

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

In the Matter of)	
)	
Telephone Number Portability)	CC Docket No. 95-116
)	
CTIA Petitions for Declaratory Ruling on)	
Wireline-Wireless Porting Issues)	
<hr/>		

SPRINT COMMENTS

Luisa L. Lancetti
Vice President, Wireless Regulatory Affairs
Sprint Corporation
401 9th Street, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20004
202-585-1923

Scott Freiermuth, Attorney
Sprint Corporation
6450 Sprint Parkway
Overland Park, KS 66251
913-315-8521

January 20, 2004

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction/Summary	1
II.	A Recommended Framework for Addressing Porting Intervals and the Port Provisioning Process	4
	A. The Commission Should Give NANC Until June 1, 2004 to Develop New Port Provisioning/Interval Recommendations	4
	B. There Are Several Steps the Commission Can Take in the Near Term to Facilitate the NANC Consensus Process.....	6
	1. The Commission Should Promptly Resolves the Remaining Legal Challenges to LEC-Wireless Porting.....	7
	2. The Commission Should Make Clear That Customers Deserve A Rapid and Error Free Porting Interval as Is Practical – Even if Some Processes Must be Automated.....	7
	3. The Commission Should Assure All Carriers, and Incumbent LECs in Particular, That They Will Be Able to Recover Their Upgrade Costs To Meet any New Interval Ultimately Adopted.....	9
III.	The “Rate Center/Competitive Parity” Issue Does Not Exist And, In Any Event, Is Not a Matter in Need of a Regulatory Solution	10
	A. To Date, There Has Been Little Demand for Wireless-to-LEC Porting and Sizable Demand Is Not Expected in the Near Future	10
	B. There Is No Factual Basis to the Assertion of Some LECs That LEC-Wireless Porting Creates a Competitive Inequality	11
	C. Given the Forces of Competition, the Commission Need Not Take Any Steps to Facilitate LEC-Wireless Porting	12
	D. Wireless Carrier Numbering Resources and a Point of Interconnection in a Rate Center Having Nothing to Do with the Technical Feasibility of Number Portability.....	14
IV.	Conclusion	16

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

In the Matter of)	
)	
Telephone Number Portability)	CC Docket No. 95-116
)	
CTIA Petitions for Declaratory Ruling on)	
Wireline-Wireless Porting Issues)	
<hr/>		

SPRINT COMMENTS

Sprint Corporation, on behalf of its local, long distance and wireless divisions (“Sprint”), submits these comments in response to the Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking that the Commission commenced on November 10, 2003 (“*Intermodal Porting NPRM*”).¹

I. INTRODUCTION/SUMMARY

Several points have become apparent since wireless number portability commenced less than two months ago, on November 24, 2003.

- Importantly, wireless number portability (including LEC-wireless porting) is technically feasible. Wireless customers have successfully ported their numbers to another wireless carrier, and LEC customers have also successfully ported their numbers to a wireless carrier (albeit in much fewer numbers);

- The process of completing port requests has been more challenging than anticipated, and all industry members are having difficulty achieving the porting interval targets they set for themselves. It is not surprising that problems in the provisioning process have been encountered,

¹ See *Telephone Number Portability – CTIA Petitions for Declaratory Ruling on Wireline-Wireless Porting Issues*, CC Docket No. 95-116, *Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, FCC 03-284, ¶¶ 41-51 (Nov.

given the complexity and scope of the deployment and given how little intercarrier testing was undertaken before wireless porting commenced – although the sheer number of different kinds of glitches was unanticipated. But importantly, most industry members are working diligently and cooperatively to fix the numerous “bugs” that have been discovered, and improvements in the provisioning process (and, therefore, the porting interval) are being made;

- Experience has confirmed that customers want accelerated porting intervals that work, and industry is committed to meeting customer expectations; and
- Many in industry appear committed to improving the porting process in the longer term by undertaking more structural reform. Not only is faster, more efficient porting in the customer’s interest, but it is also in the industry’s interest to keep expensive, manual processes to a minimum. As the Commission has requested, the North American Numbering Council (“NANC”) created within the past month a new Issue Management Group (“IMG”) to investigate and, ultimately, recommend a course of action for reducing the interval for intermodal porting. The IMG has established an aggressive date to complete its work (March 15, 2004). In this regard, it is important for the Commission to understand that industry will need time (e.g., 24 months) to implement any changes in the process that the Commission may adopt as a result of the IMG’s recommendations.

