



Telecom Decision CRTC 2007-122

Ottawa, 4 December 2007

Processes and implementation time frames for making an exchange ready for number portability

Reference: 8638-C12-200617285

In this Decision, the Commission approves processes and implementation time frames associated with implementing number portability (NP) in exchanges where NP has not yet been implemented, and determines that the incumbent local exchange carrier should be the party to notify the Commission of the opening of exchanges for NP.

Introduction

1. In Telecom Decision 2006-28, the Commission directed the Network Working Group (NTWG) of the CRTC Interconnection Steering Committee (CISC) to develop a rollout schedule for exchanges where number portability has not yet been implemented.
2. On 22 October 2007, the NTWG and the CISC Business Process Working Group (BPWG) (the work groups) submitted reports¹ setting out a proposed number portability (NP)² rollout schedule and a request-driven process for the introduction of NP in exchanges not yet given NP implementation dates in previously issued Commission decisions.
3. Although most of the issues in the reports resulted in consensus, one non-consensus issue was identified that required a Commission resolution. This issue is discussed below.

Which party is responsible for sending the notification letter to the Commission?

4. TELUS Communications Company submitted that because the competitive local exchange carrier (CLEC) or wireless service provider (WSP) making the request that a particular exchange be opened for NP was the party directly impacted by the notification if it was not properly issued, the CLEC/WSP should be the party responsible for notifying the Commission of the effective date for the availability of NP in the affected exchange.
5. Other parties preferred that the affected incumbent local exchange carrier (ILEC) continue to be the party to issue the notification to the Commission. These parties submitted that the existing process did not add significant work for the affected ILEC and the ILEC had the onus for ensuring that the network was ready for NP.

¹ The NTWG submitted consensus reports NTRE040 and NTRE042. The BPWG submitted non-consensus report BPRE062e.

² Number portability for the purposes of this Decision means both local number portability and wireless number portability.

6. The Commission notes that the current process to open an exchange for local number portability requires the affected ILEC to notify the Commission of the exchange(s) that will be opened for NP and associated implementation timelines. The Commission notes that, to date, there has been no significant issue with the existing process. The Commission further notes that having the ILEC directly confirm the implementation timelines to the Commission adds certainty to the rollout time frames. As a result, the Commission considers that the ILEC should continue to have the responsibility of notifying the Commission of the opening of an exchange for NP.

Conclusion

7. The Commission has reviewed, and **approves**, the consensus items in the above-noted reports.
8. Further, with respect to the one non-consensus issue identified above, the Commission determines that, consistent with the current practice for local number portability, the affected ILEC is responsible for notifying the Commission of the opening of an exchange for NP.

Secretary General

Related document

- *Regulatory issues related to the implementation of wireless number portability*
– *Follow-up to Public Notice 2006-3, Telecom Decision CRTC 2006-28,*
18 May 2006

This document is available in alternative format upon request, and may also be examined in PDF format or in HTML at the following Internet site: <http://www.crtc.gc.ca>