

Submissions to Consultation on Setting a Maximum Fixed and Mobile Number Porting Charge



Commission for
Communications Regulation

Submissions received in relation to Consultation

Setting a Maximum Fixed and Mobile Number Porting Charge

Submissions received from respondents

Document No:	09/04a
Date:	5 February, 2009

Consultation:	08/65
Response to Consultation:	09/04

ComReg 09/04a

Submissions to Consultation on Setting a Maximum Fixed and Mobile Number Porting Charge

Contents

- 1 Vodafone Ireland Ltd.
- 2 O2 Communications Ireland Ltd.
- 3 Hutchinson 3G Ireland Ltd.
- 4 Meteor Mobile Communications Ltd.
- 5 Tesco Mobile Ireland
- 6 Eircom Ltd.
- 7 BT Communications Ireland Ltd.
- 8 Imagine
- 9 Magnet Networks Ltd.

Submissions to Consultation on Setting a Maximum Fixed and Mobile Number Porting Charge

1 Vodafone Ireland Ltd.



**Non-Confidential Vodafone Response to the ComReg Consultation on
Setting a Maximum Fixed and Mobile Number Porting Charge – ComReg
08\65**

Response to Consultation Questions

Q. 1. Do you agree with the allowable costs, in the context of mobile number porting, considered by ComReg (in table 1)?

Without prejudice to Vodafone's position on the relevant allowable costs as stated in the Vodafone response to ComReg Document 07/21, we agree with the allowable costs as set out in table one. Vodafone does not however agree that this list is exhaustive. This issue is addressed further in the response to question 2.

Q. 2. Do you agree with the disallowed costs, in the context of mobile number porting, considered by ComReg (in table 1)? Please state the reasons for your answer.

Vodafone does not agree with many of the costs designated as disallowable by ComReg. The costs that must be included as allowable are:

1. New Entrant Costs

Vodafone believes that the costs associated with implementing porting capability for new entrants must be allowable and that ComReg has erred in not including this category in the maximum mobile porting charge. Vodafone supports this contention on the basis of the following;

1. Unlike other porting systems where additional volumes arising from a new entrant would primarily require more support staff (and where the additional costs are then recoverable from recipient operators), a new entrant in mobile requires a large capital outlay by existing operators, a cost for which ComReg does not allow recovery. In the case of Vodafone (as shown in the costing data supplied to ComReg), this outlay amounted to almost **[Confidential]**. **[Confidential]** is not recoverable, according to ComReg because it constitutes a fixed cost which if allowable would introduce price instability when linked to fluctuating volumes, in particular falling volumes. Vodafone rejects this reasoning because;
 - (a) ComReg has no evidence to support the contention that the volumes of mobile ports have or will fluctuate to the extent that prices will vary in any material way. ComReg's Quarterly Market Report shows 79K customers changed network in the quarter April- June 07 and there was an average of 83k ports for the last 3 quarters. A total of 1.3 million customers have ported since the inception of full mobile number portability in 2004. ComReg relies on the example of the fluctuating volumes in the fixed market to justify its approach in relation to porting charges in general. However, it is clear that the two markets operate in a demonstrably

Setting a Maximum Fixed and Mobile Number Porting Charge

different fashion, with large porting volumes being an integral and continuing characteristic of the mobile market. The risk of charges fluctuating due to a change in the cost\volume relationship is negligible for any reasonably foreseeable time and is an entirely unreasonable basis for excluding legitimate cost.

- (b) The issue of large fixed costs in mobile porting (both in relation to the initial implementation and the enablement of new entrants) only arises because of the system architecture and processes required by ComReg's mandated porting obligations. The initial industry agreed porting charge of €20, at least gave donor operators a contribution towards the significant original set up costs for porting (at that time two operators calculated the total per port cost to be greater than €20). The decision by Comreg now to set a price which does not allow for any new fixed cost recovery (at least from the port charge), in effect amounts to a form of regulatory taking. Vodafone could have had no fore-knowledge that its capital outlay in relation to new entry enablement would not be recoverable on the basis of a set of rules only now being set by ComReg. Had Vodafone known this was possible, they could have chosen a system where more of the costs were variable (and thus recoverable) and where porting would still have met industry standards.
- (c) In the European Court of Justice ('ECJ') 'Mobistar' case, set-up costs (as defined in Article 18 of the Royal Decree are 'the non-recurrent additional cost generated as a consequence of the porting of one or more mobile numbers, in addition to the costs connected with the transfer of clients without number portability to another mobile operator or service provider or in order to terminate the provision of the service'. The costs associated with establishing new entrants are once-off or non-recurring in the case of that operator. They are distinguishable from another cost category identified in the 'Mobistar case', namely the 'cost generated by the setting up of portability' which are costs incurred at the establishment of the porting regime and by the original porting operators.

2. Support Teams (Strategy and Regulatory)

At a minimum, the Strategy\Regulatory costs associated with the escalation of faults and disputes beyond the first and second level support teams should be included. There is no logic to ComReg's decision to exclude these costs. The costs given by Vodafone under this category are legitimate as they represent the Strategy and Regulatory resources required to manage inter-operator issue escalations (logically related to the volume of ports) and integrating new entrants. If ComReg believes that these costs are not recoverable from the porting charge, it is logical to assume that they should not form part of the porting process. If this is the case, Vodafone will be withdrawing these support functions.

3. Port Training Costs for Customer care staff (Porting Support Team)

Setting a Maximum Fixed and Mobile Number Porting Charge

In the consultation, ComReg considers the costs of Porting support staff as an allowable in the calculation of the maximum porting charge. In Vodafone's cost submission, this amount constitutes the hiring cost to Vodafone of customer care personnel. However, Porting Support require additional training above that for standard CSR duty and this should be included as part of PST costs. Vodafone submitted these costs separately for transparency purposes only. If ComReg insist on the exclusion of these costs, then Vodafone will not continue to up-skill its CSR teams.

In its response to 07/21, Vodafone agreed that an average port charge was the optimum way to recover porting costs in the interest of simplicity and certainty. However, this view was totally predicated on the basis that all the costs arising from resolving problematic ports and the subsequent frequent escalation to the various support teams would be allowed. Had Vodafone had any foreknowledge that ComReg would disallow these costs, our view on the suitability of a single average cost would have been different. If these costs are not allowable, there is a much stronger case for different port categories charges.

Q. 3. Do you agree with ComReg's views on allowable costs, in the context of fixed number porting, considered by ComReg (in table 2)? Please state the reasons for your response.

Vodafone agrees that the costs of provisioning including the total costs of support staff should be allowable.