What does industry need from the Commission at this point in time? While Sprint is cognizant of the Commission’s desire to address these issues expeditiously, industry needs adequate time to address the complex issues; and hasty action could have the unintended effect of undermining this industry effort. Industry needs time to continue to fix “bugs” in the current

10, 2003), summarized in 68 Fed. Reg. 68831 (Dec. 10, 2003)(“*Intermodal Porting NPRM*”). See also *Comment Extension Order*, CC Docket No. 95-116, DA 03-4059 (Dec. 22, 2003).

process and to develop the longer term solution that the NANC IMG is currently exploring. Assuming the NANC IMG can develop new consensus recommendations or if the NANC IMG report provides shorter porting interval options with no consensus recommendation, the Commission should promptly request comment on the proposals and, thereafter, promptly make its public interest determination. Once the Commission acts, industry can commence the process of modifying and upgrading its respective systems to conform to any new requirements that the Commission may adopt.

There are also several steps that the Commission can take in the immediate future to assist industry and its efforts:

- The Commission should promptly address and resolve the continuing legal challenges to wireless portability, such as the so-called “competitive parity” issue. Certain industry members will continue to be reluctant to commit to make number portability work in practice so long as they think there is some chance they may be relieved in the future of their porting obligation *in toto* or in part;
- The Commission should reaffirm that customers deserve as rapid a porting interval as is practical. Current processes will never be improved if some industry members take the position in the industry consensus process that the portability interfaces established *circa* 1997-98 at the inception of local competition need not be changed under any circumstance; and
- The Commission should assure all carriers, and incumbent LECs in particular, that they will be able to recover their costs of modernizing their porting systems to provide an improved porting experience for all customers. Carriers understandably will be reluctant to discuss major changes to current processes if there is no confidence they can recover their modification costs. Incumbent carriers would be much more willing to consider a reduced porting interval if

the Commission will permit them to recover the costs they will incur in meeting any new interval adopted. Sprint therefore urges the Commission to provide this assurance as soon as practical.

II. A RECOMMENDED FRAMEWORK FOR ADDRESSING PORTING INTERVALS AND THE PORT PROVISIONING PROCESS

The Commission has asked whether it should “reduce the current wireline four business day porting interval for intermodal porting” and if so, “what porting interval we should adopt?”² It specifically seeks “input from NANC on reducing the interval for intermodal porting” and on the “appropriate transition time” to achieve any new intervals adopted.³ Sprint below makes a set of recommendations that it believes will result in the most orderly and expeditious adoption of a new, *workable* port provisioning process that will most likely result in a more compressed and transparent porting interval for customers. While parties, including Sprint, have previously expressed views on what the intermodal porting interval could be, given the current realities and the industry’s actual LNP experience to date, Sprint believes it is best for industry to further examine this matter before making a specific recommendation.

A. THE COMMISSION SHOULD GIVE NANC UNTIL JUNE 1, 2004 TO DEVELOP NEW PORT PROVISIONING/INTERVAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The Commission has wisely relied on the expertise of NANC to develop consensus arrangements for the details of number portability provisioning. In its *Further NPRM*, the Commission appropriately seeks “input from NANC on reducing the interval for intermodal porting,” which may require “adjustments . . . to the LNP process flows developed by NANC.”⁴ The Commission also asks NANC to submit its “recommendations on an appropriate transition pe-

² See *Intermodal Porting NPRM* at ¶ 49.

³ *Id.* at ¶ 51.

