

RECEIVED

95-116

From: united6060@yahoo.com
To: united6060@yahoo.com
Date: Wed, May 28, 2003 8:59 AM
Subject: <No Subject>

JUN 13 2003

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Sir/Ms.,

It is important to all consumers that we get cel phone number portability.

This issue will clearly determine who I will vote for/contribute money to, in the next election.

Respectfully,
A Rogers

Do you Yahoo!?
Free online calendar with sync to Outlook(TM).

No. of Copies rec'd 0
Date ASOBE

RECEIVED

95-116

From: RaceStock@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 23, 2003 6:50 PM
Subject: re: Phone Number portability

JUN 13 2003

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

We have been maintaining an account with AT&T for two years simply because we are waiting to be able to take our number with us, despite the fact that their plans are not competitive with other carriers.

This is a major issue for us. It is one way that phone companies hold us hostage, particularly if we have business issues. It is important that we not be forced to stay in outdated service plans simply because we cannot afford the lack of continuity in our business activity. When I changed to distance ground carriers I am not faced with this problem. Why should cell service be any different.

No. of Copies rec'd 0
LH/BSDE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL 95-116

From: Wilma3513@aol.com
To: Commissioner Adelstein, Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM
KJMWEB
Date: Sun, Jun 1, 2003 5:36 PM
Subject: Number Portability

I am a Hawaii resident and I cellular phone subscriber. A 1996 FCC ruling called "Number Portability" would permit wireless users to switch wireless carriers and keep their wireless number. This ruling was supposed to be implemented in 1999 based on a Congressional mandate applying to landline service but was never enforced.

According to my sources, the consumer was supposed to be offered the right of "Number Portability" first in 1999, then it was supposed to be implemented in the summer of 2002, then it was delayed to November, 2002, and then delayed again to November, 2003.

For example; Nextel users have been paying 55 cents per phone number per month (now increased to \$1.55 per phone number per month) for the right to keep their own phone number. Other wireless users have been paying similar charges. Now, the wireless carriers are arguing in court to toss the 1999 FCC ruling out, after charging consumers for services they have not received.

As a wireless telephone subscriber, I see the enforcement of the FCC rule as a benefit to the consumer and also as a way to get the providers of this service to provide better service in order to prevent consumer from seeking service with another carrier. And since we have been paying for this for the past 4-6 years, I feel it is only right that we receive the service OR get our money back.

Jacqueline Lee
91-1029 Halana Street
Kapolei, HI 96707
(808)256-8589

RECEIVED

JUN 13 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the SecretaryNumber of copies rec'd
DATE

0