

FCC MAIL SECTION

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

JUL 18 11 16 AM '96

DN

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

64044

In the Matter of)
)
Telephone Number Portability) CC Docket No. 95-116
) RM 8535
)

ERRATUM

Released: July 17, 1996

1. On June 27, 1996, the Commission adopted the First Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (Order) in the above-captioned proceeding, CC Docket No. 95-116, FCC 96-286, released July 2, 1996. Due to an error in the word processing program, footnotes 198, 199, and 200 may not appear on page 37 of copies of the Order released by the Commission and ITS. This erratum adds those footnotes:

- 198 Time Warner Holdings Further Comments at 5.
- 199 Sprint Further Reply Comments at 3-4.
- 200 Id. at 5-6; see also ALTS Further Reply Comments at 2-3.

2. In addition, footnotes 208 and 209 may appear on both pages 37 and 38. This erratum deletes those footnotes from page 37.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Richard K. Welch

Richard K. Welch
Chief, Policy and Program Planning Division,
Common Carrier Bureau

portability methods until LECs demand them.¹⁹⁸ Similarly, Sprint argues that technically feasible does not mean that every operational and regulatory issue must be resolved before any decision on national number portability can be made.¹⁹⁹ Sprint further claims that Congress's use of the phrase "technically feasible" precludes any consideration of economic feasibility.²⁰⁰ AT&T and MCI argue that LRN is technically feasible, although they do not explicitly address the precise meaning of the statutory language.²⁰¹

70. **Phased Implementation.** Most parties addressing the implementation of number portability caution against a flash-cut approach (i.e., deployment nationwide simultaneously).²⁰² USTA argues that because section 251(b)(2) only requires provision of number portability, not deployment of the necessary software and network upgrades, LECs need only deploy portability upon a bona fide request.²⁰³ Most parties, however, recommend that service provider portability be deployed on a per-market basis within a period of time specified by the Commission.²⁰⁴ For example, Competitive Carriers proposes that service provider portability be implemented in the 100 largest MSAs within 24 months of this Order.²⁰⁵ Similarly, Sprint proposes that the Commission adopt a phased approach requiring local service providers to deploy a long-term solution upon receipt of a bona fide request from a certified carrier: (1) in the top 100 MSAs by the end of fourth quarter 1997; (2) in the next 135 MSAs, within 3-4 years after this Order is issued; and (3) within any remaining areas, beginning in the fifth year after this Order is issued.²⁰⁶ Omnipoint maintains that service provider portability should be made available in the top 100 MSAs between October of 1997 and October of 1998,²⁰⁷ while GO Communications proposes implementation of service provider portability in the major

¹⁹⁸ Time Warner Holdings Further Comments at 5.

¹⁹⁹ Sprint Further Reply Comments at 3-4.

²⁰⁰ Id. at 5-6; see also ALPS Further Reply Comments at 2-3.

²⁰¹ AT&T Further Reply Comments at 3; MCI Further Reply Comments at 2-3.

²⁰² See, e.g., US West Comments at 22; Illinois Commerce Commission Comments at 9; GTE Further Comments at 8.

²⁰³ USTA Further Reply Comments at 7 & n.4.

²⁰⁴ See, e.g., Citizens Utilities Comments at 8, 17; Nextel Comments at 5.

²⁰⁵ Competitive Carriers Comments at 15. See also Jones Intercable Reply Comments at 7-8.

²⁰⁶ Sprint Comments at 11-12; Sprint Reply Comments at 5; Sprint Further Comments at 5, 6. See also Teleport Comments at 12.

²⁰⁷ Omnipoint Reply Comments at 9.