⁴ See *Intermodal Porting NPRM* at ¶¶ 49 and 51.

riod” and to provide its recommendations “promptly as we intend to review the record and address this issue expeditiously.”⁵

Sprint submits that the most important step that the Commission can take at the present is to give NANC an adequate period of time to develop comprehensive recommendations for a modified and improved port provisioning process that will likely lead to a reduced porting interval. While Sprint is cognizant of the Commission’s desire to address these issues expeditiously, the industry needs adequate time to address the complex issues; again, hasty action could have the unintended effect of undermining this industry effort. As such, Sprint submits that four additional months, until June 1, 2004, while aggressive, can be achieved.

The NANC Chairman, in response to the *Intermodal Porting NPRM*, formed a new Issues Management Group (“IMG”) to address the issues the Commission has identified. IMG first met on December 22, 2003; it conducted additional meetings on January 9, 13 and 16, 2004; and it is scheduled to meet again today, on January 20, 2004, and thereafter. All major stakeholder segments – including large LECs, small and rural LECs, competitive LECs, wireless carriers, public safety, state commissions – are participating in this IMG process. The IMG has begun to investigate several different reform alternatives.

IMG’s current plan is to submit to NANC its recommendations at the March 15, 2004 NANC meeting. Sprint requests that the Commission give IMG and NANC an additional 75 days (until June 1, 2004) to complete their work for the following reasons:

- The issues are extraordinarily complex, because the port provisioning process impacts so many of a carrier’s operational support systems and because for each option identified and considered, every step of the process flow will have to be reviewed (and possibility modified);

⁵ *Id.* at ¶ 51.

- Because of time constraints, IMG is focusing almost exclusively on the LEC-wireless port provisioning process. Sprint submits the public interest would be served if IMG concurrently examines ways to improve the LEC-LEC and wireless-to-wireless provisioning process and thereby ensure that all port provisioning processes and intervals are compatible;
- There may be a need for IMG to coordinate with the LNPA Working Group;
- Once revised consensus flows are developed, the IMG will then need some time to attempt to understand the costs that might be incurred and the transition period needed if the Commission selects the option;
- Trade association participants need time to consult with their respective members to ensure industry-wide input; and
- IMG is attempting to give special consideration to the needs of rural and smaller carriers and is planning to consider the impacts to these carriers in its final report.

Obtaining consensus even with the additional 75 days recommended will be challenging, given the diverse interests of all the different stakeholders. (Sprint recommends in subpart B below certain steps the Commission can take to increase the chance that consensus can be achieved.) Hopefully, consensus can be achieved so a set of NANC recommendations is forwarded to the Commission on June 1, 2004. If consensus cannot be achieved, NANC should report the options that were considered. Either way, the Commission should then be prepared to issue expeditiously a public notice requesting comments on the NANC report. Again, depending on the decisions the Commission makes in response to NANC's recommendations, industry will need additional time (*e.g.*, possibly 24 months) to implement any modified provisioning process and porting interval.

B. THERE ARE SEVERAL STEPS THE COMMISSION CAN TAKE IN THE NEAR TERM TO FACILITATE THE NANC CONSENSUS PROCESS

NANC considered the LEC-wireless porting interval in the past, and industry was unable to reach consensus (thereby preventing NANC from making specific recommendations to the Commission). Sprint below identifies certain straightforward steps the Commission should take

in the immediate future that would greatly facilitate the chance that consensus can be achieved in the new IMG process.

1. The Commission should promptly resolve the remaining legal challenges to LEC-wireless porting. Events over the past two months confirm that LEC-wireless porting is technically feasible. Nevertheless, some LECs continue to press legal challenges in the hope they can impose new costs on competitive carriers or limit/delay the availability of number portability to their customers. Carriers that continue to raise legal challenges have little interest at this time in focusing on making number portability work and in achieving industry consensus in order to improve current interfaces and provisioning details. The Commission should therefore promptly:

- Resolve the “rate center/competitive parity” argument that some LECs continue to advance. Sprint demonstrates below that this argument has no basis in fact.
- Reaffirm that the porting rules do not change existing interconnection rules affirmed on appeal. For example, rural LECs may not demand that competitive carriers interconnect directly with their networks or require competitive carriers to pay for the cost of transporting LEC traffic to a centralized interconnection point in the LATA.
- Reaffirm that the porting rules do not change existing number assignment rules, which permit (but do not require) competitive carriers to obtain thousands blocks/NXX code in any rate center where they provide their services.