Q. 4. Do you agree with ComReg's views on disallowed costs, in the context of fixed number porting, considered by ComReg (in table 2)? Please state the reasons for your response.

Q. 5. Do you agree that the existing price structure for GNP, in table 3 above, remains appropriate? If not please provide suggested amendments in your response.

Vodafone agrees that the existing price structure remains appropriate.

Q. 6. Do you agree with Eircom's proposal to withdraw the category of charges for '2 Day Deferred Port' on the basis that there is currently no industry requirement for this type of port? Do you believe that the current categories of CLI's i.e. 1 CLI, 2-5 CLIs, etc should be refined to just three categories of CLIs i.e. 1 CLI, 2-100 CLIs and 101+ CLIs? Please provide a detailed response to both questions.

Vodafone agree that if there is no demonstrable demand for a service at present or for a reasonably foreseeable period, the eircom should be allowed to withdraw the service.

In relation to the proposed reduction of CLI categories, Vodafone agrees with ComReg that no change in the current structure should be implemented until operator's views are known.

Setting a Maximum Fixed and Mobile Number Porting Charge

Q. 7. Do you believe that there should be a similar pricing structure, to that of GNP, for NGNP services? Under what circumstances do you believe a detailed price structure for NGNP services is warranted? Please provide a detailed response to both questions.

Q. 8. Do you agree that a maximum charge is appropriate in setting a charge(s) for fixed and mobile number porting? If not please provide detailed reasons in your response.

Vodafone agrees that the maximum charge is appropriate for setting a charge for fixed and mobile number porting.

Q. 9. Do you agree, on the basis of the assessment carried out by ComReg, that a cost oriented maximum charge of €2.05 should apply to all mobile number ports out? If not please provide a detailed response.

Vodafone agrees that a cost oriented maximum charge should apply to all mobile number ports out. However Vodafone does not agree that the amount should be €2.05 on the basis that this charge does not cover all of relevant costs associated with porting out and which should be recoverable from the recipient operator.

In the Mobistar judgement, The ECJ stated that *'Article 30(2) of Directive 2002/22 does not preclude the adoption of a national measure laying down the specific method to be used in calculating costs and which fixes in advance and on the basis of an abstract model of the costs maximum prices which may be charged by the donor operator to the recipient operator as set-up costs, provided that the prices are fixed on the basis of the costs in such a way that consumers are not dissuaded from making use of the facility of portability' – Vodafone underline.*

As Vodafone has stated earlier, there is no evidence that the original mobile port charge, dissuaded customers from making use of the facility. The charge was not set at a level that obliged recipient operators to charge the porting customer for the service or which proved to be a barrier to competition. Indeed, one operator was prepared to pay customers €30 if they could not be ported in less than 3 minutes.

ComReg therefore has no grounds arising from the Mobistar judgement, for refusing to allow operators to recover a portion of their fixed costs from the recipient operator through the port charge. In fact the Mobistar judgement clearly supports the Vodafone position that the set up costs for a new entrant are recoverable, as are the incremental costs associated with porting an additional number.

Q. 10. Do you agree, on the basis of the assessment carried out by ComReg, that the charges proposed in table 4 (page 23) should apply to all fixed operators in relation to ports out for GNP? If not please provide a detailed response.

Setting a Maximum Fixed and Mobile Number Porting Charge

Q. 11. Do you believe that the charges for the bulk porting of geographic numbers should include the cost of technical manual handling? Please provide a detailed response.

Q. 12. By including the cost of technical manual handling, do you believe that the charges for bulk ports are in line with Specification 1 relating to a ‘fully efficient number porting process’? Please provide a detailed response.

Q. 13. In terms of the current fixed number porting system used by Eircom, is it reasonable to automate single geographic number ports but require manual intervention for bulk ports? Please provide a detailed response.

Q. 14. Do you agree, on the basis of the assessment carried out by ComReg, that the charges proposed in table 5 (page 23) should apply to all fixed operators in relation to successful ports out for NGNP? If not please provide a detailed response. In addition, do you believe that there should be a multiple charges, similar to GNP, for NGNP services? Please provide a detailed response.

Q. 15. Do you agree, on the basis of the assessment carried out by ComReg, that the charge proposed in table 6 (page 23) for GNP in the context of GLUMP is appropriate and reasonable? If not please provide a detailed response.

Q. 16. Respondents are requested to provide views on whether the proposed directions are proportionate and justified and offer views on other factors (if any) ComReg should consider in completing its Regulatory Impact.

It was not clear to Vodafone at the time of the original consultation Document 07/21, why ComReg deemed it necessary to revisit the issue of appropriate charging principles for mobile number portability (MNP) as the existing MNP charge was agreed by the mobile industry, in a process overseen and driven by ComReg, prior to the launch of MNP in 2003. The parties to the agreement included the then smaller entrant operator (Meteor), indicating that the porting charge agreed was not seen as an impediment in any way to competing in the market. Developments in the market since the launch of MNP have supported this view. For example:

- The industry has seen a very high level of take-up of the MNP facility, with more than 1000,000 cumulative ports to date. This represents one in four Irish mobile customers.

Setting a Maximum Fixed and Mobile Number Porting Charge

- The rapid growth in Meteor’s customer base to 1,000,000 in a maturing market demonstrates that competition has not been constrained by the level of the present donor charge.

It should also have been noted that the porting charge has not changed in four years, representing a significant reduction in its level in real terms over the period, in spite of the increased number of operators and the increased complexity and expense involved in integrating new operators. Vodafone was then strongly of the view that there were no grounds either for conducting a review of the basis of the current MNP charge or for considering the possibility of regulatory intervention given that no relevant competition problem has been identified and competitive conditions in the market are robust.

Nevertheless, once ComReg decided to conduct a review, it became clear that ComReg relied heavily on the Mobistar judgement to guide its thinking in relation to setting the appropriate charge for mobile ports. However, nothing in Mobistar precluded ComReg from allowing donor operators recover a portion of their fixed costs (e.g. from enabling new entrants) from recipient operators. In the case of mobile ports, ComReg excluded fixed costs on the tenuous assertion that mobile porting could see volumes decrease to the extent that the recovery of the fixed cost element would cause porting charges to fluctuate unacceptably. ComReg has provided absolutely no evidence for such an assertion.

Vodafone agrees that in the absence of an industry agreed charge, a reciprocal cost oriented charge based on an efficient operator is appropriate. This should not however preclude the recovery of properly incurred fixed and common costs from recipient operators

Submissions to Consultation on Setting a Maximum Fixed and Mobile Number Porting Charge

2 O2 Communications Ireland Ltd.



O₂

Response to Document 08/65

Setting a Maximum Fixed and
Mobile Porting Charge

September 2008

General

O2 Ireland welcomes this opportunity to respond to ComReg's consultation and draft decision on Number Porting (NP). O2 is disappointed that ComReg's draft decision does not ensure that MNO's in Ireland are appropriately compensated for the very significant investment made in developing and implementing a "best in class" mobile porting system.

