | BellMobility                |
| Mike Sexton, ENP  | Sexton and Associates       |
| Dwayne Smith  | L.R. Kimball and Associates |
| Paul Stoffels, ENP  | SBC                         |
| Gail Wicks  | Intrado                     |
| Ron Whitehurst  | CBeyond Communications      |

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| <b>1. EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW .....</b>                                       | <b>5</b> |
| <b>2. INTRODUCTION.....</b>  | <b>5</b> |
| 2.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE .....  | 5        |
| 2.2 REASON TO IMPLEMENT .....  | 5        |
| 2.3 BENEFITS .....   | 5        |
| 2.4 TECHNICAL IMPACTS SUMMARY .....                                      | 6        |
| 2.5 DOCUMENT TERMINOLOGY .....   | 6        |
| 2.6 REASON FOR REISSUE .....   | 6        |
| 2.7 COSTS FACTORS .....  | 6        |
| 2.8 COST RECOVERY CONSIDERATIONS .....                                   | 6        |
| 2.9 ACRONYMS/ABBREVIATIONS.....  | 6        |
| <b>3 OPERATIONAL DESCRIPTION .....</b>                                   | <b>7</b> |
| 3.1 OPERATIONAL STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT PREMISE.....                       | 7        |
| 3.2 CALL ROUTING SCENARIOS DEFINED .....                                 | 8        |
| 3.3 MSC- SR OVERFLOW ROUTING: OPERATIONAL STANDARD RECOMMENDATION.....   | 8        |
| 3.4 MSC TRUNK ALTERNATE ROUTE: OPERATIONAL STANDARD RECOMMENDATION ..... | 8        |
| 3.5 MSC DEFAULT ROUTE: OPERATIONAL STANDARD RECOMMENDATION .....         | 9        |
| 3.6 ROUTE DIVERSITY: OPERATIONAL STANDARD RECOMMENDATION .....           | 9        |
| 3.7 EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES / OTHER ALTERNATIVES .....                     | 9        |
| <b>4. REFERENCES.....</b>  | <b>9</b> |
| <b>5. EXHIBITS.....</b>  | <b>9</b> |

## **1. Executive Overview**

The Wireless Overflow, Default and Diverse routing work group was formed to establish recommended operational standards associated with an important element in the deployment of wireless E911 Phase I and Phase II service – system design considerations regarding overflow, default, alternate and diverse routing. The intent of the document is to provide operational guidance and recommendations regarding the identified call routing scenarios as they relate to calls processed between the MSC and SR.

Development of the associated operational recommendations included general review of call routing scenarios currently deployed, options generally available based on MSC switch technologies, impacts to the PSAP and impacts to the 9-1-1 caller.

## **2. Introduction**

### **2.1 Purpose and Scope**

The NENA Wireless Overflow, Default and Diverse routing recommendations document was developed to provide guidance in the routing development associated with wireless Phase I and Phase II deployment efforts. This document provides recommended terminology definitions, describes each call routing scenario, and associated routing recommendations.

### **2.2 Reason to Implement**

Implementation of these recommendations will foster consistent operational standards across wireless E9-1-1 systems. In addition this document establishes definitions for the call routing scenarios to foster a common understanding and use of terms between PSAPs and Wireless Service Providers as the wireless deployment is being planned.

### **2.3 Benefits**

Use of this document will:

- Foster a common understanding of terms used in the deployment of wireless service for the associated call routing scenarios.
- Foster increased communication regarding wireless call routing options in the planning of wireless 9-1-1 deployments
- Foster a common set of standards to be applied to wireless 9-1-1 call routing scenarios • Provide guidance to switch vendors regarding desired operational attributes of MSC's.

## 2.4 Technical Impacts Summary

Technical impacts are related directly to the network architecture of the MSC, cellular towers and network operations center alarming. The recommendations regarding the treatment of calls in each routing scenario will be impacted by the capability of the wireless switch to meet the associated recommendation.

## 2.5 Document Terminology

The terms "shall ", "must " and "required" are used throughout this document to indicate required parameters and to differentiate from those parameters that are recommendations. Recommendations are identified by the words "desirable" or "preferably".

## 2.6 Reason for Reissue

NENA reserves the right to modify this document. Whenever it is reissued, the reason(s) will be provided in this paragraph.

## 2.7 Costs Factors

The Cost Factors section is intended to provide a brief summary of potential system or application cost impacts regarding the subject of this NENA document. If it is not applicable in any given document, simply enter "Not Applicable " in this section.

This document provides recommended standards regarding call routing associated with various scenarios. Compliance with the recommended standards will be dependent upon the associated wireless switch, wireless tower and selective router capabilities. Cost factors will be associated with these system components to the degrees that switch upgrades or changes are required. Cost factors associated with route diversity and system diversity recommendations will have potential impact to the wireless service provider, local 9-1-1 service provider and the PSAP – to the degree that the recommendations are fully deployed.

## 2.8 Cost Recovery Considerations

Cost recovery will be dependent upon legislative and regulatory cost recovery mechanisms for wireless deployment in each state.