The sooner the Commission addresses these issues, the sooner the LECs making these arguments will be incented to move on and focus their energies on making number portability work for the benefit of customers.

2. The Commission should make clear that customers deserve a rapid and error free porting interval as is practical – even if some processes must be automated. The Commission asks whether it should “reduce the current wireline four business day porting interval for intermodal

porting,” noting that a reduced interval “could benefit consumers by making it quicker for customers to port their numbers.”⁶

The benefits of reducing the current LEC four-business day porting interval are clear. As JP Morgan has observed, it is “intuitive that the length of the porting period . . . will have an impact on a subscriber’s willingness to use [number portability], as the inconvenience of having to wait several days or even weeks to have a number ported will offset some of the benefit”:

While this may appear to be a minor inconvenience, countries with porting periods greater than a week, such as the Netherlands and the U.K., showed little increase from [number portability] in churn, indicating that the porting period was a concern for consumers.⁷

Delays in the porting interval could also inhibit the competition that the Commission hoped to intensify by making number portability available to all customers. LEC customers may be deterred from porting their numbers and switching to a wireless carrier if they learn from others of the delays and problems associated with LEC-wireless porting. Lengthy porting intervals thus could jeopardize the Commission’s objectives of increased customer choice and competition in the local telecommunications marketplace.

While Sprint respectfully submits that it would be premature at this time for the Commission to establish a new LEC porting interval (as NANC-IMG is currently examining in detail this very subject), some industry members are reluctant to change their existing processes in any way and these members can effectively preclude the industry from reaching the consensus that NANC requires to make recommendations to the Commission. So as to facilitate a meaningful dialogue for reform, the Commission should make clear to NANC and the IMG that they are to

⁶ *Intermodal Porting NPRM* at ¶ 49.

⁷ JP Morgan North American Equity Research, *Wireless Number Portability: Not Positive for ROIC, but Potential Upside Exists*, at 11 (April 14, 2003).

consider appropriate ways of improving the port provisioning process and accelerating current port interval targets. Simply put, NANC's mission should be clear to all industry members: the issue is *how* the porting interval can be reduced, not whether the porting interval should be reduced from four business days.

3. The Commission should assure all carriers, and incumbent LECs in particular, that they will be able to recover their upgrade costs to meet any new interval ultimately adopted. Some industry members are reluctant to consider change for fear they will be unable to recover their modification costs, which could be sizable.⁸ This is not a major issue for competitive carriers, because they can recover their costs in any lawful manner.⁹ Incumbent carriers, in contrast, require Commission approval before they can recover their costs,¹⁰ and it is understandable why they may be reluctant to make new commitments without some assurance over cost recovery. Incumbent carriers would be much more willing to consider a reduced porting interval if they had confidence that the Commission will permit them to recover the costs they will incur in meeting any new interval adopted. Sprint therefore urges the Commission to provide this assurance as soon as possible.¹¹

⁸ See *Intermodal Porting NPRM* at ¶¶ 45 and 47-48.

⁹ See 47 C.F.R. § 52.33(b).

¹⁰ See *id.* at § 52.33(a).

¹¹ Of course, incumbent carriers would still be required to prove their carrier-specific costs as part of a tariff proceeding.

III. THE “RATE CENTER/COMPETITIVE PARITY” ISSUE DOES NOT EXIST AND, IN ANY EVENT, IS NOT A MATTER IN NEED OF A REGULATORY SOLUTION

The Commission has asked how it can “facilitate” wireless-LEC porting where there is a “mismatch between the rate center associated with the wireless number and the rate center in which the wireline carrier seeks to serve the customer.”¹² The Commission made this inquiry because some LECs have asserted that they are “effectively precluded” from competing for wireless customers who are not located in the LEC rate center where their wireless number is rated and that as a result, wireless carriers enjoy an “unfair competitive advantage” over them.¹³ As a provider of landline and wireless services, Sprint does not share this view.

