

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

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Nationwide Service Long Distance	)	IC No. 08-S0291729
	)	
Complaint Regarding	)	
Unauthorized Change of	)	
Subscriber's Telecommunications Carrier	)	

**ORDER**

**Adopted: April 28, 2009**

**Released: April 30, 2009**

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

1. In this Order, we consider the complaint filed by Complainant<sup>1</sup> alleging that Nationwide Service Long Distance (Nationwide) changed Complainant's telecommunications service provider without obtaining authorization and verification from Complainant in violation of the Commission's rules.<sup>2</sup> We conclude that Nationwide's actions did result in an unauthorized change in Complainant's telecommunications service provider and we grant Complainant's 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 "slamming," the submission or execution of an unauthorized change in a subscriber's selection

---

<sup>1</sup> Informal Complaint No. IC 08-S0291729, filed February 25, 2008.

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

<sup>3</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); Third Order on Reconsideration and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making, 18 FCC Rcd 5099 (2003); Order, 18 FCC Rcd 10997 (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).

of a provider of telephone exchange service or telephone toll service.<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</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>6</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; (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>7</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>8</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>9</sup> Carriers should note that our 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 Complainant's complaint on February 25, 2008, alleging that Complainant's telecommunications service provider had been changed from Verizon to AT&T without Complainant's authorization. Pursuant to Sections 1.719 and 64.1150 of our rules,<sup>11</sup> we notified AT&T of the complaint and AT&T responded on April 3, 2008.<sup>12</sup> AT&T stated that

---

<sup>4</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 258(a).

<sup>5</sup> See 47 C.F.R. § 64.1120.

<sup>6</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 258(a).

<sup>7</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>8</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>9</sup> See 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.1140, 64.1170.

<sup>10</sup> See 47 U.S.C. § 503.

<sup>11</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>12</sup> AT&T Corporation's Response to Informal Complaint No. 08-S0291729, received April 3, 2008.

Complainant's calls defaulted to the AT&T network due to a routing or switch error from the Complainant's local phone company, Verizon. Pursuant to Sections 1.719 and 64.1150 of our rules,<sup>13</sup> we notified Verizon of the complaint and Verizon responded on June 12, 2008.<sup>14</sup> Verizon stated that Complainant's calls were "routed over Alliance's CIC."<sup>15</sup> Based on Verizon's response, we notified Alliance of the complaint, pursuant to Sections 1.719 and 64.1150 of our rules,<sup>16</sup> and Alliance responded on July 18, 2008.<sup>17</sup> Alliance stated that it is a reseller of AT&T services and submitted a third party verification (TPV) recording on behalf of its reseller, Nationwide, as evidence that Complainant authorized the carrier change. We reviewed the TPV and found there was no clear and convincing evidence that the verifier confirmed that the person on the call was authorized to make the carrier change, and therefore found that Alliance's actions resulted in an unauthorized change in Complainant's telecommunications service provider.<sup>18</sup>

5. Alliance sought reconsideration of our findings. Alliance asserted that it operates exclusively as a wholesaler of telecommunications services, there was no evidence Alliance changed Complainant's preferred carrier to itself or any other carrier, and that Nationwide was the carrier responsible for changing Complainant's long distance carrier.<sup>19</sup> During the pendency of Alliance's *Petition*, and pursuant to Sections 1.719 and 64.1150 of our rules,<sup>20</sup> we notified Nationwide of the complaint and served all other relevant documents on Nationwide in order to obtain a response directly.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>13</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>14</sup> Verizon's Informal Complaint IC Number 08-S0291729, received June 12, 2008.

<sup>15</sup> Verizon's Response to Informal Complaint No. IC-08-S0291729, received June 12, 2008. CIC is an abbreviation for carrier identification code.

<sup>16</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>17</sup> Alliance's Response to Informal Complaint No. IC-08-S0291729, received July 18, 2008.

<sup>18</sup> *See Alliance Group Services*, 23 FCC Rcd 12979 (2008); *see also* 47 C.F.R. § 64.1150(d).

<sup>19</sup> *See* Petition for Reconsideration of Alliance Group Services, Inc. (filed September 29, 2008) (*Petition*) seeking reconsideration of *Alliance Group Services*, 23 FCC Rcd 12979 (2008), issued by the Consumer Policy Division, Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau (Bureau).

<sup>20</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>21</sup> Notice of Informal Complaint No. IC 08-S0294901 was mailed on November 19, 2008. On December 1, 2008, the Commission received the certified mail return receipt confirming delivery. Subsequently, the Bureau granted in part Alliance's request for reconsideration, finding that Alliance did not violate the Commission's carrier change rules. *See Alliance Group Services*, 24 FCC Rcd 2509 (2009). The Bureau noted that the issue of whether or not there was a violation by Nationwide of the Commission's carrier change rules would be addressed in a separate order based on Nationwide's response. *See* 23 FCC Rcd 1282 n.24.

6. Nationwide has failed to respond to the complaint. The failure of Nationwide to respond or provide proof of verification within 30 days is presumed to be clear and convincing evidence of a violation.<sup>22</sup> Therefore, we find that Nationwide's actions resulted in a violation of our carrier change rules and we discuss Nationwide's liability below.<sup>23</sup> We also will forward a copy of the record of this proceeding to our Enforcement Bureau to determine what additional action may be necessary.

7. Nationwide must remove all charges incurred for service provided to Complainant for the first thirty days after the alleged unauthorized change in accordance with the Commission's liability rules.<sup>24</sup> We have determined that Complainant is entitled to absolution for the charges incurred during the first thirty days after the unauthorized change occurred and that Nationwide nor Verizon may pursue any collection against Complainant for those charges.<sup>25</sup> Any charges imposed by Nationwide on the subscriber for service provided after this 30-day period shall be paid by the subscriber to Verizon at the rates the subscriber was paying to their authorized carrier at the time of the unauthorized change.<sup>26</sup>

8. 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 Complainant against Nationwide Service Long Distance IS GRANTED.

9. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, pursuant to Section 64.1170(d) of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. § 64.1170(d), Complainant is entitled to absolution for the charges incurred during the first thirty days after the unauthorized change occurred and that neither Verizon nor Nationwide Service Long Distance may pursue any collection against Complainant for those charges.

---

<sup>22</sup> See 47 C.F.R. § 64.1150(d).

<sup>23</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 the 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 such Complainant. See 47 C.F.R. § 1.719.

<sup>24</sup> See 47 C.F.R. § 64.1160(b).

<sup>25</sup> See 47 C.F.R. § 64.1160(d).

<sup>26</sup> See 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.1140, 64.1160.

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

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

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