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

In the Matter of	)		
In the Matter of Sprint Communications Company Complaints Regarding Unauthorized Change of Subscriber's Telecommunications Carrier	) ) ) )	IC Nos.	01-S60203 01-S63473 02-S67959 02-S69119 02-S69368 02-S70675 02-S74929 02-S76022
			02-S79521 02-S80143 02-S80149 02-S80358 02-S80670 02-S81567 02-S81595

## **ORDER**

Adopted: May 11, 2004 Released: May 13, 2004

By the Deputy Chief, Consumer Policy Division, Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau:

- 1. In this Order, we consider the complaints¹ alleging that Sprint Communications Company (Sprint) changed Complainants' telecommunications service providers without obtaining authorization and verification from Complainants' in violation of the Commission's rules.² We conclude that Sprint's actions did not result in an unauthorized change in Complainants' telecommunications service providers and we deny Complainants' 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>3</sup> Section 258 prohibits the practice of

See Appendix A.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.1100 – 64.1190.

<sup>47</sup> 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 (continued....)

"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. In the Section 258 Order, the 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. 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. 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) obtains 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.

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. 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. Carriers should note that our

(Continued from previous page)
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); Third Order on Reconsideration and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making, 18 FCC Rcd 5099 (2003); Order, FCC 03-116, (rel. May 23, 2003). 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>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 258(a).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> See 47 C.F.R. § 64.1120.

<sup>6 47</sup> U.S.C. § 258(a).

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.

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>9</sup> See 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.1140, 64.1170.

actions in this Order do not preclude the Commission from taking additional action, if warranted, pursuant to Section 503 of the Act.<sup>10</sup>

- 4. We received Complainants' complaints alleging that Complainants' telecommunications service providers had been changed without Complainants' authorization. <sup>11</sup> Pursuant to Sections 1.719 and 64.1150 of our rules, <sup>12</sup> we notified Sprint of the complaints and Sprint responded. <sup>13</sup> We find that Sprint did not violate our carrier change rules. <sup>14</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 complaints filed by Complainants against Sprint ARE DENIED.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Nancy A. Stevenson, Deputy Chief Consumer Policy Division Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> See 47 U.S.C. § 503.

See Appendix A.

<sup>47</sup> 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).

See Appendix A.

If a Complainant is unsatisfied with the resolution of this complaint, such Complainant may file a formal complaint with the Commission pursuant to Section 1.721 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. § 1.721. Such filing will be deemed to relate back to the filing date of such 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.

## APPENDIX A

9	INFORMAL COMPLAINT NUMBER	DATE OF COMPLAINT	DATE OF CARRIER RESPONSE
(	01-S60203	July 30, 2001	November 8, 2001
(	01-S63473	September 4, 2001	April 2, 2002
(	02-S67959	August 17, 2001	October 19, 2001
(	02-S69119	March 9, 2002	July 16, 2002
(	02-S69368	March 5, 2002	July 22, 2002
	02-S70675	March 14, 2002	September 9, 2002
	02-S74929	March 19, 2002	July 22, 2002
	02-S76022	May 20, 2002	September 4, 2002
	02-879521	June 14, 2002	December 17, 2002
	02-S80143	August 14, 2002	November 8, 2002
	02-S80149	August 16, 2002	October 22, 2002
	02-S80358	July 18, 2002	December 2, 2002
	02-S80670	September 26, 2002	December 17, 2002
	02-S81567	November 14, 2002	January 14, 2003
	02-S81595	November 14, 2002	January 17, 2003