BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| In re: Petition for expedited review of NXX-X code denial by Number Pooling Administrator for Miami exchange (Poinciana), by BellSouth Telecommunications, LLC d/b/a AT&T Florida. | DOCKET NO. 160044-TPORDER NO. PSC-16-0100-PAA-TPISSUED: March 11, 2016 |

NOTICE OF PROPOSED AGENCY ACTION ORDER

DIRECTING NEUSTAR TO PROVIDE BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, LLC D/B/A AT&T FLORIDA WITH ADDITIONAL NUMBERING RESOURCES

BY THE COMMISSION:

 NOTICE is hereby given by the Florida Public Service Commission that the action discussed herein is preliminary in nature and will become final unless a person whose interests are substantially affected files a petition for a formal proceeding, pursuant to Rule 25-22.029, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.).

BACKGROUND

On February 17, 2016, BellSouth Telecommunications, LLC d/b/a AT&T Florida (AT&T Florida) filed a request for additional numbering resources from the Number Pooling Administrator (NeuStar) for the Miami exchange, Poinciana (MIAMFLPBDS0) switch. AT&T Florida requested three blocks to meet the request of a specific customer for 3,000 consecutive numbers. On February 17, 2016 NeuStar denied AT&T Florida’s request for additional numbering resources because NeuStar determined that AT&T Florida did not meet the utilization criteria.

On February 26, 2016, AT&T Florida filed a petition requesting that we reverse NeuStar’s decision. In its petition, AT&T Florida stated that the Miami exchange consists of twenty four central offices and twenty eight switching entities that utilize numbering resources, namely, the Airport (MIAMFLAPDS0), Alhambra (MIAMFLAEDS0 and MIAMFLAERS0), Allapattah (MIAMFLALDS0), Bayshore (MIAMFLBARP0), Beach (MIAMFLBRDS0), Biscayne (MIAMFLBCDS0), Canal (MIAMFLCADS0), Dadeland (MIAMFLDBRS1), Flagler (MIAMFLFLDS0), Grande (MIAMFLGRDS0 and MIAMFLGRDS1), Hialeah (MIAMFLHLDS0), Indian Creek (MIAMFLICDS0), Key Biscayne (MIAMFLKEDS0), Metro (MIAMFLMERP0 and MIAMFLMERS0), Shores (MIAMFLSHDS0), North Miami (MIAMFLNMDS0), Northside (MIAMFLNSDS0), Opa Locka (MIAMIFLOLDS0), Palmetto (MIAMFLPLDS0 and MIAMFLPLRS0), Poinciana (MIAMFLPBDS0), Red Road (MIAMFLRRDS0), Silver Oaks (MIAMFLSODS0), West Dade (MIAMFLWDDS0) and West Miami (MIAMFLWMDS0).

AT&T Florida further asserted that at the time of the code request, the Miami exchange had a Months-to-Exhaust (MTE) of 1136.06 and a utilization of 53.77%, while the MTE for the Miami exchange, Poinciana (MIAMFLPBDS0) switch was 488.33 with a utilization of 71.30%. AT&T Florida requests that we reverse NeuStar’s decision as NeuStar’s denial interferes with its ability to serve its customers in Florida.

We are vested with jurisdiction pursuant to Sections 364.16(7), F.S., and 47 U.S.C. 151, and 47 C.F.R. 52.15(g)(3)(iv).

ANALYSIS

Prior to March 31, 2000, carriers submitting an application for additional numbering resources had to certify that existing codes associated with that switch, Point of Interface (POI), or rate center would exhaust within 12 months. In jeopardy Numbering Plan Areas (NPAs), applicants seeking additional numbering resources had to certify that existing NXX codes would exhaust within six months.

Pursuant to Order No. FCC 00-104[[1]](#footnote-1) applicants must now show the MTE criteria by rate center instead of by switch, and have no more than a six-month inventory of telephone numbers. Pursuant to 47 C.F.R. 52.15(g)(3)(iii):

All service providers shall maintain no more than a six-month inventory of telephone numbers in each rate center or service area in which it provides telecommunications service.

We find that the new MTE criteria creates a disadvantage for carriers with multiple switch rate centers because it is now based on rate centers, rather than switches. One switch in a multiple-switch rate center may be near exhaust while the average MTE for the rate center is above six months, thus preventing a carrier from obtaining additional numbering resources for the switch near exhaust.