A. TO DATE, THERE HAS BEEN LITTLE DEMAND FOR WIRELESS-TO-LEC PORTING AND SIZABLE DEMAND IS UNLIKELY IN THE NEAR FUTURE

The so-called “mismatch” issue involves a *subset* of wireless customers wanting to port their mobile wireless number to a fixed landline service, and the Commission appropriately seeks comment on “the expected demand for wireless-to-wireline porting.”¹⁴ The Commission has already answered its own question by noting that the demand for wireless-LEC porting necessarily will be small in the near future:

It is important to remember that, at this point, the vast majority of wireless customers still have wireline telephone service as well, so that right now wireless customers have relatively little incentive to port their numbers to wireline service. * * * Thus, there are few wireless customers whose business a LEC has the opportunity to gain by porting their numbers in.¹⁵

¹² *Intermodal Porting NPRM* at ¶¶ 42-43.

¹³ *See id.* at ¶ 41.

¹⁴ *See Intermodal Porting NPRM* at ¶ 42.

¹⁵ *Opposition of the Federal Communications Commission to Emergency Motion for Stay, USTA v. FCC*, No. 03-1414, at 16-17 (D.C. Cir., Nov. 26, 2003).

The Commission has further observed that a LEC's ability to compete for wireless customers "will not develop until a significant number of customers have given up their landline phones."¹⁶ In other words, LECs must lose some market share before they can compete to regain the market share they have lost.

This Commission view is, moreover, confirmed by actual experience to date. As of January 15, 2004, the number of customers seeking to port from Sprint PCS to a LEC has constituted less than one percent (1%) of the LEC-to-Sprint PCS port requests. Thus, as the Commission has already recognized and as available facts confirm, in the near term LEC-wireless will constitute a miniscule percentage of all porting.

B. THERE IS NO FACTUAL BASIS TO THE ASSERTION OF SOME LECs THAT LEC-WIRELESS PORTING CREATES A COMPETITIVE INEQUALITY

As noted above, the Commission commenced this proceeding because "some LECs" had argued that LEC-wireless porting gives wireless carriers "an unfair competitive advantage over wireline carriers."¹⁷ These LECs have asserted that they are "precluded from offering wireless-to-wireline porting to those subscribers who are not located in the wireline rate center associated with their wireless numbers."¹⁸ And, these LECs further claimed they would have to undergo "significant and costly operational changes" in order to serve this subset of wireless customers. As a LEC itself, Sprint does not share this opinion.

As Sprint has previously explained, the availability of foreign exchange ("FX") service demonstrates that there are no "technical impediments" that "preclude" LECs from serving wireless customers with a telephone number associated with a rate center different from the one

¹⁶ *Id.* at 16.

¹⁷ See *Intermodal Porting NPRM* at ¶ 41.

¹⁸ *Id.*

where the wireless customer wants to receive a LEC service.¹⁹ Most LECs offer FX service, and LECs can serve these wireless customers with their existing FX services.²⁰

Assume a wireless customer has a telephone number rated to Potomac, Maryland, where the customer works, but the customer lives in Frederick, Maryland. If this customer wants to port his wireless number to a LEC and wants to receive the LEC services at his work location, the LEC can port-in the number and serve this wireless customer with its ordinary exchange service. On the other hand, if this customer wants to port his wireless number to the LEC and to instead receive the LEC service at his residence in Frederick, the LEC can port-in this number and serve the wireless customer with its foreign exchange service. Thus, there is no basis for the assertion of some LECs that they are “precluded” today from, or face “technical impediments” in, offering wireless-LEC porting “to those wireless subscribers who are not located in the wire-line rate center associated with their wireless numbers.”²¹

C. GIVEN THE FORCES OF COMPETITION, THE COMMISSION NEED NOT TAKE ANY STEPS TO FACILITATE WIRELESS-LEC PORTING

The Commission seeks comment on how to “facilitate” wireless-LEC porting where there is a “mismatch between the rate center associated with the wireless number and the rate center in

¹⁹ See, e.g., Sprint Ex Parte Letter, CC Docket No. 95-116 (Sept. 22, 2003); Sprint Ex Parte Letter, CC Docket No. 95-116 (Oct. 8, 2003).