We feel it is important to reiterate that O2 does not agree with ComReg's views on the scope of costs which can be recovered through the porting charge. O2 believes that ComReg's approach of limiting the recoverable costs to incremental administrative costs is an inappropriate, incorrect, and potentially dangerous precedent for future investment by network operators.

It is widely acknowledged that the mobile porting system in Ireland is one of the best if not the best such system in Europe. The Mobile porting system has been developed at great expense and considerable investment of time and resources by Irish MNO's however, as a result of ComReg's decision MNO's will now be unable to recover the vast majority of those costs.

The disproportionate nature of ComReg's approach to allowable costs is well illustrated by reference to the Mobile porting charges being sanctioned by other European Regulators for less efficient porting systems, for example in Germany where the Regulator set a cap of 29.95 euro per port.

Response to Specific Questions

Q. 1. Do you agree with the allowable costs, in the context of mobile number porting, considered by ComReg (in table 1)? Please state the reasons for your response.

O2 does not agree with the allowable costs as defined by ComReg. In particular we believe that ComReg is wrong to disallow the cost of porting training for customer care staff and the cost of porting related customer care calls. Both of these costs are "incremental administrative costs to the porting process" as defined by ComReg and as such should be allowable.

Q. 2. Do you agree with the disallowed costs, in the context of mobile number porting, considered by ComReg (in table 1)? Please state the reasons for your response.

Please see response to Q.1.

Q. 3. Do you agree with ComReg's views on allowable costs, in the context of fixed number porting, considered by ComReg (in table 2)? Please state the reasons for your response.

Q. 4. Do you agree with ComReg's views on disallowed costs, in the context of fixed number porting, considered by ComReg (in table 2)? Please state the reasons for your response.

Q. 5. Do you agree that the existing price structure for GNP, in table 3 above, remains appropriate? If not please provide suggested amendments in your response.

Q. 6. Do you agree with Eircom's proposal to withdraw the category of charges for '2 Day Deferred Port' on the basis that there is currently no industry requirement for this type of port? Do you believe that the current categories of CLIs i.e. 1 CLI, 2-5 CLIs, etc should be refined to just three categories of CLIs i.e. 1 CLI, 2-100 CLIs and 101+ CLIs? Please provide a detailed response to both questions.

Submissions to Consultation on Setting a Maximum Fixed and Mobile Number Porting Charge

Q. 7. Do you believe that there should be a similar pricing structure, to that of GNP, for NGNP services? Under what circumstances do you believe a detailed price structure for NGNP services is warranted? Please provide a detailed response to both questions.

Q. 8. Do you agree that a maximum charge is appropriate in setting a charge(s) for fixed and mobile number porting? If not please provide detailed reasons in your response.

Given the lack of information provided by ComReg regarding the fixed porting systems and processes both in the original consultation and in this draft decision we are unable to sensibly address the specific questions listed above.

However, we believe it worth noting that ComReg's approach to allowable cost i.e. allowing "incremental administrative costs" only has as we anticipated in our original submission resulted in a situation where mobile operators that have made considerable investments in providing porting systems and processes which are world class in terms of operational efficiency and automation end up being unfairly penalised.

Conversely, fixed operators that have implemented an operationally inefficient and unreliable manual system are rewarded with higher allowable charges.

Q. 9. Do you agree, on the basis of the assessment carried out by ComReg, that a cost oriented maximum charge of €2.05 should apply to all mobile number ports out? If not please provide a detailed response.

O2 believes that a single maximum charge should apply to all mobile operators however, due to the restricted definition of allowable charges applied by ComReg and specifically some of our incremental administrative costs being excluded, the maximum is charge of 2.05 euro is incorrect.

Submissions to Consultation on Setting a Maximum Fixed and Mobile Number Porting Charge

- Q. 10. Do you agree, on the basis of the assessment carried out by ComReg, that the charges proposed in table 4 (page 23) should apply to all fixed operators in relation to ports out for GNP? If not please provide a detailed response.
- Q. 11. Do you believe that the charges for the bulk porting of geographic numbers should include the cost of technical manual handling? Please provide a detailed response.
- Q. 12. By including the cost of technical manual handling, do you believe that the charges for bulk ports are in line with Specification 1 relating to a 'fully efficient number porting process'? Please provide a detailed response.
- Q. 13. In terms of the current fixed number porting system used by Eircom, is it reasonable to automate single geographic number ports but require manual intervention for bulk ports? Please provide a detailed response.
- Q. 14. Do you agree, on the basis of the assessment carried out by ComReg, that the charges proposed in table 5 (page 23) should apply to all fixed operators in relation to successful ports out for NGNP? If not please provide a detailed response. In addition, do you believe that there should be a multiple charges, similar to GNP, for NGNP services? Please provide a detailed response.
- Q. 15. Do you agree, on the basis of the assessment carried out by ComReg, that the charge proposed in table 6 (page 23) for GNP in the context of GLUMP is appropriate and reasonable? If not please provide a detailed response.

No comment.

- Q. 16. Respondents are requested to provide views on whether the proposed directions are proportionate and justified and offer views on other factors (if any) ComReg should consider in completing its Regulatory Impact Assessment.

O2 believes that ComReg's approach of limiting the recoverable costs to incremental administrative costs is an inappropriate and dangerous precedent for future investment by network operators. The approach taken by ComReg to date in the number porting charge review and draft determination will have done little to ensure efficient investment by operators going forward.

Submissions to Consultation on Setting a Maximum Fixed and Mobile Number Porting Charge

3 Hutchinson 3G Ireland Ltd.



ANNEX 1 – CONSULTATION QUESTIONS TO COMREG 08/65

Q. 1. Do you agree with the allowable costs, in the context of mobile number porting, considered by ComReg (in table 1)? Please state the reasons for your response

Yes.

Q. 2. Do you agree with the disallowed costs, in the context of mobile number porting, considered by ComReg (in table 1)? Please state the reasons for your response

Yes.