## 2.9 Acronyms/Abbreviations

See NENA-ADM-000, NENA Master Glossary of 9-1-1 Terminology, located on the [NENA web site](#) for a complete listing of terms used in NENA documents. All acronyms used in this document are listed below, along with any new or updated terms and definitions.

| <b>The following Acronyms are used in this document:</b> |                                   |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| ALI  | Automatic Location Identification |
| ANI  | Automatic Number Identification   |

---

---

|      |                                |
|------|--------------------------------|
| ESRK | Emergency Services Routing Key |
| MSC  | Mobile Switching Center        |
| NOC  | Network Operations Center      |
| pANI | Pseudo-ANI                     |
| PSAP | Public Safety Answering Point  |
| SR   | Selective Router               |

The following *new terms* are included in this recommendation:

**Fast Busy Tone:** Also, Reorder Tone. An audible tone of 120 interrupts per minute (IPM) returned to the calling party to indicate the call cannot be processed through the network.

**MSC Trunk Overflow:** the routing condition that occurs when all trunks from the MSC to the SR are busy with calls and additional calls need to be routed to the PSAP. Wireless call volume exceeds available MSC to SR trunk capacity.

**MSC Trunk Alternate Route:** the routing condition that occurs when all trunks from the MSC to SR are *out of service* and calls need to be routed to the PSAP. The scenario represents an MSC to SR trunk *failure* condition versus an all trunks *busy* condition.

**MSC Default Route:** the routing condition that occurs when a) a wireless 9-1-1 call arrives at an MSC with insufficient data to allow normal routing to the correct PSAP, or b) all dedicated MSC to SR trunks, primary and secondary routes, are out of service (ie. trunk *failure* condition). **Serving PSAP:** the PSAP to which calls would normally be routed.

### 3 Operational Description

#### 3.1 Operational Standards Development Premise

The wireless overflow, default, alternate and diverse routing operational standards recommendations are centered on the following premises:

- Overflow, alternate, default and diverse routing should be reviewed with the WSP during the planning and implementation of wireless E911 service.
- Wireless 9-1-1 calls should be routed within the 9-1-1 network infrastructure.
- Wireless 9-1-1 calls should be routed via dedicated 9-1-1 call paths.
- Wireless 9-1-1 calls should not be routed to ten digit administrative numbers.
- Wireless 9-1-1 calls routed to other than the serving PSAP should be done on a pre-planned basis using appropriate communications infrastructure, SOP's, mapping and associated resources. Appropriate agreements with the serving PSAP must be in place to ensure proper notification, routing, data integrity and call handling.

### 3.2 Call Routing Scenarios Defined

The following provides Operational recommended standards associated with the MSC to S/R call path and the following call routing scenarios:

- **MSC – SR Overflow Routing**

Description : MSC/SR overflow routing occurs when all trunks are “traffic busy”.

- **MSC Trunk Alternate Routing**

Description: Calls requiring alternate routing due to an “out of service” condition where extended timeframes may be required for call path availability.

- **MSC Default Route**

Description: Call routing required due to insufficient call data received by the MSC and/or S/R to route the call to the proper serving PSAP

- **Route Diversity**

Description: the practice of routing circuits along different physical paths in order to prevent total loss of 9-1-1 service in the event of a facility failure.

### 3.3 MSC- SR Overflow routing: Operational Standard Recommendation

**MSC-SR overflow routing shall be to either a) “fast busy tone” or b) to an appropriate MSC recorded announcement advising the caller that the call cannot be completed (where option a) is not available due to MSC switch architecture limitations).**

It is a desired switch feature to be able to differentiate between a “traffic busy” condition versus an “out of service” condition as noted in the MSC alternate routing recommendations.

### 3.4 MSC Trunk Alternate Route: Operational Standard Recommendation

**MSC Trunk Alternate routing shall be to a) “fast busy” or, where this capability is not available, b) route to appropriate recorded announcement advising that the call cannot be completed.**

It is desired that the switch translations (based on alarm conditions sent to the NOC) be invoked to route the calls to a secondary pre-designated PSAP over existing MSC / SR trunks. The process must be pre-planned to ensure appropriate router/router data handling, ESRK/pANI rebid capability, communications networking (voice and data) and related SOP's are in place between the PSAPs. Notification to the affected PSAP(s) should be made, by the WSP, within (15) minutes of the alarm threshold notification.



Where this capability is not available, the call may be routed to a pre-designated, dedicated 10-digit number in the serving PSAP. This number should be in the PSAP, manned 7x24x365 and identifiable to the call taker with a priority equivalent to a 9-1-1 call. *Administrative numbers shall not be used for this purpose.*

*It is a desired feature that a trunks “out of service” condition be able to be differentiated, via alarm thresholds, from trunks that are traffic busy at the MSC.*

### **3.5 MSC Default Route: Operational Standard Recommendation**

**MSC default routing, based on cell tower location, to the proper serving PSAP is a desired feature. Where MSC capabilities exist, default calls should be routed based on the location of the cell tower / MSC, to the MSC-SR trunks designated for that cell site to the serving PSAP.**

Switch level defaulted calls, where insufficient call data is received to identify and initiate routing to the proper serving PSAP, shall be routed to a “fast busy” tone or, where that option is not available, to an appropriate recorded announcement.

### **3.6 Route Diversity: Operational Standard Recommendation**

**Call path facilities shall be diverse and redundant between the MSC/ SR and the S/R – PSAP to avert single points of failure. Diversity and redundancy within associated 9-1-1 components in the network and at the PSAP is a desired feature to avert single points of failure.**

### **3.7 Emerging Technologies / Other Alternatives**

The Wireless Operations Routing Working group will evaluate emerging technologies and other alternatives at the MSC /SR level as they become available. Future recommendations will be made as appropriate.

## **4. References**

Future

## **5. Exhibits**

Future