²⁰ FX service “connects a customer’s telephone to a remote exchange, resulting in the equivalent of local service from the distant exchange.” *Access Telecommunications*, File No. I-T-C-85-085 (June 20, 1985). See also *RCA Global*, 61 F.C.C.2d 289 n.1 (1976)(“FX enables a customer to be accessed in the same manner as if he were situated within the local exchange served through a distant central office.”). In other words, an FX customer “can send and receive calls *as if located in the other exchange.*” *Investigation of Access and Divestiture Related Tariffs*, 57 R.R.2d 1511 n.9 (1984)(emphasis added). LECs have told the FCC that their FX services are “a type of local exchange service” because the service “merely extends the subscriber’s local loop to a different local calling area.” *AT&T v. Bell Atlantic*, 14 FCC Rcd 556, 589 ¶ 76 (1998).

²¹ See *Intermodal Porting NPRM* at ¶ 41.

which the wireline carrier seeks to serve the customer.”²² Sprint submits that, given the forces of competition, the Commission need not take any steps to facilitate LEC-wireless porting.

One option available to LECs is, as discussed above, for LECs to use their foreign exchange services in order to serve the “mismatch” situation. However, LECs have other alternatives. For example, as the Commission has noted, LECs can also consolidate their rate centers to establish “larger wireline local calling areas.”²³ In this regard, Qwest has acknowledged that it “averages two rate centers per local calling area.”²⁴ Because wireless carriers obtain their telephone numbers based on local calling areas rather than LEC rate centers, such a rate center consolidation would address much of the “mismatch” situation over which some LECs complain.²⁵

One of the major reasons the Commission adopted its wireless portability rules was to provide to customers of incumbent LECs choices they did not previously enjoy. As the Commission recently told one appellate court, “A fundamental point of the 1996 Act, including the number portability provision, was to eliminate the longstanding LEC monopoly in the local exchange market and open that market to effective competition for the first time”

LECs are virtual monopolists with more than 90 percent of the wireline market share, and at this point, most wireless customers still have wireline phones. The introduction of *any* type of competition into a monopoly marketplace will necessarily result in loss of customers by the monopolist; indeed, that is what is expected to happen upon introducing competition.²⁶

²² *Intermodal Porting NPRM* at ¶¶ 42-43.

²³ *See id.* at ¶ 44.

²⁴ *See* Qwest Ex Parte Letter, CC Docket No. 95-116, at 2 (Sept. 17, 2003).

²⁵ Sprint acknowledges that consolidating rate centers in different local calling areas is far more complex for LECs. But with respect to these situations, each LEC can make a business decision whether the benefits of rate center consolidation exceed the costs of such consolidation.

²⁶ *Opposition of the Federal Communications Commission to Emergency Motion for Stay, USTA v. FCC*, No. 03-1414, at 15 and 18 (D.C. Cir., Nov. 26, 2003)(emphasis in original).

LECs will need to respond if they want to compete for wireless customers. Some LECs may choose to reduce the prices of their FX services. Other LECs may choose to consolidate their rate centers and offer their customers a larger local calling and number portability area. Still other LECs may find entirely new ways to offer a more competitive service. These kinds of business decisions are best made by each individual competitor, rather than by having a government regulator divine a single solution for all competitive situations (and thereby reduce the options made available to consumers). In short, Sprint submits that the seeds of competition (*via* number portability) have been planted and they should be allowed to take root without further regulatory interdiction.

D. WIRELESS CARRIER NUMBERING RESOURCES AND A POINT OF INTERCONNECTION IN A RATE CENTER HAVE NOTHING TO DO WITH THE TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY OF LEC-WIRELESS PORTING

Some LECs have claimed that requiring wireless-LEC porting “where the wireless carrier does not have a point of interconnection or numbering resources in the rate center creates a competitive disparity.”²⁷ The Commission has therefore asked whether LECs “should absorb the cost of allowing the customer with a number ported from a wireless carrier to maintain the same local calling area that the customer had with the wireless service provider.”²⁸ However, as the Commission confirmed in its *Intermodal Porting Order*, *whether or not a wireless carrier has numbering resources or a point of interconnection in a given rate center has nothing to do with number portability.*

The Communications Act requires LECs to provide number portability unless such portability is not technically feasible, and the LEC-wireless ports that have been activated in the past

²⁷ See *Intermodal Porting NPRM* at ¶ 42.