Q. 3. Do you agree with ComReg's views on allowable costs, in the context of fixed number porting, considered by ComReg (in table 2)? Please state the reasons for your response

Q. 4. Do you agree with ComReg's views on disallowed costs, in the context of fixed number porting, considered by ComReg (in table 2)? Please state the reasons for your response

Q. 5. Do you agree that the existing price structure for GNP, in table 3 above, remains appropriate? If not please provide suggested amendments in your response

Q. 6. Do you agree with Eircom's proposal to withdraw the category of charges for '2 Day Deferred Port' on the basis that there is currently no industry requirement for this type of port? Do you believe that the current categories of CLI's i.e. 1 CLI, 2-5 CLIs, etc should be refined to just three categories of CLIs i.e. 1 CLI, 2-100 CLIs and 101+ CLIs? Please provide a detailed response to both questions

Q. 7. Do you believe that there should be a similar pricing structure, to that of GNP, for NGNP services? Under what circumstances do you believe a detailed price structure for NGNP services is warranted? Please provide a detailed response to both questions.

Q. 8. Do you agree that a maximum charge is appropriate in setting a charge(s) for fixed and mobile number porting? If not please provide detailed reasons in your response.

Yes.



Q. 9. Do you agree, on the basis of the assessment carried out by ComReg, that a cost oriented maximum charge of €2.05 should apply to all mobile number ports out? If not please provide a detailed response

Yes. However, H3GI urges ComReg to go further and seek the abolition of MNP charges. They are anti-competitive and anti-consumer. They prevent H3GI from bringing further value to the Irish mobile market. H3GI's comments are without prejudice and in addition to:

1. Its response to ComReg Consultation Doc. No. 07/21 "Consultation on Number Portability in the Fixed and Mobile Sectors" dated 25 May 2007;
2. Its letter to ComReg dated 25 March 2008; and
3. Its pricing submission to ComReg dated 25 March 2008.

Q. 10. Do you agree, on the basis of the assessment carried out by ComReg, that the charges proposed in table 4 (page 23) should apply to all fixed operators in relation to ports out for GNP? If not please provide a detailed response

Q. 11. Do you believe that the charges for the bulk porting of geographic numbers should include the cost of technical manual handling? Please provide a detailed response

Q. 12. By including the cost of technical manual handling, do you believe that the charges for bulk ports are in line with Specification 1 relating to a 'fully efficient number porting process'? Please provide a detailed response

Q. 13. In terms of the current fixed number porting system used by Eircom, is it reasonable to automate single geographic number ports but require manual intervention for bulk ports? Please provide a detailed response

Q. 14. Do you agree, on the basis of the assessment carried out by ComReg, that the charges proposed in table 5 (page 23) should apply to all fixed operators in relation to successful ports out for NGNP? If not please provide a detailed response. In addition, do you believe that there should be a multiple charges, similar to GNP, for NGNP services? Please provide a detailed response

Q. 15. Do you agree, on the basis of the assessment carried out by ComReg, that the charge proposed in table 6 (page 23) for GNP in the context of GLUMP is appropriate and reasonable? If not please provide a detailed response

Q. 16. Respondents are requested to provide views on whether the proposed directions are proportionate and justified and offer views on other factors (if any) ComReg should consider in completing its Regulatory Impact Assessment

Please see answer to question 9.

Submissions to Consultation on Setting a Maximum Fixed and Mobile Number Porting Charge

4 Meteor Mobile Communications Ltd.



**Response to Consultation and Draft Direction on:
Setting a Maximum Fixed and Mobile Number Porting
Charge**

ComReg Consultation 08/65, 15 August 2008

19 September 2008

Introduction

Meteor Mobile Communications Ltd. (Meteor) welcomes the opportunity to respond to ComReg's Draft Direction on Setting a Maximum Fixed and Mobile Number Porting Charge.

In so doing, Meteor would also like to reference responses provided to ComReg's Consultation Paper on Number Portability in the Fixed and Mobile Sectors, 25 May 2007, (Doc: 07/21) and ComReg's Request for Pricing Submission – Number Portability, 29 February 2008 (Doc: 08/09). In answering both consultation documents, Meteor clearly demonstrated that mobile number portability charges imposed since 2003 are excessive, abusive, in breach of regulation and anti-competitive.

Meteor notes that the Draft Direction has, by applying the Specification, determined that the allowable costs for the pricing of interconnection related to the provision of number portability are limited to the "incremental administrative cost to the donor operator of per-line enabling/transition costs", a cost which is considerable lower than that currently established in the market. Meteor welcomes this finding.

Meteor notes that the wholesale full mobile number porting charge (FMNP) is €20. This mobile industry standard charge level was established at the launch of mobile number portability (MNP), July 2003, following a less than satisfactory negotiation process from Meteor's perspective. At that time ComReg (ODTR) was unwilling to intervene in the determination of porting charges and Meteor had to accept the wholesale porting charge level of €20 imposed by O2 and Vodafone.

Q1. Do you agree with the allowable costs, in the context of mobile number porting, considered by ComReg (in table 1)? Please state the reasons for your response.

ComReg has determined that the allowable cost categories include the following:

- Porting support staff
- IT support staff
- Invoice production / billing operations
- Costs of calls for single and multi port escalations (wholesale)

Meteor does not dispute the cost categories as listed above.

Q2. Do you agree with the disallowed costs, in the context of mobile number porting, considered by ComReg (in Table 1)? Please state the reasons for your response.

Meteor accepts the disallowed costs in accordance with ComReg's specification on cost orientation.

Submissions to Consultation on Setting a Maximum Fixed and Mobile Number Porting Charge

5 Tesco Mobile Ireland



Tesco Mobile Ireland
3rd Floor
Building 2
Harbour Square
Crofton Road
Dun Laoghaire
Co. Dublin

Caroline Jordan
ComReg
Abbey Court
Irish Life Centre
Lower Abbey Street
Dublin 1

11 September 2008

Dear Caroline

Reference: Submission re ComReg 08/65

I refer to your consultation published on 15 August 2008 entitled *Setting a Maximum Fixed and Mobile Number Porting Charge* with document number 08/65.

Tesco Mobile Ireland (TMI) agrees that the mobile number porting out charge should be substantially reduced from its current level. In our submission of 8 February 2008 we argued that the maximum porting charge should be at €1.03. We are nonetheless content to accept ComReg's proposal for a maximum porting out charge of €2.05 which should apply to all mobile operators.

We would encourage ComReg to issue its final decision in good time so that this revised charge can apply in the shortest practicable time.

Regards

Julian Keeley
Regulatory Manager

Mobile 089 411 2283

Submissions to Consultation on Setting a Maximum Fixed and Mobile Number Porting Charge

6 Eircom Ltd.

eircom Ltd.

