

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

In the Matter of)	
)	
Sprint Communications Company)	IC No. 01-S50490
)	02-S67642
Complaint Regarding)	02-S70571
Unauthorized Change of)	02-S71927
Subscriber's Telecommunications Carrier)	02-S76075
		02-S80027
		02-S80265
		02-S81206
		02-S81975
		03-S82376
		03-S82711
		03-S82737
		03-S83166
		03-S83308
		03-S83522
		03-S83617
		03-I0029044

ORDER

Adopted: September 29, 2003

Released: October 1, 2003

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

1. In this Order, we consider the complaint¹ alleging that Sprint Communications Company (Sprint) changed Complainants' telecommunications service provider(s) without obtaining authorization and verification from each Complainant 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 provider 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

¹ See Appendix A.

² See 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.1100 – 64.1190.

by the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (1996 Act).³ 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.⁴ 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.⁵ 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.⁶ 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.⁷

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.⁸ Where the subscriber has paid charges to the unauthorized

³ 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).

⁴ 47 U.S.C. § 258(a).

⁵ *See* 47 C.F.R. § 64.1120.

⁶ 47 U.S.C. § 258(a).

⁷ *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.

⁸ *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.*

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.⁹ 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.¹⁰

4. We received Complainants' complaints alleging that Complainants' service provider(s) had been changed without Complainants' authorization. Pursuant to Sections 1.719 and 64.1150 of our rules,¹¹ we notified Sprint of the complaints and Sprint responded.¹² Based on information obtained by each Complainant's local exchange carrier, we find that Sprint did not violate our carrier change rules.¹³

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 Complainants against Sprint ARE DENIED.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

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

⁹ See 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.1140, 64.1170.

¹⁰ See 47 U.S.C. § 503.

¹¹ 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).

¹² See Appendix A.

¹³ 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 Complainants' 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

INFORMAL COMPLAINT NUMBER	DATE OF COMPLAINT	DATE OF CARRIER RESPONSE	NAME OF AUTHORIZED CARRIER
01-S50490	April 9, 2001	January 29, 2002	AT&T Corp.
02-S67642	December 27, 2001	April 12, 2002	AT&T Corp.
02-S70571	April 3, 2002	May 24, 2002	AT&T Corp.
02-S71927	July 26, 2002	October 8, 2002	Teleshare
02-S76075	May 23, 2002	August 9, 2002	Isterra
02-S80027	July 30, 2002	November 8, 2002	Qwest
02-S80265	August 5, 2002	October 29, 2002	None
02-S81206	October 18, 2002	April 16, 2002	Qwest
02-S81975	December 17, 2002	February 7, 2003	None
03-S82376	January 22, 2003	March 14, 2003	WorldCom
03-S82711	February 14, 2003	April 18, 2002	WorldCom
03-S82737	January 30, 2003	April 18, 2003	CGI Long Distance
03-S83166	March 19, 2003	May 16, 2003	ExpressTel
03-S83308	March 12, 2003	May 23, 2003	WorldxChange Comm.
03-S83522	April 23, 2003	May 30, 2003	None
03-S83617	April 9, 2003	June 27, 2003	GE Residential Long Distance
03-I0029044	February 6, 2003	May 9, 2003	None