²⁸ *Id.* at ¶ 44.

two months confirm that LEC-wireless porting is technically feasible.²⁹ Whether a wireless carrier has its own customers (and, therefore, set of telephone numbers) in a given LEC rate center has nothing to do with the technical feasibility of a LEC porting *its* customers' numbers to a wireless carrier. Requiring wireless carriers to obtain telephone numbers they do not need certainly would not promote the Commission's number conservation policies or be consistent with the public interest.³⁰ Thus, it appears that the only reason a LEC would make this "wireless carriers must have their own numbers" argument is to delay the date *their* customers enjoy new competitive options.

Also without merit is the LEC assertion that wireless carriers must interconnect directly with them in each of their thousands of rate centers as a condition of their making portability available to their customers. As a legal matter, the Commission squarely rejected this precise argument over six years ago, when it held that "carriers can interconnect either directly *or indirectly* as required under Section 251(a)(1)" in a number portability environment – and it reaffirmed this decision in its *Intermodal Porting Order*.³¹ And, again, experience confirms that it is technically feasible to port a number between carriers that are not directly connected.

²⁹ 47 U.S.C. § 251(b)(2).

³⁰ Sprint PCS has previously explained that it alone would require the assignment of more than nine million numbers it does not currently need if the FCC required it to obtain telephone numbers in each ILEC rate center as a pre-condition to LEC-wireless porting. See Sprint Ex Parte Letter, CC Docket No. 95-116, at 6 (Aug. 8, 2003).

³¹ *First Porting Reconsideration Order*, 12 FCC Rcd 7236, 7305 ¶ 121 (1997)(emphasis added). Moreover, the Fourth Circuit recently reaffirmed that under the FCC's "existing" and "unambiguous" interconnection rules, competitive carriers may interconnect using a single POI per LATA and incumbent carriers may not charge competitive carriers for the costs of transporting their own customers' traffic from the originating rate center to that centralized interconnection point. See *MCImetro v. BellSouth*, No. 03-1238, 2003 U.S. App. LEXIS 25782 (4th Cir., Dec. 18, 2003). Similarly, just last week the D.C. Circuit vacated a FCC order that had permitted a LEC to charge a wireless carrier for the costs the LEC incurred in transporting its own customers' traffic to the wireless carrier's centralized interconnection point in the LATA. See *Mountain Communications v. FCC*, No. 02-1255, 2004 U.S. App. LEXIS 643 (D.C. Cir., Jan. 16, 2004).

Wireless carriers have been interconnecting indirectly with most LECs since the inception of cellular service 20 years ago (*via* Type 2 interconnection). If LECs do not like the existing (and long-standing) interconnection rules (affirmed on appeal), they should file a petition for rulemaking – but in an interconnection docket rather than this number portability docket (because interconnection rules do not change based on whether porting is available or not).

* * *

It is important to emphasize that LECs are not being told that they must serve customers they do not wish to serve. A particular LEC may decide, for example, that it is not cost effective to serve a wireless customer whose number is associated with a different rate center than the customer's physical location. Of course, a wireless customer would have little interest in switching to a carrier that shows no interest in the customer's business.

IV. CONCLUSION

The past two months have confirmed that LEC-wireless porting is technically feasible. There is a need to improve the process, for the benefit of consumers. Sprint above presents a framework that it believes will enable the orderly and expeditious adoption of more compressed and workable porting intervals.

For the foregoing reasons, the Commission should take action consistent with the positions and recommendations Sprint discusses above.

Respectfully submitted,

SPRINT CORPORATION

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'L. Lancetti', written over a horizontal line.

Luisa L. Lancetti
Vice President, Wireless Regulatory Affairs
401 9th Street, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20004
202-585-1923

Scott Freiermuth, Attorney
Sprint Corporation
6450 Sprint Parkway
Overland Park, KS 66251
913-315-8521

January 20, 2004