Response to ComReg Doc. 08/65

***Consultation & Draft Decision
on***

***Setting a Maximum Fixed and
Mobile Number Porting Charge***

DOCUMENT CONTROL

Document name	eircom Ltd. Response to ComReg Consultation Paper 08/65
Document Owner	eircom Regulatory Operations
Last updated	19 th September 2008
Version	Final
Status	Non-Confidential

I. Introduction

The obligation to ensure Number Portability under Regulation 26(1) of the Universal Service Regulations applies to all providers of publicly available telephone services and is accordingly independent of any finding of significant market power (SMP). In this context, as it is clear from the judgments of the European Court of Justice in the *Mobistar* and *Arcor* cases, the obligation of cost orientation set out in Regulation 26(2) differs from the obligation of cost orientation imposed as a remedy in the context of a finding of SMP. It follows that any principles established regarding allowable costs for the purpose of the provision of Number Portability do not and cannot be considered to set any precedent with regard to the assessment of allowable costs in the context of an obligation of cost orientation imposed following a finding of SMP. eircom's comments in this submission should be understood in this context.

It is eircom's view that, as a matter of principle, eircom is entitled to the full recovery of its legitimate costs. This means that, should ComReg disallow the recovery of these legitimate costs through the suite of Number Portability prices, eircom must be allowed recover these costs through the "Carrier Administration" conveyance charge.

II. Questions

Q1 Do you agree with the allowable costs, in the context of mobile number porting, considered by ComReg (in table 1)? Please state the reasons for your response

Not relevant for a Fixed operator.

Q2 Do you agree with the disallowed costs, in the context of mobile number porting, considered by ComReg (in table 1)? Please state the reasons for your response

Not relevant for a Fixed operator.

Q3 Do you agree with ComReg's view of allowable costs, in the context of fixed number porting, considered by ComReg (in table 2)? Please state the reasons for your response.

eircom agrees that it should be allowed to recover the incremental administrative cost of support staff involved in exporting the ported number. eircom, however, does not agree with ComReg's Draft Direction that Product Management, Sales & Marketing and Operations costs are not appropriate for recovery in the Number Portability price. Furthermore, eircom is concerned at ComReg's Draft Direction to disallow relevant overhead costs.

Q4 Do you agree with the disallowed costs, in the context of fixed number porting, considered by ComReg (in table 2)? Please state the reasons for your response.

eircom does not agree with ComReg that Operations pay costs should be disallowed. Furthermore, eircom is concerned at ComReg's draft direction to disallow relevant overhead costs.

In relation to the exclusion of overheads, ComReg appears to be adopting this position on the basis that the price should only recover short term volume dependent costs because, due to the volatile nature of the volumes ported, the inclusion of long term/fixed costs would cause the unit price to fluctuate excessively. However, eircom maintains that ComReg has defined short term volume dependent costs in too strict a sense and that it is appropriate to recover some "overheads" from pay. This is because, in any pricing model, some overheads move in line with pay costs and such costs should, accordingly, also be considered to be "volume dependent". Their inclusion would not result in changes in the pattern of unit costs. Rather, the "pay + overhead" costs would move in line with changes in volumes, contributing to a stable pattern of unit costs while ensuring that the resulting prices contribute to full cost recovery for service providers.

eircom Wholesale Product Management staff continue to be involved in the porting process to the extent that clarifications are often sought on the appropriate procedures to follow in more complex porting scenarios. This arises generally due to the low volumes of such ports and the resulting limited product expertise in the customer service centre.

The sales and marketing costs included relate to the handling of porting escalations and complaints raised through the account management process.

eircom Wholesale Operations staff are intrinsically involved in the porting process insofar as they produce and issue SLA reports. They also handle any resulting queries in relation to those reports.

The eircom staff costs provided in the cost model supporting the pricing proposed for Number Porting are direct pay costs – including only wages, pension and employer’s PRSI. For indoor staff such as those who generally process porting orders, eircom incurs a level of overhead above this level. This is made up of a number of cost categories – some of which are short term volume dependent.

The main categories that eircom find are volume dependent are:

- IT - costs of desktop resources and local support
- Accommodation – the costs of space in the call centre housing the order handling staff
- Supervision – the costs of immediate line management
- Pension liability – in addition to the cash cost of the employers contribution to the employee’s pension fund there accost reported in each period of the additional liability under IFRS guidelines
- HR – a proportion of the cost of providing human resources support to local management depends directly on the number of staff managed.

Should ComReg find that the costs other than the direct pay costs of providing the number porting service should not be recovered from the number porting charge, eircom proposes to recover these legitimate costs of providing wholesale service from the Carrier Administration charge on call conveyance.

In addition, eircom could only accept that the Number Porting charge recovers only short term volume dependent costs on the basis of the recognition that the obligation of cost orientation for Number Portability is mandated on all providers of publicly available telephone services under Regulation 26 of the Universal Service Regulations and not as a remedy following a finding of SMP. This means that eircom’s position in respect of the appropriate charge for Number Portability cannot be extended to the issue of the determination of a cost-oriented price on the basis of an obligation of cost orientation imposed following a finding of SMP. In particular, where eircom is required to offer a wholesale or interconnect service at a cost oriented price following a finding of SMP in a designated market such cost-oriented price must recover all efficiently incurred overhead costs – including a reasonable rate of return on capital employed. eircom notes in this regard that the differences between these situations in respect of setting a cost-oriented price has been recognised by the Court of Justice in the *Mobistar* and *Arcor* judgements.

Q5 Do you agree that the existing price structure for GNP, in table 3 above, remains appropriate? If not please provide suggested amendments in your response

eircom’s experience to date is that there is no demand for either the normal hours or outside normal hours versions of the Deferred Port 2 Day option. eircom proposes that this option be withdrawn.

Q6 Do you agree with eircom's proposal to withdraw the category of charges for "2 Day Deferred Port" on the basis that there is currently no industry requirement for this type of port? Do you believe that the current categories of CLI's i.e. 1 CLI, 2-5 CLIs, etc should be refined to just three categories of CLIs i.e. 1CLI, 2-100CLIs and 101+CLIs?. Please provide a detailed response to both questions

eircom supports the withdrawal of the "2 day Deferred Port" category on the basis that there is no customer demand for it.

eircom agrees with the ComReg proposal to amalgamate the 2-5CLI, 6-30CLI and 30-100 CLI categories into a single 2-100CLI category on the basis of limited demand for these services. eircom's agreement is predicated on ComReg's concurrence that the new price for this extended category is the weighted average price of its constituent parts.

Q.7 Do you believe that there should be a similar pricing structure, to that of GNP, for NGNP services? Under what circumstances do you believe that a detailed price structure for NGNP services is warranted? Please provide a detailed response to both questions.

eircom is of the view that until volumes grow to a level requiring pricing differentiation, the NGNP Number Portability structure should remain in place.

Q.8 Do you agree that a maximum charge is appropriate in setting a charge(s) for fixed and mobile number porting? If not, please provide detailed reasons in your response.

eircom agrees.