We conclude that the denial of additional numbering resources also poses a possible barrier to competition. A customer desiring service from one company may have to obtain services from another carrier simply because AT&T Florida cannot meet the MTE rate center requirement. Another carrier who may have just one switch in the rate center would have an advantage and may be able to obtain the additional numbering resources to provide the service. In Order No. DA 01-386[[2]](#footnote-2), the FCC stated:

Under no circumstances should consumers be precluded from receiving telecommunications services of their choice from providers of their choice for want of numbering resources.

FCC No. DA 01-386 at 11.

A procedure is available to carriers who are denied additional numbering resources because of the rate center MTE requirement. Addressing additional numbering resources denials, 47 C.F.R. 52.15(g)(3)(iv), states, in part:

The carrier may challenge NeuStars decision to the appropriate state regulatory commission. The state regulatory commission may affirm or overturn the NeuStar decision to withhold numbering resources from the carrier based on its determination of compliance with the reporting and numbering resource application requirements herein.

In processing the companys petition as contemplated by 47 C.F.R. 52.15(g)(3)(iv), we have required the company to provide this Commission with the following:

1) The customers name, address, and telephone number.

2) The utilization thresholds for every switch in that particular rate center where additional numbering resources are sought.

3) The MTE for every switch in that particular rate center where additional numbering resources are sought.

 Upon consideration of the information provided and in accordance with our Order No. PSC-01-1973-PCO-TL, we find that the company has met the following criteria:

1) The carrier has demonstrated that it has customers in need of immediate numbering resources.

2) The carrier has shown that it is unable to provide services to a potential customer because of NeuStars denial of the numbering resources.

3) A potential customer cannot obtain service from the provider of his/her choice because the carrier does not have the numbers available.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, we find it appropriate to reverse NeuStars decision to deny additional numbering resources and direct NeuStar to provide AT&T Florida with additional numbering resources to meet its customer’s needs in the Miami exchange, Poinciana (MIAMFLPBDS0) switch as soon as possible.

Based on the foregoing, it is

ORDERED by the Florida Public Service Commission that the Number Pooling Administrator (NeuStar) shall provide BellSouth Telecommunications, LLC d/b/a AT&T Florida with additional numbering resources for the Miami exchange, Poinciana (MIAMFLPBDS0) switch as soon as possible, as reflected in the body of this Order. It is further

ORDERED that the provisions of this Order, issued as proposed agency action, shall become final and effective upon the issuance of a Consummating Order unless an appropriate petition, in the form provided by Rule 28-106.201, Florida Administrative Code, is received by the Office of Commission Clerk, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, by the close of business on the date set forth in the Notice of Further Proceedings attached hereto. It is further

ORDERED that in the event this Order becomes final, this Docket shall be closed.

 By ORDER of the Florida Public Service Commission this 11th day of March, 2016.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | /s/ Hong Wang |
|  | HONG WANGChief Deputy Commission Clerk |

Florida Public Service Commission

2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard

Tallahassee, Florida 32399

(850) 413‑6770

www.floridapsc.com

Copies furnished: A copy of this document is provided to the parties of record at the time of issuance and, if applicable, interested persons.
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NOTICE OF FURTHER PROCEEDINGS OR JUDICIAL REVIEW

 The Florida Public Service Commission is required by Section 120.569(1), Florida Statutes, to notify parties of any administrative hearing that is available under Section 120.57, Florida Statutes, as well as the procedures and time limits that apply. This notice should not be construed to mean all requests for an administrative hearing will be granted or result in the relief sought.

 Mediation may be available on a case-by-case basis. If mediation is conducted, it does not affect a substantially interested person's right to a hearing.

 The action proposed herein is preliminary in nature. Any person whose substantial interests are affected by the action proposed by this order may file a petition for a formal proceeding, in the form provided by Rule 28-106.201, Florida Administrative Code. This petition must be received by the Office of Commission Clerk, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, by the close of business on April 1, 2016.

 In the absence of such a petition, this order shall become final and effective upon the issuance of a Consummating Order.

 Any objection or protest filed in this/these docket(s) before the issuance date of this order is considered abandoned unless it satisfies the foregoing conditions and is renewed within the specified protest period.
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