

**Before the  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Business Options, Inc.	)	IC No. 01-S51331
	)	
Complaint Regarding	)	
Unauthorized Change of	)	
Subscriber's Telecommunications Carrier	)	

**ORDER**

**Adopted: July 12, 2001**

**Released: July 13, 2001**

By the Chief, Consumer Information Network Division, Consumer Information Bureau:

1. In this Order, we consider the complaint filed by Deborah Haverty (Complainant) alleging that Business Options, Inc. (Business Options) changed Complainant's long distance service without obtaining authorization and verification from Complainant in violation of the Commission's rules.<sup>1</sup> We conclude that Business Options has responded fully to the Complainant's complaint and has taken appropriate action to resolve the complaint.

2. In December 1998, the Commission released the *Section 258 Order* in which it adopted rules to implement section 258 of the Communications Act of 1934 (Act), as amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (1996 Act).<sup>2</sup> Section 258 prohibits the practice of "slamming," the submission or execution of an unauthorized change in a subscriber's selection of a provider of telephone exchange service or telephone toll service.<sup>3</sup> In the *Section 258 Order*, the

<sup>1</sup> See 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.1100 – 64.1190.

<sup>2</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 258(a); Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996); *Implementation of the Subscriber Carrier Selection Changes Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; Policies and Rules Concerning Unauthorized Changes of Consumers' Long Distance Carriers*, CC Docket No. 94-129, Second Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making, 14 FCC Rcd 1508 (1998) (*Section 258 Order*), *stayed in part*, *MCI WorldCom v. FCC*, No. 99-1125 (D.C. Cir. May 18, 1999); First Order on Reconsideration, 15 FCC Rcd 8158 (2000); *stay lifted*, *MCI WorldCom v. FCC*, No. 99-1125 (D.C. Cir. June 27, 2000); Third Report and Order and Second Order on Reconsideration, 15 FCC Rcd 15996 (2000), Errata, DA No. 00-2163 (rel. Sept. 25, 2000), Erratum, DA No. 00-2192 (rel. Oct. 4, 2000), Order, FCC 01-67 (rel. Feb. 22, 2001); *reconsideration pending*. Prior to the adoption of section 258, the Commission had taken various steps to address the slamming problem. See, e.g., *Policies and Rules Concerning Unauthorized Changes of Consumers' Long Distance Carriers*, CC Docket No. 94-129, Report and Order, 10 FCC Rcd 9560 (1995), *stayed in part*, 11 FCC Rcd 856 (1995); *Policies and Rules Concerning Changing Long Distance Carriers*, CC Docket No. 91-64, 7 FCC Rcd 1038 (1992), *reconsideration denied*, 8 FCC Rcd 3215 (1993); Investigation of Access and Divestiture Related Tariffs, CC Docket No. 83-1145, Phase I, 101 F.C.C.2d 911, 101 F.C.C.2d 935, *reconsideration denied*, 102 F.C.C.2d 503 (1985).

<sup>3</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 258(a).

Commission adopted aggressive new rules designed to take the profit out of slamming, broadened the scope of the slamming rules to encompass all carriers, and modified its existing requirements for the authorization and verification of preferred carrier changes. The rules require, among other things, that a carrier receive individual subscriber consent before a carrier change may occur.<sup>4</sup> Pursuant to section 258, carriers are absolutely barred from changing a customer's preferred local or long distance carrier without first complying with one of the Commission's verification procedures.<sup>5</sup> Specifically, a carrier must: (1) obtain the subscriber's written or electronically signed authorization in a format that meets the requirements of section 64.1130 authorization; (2) obtain confirmation from the subscriber via a toll-free number provided exclusively for the purpose of confirming orders electronically; or (3) utilize an independent third party to verify the subscriber's order.<sup>6</sup>

3. The Commission also has adopted liability rules. These rules require the carrier to absolve the subscriber where the subscriber has not paid his or her bill. In that context, if the subscriber has not already paid charges to the unauthorized carrier, the subscriber is absolved of liability for charges imposed by the unauthorized carrier for service provided during the first 30 days after the unauthorized change.<sup>7</sup> Where the subscriber has paid charges to the unauthorized carrier, the Commission's rules require that the unauthorized carrier pay 150% of those charges to the authorized carrier, and the authorized carrier shall refund or credit to the subscriber 50% of all charges paid by the subscriber to the unauthorized carrier.<sup>8</sup>

4. We received Complainant's complaint on May 7, 2001 alleging that Complainant's long distance service had been changed from Qwest Communications, Inc. (Qwest) to Business Options without Complainant's authorization.<sup>9</sup> Pursuant to section 1.719 and 64.1150 of our rules,<sup>10</sup> we notified Business Options of the complaint and Business Options responded on June 1, 2001.<sup>11</sup> While not admitting liability for an unauthorized carrier change, Business Options indicates in its response that it has fully absolved Complainant of all charges in a manner consistent with the Commission's liability rules.<sup>12</sup> Based on the information before us, we

---

<sup>4</sup> See 47 C.F.R. § 64.1120.

<sup>5</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 258(a).

<sup>6</sup> See 47 C.F.R. § 64.1120(c). Section 64.1130 details the requirements for letter of agency form and content for written or electronically signed authorizations. 47 C.F.R. § 64.1130.

<sup>7</sup> See 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.1140, 64.1160. Any charges imposed by the unauthorized carrier on the subscriber for service provided after this 30-day period shall be paid by the subscriber to the authorized carrier at the rates the subscriber was paying to the authorized carrier at the time of the unauthorized change. *Id.*

<sup>8</sup> See 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.1140, 64.1170.

<sup>9</sup> Deborah Haverty, Informal Complaint No. IC-01-S51331 (filed May 7, 2001).

<sup>10</sup> 47 C.F.R. § 1.719 (Commission procedure for informal complaints filed pursuant to section 258 of the Act); 47 C.F.R. § 64.1150 (procedures for resolution of unauthorized changes in preferred carrier).

<sup>11</sup> Business Options Response to Informal Complaint No. IC 01-S51331 (June 1, 2001).

therefore find that the complaint referenced herein has been resolved.<sup>13</sup>

5. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that, pursuant to section 258 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. § 258, and sections 0.141, 0.361 and 1.719 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 0.141, 0.361, 1.719, the complaint filed by Deborah Haverty against Business Options IS RESOLVED.

6. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Order is effective upon release.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Jack L. Forsythe, Chief  
Consumer Information Network Division  
Consumer Information Bureau

(Continued from previous page) \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>12</sup> See 47 C.F.R. § 64.1160.

<sup>13</sup> If Complainant is unsatisfied with the resolution of this complaint, Complainant may file a formal complaint with the Commission pursuant to section 1.721 of Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. § 1.721. Such filing will be deemed to relate back to the filing date of Complainant's informal complaint so long as the formal complaint is filed within 45 days from the date this order is mailed or delivered electronically to Complainant. See 47 C.F.R. § 1.719.