The maximum charge should be set to recover the costs of an efficient operator in the relevant market with a sustainable market share. The determination of this level of cost is usually determined by an abstract modelling exercise that uses cost inputs from the incumbent – or SMP – operator but models the volume effects for a hypothetical operator with average market share. To allow any operator to charge more than this level sends inappropriate economic signals - with a risk of encouraging inefficient entry. Certain operators may achieve lower unit costs from time to time – due to high volumes of porting activity and consequent scale effects. They may opt to raise a lower charge but should always be allowed to raise the maximum charge as the volume effects reducing their unit porting costs may be temporary. The unit cost of all operators will tend to the correct level of the maximum charge over time.

Q9. Do you agree, on the basis of the assessment carried out by ComReg, that a cost oriented maximum charge of EUR 2.05 should apply to all mobile number ports out? If not please provide a detailed response.

Not relevant for a Fixed operator.

Q10. Do you agree, on the basis of the assessment carried out by ComReg, that the charges proposed in table 4 (p.23) should apply to all fixed operators in relation to ports out for GNP? If not please provide a detailed response .

eircom does not agree with the prices produced by ComReg for the reasons outlined previously in this document.

Q11. Do you believe that the charges for the bulk porting of geographic numbers should include the cost of technical manual handling? Please provide a detailed response.

eircom believes that it is entirely reasonable to charge for technical manual handling as, due to the nature of these bulk orders, it is not possible to easily automate the process. The technician plays an integral part in the porting process.

Current demand (orders) for bulk number porting is low. However, these orders can be extremely complicated. Due to the nature of the system used, eircom is unable to validate main numbers against their DDIs. Automation of this process would require very significant system changes. The process is not easy to automate and is the most efficient under the circumstances.

Q 12. By including the cost of technical manual handling, do you believe that the charges for bulk ports are in line with Specification 1 relating to a “fully efficient number porting process”? Please provide a detailed response.

The processes involved in Number Portability are varied and complex and, for these reasons, defy attempts at full automation. More specifically, bulk number porting order volumes are low. These orders can be extremely complicated. Due to the nature of the relevant system, eircom cannot validate main numbers against their DDIs. To do this would require very significant system changes. This cannot be justified. The process is efficient and effective given the nature and the volume of OAO activity.

Q.13 In terms of the current fixed number porting system used by eircom, is it reasonable to automate single geographic number ports but require manual intervention for bulk ports? Please provide a detailed response

As per eircom’s response to Q.11, eircom believes it is entirely reasonable to have a manual intervention process for bulk number porting orders. It must be noted that the complexities involved in automating this process are very significant.

Current orders for GNP bulk number porting are low in number and intermittent in nature. These orders, often weeks apart, can be satisfactorily accommodated without any reduction in service to OAOs. However, as an efficient operator, eircom is constantly monitoring its processes and, if volumes increase to such an extent as to justify an automated process, then eircom will act accordingly.

Q14. Do you agree, on the basis of the assessment carried out by ComReg, that the charges proposed in table 5 (p.23) should apply to all fixed operators in relation to successful ports out for NGNP? If not please provide a detailed response. In addition do you believe that there should be a multiple charge, similar to GNP, for NGNP services? Please provide a detailed response.

eircom does not agree with the prices produced by ComReg for the reasons outlined previously in this document.

Q15. Do you agree, on the basis of the assessment carried out by ComReg, that the charges proposed in table 6 (p.23) for GNP in the context of GLUMP is appropriate and reasonable? If not please provide a detailed response.

eircom agrees with the proposed price of €3.50.

Q16. Respondents are requested to provide views on whether the proposed directions are proportionate and justified and offer views on other factors (if any) ComReg should consider in completing its Regulatory Impact Assessment.

eircom requests visibility of the Regulatory Impact Assessment that ComReg has carried out in this case.

Submissions to Consultation on Setting a Maximum Fixed and Mobile Number Porting Charge

7 BT Communications Ireland Ltd.



BT Response to
Setting a Maximum Fixed and Mobile Number
Porting Charge

Reference: Submission re ComReg 08/65

1. Introduction

BT notes the legal and regulatory basis for this consultation.

Our responses to the questions on fixed porting charges are as set out below.

2. Response to Questions.

Q. 1. Do you agree with the allowable costs, in the context of mobile number porting, considered by ComReg (in table 1)? Please state the reasons for your response.

A.1. BT has no comments to make in this regard.

Q. 2. Do you agree with the disallowed costs, in the context of mobile number porting, considered by ComReg (in table 1)? Please state the reasons for your response.

A.2. BT has no comment to make in this regard.

Submissions to Consultation on Setting a Maximum Fixed and Mobile Number Porting Charge

Q. 3. Do you agree with ComReg's views on allowable costs, in the context of fixed number porting, considered by ComReg (in table 2)? Please state the reasons for your response.

A.3. We agree with ComReg's views on the grounds that this is consistent with the manner in which eircom's porting charges have been evaluated.

Q. 4. Do you agree with ComReg's views on disallowed costs, in the context of fixed number porting, considered by ComReg (in table 2)? Please state the reasons for your response.

A.4. We agree with ComReg's views on the grounds that this is consistent with the manner in which eircom's porting charges have been evaluated.

Q. 5. Do you agree that the existing price structure for GNP, in table 3 above, remains appropriate? If not please provide suggested amendments in your response.

A.5. We agree that the price structure remains appropriate.

Q. 6. Do you agree with Eircom's proposal to withdraw the category of charges for '2 Day Deferred Port' on the basis that there is currently no industry requirement for this type of port? Do you believe that the current categories of CLIs i.e. 1 CLI, 2-5 CLIs, etc should be refined to just three categories of CLIs i.e. 1 CLI, 2-100 CLIs and 101+ CLIs? Please provide a detailed response to both questions.

A.6. BT believes that it would be satisfactory for *eircom* to withdraw the '2 day deferred port', however, should the industry require this in the future, this should be re-assessed with a view to speedy reinstatement. However, it should be noted that as GNP is an automated process, BT is of the view that the current 9 working day parameter is excessively long and should be revisited in the near future.

BT agrees that the categories should be refined to the following categories 2-99 and 100+.

Submissions to Consultation on Setting a Maximum Fixed and Mobile Number Porting Charge

Q. 7. Do you believe that there should be a similar pricing structure, to that of GNP, for NGNP services? Under what circumstances do you believe a detailed price structure for NGNP services is warranted? Please provide a detailed response to both questions.

BT notes that it should be similar to GNP.

Q. 8. Do you agree that a maximum charge is appropriate in setting a charge(s) for fixed and mobile number porting? If not please provide detailed reasons in your response.

