

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

In the Matter of )  
 )  
The Use of N11 Codes and Other Abbreviated ) CC Docket No. 92-105  
Dialing Arrangements )

**COMMENTS TO REFRESH THE RECORD OF  
CTIA – THE WIRELESS ASSOCIATION™**

CTIA – The Wireless Association™ (“CTIA”)<sup>1</sup> hereby submits its Comments to refresh the record regarding reconsideration of the Commission’s designation of the 211 and 511 abbreviated dialing codes.<sup>2</sup>

**INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY**

On July 31, 2000, the Commission released the *211/511 Assignment Order* (“Order”).<sup>3</sup> In this *Third Report and Order*, the Commission required providers of telecommunications

---

<sup>1</sup> CTIA – The Wireless Association™ (formally known as the Cellular Telecommunications & Internet Association) is the international organization of the wireless communications industry for both wireless carriers and manufacturers. Membership in the association covers all Commercial Mobile Radio Service (“CMRS”) providers and manufacturers, including cellular, broadband PCS, ESMR, as well as providers and manufacturers of wireless data services and products.

<sup>2</sup> See *The Use of N11 Codes and Other Abbreviated Dialing Arrangements*, CC Docket No. 92-105, *Public Notice*, DA 04-3219 (rel. Oct. 8, 2004).

<sup>3</sup> *The Use of N11 Codes and Other Abbreviated Dialing Arrangements*, CC Docket No. 92-105, *Third Report and Order and Order on Reconsideration*, 15 FCC Rcd 16753 (2000) (“Order”).

services, including CMRS carriers, to use the 211 abbreviated dialing code to provide callers with access to community information and referral services, and to use the 511 abbreviated dialing code to provide callers with access to travel information.<sup>4</sup> The Commission envisioned that the community information and referral services would serve “[i]ndividuals facing serious threats to life, health, and mental well being [who] have urgent and critical human needs that are not addressed by dialing 911 for emergency assistance or 311 for non-emergency police assistance.”<sup>5</sup> While not explaining how carriers should manage the 211 code, the Commission directed carriers, upon receipt of “a request from an entity ... to use 211 for access to community information and referral services,” to ensure that entities providing non-compliant services relinquish use of the codes, and to “take any steps necessary (such as reprogramming switch software) to complete 211 calls from its subscriber to the requesting entity in its service area.”<sup>6</sup> To implement this service, the Commission said that it “expect[s] community service organizations to work cooperatively to ensure the greatest public use of this scarce resource.”<sup>7</sup>

In adopting the 511 requirement, the Commission concluded that “a governmental entity may request 511 from both wireline and wireless providers to use for intelligent transportation systems or other transportation information.”<sup>8</sup> The Commission declined to specify technical parameters, and left the discretion to determine deployment schedules and the types of

---

<sup>4</sup> *Order* at ¶ 2.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* at ¶ 18.

<sup>6</sup> *Id.* at ¶ 21.

<sup>7</sup> *Id.*

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* at ¶ 15.

information provided, to federal, state, and local government transportation agencies cooperatively.<sup>9</sup>

On March 12, 2001, CTIA and four wireless carriers filed petitions seeking reconsideration of the *Order*.<sup>10</sup> CTIA, along with Nextel Communications, Qwest International Corporation (on behalf of Qwest Wireless, LLC and TW Wireless LLC), Sprint PCS, and Verizon Wireless, each sought reconsideration of the *Order* arguing, *inter alia*, that the Commission did not properly consider the mobile nature of CMRS services in adopting the 211 and 511 abbreviated dialing requirements.<sup>11</sup>

CTIA challenged the *Order* because CMRS networks are designed without regard to state, municipal, or other political boundaries.<sup>12</sup> In fact, CMRS service areas routinely cover more than one state. Indeed, a caller may drive through multiple jurisdictions during a single call. These characteristics of CMRS networks complicate the implementation of the 211 and 511 abbreviated dialing codes in a manner that does not apply to wireline networks. CTIA also sought reconsideration of the *Order* because the Commission did not provide sufficient specificity for the requirements to enable wireless carriers to implement them with minimal operational difficulties. Unfortunately, in the years that have passed since the petitions for

---

<sup>9</sup> *See id.*

<sup>10</sup> Cellular Telecommunications & Internet Association, *Petition for Reconsideration*, CC Docket No. 92-105 (filed Mar. 12, 2001).

<sup>11</sup> *See id.*; Nextel Communications, Inc., *Petition for Reconsideration*, CC Docket No. 92-105 (filed Mar. 12, 2001); Qwest International Corporation, *Petition for Reconsideration*, CC Docket No. 92-105 (filed Mar. 12, 2001); Sprint Spectrum, L.P., d/b/a Sprint PCS, *Petition for Reconsideration*, CC Docket No. 92-105 (filed Mar. 12, 2001); Verizon Wireless, *Petition for Reconsideration*, CC Docket No. 92-105 (filed Mar. 12, 2001).

<sup>12</sup> *See* CTIA, *supra* note 10, at 3.

reconsideration were filed, the concerns expressed by CTIA and its members have been borne out, providing the factual predicate for Commission action. Accordingly, CTIA respectfully renews its request and seeks reconsideration of the Commission's order adopting the 211 and 511 abbreviated dialing code requirements for CMRS carriers.

