EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

JUN 03 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

01-184

From: John Griffin
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 5/22/03 9:58AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

John Griffin (john@the-bear-den.com) writes:

After reading a recent article on phone number "portability", I am writing to request that you support all efforts to provide "phone number portability" by the current November deadline.

Article text:
If all goes well, on Nov. 24, 2003, consumers will be able to fire their mobile phone carriers and move to rival services while keeping their current mobile numbers.

So-called "portable" numbers were supposed to be available years ago, but the wireless phone companies have persuaded the Federal Communications Commission to delay enactment several times, citing the cost of converting their systems to allow portability.

In fact, the trade group representing the carriers went to court recently to argue that the FCC does not have the authority to order number portability. We won't know until later this summer if the court will side with the carriers or with consumers.

Another part of the pending FCC regulation would allow consumers to have their wired, landline phone numbers transferred to a mobile phone. The landline phone companies hate this idea, too, because it would allow customers to dump their home and apartment phones for a 100-percent mobile solution. In parts of northern Europe, it's rare to find people under age 30 who think having a phone line is a good idea.

The mobile carriers hate number portability not because of the cost of revamping their infrastructure - they're already raising rates to cover their costs - but rather because they know that unhappy consumers will have one less excuse not to shift to rival services.

Landline phone companies hate number portability because more than a few consumers would probably switch to mobile phones from landline phones.

Number portability is clearly in the best interests of consumers, and that's why the phone companies hate the idea. Why, imagine: They would have to compete on service and pricing.

Let's hope that the FCC does the right thing and sticks with the Nov. 24 deadline for implementation.

And then, who knows? Maybe someday customers of spam- and pop-up infested online services -- you know which ones they are -- will be able to take their e-mail addresses with them when they switch to better service providers.

Thank you
John Griffin, an irate Sprint customer.
Denver, CO

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 32.97.110.142
Remote IP address: 32.97.110.142

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List A B C D E