A.8. We agree that a maximum charge is appropriate. It provides greater certainty and market stability in our opinion and is therefore to be welcomed.

Q. 9. Do you agree, on the basis of the assessment carried out by ComReg, that a cost oriented maximum charge of €2.05 should apply to all mobile number ports out? If not please provide a detailed response.

A.9. We have no comment to make in this regard.

Q. 10. Do you agree, on the basis of the assessment carried out by ComReg, that the charges proposed in table 4 (page 23) should apply to all fixed operators in relation to ports out for GNP? If not please provide a detailed response.

A.10. We agree with Comreg's proposed table of charges.

Q. 11. Do you believe that the charges for the bulk porting of geographic numbers should include the cost of technical manual handling? Please provide a detailed response.

A.11. We believe that the charges for the bulk porting of geographic numbers should include the cost of technical manual handling if it is a justifiable process and cost.

Submissions to Consultation on Setting a Maximum Fixed and Mobile Number Porting Charge

Q. 12. By including the cost of technical manual handling, do you believe that the charges for bulk ports are in line with Specification 1₁₆ relating to a *'fully efficient number porting process'*? Please provide a detailed response.

A. 12. Our comments are as at A.11 above.

Q. 13. In terms of the current fixed number porting system used by Eircom, is it reasonable to automate single geographic number ports but require manual intervention for bulk ports? Please provide a detailed response.

A13. Our comments are as at A.11 above.

Q. 14. Do you agree, on the basis of the assessment carried out by ComReg, that the charges proposed in table 5 (page 23) should apply to all fixed operators in relation to successful ports out for NGNP? If not please provide a detailed response. In addition, do you believe that there should be a multiple charges, similar to GNP, for NGNP services? Please provide a detailed response.

A.14. We agree that the charges proposed in table 5 should apply to all fixed operators.

We see no justifiable reason why the structure should be different between GNP and NGNP services.

Q. 15. Do you agree, on the basis of the assessment carried out by ComReg, that the charge proposed in table 6 (page 23) for GNP in the context of GLUMP is appropriate and reasonable? If not please provide a detailed response.

A.15. We agree with ComReg's assessment.

Q. 16. Respondents are requested to provide views on whether the proposed directions are proportionate and justified and offer views on other factors (if any) ComReg should consider in completing its Regulatory Impact Assessment.

A16. We agree that the directions are proportionate and justified.

Submissions to Consultation on Setting a Maximum Fixed and Mobile Number Porting Charge

8 Imagine

Submissions to Consultation on Setting a Maximum Fixed and Mobile Number Porting Charge

Q. 1. Do you agree with the allowable costs, in the context of mobile number porting, considered by ComReg (in table 1)? Please state the reasons for your response.

Imagine agrees with the principle that only incremental per port costs should be allowable. For a mobile operator with significant scale it is unlikely that additional IT support personnel would need to be allocated to support existing porting systems or that this would flex upwards with porting volumes. Therefore we do not think that this category should be included.

Q. 2. Do you agree with the disallowed costs, in the context of mobile number porting, considered by ComReg (in table 1)? Please state the reasons for your response.

Imagine agrees that all of these categories should be disallowed from number porting costs.

Q. 3. Do you agree with ComReg's views on allowable costs, in the context of fixed number porting, considered by ComReg (in table 2)? Please state the reasons for your response.

The only allowable costs should be the incremental costs associated with porting numbers. The category of "provisioning i.e. support staff costs" is broad, and within this category only genuine staff costs associated with supporting number pointing on an ongoing basis should be included. Imagine does not agree that IT support staff which are already on the operators payroll should be included as a variable costs under this category.

Q. 4. Do you agree with ComReg's views on disallowed costs, in the context of fixed number porting, considered by ComReg (in table 2)? Please state the reasons for your response.

Imagine agrees that all of these categories should be disallowed from number porting costs.

Q. 5. Do you agree that the existing price structure for GNP, in table 3 above, remains appropriate? If not please provide suggested amendments in your response.

Imagine agrees with the structure as set out.

Q. 6. Do you agree with Eircom's proposal to withdraw the category of charges for '2 Day Deferred Port' on the basis that there is currently no industry requirement for this type of port? Do you believe that the current categories of CLIs i.e. 1 CLI, 2-5 CLIs, etc should be refined to just three categories of CLIs i.e. 1 CLI, 2-100 CLIs and 101+ CLIs? Please provide a detailed response to both questions.

Imagine agrees with this proposal on the basis that it simplifies the wholesale product set and due to lack of demand for the various products.

Q. 7. Do you believe that there should be a similar pricing structure, to that of GNP, for NGNP services? Under what circumstances do you believe a detailed price structure for NGNP services is warranted? Please provide a detailed response to both questions.

Submissions to Consultation on Setting a Maximum Fixed and Mobile Number Porting Charge

The same pricing structure should be used for geographic and non geographic number porting.

Q. 8. Do you agree that a maximum charge is appropriate in setting a charge(s) for fixed and mobile number porting? If not please provide detailed reasons in your response.

The number porting charge should be a maximum charge with operators free to set lower charges at their discretion.

Q. 9. Do you agree, on the basis of the assessment carried out by ComReg, that a cost oriented maximum charge of €2.05 should apply to all mobile number ports out? If not please provide a detailed response.

A low cost, efficient number porting process is a prerequisite for competition in the mobile sector. It is therefore essential that inter-operator number portability charges are set as low as possible. To date the mobile number porting charge has been excessive and has not reflected the incremental cost of porting numbers. The proposed number porting charge of €2.05 should help to address this situation and should be further reduced in the future should the costs of providing this service decrease.

Q. 10. Do you agree, on the basis of the assessment carried out by ComReg, that the charges proposed in table 4 (page 23) should apply to all fixed operators in relation to ports out for GNP? If not please provide a detailed response.

Transferring a number in the fixed network is a similar process to transferring a number in the mobile network. Therefore it is not clear why the cost-oriented price for mobile number portability is almost 50% less than that for the fixed network. On this basis, Imagine believes that fixed number portability should be further reduced to €2.05.

Q. 11. Do you believe that the charges for the bulk porting of geographic numbers should include the cost of technical manual handling? Please provide a detailed response.

Bulk porting of geographic numbers should be done using an automated process and the costs reduced accordingly.

Q. 12. By including the cost of technical manual handling, do you believe that the charges for bulk ports are in line with Specification 1 relating to a 'fully efficient number porting process'? Please provide a detailed response.

It is not clear why porting of multiple numbers is based on a manual process while porting of single numbers is automated. It is common process in the telecoms industry for an efficient operator to automate such processes.