**THE COMMISSION SHOULD PROVIDE A GREATER DEGREE OF  
SPECIFICITY FOR THE 211 AND 511 IMPLEMENTATION REQUIREMENTS  
AND REEVALUATE THE ENTIRE REQUIREMENT  
WITH WIRELESS SERVICES IN MIND.**

The Commission should reconsider its requirement that CMRS carriers provide 211 and 511 services and provide greater specificity regarding implementation requirements. The creation of the 211 and 511 abbreviated dialing codes has had unique effects on CMRS carriers that are not addressed in the *Order*. As the Commission has recognized in other proceedings, CMRS services do not easily fit into either the regulatory or technical models of wireline services.<sup>13</sup> CMRS providers allow their customers to call from anywhere within large geographic areas and from constantly changing locations. CMRS customers freely cross between states and municipalities without limitations on the use of their wireless phones. As a result, mobile services are not identified with a particular "community." Indeed, a customer's mobile telephone number may not be associated with the user's "community." Mobile users may have telephone numbers that do not correspond to the user's home, work, or calling locations. Moreover, a particular cell site within a carrier's network may overlap with other cell

---

<sup>13</sup> See *Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service*, Docket No. 96-45, *Memorandum Opinion and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, 13 FCC Rcd 21252, ¶ 13 (1998) (providing "safe harbor" guidelines for universal service contributions by CMRS carriers due to the unique characteristics of CMRS networks and services that make it difficult for CMRS carriers to separate revenues between interstate and intrastate jurisdictions).

sites, may serve more than one jurisdiction, or may serve parts of several jurisdictions, making it difficult to route calls based on political boundaries or communities of interest.

The implementation of any abbreviated dialing code requires extensive effort to coordinate routing, interconnection, and jurisdictional issues. The Commission should provide more specific guidance on the 211 and 511 requirements, so that CMRS carriers may comply with the Commission's mandate as efficiently as possible, given that the operational issues of N11 code implementation are complex even when carriers have clear guidance to follow. For example, the Commission should clarify that carriers are not required to route calls based on narrow geographic areas. If areas are defined too narrowly, call routing will be overwhelmingly burdensome for carriers and will commonly result in misdirected calls. Thus, if carriers are required to provide 211 access to multiple entities within a single county, carriers would be required to route calls based on such small geographic areas that proper routing would be impractical or infeasible. Therefore, the Commission should clarify the geographic scope of these requirements.

On a related point, the Commission did not give sufficient guidance on which entities should be allowed access to the 211 and 511 codes or how carriers should resolve mutually exclusive requests. When a carrier receives a N11 implementation request from different agencies covering similar boundaries (i.e., City of Los Angeles and the County of Los Angeles) both wanting to route N11 calls to different numbers, the wireless carrier is placed in an untenable position. These conflicts between governmental agencies delay (or deny) service to the public. While the Commission ordered carriers to provide access to the 511 code for a governmental entity, it did not specify how a carrier should determine which government entity should be allowed access if government agencies are not in agreement. Its only guidance on this

issue is that it “leave[s] with federal, state, and local government transportation agencies the discretion to determine the deployment schedule and the type of transportation information that will be provided using 511....”<sup>14</sup>

In the four years that have passed since the *Order* was adopted, only a few cities have been willing to spend the money to establish 511 service.<sup>15</sup> However, a number of innovative traffic services have been introduced, most of which do not use the 511 abbreviated dialing code.<sup>16</sup> The traffic personal alerts service offered by the Washington Post is typical of these services.<sup>17</sup> Some of these services use traditional (non-abbreviated) telephone numbers; others use the Internet, and some “push” real time, route specific traffic information to users.<sup>18</sup> Because “push” services deliver traffic information to a customer’s wireless device, no abbreviated dialing code is needed for mobile users to receive advanced traffic information. The Commission wisely committed to examine and reassess its assignment of the 511 code for access to travel information systems five years after the effective date of the *Order*.<sup>19</sup> CTIA urges the

---

<sup>14</sup> *Order* at ¶15.

<sup>15</sup> See Cal-(IT)<sup>2</sup>, *Press Release*, available at [http://www.calit2.net/news/2004/4-2\\_traffic.html](http://www.calit2.net/news/2004/4-2_traffic.html) (last visited November 11, 2004).

<sup>16</sup> *Id.*

<sup>17</sup> See Washingtonpost.com, *RealTraffic Personal Alerts*, available at <http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/personalization/traffic> (last visited November 11, 2004).

<sup>18</sup> See, for example, MSN Auto, *Traffic Alerts*, <http://autos.msn.com/everyday/trafficreport.aspx?metro=wdc&src=QL> (“Get real-time **local traffic alerts** from MSN Alerts delivered right to your **desktop, inbox or mobile device**”)(last visited November 10, 2004).

<sup>19</sup> *Order* at ¶ 16 (“If, at that time, 511 is not being used on a widespread basis for provision of travel information services, we may consider designating the 511 code for other uses...”).

Commission to begin collecting data on the use of the 511 code to create the record needed for next year's reassessment.

The Commission provided even less guidance with regard to entities that are qualified to provide community information and referral services using the 211 code. Carriers should be on notice of what community organizations have proper qualifications to provide these services. In addition, given the Commission's order that carriers provide access to 211 service to "an entity" without more detail, carriers can receive numerous competing requests. Carriers need to know how to resolve mutually exclusive requests. As explained above, the nature of CMRS service makes call routing of this type an already complex undertaking. Reducing the geographic area in response to competing requests would be overwhelmingly burdensome and likely infeasible for CMRS carriers. Therefore, the Commission should provide guidelines on how carriers should resolve mutually exclusive requests from entities seeking to provide 211 services.