Q. 13. In terms of the current fixed number porting system used by Eircom, is it reasonable to automate single geographic number ports but require manual intervention for bulk ports? Please provide a detailed response.

It is not clear why porting of multiple numbers is based on a manual process while porting of single numbers is automated. It is common process in the telecoms industry for an efficient operator to automate such processes.

Submissions to Consultation on Setting a Maximum Fixed and Mobile Number Porting Charge

Q. 14. Do you agree, on the basis of the assessment carried out by ComReg, that the charges proposed in table 5 (page 23) should apply to all fixed operators in relation to successful ports out for NGNP? If not please provide a detailed response. In addition, do you believe that there should be a multiple charges, similar to GNP, for NGNP services? Please provide a detailed response.

No. Imagine believes that the porting charges for non-geographic numbers should be reduced in line with the charge for geographic numbers. In principle, the charging structures for non-geo and geo numbers should be brought together.

Q. 15. Do you agree, on the basis of the assessment carried out by ComReg, that the charge proposed in table 6 (page 23) for GNP in the context of GLUMP is appropriate and reasonable? If not please provide a detailed response.

No. Imagine believes that the GNP charge should be reduced to €2.05 in line with the mobile porting charge as the process for an efficient operator should be equivalent in the mobile and fixed networks.

Q. 16. Respondents are requested to provide views on whether the proposed directions are proportionate and justified and offer views on other factors (if any) ComReg should consider in completing its Regulatory Impact Assessment.

Imagine agrees that the proposed directions are proportionate and justified. These directions are necessary to reduce barriers to competition in the mobile and fixed telecommunications sectors to the ultimate benefit of all users of telecommunications services.

Submissions to Consultation on Setting a Maximum Fixed and Mobile Number Porting Charge

9 Magnet Networks Ltd.

Q. 1. Do you agree with the allowable costs, in the context of mobile number porting, considered by ComReg (in table 1)? Please state the reasons for your response.

Yes, as this is the only cost that an operator should have.

Q. 2. Do you agree with the disallowed costs, in the context of mobile number porting, considered by ComReg (in table 1)? Please state the reasons for your response.

Yes, as the disallowed costs are incidental to porting numbers and are generally part of the day to day business support of the provider.

Q. 3. Do you agree with ComReg's views on allowable costs, in the context of fixed number porting, considered by ComReg (in table 2)? Please state the reasons for your response.

Yes, as this is the only cost that an operator should have.

Q. 4. Do you agree with ComReg's views on disallowed costs, in the context of fixed number porting, considered by ComReg (in table 2)? Please state the reasons for your response.

Yes, as the disallowed costs are incidental to porting numbers and are generally part of the day to day business support of the provider.

Q. 5. Do you agree that the existing price structure for GNP, in table 3 above, remains appropriate? If not please provide suggested amendments in your response.

Magnet believe a charge for porting complete number ranges is appropriate e.g. a range of 100 numbers costs 100 times one number currently. Resource and work is the same or even less

Q. 6. Do you agree with Eircom's proposal to withdraw the category of charges for '2 Day Deferred Port' on the basis that there is currently no industry requirement for this type of port? Do you believe that the current categories of CLIs i.e. 1 CLI, 2-5 CLIs, etc should be refined to just three categories of CLIs i.e. 1 CLI, 2-100 CLIs and 101+ CLIs? Please provide a detailed response to both questions.

Magnet Networks only currently use the 2 Hour Port i.e. we are given a scheduled two hour window to port customers over. This fits our current needs.

Q. 7. Do you believe that there should be a similar pricing structure, to that of GNP, for NGNP services? Under what circumstances do you believe a detailed price structure for NGNP services is warranted? Please provide a detailed response to both questions.

Magnet Networks believes that there is no reason to have a different structure.

Q. 8. Do you agree that a maximum charge is appropriate in setting a charge(s) for fixed and mobile number porting? If not please provide detailed reasons in your response.

Overall I agree, however, if maximum price is set companies will charge the maximum price irrespective of their operating costs.

Q. 9. Do you agree, on the basis of the assessment carried out by ComReg, that a cost oriented maximum charge of €2.05 should apply to all mobile number ports out? If not please provide a detailed response.

Yes.

Q. 10. Do you agree, on the basis of the assessment carried out by ComReg, that the charges proposed in table 4 (page 23) should apply to all fixed operators in relation to ports out for GNP? If not please provide a detailed response.

In the telecom's world numbers are router in blocks of 100, 1,000 & 10,000. In routing tables it is easier to reroute / port a 100 block number range than it is to reroute 10 or 23 numbers for instance.

However, in the GNP proposal, the cost for porting 23 numbers will be less than porting a single 100 block of numbers.

The easiest route is to agree the proposed charges with one exception – 100 blocks of numbers should be treated differently as they are much easier to route. There should be a standard charge for these 100 blocks and it should be cheap – not the 500+ euro as outlined in the consultation, it should be less than €50 as a single port is only €5 and the effort involved in 100 is only slightly larger than the effort required for a 100 block.

Q. 11. Do you believe that the charges for the bulk porting of geographic numbers should include the cost of technical manual handling? Please provide a detailed response.

No, it should be based on efficient operator theory.

Q. 12. By including the cost of technical manual handling, do you believe that the charges for bulk ports are in line with Specification 1 relating to a 'fully efficient number porting process'? Please provide a detailed response.

No.

Q. 13. In terms of the current fixed number porting system used by Eircom, is it reasonable to automate single geographic number ports but require manual intervention for bulk ports? Please provide a detailed response.

It's reasonable to have an automated option for those carriers that have suitable systems in place however it should be cheaper price. Manual intervention should remain for bulk ports i.e. Multiple Number ranges

Q. 14. Do you agree, on the basis of the assessment carried out by ComReg, that the charges proposed in table 5 (page 23) should apply to all fixed operators in relation to successful ports out for NGNP? If not please provide a detailed response. In addition, do you believe that there should be a multiple charges, similar to GNP, for NGNP services? Please provide a detailed response.

Magnet Networks think it's reasonable to have a charge for successful NGNP Ports and yes NGNP should have a similar structure to GNP

Q. 15. Do you agree, on the basis of the assessment carried out by ComReg, that the charge proposed in table 6 (page 23) for GNP in the context of GLUMP is appropriate and reasonable? If not please provide a detailed response.

On one hand GLUMP is an automated process so the price should be cheaper than the Manual GNP/NGNP Process. On the other hand because it's automated a simple pricing structure makes sense i.e. one price

Q. 16. Respondents are requested to provide views on whether the proposed directions are proportionate and justified and offer views on other factors (if any) ComReg should consider in completing its Regulatory Impact Assessment

Yes.